Commentary VII

[VII.1–17 JPB]

VII.18 Indra (Battle of the Ten Kings)

I have little or nothing to contribute to the interpr. of this famous hymn, esp. of its historical or quasi-historical aspects. The hymn has been extensively treated by a number of scholars both fairly recently, esp. H.-P. Schmidt (*Indica* 17 [1980], 41–47) and M. Witzel (in *The Indo-Aryans in Ancient South Asia* [1995], esp. 333-37), and in the past, and I will therefore limit my comments. See the publ. intro. for structural and contextual disc. I am certain that many puns, wordplays, and snide asides are completely unrecoverable today and respectfully suggest that we put our energies into interpreting parts of the RV where we have a chance of success.

VII.18.1: Pāda c contains two parallel nominal clauses. Both should be in the causal domain of the *hí*, but it is located only in the 2nd of the two. We might have expected **tᵘvé hí gắvaḥ sudúghās tvé áśvāḥ*, which would have been just as good metrically.

On the pun in d see publ. intro. and comm. ad vs. 4.

VII.18.2: As I interpr. it, the first hemistich presents us with a causal *hí* clause followed by an imperatival non-sequitur. What is immediately striking is that it is emphasized that Indra is dwelling in peace and domestic harmony -- not always the first picture of Indra we conjure up -- in a hymn that is about to become very martial. In the imperatival clause of b, he is also identified as a wise *kaví*, again not a militant role for Indra. Perhaps the connection between the causal *hí* clause and the imperatival ones that follow is that Indra has the leisure to pay due attention to our hymns and reward our poetic offerings (which, as a *kaví*, he has the connoisseurship to appreciate) with aid and material goods.

The interpr. just given assumes that *áva* opening b and *piśā́* opening c are both imperatives. Both of these identifications have been questioned. Some (e.g., Lub) take *áva* as the preverb (Gr by implication, since he does not list it under √*av*), but both Ge and Old (the latter after some hesitation) interpr. it as an impv. As for *piśā́*, Gr takes it as the instr. of a root noun, but most subsequent interpr. as the impv. to an otherwise unattested them. aor. (see, e.g., Old, Ge, Schindler [Rt. Noun], Lub). Our form could well be a thematic substitute for a form of the root-aor., found once in the part. *piśāná-*, since the expected root aor. impv. should be the quite opaque **pīḍhí*.

As indicated ad I.71.10, I do not have an independent view about the morphology of *vidúṣ*, which occurs in the same phrase in both passages (*abhí vidúṣ kavíḥ sán*). I do think that it is a nom. sg. (with Old), not a haplologized acc. pl. as Ge takes it (see his n. 10b ad I.71.10). (Debrunner [AiG II.2.471] seems weakly to assign it to a -*u*-stem [but possibly to -*uṣ*- instead] and interpr. as a nom. sg., while Wackernagel [AiG III.300, which publication of course long predates II.2] accepts Ge's acc. pl.) To me the form looks as if it is a truncated form of the weak form of the pf. part. *vidvā́ṃs-*, though it could of course belong to a *u*-stem *vidú-* instead, but

whether it is archaic or innovative I wouldn't venture to say. It is also curious that in neither passage is the pres. part. *sán* concessive, though that is the usual function of the nom. forms of this participle. However, here the *sán* is by my interpr. in tmesis with *abhí*, which opens the repeated phrase, in the sense 'be preeminent' (so also Ge).

The apparent close sandhi with following *kavíḥ* that it exhibits seems to me not to support the haplology explanation, though the sandhi issue is complex. Mark Hale (in "Preliminaries to the Study of the Relationship between Syntax and Sandhi in Rigvedic Sanskrit" [MSS 51, 1990], as well as the unpubl. *Wackernagel's Law: Phonology and Syntax in the Rigveda* [1995], 33–36) insightfully discusses the general problem of irregular sandhi of *-s* before *k-*. The great majority of the examples occur before forms of √*kṛ*, and Hale plausibly accounts for this phenomenon by pointing out that *kṛ* has an *s*-mobile doublet √*skṛ* and that the unusual *-s* sandhi outcomes can result from the doubled *-s s-* that would be underlying. The single example of such a result before the PN *káṇva-* can also be so explained, since we have a synchronic doublet *-skaṇva*. However, Hale's invocation of the *s*-mobile explanation for the exx. before *kaví-* is not supported by internal evidence for a **skaví-* or by solid evidence of *s*-mobile cognates outside of Indic, and I therefore think the *kaví-* examples require a different explanation -- though I don't know what that is. We should first note that they form a more limited set than Hale's presentation (1995: 36 n. 28) makes clear. The two *vidúṣ kavíḥ* passages are identical, and *paśuṣ kavíḥ* occurs in our same hymn (8d) and is most likely responsive to the earlier example; *vásuṣ kavíḥ* (I.79.5) is nearby *vidúṣ kavíḥ* in I.71.10 (though admittedly not attributed to the same poet) and could be based upon it. *brahmaṇas kave* (VI.16.30) is in a voc. phrase where close sandhi effects are at home; cf. the very similar *brahmaṇas pate* (I.18.3). Of Hale's collection, this leaves V.59.4 *kás kāvyā* [*sic*, not Hale's *kāvyāḥ*] and *ṛtás kavíḥ* (VIII.60.5). The latter is problematic for a different reason: it contains one of only two exx. of a masc. *ṛtá-*; the other is in the same phrase (IX.62.30) but with standard sandhi *ṛtáḥ kavíḥ*. In fact most occurrences of *kaví-* (*kāvya-*, etc.) preceded by *-s* do show the standard visarga (e.g., among the many, I.76.5 *kavíbhiḥ kavíḥ*). I don't know what to make of all this. I am inclined to think that the irregular sandhi originated in the morphologically problematic phrases *vidúṣ kavíḥ* and *ṛtás kavíḥ* and is a dark reflection of their troubled morphology. It then had a very limited spread. But since I don't understand what the morphology is or how this could affect the sandhi, this is not much of a theory! In any case, the poet of this hymn seems to showcase this sandhi anomaly, by not only including the two -*uṣ ka-* examples (2b, 8d), but also adding the correct *āśúś canéd* (9b) and close sandhi *rāradhuṣ ṭe* (18a); cf. also *suṣupuḥ ṣáṭ* (14b).

The cows and horses attributed to Indra in 1c reappear here in c as his ornamental gifts to us.

VII.19.4: The desid. part. *dúdukṣan* is mildly notable because 1) it does not exhibit reverse-Grassmann (*dúdhukṣan) unlike the *s*-aor. *ádhukṣat* (also, however, *adukṣat*); 2) it is a real part., not the *u*-adj. often substituting for the part. in the desid. (**dudukṣú-*).

Because of the overt switch to the 1ˢᵗ ps. in c, I take the pf. *sasṛje* in b as 1ˢᵗ ps. (flg. JPB p.c.), with *vásiṣṭhaḥ* doubling the underlying subject. The pf. form is of course ambig. between 1ˢᵗ and 3ʳᵈ.

As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. exhibits a kind of ring comp. via an anagrammatic pun: 1c *vásu ... vániṣṭhaḥ* "best gainer of goods" is compressed into the name of the poet *vásiṣṭhaḥ* (*vás[u]… [ván]iṣṭhaḥ*). This brings the first section of the hymn to a close; the battle scene erupts abruptly in the next vs.

VII.19.5: My tr. of the 2ⁿᵈ hemistich follows Old's, contra Ge.

VII.19.6: The first hemistich contains two ironic reversals, based on what are presumably personal names or plays on them. In the first pāda *yákṣu-*, perhaps a pun on Yadu, can be rendered as 'sacrificer' (so Schmidt, from whom I adapted the tr.), and he himself becomes the sacrifice, or a part of it: *puroḷā́ḥ* 'offering cake'.

The presumed underlying form of this nom. sg., *puroḷā́s* (also found in III.28.2), is unexpected: to the stem *puroḷā́ś-* we might rather find **puroḷā́ṭ*. See Scar (221) with lit. It is worth pointing out in this case, as well as with equally unexpected *sadhamā́s* in the next vs., that the final of both forms matches that of *sudā́s*, our hero the king Sudās, and so there may have been some adjustment in that direction, esp. in a hymn given to phonological manipulation. Unfortunately this doesn't explain the occurrence in III.28.2.

In b the name of the ill-fated enemy *mátsyāsaḥ* is also the common noun 'fish', and this word should be read in both the simile and the frame. Following Old (and Ge, who adopted Old's suggestion), I take *ápīva* as containing not only the particle *ápi* 'also' but also a putative loc. sg. to *áp-* 'water'. Although there are vanishingly few singular forms to this stem in the RV, they do exist (also in Avestan). The loc. should also be accented **apí*, but in puns accentual fluidity is common. The "fish" pun cries out for the "water" interpr., though Schmidt seems to reject it. He then introduces a pun that isn't supported by the text, rendering *rāyé … níśitāḥ* as "hooked on wealth (like fishes on bait)." Though this is appealingly cute, it is hard to push *ní √śā* 'whet (down)' to 'hook', and dat. *rāyé* is also hard to fit into that idiom. Moreover, (*ní*) √*śā* is a sort of signature verb in this hymn; cf. 2d, 11c, 24d, and in particular the positive 2d *śiśīhi rāyé asmā́n* "whet us for wealth" appears to be the polarized counterpart of our negative *rāyé … níśitāḥ*. I wish I could find a clever expression to capture the image, but so far I have been unable to.

There is a diversity of opinion on what is happening in d as expressed by the verb *atarat*. Ge thinks that friend is helping friend, though this requires √*tṝ* to mean 'help', not a usage I'm aware of; Old that the enemy ranks were divided into two parts, both fleeing but one faster than, and therefore overtaking (√*tṝ*), the other. This seems also to be Schmidt's view, though his "crossed (overcame)" shows a non-idiomatic usage of English 'overcame' (meaning 'overtook'?). The Old/Schmidt view seems possible, but I interpr. it in the light of VIII.1.4, where I take *tartūryante* to refer to the crisscrossing movements of people in opposite sides of a conflict. I suggest that here *sákhā sákhāyam* refers to former comrades who are now fighting on

opposite sides and crossing each other's path in the battle line: the shifting alliances of the participants in the Ten Kings battle are notorious and much discussed (see esp. Witzel's treatment cited above).

VII.18.7: Ge (fld. by Gotō, 1ˢᵗ Kl., 222) takes *bhananta* as reflexive ("… nannten sich") with *śivāsaḥ* as pred. nom., but the responsive pairing of act. 3ʳᵈ pl. pres. *bhananti* and mid. 3ʳᵈ pl. injunc. *bhananta* in adjacent vss. in the same metrical position in IV.18.6–7 (see comm. ad loc.) marks *bhananta* as a text-book case of -*anta* replacement, as disc. in my 1979 article. Flg. Schmidt, I take cd as the direct speech implied by *bhananta*. Old also rejects the Ge interpr.

    The *l*'s of the names *bhalānás-* and *álina-* and the unmotivated retroflex -*ṣ*- in *viṣāṇín-* suggest peoples outside of the Ārya mainstream, although of course they could also show the kinds of deliberate phonological deformation found elsewhere in the hymn. It's possible that *bhalānás-* reflects a form of √*bhṛ*, hence my 'raiders'. It is not clear whether *śivāsaḥ* should be interpr. as the usual adj. ('kindly') or as the name of another group of fighters. The publ. tr. reflects the former (flg. Schmidt), but I am now inclined to consider the latter more likely, primarily because it's not phonologically outlandish. In this case I'd tr. "The Pakthasand the Bhalānases spoke out, and the Alinas and the Viṣānins -- (all) 'kindly' --" This would be a sarcastic aside about the martial forces ranged against us.

    If we accept the Schmidt/Witzel distribution of the allegiances of the various named forces, those named in ab are complaining about the defection of the *sadhamā́d-* who led them to the battle but has now gone over to the Tṛtsu (/Sudās) side and has turned to attack the *nṝn* ('superior men'), by which they mean themselves. The *sadhamā́d-* is most likely Indra, and so losing him as an ally would be a serious blow.

    On the unexpected form *sadhamā́s*, if the nom. sg. to *sadhamā́d-*, see Scar (381) with lit. I think it unlikely that it's an acc. pl., a possibility Old considers by assigning it to a diff. root. As noted above (vs. 6) with regard to *puroḷā́s*, the rhyme with king Sudās may have played a part.

    Ge's interpr. of the syntax of cd is impossible: it contains an embedded *main* clause! His rel. cl. consists of *ā́ yó 'nayat … yudhā́ nṝn* "… der seine Mannen unter Kampf heranführte" -- the beginning of c and the end of d. While his main clause is the end of c and the beginning of d, … *sadhamā́ ā́ryasya, gavyā́ tṛ́tsubhyo ajagan* … "Der Mahlgenossen des Ariers … ist aus Verlangen nach Kühen den Tṛtsu's (zu Hilfe) gekommen." My tr. follows Old's, which is slightly adjusted by Schmidt.

VII.18.8: Both this vs. and the following one concern the Paruṣṇī river, known from elsewhere in the RV and later. In the 2ⁿᵈ pāda the VP *ví jagṛbhre páruṣṇīm*, lit. "they grasped apart the P.," is generally taken to mean 'divert' the course of the river (so already Gr, also Ge; Schmidt slightly differently 'divided'). The lexeme *ví √grabh* occurs only once in the RV, but this seems a reasonable interpr. -- though I'm not exactly sure how this feat of engineering would be accomplished. Perhaps so many bodies accumulated in the river that it either had to flow around them (hence

Schmidt's 'divided') or switch its course altogether. The use of the middle *jagr̥bhre* might support the former interpr.: they themselves [i.e., their own bodies] parted the river. One is reminded of Iliad 21.205ff., where Achilles drives his enemies towards the Scamander river, which berates and then fights with Achilles for filling the river with corpses.

In the preceding pāda *áditi-* is also sometimes taken to be a river (Ge n. 8a, Schmidt), but this seems much less likely to me. Aditi is, of course, a well-known goddess, and her miscarriage is also a well-known mythological incident, in the narrative of the sequence of her twin births ending with one miscarriage and one live baby -- found already in the RV (see the clear passage X.72.8). It therefore seems wiser not to make her capriciously into a landscape feature, but to start with the mythological facts that might match the VP *áditiṃ srevayántaḥ* "making Aditi abort." Now, as is often related in middle Vedic texts, when the eighth embryo of Aditi aborts, it becomes first the discarded Mārtāṇḍa ('stemming from a dead egg'), but is then fixed up and becomes Vivasvant, a name for the sun (see my Hyenas, pp. 204-8; this identification is already implicit in the RV, *pace* Hoffmann). I wonder if "causing Aditi to abort" refers to her aborted son, the sun, and in this case, by metaphor, to an eclipse of the sun -- or at least something that could pass for one. If the dust of a pitched battle got thick enough it could rise to blot out the sun's rays temporarily. Rising dust is often elsewhere a sign of intense fighting in the RV. This loss of light could render the combatants *acetás-* (b), lit. 'without perception' in b.

The *durādhyàḥ* 'ill-intentioned ones' are probably the same faction as those referred to, probably sarcastically, as 'kindly' (*śivā́saḥ* in the previous vs., 7b).

Apparently alone of all tr. and comm., I do not have an opinion about who the personnel are in cd. See the various suggestions, esp. those of Schmidt and Witzel.

As for *cā́yamāna-*, I assign it the intrans./pass. sense 'being perceived as, appearing as', rather than, e.g., Schmidt's "receiving due respect." Gotō's interpr. (1st Kl. 137) is closer to mine, but he considers it reflexive: "sich als ... betrachtend, sich für ... haltend." He does not tr. this passage (or the other participial form in X.94.14). Whoever the subject is -- Schmidt and Witzel think it's Vasiṣṭha, the purohita of Turvaśa, but I remain agnositc -- in my view, this kavi has been felled, at least temporarily, and therefore gives the impression of being a *paśú-*, in this case a sacrificial, or already sacrificed, animal. Note the main verb *aśayat* (√*śi* 'lie'), which is the signature verb describing the slain Vr̥tra in I.32. Note *paśúṣ kavíḥ*, which shows the same sandhi before *kavíḥ* as *vidúṣ kavíḥ* in 2b; see disc. there.

VII.18.9: With Ge (etc.), I take *ná* in pāda a as a simile marker, not a negative; the simile and frame participate in a pun on (-)*ártha-*. What they reached was a *ni-àrtha-* 'failed goal' (see, e.g., VI.27.6, X.107.8), which is *like* but tragically *not* their real goal.

In b note *āśúś (canéd)*, which echoes *paśúṣ (kavíḥ)* in the previous vs. (8d) also pāda-initial. Here the sandhi is of course standard.

The adj. *sutúka-* occurs 7x in the RV; acdg. to EWA (s.v.) its meaning and etymology are unknown, though it is generally translated in the 'quick, swift' realm

(like so many other unclear RVic adj.), e.g., Gr "rasch dahin eilend," Ge (this passage) "spornstreichs fliehend." On the basis of X.42.5, where it appears parallel to *sváṣṭra-* 'easily goaded', I suggest that it means 'easily thrust/thrusting' and is ultimately derived from √*tuj* 'thrust'. Under this analysis, of course, the voiceless *-k-* is a problem. Easiest would be to extract it from the unattested nom. sg. of the reasonably well-attested root noun *túj-*, which should be **túk*, supported by pre-C forms like **tugbhís*, **tukṣú*. This is essentially a variant of Re's (EVP XII.108) suggestion that it belongs to a root √*tuc*, a doublet of √*tuj*, but it avoids the awkwardness of positing this extra root to explain one stem. In fact, Re suggests in passing that it could start from an athematic nom. sg. **sutuk* (he gives no accent), but he prefers the √*tuc* hypothesis.

In view of the disorderly rout of these forces described in the next vs., presumably due to the collapse of their alliance, I now wonder if *amítrān* refers not to their non-alliance with us (as in the publ. tr.), but to the lack or loss of unity among themselves.

In d Ge takes *mā́nuṣe* as a place name ("in Mānuṣa"), on the basis of JB III.244, which identifies it as the place of the Ten Kings battle. But, as Ge admits (n. 9d), the JB rendering could easily result from a misunderstanding of our passage. Old suggests (not very enthusiastically) that it refers to (all) the enemies "in der Menschenwelt." Schmidt's interpr. is somewhat puzzling, putting it in an (unexpressed) simile contrasting the "castrates" of *vádhri-vā́c-* to a (presumably virile) man expressed by *mā́nuṣa-*: "who were talking like castrates in the world of a man." I think rather that it refers to Manu's race or people: all other loc. singulars of this stem modify *jáne* (save for I.12.8.7, where it qualifies the semantically close *vṛjáne*). I take the expression as concessive "(though) in Manu's (race)": the point is that the opponents belong to the larger Ārya community though they are fighting against us. They therefore in principle share the same sacrificial practices, including ritual speech, but their ritual speech is ineffective (or so we hope), like that of a castrate. The extensive ritual references in the account of the battle only work under these conditions.

The cmpd. *vádhri-vā́c-* 'possessing gelded/castrated speech' provides another parallel to the famous Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, whose vs. 7 likens Vṛtra to a *vádhri-* wishing to become a bull.

VII.18.10: The vs. begins *ī́yúr gā́vo ná*, very similar to the opening of the preceding vs. 9 *ī́yúr ártham ná*. The simile of the cows without a cowherd (*gā́vo ná … ágopāḥ*) presumably depicts the disordered flight of the troops that have lost their leader.

I have now considerably changed my interpr. of the 2nd pāda. In the publ. tr. I take *citā́saḥ* as belonging to √*ci* 'perceive', meaning 'perceived as, seeming', rather than to √*ci* 'gather', the usual interpr. I now think the standard root assignment is correct, but that it means not 'assembled, gathered' (so Ge, Schmidt) but 'piled up'. In other words, the panic-stricken troops, running pell-mell without an overall leader, hit an obstacle and pile up on top of each other in a heap of bodies.

The object they run into (*abhí*) is the opposing side, which is acting as allied forces under a properly concluded agreement: *yathākṛtám … mitrám*. The standard view of this phrase is that it describes the situation of the subjects, the fleeing fighters, construed with *citāsaḥ* and therefore referring to an accidental or on-the-spot alliance; so Ge "zu zufällig geschlossener Freundschaft geschart," Schmidt "... assembled for an alliance made on the spur of the moment." But as Old points out, *mitrám √ kṛ* is the standard phrase for concluding an alliance in the normal fashion, not for one made under pressure or by chance. It therefore better describes the well-organized forces the subjects are confronting, and as I said in the comm. to the preceding vs., the adj. *amítrān* there may well describe the lack of alliance among these fighters going to defeat, here contrasted with our side, which is acting in concert under a functioning alliance. I would therefore alter the publ. tr. to "They went … piled up against an alliance properly concluded [=their enemies]."

In c the pl. *pṛśnigāvaḥ* may well be the name of a clan, as Old suggests; the PN interpr. is followed also by Ge and Schmidt as well as the publ. tr. But it of course has a straightforward bahuvrīhi interpr. ('having dappled cows') and, more to the point, echoes the cow simile of the first hemistich, with *-gāvaḥ* in the same metrical position as *gā́vaḥ* in a. That the first member *pṛśni-* is immediately repeated in the cmpd *pṛśni-nipreṣitāsaḥ* calls further attention to the cmpd analysis. As for the 2nd cmpd., I am drawn to Ge's suggestion (n. 10) that *pṛśni-* is a pun on the river name Paruṣṇī.

In d *ránti-* is problematic. In its other occurrence, IX.102.5, it clearly means 'joys'. But that makes no sense here. Ge refuses to tr.; Old tentatively suggests that the word has developed into a "sakral-poetisch" term for cow, presumably starting from 'joy'. Schmidt tr. "supply lines" (< 'refreshment' < 'enjoyment'), but this seems a semantic chain too tenuous, esp. since the logistics and support for the battle do not otherwise figure in this hymn (unless in 15cd). I take it as 'battler', assuming that it shows the same semantic bifurcation as *ráṇa-*, both 'joy' and 'battle'.

The phrase *śruṣṭím cakruḥ* opening d, "they followed orders," forms a ring with the same phrase in 6c. This is, at first, puzzling, since vss. 6-10 do not appear to form a discrete section. However, on 2nd glance we can note that these five vss. mark out the most intense and name-heavy portion of the battle. Starting with the next vs. Indra takes over the fighting, and the hymn turns to the celebration of Indra and his victorious feats; vs. 5, preceding this section, also attributes the whole victory to Indra. The god is absent from 6–10, with the combatants on their own and engaged in pitched battle.

VII.18.11: The king who is the subj. of ab may be Sudās (so Ge, flg. Sāy.) or Indra, who appears by name in d, or Sudās identified with Indra. Given the ring-compositional structure discussed ad vs. 10, I favor either Indra or Sudās=Indra.

The relationship between the simile of c and the first hemistich is intricate and partly unclear. The first hemistich portrays the destruction by a king of a large force belonging to an otherwise unknown pair (the Vaikarṇas), using the aniṭ root *ní √ stṛ* (root aor. *ny ástaḥ*) 'strew down' found also in other hostile encounters (e.g.,

II.11.20). Pāda c by contrast sketches a *ritual* incident in a simile, but the simile is slightly "off" for several reasons. For one thing, the predicate phrase *sádman …barhíḥ* "the ritual grass on the seat" suggests that the verb to govern it should also be 'strew down', though in its seṭ form (cf., e.g., VII.43.2 *stṛṇītá barhíḥ*). The actual verb of the simile, *ní śiśāti* 'whets down', is far less appropriate to its object, and we must assume a metaphorical use of this verb in the simile -- a piling of figurative language on figurative language, made all the more peculiar by the fact that the verb of b would be better suited to the simile of c and vice versa. (Recall also that [*ní*] √ *śā* is the signature verb of this hymn; see comm. ad vs. 6.) It is almost as if the simile had been turned inside out or the two clauses had swapped out verbs. Also disturbing the simile is the fact that the subject of the clause, which, as agent of a verb governing ritual grass, should be a priest or ritual functionary, is identified as *dasmá-* 'wondrous, wonder-worker', an adj. otherwise only applied to gods, esp. Indra (e.g., in nearby VII.22.8). So it too seems more at home in the main clause of ab than in the simile of c, an association made stronger by the fact that *dasmá-* several times occurs with *rájan-* in a simile (IX.82.1 *rájeva dasmáḥ*, X.43.2 *rájeva dasma*) and *rájā* is the subject of ab. The interconnections become even more tangled when we consider the 2nd of those just-cited similes: X.43.2 *rájeva dasma ní ṣadó 'dhi barhíṣi* "Like a king, wondrous one [=Indra], sit down upon the ritual grass," which contains the grass and the root √ *sad* 'sit', but there realized as a verb rather than as the loc. nominal *sádman*.

VII.18.12: Old suggests that we read *ánuṃ*, not *ánu*, in b -- thus a PN, not a preverb -- given the co-occurrence of the PNs *ánu-* and *druhyú-* elsewhere, incl. 14a, I.108.8, etc., as well as the vṛddhi deriv. *ắnava-* in the next vs. (13c). I have adopted this suggestion; note that it does not affect the meter, as the next word (*druhyúm*) begins with a cluster.

The relationship between the two hemistichs is loose and unclear. On the basis of vs. 11, esp. 11d, and the epithet *vájrabāhuḥ* in 12b, we are entitled to assume that the 1st hemistich has Indra as subject and is couched in the 3rd ps. But the 2nd hemistich refers twice to 'you' (d *tvāyántaḥ … tvā*), manifestly referring also to Indra, and the verb in the first hemistich, *ní vṛṇak* is ambig. between 2nd and 3rd -- a typical modulation point. I would keep the publ. tr. ("he wrenched down"), but with the awareness that the transition to 2nd ps. reference may already be underway.

The 2nd hemistich has Indra's followers as subj., with d containing a rel. cl. with nom. pl. *yé*. How to construe it is the question. Although there is no overt (or indeed covert) representation of this plural group in the first hemistich, Ge takes the whole of cd as an improper relative, tr. "während deine Anhänger, Freundschaft für Freundschaft erwählend, dir zujubelten." This not only reinterprets *yé* as a general subordinator rather than a rel. prn., but it also has this subordinator placed very deeply in its supposed clause. I prefer to take pāda c as containing a predicated root aor. part. *vṛṇānăḥ* ["(They were) choosing your partnership … (those) who …"], which allows the rel. cl. of d to have a more standard configuration, referring to the pl. subj. of the nominal clause of c.

VII.18.13: With nom. *índraḥ* this vs. seems to return to 3rd ps. reference—though it's worth noting that both verbs of which *índraḥ* is subject are ambig. between 2nd and 3rd ps. (*dardaḥ* b, *bhāk* c), and so an appositive 2nd ps. reading "(you,) Indra, …" is barely possible.

The adv. *sadyáḥ* 'in an instant, all at once' seems to clash semantically with its verb *dardaḥ*, given the usual function of the "intensive" as a frequentative. It would probably be better here to render *sadyáḥ* with Ge as 'in a single day', indicating that Indra could destroy multiple fortifications in a limited time span.

The 1st pl. *jeṣma* is generally interpr. these days as a precative: see esp. Hoffmann (Injunk. 254), Narten (Sig.Aor. 119–20), and Ge's tr. "Möchten wir … besiegen." Certainly the other two occurrences of this form in the RV (VI.45.12, X.156.1) have clear modal value. But in this context, in a long narrative set in the past, though carried in part by injunctive forms like *dardaḥ* and *bhāg* in this vs., a modal would be jarring and would interrupt the narrative by suddenly expressing a hope for the future. I therefore follow, for this form here, the older interpr. of *jeṣma* (see reff, in Hoffmann and Narten) as an irregular injunc. (for expected *jaiṣma; cf. *ajaiṣma* VIII.47.18=X.164.5).

VII.18.14: Pāda b is notable for its alliteration, making full use of all three sibilants: *ṣaṣṭíḥ śatā́ suṣupuḥ ṣáṭ sahásrā*. The sums are tautological, as Old points out: sixty hundred and six thousand amounting to the same number. Both 'sixty' (*ṣaṣṭíḥ*) and 'six' (*ṣáṭ*) reappear in the next pāda. The standard interpr. is that these sixty-six in c are just an addition to the six thousand enumerated in the previous pāda. However, Old suggests that they constitute the opposite side, the 'heroes' (*vīrā́saḥ*) 'seeking favor' (*duvoyú*), who are fighting against those enumerated in pāda b. This interpr. has the merit of not requiring those two words to be used ironically (on the latter, see Ge's n. 14c), and it also makes the victory that much more impressive, that this small number, with Indra on their side, could defeat many multiples of themselves. The same point is made more forcefully in vs. 17. The same balance between the good guys and the bad guys, as it were, is found in the next vs., 15, where the Tṛtsus of ab are Indra's allies, but their opposite numbers are found in cd.

VII.18.15: As just noted, the vs. is divided into two, with the Tṛtsus of Indra's party in full flood in ab (on the attack, one presumes) and their enemies abandoning their possessions under the pressure of this attack. These enemies are identified as *durmitrā́saḥ*; as with *amítra-* of 9c, this descriptor seems meant to signal the fraying or loss of the alliances that bound them and perhaps also to identify these alliances as badly formed in the first place. The other example of this form as a full adj. is nearby in VII.28.4; *durmitrá-* in X.105.11 is used as a PN in a quite possibly independent play on the PN *sumitrá-*.

The first hemistich is straightforward; the second has its puzzles, starting with the form *prakalavíd* (or, theoretically possible, *-vín*) in c. See, first, Old, who rejects several previous suggestions and hesitantly follows what is found in Gr, as does Ge

(as do I): a root-noun cmpd. with √*vid* 'know', a 1ˢᵗ member related to *kalā̆-* 'small part' (VIII.37.17), used adverbially (Gr 'die kleinsten Theile berechnend' → 'kleinlich'). Scar (486) discusses in somewhat more detail but reaches the same hesitant conclusions. The universal uncertainty has much to do with the difficulty of fitting this sense into context. I take the cmpd as implicitly contrasted with *víśvāni* in d. By my interpr., the enemy forces measure their supplies precisely and parsimoniously, "knowing every little piece" (Old "mit Kunde jedes kleinsten Teils") -- hence my idiomatic "with a miser's eye." But when confronted by the Tṛtsus' attack, they profligately abandon everything and flee.

   Kü (608) interpr. *mímānāḥ* as reflexive/intrans. 'die kleinlich sich messen', though with ?, but, despite the middle voice, the other forms to this stem are consistently transitive.

VII.18.16: Pāda c is notable for the alliterative and etymological figure *manyúm manyumyò mimāya*, with the middle term *manyu-mī́-* containing the noun to its left (*manyú-*) and the root noun of the verb to its right (√*mī*). Though *mimāya* phonologically echoes *mímānā(ḥ)* at the end of 15c, they of course belong to different roots.

   Pāda d contains a rare and curious idiom PATH √*bhaj*; cf. VII.39.1 *bhejā́te … pánthām*, IX.102.2 *ábhakta … padám*, which I take (with Ge) to mean "set out on the road," similar to, though with a different idiomatic verb, Engl. "hit the road." The expression is complicated here by the question of how to construe *pathó vartaním*. Is *patháḥ* acc. pl. and direct object of *bhejé*, with *vartaním* the obj. of *pátyamānaḥ*? Such is the interpr. of Ge and Kü (334, 368) -- Ge with an idiomatic interpr. of *bhejé patháḥ*, Kü with a more literal one. However, I think it more likely that *patháḥ* is a gen. sg. dependent on *vartaním* on the basis of IV.45.3 *ā́ vartaním mádhunā jinvathas patháḥ* "You quicken the course of the path with honey."

VII.18.17: If my interpr. of 14c is correct in taking the small number (66) as the allies of Indra facing off a much larger force, this vs. continues the same theme, first as a straightforward statement (a), then with two different metaphors (b, c): Indra easily prevailed despite the relative insufficiency of his tools.

   In b, if the standard interpr. of *pétva-* as 'castrated ram, wether' is correct (see, e.g., EWA s.v.), the pairing of target and instrument is esp. striking: a fierce but female wild animal, the lioness, and a castrated but (originally) male domestic one, a wether, with opposition of both animal-type (wild/domestic) and gender, with the latter complicated by the emasculation of the male representative.

   The same thematic and syntactic template prevails in c, but neither the target nor the tool is clearly identified. *veśī́-* (in the instr. *veśyā̀*) is a hapax; the standard tr. 'needle' derives from Sāy., but in fact this doesn't make much sense. *sraktí-* has better representation: it's found in the cmpd. *náva-srakti-* '9-srakti-ed' (also VS *cátuaḥ-srakti*) and has an Aves. cognate *sraxti-*, *ϑraxti-* 'edge, side'. EWA connects it with *sṛká-* 'fang'. To figure out what must be going on, we need to turn to the verb, *áva … (a)vṛścat*. The lexeme *áva* √*vraśc* 'hew down' is found only once elsewhere,

in I.51.7, where it is used figuratively. But *ní √ vraśc*, with the semantically similar preverb *ní*, twice appears with a concrete image: hewing down trees with an axe. See esp. I.130.4fg *tášṭeva vṛkṣám vaníno ní vṛścasi, paraśvéva ní vṛścasi* "like a carpenter a tree from the wooden one [=forest], you cut down (the serpent) -- as if with an ax you cut (him) down" (sim. VI.8.5). The acc. pl. *sraktī́ḥ* in our passage matches the role of the trees in the passages just cited. I suggest that as 'edge' it refers to the edges of a tree trunk or to something that is, as it were, pure 'edge' -- a pole. As the instr., *veśyã* should correspond to the axe. A needle doesn't work, but perhaps a pin -- a small, sharp-pointed object that would ordinarily not have much success in felling tall poles. I agree with Old that the expression is probably proverbial.

The ending of d, *bhójanā sudã́se*, is identical to the end of the last vs., 15d, preceded by *víśvāni* (15d) and *víśvā* (16d) respectively. The *bhójanā* that the enemies abandoned in 15 are here given to Sudās by Indra.

VII.18.18: I follow Ge in taking this vs. as direct speech.

Although Ge's tr. of *rándhi-* in b as "schwache Stelle" is appealing, I preferred to register the etymological figure between the verb of pāda a, *rāradhuḥ*, and this noun.

Note the close sandhi *rāradhuṣ ṭe*, which reminds us of *vidúṣ kavíḥ* (2a) and *paśúṣ kavíḥ* (8d), as well as correct *āsúś canéd* (9b).

The rel. prn. *yáḥ* is too deep in its clause, following both direct objects of *kṛṇóti*: *mártān … stuvatáḥ* and *énaḥ*. I have no explan. for this violation.

VII.18.19: This is the last vs. with direct reference to the battle. The following two (20–21) provide general praise of Indra's aid and generosity, leading up to the 4-vs. dānastuti.

Ge (n. 19d) insightfully suggests that pāda d is an ironic reflection on the horses that died in the encounter.

VII.18.20: Ge takes *pū́rvāḥ … nū́tnāḥ* as qualifying *sumatáyaḥ … rã́yaḥ*: "Deine Gnaden und deine Reichtümer, die frühere und die neuesten, sind nicht vollständig aufzuzählen, so wenig wie die Morgenröten." I prefer to take them with *uṣásaḥ*, for several reasons. First, the word order, with *uṣásaḥ* nestled between the two temporal adjectives, favors this interpr. Also my interpr. allows the *ná … ná … ná* sequence to be entirely negative, rather than requiring the last to be a simile marker. Moreover, the contrast between former and current dawn(s) is a standard trope in the RV, with *pū́rva-* qualifying dawn in a number of passages. And finally morphology is against it: Ge would need to explain why a fem. nom. pl. *pū́rvāḥ*, rather than the masc. *pū́rve*, was used to modify a mixed feminine (*sumatáyaḥ*) and masculine (*rã́yaḥ*) NP; ordinarily the default would be masc., esp. in this case where the masc. is closer to the adjectives. (He could of course invoke the supposed occasional use of *rayí-*, *rāy-* as feminine, but these exx. are vanishingly rare, if they exist at all.) I take the whole dawn phrase as an acc. of extent of time. It would be possible to assign the temporal adjectives to *uṣásaḥ* but interpr. that phrase as a simile in the nom., as Scar (167)

does: "Nicht sind deine Gnaden, nicht deine Gaben zu überschauen, genausowenig wie die vergangenen und jetzigen Morgenröten." I still prefer mine, since Scar's interpr. again requires the third *ná* to be a simile marker, even though it does avoid the problems raised by taking the temporal adjectives with the NP in pāda a.

In c *dévaka-* is a lovely ex. of the use of the *-ka-* suffix both in a pejorative sense and as signal of a lower register. Edgerton's (-ka-suffix, 43) tr. is rather nice: "the wretched little fellow who thought himself a godling."

The form *mānyamāná-* is of course peculiar, though its source is clear: it is a vṛddhi deriv. of the middle part. *mányamāna-* 'think oneself to be …' Although Ge takes it separately from *dévaka-* as two distinct pejorative epithets ("…den Götzen, den Dünkling"), I find it hard not to think that the participial usage is not still present and that *dévaka-* is the de facto predicate nominative. The vṛddhi is perhaps used to turn the typical subject of this participle into a category characterized by blind arrogance ("the type of blowhard who would think himself …") -- well captured by Edgerton's tr.

The verb in d, *bhet* (√ *bhid*), recalls the enemy Bheda targeted by Indra in vss. 18–19.

VII.18.21: The sense of the first pāda is disputed, primarily because it is unclear how to construe the abl. *gṛhāt*. Old discusses at length without a definite decision; Ge has his own idiosyncratic view: that in this context, with the abl. *gṛhāt*, *prá* √ *mad* means 'to go on a pilgrimage' ("die … von Hause fortgepilgert waren"), a bizarre interpr. (rejected by Old), which he connects to *abhí … pramandúḥ* in VII.33.1, where his pilgrimage interpr. seems equally odd. The phraseology here needs to be considered in the context of similar expressions, not only VII.33.1, but also VIII.61.9 *sá prá mamandat tvāyā* and vs. 12d in this hymn *tvāyánto yé ámadann ánu tvā* (and consider the immediately preceding pāda 12c *vṛṇānā átra sakhyāya sakhyám*, which resonantes with our c *ná te … sakhyám mṛṣanta*). Because of their proximity in the same hymn, I think vs. 12 needs to be weighted more heavily than the other passages, despite the difference in preverb (*ánu* there versus *prá* here). That vs. states that the men devoted to Indra cheered him on -- in other words, Indra was the recipient of an overt expression of their devotion -- and in turn they acquired a partnership with him. I now think that *prá … ámamaduḥ* in this vs. should also be transitive, with Indra as the object. Perhaps by haplology *tvā tvāyā. I would therefore alter the publ. tr. to "… who exhilarated (you) in devotion to you," with a different type of overt expression of devotion, here the soma. Pāda c then indicates that by doing so they did not neglect the responsibilities of their side of the partnership and (d) happy days ensue as a result. Interpreting *prá … ámamaduḥ* here as transitive also has the merit of matching the use of *abhí … pramandúḥ* in VII.33.1, where there is an overt object *mā*. The similar expression in VIII.61.9 is more equivocal; see disc. there.

This reappraisal of the verbal complex does not, however, solve the ablative problem. My proposed solution, already found in the publ. tr., is quite simple: the individuals named in pāda b (who include Vasiṣṭha) are relatives, "from the (same) house" -- a use of 'house' similar to that in expressions like "the House of Atreus."

Under this interpr., there is no physical movement out of or location away from an actual dwelling. As this is the only abl. form of *gṛhá-* in the RV, it is difficult to know if such an idiomatic usage is possible, but given that the verb in its clause is not a verb of motion and cannot be made one without damage to its normal semantics, this seems like a reasonable alternative.

bhojá- 'provider, benefactor' is used of Indra elsewhere on a number of occasions (e.g., VI.23.9), but it is also used explicitly of a human *sūrí-* 'patron' in VIII.70.13, as well as being repeated densely in X.107.8–11, the hymn devoted to the dakṣiṇā and the *bhoja*-s who give it. So I suggest in our vs. that its appliication to Indra in c is an attempt to transfer the epithet to the *sūri*-s in d.

VII.18.22: The first two pādas begin the enumeration of the Paijavana's *dána*-mentioned in c -- an enumeration continued in 23.

The simile in d, *hóteva sádma páry emi*, is one of the few clear references to the animal sacrifice, with this depicting the Paryagnikaraṇa; cf. IX.97.1, where the animals are explicit.

VII.18.23: On *smáddiṣṭi-*, see comm. ad III.45.5.

In ab I supply *vahanti* on the basis of d, with Ge.

VII.18.24: The *śrávas-* in pāda a echoes the one in 23d.

Ge, flg. Sāy., takes ab as separate clauses, supplying "(sich ausbreitet)" as the verb in pāda a. This is unnecessary: the hemistich can be a single clause, with the accent on *vibabhā́jā* in b conditioned by the rel. *yásya* in a. (Ge considers this possibility in n. 24ab.) Kü (333) also follows the single clause interpr.

Note the lengthened 3rd sg. pf. ending in *babhā́jā*, guaranteed (and required) by the cadence. On lengthening of the pf. endings see the brief remarks by Kü (42), though without any indication of the relative frequency; it is my impression that lengthening of the 1st/3rd sg. *-a* is quite rare in the RV, but I haven't made a count.

The fame being distributed is presumably that of Sudās, though covertly assimiliated to Indra's; note the explicit comparison of the praise he receives to Indra's in the simile in c. The āmreḍita "every head" (*śīrṣṇé-śīrṣṇe*) must refer to every person, or rather every person eligible for fame (excluding women and non-elite males), in Sudās's entourage: they all get a piece of the fame-pie that he acquired by himself. The geographical extravagance of "every head between the two wide world halves" -- that is, every eligible person on earth -- is presumably part of a totalizing claim about the outcome of the Ten Kings' Battle, that the whole world was brought under Sudās's sway.

The loud sound of rivers in flood is the point of the comparison in c. One of the words for 'river', *nadī́*, is folk etymologically (and probably etymologically; see EWA s.v.) connected with √*nad* 'roar', as in the explicit etymological statement in AV III.13.1 *yád adáḥ saṃprayatīr áhāv ánadatā haté / tásmād ā́ nadyò nā́ma stha* Wh "Since formerly (? *adás*) going forth together, ye resounded (*nad*) when the dragon was slain, therefore ye are streams (*nadī́*) by name."

The signature verb *ní √śā* 'whet down' that we have met a number of times before (see comm. ad vs. 6) now implicitly takes Sudās as its subject, as a sort of climactic usage.

The PN *yudhyāmadhí* is obviously a speaking name, with some form of √*yudh* 'fight' embedded in it. See Old for various possibilites for its formation. It is tempting to see as its base a 1st pl. middle **yúdhyāmahi* "let's fight," with the older expected 1st pl. ending **-madhi* before de-occlusion.

VII.19 Indra

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

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

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

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

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

VII.19.2: Pāda b is repeated in IV.38.7, there of Dadhikrā the racehorse. (This repetition is not noted in Bl RR.) Re at IV.38.7 and Ge here (but not there) take

śúśrūṣamāṇaḥ as meaning something like "putting oneself at the disposal (of someone else, here Kutsa)." I assume that they are thinking of the enlarged root √*śruṣ* 'be obedient', but the two meanings seem quite distinct to me – I can't see Indra being obedient to any man – and formally our participle is a well-formed desiderative to √*śru*. In both places I take it as meaning "desiring to be heard/famed'; here Indra also helps out Kutsa, but at least part of his aim is to ensure his own fame. In IV.38.7 there is no subsidiary beneficiary, and so the focus on the subject and his fame is ever clearer. Heenen is similarly puzzled by Ge (238 n. 263) but tr. "(toi qui) en personne as la volonté d'écouter au combat," attributing an active sense to the middle participle.

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

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

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

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

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

ordinals the well-attested feminine *prathamā́-*. Or, if Ge is correct that the reference is to Śambara himself, *śatatamā́* can be a masculine instr. sg. In either case the text can stand as it is, with no metrical or sandhi problems, and the syntax can be rescued.

Ge takes *nivéśane* in c as 'at evening'. The word generally means 'causing to settle down' (the usual association of -*ana*-nominals with the transitive-causative *áya*-formations) or, as a noun, 'settling down', and is sometimes associated with Savitar's bringing the world to rest in the evening (IV.53.6, I.35.1, VI.71.2), an association that must have led to Ge's tr. But the word never otherwise means 'evening'. I read it with its full lexical value, but with a sinister edge. "Bringing them to rest" is a euphemism like *ásvāpayaḥ* 'you put to sleep' in 4d. Old mentions the "going to rest" possibility, but opts instead for "in the dwelling place (of the enemy)." Again, there seems to me no reason for this attenuation of the meaning.

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

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

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

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

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

VII.19.7: My construction of the first hemistich differs from Ge's, both with regard to the syntactic role of *te* and the sense of *párisṭau* and leads to a very different interpretation of the meaning. The latter word, literally 'encirclement', is generally

taken as always negative, a tight spot or constriction (Ge's "in dieser Klemme"), but I find this interpretation hard to reconcile with the hic-et-nunc deictic *asyā́m*, since the poet has given no indication that he is currently in distress. (Ge's note suggests that this is a memory of the situation in VII.18, the Ten Kings battle, but this seems to me an ill-supported attempt to account for the deictic.) I therefore think the *páriṣṭi-* here is positive – Indra's encirclement (that is, protection) of us now – and *te* is to be construed with *páriṣṭau*: "in this enclosure (that is, protection) of yours." Weak support for this may be provided by the first pāda of the next verse, 8a, where … *te … abhíṣṭau*# matches … *te … páriṣṭau*# here, with rhyming forms and identical morphology – and a parallel positive sense: "in your charge." There is also a parallel in the next hymn, in roughly the same part of the hymn, with *te asyā́m* as here and a string of locatives: VII.20.8 … *te asyā́m sumataú …várūthe … nṛ́pītau* "in this benevolence of yours, in your defense, in your protection for men." In our passage Ge (followed by Scar 207) instead takes *te* as the subject of the infinitive *parādaí*; in order to make this work he has recast the sentence from one with 1st person subject (*mā́ … bhū́ma* "may we not be…") to one with 2nd ps. subject: "Nicht sollst du uns … dem Bösen preisgaben." Scar's tr. maintains the syntactic structure of the original, but otherwise follows Ge's interpretation. Better is Keydana's (*Infinitive im Ṛgveda* 156, 203) interpretation of *parādaí* as a passive infinitive, as I take it – though he still takes *te* as the ultimate agent of the handing over. Again, I don't see that the poet has expressed any fear that Indra will betray them; rather, he hopes that the protection Indra provides them will keep any such ill-fortune from befalling them, a hope that is repeated in the next pāda.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VII.20 Indra

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

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

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

VII.20.2: Continuing the focus on nominal forms with verbal rection, the poet picks up the pāda-initial agent noun *trātā́* of 1d and deploys three more pāda-initial nominative *tar*-stems in 2a, c, d: *hántā*, *kártā*, and *dā́tā*, each with an acc. object (*vṛtrám*, *ulokám*, and *vásu* respectively). Although pāda b lacks a subject *tar*-stem, it does have one as object: *jaritā́ram*. The stem that began it all, *trātā́* in 1d, contrasts with those in vs. 2 by being suffix-accented, and it should therefore, according to general practice, have a genitive complement. I suggest that it's not an accident that its object is the enclitic *naḥ*, which could be accusative (and thus parallel with the objects in vs. 2) or genitive (and thus conform to the usual rule). Recall this poet's tricky case syntax with the *tar*-stem *prayantā́* in VII.19.1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VII.20.5: Once again a particle is positioned oddly: *ádha* in the middle of the relative clause (versus properly positioned *ádhā* in 3d). Klein (II.130) suggests the *ádha* here

"is either a subclausal conjunction [but conjoining what? sj] or weakly conjoins the second distich with the first," but neither explanation accounts for the mid-pāda position.

VII.20.6: The final pāda has two linked uncertainties: the identity of the verb and the case form of *rāyá*. Though the Pp. reads dat. *rāyé*, gen.-abl. *rāyaḥ* is equally possible. The choice depends in great part on the analysis of the verb *kṣáyat*: whether it belongs to √*kṣi* 'dwell' or √*kṣi* 'rule'. If the former, it would be a subjunctive; if the latter, an injunctive. The immediate context favors a subjunctive (*dádhate* in the rel. clause attached to this main clause, plus *bhreṣate* [on this form as an s-aor. subj. to √*bhrī*, see EWA s.v. *bhrī*, with ref. to Hoffmann], *reṣat* probably, and *āvívāsāt* in ab), but this does not necessarily decide for an affiliation to 'dwell', because there are no overt subjunctives to the Class I present of 'rule over' (no *kṣáyāt) and the injunctive might function modally here. Parallel passages cut both ways. On the one hand, 'rule' regularly takes the gen. of 'wealth': cf. I.51.14 (of Indra) *rāyáḥ kṣayati*, VII.93.2 *kṣáyantau rāyáḥ* (Indra and Agni), X.106.7 *kṣayad rayīṇām* (though in an otherwise incomprehensible verse); on the other, a form of 'dwell' appears in a parallel passage with the material from the end of the pāda: VI.3.1 … *sá kṣesad ṛtapã ṛtejãḥ*. Old, having considered both possibilities, opts (slightly) for the latter; Ge's tr. also assumes an affiliation with 'dwell' and a dat. *rāyé*: "der wird im Frieden lassen, um zu Reichtum (zu gelangen)." The publ. tr. instead chooses 'rule over' and gen. *rāyáḥ*, though I recognize that both possibilities were probably in the poet's mind. One slender support for my choice may be the parallel phrase in 9d … *vásva ã śakaḥ*… "you hold power over goods," with gen. *vásvaḥ* reprising the gen. *rāyáḥ* that opens 9c.

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

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

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

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

VII.20.9: *stāmú-* is a hapax and there is no agreed upon etymology or interpretation. Gr takes it as belonging to √*stan* 'thunder' and meaning something like 'sighing' (with no explanation of the semantic distance), and he is followed implicitly by Oberlies (II.210). KEWA also registers this idea, but in EWA it seems to have been abandoned, without anything to replace it. Ge, on the other hand, connects it to the root √*stā* 'steal', a suggestion I find very appealing. However, his further

interpretation does not seem compelling: "und verstohlen hat (der Sänger) geklagt." The structure of the hemistich, with two clauses joined by *utá*, each with a verb of noisemaking, whose subject in the first clause is an animal, suggests that an animal should be the subject of the second as well. I therefore suggest that *stāmú-* means 'thieving' and it is a well-known characteristic of some animal or other. I suggest 'monkey': monkeys are of course well known for thievery and Vṛṣākapi, Indra's monkey pal in X.86, steals "the goodies of the Arya" (X.86.1). Monkeys are also know for their sharp cries. The presence of *vṛṣā* (recalling Vṛṣākapi) in pāda a may support this idea, but of course all of this is very tentative, and in particular I have no explanation for why configuring his praise as a screeching monkey would please Indra (unless, again, to remind him of his friend Vṛṣākapi). An alternative animal possibility is the magpie, which has a reputation at least in the West as a thief (cf. Rossini's opera "The Thieving Magpie" [La gazza ladra]), although the internet tells me that this reputation is undeserved. There are species of magpies in northern India and they do make sharp cries.

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

The old idea that *stāmú-* is cognate to Grk. στωμυλός 'talkative, loquacious' was revived with considerable discussion by Ch. de Lamberterie (*Les adjectifs grecs en -υς*, 1990: 704–14 [esp. 704–5]) and recently considered anew and more or less favorably by Brent Vine ("Greek στωμυλός 'chatty'," paper presented at ECIEC, Univ. of Michigan, June 2018). Although the coincidence of form and possible semantics is suggestive, I think it unlikely that an entirely isolated *stāmú-* (no root, no related nominal forms) would have been preserved in this sense from hoary antiquity, and although it might have inhabited a lower register and therefore generally not surface in "high" Vedic, I know of no possible MIA correspondents. Furthermore, the anagramatic word play noted above makes it more likely that the word is semi-artificial, though based on attested material -- hence my favoring of the √*stā* 'steal' connection.

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

VII.21 Indra

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

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

VII.21.2: In the -*áya*-book (Jamison 1983: 50), I take *vipáyanti* as intransitive, in keeping with its vocalism, supplying a form of √*sad*, which is extraordinarily common with *barhís-*: "(Sitting on) the barhis, they become inspired." However, the publ. tr. takes *vipáyanti* as transitive, despite the vocalism, both to avoid supplying extraneous matter and because I did not think the pressing stones that are the verb's unexpressed subj. should sit on the barhis. I failed to note that in V.31.12, adduced by Ge, the pressing stone "will be brought down to the vedi" (*áva védim bhriyāte*). Since the vedi is where the barhis is strewn, the passage seems to put the stone in a position actually to "sit on the barhis." See also VIII.27.1 *agnír ukthé puróhito grāvāṇo barhír adhvaré* "Agni has been set in front while the solemn speech (is being recited), as have the pressing stones and the ritual grass while the ceremony (is going forth)," which has the stones and the barhis set out together, and III.42.2, which describes soma as *barhiṣṭhāṃ grāvabhiḥ sutám* "stationed on the ritual grass, pressed by stones." The transitive interpr. found in the publ. tr. has the merit of not requiring an extra verb to be supplied, but what ritual event it might depict is unclear. I suppose that the vigorous activity that pressing required would make the material on which the pressing apparatus was placed (presumably the barhis) tremble. But I now tentatively favor my old 1983 intransitive interpr., which takes better account of the vocalism. Moreover, since what is most often emphasized about the pressing stones is the noise they make, "become inspired" (like *vípra*s 'inspired poets') would express this well-known characteristic of theirs. Note in the next hymn, VII.22.4ab, where the call of the pressing stone (*hávam … ádreḥ*) is parallel to the thought of the inspired poet (*víprasya … manīṣām*). Indeed in that passage the *vípra* might refer to the pressing stone itself. On the vedi as the place where the soma pressing apparatus is placed, see Oberlies, *Der Rigveda und seine Religion,* 254.

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

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

VII.21.4: Ge supplies a second, accusative, form of *ā̆yudha-* as object of *viveṣa* and supplies "enemies" as the referent of *eṣām* 'of them', while making the accusative phrase in b the object of *vidvān* 'knowing': "Der Fürchtbare hat mit den Waffen ihre (Waffen) abgetan, der aller mannhaften Werke kundig ist." But there are several reasons to reject this interpretation in addition to the necessity of supplying a significant word. The root √*viṣ* 'labor, bring to fulfillment' does not mean 'abtun' (dismiss, brush aside). Moreover it regularly takes *ápas-* 'work', a form of which

appears in pāda b, as object; see esp. IV.19.10 *ápāṃsi ... náryā̀viveṣīḥ*. By contrast, the participle *vidvā́n* is usually used absolutely, without object. As for the referent of *eṣām* it would of course possible to supply "enemies," although they are not mentioned previously in the hymn: the only preceding masc. or neut. plurals are the pressing stones (subject of the whole of vs. 2), the "finely made (fortifications)" of 3d, and, in a simile, the charioteers in 3c. Because the pressing stones are extravagantly celebrated in vs. 2 and called Indra's "companions," I think it likely that they are the referents here: the soma they produce is their weapon, and this soma fuels Indra's labors. This is also Caland-Henry's solution (*L'Agniṣṭoma*, p. 285 and n. 3).

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

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

VII.21.5: A verse with several rare words. The neut. pl. *vándanā* in b is unclear; the neut. sg. *vándanam* in VII.50.2 appears to be some medical condition, and in AV VII.115.2 it refers to some sort of negatively viewed plant (a parasitic plant, acdg. to Gr; see also EWA s.v.), neither of which is helpful here. I think it better to start with the root √*vand* 'praise, extol' and give it a negative twist appropriate to the context, hence my 'sycophant': praise gone wrong. A similar negative interpretation is needed for the usually positive term *vedyā́-* in the same phrase. Why *vándanā* is neuter and not masculine isn't clear to me; perhaps a better tr. would be "sycophancy, sycophantic (words)." With sorcerers and flatterers in this first hemistich we then have two different ways in which *ṛtá* can be undermined within our own community, while the *arí-* 'stranger' whose ways are contrary to ours and the phallus-worshippers in the second hemistich represent external threats to *ṛtá-*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VII.22 Indra

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

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

VII.22.4: The lexeme *ví* √*pā* in later Vedic is regularly found in specialized sense in the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, and there it refers to the feat of separating the surā from the other liquid (milk or soma). This sense and context are already found in the late RVic hymn X.131.4 in the med. part. *vipipānǎ*. See Old ad loc. (and NGGW 1893, 348–49). Though it has been suggested that this usage belongs to a separate root √*pā* 'go' (see, e.g., EWA s.v. *PĀ³*), this seems unnecessary and somewhat perverse. Although the other *ví* √*pā* passages (all medial) don't have a Sautrāmaṇī association, I think they (or most of them) belong to this same lexeme, though Old is less certain. Here the stones are separating the soma juice from the stalk. In IV.16.3 the pressing stone is also the subj., and there is a pressing stone association in III.53.10. However, I.112.15 is more enigmatic. The subj. there is an ant (or someone called "ant"), *vamrá-*, and the vignette occupies half a pāda in a list of the Aśvins' helpful deeds. For further on that passage, see disc. ad loc.

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

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

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

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

VII.22.9: The publ. tr. interpr. *asmé* as a dat. But the parallel in IV.10.8 *śivā́ naḥ sakhyā́ sántu ... devéṣu yuṣmé*, where the -*mé* pronominal form is anchored as a loc. by *devéṣu*, makes a loc. reading more likely. Cf. also VI.18.5 *tán naḥ pratnáṃ sakhyám astu yuṣmé*. I would therefore change the tr. to "Let there be friendly fellowship of you among [or, with] us."

VII.23 Indra

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VII.24 Indra

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VII.24.6: For *pūrdhi* see EWA s.v. *PAR^{Ir2}* 'give'.

VII.25 Indra

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VII.26 Indra

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

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

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

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

 The verb *saścata* in d is morphologically ambiguous. My publ. tr. follows Ge in rendering it as a modal (Ge "… sollen … zufallen," SWJ "will be companions"). Ge does not, however, comment on the form. Gr identifies it as a 3rd pl. to an athematic redupl. stem *saśc-*; since this stem precedes and is distinct from his "schwaches Perf. *saśc-*," he must consider it a redupl. pres., as Whitney and Macdonell (VGS) do; Hoffmann (Injunc. 260) likewise calls our form an injunctive. A 3rd pl. mid. injunc. is certainly possible here, but if we wish to maintain the modal value (which, in fact, is not actually necessary), the injunctive is a small embarrassment, since modal value is fairly rare, and generally limited to particular forms like *dhãs* for the injunctive. An alternative would be to take it as a 3rd *singular subjunctive*, possibly built to the perfect stem. The neut. pl. *bhadrãṇi … priyãṇi* could serve as subject to the singular verb in the well-known inherited construction, though it is not overwhelmingly common in the RV. Of course, we would far prefer a primary *-te* ending for the middle subj., but I do not think secondary *-ta* is impossible. Alternatively, with an analysis as 3rd plural injunctive, the tr. could be changed to "… are companions to us."

VII.27 Indra

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

 I interpret c as containing an implicit pun. The form *vícetā(ḥ)*, masc. nom. sg. of *vícetas-*, derived from the root √*cit* 'perceive', means 'discriminating', hence my 'tell things apart', and is regularly applied to Indra (and other gods). But this leaves

dṛḷhắ with no verb to govern it. (It cannot be object of *ápa vṛdhi* in d, because the *hí* in c should trigger verbal accent.) I suggest that *vícetā* (in sandhi) might also be secondarily construed as the agent noun of *ví √ci* 'pile apart, pull apart', governing *dṛḷhắ*. Of course we would expect the Saṃhitā text to show coalescence of the final vowel of the agent noun and the initial vowel of the next pāda, but the recitational text would not reflect that. Although most agent nouns compounded with preverbs take suffix accent, compare *nícetar-* (I.184.2) to a different root √*ci* 'perceive'. If this suggestion seems too radical, it would also be possible to detach the preverb *ví* from *vícetā(ḥ)* and supply a form of √*vṛ* 'cover' (found in *ápa vṛdhi* in d), producing the familiar lexeme *ví √vṛ* 'uncover'.

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

VII.27.4: Note the rhyming pāda-final … *(sáh)ūtī* (a), … *ūtī́* (b).

In b Ge takes *dānáḥ* as gen. sg. of *dāmán-*, dependent on *vắjam*: "… den Lohn der Gabe." This is possible, though it would be more natural to have *vắjam* as object of some form of √*dā* (esp. given the parallel he cites, VI.45.23 *dānám vắjasya*, with *vắjasya* dependent on *dānám*). I therefore prefer to take *dānáḥ* as the ablative singular of the *mán*-stem, with verbal rection, or, possibly (but somewhat farfetched) the nom. sg. of an otherwise unattested medial root aorist participle of √*dā*.

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

VII.28 Indra

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The position of *yád* in this dependent clause is somewhat disturbing. It occurs in Wackernagel's position in the second pāda (b), but the a-pāda is part of this same clause and is intimately interwoven with the elements in pāda b: note esp. the acc. pl. *jóhuvānān*, which modifies *nr̥n*, the third word in b. Although superficially late position of subordinating elements is not uncommon in the RV (see, e.g., *hí* in pāda c), what precedes is generally syntactically unified, belonging to a single constituent (as in pāda c), but this is not true of the assorted material found in pāda a. I have no explanation.

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

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

VII.28.4: A curious verse. It begins conventionally enough, with a plea to Indra to favor us "though these days" (*ebhíḥ … áhabhiḥ*). *Which* days is not clear, but I assume it means "now." The verse then turns towards the moral sphere: the peoples (*kṣitáyaḥ*) who are *durmitrá-* 'having bad allies/alliances' (or possibly 'bad allies')

are purifying themselves (*pávante*). This pāda presents a number of problems: not only whether *durmitrá-* is a bahuvrīhi or tatpuruṣa (opinion is divided; I take it as the former; see also comm. ad VII.18.15), but also whether the *kṣitáyaḥ* are intrinsically our enemies or are members of our larger community who have fallen into an evil state. *kṣitáyaḥ* are ordinarily presented either positively or neutrally, but see III.18.1, where they are *purudrúhaḥ* 'possessing many deceptions', so an intrinsically hostile reading is possible (if, in my opinion, less likely). If here they are intrinsically hostile, the point may be that if they're sprucing themselves up, we had better get to work on it as well, to meet the challenge of our enemies. If they are not our sworn enemies but peoples with whom we have dealings (or who we ourselves actually are), is it that they are purifying themselves *of* their bad allies/alliances, and therefore are worthy of Indra's aid? Varuṇa, as if evoked by his partner Mitra in *durmitrá-*, then makes his appearance, noting untruth and releasing us from it. As was stated in the intro., Varuṇa's presence is unexpected here. I now wonder if the hymn is specialized for a particular ritual context (signaled by "these days"), perhaps the Varuṇapraghāsa. A purificatory period (like that described in pāda b) might be appropriate then. For this reason I favor an interpretation of pāda b in which the *kṣitáyaḥ* are identified with, or associated with, us.

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

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

VII.29 Indra

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

VII.29.2: The pāda-initial voc. *bráhman* shows the accent of the neut. *bráhman-* 'formulation', though it clearly belongs to the m. *brahmán-* 'formulator'. The confusion is probably deliberate; the first word after the voc. phrase is *bráhmakṛtim* with the neut. 1ˢᵗ cmpd member, neut. pl. *bráhmāṇi* is found in pāda d, and note that the preceding hymn begins *bráhmā* (V.29.1a), with the neut. (see also V.29.2b).

Just as 1d is a variant of V.28.5ab, so also does 2b (*arvācīnó háribhiḥ yāhi tū́yam*) appear to play on V.28.1ab … *úpa yāhi …, arvā́ñcas te hárayaḥ* …, as well as echoing the immediately preceding vs. (29.1b *ā́ tu prá yāhi harivaḥ* …) with *háribhir yāhi tū́yam*.

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

       Note that the hemistich finals *dāśema* (b) and *hávemā* (d) rhyme, though they are morphologically entirelhy distinct.

VII.30 Indra

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

VII.30.2: The first hemistich is characterized by alliteration, *v*-s in a, *u*-s and sibilants in b: *hávanta u tvā hávyaṃ vivā́ci / tanū́ṣu śū́rāḥ sū́ryasya sātaú*.

       suhántu in d is a nice example of a proleptic adjective: "weaken the obstacles (so that they are) easily smashed."

VII.31 Indra

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

VII.31.3–4: Although these verses straddle a tṛca boundary, they are neatly responsive. The repeated *tvám* of vs. 3 is matched by the initial *vayám* of vs. 4, and the repeated *-yú-* ('seeking X') adjectives of 3 are again matched by the *tvāyú-*

'seeking you' of 4a. The final word of both verses is the voc. *vaso*. Even the *gavyú-* 'seeking cows' of 3b has its complement in 4b *vṛṣan* 'o bull'.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VII.32 Indra

VII.32.2: It is tempting to take *suté* as parallel to *mádhau* in the simile and *sácā* with *āsate*, rather than taking *suté sácā* as a formulaic phrase with semi-pleonastic *sácā* as the publ. tr. does. The former interpr. would yield "because these who craft sacred formulations for you sit together at [=by/around] the soma like flies on honey when (the soma) is pressed," an interpr. also suggested to me by Dieter Gunkel (p.c.,

11/5/15). I chose the latter path because of the parallel cited by Ge, X.50.7 ... *brahmakŕtaḥ suté sácā* # However, it could be argued that X.50 is presumably a later composition than VII.32 and need not provide unassailable evidence for how VII.32.2 should be interpreted.

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

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

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

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

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

VII.32.14: *śraddhā́* is most likely instrumental, but its lack of contraction with the following vowel in the Saṃhitā text gives pause. See Old on this problem.
    vājī́ vājaṃ siṣāsati seems like a variant of *gámad vájam vājáyan* in 11a with different emphasis. See also 20a below.

VII.32.17: The relative clause of b, *yá īm bhávanti ājáyaḥ*, is very peculiar. There is no possible referent for the *yé* in either the preceding or the following main clause, and in addition the *īm* lacks function. It seems like a mangled paraphrase of I.81.3 *yád udīrata ājáyaḥ* "when (battle-)drives arise/happen," but what caused the mangling is unclear to me. The *yé* can be by "attraction" to the m. nom. pl. *ājáyaḥ* from putative **yád*, and this set of Indra hymns has several examples of functionless *īm* (VII.20.3, 21.1). But it still lacks motivation.
    The VP *nā́ma bhikṣate* "desires a share in your name" is striking and a little puzzling. The same phrase *nā́ma √bhaj* is found in V.57.5, but there it means that the Maruts, the subjects of the verb, all share the same name. Here, by contrast, it must be a clever way of saying that everyone calls Indra's name, a novel paraphrase of the common epithet of Indra *puruhūtá-* 'called upon by many', found in this verse and vss. 20 and 26. (The English slang equivalent would be "wants a piece of you.") Ge

renders *nǎma bhikṣate* as "Deinen Namen fleht … an" (implores), robbing the expression of its vividness.

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

VII.32.24: There are two word plays in this verse. The simpler one is between the impv. *bhara* 'bring' in pāda a and the āmreḍita *bháre-bhare* 'at every raid', where the noun *bhára-* has been specialized from '(an occasion for) bearing away' to 'raid'.
    The more complex one involves the creation and disappointment of expectations. The verse begins with *abhī́ ṣatáḥ*. The juxtaposition of these two forms (the latter being the pres. part. to √*as* 'be' in either gen.-abl. sg. or acc. pl.) and their close sandhi, with retroflex initial *ṣ*, invites the audience to fill in the semantics of the lexeme *abhí* √*as* 'be superior'. But to our surprise, at the end of this hemistich we find the semantic opposite, *kánīyasaḥ* 'the lesser ones', requiring us to revise our analysis of the opening, dissolving the presumed lexeme into the directional preverb/preposition *abhí* and the independent pres. participle modifying *kánīyasaḥ* much later in the line. For extensive discussion see Old.
    I cannot follow Gr, Old in interpreting *jyā́yaḥ* as voc., but take it, with Ge, as neut. sg. with *tád*. Among other things, AiG III.296 notes only two masc. vocatives in *-īyas* in the RV, this one and *ójīyaḥ* in X.120.4, which is also better taken as a neut.

VII.33 Vasiṣṭha and the Vasiṣṭhids
    On the structure and thematics of this famous hymn see the publ. intro., as well as the introductory remarks of both Old and Ge. With VII.18, the account of the Battle of the Ten Kings, it bookends the Indra hymns of VII and contributes its own background to the (fragmentary) narrative of King Sudās and the Ten Kings Battle.
    The name *vásiṣṭha-* appears in every vs. of this hymn, primarily at the end of the d pāda: vss. 1, 2, 3, 4, (not 5, 6, though *vásiṣṭha-* appears in both c pādas,) 7, (not 8, though it's in middle of d,) 9, (not 10 though in c, nor 11 though in a,) 12, 13, 14.

VII.33.1: By most accounts this vs. is spoken by Indra, who is the referent of the 1st ps. enclitics *mā* and *me* in pādas a and d and the subj. of 1st ps. *voce* in c.
    As noted already ad VII.18.21, Ge has a peculiar interpr. of the verbal lexeme *(abhí) prá* √*mad* as 'go on a pilgrimage', for which there is no support that I can see. Old also rejects this interpr. I follow Old's view that Indra is present at a competing sacrifice -- a constant preoccupation of the Indra hymns of VII -- and recalling the Vasiṣṭha's ritual service to him, he gets up to the leave the sacrifice where he is present to go to theirs. Pāda d is the embedded self-quotation of Indra, providing the reason for his departure for the Vasiṣṭhas.

The descriptors of the Vasiṣṭhas *śvityáñcaḥ … dakṣiṇatáskapardāḥ* are found almost identically in VII.83.8 *śvityáñcaḥ … kapardínaḥ*, where they modify the Tṛtsus, Sudās's fighting force in the Ten Kings Battle, in a hymn much concerned with that battle. Vasiṣṭha was at least an adoptive member of the Tṛtsu clan. See Ge's n. 1a and esp. vss. 5, 6, and 15 in this hymn.

Despite the position of the generally sentential, Wackernagel's Law particle *hí* far to the right in b, the verb complex *abhí hí pramandúḥ* must have domain over the entire hemistich, with *mā* in 2nd pos. in pāda a serving as its object. As often, when a preverb stays with its verb at the end of a clause rather than moving to the front of its clause, *hí* is inserted, between preverb and verb (or here preverb₁ and preverb₂ verb).

VII.33.2: In this vs. the perspective and location shifts from Indra, at the competing sacrifice announcing this intention to go to the Vasiṣṭha, to the Vasiṣṭhas at their place of sacrifice "leading" Indra to them. The vss. are linked by *dūrā́t* 'from a distance' (1d, 2a), in 1d referring to the distant location of the Vasiṣṭha from Indra's point of view, in 2a the distant location of Indra from that of the Vasiṣṭhas.

With Old, I consider Pāśadyumna Vāyata the hapless sacrificer whom Indra deserted in favor of the Vasiṣṭhas. But I do not follow Old in thinking that b describes an intermediate place on Indra's journey from PV to the Vasiṣṭhas.

VII.33.3: With this vs. we pass to the Ten Kings Battle and the Vasiṣṭhas' crucial efforts in securing Indra's aid for Sudās. The empathic repeated opening of the first three pādas *evén nú kam* highlights the critical incidents. The two sequences *evéd* and *nú kam* are both found fairly frequently elsewhere, but never elsewhere together, so it's difficult to judge the force of their combination.

VII.33.4: Ge appears to be right that this vs. is also Indra's speech. He picks up the *bráhmaṇā vaḥ* from 3d in pāda a and also addresses them as 'superior men' (voc. *naraḥ*), just as he spoke about the superior men (acc. *nṝn*) in 1c.

Ge takes *pitṝ́ṇām* with both *júṣṭī* and *bráhmaṇā*; I doubt the first, as does Old. Since I think Indra is addressing the Vasiṣṭhas at the time of the battle, not a younger generation of Vasiṣṭhas long after the battle, his "by reason of your fathers' sacred formulation" (*bráhmaṇā vo pitṝ́ṇām*) must refer to the formulation they inherited from their own poetic forebears and are putting to use in enlisting Indra's help.

The action Indra performs in response to the Vasiṣṭhas' employment of the *bráhman-* is not altogether clear. (Old, after some speculation, concludes "'ich komme hier nicht zur Klarheit.'") The bare phrasing *ákṣam avyayam* must mean literally "I enveloped the/an axle," but whose axle it is and whether the enveloping is a help or a hindrance aren't recoverable from context. However, as Old points out, III.53.19 may provide some guidance. That vs. is addressed to an axle (voc. *ákṣa*) in a series of vss. (17–20) mean to avert possible disasters that might afflict a team of oxen and the vehicle they are pulling. In vs. 19 the axle is urged *abhí vyayasva khadirásya sā́ram* "Engird yourself in the hardwood of the Acacia tree," before being told to be and stay firm (*vīḷáyasva*). The first instruction to the axle contains the verb

(*abhí*) √*vyā* 'envelop, engird', which I take as referring to fixing the ends of the axle firmly in the wheel hubs till the ends are literally surrounded with / enveloped in the wood of the wheel hub. If the same type of action is referred to here, Indra is performing a positive action, presumably securing the axle of the Vasiṣṭhas or their allies in position, to protect them and their chariot from harm, as Indra promises with *ná kílā riṣātha*.

As Ge points out (n. 4c), *śákvarī-* is the name of a meter with martial associations. As he also points out, this fairly rare meter is found in the first three vss. of X.133, a hymn to Indra attributed to Sudās Paijavana, that is, the royal hero of the Tbe Kings Battle, though there is no particular ref. to that battle in X.133. Since *śákvarīṣu* is plural here, it would be better tr. "in Sakvarī (verses)" than "in Śakvarī (meter)," as in the publ. tr.

VII.33.5: For the very compressed simile of the thirsty and heaven, cf. V.57.1 *tṛṣṇáje ná divá útsā udanyáve* "like the well-spring of heaven for a thirsty man seeking water," where the "water" part is made clear.

VII.33.6: It is a curious, but perhaps coincidental, fact that the sole occurrence of *daṇḍá-* in the RV is found in the same hymn with the only occurrence of the vṛddhi deriv. *maitrāvaruṇá-* (vs. 11), given that the *daṇḍa-* 'staff' is the emblem of office associated with the Maitrāvaruṇa priest in śrauta ritual. See Minkowski, *Priesthood in Ancient India,* pp. 141–54 and passim. The conjunction in our hymn was pointed out to me by Elizabeth Tucker.

The addition of the pejorative and sometimes diminutive suffix *-ka-* on a word already meaning 'small' -- *arbha-ká-* -- is a nice slangy touch.

In c the *ca* appears to be subordinating (so also Klein, DGRV I.242–43), though because *ábhavat* is pāda-initial, its accent need not be due to subordination.

VII.33.7: For the riddles here, see publ. intro. I make no effort at a definitive solution (or even any solution at all). In this abstention I follow the good example of Old.

VII.33.9: On the weaving, see publ. intro. and vs. 12c, as well as comm. ad vs. 14.

VII.33.10–13: Old discusses Vasiṣṭha's two births and suggests that they are presented in reverse chronological order. The birth depicted in vs. 10 is the second birth, while 11–13 treat the first. In the first birth Mitra and Varuṇa emit semen at a Sattra, which falls into a pot and ultimately gives rise to the seer Agastya. But a drop of this semen is taken into a lotus, somehow comes to the Apsaras Urvaśī, who somehow conceives and gives birth to Vasiṣṭha "from mind." In the second birth the wondrously conceived divine being of the 1st birth is received into a human Gotra. Old is uncertain about the details; I am even more uncertain.

VII.33.10: In III.51.4 I take *sám* √*hā* as 'compact oneself together', that is, 'concentrate one's essence', and that seems the image here, of the embryonic

Vasiṣṭha taking shape from concentrated lightning. Ge (n. 10a) suggests rather that it refers to semen suddenly poured out. I do not see this, and his suggested parallel in X.95.10 seems irrelevant, esp. since the lightning there is Urvaśī.

Old's argument that vs. 10 depicts one birth and the following vss. another depends in part on taking the two *utá*'s of 10c and 11a as marking the two births. This would be more convincing if the first *utá* were not in the middle of the pāda. This position seems better accounted for by assuming that 10c refers to both births, with *utá* conjoining *tát te jánma* and *ékam*, as Ge takes it ("das war deine (eine) Geburt und eine …"). So also Klein (DGRV I.368). The double *yád* in b and d support this interpr., with each *yád* introducing one of the births. I follow this general interpr.

The *yád* in b is very deep in its clause, with both subj. and obj. preceding it, if pādas ab form a single clause as in the standard tr. (incl. Ge and the publ. tr.). It would, however, be possible to take pāda a as the main clause on which b is dependent: "light was compacting out of lightning when M+V looked upon you." This would solve the problem, but the unusual position of *yád* could also be attributed to an attempt to make b and d parallel, each recounting one of the births and opening with the putative father (or fathers) followed by *yád*, with a preterital verb and the obj. *tvā* (the latter in different orders): b *mitrã́váruṇā yád ápaśyatām̐ tvā* and d *agástyo yát tvā viśá ājabhãra*. In this scenario, pāda a, which is a single NP, would have been fronted around the core clause.

With Old (fld. by Ge), I read dat. *viśé* contra Pp. *viśáḥ*. The clan in question is supposed to be the Tṛtsus.

VII.33.11: The pub. tr. reads "born from her mind," but given the uncertainties of this birth story, the mind need not be Urvaśī's, but someone else's, or even pure mind. So it might be better rendered as "born from mind."

On the semen (if that's what the drop is) and the lotus, see disc. ad vss. 10–13. If the underlying narrative really does involve transporting spilled semen in a leaf and long-distance conception therefrom, it anticipates the MBh narrative in which the king Vasu ejaculates while hunting, catches the semen in a leaf, and tries to send it home to his wife Girikā by enlisting a bird, though the bird and the semen meet with a disaster over water that leads to the semen impregnating a fish (MBh I.57.35ff.).

I take *drapsáṃ skannám* as a nominal clause, rather than taking cd as a single clause with *drapsáṃ skannám* coreferential with *tvā*.

VII.33.12: As Ge points out (n. 12a), *praketá-* is otherwise only a noun, and so it is best to go against the Pp's reading *praketáḥ* in favor of the loc. *praketé*. (Ge also entertains the possibility of reading *sapraketáḥ*.)

The "both" are presumably both births; so Ge.

The weaving in pāda c is repeated almost verbatim from 9c, but with the single Vasiṣṭha, not the pl. Vasiṣṭhas as subject. As noted in the publ. intro., I assume that this refers to the production of the sacrifice. See comm. ad vs. 14 below.

The hapax *sádāna-* is not entirely clear. Ge suggests that it stands for **sádādāna-* by haplology and tr. "der … immerdar Geschenke hat." He does not render the *utá vā*, implicitly taking *sahásradānaḥ … sádānaḥ* as appositive adjectives. Klein (DGRV II.169) follows Ge's interpr. of *sádānaḥ* without mentioning the possible haplology and states that the conjoined terms in the phrase *sahásradana utá vā sádānaḥ* "come close to being synonymous." His tr. "having a thousand gifts or having constant gifts" both illustrates this suggestion and shows how flat-footed such a phrase would be. Old discusses without coming to a conclusion, though he does reject the haplology explan., which goes back to Ludwig. My own interpr. takes the text as given and interprets the second adj. as additive "and one gift (more)," with *sádāna-* 'with (a) gift' standing for 'with one gift'. If the *utá vā* should be read as disjunctive 'or' (as I admit it should), perhaps this is instead a version of the Archilochus fox-and-hedgehog dichotomy ("the fox knows many things, but the hedgehog one big one") -- hence "having a thousand gifts -- or one (big) gift." This in fact is now my preferred tr. What the gifts refer to I have no idea.

VII.33.13: This vs. is the basis of Old's (and others') reconstruction of the 1st birth of Vasiṣṭha (see comm. add vss. 10–13), with Mitra and Varuṇa at a Sattra emitting semen into a pot, which then gave rise to both Agastya and Vasiṣṭha. Unfortunately the details of this vs. are far from clear, though pāda b does (fairly) straightforwardly depict a dual entity pouring semen into a pot.

The gravest problems are in pāda a. The opening *satré ha* is interpr. by Sāy, fld. by Ge., as standing for *sattré* 'at a Sattra'. The single *-t-* versus double *-tt-* before *-r-* is of course not a problem [Max Müller's ed. in fact prints *sattré*], but it *is* the case that, though the word *sat(t)rá-* and its ritual complex are well attested already in Saṃhitā prose, the word is not found elsewhere in the RV. (However, the ritual almost surely already existed; there seems a clear reference to it in vs. 9 of the Indra hymn III.31, where the Aṅgirases "sit a sitting" [*sádanam √sad*, though with the words not in the same VP] to open the Vala cave. See comm. ad loc.) However, Gr suggests reading **satréhá* instead, to be analyzed as the adv. *satrā* 'entirely' and *ihá* 'here'; the only change required would be accenting the second word. Old sits on the fence, but seems weakly to favor the Sattra interpr., as do I, since it at least provides richer semantics and a ritual context for the actions. Moreover the particle *ha* would exactly match the same particle in the same location in pāda c.

The next problem is *jātaú*. If it is a dual ppl. (rather than a loc. sg. to the putative stem *jātí-*, which, however, is not found in the RV), it can of course modify the dual subjects of the verb *siṣicathuḥ*, and it is also quite possible that that dual subject is Mitra and Varuṇa, as Old and Ge interpr. it. The problem is thus not syntactic but semantic. In what way would M+V be "born" at a Sattra? Ge elides the problem by (as far as I can see) folding it into an anodyne phrase with *iṣitā*, rendered as "erregt geworden," where I assume the 'geworden' is a bleached, auxiliary-like version of *jātaú*. Sāy glosses it as *dīkṣitau*, and this might nicely reflect the middle Vedic configuration of the *dīkṣā* of a soma sacrificer as tantamount to a second birth. No forms of the (secondary) root √*dīkṣ* are found in the RV; however, both *dīkṣā́-*

and *dīkṣitá-* are attested in the AV, with the former fairly common. I therefore am inclined to follow Sāy's interpr. -- or what I assume Sāy's interpr. rests on -- that *jātaú* refers to the conceptual rebirth of a consecrated sacrificer. This rebirth would be somewhat comparable to the two births of Vasiṣṭha himself. This interpr. of *jātaú* would be more clearly expressed than in the publ. tr. by rendering it "(re)born [=consecrated] at a (ritual) Session."

Pāda c appears to describe the creation of Agastya (see comm. above ad vss. 10–13). Māna is the name of Agastya's father and family or indeed of Agastya himself. See Mayrhofer PN s.v. for reff.

Kü (99, 570) has a very diff. interpr. of the vs. In the first hemistich he takes *kumbhé* as a dual, modified by the dual ppl. in pāda a and subject of the dual verb in b: "Beim Somaopfer geboren, angetrieben durch Verehrungen haben die beiden Krüge den gemeinsamen Samen ergossen" (99). This is grammatically impossible, because *kumbhá-* is masc., as the two occurrences of the acc. pl. *kumbhā́n* show, and so its dual should be **kumbhā̆(u)*. In c he takes *mā́naḥ* as 'house': "Mitten daraus ist ein Haus hervorgegangen" (99=570). He does not comment on the mythological content of the vs., but though *mā̆na-* 'building, house' is at least marginally attested in the RV (clearest in VII.88.5), the creation of a house from semen would be such an outlandish feat that the creation of a seer seems positively plausible.

VII.33.14: As Ge (n. 14) points out, this vs. seems to pick up 10d, describing the second "birth" of Vasiṣṭha, when Agastya presents him to the clan, and it seems to consist of Agastya's direct speech. As Old points out, the first hemistich seems to identify the three priests of śrauta ritual, though not by title: the Hotar, supporter of the *ukthá-*; the Udgātar, supporter of the *sā́man-*; and the Adhvaryu, supporter of the pressing stone, i.e., the one who performs the physical actions. Assuming this is the case makes it reasonably likely that the weaving of "the covering stretched by Yama" (9c, 12c) does indeed refer to the production of the sacrifice. Vasiṣṭha is thus presented as responsible for the whole of the sacrifice, not just a portion of it.

VII.34 All Gods

Re characterizes this hymn as "invitation without praise."

The first 21 (or actually 20 and a half) of this 25-vs. hymn are in Dvipadā meter. Despite its name, this meter should be considered to consist of *four* pādas of 5 syllables each, since verbs located in the 6th syllable of a putative 10-syl. pāda are generally accented (see 3b, d, 4b, 6b, 20d); however, consider 14d, 17d, where verbs in that position are unaccented. Those two violations fall in the latter part of the Dvipadā portion and may be beginning the transition to Triṣṭubh, which takes over in the 2nd half of vs. 21. On the meter see Old, Prol. 95–98.

VII.34.1: HvN's resolution of the sandhi in pāda a as *śukra étu* is incorrect: the Pp rightly reads *śukrā etu*.

The reference to the departure of our well-crafted *manīṣā* is a fitting beginning to a hymn, as describing the dispatch of the praise hymn to the targeted divinities.

VII.34.2: Ge (n. 2a), flg. Sāy., takes the waters as subj. of *vidúḥ* and suggests that the point is that the waters are older even than Heaven and Earth: they are the Urelement. They therefore were around for the creation of H+E and know all about it. In the absence of any other obvious subject, this seems reasonable.

In the 2nd hemistich the function and position of *ádha* are somewhat puzzling. Klein (DGRV II.96 n. 23) lists it with passages with the "logical conjunctive value" 'therefore'. But he does not tr. it or comment on its non-clause-init. position, and I find it difficult to wring a 'therefore' sense out of it. In the Prol. (369 n. 1) Old suggests that the PB parallel (I.2.9, VI.6.17) with the reading *adhaḥ* 'below' is correct and the RV should be emended, but he essentially drops that idea in the Noten, remarking that RV *ádha* is "tadellos" and that the emendation would also require altering the accent (to *adháḥ*). Our passage is reminiscent of IV.17.10 *ayáṃ śṛṇve ádha jáyann utá ghnán*, which I tr. "this one is famed for conquering and smiting." Both passages have a mid-clause *ádha* that introduces a pres. participle or participles and both contain a form of √*śru*. See comm. ad IV.17.10. In both cases I think *ádha* opens a mini-clause that modifies or expands on the main verb. In our passage I think the point is that, though rivers are very noisy when they flow (as is often emphasized in Vedic texts), these waters also know how to listen. Note also that in our case *ádha* is pāda-initial, though not clause-initial.

VII.34.3: As noted in the introductory remarks above, both *pínvanta* and *máṃsante* are accented because they open 5-syl. pādas.

Both Ge and Re take the (soma) sacrifice as the referent of *asmai*, contra both Sāy. and Old, who supply Indra instead. I definitely side with the latter. Like many All God hymns, the separate vss. can serve as little riddles, each pointing to a different god,, and the mention of *vṛtréṣu* '(battles against) obstacles', even in the plural, seems a tip-off that Indra is lurking.

I'm not quite sure what the subjunctive *máṃsante* is meant to convey -- perhaps that in times to come poets will talk about them that way in the accounts of the Vṛtra-slaying?

VII.34.4–6: Note the chiasmic verb sequence 4b *dádhāta* [… 5a *sthāta*] ... 5d *tmánā hinota* ... 6ab *tmánā … hinóta* ... 6c *dádhāta*, with one interruption.

VII.34.4: The 2nd pl. subj. of *dádhāta* is unspecified, but is probably the priests / poets associated with the current sacrifice, who were referred to in the 1st pl. *asmát* in vs. 1. See vss. 5–6, where this identification is more explicit.

Once again both Ge and Re take *asmai* as referring to the sacrifice. They also take the nominative(s) of the 2nd hemistich as coreferential with the subj. of the impv. *dádhāta* in a: in other words, "put the horses to the chariot pole, as Indra (does/did)."

This seems unnec. Old's view that the *asmai* refers to Savitar, who is then the subj. of the 2nd hemistich, is far more plausible. Although *híraṇya-bāhu-* is found only here in the RV, the very similar *híraṇya-pāṇi-* 'having gold hands' is used a number of times of Savitar, and the uncompounded phrase *bāhū … hiraṇyáyā* is used of Savitar's arms in nearby VII.45.2 (also VI.71.1, 5), as Old points out. Since Tvaṣṭar fashions the mace for Indra in I.32.2, calling him *vajrín-* here is perfectly sensible.

VII.34.5–6: The 2nd pl. impvs. in these two vss., 5a *abhí prá sthāta*, 5d *hinota*, 6b *hinóta*, 6c *dádhāta*, all take the sacrifice (*yajñám*, explicitly 5b, 6b) as object and make the identification of the subject as the priests/poets, suggested ad vs. 4, more likely.

VII.34.5: The simile *áheva*, despite Pp *áha iva*, is surely to be analyzed as *áhā iva*, as Old indicates, pointing out that in other places where it occurs (e.g., IV.33.6) the Pp. gives the long vowel form. Both Old and Ge take *áhā* as nom.: "set out on the sacrifice, as the days (do [=follow one after the other])." Re takes it as acc., supplying "as (the sun) does the days," which requires that he make the verb *abhí prá sthāta* transitive ("mettez en marche"), which is unlikely. I prefer to take it as acc. extent of time, meaning something like "'keep going in the performance of sacrifice, as one keeps going day after day."

VII.34.7: Like vss. 3 and 4, this contains an unaccented oblique form of *ayám*, in this case *asya*, and as with those vss., I think it likely that *asya* is the sign of a riddling mention of a god -- in this case likely Agni, as Old tentatively suggests. Ge and Re also see a reference to the offering fire.

I do not understand the simile in the 2nd hemistich. If the *bhū́ma* that the earth bears is its surface, what would an equivalent burden be for the offering fire?

In order to get 2 Dvipadā pādas in the 2nd hemistich, we must read **pṛthvī́* for *pṛthivī́*, as Old points out. Otherwise we have a Triṣṭubh anticipating the switch to Triṣṭubh that happens much later in the hymn.

VII.34.8: Old asserts that *áyātu-* is a determin. cmpd., not a bahuvrīhi, thus 'non-sorcerer' rather than 'not having sorcery/sorcerer'. The publ. tr. reflects -- and indeed reflects somewhat loosely -- a bahuvrīhi interpr., though I think the difference is minor. Re also takes it as a b.v.: "sans (user de) sorcellerie" (tr. EVP V), "sans user de procédés magiques" (comm., EVP IV); see also Wh n. ad AV tr. VIII.4.16. Nonetheless, a determin. interpr. is a reasonable alternative: "I -- no sorcerer -- invoke the gods." A 2nd RVic occurrence of this stem, acc. *áyātum* in VII.104.16, with AVŚ+P repetitions, is not registered in Gr., which omission is probably responsible for Re's erroneously calling our occurrence a hapax in his comm. Unfortunately this other occurrence does not resolve the question of cmpd type. The cmpd. is not disc. in AiG.

Presumably the implied opposition in this vs. is between sorcery in the 1st half-vs. and truth (*ṛtá-*) of the 2nd half. So also Re (comm.).

VII.34.9: Once again the unspecified 2nd pl. subj. should be the priests/poets.

Note the extreme alliteration of … *devī́ṃ dhíyaṃ dadhidhvam*.

The morphological identity of this last form, *dadhidhvam*, can be queried. The three occurrences of this form are normally assigned to the perfect rather than the redupl. pres. (see esp. Kü 275), on the grounds that the *-i*-liaison is proper to the perfect. Yet no corresponding med. 2nd pl. impv. is built to the pres. stem; indeed, the posited correspondent (cf. Whitney, Gr. §668), the monstrous *dhaddhvam, is not attested in Vedic (as imperative, injunctive, or augmented imperfect). It is likely, therefore, that *dadhidhvam* serves as impv. to both pf. and redupl. pres., neutralizing the distinction between those T/A stems. In fact, given that in this passage it is parallel to the present impv. *kr̥ṇudhvam* in the same vs. and immediately follows on an unambiguous redupl. pres. form to the same root and with the same obj. (8d *dhíyaṃ dadhāmi*, 9b *dhíyaṃ dadhidhvam*), a present-stem interpr. is favored. On ambig. pf. impvs. see my 2018 "The Vedic Perfect Imperative" (Fs. Lubotsky).

VII.34.10–11: After several vss. with a ritual, priestly focus, we return to the semi-riddling listing of gods, with these two vss. devoted to Varuṇa. In 10 the subj. Varuṇa is withheld till the 2nd half, thereby producing a quickly solved riddle. Vs. 11 does not name him at all, but the referent is clear from the phraseology, as well as the previous vs.

VII.34.10: The easiest thing to do with fem. gen. pl. *āsā́m* is to have it modify fem. gen. pl. *nadī́nām*, as Ge and Re do (e.g., "de ces rivières"). But it is unaccented and therefore should be a pronominal demonstrative, rather than an adjectival one. I therefore assume that it picks up the waters (*ā́paḥ*) earlier in the hymn (2c, 3a); the connection of Varuṇa with the waters, though not as firm in the RV as it is later, would evoke them. The rivers are then in apposition to these unnamed waters. Re in his comm. notes the "lien" of *āsā́m* with *ā́paḥ* earlier in the hymn but seems to stop short of syntactically separating *āsā́m* from the rivers in this vs. For further disc. see comm. ad I.68.7.

VII.34.12–13: The 2nd pl. subjects of all the verbs but *vy ètu* in 13a must be the gods in general. The priests/poets who were previously unspecified 2nd pl. subjects do not command the powers to carry out the desires specified.

VII.34.12: The hapax *ádyu-* has been variously analyzed and rendered: e.g., Sāy. *adīpti-* 'non-shining', reflected in Gr's 'glanzlos' and probably Re's 'sans éclat'; Old 'excluded from heaven'. But Ge's (n. 12b) comparison of Old Avestan *aidiiu-* (YH 2x, plus a YA rep.) 'harmless' is surely correct and is accepted by EWA, etc. For disc., with earlier lit., see Narten, YH 280–81.

Our half-verse *ádyuṃ kr̥ṇota śáṃsaṃ ninitsóḥ* is nearly identical to VII.25.2c *āré tám śáṃsaṃ kr̥ṇuhi ninitsóḥ*, though in a different meter (our two 5-syl. pādas of Dvipadā versus Triṣṭubh). To accommodate the meter the verb and object had to be

flipped and a different predicate supplied. This metrically driven modification procedure is instructive.

VII.34.14: Initial injunc. 3rd sg. -*iṣ*-aor. *ávīn* (for *ávīt*) matches the init. *áviṣṭa* (+*u*) of 12a, which I (and the standard tr.) take as a 2nd pl. -*iṣ*-aor. impv. Re. takes *ávīt* here as hortatory/imperatival ("Qu'Agni favorise …"), but I see no problem in having a preterital (or perhaps general present "Agni aids …") injunc. form in this vs. characterizing an individual god. The 2nd pl. is found in the hortatory address to the gods in general, parallel to impv. *kṛṇota* in 12c, whereas *ávīt* is followed by an augmented pass. aor. *adhāyi*, expressing the reciprocal human action in response to the god's help.

      The first half-vs. contains two exx. of -*t*/*d* → -*n* sandhi before nasal: (*ávīt* →) *ávīn no* and (*havyā́d* →) *havyā́n námobhiḥ*. Re renders the latter as if it were an acc. pl. to *havyá-* ("… favorise nos oblations"), but this must be an example of a hasty Homeric nod, since *havyá-* 'oblation' is always neut.

      Whose *námobhiḥ*? Ge takes them as Agni's, which he offers to the gods. I think it more likely that it refers to *our* acts of reverence to Agni, to which he reciprocates by aiding us. So also Scar (40: "durch {unsere} Ehrerbietungen"). Re takes *námobhiḥ* with the following clause: "Avec hommages a été déposée … la louange …"). This avoids the problem and works well semantically, but in this hymn verses regularly fall into two clauses separated by the half-vs. boundary, and there are no examples of a portion of b adjoined to the clause of cd.

VII.34.15: Here the 2nd pl. address appears to be to the priests/poets.

      This is the one of the few vss. in which the half-vs. break does not coincide with a major syntactic break, and this is made more noticeable by the fact that there is a clause break between pādas c and d.

VII.34.16: Assuming that it is the serpent that is sitting in the depths, that is, that the referent is Ahi Budhnya, who is found explicitly in vs. 17, I see no alternative to taking the nom. sg. pres. part. *sī́dan* as the predicate of a nominal sentence in cd, picking up the acc. obj. *abjā́m …áhim* in ab. Sāy. simply indicates that *sī́dan* is for acc. *sī́dantam*, and Ge and Re tr. cd as it if were a rel. cl. (e.g., "qui siège …"), a translational choice that blurs the Sanskrit. The alternative, which unifies the syntax at the expense of the sense, is to take *sī́dan* as implicitly modifying the 1st sg. subj. of *gṛṇīṣe* 'I will sing' in the first hemistich. So Scar (134): "… Den wassergeborenen Drachen preise ich …, {ihn}, der auf dem Grund der Flüsse weilt, wenn ich im Finstern sitze," construing c (*budhné nadī́nām*) with the acc. serpent of ab and d (*rájassu ṣī́dan*) with the 1st sg. subj. This interpr. seems highly unlikely: why would the poet "I" be sitting in the darkness? and where does Scar get the "weilt" for the serpent?

      I do not understand the reason for the close sandhi of *rájassu ṣī́dan*.

VII.34.17: The first half vs. is also found in V.41.16, and in both places it is metrically anomalous. Here it has the requisite 10 syllables for Dvipadā, but the caesura/pāda break comes after the 4ᵗʰ syllable, so that it does not fall into two 5-syl pādas. In V.41.16 (which, with the following vs. 17, is metrically different from the Triṣṭubhs that make up the bulk of that hymn) it has 10 syllables, rather than the expected 11. It is also somewhat striking that two vss. in our hymn are devoted to the very minor divinity Ahi Budhnya, when far more important gods receive only one, and I wonder if 17 hasn't been inserted to make the identification of this divinity clearer, since vs. 16 does not give him his full title. It is worth noting that our 17cd was already flagged above as one of the few places in the hymn in which a verb beginning the d pāda is not accented. This may provide further support for the idea that the vs. is a later insertion.

VII.34.18: The nom. pl. subjects of the two half vss. are different, in my opinion. The loc. 'men', recipients of the fame bestowed on them by (presumably) gods in ab, are the ones who go forth for wealth in cd.

　　The phase *śárdhanto aryáḥ* has an almost identical correspondent in nearby VII.21.5 *sá śárdhad aryó víṣuṇasya jantóḥ*, where the second phrase shows (or at least strongly suggests) that *aryáḥ* is gen. sg. On the phrase see Thieme (Fremdling 54–55).

VII.34.19: My tr. "the worlds" assumes that *bhū́mā* is pl., contrary to the standard, who tr. "the earth." I would be happy with the latter.

　　I have taken *-senā-* as 'weapon' here, but it could as well be 'army', with Ge, Re, etc. It does not affect the sense appreciably.

VII.34.20: The pl. "wives" (*pátnīḥ*) refers, as often in the RV, must refer to the Wives of the Gods. As I have argued elsewhere ("'Sacrificer's Wife' in the Rig Veda: Ritual Innovation?" 2018 in Proceedings of the 13ᵗʰ World Skt. Conf., 2006), one of the models for the introduction of the Sacrificer's Wife (*pátnī*) in Vedic ritual, beginning in the late RV, is the presence of the Wives of the Gods on the ritual ground, as here. Tvaṣṭar is their usual companion and chaperone. He is also associated with the shaping of the embryo in the womb, as in the pregnancy charm X.184.1. The request that he confer heroes on us here must be a prayer for sons (who will become) heroes.

VII.34.21: As noted above, the first hemistich contains 10 syllables falling into two 5-syllable pādas, but the second half is a straight Triṣṭubh, anticipating the Triṣṭubhs of the rest of the hymn.

　　The stem *vasūyú-* can modify both masc. and, as here, fem. nouns. This exact phrase, *arámatir vasūyúḥ* is also found at VII.1.6.

VII.34.23: Both Ge and Re take *rā́yaḥ* here as nom. sg., parallel to the other entities like mountains and waters, but I do not see why the the construction that ends vs. 22,

ví dadhātu rǎyaḥ "let him apportion wealth," is not simply continued here. There *rǎyaḥ* must be the obj. of the verb, whether acc. pl. or partitive gen. sg.; in either case the preferred accent would be *rāyáḥ*, but there are enough forms with the opposite accent that we need not be too troubled. If we can accept the wrong accent in 22d, I see no reason not to do so in 23a. Re gestures towards my interpr. in his n.

VII.34.24: Note the izafe-like *yé sahǎsaḥ* nominal relative clause.
        Correctly accented gen. sg. *rāyáḥ* appears here; see comm. on vss. 22–23.
        On the infinitive construction here, see Keydana, Infinitive im Ṛgveda, 70, 159.

VII.34.25: I do not understand why Ge and Re render the *juṣanta*, to the common and well-understood medial stem *juṣáte* 'enjoys', as 'grant' (zibilligen) and 'agree' respectively. Although it is true that the final vss. of hymns frequently ask gods for things, it is also true that we commend our praises to them -- and surely that's what's going on here: we want the gods to take pleasure in the hymn, or the ritual in general, that we have just offered them.

VII.35 All Gods
        As indicated in the publ. intro., this hymn is remarkably monotonous and has no real content -- simply the unbroken repetition of the wish that various gods or natural elements "be luck" (*śám*) for us. It therefore needs and deserves very little comment. Besides the deities mentioned in each vs., what variety there is in the hymn is found in the adjuncts associated with each one, often a characterizing adjective (e.g., 1b) or an oblique case form expressing accompaniment (e.g., 1a) or circumstance (e.g., 1d). The 1ˢᵗ 13 vss. follow a fairly rigid template: # *śám (naḥ)* GOD NAME (ADJUNCT) ("BE") (with the latter expressed by a 3ʳᵈ ps. impv. of √*bhū* or √*as*, or gapped; there seems no functional difference between √*as* and √*bhū* in this hymn). The order of adjunct and "be" can be flipped. Sometimes a single god (or god pair) occupies a pāda; sometimes two separate *śám* clauses are found in a pāda. In the former case, the adjuncts fill the extra space, while in the latter case the god/power name is all there is room for. In a few cases, noted below, the pattern is broken by the substitution of a verb other than 'be'.

VII.35.1: This gods listed in this vs. are dual divinities, each with Indra as the first part of the pair and all expressed in dual dvandvas. All have the expected double accent except *indrāgnī* in pāda a, which always lacks an accent on the first member in its numerous occurrences. Re suggests this is because the putative dual ending on **índrā-* is not perceived because of its coalescence with the initial vowel of *agnī*. This is fairly plausible, though there are a number of instances where the word must be read with four syllables and there the dual ending of the 1ˢᵗ member should have been recoverable.

VII.35.2: In a and c the provider of luck is *śáṃsaḥ* 'Laud', a clear play on the ubiquitous *śám*. In c *śáṃsaḥ* is the head of a NP with dependent gen.: *satyásya suyámasya*.

In d Ge renders *purujātáḥ* as "der viele Nachkommen hat," but given the form of this cmpd., this can hardly be correct. Cmpds. of the shape *puru*-PAST PPL (+ACCENT), like frequent *puru-ṣṭutá-*, *puru-hutá-*, mean 'much Xed' or 'Xed by many', and in cmpds. with *jāta-* as 2ⁿᵈ member, *-jāta-* means 'born, generated' not 'offspring'. Re, who tr. "aux nombreuses naissances," suggests that Aryaman is so qualified because of his association with marriage.

VII.35.3: Although sg. fem. *urūcî* is not otherwise used of the earth in its 5 other occurrences, the du. modifies *ródasī* in VI.11.4 (and at some distance in IV.56.4), which supports Ge's supplying of Earth here.

The well-attested adj. *suháva-* almost always modifies a god or gods and means 'easy to invoke'. Ge supplies 'names' here, and I follow him: "god X, easy to invoke" and "the name of god X, easy to invoke" are functionally nearly identical. And in X.39.1 *pitúr ná nā̆ma suhávam* "(the chariot), easy to invoke like the name of one's father," we have the posited phrase, though "name" is in a simile. Re rejects this interpr. in favor of a nominalized *suháva-* "les appels propices (faits) aux dieux," with, in my opinion, insufficient reason.

VII.35.4: The relentless pattern "luck be" is briefly broken here in pāda d, with *śám* the object of the verb 'blow' (*śám … abhí vātu*).

VII.35.5: Ge takes b as another break in the pattern: "Das Luftreich soll uns Glück sehen lassen," with *śám* the object of the inf. *dṛśáye*. But this seems unlikely: the clause is easy to interpret within the template, and furthermore the periphrastic causative assumed by his tr. would be awkwardly or impossibly expressed (lit. "let the Midspace be for us to see luck"); to express such a meaning we would expect rather a form of √*kṛ* ("let the Midspace make us to see luck").

VII.35.6: The last pāda here again has a real verb 'let hear' (*śṛṇotu*), not simply 'be', and *śám* is thus displaced from predicated nominative ("X be luck") to adverbial usage ("for luck"), with *naḥ* correspondingly promoted from dative ("for us") to acc. obj. of the verb ("hear us"). Note that this same construction might be found in pāda b and c, which lack verbs, while pāda a must follow the usual pattern because of its *astu*. Thus bc possibly, "let Varuṇa … (hear us); let Rudra … (hear) us." However, I think it likely that b+c simply follow a. In any case it's striking (or at least striking in a hymn that otherwise has so little variation) that the verbal construction changes within the vs., while the pattern of personnel is rigidly fixed: each pāda contains a single god as subject with an instr. pl. of his entourage.

VII.35.8: The first pāda again has a verb with content, *úd etu* 'let go up', and as in 6d this slots *śám* into an adverbial role.

VII.35.8: *bhavítra-* is found only here in the RV. My "(the means of) Creation" gives full functional value to the instrument suffix *-tra-*. Gr "die Welt," Ge "Creatur (?)," Re "le séjour-des-existences"; see Re's n. for further, though inconclusive, disc. The immed. preceding hymn contains *janítra-* (VII.34.2), which seems to mean something similar, insofar as it's possible to tell.

VII.35.14–15: These last two vss. stand apart from the 13 monotonous vss. that precede them, though they hardly have more content.

VII.35.14: The first hemistich refers, as often, to the hymn just concluding, with particular insistence on its absolute currency in the present moment, as shown by the pres. participle and the comparative adj. 'newer': *idám bráhma kriyámānaṃ návīyaḥ* "this sacred formulation being made anew."

Who the "cow-born ones" are is debated (see, e.g., Ge, Re, and the long n. by Bl [RV Rep. 316–17]), a question I confess to finding not very interesting, perhaps because the longueurs of this hymn have dulled my senses.

The last phrase of 14, the afterthought nominal rel. cl. *utá yé yajñíyāsaḥ*, is probably meant to include all stray divinities and cosmic or natural elements that don't fall under the first three categories (heavenly, earthly, cow-born) but might deserve worship. It might be better rendered "and those (others) who are worthy of the sacrifice."

VII.35.15: The just discussed phrase in 14d *yé yajñíyāsaḥ* is picked up by 15a *yé devānāṃ yajñíyā yajñíyānām*. I assume that this phrase doesn't introduce another group of worthies, but is simply an intensive elaboration of the original phrase. The next pāda qualifies them with another derivative of √*yaj*, the *-tra-*stem *yájatra-*, which I interpr., somewhat capaciously, as meaning that they provide the occasion or reason for Manu's sacrifice.

[**VII.86–89 JPB**]

VII.86 Varuṇa

VII.86.7b: 'god' omitted → "to the ardent god"