

Maṇḍala I

[I.1 JPB]

I.2: Vāyu, etc. (Prauḡaśāstra)

The recipients of the various ṛcas making up these two rather simple hymns are clearly signalled. All three verses making up the first ṛca to Vāyu (vss. 1-3) open with a voc. *vāyo*; the second ṛca (to Indra and Vāyu, vss. 4-6) opens with the voc. *īndravāyū*, while the next two begin with the famous “Vāyav Indraś ca” construction (on which see Jamison 1988). The pattern is varied in the Mitra and Varuṇa ṛca (7-9), with the conjoined accusatives *mitrām* and *vāruṇaṃ ca* opening the first and second pādas of vs. 7, and the dual dvandva *mitrāvāruṇā(v)* in second position in the next two verses, first as a vocative, then as a nominative.

There appears to be some attempt to create bridges between the ṛcas: verses 3 and 4 both sketch a reversal of the usual ritual model; vss. 6 and 7 both concern our ‘insight’ (*dhī*).

I.2.2: Ge. suggests that *jarante* here can be ambiguous, belonging not only to ‘sing’, but also to ‘awaken’, with identical present stem. This is possible, but only with an intransitive sense of ‘awaken’: “the singers awaken / wake up to you,” since the ‘awaken’ present is only intrans. (see Gotō 1987: 150). In any case surely the primary sense is ‘sing’, given the the etymological figure produced by its grammatical subj. *jaritārah* ‘singers’.

I.2.3: The difficult words *dhénā* and *prapṛñcatī* complicate the interpretation of this verse. The former, investigated in detail by H.-P. Schmidt (Gd. Nyberg), is now generally interpreted as ‘(milk)stream’, rendering Geldner’s ‘lip’ and Renou’s ‘tongue’ out of date. As for *prapṛñcatī*, the simplex *pṛñcatī* appears in another Prauḡaśāstra hymn (I.23.16), modifying waters and referring to the mixing of milk (acc.) with honey (instr.). Given the similarity of context, a direct object referring to a liquid should be supplied.

What is also puzzling here is in what way the ‘stream’ is Vāyu’s: it should not originate with him, but rather be destined for him, but then why is the ‘pious man’ apparently receiving the benefit of it? As in the next verse, there seems to be a bit of role reversal here, with the gods depicted as providing the ritual benefits rather than receiving them. Presumably the point is that the pious man gets the benefit secondarily, by having pleased the god, but the dative *dāśúṣe* is striking, esp. as it is apparently parallel grammatically (though it cannot be functionally) to the dat. *sómapītaye* ending the verse. Although the verse presumably depicts the sacrificer’s offering of soma to Vāyu to drink, the lexicon and the case usage complicate the message.

I.2.4: As noted in the comment on the last verse, the ritual model here is shaken up a bit: Indra and Vāyu are urged to come *with práyobhiḥ*, a word generally used of

‘pleasurable offerings’ that are presented *to* the gods and *to which* they come (cf. VIII.60.4 *abhí práyāṃsi ... gahi*). Our translation “with delight,” agreeing with most other translators, avoids, and conceals, the problem. The gods should not be bringing *práyāṃsi*. The little disturbance of the ritual model is confined to these two verses in this hymn.

The pāda-final position of *hí* here is unusual, and I have no explanation for it, esp. as it does not take second position in its clause as is usual.

I.2.7-9: As mentioned in the intro., this ṛca contains the trio *dhī* ‘insight’ (vs. 7), *krātu-* ‘intention’ (vs. 8), and *dākṣa-* ‘skill’ (vs. 9), the three elements necessary to conceive and carry out an action. Their interconnection is emphasized by the fact that all three are in the accusative and each is stationed initial in the last pāda of its verse.

The juxtaposition across vss. 8-9 of *krátum* (beginning 8c) and *kavī* (beginning 9a) may also be meant to evoke the well-established compound *kaví-krātu-* ‘having the will/resolve of a poet’, ‘having a poet’s purpose’, an occurrence of which is found in the preceding hymn by the same poet (I.1.5).

I.2.7: Here and everywhere else it is found, the word *riśādas-*, an epithet of various gods, is opaque. There are currently two competing and entirely different interpretations: that of Karl Hoffmann (Aufs. 564 n. 16) as ‘discriminating, fastidious’ (< ‘picking at food’) and Paul Thieme’s ‘caring for the stranger’ (*Fremdling*). See EWA s.v. The contexts are not diagnostic, and it is probably the case that the epithet was no longer understood even as it was being deployed (note that it is almost always pāda-final, possibly a sign of formulaic freezing).

Throughout our translation we have followed the Thieme interpretation, but not with any great conviction. One thing in favor of the Thieme interpretation is that the word is regularly applied to one or more of the Ādityas (as here), who might be expected to show care for humans in their charge. That it is also regularly used of the less ethically inclined Maruts might give us pause (though these contexts are generally benevolent ones) – except that ‘fastidious’ is even less a likely quality of the Maruts than ‘caring for the stranger’.

I.2.8: The unaccented voc. *ṛtāvṛdhāv* opening the 2nd pāda has been thus transmitted, though we would expect **ṛtāvṛdhāv*. In fact there is a striking string of 13 unaccented syllables in this hemistich, starting after the first word of the vs., *ṛténa* (14, counting *-na*). See Old, who has no good explanation for the lack of accent on the first word of the 2nd pāda, though he considers it an old error. It cannot be simply a peculiarity of this hymn, because I.3.1b (forming part of the Praügaśastra sequence with I.2, as discussed in the publ. intro.) opens with an initially accented voc. *drávatpāñī* (to the stem *dravátpāñi-*).

I.3 (Praügaśastra continued)

As in I.2 the recipients of the various ṛcas are emphatically signalled. In vss. 1-3 to the Aśvins, the voc. *ásvinā* opens the first two verses, while their alternative

name *nāsatyā* opens the second pāda of the third. The voc. *indra* opens all three verses of the next ṛca (4-6). The Viśvedevāḥ ṛca contains three instances of that phrase: the voc. in 7b, nominatives opening vss. 8 and 9. The final ṛca to Sarasvatī likewise contains three occurrences of her name in the nominative, but all three end their pādas (10a, 11c, 12a).

I.3.2: *śāvīra-* rendered as ‘powerful’ in the publ. tr. But see disc. below ad I.30.17.

dhīṣṇya- and related forms are obscure and much discussed; indeed Ge. refuses to translate the word. We generally follow the view of Pinault (UTexas Vedic Workshop), who takes it to mean ‘related to / proper to the holy place’, thence simply ‘holy’.

I.3.3: In the compound *rudra-vartanī*, number is of course neutralized in the first member. The Maruts are regularly called Rudras (without vṛddhi or derivational suffix) after their father. The ‘course of the Rudra/Maruts’ is simply a reference to the midspace (antarikṣa) much frequented by the Maruts, where the Aśvins are now driving.

I.3.8: A small grammatical mismatch here: the phrase *viśve devāsaḥ* and the adjectives modifying it (*aptúraḥ, tūrṇayaḥ*) are nominatives and should not be the subject of the imperative *ā ganta*. Ge. (and WG) ignore the problem by translating the nom. as voc. (“Ihr Allgötter”). Although the effect is minor, my translation reflects the grammatical disjunction by rendering pāda b as an interjection.

Another question is why 7b contains the same 2nd pl. imperative, except with a different grade of the root: *ā gata* vs. *ā ganta*. Both forms are reasonably well attested, with 7b a repeated pāda (=II.41.13a, VI.52.7a). Whatever the history of the distinction, the synchronic distribution seems to be metrical, with *ā gata* almost always final, providing an iambic cadence in dimeter verse, and *ā ganta* found earlier in the verse.

In b *tūrṇayaḥ* was carelessly omitted from the tr., which should read “Come here swiftly...”

I.3.9: I follow the analysis of the hapax *éhimāyāsaḥ* as a frozen 2nd sg. imperative phrase, “*éhi mā+yāḥ*” (“come! don’t go”), transformed into an adjective in the nom. pl. masc. – an analysis that goes back at least to Sāyaṇa. Ge also follows this analysis, though it is somewhat difficult to excavate from his “willkommen und ungerne fortgelassen.” I interpret it as representing the words of the singers’ invitation regularly heard by the VDs. The other currently competing explanations, as a frozen phrase “*éhi māyā*” [better voc. *māye?*] “come here, magic” (Old) or as a deformation of *áhi-māya-* ‘vielgestaltig’ (Gr) [=‘snake-sly’ (J+B)] (BR, followed by Gr), fit less well into the content of the hymn, which after all focuses on calling the various gods to the ritual; note the *ā gata, ā ganta* of vss. 7-8 addressed to the same VDs. Support for this analysis may also come from the next hymn (I.4), attributed to the same poet,

in which successive vss. (3c, 4a) contain the imperatives *ā gahi* ‘come here’ and *pārehi* ‘go away’, with at least the former addressed to the god Indra.

I.3.11-12: Note the contrastive values of the simplex pres. *cétantī* ‘perceiving, taking note’ and the *-āya*-pres. (*prá*) *cetayati* ‘makes perceived, reveals’ in successive vss.

I.4 Indra

I.4.2: *godā(h)* of pāda c echoes *godúhe* of 1b. I consider pāda c a proverbial expression – when a rich man is pleased, he gives cows – though it’s obviously applied to Indra here.

I.4.4: Striking is the abrupt change of subject of the 2nd sg. imperatives, from Indra (3c) to an unidentified human companion (4a).

My interpretation differs substantially from those of most others in pāda b. In my view, the accusative *índram* marks Indra as the one directly interrogated, rather than (with most interpretations) the one to be asked about. Most interpreters take *vipaścítam* as identifying the person to be interrogated (e.g., Ge. “einen Weisen”), thus assuming two different referents for the accusative singulars in that pāda: “ask the wise one about Indra.” I find that unlikely, in part because, though *vipaścít-* can be used of humans, it more often qualifies gods.

Taking Indra as the one interrogated has further effects on the interpretation. For others the relative clause in c has Indra as its subject (*yáh*) and the 2nd ps. *te* refers to the human interrogator: it is Indra who is dear(er) to you, the poet, than your comrades. I, on the other hand, take pāda c as a syntactic hybrid, with an underlying direct discourse question, directed to Indra, “who [expected *káh*] is your choice from among your comrades?” incompletely converted into a relative clause in indirect discourse “ask (Indra) about (the one) who [*yáh*] is your [=Indra’s] choice...” In my view the 2nd ps. ‘your’ of “your choice” in pāda c refers to Indra, not to the subject of the imperatives *pārehi* and *prchā* of ab, while Indra is in the 3rd ps in pāda b. (I will not even contemplate the possibility that *prchā* in b is a 1st ps subjunctive: “Go away. I will ask / let me ask Indra...”)

Although this interpretation complicates the syntax, in my opinion it fits better into its *tr̥ca* and better reflects the relationship between Indra and humans. As often in Indra contexts, the poet worries that Indra will favor others over the poet himself, and this verse poses the question directly to Indra: who do you like best? Indra’s presumed and desired answer is “you!” This answer then allows the poet to dismiss those who criticize him for not spreading his devotion around to other gods (vs. 5) and defends this exclusive focus as a good bargain, as the rest of the world has to admit (vs. 6).

I should admit, however, that the standard view is somewhat compatible with my larger interpretation, in that “... ask about Indra, who is your [=poet’s] choice from among your comrades” could reinforce that message that our focus is only on

Indra, not on other gods. But I do not see how questions *about* Indra fit with the next two verses.

I.4.5-6: Most interpretations take these two verses as syntactically parallel (e.g., Ge. “Mögen ... Und mögen ...”), but the impv. *bruvantu* and the opt. *vocéyuh* are surely doing different things: the imperative is concessive: “let them say / even if they say ...” while the optative expresses the conclusion that the rest of the world would have to draw. The parallel *utá*’s that open these verses might give us pause, but they may have something like the value “on the one hand ... on the other.”

I.4.7: (JL) The b and c pādas both end with an adjective modifying the implicit object soma, a compound of the root \sqrt{mad} ‘exhilarate’ (the second time in its byform *mand*) and a noun expressing the personal object of the verb, but in exactly opposite order: *nṛ-mādana-* and *mandayát-sakha-*, what might be called a “compound chiasmus.” A less complex etymological figure is found at the beginning of the verse: *āśúm āśáve*.

I.4.8: My occasional tr. of *ghaná-* as ‘bane’ was inspired by my husband’s treatment of etymologically related nominal constructions in Greek and Germanic (Watkins 1996: 418ff., 423). I think JL for reminding me of this.

I.4.9: (JL) Etymological figure also in *vājeṣu vājínam*, immediately followed by *vājáyāmasi*, which, however, is synchronically distinct from the ‘prize’ words.

I.4.10: There may be bit of ring composition here, with 10b *supārāḥ* echoing the first word of the hymn, 1a *surūpa-*.

I.5 Indra

I.5.1: Seems deliberately to echo the last vs. of the preceding hymn (I.4.10), with pāda b *índram abhí prá gāyata* “sing forth to Indra” matching I.4.10c *tásmai índrāya gāyata* “sing to him, to Indra” (the difference in case being governed by the presence of the preverb *abhí* in I.5.1). I.4.10 is then exactly repeated in I.5.4c. The *sákhāyaḥ* of I.5.1c also recalls I.4.10b *sákhā* — though the latter refers to Indra and the former to the priest-poets. But I.4.4c contains a pl. *sákhibhyaḥ*, which in our analysis has the same human referents as I.5.1, showing the reciprocal relation between men and gods that was one of the points of I.4.

I.5.2: *purūtámam purūṇām* is pleonastic, meaning literally “the first of many, of the many ones.”

I.5.3: My interpretation of these sentences as questions is not overtly marked in the text, but seems a reasonable use of the subjunctives.

I.5.5: The double dative *sutapāvne ... vītāye* with *yanti* is more literally “... go to the soma-drinker [lit. ‘pressed (soma) drinker’] to pursue (him).”

I.5.10: A whiff of ring composition – 10c *īśānaḥ* ‘having control over’ echoes 2b *īśānam*, both modifying Indra. In 2b the god controls something undeniably positive, “choice things,” which he will presumably distribute to this favorites. In 10a he controls “the deadly weapon” that other mortals might wield against us. The identity of expression ties together the very different sentiments.

I.6 Indra and the Maruts (per Anukr.)

As noted in the intro. the Anukramaṇī’s identification of the divinities as Indra (1-3, 10), Maruts (4, 6, 8-9), and Indra and Maruts (5, 7) does not conform to the content of the hymn, which is quite disjointed, but appears to concern, at least in part, the Vala myth. The Maruts do not seem to figure at all in the hymn; the plural entities with Indra are probably the Aṅgirasas. For my view of the structure (which is informed by the discussions of Ge and Old), see publ. intro.

I.6.1-2: These verses begin identically (*yuñjānti* ‘they yoke’), inviting the audience to equate the action of the two verses.

1b: The referent of the apparent acc. plural *tasthúṣaḥ* ‘(those) standing still’ is not given. Ge. (/WG) thinks it refers to stable things on the earth, but if the sun is referred to in the first pāda, it is more likely to “move around” celestial features than earthly ones, and the stars or other luminous heavenly bodies are referred to in the next pāda. Re’s interpretation (flg. Ludwig) of *tasthúṣaḥ* as an abl. sg. (“from the one standing still” – “à partir de (l’espace) immobile”) is ingenious and would match the minor syntactic idiom ‘yoke from ABL’ (e.g., I.115.4 *yadéd áyukta harítaḥ sadhásthāt*), so it cannot be dismissed. The ablatives in the final verses (9-10) might lend weak support for Re’s view.

2b: The hapax compound *vīpakṣasā* is difficult and has been variously interpreted. The second member, *pākṣas-* (and related and more common *pākṣá-*), can mean either ‘wing’ or ‘side’; the first member, *vī-*, is most likely the preverb *vī*, but in compounds this element has a number of possible meanings: ‘without’, distant’, ‘wide’, ‘alternating/opposite/different’, ‘dispersed’. It could also possibly represent *vī-* ‘bird’, which has been claimed as the first member of some other compounds (see EWA s.v. *váy-*, KEWA III.266). The possible combinations of these two ambiguous elements allow for a number of interpretations. I more or less follow the Sāy/Gr interpretation, ‘auf beiden Seiten des Wagens gehend’, though I take it as an adverbial instrumental, not a dual. (The presence of a number of duals in *-ā* in the verse does not favor an adverbial interpretation, however.) Re’s “aux ailes d’oiseau” obviously takes the first member as the ‘bird’ word, while WG “die mit weiten Flügeln” takes *vī* as the preverb, but with the second member meaning ‘wing’ as in Re’s interpretation. Ge’s ‘auseinanderstrebenden(?)’ treats the second member quite loosely.

I.6.3: The baffling part of this verse is the voc. plural *maryāḥ* ‘o young men’ in b, embedded in a verse that otherwise has 2nd singular reference (*ajāyathāḥ* c, along with sg. ptcpl. *kṛṇvān* in a). There is no clear referent for this voc., though it may refer to the unidentified plural subjects of the verbs in vss. 1-2 (*yuñjānti*) and 4 (*eriré*). In the plural *márya-* is often used of the Maruts, which may account for the Anukramaṇī identification of them as divinities of the hymn. Though Ge suggests they may constitute the audience for the singer and Re that they are the singers themselves, this seems unlikely because when *márya-* has an identifiable referent, it is never a human. I tentatively assume that it refers to the Aṅgirasas as the fire-priests who first kindled Agni, the subject of the verse.

As for the subject of *ajāyathāḥ*, contrary to most interpretations I take this as primarily referring to Agni, not the sun, though perhaps, with Re, “Agni solaire.”

I.6.4: Grammatically problematic is the accent on the verb *eriré* in b, a fact that seems to have been elided in most translations, including mine. Old suggests that the particle *áha* may have conditioned the accent, but this seems unlikely because *áha* doesn’t have this effect elsewhere. I would now alter the translation to make vs. 4 syntactically dependent on vs. 3, without an overt subordinator. Thus, “you were born together with the dawns, / (as/when) just after that they once again roused ...” Again, though most commentators (save Old) consider this to concern the rebirth of the sun, I think it more likely that Agni/the ritual fire is the object, esp. as *erire +/- ní* is regularly used of establishing the ritual fire (e.g., I.134.4). As for c, the service to the ritual fire of the unnamed subjects (=Aṅgirasas?) would account for their receiving a name worthy of the sacrifice; see, e.g., I.72.3.

I.6.5: As noted in the intro., this verse helps resolve the unclear referents in the earlier part of the hymn by giving a relatively clear sketch of the Vala myth, with Indra finding the cows after his companions “break the stronghold (=Vala).”

I.6.6: This verse contains, in my opinion, what Re might call a “legère zeugma,” in which the verb *anūṣata* “they bellowed” takes (as is usual) an acc. of the target of the bellowing (“to the finder of goods,” i.e., Indra) in the frame, but in the simile it takes an acc. of the content of the bellowing (“their thought”). Ge avoids this mismatch of acc. function by removing *matīm* from the simile by supplying a form of $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ ‘bear, present’, leaving *devayāntaḥ* as the only term directly compared in the simile: “Wie Gottverlangende, die das Lied [vortragen], so haben die Lobreden ... hergerufen.” It is certainly true that *matí-* is common as the object of $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ and that \sqrt{nu} doesn’t normally take an acc. of content, but since the poet of the hymn has pushed the linguistic limits elsewhere, I prefer to think he meant the jarring figure. Note that there is also a mismatch between the two subjects, with the simile referring, implicitly, to human actors, while the frame has ‘songs’ (*gírah*) as subject (unless we take the Aṅgirasas or the cows as subj. and allow *anūṣata* to take two accusatives: “they bellowed their songs to the finder of goods” – however, \sqrt{nu} doesn’t take two acc., to my knowledge).

The zeugma may iconically represent the fact that the verse connects across a temporal gap as well: the simile seems to refer to present-day worshippers producing their praise, but the frame (with augmented verb form) refers to the mythic past of the Vala tale. This verse thus serves as a transition to the here-and-now of the current ritual, which is treated in vs. 7.

I.6.7: As noted in the intro., this verse pairs structurally with vs. 3; I therefore take Agni to be the subject, with the verse expressing the kindling of the fire at the time when Indra arrives to receive the morning offering.

The form *dṛkṣase* is isolated, but its grammatical identity is fairly clear (see Narten, Sig. Aor. p. 146): a 2nd sg. mid. *s*-aor. subj. with the “wrong” grade of the root (expect **darkṣase*); it is probably based immediately on the other *s*-aor. middle form, 3rd pl. indic. *adrkṣata* (5x, once accented) of the same metrical shape (minus augment), which always appears final, as does *dṛkṣase*, and usually in dimeter verse as here.

The two beings in pādas ab, one as unexpressed sg. subj. of the verb, one in the instr., are then referred to as a pair in the du. nom. of pāda c, the predicate of an unexpressed nominal sentence “you two are...”

I.6.8: The Aṅgirasas are presumably the referents of the instr. phrases, and the verse is, like 5, a pretty clear allusion to the Vala myth.

I.6.9: As suggested in the intro., this is the last real verse of the hymn, as vs. 10 is a mere variant of 9, and it shows a bit of ring composition: the *diváḥ ... rocanāt* echoes *rocanā diví* of 1c, and if we were to accept Re’s interpr. of 1b *tasthúṣaḥ* as an ablative, the ablatives *átah* and *rocanāt* would match it grammatically.

This is a rare example of the present middle *ṛñj* not taking an acc. (see Tucker 2002: 284 n.17, HS 115 “RV rgmín-, ṛgmíya- and ṛñjate”). (JL)

I.7 Indra

I.7.1: *anūṣata* provides a link to the immediately preceding hymn, I.6.6.

I.7.2: Though a number of interpreters (Gr, WG, Scar) take *vacoyújā* as an instr. sg. and supply *ráthena* ‘chariot’, this form otherwise (4x) is only du. and modifies *hárī* ‘the two fallow bays’. Thus, it seems better to follow the Sāy/Ge/Re interpr. As Ge points out, the untethered *ā* in b allows a form of $\sqrt{sthā}$ to be supplied, in the idiom $\bar{a} \sqrt{sthā}$ ‘mount’. The verse is then slightly unusual in referring to Indra’s twin horses in two grammatical cases in the same sentence (*hároḥ* loc., [*hárī*] *vacoyújā* acc.).

I.7.3: A more felicitous tr. of *dīrghāya cákṣase* might be “to be seen for a long time,” but “for the long view” allows the phrase to be read as referring to either time or space (“to be seen for a long distance”) or both.

The usage of the instr. *góbhiḥ* is somewhat strange; it is clearly not meant either as an instr. of agent/instrument or of accompaniment, at least of simple accompaniment. It might be an instr. of separation, or, as in this tr., an adjunct or accompaniment to the obj.: “the rock (which was) with cows.” ET points out to me that such a construction would be very unusual; I suggest that it could derive from an instr. of accompaniment: “the rock along with its cows.”

I.7.6: For the pot, see intro. The doubling of the 1st pl. pronoun (*naḥ* in a, *asmábhyam* in c) is probably simple redundancy, with *naḥ* a Wackernagel placeholder at the beginning of the sentence, anticipating the full pronoun that opens c. However the *naḥ* could possibly be construed with the voc. *sátrādāvan* ‘who give in every way’ in b, though it seems a bit distant from the enclitic.

I.7.7: Improper relative, as shown best by Re’s rendering, “Les corps-de-louange qui, poussée, (vont toujours) plus haut...” (Re’s suspension dots). The masc. nom. pl. *yé ... stómāḥ* of ab has no matching grammatical referent in the main clause of c, though it is picked up by its semantic and etymological equivalent, fem. sg. *susṭutí-*.

I.7.8: Connected to vs. 6 by shared vocab., *vṛṣan-* (a) and (the rather rare) *ápratiṣkuta-*, though separated by vs. 7.

I.7.9: Incomplete sentence, consisting only of rel. cl., completed by main cl. of 10. The *ékaḥ* opening this last sentence of the hymn and the *kévalaḥ* ‘exclusively’ that is its last word are more insistent counterparts of *íd* in the opening pādas of vss. 1-2. Once again Madhuchandas seems to be faintly signalling ring composition.

I.8 Indra

I.8.2: Incomplete sentence, with relative hanging off *rayím* ‘wealth’ in the previous verse. Two methods of fighting are contrasted: ‘fighting (*-hatyā-*) by fist’ (*muṣṭi-*, my ‘bare-knuckled’) and ‘on horseback’ (*árvatā*). Although the two terms are grammatically parallel (instrs. *muṣṭi-hatyáyā* and *árvatā*), they are not semantically, since it’s the first member of the compound, *muṣṭi-* that corresponds to *árvatā*, and ‘fighting’ must be supplied with the second term.

The verse shows overt signs of late grammatical features: esp. the *-ai* ending of the middle subjunctive *ruṇádhāmahai* (rather than *-e*), but also the longer *-ā*-stem instr. *-áyā* (rather than *-ā*), though of course the latter is fairly well distributed throughout the RV.

I.8.3: Concatanation of *tvótāsaḥ* (pāda a) with the same form in 2c, though the one in 2c requires distraction (*tuvo-*), but not the one in 3a. Ge/Re take *ghanā* as (an archaic) instr. sg., but nom. pl. *ghanā(ḥ)* seems preferable, esp. as Madhuchandas uses the same word in the sg. as a personal designation in I.4.8 (where it applies to Indra and which I tr. ‘bane’). So Old. Although designating animate beings (namely

“us”) as “hammers” may seem unusual, it’s not unprecedented, at least in English: cf. the rock song entitled “Sometimes you’re the hammer and sometimes you’re the nail,” and (gleaned from Google) a quotation from an American poet unknown to me, Edwin Markham (1852–1940), “For all your days be prepared, and meet them ever alike. When you are the anvil, bear – when you are the hammer, strike.”

I.8.6: The whole verse is a relative clause with accented verb (*yá āśata*), with no overt antecedent available in either the preceding or the following vs. My solution follows Old, who suggests that it implicitly hangs off vs. 5: Indra’s power is (for those) who... This fits the message of the hymn, that men’s success is entirely dependent on Indra’s aid and intervention, a message that is reinforced by the interdependence of various vss. already noted (1-2 [main cl., rel. cl.], 2-3 [lexical concatenation]) and to be described below [7-10].

Though *āśata* lacks expressed obj., ‘him’ (=Indra) should be supplied, on the basis of passages like I.85.7, VIII.97.9.

In the publ. tr. I follow Gr’s deriv. of *samohá-* from *sám* $\sqrt{ūh}$ ‘shove together’, but I now think that it is better analyzed as *sa-mohá-* to \sqrt{muh} ‘be confused’ (see comm. ad IV.17.13) and would slightly modify the tr. here to “in the confusion (of battle).”

I.8.7: Yet another untethered rel. cl. In my view, the description of Indra’s physical capacity serves as the basis for the expressions of Indra’s vast liberality and help in vss. 8-9, each of which begins with *evá hí* “for just in the same way.” Therefore the *yáḥ* ‘which’ of 7a seems a substitute for *yáthā* ‘even as’, the usual relative with *evá*. Although I do not so translate it, 7-8 could be rendered “even as his cheek ... swells ..., even so is his liberality...”

For *kukṣí-* as ‘cheek’, not ‘belly’, see Jamison 1987 (Gs. Cowgill).

I.8.8: The image of Indra’s generosity as “a ripe branch” is an unusual one; I do not know of a parallel. In any case, “ripe branch” must be a condensed expression for something like a branch laden with ripe fruit. (JL)

I.8.10: Despite sharing the *evā hí* opening with vss. 8-9, this verse is not entirely parallel with those two, which express the vastness of Indra’s liberality and help. Here it is what we owe Indra, praise and recitation, that are implicitly suggested to be as vast as what he gives us. A tr. more parallel to the previous two verses would be “Just the same [that is, just as vast] are those things beloved of him, the praise-song and recitation to be proclaimed ...” However, I favor the published tr., with *sámṣyā* ‘to be proclaimed’ as predicate, because it provides a hortatory end to the hymn.

I.9 Indra

I.9.1: *somapárvan-* ‘soma-joint’ could refer either to the segments of the stalk of the soma plant (e.g., Re) or to the segments of the Soma Sacrifice (e.g., WG). Ge

suggests it's a word play. It is difficult to judge, but I weakly favor the horticultural interpretation.

There is no explicit 2nd ps. in c, but the general interpretation of this pāda as referring to Indra seems correct.

I.9.2: For the doubling of the enclitics *īm enam* see Jamison 2002.

I.9.6: With Re I take the two acc. pl. *-vant-*adjectives (*rābhasvataḥ ... yáśasvataḥ*) as proleptic, with the acquisition of these qualities being the result of Indra's impelling of us – rather than taking them as qualities we already possess, as most translators do.

I.9.8: *rathín-* should of course mean 'possessing chariots' or express some looser association with a chariot or chariots (such as Re's "carried on chariots") but since there's no obvious association of refreshments with chariots, an idiomatic and figurative use like Ge's "wagenvoll" seems appropriate – hence my "by the cartload."

I.9.9: In my view *grṇánta(h)* is an instance of the comparatively rare (but more common than generally supposed) predicated present participle. Other translators (Ge, Re, WG) take the participle as attributive and consider the sentence incomplete.

I.9.10: As Thieme (Fremdling, pp. 11f.) points out, the verse sets up an implicit contrast between Indra, who is "at home" (*nyòkas-*) wherever soma is pressed, and the stranger – but this opposition also implicitly suggests that, despite being a stranger or foreigner, any man can offer soma and praise to Indra, who will make himself at home in those foreign parts. This contrast would be better expressed by "even the stranger chants..." rather than the published "the stranger himself chants..."

The position and function of *ā* (embedded in *éd*) in b are unclear. The verb \sqrt{arc} doesn't take *ā* and in any case preverbs don't usually ended up stranded in the middle of a pāda (of course the etymological figure *bṛhád bṛhaté* could have been fronted around it); a mid-pāda position suggests a role as adposition, but as an adposition *ā* doesn't take a dative.

I.10 Indra

I.10.1: The first three pādas almost, but not quite, provide a tripartite ritual speech division: Sāmaveda, Ṛgveda, X? Veda. The last is the problem: the "formulators" don't work very well as speakers of Yajurveda yajuses, and it's too early for the brāhmaṇa priest to be associated with the Atharvaveda, as in later Vedic.

Pace most translators, pf. *yemire* is ordinarily presential in value; see Kümmel s.v. *yam*.

I.10.2: Most translators take the subject of ab to be the sacrificer, but Indra seems a more likely candidate, esp. since *kártva-* 'to be done' is regularly used of the prospective deeds of Indra (e.g., II.30.10, IV.18.2, VIII.63.6).

I.10.3: On *hí* with the imperative marking that clause as the causal basis of the next clause, here initiated by the logical connector *átha*, see Brereton 2012 [Bronkhorst Fs.].

I.10.5: *rārānat*: pf. subj. with presential value, like the whole pf. system of this root. See Kümmel s.v. *ran* and Jamison (García Ramón Fs).

I.10.6: The case usage here is somewhat odd, in that the three benefits we beg Indra for, in strict parallel structure, are in loc., dat., and loc. respectively (underlying forms *sakhitvé ... rāyé ... suvīrye*). However, all end in *-e* — showing that surface phonetic agreement can sometimes trump case function.

The transformation of an epithet (*śakrá-* ‘able’) into its associated verb (*śakat* ‘he will be able’) is a neat little figure and demonstrates the importance of gods’ dynamically living up to their verbal attributes. (For the almost identical pāda see VIII.32.12.) It is an example of a type of verbal transformation of divine epithets into desired divine action that Elizarenkova (1968: 267–68) attempted to claim as the, or an, organizing principle of RVic hymnic composition., despite its relative rarity. Of the other standard translations, only Re (“... le puissant; qu’il exerce .. sa puissance”) captures the etymological figure.

I.10.7: The two compounds in pāda a, *suvivṛtaṃ sunirājam*, do not occur elsewhere and are grammatically and interpretively ambiguous. The semantic reference of the two words is clear — the easy opening (*vī√vr̥*) of the Vala cave and the easy driving out (*nir√aj*) of the cows, using the standard lexemes for those actions — but 1) what are their stems? and 2) assuming they are adjectival, what do they modify? Gr/Lub analyse them as *-a*-stems -- also AiG II.1, though AiG II.2 takes *sunirājam* as belonging to an *a*-stem (p. 86) but *suvivṛtam* to a root noun (p. 43) [and Hauschild’s Index to AiG lists them both as root nouns, somewhat emphatically] -- while, e.g., Old and Scar take both as root nouns. There is another formal anomaly: the pāda they form, *suvivṛtaṃ sunirājam*, has only one internal heavy syllable, the final syllable of the first word, where the initial consonant of the second makes position. A very unusual metrical line. Arnold (VM 125–26, 290) suggests the possibility of reading *suvivṛtam* on the basis of the lengthening of the final vowels of the preverbs *ápi*, *abhí*, *pári*, etc., before forms of *√vr̥*. Thanks to ET for pointing this out.

As to their reference, the general approach has been to take them as modifying an unexpressed *índram*, supplying the whole structure of 6a (*tám ... īmahe* “we beseech him”) or some similar verb phrase to provide a grammatically acceptable referent for the two forms in 7a. But this solution is not very satisfying: Indra appears in the 3rd ps. *nominative* in 6c and as 2nd ps. *vocative* and *subject* of impv. in 7bcd, so extracting an acc. from a pāda in the past seems arbitrary. Scar suggests that the two words might instead modify *yásah* in b, which has the merit of providing a referent close by; however, this would technically eliminate the possibility that the two are root nouns, since *yásah* is neut. and presumably nom., and

if the two words in pāda a are root nouns, they can only be acc. sg. I am nonetheless attracted by this solution (and would therefore be open to the *-a*-stem interpretation), with the possible modification that the two might actually be nouns (“the easy opening ..., the easy driving ...”) that specify the glory (*yáśaḥ*) of b. I have not troubled myself to figure out how the accent and other details of the formation would work, however.

On the possible double sense of *tvādātā* in b, see publ. intro.

I.10.8: *jéśaḥ*: The standard translation take this *s*-aor. subj. as a functional impv. parallel to *dhūnuhi* in d, whereas I take it as having real subjunctive value. This has the merit of providing a main clause to the subordinated *hí* clause of ab. Moreover, the otherwise identical pāda VIII.40.10 with 3rd sg. subj. *jéśat* has clear subjunctive value, and in addition there is already a well-attested “*-si* imperative” *jéśi* (7x) that fills that function for the *s*-aor., so it seems unlikely that *jéśaḥ* would be so used.

I.10.9: *āśrutkarṇa śrudhī*... shows the same transformation of an epithet into a derivationally related divine action as 6c.

I.10.10: Takes the verb phrase of 9a *śrudhī hávam* and elaborates on both its members, with b *havanaśrútam* and c *hūmahe*.

I.10.11: Kuśika is the ancestor of the Viśvāmitras, the family to which our poet belongs. As this is the last hymn attributed to Madhuchandas in this set, an ancestral reference is in order.

I.11 Indra

I.11.1: The phraseology involving “songs” (*gírah*) and “strengthening” ($\sqrt{vṛdh}$) matches that of the last verse of the preceding hymn (I.10.12) attributed to the father (or other ancestor) of this poet.

“Lord of prizes and lord of settlements” in d may set up an implicit contrast between battle and battle-like activity (contests with prizes) and peace.

I.11.2: “Conquerer” (*jétar-*) as epithet of Indra here may be responsible for the poet’s name Jetar in the Anukramaṇī.

I.11.3: Though the printed text reads *yádī* ‘if’, with (as often) lengthened final vowel, nothing prevents us from taking this as *yád ī*, ‘when’ + enclitic acc. pronoun, anticipating the expressed acc. obj. For this phenomenon, see Jamison 2002.

I.11.5: Though it may seem odd that the enemy Vala is called ‘fearless’, the other solution, to take *ábibhyuśaḥ* as an “irregular” nom. pl. masc. pf. part. (expect *ábibhīvāṃsaḥ*) (so Sāy/Old), is not satisfying, esp. as it’s hard for me to see how the gods could be both “fearless” and “being pushed back” (although ET points out that

they could have come to Indra’s aid without fear, even though being pushed back). The question is what syntactic function the gen./abl. *ābibhyuṣaḥ* is fulfilling. Re seems to take it as a gen. agent with *tuḥjyāmānāsaḥ* (“pressés par le (dieu) sans peur”), but gen. agents are rare and confined to semantically and grammatically specialized situations (see Jamison 1979), and an ablative value “before,” as implied by Ge, seems better. Since expressions of fearing take the ablative, we can even assume an underlying implicit contrast: “the gods, (fearful) of [=from] the fearless one...”

I.11.6: Although Ge suggests simply that the poet is announcing Indra’s gifts to the river of his native land, this may have a further mythological reference. Esp. in X.108 (Saramā and the Paṇis), the (Vala) cave in which the Paṇis have trapped Indra’s cows is on the edge of the world, across the river (Rasā) that borders the world. Here the poet may be evoking this myth to indicate the efforts that he (and Indra) must expend to retrieve the good things his community desires, and to emphasize that poets and wise men (see also vs. 7) must bear witness to Indra’s deeds performed far away in order to attract his munificence.

I.12 Agni

I.12.6: The plethora of ritual fires implied by the āmreḍita *agnīm-agnim* in vs. 2 is made more explicit in this expression of the kindling of one fire by another, presumably (as Ge suggests) through the taking out of the Āhavanīya fire from the Gārhapatya, much treated in the later ritual lit. The Āhavanīya may be referred to in 5a *ghṛta-āhavana-* ‘whose oblation is ghee’, and in this vs. the second pāda (6b) might contain allusions to the three ritual fires, *grhāpati-* ‘household’ a transparent reference to the Gārhapatya and *yúvan-* ‘youth’ referring to the newly kindled Āhavanīya (see pāda a). However, this would leave *kavī-* ‘poet, sage-poet’ as a designation of the Dakṣināgni, which doesn’t make a lot of sense, as far as I can see.

I.13 Āprī

I.13.5: The singular *amṛtasya* ‘of the immortal’ seems to refer to the collectivity of gods who will come to the sacrifice and sit on the barhis. Vss. 7, 9 name some of the individual gods who will sit on the barhis.

I.14 All Gods

I.14.3: All these gods names are in the accusative, but there is no verb to govern them, either in the verse or in the immediately preceding or following pādas. One solution is to reach back to 2a *ā ACC káṇvā ahūṣata* “The Kaṇvas have called ACC here,” though skipping over the intervening syntactic constructions is not appealing. However, the recurrence of a similar construction in 5ab *īlate ACC ... káṇvāsaḥ* “The Kaṇvas solemnly invoke ACC” may suggest that the structure of invocation underlies the hymn.

I.14.6: By making pāda a a nominal sentence, from which the relative clause of bc hangs, I avoid the need to supply a main clause verb for c that other tr. encounter. E.g., Ge “Die ... Fahrrosse, die dich fahren, (mögen) die Götter ... her(fahren).” However, in the following vs. (7) Agni himself is urged to bring the gods here, so lumping together the transport of Agni and the gods as in my interpretation of 6 may not be in the spirit of their separation in 7. Nonetheless, I still feel that the syntactic argument is strong.

I.14.7: The ab pādas literally mean “make (the gods) possess wives,” but we know from the ritual that this refers to the coming of the gods *along with* their wives. Cf. III.6.9 *pātmīvataḥ ... devān ... ā vaha*. Ge translates our phrase literally: “Die Opferwürdigen ... mache beweibt,” but then paraphrases it in his note: “D. h. bring ihre Frauen mit.” The problem would be solved by supplying the preverb *ā*, because *ā √ kr* generally means ‘bring/attract here’. Although I am generally loathe to supply material without a clear warrant, it is the case that the immediately preceding pāda, 6c, begins with *ā*, which might have been taken to have domain over what follows.

I.14.9: The hapax *ākīm* (so, e.g., Gr, Aufr, HvN, Lub) or, more likely, *ā kīm* contains what is apparently a now meaningless particle *kīm*, matching the shape of the acc. particles *īm* and *sīm*. Though clearly derived from the interrogative **k^u*-stem, it has lost all interrogative value, presumably “laundered” through the weak negative indefinites *nā kīm* (or *nākīm*) and *mā kīm* (or *mākīm*). It is not at all clear what, if anything, *kīm* is doing here.

I.14.10: Instrumental plurals begin (*vīśvebhiḥ*) and end (*dhāmabhiḥ*) the verse. The question is whether they should be construed separately or together. Ge chooses the latter path: “Mit allen Verkörperungen des Mitra (der Freundschaft).” But because the hymn is dedicated to the Vīśve Devas and there is an emphasis on them throughout (see esp. vss. 1, 9, with ‘gods’ or words referring to them collectively in vss. 2, 6, 7, 8), I prefer to supply ‘gods’ with *vīśvebhiḥ* and take *dhāmabhiḥ* separately (sim. Re, WG), interpreting *mitrāsya* not as the god’s name (or not principally the god’s name) but as referring to the alliance that undergirds the sacrificial system.

I.14.12: The construction involving the normally causal particle *hī* and the imperative is a troubling one. Brereton (2012 Bronkhorst Fs.) plausibly argues that in cases like this, with two imperative clauses in sequence, the *hī* clause expresses the action necessary for the second one to take place. In other words, the usual causal value of *hī* is found there as well, though the addition of imperative modality makes it difficult to render in English.

I.15 Sequential deities (for the ṛtugrahas)

Although this hymn is in some ways a rote and formulaic listing of the Ṛtugraha deities with invitations to drink of their respective cups, the poet does inject some life in the hymn by varying the expected phraseology. After having established the formula DRINK *ṛtúnā* in the first few verses, the poet introduces deviations from that formula. In vs. 5 he urges Indra to drink not from the Brahman's cup (as would be standard: see II.36.5), but from the Brahman's "largesse" (*rādhasaḥ*) and *ṛtūṁ ánu* substitutes for *ṛtúnā* (note the phonological crossing of *únā: ánu*). In vs. 6 there is no invitation to drink, though *ṛtúnā* is found in another expression. In vs. 7 the expected deity ("Wealth-giver") appears in the nominative (*draviṇodā(h)*) as expected, but there is no attached predicate: the verse goes off in a different direction. The Wealth-giver is the subject of the next three verses (8-10) as well, but it is only in vs. 9 that any drinking goes on. Here the imperative "drink!" is replaced by the desiderative "desires to drink" (*pipīṣati*), and though there is an ablative of a priestly cup, it is one belonging to a different priest and the verb used with it is not 'drink'. Although this is not high art, it does show that even the most cut-and-dried litany affords some room to tinker with the verbal form.

I.15.1 The accent on *píba* is syntactically unnecessary and not well explained. Oldenberg (ZDMG 60) suggests either that it's a not explicitly marked foundation clause for the following clause, or that *píba* has a tendency to emphatic accentuation. Although he does not want to get the accent from *píbata ṛtúnā* in the next verse, where the accent is correct (following voc. *márutaḥ*; cf. also *píba ṛtúnā* in 4c, again with correct accent), this seems a possibility. One might also note that in the second Ṛtugraha hymn sequence (II.37.1-3), the verb is accented in the phrase *píba ṛtúbhiḥ*, though again the accent is unnecessary. So perhaps *píba ṛtúnā/ṛtúbhiḥ* was a separable refrain-phrase in the Ṛtugraha ritual, and therefore received accent even when incorporated into a hymnal context. See now comm. ad III.32.1.

I.15.2: *sudānavaḥ* lacks accent and is therefore a vocative, not (as the tr. implies) a predicative nominative. The predicated vocative has been much discussed in the lit.; see Old, *Noten* ad loc. and Bloomfield, *RR*. On this repeated pāda see comm. ad VIII.7.12.

I.15.3: Tvaṣṭar is called Neṣṭar ('leader') here because he regularly "leads" the wives of the gods.

I.15.4: The three wombs are presumably the three ritual fires, so "at/by" would be a more felicitous translation than the published "in."

I.15.6: The voc. *dhr̥tavrata* 'of steadfast commandments' is apparently a *singular* in the Saṃhitā text, though the Pp. reads *-ā*. There is, however, no sandhi situation that could have triggered a shortening of the final vowel. Although the epithet is several times found in the du. modifying Mitra and Varuṇa (VIII.25.2, 8), it is more often in the singular modifying only Varuṇa (e.g., I.44.14, 141.9), and this may have been the

intent here. The *vratá* is really Varuṇa's province, not Mitra's. However, the matter is complicated by the fact that the clear dual dvandva voc. *mítrāvaruṇa* in b also has a singular ending, rather than expected *-ā*. I would attribute this shortening to an attempt to match the short final of sg. *dhṛtavrata*, rather than assuming the shortening affected both words for the same reason. Alternatively, as JL points out to me, it would be possible to consider the final short vowel of *dhṛtavrata* an example of Kuiper's Law, with loss of final laryngeal in pausa, though this could not account directly for the following *mítrāvaruṇa*, which is the real problem.

I.15.9: For *prá* √ *sthā* with soma as expressed or implied obj., see parallels cited at VI.41.2.

I.16 Indra

I.16.1: It's not clear why Indra's horses are called *sūracakṣas-* 'having the eye of the sun', a word otherwise (3x) used of gods. The awkward doubling of the enclitic *tvā* (found in both a and c, as object of the same verb) might suggest that the c pāda was borrowed from elsewhere. And indeed this hymn gives the impression of being assembled from ready-made formulae; the proportion of repeated pādas is fairly high (see Bloomfield, *RR*), not to mention sub-pāda repetitions. JL suggests, however, that the repeated *tvā* might not be the result of careless doubling, but rather the stranded object of a gapped repetition of *vahantu* in pāda a.

I.17 Indra and Varuṇa

I.17.3: The other standard translations take *tarpayethām* as a self-beneficial reflexive "satisfy yourselves" with *anukāmām* referring to the gods' desire (e.g., Ge "freuet euch nach Herzenslust"; Re "Rassasiez-vous à votre gré"), but this doesn't make sense. The whole hymnic context depicts Indra and Varuṇa as givers, not takers, and it's not clear to me that gods ever desire wealth, per se. It is much more likely that the poet is asking the gods to grant *us* wealth, and that the *kāma* is the mortals', not the gods'. For further discussion, with a strikingly parallel usage, see Jamison 1983: 140-41 and esp. n. 73, though I would not now emend the text to *ānu kāmam*, as I suggested there. Curiously, though Ge *translates* the verb as a reflexive, he goes to elaborate pains to *interpret* the whole phrase as urging the gods to give us their wealth, in other words much the same meaning as I favor.

In b *rāyá ā* is ambiguous as to case; it could be either dat. *rāye* or abl./gen. *rāyas* (so Pp.). Ge takes it as a gen., construed with *anukāmām*, but *rāya ā* is a fairly well-established expression (e.g., I.81.7, III.56.6) and the *rāya* seems too distant from *anukāmām* to be naturally construed with it. Most other tr. seems to favor the dat. (see esp. disc. of Old ad loc, also Re.), but I weakly favor an abl. reading "from (your) wealth."

A further question is what noun to supply with *nēdiṣṭham* 'closest' or what else to do with it. Ge suggests 'wealth' in a note; Re seems to take the word as

adverbial (“de la manière la plus proche,” whatever that means). My supplied “friendship” is based on two occurrences of *āpyam* (VII.15.1, VIII.73.6) and one of *āpīm* ‘friend’ with *nēdiṣṭham*. Esp. telling is VIII.73.6 *nēdiṣṭham yāmy āpyam* “I beseech (you two) for closest friendship,” with the same verb as here.

I.17.4: A curious construction: $\sqrt{bhū}$ + GEN., which seems to express partitive value: “become (part of) X” → “partake of,” though the path to partitive meaning is not straightforward. (Other translators seem to feel less guilt about making this leap than I do.) Closest to it formulaically is *vidyāma* + GEN., “might we know of X.” Cf. *vidyāma sumatīnām* (I.4.3, X.89.17) “might we know (of) your favors.” The oddity of the construction is exacerbated by the emphatic pāda-initial repetition (a, b) of indeclinable *yuvāku* ‘of you two’.

I.17.5: As noted in the intro., this is the middle verse of the hymn and the only one in which Indra and Varuṇa are separated, and in my view translations that don’t take this into account are likely to be on the wrong track. (So, Ge’s “Indra, Varuṇa sind der preisliche Rat der rühmlichen Tausendschenker,” which puts all nominatives and all genitives together.) The rhetorical structure of ab, nom. sg. – gen. pl. / nom. sg. – gen. pl., invites an association of each nom. sg. with its immediately following gen. pl., producing a contrastive pair of Indra associated with thousand-giving and Varuṇa with (something) to be proclaimed. I have followed this rhetoric clue and, further, have tentatively supplied a noun (‘master’) to head the gen. phrase. Alternatively, *krātuḥ* of c may be the head (“Indra becomes the *krātu* of ...”), as WG take it (also Ge).

There is the further question of what *śamsyānām* refers to. I have somewhat reluctantly supplied ‘riches’, since this is a theme of the hymn and *śamsyā-* several times modifies *rayí-* and similar words (e.g., VIII.60.11, X.47.2). However, it also regularly qualifies verbal products like *ukthyā-* or *ukthā-*, and given Varuṇa’s nature, an association with “(solemn words) to be proclaimed” is probably more likely than with “(riches) to be proclaimed.” I might therefore modify my published translation, though the desire for wealth is quite strong in this hymn (see vss. 3-4, 6-7).

I.17.8: The doubled *nū nū* ‘now now, just now’ is found only here, though doubling with an intercalated particle is found (*nū cin nū* I.120.2, VI.37.3, VII.22.8). It is possible that the sequence *nū nū vām* is meant to evoke a form of \sqrt{nu} ‘bellow, shout’, in this verse concerning the poet’s praise of the gods. Various forms of song and so forth serve as subjects of \sqrt{nu} . Cf. nearby I.6.6, 7.1.

I.17.9: *suṣṭutí-* ‘lovely praise’ is not a particularly good obj. of *huvé*, which ordinarily takes the addressee, not the content of the call. (See ... *vām* ... *huvé* in vs. 7.) Here the semantic disharmony may suggest that the lovely praise is personified and urged to do her part to please Indra and Varuṇa.

I.18 Brahmanaspati and Sadaspati

I.18.1: Though *somānam* is assigned to a *-man-*stem by Debrunner (*AiG* II.2.760), it seems preferable to analyze it, with Kuiper (*IIIJ* 15 [1973]: 190–94 [my thanks to ET for the ref.]), as having the so-called “Hoffmann suffix” (*-*Hon-*/-*Hn-*) (Hoffmann 1955 = *Aufs.* II, 378-83) added to the thematic noun *sóma-*, of the same type as Aves. *mąθrān-* ‘possessing *mąθras*’ to *mąθra-*. Our *somānam* is a hapax, so there are no diagnostic forms; a masc. agent noun in *-mán* would also have suffixal accent and a long suffixal vowel (cf. *dharmānam*, *-as* ‘upholder(s)’). In favor of the Hoffmann-suffix interpretation is the quadrisyllabic scansion, inviting distraction of the *-ā-*, which should not occur in a *man-*stem. The accent might be a problem; Hoffmann is somewhat cagey about the accent of these forms (not difficult, since most of his examples are Avestan), but he does suggest (p. 381) that the original accent of the acc. sg. might fall on the suffix, as here. Kuiper makes no mention of the accent.

Most translators (Ge ‘Lautsingenden(?)’, Re, Schmidt B+I, WG) take *svāraṇam* to the ‘sound’ root $\sqrt{\text{sva}}$, though Gr connects it with *svār-* ‘sun’ (‘glanzreich’). The metrical distraction to *svāraṇam* might favor a connection with the ‘sun’ word, since, as far as I know, the ‘sound’ root is never so distracted. This hapax is also phonologically reminiscent of *svārṇara-* ‘possessing solar glory’, whose initial cluster is always distracted and which almost always occupies the end of the *pāda*, as our word does. At the very least, it is likely that *svāraṇa-* is a pun.

It is surprising to find Kakṣīvant Auśija, the dazzling poet of I.116-26, in the context of this rather simple and mundane hymn, for Medhātithi certainly lacks Kakṣīvant’s skill. The request must then be seen as a species of wishful thinking. I translate *auśijá-* literally, as ‘descendant of a fire-priest’, though it is also Kakṣīvant’s patronymic, because I think the word previews the Agni theme of the second half of this hymn. The publ. tr. follows Ge in assuming a desired identification of Medhātithi with Kakṣīvant: Ge “Mach ... zu einem (zweiten) Kakṣīvat.” ET points out that there is actually no overt mention of Medhātithi and the verse could simply mean “make Kakṣīvant a possessor of soma ...” But then we still must explain the presence of Kakṣīvant here.

I.18.3: The *śámso áruruṣaḥ ... mártiyasya* “(male)diction of the grudging mortal,” which is dreaded by the poet, anticipates the desirable *nárāśámso-* ‘praise of men’ that opens the last verse of the hymn (9).

I.18.6: *ayāsiṣam*: I take this form to the root $\sqrt{\text{yā}}$ ‘beseech, implore’, not to $\sqrt{\text{yā}}$ ‘drive, go’, which does, admittedly, have a well-attested *-siṣ-* aorist. So also WG, though other translators (including Schmidt, B+I) render as a verb of motion (Ge “habe ich ... angegangen”). That interpretation isn’t impossible, but ‘beseech’ fits the context better.

I.18.7: If the referent of *yásmāt* is Agni and the two halves of the hymn concern the verbal and the physical parts of the sacrifice respectively, as I argue in the intro., this verse makes particular sense: even a skilled poet has to get the oblations right.

I.18.8: All standard tr. take *hótrā* as nom. sg. and the subject of the clause. But since the point of this verse and the last is the labor Agni expends in making the sacrifice succeed, it seems better to keep him as subj. of *gachati*, as he was of *ṛdhnoti* (a) and *kr̥ṇoti* (b). *hótrā* can then be an instr. sg. of the *ā*-stem, as commonly. The ritual model in which Agni goes to the gods with the offering is of course quite widespread in the RV.

I.18.9: Note the high proportion of sibilants in this verse.

The meaning of *makhá-* and its relatives (here represented by the second cmpd. member *-makhas-*) is much discussed. I consider it to have both martial and bountiful senses. I take the original sense to be martial and, despite some difficulties, believe the often suggested connection with Grk. μάχομαι. The ‘bounteous’ sense comes, in my opinion, from secondary association with *maghá-*, etc. In this compound *sádmamakhas-* most tr. take the second member in a ‘give, be bounteous’ sense (e.g., Ge “der einen Wohnsitz beschert,” Re “qui confère-généreusement un siège,” WG “den ... mit einem Himmelssitz freigebigen”). However, the martial sense fits the context well. The image is of the smoke of the ritual fire rising to, and thus visually ‘besieging’, heaven itself (so Gr). See Old’s disc.; Scar (277) questioningly suggests both.

I.19 Agni and the Maruts

I.19.4: Note the double etymological figures *arkám ānṛcúh* ‘chanted the chant’ and *ugrāh ... ójasā* ‘strong ones ... through strength’, with the former nested inside the latter. There is also phonological play between ...*ám ānṛ-* and *ánādhṛ-*

I.19.7–8: Ge (sim. Re) supplies a verb (“kommen”) with 7b. I am, as usual, reluctant to do so, but as ET points out, swinging the mountains across the sea is a very peculiar image. I would prefer to supply the ‘stretch’ (*ā ... tánvanti*) of the next verse, since the b pādas of 7–8 are structurally identical, producing a tr. of 7ab “Those who make the mountains swing, (as they stretch) across the undulating sea.” However, Ge/Re don’t construe the ‘stretch’ verb with 8b either.

I.20 Ṛbhus

I.20.1 Calling the Ṛbhus “the godly breed” (*devá- jánman-*) is a bold way to begin this hymn precisely because they did not begin as gods but obtained immortality by their wondrous deeds — the deeds about to be recounted in the hymn.

I.20.2: Although *vacoyújā* is principally a dual acc., modifying the two fallow bays (*hári*) as usual, it could also secondarily be taken as an instr. sg., modifying *mánasā* ‘with mind’. In any case, ‘speech’ and ‘mind’ are implicitly contrasted in this verse, and in addition *mánasā* contrasts with *āsayā* ‘by mouth’, referring to the means of creating.

I.20.3: Though Ge (/WG) takes *sabardúgha-* as the cow’s name, the word has a literal sense that works well in context.

I.20.5: A reference to the Third Pressing, with which the Ṛbhus are associated.

I.21 Indra and Agni

The verbal “hero” of this hymn is the nom.-acc. du. pronoun *tā* ‘these two’, which represents the pairing of the otherwise very different gods Indra and Agni. The form appears 6x in the hymn, with an additional gen.-loc. *táyoḥ* in 1b.

I.21.6: The opening of this vs., *téna satyéna*, is of course the standard signal of the later truth formulation (*satyakriyā*). It is difficult to impose such a value here, but the phrase *can* be seen as a summary of the praise-hymn that precedes this final vs. and therefore as the grounds on which the poet asks for their vigilance and help.

Ge (followed by WG) considers the *padá-* that is to be watched over the track or traces of something demonic or monstrous (“Die Spur der Unholde”), presumably the *rákṣas-* of the previous vs. But Re (XIV.121) points out that the root \sqrt{gr} ‘be watchful, wakeful’ always governs an object with favorable sense. Still, the exact reference of *padá-* is unclear. As the word is often used of the ritual ground (e.g., in the phrase *ilás padé* “in the footprint of refreshment” [I.128.1, etc.]), I have interpreted it in this way in the transl. But it’s also possible to invoke another common use of the word, for the cosmogonic footsteps of Viṣṇu, an example of which is in the last verse of the next hymn, also close to a form of \sqrt{gr} (I.22.21): *jāgrvāmsaḥ ... viṣṇor yát paramám padám* “watchful (over) what is the highest footstep of Viṣṇu.” These two views can in fact be reconciled. As noted below, the “highest footstep of Viṣṇu” in that verse is probably a reference to the sun, identified with the ritual fire, and therefore here “the footprint of discernment” can be both the ritual ground and Viṣṇu’s footprint in heaven.

I.22 Various divinities

I.22.4: The use of the diminutivizing *-ka-* suffix on *dūraké* ‘at a (little) distance’ reinforces the point of the verse, that it’s not much of a trip for the Aśvins to come here.

I.22.6: It is not entirely clear why we “desire the commandments (*vratāni*)” of Savitar, though I think it is likely that it is because his *vratá* keep the world functioning, esp. the cyclical rising and setting of the sun.

I.22.10: Note the opening phonetic figure *ā gnā agna*.

The shadowy goddess figures mentioned here are difficult to sort out. I assume that there are three goddesses here, with *Hotrā Bhāratī* the double name of the deified libation belonging to the Bharatas. In this passage Ge takes them as two

different figures (also in II.1.11, III.62.3), but in I.142.9 as a doubly named single figure. See Old (SBE, ad I.142.9): “Hotrâ Bhâratî, i.e., the personified Offering of the Bharatas, seems to be one goddess, more usually called simply Bhâratî,” with reff.

I.22.11: The goddesses “with unclipped wings” (*âchinnapatra-*) are found only here in the RV, but appear in a set of YV mantras used in the Agnicayana at the placing and heating of the ukhâ pot (for firing the bricks). See VS XI.61, MS II.76, KS XVI.6, ŚB VI.5.4.8, etc. A number of other female divinities are mentioned in the same context. What *âchinnapatra-* actually refers to is unclear to me. Griffith (ad VS XI.61) suggests “moving freely and without interruption.” It might evoke the myth of the originally winged mountains, whose wings Indra clipped so that they would settle down. But the mountains are masculine figures. I also do not see any sign of the later Agnicayana employment here, simply an association with other female divine figures.

I.22.13: *mahî* is grammatically ambiguous, as it can be either fem. singular or fem. (or neut.) dual. Most tr. take it as the former, modifying only *dyaúh*, but all things being equal, it is preferable to take *dyaúh* as masculine (though fem. occasionally is unavoidable), esp. as *mahî* by itself can refer to the earth without further specification. I see no reason why *mahî* cannot be dual here, modifying the conjoined NP *dyaúh pṛthivî ca*.

I.22.14: The meaning of this verse is entirely obscure to me, and it comes as a surprise in hymn (or set of hymns) displaying no other verbal tricks at all. (It is true that the Gandharva spreads obscurity almost every place he appears in the RV.) I might speculate that what the verse is conveying is that by their inspired hymns the poets have achieved a place in the highest firmament, where the Gandharva often seems to be located, and where they consume the luscious food produced by Heaven and Earth. If this speculation has any merit, the instr. *dhītībhiḥ* should not be taken as an instrument of licking (“lick ... with their poetic insights”), but rather as an instr. of cause (“by reason of their [prior and successful] poetic insights”), so the publ. tr. could be amended accordingly.

I.22.15: On *anṛkṣarâ-* as ‘not sweeping men away’, rather than ‘thornless’, see Jamison 1993 (Fs. Rix). The standard ‘thornless’ interpretation has no real support; I derive the word instead from *a-nṛ-kṣara-*, to the root $\sqrt{kṣar}$ ‘flow, stream’, cognate with Greek φθείρω ‘I destroy’. Formulaic and textual support for this analysis is given in the art. cit.

“A place to settle down” (*nivésanī*) might have been better tr. adjectivally “bring to rest, causing to settle down,” but this causes awkwardness in the English.

I.22.16-18: This ṛca is marked by minor ring composition: the *átaḥ* [sandhi *áto*] ‘from there’ that begins 16a also begins the last pāda of 18, in the same sandhi form.

I.22.20: The image in pāda c needs a little unpacking. The “eye in heaven” is of course the sun; the incongruity is that it is depicted as “stretched out,” which might suggest an elongated ovoid sun, not a happy picture. The concentrated expression of pāda c rests on the common formula of the sun stretching (through space) with its rays (*raśmí-*), as in VII.47.4 *yāḥ sūryo raśmībhir ātatāna* “towards which [=waters] the sun has stretched with its rays.” Note that *sūrāyaḥ* ‘patrons’ ending b phonologically evokes the absent *sūr¹ya-* in c.

I.22.21: This verse also contains some semantic incongruities: “kindling the footstep” is of course a curious expression, and that poets, presumably human, perform this action on the “highest footstep of Viṣṇu,” usually an expression for highest heaven, makes it all the odder. Ge (also Old, WG) plausibly identify “the highest footstep of Viṣṇu” here as the sun, and the verse would therefore express the common notion that priests kindling the ritual fire at dawn cause the sun to shine.

I.23 Various gods (Prauḡaśastra)

I.23.4-6: This trīca to Mitra and Varuṇa stations the two names in three different ways in the three verses. In 4 *mitrá-* opens the first pāda and *váruṇa-* the second; in 5 they are expressed in the dual dvandva *mitrāváruṇā* in c; in 6 they again open the first two pādas, but with *váruṇa-* first and *mitrá-* second.

I.23.8: It is striking that all of ab is made up of vocatives, with each one accented: because of the place of the accent, three of the four words *have* to be vocatives; only *índrajyeṣṭhā(h)* could be nom. pl., since *índra-* has inherent initial accent. The first word of c, *vísve*, may also be and probably is a voc.

It would be satisfying to have three GOD-X bahuvrīhis parallel in semantic and morphological structure, but although Ge (followed by WG) interprets the *rāti-* in *pūṣa-rātayaḥ* as an agent noun (“mit Pūṣan als Gönner”), *rāti-* both as simplex and in its fairly numerous compounds is always an abstract ‘giving’ or concretized version thereof (‘gift’), as its morphology as a deverbal feminine abstract would require. I therefore take the third cmpd as a tatpuruṣa *pūṣa-rāti-* the gift(s)/giving of Pūṣan’. It owes its initial accent to the fact that it is a voc. (as does the bahuvrīhi *máruḡaṇāḥ* [expect **marúḡaṇa-*].) The ‘gift’ or ‘giving’ of Pūṣan is described as auspicious (*bhadrá*) in VI.58.1.

I.23.9: Ge (WG), following Gr, tr. *sáhasā* as an adj. modifying Indra (“mit dem stärken Indra”), but this is of course impossible. With that accent it must be a neut.; accent shift to **sahás-* would turn it into an adjective, but this form is unattested (versus, e.g., *yásas-* ‘glory’ → *yaśás-* ‘glorious’).

On the analysis of fairly common 3rd sg. *īśata* (always with *mā(kiḥ)*) as an injunc. to a reduplicated aor., see Hoffmann 1967 (*Injunk.*): 64-66 (seemingly accepted by Lub, Concordance). Although he adduces semantic and syntactic factors that impose this interpretation, it nonetheless does not seem entirely satisfying,

because the thematic stem envisioned (*īśa-* [never accented]) seems insufficiently distinguished from the presential perfect stem *īś-*, and Hoffmann does not suggest a mechanism for deriving such an aorist stem from either the presential perfect stem or directly from the root. Moreover, his argument that *mā* preventive clauses should have an aorist might falter in the face of a root that simply lacks an aorist. (See now IH’s work demonstrating just that.) I prefer Debrunner’s explanation, rejected by Hoffmann, that *īśata* represents a re-marking of *īśa* with *-ta* to make it more clearly a 3rd sg. Judging from the accent (*īśe, īśāna-* [versus *īśāná-*]), the old presential perfect had been mostly reanalyzed as a root present, and *īśa* would be an anomalous 3rd sg. injunctive to such a present.

I.23.13-15: As noted in the intro., I take the “king” that Pūṣan is returning as Agni, not, with most tr., Soma. The theme of the finding and returning of the god-in-hiding in 14 is much more appropriate for Agni than for Soma, and the “glittering barhis” is also more likely to be associated with Agni. Both Agni and Soma are called “buttress, support” (13) (Agni in V.15.1–2) and both are called king (14). The drops (*īndu-*) in 15 might seem rather to indicate Soma, but in VI.16.16 Agni is strengthened by drops (*īndubhiḥ*), which must be drops of ghee.

I.23.15: The ritual referent of the “six yoked” entities (*ṣāḍ yuktān*) is unclear, no matter whether Soma or Agni is taken as the main referent: those in the Soma camp consider the yoked ones to be the dakṣiṇās due the poet; I consider them the flames of the recovered Agni, roused by the drops of ghee. In terms of the simile in c, the six yoked ones are clearly the teams for plowing. See esp. AV VI.91.1, cited by Schaefer (1994: 197). On *anu √sidh* as ‘entlangtreiben’, see Schaefer 1994: 196–97.

In my translation I have reversed the renderings of the finite intensive (unaccented *carkṛśat* in c) and the intensive participle (accented *anuséśidhat*) to make the relationship between simile and frame clearer.

I.23.16: Contra Ge and others but with Re, I construe the gen. pl. *adhvarīyatām* ‘of those performing the rites’ with *ādhvabhiḥ* ‘along the roads’, as I do not think the waters are the mothers of the priests (Ge “Die Mütter der diensttuenden (Priester)”).

I.23.18: Ge and others attach b to a, with c a separate sentence, which is also possible.

I.23.19: Again I disagree with most tr. in the disposition of the b pāda. I take it with a, because I think we mortals are to glorify the waters. Others think the gods should become strong or victorious in order to praise the waters – but gods are not usually the agents of such praising.

I.23.20-23 = X.9.6-9, save that the fourth pāda of 20 is missing in X.9.6.

I.23.20: The semi-direct speech and esp. the casual conversational tone of this verse are quite unusual for the RV. Although most tr. take the whole as indirect speech

(“Soma said to me that...”), the construction of the verse seems to me to mix direct and indirect speech, with c, couched in the acc., shading into indirect speech. I take the final pāda separately, as it is absent from the parallel in X.9.6.

Note the distraction of the *apsú antár* phrase that opens 19a into two pāda opening words: 20a #*apsú* ... b #*antár*

I.23.23: Most tr. take *āpaḥ* as acc. here (“I have followed the waters.”). This is of course possible: the nom. of this stem does get used for acc. occasionally in the RV. However, such an interpr. is not nec. in this case, since it is easy to supply an acc. “you.” And the fact that the two previous vss. (21a and 22a) contain vocatives *āpaḥ* and *āpaḥ* respectively supports a vocative interpretation here.

I.23.24: It is difficult to know what, if anything, is the referent of *asya*. I have tentatively supplied ‘hymn’, but the poet may simply be calling upon the gods to witness the general situation (so Ge). The same expression \sqrt{VID} *me asya* is found in the refrain of I.105, except with accented *asyá*, for which reason I more confidently supply ‘speech’ there.

[I.24–25 JPB]

I.26 Agni

I.26.1: As often, the *hí* in the first of two imperative clauses marks the action urged in ab as subordinate to and the basis for the consequence expressed in c. See Brereton 2012.

I.26.2: As on some other occasions the pāda-final *vácaḥ*, superficially a nom.-acc. (or a stem form), is to be construed as an instr. with the instr. adj. (*divítmatā* in this case), whatever the source of this truncated form. (See M. Hale [Fs. Melchert] for an attempt, unsuccessful in my view, to see it as an archaic zero-grade *s*-stem instr. [*-*es-H*, not the renewed and standard *-*es-eH*]. For further disc. see comm. ad VIII.39.2.) In this particular phrase, the existence of a fully instr. parallel in X.76.6 *vācā divítā divítmatā* strongly suggests that *vácaḥ* should indeed be construed with *divítmatā* here. On *divítmant-* itself, see comm. ad IV.31.11.

I.26.3: A paradigm ex. of the use of the act. of \sqrt{yaj} to express sacrificing on behalf of someone other than the grammatical subj.

I.26.5: In the phrase ... *asyá naḥ, mándasva sakhyásya ca* most tr. render the *ca* as ‘also’ and construe the demonstrative with the noun (Ge “... freue dich auch dieser Freundschaft mit uns”). However, the most natural way to take the syntax is as a conjoined NP: “of this (x) and the comradeship of ours.” The question is what *asyá* is modifying. Following Gr I supply ‘ritual grass’, because *barhíḥ* is the most recent ritual referent (4a). Although “rejoicing in ritual grass” may seem an odd activity, cf.

VIII.13.4=VIII.15.5 *mandāno asyā barhīṣo ví rājasi*, with the same verb \sqrt{mand} ‘rejoice’ and the fuller version of the nominal phrase. (As it happens, in that passage I construe the barhis phrase with the main verb *ví rājasi*, but it is certainly ambiguous.)

I.26.8: Although most tr. implicitly take pāda a as subordinated to b (e.g., Ge. “Denn wenn ..., so...”), again the *ca* suggests rather that they are coordinate structures, with pāda a a nominal sentence (*svagnáyaḥ* predicated of *devāsaḥ*) coordinated with the finite verb *dadhíré* in b. This verb is accented because it is under the domain of *hí* in a. In this reading, pāda c functions as the main cl. of ab.

I also supply ‘him’ (=Agni) as first object of *dadhíré*, again unlike most tr. (eg., Ge “so bringen sie auch uns Erwünschtes”). For the reasons for this in the structure of the hymn, see disc. in intro.

I.27 Agni

I.27.1: *vandádhyai* is a predicated infinitive, serving as the main verb.

Pāda a contains a likely et, the possessive *-vant*-stem adj. *vāravantam* modifying Agni. In the first instance it means ‘having (that is, providing) choice things’ (*vāra-*, to \sqrt{vr} ‘choose’), but the homonym *vāra-* means ‘hair, tail-hair’ (cf., e.g., nearby I.32.12) and so the *-vant*-stem can mean ‘possessing (long) tail-hair’. Either of these meanings is applicable to the horse of the simile, which has tail-hair by nature and brings choice things by winning races and contests. ‘Bringing choice things’ is more applicable to Agni than ‘having hair’, but his flames could be so conceived. Note that Agni is characterized as “ghee-haired” (*ghṛtá-keśa-*) in VIII.60.2.

I.27.2: With Old I supply *śávasaḥ* with *sūnúḥ*, to complete the common epithet of Agni “son of strength,” which is suggested by the associated instr. *śávasā*. Indirect support might come from the parallel voc. *sahasō yaho* ‘o young (son) of strength’ (with a different word for strength, also regularly appearing as an epithet of Agni) that ends the preceding hymn (I.26.10c). However, this supplement is not strictly necessary, and most tr. do not supply it (e.g., Ge simply “unser Sohn”). In favor of a translation like Ge’s is the presence of *naḥ* in pāda a. However, this could simply be a Wackernagel place-holder for *asmākam* in c. Although the difference might seem slight, in fact the two interpretations are quite different. Ge’s emphasizes that *we* have created Agni, supplying ‘our’ with *śávasā* (“unser Sohn durch (unsere) Kraft”); this might suggest that Agni is in our debt because we begot him and he ought therefore to become our benefactor. The other tr. invest Agni with his own strength and hopes that he will graciously use some of it to benefit us.

I.27.6: With Ge (/WG) and Re I take the expression in pāda b as a simile or comparison that provides the basis for the verb ‘stream’ (*kṣarasi*) in c. Agni/the fire cannot literally be on or in a river’s wave.

I.27.7: It is difficult not to interpret the agent noun *yantā* in c as a periphrastic future, given the subjunctives in ab, *pace* Tichy 1995: 226. Although it is sometimes claimed that no examples (or “no certain examples”) of this usage are found in the *Samhitās* (see esp. Macdonell VGS §152), there are too many passages in the RV where a future interpretation of the *-tar*-stem is more natural and fits the context better than a purely agentive one.

I.27.8: Since this verse continues the thought of 7, the agent noun *paryetā* in b should likewise be future in value, despite Ge’s “Keiner überholt ihn.”

asya ... kāyasya cit: most tr. take these two genitives as coreferential, with the indefinite referring to a person – so Ge’s “Keiner überholt ihn, wer er auch sei.” But the person in question has already been defined as a client of Agni’s, and so an indefinite seems odd in context. Moreover, the other two instances of *paryetar-* both take inanimate complements; cf. VII.40.3 *nā tāsya rāyāḥ paryetāsti* “There exists no one who can encompass his wealth.” Therefore I take *kāyasya cit* as referring to anything belonging to the favored man, expressed by *asya*. Ge’s note seems to lean in this direction, but not his tr.

On *śravāyā-* see I.31.5 below.

I.27.10: The supposed voc. *jārābodha* in a is problematic on several grounds. It is generally taken to mean something like “attentive to the early call,” but 1) the first member, *jarā-*, is only attested in the meaning ‘old age’ (hence Old’s suggested “im (bis zum) Greisenalter wachend”), and 2) the second member, the thematic nominal *bodhā-*, is not otherwise found in the RV (though it does occur in the AV). I therefore prefer to interpret it as a pair of linked imperatives, *jārā bodha*. The latter is found 5x in the RV, as impv. to the thematized aor. to \sqrt{budh} ‘awake’; the former would belong to the thematic pres. *jāra-* of $\sqrt{gr/jr}$ ‘sing’. Although this present is ordinarily only middle (vs. *jāra-* ‘make old’), attraction in voice would not be surprising in a construction like this. The long *-ā* of *jārā* simply reflects the common lengthening of the 2nd sg. impv. Although we might expect *bodha* to be accented, it may have lost the accent when the construction ceased to be understood, or it may never have received it in this close semantic nexus. Under this analysis the order of imperatives is actually “sing (and) awake!” which I have reordered for clarity. Alternatively, we might take *jārā* to $\sqrt{gr/jr}$ ‘awake’, which likewise builds a Class I middle pres., and translate “awake (and) take heed.” See Gotō 1987: 150-56 for discrimination of the various Class I *jāra-* presents.

Since *dṛśīka-* is otherwise a neut. substantive, I have rendered it as appositional to *stómam* rather than as an adjective (e.g., Ge “ein schönes Lied”). So also Re (“un corps-de-louange, chose belle à voir”). Note also the synesthesia, with the praise-song something to be seen, not heard. This usage somewhat anticipates the later Vedic notion that *ṛṣis* “see” divinely bestowed *sāmans*.

I.28 Indra (Abbreviated Soma Rite)

See intro. for detailed discussion of my interpretation of the context of the hymn, which differs significantly from the standard view. I discuss this further in a (so-far-unpublished) treatment of the prehistory of the śrauta/grhya ritual split.

I.28.1: Both *pr̥thúbudhna-* ‘having a broad bottom’ and *ūrdhvá-* appear to be double-entendres. The salacious references continue, more clearly, in vss. 3-4.

I.28.6: The reference in this verse is not entirely clear, but “the lord of the wood” (*vánaspáti-*, ordinarily a word for tree, or an esp. prominent tree, then applied the sacrificial post) is probably here the pestle and metaphorically the erect penis. If so, *ágram* might be better tr. ‘tip’ than ‘top’ and the whole clause as “the wind blows across [rather than ‘through’] your tip.” In an unpublished paper on this hymn, “Rgveda I.28 and the Two Forms of Pressing Soma,” Hanns-Peter Schmidt cites a Kuntāpa verse AV 20.136.6 = ŚŚS 12.24.2.7, which he tr. “The harlot, stepping over the mortar, said, ‘Just as on thee, o tree (o wooden mortar), they strike (with the pestle) so may they strike on me,’” which also shows the connection of mortar and pestle with unlicensed sex. If the tr. is correct, the “lord of the wood” there is the mortar, not the pestle, as it seems to be here. In vs. 8 below, both the mortar and the pestle seem to be so called.

I.28.7: On the motions involved, see Schaefer 1994: 163-64.

I.29 Indra

I.29.2: Ge takes ... *táva daṃsánā* as a nominal sentence “du hast ja die Machtvollkommenheit.” This is possible. But with Gr and Re, I prefer to take *daṃsánā* as an instr. (as it often is), in order to allow the whole verse to be a single sentence.

I.30 Indra, Aśvins, Dawn

I.30.1: The word *krívi-* makes trouble wherever it shows up. In some of its occurrences it appears to be a personal name, but that is unlikely here. It is not even clear if all the occurrences of *krívi-*, even in non-personal uses, belong to a single stem -- in fact it seems unlikely (see comm. ad V.44.4). Here the context favors an equine reference, and I have taken it as designating a particular color of horse, viz., ‘blood-red’. Assuming, with most scholars, that *krívi-* in at least some of its usages is connected with *krívis-* in the hapax adj. *krívir-dant-* (I.166.6), which possibly means ‘having gory teeth’, and that both are etymologically connected with *kravís-* ‘raw, bloody flesh’, as a color term ‘blood-red’ would work well. The details of the derivational relation I leave to others, but a putative *-i-* stem to the underlying root *krū* < **kruh₂* (in *krūrá-* [AV+]) would have the shape **kruh₂-i-* > **kruv-i-*, and assimilation to *krívi-* would not be difficult.

The verse is structured by number disharmony — the pres. part. *vājayántaḥ* is nom. plural, but the finite verb *siñce* is singular — reflecting the common conceptual fluctuation between the collectivity of priests and singers and the priest-poet speaking in his individual voice.

I.30.2: The number disharmony continues here, at least in my view. Ge. takes the sg. rel. pron. *yáḥ* as referring to Indra and then supplies the verb ‘drinks’ to governing the ‘hundred’ and ‘thousand’ phrases referring to soma. But if *yáḥ* is instead taken as referring to soma and coreferential with the (unexpressed) subj. of the verb in the main clause *rīyate*, no material needs to be supplied. Instead the singular ‘which (soma)’ is defined as consisting of a hundred or a thousand separate drinks. So also Re.

I.30.3: The form *śuṣmína* (in sandhi) can represent either *śuṣmíne* (dat. sg.) or *śuṣmínaḥ* (in turn, either gen.-abl. sg. or nom.-acc. pl.). (The Pp. reads *-e*.) Any of these possibilities is possible in context, and so it may well be that the ambiguity is meant. As a nom. pl. it could characterize the subj. (‘they’ = soma drinks), as Re. takes it. As a gen. sg. it could refer to Indra, who is indeed regularly modified by this adj. As a dat. sg. it could modify *mádāya* (so Ge), or it might still refer to Indra, in well-known double dative construction of the type “for the tempestuous one for his exhilaration” → “to exhilarate the tempestuous one.” I favor an interpretation that attributes the word to Indra; among other things, this makes the unaccented *asya* in b easier to account for. Preferably genitive *śuṣmínaḥ*, though I have not been able to find a parallel expression.

On the surface, pāda a lacks a main verb, but it is possible that it is lurking there. The subordinator *yád* appears as *yán* in sandhi before a nasal. The otherwise unattested 3rd pl. injunctive of \sqrt{i} ‘go’ would have the same shape and is the expected verb in this idiom (cf., e.g., 3rd pl. impf. *sám āyan* X.27.8). I therefore suggest we have a notional haplology *sám *yád yán*.

I do not understand the function of *hí* in b, which triggers accentuation of the main verb *dadhé* in c. I would at all costs prefer to avoid attributing pure emphatic function to *hí*, but this passage comes perilously close to that.

I.30.4: *ohase* is generally taken as a 2nd sg. mid. to the root \sqrt{uh} / *oh*, which has a messy set of forms. Cf., e.g., Ge. “Diese Rede von uns weisst du gewiss zu würdigen.” However, I interpret it as a 1st ps. *-se* form of the type *stuṣé* ‘I shall praise’, *grṇīṣé* ‘I shall sing’, all of which fall into this semantic sphere. Indeed the root has a *-se* formation of different shape in VIII.5.3 *vācam ... ohīse*, with almost identical object (our passage: *vācaḥ*). For the thematic/(pseudo-)subjunctive form here, cf. *arcase* ‘I shall address’ (X.64.3). Despite the complications involved in positing a second 1st ps. *-se* form to this root and separating *ohase* from the identical form in VIII.80.9, which I take as a 2nd sg. in passive usage, I prefer my interpretation to that of Ge (/WG) ‘value’, Re ‘take into consideration, take note of’,

because these latter seriously attenuate or alter the meaning of the root, which otherwise means ‘solemnly proclaim, praise, vaunt oneself’.

I.30.5: The word order of ab is rather tortured. The clause is simply a nominal sentence forming a relative clause, but the relative pronoun phrase *yásya te*, instead of appearing in 2nd or modified position after *stotrám* as is overwhelmingly common (see, e.g., modified 2nd in 2a *śatám vā yáḥ* ... above), comes at the very end of the hemistich, separated from its noun by three vocative phrases. This still *counts* as 2nd position in some sense, but the poet is pushing the limits. The *te* is simply there to indicate that the rel. pron. has 2nd ps. reference, which is of course not syntactically coded onto the relative. Cf. the common phrase *tám tvā* (e.g., 10a below), where the 2nd ps. pronoun has the same function: to give 2nd ps. ref. to the demonstrative.

I.30.8: *yádi* here stands for *yád* **ī*, ‘when ... it’ rather than ‘if’. The pronominal enclitic *ī* has been shortened before the initial cluster of *śrávat*. See Jamison 2002.

I.30.9: Although *huvé* in c is morphologically problematic, its interpretation is imposed by context: a past-tense 3rd ps. ‘he called’. But this is the only 3rd ps. *huvé* (in contrast to over 70 exx. of 1st ps. *huvé*, -*e*), and it must be preterital not present, as *huvé* otherwise is. I have no explanation.

The referent of *te* ‘your’ in the same pāda is unclear. Assuming the relevant constituent is “your father” (*te* ... *pitā*), *te* should refer to the poet, or some poet, in whose lineage “you” are, but I would expect the poet to be the 1st ps. speaker of the first *huvé* (pāda b). Perhaps the reference to the “ancient house” in pāda a indicates that another, more venerable poet is on the scene, whose model (and that of his forebears) the current poet is following. The publ. tr. of pāda a supplies “your” with “ancient house” – implying that the current poet is modeling himself on “you” and “your father,” but it should be remembered that the “your” of a is not explicit in the text. It could well be “my ancient house” (or indeed someone else’s). Though the pāda is repeated in VIII.69.18, that passage is not helpful in interpreting this one. However, I.87.5 contains an occurrence of *pratná-* modifying father that seems to assert a similar entitlement to poetic speech by lineage: I.87.5 *pitúḥ pratnásyā jánmanā vadāmasi* “We speak by virtue of our kinship with our primordial father.”

I.30.11: Though it modifies *asmākam* ‘of us’ and “we” are definitely male, *śipriṇānām* ‘of the (well-)lipped ones’ is a *feminine* gen. pl. The form must be contextually motivated: the other two pādas end with (masc.) gen. pls. in -*Vnām* / -*Vnaam* (*somapāvānām* [my preference, for HvN *somapāvnām*], *sákhīnām*). Esp. the latter, with -*īnām*, invites a type of dittography: **śipriṇānām* → *śipriṇīnām*. Although this form reminds us of the equally unexpected fem. for masc. *návyasīnām* V.53.10, 58.1, I explain the latter differently. See comm. ad V.53.10.

I.30.12: Ge (WG) take *iṣṭáye* as “dass du rasch kommst,” without comment, but it is not clear to me what root they are using to produce ‘come quick’. There are several

roots $\sqrt{iṣ}$ to which *iṣṭáye* could belong: ‘seek, desire’ and ‘send’ are the most likely, along with the marginal root ‘prosper’ found in *iṣáyati*. A zero-grade of \sqrt{yaj} ‘sacrifice’ could (and does) also produce *iṣṭí-*. None of these comes close to ‘come quick’; my conjecture is that they are connecting it with ‘send’, but forms of this root are always transitive. Re more reasonably assigns it to the ‘seek’ root: “... que (tu) cherches (des biens pour nous),” but must supply much material for it to work. I suggest that it belongs to this same root, but in the sense ‘desire, want’, and that the message here is the mutually reinforcing “we want you to want what we want.” This expression is somewhat reminiscent of *sá naḥ sanítā sanáye* in vs. 16: “he the winner, for us to win it,” though using two different but synonymous roots, rather than the etymological figure of 16.

I.30.13: A noun needs to be supplied with *revátīḥ* ‘rich (fem.)’. Old suggests *iṣaḥ* ‘refreshments’, which works formulaically with the rest of the lexicon in the passage (including the verb in c; cf., e.g., VII.64.3 *iṣā madema*, with an instr. as in our *yābhir madema*). Ge’s “Geschenke” (gifts) is not so happy.

sadhamāda out of sandhi could end in either *-e* (so Pp., followed by most) or *-aḥ*. Complicating the decision is the fact that both a thematic stem *sadhamāda-* and a root noun *sadhamād-* are well attested. Though most tr. take presumed underlying *sadhamāde* as loc. to the thematic stem (Ge “bei dem Mahlgenossen”), I think it possible that it is the dat. of purpose to the root noun. It may be that Re’s “pour le symposion” also assumes such a dative.

I.30.14: Vss. 14–15 are parallel in structure and phraseology, but this does not help as much as we might like. To begin at the beginning, it seems odd to refer to Indra as “one like you” (*tvāvān*), and grammatically it is also problematic, because *tvāvant-* ordinarily takes a 3rd ps. verb, not 2nd ps. as here. It is tempting to follow Ge’s path and make ab into a subordinate clause (“Wenn einer wie du...”), but this doesn’t work because the initial *ā* of pāda a must be construed with the *ṛṇóḥ* of c. The rest of the first hemistich, two participial phrases, is somewhat awkwardly phrased (at least in translation) but comprehensible: the praisers obtain Indra (or his like) in his own person and implore him for aid, which he provides in c. That pāda uses an idiomatic expression for fitting an axle between two wheels. As the presence of *ná* in 14c and the structure of vs. 15 show, this expression is a simile, to which some other action of Indra is being compared, even though in 14 there is no obvious frame. The meaning of *ā ṛṇóḥ* in the frame is somewhat different from the idiomatic usage, but not, to my mind, the “untranslatable wordplay” that Ge sees. I take it mean ‘fit out’, namely ‘provide’. In 14c I supply ‘refreshments’ from the preceding vs. (13), the first vs. of the ṛca. Nonetheless, this translation of the ṛca, esp. 14–15, strikes me as less than satisfactory.

I.30.17: *sávīra-*. Although this may just have a suffix *-īra-*, it is tempting to see it as a bahuvrīhi containing a Caland form *savi-* (root *sū*; cf. *sūra-*) plus *írā-* ‘refreshment’, so ‘possessing powerful refreshment’. For the accent, see the many compounds with

śuci-, e.g., *śuci-jihva-* ‘having a blazing tongue’. If this is correct, the translation of the same word in I.3.2 should be modified. There it modifies *dhī-* ‘insight’, which might not be as apt, but thoughts and hymns that provide refreshment are not foreign to the RVic conceptual universe. Although we might expect **śuvi-*, ET suggests comparing presumed Caland forms RV *ákravihasta-* and PN *dabhīti-*, which apparently show full grade of the root.

The neut. adjectives *gómat* and *híraṇyavat* are generally taken to refer directly to the gifts that the Aśvins will provide us (e.g., Ge “Rinderbesitz ... Goldbesitz (sie uns)!” But (as Ge suggests in his note) in I.92.16 and VIII.22.17, where the pāda is repeated, the adjectives modify *vártiḥ* ‘circuit, course’, in turn the object of forms of $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘drive’ in VIII.22.17 (and often elsewhere). Since 17b contains *yātam*, I supply *vártiḥ* here as well.

I.30.18: Because *yójana-* has a number of different meanings (‘yoking, stage of journey, distance, route’), the compound *samānáyojana-* has received a number of different translations. The analytic phrase *samānéna yójanena* occurs in I.92.3 of Dawn’s journey, where again ‘route’ best fits the context.

I.30.19: Other passages also depict the Aśvins’ chariot with one wheel at rest (presumably on earth, on the ritual ground) and the other in motion (V.73.3, VIII.22.4), as Ge explains in his note.

The “head of the inviolable (bull)” is somewhat opaque, but is probably a mystical expression for the ritual ground – more clearly expressed in *mūrdhán yajñásya* “on the head of the sacrifice” (II.3.2, IX.17.6). Others have speculated that the whole complex (the two wheels and the bull’s head) refer to a constellation. See WG n.

I.30.20: “Fair-weather friend” translates the voc. *kadhapriye* and is an attempt at an idiomatic English rendering of ‘when-friend’, i.e., ‘uncertain, fickle, or capricious friend’ – following Bloomfield’s (*RR*, ad I.38.1) attractive explanation of closely related *kadhaprī-* as built to the Aśvins’ epithet *adhapriyā* ‘then-friends’. The epithet is appropriate to the usually reliable Dawn in this verse because the poet questions her as to where she will bestow her presence and favors.

I.30.21: All of pāda c is a vocative, though it is syntactically peculiar for the noun in the simile to be in the vocative: *ásve ná*, literally “like o mare.” It must have been attracted into the voc. by the voc. adjectives that are the points of comparison: *citre aruṣi* “bright and ruddy.” See also I.57.3 below.

I.31 Agni

This is the first of five hymns attributed to Hiraṇyastūpa Āṅgīrasa and the only one addressed to Agni. It is noteworthy that the hymn begins and ends with references to the Āṅgīrasas: 1a (*agne ...*) *āṅgirā ṛṣiḥ*, 2a (*agne ...*) *āṅgirastamaḥ* and 17a (the last vs. before the extra-hymnic summary vs.) (*agne*) *āṅgirasvād āṅgiraḥ*, a

reference to his parentage and a word that often plays off its phonological similarity to *agní-* (cf. RV I.1), a voc. of which occurs in every vs. in this hymn.

I.31.1-2: Some reciprocal vocabulary: in 1c the *kavis* (the Maruts) are born under the *vrata* of Agni, while in 2b Agni as *kavi* tends to the *vrata* of the gods.

I.31.1: Wackernagel treats the structure of the bahuvrīhi *vidmanāpas-* differently in different parts of the grammar. It is clear that the first member is the instr. of *vidmán-* ‘wisdom, know-how’, but in some places (II.1.234, III.268) he suggests that the 2nd member is the secondary adj. *apás-* (so also Gr) and that the first member is accented (as is customary in bahuvrīhis), but with end-accent *vidmanā*, rather than the attested independent *vidmánā* (I.110.6, etc.) (so explicitly III.268). Elsewhere (esp. II.1.301) he groups it with other bahuvrīhis containing *-as-* stems as 2nd members, which have accented 2nd members (on the 1st syllable), such as *pr̥thu-pákṣas-* (and cf. *purū-rávas-* in 4b). The latter analysis must be correct: inter alia, we don’t expect bahuvrīhis of similar sense to have adjectives as 2nd members, and it seems arbitrary to assume ending accent of the instr. against the independent usage of *-n-* stems. Therefore, the cmpd. must represent *vidmanā-ápas-*, built to the neut. *-as-* stem ‘work’, inflected as a masc. nom. pl. because the cmpd. is a bahuvrīhi and hence an adjective. The meaning should be literally ‘having/displaying work with know-how’.

I.31.2: In c note the phonetic figure **vibhúr víśvasmai bhúvanāya**, with the two elements of the first word distributed over the next two.

Note that Agni here is said to have “two mothers” (*dvimātā*), while in vs. 4 he swells in his “two fathers” (*pitróḥ*; see also 9a) -- in both cases referring to the kindling sticks. Although both “two mothers” and “two fathers” can refer pregnantly, as it were, to a mixed gender set of parents, it is striking that both are used so close together here, and of the same referents.

I.31.3: The mythology behind ab is related in I.143.2, as Ge points out; see also VI.8.4. It is not clear here why a mythological situation should be couched in the imperative (“become manifest!”), esp. as the second hemistich contains three augmented imperfects, but I cannot see any way to fix it. As Old points out, various scholars have suggested reading injunc. *bhavaḥ* but it is not easy to switch that form in, esp. because 1) the hymn has no other injunctives, and 2) the stem *bháva-* doesn’t have any clear injunctives, certainly no *bhavaḥ*, in the RV. In I.143.2 the same myth is related in the same phraseology in the impf.: *āvír agnír abhavan mātariśvane*.

sukratūyā must mean something more than simply *krátvā / krátunā*; see the denom. *sukratūyase* in X.122.6.

I.31.4: Purūravas is found only here in the RV outside of his dialogue with the Apsaras Urvaśī in X.95. It’s not entirely clear why he is here, but his is a speaking name (‘having much roaring’), which fits with the bellowing in pāda a. Moreover his

son Āyu figures several times in this hymn (vss. 2, 11), and Idā, said to be Purūravas's mother in X.95.18, also appears in vs. 11.

Contrary to most tr., I have segregated *sukṛte sukṛttaraḥ* as a separate clause, since this expression is found in different context in I.156.5. *sukṛt-* is usually used of the priest or ritual performer, and this interpretation fits with the 2nd hemistich, which refers to the ritual here and now. Starting a new sentence in pāda b also helps mitigate the tense disharmony in this verse, where the present in the subordinate clause (*múcyase*) is by most accounts connected to an imperfect in the main clause of d (*anayan*), the action of which should temporally follow the verb in c (or to the imperfect *avāśayaḥ* in a). By connecting c instead with the last part of b, this temporal reversal is avoided.

Ge (following Gr) tr. *śvātra-* as simply “Kraft,” but the noun belongs with the root $\sqrt{śū}$ ‘swell’, and the image in this pāda is a vivid one: Agni’s “swelling” in his two parents refers to the flaming up of the fire created by the kindling sticks (already referred to in 2d). Both Re and WG render the ‘swell’ sense. With Sāy. (see Ge’s n. 4c) I take *pitróḥ* with *śvātréna*, not with *múcyase*. On “two fathers” see comm. ad vs. 2. Because of the contrast between the two mothers in 2 and the two fathers in this vs. and 9a, I would now alter the tr. of both 4 and 9 to “in your two fathers.”

I do not understand what the final pāda is conveying. I have tr. *pūrvam ... āparam punaḥ* as “to the east ... then again to the west”; Ge has “vorwärts und wieder zurück.” But in either case the ritual ref. is hard to decode, since generally the fire “taken out” of what will later be called the Gārhapatya fire, situated at the west of the ritual ground, is carried to the east to become what will later be called the Āhavanīya fire. Sāy. (see Ge’s n. 4d) takes the vedi as the reference point, with one part of the fire going to the east (Āhavanīya) and one to the west (Gārhyapatya), but this is not how the placement of the ritual fires happens.

I.31.5: *údyataśruce ... śravāyyaḥ*: Ge’s (/WG’s) “ruhmbringend” is not possible for *śravāyya-*, because this is a (pseudo-)gerundive and hence passive. The dat. *údyataśruce* can serve as agent, because RVic gerundives can take dat. agents (see Jamison 1979 [Die Sprache 25] 137–38 n. 14), as also in other IE languages.

The publ. tr. renders *bhavasi śravāyyaḥ* as “should be celebrated,” because a more lit. “become one to be celebrated.” However, despite its awkwardness, the more literal tr. should probably be preferred. The use of $\sqrt{bhū}$ + GRDV may well indicate that Agni/the ritual fire only deserves celebration after he/it has been kindled and placed to the west. The *āhuti-* in the next pāda may be an indirect ref. to the thus-placed fire as receiver of oblations, what will, by the time of the AV, be called the Āhavanīya.

The rel. pronoun *yáḥ* in c has double reference: in c it refers to the priest in the 3rd ps. and is the subject of accented *védā*; in d it refers to Agni in the 2nd ps. and is the subject of the accented *āvívāsasi*. Both referents are present in the main cl.: the priest as *údyataśruce* in b and Agni of course as *tvám agne* in a. This grammatical play cannot be easily rendered in English.

ékāyu- is a hapax and also probably a pun. On the one hand it is formed like *viśvāyu-* ‘having a complete lifetime’, *dīrghāyu-* ‘having a long lifetime’, hence ‘having a single lifetime’; on the other, it can contain the proper name of Āyu, who is found in vss. 2 and 11 of the hymn, hence Ge’s tr. “im Alleinbesitz des Āyu,” WG “den Āyu (als) einzigen (Opferer) hatte.” Although Ge (/WG) do not recognize the “lifetime” possibility, the parallel formations make such a reading hard to avoid. In the lifetime meaning, the compound presumably refers to the ritual fire’s duration through a single sacrifice or, perhaps more likely, through the lifetime of the sacrificer. In the personal-name reading, it would mean that Agni and our ritual fire have the ur-Aryan sacrificer and clanlord (see 11b) Āyu on their side (‘having Āyu as [yours] alone’?). In vs. 11 Agni is identified with Āyu the clanlord, and so here, in that identity, he brings together the *viśaḥ* ‘clans’. The publ. tr. does not register the personal-name reading, which should be remedied: I would add as an alternative tr. “having Āyu as yours alone.”

ágre: Although in absolute usage this word can refer to the beginning of time, as it were, that sense seems unlikely here because of the present tense verb. I therefore consider it to reflect a phrase like *ágre yajñásya* (VII.15.5), at least in the primary reading. Secondly, with the second meaning of *ékāyu-* (‘having Āyu as yours alone’), it may allude to the primal sacrifice.

I added the parenthetical “divine” qualifying “clans” because gods (or their qualities) are the usual object of *āvívāsa-*, and I still think that is the more likely interpretation. However, ET points out to me that, in light of vs. 11b *tvām ... devā akr̥ṇvan náhuṣasya viśpátim* “You ... did the gods create as the clan-lord of Nahuṣa,” it might instead refer to human clans. Proferes (2007) argues at length, though not mentioning this hymn, that a royal fire can unite several clans.

I.31.6: *sákman* is a hapax, rendered by Ge as “in der Freundschaft” but by Re as “en détresse” (followed explicitly by WG “aus der Not”). The former interpretation is surely the correct one, taking it as a derivative of the very common root \sqrt{sac} ‘accompany’ and directly cognate with Aves (O+Y) *haxman-* ‘association, community’. (So EWA s.v.) Re suggests a derivation rather from \sqrt{sac}^2 ‘dry up’, but the semantics of the derivation are not straightforward, and such a connection requires both the apparent Avestan cognate and RVic hapax *sákmya-* ‘comradeship’ to be decoupled from *sákman-*. It is hard to see the motivation for this proposal. It must have been that the context seemed not to be one of comradeship, but in fact there is no problem with that meaning in context: Agni demonstrates his comradeship with the man at issue by giving him aid.

I interpret the first hemistich to be entirely concerned with the sacrifice, as the loc. *vidáthe* ‘at the ceremony’ suggests. In my view *vṛjiná-vartani-* ‘having twisting turns’ envisions the sacrifice as a race-course, which the sacrificer must navigate, esp. the tricky turn at the further end. That the sacrifice was commonly envisioned as a course to traverse is clear from the word *adhvará-* ‘ceremony, rite’, related to *ádhvān-* ‘road, way’ and found in expressions like *rathîr adhvarāṇām* “charioteer of the rites” (I.44.9, cf. VI.7.2). Although *vṛjiná-* ‘twisted, crooked’ often has a morally

negative sense (like its English glosses), in this case the twist(s) would simply be tricky (that is, challenging) to steer. It is possible, with some other tr., to assume that the twisting turns are not ritual but refer to unfortunate life circumstances, but then *vidáthe* is hard to account for.

The image of the sacrifice as a race-course in ab then transitions to the image of a race or contest in general in pāda c. *páritakmye* ‘at the crucial turn’ picks up the *vṛjinávantani-* of pāda a. As so often, *dháne* is a truncated loc. absol. for the common expression *dháne hité* (I.40.2, etc.) “when the stake is set.” Contra Gr and Ge, I do not take *páritakmye* as an adj. with *dháne*; like me, Re. and WG keep the two expressions separate, and Re. suggests that *páritakmye dháne* is “abregé” from *páritakmyāyām ... dháne hité*. Although I am leery of characterizations like “abregé,” in this case I think that the form we have has been manipulated in some such way. Gr lists an adj. *páritakmya-* to which our form is said to belong, but this stem does not exist: all clear forms belong to the fem. noun *páritakmyā-*, almost all of whose forms are loc. sg. *páritakmyāyām* at the end of a Triṣṭubh line. This stem is subject to various poetic deformations: see comm. ad V.30.113–14. I believe that our *páritakmye* here also belongs to this noun stem and reflects a loc.; it is positioned exactly like the *páritakmyāyām* forms, at the end of a trimeter line after an opening of 5. But to conform to the Jagatī line this loc. has been replaced by an apparent masc./neut. loc. in *-e*, and the independent loc. absol. *dháne* has been added to supply the requisite light + anceps ending. For further on the phrase *dhána- hitá-* see comm. ad VI.45.

The last pāda thus turns the contest image into an actual battle; the line between contest and battle is a thin and permeable one in the RV.

I.31.7: Though both Ge and Re make *amṛtatvé* ‘immortality’ and *śrávase* syntactically parallel, despite superficial appearances they are in different cases and should be so rendered.

In the 2nd hemistich *kṛṇóṣi* has a complex direct and indirect object phrase: *ubháyāya jánmane máyaḥ kṛṇóṣi práya ā ca sūrāye*, with the chiasmic structure DAT.-IO ACC-DO VERB ACC-DO DAT-IO arranged around the verb. In such a structure we might expect coordinating *ca* to be positioned immediately after the 1st term of the second object complex, that is, after *práyaḥ* (*práyaś ca*); see Klein DGRV I.54 and passim. The interruption of this balanced construction by *ā* is also curious; the point seems to be that Agni makes refreshment for the first, mixed set of beneficiaries in an unspecified place but the meal for the patron right here (*ā*) on the ritual ground. It may be that the propensity of *ca* to follow preverbs in tmesis (/adverbial usage) has dictated the position; Klein implies as much (DGRV I.134 and n. 49, 227).

I.31.8: The question in ab is who is winning the stakes. I take it to be “us,” with our winning enabled by Agni’s giving glory to our poet. Most take it to be the poet himself, a poet identified as ours (“for our bard to win the stakes”). This is certainly possible. Indeed Old (SBE) actually interprets *sanáye ... kṛṇuhi* as a periphrastic causative “make/cause to win,” with the poet the first object. Although Zehnder

(Periphrastic Kaus., 2011) does not discuss this passage, he does recognize (p. 61) other examples of periphrastic causatives to \sqrt{san} ‘win’, which does not build a morphological causative (expect **sānáyati*, or possibly **sanáyati*, neither of which would cause phonological problems). Of course at this period of the language, underlying transitive verbs like \sqrt{san} should not build double transitive causatives (“cause X to win Y”).

apásā návena: the suffixal accent of *apásā* should rule out a tr. ‘work’, but most tr. ignore (Re actually cites it in his notes as *ápas-*) or overrule the accent. So Ge “durch das neue Machwerk” (i.e., the hymn), sim. Re, WG. Although Gr cites other forms of *apás-* in the meaning ‘work’, none of these is convincing. Therefore, although it would simplify the tr. to take it as neut. ‘work’, the transmitted text can only mean ‘worker, laborer’. My tr. implies that we have a new poet, or perhaps the bard, made glorious by Agni in pāda b, who takes a new lease on his poetic life. Alternatively, we might follow Old (SBE), who alone paid attention to the accent and tr. “with the help of the young active (Agni).”

The introduction of Heaven and Earth as recipients of our prayers in the last pāda of this vs. is odd, giving the vs. the appearance of a hymn-final vs., since extraneous gods are often brought in at that point. The fact that the vs. is in Triṣṭubh, rather than the Jagatī that prevails in the hymn (save for 16 and 18) also supports the view that this vs. marks at least an internal boundary, and though the initial *tvám (no) agne* sequence continues in the vss. that follow, the subject matter subtly changes. See publ. intro.

Note the phonological play in bc (... *kārúṃ kṛṇuhi ... kárma*), which may imply a folk-etymological connection of *kāru-* ‘bard’ with $\sqrt{kṛ}$, and in d (*devair dyāvā pṛthivī prāvataṃ*)

I.31.9-11: Some patterned responsion in these two verses: 9 *tanū-kṛt ... prāmatih / 10 prāmatih ... vayas-kṛt*. However, although these two verses are roughly in the middle of the hymn and patterned responsion is characteristic of omphalos verses, the repetitions do not seem sufficiently important to constitute an omphalos. On the relationship between *prāmati-* and *vayas-* and between *tanū-* and *vayas-* see disc. ad I.71.7, where it is suggested that *tanū-* and *vayas-* are the tangible and intangible elements that together make up a living being.

The “two fathers” in 9a ushers in the paternal imagery found in the rest of 9–11 (and beyond). Besides the *tanū-kṛt-* ‘body-creator’ and *vayas-kṛt-* ‘life-force-creator’, which jointly define the parental contribution to a new human being, we have the repeated word *prāmati-* ‘solicitude’, which is strongly associated with the father (see disc. ad I.71.7). Here the word first appears by itself in 9c, then along with *pitā-* in 10a (as well as 14c, 16c). The father figure in these vss. switches back and forth: Agni is first “in the lap of his two fathers” (thus implicitly the son) in 9a, but has the fatherly role in 9cd, 10ab -- then switching back to the son in 11d. The two remaining allusions to the father (14c, 16c) cast Agni in that role again.

I.31.9: As noted above (ad vs. 4), I would now change “your two parents” to “your two fathers” because of the contrast with the “two mothers” of 2.

The *naḥ* in 2nd position in the vs. does not fit easily into the first hemistich (though cf. Ge “Du Agni (sei) uns im Schosse der Eltern als Gott ...”). I have postponed it to the 2nd hemistich -- with no verb in the 1st this seems possible -- and taken it as a gen. dependent on *kārāve* ‘bard. It could also be taken as a dat. with *tanūkṛt* in a chiasmic construction exactly like that of 7cd discussed above. Hence, “become body-creator for us and fatherly solicitude for the bard. Otherwise it might be possible just to assume that it was generated to the pattern *tvám (no) agne* in the rest of the hymn, when another syllable was needed. Both Re and Old (SBE) simply ignore it.

I.31.11: On *Āyu* and *Iḍā* see disc. ad vs. 4 above. This verse clearly refers to the primal institution of the ritual fire at the *Ārya* sacrifice, but the details are somewhat obscure.

Because of the tense differences between c and d (augmented impf. *akṛṇvan* vs. pres. *jāyate*), I follow Re in taking d as the content of *Iḍā*’s instruction, namely that in mundane current-day terms Agni/ritual fire has a mere human father, the sacrificer, though it was the gods who originally created him/it.

I would now tr. *mānuṣasya* as “of Manu,” since this refers to the original establishment of the sacrifice.

I.31.12: The theme of protection gets hammered home by the use of three different roots in this semantic sphere: $\sqrt{pā}$ (*pāyúbhiḥ* a), $\sqrt{rakṣ}$ (*rakṣa* b, *rakṣamāṇaḥ* d), and $\sqrt{trā}$ (*trātā* c).

In the conjoined NP *maghónaḥ ... tanvās ca, tanvāḥ* must be reflexive “(we) ourselves,” despite *tanū-kṛt*, where *tanū-* refers specifically to the body.

In c the standard tr. construe the genitives *tókasya .. gāvām* with *trātā*, but I take them with *tánaye*, which they flank, as in the symmetrical constructions discussed above ad vss. 7 and, possibly, 9.

Pāda d can be seen as a paraphrase of 9b, with *ánimēṣaṃ rákṣamāṇaḥ* “unblinkingly watchful” an expansion of *jāgrviḥ* “wakeful,” and of 10d, with *rákṣamāṇas táva vraté* “watchful in accord with your commandment” expanding *vratapā-* “protector of the commandment.”

I.31.13: The man who lacks even a quiver lacks weapons and is therefore defenseless.

My interpr. of cd differs significantly from the standard (though it is close to Ge’s alternate, given at the end of his n. on 13cd). Most take *yó rātáhavyaḥ* as a nominal rel. cl. referring to the worshipper, with coreferential resumptive pronoun *tám* in the main clause *vanóṣi tám*, whose subject is Agni (e.g., Ge “Wer Opfer spendet ... den begehrt du.”). (Its initial position in its clause would of course account for the accent on the main verb.) This interpretation has several merits: the skeletal syntactic structure is clear; it explains the unusual position of the *tám*; it parallels the structure of 14b; and *rātáhavya-* is more often used of mortals than of

gods (a usage that might be supported here by the parallel compound *práyatadakṣiṇa-* in 15a). However, it makes the phrase *kīrés cin mántram mánasā* impossible to construe: the acc. sg. *mántram* has nothing governing it, and the “solution” in such tr. is simply to set it off by dashes and hope for the best. I therefore prefer to take cd as a single relative clause with Agni as subject. The adj. *rātáhavya-* can modify gods, including Agni in IV.7.7. This reconfiguring of the syntax allows *mántram* to be the obj. of *vanóṣi*, with the point being that Agni, by properly performing his ritual duties, acquires a powerful mantra for the weakling in his charge. (The perhaps overly heavy tr. “mental spell” was meant to highlight the etymological relationship with *mánas-* ‘mind’.)

My interpretation differs from the standard in other smaller ways. In c I take *dhāyase* not as a quasi-infinitive to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place, establish’ (e.g., Ge “um sich Sicherheit zu schaffen”), a formation not otherwise found, but to the standard *s*-stem *dhāyas-* ‘nourishment’ to $\sqrt{dhā(y)}$ ‘nourish’. I also take *kīrés cid* with the preceding dative phrase, rather than with *mántram*.

I.31.14: Again my interpr. differs from the standard, though not as radically as in vs. 13. Most tr. take ab as a single clause with, implicitly, an embedded nominal relative clause *spārhaṃ yád réknaḥ paramám*. The main clause resumes with *vanóṣi*, hence the accent, and the *yád* clause is picked up by *tád*. The problem is that the RV does not ordinarily allow embedded relatives; (almost) all relative clauses are either pre- or postposed, as M. Hale has argued in the past. I therefore supply the frame “you are kindled as protector” + DATIVE from the parallel vs. 13ab. Note that Agni as protector also begins the next verse (15).

The phrase *prá pākam śāssi prá díśaḥ* in d causes problems, because, despite the strong superficial parallelism, the two accusatives *pākam* and *díśaḥ* do not appear to be parallel. I have translated them as parallel, but admit the awkwardness. If the verb *prá śāssi* is used in the same way in both iterations, the “quarters,” that is, the geographical directions, are receiving the same instruction as the simple man. In support of this interpretation ET remarks “my guess is that the poet intends a contrast between two extremes (the limited simple man and the vast semi-divine quarters) as recipients of instruction from the one who is superior to all in knowledge.” Ge supplies a different verb with the second *prá* phrase: “du (gibst) Weisungen,” suggesting that while *pākam* refers to the person who receives the instruction, *díśaḥ* might rather express the content (“directions”) of the instruction.

I.31.15: In *upamā* I prefer to see the first attestation of the root noun compound *upamā-* ‘likeness’ (< ‘measure’), rather than the adverbial instrumental preferred by Old and apparently followed by the standard tr. How an instr. would function here is not clear to me, and Ge’s “der kommt zu oberst im Himmel” seems to push *sópamā diváh* further than the meager expression will take it. Old’s objection is that for such a root noun we would expect nom. sg. *upamāḥ*, but this isn’t apposite: in this sandhi situation *upamā* would be the outcome in any case, so it is only the Pp. reading that enforces an underlying *-ā* final. Moreover, the parallel compounds *pramā-* and *pratimā-* are attested in the RV with clear asigmatic nom. sg. (X.130.3), suggesting

that they have been reinterpreted as *-ā*-stems (see Scar p. 378). There is no reason that an *upamā-* wouldn't have been treated similarly. See also *upamā* in VIII.60.13.

I.31.16: I interpret *mīmṛṣaḥ* slightly differently with its two different objects, as “make x forgotten” and “make us forget x” respectively. The verb ‘forget’ is an I/T verb of perception (in the terms of my 1983 book), and its causative thus can take two different types of constructions.

Agni is “whirling” (*bhṛmi-*) because of the movements of his smoke and flames.

[I.32 JPB]

I.32.12: This vs. contains a famous crux. The first hemistich reads *ásvyo vāro abhavas tād indra, sṛké yát tvā pratyáhan devá ékaḥ*, rendered (up through *pratyáhan*) in the publ. tr. as ‘You, Indra, then became the tail of a horse when he struck his fangs at you’. Indra is clearly addressed in the 2nd ps., as shown in pāda a by the 2nd sg. *abhavaḥ* and the voc. *indra* and in pāda b by acc. *tvā*. This means, by easy process of elimination, that the subject of the verb *pratyáhan* ‘struck at’ must be Vṛtra. What then to do with the following nominative phrase, *devá ékaḥ* ‘the one god, the god alone’? Indra’s arch-opponent in the Rig Veda is emphatically not a god, and certainly with Indra on the scene he could not be the *one* god. There are several alternative solutions to this conflict between grammar and sense: to read this nominative phrase as an independent nominal clause, or as a continuation of the clause in pāda a with the dependent clause *sṛké yát tvā pratyáhan* embedded within it (the solution in the publ. tr.), or as anticipating the next hemistich, where Indra returns as the 2nd sg. subject of the verbs *ájayah* ‘you conquered’, etc. Thus, the first possibility: ‘you became the tail of a horse when he struck his fangs at you; (you are) the one god / (you as) god (were) alone’ (etc.); for the second: ‘o Indra, you became the tail of a horse -- when he struck his fangs at you -- (you) the god alone’; for the third: ‘you became the tail of a horse when he struck his fangs at you; as god alone, you conquered ...’. None of these is impossible, but they are all ad hoc, constructed under desperate circumstances to avoid the semantic clash between the undoubted subject of the verb *pratyáhan*, namely Vṛtra, and the immediately following nominative phrase that should not modify him.

There is a potential way out of this conundrum, however. The verb *áhan* is the 3rd sg. imperfect to the famous root present *hánti*; its older form should have been **ahant*. I tentatively suggest that the sequence **áhant evá*, containing the emphatic particle *evá*, at an early stage underwent external sandhi voicing assimilation to **áhand evá* and then resegmentation to *áhan devá*, rather than displaying the expected synchronic sandhi development to **áhann evá*. This aberrant resegmentation was facilitated by the existence of the ubiquitous noun *devá-* and the following adj. *ékaḥ*, with which that noun could be construed. My proposed underlying original **áhand *evá ékaḥ* has the particle *evá* stationed after the verb to emphasize the unusual use of Indra’s signature verb *áhan*, found in this hymn five

times with Indra as subject (1c, 2a, 3d, 4a, 5a; cf. also 11c *jaghanvān* in the vs. immediately preceding ours), with Vṛtra as subject. The following *ékaḥ* emphasizes the single combat between Indra and Vṛtra: the equal balance between the two opponents is a feature of this part of the hymn -- cf. esp. 13c *índraś ca yád yuyudhāte áhiś ca* “When Indra and the serpent fought with each other ...,” with middle dual verb and conjoined subject NP. This contrasts sharply with the much more one-sided depiction of the battle in the earlier parts of the hymn. I would therefore translate 12b as ‘when just he, alone, struck his fangs against you’.

One major stumbling block to accepting this scenario: the sandhi of **evá ékaḥ*. The hiatus found in the transmitted text in the sequence *devá ékaḥ* is of course expected from underlying **devás ékaḥ* (*/deváh/z*), with loss of the final consonant of the nom. sg. and the resulting hiatus maintained. But we would ordinarily expect the final vowel of the particle *evá* to coalesce with the initial of *ékaḥ* to produce **evaíkaḥ* (as in IV.54.5, X.44.7 *evaívá*, X.173.2 *iháiváidhi*). However, the application of the sandhi rules governing the coalescence of final and initial vowels is by no means exceptionless. For further discussion, with reff., see my “Hidden in Plain Sight: Some Older Verb Endings in the Rig Veda” in a forthcoming festschrift.

I.33 Indra

I.33.1: There is no overt interrogative marker in b, but the *kuvíd* of c may suggest a similar question in b.

The transitive thematic subjunctive *vāvṛdhāti* is assigned to the “Aorist des Caus.” by Gr, but the properly formed redupl. caus. aorist *ávṛdha-* occupies that slot. Other than our form, all forms belonging to the *vāvṛdha-* stem are medial, and it seems best to follow Kü (471) in seeing this thematic stem as built to the perfect in order to allow the root-final consonant to be maintained in forms like 2nd sg. impv. *vāvṛdhásva* (since athem. **vāvṛtsvá* could be taken to the root $\sqrt{vṛt}$ ‘turn’); see now further my 2017 art. on perf. impv (García Ramón Fs.). These medial intrans./reflex. forms in turn generated the oppositional trans. act. *vāvṛdhāti*.

I take *kétam páram* in d as referring to Indra’s “distant intention” (which we hope to move closer to us; see *úpa* in 1a, 2a), rather than our “highest wish,” as is standard. The middle voice of *āvárjate* may support this. However the other interpretation is certainly possible.

I.33.2: Given the importance of the close/distant theme in these verses and the repeated *úpa*’s of 1a and 2a, *upamébbhiḥ* in c should probably be rendered not only as “best” but also “nearest/most intimate.”

I.33.3: Although the gen. in the rel. cl. *yásya váṣṭi* appears to be parallel to *aryáh*, as I’ve tr. it, it may be better as a datival gen. “for whomever he wishes,” that is, Indra redistributes cows belonging to enemies to his friends.

I’ve tr. the part. *coṣkūyámāṇaḥ* as an impv. to avoid the awkwardness of “continuing to poke...”

In my opinion *asmád ádhi* continues the “distance” theme, and is equivalent to the common *āré asmát*.

I.33.4: *vádhiḥ ... ghanéna*, with verbal \sqrt{vadh} and nominal \sqrt{han} reverses the expected distribution found, e.g., in VII.104.16 ... *hantu mahatā vadhéna* (cf. also I.94.9), with verbal \sqrt{han} and nominal \sqrt{vadh} .

The phrase *ékaś cáran* is a first instantiation of the lexeme famous in much later times from the Rhinoceros(-horn) Sūtra. For the phrase in the dharma lit. and the association with the rhinoceros (not, in my opinion, its horn), see Jamison 1998.

upaśāká- is only here, but *śāká-* is several times used of the Maruts or Aṅgirasas in their roles as helpers of Indra (IV.17.11, V.30.10). Therefore, though there is a disjunction between “going it alone” and being accompanied by a host of helpers, I take *upaśākébhiḥ* as personal here. The *upa-* may mark them as particularly subsidiary, or it may simply have been prefixed to the stem because it is a signature word in this part of the hymn.

Other tr. take *sanaká-* as the name of a group, but it seems a perfectly well-formed *-ka-*-suffixed form of *sána-* ‘old’, with a pejorative diminutive sense appropriate to belittling one’s enemies. So Edgerton (1911 [k-suffixes]): 53: “the old rascals.” My “old codgers” is also an attempt to capture the slangy and deprecatory tone. On the demotic value of *-ka-* see Jamison 2009 (IIJ 52).

Ge takes *prétiṃ t̄yuh* as an idiom “gingen in den Tod,” but despite the later such usage of *pra* \sqrt{i} , this idiom does not appear in the RV. As indicated in the intro., I take this as referring to the separation of sacrificers from non-sacrificers.

I.33.5: Because the verb in d, *adhamah*, is unaccented, something must be supplied to complete the subordinate clause of c (*prá yád ...*). It seems simplest to supply a form of the verb \sqrt{i} ‘go’, esp. as *prá* \sqrt{i} is found in 4d. Ge’s solution, to supply the same verb as in d, is possible, but seems pleonastic.

I.33.6: The Navagvas are ordinarily adherents of Indra’s. In order to preserve this alliance, we must assume that the plural reference in pādas a-c alternates, with a and c referring to Indra’s enemies, and b to his friends.

vṛṣāyúdhō ná vādhrayaḥ is the clearest echo in this hymn of the phraseology of the immediately preceding, very famous hymn depicting the Indra-Vṛtra battle: I.32.7c *vṛṣṇo vādhrīḥ pratimānam búbhūṣan* “a steer who tried to be the measure of a bull.”

citáyantaḥ is unclear, as forms built to this stem often are, and the tr. differ appreciably: Ge “zu Einsicht kommend,” WG “erkennend,” Re “se rendant compte.” In my opinion, it is in its usual intrans. value “appearing” and adds a simile-like aspect to the main verb *āyan*, a sort of *utprekṣā*.

I.33.8

: The verse is full of adornment/clothing terms; clear are *súmbhamāna-* ‘adorning themselves’ in b and *pari* $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘clothe’ in c. In pāda a the middle

participle *cakrāṅśaḥ* has a clear parallel in the adornment phrase in VIII.14.5 *cakrāṅśa opasām divi* “creating for himself a headdress in heaven.” As in the previous verses, there seem to be two contending sides, the enemies found in pādas abc and the friends in d. “Having made for themselves a girdle from the earth” in a is easily interpretable in this framework: the enemies have fallen and are perhaps dead. But “adorning themselves with a golden amulet” in b is more difficult, since a golden amulet sounds like a positive decorative item. However, Younger Avestan has a compound *zarənu-maini* (Yt. 14.33), apparently made of related verbal material, which is the epithet of a vulture, found in a passage in which the vulture spies bloody meat from far distances. If there is a connection between the two (see EWA s.v. *mañî*), “to adorn oneself with a golden amulet” may mean figuratively “to become food for vultures.” In contrast to Indra’s doomed adversaries in ab, in d he clothes his “spies” with the sun; sunlight is often a symbol of untroubled life, as in the often repeated wish “to see the sun” (*sūryam drśé* and related expressions).

For a detailed discussion of this vs., esp. pāda b and its Iranian correspondents, see my “A Golden Amulet in Vedic and Avestan” (Ged. H.-P. Schmidt). I would now emend the publ. tr. of pāda a to “having made for themselves a coverlet from the earth.”

I.33.9: ET points out that the verb of ab *pāri ... ābubhojīḥ* “you coiled around” might be more appropriate as a description of Vṛtra; it is almost as if Indra is appropriating the qualities of his opponents in addition to his own and thereby showing himself to be even more powerful. The form *ābubhojīḥ* itself is isolated, the only reduplicated form to the root \sqrt{bhuj} ‘bend’. Kü gives it a lemma in his monograph on the perfect (351–52) but does not commit himself further, beyond stating that the form is a 2nd sg. preterite “in der statisch-attingenten Bedeutung” and suggesting that there might have originally been a stative perfect that is no longer alive in Vedic. This would allow a plausible analysis of our form as a pluperfect, with a renewed ending *-īs*, to avoid expected but non-transparent **abubhok*. JL points to the mirror-image phonetic echo *ubhe ābubhojīr* across the pāda boundary.

adhamah in d needs to be read with both pādas, c and d.

I.33.10: The rel. clauses with plural subj. in ab have no possible connection with anything in the second hemistich. I take them instead as completing the portrayal of the conflict between the two moieties depicted in the earlier parts of the hymn. The pl. rel. prn. *yé* has no direct antecedent in the preceding pāda (9d), though it can pick up the intent of sg. *dásyūm*; it can also hark a little further back to 9c *āmānyāmānān* ‘heedless ones,’ as H-P Schmidt suggests (B+I).

If pādas ab close the preceding myth, the rest of the verse seems to allude glancingly to the Vṛtra (c) and Vala (d) myths.

I.33.11: *abhí dyūn*: acc. pl. *dyūn* almost always refers to ‘days’ (as in the expression *ānu dyūn* “through the days,” which regularly occupies this same metrical position. However, *pace* Re’s “pour toujours” (which is, in any event, not equivalent to

“through the days”), a temporal interpretation does not work here. Ge (/WG) “für die Himmels(götter),” for which there is no support (their I.190.4 is better tr. otherwise) and whose dative “für” is an odd rendering of *abhí*. My “to high heavens” (the “high” being imported from the English idiom) rests on the adj. *abhídyu-* ‘heaven-bound’; as ET suggests it can be taken as a decomposition of this adjective, which, as it happens, is almost always *pāda* final.

I.33.12: Bloomfield’s disc. of the 2nd hemistich (RR) is interpretively useful, though somewhat dismissively phrased. It is too long to paraphrase here, but he acutely observes that previous translators have glossed over the problem that Indra is uncharacteristically depicted as at the end of his strength.

I.33.13: Stylistically the verse is marked by 4 fronted preverbs in tmesis, an effect not possible to convey in English without awkwardness.

I.33.15: *śáma-* ‘hornless’ found only here and in I.32.15, another piece of shared terminology.

I.34 Aśvins

I.34.1: “Three times a day” (*trīḥ ... adyá*) opens the hymn, announcing the hymn’s “three” theme and also linking it to the three pressings of (some Ṛgvedic versions of) the Soma Sacrifice.

Predicative voc. *navedasā* here rendered as part of a phrasal verb, with impv. *bhavatam*.

The second hemistich is built on an etymological relationship between the instrument noun *yantrá-* (c) and the gerundive *abhyāyaṃsénya-* (d), both built to the root \sqrt{yam} ‘hold’ (the second form presumably to the *s*-aor. of that root; so AiG II.2.503, though the reason for using this base isn’t clear). This word play is lost in Ge’s (/WG’s) tr., but I have aimed to keep it, unfortunately producing some awkwardness in the English.

I.34.4: *suprāvyè: prāvī-* and related forms I take, following Old (Noten ad II.13.9; also Scar. 501) to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, rather than to \sqrt{av} ‘help’ (e.g., Gr). The forms are specialized for the pursuit of ritual activities.

tredhéva “as if threefold” presumably refers to the Aśvins, who, though only being a pair, are as effective as if they were three.

With Ge (/WG) I take *akṣárā* (in *akṣáreva*) as nom. sg. fem., corresponding to the Aśvins, who are subject to *pinvatam*. See Old’s somewhat inconclusive disc. (ZDMG 63 [=KISch p. 310]) of the various options. Rivelex (I.16–17) takes it as a neut. nom. pl. collective; Gr. also as a neut. pl., though without specifying case.

I.34.5: *sūre duhitā* “daughter of the Sun” preserves, by most accounts, the archaic sandhi of final *-as* > *-e* before initial dental. For further disc., see Jamison 2010 (Fs).

Melchert). The myth on which this pāda is based, Sūryā's marriage, is not otherwise mentioned in this hymn. On the formulaic representation of the myth in the RV see Jamison 2001 (Fs. Parpola).

I.34.6: Ge (/WG) take *mámakāya* as referring to the poet himself (“... meiner Wenigkeit”), with *sūnáve* in apposition and identifying the poet as the Aśvins' son (“als (eurem) Sohne”). This is certainly possible and in line with the self-deprecatory use of *mámaka-* in I.31.11 for the poet-sacrificer's self-reference. It is by no means necessary, however, and it does introduce extra machinery.

I.34.7 *ātméva vātaḥ* is an underlying grammatical pun. Though *vāta-* is of course an Indo-Iranian word for ‘wind’, historically it is actually a thematized present participle to the ‘blow’ root. Here I think it is an adjective ‘blowing’ qualifying *ātmā*, which is itself being compared to wind in this simile. *ātmán-* here shows its older ‘(life-)breath’ sense, not the ‘self, soul’ that already begins to take over in the RV.

I.34.8: I take the *kṛtām* in b as predicated of both *āhāvāḥ* and *havīḥ*, with number agreement with the nearer noun and slightly different senses (at least in English).

I.34.10: It is a physical oddity that the two Aśvins are apparently credited with plural mouths. There are two possible solutions: 1) The plural expression has been adopted from elsewhere. There is one other occurrence of *madhupébhīr āsábhiḥ* (IV.45.3), unfortunately also in an Aśvins hymn; however, other examples of *āsábhiḥ* occur in plural context. 2) The mouths don't belong exclusively to the Aśvins, but to other soma-drinking gods. The 33 gods who accompany the Aśvins here for drinking in the next verse might support this possibility.

I.34.12: The *ca* of d has no obvious function; Klein (DGRV I.227-28) ascribes the construction to “looser nexus.”

I.35 Savitar

I.35.4: I take *kṛṣṇā rájāṃsi* loosely as an accusative of extent. Others (Ge, Re) supply a verb to govern this phrase (‘verbreitend’ and ‘pour traverser’ respectively), while still others (Macd., Falk 1988, WG) take it as a second acc. with *dádhānaḥ*, as appositive to *táviṣīm* “assuming the dark realms as his power.” This latter solution is possible grammatically and does not require additional material to be supplied, but I am somewhat dubious that the dark realms constitute his power.

I.35.6: This verse of cosmic mystery decked out in numerology comes as a surprise after the simple, descriptive beginning of this hymn. The syntax of c is ambiguous: Ge (Re / WG) takes *amṛtā* as nom. pl., supplying “him” as acc. with *ádhi √sthā*: “Alles Unsterbliche ruht (auf ihm)...” I follow Old, who takes it as acc. pl., citing

III.38.4 *ā viśvárūpo amṛtāni tasthau* “Having all forms, he mounted on the immortal (things?).”

I.35.7: In some ways a responsive verse to the previous one(s): *vī ... akhyat* (a) parallels 5a *vī ... akhyan*; *ciketa* (c) responds to *cīketat* in 6d; and the three heavens of 6a are alluded to in the query in 7d *katamāṃ dyām* “to which heaven (of three or more)?”

I.35.8: In b I read *trī* with both *dhánva* and *yójanā* (taking both as neut. pl.). The position of the numeral favors taking it with *dhánva*, which could, however, be singular; in favor of reading the numeral (also) with *yójanā* is X.86.20 *dhánva ca yát kṛntátram ca, káti svit tā vī yójanā* “Wasteland and chasm -- how many yojanas (of distance) are they away (from here).” (Note that *dhánva* is singular in that passage.)

I.35.10: On *svávāṃ* as nom. sg. of the -s-stem *sv-ávas-*, see AiG III.287. The Pp. analyses it rather as *svá-vān* ‘possessing property’. Curiously Macdonell (Ved. Reader, ad loc.) claims to be following the Pp., but tr. ‘aiding well’.

Most tr. take *pratidoṣám* as a temporal, “towards evening” or “every evening.” I think rather that it’s spatial, construed naturally with *ásthāt* ‘took his place, stood’. The god is facing west. (Cf. Peter Pan: “straight on ‘til morning,” presumably meaning ‘east’.) The same expression, also of Savitar, is found in VI.71.4, though it does not clinch the interpretation.

I.35.11: Although it is possible to construe c directly with d, it seems best, following Ge, to supply a verb of motion in c. The d pāda has a close parallel in I.114.10, suggesting that it is independent.

Note the unusual duplication of the nominal referent in both rel. and main clause: *yé ... pánthāḥ ... / tébhiḥ ... pathíbhiḥ*.

I.36 Agni

I.36.1: *purūṇām* is generally construed as qualifying *yahvám*, but this requires taking the latter as an implicit superlative (Ge “den Jüngsten unter vielen”), which it is not. (JL points out that a derivative of the real superlative, *yáviṣṭhya*, appears twice in the hymn, vss. 6, 15.) Better to take it as parallel to *viśām*, though, since *viś-* is fem., not modifying it as Proferes (2007: 31) does.

I.36.10, 17: As often, it is difficult to know when to tr. analyzable words as PNs rather than literally. There is no particular reason that I explicitly allowed both possibilities in vs. 10 and only the PN in 17.

I.36.13: *añjībhiḥ* would have been better rendered as ‘ornaments’ than ‘unguents’, and as ET suggests, these ornaments could be vocal.

I.36.14: In keeping with I.37.14, it might be best to change ‘favor’ to ‘friendship’ for *dúvaḥ* in d.

I.36.16: On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

I.36.18: Ge (/WG) takes *dásyave sáhaḥ* as a phrasal personal name “Dasyave Sahas,” a personal name that would have to be neuter. Better to follow Old (SBE) by taking it as a qualifier of Agni. Re also rejects the personal name interpr., but considers it a pāda-final truncation of the instr. *sáhasā*. (Because *sáhaḥ* can be construed without problem as the nom./acc. neut. it appears to be, there is no reason to resort either to Re’s truncation or to an archaic instr. sg. zero-grade ending **-h₁* in the mode of Hale [Fs. Melchert].) Old’s interpretation finds support in 19, where the second pāda contains an entirely parallel phrase qualifying Agni, with neut. noun construed with benefactive dative: *jyótir jánāya* “a light for the people.”

I.36.19: *ukṣitá-* is ppl. to both $\sqrt{vakṣ/ukṣ}$ ‘grow’ and $\sqrt{ukṣ}$ ‘sprinkle’; both meanings are apt for Agni.

I.36.20: I read *ná* twice in b, both as the neg. with the dat. infinitive *prátītaye* and as a simile marker, evoking the common phrase *mṛgó ná bhīmáḥ* (I.154.2, etc.) and its variants.

I.37 Maruts

I.37.1: There are two ways to take the apparent masc. acc. phrase *anarvāṇam ratheśúbham* in b. In the publ. tr. I interpret *ratheśúbh-* as a noun, ‘beauty on a chariot’, modified by masc. *anarvāṇam*, with the phrase an appositive to the neut. *śárdho mārutam* in pāda a. But there are some problems with this. First, the indep. noun *śúbh-* is fem. Of course, its acc. is also *śúbham*, and it is arguable that the bahuvrīhi adj. *anarván-* would make a fem. of the shape *-āṇam*, rather than a deriv. fem. **anarvaṇī-* (acc. **-aṇīm*). So the interpr. of the publ. tr. remains (barely) possible. However, the standard tr. treat the phrase as adjectival with the preceding neut. acc. This interpr. finds support in V.56.9 *śárdham ratheśúbham*, with masc. *śárdham*, and also from VI.48.15, where masc. acc. *anarvāṇam* apparently modifies the same neut. phrase as here, but in a simile *śárdho ná mārutam*. See comm. ad loc. To construct a proper neut. for our phrase here is enough to provide the answer: **anarvá *ratheśúp* is remarkably unappealing, and a slide into a form more recognizably acc. and more recognizably associated with the underlying stems is easy to understand. For *anarvá-* see comm. ad I.185.3.

I.37.1-2: An “improper” relative construction, with masc. pl. *yé* in 2a picking up *śárdhaḥ* ‘troop’ of 1a, which is grammatically neut. sg., though conceptually plural.

I.37.3: The Pp. reads pl. *kásāḥ* ‘whips’ here, and standard tr. follow this, making it the subj. of *vádān*. But *kásā-* is otherwise only sg. in the RV, even when plural entities wield it. I therefore take it as sg. *kásā* and as the subj. of *śṛṇve*, with the Maruts as unexpressed subj. of *vádān*. This also makes better sense of the positions of both *eṣām* and *yád*: most tr. construe *eṣām* with *hásteṣu*, which means the unaccented pronoun would begin a clause. And *yád* would be too far to the right in its clause: we expect *yá*-forms to follow at most one constituent. (Of course, it might be possible to interpret *eṣām kásā hásteṣu* “the whip in their hands” as a single constituent, but this would be pushing it.)

I.37.5: It is possible to take *prá śamsā* as 1st sg. subjunctive, as Re. does, though there seems no compelling reason not to continue with a 2nd sg. impv., following the 2nd pl. *gāyata* in the previous pāda (4c).

Pāda b seems an incipient izafe construction, with an appositive introduced by *yád* -- even though it is grammatically impeccable as a standard rel. cl. (allowing for the attraction in gender to neut. *yád* of putative **yám*, whose antecedent *ághnyam* is masc.).

Ge unaccountably interprets the med. pf. *vāvrdhe* as a 1st sg. (“Ich habe mich ... gestärkt”; so also WG), though he doesn’t read *prá śamsā* in a as 1st ps. Although this is grammatically possible, context suggests that the Marut troop is the subj. of this verb.

I.37.6: Although nouns not in the vocative case generally lose their accent in vocative phrases (type *sūno sahasaḥ* “o son of strength”), the conjoined genitives *divás ca gmás ca* retain their standard accent though being part of the voc. phrase headed by *dhūtayaḥ* “o shakers” – presumably in part because the pāda needs to begin with an accented word and also because this particular voc. phrase is not only structurally complex (with a conjoined NP as gen.) but also not a fixed idiom. Of course, since *divás ca gmás ca* opens the pāda, it would have to be accented one way or other, but if it had received default voc. accent we would expect *dívaś ca gmaś ca*.

I.37.9: The syntactic structure of this verse is not clear, in great part because it contains no finite verbs, and most tr. leave the structure undefined. In my interpr. pāda a is a causal clause dependent on the main clause of pāda b, with *yát ... śávaḥ* in the relative clause of pāda c coreferential with the *váyah* of b. The point is that at the point of birth, in a stable situation (a), the Maruts had the strength to leave their mother’s womb on their own (*nír √i* is a lexeme specialized for birth contexts; cf., e.g., IV.18.2, V.78.9) (b), and that same strength remains with them (c).

I construe *ánu* with preceding *sīm* (“follows them”); cf. I.141.9.

I.37.10: The standard tr. separate pādas a and b and supply a verb with the former (e.g., Ge “stimmen”) with no obvious source. I prefer to take the two pādas together and take *kāṣṭhāḥ* as an unmarked simile: “their songs (like) race-course posts.” The

lexeme *úd√tan* then has the meaning ‘stretch upward, erect’; this is the only finite form of the idiom in the RV (or, it seems, anywhere), which is mostly attested in the frozen adjective *uttāná-* ‘stretching upward, stretching out’.

Why their knees are bent is a matter of speculation, but it probably refers to a crouching position suitable for driving (cf. VIII.92.3).

I.37.11: Although most tr. take the “child of mist” to be the rain, its physical description here (“long and wide”) makes better sense for a cloud.

ámṛdhra- normally means ‘not neglectful, not slighting’, but this doesn’t yield much sense here. I therefore take it in the passive sense ‘not (to be) neglected / slighted’; English “not negligible” provides a perfect idiomatic counterpart.

I.37.13: The mutual chatter of the Maruts on their journey refers of course to the thunder.

I.37.14: For plural *dúvaḥ* pl. see Schindler, Rt. noun, p. 25, EWA s.v. *dúvas-*. The same nom. pl. is found in VI.29.3.

I.37.15: This final verse is oddly disjointed. For one thing there must be a change of person from 2nd (*vaḥ*) to 3rd (*eṣām*) in ab in reference to the Maruts; it is difficult not to take these pl. pronouns as coreferential. I supply *dúvaḥ* in a, because this pāda is structurally similar to 14b; however, this is not strictly necessary, and an interpretation like Ge’s “Denn es gibt etwas für euch zum Schwelgen” is certainly possible. As for pāda b, it is generally taken to mean “we are theirs,” and, again, this is possible. But given its structural similarity to the immediately preceding pāda, I interpret it in similar fashion, as suggesting that we have something to offer them. The last pāda then expresses what our service to the Maruts should bring about for us.

I.38 Maruts

I.38.1: For *kadhapriyaḥ* see I.30.20. In this passage the connection of this voc. with the interrogative is esp. clear, since the pāda begins *kád dha* “what indeed?” *kád* is translated twice, for clarity.

I.38.2: The gen./abl. form of *diváḥ* and *pṛthivyāḥ* is somewhat surprising, but, with Old, it is best to assume they depend on *kvà*. Although the *ná* separating them is also somewhat surprising, it is possible to take it as a real simile particle rather than a bleached connective (Re’s “aussi bien que...”). Since the point of this *ṛca* is the anxiety occasioned by the Maruts’ absence from our sacrifice, the poet worries that the Maruts have disappeared to some other sacrificer on earth as definitively as if they had gone off to heaven.

In the simile in c, “in a pasture” is supplied on the basis of the formula \sqrt{RAN} *gāvo ná yāvase* (V.53.16, etc.). Note that the expected *yāvase* shows up below in 5a, in a slightly off-kilter simile. This might be taken as “poetic repair” (see Jamison

2006: Paris poetics), but simultaneously “de-repair,” in that it introduces an element from one verbal complex into another, where it is unexpected.

I.38.5: See remarks ad vs. 2 on the simile here.

The “path of Yama” is of course the path to death (or after death, to Yama’s world). The prohibitive *mā* of pāda a must have domain also over pāda c.

I.38.6: *durhāṇā* and related forms are most likely Middle Indic developments of **durhīṇā* (etc.) ‘evil rage’ from √*hr̥* ‘be angry’. See EWA s. *HAR* ¹.

Ge (WG) take *pārāparā* as representing *pāra+apara-* ‘further and nearer, earlier and later’, but Old’s interpr. (followed by Re) as an āmreḍita preposition ‘further and further, ever further’ is more appealing. As Re points out, the adv. *pārā* and related forms are characteristic of *nīrṛti-*.

I.38.7: The standard interpr. of *avāta-* here is ‘windless’, but with Gr (see also Lub) I take it to the homonymous stem ‘unextinguishable, unquenchable’ (√*vā* ‘extinguish’). The point here is that even in a waterless place the Maruts can make rain: wind is irrelevant, but water that doesn’t give out is crucial. Cf. *avānīr avātāḥ* “unquenchable streams” in I.62.10.

I.38.8: “lightning bellows” – a mixed image, of a type not uncommon in Marut hymns.

I.38.10: Ge (WG) takes the *sādma* phrase as a parallel subject to *mānuṣāḥ* (requiring a sg. form of *reja-* to be supplied), but an acc. extent-of-space interpretation works just as well, without needing an extra verb. So also Re.

The last three verses (7–9) describing the thunderstorm are all couched in the present tense, so the augmented imperfect *ārejanta* is somewhat surprising. Vs. 10 does begin a new *ṭca*, however.

I.38.11: *ródhas-* is a bulwark or fortification (√*rudh* ‘obstruct’), in this context indicating the ‘banks’ of a river, which keep the waters within.

I.38.12: The change of person between pādas, 2nd pl. *vaḥ* in a, 3rd pl. *eṣām* in b, is exactly the same as in I.37.15 and equally inexplicable. I have therefore failed to tr. *eṣām*. It is possible, of course, that *eṣām* doesn’t refer to the Maruts, but to part of the listed equipage, perhaps the chariots – hence “Let your wheel-rims be steady, and (your) chariots and their horses” – but the parallel structure in the previous hymn makes that unlikely.

I.38.13: I have tr. *jarāyai* as ‘to awaken him’, but this is probably wrong, however appealing in context. The noun *jarā-* only means ‘old age’, and therefore some version of Ge’s “dass er das Greisenalter (uns schenke)” is better. Its intent would

match the last pāda of the previous hymn, I.37.15c “in order (for us) to live a full lifetime,” and the two hymns have much in common.

I.38.14: The first two pādas contain two punning verbs, whose double meanings reinforce each other: *mīmīhī* can belong to $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘bellow’ and $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘measure’ (generally assigned only to the latter and so tr.). In the first meaning it refers to the sound of the song, in the second to its regulated production, that is, to its meter. *tātanaḥ* can belong to \sqrt{tan} ‘thunder’ and \sqrt{tan} ‘stretch out’ (Gr assigns to the former, but standard tr. reflect the latter). In the first meaning it again refers to the sound of the song, in the second, again to its method of production – in this case, the prolonging of a tone or note. The second meanings of both verbs clearly belong to the technical vocabulary of singing (see the next pāda, 14c, as well), the former connect the poet’s sounds to those of the Maruts’ thunderstorm (cf. *mimāti* ‘bellows’ in 8a).

I.38.15: The two occurrences of *tveṣā-*, 7a and 15b, both referring to the Maruts, should have been harmonized in tr. (currently ‘dazzling’ and ‘glittering’ respectively). A regrettable if minor lapse.

I.39 Maruts

I.39.1: *māna-* seems to activate the same pun on the homonymous roots $\sqrt{mā}$ as was noted in the preceding hymn, I.38.14. The Maruts project both their bellowing and the measure of their song. (Standard tr. only recognize the ‘measure’ sense.)

“Like a flame” – what does *śocīḥ* correspond to in the frame of the passage? Ge (/WG) take it as parallel to “you” (=Maruts), as the agent of throwing, and supply an object “(ihren Schein).” But since *śocī-* is a neuter, it can as easily be an accusative and express the thrown object, and this seems to me the more likely interpretation (perhaps influenced by the modern flame-thrower). In a Marut context it could stand for the lightning they deploy in addition to the thunder represented by *mānam*. For further on this image see disc. at vs. 10.

I.39.2: The two contrastive pādas of the first hemistich express offensive and defensive procedures respectively.

I.39.3: Standard treatments (including Old) divide pāda a into a rel. cl. and main clause (e.g., Ge “Was fest ist, stosset ihr um”), accounting for the accent on *hathá* by its placement immediately after the rel. cl. However, this interpr. requires taking *yát sthirám* as an embedded relative, preceded by the preverb+part. associated with the main verb (*pārā ha*). Since RV does not (ordinarily) have embedded relatives, it is best to take *yád* as the subordinator for the whole hemistich (with domain over *vartáyatha* as well). This also makes the two pādas more parallel: Ge’s tr. of b as also consisting of rel. cl. main cl. (“was schwer ist, bringet ...”) is impossible.

I.39.4: The opening of pāda c is identical to 2c. The rest of this hemistich presents a few problems. The phrase *tānā yujā* is rendered variously. My translation is based on the observation that in almost every single instance *yujā* follows an instr. in an expression meaning “with X as yoke-mate” (X may either be animate [e.g., I.8.4 *tvāyā yujā*] or inanimate [e.g., X.83.3 *tāpasā yujā* “with fervor as yokemate”]). In this case, I take the root noun *tān-* to refer to the Marut’s entire lineage, in other words their family heritage and their sibling connections to each other. The instr. phrase *sārvayā viśā* “with your whole clan” in the next vs. (5d) may convey the same meaning. Taking *tānā* as ‘lineage’ here also has the merit of allowing a semantic connection with *tānāya* in 7a.

I separate the two pādas (so also Re), in great part because of the position of *nū cid*, which usually opens its clause (here after an extra-sentential voc. *rúdrāsaḥ*). However, a tr. similar to Ge’s, “your might is never to be open to challenge,” would also be possible.

I.39.5: The two other occurrences of *durmāda-* ‘badly drunk’ (I.32.6, VIII.2.12) are both in martial context and seem to refer to warriors intoxicated on the frenzy of battle. The other occurrences are quite negative, whereas here we must take the word as positive or neutral in describing the Maruts, who are, to be sure, frequently depicted as being almost out of control. I think this is the point of comparison.

I.39.8: The threatening *ābhva-* (< privative *á-* + $\sqrt{bhū}$; cf. WG “Unwesen”) that besets us represents the Vedic fear of formlessness. See my forthcoming “The Blob in Ancient India.”

I.39.9: The signature word of this final *ṛca* is *ásāmi-*, Ge’s “vollkommen” “complete.” It literally means “without a half, not halved,” and the insistence on this unusual form merits a literal translation, in my view, although it is less fluent than the paraphrase.

kāṇvaṃ dadá “you gave Kaṇva” -- the grammar is clear, but the meaning somewhat odd. What is presumably meant is the ancient poet Kaṇva, ancestral to the current line.

I.39.10: This verse shows a type of ring composition with vs. 1, in sense though not vocabulary. The hymn begins (1b) with a shooting/throwing metaphor, *śocír ná mánam ásyatha* “(when) you cast your measure/bellowing like a flame.” The last pāda of the hymn (10d) makes the shooting image more pointed: *íṣuṃ ná sṛjata dvíṣam* “you launch your enmity like an arrow.” The “shooting” verb \sqrt{as} of 1b is replaced by more generic $\sqrt{sṛj}$ ‘launch, release’, but the simile specifies an arrow, rather than the potentially destructive but less specific ‘flame’. The resposion between these two expressions may give added support to the interpretation of *śocíḥ* as an accusative in vs. 1; see discussion there.

I.40 Brahmanāspati

I.40.3: The sense of the hapax *pañktrādhas-* ‘whose gifts come in fives’ is unexplained. It may of course be some ritual reference (and the range of available explanations tends in that direction), but I suggest that it might be a reference to the fingers and mean that gifts come by the handful, that is, abundantly.

I.40.6: The *ca* in *c* is subordinating, as the verbal accent shows (*pratiháryathā*). See Klein: DGRV I.240.

I.40.7: Although the standard tr. take *antarvāvat* as referring to territory “in between” (e.g., Ge “das dazwischen liegende (Land)”), I follow Schmidt’s (B+I, 102; see also Old ad loc., AiG II.2.893) suggestion that it is a pleonastically marked variant of *antārvant-* ‘pregnant’, an interpretation that works nicely with the following verse. Although my translation implies that *antarvāvat* modifies *kṣáyam*, this cannot be true because *kṣáya-* is masc. My rendering is an abbreviated form of “made his dwelling place into (something) pregnant” (cf. Schmidt “seinen Wohnsitz hat er zu etwas gemacht, das ... schwanger ist”). Where I differ from Schmidt (and some others) is in the interpr. of *pastyābhiḥ* in pāda *c*. Opinion is split over whether this stem (and *pastyā-*) means ‘stream’ or ‘dwelling place’, and Schmidt goes with the former. Although that meaning works well in this passage -- Schmidt takes pāda *d* as meaning “pregnant (with streams),” that is, well-watered -- on balance the ‘dwelling place’ interpretation fits more contexts better. For disc. see EWA s.v. *pastyā-* (favoring ‘dwelling place’ for *pastyā-* and, less strongly, for *pastyā-*) and Brereton (*Ādityas*, 94–96 n. 45).

I.40.8: Most tr. (including Schmidt) render *prñcītá* with the anodyne ‘increase’, but *úpa √prc* is a sexual idiom (‘inseminate’ < ‘engorge’; see, e.g., VI.28.8). The accent on this verb probably results from its adjacency to accented *hánti* (on which see, HO and JSK – reff.).

Note the gapping out of compound in the contrastive phrase *mahāadhané ... árbhe* “when there is a large stake or a small,” where the independent loc. *árbhe* is functionally parallel to the 1st compound member *mahā-*.

I.41 Ādityas

I.41.4: The voc. *ādityāsaḥ* was omitted from the tr. “O Ādityas” should be added at the end of the first line.

I.41.8: The first two pādas have elicited a fair amount of discussion and disagreement. The questions are these: 1) What is the nuance of *prāti √vac* and, in particular, what is the function of the accusative construed with it? 2) Are *ghnántam*, *sápantam*, and *devayántam* parallel accusatives, or is there a dependency relationship among them? Ge (/WG) take *devayántam* as the object of *ghnántam* and *sápantam* (Ge “der den Gottergebenen schlägt oder flucht”), while Re (EVP V) and Old consider the three

accusatives parallel, with the first two given as negative examples, the third one as a positive one. Although I think the latter view is correct, I do not follow these scholars in their assessment of the function of the accusative with *prāti* √*vac*: both take it as the topic spoken about (as opposed to Ge and WG). However, though *prāti* is rare with *vac* (one other occurrence in the RV, VIII.100.5, non-diagnostic because it is not construed with an accusative there), when that preverb appears with other verbs of speaking (√*vad*, *brū*, *ah*), the complement identifies the person spoken to, not the contents of the speech. I therefore take the clause to mean that “I” will not bother to answer back to a man who behaves badly, either physically (*ghnántam*) or verbally (*śápanam*), though I would to a godly man. The parenthetical “as if” could be omitted here, as ET points out. With *devayántam* freed from its potential as object of the first two participles, they can instead take *vah* ‘you’ as their object (though admittedly how a mortal can “smite” the Ādityas is a bit unclear).

I.42 Pūṣan

I.42.1: Note the regularly contrasting preverbs *sám* and *ví* opening the first two pādas.

Though Re and, judging from his tr., Ge take *sákṣvā* to √*sac* ‘accompany’, following Gr., according to Narten (265 and n. 834, and already so in BR, Whitney’s *Roots*, etc.) it belongs with √*sah* ‘conquer’. That *prá* √*sah* is fairly common in the RV (including nominal compounds) while *prá* √*sac* occurs only once may support this root assignment. I am, however, disturbed by the position of the preverb and its accompanying enclitic pronoun *naḥ*: the collocation looks like the start of a new clause. I wonder if we don’t in fact have two imperative clauses here, the second with a gapped *ihī*. Cf. VIII.17.9 *índra préhi purás tvám*. My translation “go forth ... to victory” reflects this possible interpretation.

I.42.4: *tápuṣi-* is attested only twice elsewhere, both times modifying *hetí-*, hence the supplied ‘weapon’ here.

I.42.7-9: *vidaḥ* is formally an injunctive and therefore functionally multivalent. Hoffmann (1967: 263) is not certain that it has modal value, though most tr. (Ge, Re, WG) take it as an impv. (e.g., Ge “schaff hierfür Rat!”). The other question is whether the *krátu-* that Pūṣan is to find is his own or meant for us (e.g., Re “procure (nous)...”). I have chosen to take the injunctive not as an impv. but a future-oriented indicative and to interpret the *krátu-* as Pūṣan’s, not ours – the point being that Pūṣan will find the resolve at our sacrifice to fulfill the requests we make of him in the imperatives. However, the other possibilities sketched above are not excluded.

I.42.8: My “with” tr. of pāda b obscures what I think the grammatical structure is. Pace Gr and Old, on accentual grounds *navajvārā-* should not be a *bahuvrīhi*, but rather a *karmadhāraya* ‘new suffering’. The question is what relationship its pāda bears to the previous one. Re’s suppressed purpose clause (or so his supplied “qu’il n’y ait” suggests) may be the best possibility syntactically. If we simply assume an

imperative “let there not be ...” (so Maurer, sim. WG “nicht (sei uns)...”), parallel to pāda a, we should expect *mā*, not *ná* as the negative. It may be, however, that existential prohibitives (of the “let there not be” type) are blocked, because the root \sqrt{as} ‘be’ does not build an aorist and also lacks injunctive present forms, although functionally similar *mā bhūt* does occur. I have not found a discussion of this issue in Hoffmann 1967, but I may have missed it.

I.42.9: Though most of the verbs represented in this catalogue of imperatives normally take objects, the rhetorical point of this listing is the stark abruptness, and the inclusion of an object (*udáram* ‘belly’) with the final verb lays particular stress on this last desire expressed, to eat one’s fill.

I.43 Rudra and Soma

I.43.1: Tr. of *vocéma* repeated for clarity.

I.43.2-3: It is striking that Aditi and her two most illustrious sons, Mitra and Varuṇa, are depicted here as closely connected with Rudra. It is not entirely clear why, though perhaps it is simply an attempt in this relentlessly upbeat hymn to associate Rudra, who can be viewed ambivalently, with these powerful and positive figures.

I.43.4: *jālāṣa-* is “of unclear meaning” (so EWA s.v.) and shows non-Indo-Aryan phonology. In the RV it occurs twice independently and twice in this compound *jālāṣabheṣaja-* (and one of its independent occurrences is adjacent to *bheṣajā-*), always in association with Rudra. The translation ‘healing’ (see also Kuiper, *Aryans* 25-26, 46) therefore makes contextual sense, despite the lack of etymological support.

I.43.5: A verse-length relative clause, which can be construed either with vs. 4 (so Ge) or, by my preference, with vs. 6 (so also Re, WG). There is no strong evidence either way, however.

I.43.6: Global ref. to human kind as “men and women” is vanishingly rare in the RV. I know only one other potential case, the identical dative phrase in VIII.77.8, though it has a more restricted sense in that passage.

I.43.8: Although *juhuranta* and related forms are assigned to the root \sqrt{hr} ‘be angry’ by Insler (1968: 219ff.), an assignment accepted by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *HAR¹*) and further developed by Kü (602–3), such a meaning simply doesn’t make sense in this passage or in III.55.2, and so I take the form to \sqrt{hvr} ‘go crookedly, go amiss’. The phonology is perfectly apt, with a zero-grade having vocalic *u* and consonantal *r* before vowel, despite the metathesized zero-grade *hru* found in some forms.

I.43.9: The construction of the various parts of this rhetorically ambitious verse is not entirely clear, and various tr. make various choices. (In addition to the standard ones,

see Lüders [*Rta*: 231–32] and Hoffmann [1967: 260].) I take *amṛtasya* as modifying *te*, rather than construing it with *prajāḥ* (as, e.g., Ge does). I consider the two locatives, *párasmin dhāman ṛtasya* and *nābhā*, to be parallel and to express the two geographically opposed places where Soma will be searching: highest heaven and the navel of the earth (supplying *prthivyāḥ* with *nābhā* as often). The larger meaning of this verse is addressed in the publ. intro.

I.44-49: For illuminating remarks on the rhetorical and grammatical connections among these hymns, see Jesse Lundquist 2014 (25th UCLA IE Conf., Proceedings).

I.44 Agni

I.44.1: On the locative *-ar* in *uṣarbúdh-*, see Lundquist 2014.

I.44.2: *sajūs-*, opening pāda c and here rendered ‘jointly’, is etymologically related to *júṣṭa-* ‘enjoyable, delightful’, which opens the verse, and the poet clearly recognizes the connection. A tr. “in joint enjoyment with...” seems too heavy, however.

I.44.3: My interpretation of *bhārjika-* I owe to Thieme (Unters. 40 n. 2; see EWA s.v. *rjika-*).

adhvaraśrī-. Pace Gr, Old (SBE) Ge (/WG), I very much doubt that *-śrī-* in this compound (or others) has transitive value: ‘das Opferfest verschönend’. For extensive disc. see Scar (545-46), who lays out a number of interpretive possibilities but seems to lean towards the one I also favor. (So also Re.)

Related to the analysis of this compound is the interpretation of *yajñānām adhvara-*. Ge (WG) take the former as dependent on the latter (clearest in WG “der die Opferhandlungen der Opfer verschönt”), but I think it more likely that the two nouns are parallel and depend on *-śrī-*, one as an independent gen., one as 1st compound member. So Re.; Scar adduces VIII.44.7 *adhvarāṇām abhiśrīyam*, with an independent gen. of *adhvarā-*, which supports this analysis.

I.44.4: The initial word of this verse, *śréṣṭham* is the superlative associated with *śrī-*, the last word of the previous verse. A translation “glory ... / Most glorious...” would have captured this connection.

I.44.6: All standard tr. take *suśámsa-* in an active sense (e.g., Ge “der ...Schönes sagt”) with the singer the recipient of Agni’s good speech. Certainly when applied to mortals, this has to be the sense, but when applied to gods I take the adj. in passive sense ‘good to proclaim/laud’, with here the singer in the dat. (*gṛnaté*) as the agent of the praising.

I.44.7: The very common epithet *viśvávedas-*, used especially of Agni, has a potential double sense in all its occurrences: ‘possessing all possessions’ and ‘possessing all knowledge’. In fact, although the latter is generally favored in standard RV

translations, the former may be the more stable sense, in that its 2nd member *védas-* is widespread in the meaning ‘possession, property’, but not found as a simplex in the meaning ‘knowledge’. The parallel formation *jātávedas-* (see above, vs. 4) has a similar problem. Though generally rendered as ‘who has knowledge of the beings’ it could as well mean ‘who has possession of the beings’. Since *jātávedas-* seems to have become more opaque to its users than *viśvávedas-*, which does often (?) participate in its context, in the publ. tr. we do not translate *jātávedas-*.

I.44.8: Pāda a, with the list of gods in the accusative, is an expansion of *devān* in 7d. Though b begins with a god’s name in the acc. (*agnīm*), this is to be construed with the following pādas.

I.44.9: As with vs. 4, the beginning of this verse connects with the final word of the previous one: 8d ... *svadhvara* ‘o you of good ceremony’ / 9a ... *adhvarāṅṅām* ‘of the ceremonies’.

svardṛś- is a difficult word, with multiple interpretations. See Scar (pp. 234-39) for discussion of the various possibilities, though his favored one (“das Sonnenlicht sehend”) seems to me the less common, since the adj. generally modifies gods. I generally take it as meaning ‘having the look/appearance of the sun’, that is ‘looking like the sun’, but occasionally as ‘having the sight of the sun’, that is, ‘seeing the sun’. Interpretations like Ge’s “deren Auge die Sonne ist” are unlikely because *dṛś-* is not ‘eye’. See Re (EVP XII.81). In this particular passage, it is possible that ‘seeing the sun’ might also be appropriate, as anticipating the description of Agni in the next vs. (10b) *viśvadarśata-* ‘visible to all’. In other words, the gods in 9 “see the sun” and in 10 Agni, often homologized to the sun, is something that everyone sees.

I.44.10, 12: In my opinion, *purohitá-*, though preserving its literal meaning ‘set in front’, also already refers technically to a priestly office, the figure later known as the Purohita. Agni is called *purohitá-* both because he is literally ‘set in front’, that is, moved to the east to serve as the offering fire (later called the *Āhavanīya*), and because he serves as priest. JPB, however, does not believe that the word has developed this technical meaning in the RV. See esp. his 2004 “Bráhman, Brahmán, and Sacrificer,” in Griffiths and Houben, eds., *The Vedas: Texts, Language & Ritual: Proceedings of the Third International Vedic Workshop, Leiden 2002*, 325-44.

I.44.10: As just noted, this verse also shares lexicon with the previous one: 9d X-*dṛś-*, 10b X-*darśata-*.

“Rich in radiance” is a less clumsy alternative for a literal rendering of the *bahuvrīhi vibhā-vasu-* ‘whose goods are radiance’.

I.44.11: Another lexical reminiscence across verses: 10d *mānuṣaḥ#* ‘descendant of Manu’ and 11c *#manuṣvát* ‘like Manu’. As with the other examples, it is the last word of the previous verse that is matched in the next.

I.44.12: Again, lexical echo, though in this case it's the next-to-last word of the preceding verse: 11d *dūtám* / 12b *dūtyàm*.

Note the synaesthesia in the second hemistich, with the sounds of the river's waves compared to the flashing of fire. The gen. *agnéh* here is a common noun referring to the substance fire, not to the god. Its parallelism with *síndhoḥ*, also pāda-initial, helps ground this usage.

I.44.13-14: The emphasis on hearing in these verses is continued in the next hymn (vss. 2–3, 5, 7).

I.44.13: *váhni-* is usually 'conveyor', but here the gods cannot be conveying Agni, and the word seems to be quite loosely connected with the notion of conveyance. My 'passengers' is probably pushing it beyond where it should go.

I.44.14: The final pāda makes a little ring with 2c.

I.45 Agni

The theme of "hearing," found also in the last two verses of I.44, is further explored here, with its complement, the "call" that the gods should hear.

I.45.1: My understanding of the structure of this verse is quite different from the consensus, which takes *yájā* of 1c as a 2nd sg. imperative, addressed to Agni, governing all the accusatives in the verse ("sacrifice to the Vasus ..."). I instead take *yajā* as 1st sg. subjunctive, governing only the accusatives of the 2nd hemistich, and supply *ā vaha* 'bring here' from 2d to govern those in the 1st hemistich. (This is supported by the fact that *tráyastrimśatam* 'three and thirty' in 2d is a virtual shorthand for 1ab *vásūn ... rudrāñ ādityāñ utá*, the three divisions of the gods, adding up to 33).

Despite the extra machinery, I think my interpretation better accounts for the contrast between the accusatives in ab and cd: the first set names the large generic groups of gods expected to attend the sacrifice, brought by Agni. The accusatives in the second set do not fit this category; in fact, their most likely referent is Agni himself: *svadhvará-* 'of good ceremony' is primarily and characteristically applied to Agni, including in the previous hymn (I.44.8, a hymn that insistently associates Agni with the *adhvará-* in 2b, 3d, 9a; see also 4c of this hymn), and *mānujāta-* 'born of Manu' cannot be applied to other gods, but is appropriate to Agni; see *mānuṣa-* 'descendant of Manu' in the previous hymn (10d) and also used elsewhere of Agni, as well as passages like VII.2.3 ... *agním mánunā sámiddham* "... Agni, kindled by Manu." It's true that *ghṛtaprúṣ-* 'ghee-sprinkling' is not a particularly Agnian epithet, though it could work if a passive interpretation of the root noun *pruṣ-* is allowed ('ghee-sprinkled'; cf. I.58.2), and that *jána-* is somewhat awkward as a designation of Agni (see my uneasy 'being').

Still, the standard interpretation of the verse is more awkward: if the accusatives in cd are held to refer to the gods (“the divine race”; see 10a *daívyam jánam*), they are described by adjectives that ill befit them; if Agni is held to be their referent (as supported by the above arguments), then the verse calls upon Agni to sacrifice to himself; if the accusatives refer to the human race, then the verse calls upon Agni to sacrifice to *humans*, which is entirely contrary to the Vedic model of sacrifice. By separating the two halves of the verse into different clauses and by interpreting *yájā* as a 1st singular, I account for the different referent types of the two sets of accusatives and avoid having Agni sacrifice to himself by providing another agent for the verb in cd.

I.45.4: *máhikeru-* is a hapax of unclear meaning. Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *máhikeru-* and *céru-*) plausibly suggests a connection with \sqrt{ci} ‘observe, take note’; so also Old. Its apparent structural similarity to *mahivrata* in 3c might invite a complementary semantic analysis.

The etymological figure *śukrēṇa śociṣā* is not rendered so in English because “blazing blaze” strikes me as limp.

I.45.8: Note the phonetic figure in c: *brhád bhā bíbh rato havír*, playing with *b*, *bh*, and *h*; *r* and *r*.

Most tr. take *brhád bhāḥ* ‘lofty light’ as coreferential with *tvā* (=Agni), not as object of *bíbh rataḥ*, parallel with *havír*. This in some ways makes better sense, though the word order weakly favors my tr. Old (SBE) also takes the phrase as the obj. of *bíbh rataḥ* and adduces a telling parallel, IV.5.1 *kathā dāśemāgnāye brhád bhāḥ*, where the phrase is emphatically not coreferential with Agni.

I.45.10: I tr. *sudānavah* as “you of good drops,” rather than “of good gifts,” which is always also possible for this ambiguous stem, because of “the Maruts of good drops” (*marútaḥ sudānavah*) who ended the previous hymn (44.14) in the same structural position. But as a general descriptor of the gods in this verse it might be better as “of good gifts.”

[I.46-47 JPB]

I.48 Dawn

I.48.1: The voc. *uṣaḥ* was carelessly omitted in the published tr.

I.48.2: With most tr./comm. I follow Bloomfield in interpr. *viśvasuvíd-* as haplogy for **viśva-vasu-víd-*.

The pāda break favors taking *bhūri* with the verb, as most do (e.g., Ge “geben sie sich viele Mühe”), but semantically it goes better with pāda a. Cf. expressions like *bhūri te vāsu* (I.81.2, 6, VIII.32.8), *bhūri vāmam* (I.124.12, VI.71.4), and esp. *bhūri ... saubhagam* in 9c below.

On *sūnṛtā-* as ‘liberality, liberal (gifts)’, see Re’s discussion here (EVP III.17), summarizing previous work.

I.48.3: Most tr. take *jīrā* as agentive with an objective genitive (e.g., Ge “die Wagen in Bewegung setzend”), but I think this unlikely because it would be the only such usage of *jīrā-*. (*gó-jīra-* in IX.110.3 is sometimes so interpreted [Ge ‘die Kühe zutreibend’] but need not be.) Although not taking *jīrā* as transitive leaves *ráthānām* without any clear governing word, that seems preferable to claiming a unique value for *jīrā-* in this passage. That Dawn may be “the lady of the chariots” is also suggested by her hundred chariots in 7c.

The referent of *yé* in c and the affiliation of that rel. cl. are disputed. Ge takes the rel. pronoun as referring to the *ráthānām* of b. This has the merit of associating the rel. with an adjacent noun in the proper number and gender and keeping the relative clause syntactically confined to the verse in which it appears. However, it affords these chariots more agency and significance than I think they deserve. Instead, the rel. cl. of cd seems to group more naturally with the identically structured *yé* clause in 4ab, which also has a 3rd pl. presential reflexive verb preceded by a loc. pl. and also contains a genitive referring to Dawn. The two clauses also begin with a metrically irregular 11-syllable *pāda* with a rest right before the caesura, an irregularity that also speaks for their association. This pair of relative clauses is resolved by the main clause in 4cd. Such an enjambed structure is characteristic of *pragāthas*. (Re also take the two verses this way.)

Then there is the question of the meaning of *dadhriré*. It belongs to the root \sqrt{dhr} ‘hold, support’, and in this (rare) middle usage seems to have reflexive value ‘hold oneself’/‘hold oneself fast’, with the possible pregnant sense ‘hold oneself ready’ (so Re, WG, Ge n.). I take it as having slightly different meanings in simile and frame (a favored poetic strategy of Vedic bards). In the simile it depicts sailors (or some sort of boatsmen) standing firm against the rigors of the voyage, whereas in the frame the subjects (who are identified in the parallel rel. clause of 4ab as patrons) hold themselves ready to give, an action that is also the topic of that parallel rel. clause. In fact, one could almost construe (or supply) the *dānāya* of 4b with *dadhriré* as well as with its own clause.

I.48.4: This verse is somewhat oddly constructed, especially the distribution of elements in cd. The opening of c, *átrāha tād*, seems overburdened with functionless elements, esp. the *tād*, which has no obvious referent. As it turns out, this opening is found elsewhere (I.135.8, 154.6), with a likewise referent-less *tād*. I therefore assume that the *tād* here emphasizes the temporal/logical *átra*. Then we find two gen. plurals, *eṣām* and *nṛṇām*, separated from each other, but probably ultimately coreferential. I assume that enclitic *eṣām* serves as the correlative for *yé* in *pāda* a (though we might expect *téṣām*) and that the unusually heavy opening of the *pāda* has bumped it into pseudo-second position after the first real word of the clause, *kāṇvaḥ*. But until we understand more about the interaction of the placement of these various elements, this is simply an after-the-fact description. It should be noted that *eṣām* generally

does not show the standard Wackernagel’s Position behavior (modified 2nd position) that we might expect from an enclitic, and in particular has a tendency to take final position. The *nṛṇām* at the end of the verse simply doubles and further specifies *eṣām*. I have tr. *nāma* twice, for ease of English.

I.48.6: The first pāda depicts the usual effect of Dawn – sending all creatures on their daily business.

ódatī: Though this form appears to be a fem. pres. participle to a Class I present (also in its other occurrence VIII.69.2), such an analysis is formally troublesome, because the feminine stem is weak (*-at-ī*), though a strong suffix is expected in Class I (e.g., *bhávantī-*). Moreover, there are no other forms to the putative present **ódati*; the standard present is nasal-infix *unátti* with transitive value. And *ódatī-* lacks participial sense: it simply means ‘wet’. It thus seems best to take it as a non-participial *-ant-* adjective (as *járant-* is often interpreted). It is worth noting that Whitney (*Roots*) classifies it as a primary derivative of the root and gives no Class I present and that Gotō makes no mention of it in his monograph on Class I; it is likewise undiscussed in Lowe’s monograph on RVic participles.

As for its meaning here, it is used simultaneously in two senses: the literal one, ‘wet’, referring to the dew characteristic of early morning, and ‘lubricious’, referring to Dawn’s notorious hyperfeminine and sexual qualities, also reflected in 5ab *yóṣeva ... prabhuñjatī* “giving delight like a maiden.”

vājīnīvant- (also *vājīnī-vasu-*). This fairly common adjective is obviously a derivative of extremely well-attested *vājīn-* ‘prize-winning (horse)’, itself a possessive adjective formed to *vāja-* ‘prize’. The usual tr. of *vājīnīvant-* are rather attenuated — Gr ‘gabenreich’, Ge (here) ‘du Reichbelohnende’, Debrunner (AiG II.2.875) ‘gabenreich’ — or render it as if it were identical to *vāja-vant-*; so Re. (here) ‘porteuse des prix de victoire’, WG ‘du Rennpreisbesitzende’. By contrast, I feel that both the apparent feminine *vājīnī* and the second possessive suffix (*-vant-* in addition to *-in-*) should be noted and I interpret the stem as meaning ‘possessing prize-winning mares’. *vājīnīvant-* is esp. characteristic of Dawn and other female figures (e.g., Sarasvatī), who might be expected to have female animals; though *vājīnī-vasu-* is almost entirely confined to the Aśvins, those gods are very closely associated with Dawn. Debrunner (AiG II.2.409) instead ascribes the *-ī-* to “Erweiterung durch *-ī-* nach Analogie anderer Wörter,” but doesn’t in this case suggest what other word(s) might be involved.

I.48.9: The standard tr. take the injunctive *uchat* as a modal (Ge “soll ... hinweg leuchten”), but since this verb is parallel to a presential perfect *nānāma* (so Kü 278-79, *pace* WG “hat sich ... gebeut”) and a pres. indic. *kṛṇoti*, I see no reason to ascribe modal value to *uchat*.

I.48.10: The publ. tr. “with your lofty chariot ... heed our call” implies that the chariot is the instrument of her hearing. This was not the intent: the chariot is simply one of her attributes.

I.48.11: *sukṛtaḥ* is multiply ambiguous. Though it literally means ‘doing/performing well’ / ‘of good action’, it is ordinarily specialized for performing the sacrifice well and refers to the human actors in the ritual. However, it can also on occasion be used of gods (e.g., X.63.9). In this passage most tr. take it as a gen. sg. referring to the sacrificer and dependent on *adhvarān* (e.g., Ge “zu den Opfern des Frommen”). However, this leaves *ā vaha* without an object. I therefore read *sukṛtaḥ* as acc. pl., and in fact I read it so twice — once as obj. of *ā vaha* and referring to gods (so also Gr) and once as the goal of *ā vaha* and referring to the mortal sacrificers. The first reading seems confirmed by the first pāda of the next verse, 12a, which “repairs” the less clear expression with *vīśvān devāṃ ā vaha*, using the same verb. The second reading, referring to the sacrificers, allows the *yé* of 11d to have an antecedent of the right grammatical number. It would of course be possible to take *sukṛtaḥ* only once, as referring to the gods, assuming the gapping of a pronominal antecedent to *yé*, but this loses the neat equation of gods and sacrificers.

I.48.14: The relative clause of ab (lit. “which previous seers ...” *yé ... ṛṣayaḥ pūrve...*) has no explicit referent in the main clause, but implicit is the notion that our praises should receive the same favorable response from Dawn as theirs did, so there is a suppressed gen. pl. *tēṣām* or the like. The other passage containing the 3rd pl. mid. pf. *juhūrē* (VIII.8.6) is constructed almost identically to this one, though in dimeter meter, with a similar implicit understanding of the relation between subordinate cl. and main cl.

I.49 Dawn

On this hymn and, especially, on its “versified sandhi paradigm” (in JL’s felicitous phrase) and the aberrant voc. *uṣar* (4c), see Lundquist 2014. The appearance of this entirely anomalous form in the final verse of Praskaṇva’s Dawn ritual series (I.44-49) defines this series as a type of ring: *uṣar-* as an *-ar* locatival occurred in the first verse of the series (I.44.1) in the compound *uṣar-budh-* ‘waking at dawn’.

The hymn itself has a simple ring structure: *bhadrébhiḥ* in 1a (with which ‘rays’ is supplied on the basis of I.48.13) matches *rásmibhiḥ* in 4a, *rocanāt* in 1b matches *rocanám* in 4b, while the genitive *diváh* of 1b anticipated in 3d.

I.49.1: The tr. of *aruṇápsu-* as ‘of reddish breath’ is owing to Thieme (Fs. Schubring). See EWA s.v. *psu*.

I.50 Sūrya

Although this is the last hymn in the Praskaṇva group (I.44-50), it does not belong directly with the preceding hymns, which are clearly grouped in pairs and belong to the Prātaranuvāka litany.

I.50.3: I separate pādas a and b and supply a verb of extension with b. Most tr. take *ádrśram* as the main verb of the whole verse. Although my interpretation requires more machinery, it takes account of the fact that *ví* is vanishingly rare with the root $\sqrt{drś}$ (though it must be admitted that there's an example in the nearby Praskaṇva hymn I.46.11), while it is common with roots like \sqrt{tan} 'stretch', which also appears regularly with *raśmí-*. Cf. X.129.5 *vítato raśmíh*. However, the standard tr. is certainly possible. ET also suggests that since *ví* is fairly common with $\sqrt{bhrāj}$, that might be the verb to understand with bc: "... his rays flashing widely through the peoples like fires." Of course, ordinarily participles with preverbs are univerted, but not always.

I.50.4: I don't understand Ge's "pünktlich" for *taráñih*, which does not seem to reflect any of the possible meanings of $\sqrt{tṛ}$ 'cross over, surpass, etc.'. Here the idea is clearly that the Sun crosses the sky.

I.50.6: The first mention of any divine being but the Sun. The question here is whether we have two additional gods or one. The two vocatives *pāvaka* and *varuṇa* are in two different pādas (a, c), and the former is almost exclusively used elsewhere of Agni. However, already in the hymn (vs. 1) another standard epithet of Agni, *jātávedas-*, has been applied to a different god (Sūrya), and so it may be that aspects of Agni, an alter ego of the Sun in some sense, are being distributed to other gods in this hymn. Moreover, the sun is regularly considered Varuṇa's eye, but not, I think, Agni's. Re, however, takes *pāvaka* as Agni.

The other question is the identity of the "bustling one" (*bhuranyánt-*). The root \sqrt{bhur} and its derivatives are sometimes used of Agni and this referent is possible here, but I think it more likely that it refers to the human ritualist, who is active at the dawn sacrifice.

I.50.8–9: I assume that the seven mares of vs. 8 are the same as the sleek daughters (*śundhyúvah ... naptýāh*) (or granddaughters) of the chariot, but I do not know why the rare word *naptī-* is used of them. Thieme (KISch: 220), on the basis of *śundhyúvah*, thinks they are wild geese ("...hat sich sieben Wildgänse als Tochter des Wagens angeschirrt"), but this seems to introduce an unnecessary complication since *śundhyú-* can be taken in its literal meaning.

I.50.8: The reassignment of Agni epithets continues in this verse: *śociṣkeśa-* 'flame-haired' is otherwise only of Agni.

I.50.9: *sūrah*: Although most take this as nom. sg. (Gr, Ge, Th, Lü), Re makes a good case for it as gen. sg. (followed, it seems, by WG), also adducing V.31.11 *sūraś cid rátham*.

I.50.12: ET comments "1.50.12 is AVS 1.22.4, AVP 1.28.4, the final verse of 4-verse compositions for getting rid of jaundice. However, it's interesting that in both AV recensions the first verse refers to the sun, but it's not the same as RV 1.50.11. The RV

seems to have a *ṛca* which incorporates the verse that appears as 1.50.12 whereas AV tacks it on to a different *ṛca*. On the other hand, the 1st pl verb forms are jarring in RV 1.50.12, but in the AV they harmonise with other 1st pls.” This formal and structural argument suggests that the verse was taken over from Atharvan context, a possibility that its contents also support.

I.51 Indra

I.51.2: This verse displays a type of “poetic repair”: the first hemistich has a grammatical subject that is ordinarily inanimate (*ūtáyaḥ* ‘[forms of] help’) with a verb that ought to have a personal subject (*abhí .. avanvan* ‘they attained to / gained’), with an object possessing a number of qualities, but unnamed; the third pāda solves this slight puzzle by giving names to both: the subject is the R̥bhus, the object Indra.

The spatial contrast in b between filling the midpace, but being himself enclosed by his own powers (muscle-bound?) is nice.

jávana- occurs only here in the RV, but the *-ana-* suffix ordinarily makes transitive nominals (*pace* Ge’s “raschhandeln,” Re’s “véloce”).

I.51.3: Though the verse starts promisingly, with two identifiable myths (Vala, pāda a; Atri, pāda b -- though the 100-doored [house] is not otherwise known), the second hemistich brings obscurity. As noted in the intro., the standard myth about Vimada involves the Aśvins bringing him a wife, usually with the verb (*ní*) \sqrt{vah} . Is this the same story, with *vásu* ‘good thing’ a generic substitution for ‘wife’, or is Indra’s relationship with Vimada of a different sort from the Aśvins’? As for pāda d, the action here is completely obscure (see Ge’s somewhat desperate note attempting to make this about a rocky nest [Felsennest] of robbers), and what it has to do with the Vimada story is equally obscure. Since *nartáyan* in d is only a participle, it should be attached to the main clause in c rather than relating a separate myth. A final bit of obscurity is *saséna* ‘with grain’, which opens c. The stem *sasá-* generally shows up in enigmatic phrases referring, probably, to the ritual grass and/or the cereal ritual oblations.

I.51.4: This verse, by contrast, clearly concerns the Vṛtra myth and is for the most part unchallenging. It is worth noting that its first pāda is structured almost exactly like 3a and begins and ends identically: *tvám ... (a)vṛṇor ápa*. The verse also contains an occurrence of *vásu* (in b), which unfortunately doesn’t shed any light on the mysterious *vásu* in 3c. In fact 4b is the only part of this verse that is somewhat unclear: the *dānumad vásu* (‘drop-laden goods’, taking *dānu* to ‘drop’ with Gr and Re, rather than ‘gift’ with Ge [WG]) is of course the water confined in the mountain by Vṛtra, which Indra releases. But why does Indra hold it fast (*ádhārayaḥ*) in the mountain rather than releasing it as usual? The passage is similar to the Indra ātmastuti X.49.9 *ahám saptá sraváto dhārayam vṛṣā*. Perhaps he gave the waters, as it were, emotional support – but this doesn’t sound like either the Rigveda or Indra. At best we’re left with an attenuated meaning like “help out.” Or — a long shot — this is an expression like I.103.7 *sasántam ... abodhayó* ‘him “you ‘awakened’ the

sleeping serpent,” where *abodhayah* is meant to evoke its opposite, ‘put to sleep’. See intro. to that hymn and Jamison 1982/83. In that case ‘hold fast’ would evoke ‘let go’. For a possibly similar passage with Indra “bringing to rest” the waters rather than releasing them, see V.32.1 and comm. thereto. However, the formulaic nexus between \sqrt{budh} ‘awake’ and \sqrt{sas} / \sqrt{svap} ‘sleep’ is very strong, whereas \sqrt{dhr} is not regularly paired with, say, forms of \sqrt{srj} ‘release’, and so I advance this possibility only very tentatively. ET offers another intriguing suggestion. She cites the well-known Old Persian PN *Dāraya-vahu* (corresponding phonologically to Skt. **dhārāya-* + *vāsu*, and wonders “Could the poet be deliberately using, perhaps even punning on, an inherited Indo-Iranian collocation of the verb **dhr* with object **vāsu*?”

I.51.5: Note alliteration: ... *pipror* ... *prārujah púrah, prá* ...

I.51.5: JL cleverly suggests that the verse contains a word play on the PN of Indra’s defeated opponent Arbuda: by characterizing him as ‘great’ (*mahānt-*), the poet implicitly evokes the semantic opposite *ārbha-*, *arbhaká-*, which resembles the PN phonologically and would help regularize the non-IndoAryan *-b-* in *arbudá*. So, “you trampled down Arbuda (the little one), though he was great.” As JL points out, support for this interpretation comes from 13a *ádadā árbhām mahaté ... kakṣīvate vṛcayām* ... “You gave little Vṛcayā to great Kakṣīvant.

I.51.7: The phrasing of pāda b is conceptually backwards, strikingly so. Ordinarily Indra drinks the soma and is moved to be generous, whereas here his (latent) generosity rouses itself in anticipation of the soma.

vīśvāni carelessly omitted in publ. tr.: “all the bullish strengths.”

More alliteration: *vṛścā śātror āva vīśvāni vṛṣnyā*, with sequences of *v* with either *i* or *r*, followed by *ś* or *ṣ* (with a few more *v*’s and a *ś* thrown in).

I.51.9: The *avratá-* ‘having no commandment’ of 8b is transformed into the even less savory *āpavrata-* ‘against/rejecting commandments’ and contrasted with their opposite number, the *ānuvrata-* ‘following commandments’.

The image of Indra’s transformation into an ant (*vamrá-*) presumably concerns his ability to pass unnoticed in the enemy camp and then bring the fortifications down from within. However, “smashing apart” (*ví* \sqrt{han}) doesn’t seem a likely action for an ant, or even a huge nest of ants, so the combined image is somewhat unsettled.

The identity of the enemy in this hemistich is not clear. The other occurrence of the phrase *dyām ínakṣant-* (X.45.7) refers to Agni, but that identification seems unlikely here. It should also be noted that the other genitive phrase referring to this enemy, *vṛddhāsya cid vārdhataḥ* “the one who, though already full grown, kept growing,” is grammatically problematic because the active present participle *vārdhant-* should be transitive, as the rest of this extremely well-attested active inflection is. Gotō (1987: 291) notes the problem but has no explanation either. Expected middle **vārdhamānasya* would of course not fit this metrical position, but

that is not enough for a Rigvedic poet to contravene grammar. However, the active part. more nearly matches the paired ppl. phonologically: *vṛddha... vardha...*, and this may have influenced the poet to use the active form.

I.51.10: A nice adjacency figure, *nṛmano manoyujāḥ*.

Ge (/WG) supplies “with strength” with *pūryamānam* ‘being filled’, but Re’s “with soma” (an alternative allowed by Ge in his n.) seems more likely on the basis of other “fill” phrases involving Indra. Esp. apposite is V.34.2, adduced by Ge, where Indra fills his belly with soma while Uśanā offers him a weapon, much as here. Indra’s exhilaration in the immediately following verse here (11a) also supports the soma interpretation.

I.51.11: *vañkū vañkutārā* is generally taken as characterizing the speed of the two horses, and I agree that that is the general idea -- but think this meaning arises indirectly. Ge takes it as ‘flying’, Re as ‘rapid’, Hoffmann (Inj. 221) ‘ever faster moving’, WG ‘ever faster galloping’, but this basic meaning does not fit the root to which it most likely belongs, $\sqrt{vañc}$ ‘move crookedly’, or the other occurrences of *vañkū-*, esp. I.114.4. I think the nuance here is the same one found in the deriv. adj. *vákva(n)-* ‘billowing’ → ‘surging’. The non-linear movement of the root is here concretized as a wave motion, with the attendant speed and power associated with waves.

The c pāda presents some difficulties of construction, particularly the two accusatives *yayīm* and *apāḥ*, which do not match in number. Ge and Re supply ‘mounts’ (*ādhi tiṣṭhati*) from the end of pāda b (or perhaps *ā ... tiṣṭhasi* from 12a) and ‘chariot’ with *yayīm* and begin a new clause with *nīr*. So, “the powerful one (mounted) the speeding (chariot); he released the water in a stream.” Alternatively Ge suggests that c is a single clause, but that *apāḥ* is not an acc. pl., as is usual, but the rare gen. sg. construed with *srótasā*, so “the powerful one released the speeding (chariot) with the water’s stream(speed) [mit des Wassers Strom(schnelle)].” Neither of these fussy solutions is appealing. With regard to the latter, *nīr apāḥ* [acc.pl.] \sqrt{srj} appears to be formulaic (cf. I.103.2, X.124.7, the only other examples of *nīr* \sqrt{srj} that I know of), and so a gen. sg. is unlikely; with regard to the former, it seems overly elaborate to supply so much material in a pāda that can be read as a unity. I follow Old in taking *yayīm* as an epithet of (so Old) or, better, an appositive or qualifier to the waters. Since *áp-* ‘water(s)’ is in essence a plurale tantum, a parallel singular would not be surprising. For *yayí/-* qualifying waters, cf. X.78.7 *síndhavo ná yayíyah* “coursing like rivers,” adduced by Old (also X.92.5). My tr. “for coursing” rather than “as coursing” or the like is a concession to English.

I.51.12: Another verse with tricky constructions. In the first pāda the loc. *vṛṣapāñesu* goes misleadingly easily into English (“you mount the chariot to...” like “the bus to town”). Despite my tr. I think it more likely that *vṛṣapāñesu* is functionally a loc. absolute of the type “when bullish drinks (are available)” → “on the occasion of bullish drinks / when there are bullish drinks.”

In pāda b most tr. (Gr, Ge, Re, WG) take *prábhṛtā* as representing *-āḥ* out of sandhi – following the Pp., hence a nom. pl. m. past participle – but as Old points out, this is very disruptive to the syntax. Better, with Old, to interpret it as a loc. sg. to the *-i*-stem *prábhṛti-* ‘presentation’, a possibility suggested by Pischel (see Old) and mentioned by Ge in his n.

Pāda c is standardly taken as preposed to d and the verb is tr. as indicative (e.g., Ge “du ... deine Freude hast,” Re “tu prends plaisir”), but *cākānaḥ* is undeniably subjunctive; *yáthā* + subjunctive regularly builds purpose clauses, which are regularly postposed. I therefore take pāda c with ab: the purpose of Indra’s mounting of the chariot is the pleasure he will receive at the soma sacrifice.

In d all tr. take *ślókam* as ‘fame’, but the noun refers rather to a very perceptible noise or call that signals some event. The event is often the sacrifice and the *ślōka-*, the noise, is often issued by the pressing stones (e.g., I.113.3, 139.10, III.53.10); the noise of the *ślōka-* is loud enough to reach to heaven (e.g., I.83.6, 190.4). This pāda contains this same notion of the *ślōka-*, the audible signal of the sacrifice, going to heaven, but it seems also, oddly, to suggest that Indra follows it there. Perhaps this refers to Indra’s departure to heaven at the end of the sacrifice, a common theme.

I.51.13: Indra’s transformation into a human female is no more surprising than his changing into an ant in vs. 9, and is better supported. See Ge’s note, as well as my 1991 *Hyenas*, where in a widespread story in Vedic prose Indra is transformed into a female hyena.

I.51.14: The standard tr. take pāda b as a nominal sentence (“the praise song is a doorpost”), but the verb of pāda a, *aśrāyi* ‘has been fixed, propped’, fits b very nicely, as Old argues. Ge suggests such an interpretation in his notes, without rendering it in tr.

The poet Kakṣīvant mentioned in vs. 13 is associated with the Pajras, who are mentioned a number of times in the hymns attributed to Kakṣīvant. ET points out that pāda b probably contains a pun on the PN *pajrá-*, which literally means ‘sturdy, steadfast’, a meaning which works well with the fixed doorpost.

I take *prayantā* in d as a periphrastic future, not a straight agent noun.

I.52 Indra

I.52.1: The verb *mahayā* can either be a 2nd sg. imperative (so Ge [/WG]) or a 1st sg. subjunctive (so Re). In favor of the former interpretation is the parallel initial verse of the last hymn, I.51.1. *abhí tyám meṣám ... madatā*, with imperative (2nd pl.); in favor of the latter is the other main verb in this verse, 1st sg. opt. *vavṛtyām*. Either is possible; I weakly favor the 1st ps. subjunctive.

Since *subhū-* ‘of good essence’ is adjectival, a noun should be supplied as the subject of pāda b (*pace* Ge, who simply tr. “Kräfte”). The likely solution is found in

vs. 4 *subhvàḥ svā abhīṣṭayaḥ* “his own superior powers of good essence,” and I have supplied *abhīṣṭayaḥ* here. (So also, it seems, WG.)

The standard tr. take cd as a single clause, with the acc. *índram* of d identified with the *rátham* of c. Although this is not impossible, turning the literal chariot of a god towards the sacrifice is a common practice in the RV, just as turning the god himself is, and an equation of Indra and the chariot is somewhat awkward. I therefore think we have two separate clauses, with *ā ... vavrītyām* applicable to both.

The c pāda has, in my interpretation, a non-insistent but appealing syntactic play, with the compound *havana-syád-* “rushing to the summons” parallel to the simile *átyaṃ ná vājam* “like a steed (rushing to) the prize” — the suppressed term being a form of the root $\sqrt{\text{syand}}$ and the accusative *vājam* matching the first compound member *havana-*.

I.52.3: A challenging verse, describing Indra in unusual ways and deploying unusual words and constructions.

The first pāda contains the difficult but clearly related words *dvaró dvarīṣu*, which seem also to belong with *vṛka-dvaras-* (II.30.8) ‘having the X of a wolf’. Wackernagel (1918 [see details in EWA s.v. *dvará-*] = KISch 325-26) adduces the Avestan root *duuar*, which expresses a daevic way of moving. If *vṛka-dvaras-* means ‘having the movement/gait of a wolf’, I tr. the words in this passage as ‘skulking, skulker’, as characteristic of a wolf.

The rest of the first pāda consists of *vavrá ūdhani*. The latter is clearly a locative, but the former is taken by the Pp. as *vavráḥ*, nom. sg. of *vavrá-* ‘cave, cavity’ out of sandhi, an interpretation followed by the standard tr. and argued for by Old. (Gr, however, takes it as a 3rd sg. pf. to $\sqrt{\text{vṛ}}$ ‘cover’, *vavré*.) The sense is taken to be “a cavity at the (soma) udder”; that is, Indra’s mouth, throat, and stomach are an enormous empty space to be filled with soma. By contrast I take it as a loc. to the same noun *vavrá-* and a simultaneous reference to the Vṛtra myth and the Vala myth, as well as fitting the image conjured up by the *dvar-*words. To start with the last, caves are good places to skulk and quite possibly a haunt of wolves. As for the Vṛtra myth, Vṛtra himself is called a *vavrá-* in V.32.8, while Vala is itself a cave and the word *vavré* is several times used of this myth and Indra’s involvement in it (IV.1.13, V.31.3). Thus Indra is “skulking” in the vicinity of these mythological enemies in the first part of this verse. The published tr. limits the reference of *vavré* to the Vṛtra myth; I would now expand that.

I then take the adjacent loc. *ūdhanī* as contrastive and construe it with pāda b: Indra skulks near his enemies (the “cavities”), but at the (soma-)udder he becomes roused to elation and display his golden foundation, that is, the riches he will dispense in return for the soma. Indra’s bright *budhná-* here contrasts with the *budhná-* associated with Vṛtra in vs. 6, where the latter lies on the *budhná-* “of the dusky realm” (*rájasah*).

The last part of the last pāda, *sá hí páprir ándhasah*, is also problematic. It is universally interpreted as “he is filled / fills himself with soma,” which makes good sense. Unfortunately it does violence to the grammar. First, *pápri-* does not

otherwise mean ‘filling’ (in my opinion, but see, e.g., Grestenberger, JAOS 133.2: 271, though she does not give exx.), but either ‘providing’ or ‘delivering’. Furthermore, reduplicated *-i-* nominals are otherwise agentive (AiG II.2.291-93) and regularly take accusatives (see esp. VI.50.13 *dānu pápriḥ* ‘supplying gifts’)(see Grestenberger JAOS 133.2). Ge is aware of the morphological problem (though not, it seems, the semantic one) and in his n. suggests that the form is either reflexive or that *jaṭhāram* ‘belly’ should be supplied, but there is no basis for either of these solutions. Therefore, although I see the attractions of “is filled with soma,” I do not see a way to wrest this meaning out of the text. Instead I take *ándhasaḥ* as a causal ablative and *pápriḥ* in the same fashion as VI.50.13. The clause then paraphrases pāda b: Indra provides wealth because he becomes exhilarated on soma.

I.52.4: It is not clear to me why Indra’s superior powers have barhis as their heavenly seat, but this does not license the grammatically impossible tr. of Ge and Re, who seemingly take *sádmabarhiṣaḥ* as modifying *índram*.

For *avātá-* see comm. ad I.38.7 and VIII.79.7.

I.52.5: *svávṛṣṭi-* is found only here (and 14c below, in the same phrase), and the etymological identity of *vṛṣṭi-* is not clear. Easiest (with Gr) would be to take the second member as *vṛṣṭi-* ‘rain’, but ‘having his own rain’ doesn’t make much sense. Ge (n. to 14bc) connects it with *várṣman-* ‘height’, *várṣiṣṭha-* ‘highest’, *vṛṣan-* ‘bull’, tacitly positing a root $\sqrt{vṛṣ}$ ‘be high/great’ and tr. ‘Eigengrösse’. One of the difficulties with this interpretation is that the word should be a bahuvrīhi (so Old) not a karmadhāraya, judging from parallel formations (cf. *svá-yukti*, *svá-vṛkti* [pace Gr, Old]). I prefer the interpretation that links the word to the IE root **uerǵ* ‘work’, found in Aves. *varəz* (and of course Engl. work, Grk. *ἔργον*)(see EWA s.v. *svávṛṣṭi-*). So, evidently, Re: “son action propre,” though Re also takes it as a karmadhāraya. Because of the formal parallels, I interpret it as a bahuvrīhi ‘having his own work’, even though this causes some problems: in this clause Indra must be referred to both in accusative, in this compound, and in the genitive, in the phrase *asya yúdhyataḥ*, which depends on *máde*. Nonetheless, as usual I don’t feel we can ignore grammar whenever it complicates interpretation.

I.52.6: *durgṛbhiśvan-* clearly belongs with *durgṛbhi-*, but the *-śvan-* is curious. Probably best to explain it, with Scar (116) as a Kunstbildung based on *ṛjíśvan-* and possibly *mātaríśvan-*. For this reason I’ve translated it as a nickname.

I.52.7: I take *yújyam* as having gerundive force, construed with *te*, rather than simply ‘his own’ < ‘associated (with himself)’ of other tr.

I.52.9: Another puzzling verse, and my interpretation is accordingly not at all certain. I take the first pāda, couched in the neuter, to refer to the sun (n. *svār-*), the placing of which in heaven (as m. *sūryam*) was Indra’s last act in vs. 7. In the 2nd pāda the subjects of *ákrṇvata* (note the middle, which should have self-beneficial force) make

this sun into their own means of getting to heaven. As an *-ana-*nominal, *róhana-* (only here) should have transitive-causative force.

However, I think there is more going on here, for in the 2nd hemistich Indra is identified as the sun (n. *svàr*), while his helpers, the Maruts, are associated with humans, the descendents of Manu (*mānuṣa-*), and their activities. If Indra is the sun, then the sun of pāda a, which the Maruts/gods used to get themselves to heaven in pāda b, may well be Indra. For this identification note the *-(ś)candra-* reminiscent of Indra's *candra-* in 3b, and in 6a the glowing heat surrounding Indra and his flaring power seem to depict something very like a solar Indra. The Maruts' aid to Indra in the Vṛtra battle (4c, where they are called *ūtáyaḥ* as here) stood them in good stead, enabling them to bridge the distance between the human world and heaven by hitching their wagon to a star (=sun, =Indra).

I do not quite understand the *bhíyasā* of b, though it obviously must be considered in connection with the same word in the same metrical position in the b pāda of the next verse. I assume it refers here to the awe- and fear-inspiring aspects of Indra in his celestial form.

I.52.10: I agree with Ge (against Pp, Gr, Old, Re, WG) that loc. *vájre* should be read for Pp. nom. *vájraḥ* and that this locative is functionally, but not grammatically, parallel with *áheḥ svanāt* “from the sound of the serpent.”

With Ge and Old (and back at least to Ludwig), I see no choice but to accent the apparent voc. *rodasī* as *ródasī*. In the publ. tr. it should therefore be marked with an asterisk.

I.52.11: I supply a form of $\sqrt{\text{tan}}$ ‘extend’ in the first pāda, though with a general injunctive sense, not the subjunctive of *tatánanta* in b. The “ten coils” of pāda a invite an interpretation of increased or increasing space, as do the next verses with their emphasis on distance and vast space.

I.52.13: The 2nd sg. act. forms *bhuvah* and *bhūḥ* that serve as the main verbs of the first two pādas respectively are difficult to distinguish. (Note that Hoffmann [Inj. 214–15] translates them both as “bist.”) The problem is made more acute by the fact that though *bhūḥ* is definitely a root aor. injunctive, *bhuvah* can either be an injunctive to the marginal and secondary thematic aor. stem *bhúva-* or the subjunctive to the root aor., as it is, in fact, in 11d. I have made an effort to distinguish them in tr., and given the general preterital cast of this verse and the previous one I am reluctant to interpret *bhuvah* as subjunctive (“you will become the counterpart of earth”), though that interpretation is not beyond possibility.

I.53 Indra

I.53.1: I am puzzled by Ge's (/WG) interpretation of this pāda, which introduces a thief with no support from the text (“Noch nie hat ja einer das Kleinod wie (ein Dieb) bei Schlafenden gefunden”). As far as I can tell, the proposed purport is that it's easy

for a thief to find (and presumably steal) a treasure that belongs to people who are asleep, but not so easy for us to do so in this case. WG remark that stealing something from sleepers is a favored theme in later literature. But it is not otherwise met with in the RV, as far as I know, and it doesn't fit the context very well. I think the point is rather simpler: we had better get to work presenting our praise to Indra because the lazy and somnolent don't get rewarded – “asleep at the switch” is an English idiom for people who don't pay attention.

I.53.2: The slightly slangy tone of the previous verse is continued here, in the repeated verb *duráḥ* ‘break out’ and the cpd. *ákāmakarśana-* ‘not shorting desires’, as well, perhaps, as *śikṣānará-* (for which see AiG II.1.316–17, which classifies it with cmpds of the type *trasá-dasyu-* with verbal 1st member governing the 2nd). There is surely more to be said about *śikṣānará-*; among other things, its accent doesn't match the *trasádasyu-* type. But at least for now I will avoid the very contentious topic of such cmpds. *śikṣānará-* is also found in IV.20.8.

I.53.3: *mā ... kāmam ūnayīḥ* “don't leave the desire lacking” matches the compound *akāmakarśanaḥ* “who does not short their desires” in 2c.

I.53.6: *tāni vṛṣṇyā* can be either nom. or acc. Most tr. opt for the former, but I do not see how “bullish powers” can be the agent of exhilaration in the same way that soma drinks are. Surely the point is to rouse Indra's bullish powers for the fight to come.

Ge (/WG) take *dáśa ... sahásrāṇi* as “ten thousand,” while Re separates the two numbers as I do. The former interpretation is certainly possible, although the distance between the words mildly supports taking them separately. The compound numbers in vs. 9 are adjacent to each other. However, note *navatím ... náva* ‘99’ in I.54.6d.

A little phonological play: *barhíṣmate ... barháyaḥ*.

I.53.7: Note the parallel complex double figures opening pādas a and b: *yudhā yúḍham* and *purā púram*, with instr. and acc. sg. of a root noun in each instance.

I.54 Indra

I.54.1: The *mā* prohibitive lacks a verb, and there is nothing nearby to supply. The universal solution, “leave, abandon,” does the trick, although it would be nice to have some support for it.

róruvad vānā is variously interpreted. I have taken *vānā* as extent-of-space, though construing it as a second object of *ákrandayaḥ* (WG) would also be possible, save for the fact that the same phrase recurs in 5b and WG must construe it with a different verb. There seems no reason to supply a separate verb to govern it, as Ge does: “(du knackest),” and taking *vānā* as agreeing with *róruvat* as Re does (“les arbres (ont) grincé-violemment”) introduces unnecessary grammatical complications. (Is he thinking of this as a variant on neuter pl. + sg. verb?) For an expression similar

to my suggested interpretation see *váne ... vacasyate* “display his eloquence in the wood” in the next hymn (55.4).

I.54.3: The construction of the second hemistich is not entirely clear. Most tr. take *barhánā kṛtāḥ* together (e.g., Re “créé par une pression-violente”), but this requires supplying a verb with the first part of pāda d (e.g., Re “(s’est mis)”). I instead think the idiom is *purāḥ √kr* ‘put in front’ (I.102.9, VIII.45.9, X.171.4, of which the first two have ‘chariot’ as obj. – e.g., VIII.45.9 *rātham purāḥ ... kṛnotu*). I do *not* take *hāribhyām* as an ablative, because 1) *purāḥ* + ABL is only dubiously attested, and 2) setting Indra-as-chariot in front of his horses would be literally putting the cart before the horse. I take *hāribhyām* as dative, and think the idea is that Indra/the chariot is set out front for the horses, that is, for them to be hitched up.

Ge and Re take *vṛṣabhāḥ* with *rātho hí śāḥ*, but this is basically impossible, given the position of the *hí*, which overwhelmingly takes 2nd position. Nonetheless I agree that Indra is being identified with the chariot (not, however, with Ge the chariot(-fighter)); WG supply “word” as the referent of *śāḥ*, but the striking equation of Indra and chariot better fits the extravagance of the praise of Indra.

I.54.5: *ní ... vṛṇákṣi* is here tr. ‘yank down’, whereas in the preceding hymn, 9d, I render *ní ... avṛṇak* as ‘wrenched down’. The two should have been harmonized in the publ. tr. More serious is the question of what object the verb takes here. Most tr. use *vánā*, which, admittedly, is the only available accusative, but I am reluctant to follow this interpretation for two reasons: 1) As noted above *róruvad vánā* also appears in 1c, which suggests that these words belong together and one shouldn’t be extracted to serve as a complement for a different verb; 2) I really doubt that there’s an alternate version of the Śuṣṇa story that involves felling trees on his head. In fact Śuṣṇa himself serves several times as the object of (*ni*) *√vrj* (I.101.2 *śúṣṇam asúṣaṃ ny āvṛṇak*, also VI.18.8, 26.3). In nearby I.51.11 Indra destroys Śuṣṇa’s fortified strongholds (*dṛṃhitāḥ ... púrah*), and I’m inclined to supply them here, with Indra wrenching them down onto the head of their hapless defender. Note that Indra also destroys *púrah* in the next vs. (6d). I would thus change the publ. tr. to “as you wrench down (the fortresses) of the snorting Śuṣṇa onto his head.”

The question in the last pāda, *kás tvā pári*, lacks a verb, but it does contain the preverb *pári*, which suggests the solution: *pari √vrj* is a common idiom meaning ‘evade, avoid’, and since the root *√vrj* supplies the main verb of the earlier part of the verse (5a *ní ... vṛṇákṣi*), there is support for supplying it here, with the pleasing effect that the two different preverbs used with it provide two different idioms.

I.54.6: Support for supplying ‘help’ in pāda c (from *āvitha* in a) comes from VIII.50.9 *yáthā prāva étaśam kṛtvye dháne*, with the same root *√av* ‘help’ and the same situation depicted.

I.54.7: As Ge notes, *práti inoti* is not otherwise attested, and so its sense here is unclear (Ge “der sich an das Gebot hält,” Re “qui ... va au-devant de l’ordonnance,”

WG “der ... das Gebot entgegensendet”). I prefer to read the *prāti* as adverbial ‘in turn’, not as a preverb, and *ínvati* in its usual transitive sense ‘drive, advance [smtg]’. See I.55.4.

I.54.10: A poetically dense verse with striking images and concomittant difficulties.

The first problem is the isolated compound *dharúṇa-hvara-*, modifying *támaḥ* ‘darkness’ in pāda a. The compound is generally interpreted as a tatpuruṣa, with *-hvara-* in verbal sense governing the first member (e.g., Ge “die den Urgrund der Gewässer zu Fall brachte”), but the accent is wrong: we would expect final accent of the type *puram-darā-* ‘fortress-smashing’, *brahma-kārā-* ‘formulation-making’. By accent the compound should be a bahuvrīhi (so WG “deren Wölbung ihr Grund war”). The *s*-stem *hvāras-* means ‘snare, tangle’ (from the meaning of the root \sqrt{hvr} ‘go crookedly’). I suggest that *hvarā-* has a similar meaning and the whole compound means ‘whose tangles were the foundation (of the waters: *apām*)’. And what would this mean?

In order to decode it, we must first note the use of *dharúṇa-* elsewhere in the Savya hymns: 52.2: *pārvato ná dharúṇeṣu ácyutaḥ* “like a mountain, immovable on its foundations” and 56.5-6: *ví yát tiró dharúṇam ácyutam ...* “when you traversed the immovable foundation” and ... *divó dharúṇam ... pṛthivyāḥ ...* “the foundation of heaven and of earth.” Given the connection of *dharúṇa-* with *ácyuta-* and *pārvata-* elsewhere, I think we can confidently take the *támaḥ* in a and *pārvataḥ* in b as coreferential (unlike Ge [WG], Re). Remember also that *Vṛtra* is associated with murky darkness (e.g., his lying “on the foundation of the dusky realm” in I.52.6). In other words the mountain within *Vṛtra*’s belly in pāda b is the pure darkness of pāda a. Its “tangles” represent the inability to see a clear path in the dark and may also represent what happens to vision as it gets dark, the blurring and distortion of objects. These tangles provide a foundation, and an enclosure, for the waters. If I am correct, it is a powerful image.

The second hemistich is also problematic. At issue is the meaning of *anuṣṭhāḥ*, which Indra smashes. The form must be acc. pl. feminine (though Scar [644] allows the possibility of a nom. sg. masc., which would necessarily separate it from the preceding *viśvāḥ*). The lexeme *ánu* $\sqrt{sthā}$ straightforwardly means ‘stand by, stand following, stand along’ and can be used for helpers who stand by a leader (as indeed in nearby I.52.4); see exx. adduced by Scar. Scar then reasonably suggests that *anuṣṭhāḥ* here refers to ‘Gefolgsleute’ (sim. WG). But this introduces a set of subordinates and helpers to *Vṛtra* that do not otherwise figure in this well-known myth. Ge takes it as “Einsperrer” (barriers), which makes sense but is hard to extract from the form. Re’s “les positions-successives” is apparently an attempt to render Ge’s translation in a lexically legitimate way, but it doesn’t make much sense. My “rows (of palings) ... in succession” is a similar attempt, with the palings a complete invention. I do not feel that a satisfying solution has yet been reached.

I.55 Indra

I.55.1: phonetic figure ... *ví papratha*, ... *pṛthivī* ... *prāti* #

I.55.1–2: The two stems *varimán-* and *várīman-* appear here in successive verses without clear differentiation in meaning (though they do appear in different grammatical forms, nom. sg. and instr. pl. respectively).

I.55.2: The object of the verb *prāti gṛbhñāti* in the frame, which would correspond to the rivers in the simile, is not expressed. Ge (/WG) supplies “die Somaströme,” Re “chants.” Given the liquid nature of the simile, Ge’s suggestion seems the most likely. Unfortunately most of the examples of *ví √śri* are used of the opening of the divine doors in Āprī hymns, so there is no formulaic material to aid in determining what to supply.

The phrase *yudhmá ójasā* is repeated in 5b and *ójasā* alone in 6b, both in the same metrical position.

I.55.3: As Ge notes, *√bhuj* ‘enjoy, derive benefit’ is formulaically associated with mountains, however odd that association may be to us. The question is then what does Indra enjoy *like* a mountain. Ge takes it to be one of the elements in b, either the ‘principles’ (neut. pl. *dhárman-*) or the ‘manliness’ (neut. sg. *nṛmṇá-*), and interprets masc. sg. *tám* in pāda as attraction from *tāni* or *tád* respectively. This is not impossible, but I prefer to take the object in the frame as soma, which has the correct gender and number, appeared in the previous vs. (2c), and is certainly something Indra enjoys (although I have found no passages in which soma is explicitly construed with *√bhuj*). The message of this first hemistich of vs. 3 – that Indra displays manly power in order to enjoy the soma – is essentially the same as that of 2c, where he “acts the bull” to drink the soma.

Re rather trickily interprets the simile / frame construction with one verbal expression in the frame (*irajyasi* “tu règnes sur”) and one in the simile (*bhujé* “comme on jouit”), but this completely violates the structure of RVic similes, which always hold the verbal notion constant between simile and frame. See Jamison 1982 (IIJ 24). WG supply soma, as I do, but also supply the verb ‘drink’ in pāda a and separate it syntactically from pāda b. There seems no reason to do that.

In c I am very tempted to read **devátāti* with one accent, the loc. sg. of *devátāt-*, rather than the transmitted *devátāti*, that is, *devátā + āti*, with the adverbial instr. to *devátā* plus the preverb *āti*. (An asterisk should therefore be inserted in the publ. tr.) The loc. **devátāti* would convey essentially the same meaning as *devátā*, and though *prá √cit* is very common, *prá-āti √cit* would only occur here. For a parallel construction with *prá cékite + instr.* and loc., see VI.61.13 *prá yā mahimnā mahínāsu cékite* “The one who by her greatness shines ever more brightly among the great (rivers).”

I.55.4: What’s going on in this verse is a little baffling, but it seems to concern Indra’s participation in the ritual as a (quasi-)priest-poet, speaking along with the other priests (*namasyúbhiḥ*)(a) and (b) announcing his own name at that ritual. (That

‘name’ should be supplied here is clear from I.57.3, another Savya hymn, with *nāma indriyām.*) Indra’s “singing along” with the human priests, as it were, is also found in the passages adduced in Ge’s n. to 4a. It is a familiar topic.

Indra also seems to be homologized to soma in the first pāda: the only other occurrence of *vacasyate* is found in a soma hymn (IX.99.6), where soma “displays his eloquence” while sitting in the cups (*camūṣu*). Our word *vāna-* ‘wood(en)’ is often used in the soma maṇḍala for the wooden cup in which soma is put, and a well-attested formula combines *vāne*, the bull (there =soma), and noisemaking, as here: IX.7.3 *vṛṣāva cakradad vāne* “the bull has roared down into the wood(en) cup” (cf. IX.74.1, 88.2, 107.22). This superimposition of soma imagery on Indra contributes to the obscurity of this pāda, esp. what “in the wood” means in reference to Indra. Ge (n. 4a) seems to think of a sort of summer camp in the woods for ṛṣis and their families, while Re suggests a “marche” in the forest. I doubt both scenarios, although I do not have a satisfactory solution of my own. If *vāne ... vacasyate* evokes the phrase *róruvad vānā* of the immediately preceding hymn (54.1, 5), it can on the one hand refer to Indra’s loud roar while doing battle in a natural setting; but in a ritual context it might refer to the sacrificial posts or to the wood for the ritual fire, though I am not entirely persuaded by either.

Indra’s benevolent aspect, despite his bullish nature, is emphasized in the second hemistich.

I.55.5: As noted in the intro., this martial verse contrasts with the peaceful preceding one, a contrast emphasized by their parallel structure.

A cute play in *nighánighnate*, where the preverb *ni* appears to repeat in the middle of the word, although the second *ni* consists of the root-final *n* of the intensive reduplication followed by an *i*-liaison.

I.55.6: This verse cannot be a single clause (as Re, WG seem to take it) because the finite verb *srjat* in d lacks accent, while *hí* in the first pāda should induce accent on the verb. But if we separate the last pāda from the rest, there is no main verb, just the pres. participles *vināśáyan* and *kṛṇvān*. Although present participles are rarely predicated (as opposed to past participles), there are cases of such predication (*pace* Lowe 2012), and I consider this one of them. In fact I connect the first three pāda of this verse with the preceding verse, 5cd – with 6abc giving the reasons why the people trust Indra – and the present participles in some sense reflect the intensive (that is, iterative-frequentative) participle of 5d: he “is doing” rather than “did/does” the actions; they are repetitive and ongoing.

I.55.7: “mind on” is the English idiom and is therefore used here, despite the Skt. dative *dānāya*.

kéta- can belong either to gods or to men; here they must be Indra’s since they are identified with his *sārathi-* ‘coachmen, charioteers’. His intentions are presumably to come to the sacrifice for praise and soma and, more to the point from our point of view, to give to us, as expressed in the first pāda.

I.55.8: The etymological figure in b, *áṣālham sāhaḥ*, rendered here with the somewhat awkward “undominatable dominance” and belonging to the root \sqrt{sah} ‘vanquish, conquer’, is notable in part because the two root syllables *ṣālḥ* and *sah* share no surface phonemes, since the past participle has undergone several regular phonological processes that obscure its relationship to *sah*. Nonetheless any Vedic speaker would instantly see the connection.

The simile in c is a little unclear in the absence of real-world knowledge of life in Vedic India. WG suggest that, on departure from a temporary stopping place, wells need to be covered over to avoid their getting filled in or otherwise damaged; this seems reasonable, although I don’t see that this action needs to be restricted to camps that are being left. In general it makes sense also in permanent settlements to cover wells to avoid their being contaminated. In any case, the simile seems rather more pointed and precise than necessary: that Indra has many hidden powers, mental and physical, is a commonplace, and the image of wells seems, at least to me, a bit of a distraction.

I.56 Indra

I.56.1: A bit of a mess, but very clever, once decoded.

For the first hemistich two features of interpretation are crucial: 1) I read **avatásya* ‘of the well’ instead of *áva tásyā*, a reading already suggested by Gr (s.v. *áva*). The ‘well’ word appears in the last verse of the preceding hymn (55.8c) and so belongs to Savya’s diction. 2) The simile / frame structure of ab involves a disharmony, with the verb to be interpreted in two different senses. In the frame, *prá ... úd ayamsta*, with the medial *s*-aorist to \sqrt{yam} ‘hold’, has a fairly literal meaning: ‘raised forth for himself’. The object is the “many dippers” (*pūrvīḥ ... camrīṣaḥ*) of the well (**avatásya*). (In the publ. tr. “this” should probably be replaced by “the,” since *tásya* is by my reading no longer there.) The word *camrīṣ-* is found only here, but it appears to be related esp. to *camrīṣá-* (I.100.12), apparently ‘beaker’, and the ‘cup’ words (*camasá-*, *camū-*) specialized for the serving of soma. The well is of soma; in X.101.5-7 the preparation of soma is likened to raising water from a well. In the simile (pāda b) the verb is used reflexively: the horse “raises himself up and forward” to (mount) the mare, a pretty good representation of equine copulation. The acc. *yóṣām* in the simile is not parallel to the acc. *pūrvīḥ ... camrīṣaḥ* of the frame: the latter is a direct object, while the former is a goal. The excitement of the mounting stallion is implicitly transferred to Indra’s excitement at the many drinks of soma in store for him.

In c I take *dákṣam ... hiraṇyáyam* “golden skill” as a descriptor of soma: golden because of its color, skill because drinking it gives Indra the ability to do battle. It is a bit like calling alcoholic drinks “Dutch courage.” (In the next vs. Indra is, or has become, the “lord of skill.”) The verb *pāyayate* is a lovely example of a reflexive double I/T (in the terminology of my 1983 book): “he causes himself to drink X,” with the appropriate middle voice. It is hard to know what (if anything) to supply with *mahé*. I supply *kárman-* ‘deed’, whose only appearance in the RV is in

the preceding verse (55.3), Ge (/WG) “Kraft,” while Re takes *mahé* as standing for an abstract, “pour (sa) grand(eur).” Any of these is possible; none is highly favored over the others.

In d “ingenious” may not be the happiest tr. of *ḥbhvas-* as applied to an inanimate thing. The word refers to craft or skill, and Re’s “habile(ment construit)” may be the point.

I.56.2: On *nemanníśaḥ* see the lengthy treatment by Scar (55-56). I take *pārīṇasaḥ* somewhat loosely, following Gr, as an adverbial ablative.

In c Ge takes *sáhaḥ* as a pāda-final truncation of instr. *sáhasā* as sometimes elsewhere, but this seems unnecessary. In the final verse of the preceding hymn (55.8) Indra took *sáhas-* into his body. It does not seem odd that he would here be identified as *sáhas-* itself. The odd placement of *nū* may support this analysis: the NP *vidáthasya ... sáhaḥ* may be structurally parallel to *pátim dákṣasya*, and the 2nd-position *nū* could mark the second NP as a new syntactic unit.

I.56.3: “Like a mountain peak, ... glints with its thrusting” – the image seems to that of a pointed, snow-capped mountain, with the snow shining in the sun and the point appearing to thrust into the sky, though of course it doesn’t move.

Again Ge suggests that pāda-final *sávaḥ* could be for instr. *sávasā*, though he doesn’t so tr. – only wistfully remarks that ab could be a single sentence if *sávaḥ* were instr.

I.56.4: *arhariṣvániḥ* is completely unclear; *-sváni-* is ‘sound, noise’, but the first member appears nowhere else and has no etymology. All tr. take it as a cry of triumph, but this unanimity reflects a dearth of other choices rather than conviction in its rightness. Ge suggests *arhari* might be onomatopoeic, but it’s hard to see what sound it’s imitating. One tack might be to play with MIA possibilities, but juggling the phonology according to known MIA sound laws has not so far yielded anything useful.

I.56.5: Though Gr and Lub take *tiráḥ* as the prepositional adverb, standard tr. interpret it as the 2nd sg. injunctive to *tiráti*, which is surely the correct analysis. There is a surprising disagreement among tr. as to what *ácyutam* ‘immovable’ should modify. I take it with *dharúṇam* on the basis of Savya’s I.52.2 *dharúṇeṣv ácyutaḥ*. I take *rájah* as obj. of *átiṣṭhipaḥ*, despite the pāda boundary, since otherwise this causative aorist is left without an expressed object.

I.56.6: *pāṣyā* has neither an etymology nor a secure meaning; it occurs only once elsewhere (IX.102.2), but since it is both times in the dual and in this case is used of something belonging to Vṛtra that gets broken apart, “jaws” is a contextually attractive translation. Savya’s I.52.6 *vṛtrásya ... nijaghántha hánvor indra tanyatúm* “when you, Indra, struck your thunder down upon the jaws of Vṛtra” is similar.

I.57 Indra

I.57.1: Unlike the standard tr., I take d to mean not that his generosity is meant to *display* his power, but rather that his generosity has opened up to, that is, has been set in motion by his exercise of power.

I.57.2–4: A bit of word play in the sequence *haryatá(h)* (2c), *harító* (3d), *harya tád* (4d).

I.57.2: Note the Wackernagel particle *ha* positioned between the preverb *ánu* and the verb *asat*, despite the material preceding it in its clause.

With Ge I supply a verb of motion in b, because the “like waters to the depths” simile regularly appears with one (e.g., V.51.7 *nimnáṃ ná yanti síndhavaḥ*).

I.57.3: The phrase *úṣo ná śubhre* is quite problematic. In the first place, it is syntactically odd to have a voc. in a simile (“X like o Dawn”). *úṣaḥ* may be vocative by attraction from an underlying nominative, as in I.30.21 *ásve ná citre aruṣi* “O you, dappled bright and ruddy like a(n o) mare.” Then, for reasons given in the intro., I am certain that the fem. voc. *śubhre* in b cannot be addressed to the Sacrificer’s Wife, despite the standard view, but that leaves the identity of the addressee baffling. Fem. *śubhrā-* is ordinarily used of Dawn herself, not someone or something *like* Dawn. However, its other standard referent is Sarasvatī or another river or rivers (III.33.1-2, VII.95.6, 96.2, V.42.12; waters V.41.12, maybe II.11.3; drops IX.63.26), so it is barely possible that the water similes of vss. 1–2 here evoke an actual river to bring the materials to the sacrifice. Better, but textually problematic: perhaps the identity of simile and frame should be reversed, and the phrase means “O Dawn, like a lovely (river), assemble ...” (assuming an underlying **úṣaḥ śubhrā ná...*). This would make fine sense in the passage: Dawn comes at the beginning of the sacrifice, bringing materials for it, and is compared to a river that picks up material from its banks. Although this requires more manipulation of the text than I would like, a sequence such as I just reconstructed, with the *ná* following two feminine singulars, might have seemed anomalous and been restructured to a more conventional order: *X ná X*. On balance and with due caution, I endorse this solution and would now translate the phrase as suggested above.

As for the object of *sám ... ā bharā*, I supply ‘everything’, based on *víśvam* in 2a, also referring to the sacrificial materials.

The semantic basis for the simile in d is somewhat obscure. On the one hand, the “tawny mares” (*harít-*) are often the horses of the sun, so that Indra has been made a light (*jyótiḥ*) like the sun’s horses. On the other hand, Indra’s name and form (*dhāma ... nāmendriyām*) are as suited for fame as horses are for running.

In d *nāyase* is analyzed (starting with the Pp.) as *ná áyase*, but this produces a bad cadence. I do not see any obstacle to assuming a preverb *ā*, so *ná āyase* ‘for coursing hither’, which fixes the cadence.

I.57.4: The translation “Here we are -- those of yours” reflects the annunciatory *imé* as well as the *te ... té vayám*, which identifies the speakers as Indra’s own.

In c I take *cárāmasi* as an independent verb, meaning to ‘carry on’ with life and activities, though it is possible that it is an auxiliary verb with the gerund *ārābhya*, as Ge takes it.

On *kṣoñī-* as ‘war-cry’, see Thieme (1978[79]: KZ 92: 46), EWA s.v.

I.57.5: *táva smasi* is a paraphrase of 4a (*imé*) *te ... té vayám*

I.57.6: The “cut” in the first hemistich is ambiguous in English but is a past tense rendering pf. *cakartitha*. I added ‘apart’ despite the absence of *ví* because unadorned English “cut the mountain” sounds odd. The *vájreṇa vajrin* opening pāda b at least provides the desired *v-*.

Verbal play, in which two unrelated words mimic an etymological connection: *párvatam* (a) ... *parvasáh* (b) “mountain ... joint by joint.” The two items are in the same metrical position, and each is in a pāda that begins with an alliterative pair: *vám tám* and *vájreṇa vajrin*.

I.58 Agni

I.58.1: Phonetic figure spanning the end of the first hemistich and the second (esp. its end): ... *vivásvataḥ# #ví ...* , ... *havísā vivāsati#*

The lexeme *ní √tud* is generally taken to mean something like ‘spur on’, but that tr. fails to render the *ní*. I prefer to take it in the literal sense ‘push down, force down’, meaning that, in the English idiom, you can’t keep Agni down.

I connect pāda b with c, rather than with a, as the standard tr. do, because of the difference in tense (pres. *ní tundate*, impf. *ābhavat*). This tense mismatch requires the *yád* of b to have the sense “ever since” (Ge/[WG] “seitdem,” Re “depuis que”), which does not seem to me to be natural to it. By contrast, Agni’s assuming the office of messenger in b leads directly to his journey in c.

I.58.2: In b *tiṣṭhati* can mean, as I take it, “stays (within)” or, with Ge, “stands up (in).” In the latter case, the image would be of a forest fire, fed by brush, flaring up. This is possible, but in the absence of the preverb *úd* or similar directional indications, I prefer the former.

I.58.3: On *krāṇā* ‘successfully’, derived from the old fem. instr. sg. of the med. root aor. participle of *√kr* in adv. usage, see Old (Fs. Kern 33ff. [details in EWA s.v. *krāṇā*]).

Since *ví + ṛṇóti/ṛṇvāti* regularly refers to the unclosing of doors (e.g., I.128.6 *dvārā vy ṛṇvāti*), the tr. ‘distribute’ (Ge ‘teilt ... aus’, WG ‘verteilt’, Re ‘répartit’) seriously manipulates the idiom. I therefore prefer ‘disclose’ – that is, unclose and reveal to sight. (So also Old SBE.)

I.58.4: The voc. *rúśad-ūrme* ‘o you possessing gleaming waves’ should, strictly speaking, not be accented. It may owe its accent to IV.7.9 *kṛṣṇám te éma rúśataḥ puró bhāḥ* “Black is your course, (though) you are gleaming; your light is in front,” with a gen. sg. part. *rúśataḥ* following an identical opening. (So tentatively B1 RR.) Or perhaps as the first of two voc., in post-caesura position, it was felt to begin a new syntagm.

I.58.5: On *pājas-* see Re ad loc. (n.; EVP XII) and EWA s.v., with lit. It seems to refer to a surface or face, then to shape, area, or dimension in general, often with the sense of “full dimension.”

I.58.5: On *sthātúḥ* (in the pair *sthātús carátham* “the still and the moving”) as neut. sg. to the *-tar-*stem (< *-tṛ) see AiG I.23, 301; III.204 and most recently Frotscher 2012. Tichy (1995: 71) rejects this explanation, but her alternative (a masc. nom. sg. to a *-tu-*stem) breaks the tight rhetorical structure of this merism by pairing a masculine with a neuter (*carátham*). Thus, whatever phonological problems there may be in assuming an *-ṛ# > -ur# change (as opposed to *-ṛs > -ur as in the gen. sg. of *-ṛ-*stems), I favor the older view. Frotscher’s suggestion that accented final *-ṛ* develops to *-úr* may help solve the problem. In any case the nom./acc. neut form here would also be reinforced by the semantically identical *genitive* sg. phrase *sthāthús ca ... (jágataś ca (I.159.3, II.31.5).*

I.58.6: The last halves of the two hemistichs are parallel and complementary, referring to humans and gods respectively: b: ... *jánebhyaḥ#* / d: ... *divyāya jánmane#*

In *c mitráṃ* is of course ambiguous: it can refer simply to the god of that name (so Re), but more likely is at least a pun on the meaning of the common noun ‘ally’. Agni is often so called because he serves as go-between between gods and men.

I.58.7: The “seven tongues” (*saptá juhvaḥ*) are somewhat puzzling, or rather the phrase has several possible interpretations. Re takes it as a “pré-bahuvrīhi” (probably better expressed as “de-composed” bahuvrīhi), referring to the priests “having seven offering ladles” (*juhū-* meaning both ‘tongue’ and ‘ladle’); it is, of course, also possible to take the ladles as subject without reference to an underlying bahuvrīhi (so Old SBE, Ge), since inanimate things often have agency in the RV. But the other meaning ‘tongue’ could also be meant literally (either in a de-composed bahuvrīhi or not): (priests having) seven tongues, that is seven voices devoted to praising Agni. See Ge’s n. (also WG). This interpretation would make the first pāda semantically parallel with the second, where ‘cantors’ (*vāghátaḥ*) is the subject. And I will add another, more distant possibility, but one that makes better sense of the ‘seven’ – viz., the seven rivers or streams. The seven rivers are credited with giving birth to and nourishing Agni in a mystical passage in III.1.3–6, where they are also identified as seven *vāñīḥ* ‘voices’ (III.1.6d). Seven is a number especially characteristic of rivers,

and since rivers are often said to be noisy (indeed the word *nadī-* ‘river’ is derived from the root \sqrt{nad} ‘roar), calling the rivers “seven tongues” here would fit semantically. In the end I don’t think that choosing one of these possibilities and eliminating the others is the right strategy; the phrase is meant to be multivalent, evoking a number of features of the ritual context.

I.58.8–9: Vs. 9 is essentially a paraphrase of vs. 8, with several parallel expressions. And the final pāda of 9 is the Nodhas refrain.

I.59 Agni Vaiśvānara

I.59.2: On *arati-* as a spoked wheel, which often serves as the symbol for the ritual fire, see Thieme (Unters. 26ff., EWA s.v.).

I.59.4: The first pāda of this verse is metrically disturbed, which, in conjunction with its syntactic incompleteness, leads some tr. to consider the text corrupt. I’m afraid I find that reasoning too convenient.

This verse is variously interpreted, with its difficulties in great part arising from the fact that there is no finite verb, but it can be decoded by paying attention to the functional roles of the nominal complements. What seems to unify the verse is the presence of a dative recipient in pādas a, cd, and I therefore (with most tr., but not Ge) take the verse to be a single sentence, with the datives throughout referring to Agni. The objects presented to Agni are songs (*gírah* b), qualified as many (*pūrvīh* c), and implicitly compared to exuberant maidens (*yahvīh* d), based on the fact that *gír-* ‘song’ is feminine in gender. The grammatical subject is *hótā* in b, with parallel subjects in similes: the two world halves (*ródasī*) in the first pāda and “skill” (*dákṣah*) in the second. The *manuṣyàh* in b I read twice: on the one hand, its position directly before *ná* marks it as the first word of the simile, going with *dákṣah*, hence “Manu’s/manly skill,” but I believe it should also be read with the immediately preceding *hótā* (“manly/human Hotar”). In Agni hymns the title Hotar is ordinarily specialized as a designation of that god (see, e.g., immediately preceding I.58, vss. 1, 3, 6–7), and *manuṣyàh* here would make it clear that the human priest is at issue, with Agni himself the dative recipient. The last question is what verb to supply, and in a sense the exact identity of the verb is not terribly important, as long as it has approximately the right meaning and the right case frame. With Old (SBE, Noten) I supply ‘bring’ (\sqrt{bhr}), which is frequently used with *gírah* and a dative recipient (e.g., I.79.10 ... *agnáye | bhárasva ... gírah*), but ‘sing, present, give,’ etc., would all work. I do not see any reason for, or justification of, supplying a 1st-person subject, however, *pace* Old SBE (1st pl.), Ge, Re (1st sg.).

I.59.5–6: 5d pāda here = VII.98.3d, of Indra, and Nodhas uses a similar expression of Indra in I.63.7d. Vs. 6 is even more Indraic. As noted in the intro., this part of the hymn is designed to associate Indra and his great deeds with Agni.

I.59.7: The rest of pāda a essentially glosses *vaiśvānarāḥ*.

I take *puruṇīthā-* as a qualifier, not a personal name, contra most tr.

I.60 Agni

Taking off from my comment below on vs. 5, JL has further articulated the structure of this hymn. What follows is mostly verbatim from his comments, with some additions and light editing of my own:

I think this little hymn might have a slightly more elegant structure than has been appreciated (I thought of this following your mention ad vs. 5 of the “faint ring”). It seems to me that the 5 verses are nicely balanced rings within rings revolving around vs. 3, the omphalos-like *jāyamānam... jījananta*, harking back to Agni’s double birth in 1c. The outer rings would be, as mentioned ad vs. 5, vss. 1c *rayīm iva praśastām = 5 pátim ... rayīnām, prá śamsāmaḥ*. Vss. 2 and 4 contain the same word *vikṣú*; note esp. the alliterative and partly etymological figure in 2d *viśpátir vikṣú vedhāḥ*. The hymn has not only a ring structure, but also forward momentum provided by the movement from the larger social organization of the *vís-*, in the full expression *viśpátir vikṣú* (2d), to the more intimate setting of the home, emphatically presented in 4c *dámūnā gṛhapatir dáme*. The momentum can also be tracked in the expressions of lordship involving *páti-*: *viśpáti-* (2d) to *gṛhapatí-* (4c) and finally the solemnly pleonastic *rayipátī rayīnām* (4d). Agni, celebrated ($\sqrt{\text{śams}}$) “like wealth” in 1c (*rayīm iva*), is transformed into the lord of wealth in 4d. This final title is repeated in 5a *pátim agne rayīnām*, with his name interposed between the two elements, and again the object of $\sqrt{\text{śams}}$. The use of these three *-páti-* compounds may convey the message that Agni will deploy his wealth in the arenas of clan and house.

I.60.2: *divás cit pūrvah* is standardly taken as temporal “before day(break),” but this case form of *div/dyu* is more often spatial than temporal (note *divás cid ... brhatāḥ* in the immediately preceding hymn, 59.5), and *pūrvā-* + ABL. has a spatial sense elsewhere in just this ritual context: e.g., X.53.1 *ní hí śátsad ántarah pūrvō asmát* “for he [=Agni] will sit down (as Hotar) close by, in front of us.” Cf. also II.3.3 *mānuṣāt pūrvah*.

I.60.4: Note the extraordinary pile-up of ‘house’ words in this vs.: *dámūnā gṛhapatir dáma ā*. On the relation between the *dám(a)-* and *gṛhā-* designations for ‘house’ and their use in the RV, see my forthcoming “The Term *gṛhastha* and the (Pre)history of the Householder,” to appear in *The Householder in Ancient India: A History of the Gṛhastha* ed. P. Olivelle.

I.60.5: *ab pátim ... rayīnām, prá śamsāmaḥ* picks up 1c *rayīm iva praśastām*, forming a faint ring.

I.61 Indra

For general discussion of the intricate structure of this hymn, see the publ. intro. as well as Jamison 2007: 60-68.

I.61.1: *ṛcīṣama-*, an epithet of Indra, is an impossible word; Ge wisely refuses to tr. it. However, it is difficult not to see in it a combination of *ṛc-* ‘chant, song’ and *samā-* ‘like, same’, however obscure the morphological details are – and obscure they certainly are. The first member cannot, straightforwardly, be a case form of *ṛc-* because the case-ending should be accented. The length of the *-ī-* might be analogical to the long *ī* in phonologically similar *ṛjīpīn-*, *ṛjīśīn-*, but motivating a short *-i-* (in putative **ṛci-*) is hard enough (Caland compounding form, like *śūci-*?). It is tempting (and some have succumbed to the temptation) to connect *-sama-* with another designation of ritual speech, *sāman-*, but the difference in vowel length is probably fatal. Note that in our passage the word is adjacent to another old crux, *ádhrigu-*, the controversies about which (see KEWA and EWA s.v.) should have been definitely settled by comparison with OAv. *drigu-* ‘poor, needy’ (Narten, YH 238–40). Both *ṛcīṣama-* and *ádhrigu-* are disproportionately represented in the VIIIth Maṇḍala, the home of much aberrant vocabulary. In the end those who elect to tr. *ṛcīṣama-* take it as a compound of the two elements suggested above: Re ‘égal à la strophe’, WG (somewhat peculiarly, though starting with the same elements) ‘der im Preislied (immer) als dieselbe Person erscheint (?)’; so also the publ. tr. ‘equal to song’. For further, see EWA s.v.

I.61.1–2: Here and throughout the hymn, there is a certain amount of phonological and lexical chaining (in addition to the repeated fronted demonstratives). Here 2b *bhárāmi* picks up both 1c *harmi* and 1d *bráhmāṇi*, and 2a *asmā íd u práyaḥ ... prá yaṃsi* playfully echoes 1a *asmā íd u prá...*, with *práyaḥ* of 1b substituted for the bare preverb *prá*.

I.61.2: In addition to the inter-verse echoes just noted, alliteration in 2c *mánasā manīṣā* and 2d *pratnāya pátye*. JL adds 2a *práya iva prá yaṃsi*.

bādhe in 2b is universally taken as a dat. infinitive (as it is in I.132.5), but this makes semantic difficulties because $\sqrt{bādh}$ means ‘thrust, press, oppress’. Ge’s “um (ihn) ... zu nötigen(?),” Re’s “pour contraindre (le dieu),” and WG’s “um (ihn) ... zu überhäufen” thus misrepresent the sense of the verb. The $\sqrt{bādh}$ is esp. common with the preverbs *ápa* and *ví* in the meanings ‘thrust away, thrust apart’, but I here take the *prá* of pāda a with both verbs (*bhárāmi* and *bādhe*) in pāda b. As for morphology, I take *bādhe* as a 1st sg. mid. pres. (the root is always inflected in the middle), rather than as an infinitive, which allows the root to maintain its standard sense: I push the hymn toward Indra with particular forcefulness. As a finite verb, *bādhe* owes its accent to its initial position in the new clause.

suvṛktí- is a bahuvrīhi specialized for praise hymns (and occasionally the gods who receive them) and is often simply tr. ‘praise(-song)’ (e.g., Ge ‘Preis’ here). I prefer to render it literally; *-vṛktí-* belongs to the root $\sqrt{vṛj}$ ‘twist’, and the English

idiom “good twist” refers to particularly clever turns in a plot or other verbal products.

Most tr. take c with d, not ab. This is possible, but not necessary.

I.61.4: As Ge suggests (in n. 3 to his n. to 4ab), the apparent pleonastic doubling of the simile particle (*rátham ná táṣṭā-iva*) may instead signal that two images have been crossed here: one with a simplex *hinomi* (“I impel the praise like a chariot”) and the other with *sám hinomi* and the addition of the carpenter as subject (“I, like a carpenter, put together praise, like a chariot”).

I.61.5: *juhvā* has its standard double meaning, ‘tongue’ and ‘offering ladle’, a pun that is enabled by the verb *sám añje* “I anoint”: anointing with the tongue means producing praise, while ‘offering ladle’ fits better with the literal meaning of the verb. *dānaúkas-* is likewise of double sense, both ‘accustomed to giving’ and ‘accustomed to gifts’, representing the reciprocal trade in praise and sacrifice given to the gods, in return for the gods’ material gifts to us.

I.61.6: The *tváṣṭā* here has been prepared for by 4b *táṣṭā*, and both appear in alliterative phrases: *táṣṭeva tátsināya* and *tváṣṭā takṣat*.

Another word with a standard double sense: *rāṇa-*; both senses are possible here, also in vs. 9 below.

The position of *yád* in this subordinate clause is anomalous, as we expect at most one constituent to precede the *yá-* form. I have no explanation, but there is much that is off-kilter in the deployment of sentence parts in this hymn.

I’ve tr. the participle *tuján* as it were a finite verb, because the English otherwise dribbles off into unintelligibility.

The unclear *kiyedhā-* is found only here and in vs. 12. See EWA s.v. and Scar’s (250–52) discussions of previous attempts at explanation. I favor the suggestion registered (and dismissed) by Scar that it consists of the weak stem of *kíyant-* ‘how much, how great’ + the root noun *dhā-*, with the development **-ṅt-dh-* > **-adzdh-* > **-azdh-* > *-edh-*, despite Hoffmann’s dismissal of the posited phonological development (Aufs. 400), although I recognize the phonological problems of this solution. Re’s “lui qui confère (on ne sait) combien” represents this etymology one way or the other.

I.61.7: On the introductory gen. *asyá* referring to Indra, even though Indra is otherwise in the nominative in this verse (as subj. of *papivān* [b] and of *vidhyat* [d]), see disc. in intro. and in Jamison 2007 noted above.

The verse concerns Indra’s surreptitious drinking of his father’s soma right after birth, an act enabled by his mother (ab), and Indra and Viṣṇu’s vanquishing of the Emuṣa boar (cd), a rarely told tale. For Indra’s mother’s complicity in the soma-drinking, see esp. III.48.2–3. In our passage Indra’s father is not directly referred to (only by initial *maháḥ* ‘of the great [one]’ in b), but the beginning of the next word promises the genitive of ‘father’ (i.e., *pitúr*), and only the final consonant of *pitúm*

removes that possibility — one of the many tricks Nodhas plays on us in this hymn. (Ge ascribes the absence of *pitúḥ* to Worthaplogie, but I think rather that Nodhas is laying a trap.)

On the basis of other tellings of the Emuṣa myth, the word to supply with *pacatám* is *odaná* ‘rice-porridge’; cf. VIII.69.14, 77.6, 10.

The final pāda is quite artfully composed, beginning and ending with alliterative phrases: *vídhyad varāhám* and *ádrim ástā*. Moreover, the first of these is a variant of the very common formula that compresses the Vṛtra slaying, *áhann áhim* ‘he/you slew the serpent.’ Here, with the victim beginning with *v-*, the poet substitutes a verb beginning with *v-*.

I.61.8: Although I tr. *devápatnīḥ* as ‘wives of the gods’, it is of course grammatically a bahuvrīhi ‘having the gods as husbands’ (with the fem. stem *patnī-* substituted for the masc. equivalent *pati-* in this feminine adjective). It reminds us of *dāsápatnī-* ‘having a Dāsa for a husband’, applied to the waters confined by Vṛtra, often identified as a Dāsa, most famously in I.32.11 but also twice elsewhere of the waters and Vṛtra (V.30.5, VIII.96.13). Since the context here is the Vṛtra battle (*ahihátye*), the complementary terminology is probably deliberate.

JL notes that there is complementarity also in the second hemistich: 8c has *pári jabhre* with Indra as subject and *dyāvāprthivī* as object, while 8d reverses this: *ná ... pári staḥ* with *dyāvāprthivī* as implicit subj. and Indra as implicit object (via his *mahimānam*). This theme and its lexicon are picked up in the 9ab: *mahitvám / divás prthivyāḥ páry antárikṣāt*.

I.61.9: The phrase “reverberant tankard” (*svarír ámatraḥ*) is striking, but intelligible in R̥gvedic context. Indra is compared to a large drinking vessel because of his immense capacity and size, also described in 8cd and 9ab; “tankard” hints at his ability to drink vast quantities of soma and implicitly promises his generosity because he can contain vast quantities of goods. I follow Old in taking all forms of *ámatra-* as belonging to a single stem (*pace* Gr, Lub, and EWA). As for ‘reverberant’ (*svarí-*), it echoes *svarāl*, which opens the preceding pāda; it also suggests the deep sound made when a large (empty) vessel is struck and Indra’s own war-cries. (For a possibly similar image, see I.100.12.)

I.61.10: Numerous phonological plays in this verse: a *sávasā śuśántam*; b *ví vṛścad vájreṇa vṛtrám*; c *gā ná vrānā avánīr* (in this last example note the rhyme of the 1st two words with the 2nd one).

I.61.11: This verse nicely juxtaposes a well-known deed of Indra’s, when he stops the waters to make a ford for his client(s), with the even better known deed of releasing the stopped waters in the Vṛtra myth, treated in the preceding vs. (10). On the playful transition between these two myths here, see Jamison 2007: 113–14 n. 20. The stopping of the waters causes mild surprise immediately after a verse concerning their release.

tveṣāsā is universally taken as belonging to Indra, whereas my published tr. ascribes it to the rivers. I would now probably correct this, also to take it as Indra's: "just this one – with his turbulence/glittering," because of the parallelism between 10a *asyéd evá śávasā* and 11a *asyéd u tveṣāsā*. But I am still disturbed by the form. Its accent suggests that it should be adjectival, not a neuter -s-stem abstract like *śávas-*, despite AiG II.2.224, which implies that it is nominal despite its accent. It is curious that the expected root-accented neut. noun (**tvéṣas-*) is not attested, and this is the only (supposed) attestation of the suffix-accented stem. If it is a real adjective, it could modify *vájreṇa* in pāda b, but this not only breaks the parallelism between 10a and 11a just noted, but, more seriously, would have to be extracted from one clause and plunked into the next. (Ge in his note suggests supplying *vájreṇa* in pāda a.) The *a*-stem adj. *tveṣá-* is also sometimes used of waters, e.g., VI.61.8 *tveṣáh ... arṇaváh* "glittering/turbulent flood," which accounts for my original connection of *tveṣāsā* with the rivers.

The distribution of elements in pāda b is odd, with the subordinating *yád* in normal 2nd position, but *sīm*, ordinarily another 2nd position element, just before the verb.

īśāna-kṛt- is variously interpreted, either with the 1st member in a direct object relationship with the 2nd -- "zum Herrscher, mächtig machend" (Scar's tr; sim. also Ge, Re, WG) – or in a sort of appositive subject relationship, "als Herrscher handelnd" (Scar's tr.; sim. Gr). Because the first member *īśāna-* is itself a participial form 'being lord, showing mastery', I prefer the 2nd alternative. Note also that independent *īśāna-* is used three times of Indra in this hymn (6d, 12b, 15b), and it is more likely that the same form in the compound refers to Indra's masterful ways, not to someone else whom he makes masterful. Scar allows both, though somewhat preferring the 2nd.

More phonological play: *c dāśúṣe daśasyan; d turvītaye ... turvāṇiḥ*.

I.61.12: On this very tricky verse, I simply reproduce (slightly paraphrased) my discussion of it in Jamison 2007: 66: The beginning of 12 appears to return us from the mythological past to the realm of the current-day poet of vss. 1-5; not only does it start with the dative pronoun after a series of verses with the genitive phrase but it continues with a standard lexeme for presenting a hymn to a divinity: *prá √bhṛ:* *asmā íd u prá bharā ...* Cf. from the same poet also with a dative recipient I.64.1b. *nódhaḥ suvṛktím prá bharā marúdbhyaḥ* "O Nodhas, present a well-turned (hymn) to the Maruts." But the phrase in 61.12 quickly goes awry. At the opening of the next pāda, where Indra's name has been prominently placed in previous verses (*índrāya* 1d, 4d, 5b, 8b), we find, most shockingly, the name of his arch-enemy, *vṛtrāya*, immediately followed by the accusative object *vájram*, Indra's weapon, not the word for hymn we were expecting. The relevant parts of the half-verse *asmā íd u prá bharā...*, *vṛtrāya vájram...* must mean "Towards just this one, towards Vṛtra, bear down the mace..." The poet has simply tricked us, having laid a trap with conventional phraseology and syntax and with the stylistic patterns established earlier in the hymn. He also skillfully exploits the morphological ambiguity of the

verb form *bharā*: given the pattern set in vss. 1-5 we are primed to interpret *bharā* as a 1st sg. subjunctive (cf. indicative *bhārāmi* in vss 2-3), but as the half verse unfolds, it becomes clear that *bharā* must rather be taken as a metrically lengthened 2nd sg. imperative. [end of citation]

In order to let the audience in on the trick, the poet has imported much of verse 6, the first mention of the Vṛtra conflict in this hymn: 6d reads *tujānn īśānas tujatā kiydhāḥ* “gaining mastery, thrusting with the thrusting (mace), while conferring (who knows) how much,” while 12ab echoes this with ... *tūtujāno*, ... *īśānaḥ kiyedhāḥ* “thrusting, gaining mastery, conferring (who knows) how much.”

In d *īṣyan* echoes *īśānaḥ* of pāda b (as well as 11c) and anticipates *iṣṇānāḥ* of 13c.

I.61.13: On this verse as a species of “poetic repair” of verse 12, see Jamison 2007: 66–67. The expected offering of praise to Indra thwarted in 12ab is successfully effected in 13ab.

I.61.14: *dyāvā ca bhūmā* has the appearance of a dual dvandva, interrupted by the *ca* that connects it to the NP with which it’s conjoined, *girāyaś ca dṛḥhāḥ*. But the uninterrupted dvandva is actually *dyāvābhūmī*, with a different stem for ‘earth’, and *bhūman-* (n.) has no dual attested (and its dual should of course not be *bhūmā*, but probably **bhūmanī*). See the next hymn for a variant on this usage. It is likely that the lengthened N/A sg. form or the N/A pl. form is being used, but why? On this problem, see AiG II.1.152.

In the publ. tr., “other” was careless omitted at the end of the first hemistich: it should read “against each other.”

The mention of the poet Nodhas at the very end of the verse has perhaps been prepared by several not entirely expected *o*’s: *úpo ... jóguvāna oṇím, sadyó*, only the last of which is a normal sandhi *o* < *-as*. The poet’s fondness for his own vowel may account for the appearance of several relatively rare words: the intensive *jógu-* and the noun *oṇí-*.

I.61.15: I follow Ge’s suggestion (in n. to 15a, followed by WG) that the unexpressed subject that is being conceded to Indra is the soma-drink. The parallel he adduces, V.29.5, contains the gods, the soma-drink, the concession, and Etaśa:

*ádha krátvā maghavan túbhyaṃ devā ánu víśve adaduḥ somapéyam
yát sūryasya harítaḥ pátantīḥ puráḥ satīr úparā étaśe káḥ*

Then according to your will, o bounteous one, all the gods conceded the
soma-drinking to you,

when you put the flying golden mares of the Sun behind, though they were in
front, in Etaśa(’s presence).

In the publ. tr. I take *eṣām* as a genitival agent, somewhat reluctantly. However, ET suggests a much more attractive solution, which rescues the syntax: that *eṣām* is dependent on *asmaí* “just to this one of them [=gods].” The singularity of Indra would then be emphasized by the *ékaḥ* that begins the next pāda.

Etaśa is the horse of the Sun and is not, as far as I know, a soma-presser (the physical image is a little comical). Against all tr., I therefore do not take *súṣvim* in d as coreferential with *étaśam* in c, but rather as a second object with the verb. Nodhas is now juggling the mythic past (the aiding of Etaśa) and the desired future (the aiding of the soma-presser), as he nears the end of the hymn. I read the participle *pasprdhānām* twice, once with each object, with a different desired goal in the locative for each. I also give the verb *āvat* two simultaneous morphological analyses, fitting its two objects: the first as augmented imperfect to the Class I present *āvati*, the second as perfect subjunctive to the pf. *āva* (cf. *āpas*, *āpat* taken by Hoffmann 1967: 64 n. 102, 101 n. 220, and Kümmel 2000: 118 as subjunctives to pf. *āpa* √*āp* ‘attain’). Although such an interpretation might be too artificial in some cases, I have no hesitation in assuming Nodhas is capable of this.

Another phonetic play: d *saúvaśv'ye súṣvim*

I.61.16: *hāriyojanā* is unaccented and therefore taken by most as a vocative addressed to Indra. I follow Old in emending to an accented form (*hāriyojanā*), modifying *bráhmāni*. See in the next hymn *bráhma hariyójanāya* “formulation for the fallow-bay-yoking.” As Old points out, taking it as a vocative with Indra requires either shortening the last vowel or allowing a lengthened vocative ending (which is not usual), and possibly also shortening the first vowel.

This verse is extra-hymnic in some ways: its opening breaks the pattern set in the previous 15 vss.; it makes a meta-announcement about the contents of the hymn just recited; and it ends with the Nodhas refrain. But it also forms a ring with the first verse, with the repetition of *bráhmāni*, and with the first part of the hymn concerning the presentation of praise-hymns, with the reappearance of *suvṛktí*, which was a signature word there (2b, 3d, 4c).

I.62 Indra

Shares much vocabulary with I.61 and sometimes plays off the turns of phrase in that hymn.

I.62.1: Rich with phonetic figures: a *śavasānāya súṣám*; b *āṅgūṣám gírvaṇase aṅgirasvát* [note that *āṅgūṣám* participates in both: it rhymes with preceding *súṣám*, but its initial matches *aṅgirasvát*, while *gírvaṇase* takes up the 2nd syllable of *aṅgirasvát*]; cd *ṛgmīyāya, árcāma arkám* [this last also a clear etymological figure].

śavasānāya súṣám recalls *śavasā śuṣántam* of 61.10a in the same metrical position, with our phrase referring to Indra, the one in I.61 to Vṛtra.

The Pp. reads *stuvaté* in c, a reading that is universally followed. But this dative is awkward: if it is coreferential with the other datives in the verse, it must refer to Indra, and Indra “praising” is an odd concept in a hymn devoted instead to presenting praises *to* him. Although Indra occasionally joins in the verbal parts of the sacrifice (see above ad I.55.4), he does not ordinarily (or ever?) praise others.

Nonetheless, this is Re’s solution: “(dieu) louangeur.” Schmidt (1968, B+I, 163) suggests a variant of this: “den mit guten Liedern (selbst) preisenden,” but self-praise

suggests a medial form, not the active we have. If the participle does not modify Indra, another person in the dative needs to be introduced, despite the unlikelihood of a separate dative referent. This is Ge’s solution: “ihn [=Indra], der für den Sänger ... zu preisen ist,” construing *stuvaté* with *ṛgmīyāya*. So also WG with slightly different tr., though both they and Ge consider the “praising” possibility. But the difficulty disappears if, against the Pp., we read instead *stuvatāḥ*, genitive sg. of the participle, as I do.

I.62.2: This verse is in some ways a double of vs. 1. They both begin with *prá*, and the opening phrases *prá manmahe* and *prá vo mahé* rhyme, although the two *mahe*’s have entirely different analyses. (Note also the *mahé máhi* play in 2a.) The next phrase of 1a, *śavasānāya sūśám*, is paralleled in 2b, with the first word identical and *sāma* substituting for the second (both *sūśám* and *sāma* referring to the verbal product offered to Indra). At the beginning of the second pādas, *āṅgūṣyām* of 2b matches *āṅgūśám* of 1a. “Like the Aṅgirasas” (*aṅgirasvát*) of 1b is picked up by the Aṅgirasas themselves *aṅgirasah* in 2d, and the heavy etymology figure involving the root $\sqrt{\text{arc}}$ ‘chant’ is reprised by the participle *ārcantaḥ* in 2d, which opens its pāda just as the finite verb *ārcāma* does in 1d.

I.62.3: I follow Janert (1956, *Sinne und Bedeutung des Wortes “dhāsi” und seiner Belegstellen im Rigveda und Awesta*) in taking *dhāsi-* as ‘wellspring’.

The post-caesura phrase in *c bhinád ádrim vidád gāḥ* contains rhyming verbs followed by their objects; the disyllable *ádrim* contrasts with monosyllable *gāḥ*, creating an almost syncopated effect. The strict parallelism of the two VPs may account for the unnecessary accent on *bhinát*, which functions rhetorically like a fronted verb, just like *vidát*. In fact, as my tr. indicates, I consider the initial subject *bḥhaspátih* to be essentially extrasentential, a very topicalized topic.

The second of the VPs is also a mirror-image of the final phrase in 2d *gā ávindan* (imperfect in 2, versus aorist in 3), and it can be considered a “repair” of the somewhat opaque *vidát ... dhāsím* “found the wellspring” that intervenes (3b).

I.62.4: The repetitions and lexical and phonological echoes that have served Nodhas well in the first three verses increase here, to an almost incantatory level. To point to a few of these: a *sá suṣṭúbhā sá stubhā* (again a syncopation, as in 3c); b *svaréna ... svar’yo ...*; c: *saraṇyubhiḥ* echoes the *sá*’s of a and the *s(v)ar*’s of b, while finding its own faint echo in the final *śakra* of the pāda; d *rāveṇa* is a virtual anagram of *svaréna* in b, *darayo* is almost a rhyme form of *svar’yo* in b in the same metrical position, and both *svar’yo* and *darayo* precede the hemistich-final words ending in *-gvaiḥ*.

All other tr. take this verse as a single sentence with 2nd ps. subj. However, as I have shown (1992: “sa figé”), *sá* with 2nd ps. reference is limited to imperatives and should not appear with an injunctive like *darayah*. I therefore consider the first hemistich to continue the 3rd ps. reference of vs. 3, with a switch to 2nd ps. in the second half. This type of switch is quite common in the RV.

In c I do not take *saranyú-* and *phaligá-* as personal names, *pace* Ge et al. The tr. ‘bolt’ for the latter follows Hiersche (*Asp.*, ‘Riegel, Verschluss’), based on a possible connection with *parigha-* (Up+) ‘iron bar for shutting a door/gate’; see EWA s.v. However, as ET points out, a less specific sense such as ‘barrier’ would fit the contexts better and would also make fewer assumptions about early technology.

I.62.5: The instrumentals in b (*uśásā sūryeṇa góbhiḥ*) are not parallel with *āngirobhiḥ* in a. The *Āngirases* there are the agents of the passively used participle *grṇānāḥ* (and also potentially instrumental of accompaniment with the main verb, as Indra’s helpers: “along with the A’s you uncovered...”). The instrumentals in b are the additional elements that Indra uncovered.

āndhaḥ is a potential pun, as a homophone meaning both ‘blind darkness’ and ‘soma stalk’. The former is surely the first reading in this treatment of the Vala myth, with the cave a black hole, as it were. So Ge, Re, WG. But soma is never far from Indra’s mind, and the cosmogonic deeds with which he is credited in the second hemistich are often performed under the influence of soma. Schmidt (p. 164) favors ‘(Soma-)Flut’, following Bergaigne and Lüders.

I.62.6: This verse has to be Nodhas’s joke. It is conspicuously placed, as the central verse of the hymn and thus a potential omphalos, and it announces Indra’s deed (*kárma*) with extraordinary fanfare, including two superlatives (*práyakṣatamam ... cārutamam*). But in a hymn so far devoted to what *is* one of Indra’s greatest deeds, the opening of the Vala cave, the poet springs on us instead a deed of utter obscurity involving the swelling of four rivers, an act with no other clear mentions in the RV. Ge valiantly seeks parallels, but the two passages he adduces (I.104.3–4 and I.174.7) have little or nothing in common with our passage and it’s not even clear that there are rivers in the second. Lüders (*Varuṇa* 335–37) predictably sees these as heavenly rivers — four because they flow “nach den vier Himmelsgegenden.” Re also sees them as associated with heaven, while Schmidt (*B+I* 164) and WG seem to see them as being “under” (something unspecified). I have no solution for the affinities of this scrap of mythology, although I tend to agree generally with Lüders that the rivers are more likely to be celestial than terrestrial, and I would suggest that it may have to do with producing rain. But I still think the point here is that Nodhas has set us up for a grand announcement and then, by bait and switch, given us a myth that none of us has ever heard of.

The *asti* in this hemistich may provide another bit of evidence for this view. Unaccented *asti* almost always has existential value (“there exists...”) because the 3rd sg. pres. copula in equational sentences (“X is Y”) is regularly (indeed, probably by rule) gapped. But an existential sense here doesn’t work (“There exists this most conspicuous deed...”). I suggest that the overt *asti* here signals a strong assertion in the face of expected opposition (“This *is* his most conspicuous deed” – rather like American children’s quarrels: “*is too*” “*is not*”).

The disputed word *upahvaré* adds to the obscurity of this bit of myth. It is clearly a derivative of \sqrt{hvr} ‘go crookedly, deviate’, but the exact sense of this

nominal derivative is not clear. In this passage Ge takes it as ‘lap’ (Schoss), Re as ‘fold, crease’ (repli), WG as ‘abyss, chasm’ (Abgrund), while Schmidt bypasses any literal rendering with “im Felsen.” Lüders considers it the name “für den Behälter des himmlischen Urquells,” which of course fits his larger picture of the heavenly ocean. I consider the word to convey in the first instance a visual image, that of a meander or deviation from the straight. In connection with rivers (as also in VIII.96.14) it refers to eddies, the circular or oval shapes produced against the current by uneven flow -- or to the “oxbows” or “meanders” created in a river’s course by such uneven flow (Google images are quite striking). In other geographical contexts it can refer to byways, detours from the straight path, and ultimately to remote places, the backeddies, as it were, of the mountains.

I.62.7: Nodhas continues to deploy his tricks in this verse. He has moved on from the obscure four-river reference in the preceding verse, to a more standard domain for Indra to display his power: the two world halves. But in the first hemistich Indra is not depicted as filling them or propping them apart or any of his usual actions with regard to them, but rather as “uncovering” them, using the same lexeme $\sqrt{v}r$ as was just used in a Vala-myth verse (5a $\sqrt{v}r$, 7a $\sqrt{v}r$). (That lexeme is close to being the signature Vala verb, though it is actually more commonly $\sqrt{apa} \sqrt{v}r$, with the same sense, but a different preverb.) Notice that the two occurrences of $\sqrt{v}r$ surround the pseudo-omphalos verse 6, in the usual manner in which concentric lexical rings signal an omphalos. So Nodhas thus presents this new mythological theme as if it were the old one, the Vala myth found in vss. 2-5, though he is entering different mythological territory.

He also reuses the \sqrt{rc} lexical theme from vss. 1–2, with \sqrt{rc} in b, which is apparently qualified by the middle participle $\sqrt{st}avamānebhīh$ (remember $\sqrt{st}uvatā$ in 1c). This participle is somewhat disturbing; like all middle participles to the root \sqrt{stu} , it is used passively here, but unlike all the other passive uses, its subject is not the god praised but the praises themselves. It may be that Nodhas want his audience to take notice of such an aberrant usage. However, I am tempted to read $\sqrt{st}avamānaibhīh$ here – that is, nom. sg. $\sqrt{st}avamānas$ + pron. $\sqrt{ebhīh}$, with rare double application of sandhi: $-as + e- > -a + e- > -ai-$. The participle $\sqrt{st}avamānas$ would modify Indra, as would be expected; $\sqrt{ebhīh}$ occurs several times with \sqrt{rc} (IV.3.15, 10.13) and the passive of \sqrt{stu} also appears with this instr. (see passages adduced by Ge in n. 7b, where he suggests a similar, but far from identical, reanalysis of the form in the text, calling it “vielleicht Hypallage”). If the emendation is accepted, I would change the tr. to “the irrepressible one being praised by these chants.” The \sqrt{rc} might also be construed secondarily as it currently is in the tr., with $\sqrt{v}r$, as the instrument with which he performed the uncovering.

$\sqrt{ay}āsyā-$ regularly qualifies Indra; there is no reason to take it as a personal name, identifying a distinct second figure here (*pace* Ge, Re).

Phonetic figure: $\sqrt{san}ājā \sqrt{sān}īle$ taking up the \sqrt{sa} ’s in vs. 4 and prefiguring the \sqrt{sa} ’s that will be conspicuous in the next few verses.

The second hemistich contains a clever pun between simile and frame. In the frame (pāda d) Indra supported, that is, held up, the two world halves in familiar fashion (somewhat repairing the less standard uncovering he performed in ab, though cf. VIII.96.16). In this task he is compared to the god Bhaga (though it is not an activity that I think of as particularly associated with Bhaga). But in the simile *bhága-* is used as a common noun ‘(good) portion’, which provides support for two consorts (*méne*) – the point presumably being that a man needs a particularly large portion of property to support two wives. I do not follow Hoffmann’s view (1960: 245; KZ 76) that *méne* here is an elliptical dual referring to concubine and lawful wife, and in fact believe that *ménā* in general has a wider sense than he allows. He restricts it to concubines, but the derivation from \sqrt{mi} ‘exchange’ suggests a wider application, with the wife as an “exchange token” in the economic transaction of marriage.

I.62.8: From the spatial dual females of vs. 7 Nodhas now moves to the temporal: night and dawn, also dual females, whose activities have kept occurring “from of old” (*sanāt*), linking them lexically to the two world-halves of 7a who were born of old (*sanájā*).

In *dívam pári bhūmā* we encounter the not-quite-dvandva also met in 61.14; there in *dyāvā ca bhūmā*, *dyāvā* was definitely dual, but its partner *bhūmā* was either singular (with lengthened final) or plural. Here *dívam* is definitely singular, with *bhūmā* either of the choices just given, probably singular.

punarbhū- later (already in the AV) has a specialized legal application as a designation for a remarried widow (see Thieme Kl.Sch. 445-60 = KZ 78, 1963), but this sense does not seem to be in play here or in the other RV passages.

Though most take *aktā* (which only appears here) as the ppl. of $\sqrt{añj}$ ‘anoint’, serving as a poetic designation for ‘night’, I favor a root connection with the ‘night’ word, with zero-grade in the root syllable, esp. since *aktú-* ‘night’ is probably so connected (*pace* EWA s.v.). See EWA s.v. and AiG III.234, though both are skeptical. Of course secondary association with $\sqrt{añj}$ would be natural.

JL notes the chiasmic *kr̥ṣṇébhīr aktā-uṣā rúsadbhīḥ* of c; for a similar chiasmus see 11c.

JTK suggests that *vápus-* here and in other dawn/night passages refers to bridal clothing and suggests a tr. ‘finery’.

I.62.9: Although the first hemistich is perfectly easy to tr., it is not at all clear what it is referring to. First, what is the “partnership” (*sakhyám*)? Ge thinks it is with the beings named in vss. 7-11, while Sāy thinks rather of the sacrificers. Nothing in the context helps to define what type of partnership it is or with whom, and the verb that governs it, “supported” (*dādhāra*), seems oddly chosen. The subject of this verb is also not fully identified: the larger context of course points to Indra, and *sudāmsāḥ* ‘possessing very wondrous power’ was just used in 7c of Indra (where he was likewise the subject of a form of \sqrt{dhr}), and see *dāmsaḥ* applied to his deed in 6b. But who is he the “son” (*sūnú-*) of? and more to the point, the epithet *sávasaḥ sūnúḥ*

“son of strength” is ordinarily Agni’s. Here we have the variant *sūnúḥ ... śávasā* with instr., and *sūnúḥ śávasā* is used of Agni in I.27.2. On the other hand, *śavasāná-* is twice used of Indra in the beginning of this hymn (1a, 2b) and *śavasāvan* in 11d, *śavasāna* in 13c; cf. also the clear *śavasah sūnúm índram* in IV.24.1. I tentatively suggest that there is an attempt to blur the lines between Indra and Agni here, and that the partnership or fellowship may be the mutually beneficial relationship between gods and men centered on the sacrifice, where Agni officiates. But I cannot point to hard evidence for this interpretation.

The paradox of the cooked milk in the raw cows is a standard one, often trotted out as a natural wonder to contemplate. Here it seems to be taken further: there are literal milk and literal cows in c, but in d the black and red cows are likely to be the nights and dawns (as in 8cd) and the “gleaming white milk” the early light known as the “milk of the dawn cows” (see Watkins MoreDawnCows). As far as I can see, this hemistich has no integral connection with the first half of the verse, and the shift from 3rd to 2nd person underlines this disconnect.

I.62.10: A nicely balanced alliterative pāda *sanāt sánīlā avānīr avātā*, with the first phrase picking up 7a *sanájā sánīle*. Note also that the first word of b, *vratā*, echoes *avātā*. On *avātā-* see comm. ad I.38.7 and VIII.79.7.

Again the reference of this verse is somewhat obscure. Are the streams here the same as the four rivers in 6cd? or are they the streams released from Vṛtra’s confinement? (Ge suggests sensibly that Indra gave them the command to wander in I.61.12, though it is their own commandments, not Indra’s, that they safeguard here.) The identity of the sisters of cd, compared to wives, is even less clear. Are they the same streams as ab? or possibly praise-songs (*gírah* appear with the same simile, *jánayo ná pátnīḥ* in I.186.7, and in our next vs., 11cd, “inspired thoughts” [*manīṣāḥ*] are compared to eager wives). Again, I think the reference is supposed to be shifting, with the literal streams of mythological time replaced by the thoughts and praises of the ritual here-and-now, mediated by the feminine gender of the words used of both streams and praises. The temporal shift in this part of the hymn, or rather the double temporal vision, is signalled by the repeated initial *sanāt* ‘from of old’ and related terms (8a, 10a, 11a, 12a, 13a) and its contrast with the present tense verbs that prevail in this section.

I.62.11: *sanāyú-* ‘age-old’ is found only here, and was clearly created to match the other pāda-initial *sanā-* ‘old’ forms in this section, while matching its nom. pl. *sanāyúvo* with *vasūyávo*, which opens the next pāda. JL suggests that part of the motivation for creating this particular hapax is to invoke the paradoxical juxtaposition of *sana-* ‘old’ and *yuvan-* ‘youth’. Verse 8 contains the same juxtaposition: *sanāt ... yuvatī* “from of old the two young girls,” and the theme of old and new runs throughout this hymn, indeed in this verse.

JL also notes the chiasmic *pátim ná pátnīr usātīr usántam* of c.

I.62.13: *sanāyānt-* is likewise only here. Note its semantic opposite *nāvyam* at the end of the pāda, the same contrast as *sanāyūvo ... nāvyo* in 11a.

Like the last verse of the preceding hymn (I.61.16), this verse is extra-hymnic in some ways, but also has connections with the rest of the hymn. The “old” pattern continues to open the verse, and the voc. *śavasāna* in c forms a ring with the same stem in the dative in 1a.

I.63 Indra

I.63.1: The very first hemistich of this hymn presents us with a syntactic problem: although the most natural way to read this is with a rel. clause beginning with *yó ha* and continuing through the second pāda, the verb there, *dhāḥ*, is unaccented. There are three possible ways to handle this. The first, the one I followed in the publ. tr., is to assume that *dhāḥ* got de-accented for some reason. Several possible reasons are available, though none of them strong: 1) it lost its accent redactionally from being matched to (properly) unaccented *dhāt* in 2b, also at the end of its hemistich; 2) the same idiom *áme (...) dhāt* is found in nearby I.67.3 (unfortunately by a different poet) and this caused the loss of accent redactionally; 3) because the 2nd hemistich of the verse in question is also a subordinate clause (beginning *yád dha*), the previous subordinate clause lost its verbal accent and became a kind of “honorary” main clause, because the action of cd is based on that of the relative clause that precedes it. (This seems to be one possibility that Old floats, though he is rather sketchy about it.) Though Ge does not mention the lack of accent, he tr. the whole as a rel. clause.

The other two ways to deal with the problem involve having the rel. clause end at the end of the first pāda. Old also suggested the possibility that the rel. cl. is limited to *yó ha śúṣmaiḥ*. Re, Hoffmann (1967: 181), and WG all follow this path, with tr. of the type “You are great, Indra, who are (so) because of your *śúṣma*.” I rejected that because of its awkwardness, although I recognized that it solves the accentless verb problem, since the main clause can occupy pāda b without problem. A third way, also ending the relative clause with the end of the first pāda, seems to me to be less clumsy, and that is to make all of the first pāda the relative clause. Though *yáḥ* appears to be fairly far into that clause, in fact it is not preceded by more than one constituent (plus a vocative, which doesn’t count). This produces a tr. “(you) who are great because of your *śúṣma*-, you placed” This actually has a parallel in IV.22.3 *yó deváḥ ... mahó vājebhir mahádbhiś ca śúṣmaiḥ* “The god who ... is great by reason of his prizes and his great *śúṣma*.” I would therefore now change the tr. accordingly, to this third option.

The next problem in this half verse is the construction of *áme √dhā*. All the standard tr. render it more or less as “you put Heaven and Earth in panic/fear.” This makes sense of the syntax, but attenuates the meaning of the noun: *áma-* is an attack or onslaught, or more abstractly offensive power, whereas ‘panic, fear’ suggests the opposite. Therefore, although slightly more machinery is required, I tr. this idiom (found also in I.67.3, IV.17.7) as “put X in the path/way of your onslaught.”

Notice that here Nodhas manages to deploy a perfectly orthodox de-coupled dual dvandva for Heaven and Earth (*dyāvā ... pṛthivī*). See remarks on I.61.14, 62.8.

The subject NP(s) of cd are neatly interwoven: with *vísṡvā ... ābhvā* (neut.) chained with *girāyaś cid ... dṛḷhāsaḥ* (masc.).

Hoffmann (p. 181) argues convincingly that *naījan* should not be interpreted as *nā aījan* with the Pp., but with the injunctive *éjan*.

I.63.2: If my new parsing of the syntax of vs. 1 is correct, these two verses are structurally parallel, with a relative/subordinate clause in a, the main clause in b, and a further subordinate clause, esp. dependent on the main clause, in cd.

Note the phonological trick, where (*ā*) *yád dhá(rī)* opens 2a, apparently matching *yád dha* of 1c (which in turn shows *dha* for *ha*, found in the grammatically different rel. clause *yó ha* in 1a). The verse ends with more alliteration: *d púra(h) ... puru- ... pūrvīḥ*.

The meaning of *vívrata-*, several times of Indra’s horses, but also with a few other referents, isn’t entirely clear, because it depends on which of the many value of *ví* to assume. I favor ‘having separate commandments’, that is, acting independently but each in obedience to Indra, but it could also mean ‘without commandments’ (which must underlie Ge’s ‘widerspenstige’ [stubborn], followed by Hoffmann [but with ?]).

The c pāda lacks a caesura and in its place has a somewhat bizarre compound, voc. *aviharyata-kratu-*. The second member is clear, and the whole must be a bahuvrīhi. The first member appears to contain the well-attested adj. *haryatá-* ‘gladdening’, but this presents certain problems: the present *haryati* does not appear with the preverb *ví* and it is difficult to construct an appropriate meaning, esp. one that would harmonize with *krātu-* ‘resolve’. Possibly, with double negation via *a + ví*, “whose resolve is not undelightful” – not a particularly compelling possibility. Nonetheless, this derivation seems the path of least resistance and is probably responsible for Ge’s “dessen Rat nicht verschmäht wird” and WG’s “... nicht unbeliebt ist” (possibly also Hoffmann’s “... nicht zu unterschätzen ist” – it’s hard to tell). But all of these must take the *-haryata-* in a passive sense, although the simplex adjective never has that value.

I think it’s likely that the compound involves some complex word play, scrambling and recombining the (*d*)*hárī* and *ví(vratā)* of pāda a. Despite the ad hoc explanations required, I’m inclined to consider the *-viharyata-* somehow a derivative of *ví √hvr* ‘deflect, swerve, overturn’, a well-established idiom. (Re’s “dont le pouvoir est incontrariable” seems to reflect this.) Two negated nominal derivatives of this lexeme are found in the RV: *ávihruta-* ‘unswerving’, jpb: ‘not overturned’ (V.66.2, X.170.1) and *ávihvarant-* jpb: ‘not overturning’ (IV.36.2). Unfortunately the morphological details are not going to be easy. Accounting for the loss of the *v* in a putative **avihvaryata-* is not so difficult: it can be ascribed to dissimilation, in combination with the word play on (*d*)*hárī* just mentioned. But what about the rest of the word. For the suffix *-ata-* I can only invoke the (small) class of *-ata-* adjectives with full-grade root syllable of the type *darśatá-* ‘(lovely) to be seen’, *yajatá-*

‘worthy of the sacrifice’, and the aforementioned *haryatá-* ‘delightful’. As for the intermediate -y- between root syllable and ending, I again invoke the play on (*d*)*hárī*, with the -y- representing the sandhi of -ī- before the suffix -ata-. If word play is indeed involved here, it’s possible that a second reading of the first member could be “not without his fallow bays” and the whole compound means “who has no resolve without his fallow bays.”

I am fully aware of what a house of cards this is and only sketch these scenarios because I think Nodhas is capable of such manipulations. I do think it possible, however, that the lack of caesura and the problematic compound are connected and that the transmitted text is not what Nodhas originally composed. It should be noted that the word division *yénā viharyatakrato* is also a possibility, but this doesn’t help either with the lack of caesura or the analysis of the compound.

I.63.3: I interpret *dhṛṣṇúḥ* as governing the acc. *etān*, though as a goal not a direct object..

I.63.4–7: *tvám ha tyád* provides the opening of the next four verses. Although *tyád* is a neut. pronoun and in 4a could function as the object of the otherwise object-less *codīḥ*, in the following verses it does not have pronominal function; the expression X *ha tyád* is a way of providing emphasis, particular of the 2nd ps. pronoun (cf., e.g., VII.19.2, VIII.96.16–18). I would now be inclined to tr. the vss. in this sequence with “It was just you who ...” rather than the rather recessive “You then, ...”

I.63.5: This verse contains many small problems of interpretation that hinder putting together the whole. I’ll start with the details and turn to the construction of the whole thereafter.

áriṣānyan is universally taken as intrans., patient-oriented ‘not receiving harm, not being harmed’, but in all cases this stem is better taken as ‘not allowing harm’. The finite verb *riṣānyáti* also has this meaning “intends harm, allows harm’. The parallel stem *áriṣānya-* in II.29.4 has the same meaning and takes a genitive (*áriṣānyā tanūnām* “not allowing harm to our bodies”), and I construe the gen. *mártānām* in b with *áriṣyan*: “not intending harm to mortals.”

The next problem is *dr̥ḷhásya*. Ge takes this as the causer of the harm to Indra (gen. agent), while Hoffmann, followed by WG, construe it with *ájuṣtau*, with the gen. pl. *mártānām* dependent on *dr̥ḷhásya* (KH “bei Missfallen selbst eines Feststehenden unter den Sterblichen”), but both the Ge and the WG interpretations require that *dr̥ḷhá-* be a person. This is unprecedented: this past participle is virtually always used of a place, a fortified stronghold. Indra is once (VIII.44.12) called *dr̥ḷhá-*, presumably because he is as steadfast as a fortress (in the vein of “a mighty fortress is our god”), but I know of no examples with people so called. If at all possible it should have the standard meaning here. I think this is possible, by reading the verb *ví ... var* of pāda c also with the first hemistich and supplying the word *dúrah* ‘doors’. In fact, the other two passages containing the gen. sg. *dr̥ḷhásya* strongly support this solution, as they both contain the verb *ví √ vr̥* and the headnoun *dúrah*: VI.62.11

dr̥hásya cid gómato ví vrajásya, dúro vartam ... “Open the doors of the cattle pen, even though it is shut fast” and VII.79.4 *ví dr̥hásya dúro ádrer aurnoh* “you opened up the doors of the firm-fixed stone.” Note that *ví ... var* is rather more appropriate to this hemistich than it is to the pāda in which it’s found. (Recall the double use of \sqrt{var} in I.62.5 and 7.)

The last word to be accounted for in this hemistich is *ájuṣṭau*. Unlike most tr. I take it to be Indra’s displeasure. The object of his displeasure is not expressed, but it is easy to supply — presumably Vala, since Indra is opening up his stronghold. His displeasure at Vala (or other demonic enemies) is implicitly contrasted with his benevolent care not to injure mortals.

I am less sure about what pāda c is conveying. I assume this is a racing image: Indra starts the race by opening the barriers at the starting line. Ge and Re take the injunctive *ví ... var* as a functional imperative, but this is certainly not necessary. I tr. as a past tense, in keeping with its rendering in the first hemistich, but it would be possible to take it as a present in c, as Hoffman/WG do. The phrase *asmád ā* “(coming) from us” seems a bit heavy simply to express that it’s *our* horse, so there may be some racing terminology embedded here.

In d *ghanéva* contains the old instr. *ghanā*.

I.63.6: The gerundive *atasāyya-* is taken by Ge as belonging to \sqrt{at} ‘wander’ and tr. “soll ... erreichbar sein,” while most (Gr, Re (?), AiG II.2.286, Hoffman, WG) take it to mean “to be asked for/begged” and derived from the hapax *atasī-* supposedly ‘beggar’ (VIII.3.13). But this is entirely circular, with the meaning of each of these two words determined on the basis of the other, with an occasional nod towards \sqrt{at} ‘wander’ as their possible root (whose relevance Mayrhofer casts doubts on; see EWA s.v. *atasī-*). I instead take it as a negated gerundive to \sqrt{tams} ‘tug, yank, shake’, which forms a similar gerundive to its intensive, *vitantasāyya-*. Negated gerundives do not ordinarily take accent on the privative (AiG II.1.217), and the derivational opacity of *atasāyya-* would make it likely to receive the usual *-āyya-* gerundive accent. Ge also suggests the possibility of derivation from \sqrt{tams} in a note.

I.63.7: “one after the other” is my attempt to render an “object-distributive” value for the intensive *dardaḥ*. (For this notion see Schaefer 1994: 86–87, though she considers *dardar-* lexicalized and does not attribute this sense to it, pp. 135–36.)

The use of *vārg* ‘you twisted’ differs in tone in simile and frame. In the frame it is distinctly hostile and destructive, but in the simile it simply expresses the ritual action of twisting the barhis grass into seats for the visiting gods.

I.63.8: *āpah* in b can certainly be the old nominative plural used as an accusative, as occasionally happens in late RV (so Gr and implicitly most tr.), but as I suggested elsewhere (1982: 260), it may be the nominative plural it appears to be; this may be an example of case disharmony in a simile, exploiting the ambiguities in syntax of the verb \sqrt{pi} ‘swell’ that the poets were always happy to capitalize on.

I take *tmánam* as functioning as a reflexive pronoun (“extend yourself”), while most tr. take it as a noun (Ge ‘Lebensgeist’, WG ‘Lebenshauch’). This is the only acc. to the truncated stem *tmán-*, and so its usage is hard to determine. The oblique cases (dominated by inst. *tmánā*) generally refer to the self (‘by yourself, for ourselves’, etc.), without a full-blown nominal sense, which accounts for my tr. However, the active form of *yámsi* gives my pause, and so the standard tr. should be considered (though I am not ready to adopt it). “Extend nourishment to us” seems to be formulaic, with an active form of \sqrt{yam} , and so that voice may have prevailed here, despite the reflexive *tmánam*; cf. III.1.22 *prá yaṃsi ... íṣo nah*, IV.32.7 *sá no yandhi ... íṣam*.

I.63.9: I supply ‘hymn’ as subject for *ákāri* in the first pāda and take *bráhmāṇy ūktā* in b as a separate nominal clause. It is of course grammatically possible to take the latter phrase as subject of *ákāri*, since neuter plurals famously can take singular verbs. But, fame aside, this construction is quite rare in the RV, and in this case there are two different recipients, Indra in a and the horses in b. However, I do not consider the other interpretation impossible.

I.64 Maruts

I.64.1: Ge argues that *apó* (apparently the acc. pl. of ‘waters’) should be emended to *ápo* (neut. acc. sg. of ‘work’). His parallels are persuasive, and I accept the emendation. Therefore the published tr. should have an asterisk * before ‘work’. The accent shift may have been made redactionally, on the basis of vs. 6, which contains *apó* ‘waters’ in its first pāda and *vidátheṣv ābhúvaḥ* in its second, as here. On the other hand, if we choose to retain the reading *apó* (see below), the hemistich can mean “Wise in mind, with dextrous hands I anoint the hymns, like waters standing ready at the rites.” WG accept the reading as given, but take it as “Werkmeister,” i.e., to the internally derived adjectival stem *apás-* ‘possessing work’. This would be appealing save for the fact that the masc. nom. sg. should be **apās* (or *ápā* in this sandhi context). This morphological problem is not mentioned.

I.64.4: *vy añjate* here responds to *sám añje* in 1d, though here the verb is reflexive and in the 1st vs. it is transitive but with subject involvement (“I ornament [my own] hymns”). I tr. the verbs slightly differently because the ‘anoint’ sense doesn’t work very well in vs. 1, esp. with the simile, whereas here the etymological figure with *añjibhiḥ* ‘unguents’ enforces the more literal sense.

Gr suggests emending *mimṛkṣur* ‘they rubbed’ to *mimikṣur* ‘they were fixed/attached’ (accepted by WG), since this verb $\sqrt{myakṣ}$ is used elsewhere of spears in similar contexts. However, ‘rub’ makes fine sense, and the poet may well be playing with a well-known phrase. (This perhaps should give us pause about emending *apó* to *ápo* in 1.)

Pāda d *sākāṃ jajñire svadháyā* ... “They were born all at once by their own power” -- that the Maruts were self-born is asserted in I.168.2; see also V.87.2.

I.64.5: Very alliterative verse, esp. in 2nd half, with pāda c *duhānty ūdhar divyāni dhūtayo* (cf. also *dhúnayo* in pāda a) and d ... *pinvanti páyasā párijrayaḥ*. Cf. also b *vātān vidyútas (ta)vi(ṣṭbhir)*.

Most tr. take *ūdhar divyāni* together (e.g., Ge “die himmlischen Euter”). Although *divyá-* does modify *ūdhar-* elsewhere in similar context (e.g., IX.107.5 *duhāná ūdhar divyám mádhu priyám*), the collocation is not grammatically possible here, since *ūdhar* is definitely singular and *divyāni* is definitely plural. At best one would have to argue that short-vowel neut. plurals to *n*-stems, which are identical to their neut. sgs., provided some sort of model (cf., e.g., I.173.3 *sádma mitā* “fixed seats”). Old (ZDMG 55.273 n. 1 [=KlSch 732]) claims that this is a vicarious introduction (“ein vicarirendes Eintretung,” whatever that means) of the sg. *ūdhar* since the plural of *ūdhar-* doesn’t exist. (We would expect **ūdhāni*, like *áhāni* to *áhar*, though Old bizarrely produces **ūdhṛṇi* instead; I see no reason why **ūdhāni* could not exist and assume its non-attestation is an accidental gap.) But the issue here is not the singular of ‘udder’, but the plural of ‘heavenly’, which the poet could easily have made singular (as in the parallels) if he had wanted. The root \sqrt{duh} can take a double accusative, as in IX.107.5 just quoted: “milking the heavenly udder of its dear honey”), and this is how I interpret *divyāni* here, supplying a form of *vásu* ‘goods’, which *divyá-* regularly modifies. In one way or another this alternative goes back to Gr and Delbrück AiS.80 and is accepted by WG. Again, Nodhas seems to be playfully evoking a familiar phrase but modifying it.

On *párijrayaḥ*, supposedly a cmpd with root noun *-jri-*, lacking the usual *-t-* extension, see comm. ad V.54.2.

I.64.6: *vidátheṣv ābhúvaḥ*, repeated, as noted above, from 1d, is ambiguous. It can modify the waters of the first pāda, as Ge (/WG) take it, or the Maruts (so Re). I have tried to maintain the ambiguity. In vs. 1 the phrase qualified the hymns (fem. pl. *gírah*) and, if *apó* of pāda c is not emended, those waters as well.

I.64.8: *piśá-* in b occurs only here in the RV, so although the meaning assumed by most (‘mottled [deer]’ vel sim., beginning with Sāy) is plausible, it has no other support. The plethora of wild animals in this run of verses (7: buffalos, wild elephants, 8: lions, snakes) does suggest that this term names animals too. Re by contrast tr. the etymological phrase *piśā iva supíśaḥ* as “bien ouvragés comme des oeuvres-peintes,” though he is more cautious in his n. Kulikov (JIES: 2009) suggests ‘cheetah’ or ‘leopard’ on the basis of the wild animal company it keeps in its AV occurrence (AVŚ XIX.49.4 = AVP XIV.8.4). This is plausible but by no means certain.

I.64.9: As noted in the intro., *ródasī* is a pun. In pāda a it refers to the two world-halves, but in cd the unexpressed subject is feminine and mounts the Maruts’ chariot. This can only be Rodasī, the Maruts’ consort (for mounting their chariot, see

I.167.5–6), who ordinarily is accented *rodasī* but here must be generated by otherwise homonymous *ródasī* in pāda a.

āhimanyavaḥ should probably be unaccented, in a voc. phrase with *śūrāḥ*, but since the phrase *śávasāhimanyavaḥ* is exactly repeated from the preceding vs., 8d, where it is properly nom., it could hardly have failed to acquire an accent redactionally.

I.64.11: *payovṛdh-* has several possible values. In addition to the ‘milk-strong’ in the publ. tr., it would also be possible to take the *-vṛdh-* transitively: “strengthening with their milk [=rain]” or “strengthening the milk [=rain]”; either alternative is supported by vss. 5–6.

The lexeme *úd√han* is quite rare and occurs with the verb stem *jíghna-* only here. Since the exact sense of the lexeme is not certain, it is difficult to know how to complete the simile. I have interpreted the verb to mean ‘beat up’; with regard to roads there is a nice parallel in the English idiom “pound the pavement.” I assume that *āpathi-* refers to walkers on a path and supply ‘road’ as the object parallel to the mountains and their feet as the instrument of pounding that is parallel to the wheel-rims. ET compares the French idiom ‘frayer le chemin’, used of blazing a trail, which may well be the sense meant here. Ge takes the verb as ‘aufreissen’ (tear open/up) and supplies ‘stones’ as the object (sim. WG). I am a little puzzled as to why his Strassenfahrer would be tearing up stones, but I suppose it might be to clear a rugged path. Re: “... arrachent les montagnes, tels des frayers-de-voie.” I do not know what he means by this.

I.64.12: The word *sūnú-* ‘son’ in the singular takes one aback in a hymn devoted to celebrating the very plural Maruts. It clearly refers to the ‘flock’ (*ganá-*) in pāda c, but I have tr. ‘offspring’ to avoid the misleading “we hymn the son of Rudra...”

I.64.13: Ge (/WG) construes *āpṛchyaṃ krátum* with *ā kṣeti*, giving the latter the meaning ‘possess’. But this Class II present means only ‘inhabit, dwell’ (as opposed to Class I *kṣáyati* ‘rules over, owns’ to a different [synchronic] root $\sqrt{kṣi}$). Re clearly recognizes the problem and tries to reconcile the meaning of the root present with its construal with an object, producing the very odd “il habite une force-spirituelle digne-d’être-recherchée.” It seems preferable to me to take *āpṛchyaṃ krátum* with the previous pāda and tr. *ā kṣeti púṣyati* separately. The two verbs (admittedly without the preverb *ā*) form a fixed expression (I.83.3, V.37.4, VII.32.9). The position of the preverb also does not favor construing the preceding accusative with *ā kṣeti*: we might then expect the preverb to begin the clause, though this argument is considerably weakened by the fact that the pāda would begin **ā āpṛchyam*, in sandhi *āpṛchyam*, and the separate preverb would be essentially lost. As for the sense of *bharate ... āpṛchyaṃ krátum*, I interpret it as what I think Re would call a “legère zeugma.” The first two objects of *bharate*, *vājam* and *dhánā*, are both physical objects that the subject carries from one place to another; the third proposed object is a mental attitude. The English idiom “carries himself” and the English noun “bearing”

use ‘carry, bear’ in a similar sense, to refer to a person’s mental self-presentation, and the middle voice of *bharate* would neatly fit such a value.

I.65 Agni

I.65.2–3: These verses contain 3rd pl. act. root aorists *ánu gman* (2b) and *ánu ... guḥ* (3b) to the associated roots \sqrt{gam} and $\sqrt{gā}$ respectively, with no apparent difference in semantics. Here one might almost invoke the much over-used explanation of metrical convenience: both of these 3rd plurals are always (*gman*) or almost always (*guḥ*) pāda-final, with the first “making position” with a preceding light syllable (often *ánu*) and the latter not.

I.65.3: The second half of this verse is very economically and ingeniously expressed. First, the syntactic modes of simile and frame are entirely different. The frame consists of a single noun, nominalized from an underlying verb (*pářiṣṭih* ‘enclosing’ < *pári* \sqrt{as} ‘enclose’), with the object (Agni, an underlying objective genitive) to be supplied from context (“the enclosing [of Agni]”). The simile contains both subject and object in the appropriate cases (nom. *dyaúḥ* and [presumably] acc. *bhūma*) but no verb, which must be generated from the noun *pářiṣṭih* (“as heaven [encloses] the earth”), which in turn was generated from the underlying verb. Thus, the frame and the simile are in syntactic complementary distribution – the former with a verb (or verb substitute) but no overt nominal complements, the latter with nominal complements but no overt verb. That the verb-y half is expressed nominally and the noun-y half as if it contained a governing verb is a further bit of cleverness. This syntactic skew produces case mismatch, with the nom. “heaven” of the simile apparently compared to nom. “the enclosing” (*pářiṣṭir dyaúr ná*), and, further, the mismatch between the single (presumed) complement of the frame and the two overt complements in the simile gives an impression almost of case disharmony of the type treated in Jamison 1982, although in fact the objective gen. “of Agni” that must be supplied matches the acc. object *bhūma* in the simile.

Or at least it matches *bhūma* acdg. to the standard renderings (Ge, Re, WG, Lü, *Varuṇa* p. 590, and the publ. tr.). However, *bhūma* is a neuter and ambiguous as to case, and heaven enclosing the earth does not strike me as a standard Vedic image — though it slips easily into our round-earth cosmological worldview. Far more commonly in Vedic heaven and earth together encompass something else (e.g., X.27.7, under an epithet) or fail to (II.16.3, again under an epithet), or they themselves are encompassed (see the expressions quoted in Jamison 1998). For a nicely balanced passage in which the two appear both as object and subject, see nearby (but attributed to a different poet) I.61.8cd *pári dyāvāprthivī jabhra urvī, nāsya té mahimānam páři ṣṭah* “He held encircled broad heaven and earth; they did not encompass his greatness.” I therefore now wonder if *bhūma* should be taken as a nominative parallel to *dyaúḥ*, with an object to be supplied (“... as heaven [and] earth [encompass X]”) or even if *dyaúḥ ... bhūma* should be recombined into a dual dvandva (cf. *dyāvā-bhūmī*, with slightly different 2nd member) and taken as an object

(“as [X encompasses] heaven [and] earth”). (Note that the disyllabic reading of *d̥yaúh* could accommodate a *dyāvā*.) In any case, I believe that the poet kept these possibilities open by the ambiguous concision of his wording.

Yet another aspect of this little expression is its relation to other such expressions in this small group of hymns attributed to Parāśara Śāktya (I.65-73): twice elsewhere in this collection Agni is depicted as encompassing something else, with the lexemes *pári √bhū* (I.68.2 *pári ... bhúvat*, I.69.2 *pári ... babhūtha*), while in I.72.2 something else is enclosing Agni, configured as a calf (*vátsam*), using *pári √as*. (I wonder if the somewhat pleonastic presence of *bhúvat* in our passage is meant to resonate with those *pári √bhū* passages.) Thus, though in our passage Agni is clearly the *object* of enclosure in the myth of his hiding in the waters, he himself can take the role of encloser in this tight-knit collection – allowing for the possibility that he might here be supplied as *subjective* genitive with *páriṣṭih*, save for the mythological context.

All in all, I.65.3cd packs a lot into its ten syllables and five words, as witnessed by the many more words (more than ten times as many) in this entry required to describe its syntactic and semantic tricks.

I.65.4: The initial sequence in this vs. *várdhantīm* can, uncontroversially, consist of the 3rd pl. act. pres. *várdhanti* and the enclitic pronoun *īm*, as the Pp. and all subsequent analyses take it. I wonder, however, if it should not be analyzed like nearby I.67.4 *vidántīm* (q.v.; also a Parāśara hymn), where I segment the sequence as *vidánt īm*, with the old secondary ending *-*ant* preserved because it was misanalyzed as *-ánti + īm*. In I.67.4 there is stronger motivation to accept my reanalysis because *vidá-* is otherwise only an aorist stem and should not have indicative forms with primary endings. Here, of course, *várdha-* is a present stem and *várdhanti* would be perfectly at home. Nonetheless, the first four vss. of this hymn treat the disappearance of Agni and his concealment in the waters and are couched in the past -- note esp. *ánu guh* ‘they followed’ in 3a, the vs. paired with this one. I would therefore tentatively emend the published tr. to “the waters strengthened the lovely child.” For this and other such passages (esp. I.65.4 and I.85.11), see my “Hidden in Plain Sight: Some Older Verb Endings in the Rig Veda” in a forthcoming festschrift.

It is unclear with what part of the sentence the instr. *panvā* should be construed. I take it with the verb *várdhant(i)* (though I do not go as far as Old, who suggests that the phrase is equivalent to *panáyanti*), while Ge (/WG) and Re, in slightly different ways, take it with *súsísvim*. The stem is a hapax and there is no obvious way to decide the matter, though the passages Re adduces for his instr. of characterization (IX.85.11, 86.31 *sísum .. pánipnatam* and III.1.13 *apām gárbham ... pániṣṭham jātām*) may tip the scales in his direction. So I might modify the publ. tr. to “The waters strengthen(ed) the lovely child in his wonder” or (see below) “... strengthen(ed) the one growing well with/in wonder,” though construing it with *várdhant(i)* still seems to yield more sense.

The matter is made more difficult by the fact that *súsísvi-* is also a hapax. It is generally taken as an adj. “schön wachsend” (ultimately to *√sū* ‘swell’), and this is

certainly possible. But because of *śíśvā*, instr. of *śíśu-* ‘child’, in 10c, I follow Old (SBE, “the fine child”) and Re (“le beau Nouveau-né”) in taking it as a noun.

I.65.5: It is tempting to take the adjectives *raṇvā*, *pṛthvī*, and *śambhú* as referring to Agni and specifying the term of comparison with the item in the simile (“broad like a place of peaceful dwelling,” etc.), and in fact Ge (mostly) and Re (entirely) give in to this temptation. However, all three adjectives agree in gender with the noun in the simile (fem. in the first two, neut. in the last), and although it would be possible to explain this agreement as “attraction” (so Re), a simpler solution is to assume that the adjective belongs with the comparandum. (So also WG.) The phrase *girír ná bhújma* poses a different problem, in that *girí-* is masc., and therefore if *bhujmá* is an adjective, it does not modify *giríh* — unlike the otherwise entirely parallel expression in VIII.50.2 (Vālah.) *girír ná bhujmā*. We should either emend the text (→ *bhujmā*, so Gr) to agree with that passage (“like a beneficial mountain”) or take it as a nominalized neut. “source of benefit,” the solution adopted in the publ. tr. On this characteristic of mountains, see, e.g., I.55.3.

I.65.6–7: The similes continue in these verses, but with less strict parallelism in structure.

I.65.6: The construction of *síndhur ná kṣódaḥ* is clarified by its occurrences in the next hymn, I.66.10 *síndhur ná kṣódaḥ prá nīcīr aīnot* “Like a river its gush, he has sent forth those [=butter offerings?] heading downward.” Hence the “(sending)” supplied here.

I.65.7: *ibhya-* is found only here in the RV, though it occurs later. It is a derivative of *ibha-*, which is slightly better attested in the RV and seems to mean ‘(group of) servants, retinue’. Tr. of *ibhyān* split dramatically between ‘wealthy’ (Ge “die Reichen,” WG “die Begüterten”) and ‘vassal, servant’ (Re “les vassaux”), and the Pāli cognate *ibbha-* is also glossed with both, though with the ‘vassal’ sense first and dominant (see the newest ed. of the PTS dictionary, 2001 s.v.: “a member of a king’s entourage; a vassal; dependent; wealthy”). I will not enter into a reexamination of all the Sanskrit and MIA evidence, but in my opinion context here favors ‘vassal, dependent’ rather than ‘wealthy’. See Proferes’s disc. of vss. 7–9 (2007: 111–12); although he refuses to tr. *ibhyān*, he argues that it refers “to those who are subordinated to the king,” quite possibly the clans — as the AV passage he adduces suggests: AV IV.22.7 *vīśo addhi* “eat the clans,” addressed to the king at his consecration.

I.65.9: Strictly speaking, given the position of *ná*, the *apsú* should go with the frame, not the simile: “he hisses in the waters, like ...” This is presumably a reference both to the myth of Agni’s hiding in the waters treated earlier in the hymn and to his identification with Apām Napāt, but the *haṃśá-* is surely sitting in the waters, too — though the primary point of comparison is the hissing noise both make.

How to construe gen. *viśām* is not clear. I take it loosely as a dative gen. with the *cētiṣṭhaḥ*, while Re considers it dependent on a “virtual” *viśpāti-* (“le plus remarquable ... de (ceux qui président aux) tribus”), and Ge and WG, in slightly different ways, take it as dependent on *uṣarbhūd* (Ge “der Frühwache der Ansiedelungen”; WG “der von Niederlassungen am Morgen wach wird”). Proferes’s rendering is quite awkward, but closest to my own in intent: “the clans’ brightest as concerns strategems.”

I.65.10: The simile in cd is unclear; its purport depends on what meaning is assigned to multivalent *vibhū-*, whose senses include ‘conspicuous’, ‘distinguished’, and ‘wide-ranging’, to which Ge adds ‘sich mehrend’, Re ‘abondant’, and WG ‘kräftig’. In Ge’s and Re’s readings, the point of the simile would be the size of the herd and its growth through the birth of its young. This is certainly possible, and the point of contact with Agni would be the growth, that is, the blazing up, of the fire after its kindling. However, I do not see ‘increase’ as one of the core meanings of *vī√bhū* and prefer ‘wide-ranging’ here, with the simile expressing the grazing behavior of herds and the frame the fire’s tendency to spread. See 8b *vānā vy āsthāt* “he has spread out through the wood.” The final word of 10, *dūrēbhāḥ* ‘far-radiant’, may support this interpretation. I do admit, however, that *śiśvā* ‘with their young’ makes less sense than in the Ge/Re interpretation.

Note that the opening of the last hemistich of the hymn, *paśúr ná śiśvā*, “unpacks” the hymn’s first word *paśvā* in a type of ring comp., and that this phrase was in a sense anticipated by 4b *panvā súśiśvim*.

I.66 Agni

I.66.1: The fem. gender of *citrā* is a problem. The standard solution (see, e.g., Gr) is to assume that *rayí-*, which is normally masc., is occasionally fem. (so also, supposedly, in nearby I.68.7, though see disc. there). I find this unsatisfactory and explain the gender by assuming that *citrā* modifies not only *rayiḥ* but also fem. *saṃdṛk* and agrees with the latter.

Gr takes *sūrah* as the nom. sg. of the thematic stem *sūra-*; in this he is apparently followed by Re: “(propre à la) vision (des hommes) comme le soleil.” I find this unlikely, since *saṃdṛś-* regularly takes the gen., incl. *sūryasya* (II.33.1, X.37.6, X.59.5). I therefore take *sūrah* as gen. of *svār-*, with, apparently, Ge (/WG).

More problematic is *āyur ná prāṇāḥ*, where the first word should be the neut. noun *āyus-* ‘lifetime’, since Gr’s supposed adjectival stem *āyu-* ‘beweglich’ does not exist (only the neut. noun *āyu-*, also ‘lifetime’). Thus, properly speaking, we should have an equational simile “breath like lifetime,” represented in Re’s “souffle-animé comme la vie (même)” and WG “der Atem gleichsam als Leben.” Nonetheless I consider the interpretation as an improper compound, as in Ge’s “wie der Lebenshauch,” to make more sense.

I.66.2: Both *tákvān-* and *bhūrṇi-* have received diverse tr., which I will not treat in detail here. For \sqrt{tak} as ‘plunge, rush’, etc., see EWA s.v. *TAK*; here and in *takva-vī-* I take it to refer to a “swooping” bird of prey. As for *bhūrṇi*, it belongs to \sqrt{bhur} ‘quiver’, and I tr. it here as ‘restless’ to capture the constant circling and diving of birds of prey. How then can he ‘cling’ (*siṣakti*) to the wood? The image must be of the flames of the fire constantly licking and dancing (to use our preferred metaphors in English), but always in contact with the wood. My “clings” is a more vivid version of the literal “accompanies, keeps company with.” To avoid the appearance of contradiction, the phrase might better have been rendered “ever restless, like a swooping (bird), he (yet) clings to the wood.”

Note that the second syllable of *vānā* somewhat echoes the *nā* simile markers of previous *pādas*.

The simile of *c* is syntactically problematic, consisting of a neut. NA sg. *pāyaḥ* ‘milk’ and a fem. nom. sg. *dhenúḥ* ‘milk-cow’, with the relation between them unspecified. Ge simply takes it as a functional compound (“wie die Kuhmilch”), though unlike “life-breath” in 1c, the order of the elements would be wrong; Re takes *dhenúḥ* as if it were gen. (“comme le lait (de) la vache-laitière”), while Old (SBE) and WG render it as two similes (Old “like milk, like a milch-cow”). I have supplied a verb “(yielding),” allowing *pāyaḥ* to serve as acc. object, on the basis of IV.57.2 *dhenúr iva pāyaḥ ... dhukṣva*. None of these solutions is immediately satisfying. One clue might be whether the adjectives in *d* (*śúcir vibhāvā* ‘blazing/gleaming and ‘far-radiant’) are applicable to either the one or the other of the nouns in the simile, but this doesn’t turn out to be very helpful. Although both adjectives are regularly used of Agni, they are characteristic of neither milk nor cows. One exception is V.1.3 *śúcir ankte śúcibhir góbhīr agnīḥ* “blazing Agni is anointed with blazing cows,” but there the “cows” stand for products of the cow, either milk (so the publ. tr.) or, more likely, ghee, so that a metaphorical application to either noun is possible. And it may be that the simile in *c* is to be taken by itself, detached from the adjectives in *d*; see, e.g., 3cd, where the two *pādas*, one a simile, the other not, are semantically independent.

I.66.3: As Re notes, we might expect suffix-accented *jetā* with gen. *jānānām*. WG, following Tichy (1995: 343–44), interpret the gen. in dative function (“als Sieger für die Menschen”) to avoid nominal rection with a root-accented agent noun. But since this accentual “rule” is often broken, I see no problem with the standard interpr. as objective gen. “conquerer of peoples.”

I.66.5: The two halves of this verse are conceptually more complex than those preceding. Most tr. take *a* and *b* as implicitly contrastive: Agni’s blaze is undomesticated but he is nonetheless intimately familiar -- e.g., Ge “Dessen Flamme schwer heimisch wird, (und doch ist er) eingeboren wie die Einsicht.” This is certainly possible. However, although I recognize the contrast between *duróka-* and *nítya-*, I think the poet is equating the two elements in a clever play: Agni’s flame

can't be controlled and "domesticated" anymore than a man in the grip of his own will.

As for the second half, I find it hard to believe that the poet is implying that one's wife is at the disposition of everybody, with the distasteful sexual connotations this implies -- as in Re's "(se mettent) à disposition pour chacun comme l'épouse sur la couche." Rather I think this is the Papageno situation: all it takes for anyone to be happy is his own wife in his lap.

I.66.6: The "horse" generally supplied with *śvetāḥ* 'white' is based on the regular co-occurrence of that adj. with *áśva-* and other expressions for 'horse', including metaphorically of Agni (e.g., V.1.4). It of course also harmonizes nicely with the chariot of cd.

I.66.7: In the RV it's necessary to allow *śenā-* to mean both 'army' and 'weapon'; although the latter could make sense here (so Re), an army is more likely to produce an onslaught than a single weapon.

I.66.8: As discussed in the publ. intro., this verse is quite opaque and breaks the pattern of Agni-describing similes that has prevailed up to now in this hymn (and the last one). It has, not surprisingly, stimulated much discussion and some fanciful interpretations, all the details of which I will not rehearse here. The first question that must be addressed is what the first word (and the fourth), *yamáḥ*, represents here. Is it the PN Yama, naming the first man and the king of the dead? or the common noun 'twin'? or even the common noun 'controller' (though we might then expect the accent *yáma-*)? What one decides about this question determines the direction of interpretation of the rest of the verse. Ge (/WG) take it as Yama, here identified with Agni; Re and Old (and I) as 'twin', with the two twins displaying different characteristics. The rhetorical structure of the verse favors this interpretation; not only do the first two pādas both begin *yamáḥ*, a repetition that invites (but does not require) a "the one ... the other ..." reading, but the contrastive characterizations found in cd also support it.

The next problem is the gender discrepancy between *jātāḥ* (m.) and *jānitvam* (n.) in what appear to be parallel equational clauses. To solve this Ge (/WG) simply supply a verb with the second, to which *jānitvam* serves as object: "als Yama (erzeugt er) das künftiges Geschlecht." But this would disturb the balanced structure of the verse, and it seems best to allow *jānitvam* to be predicated of *yamáḥ*, as Old and Re (and I) do. Where I differ from these latter is in my interpretation of the two equations. Old and Re take both twins to be identified with Agni, with each "twin" representing one aspect of Agni's nature. I think that each twin is identified first with another entity, which is then secondarily identified with Agni. Although this might seem complex, it allows the other parts of the verse to bear more meaning than the exclusive "Agni = one twin, Agni = other twin" interpretation admits. As indicated in the publ. intro., I take the verse as reflecting the circumstances of the early morning ritual, when the fire is kindled at sunrise and the soma is pressed for the first offering.

Under that interpretation the twin that has (already) been born (*jātāh*) would be the sun, at whose appearance the ceremony gets started. The twin that is the substance to be born (*jānitvam*) would be the soma. The two are not only twins of each other, but each is the twin of Agni. Soma and the sun are not infrequently identified (see, e.g., IX.66.18 *tvām soma sūra ēṣaḥ* “you, Soma, are the sun”); the identification of Agni and the sun is a commonplace; and Agni can also be identified with Soma (see, e.g., the ṛca IX.66.19–21), and they frequently share epithets (like *sūci-*, discussed above 2d, though in another context).

I then take the two *pādas* *cd* as referring to the sun and the soma respectively. The sun is “the lover of girls” because he appears with the Dawns. For the same phrase, in the acc., referring (most probably) to the sun, see I.152.4. Whereas in IX.86.32 our same phrase *pātir jānīnām* is applied to Soma, where the “women/wives” are the milk-drinks with which he is mixed. As for the secondary reference to Agni, of these characterizations, either group of females (or both) might refer to the offering ladles (fem. *juhū-*) that approach the ritual fire with their oblations or the streams (fem. *dhārā-*) of melted butter being offered. See the fem. pl. *nīcīḥ* in 10b.

Despite the complications of this interpretation, it provides a rich reading of the enigmatic verse, which fits well with the two ritually centered verses that end the hymn.

I.66.9: As indicated in the publ. intro., I consider the last two verses of the hymn to reflect the ritual situation. This scenario is supported by the presence of 1st and 2nd pronouns (*vayām* and *vaḥ* respectively), with the 2nd ps. enclitic indicating, as often, the other human participants and observers besides the poet and priests, who are the “we.”

The crux in this verse is *carāthā*. The first problem with it is the long *ā* in the 2nd syllable, the only instance of such a stem in the transmitted RV beside regularly formed *carātha-* (13x). However, the situation is more complex: 4 of the transmitted *carātha-* forms occur in the Parāśara hymns (I.68.1, 70.3, 7, 72.6), but of these, 3 (68.1, 70.3, 7) would be metrically better if read **carātha-*. I have no explanation for the variation and will not pursue the issue further. More interesting is the grammatical identity of the form and the semantic role it plays in the verse. Old (SBE, Noten) and Ge (/WG) take it as a nom. pl. ‘wanderers’, neuter if flg. the Pp., though Ge suggests that it might reflect masc. *carāthāḥ*. They further interpret it as conjoined with *vayām* (Old, Ge) or identified with it (WG). However, in the Noten (ad loc., fn. 1) Old allows the possibility that the form could be an instr. parallel with *vasatyā* (“mit Gehen und mit Verweilen”), an idea that Re develops, suggesting that the pair are semantically parallel to the contrastive pair *yóga / kṣéma* (roughly “activity and rest”). Re believes that the instrumentals characterize Agni (“(soit) dans (sa) marche, (soit) dans (sa) demeure”). This is possible, though it would be a slightly odd use of the instr. With Re I consider *carāthā* an instr. contrasting with *vasatyā*, but think that the pair is applicable to “us”: we approach Agni with homage

with both our movable goods, that is, the livestock that provides the butter and milk offerings, and our household establishment that supplies the rest.

The 3rd pl. *nákṣante* (*nákṣanta* in sandhi) does not agree with its 1st pl. subject *vayám*. With Ge I take it as attraction to the immediately preceding simile, *ástam ná gāvaḥ*. It is accented because it begins the pāda.

I.66.10: The fem. pl. *nīcīḥ* has almost too many possible referents -- waters, flames, cows, or butter offerings (configured as cows) – all of which have been proposed by one or more tr. I favor butter offerings. See also VIII.101.13, also containing *nīcī* and showing the same range of possibilities; sim. V.44.4. The cows of c may well be the same offerings metaphorically.

See intro. for the ring compositional final pāda. As Re points out, *svàr dṛśīke* is a nominalizing extension of the infinitive phrase *svàr dṛśé* “to see the sun,” and we need not try to interpret *svàr* as a genitive.

I.67 Agni

I.67.1: ‘Demand’ may push $\sqrt{vṛ}$ ‘choose’ a bit, but the simile suggests a degree of coercion.

Adverbial *ajuryám* is lit. ‘undecaying, unaging’, but in the developed sense ‘unfailing’ or, in English idiomatic terms, ‘without fail’.

I.67.3: On the idiom *áme $\sqrt{dhā}$* see disc. ad I.63.1; this expression must also be considered in relation to Parāśara’s *amaṃ $\sqrt{dhā}$* in the preceding hymn (I.66.7). Although a tr. like WG “setzt er die Götter in Schrecken” is easier, I do not think we should lose the sense of ‘onslaught’ for *ama-* by redefining it as ‘panic’ or ‘terror’ in this idiom. Here I think the point is that the leaping flames of Agni put even the gods in his way, even though he is, for the moment, sitting undetected. The first pāda of the hymn (*vāneṣu jāyúḥ* “a conquerer amid the wood”) also implicitly contrasts his martial power with his apparently humble station.

I.67.4: The anomalous 3rd pl. *vidánti*, to the thematic aorist *ávidat*, is the only apparent primary indicative form to this stem and should belong to a present. However, I think it can be eliminated: rather than following the Pp. *vidánti im*, we can instead read *vidánt im*, an injunctive with secondary ending whose final *-t* was preserved in this ambiguous sandhi situation. No alteration of the text is required. The publ. tr. need not be altered either, though a preterital interpretation is in fact better: “They found him there when they recited mantras...” – since this passage appears to refer to the mythological tale of the gods finding Agni hidden in the waters. Cf. I.72.2 (also a Parāśara product), where the immortals did *not* find him (*ná vindan*) though they sought him; they are also described as *dhiyaṃdhā-*, as here. For this and other such passages (esp. I.65.4 and I.85.11), see my “Hidden in Plain Sight: Some Older Verb Endings in the Rig Veda” in a forthcoming festschrift.

I.67.5: Tr. of the subj. *ajāḥ* vary between ‘unborn’ (Ge, Re) and ‘goat’ (Old SBE, WG), but parallel passages show that it must be the shadowy divinity Aja Ekapad (“One-footed Aja”), whatever the *ajā-* signifies in that conjunction. (Old recognizes as much in his n.) Cf. esp. AV XIII.1.6 *tātra śísriye ’já ékapādó ’dr̥ṃhad dyāvāpr̥thivī bālena*; also RV X.65.13 where *ékapād ajāḥ* is adjacent to *divó dhartā*. In our passage the word *padá-* appears in the next verse and gestures toward the epithet.

The pf. *dādhāra* is ordinarily always presential (Kü 261); Kü cannot decide whether the pf. of $\sqrt{\text{stambh}}$ is presential or preterital, but at least in this context I think it matches *dadhāra* in value.

I.67.6: The verse is highly alliterative: ab: *priyā padāni, paśvó ní pāhi*; d: *guhā guhām gāḥ*. For the stylistic figure *guhā guhām* see Hoffmann, KZ 76 (1960) 242–48, esp. 246–47 [=Aufs. I.113-19]. Note that *guhā* has a different accentuation from adverbial *gúhā*.

I.67.7–8: These two verses are syntactically dependent on each other, consisting of three relative clauses (7ab, cd, 8ab) and a main clause with coreferential pronoun (8cd). However, this structure is complicated by the fact that, though two of the rel. clauses have singular rel. pronouns (*yáḥ* 71, 7c) and the pronoun in the main cl. is likewise singular (*asmai*), the intermediate rel. cl. (8ab) has pl. *yé*, though all seem to be roughly coreferential. There is no obvious solution for this jarring inconsistency; Ge simply labels it Anakoluthon. However, certain features of the larger context may have encouraged this syntactic anomaly. First, the relative/correlative construction is of the indefinite “whoever ...” type, where number is functionally, though not grammatically, neutralized. That is, it doesn't matter how many (or few) people the definitional relative clauses identify: if many people perform the functions, they should all get the reward; if only one does, then only he would. Moreover, as Lüders argues (p. 448), vss. 7–8 respond to vss. 3–4. In those earlier verses Agni goes into hiding (3d), but the “superior men” (*nāraḥ*) find him after they produce and recite effective speech (4). In vss. 7–8 we seem to have the same situation, but in the human realm: he/they who has/have recourse to and do(es) service to the truth (7cd, 8ab) and perceive(s) Agni in hiding (7ab) receive(s) acknowledgement from Agni himself (8cd). Since in vss. 3–4 the discoverers of Agni, the gods, are plural, it may be that the plural crept in here, too. And finally this sequence may anticipate the next hymn, where it is emphasized that “all” (in the plural) perform the proper ritual and devotional functions, and in particular the almost identical phrase *ṛtām sápantaḥ* (68.4c) echoes our *ṛtā sápantaḥ* (67.8b).

I.67.8: The verb *ví ... cṛntānti* lacks an overt object, and several different ones have been proposed: Ge (in n.) suggests it's “the stream of truth” from 7d; Re supplies “(l'énigme)”; and WG read *ṛtā* with this verb as well as the participle *sápantaḥ* (“welche ... die Ṛtas aufknoten, (sie) pflegend”). Since the other two occurrences of this root (impv. *ví ... cṛta* I.25.21, ppl. *vícṛta-*) are both construed with *pāśa-* ‘fetter’,

that seems the likely object here as well. More speculatively, on the basis of VII.59.8 *druhāḥ pāsān* ‘fetters of deceit’, I have supplied that whole phrase here, since ‘deceit’ contrasts nicely with the emphasis on *ṛtá-* ‘truth’.

The pf. *prá vavāca* is one of the very few pf. forms to \sqrt{vac} with full reduplication (against *uvāca*, etc.). On the basis of its agreement with Aves. *vauuac-*, Kü (p. 441) considers this the older type of reduplication, with the newer type spreading from Samprasāraṇa roots.

I.67.9: The second half of the verse is metrically disturbed. As HvN note in their metrical commentary, it actually reads better as a Triṣṭubh, as is occasionally the case with Dvipadā Virāj.

The syntax of the verse is also problematic. The two *utá-s* of *c* are difficult to construe, and partly for this reason Gr, Old (SBE [disavowed in Noten]), Re, and Klein (DGRV 358) emend *prajā utá* to *prajāsu* (presumably then **prajāśūtá* in the Saṃhitā text, though it’s not stated). If the original text had read this, it is hard to see why it would have become corrupted, given the two other loc. pl. in this verse. I consider the problematic *utá-s* and the problematic *prajāḥ* connected and suggest that the *utá-s* are connecting different entities: the first connects the nominatives *yáḥ ... utá prajāḥ* “who [Agni] and his offspring” (not grammatical in English, of course, but possibly so in Skt; consider the common “X and which Y” construction), the second the locatives *vīrútsu ... utá prasūṣu antáḥ* “in the sprouts and within the fruitful (plants).” Both Agni and his offspring grow in both media; note that because of its sandhi position *ródhan* can be both sg. (*ródhat*) and pl. and thus construed with both suggested subjects.

Note also that the verse begins *ví REL*, just like vs. 8, but with entirely different referents for the rel. pronoun. This might be another reason why 8ab shifts to the plural, to establish the difference between those who serve Agni and Agni himself.

I.67.10: The exact sense of *cittí-* and the syntactic disposition of *apām* are the two issues in this verse. Although *cittí-* ordinarily means ‘perception, insight’ and most tr. so take it, I prefer to make it the abstract to a different, but well-represented, sense of \sqrt{cit} , namely ‘appears’, hence ‘apparition’. I also, with Old SBE, take *apām* with *dáme* rather than *cittíḥ*. I find tr. like “la pensée active des eaux” (Re), “der Verstand der Wasser” (WG) hard to interpret, indeed even lacking sense. Since much of the hymn has dealt with the theme of Agni’s hiding – and since his hiding place was the waters, though this was not overtly stated earlier – I think that this verse describes him glowing in the waters (and therefore detectible) and also makes reference to him as Apām Napāt.

The *sádma* of *c* must be read with both simile and frame.

I.68–70 Agni

I consider these three hymns to be thematically and verbally linked, treating the Vaiśvānara fire and encoding this theme by deploying the two words underlying

this vṛddhi compound, *viśva-* and *nṛ-*. The first, *viśva-*, dominates I.68, the second, *nṛ-* I.69, and they are juxtaposed in the climactic verses of I.70.9–10. See the introductions to the three hymns in the publ. tr., and for a detailed discussion, Jamison, Fs. J. S. Klein (“Inter-hymnic Rhetorical Structure in Ṛgveda I.68-70: Parāśara Śāktya’s Vaiśvānara Cycle,” 2016).

I.68 Agni

Note that Hoffmann tr. the entire hymn (1967: 141–42) because it contains 10 injunctives. I agree with Hoffmann’s tr. of these forms as presents, although I do not think this requires a Zeitlos-type interpretation.

I.68.1: For this interpr. of *śrīṇán*, which lacks overt object, see Narten 1987: 281 (=KISch p. 351).

Rather than taking *aktūn* as a second object with *vy ūrṇot*, I make it an acc. of extent of time, as it often is elsewhere (e.g., V.54.4).

On the metrical shape of *carátham* see I.66.9.

I.68.2: The second half-verse does not work as Dvipadā Virāj, since it would have pādas of 4 and 6 syllables. It has long been suggested (for reff. see Old SBE and HvN comm., both ad loc.) that putting *devó devānām* in the opposite order would fix this problem. However, Old argues in the Proleg. (97) that this is unnecessary, that Dvipadā Virāj has an affinity to Triṣṭubh, and that this line, though 10 syllables, configures itself nearly as a Triṣṭubh. See I.67.9 above.

The verb *pári ... bhuvat* lacks overt object, and various suggestions have been made. I assume that its object is the same as the object of 1cd “the still and the moving.” Hoffmann (sim. WG) tr. the verb simply as “überraagt” (stands out), but this interpr. ignores the emphasis on “encompassing” in this set of hymn (see disc. ad I.65.3).

The unaccented gen. pl. *eṣām* presents a problem similar to that posed by *āsām* in vs. 7, though I account for them in different ways. Given its lack of accent, *eṣām* should be a pronominal, not adjectival, demonstrative, but it appears to be construed with *viśveṣām ... devānām* “of all these gods.” Because *devānām* is fairly distant from both *eṣām* and *viśveṣām* and appears to be bound to immediately preceding *deváḥ*, I would now take *eṣām ... viśveṣām* together, separate from *devānām* and emend the tr. to “When alone of all these, the god among the gods, encompasses ...” Though it may be difficult to maintain this in the face of vs. 7, as I argue in the forthcoming article cited above, the poet is doling out the genitive plurals here and does not want to specify that “these all” are the gods until the last minute, since masc. pl. “all” in this hymn otherwise refers to the unified worshippers of the Vaiśvānara fire.

I.68.4: The publ. tr. has “All have a share in divinity and its name.” I would now replace this with “... your divinity and your name.” As I argue in the art. cit., the “all” literally share the name Vaiśvānara.

The contrast between the joint enterprise of those unified by the Vaiśvānara fire, expressed by *bhájanta víśve*, and the separate actions of each of the members, expressed by *évaiḥ*, is the theme of this verse as well as vs. 8.

I.68.5: The logical and syntactic connections between the nominal expressions of ab and the clause in cd are not clear. Ge simply pronounces ab elliptical and suggests supplying *cakruḥ* from cd, while Re supplies “(telles sont/est)” with the two phrases. My assumption is that the promptings and vision of truth are the indirect cause of the actions in cd by defining the proper tasks that all should perform throughout their lifetimes.

I.68.7: There is a syntactic problem in cd that is ignored by all tr. as far as I can see, though Old treats it briefly (ZDMG 61 [1907]: 829 = KISch p. 260; see below): the fem. gen. pl. demonstr. *āsām* is unaccented. Oblique forms of the *ayám* demonstrative are unaccented when used pronominally, but accented when used adjectivally. The two accented forms of *āsām* appear with NPs, *pūrvāsām* ... *svásṛṇām* “previous sisters” I.124.9 and *viśām* .. *ābhayānām* “fearless clans” X.92.14, and unaccented *āsām* (25x) is always pronominal (for VII.34.10 and X.75.4 see disc. ad loc.) Yet all interpr. of our passage construe *āsām* with *rayīnām* (e.g., Ge [WG] “der Herr dieser Reichtümer,” Re “le maître de ces richesses”). This produces another anomaly: *rayí-* is overwhelmingly masculine and should not be modified by a feminine demonstrative. (On supposed fem. *rayí-* in I.66.1 belonging to this group of hymns, see disc. ad loc. It need not be, and in my opinion is not, feminine there either.) Although it introduces some complexity, I therefore think that *āsām* “of these” must stand for a different feminine noun also construed with *páti-*. The problem then is what noun? It should already be present in the discourse, since unaccented forms of *ayám* are anaphoric, but there are no obvious candidates – indeed, no candidates at all if we limit ourselves to overt feminine plurals in the previous verses of this hymn. However, an underlying feminine referent can be generated from the context. I see two possibilities. 1) From *ápatya-* ‘progeny’ in the phrase *mānor ápatye* we can generate the synonym, fem. *prajā-* ‘offspring’ – note their juxtaposition in I.179.6 *prajāṃ ápatyam*. The gen. pl. of *prajā-* does not occur in Vedic (indeed no gen. pl. to a root noun in *-ā* does; see Macdonell VG), presumably because it should be *prajāṃ* and identical to the acc. sg. (though with possible distracted 2nd syllable). By this interpretation Agni would essentially be *prajā-pati*. 2) More likely, in my view: the underlying noun is *viś-* ‘clan’. Although no direct reference to clans is made in the hymn, as I point out in the publ. intro. and argue in more detail elsewhere (Jamison Klein Fs., 2016; see above), the repeated *víśve* ‘all’ triggers a pun with *viś-* in this set of hymns (see esp. I.70.4) and so would be present in the minds of the poet and his audience. Agni is regularly called *viśām páti-* and *viśpáti-*, sometimes at the same time – e.g., III.13.5 *hótāraṃ viśpátim viśām*, which also contains *hótar-*, as also here. The mention of Manu might also have triggered the association; cf., e.g., V.4.3 *viśāṃ kavīm viśpátim mānuṣīnām* “the poet of the clans, the clanlord of the (clans) of the sons of Manu.” If this solution seems too fussy, it is possible to follow Old’s

explanation of the lack of accentuation (see ref. above): that *āsām* does not modify *rayīnām* but anticipates it (“he is the master of them, of the riches”), while being anaphoric to sg. *rayīm* in 6d. This does not eliminate the gender issue, however, and also seems over-tricky. The *eṣām ... vísveṣām ... devānām* of vs. 2 makes some problems for my interpretation here, but see discussion there.

I.68.8: This verse has given rise to a number of different interpretations, which cannot be discussed in detail here. I interpret it in the framework of Proferes’s treatment of the joint clan-fire (see publ. intro.; also Fs. Klein), which must be kindled and tended by members of the separate clans working together. This cooperative and reciprocal enterprise is expressed by the phrase *mithás tanūṣu* “mutually among themselves” (at least in my interpretation; it has received varying tr., but with most rendering *tanūṣu* as ‘bodies’), by *sám jānata* “they agree, act in unison” to the resonant lexeme *sám √jñā* (see publ. intro. to I.68 and esp. I.68.9), and by the middle voice of *ichanta* “they seek (from each other).” The *rétaḥ* they seek is, I think, the means of kindling the fire, though I admit that this is not a usual sense of that word. Again, as in 4cd, there is a contrast between joint action (*sám jānata*) and each individual’s contribution to it (*svaír dáḥsaiḥ*).

I.68.9: This verse returns us to vs. 3; the b-pādas of both are identical: *krátuṃ juṣanta* “They take pleasure in your/his resolve.” In vs. 3 the subject is “all”; here we can assume that the unidentified subject here is “all” as well, and, since vs. 8 follows easily on vs. 7, we can superimpose “all” as subject there too. In vs. 3 the “all” found this pleasure when Agni was born in cd; the parallelism between vs. 3 and vss. 8–9 supports my view that vs. 8 also concerns the kindling of the fire, and the birth metaphor of 3cd (*jániṣṭhāḥ* ‘you are born’) further supports my suggestion that the *rétaḥ* ‘seed’ of 8a refers to the means of begetting the fire.

I.68.10: As Hoffmann points out, *ví ... aurṇot* is the only augmented form in the hymn and is esp. striking because it forms a ring with *vy ūrṇot* in 1d. The use of a clear past tense form seems to me to mark the conclusion of the ritual kindling of Agni and the attendant distribution of largesse. In other words, like so many final verses it summarizes the ritual activity whose general description precedes it. The final half-verse, in which Agni decorates the vault with stars, may seem out of place, but it also forms a ring, thematic not lexical, with vs. 1, where Agni approaches heaven and performs his tasks through the nights: the vault (*nākam*) reprises heaven in 1ab, and the stars are appropriate to the nights.

Strictly speaking, *rāyaḥ* is acc. pl., not gen. sg. (*rāyáḥ*), and a more literal translation would follow Ge’s “Er schloss die Reichtümer, die Töre (dazu), auf,” or – to match my tr. of 1cd and accommodate English idiom – “he disclosed riches, opened wide (its) doors.” However, Old strenuously argues that it should be interpreted as gen., and certainly the idiom *rāyó dúraḥ* (with the correct accent) is found nearby in Parāśara’s oeuvre (I.72.8)

What exactly is meant by Agni's decorating heaven with stars is unclear. However, in a similar passage (IV.7.3) Proferes (p. 27) argues that the stars in the sky represent the domestic fires distributed through many households.

I.69 Agni

As discussed in the publ. intro. and in the art. cit., this hymn is twinned with I.68.

I.69.1: The etymological figure *śukráh śúśukvān* is not as redundant as it seems, because both forms are found in similes with the sun — *svār ná śukráṃ* (II.2.7, IV.45.2) with the adjective and *svār ná śúśucīta* (II.2.10, X.43.9) with the perfect — both are found together in X.43.9 *svār ná śukráṃ śúśucīta*. In other words, since the similes "like the lover of Dawn" and "like the light of heaven" have the sun as their underlying referent, at least one of the $\sqrt{śuc}$ forms is, as it were, bound to it formulaically.

I.69.2: This verse is parallel to its twin in I.68, with the same verb: *#pári ... babhūtha* [*bhúvat* 68.2]... ; the emphasis on Agni's status among the gods (*devó devānām* 68.2, *devānām pitā* 69.2); and an instr. in *-tvā* (*mahitvā* 68.2, *krátvā* 69.2), though to non-parallel stems (*mahitvā-*, *krātu-*). It is therefore surprising that tr. do not note the parallelism of the two verses or necessarily treat them in the same way. In particular, both Ge and Old (SBE) take the *pári...bhúvat* in 68.2 as 'encompass', but *pári ... babhūtha* in 69.2 as 'be superior, excel'. (Re tr. both as 'encompass' and WG both as 'excel'.) Given the focus on encompassing/surrounding in this set of hymns (see disc. ad I.65.3 above), I think both lexemes should be tr. the same way, and each requires an object to be supplied. In 68.2 I supply "the still and the moving" from the previous verse; here I would use the conjoined world-halves, also from the previous verse.

The poet handles the parallelism between the two verses in almost a syncopated fashion. As just noted, each verse contains the idiom *pári √bhū*; in 69.2 this is contained within the first hemistich, whereas the finite form *bhúvat* opens the second hemistich in 68.2. But 69.2 has the almost identical form *bhúvaḥ* in that same position, but not as part of the idiom (see also *bhúvat* I.67.2, 65.3). As Hoffmann argues (e.g., 1967: 236–37), *bhuvāḥ*, *bhuvat* are formally ambiguous, both injunctive to the thematic aorist and subjunctive to the root aorist of $\sqrt{bhū}$. In the publ. tr. I render *bhúvaḥ* in I.69.2 as a subjunctive, but now I am inclined to take it as a presential injunctive "you become..." parallel to my interpretation of *bhúvat* in 68.2.

I.69.4: I supply *mitráḥ* 'ally' on the basis of a number of similar formulaic phrases: *jāne mitró ná* X.22.1; *mitráṃ ná jāne* VIII.23.8 (of Agni); *mitrá iva ... jāne* II.4.1 (of Agni). This would be via the collocation *mitrá séva*; cf. nearby I.58.6 *mitráṃ ná sévam divyāya jánmane* "favorable like an ally to the divine race," also of Agni, with a different word for 'people, race' (cf. also *sevām mitráya* X.113.5, a diff. permutation). Note also, two hymns previously, I.67.1b *márteṣu mitráḥ*, where *márteṣu* is a reasonable equivalent to *jāne*.

āhūrya- is a hapax, universally taken to belong to $\sqrt{hvṛ}$ ‘go crookedly, go astray’; although this derivation is not impossible, it leads to some forced tr. (e.g., Ge Durchgänger [‘bolter’, of horses]). I take it rather as the gerundive to the set root $\sqrt{hṛ}$ ‘be angry’.

I.69.5: The phrase *vísō ví tārīt* is variously interpreted. The first issue it raises is whether to take the acc. *vísah* as direct object (so Ge, Re, WG) or to construe it with the preverb *ví* as acc. of extent of space (Old SBE). Both usages are attested for $\sqrt{tī}$, but it is worth noting that the latter usage is found in Parāśara’s oeuvre using the same form *ví tārīt* (I.73.1), and I adopt it here. In the simile, “traverse the clans” may refer to the year-long journey of the horse ultimately sacrificed in the Áśvamedha. In the frame it reflects the idea of the Vaiśvānara fire spread through all the clans, not limited to a single household or small family group.

I.69.6: The intrusion of the 1st sg. speaker through *āhve* “I have summoned” is remarkable. Who is he? Although ordinarily in the RV the default referent of a 1st ps., esp. a 1st sg., is the poet, I wonder in this instance if it is not the leader of the united forces, the Kriegskönig, calling the clans and their leaders and best warriors to unite them for action.

My tr. differs syntactically in several ways from most tr., though it agrees with Re in both. First, I do not construe instr. *nṛbhiḥ* with *sánīlāḥ* (“of the same nest with the men”) but as an independent instr. of accompaniment. This would be the only ex. of *sánīla-* with an instr. By specifying “the clans along with their men,” the poet both refers to the whole social group and singles out its most conspicuous and important members, perhaps the *viśpāti-s*.

Second, I take *devatvā* as an instr. sg., not acc. pl. neut. with *víśvāni*. There are several reasons for this. The first verse of the next hymn (I.70.1) contains the same phrase *víśvāny aśyāḥ*, without further specification, and if at all possible the two phrases should be rendered in the same way. Moreover, as Re points out, no direct cases of the plural are attested in this type of derivative. It’s also the case that Agni is characterized by instrumentals in *-tvā* in this group of hymns (*mahitvā* I.67.9, 68.2; *krátvā* I.69.2), and his divinity is emphasized (I.68.2, 4, 69.2). I am, however, given pause by several passages containing *devatvám* (sg.) $\sqrt{(n)aś$: I.151.9 *ná devatvám paṇáyo nānaśuḥ* ... and III.60.2 *téna devatvám ṛbhavaḥ sám ānaśa*.

I.69.8: The first hemistich has 11 syllables and is best interpreted as a Triṣṭubh, with HvN.

The verse is otherwise problematic, and my interpretation differs sharply from that of others. The crucial point of difference is *áhan*, which is universally taken as the 2nd sg. impf. of \sqrt{han} ‘smite’. This seems to me contextually very unlikely: \sqrt{han} is a very rare verb with Agni as subject, and when it is found, it is almost always of Agni’s special form as *rakṣo-hán-* (see IV.3.14, V.2.10, VI.16.29, and with a different object V.4.5). The context does not favor a verb of violence, and I find it hard to believe that \sqrt{han} would be attributed to Agni out of the blue, esp.

without specifying an object and esp. announcing this action as his particular “wondrous power” (*dāmsaḥ*). Instead I take it as the loc. sg. of *áhar* ‘day’, in the formula *samāné áhan* “on the same day” (cf. I.34.3, 186.4), with the *samāné* suggested by (or suppressed by) adjacent *samānāṭh*. (Something like this possibility is considered by Old in his n. in SBE and attributed to Aufrecht in Noten.)

The major argument against this interpr., as far as I can see, is the double *yád*, which is unusual under any interpretation but passes better with two verbs (*yád áhan ... yád ... vivéḥ*) than one. I do not have a good solution for this doubling. Either it is rhetorical or simply pleonastic, or it marks off *nṛbhiḥ ... yuktaḥ* as a quasi circumstantial clause: “This is your wondrous power, that (*yád* 1) on the (same) day, when (*yád* 2) yoked with the same men, you ...” But I know of no parallels for such a usage. Another argument for seeing \sqrt{han} here, made by Old (Noten), comes from X.147.1, which contains both *áhan* and *vivér apáḥ* (see immed. below), but I do not think that very late hymn, dedicated to Indra, should overly influence our interpretation of this passage.

With Old (SBE and Noten) I read *vivér apāṃsi*, against Pp. *vivé rápāṃsi*; Old’s parallels are very persuasive, and this analysis does not require a change in the Saṃhitā text. Ge’s tr. appears to follow the Pp. reading, however, as does Re’s, though in his n. he accepts Old’s reading.

I.69.9: The first pāda is identical to 1b and thus forms a ring.

Gr, Ge, Re (apparently), and Lub take *usráḥ* as gen. to *uśár-*, but since there exists a robust stem *usrá-* ‘ruddy’, I see no reason not to take it as nom. sg. to that stem, esp. since *vibhāvan-* doesn’t otherwise take a gen.: the three passages Ge adduces are not compelling.

As discussed in the publ. intro., I do not follow the standard interpr. of *sámjñāta-rūpa-*, i.e., “having (his) well-known form,” since the idiom *sám√jñā* has a quite specific meaning ‘come to agreement’. The idiom is distinctive enough, and the compound is heavy enough, that that idiom is surely meant, esp. because it appears in finite form in I.68.8. Instead of being an anodyne description of the fire, this is a meaningful characterization of the shared clan-fire as the symbol of, and the product of, the mutual and unified ritual activity of the clans. Unfortunately, to render this comprehensibly in English requires a heavy and awkward locution.

The referent of *asmái* is not entirely apparent. The standard solution, going back to Sāy, is that it is the sacrificer. This is basically correct. However, the lack of accent on the pronoun should require that the referent is already present in the discourse. I suggest that it is to be found in the 1st ps. subject of *áhve* “I have summoned” in vs. 6, a subject that may be one of the ritual participants or, as suggested above, the Kriegskönig. Switch between persons is of course extremely common in the RV.

I.69.10: The phrase *dúro vy ṛṇvan* echoes *ví ... aurṇod dúraḥ*, which opens the last verse of the preceding hymn (I.68.10) and which itself forms a ring with *vy ũrṇot* of I.68.1.

The *tmánā* ‘by himself/themselves’ must refer to the priests; since Agni is regularly the subject of \sqrt{vah} , as the conveyor of oblations to the gods and of the gods to the sacrifice, it is here emphasized that others are conveying *him*.

The last hemistich is identical with the last one of I.66.10, which itself forms a ring with I.66.1. This set of hymns is very tightly knit together! As argued in the art. cit., this verse marks the completion of the fire’s transformation into the Vaiśvānara fire. Since that fire is identified with the sun, “all cry out on seeing the sun” is an expression of the unified group’s first sight of and recognition of the fire that symbolizes their unity – which has been presented to them by the priests who carry it and throw open the doors for it to be seen in 10ab.

I.70 Agni

Again, for detailed discussion of the thematics of this hymn and its relation to the two that precede it, see the publ. tr. and the art. cited above.

I.70.1: It is perhaps appropriate that this last hymn in the Vaiśvānara series begins with the martial verb *vanema* “may we vanquish,” since the function of the Vaiśvānara fire is to unite the clans as a force to oppose its enemies.

The Pp. reads *manīṣā*; most tr. read *manīṣā(ḥ)* (see Old’s disc [Noten]). However, I take it as both an instr. sg. *-ā* and acc. pl. *-āḥ*, with the poet, as so often, taking advantage of potential ambiguity. This double reading is supported by I.73.9 (also Parāśara’s work), which contains the athem. opt. *vanuyāmā* corresponding to them. *vanéma* here and three pairs of instr. + acc.: *árvadbhiḥ ... árvato nṛbhir nṛn, vīraír vīrān vanuyāmā* “Might we vanquish steeds with steeds, men with men, and heroes with heroes.”

I.70.3: *sthātām* and *caráthām* are pseudo-genitive plurals to this merism much favored by Parāśara. There’s no orthodox way to generate them morphologically; Re’s suggestion that *sthātām* is a compromise between **sthātrām* and something that looks more like a gen. pl. and that *caráthām* simply copied it seems a reasonable proposal, however sketchy the details.

I.70.4: A verse subject to numerous clashing interpretations. To deal with *ádrau* first – Ge cites several passages in which Agni is born from or is the son of a/the stone. I think it also likely that it is meant to contrast with *duroṇé*; the fire in the house is actual and visible, while the fire in the rock is merely latent and not easily acquired.

Most tr. take the two hemistichs as independent units, which then necessitates supplying something (what depends on the tr.) to make ab an actual clause. I prefer to take the whole verse as a single clause, with *svādhīḥ* as the predicate, whose complement is *asmai* (“... is very attentive to him [=Agni]”).

This leaves the enigmatic expression *viśāṃ ná víśvo amítah*. Most tr. want this to refer to Agni; hence their interpretational separation of the two half-verses. I think rather that it refers to those who serve Agni, both gods and humans. The two groups are expressed in different ways and the connection between them is

actualized by a pun on *vís-* ‘clan’ and *vísva-* ‘all’; this pun in turn makes the secret connection with Vaiśvānara, the clan fire (see Proferes p. 48). In the phrase, *vísvaḥ* can be read both with *amṛtaḥ* (“every immortal”) and with the gen. pl. *viśām* “every (one) of the clans,” thus providing an indissoluble link between the mortal and divine realms. And the *ná* makes clear that gods are exactly like men in their devotion to Agni. I am reasonably convinced that this is the correct interpretation, but it does trouble me that it is apparently identical to Max Müller’s (as reported by Old, SBE n.), “To him also who dwells in the rock and in the house, every immortal like every one among men is well disposed.”

I.70.5: The interpretation of *kṣapāvānt-* as ‘earth-protector’, containing a zero-grade form of the archaic noun *kṣám-* ‘earth’, goes back at least to the Petersburg dictionary and is the overwhelming consensus in Western scholarship (see EWA, s.v. *kṣám-*). However, a connection with the root noun *kṣáp-* ‘night’ has a more ancient pedigree: the Pp. divides the word *kṣapā* ‘*vān*, and Sāy comments *kṣapeti rātrināma / rātrimān / āgneyī vai rātriḥ*. At the very least we have a potential pun, and this pun is actually realized in this hymn, since vs. 7b, two verses later, contains the relatively rare root noun *kṣáp-*. Though vs. 5 has no mention of night and ‘earth-protector’ works fine in that context, the surfacing of *kṣáp-* ‘night’ so soon after might make the audience reconsider and produce a secondary semantic association for *kṣapāvān*. With a suggestion of Scarlatta (1999: 303), we could then analyze *kṣapāvānt-* as based on a syntagm with original predicative instrumental (*kṣapā* “[he is] with night”), which was then provided with a *-vant-* possessive suffix. Scarlatta (1999: 303) also suggests other ways to incorporate *kṣáp-* ‘night’, e.g., by haplology from **kṣápā + pā-* ‘protecting by night’ (his reconstructed initial accent reflects a posited adverbial accent shift from inst. *kṣapā*; see p. 303 and n. 452). The exact details matter less than the fact that the Vedic audience could likely see a pun in this word, between *kṣa-* as a combining form of *kṣám-* ‘earth’ and *kṣap-* ‘night’. The publ. tr. “protector of riches on earth” reflects the standard Western interpr., though with an adjustment to incorporate *rayīṇām*; I do believe that the pun on ‘night’ was available to the audience, however. (See also X.29.1 and Jamison 2015 [Gerow Fs., IJHS 19].) It should also be noted, however, that the analysis ‘earth-protector’ for *kṣapāvān* is reinforced in the next vs. (6ab) by an apparent paraphrase *etā ... bhūmā ní pāhi* “protect these worlds.” The poet seems to be even-handedly offering alternative views of *kṣapāvān*.

Most tr. take ab as a nominal clause with suppressed dative (*asmai* or the like), the antecedent of the *yáḥ* of the rel. cl. (“Agni is the protector ... [for him] who...”). I follow the interpr. of Velankar (1993: 41), who takes *dāśat* as the verb of both main and relative clauses, accented in the former because it is initial in its *pāda* (and in a *hī* clause), in the latter because it’s in a subordinate clause. This grammatical and semantic reciprocity would match that of the (*asmai ...*) *asmai*, where the first, suppressed dative refers to the worshiper and the second overt one to Agni. The theme of reciprocity is prominent in this hymn group.

I.70.6: *mártān* is almost surely an irregular gen. pl., rather than the acc. pl. it appears to be. (Though “knowing the races of the gods and (knowing) the mortals” is possible, the tight formulaic connection between gods and men/mortals throughout the RV strongly favors the gen. pl.) Whether it is an archaism or is simply following the morphologically sketchy lead of *sthātām ... caráthām* in vs. 3 cannot be determined.

I.70.7: The phrase *pūrvīḥ kṣapó vírūpā(h)*, lit. “many nights of differing form,” is convincingly taken by most commentators as an elliptical pl. for “... nights (and dawns)...,” since *vīrūpe* regularly modifies the dual dvandva *náktoṣāsā* ‘night and dawn’, including in Parāśara’s I.73.7. (See Old’s lucid presentation in SBE n.) Most tr. take it as the nom. pl. subject of *várdhān*, but, with Ge, I take it as an acc. pl. expressing extent of time, supplying a pronominal subj. ‘they’, picking up “the races of gods and men” in the previous vs. Either interpr. is possible, and there is little to tip the balance one way or the other. Old argues that under the nominative interpr., which he favors, *kṣapāḥ* should probably be accented **kṣápaḥ* (there are no other nom. pl. forms), and the need to account for the wrong accent (if such it is) and the fact that almost all occurrences of *kṣapāḥ* express extent of time (save for VIII.41.3, where it’s a direct obj.) might favor the acc. interpr.

With essentially all Western commentators starting with Benfey, I read *carátham* for the Pp. *ca rátham*, producing yet again Parāśara’s beloved, but morphologically troubled, merism “the still and the moving.” With most tr. I take it as neut. sg. and a second subject of *várdhān* (adjusted for number), though Ge interprets it as a gen. dependent on the “Keim” he supplies.

The ppl. *právitā-* always means ‘impregnated’ (of females) or, as here, ‘conceived’ (see Scar p. 501); WG’s “den vom Ṛta gesuchten” seemingly rests on the root etymology to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, without taking into account the idiom.

I.70.8–9: See Proferes (pp. 47–49), esp. for the identification of the Vaiśvānara fire in particular with the sun, and the publ. intro. and the art. cit, esp. for the encoding of the Vaiśvānara fire by the successive grammatical subjects *vísve* (9cd) and *náraḥ* (10ab).

I.70.9: Note the vocabulary associated with human kingship: *prásasti-* ‘panegyric, laud’ and *balí-* ‘tribute’. Since kings receive *prásastis* rather than bestowing them and since the verb *dhiṣe* is medial (whatever else it is morphologically), the tr. of Old SBE and Ge whereby Agni bestows the *prásasti* (e.g., Ge “du legst Wert auf die Kühe, auf die Hölzer”) seem incorrect to me, esp. with the semantic bleaching of *prásasti* to ‘worth, value’ (Old ‘excellence’). Although the phrase is distinctly odd, I think the point of “you receive/acquire a laud among cows and firewood” is that both the butter oblations represented by the cows and the firewood make noise when in contact with fire, and this noise can be interpreted as an audible expression of praise. For another instance of *prá√śams* in Parāśara’s oeuvre, see I.73.2.

I.70.9–10: See Proferes (pp. 48–49) on these contrastive verses. Note the complementary *bháranta* / *bharanta* beginning 9c and ending 10d respectively. Their relationship and their semantic contrast is emphasized by the *vi(...)*s: *bháranta ví(śve)... ví ... bharanta*.

I.70.10: Neither of these hemistichs produces two proper Dvipadā Virāj pādas. The first divides into 4 / 6 and presents as a Triṣṭubh lacking a syllable; the second has 11 syllables and is simply a Triṣṭubh, though with an irregular break.

I.70.11: What referent to supply with the adjectives *sādhúḥ* and *gr̥dhnúḥ* isn't entirely clear. I follow Ge with 'horse', because *sādhú-* several times modifies horses (see Ge's cited parallels), though Re's 'warrior' is equally plausible contextually.

As disc. in the art. cit., I do not believe, with Old (SBE, Noten) and others, that this verse is a later addition. Rather it is a summary verse of the whole three-hymn Vaiśvānara sequence, or even of all of Parāśara's Dvipadā Virāj hymns to Agni, and describes the Vaiśvānara as the ideal warrior and leader for the united clans embarking on a joint enterprise.

I.71 Agni

I.71.1: The meter of this first verse almost serves as a transition from Parāśara's Dvipadā Virāj hymns that precede it to his Triṣṭubh ones beginning here (–I.73), as all four pādas (as well as 2a) have openings of 5 (as if in Dvipadā Virāj) and the first two are syntactic units. The hymn then settles down into a pattern of mostly 4-syllable openings.

The underlying fem. subject of this verse is universally taken to be the fingers of the priest producing fire by friction from the kindling sticks. The qualifier *sānīlāḥ* can be read with both the simile and the frame: the fingers belong to the same hand as the co-wives do to the same household. So Ge, etc. The sexual innuendo fits the friction context well, in addition to setting the stage for the incest theme to come.

The object phrase *śyāvīm̐ aruṣīm̐* "the dusky and the ruddy [fem.]" is generally taken to refer to night and dawn (although Old [SBE and Noten] wishes to emend the text to fem. nom. pls. modifying the sisters, a generally bad idea). The identification with night and dawn is certainly supported by III.55.11, adduced by Ge, etc., with the same vocabulary. However, it would essentially duplicate the simile of d ("they delighted in night and dawn, like cows in dawn"), a clumsiness that seems uncharacteristic of Parāśara, and one also wonders why the fingers would care about night and dawn. I think, instead, that this is another of Parāśara's tricks, using color terms associated with the two time periods to pick out another referent entirely, namely the *arāṇi-* (fem.) 'kindling sticks', which the fingers *should* care about, since they are manipulating them. The color differentiation is a little odd, but I don't think it's entirely out of the question. In X.184.3 the kindling sticks are called 'golden' (*hiraṇyayī*), and one can imagine that as the fire begins to catch hold, the upper stick might glow red, while the lower one would be wreathed in dark smoke.

I.71.3: A difficult verse with a discouragingly large number of competing interpretations. In outline, though not in detail, I follow Ge’s interpretation: pāda a concerns the production of poetry and the poetic vision by our side, in contrast to the poetic visions of the stranger, our rival, in b. After the stranger’s attempts are gotten rid of, the topic returns in cd to our poetic products, which have success. (WG basically follow Ge, while Old [SBE] and Re take b as coreferential with cd.)

The first hemistich, esp. its first pāda, is highly alliterative and rhyming: *dádhan* ṛtām *dhanáyann* asya *dhítim*, *ād íd* aryó *didhiṣvò víbhṛtāh*. The two parallel 3rd pl. verbs *dádhan* and *dhanáyan* technically do not match in mood, since *dádhan* should be a subjunctive (the injunctive to this redupl. pres. should be either **dadhat* or *dadhur*, and the subjunctive of the latter verb should be *dhanáyān*; see Hoffmann 1967: 271 n. 13, who produces a tr. with subjunctive contrasting with preterite. However, in this context I think *dádhan* was created as a nonce injunctive to match the two *an* sequences in *dhanáyan*. The subjects of these verbs are simultaneously the Aṅgirasas and the current poet-ritualists; the injunctive conveniently elides the difference between past and present action.

The beginning of b, *ād íd*, generally has temporal value (“just after that”) and is so tr. in the publ. tr. But Parāśara uses the expression in causal value in I.67.8 and I.68.3, and a causal value is possible in the next verse (71.4); such an interpretation works better here, and I would therefore change the tr. to “because of that ...” The launching of their own poetic vision by our side scatters the visions of our opponents. The sentiment, but not most of the vocabulary, echoes that in I.70.1, where the *arí-* is also the opponent.

The desid. adj. *didhiṣú-* to $\sqrt{dhā}$ is based on the middle value of that root (‘acquire’); so Heenen p. 165, though I do not subscribe to the additional semantic baggage Heenen attaches to the stem. It means ‘desirous to acquire’, hence ‘greedy, voracious’. With most tr. I assume a pl. of *dhítí-* as the referent.

Just as the injunctives of pāda a can have either presential or preterital value, the lack of verb in b allows the temporal value to be set by the preceding clause, hence applicable both to the current ritual situation and its mythological model. The publ. tr. might be changed to “are/were dispersed.” There is no agreement on what *víbhṛtra-* means here, but *ví* $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ generally means ‘disperse, pull apart, carry away’, and the form also needs to be considered in conjunction with *víbhṛtaḥ* in the next vs.

The “unthirsting” *dhítí-* belonging to us/the Aṅgirasas are implicitly contrasted with the voracious ones of the *arí-*, as Ge, etc., point out.

With Gr, Old, Re, I take *apásah* as a nom. pl. fem.; Ge (/WG) rather as a gen. sg. masc. referring to the singer/priest. This is certainly possible and would provide a neat contrast to the gen. sg. *aryáḥ* of b. I would prefer, however, to keep the possible reference to the Aṅgirasas alive.

I would prefer not to take *devān* in d as a truncated gen. pl. construed with *jánma* (or as a second acc. with *vardháyanīḥ* “strengthening the gods, their race”); therefore, despite the pāda boundary, I take it with *áchā*, which frequently governs

devān (so, apparently, also Re); cf. esp. I.132.5 (=139.1) *devāṃ áchā ná dhītáyah*, which is our underlying phrase.

I.71.4: Another difficult verse, though it is clear that it alludes to the theft of fire by Mātariśvan in the first hemistich. This theft is expressed through word play: the verse begins *máthūt*, which can mean either ‘churn, rub’ (to produce fire) or ‘steal’. In this Agni context, esp. given vs. 1, which concerns the churning of fire, ‘churn’ would be the most likely reading – and so it is tr. by Ge, Old (SBE), and Proferes (2007: 31). But the name Mātariśvan ends the pāda, and this mythological allusion would tip the balance towards ‘steal’ (so Re, WG).

The real problem comes in the middle of that pāda: the ppl. *víbhṛtaḥ*. This form should mean ‘dispersed’ or ‘carried away’, and grammatically it should modify *mātariśvā*. However, sense would require it instead to qualify fire, the underlying direct object in the clause; fire is often carried away and dispersed in various locations. Cf. *ví ... bharanta* in the preceding hymn I.70.10 and discussion there, as well as the passages adduced by Old SBE, n. to vs. 4. There is no solution that satisfies both sense and syntax. Ge suggests it's a transferred epithet, from Agni to Mātariśvan; this seems a description of the problem, not a solution. Old suggests simply displacing it rightward to read it with the assumed subj. of pāda b, namely Agni (“When Mātariśvan had produced him by attrition, he ..., who was brought to many places, has come to every house”), and WG apparently follow. But this kind of extraction from one clause and insertion in another is not syntactically possible in my opinion, esp. given that in its clause it is placed between the acc. referring to Agni (*īm*) and the nom. *mātariśvā*, so that its grammatical affiliation is emphasized. Narten reports a clever suggestion of Hoffmann's, that the *ví-* is really ‘bird’, and the form means ‘carried by a bird’ (“Das vedische Verbum *math*,” n. 38 [=KISch p. 23 n. 38]), but Mātariśvan should no more be carried by a bird than be dispersed. In the end the least jarring rendering is Re's “s'étant transporté çà et là,” presumably referring to Mātariśvan's journey. My “borne away” reflects a similar notion, and I also toyed with the possibility that “carried away” may have the same extended meaning as the English idiom, namely, “overcome with excitement.” No doubt Parāśara recognized the trap he was setting, forcing the audience to find a way to interpret *víbhṛtaḥ* with Mātariśvan rather than with the far more natural Agni.

As noted above, the subject of the next pāda must be Agni, established “in every house” (cf. V.11.4, X.91.2). Because of the accent on *bhūt*, the clause must be parallel to pāda a and is not the main clause, which is introduced by *ād īm* in c.

On the second half of the verse see Proferes 2007: 30–31. Agni's role as messenger is of course well known: he travels between gods and men, heaven and earth. This regular route may be prefigured here by Mātariśvan's theft in a, for elsewhere it is clear that M. stole fire from heaven (e.g., I.93.6). It is also said that M. bestowed the stolen fire on Bhṛgu (see nearby I.60.1), and so the epithet *bhṛgavāna-*, whatever its morphology, is apposite. What is unfamiliar is the simile, in which Agni serves as messenger as if for a more powerful king. According to Proferes, Agni is here “depicted ... as the symbol of the presence of a leader's authority within each

household.” I’m not sure, because Agni’s *dūtá* role involves traveling, not staying put. I am inclined to think the simile was generated simply from *dūtyām* and is not meant to apply directly to Agni and his relationship to royal power.

I.71.5: This vivid account of the incestuous attack of Father Heaven on his own daughter (elsewhere Dawn) comes as a surprise in this hymn. The connection must be the fact that this incest led to the birth of the Ṃgirases, who were the subject of vs. 2 (and possibly vs. 3); this birth is mentioned in the other incest verse, vs. 8cd, though without naming the Ṃgirases. The other connection is that Agni, unnamed, is the avenger in this verse, shooting Heaven as he released his semen into his daughter. Although the avenger is usually identified as Rudra on the basis of post-Ṛvic passages (see Ge n. to vs. 5, Re, WG), I have demonstrated (Hyenas, 288–97) that the original avenger was Agni. Note that *ástā* ‘archer’ is used of Agni in the last verse of the immediately preceding hymn (I.71.11). I also take Agni as the subj. of pāda b: like a hunter on his prey, he creeps up on the pair, having noticed the caresses (*prśanyàḥ*) Heaven was bestowing on his daughter.

In addition I consider Agni to be the subject of pāda a (with most tr.), but the action there is harder to explain: how and why does Agni make the sap=semen for Heaven if he disapproves of Heaven’s sexual designs on his daughter and in fact punishes him for the rape? For one thing, fire is unlikely to produce anything we might consider sap; in a naturalistic sense, making *rāsa* for heaven would seem to be storing up rain. However, our notions of nature and Vedic India’s are often at odds. That the same semen (or possibly its delivery agent, the penis) is called *tvīṣi-* ‘spark, flare’ in pāda d and, even more telling, is referred to as “blazing semen” (*śūci rétaḥ*) in 8b, brings it into fire’s conceptual sphere. It may be that the flaring up of fire produces Heaven’s semen. But what is Agni’s motivation? I’m afraid this remains mysterious; perhaps it was involuntary, produced by the flaring up just suggested.

I.71.6: This verse returns us to the ritual here-and-now and is considerably easier to interpret than the scraps of mythology in the previous two verses. Still, there are a few puzzles.

The verb *vī bhāti* ‘radiates widely’ is surprising, since its subject must be the mortal worshiper, even though Agni (or occasionally Dawn) is ordinarily the subject of this common verb. Old (SBE, repeated in Noten) suggests emending it to *vī dhāti* ‘worships’ (in Old’s tr.). (I sometimes get the feeling that in the Noten Old felt the need to stick with emendations he’d suggested in his far more free-wheeling SBE tr., even though in his later years he was otherwise very reluctant to emend.) But a metaphorical sense of ‘radiate’ works fine in the passage, as Ge points out, citing parallels like VI.5.5, also of a mortal worshiper. And this would be an instance like *vībhṛtaḥ* in 4 in which the most natural referent of a word is not the grammatically supported one.

Old (SBE and Noten) also proposes to read dat. *uśaté* in b, or rather suggests that the underlying form in sandhi was a dat. *uśatá*, since the spellings *uśató ánu* and *uśaté ánu* “belong to the inventions of Vedic grammarians” (SBE n. 2 to vs. 6). This

is certainly possible, but a gen. form *uśató* would reflect what we might call the “proleptic” use of the genitive for dative to express indirect object: the reverence was offered to you and so it is now yours. This colonization of the dative by the genitive is very common both in Vedic and in Classical Sanskrit, and already here it may reflect the weakening of the dative case that led to its disappearance in MIA. I certainly see no reason to take the transmitted *uśató* as acc. pl. with *dyūn*, as Old (Noten) and Ge (n. to 6b) tentatively suggest.

I.71.7: The second hemistich consists of two contrasting halves: in c the speaker complains that his (“our”) vitality (*váyah*), the same vitality that Agni was said to increase in 6c, is not to be seen throughout his kinsmen; this leaves Agni as the sole figure who will find solicitude (*prámati-*) for him among the gods. Put thus, the passage does not make much sense in English. It relies on the close relationship between ‘solicitude’ and kinship (see esp. I.31.9-10, I.108.1, X.23.7, also adduced by Ge) in the RV. The word *prámati-* denotes the kind of care and concern a father shows for his children (or sons) and is regularly associated with, and indeed identified with, the *pitár-* ‘father’ (see, e.g., I.31.9, 10, 14, 16) and secondarily with the kin-group; cf. X.23.7 *vidmā hí te prámatiṃ deva jāmivát* “for we know your (fatherly) solicitude, o god, like that of kin.” Since in our passage the *jāmí-* has proved disappointing, the poet turns to Agni for satisfaction. The question then is what is the relationship between vitality and solicitude, which seem conceptually distant. This is less clear, but the connection is also found in the *prámati-*-heavy I.31 already cited; cf. I.31.10ab *tvám agne prámatis tvám pitāsi nas, tvám vayaskṛt táva jāmányo vayám* “You, Agni, are (fatherly) solicitude, you a father to us. You are creator of vitality; we are your kin.” In the immediately preceding verse (I.31.9) Agni is also called *tanūkṛt-* ‘body-creator’. The balanced pairing of *tanūkṛt-* and *vayaskṛt-* in a paternal context suggests that in producing children the father creates both the physical body and the intangible essence of life that together make up a living being – ‘life-force’ might be a reasonable rendering of *váyas* – and the father’s *prámati-* seems to be the catalyst that brings them together. Moreover, at least on the evidence of our passage, *váyas-* seems to be something that can be shared by the kin-group, but in this case is not, and in such circumstances if one cannot rely on the shared vitality of his relatives, he must look only to his father and his father’s solicitude. For another association of vitality and the father in Parāśara’s work, see I.73.1.

The publ. tr. does not convey this very well. In c I would replace “is not widely perceptible” with “is not widely evident” or “does not appear throughout.” I also question my supplying an object (vitality) with *cikitvān*; I now think this simply characterizes Agni as the perceptive one or indicates that he perceives the situation as a whole. The same word *cikitvān* does seem to take an object in 5b, however.

Against the Pp. I prefer to take *vidā* as a lengthened 2nd sg. imperative rather than subj. *vidās*, though there are no real implications either way.

I.71.8: The incest myth treated in vs. 5 returns here with no more clarity. The various alternative treatments are too numerous to discuss here, so I will present only my own version, some of whose details I have adopted from others. The first hemistich describes again Agni as the avenger, loosing his weapon at Heaven in the midst of the latter's sexual encounter with his daughter. In pāda a the *téjah*, the sharp point of the arrow, reaches the lord of men (=Agni, in my view), so that he can shoot it. I do not understand why his preparation for shooting should be described thus, and in a phrase *ānaṭ* + ACC we might expect the acc. to express the target of the arrow. Nonetheless, Heaven is not otherwise called *nṛpāti-*, and it would be odd to give him this positive epithet in this situation. For Agni as an archer whose arrow has a *téjas*- see VI.3.5 *sá íd ásteva práti dhād asiṣyáñ, chíṣṭa téjò 'yasā ná dhārām* "He, just like an archer, has aimed (his arrow), about to shoot. He has whetted its point like a blade of copper." I take *iṣé* in this pāda as an infinitive to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ 'impel, send' (others interpret it as 'to enjoy'); I then supply a form of this same verb in the next pāda, which otherwise lacks one.

Note that the product of this incest, the young troop (*śárdham ... yúvānam*), is characterized as both 'faultless' (*anavadyám*) and 'well-intentioned' (*svādhyàm*), asserting their goodness despite the circumstances of their birth.

I.71.9: As mentioned in the publ. intro., the reason for including this verse, containing the Sun and Mitra and Varuṇa but no mention of Agni, isn't clear. However, it may be that Mitra and Varuṇa, the guardians of the moral and ethical order, and their all-seeing eye, the Sun, who observes all behavior, are brought in as witnesses of the shocking incest of the last verse and the appropriate punishment inflicted by Agni.

I.71.10: Another apparent non sequitur. I have nothing to say about the morphology of the famous crux *vidúḥ*, which occurs also in VII.18.2 in the same phrase with the same irregular sandhi (*abhí vidúṣ kavīḥ sán*). I do consider it a nom. sg., not acc. pl. For further disc. see comm. at VII.18.2.

I.72 Agni

I.72.1: The lexeme *ní \sqrt{kr}* , literally 'make/do down', idiomatically means to surpass one's opponent with regard to some quality by "putting" or "bringing" [them] "down." Indeed the English idiom "put down" is very close, but I chose not to use it because it doesn't convey quite the right sense with the right case frame. The verb generally takes an acc. of the quality in question; the person who is outdone can be either in the acc. (X.49.8), hence a double acc., or gen. (II.23.12), and there is some disagreement among tr. about which construction we have here, since *vedhásah śásvataḥ* can be either gen. sg. or acc. pl. Ge opts for the acc. pl. in the tr., but offers the gen. sg. as alternative in his n.; Old, Re, WG choose the sg., as I have done, though for no principled reason.

The *náryā* ‘manly powers’ in b contrasts both with *kāvya* in a and *amṛtāni* in d. The first contrast would be between, roughly, warrior skills and verbal skills, the second between human (though of course *nṛ-* can often be used of gods, too) and divine. For the latter pairing note that the two acc. pls. are construed with similar verbs: middle participles to reduplicated formations, *dádhānaḥ* and *cakrāṇāḥ*.

I.72.2: After the general proclamation of Agni’s universal powers in vs. 1, the hymn turns to the myth of the disappearance and recovery of Agni.

The immortals’ inability to find Agni “among us” (*asmé*) is contrasted with the success of the mortal who finds him “on the highest track,” presumably in the realm of the immortals, in vs. 4.

The acc. phrase *vatsám pári śántam* is ambiguous, since the participle can either modify *vatsám* (“the calf enclosing ...”) or take *vatsám* as object (“enclosing the calf”). Ge (WG) interpret it as the latter, Old, Re the former. Ge is surely correct: *pári śántam* elsewhere (IV.1.15, VI.17.5, adduced by Ge) qualifies the rock that is the Vala cave and takes “cows” as its object; cf. VI.17.5c ... *ádrim pári gāḥ* ... *sántam* “... the rock enclosing the cows.” Although in the usual myth of the disappearance of Agni, he is hidden not in a rock but in the waters, this transference of Vala phraseology is enabled here because Agni is called a calf, and cattle were enclosed in the Vala cave.

There is a slight phonological play in the phrase *amṛtā ámūrāḥ*. Also note *vísve amṛtāḥ* “all the immortals,” a variant of *vísve devāḥ*. The use of this phrase is telling because in Parāśara’s Vaiśvānara series (I.68–70) *vísve* is reserved to evoke “all (men).” See discussion esp. in I.68 and in Jamison Klein Fs. 2016. I.68.8 also contains a pāda-final *ámūrāḥ*, there referring to men.

Although the perfect of $\sqrt{sthā}$ without preverb is almost always presential (see Kü p. 580), in this mythological narrative it must be preterital (or at least so tr. into English), like the injunctive *vindan* in pāda a; perhaps we can think of it as a sort of “honorary” injunctive, whose temporal value is determined by context.

The form *cāru* (so Pp.; Saṃhitā *cārv*) is taken as a locative by Sāy (*cāru cāruṇi śobhane*). This unlikely analysis is followed explicitly by Ge and Old (SBE, more doubtfully Noten) and implicitly by Re and WG. (Gr. takes it as an adverb.) I take it rather as the neut. acc. it appears to be and an alternative locational expression to the adjacent loc. *padé paramé*, supplying *nāma* ‘name’ on the basis of *nāmāni* in the next verse (3c) and the frequency of the collocation *cāru nāma*. It’s worth noting that *cāru nāma* can be hidden or secret (e.g., II.35.11, IX.96.16), and so it would be appropriate to this tale of the hidden Agni. What exactly it would mean to take their stand at his name is not clear, perhaps at the place where Agni’s name is invoked in ritual performance. This would fit with the following verse. It’s also possible that if Agni’s dear name is what’s at issue, then the *padé paramé* might be the highest word, as well as or instead of the highest track. (See 6ab below.)

I.72.3: For my interpr. of the purport of this verse in a Tānunāptra context, see publ. intro.

The identity of the subjects in this verse is disputed: Ge “die Erzväter,” Sāy the Maruts, Re the gods. I consider this vs. a continuation (of sorts) of vs. 2 with the *vísve amṛtāḥ* still the subject. I have no explanation for the “three autumns.”

The interpretation of the verb form *saparyān* is quite problematic. It certainly appears to be a subjunctive, and contrasts with the 3rd pl. injunctive *saparyan* that Parāśara places in the same pāda-final position in I.70.10. A subjunctive does not sit comfortably in the dependent clause whose main clause contains a preterital perfect (*dadhire*) and an augmented imperfect (*ásūdayanta*). Ge (also Re) compares *vārdhān* in I.70.7 (which I take differently) and calls it the subjunctive “bei Zeitangabe” (n. to I.70.7ab), whatever that means. He tr. it as a preterite. Hoffmann calls it a “Konjunktiv in präterital Sachverhalt” (p. 244). Re “ont honoré et honoreront encore,” attributing what seems to me a unique interpretation to the subjunctive. I consider the form a straight preterital and have an admittedly quite ad hoc way to account of the apparent subjunctive. The present participle to this stem, *saparyánt-*, is found 7x pāda-final as nom. sg. masc. *saparyán*; I suggest that in order to make it clear that the form here is not that pres. participle, the final vowel was lengthened, perhaps redactionally. This lengthening has no metrical consequences, of course. The lengthening did not happen in *saparyan* in I.70.10 because it was unaccented and couldn’t be mistaken for a participle. I am quite unhappy with this explanation but even more unhappy with the idea of a subjunctive in this context.

I.72.4: I consider *ródasī* a word play. It is of course a dual, referring to the two world halves, but it also evokes *rodasī*, the consort of the Maruts. Properly speaking she should be in the acc. sg., hence a putative *rodasīm*, but this form is not attested. In I.167.4 we find *rodasī* in acc. usage: the singular consort has simply been grammatically assimilated to the dual world halves in all her appearances.

The intensive part. *vévidānāḥ* could technically belong either to $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘know’ or $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘find’, whose middle generally means ‘acquire’, and it is somewhat difficult to know which root is supposed to be represented in Ge’s “Gehör finden bei” and Re’s “trouvant-accueil près de.” With Old and Schaeffer (p. 183–85) I take it with ‘find, acquire’, though I am somewhat puzzled by what the intensive part is supposed to contribute – perhaps the sense of constantly keeping their acquisition close by; this would work better for the consort than the two worlds. Schaeffer’s tr. (p. 185) “nachdem sie die beiden hohen Rodasī gefunden haben” has no intensive nuance, and she indeed suggests that the form does not really belong to the intensive, but is a substitute for the perfect participle (**vividānāḥ*) on metrical grounds, hence her preterital tr. I find this substitution hypothesis unlikely, given that the intensive is quite a marked formation and the accent patterns of the two formations are different.

The Pp. reads *rudrīyā* (neut. pl.), not *-āḥ* with most tr. As Ge and Old (Noten) point out, the Pp. reading is not impossible, but the masc. pl. works better. If the first pāda makes reference to Rodasī, a nom. pl. referring to the Maruts makes better sense.

Tr. differ on the interpretation of *nemádhītā*; I render it as close to my interpr. of its other three occurrences, ‘when facing the other side’, used of battle arrays

(VI.33.4, VII.27.1, X.93.13). That it refers to men and gods being divided (so Ge, WG) seems farfetched and ignores the evidence of the other identical occurrences and inserts a referent (men and gods) that is simply not there.

The last pāda echoes 2d, except it is Agni standing on the highest track, not his pursuers.

I.72.5: On this verse as an expression of the Tānunāptra ritual see Proferes 2007: 59.

The verse begins with a form of the resonant idiom *sám √jñā* ‘come to an agreement, act in harmony’ that was so important in Parāśara’s Vaiśvānara cycle (see I.68.8, 69.9 and disc. there and in Jamison Fs. Klein 2016). Here it expresses the unity not of all men, as in the Vaiśvānara cycle, but of the gods, even including their wives. Or so I interpret it; Ge and Re thinks the group includes both gods and men. This seems unlikely to me, in part because *pātnīvant-* only qualifies gods (except for pressed soma drinks in VIII.93.22). As I have discussed elsewhere, I do not think that the Sacrificer’s Wife later called *pātnī* was yet established in the RV; she was only being introduced (and this introduction contentious) in the latest strata of the text.

Most tr. take *ririkvāṃsas tanvāḥ kṛṇvata svāḥ* to mean “having abandoned their former bodies, they took on their own (new bodies),” but this is somewhat incoherent: were their old bodies any less “their own” than the putative new ones? Proferes’s tr. (p. 59) seems self-contradictory, “Having yielded their bodies, they made [their bodies] their own,” but his explanation makes sense of this: they “overcome their atomization by relinquishing their ‘bodies’ in the course of a fire rite; they thus make their own (*svāḥ*) the collectivity of their own individual bodies, which is to say that each individual within the group identifies with the ‘bodies’ of all the others.” By taking *kṛṇvata* as reciprocal, as I do, rather than just reflexive, this sense can be found in the passage directly.

I.72.6: The Pp. reads unaccented *avidan*, but accented *ávidan* should be extracted from the ambiguous sequence *padāvidan*.

As often with RVic numerology, the identity of the three times seven secret *padā* is not clear. Ge tr. *padā* as *Wörte* (sim. Re), which is certainly possible and has parallels (see Ge’s disc. in n. to 6ab), but the *padé paramé* that figured significantly earlier in the hymn (2d, 4d) should be kept in mind. Moreover, in the next vs. Agni is said to be “inwardly knowing the roads (*ádhvanaḥ*) leading to the gods” (7c), and since the *padā* were found *in* Agni here, it may be that these *padā* are tracks and identical to the *ádhvanaḥ* that he inwardly knows. As I argued in the publ. intro., I think the *padā* are the “tracks” of the ritual.

What *amṛtam* refers to is also unclear; it could be, as Sāy suggests, Agni, or simply “immortality, the immortal principle” (so Re). It unfortunately cannot be the body, which is fem. Note the “way towards immortality” (*amṛtatvāya gātúm*) in 9b below.

The phrase *sthātṛṇ caráthaṃ ca* with its number mismatch shows Parāśara’s fondness for this merism (I.66.9, 68.1, 70.3, 7) and the grammatical anomaly found in most of the occurrences in his oeuvre; see disc. ad locc.

I.72.7: The referent of “for them” in the tr. of b is the “settled peoples” of a.

On the possible relationship between the *ádhvanaḥ* here and the *padā* of 6b, see disc. there.

I.72.8: The first pāda lacks an overt verb, but it is easy to read *ví ... ajānan* from b (with most tr.), rather than supplying an entirely different verb as Ge does (“brachten”). The identity of the subject is likewise not given, but, with Ge, it is quite likely the Aṅgirasas. The qualifier *svādhī-* ‘very attentive’ is a signature word of Parāśara’s (I.67.2, 70.4, 71.8); the occurrence in 71.8 is applied to the troop, presumably the Aṅgirasas, that Agni begets in punishing Heaven’s incest.

The “seven youthful ones of heaven” are the heavenly rivers; note the corresponding phrase in the previous hymn, I.71.7 (though in a simile) *sraṇātāḥ saptā yāhvīḥ* “the seven youthful streams,” and for *divó yāhvī-* III.1.6, 9, VII.70.3. The position of *ā* between *divāḥ* and *saptā yāhvīḥ* does give one pause, however, since postposed *ā* with abl. can mean ‘from’. Perhaps this is a mixed construction: “from heaven they discerned the ... maidens of heaven.” I do not know what the seven maidens of heaven are doing here.

The VP “discerned the doors of wealth” (*rāyó dúro ví ... ajānan*) is a variant of “opened the doors (of wealth)” found twice earlier in the Parāśara collection: I.69.10 *ví rāyá aurṇod dúraḥ ...* and I.70.10 *duró vy ṛṇvan*.

I.72.9: This verse is the most baffling in the hymn, both for its contents and for its connection to the rest of the hymn. Ge has a very busy interpretation (followed by WG) that involves the Aṅgirasas and the Ādityas separating themselves from the earth and contending to reach heaven. His interpr. rests on scraps of later mythology, and it is very difficult for me to see where he finds contending parties in the passage, much less the signs that would identify them as Aṅgirasas and Ādityas. It also requires an unlikely reading of *ví √sthā* as ‘separate’, rather than the usual ‘spread out’ (as Re points out). All in all, the interpretation requires a superstructure that the verse cannot support, and examining the passage without the presuppositions Ge brings to it yields a very different picture. Unfortunately, however, the picture isn’t appreciably clearer.

I think that the verse continues the theme of the original discovery of the hidden “tracks” of ritual performance: having discovered them (see 6ab), the subjects of 9ab, the gods most likely, perform the required ritual actions, which lead both to offspring and to “immortality.” The second hemistich is considerably more difficult, but I tentatively suggest that it also depicts a primal sacrifice. The “stretching” of the ritual ground in an ordinary sacrifice, that is, the laying out of its boundaries and the positioning of the offering fire, is here expressed in cosmic terms: the earth herself spreads out to provide the ritual ground; she does this through the actions of her sons, the ritual participants. And she then “suckles the bird.” Most take the bird as Agni, whatever else they do with the verse, and the suckling, that is, the tending of the

ritual fire with wood and oblations, would work fine in this scenario. Re thinks rather the sun, and again the sun as cosmic representative of the ritual fire is thinkable.

I will now treat some of the elements of the verse in more detail. Although *svapatyá-* can be substantivized to mean “good descendants,” it is originally and more commonly an adjective, and even when a head noun is absent, it can be supplied. In this case I interpret the word in the same way as VII.91.3c *vísven nárah svapatyāni cakruḥ* “The men have done all (ritual actions) bringing good descendants.” Here the governing verb is “mount” (*ā ... tasthuḥ*), which I take as metaphorical for ‘embark on’. With the journey theme of pāda b, the (actions of) the sacrifice can be conceived of as a chariot, as so often in the RV.

The *yé* of ab is picked up by the “great sons” of cd (*mahádbhīḥ ... putraīḥ*). These can be the offspring produced by the ritual in pāda a or, more likely in my opinion, the performers of those actions – the gods or, perhaps more narrowly, the Ādityas – who are responsible for the cosmic sacrifice in which their mother, the earth herself, spreads out as the ritual ground. I would slightly alter the publ. tr. to “by means of her sons ... the earth ...” Keep in mind that the gods are the sons of Heaven and Earth (cf. the *bahuvrīhi* in the dual *devá-putre* ‘having the gods as sons’), so Earth is their mother. I am inclined against restricting the subject to the Ādityas. I think rather that mother Earth is called Aditi because Aditi is an archetypal mother, but her sons are all the gods, not just the Ādityas. The next verse (10b) simply refers to the immortals, in what seems to be a continuation of this narrative, and the default subject throughout seems to be the gods in general.

Note that “to suckle the bird” (*dhāyase véḥ*) is a paradox that would be recognized by any reasonably alert observer of nature (as the Vedic people certainly were), in that birds aren’t mammals and don’t suckle. The sense of *dhāyase* can of course be bleached to something like Old’s (SBE) “for the refreshment of the bird,” but I prefer to think this paradox was meant to be savored, along with the paradox of the sons bringing about the action of their mother.

I.72.10: The first half of the verse may return to the Tānunāptra theme. Although I would prefer a middle verb rather than active *ní dadhuḥ*, the first pāda could depict the joint deposit of their shared *śrī* in the ritual fire (cf. the echo of *nīhitā* in 6b), while the second pāda continues the cosmogonic theme of the previous verse. I confess, however, that the very parallel I.73.4c *ádhi dyumnám ní dadhur bhūry asmin* gives me pause. Either I need to interpret that as also a Tānunāptra passage or delete the reflexive implication here. Because of the active verb, I am inclined to change my Tānunāptra interpretation and tr. simply “they deposited dear splendor in him,” although since *cāru-* can have a quasi-reflexive sense ‘own dear’, it may be possible to interpret the two passages differently.

As for the second hemistich, the rivers of pāda c are most likely the oblations poured into the fire. The referent of the fem. pl. *nīcīḥ ... áruṣīḥ* is less clear, and in fact most tr. (Ge, Old SBE, Re, WG) take the two feminines separately, with one nom., the other the acc. object of *prá ... ajānan*. I think rather that the two words belong together as subj. and refer again to the oblations. The lexeme *prá √jñā* does

not otherwise take an object, but just means ‘know the way, think ahead’. As underlying referent of the feminine adjectives I would supply *dhārā* ‘stream’ vel sim.; ‘downward facing’ certainly applies to the oblations, though ‘ruddy’ is more difficult. However, fem. *āruṣī-* can be used of cows; since the ghee poured into the fire is a product of cows, it can be so described, even though ghee is of course not ruddy itself.

I.73 Agni

I.73.1: For the complex relationship between ‘vitality’ (*vāyah*) and the father, see disc. ad I.71.7. The “wealth acquired from one’s father” also reminds us of I.70.10, where the sons divide and carry away the property of their aged father.

Agni’s traversing of the (sacrificial) seat (*sādma ... ví tārīt*) in my opinion refers to the removal of what is later called the Āhavanīya fire from the Gārhapatyā fire at the west end of the ritual ground and its ceremonial placement at the east end. See 2d.

I.73.2: Pāda a is more literally “who, like Savitar, possesses realized thoughts,” but I have adjusted the English to avoid awkwardness.

In c most tr. take *satyāḥ* as the shared term in the simile *amátir ná* (Ge “wahr wie ein Bildnis”) or as modifying *amátih* in the simile (WG “wie eine verwirklichte Erscheinung”). The latter is impossible because *amāti-* is feminine. The former does not convey much sense. The purport of the simile of course depends on the meaning of *amāti-*, which I consider to be more concrete and specific than the usual glosses ‘appearance, form, picture’. An *amāti-* can be golden (III.38.8), broad and wide (V.62.5, VII.38.2, 45.2); it is associated with lordship (V.69.1 *amátim kṣatrīyasya*), can be displayed on a chariot box (I.64.9), and is unloosed or unfurled (V.45.2, VII.45.3). All of this suggests that it is a pennant or ensign or other flag-like object. On the basis of its association with lordship, I suggest that it can be a royal emblem and that that is the basis for the simile here. As discussed ad I.70.9 and in Jamison forthcoming, *prá √ śams* ‘proclaim, laud’ is a lexeme particularly appropriate to kings, and here Agni is lauded by many like the royal emblem, which is the symbol of the king. This interpretation leaves pāda-final *satyāḥ* somewhat stranded, and I read it with the following pāda. Perhaps it was stationed in the c pāda because of *satyá(manmā)* in almost the same position in the a pāda. Alternatively it can simply be another qualifier of Agni in b, independent of the simile: “lauded by many like a (royal) emblem, real ...”

Most tr. give a rather vague and general rendering of the morphologically elaborate desiderative gerundive *didhiṣāyyaḥ*, “desirable to hold/win’. I think it has a more technical ritual sense, referring to the installation of the fire (so also in the other occurrence of this form in II.4.1). This would reflect the same sense of *√ dhā* as the adjective *puróhita-*, of the fire ‘placed/installed in front/to the east’ and the later ritual complex the Agnyādheya ‘establishment of the fire(s)’. If my interpr. of 1d is

correct, namely that the offering fire has been taken from west to east, then the next step would be its installation in the east.

I.73.3: For the first three pādas, cf. III.55.21.

The construction of this verse is more complex than the two preceding ones and, in my opinion, displays some tricky relationships with Parāśara’s phraseology elsewhere. To begin with, the first simile as it stands is pleonastic at best: Agni should not be “like a god,” since he *is* a god. Nor should he be “like a god who dwells on earth,” since in fact Agni is the only god, or (counting Soma) the primary god, who dwells on earth. I suggest tentatively that the opening *devó ná* is there to match *ná rājā* at the end of the hemistich. Even more tentatively I suggest that what is really being compared is *pr̥thivīm viśvādhāyā(h)*. Note first that in the preceding hymn (10cd) mother earth spread out “to suckle the bird [probably =Agni]” (*dhāyase véh*) and elsewhere earth is called “all-nourishing” (II.17.5 *pr̥thivīm viśvādhāyasam*). I think here that Parāśara is covertly comparing Agni to the earth with regard to this well-known trait of hers, but does so playfully and allusively by stationing acc. *pr̥thivīm* next to nom. *viśvādhāyā(h)* (in the same metrical position as II.17.5 though in Triṣṭubh not Jagatī cadence) and by the intertextual associations evoked by his stating that earth suckled Agni in I.72.9. So the, or an, underlying meaning of pāda a is “the god who, all-nourishing like the earth, ...,” though both the position of the simile marker and the case of ‘earth’ disallow this as a surface meaning. (Let me make clear that I am *not* suggesting emending the text to **pr̥thivī*.)

The two compounds *hitá(mitra-)* (b) and *purah(sádaḥ)* may make implicit reference to the word I suggested is to be associated with *didhiṣāyyah* in 2d, namely *puró-hita*, as a descriptor of the installed ritual fire. The second, *purahsád-*, is essentially a synonym of *puróhita-*.

Although I try to avoid explanations like “attraction,” I am afraid I must follow Ge in taking the common term of the similes in c and d as “attracted” to the comparandum: *puráhśadaḥ* to the pl. *vīrāḥ* from putative sg. **puráhśad*, *anavadyā* to the fem. *nārī* from putative masc. **anavadyáh*. Although it would be possible to avoid the attraction analysis by reading both terms as part of the simile proper (“like heroes stationed in front and stationed for protection, like an irreproachable wife pleasing to her husband,” so WG), this puts the simile marker one element too far to the right and it also submerges the common term. This would be particularly unfortunate in the first simile, since there is a play on two slightly different senses of *-sád-* there. (In I.65.5 a similar gender mismatch is found, explained by Re as attraction, an explanation I rejected. But there it does not involve a misplaced simile marker.)

I.73.4: As noted at I.72.10 our c is almost identical to pāda a there. The publ. tr. treats the first as a Tānunāptra passage (“deposited their own *śrī*”) but not this one, and the two should probably be brought into harmony. I now favor taking neither one as a Tānunāptra expression, but see disc. ad I.72.10. In this case the deposit of

‘heavenly brilliance’ (*dyumná-*) may be what allows Agni to become the foundation of riches.

I.73.5: The verb *ví ... aśyuh* should be read with both pādas, but, in my opinion, with slightly different senses. In pāda a *pṛkṣah* is a straight acc. object to the lexeme in the meaning ‘reach, attain’; in pāda b *viśvam āyuh* may be one too (“attain a whole lifetime”) as most take it, but it may also be an acc. of extent of time (“reach through a whole lifetime”). The meaning is almost the same, but it would be like Parāśara to put the constructions slightly off-balance, and the compound *viśvāyuh* is something of a signature word for Parāśara (see the immediately preceding vs. 4d, plus I.67.6, 10, 68.5) as an adverb expressing extent of time (“lifelong,” etc.). Note the phonetic echoes, pāda a: *ví ... aśyur*, b: *ví ... āyuh*; the first of these distracted sequences also evokes *viśvāyuh*.

Pāda c *sanéma ... aryó* is reminiscent of I.70.1a *vanéma ... aryó ...*

The phrase *bhāgām devēsu ... dádhānāḥ* is almost a paraphrase of I.68.4a *bhājanta ... devatvām*. I would therefore change the publ. tr. “a portion among the gods” to “a share in the gods.”

I.73.6: The referents of the “cows of truth” (ab) and the rivers (cd) are unclear, nor is it clear whether they refer to the same thing. But I think they must be evaluated in the context of this hymn, in which men (vs. 4), patrons (vs. 5), and gods (vs. 7) all serve Agni in one way or another and seek rewards from him; the cows and the rivers then must be another set of devotees and aspirants to his favor, esp. since the same phrase *sumatīm bhīkṣamānā(h)* “seeking a portion of favor” is used of the rivers (6c) and the worship-worthy (gods) (7a). I would tentatively suggest a twofold interpretation: 1) A naturalistic one: the swelling cows are the rains, “apportioned by heaven,” with their bellowing the thunder and the udders the clouds. The rains both *are* the (heavenly) rivers and feed the (earthly) rivers. Recall the seven heavenly rivers of I.71.7 and 72.8. Thus, the natural world pays heed to Agni, along with men and gods. 2) A ritual one: as Ge points out, these can be the milk and the water needed for the soma sacrifice, though I confess I would prefer ritual substances more associated with Agni. See I.72.10 where I suggested that the rivers were streams of ghee. I do not believe that we need to see a reference to the Vala and Vṛtra myths here, as Ge suggests.

I do not think that the rivers flow *through* the rock, *pace* Ge, etc., but rather over. There are three passages in IX with *samáyā* and *ví+VERB OF MOTION*, all dealing with soma going across the fleece (IX.75.4, 85.5, 97.56; cf. IX.85.5 *vy àvyáyam samáyā vāram arṣasi* “You rush across the sheep's fleece all at once.”). So I think the rivers are flowing across or over the rock, but it would help tremendously if I had any idea what the rock represents.

I.73.7: The voc. *agne* was inadvertently omitted from the publ. tr., so “o Agni” should be inserted after “in you.”

The second pāda could also mean “they acquired fame in heaven.” The phrase should be read with 5d *bhāgām devēṣu śrāvase dādhanāḥ* and 10c *ádhi śrávo devábhaktaṃ dādhanāḥ*. The latter passage, especially, suggests that ‘acquire’ is the better rendering.

The accented *cakrúḥ* in c can be explained, following Klein (DGRV I.176–77), as triggered by the “rhetorically complementary nature of pādas c and d.” There is no need to take the *ca* in c as a subordinator, particularly because subordinating *ca* introduces conditional clauses. Note the contrast between *ví(rūpe)* and *sám (dhuh)*, a common rhetorical pairing.

I.73.9: Note the echo of I.70.1, with optatives to the same (synchronic) root and a likely identical case frame. See disc. ad I.70.1.

The second hemistich reprises material from earlier in the hymn: “wealth acquired from their fathers” is exactly the same phrase, though in a different case, as the simile that begins the hymn (I.73.1a); the patrons with their long lives were encountered in 5b.

I.73.10: Ge’s interpr. of pāda c is persuasive. II.5.1 *śakéma vājino yámam* (also III.27.3, VIII.24.22) contains the missing horses supplied here. I take *sudhúraḥ* as proleptic.

For pāda d cf. 5d and 7b; for *devábhakta-* cf. *dyúbhakta-* in 6b.

I.74 Agni

Several verses in this hymn are linked in relative cl. / main cl. structures: 1/2, 4/5. Vs. 6 may also be connected to 4/5. See disc. below.

I.74.2: This interpr. of *sn̄hitīṣu* rests on a metaphorical use of the original sense of \sqrt{snih} ‘snow’. On this root as warrior slang, see Hoffmann MSS 18 (1965) = Aufs. 447ff.

I.74.4: The second pāda contains two forms of $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, which by most tr. get reduced to one, with the finite *veḥ* seemingly playing merely a modal or auxiliary role: Ge “du ... die Opferspenden entgegenzunehmen wünschst”; Re “tu vas pour agréer ses oblations”; Old (SBE) “to whose sacrificial food thou eagerly comest for feasting.” The doubling is, however, captured by WG: “der du (die Götter) aufspürst, damit sie die Opfergaben aufspüren,” resting on observations of Scar (498–99). I am in independent agreement with WG on this construction. The root $\sqrt{vī}$ regularly takes both gods and oblation(s) as object; here the oblations are overt, but the gods are the missing first object – the initial goal of Agni’s pursuit, to cause them in turn to pursue the mortal worshiper’s oblations as underlying subject of the infinitive *vītáye*. Cf. I.77.2 (also a Gotama hymn) *agnír yád vér mártāya devān* “When Agni, for the sake of the mortal, has pursued the gods,” where the gods are surface object of *véḥ* and the benefit for the mortal worshiper is emphasized. In our own hymn vs. 6 has a full surface realization of the structure presumed here, with the gods as subj. of the

infinitive and the oblations its object, though with a different main verb: *ā ca vāhāsi tāñ ihā, devān ... / havyā ... vītāye* “You will convey the gods here to pursue the oblations.”

I.74.5: I recast the acc. to nom. in English, in order to be able to preserve verse structure.

I.74.6: There is no obvious reason for the accent on the verb *vāhāsi*. Ge (/WG), Re, Klein (I.243-44) take it as triggered by a subordinating *ca*, as does, somewhat tentatively, Old (ZDMG 60: 733 = Kl Sch 208). But this verse does not work very well as a conditional clause for vs. 7, and in fact Re recognizes this semantic disconnect by ending his tr. of vs. 6 with suspension dots. If vs. 6 is subordinated to anything, it would be better to connect it with vs. 5, repeating the message of vs. 4, which is likewise subordinated to 5. I would simply call attention to several passages with this same conjunction of elements with an accented verb and no clear motivation for the accent: III.43.4 *ā ca ... vāhātaḥ*, X.110.1 *ā ca vāha ...* We may be dealing with a catchphrase or with spread of the accent redactionally from a passage in which it was correct to superficially similar phrases.

On the *vītāye* construction, see disc. ad vs. 4.

I.75 Agni

I.75.1–2: Note the play between the two final words of these verses: *āsāni / sāsāsi*. The two verses also contain four superlatives in *-tama-*, each to a stem ending in *-as*.

I.75.3–4: As noted in the publ. intro., only the first of the questions in vs. 3 is answered in vs. 4, though the latter *appears* to be structured as the replies.

I.75.5: The three pādas contain three 2nd sg. verb forms belonging to \sqrt{yaj} , two pres. imperatives *yājā* (a, b) and a so-called “*si*-imperative” *yākṣi* (c). Though “*si*-imperatives” do often function as imperatives, they are haplologized *-s*-aorist subjunctives by most accounts. I so tr. *yākṣi* here, since the poet could easily have repeated *yājā* in this context; it would have been metrically fine and in fact would have produced a more iambic pattern. It is accented because it follows an extrasentential voc. For another *si*-imperative that is better rendered as a subjunctive see *ní ... satsi* in I.76.4 in the next hymn.

I.76–77: These two Triṣṭubh hymns are out of sequence, in that they both contain five verses. The preceding hymn I.75 in Gāyatrī also contains five verses, and among hymns of the same number of verses to the same divinity, those in the longer meter (in this case Triṣṭubh) should precede. Curiously, Old does not remark on this. The proper sequencing is restored with I.78, five verses in Gāyatrī.

I.76 Agni

I.76.1: As often, *vā* ‘or’ doesn’t present two balanced choices, but could be paraphrased as “or, to put it another way...” That is, it rephrases and varies (often substantially) a previous statement or question.

The first and last *pādas* contain forms of *mānas-*, which I have tr. differently. The first, in the phrase *mānaso várāya*, is idiomatic in English as “heart’s desire,” not “mind’s desire/choice/wish.” The expression in the last *pāda*, *kéna ... mānasā*, might better be rendered “in what spirit,” though I’ve chosen to stick closer to the ‘mind’ sense.

The pf. of $\sqrt{āp}$ can be used presentially (so also Kü, though not with ref. to this passage), and that value works best here: the focus in all four clauses is what we can do to best serve Agni, not what someone has done in the past.

I.76.3: The accent on *dhákṣi* is unmotivated. WG label it as antithetical accent, but that is only found in sequences that are more tightly bound rhetorically than this one. (If all imperatives in sequence received “antithetical accent,” there would be many more of them, beginning with *ní ṣīda* and *bhavā* in 2ab.)

Ge and Re both assert that the referent of *asmai* in d, the recipient of the guest reception (*ātithyám*), is Agni. This seems perverse to me, though grammatically possible. Agni is urged to bring Indra (“the lord of soma”) to the ritual ground; the guest reception is surely for this new arrival and will consist of the usual ritual offerings given to Indra, including soma. It is of course true that Agni is regularly called ‘guest’ (*ātithi-*), but that doesn’t seem relevant here.

The two hemistichs end with two unusual *-van-* forms: (*abhiśasti-*)*pāvan-* and (*su-*)*dāvan-*. Though parallel in formation, they are in different cases (nom. and dat. respectively), which somewhat conceals their morphological match. They are near hapaxes: the first is found only once elsewhere in the RV (VII.11.3) in a similarly constructed *pāda*, the latter only here.

I.76.4: Although the contents of this verse are pretty straightforward, the syntax is particularly nasty.

The major problem comes in the first hemistich, with *huvé*, whose identity and function are not clear. Or rather what it appears to be is not easily compatible with the context. The form *huvé* and its unaccented counterpart are extremely common and always 1st sg. mid. to $\sqrt{hū} / hvā$ ‘call’, with the sense “I call / invoke X.” If we take it in this sense and construe it with the nominative of *pāda* a, *váhnih* ‘conveyor’, there is semantic mismatch. The most likely referent of the expression *váhnir āsā* “the conveyor by mouth” is Agni, who carries the oblations to the gods in or with his mouth; see *havyā júhvāna āsāni* in the previous hymn (I.75.1) and the next and final verse of this hymn where he performs sacrifice *juhvā* “with his tongue.” He should properly be the object of *huvé*. Old and Ge (/WG) interpret the *váhnir āsā* instead as the human poet, who brings the god(s) to the ritual by mouth, that is, by his hymns. This is a clever idea and does allow the 1st ps. interpretation. The problem then is the accent of *huvé*, though it could be classified with the problematic accent in

ā ca vāhāsi in Gotama’s first hymn (I.74.6), which shares the opening *ā ca*. Re does not want to give up the identification of the *vāhnir āsā* with Agni (nor do I), and attributes the syntax to anacoluthon: the first pāda is a nominative expression describing Agni, which breaks off and gives way to an abrupt imperative “je (l’)appelle.” The verbal accent remains a problem. I have another equally ad hoc solution: that *huvé* is an infinitive (built like *bhuvé* to $\sqrt{bhū}$) and used predicatively, as *huvādhyai* can be. This would solve the problem of accent, but the drawback is inventing an otherwise unattested form that is homonymous with the extremely well-attested 1st sg. mid.

Note the sequence (*vá*)*casā ...āsā* (*ā*) *ca ... ca sa(tsī)*.

The other syntactic issue in the verse is the predicated vocative phrase in d: *bodhī prayantar janitar vāsūnām*. My tr. fails to render the predication; others (e.g., Ge) fail to render the voc. There is no good way to do this in English (or German). Note that *vāsūnām* is accented, although oblique cases that are part of voc. phrases often are not (type *sūno sahasaḥ* “o son of strength”).

I.77 Agni

I.77.1: All tr. take the *kṛṇóti* in d as if it were *ā kṛṇóti* as in 2b, with the meaning “attract the gods hither.” But the *ā* \sqrt{kr} idiom in vs. 2 is medial, and there is no *ā* here. I prefer to take *kṛṇóti* as a dummy verb, standing for *yájati*, extracted from *yájiṣṭhaḥ* ‘best sacrificer’. Hence “does so,” that is “sacrifices.” This also helps account for the *íd*.

I.77.2: On the basis of VI.49.6 I most likely want to rethink my interpr. of *tám ... ā kṛṇudhvam* from “attract him here” to “make him your own.” See comm. ad loc. Among other things, since “him” is Agni and Agni as ritual fire is already here, we need not attract him here.

The verse contains yet another example in Gotama’s collection of anomalously accented verbs, here *bódhati* in the sequence *sá cā bódhati*. Cf. *ā ca vāhāsi* (I.74.6), *ā ca huvé* (I.76.4), as well as *dhákṣi* (I.76.3). Although it would be desirable to have a uniform treatment of these verbs, esp. those following *X ca*, a unitary account does not come to mind, and I have explained them in separate ways. Here I suggest that we read the adverb *sácā* at the beginning of d and group it with c (“... pursued the gods altogether”). Lubotsky gives only two examples of lengthened *cā*, this one and III.57.5, out of over a thousand occurrences of *ca*, so, as Old (Noten) points out, the form is suspect. Old also considers but rejects a reading *sácā*, though without giving reasons (beyond “kaum wahrscheinlich”). If *sácā* goes with the preceding pāda, *bódhati* begins a new clause and its accent is correct. Note that in the previous hemistich (2ab), *yáḥ ... , hótā tám ū ... ā kṛṇudhvam*, the second pāda begins with a nom. *hótā* that likewise belongs to the previous pāda, and a new clause begins with the second word *tám*, whose clause-initial status is emphasized by following *ū*.

I.77.3: Note the verbal play in ... *ná bhūd ádbhut(asya)* ...

I.77.4: There are a number of interconnected difficulties in this verse, mostly focused on what is happening in cd and the relation of this hemistich with the first one. I take ... *ca yé maghāvānaḥ* ... as the second part of an “X and which Y” construction with *naḥ* in pāda a in Wackernagel’s Position: “... for us and (for those) who, our benefactors ...” Old (SBE), Re, and WG (if I am reading this last correctly) also consider “us” and our benefactors to be the conjoined terms, though with differences in detail. Ge, however, takes the benefactors as conjoined with Agni, and they should also $\sqrt{vī}$ our hymns and thought along with Agni. The frequency with which *maghāvānaḥ* (and also *sūrāyaḥ* ‘patrons’) are conjoined with forms of the 1st pl. favors the non-Ge interpr.

Another issue is the identity of the verb *iṣáyanta* in d. Ge seems to take it with the fairly well-established stem *iṣáyati* ‘prosper, derives benefit’ (“... soll günstig aufnehmen”), similarly Re (“jouissent”) and WG (“sich ... erquicken”). With Old (SBE) I take it as meaning ‘send, propel’ and ultimately a deverbal formation from *iṣnāti*, via **iṣāyāti*, of the type *grbhñāti*, *grbhāyāti*, *grbháyati*.

The final problem is the form *tánā*. Ge (/WG) and Re take it as an instr. of accompaniment “along with their offspring/descendants.” This is not impossible, but this meaning is ordinarily found in the collocation *tanvā tánā ca* (e.g., VI.49.13). By itself *tánā* occurs several times with *girā* (e.g., I.38.13, II.2.1) “with song at length,” and I take it that way here as well, semantically construable with *mánma* ‘prayers’ at the end of the hemistich.

I.78 Agni

See the publ. intro. for the structure of this rather dull hymn. Not only is the third and final pāda identical in the first four (of five) verses, but in these same verses the opening of the first pāda is also rigidly structured: *abhí tvā* (vs. 1), *tám u tvā* (vss. 2-4). The remainder of the first pāda of these verses consists of two variant pairs: *gótamā girā* (vs. 1), *gótamo girā* (vs. 2); *vājasātamam* (vs. 3), *vṛtrahántamam*. It is thus only the second pāda of each verse that contains fully independent material. The *tvā* in the various a-pādas has a slightly different syntactic status in this seemingly rigid schema. In vs. 1 it serves as the goal of the verb in pāda c, with doubling of the preverb *abhí* (a, c). (Alternatively one can supply a verb in ab and an object in c, as Ge (/WG) do, but this seems uneconomical.) In the following two verses it is governed by a verb in pāda b (2 *duvasyati*, 3 *havāmahe*), leaving *nonumaḥ* in c without an expressed object. In vs. 4 it is again the goal of the verb in c, with an apparent embedded relative clause in b.

I.78.4: The use of the epithet *vṛtrahán-*, esp. in the superlative, for Agni is of course striking since this is overwhelmingly an Indra descriptor. The name *agní-* hasn’t yet figured in the hymn, but *jātavedaḥ* in vs. 1 clearly announces him as the recipient of this praise.

As noted above, the second pāda is technically an embedded relative (assuming that *nonumaḥ* in c governs *tvā* in a).

I.78.5: As noted in the publ. intro., this final verse breaks the pattern of the rest of the hymn, although it maintains the refrain. The aorist *ávocāma* “we have spoken” marks this as a typical summary verse, referring to the activity in the rest of the hymn.

I.79 Agni

See the publ. intro. for the structure of this hymn (or rather the four hymns collected here) and for an analysis of the first three verses.

I.79.1: As Ge notes, the identifications of Agni with sun (a), lightning (b), and fire (cd) are Ludwig’s.

Most comm. take *rájasaḥ* as a subjective genitive with *visāré* (most clearly in Ge’s “wenn der Raum sich weitet,” referring to morning in his view). I take it rather to refer to the light of the sun’s rays (his golden hair) spreading through the midspace at dawn.

The third pāda refers to the blazing up of the ritual fire at dawn. The fourth pāda consists only of a simile, couched entirely in the feminine plural. The referent of these feminine adjectives and the point of comparison with Agni are both unclear. Ge supplies Frauen; Re suggests waters; Old (SBE) waters or dawns. The dawns seem most likely (so also WG), since a sg. dawn already appears in c and dawns make sense in this ritual context. Dawns are called *apásas* ‘busy’ in I.92.3, also a Gotama hymn, and Uṣas is *yásasvatī* in X.11.3. If the feminines are the dawns, the point of comparison may be *súcibhrājāḥ* ‘having bright blazing’, since the dawns are also bright. If instead it is one of the adjectives in pāda d (‘glorious’ *yásasvatīḥ*, ‘busy’ *apasyúvaḥ*, or ‘actually present’ *satyāḥ*), we must assume that an original masc. sg. adj. has been attracted into the fem. pl. in the simile – not a problematic assumption.

I.79.2: Again, the interpretation of the image in pāda a depends on what the referent is. Most (Ge, Re, WG) take *suparṇā(h)* as referring to Agni’s flames as birds. These flames transform themselves (*ā ... aminanta*) into storm clouds. As indicated in the publ. intro., I instead think this verse develops the image of Agni as lightning found in 1b. The *suparṇāḥ* are then the lightning flashes. This entails a somewhat bold interpretation of the verb (though I would say no bolder than ‘transform themselves’, for which no parallels are cited), from ‘change, exchange, alternate’ to the physical image ‘zigzag’, from ‘change/alternate back and forth’. The middle of $\sqrt{mī}$ is several times used of night and dawn swapping their colors back and forth (I.96.5, 113.2), which can be conceived of as an alternating pattern like zigzags. Against the flickering light of the lightning there appears the black bull, that is, the thunder cloud, in b.

The nonce perfect *nonāva*, backformed to the intensive (see the repeated *nonumaḥ* of the immed. preceding hymn I.78), I take as presential, with Narten (1981 “Vedisch *lelāya*,” p. 2 with nn. 7, 8, = KISch. p. 234), against most comm., although no harm would come of taking it as a preterite.

The pāda-final tag *yādīmām* is curious. It cannot be part of what precedes, since *nonāva* is unaccented. The same phrase is found at IV.5.11, where I tr. “if it is here.” I interpret it in the same fashion here, but in addition assume an enjambement with the following pāda. Others keep it within its half verse (which I would prefer), but in their interpretation the phrase seems like mere filler (e.g., Ge’s “wenn dies (so ist)”).

The smiling females of c must be the lightning flashes (so also Ge, Re); cf. V.52.6 *vidyútaḥ ... jājjhatīr iva* “lightning flashes like giggling (girls).” Old (SBE): rain showers, WG (tentatively): dawns. The “he,” subject of *āgāt* is the black bull of b, the thundercloud as roaring fire.

For the semantic connection between these parts of the thunderstorm and the aspects of fire see the publ. intro.

I.79.3: I take ab as a parallel and paraphrase of 2c, with Agni/the thunder cloud leading (*nāyan*) the lightning flashes, while himself swollen with rain. Others supply different objects, and a radical (and in my view misguided) view of the passage makes *nāyan* a 3rd pl. finite verb with Agni as its object – quite awkward because he is in the nominative in pāda a (*pīyānaḥ*). Those who hold that view resolve the syntactic problem in ad hoc ways, by emendation (**pīyānaḥ* Old [SBE], subsequently rejected in Noten) or by taking *rtāsya pāyasā pīyānaḥ* as a parenthetical (Re).

It is unclear whether *pārijmā* is meant as an epithet of Varuṇa or a separate entity. Arguments can be made either way: in VII.40.6 the adjective qualifies wind and is associated with rain, and having Wind (Vāta) involved in this thunderstorm context would be understandable. On the other hand, a fourth god would break up the unity of the standard Āditya triad. The same pāda is found in X.93.4, but in the context of a longer list of gods.

Ge, Re take the “skin” as that of the earth, but I think it is rather the clouds in the lower atmosphere. So, more or less, Old (SBE) and WG. Cf. nearby I.62.5 (attributed to a Gautama) *divó rāja úparam astabhāyaḥ* “you propped up the nearer realm of heaven.”

I.79.5: The irregular sandhi of *vāṣuṣ kavīḥ* may be based on that in nearby *vidúṣ kavīḥ* in I.71.10, though the hymns are attributed to different poets. On this sandhi phenomenon in general, see comm. ad VII.18.2.

I.79.6: I take the point of the double *utá* construction (probably, with Klein DGRV 359, a nonce based on *ca ... ca*) to be the contrast of the two time periods: at night Agni must burn against the demons by himself (*tmānā*), but when Dawn comes, her light helps him out.

I.79.7: Since this is the first verse of a hymn in Gāyatrī (vss. 7-9), I take *gāyatrāsya* as a reference to a composition in that meter, rather than just a song.

On the basis of X.4.1 *vándyo no háveṣu*, I construe the loc. in c with the gerundive.

I.79.9: I supply *bhara* from 8a; giving the matching verse openings, *ā no*, and the same object *ráyim*, this seems the correct choice (so also Ge, Re, WG). It would also be possible to make *ráyim* here the object of *dhehi* (so Old [SBE]). There are no consequences either way.

I.79.10: The middle voice of the impv. *bhárasva* is correlated with the self-addressed of the poet. See Jamison 2007: 104; 2009 [Skjaervo Fs.], esp. p. 70, and VII.88.1.

I.79.11: The unusual post-verbal, pāda-final *sáh* is a nice match for the initial *yáh* that it picks up.

I.80 Indra

I.80.1: Old takes *śasā(h)* to $\sqrt{sā}$ ‘sharpen’ rather than $\sqrt{sās}$ ‘order’ (as does Re, judging from his portmanteau and barely comprehensible tr. “as-chassé-comme-en-aiguissant”), but there seems no advantage in this. Neither root is found elsewhere with *nīh*, but a literal additive tr. of *nīh* $\sqrt{sās}$ works well here. And $\sqrt{sā}$ does not have a reduplicated form of this shape, whereas $\sqrt{sās}$ has a pf. *śasāsa* (etc.), to which this can be a (plupf.) injunctive. So Kü (521), as well as Gr, etc. The *nīh* found in vss. 2 and 4 (also 10), also of the expulsion of Vṛtra, may account for the use of this preverb here: it seems to be a signature word of this hymn.

I.80.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this verse represents a quoted example of the “cheering on” alluded to in the refrain.

I.80.4: Ge suggests that the waters are “accompanied by the Maruts” (*marúvatīh*) because the waters here are storm-rains. Although in a Marut context this would seem reasonable, in this Vṛtra-smashing context the waters should not be rain but the rivers confined by Vṛtra, and this interpretation is in fact possible here. Note that Sarasvatī, the river par excellence, is called both *marúvatī* (II.30.8) and *marútsakhā* (VII.96.2); this association must be a mediated one: the river is accompanied by or the companion of the Maruts because their storm-rains swell the rivers.

I.80.5–6: I don’t see any real difference between *áva jighnate* (5) and *ní jighnate* (6) that could account for difference in case frame: acc. in 5, loc. in 6.

I.80.7: In c I supply a preterital form of the redupl. *jighnate* of the last two verses (**ájighnathāh*, though no forms with sec. endings exist to the stem), because the main clause verb is the suppletive aorist to \sqrt{han} , *avadhīh*.

I.80.8: On pl. *vájrāsaḥ* see publ. intro.

I.80.9: With Re I take the numbers to refer to the people producing the songs, rather than the songs or song-types themselves (as in the interpretation of Ge [/WG]). The problem is that *vimśatīḥ* is undeniably nominative, so the tr. “zu zwanzig” (and parallel “zu tausend”) (Ge, [/WG]) misrepresents the grammar.

I.80.12: Ge tr. *vépasā* as “durch seinen Wortschwall,” with the verbal (“Wort-“) component presumably on the basis of *vīpra-* ‘inspired poet’. But near-adjacent *vépete* in 11b, which refers only to physical trembling with no verbal component, is surely the word against which to interpret it.

Augmented *āyata* is one of the few clear occurrences of a thematic med. pres. to \sqrt{i} .

I.80.13: The expression in ab is striking, with Indra presiding over a fight between *Vṛtra* and his (=Indra’s) missile, but such is the usage of *yodháyati*, as opposed to *yúdhyati* ‘attacks’ (see Jamison 1983: 151)

I.80.14: The phrase *yát sthā jágac ca* is curiously formed, though the meaning is clear. Because the verb *rejate* is unaccented, the *yád* cannot mark a “real” subordinate clause. I wonder if it does not involve the imposition of an “X and which Y” construction on an indivisible merism. In other words, with an “X and which Y” we might expect **sthā yác ca jágat* “the still and what is moving”; cf. X.88.4 (also adduced by Ge) *sthā jágad yád* with a similarly pleonastic and apparently misplaced *yád*. But *sthā jágat* is a fixed expression and nothing can be inserted into it.

Note the repetition of *cit táva manyáve* from 11a, again with a verb of trembling (*vépete* 11b, *vevijyáte* 14d) and an instr. of fear (*bhiyāsā* 11b, *bhiyā* 14d).

I.80.15: *ná ... káḥ* must be read as a negative indefinite (“no one”) despite the absence of an indefinitizing particle like *cit*.

I.80.16: Although the first hemistich begins with a rel. pron. (*yām*) and the second with a form of *sá/tám* (*tásmīn*), this is not a rel. cl. / main cl. structure, as the difference in gender between *yām* and *tásmīn* shows. The latter has Indra as referent, and the former, which modifies *dhíyam* ‘poetic vision’ in b, is loosely picked up by *bráhmāni ... ukthā* “sacred formulations and hymns” in the main clause. In fact, I think the referent slippage is deliberate, with *bráhmāni* being the culminating product in our day of the age-old *dhī* of ab, attributed to legendary priest-poets. Recall that this verse is in ring-compositional relationship with vs. 1, where a *brahmán-* creates poetry in the new style.

I.81 Indra

I.81.2: see vs. 6 below.

I.81.3: Note the alliteration in b: *dhr̥ṣṇáve dhīyate dhánā*, a phrase that also contains an example of neut. pl. with sg. verb (*dhīyate dhánā*).

I.81.6: This verse paraphrases and expands vs. 2. The nominal expression in 2b *ási bhūri parādadīh* is turned into the verb *parādādāti* in 6b; *śikṣasi* in 2d is echoed by *śikṣatu* in 6c; the phrase *bhūri te vāsu* is repeated verbatim (2e, 6d); and the dative beneficiaries in 2 (*yájamānāya* 2d, *suvaté* 2e) are replaced by *dāsúṣe* (6b) and, more tellingly, *asmábhyam* (6c). The source of the wealth that Indra distributes is also made clear: it belonged to the stranger and is presumably plunder.

I.81.7: Most tr. render ab in the 3rd ps., but there is no 3rd ps. verb here, and the phrase is surrounded by 2nd ps. constructions (*táva* 6e, 2nd ps. impv. *gr̥bhāya* 7c). Nothing forbids an underlying *tvám* in ab.

Ge supplies “us” with *śisīhi*, but, although this collocation does occur, I don’t feel it’s necessary in this context.

I.81.9: On *antár* √*khyā* see disc. ad V.30.9. I suggest there that ‘detect’ is a semantic development of ‘look within’, but also that a diff. tr., ‘distinguish between’ might be a worthwhile alternative: Indra would be distinguishing between the possessions of the unworthy, which he should bring to us, and those of the deserving.

I.82 Indra

I.82.1: *artháyāse* owes its accent to *íd*.

I.82.2: Most tr. take the two verbs *ákṣann ámīmadanta* as parallel (e.g., Ge “Sie haben ja geschmaust, gezecht”), but the position of the *hí* after the second verb strongly suggests that the second verb belongs to a separate clause that provides the causal grounds for another clause. My translation reflects this: “for they have brought themselves to exhilaration” explains what “they have eaten” actually refers to: the consumption of soma or soma plus food-offerings. Then in b, as a consequence of their having received nourishment from us, they repay us with goods.

Most tr. take *priyā(h)* in b as nom. pl. masc. referring to the Maruts; this requires supplying an object for *adhūṣata* (e.g., Re “des biens”). I take it rather as an acc. pl. fem., implicitly referring to a fem. noun like *īṣaḥ* ‘refreshments’; cf. X.134.3 *áva tyā bṛhatīr īṣaḥ ... dhūnuhi* “shake down these lofty refreshments,” with the same VP.

With Old, etc., *vīprā* must be a fem. instr. sg. modifying *matī*.

I.82.3: The exact sense of the hapax *pūrṇāvandhura-* ‘having a full chariot box’ is not entirely clear. Ge suggests that it is full either because Indra has drunk so much or because he is taking Opfergabe home with him; Re goes for the latter: “plein (de biens).” This seems unlikely, since Indra is supposed to *bring* goods to distribute to us, not take them away with him like party favors. Moreover the *vandhúra-* appears

to be the place where the charioteer stands (cf. the compd *vandhureṣṭhā-*, as well as I.139.4, III.14.3), not a container for cargo. Although a jocular interpretation like Ge's is possible, I wonder if a "full chariot box" is simply one that has the driver in it; in other words, Indra has mounted the chariot and is ready to go. In any case, *pūrṇá-* here has to be read in the context of the same word in the next verse.

I.82.4: I am puzzled by the reference here. The referent of *cd*, the one who makes sure Indra's cup is full, should be the sacrificer, but the sacrificer should not be mounting Indra's chariot. We might entertain the possibility that Indra is actually the referent (and is looking out for his own interests by making sure the cup is full), but, though switch between persons is very common in the RV, referring to the same referent in both 2nd and 3rd persons in the same clause does not happen, as far as I know – and there's a voc. *indra* in the 3rd ps. *yáḥ ... cíketati* clause.

I.82.6: With *dadhiṣé* we can supply either 'reins' or (as sometimes elsewhere with $\sqrt{dhā}$ and a loc. of 'hand') the *vájra-* (cf., e.g., VI.45.18 *dhiṣvá vájraṃ gábhastyoh*). The presence of voc. *vajrin* in *d* might support the latter interpr.

The Pp. reads *amadaḥ* in *d*. This causes interpretational difficulties: Indra was ordered to leave the ritual ground and drive off to his wife in the immediately preceding verse; he is still here in this verse, so how can he have already become exhilarated in the company of his wife? Re must have recognized the problem, given his tr. "tu t'es (toujours) enivré avec ta femme," but this doesn't work very well. However, nothing prevents us from reading *pátnyā madaḥ*, with an injunctive, not an augmented form. It is true that injunctive forms are quite rare to this stem, but this does not seem to me a decisive argument. (I now see that WG also take it as an injunctive, independently.)

I.83 Indra

I.83.1: Most tr. take *vícetas-* as 'perceptive' vel sim. (Ge "die verständigen (?) Gewässer," Re "les eaux discernantes"), but in this context it makes more sense to use the intransitive sense of the root \sqrt{cit} 'be perceptible, appear' rather than the I/T 'perceive'; hence, with *ví*, 'widely perceptible, conspicuous'. The point of the simile is surely that the goods with which Indra supplies the worshiper are abundant enough to be easily visible, like the sparkling waters filling a river. Note the case disharmony: logically the waters are compared not to Indra, but to the goods he bestows.

I.83.2: This verse presents a number of small problems of interpretation, and it helps first to determine what the verse is about in general. It seems to involve the gods' ritual approach to the place of the soma pressing. They are compared to the goddess waters in a because waters are brought at the soma-pressing to mix with the pressed soma (cf. IX.69.4, e.g.). The identity of "the one who seeks the gods" (*devayú-*) in *c* is not entirely clear, but my assumption is that it is soma. I also assume that the acc.

in d does not refer to the soma, but rather to the priest-poet, though it is not impossible that the two accusatives have the same referent, most likely in that case the priest-poet.

In b (with Ge [/WG]) I take the shared term of the simile to be *vítatam* ‘extended, extensive’. Both Ge and WG supply “Opfer” in the frame, but I would suggest that it is, more specifically, the soma-filter, which is elsewhere so qualified. Cf. IX.83.2 *tápoṣ pavíttram vítataṃ divás padé*, where the filter has cosmic dimensions, as it would here.

In d *brahmaprī-* is universally taken as ‘loving the formulation’, and this interpr. would match that of *brahma-dvīṣ-* ‘hating the formulation’. However, both here and in its other occurrence in I.152.6 I take it instead as ‘pleasing [someone] with the formulation’ with the transitive value of act. *prīṇāti*, etc. In this passage it makes more sense that the gods would delight in someone attempting to please them, rather than someone who is himself deriving pleasure from something else. The passage in I.152.6 invites a similar interpr.

I.83.3: With Ge (/WG) I take the two as the Hotar and Adhvaryu priests, with pāda a appropriate to the former and b to the latter. Although it is something of a surprise to find the charged word *mithunā*, which is usually used of a sexual pairing, applied to two males, it is presumably because the two priests have complementary duties. I do not think that it refers to the sacrificer and his wife, contra Old (flg. Benfey). As I have argued at length elsewhere (Jamison 2011, 2016 [UTexas Vedic conf.], and forthcoming [World Skt. Conf. Edinburgh]), I consider the ritual Patnī to be a ritual role introduced only in the late RV and very controversial at that time, and I doubt that she would be so casually alluded to here.

I.83.4: Assuming a thematic stem *āngira-* here is unavoidable, next to the far more common *s-*stem *āngiras-*.

In order to give *ād* its usual temporal reading (“just after that”), I follow Old in assuming that pāda b provides the grounds for the Aṅgirases’ acquisition of life-force.

Ge and Re supply a verb in d, but this seems unnecessary; the accusatives here can simply expand on *bhójanam* in c.

I.83.5: This verse seems to jumble together a lot of primal mythology that does not seem to be connected (or, rather, whose connection eludes me). As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 4–5 describe the first institution of the sacrifice and touch on a number of the primordial players. It is esp. noteworthy (but I don’t quite know what to do with it) that vs. 4 contains the Aṅgirases and vs. 5 Atharvan, reminding us of the old designation for the Atharva Veda, *atharvāṅgirasah* (see, e.g., Bloomfield, Intro. to *Hymns of the Atharvarveda* [SBE 42, 1897]).

The form *tate* is a pseudo-perfect to \sqrt{tan} ; at this period we would expect **tatne* (which we in fact get at X.130.2). The light root-syllable is metrically guaranteed. Kü (210) points out that it is formed as if to a root $\sqrt{tā}$, and such a root

morpheme could have been extracted from the passive *tāyáte*. I would add that, as with many aberrant forms, the context invites this form: note the immediately following word, opening the next pāda, *tátaḥ* (recall also *vítatam* in 2b).

Note the chaining of *ājani* (b) ... *ājat* (c) ... *jātám* (d), with the middle term belonging to a different root (\sqrt{aj}) from the first and last (\sqrt{jan}).

I.83.6: The relation between the three subordinate clauses (abc) and the main clause is irregular in that *tásya* in d does not pick up a relative pronominal referent. I take it as referring to the sacrificer who has been regularly present in the hymn (the present-time vss. 1-3). Ge and Re may well be right that the *kārú-* ‘bard’ of c, which is identified with the pressing stone, is its logical referent.

I.84 Indra

See the publ. intro. for the structure of this composite hymn.

I.84.1: Unlike the standard tr., WG take *rājaḥ* ‘Raum’ with the frame, not the simile: “... soll dich (und) den Raum erfüllen, wie die Sonne ...” I assume this is because the simile particle *ná*, which usually follows the first word of a simile, here follows the second word, by most interpretations (*rājaḥ sūryo ná raśmibhiḥ*). This does not seem to me sufficient reason to split apart this cosmological image. I attribute the position of *ná* to the particularly close association of *sūrya-* and *raśmibhiḥ*, which are frequently adjacent (cf. esp. the identical simile but without a third term ... *sūryo ná raśmibhiḥ* in VIII.43.32, IX.41.5).

I.84.2: Note the chiasmic structure of cd: [*ṛṣīnām* (GEN.) *ca stutīḥ* (ACC.)] *úpa* [*yajñám* (ACC.) *ca mānuṣānām* (GEN.)]. This could have been sketched in tr. by “up to the seers’ praises and the sacrifice of the sons of Manu.”

I.84.7–9: Bloomfield (RR, ad I.7.8) suggests that each of these three verses reads like a brahmodya, with the last two words (the four-syllable tag *índro aṅgá*, which he considers to be prose “quite out of the metre”) serving as the answer. This analysis works best for vs. 7, but his separation of the two-word tag from the rest of the verse is clearly correct for all three verses -- though I do not think we need to consider *índro aṅgá* “simple prose.”

I.84.7: I take *índro aṅgá* as the main clause corresponding to the rel. cl. introduced by *yáḥ*.

I.84.8: The hapax *kṣúmpa-* is universally rendered by modern tr. as ‘mushroom’, though there is no unanimity in earlier interpretations (cf., e.g., Gr: Staude [perennial plant]). There is some etymological support for ‘mushroom’ from modern languages (see EWA s.v.), and ‘mushroom’ works well in the simile, since kicking many varieties of mushroom demolishes them, whereas a perennial plant is generally a sturdier entity. I might go so far as to suggest specifically a puffball, since kicking

puffballs releases a satisfying cloud of dust (easily viewed on various YouTube videos), and puffballs do appear to be found in the appropriate geographical area.

I.84.9: A broken construction. The subject of the 3rd ps. verb in c (*patyate*) must be Indra, though he is represented by 2nd ps. *tvā* in the apparent rel. cl. of ab. (The parallel in III.36.4b *ugrām śávaḥ patyate dhr̥ṣṇv ójaḥ*, where Indra is undeniably the subject, makes it clear that the mortal soma-presser of our ab cannot be the subject of *patyate*.) The *yá-* clause of ab thus has no direct grammatical connection with what ought to be its main clause in c, and I therefore take *yás cid* as the functional equivalent of the indefinite *kás cid*.

I.84.10-12: See publ. intro. for the structure of this *ṛca* and its relation to I.80. The subjects of all three verses are feminine (*gauryāḥ, yāḥ ... sayāvarīḥ* 10; *tā(h) ... p̥śnayaḥ, ... dhenávaḥ* 11; *tā(h)* 12; *vāsvīḥ* 10-12), but, in my opinion, the hidden referent of all three verses is the Maruts. See also comm. on vs. 16.

I.84.10: Ge (followed by Re, WG) takes the feminine plurals as referring to the milk streams, mixing with the soma, here called honey. This of course accords well with the feminine gender, and I agree that this is the first layer of reference. But both the refrain, echoing the refrain of I.80, which has the Maruts as one set of subjects, and *sayāvarīḥ* ‘fellow travellers, driving along with’ point to the Maruts as a second layer. The adj. *sayāvan-* is used 3x (out of 6) with the instr. pl. of *devá-*, once (X.113.2) quite clearly of the Maruts along with Indra. Why would the hyper-masculine Maruts be referred to with feminines? I think the point is to conflate two of the sources of Indra’s mastery: the soma-milk mixture animatized as cows, which enhances his physical strength, and the Maruts, who provide verbal encouragement and moral support.

I construe instr. *v̥ṣṇā* with *sayāvarīḥ* rather than with *mādanti* as most tr. do. The latter is of course possible.

I.84.11: This verse contains another clue that the Maruts are the underlying referent. The fem. subjects are identified as *p̥śnayaḥ* ‘dappled’, but *p̥śni-* is also the name of the Maruts’ mother. They would be called P̥śnis here, just as they are regularly called Rudras, after their father Rudra.

Note the phonetic figure *p̥śanāyúvaḥ ... p̥śnayaḥ*.

I.84.13: The use of the bones of Dadhyañc as a vajra-substitute is a particularly puzzling part of this puzzling version of the Dadhyañc myth. The appearance of this motif in the JB and MBh versions (see Ge n. on vss. 13–15) seems to me an after-the-fact rationalization of the verse here.

I.84.14: The syntax of this verse is somewhat unclear. I take ab as a rel. clause with the pres. part. *ichán* functioning as the main verb and an unusual, indeed disturbing, position of the rel. pron. *yád* (we might expect **ichán yád ásvasya ...*), which is then

picked up by *tád* in the main clause of c. Most other tr. take *ichán* as part of the main clause and the *yád* as the marker of an embedded rel. cl.: roughly “seeking the head of the horse, which was set away in the mountains, he found it...” But not only would I prefer not to allow embedded relatives in the RV, but the position of *yád* makes this interpretation difficult, too (expect **ichánn áśvasya śírah yád ...?*).

I.84.15: I confess myself to be entirely baffled by this verse, though the grammar is straightforward. Ge’s reconstruction of the mythology (n. to vs. 15) is not entirely compelling, nor is that found in WG.

I.84.16: The consensus of modern tr. is that the objects that the subject is struggling to yoke are the priests (see esp. Ge), but I find this unlikely. The violent adjectival descriptors seem uncharacteristic for priests, but quite suitable for the Maruts, to whom the poet of this hymn (now drawing to a close) will dedicate the next four hymns. Note esp. that both *śímvant-* and *mayobhū-* are used of the Maruts, once in the same hymn (VIII.20.3 and 24 respectively; for *mayobhū-* see also I.166.3, V.58.2). I therefore take the Maruts as referents of the acc. pls. and also suggest that this verse is the pivot for the Marut reference found also (in my interpretation) in vss. 10–12. In that *ṛca* the Maruts are referred to in the guise of clearly feminine bovine figures; here the cattle (*gāḥ*) are the first acc. object we encounter. Because *gó-* has fluctuating gender, this form can of course be feminine (as the bovines were in 10–12), but the immediate following adjectives establish it decisively as masculine. If both 10–12 and this verse refer to the Maruts, this verse returns them to their proper grammatical gender. Lüders (*Varuṇa* II.455) also thinks the Maruts are the referents.

ṛtásya can be construed with either *dhurí* or *gāḥ*, and tr. divide on which they choose. I attach it to the chariot pole in part because *ṛtásya* is often construed with a place (e.g., frequent *ṛtásya yóni-*), but the other is not impossible: cf. I.73.6 *ṛtásya ... dhenávaḥ*.

I.84.17: Contra the interpretation of *ibha-* as ‘elephant’ in Vedic (so Ge), see EWA s.v.

I.84.18: *yajātai* is, as far as I can tell, the only RVic examples of a medial 3rd sg. subjunctive in *-tai*, the form that takes over beginning with the AV, spreading from the 1st sg. As such it may be a sign that at least this part of this last hymn in the Indra group is late.

Pāda c presents a problem that has been glossed over by most modern tr.: the active of *ā√vah* should take an acc. of what is being conveyed, but it is distinctly odd to say that the gods are bringing the oblation here. Ge (Re, WG) avoid the difficulty by interpreting the verb as intrans. ‘fahren’ (‘arriver-en-char’), a usage associated with the middle, with *hóma* an acc. of goal. Old, however, disapproves of this makeshift (as do I), setting out the arguments very clearly. Though he agrees that “der Gedanke befremdet,” he sticks to the expected syntax (as do I) and cites a number of passages in which gods do bring oblations. The closest is V.41.7 in which

Night and Dawn bring the sacrifice to the mortal (V.41.7d *ā hā vahato mārtyāya yajñām*). I suggest that the role-switch in this verse (gods bring the oblation, rather than coming to our oblation to take it away) is also found in the next verse, where the god praises the mortal.

I.84.19: As in the last verse the usual ritual roles of god and mortal are reversed, with Indra producing a praśasti of a mortal. I do not understand why, but, unlike 18c, there is no way to wriggle out of the undeniable purport of this verb phrase – thus supporting the “gods convey the oblation” interpretation of 18c.

tvām aṅgá reprises the tag of vss. 7–9, *índro aṅgá*, with of course the same referent.

I follow Ge (/WG) in taking vs. 20 as the quoted *vácaḥ* of pāda d, though it would be equally possible to interpret *vácaḥ* as referring to what precedes, indeed even to the whole of the hymn.

I.84.20: It is tempting to take *dabhan* as related to or contextually assimilated to *dabhrá-* ‘paltry, few’ in the meaning ‘come up short’, though the *asmān* would be more difficult to construe.

I.85 Maruts

On the concatenative repetition in this hymn, see publ. intro.

I.85.1: Because of the frequent association of the root $\sqrt{su(m)bh}$ with verbs of motion, esp. $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘drive’ (cf., e.g., nearby I.88.2 *śubhé kām yānti* and cmpds *śubham-yā(van-)*), I interpret *prá ... śúmbhante* more dynamically than most tr. (e.g., Ge “Die sich wie Frauen schön machen...”), esp. given *yāman* in the same clause.

The connection of the relative clause in pāda a with its presumed main clause in d is interrupted by the *hí* clause in c. Ge convincingly suggests that the *hí* clause gives an explanation or exemplification of the “wondrous power” attributed to them in the last word of b, *sudáṃsasaḥ*, and he is followed by most tr. including me.

This clause contains a periphrastic causative *cakriré vrdhé* with a medial perfect as its base (see Zehnder, *Das periphrastische Kausativ im Vedischen*, pp. 23, 50–51). Although there is no doubt that the construction is a periphrasis, the reason for its use is unclear. As Zehnder points out (pp. 23, 51), the imperfect of the well-attested morphological causative occurs with just this object in VIII.12.7 *yát ... ródasī ávardhayat*. The context here, which contains two present indicatives (*śúmbhante* a, *mádanti* d), does not call for a perfect. I suspect (but cannot demonstrate) that the use of this periphrasis with the perfect has something to do with the middle voice of *cakriré*, which is also apparently unmotivated in the periphrastic construction, and that there is an underlying pun -- on *rodasī*, the consort of the Maruts -- namely “the Maruts made the two worlds/*Rodasī their own” (*ródasī ... cakriré*), which would require a medial form. Since, as I demonstrated long ago (“Voice Fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial 3rd Plural *-anta* in Active Paradigms” *IJ* 21 [1979]), 3rd pl. medial secondary forms in *-anta* to *-áya-*formations are almost

universally interpretable as re-marked actives in *-an*, using **avardhayanta* here would not allow the proposed double reading, with a true medial value in the pun. A different pun is also possibly latent here, involving a reflexive reading of the middle: “they made *themselves* grow strong” (*cakriré vṛdhé*). This interpretation would feed naturally into the beginning of verse 2: *tá ukṣitāsaḥ* “once grown,” and 7a *té ‘vardhanta svátavaso mahitvanā* “Those self-powerful ones strengthened themselves in their greatness” would echo this reflexive interpretation. In both of these suggested puns, one of the words in the pāda has to be ignored (*vṛdhé* in the first, *ródasī* in the second), but the suggestive if partial phraseology in both cases would resonate with the audience.

It is also worth noting (though I don’t quite know what to do with this fact) that of the fifteen occurrences of *cakriré / cakrire* in the RV, four of them are found in this hymn (vss. 2, 7, 10 in addition to this one), a strikingly large percentage. And that the three finite verbs in vs. 2 are all medial 3rd pl. with strong subject involvement: pāda a *mahimānam āśata* “obtained (their own) greatness,” b *cakrire sādah* “made (their own) seat,” and c *ádhi śríyo dadhire* “put on (their own) splendours.”

I.85.2: On the verbs in this verse, see final comments on vs. 1.

I.85.3: The pf. *dadhire* of b is not in harmony with the three pres. forms, *śubháyante* a, *bādhante* b, *rīyate* c; in particular, the tenses of the subordinate-main clause dyad in ab clash: “when they beautify themselves ..., they have put on ...” (The tr. avoids the clash by using simply ‘put’, ambiguous between present and past in English, but the Sanskrit is not so amenable.) It is difficult to wring a stative/resulative meaning (“they have put on and now have on ...”) out of *dadhire*, esp. given the identical form in preterital use in 2d. It may be best to assume that *dadhire* here just echoes the form in 2d, though it might be worth noting that the 3rd pl. mid. present indicative to the redupl. pres., *dádhate*, which we might expect here, is quite rare. However, there is another possible solution to this clash. The pres. *śubháyante* in the *yád* clause in pāda a appears before vowel-initial *añjībhiḥ* in the cadence, with, as is usual, the final *-e* scanning short in hiatus (that is, probably as **-a*). It is possible that the underlying form of the verb was actually the injunctive **śubháyanta* and that the primary ending *-ante* was substituted editorially to prevent the redactional contraction that might have resulted (**śubháyantāñjībhiḥ*). This would allow a past-time reading of the first hemistich, “When they beautified themselves ..., they put on ...”

I.85.4: This verse contains no main clause, just two different subordinate clauses introduced by *yé* (ab) and *yád* (cd) respectively, with the first couched in the 3rd ps., the second in the 2nd ps. Although such switches of person in the middle of a verse are far from rare in the RV (see in fact vs. 5), in this case it seems best to consider the first half of this verse a pendant to vs. 3 (also in the 3rd ps.) and the second half an anticipation of vs. 5 (also in the 2nd ps.), esp. since 5a is an abbreviated duplicate of 4cd.

The adj. *manojúvah* ‘mind-swift’ could equally well be a nom. pl. masc. modifying the Maruts or an acc. pl. fem. modifying *pṛṣatīḥ*. Most tr. opt for the latter, I think correctly on thematic grounds, but grammatically and semantically either is possible. Gr and Macd (Vedic Reader) take it as a nominative; certainly its position right before *marutaḥ* in pāda a, with *pṛṣatīḥ* appearing only in the middle of the second pāda, suggests that the initial audience interpretation would be as a modifier of the Maruts.

I.85.4–5: Verse 5 is an intrusive Triṣṭubh in this Jagatī hymn. (The final verse is also in Triṣṭubh, but meter change is more usual in concluding verses.) The transition between the meters is cleverly managed here (as Old already pointed out): the final word of 4d (in Jagatī) and 5a (in Triṣṭubh) is *áyugdhvam*. The ending has the distracted reading *-dh^hvam* in 4d, but is simply *-dhvam* in 5a. The reason for the change in meter is unclear to me.

I.85.5: As noted ad vs. 4, the person changes from 2nd to 3rd in the middle of this verse. But this is not the only disruption: the main clause of 5cd begins with *utá*, which has nothing to conjoin. Klein (DGRV I: 451) is puzzled and suggests, somewhat desperately, that the *utá* “focuses on and emphasizes the second action of the Maruts.” This seems to open the usage of *utá* unacceptably wide. It is possible instead to see it as an example of “inverse *utá*,” conjoining the actions of the two clauses of cd, with the parallel verbs *ví śyanti* and *vy undanti* (so also explicitly Macd, Reader). Or it may be signaling the resumption of 3rd ps. discourse after the 2nd ps. intrusions of 4cd–5ab.

The inundation of the skin in pāda 4 presumably refers to the wetting of hides in the tanning process (so Ge).

I.85.6: In vs. 1 the Maruts were themselves called *sáptayaḥ* ‘spans’, but here that image is “repaired” by separating the Maruts from the spans of draught animals that bring them here.

The two *raghu-* cmpds. pick up *raṁháyantah* in 5b.

The phrase *urú vah sádas kṛtám* could technically be in apposition to *barhíḥ* and hence accusative -- “Sit on the barhis, the broad seat made for you” -- but none of the standard tr. so render it. The position of the *vah* favors, but does not impose, this nominal sentence interpretation. For another reason supporting a separation into two clauses see comm. ad I.85.7.

The seat made for the Maruts on the ritual ground is here contrasted with the one they made for themselves in heaven in 2b (*diví ... ádhi cakrire sádaḥ*), which event is then repeated in the next verse, 7b *urú cakrire sádaḥ*, though there the seat is in/on/above the “vault” (*nākam*).

I.85.7: I tr. *avardhanta* as reflexive, rather than (with most tr.) intransitive ‘grew strong’, in part because *svátavas-* suggests that their power comes by their own

efforts and in part because of its resonance with one interpretation of 1c, for which see above.

On pāda b see comments ad 6c and the similar phrase in 2b. The accent of the apparent main verb *tasthúḥ* is surprising. Macd (Reader) invokes the principle that the first of two antithetical verbs is accented, but this seems a feeble explanation of this particular situation. Ordinarily such antithetical verbs are adjacent to each other and the semantic antithesis is clearer: “they mounted” and “they made” do not seem particularly antithetical. I see two possible explanations: either the *ā ... tasthúḥ* clause should be taken as an unmarked subordinate clause (“[when] they mounted the vault, they made ...”) or the “antithetical” explanation is correct, but the verb to which it is antithetical is not the following *cakrire*. Instead it is found in 6c, whose two clauses are in patterned contrast to 7b:

6c <i>s̄datā barhír</i>	<i>urú vah sádas kṛtám</i>
7c <i>ā nākaṃ tasthúr</i>	<i>urú cakrire sádaḥ</i>

The second part of both pādas contains *urú sádaḥ* √*kṛ*; the first parts contain the preverb *ā*, main verbs built to the semantically oppositional roots √*sad* ‘sit’ (*s̄data*) and √*sthā* ‘stand’ (*tasthúḥ*), and an acc. of goal, again oppositional, in that the *barhír* of 6c is on the earthly ritual ground and the *nākaṃ* is in heaven. I therefore think it likely that the accent on *tasthúḥ* is meant to signal the contrastive relationship between the two pādas.

The Pp. analyses *dhāvad* as *ha āvat*, and most tr. follow this interpretation, as containing an imperfect of √*av* ‘help’ (Ge “Als Viṣṇu dem ... Bullen ... beistand...”; Re “eut aidé”; Macd “helped”). (An injunctive *āvat* would also be possible.) However, we are likely dealing with a double, or even a triple, word play here, for *dhāvat* can also simply be the 3rd sg. injunctive belonging to the root (or rather roots) √*dhāv* ‘rinse’ and ‘run’. This is recognized by WG, who translate with the second, “Als Viṣṇu zu dem vom Rausch bewegten Stier läuft...,” but in the notes also raise the possibility of ‘rinse’, referring to Gotō (*Präsensklasse* p. 186 n. 333), who in turn refers to Pirart (*IJJ* 27 [1984] 102ff.).

I think that the two primary readings are “rinsed” and “aided” and that the acc. object *vṛṣaṇaṃ madacyútam* has different referents depending on the interpretation of the verb, namely soma and Indra respectively. This ambiguity is made possible by the fact that *vṛṣan-* ‘bull’ is very commonly used of both Indra and soma. The modifying cmpd. *madacyút-* also has two different interpretations, enabled by the functional ambiguity of root noun compounds like this. Root noun second members regularly have transitive force, governing their first members, hence here “arousing exhilaration.” And in fact this compound is common in this sense, modifying soma (IX.12.3, etc.). But passive value of the root noun with an instrumental or other oblique sense of the 1st member is also possible, hence here “roused by the exhilarating drink / roused to exhilaration.” For general disc. see Scarlatta pp. 128–29. In this second sense Indra would be the obvious referent, as he is elsewhere (e.g., I.51.2).

While ‘rinse’ may strike the casual reader as an odd choice of words, in fact rinsing is one of the standard steps in the preparation of soma. For Viṣṇu’s

participation in this process, see VI.17.11cd *pūṣā viṣṇus trīṇi sārāṃsi dhāvan, vṛtrahānam madīram aṃśúm asmai* “Pūṣan, Viṣṇu (and the others) rinse the exhilarating Vṛtra-smashing plant, three lakes (full), for him [=Indra].” In the ‘aided’ interpretation, Indra is the referent of the accusative and the allusion is to Viṣṇu’s help given to him in various exploits including the Vṛtra-smashing. In the “ran to” reading, which strikes me as the least interesting, presumably Indra is also the referent of the accusative, though WG don’t make this exactly clear.

I.85.9: The array of tenses in this verse requires comment. The subordinate–main clause dyad of ab/c contains an imperfect *āvartayat* in the *yád* clause and a present *dhatté* (*dhattá* in sandhi) in the main clause. Pāda d, which describes actions that necessarily follow the one in pāda c, then has two imperfects (*áhan* and *aubjat*). I consider the imperfect / present combination in the first sentence to be a makeshift attempt to convey anteriority in a language without a semantic pluperfect. That is, there is no structural means in Rigvedic Sanskrit to convey past anterior action (“when he had X-ed, he Y-ed”) via a finite verb (though see recent work by IH with a contrary opinion), since the “pluperfect” is simply the past tense to presential perfects. In later Sanskrit the gerund serves as a non-finite way to express the value (“having X-ed, he Y-ed”), but the gerund barely exists in the RV. In the RV the perfect participle does serve this function, in contrast to finite forms of the perfect system. Here the relative tense values are conveyed by the imperfect followed by the present, since the imperfect does express action prior to that of the present tense. The imperfects in pāda d then re-establish the past-time context. I therefore tr. the imperfect and present of abc with the English pluperfect and preterite.

On *náry ápāṃsi* see disc. ad VIII.96.19.

I.85.11: Old suggests a clever, but ultimately unsatisfactory, reading in pāda a: rather than *táyā diśā* with the Pp., he divides *tá(y) ādíśā*, with the instr. of *ādíś-* and the older sandhi form of *té* ‘they’. This would make the end of the pāda more parallel to 10a ... *tá ójasā*. He thinks that the Maruts performed the action in 10a with brute force, but that in 11a “durch klugen Anschlag.” Although I am drawn to this idea because of the persistent parallelisms in this hymn, I cannot accept it in the end. For one thing *ādíś-* does not occur in the instr., and it generally means ‘aim, intention’, which does not fit here. Old’s proposed reading also involves altering the accent from *diśā* to *ādíśā*, so that it is not merely a matter of redividing the Saṃhitā text. There is also the serious question of why *táḥ* would be preserved in one prevocalic environment but not in another, in adjacent vss.

The sequence *ā gachantīm* in c appears to contain the 3rd pl. pres. *gachanti* + *īm*; this is certainly the default interpretation. However, as with *vidántīm* in I.67.4 and *várdhantīm* in I.65.4, I now think it should be analyzed as *gachant* + *īm*, an injunctive with the inherited **-ant* ending preserved because it was early misanalyzed the primary ending fused with the enclitic pronoun *īm*. Vss. 11 relates how the Maruts brought rain to “thirsting Gotama”; the first two pādas contain preterities (pf. *nunudre*, impf. *ásiñcan*; note also vs. 10, devoted to the same theme, with 3 pfs.

nunudre, bibhiduḥ, cakrire), while pāda d has the functionally ambiguous injunc. *tarpayanta*. Only present *gachanti* intrudes. The publ. tr. moves from past to present in vs. 11 (allowing for a presential reading of *tarpayanta*): “They *pushed* the well aslant in this way. They *poured* out the wellspring for the thirsting Gotama. / They *come* hither to him with help -- they of bright radiance. They *satisfy* the desire of the inspired poet through their own essential qualities.” But the narrative sequence would flow better with “they came ... they satisfied,” and I would emend the published translation accordingly. For this and other such passages (esp. I.65.4 and I.85.11), see my “Hidden in Plain Sight: Some Older Verb Endings in the Rig Veda” in a forthcoming festschrift.

I.86 Maruts

On the structure of this hymn and its syntactic patterns, see publ. intro.

I.86.1: I do not understand the function of *hí* here, which is doubly unusual in occurring both in a relative clause and in the initial clause of a hymn. Hettrich (*Hypotaxe*, p. 181) also finds it puzzling. Finding *hí* in the opening pāda of a hymn is not unprecedented (cf., e.g., IV.1.1, VI.1.1, VI.2.1), but the relative clause is a further complication.

The abl. *diváḥ* is construed by Ge and Re with the voc. *vimahasah* (Ge “ihr ausgezeichneten (Mannen) des Himmels”), but we might expect it to lose its accent in the vocative phrase, like *divo naraḥ* (II.36.2, V.54.10) and *divo duhitar* (IV.51.10, etc.). It is better taken with $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘protect’, which is elsewhere found with the ablative (e.g., X.158.1 *sūryo no divás pātu*), indicating the location of the protector and hence the direction from which the protection comes. So also WG.

I.86.2–3: As discussed in the publ. intro., the syntax of these two verses is to be interpreted in the template provided by vs. 1, namely a relative clause (or clauses) expressing the beneficiary of the Maruts’ favor with the genitive *yásya* and a main clause assigning a reward to him. The full structure is seen in 1ab (rel. cl. with *yásya*) / 1c main clause with coreferential *sá*. Verses 2 and 3ab serve as the relative clauses to the main clause of 3c, also beginning *sá*. However, the relative pronoun is suppressed until 3a and the structure of parallel relative clauses is only conveyed by the repeated *vā* ‘or’ (2a, 2b, 3a). Indeed, though 2b contains a genitive of the human beneficiary (*víprasya*), 2a lacks even that: we must infer a *yásya* to limit the *yajñaiḥ*, as well as a verb to construe with that instrumental. I would diagram the structure as follows, with what is to be supplied in parentheses:

template, vs. 1:

<i>yásya</i> ... <i>pāthā</i> (2 nd ps. pl. verb) (1ab)	/ <i>sá</i>
for whom ... you Maruts perform benevolent action (1c)	/ he is (rewarded)

complex variation, vss. 2-3

(*yásya*) *yajñaiḥ vā* (2nd ps. verb) (2a)

or by (whose) sacrifices (you were attracted?)

(*yásya*) *víprasya vā* ... *śṛṇutā* (2bc)
or of (which) poet ... you heard

utá vā yásya vājínah ... *átakṣata* (3ab) / *sá*
or of which prize-seeker ... you fashioned / he is (rewarded)

This interpretation differs significantly from that of other tr. In particular, vs. 2 is generally taken as an independent sentence that does not parallel the *yásya* structures of vss. 1 and 3 and that has *śṛṇutā* as the verb of a main clause, not of a subordinate clause, as I take it. (By that account *śṛṇutā* is accented because it follows the extraclausal vocative that opens the pāda.) Although my interpretation requires several elements to be supplied, esp. in vs. 2, most other tr. also supply a verb with 2ab, and they fail to capture the structural parallelism that allows the ellipses to be filled in a principled fashion.

I.86.2: My interpretation requires *matīnām* to be construed with *hávam* “the call of the thoughts”; for this expression see, e.g., VI.69.4 *hāvanā matīnām*.

I.86.3: As noted in the publ. intro., I take the *vājín-* here to be the patron, for whom the Maruts create a worthy poet.

I take *gántā* as a periphrastic future. VII.32.10 *gámat sá gómati vrajé* is entirely parallel, save for having a subjunctive (*gámat*) in place of the agent noun here, which suggests a future sense for the latter.

I.86.4–5: As indicated in the publ. intro., the genitive of the human worshiper is continued in these verses, though with the demonstrative, not relative pronoun.

I.86.5: The condensed expression of the earlier part of the hymn continues here, and there is no consensus on how to construe pāda c, which has no overtly signaled connection with the rest of the verse. For example, Ge takes it as a simile, marked by *cid*, with its comparandum in pāda b (roughly, “who dominates the peoples like the flowing nourishments the sun”). But even if *cid* could mark similes (and I don’t think it can), the simile doesn’t make sense. I will not rehash here the various possibilities floated by other interpretations. My own generally follows Renou’s in supplying *asyá* from 1a as the oblique predicate of a possessive nominal sentence: “(his) are ...” It would also be possible to take the perfect participle *sasrúṣīḥ* as the predicate: so WG “Sogar zur Sonne sind (seine) Nahrungen gelaufen (erreicht),” but the exact value of such a predicated perfect participle eludes me.

I.86.6: There is an abrupt shift from the unidentified 3rd sg. worshiper rewarded for his work who dominated vss. 1–5 to the 1st ps. plural, but the rhetorical structure invites the audience to identify the “us” of vs. 6 with the 3rd sg. of the earlier verse.

The *dadāsimá* ‘we have done pious work’, combined with the causal *hí* ‘for’, seems to offer a summary of the activities of the previous verses. The repetition of the pl. *carṣaní-* in 5b and 6c also supports this identification: he who “dominated” the *carṣaní-* in 5b can be the same as the “we” who accomplished what we have done with the help of the *carṣaní-* in 6c. This lexical chaining should have been signaled in the translation, where instead the two words are rendered differently: “bordered domains” (5b), “separate peoples” (6c). I would now use “separate peoples” also for 5b.

I.86.7: The 3rd sg. protagonist and the syntactic structure of vss. 1–5 return here, but with the syntax reversed: *sá ... yásya*.

I.86.8: I take the *vā* here as inverse, connecting the two double gen. phrases *śaśamānásya ... svédasya* and *kāmasya vénataḥ*, though it appears after the first word of the first gen. phrase (*śaśamānásya vā ... svédasya ...*). Klein (DGRV II: 205) also thinks an inverse reading is possible (though he doesn’t use the term), but he also suggests *vā* here might be equivalent to *vaí*. This seems unnecessary, and the inverse interpretation gets some support from the inversion of the syntax in vs. 7.

Note the chiasmic structure of the two genitive phrases: in the first the personal participle *śaśamānásya* depends on the material *svédasya*, while the likewise personal participle *vénataḥ* depends on *kāmasya*.

I.86.9: The first two pādas show a nice syntactic conversion: the 2nd member *śávas-* of the voc. bahuvrīhi *satya-śavas-* ‘having real strength’ (unaccented, but would be *satyá-śavas-*) is implicitly extracted from the compound and represented by *tát*, object of *āvís karta*.

The third pāda has a striking phonetic figure *vidhyatā vidyútā*, which was already anticipated by pāda-initial *vidā* in 8c.

I.86.10: Another phonetic figure in a: *gūhatā guhyām*, whose *-atā* also echoes *vidhyatā*.

In the publ. tr. *guhyām* would have been better rendered as “to be concealed” than “concealable,” since the concealment is not merely possible but desirable.

I.87 Maruts

I.87.1: Ge tr. *usrā(h)* as “Sternbilder (?)” because he considers the interpretation with dawns as “kein naturwahres Bild.” But at early dawn stars are still visible.

I.87.2: On *upahvará-* see disc. ad I.62.6.

I.87.4: As noted in the publ. intro., in contradistinction to all standard tr. I take the *gaṇáḥ* of d to refer to the poet Gautama, whose patronymic is Rāhūgaṇa, and

consider the 2nd sg. reference of the 2nd hemistich as Gautama’s self-address. The other tr. assume that the flock of Maruts is being addressed.

All standard tr. also take pāda d as a single clause (e.g., Ge “darum ist die bullenhafte Schar ein Gönner dieser Dichtung”). But this interpretation fails to account for the medial position of *áthā*, which is otherwise almost invariably initial. (Klein, *DGRV* II: 70–71, notes the anomalous position here but follows the standard tr.) I take *áthā* as clause initial, proclaiming Gotama’s identification with the Marut flock on the basis of the shared qualities stated previously.

I.87.5: See the publ. intro. for discussion of the contents of this verse.

It may not be too farfetched to note, in connection with pāda d, where the Maruts acquire “their names worthy of worship” (*nāmāni yajñīyāni*), that in 1d they were explicitly unidentified and undifferentiated (*ké cid* “whoever they are”). The acquisition of these names follows their “reaching” (*ā́sata*) Indra, presumably to render him moral support in the Vṛtra battle with their chants (*ḥk-*) (pāda c). In other treatments of the aftermath of this battle they successfully negotiate with Indra for a share in the soma sacrifice (see I.165, etc.), and the expression “acquired names worthy of worship / sacrificial names” may be a way of expressing this incorporation of them into the dedicands of the soma sacrifice. Note that in VI.48.21 the Maruts assume *Indra*’s sacrificial name (*dadhire nāma yajñīyam*), also in connection with the Vṛtra battle.

I.87.6: It is odd that the Maruts, just called *ḥkvan-* themselves (5c), here join themselves with *ḥkvabhiḥ*. Ge suggests either that they have an “Anhängerschaft” of singers or have gone among singers themselves; Re that it’s an instrumental of identification (“en tant que chantres”). Gr invents, for this passage alone, a meaning ‘Glanz, Strahl’ for *ḥkvan-*. Given the identification of the human poet with the Maruts in the same capacity in vss. 4–5, the singers of 6b may be human singers, although the other instrumental attributes in this verse do not fit this picture. Ge points out that in the first verse of the next hymn, I.88.1b, the Maruts’ chariots are *svarká-* ‘equipped with lovely chants’, and so the *ḥkva-* here might refer to their chariots, which are conspicuously absent from the list in pādas a–c. This is the explanation I currently prefer.

The word *iṣmín-* is glossed by Gr as ‘eilend, stürmend’ (followed by WG), while Ge and Re take it as ‘possessing arrows’, deriving apparently from a suggestion of Bloomfield (see EWA s.v.), a suggestion emphatically rejected by Mayrhofer (loc. cit.). Certainly a derivation from *iṣu-* ‘arrow’ is, to say the least, not without problems. But in two of its other three occurrences, *iṣmín-* is found in a weapons context as it is here, and the derivation therefore seems worth attempting. Starting from *iṣu-*, the *-in-* possessive would be **iṣvín-*. It is possible that the normal distribution of *-vant-* and *-mant-* possessives, with *-mant-* regularly built to stems in *-u-* (*paśu-mánt-*, etc.), as opposed to *-vant-*, would make **iṣvín-* beside *iṣu-* appear anomalous, and it was “corrected” to *iṣmín-*. Note the regularly formed *iṣumant-* (2x).

I.88 Maruts

I.88.3 As indicated in the publ. tr., I take the so-far-unnamed poets (who appear as the Gotamas in the next verse) as the subject of *kṛṇavante*. They are erecting their thoughts like trees for the Maruts to chop down with the axes in pāda a. By contrast, most tr. take the Maruts as subject of *kṛṇavante* (so explicitly Re, implicitly WG; Ge hesitates between the Maruts and the poets).

The simile in pāda b causes some minor grammatical problems. The Pp reads *medhā*, but if this word belongs to *medhā-* (fem.) ‘wise thought’, we should rather read *medhāḥ* (so Ge, Gr.). This is of course possible in this sandhi context, but pāda-final *ūrdhvā* is not amenable to such an analysis: it must be neuter plural and therefore can’t modify a fem. *medhāḥ*. Gr sets up a neut. *medhā-* ‘Schaft’ for just this passage, presumably to deal with the apparent gender disharmony. But it is simpler to assume that *ūrdhva-* has been attracted into the neuter by the *vānā* in the simile (so Old).

The epithet *tuvidyumnā-* is otherwise only used of gods, save for IX.98.1, where it modifies the wealth brought by Soma. The only other plural form (V.87.7) modifies the Maruts, but the standard tr. assume that it here qualifies the priests, because the Maruts appear in the dative in pāda c and should therefore not be the subjects of the verb in the same clause. The difficulty disappears if we read c with b, rather than d. I then take the Maruts to be the subject in d, with the epithet appropriate to them, and also take the middle *dhanayante* as intransitive with an acc. of goal, rather than transitive “set the (pressing) stone in motion” with other tr.

I.88.4: For the imagery here, see the publ. intro.

The sequence *pāry ā va āgur* with doubled preverb is curious. Ge provides numerous parallels in his n. 4a, but none like this, with the two preverbs separated only by an enclitic pronoun and contained within a preverb (*pāri*) – verb sequence. I have no explanation for this, though I would note that of the 8 occurrences of supposed *aguh / āguh*, 7 are pāda-final and are unverbated with the preverb *ā*, as *āguh*.

The hapax *vārkār'yām* is of course very obscure. Ge simply takes it as an unanalyzable name of the “Sangeskunst” of the Gotamas. However, it is clearly a compound and the compound members are easily identified: *vār-* ‘water’ and \sqrt{kr} ‘make’, and so it should be susceptible to meaningful analysis. As indicated in the publ. intro. I believe that it has the same underlying referent as *anubhartrī* in 6a, namely the musical instrument, in my view the *vīṇā*, and that the poet was playing with the paradox that the instrument is grammatically feminine but in some forms looks remarkably like male genitalia. I therefore follow Gr’s gloss ‘Wasser ... schaffend’ and assume that it refers to the penis. The problem is what kind of formation it is, and how to get an agentive-like meaning out of *kār'yā-*. First, note that the formation does not have gerundive accent and is therefore not a conventional sgerundive despite the \check{v} ddhi in the root and the shape of the suffix. Formally it is most likely a verbal abstract ‘water-making, Wasserbeschaffung’, as Old takes it (so

also AiG II.2.832 following Old). However, because it was a *feminine* abstract, I think that it was secondarily available to be identified with the underlying feminine referent, the *vīṇā*, and animatized as a quasi-agent.

Note the phonological play between *vārkār-* (b) and *arkaír* (c).

I.88.5: All standard tr. take *ná* as negating the verb *aceti*. It seems unlikely to me that an annunciatory aorist would be negated (“this very thing has *not* just been seen”), and its clause-internal position, not immediately preceding the verb, also seems unusual for such an interpretation. I take it instead as negating only the following word *yójanam* and expressing the surprise that what has just appeared is very close, not (even) a trek away.

I thus take *yójana-* as a measure of distance, as it generally is, rather than as “Gespann,” with most tr. Rather than *yójanam* I take the referent of *etát tyát* to be the formulation (*bráhma*) that the Gotamas made in the previous verse. This formulation, also referred to as a *dhī-* ‘insight’ in 4b, providentially appears at the same moment as the Maruts approach. In what sense does the formulation “appear”? I interpret this verb to mean that the poem that Gotama created in private (*sasvár* 5b) is now being performed in public (i.e., at the ritual welcoming the Maruts). This interpretation also entails supplying the verb “made” in 5b (echoing *kṛṇvantaḥ* in 4c), rather than “saw” (with most tr., anticipating *páśyan* 5c).

My last departure from the standard tr. in this verse is in taking the acc. pl. masculines in cd, *híraṇyacakrān, áyodaṃṣṭrān ... varāhūn* as comprising two separate but conjoined NPs without overt conjunction (as so often), rather than one single NP, since I find “golden-wheeled boars” an unlikely entity even in the RVic universe of discourse. With ‘golden-wheeled’ in c it is natural to supply ‘chariots’; the “copper-tusked boars” in d can easily be an extravagant characterization of the Maruts.

I.88.6: For detailed disc. of this verse, see my 1981 article, “A Vedic sexual pun: *ástobhayat, anubhartrī*, and RV I.88.6,” *Acta Orientalia* 42 (1981[82]) 55-63. The gist of the article is the interpretation of *anubhartrī*, a feminine agent noun built to *ánu √bhṛ*, a euphemistic idiom that refers to sexual penetration -- e.g., in the cosmic incest myth (X.61.5). The paradox of creating a *feminine* agent noun from this idiom is the trick of the verse and echoes the use of *vārkāryā-* in vs. 4 -- both, in my view, referring to the *vīṇā*, a feminine noun but a musical instrument with a characteristically phallic shape. The hapax causative *ástobhayat* ‘cause to sound’ (beside the simplex *stobhati* in b) has as its implicit subject the (male) player of the instrument and taps into the (probably universal) notion of a man playing a woman like an instrument in sexual encounters, with the added fun of the gender reversal in *anubhartrī*. The instrument both sounds (*práti śtobhati*, b) and is caused to sound (*ástobhayat*, c), a reasonable dual view of what a musical instrument does. I take *vṛthā āsām*, with its unidentified fem. gen. pl., as referring to all women, who, in male fantasy anyway, all “want it” -- conveyed by my somewhat loose tr. “the way

women like it.” Other tr. supply ‘songs’ or ‘chants’ with *āsām*, for which there is no particular support.

I.89 All Gods

I.89.1: The subjunctive of \sqrt{as} plus infinitival *vr̥dhé*, lit. “will be for the increasing/strengthening of...,” i.e., “will be (ready/available/amenable) to increase/strengthen” is found also in 5c: 1c *vr̥dhé ásan*, 5c *ásad vr̥dhé*.

On *áprāyu-* see comm. ad V.80.3.

I.89.2: A form of *devá-* is stationed at the beginning of every pāda, the first three being the gen. pl. *devānām* -- an effect difficult to capture in English without awkwardness.

I.89.4: Ge (/WG) take the repeated *tád*’s of a-c (but not the one in d) as referring to the *mayobhú ... bheṣajám* “the remedy that is joy itself” and supply verbs in pāda bc to support this object. Re by contrast takes the repeated *tád* as adverbial, ‘ainsi’. This is more or less what I arrived at, though ascribing somewhat more meaning to the adverbially used neuter pronoun. I assume it refers to the call embodied in the *nivíd-* of 3a (though *nivíd-* itself is fem.), which call is finally the suppressed object of *tád ... śṛṇutam* “listen to this” in d.

I.89.6: The rigid parallel structure of the four pādas is resolved by the final word of the verse *dadhātu*, which verb must be supplied for the first three pādas. This rigid structure, *svastí naḥ* GOD EPITHET, also allows the metrical irregularity of the first two pādas to be kept under strict control. Under HvN’s interpretation each of those two pādas has a rest after the *s“vastí naḥ* opening, with the GOD EPITHET phrase taking the rest of the line. Old suggests reading trisyllabic *ind^rra*, as often, as well as *pūṣā*, with distracted *ū*. The former seems more likely than the latter, but because of the parallelism of a and b in HvN’s reading, I prefer theirs.

I.89.7: The identify of the *mánavaḥ* in c is not clear. I take it as a continuation of the description of the Maruts, though it is the case that *mánu-* and its derivatives do not otherwise characterize the Maruts. Ge (/WG) suggests that it refers to men who have become gods or been assimilated to the gods, like the Ṛbhus, while Re thinks c belongs with d and refers to the All Gods, though this explanation runs into the same problem as the Marut identification.

I.89.9: The publ. tr. takes *āyuh* as obj. of *rīriṣata*, but it may be better to take *naḥ* as the obj. of that verb and construe *āyuh* with the inf. *gántoḥ*. Cf. Krick’s rendering (316): “Schädigt (tötet) uns nicht mittendinnen, bevor wir die volle Lebensdauer erreicht haben.” I would differ from Krick in taking *gántoḥ* as a gen. dependent on *madhyā* “Do not harm us in the middle of our going through our lifetime.” For *madhyā* + gen. inf., cf. *madhyā kártoḥ* I.115.4, II.38.4.

I.89.10: Pāda b is a textbook example of gender attraction of the pronoun in equational clauses. Since the referent of the pronoun is feminine Aditi, we might expect **sā pitā *sā putraḥ*, but the gender of the predicated noun is transferred to the pronoun.

I.90 All Gods

I.90.2: On the small class of *-āna*-nominals to *-u*-stems (with *guṇa* of the suffixal vowel), mostly personal names, see AiG II.2.275.

I.90.4: It is unclear from Ge's 'aussuchen' (/WG's 'auswählen') whether they attribute *ví ... cyantu* to \sqrt{ci} 'pile' or \sqrt{ci} 'observe', since the proposed meaning would require metaphorical stretching for either root. With Gr (and, judging from his 'dégager', also Re), I take it to the 'pile' root, with the literal sense being 'pile [obstructions, detritus, etc.] apart or away', thus 'clear', of paths. This idiom is found several times elsewhere of paths: IV.37.7, IV.55.4, VI.53.4 (passages collected also by Ge ad IV.55.4).

I.90.6: Supplying 'blow' as the verb of pāda a not only conforms to universal good sense, but is supported by vs. 4a of the previous hymn (I.89) *vātaḥ ... vātu*.

I.91 Soma

I.91.1: The multiple possible meanings of the root(s) \sqrt{cit} and the unclear morphological identity of (*prá*) *cikitaḥ* make the interpretation of the first pāda somewhat difficult. I follow Thieme's solution (*Plusq.*), adopted also by Kü (176-77), that it is underlyingly a medial injunctive to the perfect stem (that is, an unaugmented pluperfect), patterning with pf. *cikité*, etc. But the underspecification of this posited **cikita* caused it to be re-marked with an active ending (like root presents of the type *aduha-t*). It should not be a subjunctive, despite its thematic appearance, because of the zero-grade root syllable, and, *pace* WG, it should not be a trans./caus. reduplicated aorist because of the light reduplicating syllable (expect **cīkitas*) -- although I do have to admit that *acikitat* in VII.80.2 does seem to function like a redupl. aorist. WG supply *panthām*, from b, as object in a, but this seems unnecessary. On a potential ring made by *prá cikitaḥ* here and *prá cikitsā* in the last pāda of the hymn (23d), see publ. intro.

The other question in pāda a is whose inspired thought is at issue. I assume that it is ours (that is, the poets'), in that the priests and poets create the ritual that makes soma manifest.

I.91.2: This verse is structured by a series of etymological figures involving a nom. sg. modifying soma and an instr. pl. specifying his qualities -- a: *krátubhiḥ sukrátuḥ*,

b: *dákṣaiḥ sudákṣaḥ*, c: *vṛṣā vṛṣatvébhiḥ*, d: *dyumnébhīr dyumnī*. It is not a subtle device, but effective. On the first hemistich see further ad vs. 14.

I.91.3: Soma is here identified with the three principal Ādityas.

The (pseudo-)gerundive *dakṣāyya-* has attracted a number of different renderings -- in this passage alone, Ge “zu Gunst geneigt,” Re “qu’on doit-servir-efficacement,” WG “als Zufriedenzustellender.” I prefer to tie it more closely with *dákṣa-* ‘skill’, as “whose skill is to be sought,” despite the awkwardness of the English gloss. In this passage Soma was just credited with skill (2b) and will later dispense it (7c; cf. also 14c), and in both I.129.2 and VII.97.8 the ability of Indra and Bṛhaspati to bring about good things is emphasized. JPB in VII.1.2 prefers “to be skillfully tended,” quite close to Re’s rendering above. This latter tr. would work for Agni (II.4.3, VII.1.2), who requires ritual tending, but less well for Indra, Bṛhaspati, and (here) Aryaman.

I.91.4: The perennially difficult *dhāman-*, found also in 3b, is a bit difficult to interpret here as well. In both 3b and 4ab, the *dhāman-* appear to be concrete and locatable in space, for which the tr. ‘domain(s)’ fits well (cf. also WG “Stätten”). But then in cd Soma is urged to accept our oblations with them, which seems difficult to do with a place and edges closer to Ge’s “Formen,” a nebulous and all-purpose rendering that I try to avoid with this word. Re’s “structures” doesn’t help either. I must assume that “accept with all your (domains)” is a compressed way of saying “wherever you are, accept.” The same problem is found, to some extent, in vs. 19.

I.91.6: A good example of subordinating *ca*.

I.91.7: As Ge and Re both point out, the dat. *yūne* ‘youth’ in b suggests that the parallel *mahé* in a refers specifically to an adult.

I.91.10: I take the pf. part. *jujuṣānāḥ* as expressing an action anterior to that of the main verb, impv. *upāgahi*. If this is correct, the verse is constructed chiasmatically, with *imām yajñām* construed with *upāgahi*, while the call that precedes Soma’s arrival at the sacrifice is nested in between (*idām váco, jujuṣānāḥ*).

I.91.11–12: The two alliterative root noun compounds *vacovíd-* (11b) and *vasuvíd-* (12b) nonetheless contain the two synchronically separate roots, ‘know’ and ‘find’.

I.91.14: Although it is tempting to take *dákṣa-* as adjectival here (so Ge, WG), I am somewhat dubious that this stem can be an adjective, and in any case the emphasis on the skill associated with Soma in this hymn (vss. 2b, 3d, 7c) suggests a nominal reading here. Although the pairing of an abstract quality (skill) with an animate being (poet) might seem awkward, I see it as a variant reprise of 2ab, where *krātu-* (‘intention’) and *dákṣa-* were paired; as discussed ad I.2.7–9, *krātu-* and *dákṣa-* are two of the three qualities required to bring an action about and are regularly

associated. Here *kaví-* stands in for *krátu-*. This substitution is enabled by the syntagm “the poet’s *krátu-*, as in the cmpd. *kaví-kratu-*. (Re’s interpr. is similar; see his n.)

I.91.19: Here again, as in vs. 4, the *dhāmāni* of Soma are recipients of the oblation; Ge’s Formen again works more smoothly, but I still consider these to be the locales listed in 4ab, each of which can be a site of sacrifice.

Note the disharmony in number between the neut. pl. subj. (*tā viśvā*) and the sg. pred. nom. (*paribhūḥ*) and verb (*astu*). This could be an example of the inherited construction of neuter pl. with a singular verb, but I think it’s more likely just a constructio ad sensum, with “all these” summarizing the plural subjects of the rel. cl. as if in a mass. English “all this” can be similarly used, after a listing of discrete entities. The Sanskrit has just been more punctilious about maintaining number agreement.

Ge, Re, WG all supply ‘lifetime’ as the implicit object of *pratāraṇaḥ*, rather than my ‘us’; they are most likely correct, given how common the idiom *āyus- prá √ tī* is. I might change the publ. tr. to “lengthening (our lifetime).”

I.91.20: Ge (/WG) takes the final phrase of *d yó dādāśad asmai* as expressing the indirect object with *dadāti* in b (“gives [to him,] who ...”), rather than as a qualification of *vīrām* (or even of *pitṛ-*, as Re almost seems to). I think this is correct, but it is mildly disturbing that there is no overt expression of the dative recipient in the main clause; we would expect *tāsmāi* (see Ge’s n. 20d). It may have been gapped because of the *asmai* in the rel. clause. Note that *asmai* cannot be a part of the main clause and refer to the indirect object, the man who does pious service, because it is unaccented; it must be part of the rel. cl. and refer to Soma.

I.91.21: This verse plays a minor syntactic trick. It consists of a string of acc. sg. masc. qualifiers; since the previous vs. also consists largely of an acc. sg. masc. NP headed by *vīrām*, the audience would be likely to assume that the new series of grammatically matching adjectives are also qualifiers of *vīrām*, esp. since this type of syntactic dependence between verses is not uncommon in the RV. It is only when we arrive at the middle of the final pāda that we encounter *tvām* and discover that the accusatives of *this* verse refer to Soma, not to the hero he gives us in 22.

Ge accounts for the curious hapax *bhareṣu-jā-* ‘born at raids’ by the fact that soma is especially offered before battle. This is probably correct, though the semantics could be tighter. Scar essentially accepts this explanation and cites III.51.8 (of soma) *jātām ... mahé bhārāya*, though he explores some other possibilities as well.

I.91.23: In the phrase *devéna ... mánasā* we again confront a noun (*devá-*) that seems to be used adjectivally (see vs. 14 above). I have half given in to this temptation, with “god(like).”

The verb *ā tanat* in c poses some difficulties in interpretation. Surprisingly, none of the standard tr. who discuss the phrase notes that the same lexeme (*ā √ tan*) appears in the previous verse (22c) in the same metrical position and in a common, almost clichéd usage. I think that *ā tanat* here is a slangy expression, deliberately contrasting with the high-style cosmic-description usage of *ā tatantha* in 22. I take the subject to be the wealth (or share of wealth) of b, rather than the *mānas-* of a, as Ge (/WG) take it, nor would I following Re in taking it as an impersonal construction.

It is not entirely clear who the “both” are in d: Ge singers and patrons, Re men and gods.

Ge supplies ‘path’ with *prā cikitsā* (“sei ... der Pfadfinder”) on the basis of IV.47.20. This is possible, and might even be supported by the *panthām* in vs. 1, since *prā cikitsā* seems to form a slight ring with *prā cikitaḥ* in 1a. However, the verb does not need an object, in my opinion; the desiderative here can express a general intention to be alertly perceptive.

I.92 Dawn

As indicated in the publ. intro., vss. 1–4 and 5–8 appear to be parallel hymns, the first with multiple Dawns, the second with just one.

I.92.1: In pāda a my tr. differs slightly from the standard ones. I suggest that the dawns have transformed themselves into a beacon, while in the standard interpr. they have created/manufactured a beacon for themselves.

In b following Proferes 2003 (JAOS 123, pp. 330-31), I suggest, on the basis of the fuller expression in the parallel verse 5c, that their “beam” is being anointed like the sacrificial post (*svāru-*) at a ritual.

In c the poet exploits the syntactic ambiguity of the middle participle *niṣkr̥ṇvānā-*. In the frame he takes it as a reflexive, “presenting themselves,” but in the simile it is transitive “presenting arms.” The middle voice is still justified, however, because the weapons belong to the subjects of the participle.

I.92.3: The standard tr. are in agreement that *ārcanti* only means “they sing” here and that the meaning ‘shine’ for this verb stem is dubious. This judgment seems short-sighted and unresponsive to the poetics of this hymn, and even if ‘shine’ is not the normal sense of *ārca-*, the nominal derivatives like *arcí(s)-* ‘ray, flame’ (see *arcís-* in 5a) would allow a ‘shine’ sense under the proper circumstances. And these *are* the proper circumstances. This verse-initial verb, following on two verses describing the color, brightness, and beams of the dawns, would most naturally be interpreted with a ‘shine’ sense. The simile that follows, involving women at work, would then cause the audience to rethink this assumption, producing the interpretation ‘sing’, with the women singing work songs at their labors. But ‘sing’ makes little sense for the frame of the passage: do dawns ‘sing’? While ‘shine’ makes little sense for the simile: do working women ‘shine’? As in 1c the poet uses the ambiguity of the verbal pivot to craft two incompatible but verbally impeccable pictures, but this time he relies not on syntactic ambiguity as in 1c but synonymity -- a pun on the verbal root underlying

the verb form. The pun may be even cleverer than so far presented. Although the primary sense of *árcanti* for the dawns should be ‘shine’, it is possible that there is a secondary sense ‘sing’, in that birds begin to sing at dawn and the ritual recitation also begins at that time. Similarly, although ‘sing’ should be the primary sense for the women in the simile, they may also be said to shine if they are glistening with sweat from their labors. (Recall the old expression “men sweat, but women ‘glow.’”) It should be noted that Ludwig thought the verb was “doppelsinnig” (see Ge n. 3a).

I.92.4: *bárjaha-* in b is a hapax, but related to dual *barjahyè* in AV XI.8.14 in a list of body parts, found between the ribs and the sides. Whitney/Lanman tr. ‘nipples’ there. The consensus tr. ‘udder’ seems reasonable, esp. on the assumption that *usrā* ‘ruddy’ designates a cow. However, the purport of the simile is a little unclear. Since cows don’t wear clothes, their udders are not covered to begin with and uncovering is unnecessary. Ge suggests that the simile is proleptic: Dawn’s breast becomes as visible as a cow’s full udder, but this interpretation requires that the verb (‘uncovers’) that should mediate between frame and simile has been semantically elided.

The simile in d is similarly “off,” since cows don’t have the capacity to open their own pens. Macdonell (*Hymns from the Rigveda*, 1922) tr. “as when cows break from their stalls,” which makes more sense, but again misrepresents the pivotal verb.

I.92.5: As noted before, vs. 5 seems to match vs. 1 and begin a new hymn parallel to vss. 1-4, but adapted for a single dawn, not the multiples in vs. 1. The return of the words *bhānū-* ‘beam’ and $\sqrt{a}ñj$ ‘anoint’ (1b) is particularly salient, as also $\sqrt{s}ri$ (2d), $\sqrt{a}rc$ (3a), and *pésas-* (4a).

The poet produces yet another complication of simile structure in cd. The Daughter of Heaven in d is clearly the subject of the clause, but the simile occupying c has a participle in the masc. nom. sg., *añján*, which cannot modify the grammatical subject. We must here supply a masculine ritual officiant, who is propping up and anointing the sacrificial post, as Dawn props up and anoints her beam. (Note that *bhānūm* served as object of both verbs in the earlier parts of the hymn: 1b *bhānūm añjate*, 2d *bhānūm ... aśíśrayuḥ*.) The two distinct objects in simile and frame are mediated by the word *pésas-*, which is appropriate to both. Dawn has just donned her own *pésāmsi* in 4a, but *pésas-* can also be used of ritual paraphernalia -- e.g., the pressing stones, which are called *adhvarásya pésaḥ* at VII.42.1.

I.92.6: *vayúnā kṛṇoti* reprises *ákran ... vayúnāni* in 2c.

I.92.8: ‘Forelock’ for *pravarga-* may seem slightly flippant, but I wanted to capture the ‘twist’ sense of *prá* $\sqrt{v}rj$, in contrast to the anodyne ‘having slaves at the front’ found in the other tr.

The final *brhántam* of d obviously refers back to the *rayím* so carefully detailed in ab, but is separated from that phrase by a considerable amount of material.

Rather than making it a long-delayed part of that NP I have taken it as a pseudo-goal with *vibhāsi*, with *vāja-prasūtā* giving grounds for that goal.

I.92.8–9: *vibhāsi* (8c) and *vī bhāti* (9b) should have been rendered with the same English verb, either “radiate” or “shine.” I would now change the publ. tr., to ‘radiate’ in both cases.

I.92.9: Unfortunately it is not possible to render the three fronted forms of *viśva-* (pādas a, c, d) in non-awkward English.

cákṣuḥ in b can be either nom. or acc. Most tr. take it as the latter, with Dawn facing either the eye(s) of, presumably, humans (so Ge [/WG], Re) or the eye of the sun (so Macdonell [*Hymns from the Rigveda*], Maurer). The latter is unlikely on pragmatic grounds: although the eye of the sun is a standard trope in the RV (see in fact 11d), the sun rises after dawn, and Dawn surely wouldn’t be looking behind her, to the east. The former is certainly possible, but I prefer to take *cákṣuḥ* as nominative, referring to Dawn as an eye, since she has just been said to oversee (*abhicákṣyā*) all creatures.

I’m not entirely sure what pāda d refers to, but perhaps it means that by dawning she has stimulated ritual speech and therefore “finds” it.

I.92.12: This last verse of the trimeter portion of the hymn plays more tricks with simile structure. In pāda a *prathānā* functions like *niṣkṛṇvānā* in 1c; that is, it has both reflexive and transitive values. In the frame it is reflexive (“spreading herself”), in my view, though Ge, Re, Macd., Maurer all supply “rays” as the object, on no contextual grounds. (However, Ge does allow for the reflexive possibility in his notes 12a, 1c.) In the simile *paśūn* is the object; the assumed subject might be “cowherd” or the like (so tentatively Re). But the simile is quite appropriate to Dawn for two reasons: first, it is often said that livestock go out to pasture at dawn and return to the fold at night; second, the rays of Dawn are often referred to as cows (see in fact vs. 2 above), and though I don’t think the stem *paśú-* is so used, it inhabits the same semantic space as the more usual terms that participate in this metaphor.

The second simile, *síndhur ná kṣódaḥ* in b, is taken by Ge, Re, Macd., Maurer with the verb of b, *vy àsvait*. Because this verb ‘whitened’ is intransitive, this requires either taking *kṣódaḥ* adverbially (Re “comme le fleuve (en son) remous”) or construing *síndhuḥ ... kṣódaḥ* as a loose compound (Ge “wie die Stromflot”). Although either is possible, the syntactic difficulties disappear if the simile falls within the verbal domain of *prathānā*, “like a river spreading its surge.” Given this poet’s particular delight in manipulating similes, it is entirely in character to end this section of the hymn with a triple play.

WG interpret the similes more or less as I do.

Pāda c is structurally parallel with 11c, using the same verb *mī* ‘diminish, belittle’, though here in the negative (11c *praminatī*, 12c *áminatī*), both playing off *āminānā* in 10c.

I.92.14: The tr. “rich in ... / richly...” implies that there is an etymological connection between *gomati*, *áśvāvati* and *revát*, which of course there is not. But “possessing cows and horses” seems too flat.

I.92.15: The *hí* + imperative followed by *áthā* + imperative is the same structure as I.10.3; see the commentary thereon.

I.92.16: $\sqrt{yā}$ is the usual verb that governs *vártis-* (I.34.4, I.116.18, etc. etc.), and I supply a form of it here.

The publ. tr. implies that *sámanasā* is a vocative, but, by its accent, it’s a nominative and would better be tr. “as like-minded ones.”

I.92.17: Gautama’s penchant for clever exploitation of syntactic possibilities returns in this verse, after a series of unremarkable Uṣṇih verses (13–16). The verb in b, *cakráthuh*, by my interpretation takes two different types of predicates and exhibits slightly different root meanings: in pāda a “make your call to heaven,” that is, make the call reach heaven; in b “make, i.e., create, light.” I am in agreement with the standard tr. of pāda b, but diverge from them in a, where Ge (/WG) supply a separate verb (“erhebt”) to govern *ślókam* and interpret *ā diváh* temporally (“zu dieser Stunde des Tages”), not spatially. Although *ā diváh* is sometimes used temporally (e.g., in the expression *trír ā diváh*), I take the *ā* here in the meaning “all the way to” (Gr’s “Praep. mit folgendem Abl. ... *bis an, bis hin* (räumlich)”). This usage of *ā* was prepared for in the immediately preceding vs., 16a *asmád ā* “all the way to us” (though in opposite order). For a closely parallel expression, in a Dawn hymn, cf. III.61.4 *ántād* [i.e., *ā antād*] *diváh* ... *ā pṛthivyāh* “all the way to the end of heaven and of earth.” For the *ślōka-* reaching heaven, cf. I.83.6, 190.4, and for *ślókam* as object of \sqrt{kr} , IV.53.3.

I.93 Agni and Soma

I.93.1: The expression in d *bhávatom ... máyaḥ* echoes the compound in the final verse of the immediately preceding hymn *mahobhúvā* (I.92.18) -- both dual, though applying to different divine pairs, the Áśvins (I.92.18) and Agni and Soma (here). It is possible that this final hymn of the Gautama sequence, with its unique dedication to Agni and Soma (see publ. intro.), was attached just here because of the duplication of phraseology. This connection would be clearer in the publ. tr. if they were tr. in the same way. I would therefore change “become refreshment” to “become joy” in this verse.

I.93.3: On the case frame of $\sqrt{dās}$ here, see comm. ad VI.16.31.

I.93.4: As noted in the publ. intro., Bṛsaya, with his very non-Indo-Aryan name, and the destruction of his offspring are found elsewhere only in VI.61.3, a hymn devoted to Sarasvatī. The theft of the provender (*avasá-*) from the niggard (*pañí-*) is also

found in that hymn, in vs. 1. The connection between the two hymns to different gods, found in different parts of the Saṃhitā, is not clear to me, but the strong similarity of the passages at least that Bṛṣaya is a *paṇí-*.

I.93.5: Pāda b contains an inverse *vāyav indraś ca* construction: *agníś ca soma*.

I.93.7: The three imperatives in b, *vītám háryatam ... juṣéthām*, all belong to roots that ordinarily take accusatives, yet all must be construed with the fronted gen. *haviṣaḥ prásthitasya* in pāda a. I don't quite understand the case syntax, but assume that these three verbs have been lumped together generically as verbs of consumption and enjoyment, for which gen. complements are often possible.

In *c bhūtám* can be either imperative or injunctive and is taken as injunctive in the published translation (as also by Ge and Re). However, since the immediately preceding hymn contains the clausal diptych *hí + imperative*, followed by *áthā + imperative*, exactly matching the structure here, I now think it would be better to interpret *bhūtám* as impv. here as well: “Become providers ..., then establish ...” (So WG.) An imperative interpretation also works better with the three abrupt imperatives that precede in b.

I.93.8: *saparyāt* in b echoes *saparyāti* in 2b, but displays the more usual case frame: acc. (god) + instr. (means of service). The instance in 2b takes acc. (means of service) + dat. (god), which is only otherwise found at X.37.1. The occurrence in this verse thus functions as a species of poetic repair.

I.93.9: The purport of the final pāda isn't clear to me, but it may indirectly comment on the unusual nature of the joint dedication of the hymn to these two gods.

I.93.10: *dāśati* echoes *dāśāt* in 3b.

I.93.10–11: 2nd du. *dīdayatam* (10c) and *jujoṣatam* (11b) are somewhat problematic forms. They belong to redupl. thematic stems; other forms to these stems are subjunctives to the perfect. However, they have secondary endings, and the act. 2nd and 3rd du. subjunctive endings should be primary. Lub identifies them as impvs. (Gr also *jujoṣatam*); Kü (35) treats them as “hybrids” -- morphologically belonging to the subjunctive but functioning as imperatives. They differ from some other secondarily thematized pf. impvs. in having full grade of the root syllable, like the subjunctive (versus zero-grade in *pīpyatam* \sqrt{pi} , $\sqrt{vāvrdhásva}$ \sqrt{vrdh} , etc. -- but cf. *pīpráyasva* $\sqrt{prī}$). In the publ. tr. they are treated as subjunctives (“you will shine,” “you will enjoy”), but they would might be better rendered as imperatives. For further disc. of such forms, see my forthcoming article on the perfect imperative.

I.94 Agni

I.94.1: BR corrected *sám mahema* to *sám ahema* ‘we would bind together’ to \sqrt{nah} , an emendation accepted by Gr, Ge, Old (tentatively), KEWA I.153. Although I also accepted it in Jamison 1983: 87, I now follow Gotō (1987: 243; accepted in EWA s.v.) in seeing it as a form of \sqrt{mah} ‘bring about’, etymologically separate from \sqrt{mah} ‘magnify’. Although I do not like multiplying entities, Gotō’s etymological connections look reasonable; an interpretation with ‘make great’ is difficult; and a thematic pres. or aor. stem *aha-* to \sqrt{nah} does not exist and the zero-grade (<**ñh*) that would have to underlie it is not otherwise found to \sqrt{nah} .

I.94.2: *yásmai* \sqrt{yaj} presents the classic parasmaipada configuration: “sacrifice for someone else,” but *āyájase* is resolutely middle. I do not have a good explanation for this beyond the fact that the functional distinction between act. *yájati* and mid. *yájate* is not well developed in the RV, esp. with preverb *ā*, and also that Agni, the subject, is essentially sacrificing to himself.

Although act. *sādhati* can be transitive (and WG so tr. it), it also has intransitive/absolute uses (cf. the same tag in VI.70.3). Moreover, in this hymn *sādháyati* (3a, 4c) serves as the transitive counterpart; the poet seems to have constructed an *-ati* / *-áyati* Grundverb/Kaus. relationship.

I.94.3: A choppy series of clauses, five in the first three pādas, with only the last dependent in any way on another.

I.94.5: *gopā(h)* in pāda a can be either sg. or pl. All the standard tr. take it as the former, referring to Agni, but this makes grammatical difficulties. Ge interprets the following *asya* as a word-haplology for **asy* **asyá*, thereby getting the 2nd sg. copula but gratuitously accenting the pronoun. Old reads **asy* for *asya* and suggests accenting **cáranti*. Re takes *visām gopā(h)* as a 3rd sg. expression (“Agni est ...”) and seems to leave the following text alone. But all such tr. must introduce an accent on whatever word they think follows the short initial clause, since, as it stands, two unaccented words, *asya caranti*, would open that clause. These difficulties can be avoided by interpreting *gopāh* as plural, subject of *caranti* and coreferential with *jantávaḥ*. Pl. *gopā-* is elsewhere used of Agni’s sidekicks, presumably his flames, in VI.8.7. Though it is true that this same expression *visām gopā(h)* is found two hymns later (I.96.4) as an undoubted singular referring to Agni, the grammatical complications resulting from taking it as a singular here outweigh that argument for me.

Most tr. take the two-footed and four-footed as appositional to *jantávaḥ* and therefore as those who roam by night. This is contrary to the usual RVic vision of the creatures settling down at night. Agni’s flames make more sense as the roamers, evoking the flickering firelight that provides nightly illumination. The flames are called “herdsmen” because people and animals gather around the fire then, like a flock. This interpretation does raise the question of how to construe the nom. case of that expression *dvipác ca yád utá cátuṣpat*. I take it as a definitional relative clause expanding on *visām* (so also Old). The *ca ... utá* is a mix of two “both ... and”

constructions: *X ca Y ca* and *utá X utá Y*, with the first half of the conjoined NP fronted around the subordinating *yád*. This construction is very similar to 9b *dūré vā yé ánti vā ké cid*, complete with the fronted first element.

The etymological relationship between *citráḥ* and *praketáḥ* in c is not easily rendered in English.

I.94.10: All standard tr. take b *vṛṣabhásyeva te rávaḥ* as the main cl. to the *yád* cl. beginning in a, while I take it as a part of that *yád* cl. There is no way to tell, since the second cl. lacks a verb whose accent or lack thereof would settle the matter. There are also no semantic implications; I weakly prefer mine because of the fairly emphatic *ād* ‘then, just after that’ beginning the second hemistich.

All tr. take *vanínaḥ* as ‘trees’ (lit. ‘possessing wood’). This is doubtless the primary sense here, since this sequence of vss. describes a forest fire, but ‘winners’ is also possible, since the metaphorical context is that of a chariot race; see esp. 10a, 11c.

I.94.11: I supply ‘makes’ on the basis of 9c *sugám kṛdhi*, though strictly speaking “that is an easy way” is perfectly acceptable.

tāvaká-, the vṛddhi derivative of the genitive of the 2nd ps. pronoun, enlarged with *-ka-*, is a striking form, though exactly what special effect it is aiming at is unclear. For the use of *-ka-* in pronominal derivatives, see Jamison 2009 (IIJ 52). As discussed there, the *-ka-* tends to signal a lower register or slangy tone.

I.94.12: Most tr. take Mitra and Varuṇa as the objects of *dhāyase*: approx. “Agni is for the suckling of Mitra and Varuṇa.” But Agni is the one more likely in need of suckling (that is, feeding the fire); cf., e.g., II.5.7. In particular, in the next hymn, I.95.1, Agni is the object of the transitive/causative *dhāpayete*. I therefore take the gen. *mitrásya váruṇasya* as dependent on *héḷaḥ* in b, parallel to *marútām*. *héḷa(s)-* is characteristic of Varuṇa (cf. I.24.14, VII.84.2; in VII.62.4 Mitra is included).

avayātām is the problem in the second pāda. Most tr. take it as a 3rd sg. imperative (e.g., Re “qu’il exorcise”), but if so, it must be a *middle* root pres. imperative, and there are no middle forms to this root $\sqrt{yā}$ (as opposed to $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘implore’). There is also the problem that the form should not be accented on the stem but on the preverb (**áva yātām*; see Ge n. 12b). Lub appears to take it as a gen. pl. of the act. part. to the root pres., but in the absence of a tr. it is hard to know how he would interpret it in context. Best to follow Old (who follows BR) in emending to **avayātā*, the nom. sg. agent noun. Re is tempted by this reading, save for the fact that with the acc. complement *héḷaḥ* we should expect the accent *ávayātā*. However, the “rule” about the case of complements to agent nouns is broken so often that this objection is not cogent. The final *-m* could have been acquired from the following *marútām* (so Old), and since $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘drive’ is a characteristic Marut verb and a genuine example of the gen. pl. part. *yātām* is used of the Maruts in the refrain V.55.1–9, it may have been rhetorically natural to transform the agent noun into this participle.

I.94.13: Both a and b turn on interpreting one word as both an appellative and a proper name: *mitráḥ* in a, *vásuḥ* in b, though they occupy different places in the parallel structures.

I.94.15–16: The meter here changes to Triṣṭubh, and the intra-hymnic refrain is dropped. The 2nd hemistich of vs. 16 contains the first example in the Saṃhitā of the Kutsa refrain.

I.94.15: Contra standard tr., I do not take *anāgástvam* as the obj. of *dádāśaḥ*, since $\sqrt{dās}$ seldom takes an object that is not a god, and when it does, it is a ritual offering. Instead I take it as belonging to a parallel nominal clause, still in the domain of *yásmai*.

The final phrase that is the ostensible main clause, *té syāma* “might we be they,” violates number agreement: pl. *té* cannot properly pick up sg. *yásmai*. This is a variant of a common tag and feels tacked on.

I.94.16: Because *sá* with 2nd ps. reference is restricted by rule to imperatives (see Jamison 1992 [HS 105]), ab must be a single clause, *pace* Ge.

I.95 Agni

I.95.1: Ge suggests that the sun is referred to in c, Agni in d. But it seems more likely that Agni is the referent of both (or at least the first referent: since Agni = Sun is a common identification, there may be secondary association), and the point is simply that fire looks different in the daylight from at night.

I.95.3: The riddles in this verse have given rise to much more speculation than can be covered here. In the first hemistich the major question is whether the three births of pāda a (*trīṇi jānā*) are matched by three birth locations in b or only two. That there are three locatives (*samudré ... diví ... apsú*) might support the first view; that there are only two *ékam*’s the second. Despite their polarized positions in the pāda, I believe that *samudré ... apsú* refer to one place of birth, *diví* to another. X.45.3, where *samudré ... apsú* is one place of kindling (pāda a), *diváḥ ... ūdhan* a second (b), and a third is referred to in cd, supports the two-locale view. This then allows the third birth to be the ritual kindling described in the first vss. of the hymn, while very tentatively we might identify the birth in waters as that of Apāṃ Napāt and that in heaven as that of the sun. The three births can also refer to the three ritual fires, and that notion is taken up obliquely in the second half of the verse, in my opinion.

The second hemistich describes the carrying of the kindled fire to the east end of the ritual ground, to become the Āhavanīya fire (not so called in the RV, but clearly referred to often in the text). This pacing out of the ritual ground also establishes the other ordered elements in the ritual, hence the VPs of pāda d. Gr and Old both read **pradísam* for *prá dísam*, as also in IV.29.3. I am not certain that that change is necessary here, though interrupting the *pūrvam ánu ... dísam* phrase with

the preverb is somewhat disturbing (though note that *prá* immediately follows the caesura).

I.95.4: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. describes the kindling of the fire in typically enigmatic fashion, with multiple referents possible for each entity. (See the various tr. and comm. for disc.) It also contains in pāda b a version of the beloved paradox in which the child gives birth to his parents, though in this particular case I am uncertain what exactly is meant. The *janayata* in 4b picks up the *janayanta* in 2a, but with the subject and object reversed: in 2a the ten (fingers) begat the infant (fire); here the calf (fire) begets his mothers. On the basis of the echoing of 2a, I assume that the mothers here are the fingers, though waters are also a popular suggestion -- one that does not fit the ritual context, in my opinion. The hard-working women in c are probably also the fingers, though kindling sticks are also possible, esp. on the basis of 5b.

svadhā(-van)- is a signature word of this part of the hymn: 1c, 4b, 4d.

I.95.5: The hymn began with unnamed dual feminines attending to the young fire; this verse also contains unnamed dual feminines in the same role. But the identities of the two pairs are different: Night and Dawn in 1, the world-halves in 5cd, 6a.

Note the word play of *pratīcī ... prāti*, with slightly different meanings.

I.95.5–6: The caus. (*prāti*) *joṣayete* in 5d, 6a literally means “they two cause (him) to take pleasure (in themselves),” but this tr. seems too heavy, esp. in adjacent pādas.

I.95.6: The position of simile-marking *ná* is aberrant, preceding the simile’s noun *méne* and following the verb. Since the full simile is *bhadré ... ná méne*, it seems that this syntagm was distracted in some fashion, with the verb placed in its middle. On *méne* see I.62.7.

The etymological figure in c, *dákṣāṇām dákṣapatīḥ* “skill-lord of skills,” then participates in a phonological figure with semantically distinct *dakṣiṇatáḥ* “from the right (/south)” in d.

I.95.7: I take the first half-verse as a description of fire both sending its flames upwards and stretching out horizontally. Most tr. interpret *yatate* in b as transitive (e.g., Ge “er eifert beide Heeresreihen an”), but the medial forms of this pres. stem are intransitive or reflexive. I instead take *ubhé sícau* as an acc. of extent and assume that it refers to the seams between the two world-halves found in vss. 5–6. With these two halves, heaven and earth, meeting at the horizon, as it were, the seams between them would stretch horizontally.

The “new clothes” he leaves for his mothers in d are probably the ashes that fall on the kindling wood as he burns it.

I.95.8: The first three pādas of this verse sounds very somian: the cows [=milk] and the waters of b are the standard ritual substances mixed with soma in the IXth

Maṇḍala; the beginning of a, *tveṣám rūpám kṛṇute*, is also found in a soma hymn, IX.71.8; and \sqrt{mrj} ‘wipe, groom’ in c is a signature soma verb. This may be an example of the covert equation of the two ritual gods, Agni and Soma. Pāda a is easily interpreted in an Agni context; b makes more difficulties: the cows can here be the ghee poured into the fire (which could cause the creation of an “even higher” form in a), but the waters would obviously have a diminishing effect on the fire if it actually “mingles” with them. Ge (n. 8b) suggests that the vedi is being sprinkled with water, but that’s not what the text says. I think better to assume that this is an incompletely adapted somian description.

Pāda c has caused interpretational difficulties, in particular because of the apparent equation of the poet (*kavīh*) and the insight (*dhīh*), both nominative and both apparent subjects of *marmṛjyate*. Ge takes them as conjoined nouns with suppressed conjunction, “the poet (and) his thought,” which are both tending to the Unterlage of Agni. This is not a bad solution, but it assumes that the *kavī-* is the human poet. Since Agni was identified as a “great poet” (*mahān kavīh*) in 4d, it’s desirable to maintain this identification if at all possible. Another solution is to take *dhīh* as a separate nominal clause, as Re does (“il est la Vision-poétique”). He takes the referent of both *kavīh* and *dhīh* to be Agni. WG seem to take *dhīh* as the object of the verb, though without comment. This is presumably inspired by the fact that acc. pl. *dhiyáḥ* does elsewhere serve as object to *marmṛjyáte* (IX.47.4). However, making *dhīh* into an acc. pl. is grammatically difficult (though, I suppose, not impossible).

My solution involves reading the intensive *marmṛjyate* simultaneously in two syntactically different ways, both of which are paralleled elsewhere in the RV. The stem *marmṛjyáte* is one of the new-style *-yáte* intensives, which have medial inflection and passive accent even if they have active semantics and pattern with active stems in their averbo. See, for example, IX.47.4 just cited. (On this type and its origin, see Jamison 1983 [MSS 42: 41–73].) Thus, the poet can be stroking the *budhnám* in this transitive interpretation, like the many active forms of this root including the act. athem. intensive *mármṛj-*. But several instances of medial *marmṛjyá-* have the passive value the morphology implies (e.g., IX.62.13 *marmṛjyámāna āyúbhiḥ*, of soma), and I take *dhīh* as the subject of the verb read this time as a passive. This syntactic pun might be clearer in the publ. tr. if the same word had been used for both readings; better might be “... keeps stroking ... is being stroked,” though ‘groom’ is actually better with the insight as subject.

I.95.9: Ge (/WG) assume that pāda a treats the Paryagnikaraṇa or the ritual act of circling around an object with a firebrand, but *jráyah* ‘expanse, expansion’ seems to me rather to depict the horizontal spread of the fire out from its original kindling place.

I.95.10: In pāda a *srótaḥ* can be either nominative, as appositive to the underlying subject Agni, or accusative, an object parallel to *gātúm ūrmím*. I chose the second alternative, contra Ge / Re, but either is possible and the meaning is virtually identical.

I.95.11: *revát* in b may be either adverbial (as I've taken it) or the object, with supplied noun, of *ví bhāhi* (so, e.g., Ge “Nun strahle ... reiches (Gut) aus”). Again either is possible and the effect is essentially the same.

I.96 Agni

The first verses of this hymn connect Agni with the semi-divine ancestors and culture heroes of the Ārya: Āyu, Manu, Vivasvant (vs. 2), Bharata (vs. 3), Mātariśvan (vs. 4).

I.96.1: Most tr. interpret *mitrám ... sādhan* as “they conclude an alliance” (so Re; Ge “Freundschaft”), but since *mitrá-* is so often a descriptor of Agni as the go-between between gods and men, I assume that Agni is the referent here as well. So also Old SBE.

I.96.2: This verse attributes primal creative power to Agni first in the ritual realm (ab), then in the cosmic realm (c). Ge (/WG) supply a different verb in c (“bescheint”), presumably because Agni is not usually credited with cosmogonic powers. But there is no contextual support for a new verb here, and in parallel clauses containing only one verb the default interpretation is to supply the same verb with the second clause. Given how much generative power is ascribed to the Vedic sacrifice, it is not surprising that Agni's ability to engender Manu's people, that is, those who sacrifice like Manu, can then be extended to his ability to beget the major cosmic features -- esp. as in this enterprise he is partially identified with the sun. Note that in 4c he is explicitly named as “the begetter of the two worlds” (*janitā ródasyoḥ*) as well as “the finder of the sun” (*svarvíd*).

I.96.3: On the Bharata fire as “the focus of worship of multiple *ārya* clans,” see Proferes 2007: 37.

Though *srprá-* receives various tr., it must be related to *sarpís-* ‘melted butter’. See EWA s.v. *sarpís-*; it has nothing to do with \sqrt{srp} ‘creep’.

I.96.4: Contrary to the standard tr., I take pāda a as containing a separate predication: in his capacity as Mātariśvan he ensures prosperity, while as Sun-finder he finds the way.

I.96.7: The full integration of the refrain into the syntactic structure of the verse is signalled by the shift from nominative reference to Agni to accusative, clear first in *kṣām* in b, since *sádanam* in a is neuter and could be in either case -- the common use of a morphologically ambiguous form as pivot.

I.96.8: With the refrain having finally been integrated into the verse in 7, it is abruptly dropped and its final and most salient word, *draviṇodā-* explodes in vs. 8.

Though *sánara-* is a hapax, ‘having superior men’ seems a fairly safe bet, esp. given semantically parallel *vīrávant-* in the next pāda. We might of course prefer **sánara-* given the init. laryngeal of the ‘man’ word, but in a nonce creation the phonological history of the 2nd member would no longer be available.

I.97 Agni

The grammatically incomplete refrain of this hymn (*ápa nah śósucad aghám* “blazing away the bad for us”) is introduced first as the first pāda of this hymn and then repeated as 1c. In that verse, the refrain’s participial construction is integrated into the verse structure, modifying the subject of the main verb *śuśugdhi* in b. This integration is not found again until vs. 6 and continues thereafter till the end of the hymn (vss. 7–8). However, the semantic distance between the verse proper and the refrain narrows as the hymn progresses. In vss. 2-3 there is no explicit mention of Agni, but in vss. 4–5 he appears, as enclitic pronoun + voc. (*te agne*) in 4 and gen. (*agnéh*) in 5, though neither is in the appropriate case to match the refrain.

I.97.1: It does not seem worthwhile to try to replicate the difference between the two reduplicated forms, the intensive participle (*śósucat*) and the perfect imperative (*śuśugdhi*) in tr. — Re’s tr. of the inten. part., “écartant-par-ton-éclat-puissant,” is a cautionary example of why. WG’s “immer wieder wegflammend” is somewhat less clunky but still gets wearisome in repetition.

I.97.3–5: These three middle verses, before the refrain becomes reintegrated into the verse, begin identically: *prá yát*, though the sense of *yát* in 3–4 differs from that in 5.

I.97.3: The referent of *bhándiṣṭha eṣām* “the most fortunate one of these” is not clear. However, since he is conjoined with “our patrons” and patrons are often conjoined with “us” (as in the next verse), referring to the poet-performers (explicitly II.2.12 *stotāraḥ ... sūrāyaś ca*), it is likely a singer or poet, perhaps even this very poet, referring to himself in the 3rd ps.

I.98 Agni

I.98.2: As noted in the publ. intro., I take this verse as an allusion to the well-known story of Agni’s disappearance and the gods’ search for him (treated in detail in X.51–53). (So also Old SBE.) However, this mythic allusion must be mediated by reference to the here-and-now, given the hope for Agni’s protection expressed in the final pāda. This mediation is perhaps signaled by pāda b, where Agni’s hiding place is identified. Instead of the waters, where Agni takes refuge in the myth, he has entered “all plants” (*viśvā oṣadhīḥ*). Agni’s hidden presence in plants, the quality that allows him to be born from them, is a standard trope in hymns treating the kindling of the ritual fire and is in fact alluded to at the end of a nearby Kutsa hymn, I.95.10d *antár návāsu carati prasūṣu* “he roams within the new, fruitful (plants).”

I.99 Agni

The only single-verse hymn in the RV, it closes Kutsa's Agni cycle. Though attributed to Kaśyapa Mārīca by the Anukramaṇī, it shows clear connections with other parts of Kutsa's Agni hymns, for which see publ. intro.