

II.1 Agni

For the rhetorical structure of the hymn, see the publ. intro.

II.1.1: The only attestation of the desiderative of $\sqrt{śuc}$ is this hapax adj. *āśusukṣāṇi-* ‘eager to blaze here’.

II.1.2: The accent on *ási* in d presumably results from its contrastive function in the *ca ... ca* construction. Curiously Old does not comment.

Note the two different words for house in *gṛhāpatiḥ ... dāme*, with the former replacing old *dāmpati-*. On these various terms for house-lord, see Jamison forthcoming.

II.1.3: HvN suggest the distracted reading *namas^fyaḥ* here and in 10a, which produces 12 syllables for the Jagatī line but a very bad cadence (4 light syllables), while reading an undistracted form produces a good Triṣṭubh line. They argue 1) that *namas^fya-* is always otherwise distracted in the RV (though it doesn’t otherwise appear in a cadence) and 2) that there are several other similar bad cadences in this hymn (*avidhat* 7d, 9c). These are good arguments, but I would still favor an undistracted *namasyàḥ* in a Triṣṭubh line.

Ge suggests that *vidhartaḥ* in d is a predicate voc. I think rather that it signals the absent middle term, the divinity with which Agni is here identified, namely Bhaga. So Old (SBE). Bhaga is identified as *vidhartár-* in VII.41.2 and is regularly associated with Puramdhi.

II.1.4: On this vs. see Thieme, Mitra and Aryaman, 83-85.

sambhújam in c is analysed by Gr as a 1st sg. subj. or injunc. (his “Co.”) to a thematic aorist and is so rendered by Ge (“von dem ich Nutzen haben möchte”), though he expresses doubts in his n. However, this aor. stem does not otherwise exist: the multiple *bhujema* forms, apparent optatives in *mā* prohibitives, are convincingly explained by Hoffmann (Injunk. 95–97) as reanalysed from an expression with the infinitive *bhujé* followed by enclitic 1st ps. pronoun. Moreover, act. forms to this root should mean ‘give pleasure’, not ‘derive pleasure’ (cf. *bhuñjati* I.48.5). Old (Noten) already disputed the verbal interpr. of *sambhújam*, and it is now generally taken as a nominal (so Thieme, Mitra and Aryaman, although in Fremdling [16 n. 2, 105] he takes it as a verb; Hoffmann, Injunk. 96 n. 197; Re; Scar 358), though WG tr. it as a verb, allowing for the nominal possibility in their n. Assuming that *sambhújam* is nominal, the problem is how to fill out the defective rel. cl. *yásya sambhújam*. Most supply a verb like “we eat” or “we expect,” e.g., Scar. “von dem ich Genuss (erwarte, o. ä).” The publ. tr. takes GEN *sambhújam* as a possessive expression: “whose common meal (it is)” → “who has a common meal,” further extended to “who offers a common meal.” I find this more satisfying syntactically than the invention of a verb, but it runs into morphological difficulty: by my tr. the

meal should be nominative, and if *sambhújam* belongs to a root noun paradigm, it can only be a masc. acc. sg. This forces me into the unhappy position of assuming a root-accented neut. thematic stem *-bhúja-*, which may be unlikely enough morphologically to persuade me to supply a verb to govern the acc.

II.1.5: Pāda a has the acc. and dat. appropriate to an expression of giving, but no verb; pāda c has the verb (*rariṣe*) but no dative of recipient. The accusatives of gift in the two pādas are formed in parallel: *suṽīr'yam* (a), *s"váśv'yam* (c). The two pādas thus complete each other rhetorically.

In b *gnāvaḥ* is morphologically incoherent. By its ending it should be vocative, but since it occupies non-initial position, its accent should preclude that. Nonetheless, with all the standard interpr. I take it as a voc. An ad hoc explanation could be concocted for its accent -- that the following voc. *mitramahaḥ* induced accent on the preceding one to support the voc. phrase -- but I think too many counter-examples could be adduced. Ge suggests a word haplogy, *gnā<h> gnāvaḥ*, but this seems unnecessary and also requires a tr. “you are (the Wives).” It is likely instead that the third term in this pāda is Tvaṣṭar from pāda a, since he is regularly associated with the Wives of the Gods, and in fact the other attestation of this voc. *gnāvaḥ* (I.15.3), correctly accented in pāda-initial position, refers to Tvaṣṭar.

As pointed out by Old (SBE) and Ge, the third term in pāda c is presumably Apām Napāt, who is elsewhere called *āśuhéman-*, including 2x in II. The *āśu-* in that compound echoes the beginning of *āśuśuksāñiḥ* in 1a, though that form is most probably formed to the desid. stem of $\sqrt{śuc}$ with preverb *ā*, since the *-ani-* suffix is rather commonly built to desiderative stems and there would be no obvious source of the *-s-* before the suffix otherwise.

II.1.6: I do not understand the cmpd *śamgayá-*. Wackernagel (AIG II.1.309) classifies it with cmpds with governing first-member prepositions, but *śám*, though uninflected, does not function like even the improper prepositions/preverbs like *áram*. He does recognize its singularity (314–15), but keeps it in this category, in which it seems out of place.

II.1.7: Pāda d has another bad cadence: *te (á)vidhat*, with 4 light syllables, assuming the normal shortening of *-e* before vowel. The same cadence is found in 9c. I would be inclined to follow HvN in seeing this irregular cadence as characteristic of this particular hymn (see also 3b, 10a), save for the fact that *ávidhat* shows a remarkable tendency to position itself in bad cadences: see II.26.4, VIII.27.15, VIII.61.9. I have no explanation for this phenomenon; I do not see a non-arbitrary way to get a heavy augment syllable.

II.1.8: Here and in 15a I take *práti* (+/- copula) + ACC. as an expression similar to *pratimāna-* + GEN, meaning ‘be a counterpart to’.

For *rñjate* here, see the fuller expression with instr. in the next hymn, II.2.5.

II.1.9: It is tempting to take *iṣṭibhiḥ* as ‘with sacrifices’, parallel to *śámyā* ‘with ritual labor’ in the next pāda. So Old (SBE), though he gave it up reluctantly in the Noten. Unfortunately ‘sacrifice’ is accented *iṣṭi-*, against *iṣṭí-* ‘desire’, and so perhaps the best one can do is suggest a secondary pun (so Scar 455). On the other hand, on the assumption that all *-tí-* stems began with suffixal accent and that the root accent found in some Vedic *-ti-* stems is secondary (see Lundquist 2015, *-ti-* stems), this may be a relic of suffix-accented **iṣṭí-* ‘sacrifice’, which has not yet undergone accent retraction. It is worth noting that root-accented *iṣṭi-* is found only in I and X.

On the cadence in 9 see remarks on 7b.

II.1.10: On the cadence in pāda a, see comm. ad 3b.

As Old (SBE) already pointed out, the first three pādas refer to the three Ṛbhūḥ and pun on their names: *ṛbhú-* ‘craftsman / Ṛbhu’ in a, *vāja-* ‘prize / Vāja’ in b, and *vī bhāsi* ‘you radiate / Vibhvan’ in c.

In c *dakṣi* is surely a *-si* impv. to \sqrt{dah} ‘burn’ and should be separated from the identical form in I.141.8, for which see the comm. ad loc. Ge, however, takes *dakṣi* here to $\sqrt{dakṣ}$.

The form *viśíkṣu-* in d is taken by Gr as belonging to the desid. of $\sqrt{śak}$ and meaning ‘gerne Gut austheilend’, which seems unacceptably distant from both the root meaning of $\sqrt{śak}$ and the function of the desiderative. Moreover, $\sqrt{śak}$ is not otherwise attested with *vī* except, supposedly, in the similar form *vī śikṣa* IV.35.3 (for which see below). Ge tr. “du bist der Prüfer,” Re “tu es celui que si met à l’oeuvre diversement”; neither discusses the form or its root affiliation, and one can only assume they follow the assignment to $\sqrt{śak}$, though exactly how is unclear. Old (SBE) suggested an appealing alternative, interpreting it as built to the desid. of $\sqrt{śas}$ ‘cut’, which is primarily found with *vī* -- an idea I find eminently worthy of revival. This may also be the view of WG, who tr. “Du bist williger Verteiler,” again without disc., so they may in fact simply reproduce Gr’s understanding of the semantics. Old does not sketch out the morphology, but it presumably rests on **śi-śs-su-*, with zero-grade root and simplification of the medial sibilant cluster *śss* arising from the two radical sibilants and the desiderative suffix. The finite verb *vī śikṣa* in IV.35.3 (also a Ṛbhūḥ context) belongs here as well. Heenen (Desid., 232-33) mentions this possibility though without great enthusiasm (“La possibilité ... n’est pas exclue”).

The publ. tr. “seek to carve up and to stretch out the sacrifice” implies that *ātāniḥ* is desiderative. This was not meant, and the tr. should perhaps be emended to “seek to carve up the sacrifice, as the one who stretches it out” or “... as you stretch it out.”

II.1.13: The relevant construction in d is probably *tvé ... āhutam* “poured into you,” as it is in the even further distracted identical phrase in 14ab. The tr. of 13d should be corrected to “the gods eat the oblation poured into you.”

II.1.14: The first half-verse is simply a rather crudely exploded version of 13d (also found in I.94.3), with *tvé* moved to front of first pāda and the second pāda otherwise intact. See Bloomfield's withering scorn.

II.1.15: On *prāti ... asi*, see comm. ad 8d. As far as I can determine, this is the only occurrence of *sám √as* in the RV and, rather than meaning something like 'be together', it seems to have an idiomatic meaning like *prāti + ACC*, 'be equal to' (as if to *samá-* vel sim.).

On the word order in pāda c, see comm. ad VI.15.14.

II.1.16: I do not understand the function or position of *hí*, though the latter question is more tractable.

II.2 Agni

One curious feature of this hymn is that it is the home to the densest cluster of *uśás-* occurrences in II (vss. 2, 7, 8); the word is otherwise pretty rare in this maṇḍala, and there are no Dawn hymns in it. The focus on Agni's likeness to the sun probably accounts for this. This likeness is hinted at first in the adj. *svàṛṇara-* 'possessing solar glory' in 1c. This adj. is echoed by three occurrences of the simile *svàṛ ṇá* "like the sun" (7d, 8b, 10d), where the simile particle *ṇá* (with close sandhi retroflexion as always after *svàṛ*), though having nothing to do with the *-ṇa-* in the adjective, reproduces it phonologically.

Another notable feature of the hymn is the fact that the stem *citáya-*, which occurs three times (4c, 5d, 10b), in all three cases must be read doubly, as 'appear' in one construction in the passage and as 'perceive' in another construction in the same passage.

II.2.2: Ge (/WG) take *náktīr uśásaḥ* as acc. of extent of time, supplying as subj. either prayers or priests. With Old (SBE and Noten) and Re, I take the phrase as subject in the publ. tr. This means that *uśásaḥ* must be taken as a nom. (for *uśásaḥ*), rather than the acc. it was historically -- but this is common in the RV. On reflection I wonder if Ge is right: the 2nd hemistich contains two examples of acc. of extent of time (*mānuṣā yugā* and *kṣápaḥ*), and there is also one in 8a, *uśáso rāmyāḥ*, that is very similar to the phrasing here. If the phrase is interpr. as acc., the subject to be supplied would presumably be the same as the 2nd pl. addressees of 1ab, namely the priestly officiants. So I suggest an alt. tr. "Through the dawns and the nights they [=priests] bellow towards you ..."

In addition the pf. *vavāsīre* might better be rendered as a habitual pres. '(constantly) bellow'.

II.2.3: The gerundive *védya-* in c is universally assigned to *√vid* 'know' (e.g., Ge 'allbekannt', Re '(re)connaissable'), but surely the Vedic Indians would be more anxious to acquire a chariot (*√vid* 'find, acquire') than simply to recognize it! Agni is found with the same simile in VIII.84.1.

II.2.4: A difficult vs. with multiple interpretations, which I will not treat in detail. The difficulties of the vs. arise in part from the fact that it can apply to both the ritual fire and the sun. Note that in contrast to the first three vss. the word *agní-* does not appear in this vs., which absence licenses the double reference. This double reference begins, and is least obscure, in the first pāda, where the entity in question (*tám*) grows “in the airy realm (as/and) in his own house”: “his own house” is clearly a reference to Agni as the fire in every house (see also 11c), but “in the airy realm” can refer both to the strengthening of the sun’s light after it rises and to the smoke and flames of fire rising in the air. Note that there is no simile marker here: the fire is not compared to the sun or vice versa; they are identified.

The second pāda uses the technical ritual term $\tilde{a}\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘establish’ (used of the ceremonial establishment of the ritual fire), but it is also used less technically here for the placement of both fire and sun on their respective paths. Loc. *hvāré* ‘on a meandering (course)’ can refer to the unpredictable motion of fire and its products (smoke/flames). How this word can apply to the sun is less clear, since the sun’s course is certainly not unpredictable. However, derivatives of the root \sqrt{hvr} can refer to curves, and the sun’s trajectory up, across, and down the sky can be seen as a curving path. (This second sense should have been registered in the publ. tr.) I should say that I explicitly do not think that it refers to a snake here (*pace* Old [SBE], WG), although the interpr. is tempting due to the similarity of the lexicon and imagery in this vs. to I.141.7, where *hvārā-* refers to Agni as a twisting snake. Such an identification here would require emendation to acc. **hvārām*, which Old was willing to accept in SBE and still defends in the Noten, but which does not conform to our current restrained attitude towards RVic emendation (in part due to Old). I also do not think that *candrām* in the simile refers to the moon (as Thieme [KISch 78] and WG do).

In c ‘son’ is universally supplied with *patarām* ‘flying, winged’ (e.g., Ge “den geflügelten (Sohn?) der Pṛṣni”). But Pṛṣni’s son(s) are the Maruts; Agni never seems to be so identified. The closest any interpreter can come is X.189.1, where a *gauḥ pṛśnih* ‘dappled cow’ may, or may not, refer to the fire, but there is no parental engagement there. The gen. *pṛśnyāḥ* (as here; on the ending see comm. ad 7b) is elsewhere construed only with ‘udder’ (*ūdhar-*, II.34.2, 10; cf. also IV.3.10) or ‘milk’ (*pāyaḥ*, VI.48.22); though it is true that the alternative gen. *pṛśneḥ* is found with ‘sons’ (*pṛśneḥ putrā(h)*, V.58.5), these are the Maruts, as expected. Since the only other attestations of *pṛśnyāḥ* in II limit ‘udder’, I supply that word here. Although “the flying (udder) of Pṛṣni” sounds comical, I take it to refer to a rain cloud, as also apparently in II.34. The fire and the sun are thus implicitly compared to this third entity. I read *citáyantam* in two senses, ‘appearing’ and ‘perceiving, observing’ (cf. *citayat* in the immediately following vs.), with the former sense here.

The other sense of *citáyantam* governs the rest of the vs.; the instr. *akṣábhīḥ* ‘with eyes’ signals the ‘perceive’ value, as is reflected in all the standard tr. (although WG take the participle as a double tr. ‘make perceive’, which is not supported by the zero-grade root syllable [expect **cetáyantam*]). We are not home

free, however, for the simile, *pāthó ná payúm*, gives trouble. The problem is *pātháh*. If we try to take it to as acc. to neut. *pāthas-* ‘pen, fold’, which would work semantically (“observing ... as a protector (does) a fold”), the accent is wrong; if we try to take it as gen. of *pánth-* ‘path’, which also works semantically (“like the protector of a path”), the length of the first vowel is wrong. Lub tries to avoid this Scylla and Charybdis situation by identifying it as a 2nd du. pres. to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘protect’, but this makes more difficulties: who are the two subjects? (perhaps he means the two races, but they are in 3rd ps. ref.), and the placement of the *ná* is badly wrong. In the end I follow the ad hoc solution set out by Old (Noten): a gen. of the ‘path’ word makes most sense, and it may owe its anomalous long vowel to phonological attraction to *pāyúm* in the same syntagm along with some conflation with *pāthas-*.

II.2.5: The apparent fem. loc. pl. *vr̥dhasānāsu* to the irregular participial stem *vr̥dhasāná-* ‘growing, having grown’ is generally taken as referring to the plants among which the fire is blazing, on the basis of X.92.1 ... *śuṣkāsu háriṇīṣu járbhurat*, with *járbhurat* ‘flickering, quivering’ as here. However, plants do not ‘grow’ when they are burned -- quite the contrary -- and I’m not at all sure that $\sqrt{vr̥dh}$ ‘grow, increase, strengthen’ is used of plant growth: we may be misled by translation language. Instead on the basis of IV.3.6 *dhíṣṇyāsu vr̥dhasānó agne* “growing in the holy places [=hearths], o Agni,” I interpret *vr̥dhasānāsu* as representing *vr̥dhasāná(h)āsu*, with masc. nom. sg. + fem. pronominal loc. and irregular sandhi of *-ah ā-*. There are only three occurrences of the stem *vr̥dhasāná-*; in addition to IV.3.6 and our example here, the other one, at VI.12.3, is also nom. sg. referring to Agni. One potential problem with this suggestion is that, since the hearths have not been previously mentioned, we might expect accented *āsú*. However, a number of occurrences of unaccented *āsu* lack clear referents in the preceding discourse (e.g., I.95.5, III.55.9, VIII.41.7).

Like *citáyantam* in 4cd, *citayat* in d has two different readings: with the preceding phrase *dyaúr ná st̥rbhiḥ* it means ‘appear’, while with the following *ródasī ánu* (echoing *jánasī ubhé ánu* in 4d) it means ‘perceive’. The functional split is clearer in this vs. than in 4cd and could be considered a species of poetic repair, or at least “poetic reinforcement.” See also vs. 10 below.

II.2.6: Note the phonological and morphological parallelism of the infinitival datives, *s(u)vastáye*, *suvitāya*, *vītāye*.

II.2.6–7: 6c and 7c are paraphrases of each other. Each contains a dual referring to the two worlds, an impv. of $\sqrt{kr̥}$, and an indication of directionality.

II.2.7: *sahasrín-* (sg. or pl.) regularly modifies *rayí-* and *vāja-*; *br̥hánt-* has a wider range of referents, but both *rayí-* and *vāja-* are found. Since (sg.) *rayím* occurs in the immediately preceding vs. (6b) and (sg.) *vāja-* in the immediately following pāda (7b), either is available to supply as the referent for the pl. adjectives in pāda a. I opt for *vāja-*, because of the nearer proximity.

If *śrútyā* in the Saṃhitā text represents dat. *śrútyai* (so Pp.) and belongs to a *-ti*-stem, it shows the younger ending (borrowed from the *-ī*-stems) *-yai*, confined to 7 stems mostly limited to Maṇḍala X (Macdonell VG p. 282), rather than the extraordinarily common *-aye*. This younger ending may correlate with the younger accent in this *-ti*-stem: as Lundquist has shown (“On the Accentuation of Vedic *-ti*-Abstracts,” *Indo-European Linguistics* 3 [2015]), *-ti*-stems undergo accent retraction in the course of Vedic, and root-accented forms are innovations in the late RV. Vs. 4 contains another fem. short *-i*-stem with a younger ending borrowed from long *-ī*-stems, namely gen. *pṛśnyāḥ*. However, I wonder how secure *śrútyai* is. The use of this dative (quasi-)infinitive here is somewhat unusual, and I take its supposed double (also *śrútyā* in sandhi) in X.111.3 as an ablative. Old (Not.) points out that the gerundive *śrútya-* appears several times modifying *vāja-* (VII.5.9 *vājam śrútyam*, I.36.12 *vājasya śrútyasya*). I am tempted to take our *śrútyā* here as somehow reflecting the gerundive, in a situation where the expected masc. acc. sg. **śrútyam* would produce a bad cadence. But I cannot construct a plausible scenario; Old says that an acc. pl. is not entirely excluded, but that would have to be an acc. pl. neuter or fem., and *vāja-* is masc.

Kü (251) takes *ví didyutaḥ* as intrans., not trans.-caus. (in his terms, “inattigent” not “faktiv”), interpreting *uśásaḥ* as temporal. I am doubtful.

The simile in d *svàr nā* “like the sun” is perfectly ambiguous. It can be nominative, compared to Agni, the subject of *ví didyutaḥ*, as an entity that makes the dawns shine. (Given the temporal proximity of dawn and sunrise, this causal connection is perfectly in order.) Or Agni can make the dawns shine forth like the sun, with the simile in the acc. In 8b and 10d the same simile is in the nominative, but I do not think this is a sufficient reason to impose the same analysis here.

II.2.8: Note #*sá idhāná(h)* echoing 1c #*samidhānām* and 6a #*sá ... samidhānáḥ*.

With Old (SBE), Ge, Re, I take *uśáso rāmyā* as parallel in a temporal expression (“dawns and nights”). Hoffmann (Injunk., 121; fld. by WG) rather cleverly separates them, construing only *rāmyā* with *ánu*: “Entflammt alle Morgen, nach den Nächten leuchtet er.” However, because night(s) and dawn(s) are regularly used in parallel (e.g., 2a in this hymn), I am somewhat reluctant to adopt this interpr.

The standard tr. (Old [SBE], Ge, Re, WG) take *dīdet* as a modal, but it is simply an injunctive and I see no reason to attribute modal value to it. So also Hoffmann (see his tr. just cited) and Kü (228).

In the second hemistich *agnīḥ* was omitted in the publ. tr., which should read “With the libations of Manu Agni conducts ...”

II.2.9: As Old and Ge point out, *mānuṣā* should not be a fem. nom. sg. with *dhīḥ*, since the fem. stem is well-attested *mānuṣī*. Nonetheless, the standard tr., including Ge though excluding Re, interpret it with *dhīḥ* -- Ge by taking it as shortened from *mānuṣānām* at pāda end (some shortening!) and tr. “die menschliche Dichtung” as if it were a simple modifying adjective. I instead take it as neut. pl. and supply ‘lifespans’ (*yugā(ni)*), which is commonly found with this adj., including in our 2c.

By my interpr. it expresses extent of time, indicating that poetic inspiration is a constant that will always ensure rewards for men generation after generation. For a similar thought see III.39.2 *sanajā pítiryā dhīh* the “ancient-born, ancestral hymnic vision.”

Most interpr. take *iṣāni* as a loc. infinitive with the preceding acc. as obj. (For the most recent disc., see Keydana, *Infinitive im Ṛgveda*, 195–96.) This may well be possible, but given its isolation and the unclarity of its morphological shape (see esp. the disc. by Old, Noten), I take it as a simple locative, construing the accusatives in d as Inhaltsakk. with *dúhānā* in c. In any case it produces a bad cadence (4 light syllables); I do not see an easy repair strategy.

II.2.10: As in vss. 4 and 5, a form of *citáya-* (here *citayema*) has two different senses in two different constructions, by my interpr. In pāda a it shows a development of the ‘perceive’ sense, here rendered “get in sight of,” that is, “by our efforts get close enough to see.” The means by which we do so is *árvatā* “by steed,” namely warfare or contest. In pāda b *citayema* has a developed sense of ‘be perceived, appear’, namely ‘be distinguished / distinguish ourselves’. Here the means is *bráhmanā* ‘by a sacred formulation’, that is, by ritual or poetic competition. The standard tr. simply supply a verb in pāda a (‘acquire’, vel sim.), but the double usage of the other two forms of *citáya-* in this hymn suggests that this one, too, can be used for both pādas, and it is always preferable to avoid supplying verbs. Both WG and Proferes (68) in different ways take *citayema* with both pādas; Proferes interpr. it as a trans.-caus. in both pādas (“manifest”), WG only for the first (“erscheinen machen,” but “schauen können” in b). As noted above (ad vs. 4), the zero-grade root syllable tells against the trans.-caus. interpr.

II.2.11: With most, I interpr. *iṣáyanta* as ‘derive nourishment’, though Lub lists it with $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send’ and WG tr. “streben,” presumably assigning it to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’.

The acc. singulars *yám ... yajñám* probably do not belong together, although an interpr. “whom they approach as the sacrifice,” with Agni identified with the sacrifice, is not impossible. Ge considers it attraction from **yásya ... yajñám*, but a loose purpose/goal accusative, almost a pseudo-infinitive “to sacrifice,” seems syntactically acceptable to me.

II.3 Āprī

II.3.2 Pāda a is supposed to contain a lexeme *práti* $\sqrt{añj}$ governing *dhāmāni*, but this would be the only ex. of the verbal idiom in the RV. I therefore take *práti* as governing *dhāmāni* ‘foundations’, in a parallel expression to *tisró dívaḥ práti* in b. I supply “of the earth” with *dhāmāni* on the basis of I.22.16 *dhāmabhiḥ pṛthivyāḥ*. The participle *añján* would be used absolutely and anticipate *sám anaktu* in d. The early part of the hymn has a tendency to station present participles at pāda ends, and not always with obj. (1d *árhan*, our 2a, 2c *undán*, 3a *árhan*).

II.3.4: The apparent loc. *védī* (so Pp.) should probably be read *vēdi* for metrical reasons (see Old: “nur angeblich Pragṛhya” [Noten]; Proleg. 456). AiG III.154–55 is skeptical about a loc. *-ī* to *-i*-stems and suggests that this, the clearest example, is actually to be explained by haplogy from **védy[ām] asyām*, which seems highly unlikely, esp. since it would make the cadence metrically irreparable. I think we have to take this form as given and as a locative (not instr.).

The last pāda contains a mixture of voc. (*devā ādityāḥ*) and nom. (*yajñītyāsaḥ*), with pāda-initial *vísve* ambiguous, since the accent may derive from its position. The tr. does not reflect this case mixture, since a meticulous separation would be fussy and serve no purpose.

II.3.5: As Old points out, *suprāyaṇá-* is metrically bad here and worse in several other occurrences; it should be read **suprayāṇá-*, which presumably belongs to $\sqrt{yā}$, not \sqrt{i} .

I take the adjectives in d (*yaśásaṃ suvīram*) as proleptic, the result of the purification, though this interpr. isn’t strictly necessary.

II.3.6: In b *vayyēva* belongs to a *vṛkī*-type stem *vayī-* ‘weaver’, here in the dual. Old suggests that it doesn’t really matter if we analyze it as *vayīyā iva*, with masc. du., or *vayīye (i)va* with fem. du., but given that the other adjectives in the hemistich, *ukṣité ... ranvité*, are feminine in form and that *uṣāsanáktā* is regularly fem., the latter seems more likely.

The vs. lacks a finite verb and there is no verbal form, finite or participial, to govern *ápāmsi* ‘labors’ in a. Most tr. supply ‘work’ vel sim., but I think it’s possible that *sādhú* is an adverbial predicate, “on target” in the publ. tr., and that it loosely governs *ápāmsi*.

II.3.7: Re and WG supply ‘sacrifice’ as the obj. of *sám añjataḥ*, but since acc. *devān* is already available and was the obj. of exactly the same verb in 2d (*sám anaktu devān*), this is unnecessary.

II.3.8: *sādhāya(nti)* in pāda a and *svadhāyā* in c occupy the same metrical position and echo each other.

II.3.9: *subhára-* here is used in a different sense (or senses) from the same word in 4b, where it referred to the good burden, that is, the seated gods, that the barhis was bearing. Here I think there is a pun: the hero is ‘easy to bear’, that is, his birth, depicted in pāda b, was easy. But the hero so born provides good support to those who depend on him.

With Re, I tr. *vī syatu* in two slightly different senses with two different objects: ‘unbind’ with ‘navel’ (*nābhim*), referring to the technicalities of the birth process, and ‘release’ with ‘offspring’ (*prajāṃ*), referring to the results of birth.

The Tvaṣṭar verse in Āprī hymns generally directly concerns only his participation in the birth process (see I.142.10, III.4.9=VII.2.9, X.110.9, X.142.10;

our pādas abc). Releasing the sacrificial animal and escorting it to (the fold/pen of) the gods is properly the province of the post (“Lord of the Forest,” *vānaspātīḥ*, 10a), and that expression (“go to [the fold of] the gods”) is a euphemism for the animal’s death. However, note X.70.9–10, where both Tvaṣṭar and the Lord of the Forest convey the animal to the fold of the gods (*devānām pāthah*). Like X.70.9 our pāda d implies that the journey of the sacrificial animal (that is, its death) occurs under the auspices of Tvaṣṭar, and in fact, given the apparent temporal/logical connector *áthā* beginning pāda d, the implication is that the offspring born in abc is to undertake this journey. This seems rather muddled: our new (human) offspring is not the sacrificial animal. I think the roles of Tvaṣṭar and the Lord of the Forest were quite distinct, but confluences like this could occur because the Tvaṣṭar and Vanaspati vss. are always adjacent in Āprī hymns and because the vocabulary is similar: Tvaṣṭar’s *ví√sā* ‘unbind/release’ and Vanaspati’s *áva√srj* ‘release/discharge’. The fact that the victim is usually not overly expressed (presumably a euphemistic avoidance) makes confusion all the more likely.

II.3.11: The *-si* form *vakṣi* would be better tr. as an impv. “convey,” rather than a subj. “you will convey” as in the publ. tr.

II.4 Agni

II.4.1: The stem *suṽṛktí-* generally refers to a hymn and has in fact virtually been substantivized to mean hymn. However, it must be a bahuvrīhi in origin; I generally tr. ‘having a good twist’, referring to the clever adornments, the turns of phrase, of a skillfully crafted hymn. Here I think it has two senses: first, characterizing Agni himself as ‘having a good twist’, perhaps referring to his swirling smoke and flames, but then, as a sort of secondary or double bahuvrīhi, ‘having [/receiving] (hymns) with good twists’. In this meaning it is parallel to *suprayásam* ‘having [/receiving] pleasurable offerings’. Note that the two are both final in their pādas. I do not think Ge’s “euren Preis” or Re’s “hymne (incarné)” are either necessary or illuminating.

On the desiderative gerundive *didhiṣāyya-* see comm. ad I.73.2. Although the tr. “desirable to install” is somewhat heavy, the complexity of the formation seems to require a weighty tr.

The last pāda indulges in play with the name Jātavedas: *devá ādeve jáne jātávedāḥ*. The first and last elements, *devá ... vedāḥ*, are virtual mirror images, with the 2nd word *ādeve* reinforcing the first, and *jáne* making an etymological figure with *jātá*.

II.4.2: The combination of honoring Agni “in the seat of the waters” (a) and the Bhṛguṣ “once again” installing him among the clans (b) suggests that this vs. concerns the well-known myth of Agni’s flight and concealment in the waters and the Bhṛguṣ’ discovery, recovery, and reinstallation of Agni as the ritual fire. X.46.2 begins with a pāda identical to our pāda a and then relates the Bhṛguṣ’ finding of the fire *gúhā cátantam* “hiding in secret”: *imám vidhánto apám sadhásthe, ... padaír ánu*

gman / gúhā cátantam uśíjo námobhir, ichánto dhîrā bhṛgavo ‘vindan “This one here -- having done honor to him in the seat of the waters, they followed him along his tracks ... / With reverences seeking him who was hiding in secret, the fire-priests, the insightful Bhṛgus found him.” The same myth may be alluded to, in ring compositional fashion, in vs. 9 of our hymn. Note also that the poet to whom this hymn is ascribed is Somāhuti Bhārgava.

As IH pointed out to me, *dvitādadhur* can be read, contra Pp., as *dvitā dadhur*, with perfect indic. or pres. injunc.

II.4.3: I tr. *dādayat ... ūrmyā ā* “shine towards the nights,” rather than “illuminate the nights” with the standard tr., because I could not otherwise account for the *ā*. Narten’s tr. (KISch 370 n. 5) is similarly intransitive though with a temporal, rather than goal, acc.: “Er soll die Nächte hindurch leuchten.”

Note *mitrām* √*dhā* in b reprising the same lexeme in 1c.

On *dakṣāyyah*, whose morphology resembles *didhiṣāyyah* in 1c, see comm. ad I.91.3. As noted there, in this passage it could also or alternatively mean “to be skillfully tended.”

II.4.4: The predicate adj. *raṇvā* qualifies both *puṣṭīḥ* and *sāṃdrṣṭīḥ*; for the latter see X.64.11 *raṇvāḥ sāṃdrṣṭau*.

Because *dodhavīti* in d is unaccented, it cannot be the verb of the relative clause beginning with *yāḥ* in c, despite the standard tr. Instead the intensive part. *bhāribhṛat* must be predicated in the rel. cl. and *dodhavīti* interpreted as the verb of the main clause.

Because of the equine simile and imagery, the primary reading of *dodhavīti vārān* must be “twitches his tail(-hairs),” but a second reading “shakes out choice things” is also invited.

II.4.5: This vs. describes the changes in color and form of the kindled fire as a sight to be wondered at. My tr. follows Ge’s in outline and many details. The first sight is of the shapeless dark cloud of smoke (a), but that transforms into color and bright light (bc). On *ābhva-* see my forthcoming “The Blob in Ancient India” (UCLA CMRS 2015 dragon conf. vol.), and for a parallel passage (also adduced by Ge) VI.6.4 ... *yāsya panāyanty ābhvam, bhāsāṃsi vaste sūryo ná śukrāḥ* “He whose formless mass [=smoke] they [=mortals] marvel at ..., he (then) clothes himself in lights, like the brilliant sun,” which seems to show parallel progress from dark to light and also contains a form of *bhās-* as here.

vanād- ‘wood-eater’ assumes a root noun 1st member *vān-*, preserved in a few forms such as loc. pl. *vāṃsu* (see Schindler, Rt. Noun), against the overwhelming number of forms to thematic *vāna-*.

I do not understand the simile in b, *uśígbhyo ná* “as if for the fire-priests.” Perhaps the point is that the fire-tending performed by Uśij-priests would cause the smoke to dissipate and the flames to appear, but that in their absence this change comes about anyway. Note that in X.46.2, quoted above ad vs. 2, the Bhṛgus seem to

be identified as *uśij*-priests, so the simile here may be referring to ritual behavior in ancestral time. WG tr. “wie den (danach) Verlangenden,” but *uśij*- is elsewhere the designation of a priest (and cf. Old Aves. *usij*-) and is so tr. by them elsewhere (e.g., I.60.4).

For *rāmsu* as adverbial loc. pl. to the root noun *rāṇ*- see Schindler Rt. Noun and EWA, both s.v. *raṇ*. And note *raṇvá*- in the preceding and following vss. (4a, 6c).

The last pāda describes the graying of the ash (“having grown old”) and then the rejuvenation of the flames presumably by the addition of more firewood.

II.4.6: The standard tr. take *bhāti* as the operator of the simile (e.g., Ge “Der nach den Hölzern ausschaut(?) wie der Durstige (nach Wasser)”), but this doesn’t make much sense. From *vanád*- ‘wood-eater’ in the immediately preceding vs. I extract ‘eat’ to govern *vānā* and to be compared to *tāṛṣāṇāḥ* ‘thirsting’ in the same semantic realm, hence my “(eating) wood like one athirst.”

My ‘red-hot’ for *tāpuḥ* contrasts nicely with *kṛṣṇādhvā* ‘having a black road’, but is unfortunately not entirely legitimate: it is more literally just ‘hot’; there is no color component.

Act. pf. *ciketa* in c might be expected to mean ‘perceives’, as generally, but it must mean instead ‘appears’; so all the standard tr., and see also Kü (175) on the unusual sense. It is all the more surprising given med. *cikite* in the same meaning in the immediately preceding vs. (5c). But in this case the two forms may have been seen as metrical variants with identical sense, since *ciketa* is always pāda-final, *cikite* always post-caesura, as here.

The unexpressed concept in the simile “like heaven smiling with its clouds” must be lightning, which smiles (I.168.8) or laughs (V.52.6). Lightning is white, like (some) clouds.

II.4.7: The root \sqrt{svad} is generally a ritual technical term: the ritual fire “sweetens,” that is, “ritually prepares” the oblations. Here the forest fire performs the same action on the non-ritual ground. Although this might depict some version of slash-and-burn agriculture (so WG), I think it more likely that the point is merely to give a ritual dimension to the wild and unpredictable actions of the forest fire, in the hope of exerting some control over it. The same sentiment is found in I.169.3 *agnís cid dhí śmātasé śusukvān, ... dádhati práyāṃsi* “For even a fire blazing in the brushwood can produce pleasurable offerings.” The position of *ná* after the verb *asvadayat* in our passage suggests that the simile is targeting the verb, an extremely unusual situation in Vedic poetics.

II.4.8: The phrase *ṛtīye vidáthe* “third rite of distribution” probably refers to the Third Pressing (though the two other occurrences of “three *vidáthas*”, at VI.51.2 and VII.66.10, do not seem to). Agni is of course present at all the pressings, but is not especially associated with the Third Pressing; however, *ṛtīye sávane* at III.28.5 is in an Agni context.

II.4.9: In the publ. tr. I supply with *gúhā* a form like *hitám* (cf. I.23.14, II.11.5, IV.5.8, etc.), *cárantam* (III.1.9) or *cátantam* (I.65.1, X.46.2) referring to Agni when he was hiding in the waters, a myth I also think is referred to obliquely in vs. 2 of this hymn (see above). Our vs. 2 is especially close to X.46.2, which relates this story, and X.46.2c begins *gúhā cátantam* (and continues with a ref. to the *uśíj-*; see our 5b). I therefore think my suggestion is justified, though I am usually reluctant to supply extraneous material. The point is -- if the Ṛtsamadas (re)gain the hidden Agni, just as their ancestors the Bṛgus did, they will get the upper hand against their enemies. The standard tr. must construe *gúhā* with *vanvántaḥ* ‘gaining in secret’ (e.g., Ge “heimlich überbieten und uüberwinden”). Although this is the obvious way to construe the text as given, the notion that our side would win by stealth and secret means seems antithetic to the Rigvedic ideal of combat, whether on the battlefield or the ritual ground. The adverb *gúhā* is extremely common in the flight-of-Agni myth and in an Agni hymn would likely call to mind the whole story. I would now be inclined to emend the publ. tr. to “(the one hiding) in secret,” not “(... deposited) in secret,” because of its apparent dependence on X.46.2 or a passage like it.

II.5 Agni

II.5.1: On *jénya-* see comm. ad I.128.7.

II.5.3: It is not clear what the disjunctive *vā* is disjoining. Klein (DGRV II.187–88) considers vs. 3 a reformulation of vs. 2, tr. “Or (more precisely) ...” But since vs. 3 most likely concerns a different priestly office than vs. 2 (*brahmán-* by implication, not *pótar-*), this doesn’t work. No other tr. attempts to account for *vā*. Since Agni is the implicit subject of these vss. and the referent of the various priestly offices, I think that “or” is simply introducing a different role that the same Agni performs.

The three verbs in ab, *dadhanvé*, *vócat*, and *véḥ*, have been configured in every possible way. Ge takes the first two as parallel in the dependent cl. marked by *yád*, with *véḥ* the main cl. verb (accented because it’s in the initial position of its clause). Acdg. to Re, *dadhanvé* is a main verb, with *vócat* the verb of its associated *yád* cl., while *véḥ* is the verb of an independent main cl. Old (SBE) takes all three as parallel verbs in the *yád* cl., with *c* as the main cl. Like me, Klein makes *vócat* and *véḥ* parallel main cl. verbs, with *dadhanvé* in the *yád* cl. And, finally, WG take *dadhanvé* in the dependent cl., *vócat* in the main cl., and *véḥ* as 2nd sg. direct speech specifying *vócat*. This chaotic diversity shows that we interpreters are uncertain not only about the syntax of the verse but the sense.

Ge (/WG) take the subject of *dadhanvé* to be the priest and *īm* as referring to Agni whom the priest pursues, but, as in II.1, Agni is *identified* with the various priestly functions, and I think he must be the subj. of all the verbs here. I don’t really understand the function of *dadhanvé*, but it might simply express Agni’s pursuit of the priestly role or of the formulations that he then speaks (in which case *īm* is better tr. ‘them’, as is quite possible).

The reason that WG interpret *véh* as direct speech is to render it as a 2nd sg.; they clearly reject the standard 3rd sg. interpr. But I do not think that a 3rd sg. can be avoided here or in I.77.2 or IV.7.7 (WG render the former as 3rd sg. but the latter as 2nd sg.), although Gr's assignment of the forms to an *s*-aor. to $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$ is most likely incorrect. Instead I would take *veh* (underlying *ves*) as the injunctive to the root pres. of $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$, but with the substitution of *-s* for *-t* in the 3rd sg. *as if* it belonged to an *s*-aor. or a root aor. of the type (\bar{a})*var* (2nd/3rd sg.) -- keeping in mind that before voiced sounds *véh* appears as *vér*. There are no 3rd sg. *-t* forms to this stem, unless augmented *ávet* (V.34.8) belongs here. One of the idiomatic uses of the root $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$ is with an acc. of an office or function (see esp. I.76.4 *véṣi hotráṃ utá potráṃ*, adduced by Ge), which is the apparent sense here, and so assigning *véh* to a different root, such as $\sqrt{viṣ}$, should be avoided.

II.5.4: The standard tr. construe *śúcinā* with *krátunā* (e.g., Ge “mit lauterem Sinne”). This is certainly possible -- though *śúci-* *krátu-* is not a standard collocation -- but not necessary.

The standard tr. also assume a change of subject in cd from Agni (ab) to a priest “who knows Agni’s *vratas*” (*vidvāṃ asya vratā dhruvā*). I find this unlikely; *vidvān* modifies Agni in vs. 8 (in my view), as well as twice in the next, closely related, hymn (II.6.7, 8). Moreover, *vidvān* is regularly used absolutely, taking an object much less often. I construe *vratā dhruvā* instead with *ánu*: “according to his *vratás*.” The collocation *ánu vratá-* is quite common; here the *vratá-* would be the rules that govern the natural world (plants and fires).

II.5.5: On the interpretational difficulties of this vs., see publ. intro.

II.5.6: I take *yádī* as *yád ī*, with pronominal enclitic *ī* standing for ‘him’ = Agni/Adhvaryu. See my “RVic *sīm* and *īm*” (Fs. Cardona, 2002).

Ge’s identifications, flg. Sāy., of the mother as the cow and the sister as the offering ladle or, less likely in my opinion, the ghee offering itself, seem reasonable. He suggests that the pl. *tāsām* of *c* picks up a collective in the previous clause, presumably ghee. This seems less likely to me; I suggest “the arrival of these (fem.)” refers back to the sisters who came here (*svásāro yā idāṃ yayúḥ*) in 5d.

II.5.7: The convoluted but rhetorically balanced expression *sváh svāya dhāyase kṛṇutām ṛtvíg ṛtvíjam* (“Let him, as Ṛtvij, make himself Ṛtvij, to suckle himself”) makes explicit Agni’s double role in this hymn: he is both a divine version of each priest in turn and represents the corresponding human priest. Here as divine Ṛtvij he makes himself into the human Ṛtvij, whose function is to give nourishment to the ritual fire, that is, to himself -- a kind of closed and reflexive circle. Once the mechanism of the identifications that have run through the hymn has been laid bare, the poet briskly finishes up the hymn, beginning with the summary 2nd hemistich here.

Most tr. struggle to construe *stómaṃ yajñám ca* with the closest verb, *vanéma*. Somewhat against my principles, I instead take *ād áraṃ, vanéma* as parenthetical and

construe the first NP with *rarimā*. (I have displaced the tr. of the *ād* clause to the right, because the parenthetical tr. was difficult to parse.) In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the standard tr. require *ād* to be in a highly unusual position, in the middle of its supposed clause. As it happens, WG interpr. the syntax as I do.

II.5.8: Ge (/WG) and Re take the subj. of ab to be the sacrificer, flg. Sāy., but Agni as the priestly mediator makes more sense. As noted above, ad 4c, *vidvān* must modify Agni in the last two vss. of the next hymn, II.6.7–8.

II.6 Agni

II.6.1: The most likely referent to supply with fem. *ayā* is *girā*, given *giraḥ* closing the preceding vs. and the 2 forms of this stem in the first pāda of the next vs. (3a; see also 6b). Cf. also II.24.1 *ayā vidhema ... girā*.

II.6.5: The vs. lacks a verb, though one can easily be supplied. The standard tr. supply an imperative: I extract ‘give’ out of *vāsu-dāvan* ‘giving goods’ in 4b, but ‘bring’ (so Ge, Re) works as well. What is clever about the syntax of this vs. is that the only signal of the absent imperative is the presumed 2nd ps. reference of the repeated *sá*, which of course is ordinarily a 3rd ps. pronoun, but is very frequent with 2nd ps. imperatives (see my “sa figé” article, HS 1992).

II.6.6: With Ge (/WG) *girā* could be construed with *īlānāya* “reverently invoking with song.”

II.6.7: With Sāy., Ge, Old (SBE), etc., I take *jānyeva* as representing *janya(h) iva*, with double application of sandhi, against the Pp. *jānyā*. There are various different interpr. of the sociological situation represented by *jānyeva mītryaḥ*; mine is closest to Old (SBE). See disc. in my 2001 Fs. Parpola article.

II.6.8: The undoubted subjunctive (*ā*) *piprayaḥ* seems to anchor the following *yakṣi* and (*ā*) *satsi* as the haplogitized *s*-aor. subjunctives they originally were, rather than in their later imperative function, esp. given the coordination of the first and last terms by *ca ... ca*. However, the two *ca*’s could be more or less independent, with the second one conjoining *yakṣi* and *satsi* more closely.

II.7 Agni

II.7.1: Note ... *bhārata#* (a) / ... *ā bhara#* (b).

II.7.2: On *īsata* in the *mā* prohibitive see comm. ad I.23.9.

II.7.3: The simile marker *iva* is wrongly placed, in that it follows both parts of the simile “watery streams” (*dhārā udanyā*).

The verse contains several tricks involving word order. First, the first word of the vs., *vīśvā(h)*, and the last, *dviśaḥ*, belong together: “all hatreds.” Their extreme distraction may be iconic of the distance that we must cross to pass beyond them. Notice that they are also near rhyme forms. Further, there is a clever grammatical switch between vss. 2 and 3: 2c ends with (*utá*) *dviśáḥ* (abl. sg.) / 3c with *dviśaḥ* (acc.pl.), and 3a begins with *vīśvā(h)* (*utá*). As just noted, this opening *vīśvā(h)* is to be construed with the distant 3c *dviśaḥ*, not with the *dviśáḥ* immediately before it -- even though they seem bracketed together, sandwiched in by *utá*'s, with phonologically similar *táśyā* immed. before and *tváyā* immed. after: *táśyā utá dviśáḥ // vīśvā utá tváyā*.

II.7.5: On the *vaśā* cow, see my Hyenas (258–60), building on H. Falk, “Zur Tiersucht im alten Indien” (IJ 24: 169–80). Although often tr. “barren cow,” a *vaśā* is one that has been mated but has not yet calved -- so possibly barren, possibly not. My tr. here, “mated cows,” is not fully accurate but far less awkward than accuracy would require.

WG supply “verses” with *aṣṭāpadībhiḥ*, though they allow the possibility of a cow in their n. Although this pun is probably lurking here -- eight-footed verses would of course be *pādas* with eight syllables -- the primary reading must be some sort of bovine, given the words with which it is parallel. See Old’s comment on this vs. (SBE).

II.7.6: The final word of the vs. (and the hymn) *ádbhutaḥ* echoes the finals of the last two vss., 4c and 5c *āhutaḥ*.

II.8 Agni

II.8.1–4: The *#ya(śástamasya)* that opens 1c anticipates the forms of the relative pronoun *yá-* in the next 3 vss. (2a *#yáḥ*, 3a *#yá(h)*, 3c *#yásya*, with the last, 4a *#ā yáḥ*, no longer in initial position), though of course it is entirely unrelated to the relative. The referents of all those rel. pronouns is Agni, who is also the referent of *yaśástamasya*. Phonology and syntax are thus wedded.

II.8.4–6: As the just-mentioned structural device expires in 4a, another takes its place. An unbroken alliterative string runs from the end of 4b through the beginning of 5: ... *arcíṣa / añjānó ajárait abhí // átrim ánu* ..., and the first words of the most of the remaining *pādas* also start with *a-* (5b *agním*, 6a *agnér*, 6c *áriśyantah*, 6d *abhí*). Since *ádhi* is the 2nd word in 5c, only 6b is not part of the chain.

II.8.4–5: On the disguised Svarbhānu myth in these two vss., see publ. intro. Most tr./comm. are puzzled by the appearance of Atri here, and Ge and Old in particular speculate on possible emendations. But the presence of the Svarbhānu formula guarantees that the text is genuine, in my opinion.

II.9-10 Agni

These two six-verse trimeter hymns follow the two six-verse dimeter hymns (II.7–8), though by the normal rules of hymn ordering they should precede them. In his opening n. on II.9 in SBE, Old tentatively suggests that II.9 and 10 should each be divided into two trcas, but in the Noten he essentially withdraws this suggestion because he sees signs of unity within the two hymns as transmitted.

II.9 Agni

II.9.1: *vidāna-* is ambiguous: it can belong either to \sqrt{vid} ‘know’ (Ge [/WG], Re, though he registers the ambiguity in n.) or \sqrt{vid} ‘find’ (Old [SBE]). I assign it to the latter and think it refers to the myth of the discovery and recovery of the fugitive Agni. The word forms a weak ring with *suidātra-* in the final vs., 6a, assuming the latter word is a derivative of \sqrt{vid} ; see comm. ad vs. 6.

ādabdhavratapramati- is an unusual cmpd for the RV in having three members, and with its initial accent (on which see AiG II.1.293) the accent falls about as far from word-end as it is possible to be.

II.9.4: There is some difference of opinion about the meaning of *manótar-*. Most take it as some version of ‘deviser, inventor’ (so Gr, Ge, HO [SBE], Re, WG), but Tichy (Nomen Agentis, 40 and passim) argues for the sense ‘reminder, rememberer’. I opt for something in the middle, ‘minder’. That is, I don’t think the term means that Agni creates ritual speech (the standard view), nor that he remembers or reminds the officiants of this speech (the Tichy view), but that he takes account of it, pays attention to it. The English term ‘minder’ (as in childminder) also has the connotation of taking care of someone or something, tending or ministering to it or them, and that sense would fit here as well. See also comm. ad IV.5.10 citing several passages containing the verb stem *manu-* that underlies this unusually formed agent noun with the sense ‘ponder, bring to mind’.

II.9.5: Various suggestions have been made about the two types of goods in pāda a (see the nn. of Old [SBE], Ge, Re, and WG), but Re’s suggestion that it’s livestock and offspring seems the most satisfying contextually, given the wishes expressed in cd. For disc. of similar phrases see comm. ad VI.19.10.

II.9.6: As noted above, I suggest that *suidātra-* makes a ring with *vidāna-* in 1a, a suggestion that rests on assigning both words to the root \sqrt{vid} ‘find’ and on assuming that this root meaning is still apparent in *suidātra-*. Neither of these assumptions is unchallenged. Gr assigns *-vidatra-* to $dā^1$ ‘give’+ *ví* and glosses it ‘vertheilend’. (That $\sqrt{dā}$ is not otherwise found with *ví* speaks against this derivation.) In his brief treatment of the word Debrunner (AiG II.2.170) gives its root etymology as \sqrt{vid} with a question mark, glossing it ‘wohlwollend’. Though no doubt other etymological suggestions have been made, I have not to my knowledge encountered them. The standard interpr. of the semantics, however, are like Debrunner’s --

‘wohlwollend, gnädig, d’accueil favorable’, etc. Whatever the root derivation assumed, this rather vague meaning is far from ‘find’ (or ‘know’ or ‘distribute’) and the semantic pathway to it is unclear. Moreover, a passage like X.15.3 *āhām pitṛn suvidátrāṃ avitsi* “I have found the *suvidátra*- forefathers (/forefathers that are easy/good to find)” testifies to at least a secondary connection between the form and the root \sqrt{vid} ‘find’, as well as enough semantic connection remaining to allow the phrase to function as a linguistic figure. The word is found twice in the Agni hymns of II, once here, once in II.1.8. Both vss. also contain the word *ánika*- ‘visage, face’ (though in II.1.8 admittedly not in the same clause). Especially in our passage I think the point is that because of Agni’s shining face he is easy to find -- he is the brightest thing around.

That the next hymn (II.10), which is at least metrically paired with this one (see comm. ad II.9-10), is also characterized by a ring linking the first and last vss. and that the first word of the ring is also formed with a *-tra*-suffix (*johūtra*-) lend some support to my speculations about *suvidátra*- here.

II.10 Agni

II.10.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the first word of the hymn, *johūtra*-, forms a ring with *johavīmi*, the last word. The connection between them is emphasized by the intensive redupl. in *johūtra*-; no other *-tra*- stems show redupl., much less intensive reduplication. Gr (and, it seems, WG, here though not in I.118.9; II.20.3 isn’t clear) take the stem as act. (‘laut rufend’), but a passive value makes better sense in all 3 occurrences (so Old [SBE], Ge, Re). The *-tra*- form in the next vs., *vībhṛtra*- (2d), is likewise passive. My tr. “invoked ... on every side” is based on the possibility that the *-tra*- suffix evokes the *-tra* adverbial locatives (such as *átra* ‘here’), although this may be pushing the limits (likewise my ‘dispersed in many places’ for *vībhṛtra*- in 2d). It does, however, work with the thematics of the first few vss.: vs. 2 urgently begs to hear *my* call (*hávam me*, with the possessive prn. emphatically placed pāda-final), and the two occurrences of *vīcetāḥ* ‘discriminating’ (1c, 2b) suggest that Agni is choosing among the various sacrifices he might attend on the journey described in 2cd.

II.10.2: The urgency of the poet’s desire is conveyed by the isolated precative *śrūyā(h)*, the only precative to this root, hence my “may he please hear.” It also provides a phonological template for *śyāvā* opening the next hemistich (2c) and, more distantly, *uttānāyām* and *śiriṇāyām* opening 3a and c respectively.

II.10.3: The fem. sg. loc. *uttānāyām* is generally simply tr. ‘outstretched’ or sim. I think the image is more precise: the two kindling sticks, athwart each other, are likened to a woman in birthing position with her legs stretched out and open (my “agape”).

The rhyming form *śiriṇāyām* opening the 2nd half-vs. is much more difficult. It is a hapax with no clear root affiliation, and the suggested tr. range widely --

‘night’, ‘chamber’, ‘hiding place’, etc. (See the standard tr., plus KEWA and EWA s.v.) My own very tentative suggestion links it to *sirā* ‘stream’ (I.121.11) and *sirī-* (if that means ‘stream’, as JPB takes it, X.71.9), as well as to later *sirā-* ‘vein’ (also found in MIA). By extension I take it to refer metaphorically to the birth canal, in which Agni remains, unborn, during the night -- though he cannot be kept confined for very long. This would again be a reference to the kindling sticks, in whose attenuated interior he is fancied to be hidden. The variation in sibilant would not be surprising, particularly in a body-part word that could be mediated by Middle Indic. All this is very speculative, however, and it might be wiser to leave the word untranslated.

II.10.4: This vs. describes what happens to the fire after the peaceful creature depicted in pāda b is sprinkled with melted butter (pāda a): he takes on an appearance (*dṛśānam*) that is larger and more powerful. Contra Ge, Re, WG (but with Old [SBE]) I construe *ānnaiḥ* with *vyāciṣṭham*, on the basis of III.50.1 *uruvyācāḥ ... ebhír ānnaiḥ*.

II.10.5: The first hemistich of this vs., which repeats the verb of the preceding vs., *jigharmi* ‘I sprinkle’, expresses the hope that this sprinkling, which rendered Agni ‘overpowering, violent’ (*rabhasām*) at the end of the last vs., will not make him hostile and dangerous: he should enjoy the ghee “with an undemonic spirit” (*araksāsā mānasā*).

The second hemistich states that no matter how lovely his appearance is, he is not to be touched; the unexpressed reason for this of course is that he will burn whoever or whatever does touch him. The hapax bahuvr. *sprhayádvarṇa-* is variously interpreted. I think it means not ‘having desirable color’ (so, approx. Re.) nor ‘desiring color’ (so approx. Ge and WG), but rather ‘having questing color’ -- that is, his color (=flames) flickering here and there (*járbbhurāṇaḥ*) look in their random motion as if they are seeking something.

II.10.6: The first pāda of this vs. continues the theme of trying to set limits on the unpredictably powerful Agni. (In my view; it is not so interpr. by others.) Here he is urged (again with a precativē, *jñeyāḥ*) to know or recognize his share. I take this to mean that he should take his share and no more, though his power would allow him to take whatever he wants (*sahasānó vāreṇa*). Agni thus controlled will then help the singer to achieve his goals (pādas bcd).

Note that Manu returns from the 1st vs. — another little ring. The adj. *madhupṛcam* ‘mixing with honey’ reminds us of the later Madhuparka drink offered to distinguished visitors, but I doubt that such a reference is found here. Though it would be generally appropriate for Agni the *ātithi-* (‘guest’), this hospitality theme, though common in the RV, is not found in this hymn.

For the pun in the 2nd half vs., see publ. intro.

[II.11–24 JPB]

[II.11 Indra (misc. comments by SJ to JPB tr.)

The hymn has a remarkable number of predicated tense-stem participles.

On the unusual meter of this hymn see Old Prol. 87–90, who also remarks on its unusual vocab., which, taken together, gives the hymn a “Sonderstellung” among the surrounding hymns (87 n. 1).

II.11.3 There are several syntactic problems in this verse. The easiest to deal with is the apparently misplaced *ca* in b. All the standard tr. as well as the publ. tr. take *rudríyeṣu* as a modifier of *stómeṣu*, with the whole loc. phrase *#ukthéṣu ... stómeṣu ... rudríyeṣu ca#* then interpreted as “in the hymns and in the Rudriyan praises,” with the *ca* following the 2nd word of a bipartite NP and at a considerable distance from the 1st. (We would expect **stómeṣu ca (...) rudríyeṣu*.) Klein (DGRV I.54) calls this “the most anomalous position of *ca* within adjective plus noun syntagms.” This difficulty disappears if we take *rudríyeṣu* not as an adjective with *stómeṣu*, but as a third term in the conjoined phrase: “in the hymns, in the praises, and in the Rudriyans.” The *ca* is then correctly positioned in an X Y Z *ca* construction (on which see Klein DGRV I.86–91). The Rudriyans in question are the Maruts. It is important to note that the adj. *rudríya-* is almost never used of anyone or anything but the Maruts, and in the plural never of anything but the Maruts. It is also never used of hymns or praises. It is true that my interpr. produces disharmony in semantic class: two types of verbal products and a group of gods, but Indra does indeed get pleasure and strengthening both from human praises and from the Maruts, who stood by him at the Vṛtra battle. And my interpr. solves the *ca* placement problem and also allows *rudríya-* to refer to its accustomed referent.

A more intractable problem is how to interpr. the loc. relative pronouns in a and c. The standard tr. seem to take them (it’s a little hard to tell) as embedded relatives with the loc. nouns (*ukthéṣu*, etc.) belonging to the main clause whose predicate takes shape in pāda d. The publ. tr. (JPB) takes ab as a separate sentence, supplying an impv. “delight!” as the main cl. verb, governing *ukthéṣu ... rudríyeṣu ca* and generated from the injunctive pf. *cākán* of the rel. cl. This still leaves the *yāsu* cl. embedded, since the main clause in cd must include *túbhyéd* that begins c, parallel to *vāyáve* in d. Another wrinkle is the fact that the verbal predicate of this 2nd rel. clause is not finite, but a predicated middle participle (whatever its exact derivational path) *mandasānáḥ*. In favor of the JPB solution is the fact that the *yāsu* rel. prn. has a clear antecedent in the main clause of cd: nom. pl. *etā(h)*, but it is not clear whether masc. *yéṣu* does. If we take the nominal loc. pls. *ukthéṣu*, etc., as belonging to the main clause, then it does. This seems to be the solution of the standard tr. (e.g., Re’s tentative “parmi (?) les hymnes en lesquels tu te complais et parmi (?) les corps-de-louange rudriens ...” I do not know the answer, though I’m inclined to follow the standard tr., against the publ. tr., and take these masc. locatives as belonging to the main clause, with loc. relative clauses dependent on them, parallel to the fem. loc. in c. So, rather like Re, “Amidst the hymns, praises, and Rudriyans in which you take

(have taken? injunc. pf.) delight, these (FEM. PL.), in which you are finding exhilaration, run forth to you ...”

As the just-produced tr. shows, yet another problem is the identity of the subject of the main clause and its verb *sisrate*. The subj. must be fem. because of the *etā(h)* and it is either qualified as *śubhrāḥ* ‘resplendent’ or compared to entities that are. The anomalous position of the simile particle *ná* is, uneasily, compatible with either: “resplendent like Xes” or “like resplendent Xes.” Various solutions for the identity of the subject have been suggested. The publ. tr. ‘waters’ seems the most likely, since 1) the verb means ‘run forth, flow’, 2) the subj. must be fem. pl., 3) *śubhrá-* elsewhere characterizes waters and rivers, and 4) the waters were prominent in the immediately preceding vs., though not named. Identifying the referent of *śubhrāḥ* is complicated by the fact that this stem is the signature word of the next vs.

II.11.4: The first two pādas contain two exx. of predicated pres. participles, *vardháyantaḥ* and *dádhanāḥ*, but unfortunately it’s not clear what they are predicated of. Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. supply “we,” which is a reasonable default, WG “diese Lobreden,” from 3a. In any case, the referents of these participles are not directly reflected in the rest of the verse (save perhaps for *asmé* ‘for us / among us’ in c), and it seems best with the standard tr. to assume an abrupt syntactic division between ab and cd, though the intrans./pass. part. *vāṛdhānāḥ* and the adj. *śubhrāḥ* in c show lexical and thematic continuity with the first hemistich.

JPB takes c as an independent nominal clause. I’d be inclined, with the standard tr., to take it with d with the pf. part. *vāṛdhānāḥ* expressing anteriority and notional dependence: “... having become strengthened, you should overwhelm ...”

II.11.7: The three augmented aorists in this vs. are striking, esp. because two of them are extremely marginal: the *s*-aor. seen in *asvārṣṭām* ($\sqrt{\text{sva}}$) is found otherwise in the RV only as 3rd sg. *ásvār* in late X.148.5; *áramsta* is the only form of this *s*-aor. in the RV. Both have well-attested 1st cl. present stems with the same meaning, and it is surprising in this narrative context that we don’t find imperfects.

I would be inclined to take *cid* with *sariṣyán*, rather than with *párvataḥ*, hence “the mountain, though about to run, has come to rest,” rather than “even the mountain ...” Note the use of the future participle to express past prospective value in subordination to a preterital main verb and see comm. ad 10b below.

II.11.8: After the three augmented aorists in the previous vs. and *akrān* in pāda b, the injunctive *sādi* in pāda a is a little surprising, esp. since this pāda seems to describe the same action as 7d. I wonder whether the poet is playing a trick: the negated participle *áprayuchan* almost seems to have the augment we expect in **asādi* but transposed to the next word (and of course etymologically and functionally quite distinct). Note that *áprayuchan* occupies the same metrical position as *áprathiṣṭa* in 7c (the immediately preceding hemistich) and shares the same first two syllables.

The lexeme *ní* $\sqrt{\text{prath}}$ occurs only here in the RV and, at least according to Mon.-Wms., in all of Sanskrit. This isolation makes it all the more difficult to figure

out what is going on in pāda d, since the reference of the almost equally isolated *dhamáni-* is unclear. Note the placement of the preverb *ní* after the verb *paprathan* at the end of the verse, an almost mirror image of the opening of the vs. *ní párvataḥ*.

II.11.10: It is unusual to find a subjunctive *nijūrvāt* in a subord. clause whose main cl. has an imperfect intensitive (*ároravīt*). The publ. tr. renders it as “was about to grind down” -- this seems pretty close to target, though I’d probably substitute rather “was going to” -- a past prospective. Sāy. simply glosses with a desiderative *jighāṃsatīty arthaḥ*. Of course, the *-āt* isn’t metrically guaranteed and could have been introduced from *vájrāt* at the end of 9d, so it is possible that the form was simply injunc. *nijūrvat*. Nonetheless, though the usage of the subjunctive here is unusual, I think it can be reconciled with the function of the subjunctive more generally. Note that its function is very much parallel to that of the future participle *sariṣyán* in 7d.

II.11.11: In d JPB takes *paurá* as *pauré* out of sandhi, as a PN. In VIII.61.6 I take it as ‘multiplier’ (of Indra) in a pun with *purukít-*. In VIII.50.5 a clear loc. shows the sense that JPB wants. In V.74.4 there are three exx., one apparently a PN, the other also apparently a pun on *puru-* (JPB tr. ‘muchness’). I’d be inclined here to take it in non-PN name fashion, either as loc. “in its muchness” or modifying soma: “soma multiplied” (to *puru*) or perhaps more likely, given *prñántaḥ* in c, ‘filling’ or ‘in its fullness’.

II.11.12: I would tr. *dhīmahi* in c as ‘acquire’ -- the idea being that we want to get a *prásasti-* from our actions performed with Indra’s help.

II.11.13: Pāda b contains another predicated pres. participle, *vardháyantaḥ*.

II.11.14: Pāda c contains yet another predicated pres. part., *mandasānāḥ*. It cannot belong with the main cl. verb in d, *pānti*, because it modifies a rel. prn. *yé* and *pānti* is unaccented. The primary ending on *pānti* is disturbing: the context requires a connection with $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’, but that root forms a root *aorist*. For another such form see I.134.5 and comm. ad loc.

II.11.15: And another -- or rather the same *mandasānāḥ* in the nominal rel. clause introduced by *yéṣu*.

JPB supplies “be” as the verb in pāda c; I’m inclined to follow Ge (/WG) in supplying a form of $\sqrt{vr̥dh}$ ‘strengthen’, generated from *ávardhayaḥ* beginning d. Ge suggests the impv. *vardhaya*. It would also be possible simply to read *ávardhayaḥ* with both pādas: “you have strengthened us in battles (and) have strengthened heaven ...”]

[II.12 Indra (misc. comments by SJ to JPB tr.)

II.12.3: The hapax *apadhā* is probably, flg. Old (and accepted by most), an instr. of a root noun. As Old also points out, *āpa* $\sqrt{dhā}$ must here be a formulaic variant of *āpa* \sqrt{vr} ‘uncover’, a signature verb of the Vala myth. Old tellingly adduces nearby II.14.3 *yó gā udājad āpa hí valám váḥ*. The alternative lexeme may have been used here because a root noun to \sqrt{vr} , *vr-t-* with empty *-t* as always with roots ending in short resonants, risks being mistaken for a root noun to \sqrt{vrt} .

Because starting fires with stones is not the standard method in the RV -- it usually involves fire *sticks* -- I think the “between the two stones” (*ásmanor antár*) probably refers to the two world halves between which fire would appear, perhaps in addition to stones struck against each other to produce sparks. If I am correct that this is a reference to the world-halves, it would provide some support to the claim that the meaning ‘heaven’ for this etymon, attested in both branches of Old Iranian (*asman-* in both YAves and OP), was pan-Indo-Iranian, a contested claim (see EWA s.v. *ásman-*, esp. p. 138).

Note *samvřk samátsu sa* ...

II.12.4: *cyávana-* is ordinarily agentive, ‘rousing, rouser’, but there is no escaping the sense ‘exploit, deed’ here (like its fellow derivative *cyautná-*). Perhaps the semantic development is by way of “stirring (deed)” or sim.

II.12.4–5: The phrases *aryáh puṣṭāni* (4d) and *aryáh puṣṭīḥ* (5c) with ppl. and fem. abstract to $\sqrt{puṣ}$, both in the plural, do not seem to differ from each other semantically or functionally. The only possible (but weak) motivations I can see for the use of different stems are 1) metrical (neut. pl. *puṣṭāni* would not fit in 5c; however, the shorter neut. pl. form *puṣṭā* would), and 2) gender matching between simile and frame. We don’t know the gender of the root noun pl. *vřjah* ‘stakes’, but it is clearly not neut. If it is underlyingly fem., *puṣṭīḥ* would be a better match. For *aryáh puṣṭā-*, see loc. pl. *aryáh puṣṭéṣu* in the Vřṣākapi hymn, X.86.1. That the ppl. is used in this phrase elsewhere suggests that the ppl. is the more idiomatic form in this phrase.

II.12.5: Although in answer to the question in pāda *a kúha sá* “where is he,” we might expect *nařśó asti* to mean “he is not (here),” I prefer the existential “he does not exist” of the publ. tr. for two reasons. In main clauses the pres. copula *asti* is almost always existential, and doubts about Indra’s existence are expressed elsewhere in the RV.

II.12.8: For *nānā* see my disc. in the Hock Fs. “RV *sá hināyám* (VI.48.2) with a Return Visit to *nāyám* and *nānā*,” in *Grammatica et Verba, Glamor and Verve: Studies in South Asian, Historical, and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Hans Henrich Hock*, ed. Shu-Fen Chen and Benjamin Slade, 2013. I follow Thieme’s 1949 explanation of the form as an *āmreḍita* involving the expected nom. sg. of *nř-* ‘man’, otherwise unattested in Vedic. For reasons given in my article I prefer this account to Klein’s recent (2004) derivation from a pronominal *āmreḍita* **anā-anā* → **anānā*

“in this way (here), in that way (there)” (Jared S. Klein, “Nominal and adverbial āmreḍitas and the etymology of Ṛgvedic *nānā*,” in *The Vedas: Text, Language & Ritual. Proceedings of the Third International Vedic Workshop, Leiden 2002*, ed. Arlo Griffiths and Jan E. M. Houben, 251-60).

II.12.9–11: Note the phonological sequence, with several different interlocking repetitions:

9c *yó víśvasya*

10a *yáh śaśvato ... śar"vā*

10c *yáh śardhate ... śṛdhyām*

11a *yáh śambaram ... śarádi*

II.12.10: The hapax *śṛdhyām* is generally taken as the acc. sg. of a stem *śṛdhyā-*, and this is perfectly plausible both morphologically and contextually. However, it might rather be taken as the loc. sg. of a *devī*-type *-ī*-stem *śṛdhī-* “does not yield to the vaunter in his vaunting.” This makes somewhat more sense.

II.12.13: Pāda b provides a good example of *cid* taking Wackernagel’s position even though the word it should limit occurs later in the vs. line. In the first pāda *cid* correctly follows the word it limits, or rather the first part of the dual dvandva *dyāvā cid ... pṛthivī* “even Heaven and Earth bow to him.” But in b *cid* follows the abl. *śúsmāt*, while the geographical feature corresponding to H+E in a, namely *párvatā(h)* ‘mountains’, is postponed. But surely the clause means “even the mountains fear his explosiveness” (as in the publ. tr.), not “the mountains fear even his explosiveness.”

II.12.15: As often, a pattern well established through most of a hymn gets broken, or shaken up, at the end. Here the 3rd sg. reference to Indra in the first 14 vss. changes to 2nd sg. address, but this change isn’t immediately signaled: the vs. begins with a rel. pronoun *yáh* that apparently matches the monotonously regular occurrence of the rel. with 3rd ps. ref. in the rest of the hymn. Only the verb *dárdarṣi* in b, the last word in its clause, shows that the pattern has been broken.

The sandhi form *dudhrá* is ambiguous: it can reflect either a nom. sg. *dudhráh* with the Pp. or a loc. sg. *dudhré*. The publ. tr. (JPB’s) opts for the latter, a possibility floated by both Ge (n. 15a) and Old, who does not decide. The loc. interpr. has the advantage of allowing the oddly placed *ā cid*, which would represent *ā* as “Praep. mit vorhergehendem Loc.” (Gr. 169) plus ‘even’ emphasizing that loc. Ge’s tr. follows the nom. of the Pp, and there are arguments in favor of this interpr. -- *dudhrá*-elsewhere modifies Indra (I.56.3, VI.22.4 [2 out of 5 total occurrences]), and introducing a new personage in this vs. seems unnecessary. Like Old I can’t decide.

The main clause *sá kílāsi satyáh* “you are certainly real” is an implicit answer to the doubt expressed in 5b *utém āhur naiśó astīti enam* “And they say about him, ‘he does not exist.’”

The 2nd ps. reference of *sá* in the just quoted expression is contrary to my rules of such reference with this pronoun -- that 2nd ps. *sá* (etc.) is only found with

imperatives and verbs so used. But the whole structure of this hymn, with the refrain *sá janāsa índraḥ* in the same metrical slot as this declaration, imposes the need for a *sá* here as well.

The final pāda, *suṽrāso vidátham ā vadema*, is a variant of the standard Gṛtsamāda Triṣṭubh refrain *brhad vadema vidáthe suṽrāḥ*. The refrain pāda here is found twice elsewhere (I.117.25, VIII.48.14), neither of them in Maṇḍala II or in a Gṛtsamāda hymn. The reason for this variation isn't clear, since the standard refrain would fit here unproblematically. Perhaps to mark the specialness of this particular hymn?

[II.13 Indra (misc. comments by SJ to JPB tr.)

This hymn is extremely challenging, with a discouraging number of puzzles and no clear overall theme -- though Indra's cosmogonic activities and his help to particular clients dominate the latter part of the hymn.

II.13.1: The standard tr. (incl. JPB) seem to assume that *pári* serves as a postposition with *táśyā(h)*, but the interposition of *apáh* and, esp., the close sandhi of *apás pári* make this difficult. JL suggests that *apáh* might have a double reading, as a rare singular form of *áp-* 'water', an ablative to be read with *táśyā(h)*, and as the more usual acc. pl., with which the pl. rel. *yāsu* agrees. Thus "just born from this water he has entered the waters in which he grows strong." But the most likely referent of *táśyā(h)* is the immediately preceding *jánitrī*, which refers to the season, so an abl. of water is unlikely. That *pári* might form a lexeme with *āvisat* is suggested by 8c *āpariviṣtam*.

Note the alliteration in cd: *pipyúṣī páyo ... pīyūṣam prathamám*, with the first terms of each pair echoing each other. JL suggests that *āṁśóḥ pīyūṣam prathamám* is in apposition to the *páyaḥ* phrase, rather than being, with most tr. incl. JPB's, a nominative expressing the subject of *ukthyām*, anticipating *tád*. This would allow the refrain to be a separate clause, as it overwhelmingly is in the rest of the hymn.

II.13.3: Pāda a is syntactically disturbing, in that it seems to have a clear embedded rel. cl.: *ánv éko vadati yád dádati tád*, with *tád* the referent in the main cl. corresponding to *yád* in the dependent cl. ("... that which he gives" -- so the standard tr. incl. JPB's). Since such constructions seem strongly disallowed in RV, such a bald example would be striking and in fact begs for a different interpr. The interpr. of this pāda is made more difficult by the fact that the lexeme *ánu √vad* is found only here in the RV and it is not entirely clear what action is being performed. If Sāy/Ge (et al.) are correct in identifying the first *ékaḥ* as the Hotar and the second as the Adhvaryu, a possible solution emerges. The Hotar should not in fact be "giving" anything; his job is to recite in accompaniment (an activity well conveyed by *ánu √vad*) to the ritual actions. It is the Adhvaryu who gives, that is, who actually makes the physical offering. Assuming that this division of labor already obtains in the RV, it seems likely to me that *yád dádati* begins a new sentence and is a *preposed* rel. with the main cl. ... *éka īyate*. I would tentatively tr. the hemistich "One follows

along with this speech. the (other) one hastens when he gives that [=soma/oblation], changing its forms, having that as his work.” If *yád* is rather taken as the neut. rel. pron., the tr. can be modified to “What he gives, he hastens to that, having that as his work ...” My working assumption is that the independent *tád* is coreferential with the *tád* in the cmpd *tád-apas-*.

II.13.4: Contra the standard tr. (incl. JPB’s) I wonder if *vibhájanta āsate* has $\sqrt{ās}$ ‘sit’ in auxiliary function as later: “keep Xing” (in this case “keep distributing”) rather than having the literal sense “they sit, distributing.”

I am baffled by pāda b.

II.13.5: In the causative infinitival phrase *akṛṇoḥ pṛthivīm samdṛśe divé*, Re and WG take dat. heaven as subj. and acc. earth as obj. of the dat. infinitive, in contrast to the publ. tr. and Ge. Since the usual obj. of the infinitive *dṛśé* is the sun, the Ge/JPB interpr. seems more likely, in that it also involves looking heavenward. Note also that in 8ab the datives *pṛkṣāya* and *dāsāveśāya* are objects of the dative infin. *nīhantave*, with the same syntactic pattern as is suggested here. There is also an occurrence of the same stem *samdṛś-* in the acc. pl. in 10c, but this seems to have no clear relationship to the dative here and is, in any case, quite opaque.

II.13.6: With Klein (DGRV I.135, etc.), I take the double *ca* as conjoining morphologically parallel *bhójanam* and *várdhanam*, despite the preposed position of the 2nd *ca*. This preposing would be supported by 7a where a correctly positioned second *ca* in a double *ca* construction is found in the same metrical position and before an almost rhyming final word, *dhármaṇā*.

Because of the accent on *dudóhitha*, pāda b must continue the relative cl. of pāda a, rather than serving as its main cl. as in the publ. tr., which should be corrected to “You, who distribute ... and who have milked ..., / you have hidden ...”

I’m inclined to take the loc. *vivásvati* here as “bei/chez Vivasvant” rather than “in Vivasvant” as in the publ. tr. That is, Indra set down a treasure in the vicinity of Vivasvant, presumably as a reward for V’s sacrifice, rather than within his body.

JL points out the complex mirror-image figure that straddles the pāda break in cd: #*sá* ... *dadhiṣe vivásvati*, *vísvasyaika īśiṣe sá* ... The two interior elements, *vivásvati* and *vísvasyaika(h)*, are phonologically similar and isosyllabic; they are flanked by 2nd sg. mid. perfects with rhyming ending *-iṣe*; and the pronoun *sá* with 2nd sg. reference provides an outer ring.

II.13.7: *dāna-* in b is almost universally taken as ‘pasture’ (Weide) or ‘earth’ (Re ‘sur terre’), a meaning attributed to *dāna-* only in this passage. The interpr. goes back, one way or the other, to Sāy: *upalūyante sasyāny atreti dānaṃ kṣetram*. His remark “grain is cut there” implies a connection with $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘reap, mow’ (EWA’s *DĀ*²). His gloss ‘field’ (*dānaṃ kṣetram*) is repeated thereafter, most influentially in BR, though they seem to derive the word from $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘divide’ (EWA’s *DĀ*⁴); subsequent adoptors of the gloss do not bother to comment on the etymology. Sāy’s implied derivation

from $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘reap’ is appealing. There are several clear exx. of the root pres. of this root in the RV (grouped under Gr’s 2. *dā*), as well as nominal derivatives (see EWA s.v. *DĀ*²). The reference in this vs. to the establishment of flowering and fruitful plants would have helped preserve a lexical item specific to agriculture, even though it is homonymous with the more common *dāna-* ‘gift’ (and see differently accented *dānāya* ‘to give, for giving’ in 13a).

I wonder, however, about the concrete locational sense that Sāy gives it; it might make more sense as an abstract ‘in their reaping’. The vs. seems to depict Indra as the orderer of the cosmos, with the solemn etymological figure *dhármaṇā ... ádhārayaḥ* “you established by your establishment” (or without English cognate expression, “you established by your ordinance”). (I would not follow JPB’s attribution of the *dhárman-* to the plants: “according to the foundation (of each).”) Most of the hemistich would then show Indra creating the various plants in their crucial function, to be harvested. (The presence of *ádhi* might be counter-evidence to my interpr., in that it generally has a locational sense, but I’m not certain that this is enough to derail it.)

I further think that the last bit of the hemistich, *vy àvánīr ádhārayaḥ*, is a somewhat separate expression. That is, I read *ádhārayaḥ* without preverb with the “plants” segment in pāda a / first part of b (thus not flg. JPB’s “established separately the flowering and fruitful (plants)”), and restrict *ví ... ádhārayaḥ* to the streams of the end of b; its position after the caesura in b favors this syntactic separation. If this interpr. is correct, the problematic *dāne* may require further analysis, for in addition to ‘in their reaping’ for the first part of the hemistich (to $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘reap’) it could also be taken as a derivative of $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘divide’, as JPB does: ‘in their division’. It is ideally positioned to be read with both.

I would thus tr. the hemistich “You who established by your ordinance the flowering and fruitful (plants) in their reaping (and) established the (various) streams separately in their division.” Indra’s division of undifferentiated water into separate streams would be part of his fructifying project -- bringing life-giving water to the various terrestrial regions.

Having created the relevant features of the earth -- plants and streams -- in ab, Indra then turns to a particular heavenly feature, the *didyút*-s. What exactly is meant here isn’t clear. The stem *didyút*-, like its near-twin *didyú*-, generally means ‘missile, dart’, but often a missile sent flying from heaven by a god (cf., e.g., VII.46.3 [Rudra] *yā te didyúd ávasṛṣṭā divás pári* “which missile of yours shot downward from heaven ...”). As Mayrhofer points out (EWA s.v. *didyú*-), *didyút*- has probably been remodeled after \sqrt{dyot} or *vidyút*- ‘lightning’ (I’d favor the latter). And often it seems to have a naturalistic aspect, as lightning (or the dreaded ‘thunderbolt’ of old-fashioned Vedic exegesis). Here the naturalistic reading seems esp. prominent, and I suggest that *ásama-* ‘unequalled’ may also have the sense ‘unequal’ -- that is, jagged and asymmetrical, zigzaging like lightning.

The last difficulty of this challenging verse is the first part of d, *urúr ūrvāñī abhítaḥ*. Ge (/WG) and the publ. tr. take this as an independent nominal clause (e.g., JPB: “you, the wide one surrounding the containers”). Given the cosmogonic cast of

the rest of the vs., I would follow Re, who takes *ūrvān* as a 2nd object of *ájanah* in c: “(qui,) vaste (toi-même, as engendré) les mers tout autours.” Although *ūrvá-*, lit. ‘container’, generally refers to cow-pens and the like in the RV, Re’s ‘seas’ (as particularly large containers) seems correct here; cf. the same usage, also in Maṇḍala II, in II.35.3, where the rivers all fill “the same *ūrvá-*” (*samānám ūrvám nadyàḥ pṛṇanti*). I would thus tr. cd “and who begot the unequal(led) flashing missiles of heaven (and) the ‘containers’ [=seas] all about, (you) the wide one.” The juxtaposition *urúr ūrvān* is a play on words; the two are not etymologically related, at least by most lights.

What is striking about this vs. is that, unlike the usual cosmogonic vss., which refer to large generic parts of creation (heaven, earth, etc.), this one highlights particular idiosyncratic aspects of the grand cosmic divisions.

II.13.8: To avoid the need to supply additional unsupported material (JPB’s “would do likewise”) to the brief beginning of pāda d *utaívādyá purukṛt*, I interpr. *purukṛt* as a predicated voc. (“and even today (you are) a much-doer”), with most tr.

II.13.9: The syntax of the 1st hemistich is intricate and hard to parse. The first rel. cl. (... *yásya* ...) extends through *ékasya śruṣṭaú*, with *yásya* coreferential with *ékasya*. This clause is in turn dependent on the short *yád* clause *yád dha codám āvitha*, with *codám* the referent of *yásya*. The standard tr. take *codá-* as a personal name, but this is not necessary, as Mayrhofer (PN s.v.) points out -- and in fact it would be better not to have another name for Dabhīti (c), who is the ultimate referent of both *yásya* (a) and *codám* (b).

Note that *ādiya(h)* at the end of b matches *āsíyam* at end of 8c.

II.13.10: Although *vísved ... rodhanā(h)* must belong together semantically, it is difficult to make this work grammatically: *rodhanā* in this sandhi pos. can’t be neut. *-ā*, but must stand for *-ā(h)* -- so Pp. -- (or, far less likely, *-ai*). It therefore can’t properly be modified by a *vísṅvā* extracted from *vísṅvéd*. Old sees the problem, but Gr simply lists the form as neut. *-ā*; Ge [WG], Re don’t mention and tr. as a phrase. The sandhi of either *vísṅvéd* or *rodhanā asya* has to be tampered with to harmonize the two words; I have no opinion on how to make this work. The only other RVic occurrence of the noun is differently accented: *ródhanā*, a neut. pl. (I.121.7); AiG II.2.190 considers our form a fem. stem *rodhanā-* beside root-accented neut. *ródhana-*, acdg. to an existing pattern.

The awkward doubling of *asya ... asmai* should be noted in the tr.: “... have conceded his manliness to him,” with both pronouns referring to Indra. Perhaps the *asya* is there because most exx. of *ánu √dā* ‘concede’ involve the subject conceding some quality of its/his own to a third party, so the fact that the *paúṃsya-* is Indra’s to begin with needs to be emphasized.

I have no idea what the second hemistich is about, except that it obviously involves some cosmogonic activity and the *viṣṭírah* and the *samḍṛśah* are implicitly

contrasted. In d *pári paró* shows phonetic play, but I do not understand the function of *paráh* here.

II.13.11: The first pāda, *supravācanām táva vīra vīryām*, is a nominalization of the famous opening of I.32 (found in various forms elsewhere): *índrasya nú vīryāni prá vocam*. In that hymn this opening is followed by the account of an undoubted heroic deed, the slaying of Vṛtra. Here the specification in b, introduced by *yád* (as often in such proclamations) followed by a promisingly heroic *ékena krátunā* “by your resolve alone,” turns out to be something of an anticlimax: you find goods. This lack of drama is somewhat repaired by d, which sketches a larger world of great deeds.

Unfortunately, however, the syntax of d is disturbing. The rel. cl. of d is universally tr. (incl. by JPB) “all the things you have done,” but “all” (*vísṡvā*) is not part of the rel. cl. (*yā cakārtha*). It has instead been stuck in the refrain, which only in this verse has been altered from *sāsi ukthyàḥ* (2-10d, 12d) to *séndra vísṡvāsi ukthyàḥ*. Dropping a piece of a rel. cl. into the middle of a main cl. is simply impossible in the RV. It is possible to interpr. *vísṡvā* as a real part of the main cl., an acc. of respect: “What (deeds) you have done, you are worthy of hymns with regard to all of them.” But somehow I doubt that’s what the poet intended -- though what his intentions were, esp. given the deliberate alteration of the refrain, are opaque to me.

Another possible wrinkle in d is that *yā* need not be the neut. pl. of the rel., illegally anticipating the *vísṡvā* intruding in the refrain. It could be an instr. sg. picking up *vāyah* in the preceding pāda: “... the vigor by which you have done ...”

II.13.12: The use of the secondarily shortened stem *śravāya-* here instead of inherited *śrāvāya-* may have been favored by the similarly short-root-vowel *āramayah* at the beginning of this vs. (which stem comes by its short root vowel honestly) and by the denom. *śravasyā-* in the next vs. More problematic is what *prá ... śravāyan* is conveying here. One might think that what the blind and the lame want is not fame but healing. Some such consideration must have led Gr to assign this form (and *prāśrāvayam* X.49.8) to a different root *śru* and a different idiom *prá √śru* ‘vorwärts bringen’. I see no justification for such a separation. It is possible that the causative here means (as it can elsewhere) ‘make hear/heed’ rather than ‘make heard/famed’, though this wouldn’t appreciably improve the situation of the blind and lame. Or that in the idiom *prá √śru*, the *prá* came to dominate, with a sense ‘further, favor (through fame)’.

II.13.13: The last puzzle in the hymn is found in pāda c and also involves fame. We have just urged Indra to to give us a *rādhah* (‘gift, benefit’) in the first hemistich. In c we find the phrase *yác citráṃ śravasyā(h)*. Since *citrá-* very frequently modifies *rādhah*, it seems natural to supply the recently mentioned *rādhah* here. But then what is Indra doing? *yác citráṃ* appears to be the obj. of *śravasyā(h)*. But this denom. doesn’t otherwise take an object (IV.42.2 cited by Gr is to be otherwise interpr.), and even if it did, the phrase would have to mean “which bright (gift) you will seek as fame,” which doesn’t seem to make sense. Ge essentially tr. it this way (“... eine

ansehnliche (Lohngabe) ... in der du ... deinen Ruhm suchen”), but I don’t see why Indra would be looking for his fame in that direction. JPB avoids the syntactic difficulty by tr. as if *yác citráṃ* were an instr.: “the bright gift *through which* you will seek fame” (my italics), but this still requires the gift to be something that would provide Indra with fame. Re’s tendency to supply masses of material to smoothe over the rough places is on full display here: “ce qui est éclatant, veuille le donner-par-désir de-renom” (so hyphenated). WG seem to have arrived at a novel solution, apparently separating *citrám* from its usual formulaic partner *rādhas* and supplying *śrávas-* ‘fame’ -- or so I interpret “damit du ... deinen ansehnlichen Ruhm suchen mögest.” However, as far as I can tell, *śrávas-* is never modified by *citrá-*, and context favors *rādhas-* as referent. I have no solution. The least unsatisfactory may be to assume that, in our self-serving way, we are telling Indra that giving us a good gift will bring him fame (better than heroic deeds? see 11ab) -- and in some sense it will, since we celebrate his generosity with hymns providing lasting *śrávas-*.]

II.25 Brahmanaspati

II.25.1: In c I take the phrase *jāténa jātám* as expressing an essentially hostile relationship between adversaries: he extends beyond the offspring (of his competitor) with his own offspring. This interpr. would match the similar configuration of etymological figures in 2a *vīrēbhir vīrān vanavad vanuṣyatáh* “With his heroes he will win against the heroes who seek to win,” which in turn expands the etymological figure in *vanavad vanuṣyatáh* in 1a. The standard tr. take both elements in *jāténa jātám* as referring to the offspring of the subject: “he will extend beyond his offspring with (more) offspring” or “offspring after offspring.” However, the strong parallel in 2a makes this less likely in my opinion.

II.25.2: Ge, Re, Schmidt (Bṛhaspati und Indra, 113) take pres. act. part. *vanuṣyatáh* here as gen. sg. dependent on acc. pl. *vīrān* (e.g., Schmidt “... die Mannen des Angreifenden”). I find this extremely unlikely, given that the same word in the same etymological figure in 1a and in the following hymn, II.26.1a, must be acc. pl. The acc. pl. *ṛghāyatáh* at the end of 3a with the same morphological structure also supports this analysis.

II.26 Brahmanaspati

II.26.1: With Ge, Re, and WG, I take *ṛjúr íc cháṃsaḥ* as a severed bahuvrīhi, like *nārā ca sámśam* (IX.96.42, cf. X.64.3), with accent and case ending adjusted. For a similar formation, still compounded, see V.44.5 *ṛjugātha* ‘o you whose song is straight on target’. It would be possible, however, to take the text as given and make a “straight laud” the subject, as a sort of metonymy; so Schmidt (B+I 115).

II.26.2: The impv. *vihi*, with short root vowel (also III.21.5, IV.48.1, and possibly VI.48.17), must belong to the root pres. of $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$ ‘pursue’, whose properly formed 2nd sg. impv. is *vīhí* (7x). The easiest way to explain its short vowel is by analogy to *ihí* belonging to the root pres. to \sqrt{i} ‘go’, with pres. indic. *émi*, *éši*, *éti*, and impv. *étu*, all strikingly well attested, which match *vémi*, *véši*, *véti*, and *vétu*.

Its object, *manāyatáh*, is ambiguous and for that reason its referent is not clear. Its base *manā-* means something like ‘zeal’, a meaning found also in other derivatives to it, but zeal can be positively or negatively viewed; for a negative occurrence see nearby II.33.5. In our passage Gr, Re, and Ge [WG] take it positively, referring to gods (Gr, Re) or priests (Ge), while Schmidt (B+I 115), flg. Ludwig, negatively, referring to enemies. My tr. is meant to be neutral, since I think both are simultaneously possible.

II.26.4: On the bad cadence produced by *ávidhat* see (despairing) comm. ad II.1.7.

The curious long final of *rákṣatī* is not remarked on by the standard tr./comm.; the Pp simply reads it short. In my view it represents *rákṣati* + *ī*, the latter the enclitic acc. pronoun related to *īm*, which latter follows the first, parallel verb in the pāda, *uruṣyáti* + *īm*. They would show a phonologically motivated distribution here, with *īm* before vowel and *ī* before consonant, and would be positioned identically, immediately after a clause-initial verb and before an ablative.

[II.27–28 JPB]

II.29 All Gods

II.29.2: The sequence in pāda c, *abhikṣattāro abhí ca kṣámadhvam*, invites interpr. as an etymological figure, but the agent noun, as it stands, must belong to $\sqrt{kṣad}$ ‘mete out, apportion.’ Old tentatively suggests an emendation to *abhikṣantār-* ($\sqrt{kṣam}$), though he also allows that the transmitted reading may be correct and the poet is playing with Gleichklang. This seems the better course, esp. given that the stem is found once elsewhere (VII.21.8), though *abhí* is not otherwise attested with this root. It’s worth noting that *abhí* $\sqrt{kṣam}$ is found only in this little group of hymns (II.28.3, II.33.1, 7, in addition to this).

The reason for the accent on the main verbs (*abhí ...*) *kṣámadhvam ... mṛláyata* is not entirely clear, since neither begins its clause or pāda and they are not subordinated. They must be implicitly contrasted in some way, but, impressionistically, other such sequences are not accented.

II.29.3: As Ge and Re point out, the unexpressed conditional clause with the first hemistich should be something like “if you’re not going to help us *now*.”

II.29.4: Pāda c presents interpretational difficulties, particularly if *rté* is taken as the loc. sg. of *rtá-* ‘truth’ with most interpr. The problem in that case is not merely *rté* but also how it relates to *madhyamaváh-*. None of the suggested tr. seems

satisfactory to me, and though Old discusses the passage at some length, he ultimately suggests with some despair that *madhyama-váh-* is an unknown technical term in Fahrkunst. Given the unconvincing solutions suggested by others, I am persuaded by Re's quite different interpr.: he takes *ṛté* as the postposition/adv. 'without' and construes it with *vah*. Old had already argued against the "without" interpr., on the grounds that there is no ablative and that *ṛté bhūt* occurs also at pāda end in VI.67.8 (where, however, I interpr. it as I do here). And, though *vah* is not technically an ablative enclitic, it is fairly all-purpose in terms of case. Its distance from *ṛté* can be attributed to its taking Wackernagel's position. With a "without" interpr. the rest of the pāda falls out: we do not wish for our chariot to be without you; *madhyama-váh-* then specifies where the chariot is traveling, possibly "in the middle of its journey" or "in the middle of a battle." (Though I enthusiastically adopt Re's analysis of *ṛté*, I am not at all convinced by his interpr. of this compound: he thinks *madhyama-* refers to a middling number of draft animals.)

II.29.5: In b we expect the simile "like a father his son"; instead we get the father, but a gambler in the place of the son. We must infer the filial relationship. (The distress of his family, including his father, over the fall of their gambler kin is depicted in X.34.4. Nonetheless the pairing here is peculiar.)

The expected son then appears in d. The purport of this pāda is clear -- the speaker asks that only he be punished for his offenses, not his son -- until we get to the simile. Why does the poet liken himself to a bird, and what can be supplied in the simile to match *putré*? The standard tr. conclude, reasonably enough, that the comparison involves baby birds (or maybe eggs?) (e.g., Re "Ne me saisissez pas en (la personne de mon) fils, comme (on saisit) un oiseau (en s'emparant de ses petits)."). But is this meant to imply that bird parents get more upset by the loss of their offspring than other animal parents do? or that robbing birds' nests was a particular prominent practice? I am baffled. It is possible that the simile only has domain over the acc. *mā*, with no involvement of the loc. *putré*: "do not seize me like a bird" -- expressing the trapping/snaring techniques of bird-catching. But this doesn't make much sense either.

II.29.6: Technically speaking, pāda d has two ablatives: "rescue us from falling, from the pit."

On the hapax *nijúr-* see Scar (165).

II.30 Indra and other divinities

This hymn has at least three, possibly four modern ling. features: conditional (*ābhariṣyat* vs. 2), future impv (*kṛnutāt* vs. 5 [though the fut. impv. appears to be inherited, it is fairly rare in the RV and generally seems to belong to a more colloquial speech level]), gerund (*abhikhyāya*, *hatvī* vss. 9, 10), and mid. subj. in *-ai* (*naśāmahai* vs. 11).

II.30.1: The ceaseless movement of the waters is clearly expressed in the first hemistich, and the question posed in the last pāda is a leading one, at least in my view. It asks at what (temporal) distance, i.e., how long ago, did the waters first start this movement. The implicit answer is “when they were released from Vṛtra’s hold,” which prepares for the account of the Indra-Vṛtra battle in the next vss. (On the unexpected long vowel in *kíyāti*, see comm. ad I.143.3.)

The problematic pāda is c, and this is in great part because of the uncertain interpr. of *aktúh*. Ordinarily this word means ‘night’, but since “the night of the waters” is a curious expression, most comm. instead implicitly derive it from $\sqrt{añj}$ and tr. ‘color’ vel sim. (e.g., Ge “das Farbenspiel der Gewässer”). With Old I take the word in its usual meaning ‘night’, contrasted with the āmreḍita *áhar-ahar* “day after day.” However, I think the expression “night of the waters” is used metaphorically and perhaps has oppositional semantics. The waters are often, esp. in treatments of the Vala myth, identified with the dawns. Here, perhaps, “night” is meant to evoke its opposite, “dawn” (a poetic device we’ve seen elsewhere, e.g., I.103.7; see publ. intro. to I.103 and comm. ad loc.) and the whole expresses the fact that just as the waters keep flowing, so also do the dawns keep dawning. This interpr. may be too radical, however, and the point of the image may simply be how dark waters can look compared to the sky at dawn (or dusk) -- the “night of the waters” is this dark appearance under certain lighting conditions.

II.30.2: The first hemistich of this vs. is desperately obscure. It is unclear what is being done to or for Vṛtra in pāda a, much less who is doing it, and the identity of the feminine subject in b is likewise left open. The function of *ábhariṣyat*, the only conditional in the RV, is uncertain, and also, though this is the least of our problems, whether the verb is \bar{a} + *ábhariṣyat* or is simply an augmented form without preverb (latter Pp.). The unclear meaning of the rare word *sína-* simply adds to the difficulties.

Let us start with the last one first: the stem *sína-* occurs twice in the RV (here and III.62.1, also as object of $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ with dat. complement), as well as in the compd. *tát-sína-* (I.61.4) and the deriv. *sínavant-* (X.102.11). As indicated in EWA s.v., its root affiliation depends on what we think it means, and what we think it means depends to some extent on what root we ascribe it to. I will not rehearse the various suggestions; suffice it to say that I think it belongs with $\sqrt{sā}$ ‘bind, tie’ and refers to material tied down on a wagon vel sim., a load -- equipment and the like -- hence my ‘gear’. (For a similar semantic development of a derivative of a different root meaning ‘tie’, see my “Sanskrit pāriṇāhya ‘household goods’: Semantic evolution in cultural context,” Fs. E. Hamp [ed. D.Q. Adams], 1997, pp. 139-145.) In this I follow Old.

I also follow Old in my interp. of the rest of the pāda. Someone *was going to bring* equipment for Vṛtra (hence the conditional, as a contrary-to-fact), but was impeded by the action of the main clause in b: a female, identified as a generatrix (*jānitṛī*) foils the plot by announcing it to a wise or knowing one (*vidúṣe*). That *ábhariṣyat* is the only conditional form attested before the Brāhmaṇas (so Whitney)

must mean that it carries a very particular force, one that could not be easily expressed by more standard parts of the verbal system.

The potential identities of these actors takes us yet another step into the speculative wilderness. I *very tentatively* suggest that the potential accomplice of Vṛtra is Sūrya. There are two, rather shaky reasons for this suggestion: There is some evidence in the Rig Veda for enmity between Indra and Sūrya, particularly in the (alas fragmentary) myth where Indra in conjunction with Kutsa steals the wheel of the sun. This hostility is also found, more developed, in the Mahābhārata, as is well known. And within the vs. itself there is a possible reference to Sūrya in pāda c, in the phrase *pathó rādantīh ... asmai* “excavating the paths for him.” Elsewhere in the RV Sūrya is the beneficiary of similar actions: VII.60.4 [*sūryaḥ ...*] *yásmā ādityā ádhvano rādanti*, VII.87.1 *rādat pathó váruṇaḥ sūryāya*. Although I know of no other evidence for Sūrya attempting an intervention on Vṛtra’s behalf, I nonetheless tentatively supply him as subject of pāda a. The mother figure described as *jānitṛī* in b could be the Earth, as sometimes (I.185.6, III.31.2), or Indra’s own mother (as in III.48.2, X.134.1). I have more confidence in Indra as the referent of *vidúṣe* ‘knowing’.

As just noted, I think Sūrya may be the referent of *asmai* in pāda c -- or rather one referent, for I think the pāda is deliberately ambiguous. If I am right that Sūrya is the covert subject of pāda a, then the phraseological parallels to the “excavating paths” expression that have Sūrya as beneficiary would suggest him as referent of *asmai*. The feminine pl. agents could be the dawns, who make the path for the rising sun. But in the context of the Vṛtra battle that forms the subject of the first vss. of this hymn, this pāda may refer to the paths dug out by the waters when they were released from Vṛtra, with *asmai* referring to Indra. Both dawns and waters are potential subjects: the phraseology of pāda d would fit either (or both). Both waters and dawns go to their goal (cf. I.158.6 for waters, III.61.3 for dawns). Although *dhúni-* ‘boisterous’ seems more suitable for waters than dawns (cf. *dhúnimant-* 2x of waters, *dhunayanta* once with rivers as subj.), the emphasis on dailiness (*divé-dive*) might point rather to the dawns. In short, at least the second half-vs. seems deliberately ambiguous, with potentially double referents both for the female subject and the masc. beneficiary.

I have no confidence that my interpr. of this vs. is correct, but I find the other published attempts even less convincing. However, IH has suggested an alternative interpr. to me (p.c.) that is definitely worth considering. In this scenario the *sínám* ‘equipment’ is Indra’s mace, his ‘(fighting) gear’ (so IH), brought to him (=Indra) *against* Vṛtra. Dat. *vṛtrāya* here would be a dative of malefit, as it were, exactly as it is in the next vs., 3b. The bringer of the *sínám* could be Tvaṣṭar or even Uśanā Kāvya, two regular suppliers of the mace to Indra. In b the *jānitṛī* could be Vṛtra’s mother, whom we memorably meet in I.32.9, and the knowing one (*vidúṣe*) Vṛtra himself, with the participle possibly proleptic.

The potential drawback to this interpr. is that we know that Indra *did* get the mace and smash Vṛtra, so the hypothetical value of the conditional isn’t accommodated. But since we don’t actually know what the value of the conditional

was in the RV, this should not deter us. Alternatively there may have been a previous episode in the myth in which Indra's first attempt was thwarted when Vṛtra was tipped off. A revised tr. of the hemistich acdg. to this scenario would be "The one [=Tvaṣṭar? / UK?] who was going to carry the gear here for [=against] Vṛtra -- the mother [Vṛtra's mother] announced him to the knowing one [=Vṛtra?]."

II.30.3: This vs. is a fairly straightforward account of the Indra-Vṛtra battle, though Indra's name doesn't appear until the last word.

I don't quite understand the function of *hí* in pāda a. If it is causal (a value I always try to impose on *hí*), it may take up 2b: we know (at least in one interpr. of vs. 2) that Indra already knew (2b *vidúṣe*) about the trickery before the mother's announcement, because he had already taken his position in the midspace. But this may be over-thinking *hí*. The *hí* in c is even harder to account for, and I wonder if it isn't there to provide a mirror-image figure: *míham ... hīm á(dudrot)* and to serve as hiatus breaker between *úpa* and *īm*. IH offers an alternative explanation for the two *hí*'s. In IH's account of RVic verbal function, aorists in subordinate clauses express anteriority. Here the *hí* would be a fine expression of post hoc, ergo propter hoc, with sequential events acquiring a causal cast: "because he had taken his stand, he bore down his weapon" and "because he had run up to him, he conquered ..."

In b *vṛtrāya ACC prá √bhṛ* echoes 2a *vṛtrāya ACC √bhṛ*. In my interpr. these expressions are contrastive and have different subjects and different intents (though see IH's interpr. above): in 2a the dat. *vṛtrāya* is a dative of benefit, in 3b a dative of, as it were, malefit. The same *vajrāya WEAPON prá √bhṛ* as 3b is found in I.61.12. The *prá √bhṛ* expression may be slyly alluded to even in our vs. 2, where *prá* opens pāda b and is therefore adjacent to *ábhariṣyat* pāda-final in a, even though it is construed with *uvāca* at the end of b.

In c Vṛtra must be the subj., even though it breaks the pattern: Indra is the unexpressed subj. of a and b and postposed subj. of d. However, Vṛtra has a penchant for mist (e.g., I.32.13, V.32.4), and in this context it would uniquely identify him.

II.30.4: The vs. is nicely framed with vocc., *#bṛhaspate ... indra#*, thus inviting their identification.

Ge (/WG) take *vṛkadvaras-* as a PN, but Wackernagel's explan. (KlSchr. 325–26), adducing Aves. *duuar*, a daevic way of moving, is quite convincing.

ardhám √kṛ 'go halves' (also VI.44.18) strikes me as an idiomatic or slangy expression, which may fit with the rare (and also possibly lower-register) future impv. *kṛṇutāt*.

II.30.6: WG tr. *radhrāsya ... yájamānasya* as "des ermatteten Opferers" and further explain that sacrificing under the hot South Asian sun is exhausting. But surely the point is rather that even a resolute enemy gets slammed down by Indra and Soma (pāda a), while even a weakling gets pepped up if he performs sacrifice to them.

II.30.7: *tandran* is, of course, a curious form. The Pp., not surprisingly, reads *tandrat* (with *-t* → *-n* before *ná*). Gr emends this to **tandat*; Whitney (Rts) list the form thus, though with ?; and Old allows it as a possibility, without exactly endorsing it. IH suggests following the Saṃhitā reading and interpreting it as a 3rd pl. med. root aor., with ending *-ran*. The only other verbal form to this root, *tandate*, is medial. If this is correct, there would seem to be a change of no. in the subj. from the impersonal 3rd sgs. of the standard tr. to an unspecified 3rd pl.: “It will not tire nor weary me, and they will not flag.” Who the plural subject might be is unclear -- perhaps the 1st plural that is found in the next pāda. And in fact all three verbs could be 3rd pl.: the Pp. 3rd sgs. *tamat* and *śramat* also appear immediately before *n-*, with Saṃhitā *-an*. Under this interpretation the forms would not be impersonal but have unspecified plural subj.: “they will/do not tire or weary me nor do they flag.” If we prefer to accept the emendation to **tandat*, the *-r-* can be explained, with Gr., as adopted from the nominal derivatives (*á-*)*tandra-* and *tandra*(*yú-*) (cf. also AV *tandrī-*).

II.30.8: Note that pāda a is modeled exactly on 6c.

II.30.9: Ge (/WG) supply a verb as the 1st member of the disjunctive *utá vā* constr., contrasting with *jighatnúḥ* (“Wenn uns ein Unbekannter (nachstellt), oder töten will ...”), invoking VI.5.4 with *yó naḥ sánutyō abhidāsat ...* But more salient in VI.5.4 is the contrastive pair *yáḥ ... sánutyah ... yó ántarah ...* Therefore, flg. Schmidt (B+I 81; also Klein DGRV II.171), I supply *yó ántarah* as the 2nd part of the disjunctive phrase. Re actually proposes a clever variation on the “distant ... near” contrast, pairing *abhikhāya*, which he renders “(regandant) en face,” with *sánutyah*. This avoids the need to supply additional material, but employing the rare gerund simply as a polar term with ‘distant’ seems unlikely.

As Gr points out, the idiom ‘hand over, deliver’ is characteristic of *pári √dā*, not *pári √dhā*, which generally means ‘clothe, surround’. He suggests that this sense of *pári √dhā* is attributable to “Verwechslung mit *dā*.” In a quick scan of the Gr’s conspectus of *dhā* forms, I found only one example of *pári √dhā* ‘deliver’, namely our *pári dhehi*. I wonder if *dhehi* for **dehi* is a nonce hypercorrection, for a form that appeared to have undergone Grassmann’s Law because of the *-hi* ending.

II.30.10: The literal meaning of *ánudhūpita-* is fairly clear, ‘besmoked’, but there is disagreement about its sense. Gr suggests that it means ‘puffed up, arrogant’, while Ge (/WG) think it refers to besieging enemy strongholds with fire and smoke. (If this were the case, one would think “a long time” was the wrong qualifier: smoke and fire should do the trick fairly quickly or not at all, I would think.) I am more in favor of Re’s equivalence with *mohita-* ‘bewildered’, a negative mental state. In my view, ‘besmoked’ means either that their minds have been darkened and led astray to evil ways *or* that they have become confused / befuddled by our constant threats and attacks and it is time for us to administer the coup de grâce.

II.30.11: On the ring between 1c #*áhar-ahar* and 11d *divé-dive#*, see publ. intro.

II.31 All Gods

Ge (/WG) follows Windisch (Fs. Roth) in seeing this hymn as an allegory, with *rátha-* ‘chariot’ = *stóma-* ‘praise’ and the solution provided only in the last vs. I find this interpr. overblown. The equation of the hymn / sacrifice with a chariot is a trite trope in the RV; I don’t see that this hymn treats the theme in a special way, but perhaps I’m missing something.

II.31.1: As pointed out in the publ. intro., the last word of the vs., *vanarṣád-* ‘sitting in/on the wood(s)’, applies both to the simile -- the birds sitting in the trees -- and the frame -- the charioteers sitting on the wooden chariot. The same qualifier could also characterize other aspects of the sacrifice -- the ritual fires sitting on the firewood, the soma drinks in the wooden cups (for both of which see X.46.7). It is more difficult to apply it to the priests, who are presumably the underlying referents of the plural subject here.

II.31.5: The root noun cmpd *apījũ-* is somewhat puzzling, in that the 1st member *api-* (*apī-* with lengthening at cmpd seam; for possible explan. see Scar 169 nn. 223, 224) seems to contribute nothing. In fact, the standard tr. simply ignore it. Scar is on the right track, I think, in taking it as only loosely compounded and meaning something like “also speeders,” perhaps in order to preserve some cmpd sense “speeders in addition.”

On *návyasā vácaḥ* see comm. ad VIII.39.2.

Pāda d in itself and in its syntactic relation to c is also problematic. Perhaps the first, and possibly the easiest, issue is the apparently untethered *ca*. Klein (DGRV I.226–27) takes it as conjoining the two pādas c and d, but this requires supplying a verb (*kṛṇve*, flg. Ge) that has no support. I think rather that it signals a standard syntagm that has been split across the vs.: “the still and the moving” (gen. *sthātúr jágataś ca* VII.60.2, X.63.8, plus other examples with *ca*-less phrases and lexical substitutions) is a common merism for “everything earthly.” In this verse pl. *jágatām* is found in b, where Night and Dawn are the speeders of moving things; here its formulaic partner, the still (in the sg.), is about to receive an underlayer of vigor. The *ca* simply reminds us that b and d are implicitly contrasted: moving things are impelled to even more movement, whereas still things are about to acquire a solid base. To draw attention to the pairing it might be worthwhile to begin the tr. of d with “and as for the still (world) ...”

Another of the questions is the grammatical identity of *trívayāḥ*: is this bahuvrīhi *s*-stem a nom. sg. masc., as it appears to be, or a nom./acc. neut., modifying *váyah*? Although the latter interpr. might seem ungrammatical, Wackernagel (AiG III.288) tentatively allows neut. *-s*-stem nom./acc. in *-āḥ*, though the number of exx. he cites is small and it is possible that they could all be explained in other ways. Nonetheless, in VII.24.2 (see comm. ad loc.) I do take *dvibárhā(h)* as a neut.; in IV.11.3 and X.80.4 *vīrápeśā(h)* must have a neut. sg. reading; and a neut. interpr. is the standard one for *trívayāḥ* here (e.g., Re “la vigueur tri-vigorate”). By

contrast I take it in the publ. tr. as a nom. sg. masc., modifying the 1st sg. subject of *stusé*, hence “I possessing triple vigor ...” I still think this is quite possible, but I do not consider the alternative (“... to strew triple vigorous vigor as the underlayer ...”) out of the question.

The last question is who is doing the strewing. In my publ. tr. it is “I,” and again I still consider this possible. But I think it’s also possible that I praise Heaven and Earth so that *they* will provide the underlayer. This is esp. likely if *trívayāḥ* is taken as neut.: “I praise you two ... (for you) to strew triple-vigorous vigor ...” The pair, or at least Earth, makes sense as the cosmic entity that would provide a base for the still, whereas Night and Dawn, in constant motion, make sense as the speeders of the moving things.

II.31.6: The first hemistich begins and ends with *utá*. The pāda-final *utá* of 6b puts a cap on the series of verse-initial *utá*’s that began in 3a (3a, 4a, 5a, 6a). This is perhaps fitting because vs. 6 ends the capacious list of gods of every sort (from mighty Indra to shadowy Aja Ekapad) who have been strung together additively.

The vs., or rather pādas a and d, plays on *ś*: *śámṣam usījām ... śmasi / āśuhémā ... śámi*. This may be in part to showcase the unusual truncated verb *śmasi* ending pāda a; note that verse-final *śámi* is a virtual anagram of this verb. This *śámi* is also echoed by hemistich-final *sám* in 7b (in an unusual position). There are also echoes from earlier in the hymn: *āśu-* picks up *āśávaḥ* (2a) as *ékapād* does *pádyābhiḥ* (likewise 2a). IH cleverly points out that the position of *śmasi* after (*i*)*va* ([*i*]va *śmasi*) hints at the root $\sqrt{vaś}$. See *vaśmi* in the next vs.

The Uśij-priests are credited with the production of a particular *śámṣa*-elsewhere, the *āyóḥ śámṣa-* (IV.6.11, V.3.4). For further see comm. ad II.32.2.

II.31.7: The 1st sg. *vaśmi* may be seen as a type of poetic repair, anchoring the truncated (*u*)*śmasi* of 6a.

II.32 Various Gods

II.32.1: The first hemistich here, with the skeleton *asyá me dyāvāpṛthivī ... bhūtám avitrī vácasaḥ ...* “become helpers of this speech of mine, o Heaven and Earth” is somewhat reminiscent of the famous refrain in I.105 *vittám me asyá rodasī* “take heed of this (speech) of mine, you two world halves,” though with aid rather than mere attention asked of Heaven and Earth. The different ordering of the two genitives *asyá* and *me* in the two passages conforms to our expectations of the positioning of enclitics.

The syntax of the second hemistich is rather stiff and clotted, with an oblique nominal relative clause (“of which two there is extensive lifetime”) picked up by a long main clause beginning in the middle of pāda c with the 3rd ps. du. prn. *té*. It is only after some time that we discover that *té* is an accusative, the object of verse-final *dadhe*, and that it is doubled by du. enclitic *vām*, which switches the reference to 2nd ps. The enclitic *vām* is very oddly placed, smack in the middle of pāda d, not

leaning on any of its adjacent elements semantically, as far as I can see. Moreover, *puráh ... dadhe* seems to be a phrasal verb, but with the two parts of the phrase distant from each other and separated by extraneous material.

II.32.2: The first pāda of this vs. is esp. puzzling. As usual in the RV, *Āyu* sows confusion, and here, since it is not clear who/what *Āyu* represents, it is also unclear with what to construe the gen. *āyóḥ*. The standard interpr. take it with *rípah* ‘swindles, tricks’, while I attach it to *áhan* ‘day’ (with no confidence in its correctness; Old explicitly rejects it). The problem is that *Āyu* is generally viewed positively, as in II.2.8 where the ritual fire is “the guest dear to *Āyu*” and II.4.2 where the Bṛḥgus deposit the ritual fire “among the clans of *Āyu*.” If *Āyu* is positive in value, then the “swindles of *Āyu*” must be those directed against him, as Old points out. But as he also points out, the more natural reading of this gen. would be subjective (“swindles perpetrated by *Āyu*”), not objective. It must be admitted that once in this maṇḍala (II.14.7), *Āyu* is viewed negatively: Indra strikes down the heroes of *Āyu* along with those of Kutsa and Atithigva, a trio that is subject to Indra’s violence elsewhere, though also individually named as Indra’s comrades in still other passages. More to the point, in my opinion, is the apparent formula VERB *uśíjah śámsam āyóḥ* “The Uśij-priests X-ED the Laud of *Āyu*” (IV.6.11, V.3.4). In the immediately preceding hymn, II.31, we find in 6a the expression *śámsam uśíjām* “the Laud of the Uśij-priests,” and in the next vs., 7b, the *Āyu*-s (pl.) figure as fashioners of ritual speech. This suggestive juxtaposition and echo of the fuller expression “Laud of *Āyu*” found in the preceding closely related hymn suggest that *Āyu* here is viewed positively and is related to the ritual; I therefore think that “the day of *Āyu*” is a way of referring to the day of the sacrifice.

Most forms belonging to the thematic stem *dábha-* must be root aor. subjunctives, but here the *mā* requires an injunctive. Formally the root aor. injunctive should have a zero-grade root, **dbhan*, but obviously such a form is not viable. With full-grade restored, the injunctive is identical to the subjunctive. On these forms see Hoffman (Injunk. 242–43), who suggests that a new injunc. *dabhur* was created to avoid this functional coincidence.

sakhyā occurs several times with *ví√yu* ‘keep away’. Narten (Sig. Aor. 214) states that the *s*-aor. to this root is intrans., and Ge (/WG) render it thus here: “Nicht soll sich unserer Freundschaft lösen,” presumably with neut. pl. *sakhyā* as subj. of the sg. verb. However, VIII.86.1 *mā no ví yausṭam sakhyā*, with dual verb seems to me decisive for a transitive interpr. of this idiom. In the publ. tr. (“Do not keep us far away from your companionship”) I take *sakhyā* as an instr. (sg.) of separation. However, it is also possible that it is an acc. pl., with the tr. “Do not keep your companionship(s) far away from us.” See IV.16.20.

The phrase *viddhí tásya nah* (“know this (speech?) of ours” in the publ. tr) resonates with I.105 *vittám me asyá* “take heed of this (speech?) of mine, which I adduced above in regard to *asyá me ...* opening our 1a. It might better have been tr. with “take heed.”

II.32.3: The priests' *sumnāyatā mānasā* "with a mind seeking favor" is, hopefully, matched by the god's *āhelatā mānasā* "with a mind without anger."

As in the previous hymn, II.31.2, *pādyābhiḥ* is directly adjacent to a form of *āsú-* 'swift'. Ge (/WG) take *pādyā-* as 'heels': "(Wie) en siegesstarkes Rennpferd mit den Fersen." The image assumed must be from horseback riding, with the rider spurring the horse on by putting pressure on the horse's flank with his heels. But the evidence for horseback riding in the RV is scant, and, as I understand it, the racing that is done involves chariots. (On the other hand, there may be mention of "a hero on horseback" [*vīró árvati*] in the next hymn, II.33.1, though it probably refers to Rudra.) Not only does this heel-spurring not fit the realia, as far as we know it, but it makes trouble for the verbal structure, because "with the heels" would at best only be appropriate to the simile ("(like) a swift prize-winner") not the frame ("you": we are hardly likely to be poking the god in the side with our heels). And finally, although the heel is of course a part of the foot and so *pādyā-/pādyā-* could in theory refer to it, no other occurrences of either of these stems seems so specialized, and we do have a perfectly good inherited word for 'heel', *pārṣṇi-*. I therefore think *pādyā-* means 'pace, footstep'. In the simile, "with paces" would refer either to the training the horse is put through or to the pace of another horse running in front or at its side meant to keep the *vājín-* up to speed. Its use in the frame is more complex. On the one hand, the steps can refer to the movements of the Adhvaryu around the ritual ground; his physical activity is implicitly contrasted with the verbal activity (*vācasā*) of the Hotar (and Udgātar). I also think that *pādyā-* can refer to verses measured in feet, metrical measures. Although Re thinks this unlikely ("tentant, mais trop hardi"), I see nothing against it.

II.32.4: The adj. *śatādāya-* has a more precise meaning than the standard tr. (e.g., Ge "vollwertigen") and one different from that in the publ. tr. ("having a hundred shares," flg. Gr). It was long ago established by Roth (ZDMG 41: 672–76) that this has to do with Wergeld or the worth of a man as measured in cows, hence here '(for whom) a hundred (cows) are to be given'; cf. Ge's n. 4d, Macdonell-Keith Vedic Index s.v. *vaira*, and V.61.8 with comm. ad loc. I would therefore emend the tr. to "a hero worth a hundred (cows) ..."

II.33 Rudra

This is a much anthologized hymn, fully translated by Macdonell in VRS, Doniger, and Maurer. Its popularity is not surprising: it's lively and varied, but does not pose major difficulties, though it has its share of small knots.

Re EVP XV.157–60.

II.33.1: The only difficult pāda is c, which has received a variety of interpr. The first question is whether *vīró árvati* should be construed together or *árvati* taken with some other part of the clause. With Ge (/WG) I take the two words together in the publ. tr.; most other tr. (Macdonell, Re, Doniger, Maurer) take it with *naḥ* or directly with the verb *abhí ... kṣameta*. Ge (/WG) take the hero to be one of us, a human; this

leads Ge to interpr. the verb as passive (“Es möge unser Kriegsmann zu Ross verschont blieben”), although all forms of this idiom, med. *abhí* √ *kṣam*, all of which appear in this little group of hymns (II.28.3, 29.2, 33.1, 33.7), have the same meaning, “be indulgent/patient towards” (see esp. vs. 7). With most tr. I instead understand *vīrá-* to be Rudra; it is appropriate to ask for his indulgence or patience. This leads us to the question of whether Rudra is likely to be on horseback. I know of no evidence for or against, but given that Rudra is the Maruts’ father and they are often associated with horses, it is certainly possible. However, the only other occurrence of *árvati* in the RV (VIII.71.12) appears to be an unmarked loc. absolute: we ask Agni for help “when a charger (is at stake).” It is therefore possible that the same usage is found here, and the pāda should mean “The hero should be indulgent to us when a charger (is at stake).” I leave the question open.

II.33.3: This is the only occurrence of sg. *vájra-bāhu-* that doesn’t qualify Indra. (The only non-sg. form is dual *vajra-bāhū* addressed to Indra and Agni in I.109.7.) I do not know why Rudra is thus identified here.

II.33.4: The *sáhūti-*, a joint invocation (with another god or gods), may be a sore subject for Rudra. As pointed out in the publ. intro., he receives only three hymns dedicated to him alone in the RV; otherwise two hymns joint with Soma and incidental mentions in hymns to other gods. He may feel slighted. See also disc. ad VI.49.10.

II.33.5: I am in agreement with most tr. (though not Macd.) that pāda b is the thought of the subject of the rel. cl. in pāda a, namely the over-zealous sacrificer. The verb *áva ... diṣṭya* belongs not with √ *dā* ‘give’ (with Gr), but √ *dā* ‘cut, divide’ (so already Wh Roots); see esp. Narten (Sig Aor. 138–40). The idiom *áva* √ *dā* is generally taken, including by Narten, to mean ‘abfinden’ (propitiate, compensate), but I think it has a more literal meaning here, ‘cut off’. The too-little ritual service of vs. 4 -- poor praise (*dúṣṭuti-*) and shared invocation (*sáhūti-*) -- meets the contrasting fault in vs. 5: the over-eager worshiper who wants Rudra as his own exclusively. This is a dramatic opposite of the *sáhūti-*; not only an invocation directed only to this god, but one not jointly produced by the group of priests and worshippers. Such a private one-on-one human-divine relationship would be quite anomalous in the RVic religious world, where divine service requires cooperation among various ritual personnel. The personal appeals in the Vasiṣṭha-Varuṇa hymns of VII have such a strong impact in part because they deviate so far from ordinary religious practice.

The standard interpr. of the second hemistich makes the main clause rather loosely attached to the rel. cl. of pāda a. The “us” (*naḥ*) of c is supposed to pick up the *yáḥ* of a and the *manā-* of d is supposed to refer rather vaguely to the sentiment expressed in ab: in other words, we don’t want to be the sort of person who might think such a thing or be suspected of thinking such a thing. I think the connection is much simpler. *manā-* is generally ‘zeal’ or ‘enthusiasm’; it is not inherently a negative notion, but becomes negative in the wrong hands (or mind). In my interpr.,

the “whoever” of the rel. cl. in a is our sacrificial rival, who is trying to cut us out of the deal, as it were, by getting Rudra to himself. We beg Rudra not to make us subject to, subordinate to, his over-zealous action.

The epithet *ṛdūdāra-* ‘tender-hearted’ is a charming phonetic play on Rudra’s name, which is almost always read trisyllabically (*rudara*) in this hymn.

Another adj. (see 3b above) otherwise used (almost) exclusively of Indra: *suśípra-* ‘well-lipped’ (of Agni V.22.4; in pl. of Ṛbhukṣans VII.37.1).

II.33.6: On *ghíṇī* see Old.

I take ‘favor’ (*sumnám*) as the gapped goal of the verb in c, *aśīya* ‘might I reach’.

II.33.8: The verb in c, *namasyā*, can be either 2nd sg. impv. or 1st sg. subj., and translations differ. Because of the surrounding 1st ps. verbs (b: 1st sg. *īrayāmi*, d: 1st pl. *grṇīmāsi*) I opt for the 1st sg. subjunctive, though there are no implications either way.

kalmalīkín- is obviously a possessive *-ín-*stem built to a *-ka-*suffixed form of *kalmalī-*, found once in the AV (XV.2.1–4) in unclear meaning, as descriptor of a jewel. The *l*’s and the reduplicative rhyming formation (*kal-mal-*) mark it as non-standard and suggest that it is affective in some fashion. My tr. “sparkling one” is similar to those of others, but given the uncertainty of the word and its base, it should have been marked with a question mark.

II.33.9: The tr. should be slight adjusted to “this ... world,” to reflect the adjectival demonst. *asyá*.

II.33.10: Given that the two words for ‘bow’, *dhánus-* and *dhánvan-*, are suppletive in the RV with the former supplying the nom./acc. sg. and the latter the rest of the paradigm (see disc. ad VI.75.2), my tr. of *dhánvā* (and indeed the various tr. of Re, Macd, Doniger, and Maurer; Ge’s “trägst du Pfeile und Bogen” is ambiguous, because Bogen is both sg. and pl.) as singular must be wrong, and Gr’s identification of the form as pl. is correct. In fact, though the Pp reads *dhánva* with short final, in the Saṃhitā text the word spans the pāda boundary and coalesces with the following word as *dhánvārhan* and so could be underlyingly *dhánvā*, with an unambig. pl. ending. In any case I would alter the publ. tr. to “arrows and bows.”

The VP in c, *idám dayase vísvam ábhvam*, is variously rendered: Ge “verfügst du über all diese Gewalt,” Macd “wieldest all this force” (sim. Doniger, Maurer) versus Re “tu détruis tout mal-informe,” WG “... zerstörst du all dieses Unwesen.” I do not think either of these approaches is correct. On the one hand, *ábhva-* does not mean ‘power’, but rather ‘formless(ness)’, often conceived as monstrous (Re’s ‘mal-informe’ [badly shapeless], though odd, seems close). Nor does *dayate*, if belonging to $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘cut, divide, distribute’ as Ge et al. seem to take it, mean ‘wield, have control’. As for the other view, Re simply states that *dáyate* can mean ‘destroy’, while WG explicitly adopt Gotō’s view (1st class pres., 172–74) that there are two distinct roots $\sqrt{dā}$ that have *dáyate* as pres., one ‘divide, distribute’, the other ‘destroy’. None of

the passages adduced by Gotō for ‘destroy’ requires segregation in a separate root that has little else to support its existence; they can all be seen as metaphorical extensions of ‘divide, cut apart’ (3 of the 5 passages occur with *ví*), an extension well within the bounds of RVic poetic imagination (though perhaps not of all its commentators). My own view is that the action attributed to Rudra here is a cosmogonic one, regularly performed by other Rigvedic gods, namely the division of the formless chaos of the pre-creation universe into what will later be referred to by the expression “name-and-form” (*nāma-rūpa-*) As I have discussed in numerous other places (see, e.g., my forthcoming “The Blob in Ancient India”), the Vedic conception of creation involves division into separate entities, with clear boundaries and names, of an originally fuzzy boundary-less mass, which strikes horror in the hearts of Vedic people. In my view, the verb *dayate* here has its standard root meaning, ‘cut, divide, apportion’, and Rudra is engaged in cosmogonic division. In this sense the verb often occurs with the preverb *ví*, which sometimes occurs directly after the verb occupying post-caesura position (e.g. ... *dáyase ví* ... VI.37.4, VII.23.4). Although the preverb is not found here, *víśvam* immediately follows the verb and evokes the preverb. Note a different use of the same root in vs. 5; also note that *nāma* is found in 8d and *-rūpa-* in 9a, evoking the notion “name and form.”

In my publ tr. I did not fully render the *idám*, however. I would substitute “this whole formless void” or perhaps “the whole formless void here.”

II.33.12: Although most tr. (Ge, Re, Doniger, Maurer, but not Macd) take *nānāma* as 1st sg., with nom. *kumārāḥ* relegated to a simile, I follow Kü (278)(and Macd., see also Gr) in taking *nānāma* as 3rd sg. For one thing, *cid* isn’t a simile particle (*pace* Ge), and so this would have to be an unmarked simile (not, of course, impossible), and for another we might expect (or at least hope for) **nānama* with short root vowel as a 1st sg. pf. The point of the half-vs. must be that even a little boy knows to honor someone more powerful and distinguished than he is, and so I surely know to do the same.

II.33.13: The *śám(tama)-* here makes a ring with *śám(tama)-* in 2a.

Note that in HvN the voc. *vṛṣaṇo* is wrongly given as accented (*vṛṣaṇo*).

II.33.14: The mid. impv. (*áva ...*) *tanuṣva* suggests that it is Rudra’s own bows that should be un-strung. Recall that he bore the bow in 10a (*bibharṣi ... dhánva*).

II.33.15: In the publ. tr., the *yáthā* cl. is rendered as a purpose cl. (“... that you do not become angry ...”), but *yáthā* purpose cls. always take the subjunctive, as Macd. already pointed out. It should rather be construed with the vs.-initial *evā*, in the usual “just as ..., so ...” relationship, though with the usual order reversed. Macd. also recognized this, but suggested that *evā* is “to be taken with *c*, since in the normal syntactical order it should follow *yáthā* in the sense which it has here.” This is a trickier piece of syntax than I think can be justified — hopscotching the *evā* over the whole *yáthā* clause — and the contents of *c* do not conform to the standard usage of

summary *evā*. Instead I think *evā* sums up the successful achievement of the wishes expressed in the preceding vs. (and perhaps in the whole preceding hymn): “even as you are not angry and do not smite, so (it is): the missile has avoided us, the bows are unstrung, etc.” This is somewhat hard to render in Engl., but I would change the publ. tr. to “Just as you are not angry and do not smite, so (it has come to pass).”

II.34 Maruts

A very difficult hymn, whose problems were perhaps not sufficiently signalled in the publ. intro.

II.34.1: Old rejects the cmpd interpr of *dhārāvarā-* and takes *-varā-* as a suffix meaning ‘reich an’; Ge (/WG, the latter explicitly) follow his interpr. But as Re pts. out there is no such secondary suffix in the RV -- *pace* Debrunner (AiG II.2.908), who lists this as the earliest example of the *-vara-* / *-vala-* suffix in the sense of *-vant-*. It is also Deb’s only *r*-form; the remaining examples listed have *-vala-*. (Curiously, early in II.2 [p. 98] he glosses *dhārā-varā-* as ‘Regengüsse liebend’, with the cmpd interpr., so he doesn’t seem to have paid full attention to this hapax.) One of Old’s objections to the cmpd interpr. is that the accent rules out a bahuvrīhi, but I see no reason why it can’t be a tatpuruṣa with *varā-* ‘wooer’ as 2nd member.

It is notable that “unclosing the cows” (*ápa gā avṛṇata*), the standard culmination of the Vala myth, is here attributed to the Maruts, who ordinarily do not participate in that myth. Of course here “cows” could stand for rain clouds; see the flaming cows in vs. 5.

II.34.2–5: Note the concentration of *pr*SIB forms: 2d *pṛśn’yāḥ*, 3d *pṛkṣám* ... *pṛṣatībhiḥ*, 4a *pṛkṣé*, 4c *pṛṣadaśva* (and scrambled *-śiprā* in 3c, *rapśa-* in 5a).

II.34.2: In pāda a the *-ín*-stem *khādín-* in the frame corresponds functionally to the instr. *stṛbhiḥ* in the simile. See 4d below.

The 2nd hemistich presents a severe mismatch between semantic/contextual expectations and morphosyntax. As we know, Rudra is the father of the Maruts. This vs. contains a nom. sg. *rudrāḥ* and enclitic 2nd pl. *vaḥ* referring to the Maruts, which can be acc., dat., or gen., and a form of the verb $\sqrt{\text{jan}}$ ‘beget’. All the standard tr. render the expression “Rudra begot you, o Maruts” (vel sim.). The problem is that the verb is *ájani*, a form of the so-called passive aor. Re breezily remarks “seul cas de valeur transitive.” But not only are the other occurrences of this form intrans./pass., but it belongs to a formation (the “passive aorist”) that is strongly typed for this function. Moreover, the medial *-iṣ*-aor. forms loosely associated with this form (*ájaniṣta*, etc.) are overwhelmingly intrans./pass. It is inconceivable to me that a Vedic audience would attribute or accept transitive value for *ájani* here, given the robust grammatical support for intrans./passive value.

I therefore think we must interpr. it acdg. to its formal shape, rather than imposing a transitive sense to make the passage easier (or easier by our lights). My way of doing so also requires us to read the sandhi form *śukrá* as nom. sg. *śukráḥ*,

rather than the Pp.'s loc. *śukré*. In this interpr. nom. sg. *vṛṣā ... śukráḥ* is a secondary predicate of *rudráḥ*: “R. was born *as bullish semen* in the udder of Pṛṣni.” It is this semen that combines with Pṛṣni to produce the Maruts; it can also, in naturalistic terms, be the rain in the thunderclouds that are Pṛṣni’s udder. This gender mingling and loss of distinction between the Maruts’ bull-father (=Rudra) and their mother Pṛṣni in the udder are also found, in somewhat different fashion, in IV.3.10d *vṛṣā śukráṃ duduhe pṛṣnir ūdhaḥ* “the bull as Pṛṣni milked gleaming (milk/semen) from his (/her) udder” and in VI.66.1d *sakṛc chukráṃ duduhe pṛṣnir ūdhaḥ* “only once did Pṛṣni milk the gleaming (milk/semen) from the udder.” See also VI.48.22 and comm. ad loc., which may also refer to the birth of Rudra/his semen as occurring before the birth(s) of the Maruts.

It is somewhat remarkable that both Griffith and Max Müller (SBE) also take *ájani* seriously (“Rudra .. sprang into life for you in P's radiant lap” and “as soon as R. ... was born for you ... in the bright lap of P.,” respectively; see also von Bradke, Fs. Roth, p. 118). Perhaps the commentators who came later wished to distance themselves from these not-always-reliable role models even when they appear to be right.

II.34.3: My rendering of *nadáśya kárṇaiḥ* “with the ‘ears’ of the reed(-whip)” follows Pischel’s sugg. (Ved. Stud. I.191; see Ge’s n. 3bc and Old) that *nadá-* is here ‘reed’ (cf. I.32.8) (beside *nadá-* ‘id.’) rather than ‘roarer’ and that it refers to a whip or riding crop of some sort. I suggest that the “ears” would be some part of the whip, perhaps knots on the whiplashes or the like. Pischel’s idea has been generally rejected (though Oberlies [Relig. II.247] seems to accept it); see esp. Old’s negative remarks. But the alternative notion, that the Maruts are directing their horses by the ears of a(nother? side?) horse makes no sense to me: how would such direction work? And although Old explicitly states that the number is not an issue, referring to plural (not dual) ears of a single horse (or even several horses, since pairs of body parts generally are referred to in the dual even when several individuals are in question) seems problematic to me.

In my interpr. the two instr. pls. *kárṇaiḥ* and *āsúbhiḥ* are separate. So also Old, Re, though they otherwise accept the lead-ear theory. But Ge (/WG) construe them together (“with swift ears”), which in my view makes a puzzling interpr. even more so.

The next question is how to interpr. the intensive part. *dávidhvataḥ*. Though the stem is usually transitive, Ge (/WG) take it absolutely (“schüttelnd”), while Re supplies an obj. seemingly at random (“qui secouez-puissamment (le monde)”). I extract ‘lips’ (*śípra-*) from the cmpd. *híraṇyaśípra-*, since du. *śípre* serves as object to just this participle in X.96.9.

The *prkṣám* of d should not be severed from *prkṣé* beginning 4a, though at least in Ge’s (/WG’s) tr. the connection is not signalled (Re’s rendering does connect them). In general thematic *prkṣá-* refers to a strengthening substance, esp. nourishment. The corresponding root noun *prkṣ-* has the same basic sense (see Schindler, Rt Noun, s.v.), but here in the dat. is used infinitively (so also Schindler,

as well as the standard tr.). The phrase *prkṣám yātha* may well be a syntagm, judging from the PN *prkṣá-yāma* in I.122.7 (adduced by Old), and the acc. appears to be a goal, contra Ge’s (/WG) rendering of *prkṣám* as an adverb (“kräftig”).

II.34.4: The two alternatives marked by *vā* ‘or’ (“to fortify all creatures or for alliance”) seem to have little to do with each other. Perhaps we are meant to assume “for alliance with all creatures” for the second alternative, hence my “(with them).”

As in 2a an element found in a free syntagm in the simile has its correspondent in a compound: loc. *vayúneṣu* matches *dhūr-* and both are governed by the cmpd 2nd member *-śád-*, at least in my interpr. (guided by Th., Unters., 23); the other standard tr. do not take *vayúneṣu* with the simile.

The meaning and etym. of the word *vayúna-* are much disputed; see EWA s.v., which lemma consists only of a list of secondary lit. I follow Th’s interpr. (Unters.) to some degree, but consider it more likely a derivative of the (secondary) root $\sqrt{vā}$ ‘weave’ than of $\sqrt{vyā}$ ‘envelop’ and the more likely meaning ‘pattern, tracery’ than ‘Umhüllung’. This literal meaning (arising from the repetitive patterns found in woven material) can then be applied, on the one hand, to similar visual effects (e.g., light and shadow produced by sunlight filtering through trees and bushes) or metaphorically to phenomena that show similarly repetitive patterns, such as ritual procedures. In this particular passage both senses may be at play. In the simile (in my view) the birds are sitting on “the tracteries (of the branches)”: the pattern of light and shade I just alluded to is turned on its head, to refer to the branches that produce those light patterns. But it is also possible to construe it with the frame, where the Maruts sitting at the chariot pole (often a metaphor evoking the chariot of sacrifice; see, e.g., the same cmpd *dhūrśád-* applied to Agni at the sacrifice in the 2nd hymn in this maṇḍala [II.2.1]) could also be sitting among the ritual patterns of the ongoing ceremony. I continue to maintain, however, that *vayúneṣu* here belongs primarily to the simile. I also suggest that *vayúneṣu* subtly evokes the word(s) we might expect in this simile. Birds usually sit in trees, and *váneṣu* \sqrt{sad} is fairly common; compare esp. *vanarśád-* (with a bird simile) in nearby II.31.1 (and X.132.7 *dhūrśádam vanarśádam* with the same pole-sitting as here). There is also the word *vayā-* ‘twig’, which might be another place birds would be expected to sit (though it does not occur in the loc., unfortunately). A form of this rarer word is found in the next hymn (II.35.8). I therefore wonder if *vayúna-* here is felt as a nonce blend of *vána-* and *vayā-*, in addition to having its own regular sense.

II.34.5: Despite the almost comic image of the flaming cows, the reference in this half-verse is fairly clear. The cows with their teeming udders must be the thunderclouds; their ‘enflaming’ quality is presumably the lightning. Although the formation of the hapax *índhanvan-* is morphologically peculiar, it can hardly belong with anything but the nasal-infix present to \sqrt{idh} ‘kindle’, unless it is corrupt (as Old suggests).

The simile “like geese to good pastures” may initially seem unusual -- we expect *cows* to come to good pastures (see 8c below), not geese. But anyone familiar

with Canada geese frequently sees flocks of them in pastures and post-harvest grain fields, and a Google search of “Canada geese in pastures” turns up numerous complaints about their regular mess-producing presence therein, as well as numerous pictures; similar pictures of (Indian) bar headed geese feeding in fields also turn up in a Google search. The image is appropriate to the Maruts, who would fly down in a flock to settle on the ritual ground just as flocks of geese do in fields.

Note the alliterative pāda d: *mádhora mádāya marutaḥ samanyavaḥ*.

II.34.6: The free syntagm *narām (ná) śámsa-* with gen. pl. *narām* is found also in I.173.9–10 and, in reversed order, in VI.24.2 *śámsa narām*. It is obviously a variant of the doubly accented compd *nārā-śámsa-*, which also occurs in tmesis without conversion of the 1st member to gen. pl. in *nārā (ca/vā) śámsa-* (IV.86.42 and X.64.3 respectively). It is possible that the final *-m* of *narām* was generated by the initial nasal of *ná* and the accent adjusted to produce a case form from an underlying **nārā ná śámsa-* in the three occurrences of this syntagm that have this order; the meter would be unaffected. However, the example with the opposite order makes this less likely. In any case, this scarcely matters; the problem is to figure out the referent of the phrase here, whose head is nom. sg. and therefore must be compared to the subj. of the impv. *gantana*, namely the Maruts. *Narāśamsa* is a shadowy divine figure or divine epithet (cf. Re, EVP X.76 n. 7: “la Récitation personifiée?”), who has a regular role in Āprī hymns (generally in the 3rd vs.) and is sometimes identified with Agni and less frequently with other gods (see, e.g., Macdonell, Ved. Myth., p. 100). So our vs. may be comparing the Maruts to a divine figure who should be at the sacrifice -- quite possibly Agni. (This interpr. is explicitly rejected by Re. in favor of a common noun “la récitation faite par les officiants,” EVP X.76 n. 7.) Or, in keeping with Re’s view, it may refer to a ritual element, the laud, that should be present at the sacrifice. Alternatively, and in keeping with my interpr. of the expression in VI.24.2 (see comm. there) and the phrase *śámsam āyóh* (IV.6.11, V.3.4), it may refer to the gods as being like the embodiment of the praise they receive, in an idiom like English “the toast of the town.” Under this interpr. I would alter the tr. to “like the Laud of Men.” In any case, by most interpr. of the compd (and associated syntagms) the ‘men’ (*narām*) are in subject-relation to *śámsa-*: that is, they are producing the laud, not receiving it.

The 2nd pl. act. impv. *pipyata* belongs to the perfect stem, but shows pseudo-athematic inflection (expect **pipita*). On such forms see my forthcoming “The Vedic Perfect Imperative”; briefly, the act. pseudo-thematic impvs. begin, I think, in the dual act. imperatives (here 2nd du. *pipyatam* 4x, 3rd du. *pipyatām* 1x), which owe their disyllabic desinence to the indic. dual endings *-athus*, *-atus*. Subsequently the *-a-* liaison had a limited spread, here to the phonologically similar 2nd pl.

The phrase *dhíyam ... vājapeśasam* “visionary thought that has prizes as its ornament” is a shorthand way to refer to the standard ritual tit-for-tat, with the gods giving material goods in exchange for praise. But it also probably incorporates another element of that exchange, that the gods themselves inspire or create in the poet the poetic vision that he then shapes into praise of them.

II.34.8: The function of the presumed loc. *bhāge* (*bhāga* in sandhi) is unclear. Ge (/WG) construe it with *sudānavah* (“die im Glück freigegeben”), but this common epithet never elsewhere participates in a syntagm. Re takes it as an expression of purpose, and my tr. also reflects such a function, though the loc. doesn’t ordinarily express purpose. I wonder if this is not a (deliberately) mangled dative. Our supposed loc. (the only loc. to this stem in the RV) is immediately followed by *ā* (*bhāga ā*), which resembles the dat. *bhāgāya* with quantity flip. If this seems too radical, we can simply take it as loc. + *ā* and interpr. it as “in (a state of) good fortune” vel sim.

The simile in c can be viewed as poetic repair for the one in 5c discussed above: “like geese to good pastures” there seemed a bit off (though in fact perfectly compatible with observed realia); here the milk-cow in good pastures provides the expected pairing of cow and fodder.

However, the simile here is off in a different way; it is an example of case disharmony (see my 1982, IJ 24 article), with the cow (nom. *dhénuḥ*) in the simile the subj. of an intrans./reflexive sense of *pinvate*, while in the frame the verb is transitive, with *īṣam* as obj. (The dat. of benefit stays constant in simile and frame.) This is possible because of the complex semantics of ‘swell’ words in the RV, also discussed in the just-cited article. It would be possible to avoid the case-disharmony explanation, by supplying ‘udder’ as obj. in the simile (“as a milk-cow swells her udder...”). Udders figure prominently in this hymn (see esp. 6c *áśvām iva pipyata dhenúm ūdhani* “make the mare, the milk-cow swell in her udder”). However, since this simile is not only intelligible without supplying an object but conforms to case disharmony patterns elsewhere, I see no reason to do so.

Not only is *pinvate* an ambiguous pivot in terms of syntactic valence, but its very morphology is exploited for ambiguity as well, at least in my view. The thematic Class I pres. *pínvati* is of course well established in the RV, but it is of course also historically a thematization of a Class V *nó/nu* pres. **pinóti* / **pinuté*, of which a few relic forms are found (e.g., med. part. *pinvāná-*). The 3rd pl. mid. to this pres. would be *pinvaté* (*pinvate* without accent), exactly the form we have here. So in the simile *pinvate* matches its singular subj. *dhénuḥ* in number, but in the frame it can also match its underlying plural subject, the Maruts, if it’s assigned to an athematic stem.

Note that the caesura splits the bahuvrīhi *rātāhaviṣe*. Though such a split is fairly common with dual dvandvas, it is considerably rarer with more tightly constructed cmpds. (I can’t offhand come up with any other exx., though I haven’t systematically looked.)

II.34.9: The cheating mortal of the rel. cl. has no surface representation in the (first) main clause, the two-word finale of pāda b, but the full clause of c contains *tām* (in unusual final position), which picks up the *yáḥ* of the rel. cl. The publ. tr. supplies a reference in the b-clause in the phrase “from *his* harm,” and this is certainly possible.

It might be better, however, to treat “protect us from harm” as parenthetical as Ge does (see his n. 9b), with the real main cl. found only in c.

Re is insistent on taking *tápus-* only as a noun, not as an adjective with the standard interpr. (incl. Gr), but though he is technically correct that the root accent should mark it as a noun (‘scorching heat’), it seems to have been reinterpr. as an adj., possibly on the basis of its regular participation in *tápus-X* cmpds (*tápur-jambha-*, etc.). Though these originally would have meant ‘whose X is searing heat’, it would be easy to slip into ‘having scorching X’.

II.34.10: The sense of this vs., or rather its second half, is very uncertain. See esp. Old’s comments. In the first half, the course of the Maruts shows brightly. The intens. 3rd sg. middle with *-t-*less ending, *cékite*, is taken by Schaeffer (Intens., 44, 112) as having the (/an) old stative ending, which she takes in passive sense (“wird immer wieder erkannt”) in all occurrences of this form. The passive interpr. seems unnecessary: numerous formations to \sqrt{cit} mean simply ‘appear (bright)’. In the intens. it can mean ‘appear continuously bright’ or ‘appear ever more bright’, and this sense works well for all 5 occurrences of *cékite*. As for the form, I doubt that we need to reach into deep prehistory for a stative ending; rather it seems likely to me that it is what we might call a “perfecto-intensive,” built alongside med. pf. *cikité* with adjustment of the redupl. vowel.

A different manipulation of the perfect is probably to be seen in the verb of b, *duhúh* (also twice elsewhere without accent), which appears to have been generated to the *-t-*less middle root pres. 3rd pl. *duhré* (3rd sg. *duhé*) and has acquired the act. 3rd pl. ending *-úh* because those middle forms look like unredupl. pf. forms.

It is not entirely clear who the “friends” are who milk Prṣni’s udder. The udder itself is presumably, as elsewhere (e.g., 5a above), the rain cloud; milking it causes rain to fall. In nearby II.29.4 the friends (*āpáyaḥ* as here) are the gods, in V.53.2 more narrowly the Maruts. Either would work here, though the 2nd ps. address to the Maruts in pāda a and the 3rd ps. ref. of *āpáyaḥ* in b requires person shift if the referent is the Maruts; nonetheless, Ge and Re opt for the Maruts. It is worth noting that the word participates in a word play with the verb: (*ā*)*páyo duhúh* “milk milk,” with the neut. *s-*stem *páyas-* ‘milk’ lurking there (cf. VI.48.22 *pṛśnyā dugdhám sakṛt páyaḥ*, with *páyaḥ* \sqrt{duh} as well as Prṣni). This pun may have invited the use of the stem *āpí-*. I do not understand the purport of the immediately preceding particle *ápi*, unless it is meant to resonate with *āpáyo*. *ápi* does not otherwise appear with \sqrt{duh} , though Ge unearths an ex. in MS (where it appears to be contextually driven).

The rest of the verse is close to hopeless because, on the one hand, the role of Trita (or “the third one”) cannot be pinned down and, on the other, the syntax is slippery and there is no main verb. The standard tr. think Trita is assuming the role of scapegoat and taking on scorn and old age, to spare us (or others), on the basis of passages like VIII.47.13. But Trita has other functions in Vedic, including in vs. 14 of this very hymn, where he is responsible for delivering multiple Hotars, and a more positive role for Trita than scapegoat therefore seems likely. He is also associated with the Maruts in V.54.2 as one who bellows when the Maruts come together with

lightning (*sám vidyútā dádhati vāśati tritáh*); the presence of a roarer here (*návamānasya*) is reminiscent of that passage. My tr. is provisional; for the main verb I supply a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ on the basis of nearby II.23.14 *yé tvā nidé dadhiré* with *nidé* as here. Although I supplied a 3rd pl. form, continuing the 3rd pl. of b, it could easily be 2nd pl. (so the standard tr.) with Maruts as subject; the voc. phrase *rudriyāḥ ... adābhyāḥ* may support the 2nd pl. Otherwise I frankly admit that my tr. is not based on a firm sense of what the passage is meant to convey. Note that scorn returns in 15b.

II.34.12: The relationship between the Daśagvas and the Maruts is not clear. Re suggests that they are identical, but I find this unlikely. The Daśagvas are a rarely mentioned collectivity, generally grouped together with their slightly more prominent kin the Navagvas and associated with Indra in the opening of the Vala cave. The Maruts, though also in Indra’s entourage, are not standard participants in the Vala myth. Here they seem to be implicitly compared to the Daśagvas but not identical to them. The point presumably is to associate the Maruts’ thunderstorm activity, including both the fecundity of the rain, here symbolized by cows, and the return of the light after the storm, with the powerful mythic image of the opening of Vala. The move to configure the Maruts’ activity as on a par with the opening of Vala was already made in the first vs., with the VP in *d āpa gā avṛṇvata* “They unclosed the cows” (see also *śúsucānāḥ* in 1c, comparable to *śucatā* here). Describing their light as *góarṇas-* ‘flooding with cows, whose flood is cows’ is esp. telling, since it connects their floods of rain with the cows of the Vala myth. I supply cows as the obj. of *āporṇute* in the frame on the basis of 1d, but it might be better to take *rāmīḥ*, here tr. ‘nights’, as ‘dark (things)’, referring to nights in the simile but clouds in the frame. Hence a slightly revised tr. “As Dawn ... uncloses the dark (nights), so did they unclose the dark (clouds) ...”

II.34.13: On this vs. see Thieme KZ 92: 43–44, though his etym. of *rudrá-* (n. 34) as ‘tree-breaking’ (< *dru-dra-*) is best passed over in silence. His explanation of *kṣoṇī-* as ‘cry’, here standing for thunder, is convincing. With that interpr., we can see the vs. proceed through thunder, lightning (the ornaments), rain (horse’s piss), and post-storm sunshine (or even rainbow).

II.34.14: The syntax of this vs. is quite broken: a nom. sg. participle (*iyānāḥ*) in pāda a is followed by a 1st pl. verb (*grṇīmasi*), but cd has a 3rd sg. verb (*āvavārtat*) that may (or may not) pick up the sg. subj. of a. The vs. is also notable for the return of Trita (see 10cd above), whose function is no clearer here than there.

With regard to the number/person mismatch of ab, Ge’s notion that both the 3rd sg. and the 1st pl. refer to ritual personnel seems convincing. If we take a and b as separate clauses, note that the first one has a predicated pres. participle. Since in the dependent cl. of cd the rel. prn. (*yān*) has *tān* in a as its antecedent (both referring to the Maruts), it seems reasonable to assume that the same subject is working on both:

the poet (supplied) who implores them in pāda a will cause them to turn here in cd, presumably by means of his imploring words.

It is the simile that is puzzling, though its syntax is impeccable: Trita corresponds to the unnamed subj. of *āvavārtat*, the 5 Hotars to the Maruts expressed by the rel. prn. *yān*. But under what circumstances and for what reason did Trita make the Hotars turn to him, and who were these Hotars? Priests are not usually imported from elsewhere, esp. not from above/heaven (as is implied). I have no solution.

II.35 Apām Napāt

The hymn is much translated; in addition to the standard ones, see Macdonell (VRS), Doniger, Maurer.

II.35.1–4: The first words of each hemistich in this series of vss. echo each other: 1a *úpem*, 1c *apām*, 2a *imám*, 2c *apām*, 3a *sám*, 3c *tám*, 4a *tám*. Since similar openings are found only in scattered vss. later in the hymn (9a *apām*, 11c *yám*, 12c *sám*) I consider the effect deliberate.

II.35.1: It is somewhat curious that the hymn *begins* with the expression “I have set loose my eloquence,” with the augmented aor. *asṛkṣi*. Such phrases are more usual in the final vss. of hymns, summing up the hymn that has just been produced. Perhaps here the poet means that he has set his eloquence in motion, in preparation for hymn composition.

As Ge (and Re) point out, ‘well-ornamented’ (*supéśas-*) of hymns means not only poetically skillful but also receiving adequate recompense from the gods; cf. *vājapeśas-* ‘having prizes as its ornament’ in the preceding hymn (II.34.6), esp. in conjunction with *vājayúḥ* ‘seeking prizes’ in our pāda a.

II.35.2: *aryáḥ* is morphologically multivalent; I take it as nom. sg. to *aryá-*, with most (Gr, Ge [WG], Macdonell, Thieme [Fremdling], Lubotsky, Maurer). Re instead interpr. as acc. pl. to *arí-* (“les êtres-privilégiés”), in apposition to *viśvāni ... bhúvanā*, and it must be admitted that its position between those two words invites it to be construed with them. Doniger seems to follow Re (“all noble creatures”), but I do not understand how she interpr. *aryáḥ* grammatically. It could also be gen. sg. of *arí-* (or nom. pl., though this would not fit syntactically).

II.35.3–4: These two vss. are closely knit together verbally. Both contain an etymological figure, with nom. pl. fem. and acc. sg. masc. derived from the same root: 3c *śúcim śúcayo*, 4a *yuvatáyo yúvānam*. The $\sqrt{\text{śuc}}$ of 3c recurs in 4c as *śukrébhīḥ*, which forms a phonetic figure with adjacent *śíkvabhiḥ*. The repeated PREVERB *yānti ... PREVERB yanti* of 3a is echoed by PREVERB *yanti* of 4b, while 3d and 4b both end with a formulaic expression in which only the verb varies: 4b ... *pári tasthur āpah*, 4d ... *pári yanti āpah*. And finally 3d, 4b, 4d (and 5c) all end with

forms of *áp-* ‘water’ (nom. pl., loc. pl.), contrasting with the pāda-initial gen. pl. *apām* when the god is mentioned (1c, 2c, 3d).

II.35.4: The descriptor *ásmera-*, generally taken as a derivative of \sqrt{smi} ‘smile’, is somewhat curious. It may be simply, as Macd. suggests, that the waters approach their task seriously, not like light-hearted lovers (sim. Doniger). Or (with Maurer) that they are shy. But I somehow think that this hapax is expressing something more particular, though I cannot define it more closely. It may be naturalistic: the circling waters perhaps whirl around without foam, which might be thought of as smiles. Or it may be meant to distinguish these attentive females from other natural phenomena: lightning, especially, is characterized by smiling (see I.168.8) and laughing, and Uṣas also smiles. Though the waters do gleam (see 3c), they are different from those bright celestial females, and the point may be to emphasize the two very different environments in which Apām Napāt finds himself -- the watery and the fiery. Note that in 9b Apām Napāt “clothes himself in the lightning flash” in 9b, but by then his assimilation to Agni/Fire is almost complete.

II.35.5: The identity of the three female goddesses is unclear. They could be, with Sāy., the three who show up in the Āprī hymns (e.g., II.3.8), Iḍā, Sarasvatī, and Bhāratī -- though even if so, this does not help much, since the role of those goddesses is not well defined. A (possibly) different set of three females associated with Agni is found in II.5.5, but that passage is too obscure to aid interpretation here. Macd (fld. by Doniger and Maurer) suggests that they are the waters of the three worlds, but I am not aware of a “waters of the three worlds” trope.

A more acute problem in this vs. is *kṛtā* (in sandhi before vowel; Pp *kṛtāh*) in c. There is no agreement as to what stem it belongs to or what grammatical form it represents. Some simply refuse (or fail) to tr. it (Ge, Doniger, Schaeffer 198–99); others give it a contextual meaning (Macd ‘breasts’, Re ‘plantes’, Maurer ‘nurses’), without attempting etymological justification. WG suggest ‘Spinnerinnen’ (female spinners, spinsters in fact) with a derivation from $\sqrt{kṛt}$. What makes the word so difficult is the root accent; it would otherwise be easily interpreted as a past participle to $\sqrt{kṛ}$. The most sensible disc. of the word is Old’s. He sees it a sexual slang, as in the expression *kanyāṃ* $\sqrt{kṛ}$, glossing “die Engjungferte” (deflowered girl). Certainly in English “to make” or “to do” a girl/woman is a perennial slangy verb for “have sex with,” and one can also adduce the expression “to make (s.o.) a woman,” for “deflower, have sex with a virgin.” He justifies the accent retraction from the ppl. *kṛtā-* (or rather fem. *kṛtā-*) on the basis of AiG II.1.19–20, where substantivized adjectives retract their accent. This seems the best hypothesis of a generally bad lot, and it would fit the context, in that pāda d describes Apām Napāt sucking the first milk of females who’ve given birth for the first time (if that’s what *pūrvasū-* means; see Scar 620–21) -- which makes sense if the females just lost their virginity in the preceding pāda. I therefore take the word as an acc. pl. fem. to a substantivized *kṛtā-* from the ppl. to $\sqrt{kṛ}$.

II.35.6: In pāda a the grammatical problem is *svàr* (to be read as a monosyllable, [almost] uniquely in the RV). Gr identifies it as an acc., Macd (followed implicitly by Doniger and Maurer) as an endingless loc., sim. Re. However, the phraseology, esp. the accented *asyá* (which identifies *asyá* as an adjectival demon., not a pronoun) and the placement of *ca* (*áśvasyātra jánimāsyá ca svàh*, invite, indeed almost impose, a genitive interpr. Ge achieves this by pronouncing *svàr* indeclinable (n. 6a). However, it is possible to see it as an archaic genitive with zero-grade ending *-s, as in Aves. *xuuēng* < **sh₂uuen-s*, but with the -r of the nom./acc. leveled into the oblique. See Klein DGRV I.96, WG.

The identity of the two entities born must also be sorted out. It is possible that the horse is just a horse, since origin in the water is an equine characteristic (see, e.g., I.163.1 adduced by Ge). But it seems likely that the carefully balanced *áśvasya ... asyá ca svàh* refers to two contrasted entities, quite likely the fire (Agni) and the sun (Sūrya). The obvious way to get that is for the horse to represent fire/Agni and “this sun” the sun, but I wonder if there isn’t a clever reversal: the “horse” is the sun and “this sun here” is Agni.

In b the addressee of the impv. *pāhi* is not identified, though the default assumption would be Apām Napāt. It is striking that this is the only instance of the 2nd ps. in this entire hymn.

The “raw” (*āmá-*) fortifications are convincingly explained by Ge as built from unfired brick. They need not (and in my opinion should not) be further interpreted as cloud citadels (so Macd, fld. by Maurer and, in part, Doniger). Specifying that the fortifications be unfired is a cute reversal if Agni is supposed to be in residence there. It is also possible, if Apām Napāt is at issue, that the reference is to his residence in the waters, would would most definitely be uncooked/unfired. It is also of course difficult in this post-Lévi-Strauss age not to put his conceptual spin on the term “raw,” though exactly how this concept would pertain to this passage is unclear: perhaps it refers to a place and a society so far away (*paráh*) from Ārya civilization that it counts as “raw” to Ārya “cooked.”

II.35.7: Note the slight phonological play -- a: #*svá ā dām(e)*, b: #*svadhām*.

II.35.8: Pāda c is a variant on an idea expressed several times elsewhere. that the other fires are mere twigs of Agni, the god Fire. Cf., e.g., I.59.1 *vayā íd agne agnáyas te anyé*. It seems significant that “the others” are not identified here as fires but as entities, beings (*bhúvanāni*) -- in my view, because the identification of Apām Napāt with Agni that brings the hymn to its climax is only partially complete here, and the poet is being canny about not directly referring to fire, though at the same time using diagnostic vocabulary and phraseology.

Note the etymological figure #*prá jāyante ... prajābhiḥ* #.

II.35.9: This is a transition vs. from the watery to the fiery. “Those sloping/aslant” in b can be the waters flowing downward, but they can also be firewood piled to be kindled (cf. I.95.5, where the same phrase seems to refer to firewood, as I interpret

it), and the golden-hued maidens who circle around him can be either waters or flames.

II.35.10: This vs. strenuously develops the “golden” theme that appeared in 9d -- a color more descriptive of the fiery than the watery. An even stronger indication of the transition to Agni proper is the gerund *niṣádyā* ‘having sat down’: the lexeme *ní√sad* is closely associated with Agni’s installation on the ritual ground (see, e.g., the next hymn, II.36.4).

II.35.11: See disc. in the publ. intro. on this as the climactic vs. of the hymn -- both introducing unambiguous fire references and identifying Apām Napāt as the secret name of Agni.

II.35.10–11: The ends of the d pādas in these vss. are very similar: 10d ... *ánnam asmai*, 11d ... *ánnam asya*. In 10d “The givers of gold give food to him” implies that his food is gold; 11d further makes clear that the gold(en) food is really gold-colored ghee.

II.35.12: The verb *mārjmi* is accented because of its juxtaposition with clause-initial *dídhiṣāmi*.

II.35.13: As Old noted (see also Hoffmann, Injunk., 121 n. 29), the need for a caesura suggests a reading *vṛṣā janayat*, rather than the augmented *ajanayat* of the Pp. (In fact, this suggestion is already found in Gr.) That two pres. indicatives, *dhayati* and *rihanti*, follow this proposed injunctive in the same thematic sequence supports interpreting the form contra the Pp, as Hoffmann points out.

The simile *anyásyeva .. tanvā* “as if with the body of another” is, in my view, another reference to the distinction between but ultimate identification of Apām Napāt and Agni.

II.35.14: The acc. participial phrases of ab must be construed with *pári dīyanti* “they fly around (him)” in d, even though the same referent is found in the dat. in *náptre* in c. The latter participates in a clever word play -- *āpo náptre* -- which of course evokes *apām nápāt* even though *āpaḥ* is nom. pl. fem. ‘waters’ and not part of a syntagm with *náptre*. The elision of the first part of his name may be meant: now that he is identified with Agni, he is no longer the child (only) of the waters. But as noted in the publ. intro., that the waters bring him ghee brings the watery and the fiery into harmony. Note that the waters as his cloak here (if I am correct in this interpr., see below) answers to the ghee-cloak in 4d. In the watery vs. 4 the presence of ghee was somewhat anomalous; similarly here in a mostly fiery environment the cloak of the waters stands out.

The phrase *svayám átkaiḥ* is also unclear, and indeed whether it is actually a phrase. Ge takes it as referring to Apām Napāt: “und sich selbst mit Gewändern (bekleidet).” He adduces IV.18.5 with *svayám átkam vásāna(h)*, but in fact the

difference in case between the acc. there and the instr. here speaks against his interpr. The simplex root pres. always takes the acc. of the garment, while the causative *vāsáya-* takes the instr. Moreover, as Lü points out (*Varuṇa*, 146–47 n. 8), the position of this phrase (far from the masc. acc. sg. in ab, adjacent to the fem. nom. pl. in d) and the “harsh ellipsis” required makes this interpr. unlikely. Lü himself in his tr. (146) implies the waters are bringing the ghee with their cloaks, though in the n. he sees them as “in Schmelzbutter gekleidet.” Acdg. to Re the waters fly around him “avec des vêtements (qu’elles se sont donnés) elles-mêmes,” an expression I don’t entirely understand. WG appear to separate *svayám* and *átkaiḥ* but, with Lü, Re, and me, also take the garments as belonging to the waters: “um ihn fliegen die jugendfrischen Wasser von sich selbst mit (ihren) Reisemänteln herum.” The further (and perhaps unjustified) step I take in my tr. is in interpreting *svayám* so closely with *átkaiḥ*, with the waters themselves becoming cloaks for him.

In b ‘paths’ is to be supplied with *adhvasmábhiḥ* ‘unbesmirched’ on the basis of II.34.5 *adhvasmábhiḥ pathíbhiḥ* in the adjacent hymn, at least by my interpr. The standard tr. (Ge [/WG, Re, also Lü, 146) supply ‘flames’ instead (though Re in his n. suggests that “chemins” could be supplied). Where exactly he is located (“highest footprint” generally implies high heaven) and which pathways are meant are unclear to me.

II.36 Ṛtugrahas

II.36.1: The first pāda lacks a syllable, which can be restored by reading augmented *avasīṣṭa*. In the position after the final *-o* of *hinvānó*, the Saṃhitā text could have applied abhiniḥita sandhi to initial *a* redactionally, but the transmitted text never acquired an avagraha. This solution was already noted by Gr and endorsed by Old; Hoffmann discusses it extensively (Injunk. 147).

II.36.2: The standard tr. construe *añjīṣu* with *priyā utá* (“and dear in your ornaments”), but the position of *utá* is somewhat against this: *utá* is less out of place if *priyāḥ* is all that it’s conjoining. And *añjīṣu* goes better semantically with “resplendent” than “dear”; cf., for a connection with $\sqrt{\text{śubh}}$, X.78.7 *śubhaṃyávo nāñjibhir vy àśvitan*, also of the Maruts.

II.36.3: As sometimes elsewhere, *hí* with the first of two imperatives signals that the second action depends on the first.

Despite the masc. gender of *devébhiḥ*, I do not think it identifies a different group from the wives (*jánibhiḥ*), but that the latter further specifies the neutral *devébhiḥ*. In this I follow Re ad VI.50.13, which contains the same phrase (also X.64.10). Tvaṣṭar is strongly associated with the wives of the gods and in all clear cases only with them. It is worth noting that the RV contains no examples of fem. instr. pl. *devíbhiḥ* or indeed of any fem. oblique plural.

My tr. of *jujuṣānāḥ* “having delighted (in the call),” with “call” supplied, followed a claim in John Lowe’s Oxford Univ. dissertation (p. 162) that this pf. part.

only occurs with “call,” as a prior action to the event time of the matrix verb. But in the book based on his diss. (*Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit*, 2015) he has revised this view, at least for this passage and allows *jujuṣāṇáh* to be construed with *ándhasaḥ*, with the main verb *mandasva* ‘become exhilarated!’ logically following the action of enjoyment (pp. 210–11, 214–15; passage tr. on 215). I would tentatively revise the publ. tr. to “having delighted, become exhilarated on the stalk!” Because of the VP *mándasva ... ándhasaḥ* in the first vs. of the next, closely related hymn (II.36.1) I do not take *ándhasaḥ* with *jujuṣāṇáh* here, or at least not primarily.

II.36.4: The lexeme *práti* $\sqrt{vī}$ expresses a reciprocal notion to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, hence ‘receive’; cf. the nominal form *pratīvī-* ‘(gift-)reception’.

II.36.5: This vs. is generally taken as Indra’s, but as I say in the publ. intro., I think it must be Indra as Bṛhaspati. The Brahman’s cup from which he drinks supports this identification.

II.37 Ṛtugraha

II.37.1: As noted above ad II.36.3 the VP *mándasva ... ándhasaḥ* repeats the same phrase there; our *ánu jóṣam* echoes the part. *jujuṣāṇáh* there.

II.37.1–3: The d pādas of the first three vss. have a rigid structure: PRIEST’S CUP *sómaṃ draviṇodaḥ píbartúbhiḥ*. Noteworthy is only that *píba* is accented in all three vss., though there is no obvious reason for this, and the last three vss. (4–6), which also contain imperatives to $\sqrt{pā}$, though of different form (4d *pibatu*, 5d *pibatam*, 6d *pāyayā*), in syntactically variant constructions, lack such accent. I have no explanation (and it seems not to have attracted any attention) beyond the suggestion that *píbartúbhiḥ* is treated as a detachable refrain, even though what precedes it in the pāda must be construed with it. See now also remarks ad III.32.1.

II.37.2: The nom. *dadíḥ* must be part of the rel. cl., specifying acc. *nāma*. *dadíḥ* is nominative because it is a quotation of the name.

II.37.3: Although the default referent of the voc. *vanaspate* in a ritual context might be assumed to be the sacrificial post (cf. III.8.1, 3, 6, 11), the contents of ab -- both the draught animals of a and *vīdayasvā* in b -- point rather to the chariot. See VI.47.26 cited by both Ge and Re. Why the chariot is addressed and identified with the wealth-giver is not clear to me, save for the fact that in the later ritual the Ṛtugraha libations take place in the cart shed (see, e.g., Eggeling, SBE 26.319–20). Note that the havirdhāna carts are the subject of the last trca of nearby II.41 (vss. 19–21).

II.37.5: Another ex. of *hí* with the first of two imperatives, providing the grounds for the second action. See II.36.3. Note also that although *hí* is found deep in its pāda, it

is actually in 2nd position, since a new clause begins with *ā*. For the curious behavior of *hí kam* see comm. ad VI.51.14.

II.38 Savitar

The word *vratá-* ‘commandment’ is prominent in this hymn (vss. 2, 3, 6, 7, 9). The point is repeatedly made that all creatures, incl. the gods, follow the *vratá-*s of Savitar.

II.38.1: The verb of *c*, *dhāti* with primary ending, can only be a root aorist subjunctive like the other two such forms, though neither Ge nor Re so tr. it -- nor do I. However, WG’s “... soll er ... verteilen” does represent the mood (so also Hettrich, Hyp. 177). I would emend the publ. tr. to “will distribute ...” Unfortunately it does not require trisyllabic scansion, which would have supported the subj. interpr.

The question then arises how to analyze *ābhajat* in d. The Pp. takes it as *ābhajat*, with unaccented augment. Under this analysis the verb would not be in the domain of the *hí* in *c*; otherwise the augment should be accented and the preverb unaccented and unverbated. The WG tr. reflects the Pp. by separating the clauses, but Ge, Re, and I (implicitly also Klein DGRV II.74) tr. cd as if they contain conjoined parallel clauses. It would also be possible to analyze *ābhajat* as *ābhajat*, that is, without augment. An injunctive might fit the syntactic context better, in that it could just continue the modal reading of *dhāti* (“will distribute ... and [will] give a share ...”), but paradoxically this would require the two clauses to be more independent because the verb would be unaccented and therefore could not be conjoined to *c* with accent-inducing *hí*. In larger interpretational terms the differences among the several possibilities just outlined is fairly minor -- having just given or being about to give actually turn out to be almost identical acts in Rigvedic ritual depiction -- but it is worth noting the multiple ambiguities inherent in an innocent looking form. For two parallel clauses containing first a subjunctive and then an augmented indicative, see 3ab below (*mucāti ... árāmat*).

II.38.2: The hapax *nímṛgra-* must clearly be a derivative of *ní√mṛj*, lit. ‘wipe down’, but generally either ‘clasp to oneself’ or ‘drag down’ (for the latter see I.140.2, V.52.17). The context here requires something like ‘submissive’, as all tr. take it, though I am not entirely clear on the semantic channel that gets us there. I suppose someone who has been dragged down is likely to be submissive. Note also that it has an unetymological velar *g*, presumably extracted from forms where the final palatal *j*, followed by *s-*, yields *-kṣ-*.

The submission of the waters and, especially, the quieting of the wind probably reflect the natural fact that the wind tends to drop at dusk, and this brings about calming of waves that had been raised by the wind.

II.38.3: The creatures that the hapax *ahyárṣu-* (‘snakes-stickers’, Ge (/WG), Falk ‘Schlangenspiesser’, Re ‘qui picquent les serpents’) refers to cannot be determined for certain. The consensus is that it is some kind of bird of prey; Ge suggests (n. 3c)

the Schlangenadler. Indeed, the short-toed snake eagle (*Circaetus gallicus*) is widespread in India and feeds mainly on snakes (so Wikipedia). The internet (including You Tube) has some remarkable photos and videos of this bird fighting with, swallowing, and feeding its young with snakes, including cobras. The photos with sizable lengths of snake dribbling out of their mouths and esp. the video of one wolfing down a still wriggling spectacled cobra certainly testify to the greed or avidity of these birds.

II.38.4: Though Sāy., Old, and Re identify the weaver as Night, this seems unlikely, if the hymn really depicts the evening. More likely a real human weaver, finishing her daily work.

On the semantic and functional nuance of the imperfect intensive *adardhar*, see Schaeffer (Intens., 140–41).

Pāda-initial *arāmatih* ‘Proper Thinking’ echoes pāda-initial *ārīramad* (3b), though they are of course etymologically unrelated.

II.38.5: *vī tiṣṭhate* should be evaluated in conjunction with *viṣṭhitaḥ* in 6a and *vī tasthuḥ* in 7b.

Ge (/WG) take a and b as separate clauses (sim. Falk). My rendering is closer to Re’s. I think the idea is that Agni/Fire, though in some ways a single entity, is parcelled out into separate domestic fires, one per household, and this holds for a man’s whole lifetime after he has set up his household fire. The coming of night brings the (re-)kindling of these fires and so they come into visual prominence then.

The blazing up of the home fire is accompanied by the evening meal, rather charmingly depicted here: the mother reserving the best of it for her son; the son with his appetite stimulated by the coming of evening.

II.38.6: The first pāda of this vs. takes up the idiom *vī √sthā* ‘disperse’ found in 5b and applies it somewhat differently. Here it refers to all those who were dispersed in various directions pursuing their livelihoods -- who all want to come home in the evening. On *jigīṣú-* see Narten (Yasna H., 122); as she makes clear, the desid. of *√ji* in both Vedic and Avestan lacks martial or battle context and is simply about gaining food and so on.

The verb *samāvavarti* is taken by Kü (465–66) as a (pseudo-)passive aor. to *√vrt*, with ref. to Hoffmann (Aufs. II.589–92). The lexeme *sám-ā √vrt* is used in the causative of Dawn’s cows rolling up the darkness (VII.79.2), so here I think the nuance is the gathering or rolling up together of everything that was dispersed during the day, playing on the common opposition between *vī* and *sám*.

II.38.7–8: These two vss. have been variously interpr. My interpr. is most influenced by Old (whose views also seems to have been adopted by WG). As noted in the publ. intro., the vss. enumerates the separate spheres assigned to the various categories of creatures by Savitar, as an extension of his ability to bring every creature to its proper resting place at night.

II.38.7: This vs. divides the world into habitats for fish (etc.), wild beasts, and birds. Not surprisingly the watery creatures are placed in water (pāda a). As head noun with *ápyam* I supply *jánma* from the summary pāda of this two-vs. sequence, 8d.

The problem in 7a is *bhāgám*: it is tempting to tr. “the watery (race) has been placed by you among the waters as their share,” but *bhāgám* belongs to a masc. stem and must be acc., which does not accord with the nominal clause in which it would purportedly be found. I therefore construe this last word of pāda a with b, as an appositive to acc. pl. *dhánva* ‘wastelands’. Although I would prefer to avoid such enjambment, I see no better choice, and note that a new clause also begins in the middle of pāda c (with *nákiḥ*) and continues to the end of d. Sim. also 9c.

Pāda b has its own problem, the anomalous form *mṛgayásaḥ*. Ge (n. 7ab) declares that *mṛgayás-* can *only* mean ‘hunter’, but gives no evidence for his certainty. Old’s disc. is more to the point (and rather tart about the ‘hunter’ interpr.), though his morphological analysis of it as an *-as-*derivative of the denom. *mṛgay-* seems a little shaky. On the other hand, I don’t have anything better to offer. It reminds us of a suffix-accented masc. deriv. like *rakṣás-* ‘demon’ next to neut. *rákṣas-* ‘demonic force’, which itself gets personified. But the assumed base **mṛgayas-* (or **mṛgáyas-*) ‘wild-beast-iness’ doesn’t exist and it’s hard to see to what it would be generated. AiG II.2.223 dismisses the word with a ? and a ref. to Old’s disc. In any case, Old’s structural arguments that it must refer to the beasts, not the hunters are sound. A third occurrence of *ví√sthā* is found in this pāda.

II.38.8: The general purport of this vs. is clear: it both summarizes Savitar’s distribution of the creatures (esp. in pāda d) and hints (esp. in pāda c) at their return to their own special places at night. But the first half-verse is quite challenging and my interp. is not fully worked out.

On *yādrādhyàm* see Old’s disc. My publ. tr. “As far as (Savitar’s) benefit extends” is, I’m afraid, opaque. What it means to convey is that Varuṇa’s presence in his watery womb is at the favor of Savitar, whose distribution of the creatures in their proper places extends even to the gods, or at least one of them. The dependence of Varuṇa (and other gods) on Savitar’s orders and ordering is stated plainly in the next vs., 9ab. Savitar’s *rādhas-* recurs in 11b.

This passage shows one of the early examples of what becomes Varuṇa’s principal association, that with water. His hypervigilance, familiar from other, more standard treatments of Varuṇa in the RV, is undeterred by his watery environment, as pāda b indicates.

In c *mārtāṇḍá-* is taken by the standard tr. (also Lüders, Varuṇa I.50) as ‘bird’, and this could work well, corresponding to 7c, where the birds are assigned to the forests. However, note that in vs. 7 the other member of the trio of creatures, besides the watery, is the wild beast (7b), whereas here instead of a wild beast we have precisely a domesticated one, the *paśú-*. Its formulaic partner is *mārtāṇḍá-*, lit. ‘stemming from a dead egg’, found otherwise in the RV in the creation hymn X.72.8–9 in the myth of Aditi and the birth of her sons. The last son born (or rather

the egg miscarried), *mārtāṇḍá-*, is the ancestor of mortals; for disc. of the word and the myth see Hoffmann 1976 (=1992: 723). Therefore, here the domestic herd animal (*paśú-*) is paired with the likewise domesticated human, each in its own pen.

[II.39 JPB]

II.40 Soma and Pūṣan

II.40.1: The publ. tr. does not capture the etymological play between the transitive nominal *jánana-* (3x in ab) and the first word of the 2nd hemistich, intrans.-passive *jātá-*, which could have been tr. ‘begotten’ to reflect this etym. figure. However, this tr. seems a little stiff and would not work with *jāyamānau* in 2a.

It is only in d that it becomes clear that the dual nominal phrases in the first 3 pādas are in the acc. and are the obj. of *akṛṇvan*.

II.40.2: The etym. figure involving \sqrt{jan} noted ad vs. 1 continues here with intrans.-pass. *jāyamānau* (a) and transitive *janat* (d). Another figure involves \sqrt{jus} ‘enjoy’, likewise with trans. vs. pass. manifestations: *juṣanta* (a), *ájuṣtā* (b), both pāda-final.

This vs. contains three injunctives: *juṣanta* (a), *gūhatām* (b), *janat* (d), the middle one of which could also be an impv. Ge takes all three as preterital, a course I also follow, but Re takes *gūhatām* as impv. (flg. Gr); WG take the first two as presential and the last as preterital. There seems no decisive evidence for or against any of these choices (or the others that could be made). On the one hand *imaú* (2x, ab) and *ābhyām* (c) ‘these two (here)’ would support a here-and-now presential and/or imperatival reading, as perhaps also the pres. part. *jāyamānau* in a. On the other, it seems unlikely that the gods would be *currently* celebrating the birth of Pūṣan (Soma might be another story), and, as for b, inserting an imperative into the mix seems odd to me.

Another ambiguity is posed by *ābhyām ... somāpūṣabhyām* in cd, which can be instr., dat., or abl. dual. Ge takes it as instr.: Indra performed this feat along with the two gods; Re and WG (see also Hoffmann, Injunk. 124, 193–94) as a dat.: Indra did it for them. I also interpr. the phrase as a dat. -- though not with any strong conviction. On the one hand this deed (putting “raw” milk into “cooked” cows) is almost always attributed to Indra alone, so having Soma and Pūṣan as his accomplices seems somewhat unlikely. But on one occasion (VI.72.4) it’s attributed to Indra and Soma in a dual dvandva *indrāsomā*. However, that hymn basically lays out Indra’s great deeds and attributes them to Indra and Soma jointly, so there’s no independent evidence of Soma’s involvement in this action. As for how they could benefit from the exploit and thus be in the dative -- Soma would benefit from the creation of milk because he (or the ritual substance bearing his name) is mixed with milk in the Soma Sacrifice (a point also made by WG). But what Pūṣan would gain from it isn’t clear -- unless he likes milk with his habitual food, porridge (*karambhá-*). (We should probably be wary of reading Anglo-American breakfast habits back into Vedic India.)

II.40.3: The referent of this marvellous chariot is disputed. Sāy suggested the year, Lüders (Varuṇa, 690) the sun, Ge the praise-song, the sacrifice, or the wish that the gods bring. As Re points out, a choice does not have to be made; the interpretation is “volontairement polyvalente.” However, I assume that the primary reading is the sacrifice and its associated verbal expression, as so often.

The surprising descriptor of this chariot is *áviśvaminva-* ‘not speeding/moving everyone’. This word has to be evaluated alongside its positive counterpart, *viśvaminvá-*, used of Pūṣan in 6a. In both that verse and this one Pūṣan (in this vs. along with Soma) is the subj. of \sqrt{jinv} ‘quicken’. This oppositional phraseology favors Old’s suggestion that the chariot lacks something required to “move everyone” until Pūṣan (and Soma) provide the enlivening push. However, Ge’s quite different suggestion, that the chariot only carries gods and qualified priests, gets support from the only other occurrence of *áviśvaminva-*, in the riddle hymn, I.164.10, where the gods (probably) speak speech that knows everything but does not move everyone (*viśvavidam vācam áviśvaminvām*), a formulation that probably refers to profound speech that only affects initiates or those with already prepared minds. As with the identity of the chariot itself, probably both interpr. can be simultaneously applied.

In the publ. tr. *vṛṣaṇā* appears to be tr. as a voc.; it is not, and the tr. might be clearer as “that do you two bulls quicken.”

II.40.4: The standard assumption (Ge [WG], Re) is that pāda a refers to Pūṣan and b to Soma, but the opposition between celestial and terrestrial/atmospheric dwelling places doesn’t seem to me to divide so neatly. Pūṣan seems often to be an earthly god, accompanying us on the ragged roads, finding our lost cattle, and Soma certainly has a celestial presence throughout the IXth Maṇḍala. I imagine that this contrastive pairing is meant to be a genuine riddle, which would require its audience to try out different solutions by bringing to mind everything they know about both gods and trying to match those characteristics with the description in this vs.

The two different acc. phrases in cd can both be construed with the verb that lies between them, *vīśyatām*. There seems no reason to supply a diff. verb to govern the first acc. phrase as Ge and Re do. The slightly diff. renderings “unleash” and “unloose” in the pub. tr. were simply adapted to better fit their objects.

II.40.5: The contrastive *anyáḥ ... anyáḥ* is generally taken to refer to Soma (a) and Pūṣan (b) respectively (Ge [WG], Re). But the differential characterizations in this vs. seem even less easily assigned than in the preceding vs. “Begetting all creatures” isn’t a standard action attributed to Soma; in fact the same deed is said to be Apām Napāt’s in nearby II.35.2. And Ge can attribute “watching over everything” to Pūṣan only by identifying him with the sun god, while Soma regularly gazes on things, even with the same participle: cf. the very similar IX.57.2 *viśvā cákṣāṇo arṣati* “he [=Soma] rushes gazing on all (things/beings).” Again I think this differentiation is meant to be genuinely puzzling and provoke thought in the audience.

II.40.6: Fem. *anarvā* here (and VII.40.4) is assigned to the thematic stem *anarvá-* by Gr. I think it more likely that it is simply the nom. sg. to the well-attested *-n*-stem *anarván-*, serving for the fem. as well as the masc., without the fem. derivational suffix *-ī*.

II.41 Various gods

II.41.1–3: This *ṛca* is characterized by lexical chaining. The first *pāda* of vs. 2 reprises *niyútvān* from 1c, *vāyo* from (accented) *vāyo* (1a), and *ā gahi* (1b). Vs. 3 is less closely tied to what precedes, but *śukrá-* ‘clear’, which characterizes the first drink of soma, offered to Vāyu, is repeated in 3a from 2b, and *niyútvant-* also recurs from 1c and 2a. The impv. *pībatam* (3c) picks up (*sóma-*)*pītaye* from 1c. More subtly, *ā yātam* repeats the preverb of *ā gahi* (1b, 2a) and also echoes the unrelated verb *ayāmi* of 2b.

II.41.3: The stem *niyútvant-* (3b) is repeated from 1c and 2a, as noted above, but here as an apparent gen. sg. modifying the soma drink (or rather one of them), not a god or gods. Ge (n. 3b) suggests that it is a metrically conditioned “hypallage” for dual *niyútvantā*, which would qualify Indra and Vāyu. This is a clever idea and would restore parallelism to the phraseology of the *ṛca*, though I’m not sure that’s necessary: Rigvedic poets enjoy tweaking parallelism in the syntactic equivalent of a slant rhyme. Old floats a truly oddball idea, unworthy of his usual acuity: that *niyútvant-* should modify an unexpressed *ráthena* but in the absence of a head noun in the proper case it gets sucked [not Old’s term] into the gen. by the “benachbarte” gen. Even if this were a reasonable explanation in principle -- that an untethered adj. could be captured by an adjacent or nearby word in another case -- *niyútvataḥ* is actually in a different *pāda* from the other genitives and is adjacent only to the dual dvandva *índrāvāyū*.

II.41.5: Note the phonological echo across the *pāda* boundary: ... *druhā*, *dhruvé* ...

II.41.11: The *ca* here is a subordinator (‘if’) and conditions accent on *mṛláyāti*. See II.42.1.

There are several nice phonetic sequences: ab: ... *no*, *ná nah*, where the 1st and last words are the same, with *naśat* at the end. And c: *bhadrám bhavāti*.

II.41.12: I am tempted to take *jētā* as a periphr. future, parallel as it is to the subjunctive *karat*. But this is not nec.

II.41.15: On the morphological and semantic structure of *pūṣarātayaḥ*, as well as other aspects of this vs., see the disc. of the identical vs. I.23.8.

II.41.16: Like 15ab, the first two pādas of this vs. consist entirely of accented vocatives.

II.42 Omen-bird

II.42.1: Subordinating *ca* as in II.41.11, also with a subjunctive.

The root noun compd. *abhibhā-* occurs only here in the RV, but 5x in the AV, which seems only to make it more obscure. Twice in the phrase “let not *abhibhā* or *aśasti* find you” (i.e., parallel to this phrase), but also in conjunction with dogs and jackals once, once *abhibhā-s* can speak, and once in conjunction with diseases. Wh. transl. ‘portent’. Though not a lit. tr., Engl. “evil-eye” seems to correspond well to the contextual sense of the word; I have adopted it from Klein (DGRV II.240).

Pāda d should be read as a Jagatī, though neither Old nor HvN comment. The cadence is a Jagatī cadence and the proper number of syllables is achieved by reading *vísiv’yā* as a trisyllable (so already Gr, also AiG III.78). The word is otherwise not found in the RV, but such a cluster begs to be distracted, and by Wackernagel’s analysis of it as modeled on *urviyā* (AiG III.78, flg. Brugmann), it would have *-iyā* by nature.

II.42.2: Similarly, pāda c should also be read as a Jagatī, with trisyllabic *pítr’ya-*, as always in the RV

II.42.3: Although the publ. tr. follows Ge (/WG) in rendering *dakṣiṇatāḥ* as ‘to the right’, it is also possible, given 2c *pítryam ánu pradísam* “in the direction of the fathers [that is, forefathers/ancestors],” that *dakṣiṇatāḥ* should rather be ‘to the south’, since the south is ordinarily the quarter of the Pitars.

On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

II.43 Omen-bird

This hymn seems late enough to allow terms like *sāma(n)√gā*, *gāyatrá-*, and *traiṣṭubha-* to have their full technical ritual meanings, and I have so rendered them.

II.43.1: Again as in II.42.3, *pradakṣiṇít* might refer to ‘south’, rather than ‘right’, though the idiom *prá + dakṣiṇá-* seems more limited to the traditional circumambulation of the fire with the right side facing inward.

Pāda c is somewhat oddly phrased. The vocalizer is identified as a *sāman-singer*, but is said to *speak* (both) *speech(es)*. This raises several questions: does a singer speak? and what are “both speeches”? It is tempting to equate the two speeches with the two entities in pāda d, *gāyatrám* and *traiṣṭubham*, but I am not certain that is correct. I think it’s possible that “both speeches” refers to the words and the melody. As for the question of singing versus speech, I wonder if the simile *sāmagā iva* should go rather with d than with c: “It speaks both speeches. Like a *sāman-singer* it regulates both *Gāyatī* and *Trīṣṭubh* meters.” Unfortunately this hymn is so isolated in the RV that we have no points of comparison.

II.43.2: As HvN remark in their metrical comm., although the Anukramaṇī identifies the meter of this vs. as Atiśakvarī or Aṣṭi, it appears simply to consist of 5 Jagatī pādas. That the fifth pāda is a simple variant of the fourth makes it likely that the vs. is just a version of Jagatī.

The “son of the formulation” (*brahmaputrā-*) is presumably the formulator (*brahmán-*) himself, as the standard tr. take it.

II.43.3: The provision of sitting silently reminds us of the actions and role of the Brāhmaṇa priest in later śrauta ritual: associated (secondarily) with the AV, he silently observes the proceedings for errors and omissions. But that development may be too late for even a late RVic hymn.