

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 **tʷvé hí gāvaḥ sudúghās tvé ásvāḥ*, 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 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 *piśā* 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 \sqrt{av}), but both Ge and Old (the latter after some hesitation) interpr. it as an impv. to \sqrt{av} ‘help’. As for *piśā*, Gr takes it as the instr. of a root noun, but most subsequent interpr. as the impv. to an otherwise unattested them. aor. to \sqrt{pis} ‘adorn, ornament’ (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 **pīdhí*.

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. *vidvāms-*, 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), even though participles in tmesis are rare.

The apparent close sandhi with following *kavíḥ* that *vidúṣ* 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 \sqrt{kr} , and Hale plausibly accounts for this phenomenon by pointing out that *kr* has an *s*-mobile doublet \sqrt{skr} 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 *kāṇva-* 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-* (*kāvyā-*, etc.) preceded by *-s* do show the standard visarga (e.g., among the many, I.76.5 *kavíbhīḥ 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 *āśús canéd* (9b) and close sandhi *rāradhuṣ ṭe* (18a); cf. also *susupuh śāt* (14b).

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

VII.18.4: The desid. part. *dúdukṣan* is mildly notable because 1) it does not exhibit reverse-Grassmann (**dúdhukṣan*) unlike the *s*-aor. *ádhuḥṣat* (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.18.5: My tr. of the 2nd hemistich follows Old’s, contra Ge.

VII.18.6: 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: *puroḷāḥ* ‘offering cake’.

The presumed underlying form of this nom. sg., *puroḷās* (also found in III.28.2), is unexpected: to the stem *puroḷāś*- we might rather find **puroḷāt*. See Scar (221) with lit. It is worth pointing out in this case, as well as with equally unexpected *sadhamās* in the next vs., that the final of both forms matches that of *sudās*, 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 ... nísitāḥ* 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 *śíśīhi rāyé asmān* “whet us for wealth” appears to be the polarized counterpart of our negative *rāyé ... nísitāḥ*. 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 *√tṛ* 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 (*√tṛ*), 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 *śívāsaḥ* 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 *álinā-* 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 \sqrt{bhr} , hence my ‘raiders’. It is not clear whether *śívāsaḥ* 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 Pakthas and the Bhalānases spoke out, and the Alinas and the Viṣāṇins -- (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 *sadhamād-* who led them to the battle but has now gone over to the Tr̥tsu (/Sudās) side and has turned to attack the *n̥n* (‘superior men’), by which they mean themselves. The *sadhamād-* is most likely Indra, and so losing him as an ally would be a serious blow.

On the unexpected form *sadhamās*, if the nom. sg. to *sadhamād-*, 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 *puroḷās*, 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 *ā yó 'nayat ... yudhā n̥n* “... der seine Mannen unter Kampf heranzuführte” -- the beginning of c and the end of d. While his main clause is the end of c and the beginning of d, ... *sadhamā āryasya, gavyā t̥tsubhyo ajagan ...* “Der Mahlgenossen des Ariers ... ist aus Verlangen nach Kühen den Tr̥tsu'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 jagrbhre 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 *jagrbhre* 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 srevaýántaḥ* "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, and flights of arrows so thick that they obscure the sun are a feature of battles in the epics (e.g., MBh IV.53.26, 31). 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' (*śivāsaḥ* 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 *cāyamāna-*, 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 agnostic -- 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* ($\sqrt{śi}$ 'lie'), which is the signature verb describing the slain Vṛtra in I.32. Note *paśús kavīḥ*, which shows the same sandhi before *kavīḥ* as *vidús kavīḥ* 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 (-)*ārtha-*. What they reached was a *nī-ārtha-* 'failed goal' (see, e.g., VI.27.6, X.107.8), which is *like* but tragically *not* their real goal.

In b note *āśús* (*canéd*), which echoes *paśús* (*kavíh*) 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 \sqrt{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 \sqrt{tuc} , a doublet of \sqrt{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 \sqrt{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 *mānuṣe* 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 *vádhrī-vāc-* to a (presumably virile) man expressed by *mānuṣa-*: “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 *jāne* (save for I.12.8.7, where it qualifies the semantically close *vrjāne*). 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. *vádhrī-vāc-* ‘possessing gelded/castrated speech’ provides another parallel to the famous Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, whose vs. 7 likens Vṛtra to a *vádhrī-* wishing to become a bull.

VII.18.10: The vs. begins *īyúr gāvo ná*, very similar to the opening of the preceding vs. 9 *īyúr árthaṃ ná*. The simile of the cows without a cowherd (*gāvo ná ... āgopāh*) 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 *citāsaḥ* as belonging to \sqrt{ci} ‘perceive’, meaning ‘perceived as, seeming’, rather than to \sqrt{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 (*abhi*) is the opposing side, which is acting as allied forces under a properly concluded agreement: *yathākṛtām ... mitrām*. 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, *mitrām* √*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. *amitrān* 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 *gāvaḥ* 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 *rānti-* 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 *rāṇa-*, both ‘joy’ and ‘battle’.

The phrase *śruṣṭīm 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 anṛ root *ní √str* (root aor. *ny ástah*) ‘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 ... barhīḥ* “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 *strñtá barhīḥ*). The actual verb of the simile, *ní śísāti* ‘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 *rājan-* in a simile (IX.82.1 *rājeva dasmāḥ*, X.43.2 *rājeva dasma*) and *rājā* is the subject of ab. The interconnections become even more tangled when we consider the 2nd of those just-cited similes: X.43.2 *rājeva dasma ní śadó ’dhi barhīṣi* “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. *ānava-* 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 zjubelten.” 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. *vr̥ṇānāḥ* [“(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, *bhāḥ* c), and so an appositive 2nd ps. reading “(you,) Indra, ...” is barely possible.

The adv. *sadyāḥ* ‘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 *sadyāḥ* 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 *bhāḥ* 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: *ṣaṣṭīḥ śatā suṣupuh śat sahāsrā*. The sums are tautological, as Old points out: sixty hundred and six thousand amounting to the same number. Both ‘sixty’ (*ṣaṣṭīḥ*) and ‘six’ (*śat*) 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’ (*vīrāsah*) ‘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 *durmitrāsah*; as with *amitra-* 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 $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘know’, a 1st member related to *kalā-* ‘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 *vísṣvāni* 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.

Kū (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 mīmāya*, with the middle term *manyu-mī-* containing the noun to its left (*manyú-*) and the root noun of the verb to its right ($\sqrt{\text{mī}}$). Though *mīmāya* phonologically echoes *mímānā(h)* at the end of 15c, they of course belong to different roots.

Pāda d contains a rare and curious idiom PATH $\sqrt{\text{bhaj}}$; cf. VII.39.1 *bhejāte ... pánthām*, possibly IX.102.2 *ābhakta ... 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 *patháh* acc. pl. and direct object of *bhejé*, with *vartaním* the obj. of *pátyamāṇah*? Such is the interpr. of Ge and Kū (334, 368) -- Ge with an idiomatic interpr. of *bhejé patháh*, Kū with a more literal one. However, I think it more likely that *patháh* is a gen. sg. dependent on *vartaním* on the basis of IV.45.3 *ā vartaním mádhunā jinvathas patháh* “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. *veśī-* (in the instr. *veśyā*) is a hapax; the standard tr.

‘needle’ derives from Sāy., but in fact this doesn’t make much sense. *srakti-* has better representation: it’s found in the cmpd. *náva-srakti-* ‘9-srakti-ed’ (also VS *cátuaḥ-srakti*) and has an Aves. cognate *sraxti-*, *ṣraxti-* ‘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)vṛscat*. 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 *táṣṭeva vṛkṣám vaníno ní vṛscasi, paraśvéva ní vṛscasi* “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. *sraktīḥ* 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., *veśyā* 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 sudāse*, is identical to the end of the last vs., 15d, preceded by *vísṽni* (15d) and *vísṽ* (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 *rāradhuḥ ṭe*, which reminds us of *vidúṣ kavīḥ* (2a) and *paśúṣ kavīḥ* (8d), as well as correct *āsúṣ canéd* (9b).

The rel. prn. *yāḥ* is too deep in its clause, following both direct objects of *kṛṇóti*: *mártān ... stuvatāḥ* 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 *pūrvāḥ ... nūtnāḥ* as qualifying *sumatāyaḥ ... rāyaḥ*: “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 *uśásaḥ*, for several reasons. First, the word order, with *uśásaḥ* 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 *pūrvā-* qualifying dawn in a number of passages. And finally morphology is against it: Ge would need to explain why a fem. nom. pl. *pūrvāḥ*, rather than the masc. *pūrve*, was used to modify a mixed feminine (*sumatāyaḥ*) and masculine (*rāyaḥ*) 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 *uśásaḥ* 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. *mānyamāna-* ‘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* (\sqrt{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. *grhāt*. Old discusses at length without a definite decision; Ge has his own idiosyncratic view: that in this context, with the abl. *grhāt*, *prá* \sqrt{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 *tvāyáto yé ámadann ánu tvā* (and consider the immediately preceding pāda 12c *vṛṇānā átra sakhyāya sakhyám*, which resonates 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 *grhá-* 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 application 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 *dāna*-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 *vibabhājā* 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 *babhājā*, 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 assimilated 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’, *nadī*, is folk etymologically (and probably etymologically; see EWA s.v.) connected with $\sqrt{\text{nad}}$ ‘roar’, as in the explicit etymological statement in AV III.13.1 *yád adāḥ samprayatīr āhāv ānadatā haté / tásmād ā nadyò nāma stha* Wh “Since formerly (? *adās*) going forth together, ye resounded (*nad*) when the dragon was slain, therefore ye are streams (*nadī*) by name.”

The signature verb *ní* $\sqrt{\text{sā}}$ ‘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 *yudhyāmadhī* is obviously a speaking name, with some form of $\sqrt{\text{yudh}}$ ‘fight’ embedded in it. See Old for various possibilities 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 (*tigmásṛṅgo 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 *ádāsūṣaḥ* is shown by passages like IX.23.3 ... *ádāsūṣo gáyam* and VIII.81.7 *ádāsūṣtarasya védaḥ*. It is possible, but not necessary, that *prayantāsi* is a periphrastic future.

I have no explanation for the comparative *súsvitara-* ‘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 *śúśrūṣamānaḥ* as meaning something like “putting oneself at the disposal (of someone else, here Kutsa).” I assume that they are thinking of the enlarged root $\sqrt{śruṣ}$ ‘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 $\sqrt{śru}$. 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 *dāsam* beginning c plays off both (*á*)*dāśuṣo* in 1c and *sudāsam* 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 (*bhūrīni*) *vṛtrā ... haṃsi*, which realizes *vṛtrahátyeṣu* in 3d. (Notice that both refer to plural events, handling their grammatical plurality in different ways.) A real *dāsyu-* is destroyed in 4cd, plucked from the name Trasadasyu in 3c. In a slightly different relationship, *devāvītau* ‘in pursuit of the gods’ here contains a form of the root $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’ found as 1st compound member in *vītahavyam* ‘whose oblation is worth pursuing’ in 3a. And within this verse *nṛbhiḥ* doubles the first member of the next word, *nṛmano*.

VII.19.5: This verse presents some interlocking syntactic and lexical problems. Unlike Ge, I take pādas b and c together. Splitting them requires him to supply a verb for b (“brachst”) again lacking support or necessity. Presumably again he is following the Pp, which analyzes *śatatamāviveṣīḥ* 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 *śatatamā* is a problem. Everyone wants it to be the 100th thing (probably *pūr-* ‘fortification’) that Indra destroys (after the 99 in b). Gr suggests reading *śatatamām*, which would provide the desired feminine accusative (agreeing with *pūr-*), 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. *cyautnāni* (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 *śatatamā* as a feminine instrumental with the old ending *-ā*. Although Old claims (in arguing against Gr) that the fem. stem should be *śatatamī-*, 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 *purutāmā-* of Uṣas and *mātītāmā-*, and for ordinals the well-attested feminine *prathamā-*. Or, if Ge is correct that the reference is to Śambara himself, *śatatamā* 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 *nivēśane* in c as 'at evening'. The word generally means 'causing to settle down' (the usual association of *-ana*-nominals with the transitive-causative *āya*-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 *āsvāpayah* '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 $\sqrt{viṣ}$ means 'work, work over', or here 'work to the end', again used in a slightly euphemistic sense. Note the phonetic echo between *nivēśane* and (a)*viveṣīr*.

The d pāda is a perfect chiasmus, even to the positioning of a conjunction between verb and object: *āhañ ca vrtrām nāmucim utāhan*. The mixture of *ca* and *utā* 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 *utā* conjoins the clauses of d." I prefer the former.

VII.19.6: *sānā* 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 \sqrt{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, *sānā tā te indra nāvya āguḥ*, and where I do interpret *sānā* as 'old'. The difference there is that the poet contrasts the old deeds of Indra with the new ones (*nāvya*) 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 (*vītāhavyam*) in vs. 3 has now been given by him (*rātāhavyāya*) here, tracking the progress of the sacrifice to the point of mutual benefit of man and god.

The phrase *dāsīṣe sudāse* "for the pious Sudās" displays syllabic metathesis, *dā-sū* / *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 *pářiṣṭau* and leads to a very different interpretation of the meaning. The latter word, literally 'encirclement', is generally taken as always negative, a tight spot or constriction (Ge's "in dieser Klemme"), but I find this interpretation hard to reconcile with the hic-et-nunc deictic *asyām*, since the poet has given no indication that he is currently in distress. (Ge's note suggests that this is a memory of the situation in VII.18, the Ten Kings battle, but this seems to me an ill-supported attempt to account for the deictic.) I therefore think the *pářiṣṭi-* here is positive – Indra's encirclement (that is, protection) of us now – and *te* is to be construed with *pářiṣṭau*: "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* ... *abhīṣṭau*# matches ... *te* ... *pářiṣṭau*# 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 asyām* as here and a string of locatives: VII.20.8 ... *te asyām sumataú* ... *várūthe* ... *nṛpītau* "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 (*mā* ... *bhūma* "may we not be...") to one with 2nd ps. subject: "Nicht sollst du uns ... dem Bösen preisgeben." Scar's tr. maintains the syntactic structure of the original, but otherwise follows Ge's interpretation. Better is Keydana's (*Infinitive im Rgveda* 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 *priyāsah* both with gen. *táva* and with loc. *sūrīṣu*.

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. (*asmān vṛṇīṣva* "choose us"). He does not, however, take *asmān* 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 tásmāi*) as (those) who (*yé*)..." This has the advantage of providing some reason for the final *tásmāi*, 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 *sadyás 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 abhīṣṭau* with ... *té maghavann abhīṣṭau*, where the simple addition of an accent turns the 2nd ps. sg. into a 3rd ps. pl.

nāraḥ śamsanti recalls the epithet *nārāśāṃsa*, and then participates in an interweaving of two words for ritual speech: *śamsanti ukthaśāsa ukthā*.

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

On the syntagm *yújyāya √ vṛ* see comm. ad IX.88.1.

VII.19.10: We might have expected an unaccented gen. pl. **narām* in the voc. phrase with *nṛtama*, but don't get it. There are no unaccented occurrences of this genitive. It would be possible instead to read *narām* with *eté stómāḥ* ("these praises of men"), but *nṛtama-* + gen. pl. of *nṛ-* is a fixed phrase, though usually with *nṛṇām* (I.77.4, III.51.4, IV.25.4, etc.). I am now inclined to read *narām* with both *stómā(h)* 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 *narām*, the older gen. pl. to *nṛ-*, and the newer one *nṛṇām* 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 śūrah* and *avitā nṛṇām*, each with a *ca* between the two members (so Ge, JSK I.195), I prefer to take *śūrah* as the principal predication of Indra, with the other two terms, *sákhā* and *avitā nṛṇām*, secondarily predicated of Indra as *śūra-*. Although this introduces a minor complication in word order, the fact that *śūra-* 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: ... *ūtī # ... úpa stīn #*

I think it quite likely that *mimihi* out of sandhi should be accented (*mimihí*) contra the Pp., given the balanced clausal-type constructions before and after (*úpa no vājān ... úpa stīn*), 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 *ápah*; *jágmiḥ* an acc. goal *nṛṣádanam*). For this type see Grestenberger 2013 (JAOS 133).

ápo náryaḥ is reminiscent of *ápāmsi ... 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 *trātā* of 1d and deploys three more pāda-initial nominative *tar*-stems in 2a, c, d: *hántā*, *kártā*, and *dātā*, each with an acc. object (*vṛtrám*, *ulokám*, and *vásu* respectively). Although pāda b lacks a subject *tar*-stem, it does have one as object: *jaritāram*. The stem that began it all, *trātā* in 1d, contrasts with those in vs. 2 by being suffix-accented, and it should therefore, according to general practice, have a genitive complement. I suggest that it's not an accident that its object is the enclitic *naḥ*, which could be accusative (and thus parallel with the objects in vs. 2) or genitive (and thus conform to the usual rule). Recall this poet's tricky case syntax with the *tar*-stem *prayantā* in VII.19.1.

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

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

VII.20.3: *khaja-* lacks an etymology (see EWA s.v. *khaja-kṛt-*), 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 vai* of the preceding verse. However, *īm* does serve to forestall a hiatus between *janúṣā* and *áṣalḥaḥ* and its position immediately after the former can be taken to signal that *janúṣā áṣalḥaḥ* are to be construed together. For another example of *janúṣem* see the next hymn (VII.21.1).

Note the sibilant play beginning with *samādvā* and continuing through the end of the hemistich.

VII.20.4: Again the poet plays with case disharmony, construing both inst. *ándhasā* and loc. *mādeṣu* 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. *rāyē*, gen.-abl. *rāyaḥ* is equally possible. The choice depends in great part on the analysis of the verb *kṣáyāt*: whether it belongs to $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘dwell’ or $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘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 $\sqrt{bhrī}$, 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 ṛtapā ṛtejāḥ*. Old, having considered both possibilities, opts (slightly) for the latter; Ge’s tr. also assumes an affiliation with ‘dwell’ and a dat. *rāyē*: “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 ā śakah...* “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 *áyāt* 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 \sqrt{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 \sqrt{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 $\sqrt{stā}$ ‘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 known 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 dismissed as impossible to demonstrate by Brent Vine (“Greek *στωμυλός* ‘chatty’,” *Indo-European Linguistics* 7 [2019]). 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 anagrammatic word play noted above makes it more likely that the word is semi-artificial, though based on attested material -- hence my favoring of the $\sqrt{stā}$ ‘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 $\sqrt{\text{sad}}$, 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 *barhiṣṭhām 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 *vípras* ‘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 *grbhād ā* as “bis zur Handhabung,” but in that use of the ablative with *ā* (“all the way to”) the noun follows the *ā* (see Gr s.v. *ā*). 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 *grbhá-* is an agent noun. For $\sqrt{\text{grabh}}$ with the pressing stones, see *grāva-grābhá-* (I.162.5), the title of a functionary, “Handler of the Pressing Stones.”

dūrāüpadah 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 *āyudha-* 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 $\sqrt{viṣ}$ ‘labor, bring to fulfillment’ does not mean ‘abtun’ (dismiss, brush aside). Moreover it regularly takes *āpas-* ‘work’, a form of which appears in pāda b, as object; see esp. IV.19.10 *āpāmsi ... nāryāviveṣīḥ*. By contrast, the participle *vidvān* is usually used absolutely, without object. As for the referent of *eṣām* it would of course be 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” (*púrah*) 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(nā)* directly before the verb. Cf. *āhinā* in 3b.

The first word of the verse, *bhīmāḥ*, picks up the last word of vs. 3, *bhīṣā*.

VII.21.5: A verse with several rare words. The neut. pl. *vāndanā* in b is unclear; the neut. sg. *vāndanam* 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 \sqrt{vand} ‘praise, extol’ and give it a negative twist appropriate to the context, hence my ‘sycophant’: praise gone wrong. A similar negative interpretation is needed for the usually positive term *vedyā-* in the same phrase. Why *vāndanā* 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 *ṛtā* 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 *ṛtā*.

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

The lexeme *āpi* $\sqrt{gā}$ occurs in the RV only here, but *āpi* \sqrt{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. *bhūh* 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* ... *rājāmsi*.

The verb in d, *vividat*, is morphologically slightly problematic. Following Gr I interpret it as a subjunctive to the act. pf. of $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ '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 asuryāya* in 7a), and at least one parallel passage suggests that it is the end of his *sávas*- that is at issue: I.100.15 *ná ... sávaso ántam āpuḥ*.

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

For the meaning of the idiom *ánu* $\sqrt{\text{mā}}$, see Kü (279). It parallels the concessive sense of *ánu* $\sqrt{\text{dā}}$ 'concede' and *ánu* $\sqrt{\text{dhā}}$ 'id.'

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

VII.21.8: The "man like you" (*tvāvataḥ*) 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 *vanuyāma vanuṣyātaḥ* "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 *maghāvāno 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 \sqrt{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 ...,” IJ 33: 1–19) pp. 4–5. The gerundive + *asi* in 7c (*havyaḥ ... asi* “you are to be invoked”) supports a simple copula interpr. here.

VII.22.3: The position of *ā* in the middle of the NP *vācam ... imām* is worth noting. Gr takes it as a preverb with *bódhā*, but \sqrt{budh} does not otherwise occur with *ā*, and its position would not be normal for a preverb in tmesis. Note also that *bódhā* + SPEECH is found in the next vs. (*bódhā ... manīṣām*) 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 *ā* ‘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* $\sqrt{pā}$ 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. *vipipānā*. See Old ad loc. (and NGGW 1893, 348–49). Though it has been suggested that this usage belongs to a separate root $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘go’ (see, e.g., EWA s.v. *PĀ*³), this seems unnecessary and somewhat perverse. Although the other *ví* $\sqrt{pā}$ 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 *mānyamānasya* 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 *śivā naḥ sakhyā sāntu ... devēṣu yuṣmé*, where the *-mé* pronominal form is anchored as a loc. by *devēṣu*, makes a loc. reading more likely. Cf. also VI.18.5 *tān naḥ pratnām sakhyām 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 *upaśrotā* 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(h)* of pāda a as the implied subject of plural *irajyānta*. I take the verb as a contrastive passive/reflexive to the otherwise active stem, more or less following Old’s interpretation, with *śurúdhah* 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. *dhībhiḥ* 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 vājān*, also nearby VII.21.7 *maghāni dayate*. The position of *hí* is also anomalous, though note that it exactly replicates the position of *ví* in the phrase in the preceding verse just cited and may well owe its position to this rhyme.

Despite the syntactic aberrancy I think that *mártān* must represent the recipient, and the parallelism of the *dáyase* phrases in the adjacent verses has imposed the accusative recipient. (There is also an apparent double accusative, of goods and recipient, in one other passage: VI.37.4 *maghā ... dáyase ví sūrīn* “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 *ásah*. 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 bhūh*.

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(h)* 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 *suvrktīḥ*. 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. *várīvrjat* 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 \sqrt{vrj} ‘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 \sqrt{vrdh} *vāh-* to \sqrt{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 ... nā*) may be highlighting two different aspects of the complex simile.

The genitive of goods with \sqrt{id} ‘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 *vāsūnām*, and the construction is reminiscent of nearby VII.32.5 ... *śrútkarṇa īyate vāsūnām* “he of listening ears is implored for goods.” Moreover, in X.20.2 *agnīm īle bhujām*, the gen. pl. *bhujām* is best interpr. this way (“I invoke Agni for delights”), contra the standard interpr. Alternatively we could assume the gapping of a noun like *sambhāraṇam* ‘assemblage’ as in the next hymn, VII.25.2d *sambhāraṇam vāsūnām*, but this seems less likely.

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 *divīva dyām* 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*^{m2} ‘give’.

VII.25 Indra

VII.25.1: Although *mahá(h)* 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 *yād* 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 *nā mardhīh* is of course grammatically incorrect. We expect *mā* with the injunctive in prohibitives, and in fact find it with this same stem several times: *mā no mardhīh* IV.20.10, *mā no mardhiṣtam* VII.73.4, 74.3,

always with the 1st pl. enclitic following the *mā*. Non-prohibitive forms of $\sqrt{mr̥dh}$ 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 **mā mardhīh* 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 \sqrt{rc} ‘chant’ as the main verb of the first hemistich, since this verb takes *sūśám* as object in a number of passages (e.g., I.9.10, X.96.2). Cf. nearby VII.23.6 *vásiṣṭhāso abhí arcanty arkaīh*, with the nom. pl. subj. of a group of contemporary singers and the verb \sqrt{rc} 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: On *ní* $\sqrt{mr̥j}$ see comm. ad II.38.3. The idiomatic sense ‘drag down forcefully’ (as in I.140.2, where Agni drags down trees like an elephant) allows the idiom to develop a sense not only of coercion (on the part of the agent) but of submission (on the part of the object), which is probably responsible for its use of a husband’s action towards his wives.

The use of *sárva*- rather than *vísva*- 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 *pūrvīh* ‘many’, a contrast that appears to be highlighted.

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 (Injunk. 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 *dhās* for the injunctive. An alternative would be to take it as a 3rd singular

subjunctive, possibly built to the perfect stem. The neut. pl. *bhadrāṇi* ... *priyāṇi* 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. *tēna* (see also Ge’s n.; his first alternative, to supply *tām*, is less attractive because *śikṣa-* doesn’t ordinarily take an acc.).

I interpret c as containing an implicit pun. The form *vicetā(h)*, masc. nom. sg. of *vicetas-*, derived from the root \sqrt{ci} ‘perceive’, means ‘discriminating’, hence my ‘tell things apart’, and is regularly applied to Indra (and other gods). But this leaves *ḍṛḷhā* with no verb to govern it. (It cannot be object of *āpa vṛdhi* in d, because the *hi* in c should trigger verbal accent.) I suggest that *vicetā* (in sandhi) might also be secondarily construed as the agent noun of *vī* \sqrt{ci} ‘pile apart, pull apart’, governing *ḍṛḷhā*. 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 *nīcetar-* (I.184.2) to a different root \sqrt{ci} ‘perceive’. If this suggestion seems too radical, it would also be possible to detach the preverb *vī* from *vicetā(h)* and supply a form of \sqrt{vr} ‘cover’ (found in *āpa vṛdhi* in d), producing the familiar lexeme *vī* \sqrt{vr} ‘uncover’.

VII.27.3: The *cid* in d is somewhat surprising: *cid* generally means ‘even’, but “even when praised” (*ūpastutaś 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), ... *ūtī* (b).

In b Ge takes *dānāḥ* as gen. sg. of *dāmān-*, dependent on *vājam*: “... den Lohn der Gabe.” This is possible, though it would be more natural to have *vājam* as object of some form of $\sqrt{dā}$ (esp. given the parallel he cites, VI.45.23 *dānām vājasya*, with *vājasya* dependent on *dānām*). I therefore prefer to take *dānāḥ* as the ablative singular of the *mān*-stem, with verbal rection, or, possibly (but somewhat farfetched) the nom. sg. of an otherwise unattested medial root aorist participle of $\sqrt{dā}$.

The combination of *abhī* with \sqrt{vr} ‘pursue’ would occur only here in the RV (and the other saṃhitās); Ge renders it as ‘willkommen’. I suggest that it belongs rather to $\sqrt{vyā}$ ‘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 *vísva*- 'all': #*vísve* ... *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 *āṣālhaḥ*: "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 āṣālhaḥ* compare VII.20.3 *janúṣem āṣālhaḥ*.

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 prañītī* ... *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 *nñn*, 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 *√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” (*ebhīḥ ... áhabhiḥ*). Which days is not clear, but I assume it means “now.” The verse then turns towards the moral sphere: the peoples (*kṣitáyah*) 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 *kṣitáyah* are intrinsically our enemies or are members of our larger community who have fallen into an evil state. *kṣitáyah* 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 *kṣitáyah* are identified with, or associated with, us.

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

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

VII.29 Indra

VII.29.1: Pāda d (*dádo maghāni maghavann iyānāḥ*) is almost a rewrite of V.28.5ab *vocéma ... maghāvānam ...*, ... *rādhaso yád dādan naḥ*, with *iyānāḥ* ‘being implored’ substituting for *vocéma* and *rādhaḥ* for *maghāni*.

VII.29.2: The pāda-initial voc. *bráhmaṇ* shows the accent of the neut. *bráhmaṇ*- ‘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. *bráhmāni* 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 tīyam*) appear to play on V.28.1ab ... *úpa yāhi ...*, *arvāñcas te hárayaḥ ...*, as well as echoing the immediately preceding vs. (29.1b *ā tu prá yāhi harivaḥ ...*) with *háribhir yāhi tīyam*.

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 entirely 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 *nṛmnāya*. 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 hávyam vivāci | tanūṣu sūrāḥ sūryasya sātāú*.

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 interpreters, I take *utá* as marking a new clause, summing up the actions of the poet (who addresses himself in 2a) and his ritual companions (whom he addresses in vs. 1) and comparing them to the actions of the Maruts (*yáthā náraḥ*). Klein (I.409) takes *utá* as connecting vss. 1 and 2, but the position of *utá* in 2b makes that interpretation awkward. Ge takes it as connecting *ukthám* and *dyukṣám* (“... ein Loblied ... und zwar ein himmlisches”). His interpretation assumes a new clause beginning with *yáthā* in the middle of b and also takes *cakṛmā* in c as a sort of

dummy verb substituting for a verb of poetic speech (“wie wir Männer es ... gedichtet haben”). But, although “just as we have done” works fine in English as a dummy verb, I am not sure that $\sqrt{kṛ}$ 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 *ṛca* 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, prāti bruvīmahi spṛdhaḥ* “With you as yokemate, we would respond to the challengers,” I supply ‘challenger’ here.

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

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

VII.31.10: Much phonetic and morphological play, with the repeated *prá*’s, the repetition of *mahé mahi-* (note that this replicates the *mahé ... máhi* of VII.30.1cd), and, especially, the chiasmic 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 ... *brahmakṛtaḥ suté sácā* # However, it could be argued that X.50 is presumably a later composition than VII.32 and need not provide unassailable evidence for how VII.32.2 should be interpreted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

vājī vājam siśāsati seems like a variant of *gāmad vājam vājāyan* in 11a with different emphasis. See also 20a below.

VII.32.17: The relative clause of b, *yā īm bhāvanti ājāyah*, 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 ājāyah* “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. *ājāyah* 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 *nāma bhikṣate* “desires a share in your name” is striking and a little puzzling. The same phrase *nāma √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 *nāma bhikṣate* as “Deinen Namen fleht ... an” (implores), robbing the expression of its vividness.

VII.32.18: The root *√īś* overwhelmingly takes the gen.; the construction here is identified by Gr (s.v. *īś*, col. 236: #8 mit dem Acc.) as mixed: the gen. *yāvataḥ* is construed with the implied 2nd ps. “as much as you are lord over” (*yāvatas tvám [īśiṣe]*) in pāda a, which is picked up by the acc. *etāvad* in the contrary-to-fact “if I were lord over so much” (*yád ... etāvad ahám īśiya*). I think it more likely that *etāvad* here is a quasi-adverbial summing up of the dependent clause; a more literal tr. would be “if I were lord to such an extent as” or the like. The other passages assembled under Gr’s #8 can be variously explained and do not provide strong evidence for an alternative case frame with *√īś*. In III.18.3 *yāvad* is again adverbial; see the publ. tr. “inasmuch as I am master ...” In VIII.68.7 *īśe* is properly construed with a gen. (*kṛṣṭinām*) in its own pāda; the acc. cited by Gr, *pūrvyām ānuṣṭutim* in the previous pāda, is probably an acc. of respect (see comm. ad loc.) For nearby VII.37.7 as well as III.51.4, the latter cited only as a possibility by Gr., see comm. ad locc.

VII.32.22: Despite Ge’s easy “dessen Auge die Sonne ist,” I cannot accept this for *svarḍśam*. First, *ḍś-* 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 *bhāre-bhare* ‘at every raid’, where the noun *bhāra-* 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 *abhī śatāḥ*. The juxtaposition of these two forms

(the latter being the pres. part. to \sqrt{as} ‘be’ in either gen.-abl. sg. or acc. pl.) and their close sandhi, with retroflex initial ς , invites the audience to fill in the semantics of the lexeme *abhí* \sqrt{as} ‘be superior’. But to our surprise, at the end of this hemistich we find the semantic opposite, *kānīyasaḥ* ‘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 *kānīyasaḥ* much later in the line. For extensive discussion see Old.

I cannot follow Gr, Old in interpreting *jyāyaḥ* as voc., but take it, with Ge, as neut. sg. with *tād*. Among other things, AiG III.296 notes only two masc. vocatives in *-īyas* in the RV, this one and *ōjīyaḥ* 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 *vāsiṣṭha-* appears in every vs. of this hymn, primarily at the end of the d pāda: vss. 1, 2, 3, 4, (not 5, 6, though *vāsiṣṭha-* 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* \sqrt{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 Vasiṣṭhas’ ritual service to him, he gets up to 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 *śvityāñcaḥ* ... *dakṣiṇatāskapardāḥ* are found almost identically in VII.83.8 *śvityāñcaḥ* ... *kapardīnaḥ*, where they modify the Tr̥tsus, 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 Tr̥tsu 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 his intention to go to the Vasiṣṭhas, to the Vasiṣṭhas at their place of sacrifice “leading” Indra to them. The vss. are linked by *dūrāt* ‘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 emphatic 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 *bráhmanā vaḥ* from 3d in pāda a and also addresses them as 'superior men' (voc. *naraḥ*), just as he spoke about the superior men (acc. *nṛṇ*) in 1c.

Ge takes *pitṛñām* with both *júṣṭī* and *bráhmanā*; 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" (*bráhmanā vo pitṛñām*) 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 sām* "Engird yourself in the hardwood of the Acacia tree," before being told to be and stay firm (*vīlāyasva*). The first instruction to the axle contains the verb (*abhí*) $\sqrt{vyā}$ '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 Ten 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 Śakvarī (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 *tr̥ṣṇáje 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 *ābhavat* 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 Sattrā, 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 jānma* and *ékam*, as Ge takes it (“das war deine (eine) Geburt and 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 *yād* 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 *yād*, with a preterital verb and the obj. *tvā* (the latter in different orders): b *mitrāvāruṇā yād āpaśyatām tvā* and d *agastyo yāt tvā viśā ājabhāra*. 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. *viśāḥ*. 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 *drapsām skannām* as a nominal clause, rather than taking *cd* as a single clause with *drapsām skannām* coreferential with *tvā*.

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

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 *sādāna-* is not entirely clear. Ge suggests that it stands for **sādādāna-* by haplology and tr. “der ... immerdar Geschenke hat.” He does not render the *utā vā*, implicitly taking *sahásradānaḥ ... sādānaḥ* as appositive adjectives. Klein (DGRV II.169) follows Ge’s interpr. of *sādānaḥ* without mentioning the possible haplology and states that the conjoined terms in the phrase *sahásradana utā vā sādānaḥ* “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 *sādāna-* ‘with (a) gift’ standing for ‘with one gift’. If the *utā 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 Sattrā 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 Sattrā’. 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)rā-* 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 Aṅgirasas “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 **sattréhá* 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 Sattrā 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 Sattrā? 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 *dīkṣā-* 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. *kumbhān* show, and so its dual should be **kumbhā(u)*. In c he takes *mānaḥ* as ‘house’: “Mitten daraus ist ein Haus hervorgegangen” (99=570). He does not comment on the mythological content of the vs., but though *māna-* ‘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.

In b the pf. *siṣicatuḥ* has a retroflexed root init., as we would expect. But the other two forms of the pf. in the RV (*sisicuḥ* II.24.4 and *sisice* III.32.15) do not. I have no explanation for the discrepancy.

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 *sāman-*; 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) vss. 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 and accentuation of Saṃhitā *śukraítu* 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 *adhah* ‘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 *adháh*). Our passage is reminiscent of IV.17.10 *ayám 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 \sqrt{sru} . 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 *hiraṇya-bāhu-* is found only here in the RV, the very similar *hiraṇya-pāṇi-* ‘having gold hands’ is used a number of times of Savitar, and the uncompounded phrase *bāhū ... hiraṇyāyā* 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 *bhūma* 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 **pr̥thvī* for *pr̥thivī*, 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 ... *devīm 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. *kṛṇudhvam* 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. *āsām* is to have it modify fem. gen. pl. *nadīnām*, 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 (*āpaḥ*) 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 *āsām* with *āpaḥ* earlier in the hymn but seems to stop short of syntactically separating *āsām* 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 kṛṇota śáṃsaṃ ninitsóḥ* is nearly identical to VII.25.2c *āré táṃ śáṃsaṃ kṛṇuhi 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/imperative (“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 (*havyād → havyān nāmobiḥ*). Re renders the latter as if it were an acc. pl. to *havyá-* (“... favourise nos oblations”), but this must be an example of a hasty Homeric nod, since *havyá-* ‘oblation’ is always neut.

Whose *nāmobiḥ*? 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 *nāmobiḥ* 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. *sīdan* as the predicate of a nominal sentence in cd, picking up the acc. obj. *abjām ...āhim* in ab. Sāy. simply indicates that *sīdan* is for acc. *sīdantam*, and Ge and Re tr. cd as if it 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 *sīdan* as implicitly modifying the 1st sg. subj. of *grñīṣe* ‘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 nadīnām*) with the acc. serpent of ab and d (*rājassu sīdan*) 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 *rājassu sīdan*.

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-syll 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 phrase *śárdhanto aryáḥ* has an almost identical correspondent in nearby VII.21.5 *sá śardhad 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 *bhūmā* 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*), 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 *rāyah* here as nom. sg., parallel to the other entities like mountains and waters, but I do not see why the construction that ends vs. 22, *ví dadhātu rāyah* “let him apportion wealth,” is not simply continued here. There *rāyah* 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 sahāsaḥ* 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 R̥gveda, 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 $\sqrt{bhū}$ or \sqrt{as} , or gapped; there seems no functional difference between \sqrt{as} and $\sqrt{bhū}$ 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 **indrā-* 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 *śamsaḥ* ‘Laud’, a clear play on the ubiquitous *śám*. In c *śamsaḥ* is the head of a NP with dependent gen.: *satyāsya suyāmasya*.

In d Ge renders *purujātāḥ* 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-ṣtutá-*, *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. *urūcī* 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 nāma 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. *drśáye*. 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 \sqrt{kr} (“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: *bhavitra-* 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 *janitra-* (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 nāvīyaḥ* “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 yajñīyāsaḥ*, 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 yajñīyāsaḥ* is picked up by 15a *yé devānāṃ yajñīyā yajñīyānām*. 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 \sqrt{yaj} , the *-tra*-stem *yājatra-*, which I interpr., somewhat capaciously, as meaning that they provide the occasion or reason for Manu’s sacrifice.

VII.36 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn can be read as a progress through a sacrifice. Re (EVP IV.97) follows Hillebrandt in seeing it as a “*récitation du pressurage vespéral*.” Hillebrandt (Myth. II.128 n. 3) in fact considers it as forming, with VII.37.1–7 and VII.38, an old śāstra for the Evening (or Third) Pressing. Although the focus on Indra and the Rbhus in VII.37 does identify *that* hymn as associated with the Third Pressing, I do not see that association here. The kindling of the ritual fire that climaxes our vs. 1 (d) suggests rather the Morning Pressing, as does the sun’s sending out the cows in 1b (so also Ge n. 1b). Moreover, most of the gods named in our hymn are not Third Pressing gods; for example, the Maruts, mentioned twice (vss. 7 and 9) are primarily associated with the Midday Pressing, and though the Third Pressing begins with an Āditya cup (which could subsume Mitra and Varuṇa), that pair is prominent in the Morning Pressing and are found here in vs. 2; Sūrya (vs. 1) is certainly not appropriate to the Evening Pressing. As far as I can, VII.36 and VII.37 are ritually independent.

VII.36.1: As Ge (n. 1a) and Re indicate, the opening of this hymn, with *prá bráhmaitu* (that is, *bráhma etu*), is very like the opening of nearby VII.34.1 *prá śukraítu* (= *śukrā etu*) ... *manīṣā*, with both referring to the beginning of the ritual day with the dispatch of the poets’ verbal offering to the gods.

Note the figure *ví ... sasṛje* (b) / *ví ... sasre* (c), both with 3rd sg. mid. perfects built to phonologically similar roots and compounded (in tmesis) with the same preverb.

Narten (1969 “Ai. *sṛ* in synchronischer und diachronischer Sicht” = Kl. Sch. 135–41) recognizes two synchronically distinct roots $\sqrt{sṛ}$, primarily act. ‘loslaufen, eilen’ and primarily med. ‘sich ausstrecken’. The two forms of the med. pf. *ví sasre*

(here and X.71.4) belong to the latter root; see also Kü (553). The instr. *sānūnā* I take as idiomatic for “on her back,” rather than expressing something like “along the back (of something else).” The other occurrence of the pf. *ví sasre* in X.71.4 contains an explicitly sexual image *utó tvasmai tanvām vísasre, jāyéva pátye úsatī suvāsāḥ* “And for another she [=Speech] has stretched out her body, like an eager well-dressed wife to her husband,” and the same picture of feminine yielding is presumably meant here.

Re curiously takes *pr̥thú prátīkam* as a “pre-compound” modifying Agni, but I follow Ge in taking it as an acc. construed with *ádhi*, a reference to the part of the earth on which the ritual fire is kindled.

VII.36.2: My tr. of *bruvāṇáh* “when called upon” follows Thieme’s (Mitra and Aryaman, p. 69), which in turn follows Meillet’s ([1907] “quand il est invoqué”; see Thieme p. 40). Ge and Re both take *bruvāṇáh* as pass./reflex. ‘be called, call oneself’ with *mitráh* as predicate (e.g., “der Mitra (Freund) heisst”). I now think something halfway between is probably correct. When $\sqrt{brū}$ is not cmprded with a preverb, it does not seem to take an acc. of addressee, so my passive version with addressee as subj., “when called upon,” is probably wrong. However, I don’t think it’s a mere naming construction. Rather, Thieme’s 1st tr. (p. 40) “Contract, when named ...” conveys the intent better: that, when the word -- and god -- alliance/Alliance is spoken at the concluding of a pact, the pact acquires its efficacy. JPB’s tr. of the almost identical III.59.1 “Mitra arranges the peoples when (Alliance) is declared” cleverly plays on the ambiguity of the word *mitrá-*, and I would substitute something like that here.

VII.36.3: The general consensus, beginning with Sāy. (see also Ge, Re [by implication], Lüders 395, Oberlies RdRV II.213), is that this vs. describes the rainy season, with Parjanya as the divinity. But in a hymn with such a strong ritual focus, such a detour into meteorology would seem out of place. I think that it instead concerns soma/Soma, but, as so often, with a cosmic nimbus surrounding this ritual substance. It is, of course, a commonplace that Soma in the IXth Maṇḍala is regularly called a bull; cf. one of the many passages, with the same verb of roaring as here: IX.82.1ab ... *sómaḥ* ... *vṛṣā* ... *acikradat*. The association of Soma with heaven in IX is also too ubiquitous to need demonstration, as consultation (passim) of the 2nd vol. of Oberlies’s *Relig. Ṛgveda*, devoted to the Soma hymns (e.g., “Der Himmel als Heimat des Soma” [14–16]), amply demonstrates. For Soma circling “a great heavenly seat” (*máhi sádma daívyam*) see IX.83.5. That Soma as cosmic bull evokes the concept of the thunderstorm, as I think this vs. does, is quite different from declaring that the vs. directly depicts the storm.

Under my interpr., the *sūdāḥ* (for further on this word see below) that swell like milk-cows would be the soma stalks after their soaking or even the cows that provide the milk to mix with the just-pressed soma. Pāda a is more difficult to fit into this scenario. The quieting of the wind does not have an unambiguous analogue in the soma sacrifice. It could refer to the common dying of wind at evening, but this would require following Hillebrandt’s view that this is an Evening Pressing hymn, a

suggestion rejected above. In IX.22.2 the surging of the soma juices is compared to that of the wind, and so our passage might refer to arresting the flow of the soma when it is mixed with milk. But I do not consider this a strong suggestion and remain uncertain how to fit pāda a into the overall ritual focus.

I assign *rante* (so Pp.) to $\sqrt{rā}^3$ ‘(come to) rest’ (so also Lub), along with *ranta* in I.61.11 and nearby VII.39.3, contra the various other interpr. to be found in the lit. I see no reason not to read the prim. ending *-ante* indicated by its sandhi situation and restored by the Pp., despite Lub’s entry “*ranta!*,” suggesting a sec. ending and injunctive form. As far as I can see this isolated stem can be as easily a root present as the root aorist identified by Lub.

The meaning of the word *sūda-* is much disputed. It occurs three times uncompounded in the RV (here and in IX.97.44 and X.61.2), as well as once in *sūda-dohas-* (VIII.69.3). Gr’s ‘Süssigkeit, süsser Trank’, which I essentially follow, has been rejected by most comm. and tr. since, starting with Pischel, who interprets it as ‘Somabeisatz’, referring to the extras added to the soma. Another strain of interpr., in part dependent on post-RVic passages, takes it as referring to small bodies of standing water. For disc. and various alternate tr., see, e.g., Old, *Noten* II.263–64; Bloomfield, *RR* 101; KEWA III.493 (with fuller disc. than EWA II.740); Re comm. ad loc. The general opinion is that there are at two distinct words *sūda-*. In our passage Ge renders it as ‘die Lachen’ (pools) and Re as ‘les mares’ (ponds). While I have not investigated the post-RVic ritual passages, which may belong elsewhere, I see no reason that the RVic occurrences can’t be united under one rubric. The passage in IX.97.44 refers to the preparation of soma and in fact seems almost to gloss the phrase *mādhvaḥ sūdam pavaśva* “Purify yourself into the sweetness of honey” in its pāda a by *svādasva ... pāvamānaḥ* “sweeten yourself as you purify yourself.” X.61.2 is an obscure mythological snippet in a hymn bristling with difficulties, and the use of the word there contributes little or nothing to our understanding of its sense. The cmpd *sūda-dohas-* in VIII.69.3 modifies cows in a passage that also treats the preparation of soma and seems to mean something like “milking out the sweetness / giving the sweetening milk”; we can compare the root-noun cmpd *havya-sūd-* ‘sweetening/preparing the oblation’ (I.93.12, IV.50.5), also containing a form of *sūd* and also modifying cows, in soma-preparation context. It is esp. telling that in I.93.12 the cows are urged to ‘swell’ (*ā pyāyantām*), just as the *sūdaḥ* in our passage are compared to cows and they ‘swell’ (*āpīpayanta*). The only passage in the RV that might favor a ‘puddle / pool / pond’ interpr. is the one under disc. here, and that is because the vs. has been interpr. (wrongly in my view; see above) as referring to the thunderstorm, whereas I think it is clear that soma preparation is at issue here as well as in the other *sūda-* passages. Though I still believe that the word is related to the ‘sweet’ root, my interpr. of *sūda-* is otherwise in line with Pischel’s -- I think it likely refers to the sweetness(es) that are added to the pressed soma -- though I have not arrived at this interpr. by the same route as Pischel. Since *sūda-* is elsewhere a noun, I would slightly alter my tr. here to “the sweetness(es) have swelled like milk-cows,” though the barbarity of the plural ‘sweetnesses’ would preclude allowing it in the publ. tr.

VII.36.4: The construction of this vs. is skewed: the first hemistich contains a typical generalizing rel. cl. referring to proper ritual performance (“who[ever] will yoke ...”). It is couched in the 3rd sg. and contains a pres. subjunctive (*yunájat*). In the 2nd hemistich, pāda c contains another 3rd sg. rel. cl., this time with a pres. indic. (or possibly subj.) (*mināti*), but without a ritual focus, and pāda d contains a 1st sg. optative that does relate to the ritual (*vavṛtyām*). This ill-assorted trio of clauses has been variously treated. Ge thinks that both rel. clauses have gods as subject, though not necessarily the same god (see n. 4), and that at least the rel. cl. of c has *aryamānam* in d as referent of the rel. prn. Re, mostly flg. Sāy., takes a pious human as subject of ab and supplies a main cl. with it. I think rather that d provides the main cl. for ab, with c a distinct rel. cl. dependent on d, and that there is a switch of reference between the 3rd sg. *yāh ... yunájat* of the first hemistich and 1st ps. *vavṛtyām* of d: “I” am the embodiment of the proper ritual actor as defined in ab. The rel. cl. of c is quite distinct and does indeed depend on *aryāman-* in d; the god I wish to bring here to my ritual is the one who can neutralize the battle fury of my (and his) enemy. Switch of reference between 3rd ps. and 2nd ps., even within a single vs., is extremely common when referring to gods, and I see no reason why a similar switch between 3rd and 1st would not be possible when referring to the poet/ritual officiant. For a 1st ps. version of the 1st pāda, cf. I.82.6 *yunájmi te bráhmanā keśínā hārī* (also III.35.4, VII.19.6).

dhāyú- is a hapax. Gr glosses ‘durstig’, connecting it to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘suckle’. Old suggests, quite doubtfully, that it belongs rather to $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘run’, and this suggestion underlies Ge’s ‘rennlustig’; see also AiG II.2.470, where it is explained as showing an exchange between -v- and -y-. EWA s.v. (rightly) rejects this root affiliation, in favor of one suggested by Gotō (1st Kl. 179 n. 311) to \sqrt{dhan} ‘id.’. Re tr. ‘riches en dons’, but suggests an association with *dhāyas-* ‘nourishment, sustenance’, bringing us back to Gr’s and indeed Whitney’s (Roots) root etym. to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘suckle’. My ‘seeking fodder’ reflects the same association.

Note the faint phonological figure of (b) *suráthā sūra dhā(yu) / d su(k)rát(um)*.

I follow JPB (Ādityas, 171–72) in taking *aryāman-* here as a descriptor of Indra. As Brereton points out, it makes no sense for Aryaman to appear when the poet is seeking to attract Indra. Moreover, the action of pāda c, confounding battle fury, is much more appropriate for Indra (cf., e.g., nearby VII.18.16 *índro manyúm manyumyò mīmāya*), who is also the most common referent for the adj. *sukrátu-* ‘very resolute’.

VII.36.5: Ge and Re in their different ways attempt to wring a more palatable tr. from *yajante* than the VP should allow. The problem is that the acc. with this verb here is not a god, the usual object, but two desirable qualities of a god, namely fellowship/companionship and vitality/vigor. In Ge’s rendering the reverent ones “request” these qualities (erbitten); in Re’s they “obtain them by sacrifice.” But though Re claims that this is the meaning of medial forms of \sqrt{yaj} , in fact uncompounded middles take the god sacrificed to, just like active forms; cf. nearby

VII.42.3 *yájasva ... devān*. It is forms (both act. and mid.) compounded with *ā* that acquire the meaning ‘obtain by sacrifice’. I therefore think the abstract qualities fellowship and vitality must be the objects of our sacrifice/worship, standing in for their divine possessor.

I take *ṛtāsya dhāman* “domain of truth” as referring to the ritual ground (as does Sāy.).

Ge’s tr. of *bābadhe* tentatively connects it with $\sqrt{\text{bandh}}$ ‘bind’ (flg. Sāy.), not $\sqrt{\text{bādh}}$ ‘(op)press’ (see his n. 5c). But $\sqrt{\text{bandh}}$ otherwise lacks a pf. in the RV and beginning in the AV its weak forms have a base *bedh-*. The standard weak 3rd sg. pf. to $\sqrt{\text{bādh}}$ is *babādhé*; see Kü 330–31. Schaeffer (156) takes *bābadhe* as an intens. pres., parallel to *badbadhé* with both following the standard perfect in function, and Kü (331; cf. also 488) seems to follow, though he takes *badbadhé* as an intensive perfect, distinguished from the present *bābadhe*. Since all these stems have a 3rd sg. ending characteristic of the perfect, I consider at least *bābadhe* to be a straight perfect, with adjustment of the vowel length of redupl. and root syllable to conform better to such distribution elsewhere in the perfect system; cf. esp. *vāvṛdhé* versus *vavārdha*. The intens. *badbadhé* then adopted the inflectional patterns of the other two redupl. stems. As for what the verb means here, although *vī* $\sqrt{\text{bādh}}$ generally has a negative sense ‘thrust away (undesirable things)’, here I think the same literal sense refers to the god’s pushing out towards us the *pṛkśaḥ* ‘fortifying nourishments’ we want in exchange for praise. Re (comm.) suggests a slightly different semantic pathway.

VII.36.6: According to Old and Ge, this vs. consists only of dependent clauses, and this is certainly true descriptively: there are two subordinate clauses marked by the subordinating conj. *yád* ‘when’ (a) and the rel. prn. *yāḥ* (c), one accented verb (*suṣváyanta*) in the rel. cl. of c, and no main verbs. In the publ. tr. I take d as a covert main clause, signalled only by the preverb *abhí*, with which I supply a verb of motion. However, it is perfectly possible that d is simply a continuation of the rel. cl. of c, though I do not then know what to do with the *abhí* init. in d. Under the interpr. with cd as rel. clause the 2nd hemistich would simply be “who are richly fertile, rich in milk, rich in streams, swelling with their own milk.” In any case, if it lacks a main clause, the vs. cannot be attached either to preceding vs. 5 or following vs. 7; it would have to be an independent if incomplete structure.

The first hemistich lacks a finite verb, and in my view the participle *vāvaśānāḥ* (whether pf. or intens.; Kü 488 [and Schaeffer by omission] favor the former) serves as predicate. However, both Ge and Re supply a verb of motion, presumably on the basis of initial *ā*: “her(kommen)” and “ar(rivent).” This is of course possible. Both Ge and Re also take the part. *vāvaśānāḥ* as belonging to the pf. of $\sqrt{\text{vaś}}$ ‘desire’, whose participle is homonymous with that of $\sqrt{\text{vās}}$: “zusammenverlangend” and “riches en désirs” respectively. Although this cannot be faulted formally, the well-known noise-making quality of rivers (embodied in the very word *nadī-*) provides a more vivid image and, on the other hand, it is not clear what the rivers would be eager for.

On the near-hapax *suṣváyanta* see my *-áya-Formations* (52–53), where I argue that the other occurrence of the stem, act. part. *suṣváyantī* (X.110.6=AV V.27.8) is founded upon this passage and that the form here has been generated in the playful and alliterative context of this vs. (see esp. the following *su-* adjectives *sudúghāḥ sudhārāḥ*) loosely to *suṣū-* ‘well-bearing’, a connection already suggested by Weber (see Old). Such a derivation matches the theme of the rivers’ burgeoning fertility that dominates the vs.

VII.36.7: HvN’s restoration of the pausal form at the end of c as *caránti* is incorrect; it must be *carántī*, as the Pp. has it.

Ge suggests that the ‘imperishable’ (*ákṣarā*), an esoteric designation for ‘cow’, is the Dakṣiṇā, while Sāy. thinks rather of Vāc. In this Marut vs. I wonder if it doesn’t refer to their mother Pṛṣni.

For the phrase *yújyam ... rayīm* see VIII.46.19.

The nom. pl. *té* is very oddly positioned, in the middle of both clause and pāda, breaking up the NP *yújyam ... rayīm*, and not even adjoining the caesura. I have no explanation.

VII.36.8: The NP *dhiyó avitāram*, characterizing Bhaga, reprises the VP *dhíyam ... avantu* in 7b, where the Maruts were the subject.

The phrase *sātaú vājam* in d is somewhat problematic. Ge takes it, without comment, as equivalent to the common *vājasya sātaú* (e.g., VII.21.7) with a genitive: “bei dem Gewinnen des Preises.” Re follows, commenting “seul exemple de *sātī-* avec régime Acc.” But this is the problem: although the dative inf. *sātāye* regularly takes the acc. (e.g., IX.8.2 *sātāye vāsūni*), the loc. to the same stem never does. And in fact even the dative, when construed with *vāja-*, takes the gen.: *vājasya sātāye* (V.9.7, VI.60.13, IX.7.9, X.93.10). In the one apparent exception, IX.68.7 *vājam ā darṣi sātāye*, the acc. is actually object of the main verb. I therefore think that *vājam* here has to be an obj. of *prá ... kṛṇudhvam*, parallel to the divinities and semi-divinities in the vs.

VII.36.9: On *niṣikta-pā-* see Old and now Scar (306).

I take *prajāyai* as a quasi-infinitive. See also X.73.5.

VII.37 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is primarily devoted to the Ṛbhus (vss. 1–2) and Indra (vss. 3–7), which associates the hymn with the Third Pressing.

VII.37.1: The function of *abhí*, initial in c, is unclear; the verb of this hemistich, *prṇadhvam*, final in d, does not appear with *abhí* elsewhere.

On the triple-backed (*tripṛṣṭhá-*) soma, see Ge’s n. 1c, where he suggests among other possibilities that it refers to the three ingredients making up the soma drink (soma juice, water, and milk).

VII.37.1–2: The stationing of the adj. *ámṛkta-* ‘indestructible’ at the end of the b pādas of both vss., in each case some distance from its noun, is clearly deliberate, but I’m not sure what it’s signaling.

VII.37.3: There is some lexical chaining here: in pāda a the standing epithet of Indra, *maghavan*, picks up the pl. *maghávatsu* in 2a (in the same metrical position), thus implicitly asserting an identification of the human patrons of 2 with Indra. The quasi-inf. *deṣṇám* (trisyllabic, to be read *dayiṣṇám*), also in pāda a, echoes *dayadhvam* at the end of vs. 2. Although *deṣṇá-* is standardly taken as a deriv. of $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘give’ (so already Gr., also AiG II.2.927–28, EWA s.v. *DĀ*, II.714), it is at least secondarily associated with \sqrt{day} ‘distribute’ here. A more distant, and less telling, lexical echo is *pūrṇā* ‘full’ with 1d *prṇadhvam* ‘fill!’.

Note the abundance of *vásu-* forms (*vásunaḥ* b, *vásunā* c, *vasavyā* d).

For d Ge (n. 3d) appositely cites VIII.32.15 *nákir asya ... niyantā sūñtānām*, which he tr. ad loc. as “Keiner tut ... seinen Gnadegaben Einhalt,” with *sūñtānām* an objective gen. with *niyantā*. I am therefore puzzled as to why he does not take *sūñtā* here as standing for acc. pl. *sūñtāḥ* in sandhi, as the obj. of *ní yamate*, the same lexeme as in VIII.32.15. Instead he follows the Pp. in taking it as nom. sg. *sūñtā*, subj. of the verb: “Deine Grossmut hält die Schätze nicht zurück” (sim. Re). My tr. takes account of VIII.32.15 and goes against the Pp.

VII.37.4: The connection of the first two vss., dedicated to the Ṛbhus, and the subsequent Indra vss. is made clear here: Indra is called *ṛbhukṣán-* (cf. the pl. applied to the Ṛbhus in 1b, 2b) in pāda a and compared with *vāja-* in b. Vāja is of course the name of one of the Ṛbhus, and they are all addressed as *vājāḥ* in 1b. Both Ge and Re take the simile *vājo ná* as containing the PN (e.g., “comme un Vāja”), though Ge allows the common noun sense as an alternate (“wie der gute Vāja [die gute Beute]”), but I think the comparison is stronger if the ‘prize’ sense is more prominent and the relationship to the Ṛbhu name is backgrounded. However, I would now emend the tr. to recognize the PN explicitly: “Like a prize [/like (the Ṛbhu) Vāja] ...”

Pāda b, with its description of Indra going home, is reminiscent of the envoi in the fallow-bay-yoking oblation at the end of the soma sacrifice (cf., e.g., I.82a, III.53.4–6) and is therefore appropriate to the Third Pressing context.

VII.37.5: This vs. presents minor problems of syntax and the uncertain fit of certain lexical items. In the first pāda it is not clear what the *pravátaḥ* are that Indra regularly gains for his devotee. The stem *pravát-* generally refers to a slope or sloping course. Ge takes it as an abstract Vorsprung (lead or advantage), Re as a course, Tichy (Nom.ag. 307) as “die schnellen Wege” (with !). I think the clue is found in nearby VII.32.27 *tváyā vayám pravátaḥ śásvatīr apò ’ti śúra tarāmasi* “with you let us cross over the (river-)courses one after another, cross over the waters, o champion.” Here as well the reference seems to be to Indra’s aiding us in gaining new lands by crossing river after river.

As for pāda b, all three just-named scholars take *dhībhiḥ* as part of the main clause found in pāda a and embed the first part of b within this frame. Cf., e.g., Ge's "Du gewinnst selbst ... den Vorsprung ab nach den Absichten, mit denen du (etwas) unternimmst." But, though convenient, this kind of embedding is foreign to RVic sentence structure. Instead I think we must take the rel. prn. *yābhiḥ* as coreferential with *pravātaḥ* in the main cl. (*pravāt-* being, of course, fem.). The instr. of *pravāt-* generally expresses extent: 'along the slope (etc.)' (e.g., VIII.5.37=13.8=IX.24.2 *āpo nā pravātā yatīḥ* "like waters going along a slope"), and so here I assume that Indra accomplishes his work (*vīveṣaḥ*), that is, assures victory for us, along the river-courses that are being fought for. The other instr. fem. in this hemistich, *dhībhiḥ*, is then independent of *yābhiḥ* and part of the rel. cl. that *yābhiḥ* introduces, and I take it in the same sense as the instr. *matībhiḥ* in 2d and *dhiyā* in 6c: "in accord with [thought/vision]."

The success of Indra's activities on our behalf is announced in c and his help duly noted. The number mismatch in the instr. phrase *yūjyābhir ūtī* is common in Triṣṭubh cadences containing instr. *ūtī-*, truncated from iambic cadences (dimeter / Jagatī) of the type ... *vīśvābhir ūtībhiḥ* (I.23.6 etc., etc.). See further disc. ad VI.10.5.

VII.37.6: The trans./caus. *vāsāyasi* is here used in a curious idiomatic sense. The other two occurrences of this stem, nearby each other in III.1.17, 7.3, are straightforward in function: 'cause to dwell / settle down'. But here the verb is used in a complaint: 'cause to wait, cool one's heels, hang around, bide one's time'. The idiom is reinforced by the very rare use of the simile particle *iva* with a verb. My "seem to be ..." is meant to capture this *iva*; it could also be rendered 'as it were'. Ge (n. 6) suggests that this is a hint to the poet's patron that he (the poet) has been waiting too long for his dakṣiṇā.

The adj. *tātyā-* is a transparent deriv. of the familiar word for father, *tatā-* 'daddy, papa'. I therefore think the rather formal register of Ge's väterlich and Re's paternel strike the wrong note; surely the idea is that Indra's *dhī-* is affectionate and indulgent.

VII.37.7: The sense and syntax of this vs. are extremely challenging. My interpr. differs from those of the other standard tr. I will not treat these in detail, but will note two important points of difference. I do not think that Indra is the referent of *yām* in pāda a (as, e.g., Old does), and I do not think that *tribandhú-* in c is a PN, much less a reference to Vasiṣṭha (see, e.g., Ge, Mayr PN s.v.).

My sense of the structure of the vs. is that the two outer pādas (a, d), which match by virtue of being relative clauses introduced by *yām*, go together, with the referent of the *yām* the same in each: a mortal man beset by difficulties. These relative clauses depict the same unfortunate situation, the dissolution and isolation of this man. The two inner pādas (b, c) are the main clause (or a subordinate and a main clause in b and c respectively) and present Indra as the antidote and refuge for the unfortunate mortal. This complicates the clause relations but has the virtue of making sense (some sense, anyway). Many details remain to be discussed, however.

In pāda a the VP (*abhí yám ... īse*) is puzzling: $\sqrt{\text{īś}}$ does not otherwise occur with *abhí*, and it is found overwhelmingly with a genitive, not an accusative complement. (For disc. of other possible acc. exx. cited by Gr., see comm. ad VII.32.18. Commenting on this passage, Re suggests that $\sqrt{\text{īś}}$ appears with the acc. only when it is a pronoun, but this is not borne out by the distribution; among other things, there are plenty of pronominal genitives with $\sqrt{\text{īś}}$.) Here the clue to the usage is provided by a passage in the next hymn (cited by Old), VII.38.4 *abhí yám devy áditir grṇāti*, which has the identical structure, save for a different named goddess (also a -ti-abstract) and a different verb, *grṇāti* (against our *abhí yám devy nírṛtiś cid īse*). The root $\sqrt{\text{gṛ}}$ regularly takes both *abhí* and the acc. In VII.38.4 the one referred to by *yám* is benevolently greeted by the benevolent goddess Aditi; our passage seems to have been constructed as a deliberate contrast to this happy scene, with the malevolent goddess Nirṛti extending her sway to an unfortunate mortal. (The passages differ in one notable way, however: in VII.48.4 the referent of *yám* is the god Savitar.) The pairing of the two passages accounts for the unexpected preverb and unexpected accusative with *īse* in our passage.

The middle pādas referring to Indra (in my view) present the god as a sort of venerable figure with whom the beleaguered man of pāda a (and d) can take refuge. Indra's venerable status results from the years that have accumulated for him, as pāda b indicates, and in c the subject (who, in my opinion, is the mortal man referred to by the rel. pronouns in a and d) approaches Indra because of the god's attainment of age. That old age is presented as a positive feature of Indra also gives the mortal reassurance that his own aging can likewise be positive.

As already noted, I do not follow the almost universal interpr. of the hapax *tribandhú-* as a PN nor the further identification of that PN with Vasiṣṭha. Instead I take it as the bahuvrīhi it is in full lexical value: 'having three bonds', with the bonds referring to kinship as *bándhu-* does so often. I further think that this is a reference to the three-generations model so prevalent later: a man with both father and son (or perhaps, as later, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather), ensuring the continuity of the male line and, esp. later, the śrāddha offerings to the ancestors. Although this theme is not prominent in the RV, it can be discerned indirectly in several passages; see X.135 (and my article "The Earliest Evidence for the Inborn Debts of a Brahmin: A New Interpretation of Ṛgveda X.135," *Journal asiatique* 302.2 [2014]: 245–57) and VI.20.11 (also discussed in that article, as well as comm. ad loc.). A man who had achieved the *tribandhú* state would be well along in years, and his approach to a similarly aging Indra would be appropriate. In fact, the depiction of Indra at this stage of life in this vs. contrasts strongly with the usual representation of Indra as young and virile. Note that *tribandhú-* may form a faint ring with *triprṣṭhá-* 'three-backed' in 1c.

In d we return to the afflictions visited on our unhappy man -- this time by (other) mortals. Thus a and d show him as the target of a divinity (the *devī* Nirṛti, a) and men (*mártāḥ*, d), with Indra as the literal intercessor. Both Ge and Re tr. the clear subjunctive *krṇávanta* in d as a preterite ("beraubt haben," "ont rendu"), but there is no justification for this and neither provides one. Exactly what the other

mortals will or would do isn't entirely clear to me, and it depends in great part on how we interpret *-veśa-* in the compd *āsvaveśa-*. In V.85.7, containing an array of apparently non-kin relationships, JPB tr. 'neighbor'; in IV.3.13, again in a set of calibrated relationships, I do so as well, though in X.49.5 I render it as 'vassal'. Here, if I am correct about the sense of *tribandhú-*, *-veśa-* should refer to a relationship outside the close family line. The sense would be: when mortals deprive him of his non-blood (or less closely related) associates (pāda d), he still has his tight paternal lineage (*tribandhú-* pāda c). My 'clansmen' could be correct (based on the usual sense of *vís-*), but 'neighbor' or even 'vassal' (or Re's 'clientèle') could, too. I do not think Ge's Anhang fits, however.

VII.37.8: The first pāda of this vs., *ā no ... stavádhyai*, is reminiscent of 1a *ā vo ... stavádhyai*, and thus forms a ring, already anticipated by the echo of 1c *tripṛsthāḥ* in 7c *tribandhúḥ*. However, it also makes an appeal to Savitar, who does not figure otherwise in the hymn, and thus seems to anticipate the first two vss. of the next hymn, VII.38, which are dedicated to that god. Indeed the Anukr. identifies that whole hymn as dedicated to Savitar, but see publ. intro. to VII.38 for the view that it really is an All God hymn.

VII.38 Savitar [/All Gods]

On the likelihood that this is actually an All Gods hymn, despite the Anukr.'s ascription to Savitar and the domination of Savitar in the first vss., see publ. intro.

VII.38.1: On the presential value of the pf. of \sqrt{yam} and of this passage in particular, see Kü 395.

VII.38.3: Ge takes *āpi ... astu* as "...soll Anteil (an Opfer) haben," but this isn't necessary in the passage, and I know of no parallels with that sense.

VII.38.4: On the close parallel to our pāda a in the previous hymn, see comm. ad VII.37.7.

The sequence *vāruṇaḥ ... mitrāso aryamā* presents a twist on the usual trio of the principal Ādityas, Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman, since *mitrāsaḥ* is plural and, as Ge suggests (n. 4d), must be a word play, referring to the common noun *mitrá-* 'ally'. Obviously the god Mitra must also be referenced, with *mitrāsaḥ* found in Mitra's usual place in the sequence of names.

VII.38.5: On this assortment of minor divinities, see publ. intro. In particular, *ékadhenu-* 'having one milk-cow' is a hapax, and who these beings are is otherwise unknown.

The structure of the vs. is quite loose. The initial *abhí* invites us to group the vs. with the preceding one, where *abhí* opens three of the four pādas (a, c, d) as the preverb with two forms of the root $\sqrt{gr̥}$ (*gr̥ṇāti* a, *gr̥ṇanti* c). This is indeed how I construe it, with the main cl. represented only by *abhí* and a gapped **gr̥ṇanti* (hence

my “(as do) those”), and the rest of the first hemistich occupied by the rel. cl. introduced by *yé*. In other words, the Gift Escorts, described in the relative clause, also greet Savitar. The root \sqrt{sap} does not otherwise appear with *abhí* (anywhere in Skt. as far as I know; *pace* Gr). Therefore taking the whole of the 1st hemistich, beginning with *abhí*, as a single rel. cl. (as Ge seems to) is not a favored option, esp. since there is no corresponding main clause in the vs.: the 2nd hemistich has a set of new sg. subjects and singular verbs. Ge is forced to take it as a syntactic truncation; see his —. Re gets out of this difficulty by supplying a pl. impv. to $\sqrt{śru}$ for ab “(qu’ils nous écoutent),” parallel to *śṛnotu* in c, but the *abhí* of pāda a seems to me to point to a connection with the previous vs. as just argued.

I do not understand what *mithó vanúṣaḥ* is meant to convey -- perhaps that the Gift Escorts avidly compete with each other to provide the best service? IX.97.37 *sápanti yám mithunāso níkāmaḥ, adhvaryávaḥ* ... is similar, with both \sqrt{sap} and a form of \sqrt{mith} and with *níkāma-* ‘eager’ semantically matching our *vanúṣ-*; there the sense seems to be that the Adhvaryus of various sacrifices compete with each other to be best at serving Soma (“whom they serve, eager in rivalry -- the Adhvaryus ...”).

The VP *rātīm* \sqrt{sap} seems almost to be a gloss of the root-noun compd. *rāti-ṣāc-* and might help us determine the function of this enigmatic group of divinities or semi-divinities. The use of a transitive VP as apparent gloss makes it unlikely (at least to me) that *-ṣāc-* has a passive / intransitive sense in the compd (Scar’s ‘von Gaben begleitet’ [593, Ge sim.], Re’s ‘qui ont le don pour attribut’). Gr’s transitive ‘Gabe gewährend, Spende betreibend’ is closer to the mark, though muddling the sense of the root \sqrt{sac} .

The conj. *utá* is oddly positioned in the middle of its pāda, and it is not clear what it’s conjoining. Klein (DGRV I.380) follows Re in positing an ellipsed **śṛnvantu* in the 1st hemistich, with the *utá* conjoining that clause with the *śṛnotu* clause here. But even were we to supply that verb (see above for reasons not to), *utá* would still be out of position: we would expect it pāda-initial. I think that the *utá* is loosely conjoining this clause with what precedes, but that this does not require matching verbs. I further think that it has been postponed in order to allow *áhiḥ* to take initial position, in order to echo the *abhí*’s that open this vs. (5a) and three of the pādas in the preceding vs. (4a, c, d). Notably, two of the twelve pādas containing *áhir budhnyàḥ* elsewhere in the RV are opened by *utá* (I.186.5, VI.50.14), with the latter almost identical to ours except for the order of *utá* and the divine name: VI.50.14 *utá nó ‘hir budhnyàḥ śṛnotu*. This would give support to my view that the ordinary order was disrupted to allow the semi-rhyme of *#abhí* / *#áhi(h)*. (Note that when *utá* was moved to mid-pāda, it took the Wackernagel-positioned *naḥ* along with it.)

VII.38.6: The presence of *yāti* ‘begs’ in d solidifies the affiliation to the same root of the mid. part. *iyānáḥ* in b. I follow Re in taking the part. as a passive, though this interpr. is somewhat problematic. The pāda also appears identically in VII.52.3b, where the participle has transitive, though self-beneficial, usage. Ge takes it that way here as well (“darum bittend”), and Bl (RR, ad our passage) claims that there is “no good reason” to take *iyānáḥ* passively here. However, the context favors a passive

interpr.: Bhaga gives the treasure away when we (or the powerless one of d) beg for it; I do not think Bhaga is himself begging it from Savitar, as an intermediate step before giving it away himself. Moreover, the same mid. part. is regularly used in the passive; cf., e.g., VII.17.7, 29.1 also in VII. Although I am reluctant to give identical pādas, esp. in the same maṇḍala, different interpretations, in this case the multivalence of the medial voice of this root (finite *īmahe* is regularly transitive, e.g.) allows the same sequence to be used in two different ways.

VII.38.7–8: These last two vss. concern the *vājīnaḥ* ‘prize-winners’. As indicated in the publ. intro., although most (in addition to the usual tr., see Oberlies RdV II.240) take these to be horses, as so often, I instead take the referent of *vājīn-* to be the Maruts. In an All God hymn the default expectation is that gods are the dedicands. And there are numerous phraseological parallels that support the identification. See esp. nearby VII.36.7, where the Maruts are called *vājīnaḥ*, as well as in the immediately preceding hymn, where VII.35.9 *śám no bhavantu marútaḥ svarkāḥ* is almost identical, save for the expressed subj., to our 7ab *śám no bhavantu vājīnaḥ ... svarkāḥ*. The stem *svarká-* occurs only 3 times; besides these two occurrences, the third, in I.88.1, refers to the Maruts’ chariots. The voc. phrase *amṛtā ṛtājāḥ* in our 8b is found also, addressed to the Maruts, in V.57.8 *ámṛtā ṛtājāḥ* (accented).

VII.38.7: The cmpd. *sanemí-* lit. means ‘along with its/the felly’ (see, e.g., AiG III.75, EWA s.v. *némi-*), but is a way to express ‘entirely’ (“felly and all”): “with all its gear,” “bag and baggage,” “lock, stock, and barrel” are idiomatic English equivalents.

VII.38.8: It is appropriate that the *vājīns* should be the topic in a clause with the āmreḍita loc. absol. *vāje-vāje*. The etym. figure would be clearer if the loc. had been tr. “whenever prizes (are at stake)” vel sim.

VII.39 All Gods

VII.39.1: The first pāda somewhat echoes the first hemistich of the preceding hymn (VII.38.1ab), with the final verb *asret* mimicking likewise final *ásiśret* in 38.1b and the verb’s object *sumatīm* resembling *amátim* in 38.1b and in the same metrical position. This is perhaps an additional reason to consider VII.38 to be fundamentally an All God hymn properly situated in the All God cycle, rather than an intrusive hymn to Savitar. See disc. in the publ. intro. to VII.38.

I do not know the referent of *vásvaḥ*. Perhaps, given the connections with VII.38.1, it is Savitar. The same phrase *sumatīm (...) vásvaḥ* is found in III.4.1 (an Āprī hymn), but the referent is no clearer there. Ge suggests that the referent is Agni himself. This would work in both passages and may be correct; inter alia Agni is frequently the referent of *vásu-*, but the non-signalling of coreference with the subject still seems a little odd. The pl. *vásavaḥ* appears in vs. 3 modifying the gods.

On the idiom PATH \sqrt{bhaj} see comm. ad VII.18.16.

The publ. tr. fails to render *naḥ* in d. I would emend to “will offer our true (hymn)” or “will offer for us ...”

Both Ge and Re avoid making *ṛtām* obj. of *yajāti*, both by making it an adverbially used acc. of respect (vel sim.): “... möge er ... das Opfer *richtig* [my italics] vollziehen” and “(selon) l’Ordre.” I follow Lü (436–39, esp. 439) in considering *ṛtām* ‘truth’ here a representation of ‘hymn’: “... möge ... ein Lied darbringen.”

VII.39.2: This vs. presents a number of minor problems. The first is the usage of the verb in pāda a, med. pf. *prá vāvṛje*. Ge and Re interpr. it as passive, e.g. “Das Barhis ist ... gelegt,” as does Kü (461). Since this is the only med. form of the pf., against several act. transitive ones, this is possible, but it should be noted that med. forms of the present are generally transitive. Cf. very similar VII.18.4 *prá vṛñjate ... barhīḥ*, where the 3rd pl. form of the verb precludes a passive reading. Moreover, the passive reading would require the adj. *suprayā(h)* to modify neut. *barhīḥ*; in my opinion (contra Gr and possibly Ge, Re; see also Old’s somewhat cryptic n. to II.3.5), this form belongs to the *s*-stem *suprayās-* and is a nom. sg. masc., but even if this grammatical analysis is incorrect, I do not see any way to get a properly inflected neut. sg. in *-ā(h)* out of any possible stem. The difficulty disappears if we take *vāvṛje* as transitive, supplying Agni from vs. 1 as subject. Undoubted acc. forms of the *s*-stem adj. (*suprayāsam*) modify Agni 3 times out of the 4 clear occurrences of the stem (II.2.1, 4.1, VI.11.4). Although Agni in his physical form as fire is not a likely twister of *barhis*, of course, he has just been identified as a Hotar in 1d and in his priestly role could perform other priestly actions.

I take *eṣām* as gen. for dat., as often, and referring to the gods (so also Ge, Re).

As noted in the publ. intro., the hapax *bīṛiṭa* (in sandhi; Pp. *bīṛiṭe*) in b is completely opaque. See EWA s.v. The only thing that is clear is that it has aberrant, non-Indo-Aryan phonology, with plain *b* and unmotivated retroflex *ṭ*. It is not even evident what grammatical form it might be: standing next to dual *viśpatī*, it might be expected to be a dual as well. Indeed a pragrahya *bīṛiṭe* would be better metrically, as Old points out. If the sandhi represented in the Saṃhitā text is correct, however, it could be a loc. in *-e*. Both Ge and Re take it as such, following in their tr. Yāska’s gloss *gaṇa-* (see also Kuiper, Aryans 31 and Kü 461), and both construe *viśām* in the next pāda with it (“in der Gefolgschaft ihre Clanleute” and “dans l’arroi des clans” respectively). A hemistich boundary between a locative and its dependent genitive seems highly unlikely to me, esp. when it is not a well-known standard expression. In the publ. tr. I take it as a loc., but decline to translate; I would now be inclined to take it as a nom. dual, but also decline to tr., hence “like two ? clan-lords.” Unlike many problematic hapaxes, this one does not seem to be phonologically generated.

With Ge and Re, I interpr. the verb in b, *ā ... iyāte*, as ‘hasten here’. Lub classifies it with $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘beseech, beg’, and the morphology supports him: the form cannot belong with well-attested *īyate* ‘hastens’ both because of its short root syllable and because of its athematic ending, whereas it could easily belong to the medial root pres. of ‘beg’ (cf. part. *iyāná-*). But ‘beg’ does not fit the context, and esp. with Vāyu

forming one of the paired subjects and with the time specified as dawn and the occasion the Early Invocation, the common formulaic *vāyav ā yāhi* (I.2.1, etc.) and its variants, calling Vāyu to the first pressing, imposes itself here. I don't understand the morphology, but a poet who could inflict *bîṛiṭe* on us is capable of confecting a nonce verb form in the same pāda.

If *viśām* is not dependent on *bîṛiṭe*, what is it doing? A survey of the occurrences of this gen. pl. reveals that it is often pāda-initial (as here) and dependent on *viśpāti-* (e.g., III.2.10, 13.5, V.4.3), *pāti-* (e.g., I.127.8, VI.15.1), or a similar authority figure. I therefore loosely construe it with *viśpatī* in b, though I resupply that word in c. Alternatively, II.4.1 *viśām agnīm ātithimṣ suprayāsam* “Agni, the guest of the clans, who receives very pleasurable offerings” is suggestive, since it contains a form of *suprayās-* modifying Agni. But ‘guest’ is missing in our passage, and in any case the *suprayās-* form is in a different clause.

As for the *aktór uśásaḥ* phrase, Ge. (n. 2c) has convinced me that it's an abbreviated version of *uśáso yāman aktóḥ* “at the coming of dawn from night” (III.30.13, VI.38.4). Perhaps the loc. *yāman* was gapped because of the presence of the loc. *pūrváhūtau*, although the latter is not part of the same phrase.

The epithet *niyútvan-* ‘possessing a team’ is primarily used of Vāyu, and therefore, although Pūṣan intervenes between *vāyúḥ* and *niyútvān*, it must modify Vāyu, with the name and the epithet polarized at the edges of the pāda.

Vāyu and Pūṣan do not generally appear together and do not form a natural pair; I don't know the reason for their joint appearance here. As far as I know, Pūṣan has no part in the Morning Pressing.

VII.39.3: There is almost universal agreement that *jmayā* represents an adverbial instr. of exactly that shape, despite the hiatus, rather than Pp. *jmayāḥ*. See, e.g., Old, Re, Scar 421, with lit.

With Sāy., cited by Ge, the Maruts must be the referents of *śubhrāḥ* in b: pl. forms of this adj. generally modify the Maruts, and the midspace is especially associated with them.

Note that *marjayanta* must be reflexive, with real medial value, rather than being a straight transitive *-anta* replacement of the type commonly found with *-āya-* formations.

On *urujrayaḥ* see comm. ad V.54.2.

Assuming the Agni is the messenger in d (so, e.g., Ge), this vs. contains both standard models of the sacrifice: “the gods come to the sacrifice” and “the sacrifice goes to the gods.”

VII.39.4: Pāda b contains *viśve ... devāḥ*, though distracted. Since this is the middle vs. of the hymn, this specification of the dedicands of the hymn may constitute a not very noteworthy omphalos. It also introduces a brief flood of named gods (4d, 5).

VII.39.5: In the first hemistich Agni appears to be playing on both sides, as it were: he is commanded (voc. *agne*) to bring (*ā ... vaha*) a series of gods here, including

Agni (acc. *agním*) at the end of pāda b. This seems conceptually odd: Agni the god does not need to be brought to the sacrifice -- he's already there -- and it is also hard to see how he would bring himself. Ge's (n. 5b) explanation that including Agni in the list serves for "Vervollständigung der Götterversammlung" seems weak. In that case we might expect Agni to come at the end of the list, and in any case too many gods are missing from the list to consider it a complete collection. It might be possible to consider the Agni to be brought as the celestial Agni, i.e., the sun. But I think it more likely that *agním* is parallel to *gírah* in pāda a, and both are acc. of goal, expressing the ritual elements the gods will encounter at the ritual: hymns and the ritual fire. The standard tr. take *gírah* in this way, and I see no reason why *agním* can't have the same function.

In c *eṣām* is hard to construe. I follow Old in accepting the BR emendation to **eṣām* 'quick'. Old cites the parallel in the very next hymn VII.40.5 *viṣṇor eṣásya*. As Old points out, the corruption can have arisen on the basis of likewise pāda-final *eṣām* in 2a. There are of course no metrical consequences. The emendation was not explicitly signaled in the publ. tr., which should read "... Viṣṇu, *the quick." Neither Ge nor Re accepts (or even takes note of) this emendation.

VII.39.6: I take *yajñīyānām* as gen. for dat., as in 2a.

In b I assume that Agni obtains from the gods, and then gives to mortals, what the latter wish. Cf. a fuller expression in VI.5.7 *aśyāma tāṃ kāmam agne távoṭī* "May we attain this desire, Agni, through your help." On the basis of that passage, as well as X.96.7 *só asya kāmam ... ānaśe*, both with *kāmam* $\sqrt{(n)}aś$, I also take *nákṣat* as an s-aor. subjunctive to $\sqrt{(n)}aś$, rather than as an injunc. to $\sqrt{nakṣ}$, pace Narten (s-aor. 160) and Gotō (1st Kl. 192), who assert that no such subj. exists to $\sqrt{(n)}aś$.

In d I take the position of *nú* within the instr. phrase *yújyebhir nú devaíḥ* seriously, indicating that the gods are *now* to be our yokemates, now that we have made successful sacrifice to them.

VII.39.7: A fine meta-summary vs., which is also the final vs. of the next hymn (VII.40.7).

VII.40 All Gods

VII.40.1: The standard interpr. take *vidathyā* as nom. sg. fem. modifying *śruṣṭīḥ* (e.g., Thieme [Unters. 48] "die zur Verteilung führende Erhörung"), and this is certainly the default reading. However, it leaves the *sám* in the VP *sám etu* with little to do, and I wonder if *vidathyā* is not instead an instr. sg. fem., which would justify the lexeme *sám* \sqrt{i} 'come together'. This adj. modifies *vāc-* in I.167.3, and "hearing" and "ceremonial (speech)" would make a nice pair. The speech would also stimulate the praise (*stómam*) we aim at the gods in the next pāda.

In b I take *prāti ... dadhīmahi* in its idiomatic sense, 'to fix an arrow (on a bowstring), to aim', though a more generic one (Ge 'anheben', Re 'commencer') is hardly out of the question.

In d *ratnínah* ‘possessing treasure’ is perfectly ambiguous: it can be a gen. sg. and modify *asya* (standing for Bhaga) or a nom. pl. modifying the 1st pl. subj. of *syāma*. In the publ. tr. I take it as the former (as does Thieme loc. cit.), while Ge and Re take it as the latter (though Re recants in his notes, deciding that the gen. sg. is better, on the basis of *ratna-bhāj*- VII.81.4). In fact, I think it’s probably meant to be both, with the nom. pl. a proleptic use, and would now emend the tr. to “may we, possessing [=acquiring] treasure, be at the apportioning of him who possesses treasures.”

Gr (s.v. *ratnín*-), Ge, Re, and Thieme (loc. cit.) all take the referent of *asya* to be Savitar, and the presence of unaccented *asya*, which should refer to someone/-thing already in the discourse, supports this interpr. However, since the next hymn (VII.41) is entirely devoted to Bhaga as distributor of goods and since *vibhāgé* appears to be a pun on his name, I think Bhaga is equally plausible. The lack of accent on *asya* could be accounted for by this pun.

VII.40.2: A series of four singular nouns are the subject of *dadātu*, a singular verb.

The verb *niyuvāte* is esp. appropriate for Vāyu, who is regularly called *niyútvant*- ‘having a team’. Note the use of this adj. in the immed. preceding hymn, VII.39.2, where it must qualify Vāyu rather than Pūṣan, despite the word order (see comm. ad loc.).

VII.40.3: The pl. verb *junánti* in c has two singular subjects, Agni and Sarasvatī, which should trigger a dual verb, or else a singular one as in 2ab. Since Agni and Sarasvatī do not form a stable set of gods (as, e.g., Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman do), it is not clear what god or gods should be supplied to justify the plural verb. Re adds a parenthetical “(et autres)”; possibly the Maruts addressed in the first hemistich?

With Ge and Re, I take *tásya* as a dependent genitive limiting *rāyāḥ* and referring to the man whom the Maruts, Agni, and Sarasvatī help -- not as a demonstrative adjective with *rāyāḥ*, which would be grammatically possible.

VII.40.4: Contrary to Ge and Re, I take pādas a-c as a clause subordinate to the main cl. of d.

VII.40.5: Flg. Old, I emend *vayā* to ‘*vayā* (=avayā) ‘propitiation’, which only requires the insertion of an avagraha but no emendation. Ge and Re also accept this suggestion. The word should have been marked with an asterisk in the publ. tr.

VII.41 Bhaga (or All Gods)

Like VII.38, which is essentially an All Gods hymn though ascribed by the Anukramaṇī to Savitar, this hymn is properly located within the All Gods sequence, the last of three 7-verse hymns in Triṣṭubh (save for our vs. 1 in Jagatī), followed by an All Gods hymn of 6 vss. Nonetheless, the Anukramaṇī assigns most of it (vss. 2–6) to Bhaga, with vs. 1 to the Liṅgoktadevatāḥ and vs. 7, an extrahymnic vs. (see publ. intro.) to Uṣas. The 1st vs. calls on a range of gods, including Bhaga (pāda c), in

monotonous fashion, before settling down to exclusive focus on Bhaga beginning with vs. 2, and it was surely meant as an All God hymn and positioned in the All God collection for that reason. The hymn is also found in AV (Ś III.16, P IV.31)

VII.41.1: As was just noted, this vs. is in Jagatī in an otherwise Triṣṭubh hymn (and hymn sequence) -- or rather its first three quarters are. The final pāda is in Triṣṭubh and ends with the verb 1st pl. opt. *huvema*, which gives a Triṣṭubh cadence and also ends the first pāda of the next vs. (2a), contrasting with its semantic match 1st pl. pres. indic. *havāmahe* in the first pāda (1a), which provides a Jagatī cadence. The switch in meter at the end of the vs., cleverly accomplished while holding the verb essentially constant, and the variant repetition of the opening of the 2nd hemistich, *prātār bhāgam*, at the opening of vs. 2, *prātār(-jītam) bhāgam*, knit the 1st vss. together despite the metrical difference and the range of gods in vs. 1.

VII.41.2: On the first pāda of this vs. see comm. immediately above.

The referent of the repeated rel. prn. *yá-* (b, c, d) is Bhaga, and we therefore might expect that in the sequence in d *yám bhāgam* the latter word refers to the god (as the same acc. does in pāda a and in 1c). But instead it is almost surely merely a pun on the divine name and its first reading is as the homonymous (and of course etymologically identical) common noun ‘portion’ -- though the more usual word for ‘portion’ is *bhāgá-*. At best it could be read twice, once as the name, once the common noun (“which Bhaga ... portion ...”). If we follow the Pp., *bhāgam* must be part of the quotation ended by *íti*, because the other word in the quotation, *bhakṣi*, is read by the Pp. as unaccented and cannot therefore be initial in the quotation/clause. In principle, however, the sandhi form *bhakṣīti* could contain both an accented particle *íti* and an accented *bhakṣí*, contra the Pp. which could -- and should -- then be the only word in the quotation.

Part -- but only part -- of the solution depends on how we analyze the verb form. Old and Ge inter alia (e.g., Scar 157) take it as a 1st sg. middle, which could therefore be accented, since medial *s*-aor. forms take accent on the ending (cf. *bhakṣīyá*, *bhakṣīmahi*) -- though it need not be. (Indeed no one, as far as I know, rejects the unaccented Pp reading in favor of **bhakṣí*.) I follow the view of Sāy. (also Gr, Wh. [AV tr. III.16.2], Narten [p. 179 n. 512] inter alia [see Old’s reff.]), that it is a 2nd sg. act., that is, a *-si* impv. (ultimately derived from the act. *s*-aor. subjunctive; cf. *bhakṣat*), where we should expect root accent (**bhákṣi*) if the form were to be accented. Because there seems to be universal agreement that *bhakṣi* is unaccented, the divergent interpretations of the morphology do not affect the interpr. of where the quotation begins, but it seems worthwhile to point out the possible interpr. not taken.

One reason I prefer the *-si* impv. interpr. is that the 1st sg. interpr. might impose more modality on an injunctive than we might expect: cf. Ge’s “ich möchte ... teilhaft werden” (though Scar’s “ich bekomme ...” avoids modality). The context favors a request, rather than a statement of accomplishment.

VII.41.3: Although the *prātár* of vs. 1 and 2a has disappeared, this vs. seems to contain a reminiscence of it: 1c #*prātár bhágam* is echoed by 3a #*bhága prá(ṇe)tar* (in opposite order), and pādas c and d then pick up *prá ṇ(etar)* of 3a in #*bhága prá ṇo* and #*bhága prá ṇbhīḥ* (latter without retroflexion). This is hardly the most sophisticated effect in Rigvedic poetry, but it is an illustration of the subtle concatenative effects that can provide unity and a throughline in even the most banal (as this hymn mostly is) composition.

VII.41.3–5: The concatenation continues in the next vss. The ending of vs. 3, ... *nṛvántaḥ syāma*, echoes in the following two vss. The 1st pl. opt. *syāma* is repeated at the end of 4a and d and 5b, while the *-vant-*stem adj. shifts from *nṛvántaḥ* (3d) to another punning *bhágavantaḥ* (both ‘possessing a portion’ and ‘accompanied by Bhaga’) in *bhágavantaḥ syāma* (4a, 5b; cf. *bhágavān* 5a). And *bhágavān* in 5a matches *maghavan* in the same metrical position in 4c.

VII.41.4: On the structural relationship of the various *utá*-s here, see Klein DGRV I.355–56.

VI.41.5: The punning continues here with a clever twist: even Bhaga himself should become possessed of a portion (*bhágavant-*) (a); (only) in this way (*téna*) will we become *bhágavant-* (b). In other words, Bhaga needs to get his own portion before he can pass it on to us.

This vs. forms a slight ring with vs. 1: the intensive verb *johavīti* provides one additional stem to the two forms of $\sqrt{hū}$ in vs. 1, *havāmahe* and *huvema*.

VI.41.6: This vs., bringing the Dawns into the picture, forms the transition to the extra-hymnic vs. 7 (see publ. intro.). Note that we have the newer nom. pl. form *uṣāsaḥ* in 6, whereas 7, a repeated vs. (=VII.80.3), has the inherited *uṣāsaḥ*.

The racehorse Dadhikrā(van) seems intrusive in this vs., but he is the subject of the nearby hymn VII.44. Here as there he is associated with dawn and the Dawns. As suggested in the publ. intro. to that hymn, the association may be with the *dakṣiṇā*, which is distributed at the morning pressing and which often consists at least partly of horses.

VII.41.7: Though this vs. is also found, better situated, in a Dawn hymn (VII.80.3) and is quite possibly extrahymnic here, the emphasis on the valuable goods, esp. livestock, that the Dawns bring, to distribute as *dakṣiṇā*, well fits the hope for a good portion that characterizes the rest of the hymn. Note esp. that in 3cd we hope to be propagated with cows and horses (*góbhir ásvaiḥ*) and to become possessed of men (*nṛvántaḥ*), matched here by the entities by which the Dawns are accompanied: *ásvāvatīr gómatīḥ ... vīrávatīḥ*.

VII.42–43: All Gods

These two hymns are in some ways companion pieces, progressing similarly through the ritual and sharing means of expression and images. For details see individual discussions below.

VII.42 All Gods

VII.42.1: The first three pādas of this vs. begin with *prá* ‘forth’ and seem to express the dynamic beginning of the sacrifice. None of the three verbs ($\sqrt{nakṣ}$, $\sqrt{vī}$, $\sqrt{nū}$) is commonly found with *prá*, so the use of the preverb here seems situational -- that is, the three *prá* \sqrt{X} are not standard lexemes; rather, the poet has attached *prá* to all three to emphasize that all parts of the sacrifice are setting at once.

krandanú- is a hapax, built with the rare suffix *-anú-* (AiG II.2.210). Of the very few other such stems, one -- *nadanú-* ‘roar’ (1x, also *nadanú-mant-* 1x) -- belongs to the same semantic field, and another -- *nabhanú-* ‘spurting’ (1x, also *nabhanū-* 1x) -- belongs to the same root as the genitive qualifier of our form *nabhanyā-* ‘inclined to / about to burst out’. I think it likely that this roar refers to all the sonic parts of the sacrifice: the just kindled fire (for *agní-* as subject of \sqrt{krand} , cf. e.g., X.45.4), the soma (often the subject of \sqrt{krand} in IX), the hymns (cf. VII.20.9, with *stóma-* as subj.), and most likely also the pressing stones that appear in d.

The cows “swimming in water” in c presumably stand in for the milk to mix with the soma, though the exact ritual reference is unclear. In the soma sacrifice it is the soma that undergoes a water bath (see IX.106.8 where *udaprút-* modifies the soma drops), not the milk.

The verb *yujyātām* in d requires some discussion. On the surface, the form is a 3rd du. act. opt. root aor., and this is how Ge and Re render it and how Gr and Lub classify it. Old, however, points out that the pressing stones are usually yoked (in the passive) rather than yoking something else (in the active). He wishes to take it instead as built to the passive stem *yujyá-*, but the question then is what the form is meant to be. Old himself favors a passive injunctive: though this should have the form **yujyetām*, he suggests that the rarity of such forms might have generated the “wrong” form on the analogy of athematic 3rd du. med. injunctives/imperfects in *-ātām*. He also floats the possibility of a subjunctive, though that should have the primary ending (expect **yujyāte*, I suppose, not at this period the **yujyaite* of the grammars). Although the publ. tr. reflects Old’s view that the context favors a passive, I now believe that the act. opt. analysis of Ge/Re, etc., with *péśaḥ* ‘ornament’, referring to the soma, as object, is correct. The passage, and the verb, would play with the standard passive expression (pressing stones are yoked), but take them as agents of the yoking. I would therefore now emend the tr. to “The two pressing stones should yoke the ornament of the ceremony.”

VII.42.2: The ‘road’ of Agni, *ádhvan-*, in pāda a picks up its etymological relative *adhvará-* ‘ceremony, lit. ritual cursus’ in 1d, a relationship unfortunately difficult to convey without awkwardness in tr.

Sāy. reads **sú te* for *suté*, and Old favors this reading on the grounds that *suté* is rare in Agni context. But since the last hemistich of the preceding vs. (and possibly pāda b as well) concerns the soma, this does not seem a cogent enough objection to change the text. Sāy. likewise reads **jānimā nīṣattaḥ* rather than *jānimāni sattāḥ*. This would make fine sense -- and *nī√sad* is a very common idiom for Agni's seating at the ritual when acting as Hotar -- but it again requires emending a text that makes sense on its own.

As indicated in the publ. intro., the vari-colored horses in bc are Agni's flames. The "I" of d is presumably the poet impersonating Agni as Hotar.

VII.42.3: The pl. subj. of *mahayan* in pāda is unclear; the most likely referent would be the priestly colleagues of the 1st ps. sg. poet subj. of *huvé* in 2d; in this spirit Ge supplies "die Sänger," Re "les chanteurs." However, Old adduces the almost identical passage VII.61.6 *sám u vām yajñám mahayaṃ námobhiḥ* with 1st sg. *mahayaṃ*. Noting that small differences between otherwise identical passages are common, he does not insist on the 1st sg. interpr. However, given the 1st sg. of 2d, I am now inclined to consider this a strong possibility, and would emend the translation (or at least provide as an alternative): "I magnify the sacrifice for you all ..." This makes the interpr. of *vaḥ* easier: as is common with such enclitics in ritual context, *vaḥ* should refer to the rest of the officiants, but if they are also the 3rd ps. subjects of *mahayan*, this produces a clash. The emendation of *-n* to *-ṃ* is of course trivial.

The *prá* of vs. 1 returns in d, though in the common idiom *prá√ric* 'project, extend beyond, surpass'. The medial pf. of this root, acdg. to Kü (426–27), is always presential and has the stative sense 'hervorhinausragen über Abl.' The ablative is of course missing here. In our passage I think the sense is primarily physical: the ritual fire is gaining strength and its flames project outward on the ritual ground ("in the nearness" *upāké*), though the fire's surpassing superiority may also be referenced. The physical image is found, differently expressed, in the companion hymn VII.42 in vs. 2d *ūrdhvā śocīṃṣi ... asthuḥ* "The flames have stood up erect." Given the *prá* here, this *might* be taken as a reference to the movement of the ritual fire to the east, but the fire seems to me to be already established in its location.

Both Ge and Re supply a 'speech' element to their interpr. of *mandrá-*, "wohlredende" and "à la voix-harmonieuse" respectively, but its derivation from *√ma(n)d* 'exhilarate/be exhilarated / gladden/be glad' does not suggest or require such a semantic extension. It is true that the adj. regularly modifies *jihvā-* / *juhū-* 'tongue' and is also found in the bahuvrīhi *mandrá-jihva-* 'having *mandrá* tongue(s)'. But generally when Agni's tongue is mentioned, it is as the instrument for eating the oblation and conveying it to the gods, not as a speech organ. His tongue is gladdening because it gives the gods pleasing nourishment. Agni himself is very often *mandrá-* as well, as in our passage -- probably for at least two reasons: 1) like his tongue, he is the conveyor of the oblation to the gods, 2) he produces general gladness by his presence and role in the sacrifice. Both factors are probably at issue here: in c he is commanded to sacrifice to the gods (thus conveying the oblation to

them); in vs. 4, esp. d, he gives “a desirable reward” to the mortals whose dwelling he is established in.

For *dāti* see comm. ad IV.8.3.

VII.42.5: The *adhvarām* of pāda a echoes *adhvarasya* in 1d and provides a faint ring, since the last vs. (6) is extra-hymnic.

In the publ. tr. in c the verb *sadatām* is taken as a sg. impv. with Agni as subject. At best, this would be a middle 3rd sg. (though tr. as a 2nd ps.), to a stem, and indeed a root, that is otherwise relentlessly active. This is just an error. The form must be a 3rd du. act. impv., with Night and Dawn (the decoupled dual dvandva *nāktā ... uṣāsā*) as subj. -- as is the standard interpr. (Gr, Ge, Re). The tr. should be emended to “Let Night and Dawn sit here on the ritual grass.” What this is meant to convey is another question, since times of day do not usually have a physical presence at the ritual and it is hard to conceive Night and Dawn sitting on the barhis. For the “repair” of this image in the next hymn, see comm. ad VII.43.3. The ultimate reference is probably to the daily offering to Agni at the two twilights (later called the Agnihotra).

VII.42.6: As just indicated, this vs. belongs to the class of “meta” final vss., commenting on the hymn just completed. I would now be inclined to tr. the root pres. injunc. *staut* as “has just praised.”

The second pāda is interesting for the interaction between analytic phrases and compounds. That is, the first member of the bahuvrīhi *rāyās-kāma-* ‘having desire for wealth’, *rāyāḥ*, itself a gen. case form rather than stem form in composition, is modified by / compared to an independent gen. *viśvápsnyasya*. The connection of this adj. with ‘wealth’ is clear from VIII.97.15, where the independent gen. *rāyāḥ* is modified by *viśvápsnyasya*: *kadā ... rāyā ā daśasyer, viśvápsnyasya ...* On the sense of the adj., see comm. ad VIII.97.15.

VII.43 All Gods

VII.43.1–2: The 1st two vss. of this hymn begin with *prá*, recalling the insistent *prá* in the 1st vs. of the preceding hymn (VII.42.1) and presumably fulfilling the same function: to express the energetic initiation of the ritual. However, both *prá* \sqrt{rc} (1a) and *prá* \sqrt{i} (2a) are standard lexemes, unlike those in 42.1.

VII.43.1: The inf. *iṣádhyai* is a hapax and variously interpr.: e.g., Ge “dass sie gern kommen,” Re “en sorte que (nous) en tirions profit.” The root affiliation is also not entirely clear; e.g., Lub classifies it with $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send’, though we do not of course know how he would tr. it. Both Re’s disc. and his tr. seem to me plausible: he takes it as “un doublet isolé d’*iṣayádhyai*” and cites Burrow’s (1955) interpr. “pour que nous soyons prospères.” It is worth noting that the few instances of *iṣayádhyai* (I.183.3=VI.49.5, VI.64.4) also occur in a Triṣṭubh cadence and that that form in isolation is ill-formed for such a cadence, since the root syllable should be heavy in

such a cadence. In I.183.3=VI.49.5 this problem is avoided because the root syllable amalgamates with a preceding final vowel: *yéna narā nāsa^tyeṣayádhyai*. But in VI.64.4 *rayīm divo duhitar iṣayádhyai* the cadence is simply bad (and in fact produces an uninterrupted run of 5 light syllables). Haplology of the suffix *-ayá-* to our form *iṣádhyai* here fixes this metrical problem.

víprā in c, modifying *bráhmāṇi*, is the only neut. N/A form of this stem, but the stem does modify a different word for thought/poetic formulation, *matí-*, as fem. *víprā* (VII.66.8, VIII.25.24). The Pp. analyzes it instead as nom. pl. m. *víprāḥ*, which is of course a possible form underlying the sandhi, but which cannot be easily fitted into the sentence. Sāy. does it by sleight of hand: he glosses the first part of pāda c as *yeṣāṃ viprāṇāṃ medhāvināṃ brahmāṇi*, converting the supposed nom. pl. *víprāḥ* into a gen. pl., and then supplies *víprāḥ* as subj. of *pra ... arcan* in the main clause in a: *te viprāḥ prārcann pūrveṇa sambandhaḥ*, an attempt to justify the nom. in the rel. cl. Needless to say, this doesn't work.

The verb *viyānti* in d is ambiguous. With the Pp., Gr., etc., it may be taken as belonging to *ví√i* 'go apart, spread out', but it could also belong to the root pres. of *√vī* 'pursue, go in quest'. In a rel. cl. the accent would be the same for either analysis. Because of the connections between the preceding hymn VII.42 and this one, I favor the latter affiliation on the basis of (*prá*) *vetu* in VII.42.1b, but *ví√i* is certainly not excluded -- and might make slightly better sense with the simile. The tr. might then alternatively read "go apart" for "go questing." On the other hand, I like the idea of formulations going in quest of divine response and rewards, an interpr. encouraged by the *prá* lexemes (like *prá ... etu* in the next pāda, 2a).

VII.43.2: In c I construe dat. *adhvarāya* with *sādhú*, giving the latter richer semantics than the mere adverbial "richtig" of Ge or even Re's "correctement." Found twice in 42 (1d, 5a), *adhvará-* reappears here, though the word is too common to make much of this.

As noted above ad 42.3, our pāda d seems to be a clearer expression of the image of the increasing flames of the ritual fire found also in 42.3b.

VII.43.3: In two of its four occurrences *víbhṛtra-* means something like 'dispersed', but that makes no sense here. The third occurrence is similar to ours, however: I.95.2 ... *janayanta gárbbham ... víbhṛtram*. In both these instances it seems to be an idiomatic expression for children of an age to be carried around, in I.95.2 of the newborn fire. In our passage both Ge's "die Tragekinder" and Re's "des fils (en âge) d'être portés" seem on the money. Since Eng. lacks a useful expression (or means to make one) like Tragekind, my tr. is an attempt to convey the sense in brief and also to capture the implied locus of the children in our passage. In the simile they are said to be sitting on their mother (acc. *mātáram*), but in the frame the corresponding term is loc. *sānau* 'on the back', and I suggest that the mother's back is implied in the simile as well. The difference between acc. *mātáram* and loc. *sānau* is a fairly trivial example of the "case disharmony in similes" discussed in detail in my 1982 IIIJ article of the same name.

In b the gods are urged to take their seats (*devāsaḥ ... sadantu*) on the barhis. The action ordered is of course unremarkable and repeated numerous times in the RV, but in the context of this sequence of hymns it can be considered a “repair.” In the preceding hymn, in VII.42.5, Night and Dawn are given the same command, also in the 3rd ps., also in the thematic aor. (*náktā ... sadatām uṣāṣā*). As was noted there, this produces an unusual image; 43.3 replaces and thus repairs it with the familiar one.

In c the problem is that neither of the fem. adjectives -- nom. *viśvācī* or acc. *vidathyām* -- modifies an expressed noun, and the referential possibilities are wide open. Ge follows Sāy. by taking the nom. as the sacrificial ladle and the acc. as the flame, though in his n. (3c) he suggests that ‘speech’ would be possible for both. Re follows Th. (Unters. 49) in taking over *devātāt-* from d as the acc., tr. “(la troupe des dieux) arrivant au sacrifice,” while maintaining the ladle as the nom. (One might think that the gods might find this an odd and messy welcome!) Old thinks the nom. is definitely the ladle, but suggests various possibilities for the acc. On the basis of I.167.3 *vidathyā ... vāk*, I take the acc. as speech, with the anointing metaphorical: the ladle pours the butter offering into the ritual fire as ritual speech is recited. There is precedent for this metaphor: cf. I.61.5 *arkām ... sám aṇje* and I.64.1 *gírah sám aṇje* with ‘chant’ and ‘hymns’, respectively, as object of ‘anoint’.

VII.43.4: The isolated form *sīṣapanta* is hard to assess. By form it appears to belong to a redupl. aor., but no other forms to such a stem are attested and, more to the point, there is no securely attested *-áya-*transitive. I cannot evaluate *sāpáyant-* in TB II.4.6.5, which is evidently the Brāhmaṇa form Whitney lists, with ?, in Roots s.v. $\sqrt{\text{sap}}$, but even if it belongs to the same root, it is attested too late to provide a basis on which to generate an associated redupl. aor. in the RV. Nonetheless, I see no choice but to take *sīṣapanta* as a redupl. aor. and to assume an unattested **sāpáyati* for early Vedic. What then does *sīṣapanta* mean? In my 1983 *-áya-* monograph (p. 219) I assert that it has intrans./reflex. sense, is not connected with a causative, and that it is based on nearby *sápante* (VII.38.5) (without specifying how), but I no longer believe that. Nor, despite the temptation of the *-anta* ending, do I believe it’s an *-anta* replacement. Rather I would now take it as a reflexive transitive ‘serve themselves’ (or, since that English idiom is too colloquial, ‘do service to themselves’). The basis for this is expressed in the next pāda: the gods do their own milking (*dúhānāḥ*), producing the “streams of truth,” presumably the praise hymns, by their own actions -- thus serving themselves. See Lüders (473, 475), who argues for “stream of truth” as Kultlied and (475) interprets this hemistich essentially as I do. This may be a variant on the notion that the gods are the ultimate source of the hymns that praise them because they provide the inspired thoughts to the poets, or it may be that the sheer arrival of the gods at the ritual ground provides the impetus for the “milking” of the hymns.

Both Ge and Re take the 2nd hemistich as a single cl., with *māhaḥ* as goal of *āgantana*. Ge further takes *māhas-* as “Feier” (celebration), while Re’s “manifestation-de-grandeur” is closer to the root sense of the word. But I see no

reason not to take this neut. *s*-stem in the standard sense ‘greatness’ and construe pāda c as an independent nominal cl., as in the publ. tr.

In d *sámanasaḥ* ‘of the same mind’ replicates the same word in 2b and provides a bit of a ring. Note that in 2 the referents are the human officiants, whereas here it is the gods, who are thus implicitly equated -- and equation facilitated by the similar structures: the two words are in identical metrical positions and both follow a 2nd pl. impv., with *sámanasaḥ* modifying the 2nd ps. subj. Although ‘of the same mind’ in the first instance means that all members of each group have the same mind, the repetition may imply that the human officiants of vs. 2 and the attending gods of vs. 4 also share the same thoughts.

VII.44 Dadhikrā

Both by number of vss. and by its listing style, this hymn fits the sequence of All Gods hymns in which it is found, though the presence of Dadhikrā among these deities is somewhat puzzling. As noted in the publ. intro., most of the divinities named have associations with the Dawn ritual.

VII.44.3: As discussed in the publ. intro., in the middle of a hymn of utmost simplicity and banality, this vs. -- or a single pāda, c -- is utterly baffling and has given rise to competing interpr. This pāda contains two color terms, *bradhná-* ‘coppery’ and *babhrú-* ‘brown’, and a hapax *māṁścatóḥ* (or better *maṁścatóḥ*; see Old): *bradhnám māṁścatór váruṇasya babhrúm*. Most comm. assume that the two color terms refer to horses (see, e.g., Ge n. 3c, also Old), because of the presence of Dadhikrā and because color terms often designate horses. (Cf., e.g., Re “au (coursier) couleur-fauve de Mitra, au (coursier) brun de Varuṇa.”) But the introduction of two extraneous horses seems unlikely to me, in a hymn that barely strays from the dawn ritual context.

The old and once widespread interpr. of *māṁścatú-*/ *maṁścatóḥ* is as a cmpd. ‘chasing/hiding the moon’, with a form of ‘moon’ still containing an internal nasal and the 2nd member built to \sqrt{cat} ‘hide’ (for lit. see, e.g., AiG III.250, EWA s.v. *māṁścatú-*) -- though this interpr. has generally been replaced by agnosticism about both meaning and deriv. because of the problematic details of the derivation and the uncertainty of the passages containing this forms and the related ones (see below). The form in our passage is generally assumed to be a gen. sg. to a *-u*-stem. The identification of the supposed referent given in Re’s tr., “Mitra,” also has a long history (see, e.g., Old, Ge’s n. 3c with lit.) and is due in part to the presence of apparently parallel gen. *váruṇasya* and in part to a chain of semantic assumptions: if *māṁścatú-* means ‘chasing the moon’, then it can refer to the sun, and the sun in turn can stand for Mitra (see EWA s.v.). But this chain, esp. the last link, is not strong, though the apparent parallelism with *váruṇasya* is admittedly stronger.

Assessing the cmpd is somewhat aided (but not all that much) by the existence of two related words *māṁścatvá-* and *māṁścatva-*, in two nearby vss. in the Soma Maṇḍala, IX.97.52, 54 in the same tr̥ca. Vs. 52 also contains *bradhná-*. Though the exact sense of the two vss. is obscure, the context is the usual self-

purification of soma, with the soma drop in 52 addressed directly and the *bradhná-* “also there, sped like the wind” (*bradhnás cid átra vāto ná jūtáḥ*). I tentatively identify *bradhnáḥ* there as the sun or the ritual fire at the dawn sacrifice, and take *māṁścatvé* in the same vs. as a temporal loc. If *bradhná-* is the sun, that body is copper-colored only at dawn and at sunset; a temporal loc. of *māṁścatvá-*, if it means ‘hiding/chasing the moon’, would mean ‘at the time of the hiding of the moon, viz. dawn’, a time appropriate to the ritual content of the vs. Returning to VII.44.3 with this ritual context in mind, I suggest that the same elements of the ritual are represented here: the coppery *bradhná-* is the sun, or perhaps the fire (I favor the sun, because the sun is well known as Varuṇa’s spy); the brown *babhrú-* is the soma, as often (IX.11.4, 31.5, etc.). And in my analysis *māṁścatoḥ* is not a gen. to a *-u-*stem, but rather a loc. du. to a root noun **māṁś-cát-* and, as in my interpr. of IX.97.52, is a temporal loc. “at the two twilights.” Of course, we should expect this loc. du. to be accented **māṁś-cátoḥ*, but the non-transparency of the stem could have led it to be reanalysed as a *-u-*stem gen. parallel to *vāruṇasya*. Although the cmpd in its literal meaning would only be appropriate to morning twilight, it came to be applied to both. As for *māṁścatvá-* / *māṁścatva-*, I suggest that they are *-tva-*stem derivatives of this root noun, with simplification of the geminate **māṁścat-tva-*.

Riccardo Ginevra has recently called my belated attention to Pinault’s 2008 treatment of this same word (“About the Slaying of Soma: Uncovering the Rigvedic Witness,” *Ged. Elizarenkova*, 353–88). In this extensive and exceedingly careful treatment with comprehensive treatment of the earlier lit., Pinault seriously disputes all previous analyses of the cmpd (esp. 360–64), including the one I maintain above. His most telling objection to that analysis is that the Indo-Iranian paradigm of the ‘moon’ word has no trace of the nasal found in other IE languages, since it has been vocalized in the weak forms of the paradigm and generalized from there (362–63). In order to connect *māṁś-* with the ‘moon’ word, we must assume that the nasal was preserved in just this form under exceptional phonological circumstances because of the obscurity of the formation. Although I recognize the hazards in this assumption, I am still willing to take the risk. I cannot endorse Pinault’s own suggestion, that the first member is the ‘flesh’ word, the second member was borrowed from a non-Indo-Aryan language “of the Nūristāni type” (383), and the cmpd means ‘flesh-cutting’ and refers to a disguised myth of the killing of soma. The first hypothesis (‘flesh’) is certainly possible, but the other two, esp. the second (inter alia, he gives no etymon or even source language for this borrowing), seem significantly less plausible than the isolated preservation of the nasal in ‘moon’.

Although I would hardly claim that my analysis of the cmpd or of the passage in general is airtight, it does provide an interpr. of the pāda that better fits the hymn: two more divinities (Sūrya and Soma) that the poet is calling upon (*úpa bruve pāda b*), rather than a couple of irrelevant race horses.

VII.45 Savitar

VII.45.1–2: Although Savitar’s role as god of evening, causing the world and its activities to settle down, is alluded to in 1d, his role as rouser of the world at dawn is given equal billing in that pāda (... *ca* ... *ca*). The more oblique expression in 2d must also refer to this latter role. The sun “cedes his task” of waking and rousing the world to Savitar.

VII.45.2: Both Ge and Re take the aor. injunc. *paniṣṭa* in c as modal, but the aor. injunc. *ānu dāt* in d as general pres. (e.g., “Jetzt sei ... gepriesen; ... ordnet ...”). But there is no reason that the first needs to be assigned modal value: the temporal adv. *nūnām* can instead draw attention to an immediate past action (“has [just] been wondered at”). And it seems preferable, if contextually possible, to take the two adjacent aor. injunctives in the same value.

VII.45.3: Klein (DGRV II.102) asserts that *ádha* in d “conjoins the second distich with the first, following an intervening participial phrase” (that is, conjoins ab with cd, the participial phrase occupying c); Klein tr. “And propping apart his broadly encompassing sunbeam he shall give mortal’s nourishment to us.” Although this seems roughly correct, the dislocated position of *ádha*, not only after the participial phrase of c but after the first, heavy word of d, *martabhójanam*, might have called for more comment. It would be possible to take c with ab -- there are no syntactic obstacles to this: the participial phrase can attach to the nom. subject of ab -- which would situation *ádha* closer to the beginning of the clause it’s conjoining (after only one word). But I favor a slightly richer semantics for *ádha* than Klein does: often ‘then’ rather than just ‘and’. And I think it likely here that positioning *ádha* in the last clause of the vs. and in fact in the last clause of the hymn proper) since vs. 4 is a meta-verse), is meant to emphasize Savitar’s last and most significant action, the actual delivery of his bounty to us mortals. The particle is found directly before the verb to stress the *action* of granting. With this analysis there is no need to attach c to ab.

VII.45.4: As just noted, this is a meta-summary final vs., referring to the very hymns (*imā gírah*) invoking Savitar at the present moment. The 2nd pāda focuses on his hands: *pūrṇágabhastim* ... *supāṇīm* “having full fists [that is, fists full of goods] and good palms.” This provides a semantic, but not lexical ring with the beginning of the hymn, where many good things are in Savitar’s hand (*háste* 1c). (I would in fact have tr. 4b -*pāṇí-* as ‘hand’ but used ‘palm’ instead to make the lexical difference clear in English.) The ‘hand’ focus is also continued in the two arms (*bāhū*) in 2ab, though that is so standard an image of Savitar that it may be independent here.

VII.46 Rudra

VII.46.1: This hymn begins with the NP *imā(h)* ... *gírah* “these hymns,” the same phrase that opened the last vs. of the preceding hymn (VII.45.4). In that hymn it was a nom. pl.; here it is an acc. pl., but its grammatical identity does not become clear

until almost the end of the vs., when the transitive verb *bharatā* ‘bring’ is found in the middle of d, right before the final brief cl. *śṛṇotu naḥ*. The ambiguity of case between the identical phrases in 45.4a and our 1a makes the connection seem closer.

VII.46.2–3: The final pādas of both vss. are semantic variants of each other: “don’t hurt our children.” In 2d the negative is expressed by the privative on the adj. *anamīvāḥ* (... *bhava*) “be without affliction,” while 3d contains the stronger and more conventional prohibitive *mā* ... *rīṣaḥ* “do not harm.” The word for ‘children’ is the fairly rare uncompounded root noun *jā-* in 2d, replaced by the fuller and more familiar bipartite phrase *tokā- tānaya-* “offspring (and) descendents.”

VII.46.2: The complementary etymological and morphological figure *ávann ávantīḥ* is noteworthy, but I have no idea what “helping/helpful doors” (*ávantīr dūraḥ*) are or do. Perhaps it is an indirect way to refer to the sacrificial offerings humans make to help the gods, in return for the help (etc.) they receive from the gods, in this case Rudra. As Re suggests ad loc. (EVP XV.161), “*dūraḥ* ... s’oriente vers «maison»” and the emphasis in this vs. and the next on the protection of our children and offspring may have invited this allusion to the house.

VII.46.3: The first hemistich contains two occurrences of *pāri*, but in fact it should technically have three: the first *pāri* at the end of pāda a governs the preceding abl. *divás* in the sense of ‘from’ (note the close sandhi *divás pāri*); the second, in the middle of b, should be construed with both preceding *cāraṭi* and following *vṛṇaktu* and is positioned exactly between the two clauses that contain those two verbs.

I take the hapax voc. *svapivāta* to the lexeme *āpi* √*vat*, which I interpr. after the manner of Tichy. See comm. ad I.128.2. The intimacy implied by this lexeme (‘be/make familiar/intimate’) is appropriate to the focus on the household disc. above. My tr. “o you who are our familiar” does not represent the *su-*, but it is difficult to incorporate it without making an already heavy tr. even more so.

VII.46.4: The prohibitive *mā*, introduced in 3d as a variant of 2d, dominates the first hemistich of this final vs.

VII.47 Waters

VII.47.1: I have deliberately omitted to tr. the 2nd enclitic *vaḥ*, found in c.

VII.47.1–2: *devayántaḥ* in 1ab with 3rd ps. referent (see the 3rd pl. verb *ákrṇvata*) modulates to 1st ps. reference in 2b, also signalled by the verb (*aśyāma*).

[VII.48 JPB]

VII.49 Waters

VII.49.2–3: Pādas 2c and 3c contain the same three words after the caesura, but with the first two flipped: 2c *yāḥ śúcayaḥ pāvākāḥ* and 3c *śúcayo yāḥ pāvākāḥ* (with the last word to be read **pavākāḥ* in both instances, of course). I do not understand the motivation for the permutation, although each order has a positive and negative feature: 2c puts the rel. prn. in the more usual 2nd position in the pāda, as opposed to 3c, where it is 3rd (though both positions are syntactically acceptable), but the break in 2c (~~) is decidedly less common than the one in 3c (~~~)(see Arnold, *Vedic Metre*, 188).

[VII.50–52 JPB]

VII.53 Heaven and Earth

VII.53.1: The *té* that opens the 2nd hemistich is ambiguous: it can be nom. pl. m., modifying *kaváyaḥ*, or acc. du. f., providing the object of *puráh* ... *dadhiré*.

VII.53.2: Unusually, this vs. requests and depicts physical movement of Heaven and Earth, which is conceptually awkward, given that Heaven at least has a fixed position at a great distance from our ritual ground. I have argued elsewhere (“The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas,” Staal Ged., 2016) that one of the likely reasons for the eclipse of the inherited divinity and original head of the pantheon Dyaus Pitar “Father Heaven” is his inability to move about the cosmos and esp., in conformity with the newer ritual model, to come *to* our sacrifice rather than having the oblations of that sacrifice filter up to heaven. This is one of the few passages in the RV where his presence at the sacrifice is urged, and only a little thought is required to reveal it as odd.

Ge takes *sádane* as du (“den beiden Sitzen der Wahrheit”), and in favor of this interpr. is the fact that its final vowel is *pragṛhya* in the Saṃhitā text (*sádane ṛtásya*, not **sádana ṛtásya*, as in IV.42.4), as Old points out. However, I take it, with Re and Lü (607–8)(and Gr implicitly) as a loc. sg. in the usual phrase. As Lü points out (608), gods are never themselves “seats of truth” but are located in such seats.

VII.54 Lord of the Dwelling Place

VII.54.1: On *práti* √ *jñā* see comm. ad III.45.4.

VII.54.1–2: On *práti* √ *juṣ* see comm. ad IX.92.1.

VII.54.2: The voc. *indo* ‘o drop’ in b is incongruous in this context, and as Ge points out, the 1st hemistich seems to have been adapted from a Soma hymn, where ‘drop’ would be appropriate. He adduces I.91.19 (c: *gayasphānaḥ pratáraṇaḥ* ...) and 12, whose 1st pāda also contains *gayasphānaḥ*, though the matches are not exact and neither of the cited pādas contains *indo*. However, *gayasphāna-* is found only in those two passages and in our vs.

VII.55 Sleep

As noted in the publ. intro., the first vs. does not belong with the rest of the hymn but rather with the preceding one, VII.54, to Vāstoṣpati, the Lord of the Dwelling Place. However, as also noted there, this is not just a product of wrong division of hymns: VII.55.1 is in a different meter from VII.54, and VII.54 ends with the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain, which is always the final pāda of a hymn. Moreover, as Old points out, VII.54 has three vss. and follows correctly on the three-vs. hymns VII.51–53, while an additional vs. would break that sequence. Old suggests that the single vs. VII.55.1 originally formed its own hymn and that the rest of VII.55, with 7 vss., is an addition to the original collection (Anhangslied).

VII.55.1: In addition to the voc. *vāstoṣ pate* that repeats the three vs.-initial vocc. *vāstoṣ pate* in VII.54, this vs. has other similarities to VII.54, esp. VII.54.1: *amīvahā* ‘destroying affliction’ echoes 54.1 *anamīvāh* ‘without affliction’, as *āviśān* ‘entering’ does 54.1 *svāveśāh* ‘easy to enter’; sim. *sākhā* ‘companion’ and 54.2 *sakhyé* ‘companionship’. Note also that pāda c *sākhā suśéva edhi naḥ* is identical to I.91.15; I.91 is the Soma hymn that VII.54.2ab seems to have been partially based on. In addition, pāda b is identical to VIII.15.13b and IX.25.4a, both of which are addressed to Soma (on Soma as the addressee in the former, see comm. ad loc.). I do not quite understand the Soma/Vāstoṣpati connection.

VII.55.2: The target of the simile in pāda b, ‘spears’, does not precede the simile marker *iva* and in fact is as far as it can be from it in a pāda of only 8 syllables: *vīva bhrājanta ṛṣṭáyah*. This arrangement may have resulted from an attempt to keep metrically unfavorable *bhrājante* out of the cadence.

On the refrain *ní śú svapa* and the present stem *svápa-* see my “Sleep in Vedic and Indo-European” (KZ 96 [1982/83], esp. 8 n. 3).

VII.55.3: The hapax voc. *punaḥsara* may be a word play with *sārameya*. Bollée (*Gone to the Dogs in Ancient India*, 43) tr. “recessive one,” indicating that the dog is in retreat. But the rest of the context suggests an aggressive dog on the attack.

On the intens. *dardar-* here, see Schaeffer (136), who cites a very similar Avestan passage.

VII.55.4: On \sqrt{sas} , again see my ‘sleep’ art. cited ad vs. 2.

VII.55.8: Note the two hapax cmpds with loc. 1st member, *proṣṭhe-śayá-* and *vahye-śayá-* versus *talpa-śīvan-* (*-śīvarī-*), with stem form in 1st member and a different 2nd member belonging to the same root $\sqrt{śi}$ ‘lie’.

VII.56 Maruts

VII.56.1: Ge takes cd to be the answer to the question in ab, but since vs. 2 seems more directly responsive to the question, I take cd here as simply further specification of the subject of the question.

Unusually, *īm* has no acc. function; there is no possible accusative role it could fill.

I consider *vyàktā(s)* to be at least an implied pun. The first reading is as the nom. pl. m. of the ppl. of *ví√añj* ‘anoint, ornament’, referring presumably to the Maruts’ characteristic adornments and their glistening appearance as (wet) bearers of rain. This interpr. is reflected in all the standard tr. However, I think it also is meant to contrast with *sānīlāḥ* ‘of the same nest’, as an indication that the Maruts are also separate individuals, and employing the common *ví / sā(m)* polarization. The problem is to identify a morphological form that could be represented by *vyàktā(s)* and express the sense ‘separate, individual’ vel sim. I hesitantly suggest that we start with the *-āñc*-stem, *vy-āñc-*, found only in the cmpd. *uru-vyāñc-* ‘wide-spreading’. (The rarity of this stem may be accounted for by competition with the well-attested stem *viśvañc-* of almost the same meaning [‘facing in opposite directions, divergent’], which looks like a more substantial version of *vyāñc-* and is built to the extended form *viśu* of the same preverb *ví*.) If *vyāñc-* made a collective abstract in *-tā-*, **vyāktā-* ‘individuality, separateness’, the form in our passage could be its instr. sg. in adverbial usage. There are obviously weaknesses in every link in this chain of reasoning. First, the stem *vyāñc-* is very rare and limited in distribution; second, I know of no other such abstracts to *-āñc*-stems and in fact *-tā*-stems are relatively rare in early Vedic (AiG II.2.617); third, it should be accented **vyāñc-* (AiG II.2.619). However, a poet intent on packing a pun into *vyàktā(s)* might not scruple to use unusual forms to achieve it, and elsewhere in the RV puns sometimes ignore accentuation for their 2nd reading. In slight support of the suggestion, we might note that this set of hymns has one other ex. of the instr. of such a stem in adverbial usage: VII.57.4 *puruṣātā* ‘in human fashion’, as well as an instr. to a *-tāt*-abstract in the same usage: VII.57.7 *sarvātātā* ‘in your totality’, referring to the Maruts -- the exact opposite of my suggested *vyàktā* ‘in their individuality, separately’, also of the Maruts. If my suggestion is correct (by no means certain!), it would also be a pun facilitated by sandhi, since the first reading as ppl. should have underlying *-ās* and the other one as instr. simply *-ā*, but both would show up as *-ā* in this sandhi position.

Because this vs. is in Dvipadā Virāj (which, despite its name, consists of *four* pādas of five syllables apiece), *ádha* opens the d pāda and is therefore less oddly placed than might appear. Klein (DGRV II.128) characterizes the *ádha* as “conjoining the second [term] with the first” and tr. “the young men of Rudra and the ones having good horses.” But since the two terms are coreferential, the *ádha* (/ Engl. ‘and’) seems unnec. or even misleading.

VII.56.2: This vs. seems a response, if an indirect one, to the question posed in vs. 1. The *hí*, as often, has a higher discourse function: it gives the reason for asking the question in the first place. We could tr. “(I ask) because ...” I also consider this vs. a further expression of the “individual/collective” theme I identified in vs. 1, here

conveyed by the pl. *janūṃṣi* ‘births’ in the first clause, contrasted with the sg. *janítram* ‘means of begetting’ in the 2nd. If 1ab asks “who are they *individually*?” 2ab states that the question needs to be asked because no one knows their *individual* births, even though (cd) *they* [=Maruts] know “mutually” (*mitháḥ*) their own (individual) means of begetting. In other words, they share the knowledge of their separate births -- something we don’t know. Note the middle *vidre*: they know facts about *themselves*, contrasting with the 3rd-party lack of knowledge in ab *nákiḥ* ... *véda*.

VII.56.3: This vs. continues the theme of mutuality in vs. 2, but now concerns the Maruts’ adult behavior as gods of the storm. The mutuality is expressed both by the adv. *mitháḥ* repeated from vs. 2 and by the reciprocal 3rd pl. verb *aspr̥dhran* “they contended with each other.”

The hapax *svapū-* has been variously, and surprisingly, interpr. See Old ad loc. (also KEWA s.v., etc.) for the numerous suggestions, incl. BR ‘broom’, Lanman ‘wings’. However, the most obvious analysis also is most likely the correct one, as a root noun cmpd. to root $\sqrt{pū}$ ‘purify’, hence ‘self-purifying’. This is Old’s conclusion, reflected also in Ge’s and Re’s tr. and in Scar (323). Perhaps the resistance to this obvious interpr. resulted from the fact that it is a hapax -- astonishing given the centrality of Soma Pavamāna “self-purifying Soma” in RVic ritual as the subject of the entire IXth Maṇḍala -- and in this passage it has no connection with soma. Here it quite likely refers to the rain drops accompanying the Maruts’ storm, as Ge suggests.

Old acutely notes that the verb in this pāda *vapanta* resembles *pavanta* ‘they purify(/ied) themselves’. Rather than considering *vapanta* a corruption of *pavanta* (which seems extremely unlikely to me), I would instead suggest that it’s a metathetic word play (*vap* \approx *pav*), aided by preceding (*s*)*vap*(*ūbhiḥ*).

VII.56.4: Whenever the birth of the Maruts, and esp. the udder of Pṛśni, are found in the RV, bewilderment ensues, and this passage is no exception. At least it is here identified as a secret that only the insightful can perceive -- a characterization that the modern interpreter fully concurs with. For other problematic passages on this topic see II.34.2, VI.48.22, and VI.66.1, 3 with comm. ad locc. Our passage would be fairly easy to interpr. if we could take *ūdhaḥ* (that is, *ūdhar*) as a loc. sg. Such is Ge’s solution (“im Euter,” explicitly identified as a loc. in n. 4b) and also Re’s, though the latter has the grace to bury the loc. in a parenthesis: “(en sa) mamelle.” But a loc. -*ar* to *r/n* stems “ist nicht nachgewiesen” (AiG III.311), and it is safer to take it as an acc. sg. as elsewhere. In my interpr. *yád* is a neut. pronoun (rather than a subord. conj.) and refers collectively to the Maruts and ‘udder’ is a species of appositive to it though with a bit of a twist: ‘udder’ refers to the contents of the udder, and that contents is the collective Marut embryo(s). This seems to me better than taking *yád* as ‘that’ or the like, as in Kü’s (175) “Diese Geheimnisse kennt der Weise, dass die grosse Pṛśni ein Euter getragen hat.” (On p. 339 Kü simply reproduces Ge’s tr., with *ūdhaḥ* as loc. and a pronominal obj. [“sie”], referring to the Maruts, supplied; he doesn’t comment on these two incompatible interpr.)

VII.56.5: The good heroes that the clan possesses are in fact the Maruts themselves, specified in the instr. Re calls this an “instrumental of identification.” Whatever term is used, it is not, in my experience, a common usage of the instr., but it is nonetheless not hard to interpret. A similar usage is found two vss. later, in 7cd.

VII.56.6: A very cleverly constructed vs., nicely fitted to Dvipadā Virāj meter. Each 5-syl. pāda consists of two words, phonologically and etymologically (or pseudo-etymologically) related. There are both repetition of morphological figures and variation on them. All four pādas end with a nom. pl. masc. adj.; the first two pādas end with superlative *-iṣṭhāḥ*, the third with the phonologically similar, but morphologically distinct *-iślā(h)*, the last with something phonologically distinct (*ugrāḥ*).

Three (a, b, d) of the four pādas contain etymological pairs; in the first two the etymological relation is reinforced by phonological repetition (*yāmaṃ yā(y)iṣṭhāḥ*, *śubhā śóbhiṣṭhāḥ*. (As for the first, the Samh. has *yéṣṭhāḥ*, but the first vowel must be distracted. HvN restore *yáyīṣṭhāḥ* with short root vowel, but I think *yā* is more likely. In neither of the other two occurrences of this stem [V.41.3, 74.8] does the meter establish the quantity of the root syllable.) In the third ex. (pāda d) the etymological relationship is not transparent, but would be available to the audience steeped in derivational morphology: *ójobhir ugrāḥ*. Although c, *śriyā sámīślā(h)*, lacks the etymological connection, it mimics it through alliteration, though it is notable that we have *miśLa*, not the also attested *miśRa*, which would match *śriyā* better. Another set of three versus one: in three pādas (b, c, d) the first noun is in the instr., but in pāda a it is not. The 2nd pāda is the only one that doesn’t deviate from the various patterns in any regard: it’s an etymological figure, ends with a superlative, begins with an instrumental.

One can also note the reversal of vowels in the root syllables of the word pairs of b and d: *u ... o* versus *o ... u*.

VII.56.7: The first pāda of this vs., *ugrām va ójaḥ*, restates the last pāda of the preceding vs. (6d *ójobhir ugrāḥ*) as an equational nominal clause. Because of its connection with vs. 6 it also sets up the expectation that what follows will also be an etymological figure, but b *sthīrā śāvāṃsi* is not, though it has the same syntactic configuration as pāda a.

The loose construction of the instr. *marúdbhiḥ* is similar to that in 5a.

VII.56.8: The nominal equations of 7ab continue in the first half of this vs., and *śubhrāḥ* picks up *śubhā śóbhiṣṭhāḥ* of 6b. Although *súṣmaḥ* is not etymologically related to *śubhrāḥ*, they are alliterative.

Pāda c contains a rhyming simile: *dhúnir múnir*. Such full rhyme is quite rare in the RV and seems to provide the crescendo of this highly wrought little passage. Note also that the final of d, *dhṛṣṇóḥ*, is a slight flip of the initial of c, *dhúniḥ*.

In order to get a proper Dvipadā Virāj line, the *iva* of c has to be read ‘*va*’, as it sometimes is elsewhere. See Old. If the particle is disyllabic, however, it makes cd a Triṣṭubh pāda. Since the Dvipadā Virāj section of the hymn is drawing to a close (fully Triṣṭubh starting with vs. 12), the possible double metrical reading here may be gesturing towards the upcoming Triṣṭubh takeover. Indeed the Dvipadā Virāj begins to break up beginning in vs. 10, despite the Anukr. identification of 1–11 as DV.

In the simile of c, *iva* (/va) is out of place; we expect **dhúnir iva múnih*. This displacement was doubtless made to draw attention to the rhyme noted above. But it also interacts somewhat with the question of whether cd contains two DV pādas or one Triṣṭubh, because a quick glance at Lub shows that *iva* is fairly rare immediately after the caesura, which would be its position here if we are dealing with a Triṣṭubh pāda. I imagine that this rarity has less to do with *iva*’s accentless status (though that might contribute) than with its usual tendency to take 2nd position, which would generally put it earlier in the line. There certainly do exist trimeter lines with *iva* post-caesura, e.g., IV.18.6 *ṛtāvarīr iva saṃkróṣamānāḥ* (cf. also V.1.1, 11.5, etc.); they are just less common than I had expected.

VII.56.10: The metrical decay noted for 8cd continues here. Although the first half of the vs. has the expected 10 syllables with a word boundary after 5 -- thus allowing a division into two DV pādas -- the opening of b is *huve*, an unaccented verb. In the immediately preceding vs. pāda b opens with accented *yuyóta*, which must owe its accent to its pāda-initial position, as there are no syntactic features favoring it. The DV here is far less sensitive to the pāda boundary. Even more clearly, the second half of the vs. is an undoubted Triṣṭubh, since it has 11 syllables and a caesura after the first 4, with the unaccented voc. *maruto* spanning syllables 5–7.

Both Ge and Re (also Lub) take *vāvaśānāḥ* to $\sqrt{vaś}$ ‘want, desire’ with the supposed object being soma, but I think it makes more sense, and requires less machinery, to assign it to $\sqrt{vāś}$ ‘bellow’. Otherwise too much has been gapped and needs to be supplied; cf. Re’s expansive parenthesis: “... pour qu’à satiété ... (vous vous gorgiez de soma, le) désirant-avec-force.” See the same disagreement about the affiliation of the same participle in VII.36.6, with comm. ad loc.

VII.56.11: This vs. is unambiguously Triṣṭubh, consisting of two pādas of 11 syllables. The first has an opening of 5, which could be a self-contained pāda of DV, but what follows it is 6 syllables, marking the whole as a single Triṣṭubh pāda. The second part is even less ambiguous, as it has an opening of 4, so a DV division is impossible. The only feature that matches that of DV is that there are only two Triṣṭubh pādas in the vs., not four.

On *iṣmín*- see comm. ad I.87.6.

VII.56.12: The metrical boundary, however fuzzy, between the DV and Triṣṭubh sections separates the first part of the hymn from the more ritually focused one

beginning here. The expression *hinomy adhvarám* “I set the ceremony in motion” announces the inauguration of the sacrifice.

This vs. harps, rather tediously, on the adj. *śúci-* ‘gleaming’, which occurs 6x, twice each in pādas a, b, and d.

Pāda c contrasts *ṛtá-* in *ṛténa ... ṛta-sāpaḥ* with *satyá-*, the latter as goal of \sqrt{i} ‘go, come’. In my view, *satyám ... āyan* refers to the truth-serving Maruts’ epiphany on the ritual ground: they “came to reality” for the sacrificers, that is, they became really present. This epiphany is effected “by truth”: the operation of the properly performed ritual mechanism.

VII.56.13: This vs. has no finite verbs, but three predicated tense-stem participles: pf. *upaśiśriyāṇāḥ* (b), aor. *rucānāḥ* (c), pres. *yāchamānāḥ* (d), in a hymn already well provided with such (see 10d, 11d).

As for *upaśiśriyāṇāḥ*, although pf. participles regularly have preterital value, the middle pf. of $\sqrt{śri}$ is presential (Kü 527–28) and stative, and this form contrasts with the far more common ppl. *śrita-* ‘set’ -- hence my “being set,” though this rendering somewhat undercuts the stative value.

In cd it is possible that only one of the participles is predicated, and in fact the publ. tr. renders pāda c as wholly a simile. However, this hemistich could contain two independent predications: “(you are) shining like ...; (you are) holding yourselves ...” In any case there is an unsignaled change of subject between the hemistichs: in ab the ornaments (nom. *khādāyaḥ*, *rukṃāḥ*) are the grammatical subjects, while in d the Maruts must be supplied because the participle *yāchamānāḥ* seems to assume an animate subject. Pāda c is ambiguous: either the brilliants (*rukṃāḥ*) or the Maruts can be shining. The etymological relationship between *rukṃāḥ* in b and the part. *rucānāḥ* in c might suggest that c goes with b. However, in my publ. tr. I have privileged the hemistich boundary and supplied the Maruts as subj. of c (as do Ge and Re), but the other interpr. is certainly possible. One argument for the standard interpr. might be that the subjects of medial participles to \sqrt{ruc} (well-attested *rócamāna-*, as well as *rucāná-*, *rurucāná-*, *rórucāna-*) are generally gods.

VII.56.14: Ge suggests (n. 14a) that the *budhnyā ... mähāṃsi* “deep-grounded powers” are the “verborgen Herrlichkeiten” (*nīṇyā*) concealed in Pṛśni’s udder in vs. 4. Even leaving aside the fact that, as was discussed above, *ūdhaḥ* in vs. 4 should not be a loc., this interpr. seems both unnec. and too specific, esp. since 10 vss. intervene. *budhnyā-* here may refer to the powers that the Maruts, gods associated with the midspace, derive from the earth below, or it may simply mean something like ‘fundamental’, by a semantic development parallel to that of the Engl. word.

The preverb *prá* is showcased in the first hemistich: *prá ... īrate ...*, *prá ... prayajyavas tiradhvam*. I am not certain what *prá* $\sqrt{tṛ}$ *nāmāni* in b is meant to convey, but I interpr. it in the context of the importance of the Maruts’ individual identities (vss. 1–4) and of calling their names (10a) earlier in the hymn. Perhaps the Maruts need to “put their names forward” and make themselves individually known before they can enjoy the Gṛhamedha offering.

As noted in the publ. intro., the ritual references in pādas b-d are quite specific, alluding to the Maruts' role in the Sākamedha, the last of the Cāturmāsyaṇi ("Four-monthly") rituals. See the publ. intro. for further details.

VII.56.15: The phonological figure of the two words *adhīthā*, *itthā* straddling the pāda boundary of ab provide a nice little study in syllable weight. (The echo is of course obscured by the application of sandhi in the Saṃhitā text: *adhīthéthā*). If we add in the opening of the vs., *yādi*, the echo is even more pronounced: *yādi* ... *adhīthā*, *itthā*, with (y)*ādi* doubling *adhī*.

Exactly what *itthā* is doing here is unclear to me, but this adverb several times appears in context with *vīpra-* and some verb of invoking (see Ge ad VII.94.5), as here (with the invoking represented by the nominal *hāvīman*). Cf. VII.94.5 ... *īlata*, *itthā vīprāsaḥ*, IV.29.4 = VIII.7.30 *itthā vīpraṃ hāvamānam*. I suggest that *itthā* refers to the precise manner in which a *vīpra-* makes the invocation.

The Maruts are asked to "give study to / be mindful of" what is *stutāsyā*. *stutā-* is of course a very common past *passive* participle meaning '(what/who is) praised'. In this context we might rather expect the abstract noun 'praise', and indeed Ge simply so tr.: "... des Lobpreises eingedenk seid," with no explicit comment, but a crossref. (n. 15a) to several passages with a similar idiom but with *stotrāsyā* 'praise song' instead of *stutāsyā* (e.g., V.55.9 *ādhi stotrasya ... gātana*). But the poet could easily have used *stotrāsyā* here in the same metrical slot if he had wanted to, and so I think we must take the ppl. seriously. Re in fact does so -- "prêtez-attention à la chose-louée" -- though in his n. he simply notes its similarity to the *stotrā-* passages. I think the point is a cleverer one: the poet suggests that if the Maruts pay attention to what we poets praise -- what *gifts* we poets praise -- they will know what to bestow on us. The "if" clause is immediately followed by its corollary: "right away give (us) wealth ..." -- the poet implying that the Maruts are a quick study! Although I must admit that *stutā-* 'praised' seems always to refer to gods, not to material objects, the semantic extension seems an easy one, and we can invoke the term *dāna-stuti-* 'praise of the gift' -- though it's notable that, although this term is ubiquitous in secondary lit. on the RV, it is not actually attested in Vedic.

By my rules, we might expect that *anyāḥ* in d should be definite ('the other') rather than the indefinite 'another' that better fits the passage (unless we assume that the *anyāḥ* is a rival poet). However, I suggest that *nū cid ... anyāḥ* is a composite negative indefinite expression like *nā kās cid anyāḥ*. Cf. VIII.24.11 *nū anyātrā cid ...*

The cadence of d is bad. It is tempting to emend injunc. *ādābhat* to subj. *ādābhāt*, which would fix the meter and fit the sense (in fact, the publ. tr. renders the verb as if a subj.: 'will ... swindle'), though no doubt the temptation should be resisted.

VII.56.16: Each pāda in this vs. contains a simile marked by *nā* comparing the Maruts to domestic animals (a, d), spirits (b), and children (c). Except in c, the simile begins the pāda. The vs. contains only one finite verb, *śubhāyanta*, in b; the functional role of the finite verb is filled instead by the adjectives that are the point of

contact between the simile and the frame. In the publ. tr. I deliberately failed to render ab as the rel. cl. it technically is because the “which Maruts ... they ...” structure would have intruded upon the succession of similes.

In b opinion is divided on the sense of *yakṣa-dṛś-*. Ge takes *-dṛś-* as active, with the first member in an acc. relationship with it (“Geisterseher”), flg. Sāy. in his analysis of the syntax of the cmpd., though not of the meaning of the first member. So also Re. However, Ge considers the possibility of a pass. sense in his n. (16b), and Old opts for the pass. interpr. For disc. of this cmpd. see Scar (232); of his choices I opt for the bahuvrīhi.

Another oblation to the Maruts at the Sākamedha, besides the Gṛhamedha mentioned above (vs. 14), is made to the *krīḍin-* (‘playful’) Maruts on the 2nd day of the sacrifice (see, e.g., ŚB II: 20 and Eggeling, SBE XII.408). The characterization of them in d as *prakrīḷīnaḥ* obviously makes ref. to this oblation.

VII.56.17: This vs. has the feel of a final vs. Though there is no overt sign of a break with what follows, the next vs. turns its attention to the Hotar, Agni, and this might be taken as a change of subject.

In the cadence of pāda a *mṛḷantu* should be read with a light root syllable, contrary to normal practice. Old doubts that the form should be read with this exceptional light syllable and ascribes the irregularity to “die metrische Unebenheit” of this hymn, while HvN do accept the light reading and adduce one other occurrence that requires this scansion (IV.3.3, though that passage looks more equivocal to me).

Ge and Re take *varivasyá-*, lit. ‘make wide space’, in a general ‘help, protect’ sense (e.g., “qui protègent les Deux Mondes bien fixés”). But surely the beneficiaries are us (not the two worlds), and the idea is to make the worlds spacious for us.

VII.56.18–19: As was just noted, vs. 17 “feels” like a final (or pseudo-final) vs. If vs. 18 marks a new beginning, we can note both that in vs. 18 the Hotar invokes the gods as he would at the beginning of a sacrifice and that in vs. 19 (and 20a) the Maruts are referred to four times (19a, b, c, 20a) with the near-deictic pronoun *imé* “these right here,” which might indicate their epiphany on the ritual ground.

VII.56.18: The first hemistich of this vs. presents us with a common problem: the most obvious way to interpr. it meets a syntactic stumbling block that should not allow that interpr., and the standard interpr. ignore that obstruction. In this case the issue is the middle participle *gṛṇānáḥ*. This part. is attested over 50x; the vast majority of these attestations are clearly passive in value. In fact, Gr interpr. only 2 forms as “medial” (that is, transitive, not passive): this passage and I.181.9. Nonetheless, both Ge and Re take it as transitive here (though with different objects) without comment. But I think we ignore the use of the overwhelming majority of forms at our peril. In fact, since Agni as Hotar is the implicit subject of the sentence, a passive value of *gṛṇānáḥ* is easily possible: as both Hotar and god, Agni performs a ritual invocation (as priest) while himself being hymned (as god). (The other

occurrence flagged by Gr as non-passive, I.181.9, is indeed transitive, but owes its anomalous usage to special circumstances. See comm. ad loc.)

If we eliminate *grṇānáḥ* as a potential governor of an object, the acc. *satrācīm rātīm* must be construed with *ā ... jōhavīti*. Although the acc. with (*ā*) $\sqrt{hvā}$ is more usually a god or other animate being, abstract entities (like ‘giving’ here) are also possible. The *vaḥ* in 2nd position in pāda a, which might have served as acc. to *ā ... jōhavīti* must then be a gen. dependent on the acc. NP. The more usual configuration is restored in pāda d *havate vaḥ* “he calls upon you,” a minor ex. of poetic repair.

In c both Ge and Re supply ‘sacrificer’ with gen. *īvataḥ* ‘such’, while I supply ‘wealth’. There is in fact no good support for either position that I can find. I prefer mine because ‘wealth’ would pick up ‘giving’ from the previous pāda, whereas there is no mention of a sacrificer anywhere. But I do not strongly favor my solution. *gopā-* ‘herdsman’ is regularly construed with *ṛtāsyā* ‘truth’ (e.g., I.163.5, III.10.2), so perhaps that phrase is meant, anticipating *ādvayāvī* ‘without duplicity’ in d. Note that the *gopā-* is also *ādabdhā-/ādabhya-* ‘undeceivable’ (e.g., II.9.6, X.25.7).

VII.56.19: As was noted above, this vs. contains three examples of the near-deictic *imé*, opening the first three pādas. The publ. tr. only fully renders the first one, as three examples of “these here” seemed too heavy. It is also worth noting that, though the *imé* forms might suggest the presence of the Maruts right here at the sacrifice (as was suggested above), the clauses in which they are found describe general activities of those gods, which would almost necessarily be performed away from the ritual ground.

Both Ge and Re follow the Pp. reading *sáhasaḥ*. Re interpr. it rather loosely as an abl., whereas Ge takes it as a gen. and as if it were the differently accented poss. adj. **sahásaḥ* (“die Gewalt des Gewaltigen”), without comment. Old suggests that the better reading is dat. *sáhase* and cites passages containing *ā* \sqrt{nam} with the dat. I follow this interpr.

VII.56.20: Ge and Re both take b as a self-contained clause. I think it better (with MMüller in SBE) to take *bhṛmīṇ cid* beginning b as obj. to *junanti* in pāda a, parallel to *radhrām cid* -- beginning a new clause with *yáthā* in the middle of b. The point would be that the Maruts are so vigorous that they can energize both an entity that has no energy at all (“the feeble”) and one that has energy in excess (a whirlwind).

VII.56.21: The adj. *sujātá-* ‘well-born’ generally refers to gods, or at least to mortals; it is only here used of material goods (implicitly *vasavyà-* in the preceding pāda, hence my ‘of good quality’. Of course, it is possible that *vasavyà-* here refers, at least partly, to human capital (sons), as apparently in II.9.5 *ubháyam te ná kṣīyate vasavyàm ... kṛdhi pátim svapatyásya rāyáḥ*, where the second category of “goods of both types” (*ubháyam ... vasavyàm*) is “wealth in good descendents” (*svapatyásya rāyáḥ*). But I don’t think this is a necessary interpr.: “well-born/produced” is likely available to semantic extension.

VII.56.22: As most interpr. point out, the three locc. in b are especially contested objects for the Ārya. See esp. Proferes (98): “Because of their economic value, rivers, plants and clans were subject to competing claims, and constituted flashpoints for conflict between various groups for whom control over resources meant increased power” -- as well as his elucidation of the three terms. See also Thieme (Fremdling 55), Oberlies (I.350).

Fem. *yahvī-* ‘exuberant’ is in the pl. typed for rivers/waters.

VII.56.23: Despite the use of \sqrt{kr} ‘make’ (2nd pl. pf. *cakra*), it is not likely that the Maruts created the *ukthāni* themselves, though they are singers on other occasions; rather they provided the occasion and the subject for the poets of earlier eras to celebrate them. Though Re’s ‘provoke’ is a bit strong, it’s the right idea. My ‘have given rise to’ is a bit weak.

VII.56.24: The sense of pāda d is somewhat unclear and the various tr. incompatible. Ge’s “wir möchten euch mehr gelten als das eigene Heim” seems esp. difficult to wring out of the Skt., though the other possibilities he suggests in the n. (24d) are somewhat more likely. I start with the *abhī√as* lexeme, which generally means ‘surmount, dominate, be superior’, which doesn’t seem to be reflected in the Ge suggestions. However, in my interpr. the enclitic *vaḥ* has only the vaguest syntactic connection to the clause. I do not have a better solution.

VII.57 Maruts

VII.57.1: My interpr. differs considerably from the standard—Old, Ge, Re—all of whom take ab as a single clause, with the sg. *nāma mārutam* the subject of 3rd pl. *madanti* and *mādhvaḥ* the oblique obj. of that verb. So, e.g., Old “Am Honigtrank erfreut sich ... euer Marutname (=Marutgeschlecht).” The number disagreement between subj. and verb is taken as a *constructio ad sensum* (so explicitly Ge n. 1ab, sim. Old), and the clash between 2nd person encl. *vaḥ* / voc. *yajatrāḥ* and the 3rd ps. verb is glossed over. I find these disharmonies disturbing and prefer to separate the two pādas. By my interpr., as noted in the publ. intro., pāda a has an idiomatic construction very similar to Engl. “has X’s name on it,” meaning “is destined for / belongs to X.” (“That cookie has your name on it” means “you should take it; I’ll cede it.”) Then in b the person switches from 2nd (*vaḥ* ... *yajatrāḥ*) to 3rd (*madanti* with gapped subj. = Maruts), but the number is unchanged. This situation lasts through then first hemistich of vs. 2. As for the sense, I take the ‘honey’ to refer to the soma to be offered to the Maruts at the sacrifices mentioned in b: the soma oblation at the sacrifice in question is intended just for them. Alternatively, but less likely in my view, it could refer to the rain that the Maruts produce. In that case it would have the Maruts’ name because it is their product. The rain is metaphorically referred to in d *pínvanti útsam* “they swell the wellspring.”

The relationship among the clauses in the 2nd hemistich isn’t certain, although there are no real implications whichever interpr. is chosen. With the standard tr. I

take *pínvanti útsam*, which opens d, as the main clause on which both the preceding rel. (c: *yé rejáyanti*) and the following temporal clause (*yád áyāsuḥ*) depend. In this case *pínvanti* would be accented because it opens its pāda. However, that verb could be part of the rel. cl. starting in c (*yé ...*), with all of cd dependent on b: “... they become exhilarated -- they who set ... to trembling (and) swell the wellspring, when ...”

VII.57.2: The two suffix-accented *-tár-* agent nouns in the first hemistich take accusative objects, rather than the expected gen. (*nicetāraḥ ... grṇántam, praṇetāraḥ ... mánma*). See Tichy (363–64). Although Tichy suggests some possible reasons for this unexpected (but not vanishingly rare) construction (pp. 367ff.), they don’t seem to be particularly applicable here.

I see no easy way to get a causal sense from *hí*, hence my “surely.”

Object-less *vītáye* is clarified by 6b *vyantu ... hávīmṣi*.

The pf. part. *pipriyāñāḥ* is interpr. by Ge/Re as implicitly prospective: the Maruts will become pleased/gratified as a result of their *vītí-*. I take it rather as having preterital value: they have first been gratified by the initial guest-reception ritual and are now awaiting their meal. A passage like I.73.1 *átithir ná prīṇānāḥ* “being gratified like a guest” supports this interpr.

VII.57.3: Ge takes *anyé* with *marútaḥ*: “Nicht glänzen andere Marut so sehr wie diese ...” But both the position of *yáthā*, which in its simile-marking role should follow the first term of the simile, and common sense (who would the other Maruts be?) strongly suggest that *anyé* refers to a group separate from the Maruts. By my rules *anyé* should be definite, and I think Re is correct in supplying ‘gods’. This would make sense in a ritual context: the other divine visitors at the ritual (save for Indra) are pretty drab compared with the Maruts.

Since the other occurrence of *viśva-pís-* modifies Dawn’s cart (VII.75.6), as Old points out a passive sense ‘all-adorned’ is more likely than ‘all-adorning’. So Scar (319) ‘allgeschmückt’.

The middle part. *piśāná-* is an isolated form: the only apparent attestation of a root aor. to this root, beside the thematized nasal pres. *piṁśá-* and the pf. *pipeśa*, etc. (However, *piśā* in VII.18.2 is taken by most as an impv. to a thematic aorist [see comm. ad loc.], which could easily have replaced the opaque root aor. impv. **pīḍhí*, so the root does have a fragmentary aor. system.) That it is a participle at all has been called into question by John Lowe, who suggests it may be a Caland adj. instead (“Caland adjectives ...” 2012: 92–93; see also *Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit* 2015: 133). Although I don’t see any advantage in assigning it to a category of dubious existence (Caland adj. in *-āná-*), its isolation does make it difficult to interpr. As a medial form, it might be expected to match the medial perfect usage and be pass. (e.g., VI.49.3) or reflexive (V.60.4) vel sim. However, it is generally taken as transitive, as in the publ. tr., with the transitive value ascribed to the preverb *ā* (see Gr) opening c. Lowe (*Part.* 133) disputes this interpr., declaring the supposed tmesis between preverb and participle here “a unique type of discontinuity.” He prefers to

construe *ā* with the finite verb *añjate* in d and take *piśānāḥ* as an intransitive adj.; *ródasī* is then an obj. of *añjate* along with *samānām añjī* and not construed with *piśānāḥ*: “All adorned and decorated, they anoint / the two worlds (with) the same anointing for beauty.” As far as I can find, however, there are no occurrences of $\sqrt{añj}$ with double acc. When the object anointed is in the acc., the ointment is in the instr., so his suggested interpr. would be syntactically unique in a different way. I therefore prefer to construe both *ā* and *ródasī* with *piśānāḥ*. However, the construction need not be transitive “adorning the two-world halves,” as is the standard interpr. and publ. tr. Old suggests several other possible relations (see also Re’s n.), including that *ródasī* might be an internal / Inhalts-type of acc., expressing the ornament, hence “wearing the two world-halves as adornment.” Old ultimately rejects this interpr., as does the publ. tr., but it remains a possibility, one that would better reflect the medial form.

VII.57.4: Unlike Ge/Re I attach b to c, not to a. Nothing rests on this, but the cause and the (hoped-for non-)effect are more closely allied that way.

I did not tr. *vaḥ* in c, which would have necessitated the awk. rendering “... into the way of it of yours.” This vs. is over-supplied with *vaḥ*-s, with one in each pāda.

VII.57.5: Ge and Re tr. *raṇanta* as a modal (“sollen sich ... erfreuen”; “Que les Maruts se réjouissent ...”), as does Hoffmann (259), who explicitly identifies it as a subjunctive, not an injunctive, flg. Re (BSL 33.1: 6–7), who claims that *-anta* is a regular RVic subjunctive ending. I think a modal value, whether the form is identified as injunctive or subjunctive, is unnecessary and in fact fits the context less well than a preterital reading. Previous vss. refer to the performance of the sacrifice at which the Maruts are present (esp. 1ab and 2). They are now asked to provide benefits in return, and so we might assume that the sacrifice is now over (though 6ab gives me pause), an assumption supported by *kṛté* with its past reference: ‘what has been/was done’.

In the publ. tr. *cid* is not tr. I think it is a simple emphatic here “in just what has been done here,” which is somewhat stilted in Eng., or else (perhaps more likely) it actually emphasizes the following word *ātra*: “in what has been done *here*” -- at our sacrifice, not at someone else’s. So Sāy. It could, of course, mean “also” or “even,” but neither of those makes sense in context -- nor does Ge’s (/Hoffmann’s) “wenigstens” or Re’s “(un peu) même.”

VII.57.6: With Ge, I take *viśvebhir nāmabhiḥ* with *stutāsaḥ*, despite the displacement of word order. In fact, there’s nowhere else to put that unwieldy instr. phrase but at the beginning of a new pāda. Re tr. it as an independent phrase, whose referent and relation to the rest of the sentence aren’t clear to me: “Alors, (une fois) loués, que les seigneurs Marut agréent, de tous (leurs) noms, les offrandes!”

VII.57.7: The contrast of *vísve ... sarvātātā* “all (of you) ... in (your) totality” highlights a constant theme of Marut hymns, that they are both individuals (emphasized by “all your names” in 6b) and a collectivity. See the treatment of this at the beginning of the previous hymn (VII.56) and comm. thereon.

The position of the patrons (*sūrī-*) as middle men in the circulation of goods and services is nicely expressed here: you help the patrons; they help us.

VII.58 Maruts

VII.58.1: The gen. phrase *daívyasya dhāmnah* does not have a clear syntactic relationship to the rest of its clause. The standard interpr. (Ge, Re, Scar [62]) resupplies the word *gaṇá-* in the rel. clause and seems to take the phrase as gen. of material, as it were: e.g., Ge “die starke (Truppe) der göttlichen Rasse.” By contrast I treat the possessive adj. *túviṣmant-* as a real possessive with the gen. phrase implicitly dependent on the underlying nominal *tuví(s)-/*távis-*, hence “having the power of its divine nature.”

The *utá* beginning the 2nd hemistich is relatively functionless. Klein (DGRV I.375–78) says it signals weak nexus between distichs with non-parallel structure. It might also be possible to claim that it is a sort of inverse *utá*, which should connect c with d, which *are* syntactically and thematically parallel. I also think it possible that it expresses a covert conceptual connection between the heaven indirectly referred to in b (*daívya-*) and the midspace defined by the two world-halves in c, a space also indirectly measured by the distance from ‘chaos, disorder’ (*nírṛti-*) and the heavenly vault (*nāka-*) in d.

VII.58.2: Like the gen. phrase in 1b, the instr. *tveṣyèṇa* has insufficient syntactic grounding in its clause. Like Ge “(geschieht)” and Re “(s’est produite),” I see no choice but to supply a verb to link the subject *janūḥ* and the instr.

I have no opinion on the morphology of *janūḥ*. Gr calls it a masculine nom. sg. to the *-us*-stem *janús-*, an interpr. bolstered by the acc. form *janúṣam* (3x). AiG II.2.490 posits a paradigm of alternating gender, with m. or f. in the (nom./acc.) singular, but neuter in the dual and plural, which accords with the distribution of forms in the RV (du. *janúṣī*, pl. *janūṃṣī*) but fails to account for the gender switch. In the same vol. (II.2.496–97) Debrunner suggests that our *janūḥ* belongs to a *-ū*-stem (though acc. *janúṣam* would still need to be a masc. [or fem.] form to an *-us*-stem). The problem is that non-neut. forms of *-is-* and *-us*-stems don’t lengthen the suffixal vowel in the nom. sg., unlike *-as*-stems. However, it seems possible that our *janūḥ* contains a nonce lengthening on the model of the vastly more common masc. *-as*-stems, as AiG III.292 indirectly allows. It should also be noted that because of following *cid*, the suffixal syllable of the preceding noun would be heavy, whether it originally read *janús cid*, as in the transmitted text, or **janús cid*, as grammar would have us expect.

The relationship between the first hemistich and the rel. cl. in c displays the RV’s customary willingness to switch person reference in midstream and without

warning. The first hemistich refers to the Maruts in the 2nd ps., with the enclitic *vah* in a and the b pāda consisting only of vocatives. Because there is nothing to lean on, all three vocatives are accented, but in all three cases the initial accent contrasts with the inherent accent of the stem: *bhīmāsaḥ* (*bhīmá-*); *túvimanyavaḥ* (*tuví-* cmpds. are accented either on the 2nd member [e.g., *tuví-rādhās-*] or on the 2nd syllable of the first member [e.g., *tuví-brahman-*]); *áyāsaḥ* (*ayās-*). There could therefore be no doubt that the reference is 2nd person; yet the rel. cl. that picks up the referents with the nom. pl. prn. *yé* is unequivocally in the 3rd ps.: (*prá ...*) *sánti*. The following pāda returns to 2nd ps. ref. with *vah*.

On the “X Y *utá*” construction (rather than expected X *utá* Y) see Klein DGRV I. 344ff.

VII.58.3: In pāda a I take *maghávadbhyaḥ* as referring to our human patrons, because I take the Maruts as subj. of the 2nd pl. impv.: *dadhāta*. However given the connections between 3ab and 6ab (for which see below), where *maghónām* refers to the Maruts, it is quite possible that the subj. of the impv. is the poet’s fellow priests and the Maruts are the referent of *maghávadbhyaḥ*.

The simile in c causes some interpretational problems. Both Old (ad VI.50.10) and Re suggest interpr. that violate the structure of the RVic simile, and I think both treatments are wrong; Ge’s treatment is more possible, though it differs from my own. All three take *jantúm* as part of the simile with *gató nādhvā* (= *ná ádhvā*), roughly for both “as a travelled road leads (the) people on,” while I take *jantúm* in the frame.

The RVic simile is only nominal; when a verb is involved it is shared by simile and frame. Both Old and Re take c as entirely simile, with its own independent verb (*ví tirāti*), and d as a loosely (Old) or more tightly (Re) connected frame, with its own verb (*prá ... tireta*). Old explicitly argues (ad VI.50.10) that *ná* can sometimes be a quasi-clausal simile marker, and he tr. “Der gegangene Weg vergleichsweise mag einen Menschen vorwärts bringen: so bringt auch uns verwärts.” After examining all the similes in the RV (see my “Case disharmony in RVic similes.” *IJ* 24 [1982] 251-71), I would vigorously contest his characterization of *ná*. Re’s tr. has a more conventional simile/frame relationship, but still violates the shared verb rule: “Comme le chemin parcouru fait passer l’homme outre, qu’elle nous pousse (plus) avant ...” (The subject of d, “elle,” seems to refer to the *suṣṭutí-* in b.) Although the structural violation in Re’s tr. would be mitigated by the fact that the two verbs belong to the same verb stem, *tirá-*, they have different preverbs (*ví* and *prá*), and therefore different senses, and are also in different moods (subj. and opt.).

Ge’s rendering, “Wie ein zurückgelegter Weg der Leute, so möge es (uns) zum Ziele führen,” respects the simile structure, with the subject in the frame (“es”) presumably referring to the good praise in b (see Re also), but the sense seems off. If the praise is to bring anyone or -thing across, it should be the Maruts (brought to our sacrifice), not us. Still I would be willing to consider a variation of Ge’s interpr., with the praise as subj. in the frame, but the Maruts as obj.: “As a road when it’s travelled (does) people, (the good praise) will bring the (Maruts) across.”

However, I think it likely that the focus in this 2nd hemistich has shifted to the help that the Maruts will give us when they have enjoyed our praise (see the thrice repeated *yusmótaḥ* ‘aided by you’ in the next vs., 4abc). In particular, pāda d *prá ná spārhābhir ūtibhis tireta* is almost identical to VII.84.3 *prá ná spārhābhir ūtibhis tiretam*, addressed to Indra and Varuṇa. In the latter passage, *tiretam* must be a 2nd du. active opt. with Indra and Varuṇa as subj. In other words, in that passage gods are the subject. In our passage *tireta* is ambiguous: it can be a 2nd pl. act. opt. or a 3rd sg. mid. opt., and different factors pull in different directions. The parallel in VII.84.3 suggests we have gods, namely the Maruts, as subject here too, and the easiest way to do that is take it as a 2nd pl. A passage in the preceding hymn, VII.57.5 *prá vājebhis tirata puṣyāse naḥ* “Further us with prizes for our thriving,” with 2nd pl. act. impv. to the same stem, also supports this interpr. This is the analysis of Gr, and it is also responsible for Old’s “So bringt ...” On the other hand, the clear 3rd sg. *tirāti* in c invites a 3rd sg. interpr. also of *tireta*, and the following hymn contains the idioms we have here, *prá √tī* and *vī √tī*, there with a single instance of the verb stem in the 3rd sg. middle positioned between the preverbs: VII.59.2 *prá sá kṣāyaṃ tirate vī mahîr īṣaḥ* “He furthers his dwelling place, ex(tends) his great refreshments.” Re and Ge both opt for the 3rd sg. middle interpr., but the subject they each (seem to) provide is the good praise of b, a far cry from the gods we expect as subject of the expression found in d. My interpr. of cd solves both problems, though, admittedly, not in the most elegant fashion. I supply ‘flock’ (*gaṇá-*; see 1a) as the subj. of both *vī tirāti* and *prá ... tireta*. We thus have a singular subject that will allow *tireta* to harmonize with *tirāti* and the divine subject that will allow d to harmonize with VII.84.3.

VII.58.4: As noted just above, this vs. is structured by three (abc) pāda-init. *yusmótaḥ* ‘aided by you’. The three separate clauses containing this opening build on each other in an interesting way, and the first two are also linked by a morphophonological relationship.

To begin with the latter, both a and b end with a predicated *-ín-*stem qualifying the successful poet and the successful steed respectively with semantically parallel descriptors: ... *śatasvī*, ... *sahasrī* “possessing hundreds ... possessing thousands.” The two words are also phonologically similar; to put it schematically, *SaCasRī*, where the *-s-Resonant-ī* final is esp. salient. The second one is correctly formed (to *sahásra-*) and well attested. The first is a hapax and aberrantly formed: the expected *-ín-*stem to *śatá-* is *śatín-*, which is in fact reasonably well attested. *śatasvín-* is obviously modeled on *sahasrín-* (already implied by AiG II.2.917 and Re ad loc.), aided by the fact that *-vín-* is regularly added to *-as-*stems (AiG II.2.917). So with *śatá-* temporarily re-configured as an *-as-*stem, the suffix *-vín-* can be affixed, allowing the stem to parallel *sahasrín-* in metrical and phonological shape. In b *sahasrī* is immediately preceded by *sáhuriḥ*, which reinforces the phonological pattern: *sahVri(h)*.

Now as to the relations among the three *yusmótaḥ* clauses. I suggest that they can be seen as an instance of Behagel’s Law (the law of “increasing members”) involving syntactic blocks, not merely NPs. Pāda a contains a noun and a predicated

adj. (*vípraḥ ... śatasvī*); pāda b a noun and two predicated adjectives (*árvā sáhuriḥ sahasrī*). And pāda c has two clauses, a nominal one consisting of a noun (*samrāt*) predicated of an unexpressed subject (=Indra), and a full clause, with finite verb and object (*hanti vṛtrám*). My view of the increasing complication of syntactic structure in these three clauses produces interpr. of two of the clauses that differ from the standard. In b both Ge and Re (also Klein, DGRV I.436) take *sáhuriḥ* as an attributive adj. and only *sahasrī* as predicated (e.g., “... does the winning steed become a possessor of thousand(-fold) booty”). This is of course possible, but both the structural argument already adduced and the pragmatic fact that the horse has to become victorious before he wins prizes speak for my interpr.

In c the difference between interpr. is greater. I take *samrāt* as one clause, with the noun predicated of unmentioned Indra : “(Indra) is sovereign king.” This clause is linked to the next (*hanti vṛtrám*) by *utá*: “and (he) smites Vṛtra.” Ge, Re, and Klein all take *samrāt* simply as the subj. of *hanti* (e.g., “and with your aid does the great king smash the obstacle”). But this interpr. must ignore or explain away the position of *utá*. Klein is the only one who is explicit about the function of *utá*. He groups it with passages that contain “a repeated term within one of a set of parallel clauses,” conjoined by *utá*. But in the other exx. he gives (pp. 436–37) the *utá* is adjacent to the repeated element and in Wackernagel’s position. In our passage this should yield **yusmóta utá samrāt*. Klein does not comment on *utá*’s position here. Although one could argue (though Klein does not) that *utá* was displaced to the right to avoid the clash ...-óta *utá*, in fact that is the kind of clash that RVic poets like! (Indeed the presence of *utá* in this pāda may be partly to call attention to the compositionally suppressed -*ūtá*-.) My interpr. takes the *utá* as properly positioned to conjoin two clauses, and no special pleading (much less ignoring of the problem) is required.

Although Indra’s name is not mentioned, *hanti vṛtrám* is of course a definitional predicate for Indra, who is also regularly identified as a *samrāj*-. The Maruts’ role in helping Indra in the Vṛtra conflict is of course one of the contended issues in the RV (see the Agastya hymn I.165 for example).

Re takes abc as expressing the three functions, which I find hard to see. Does he assume pāda b is the third function and c the second? Surely he doesn’t see the smashing of Vṛtra in c as third function!

VII.58.5: On *jijīliré* as a presential stative, see Kü (610–11).

VII.58.6: The first hemistich, which contains both *susṭutí*- ‘good praise’ and a form of $\sqrt{juṣ}$ ‘enjoy’ with the Maruts as subject, but in separate clauses is an expansion of 3b *jújoṣann ín marútaḥ susṭutím naḥ*. As was noted above, the first pāda of 3 also contains a pl. form of *maghāvan(t)*-, which I take there as referring to our human patrons, because I take the Maruts as subject of the 2nd pl. impv., but the presence of *maghónām* here, clearly referring to the Maruts, may instead suggest that the *maghāvanta*-s in 3a are also the Maruts.

idám in b (*idám sūktám*) is yet another example of the frequent use of a form of *ayám* in the last vs. of a hymn to refer to the whole preceding hymn.

VII.59 Maruts

VII.59.1: The āmreḍita *idám-idam* in pāda a must go with the clause in b. The *ca* that connects the two clauses is slightly displaced: we might expect it to occur after the first element of its clause, namely *idám-idam*. But the pāda boundary and the intrusion of a pāda-initial voc. *dévāsaḥ* have clearly interfered with the placement, and the sequence *yám ... yám ca* makes the syntax perspicuous.

The sequence of vocc. in cd is puzzling because the first is unaccented, while the rest are accented, including those that follow the first in the same pāda: *tásmā agne váruṇa mītrāryaman, mārutaḥ* ... We would, I think, expect either all accented (**ágne váruṇa mītrāryaman*) or all unaccented (*agne *varuṇa mītrāryaman*). Old suggests that a new “Ansatz” begins after *tásmā agne*, and it is of course true that the caesura follows *agne* -- but also of course true that vocatives are not ordinarily accented in that position. He also points out that the three vocc. in the 2nd part of the pāda are the names of the three principal Ādityas, which occur together and as accented vocc. elsewhere (V.67.1, VIII.19.35). In the latter passage the three vocc. are found pāda-internal post-caesura as here (see comm. ad loc.) Both of the factors adduced by Old no doubt contributed to the accentual behavior of this pāda, but it is a fine reminder that the rules of voc. accent, which we think of as fairly mechanical, are in part rhetorically driven.

VII.59.2: *yuṣmākam* ... *ávasā* is a variant of the cmpd. *yuṣmóta-* (i.e., *yuṣmā-ūta-*) found three times in the preceding hymn in VII.58.4.

The vs. contains two, or implicitly three, 3rd sg. act. present forms of the root $\sqrt{tṛ}$, *tarati* in b, *prá / ví tīrati* in c. For the same pairing of preverbs, see comm. ad VII.58.3 in the previous hymn.

VII.59.3: This vs. plays on the common contrast, also found earlier in this Marut cycle, between the Maruts as individuals -- here “the last” (*caramá-*) of them -- and as a collective (*vísve*).

On *sácā* as loc. absol. marker, see comm. ad IV.31.5.

I have rendered the nom. pl. *kāmínaḥ* as an adverb (avidly) to avoid the somewhat heavy ‘having desire (for it)’.

VII.59.3–4: Both of these vss. begin *nahí vaḥ*; in neither one is it easy to produce a causal value for *-hí*, hence my ‘certainly’. The opening of 4c *abhí vaḥ* plays on the *nahí vaḥ* of 3a, 4a.

VII.59.5: Both Ge and Re take c as a single clause (e.g., “Car je vous ai donné ces offrandes”), but the position of *hí* suggests that a new clause begins with preceding

raré, and *imā vo havyā* is a fine nominal clause announcing the oblations present right here on the ritual ground.

VII.59.6: The sequence *sádatāvitā* is analyzed by the Pp. as *sádata avitā*, with the latter form generally taken as a 2nd pl. impv. to \sqrt{av} ‘help’. But this interpr. is problematic on grounds of both form and meaning. There is no stem *avi-* to \sqrt{av} ; the best that can be done is to classify it with the *-iṣ-*aor. *ávīt*, etc., but, in addition to *-i-* rather than *-iṣ-*, the accent is wrong, since the *-iṣ-*aorist has root accent. Moreover, a form of ‘help’ fits badly in the passage, where the main verb should provide syntactic support for the infinitive phrase *spārhāṇi dātave vásu* “to give coveted goods.” These difficulties are treated in detail by Narten (Sig. aor. 87–88), who suggests an appealing and convincing solution, to read *sádatā vitā*, with the latter the 2nd pl. impv. to the root pres. of $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, a solution that does not require emending the Saṃhitā text. As Narten points out, this pres. appears elsewhere with an infinitive. Although we ideally would expect a long root vowel (**vītā*), she adduces the 2nd sg. impv. *vihí* (3x), beside more common *vīhí*, as a model. This solution is accepted by Lub, though it is rejected by Baum (Impv. in RV 93, although he hesitates p. 167); Klein (DGRV I.166, 167; II.39) implicitly accepts the Pp. reading, but he does not cite the following pāda containing the infinitive phrase.

The accent on the 2nd pl. impv. *sádatā* presumably results from its juxtaposition and contrast with adjacent *vitā*.

ásredhantaḥ at the beg. of c can be either a voc. or a nom. pl.; nothing hangs on the exact identification.

VII.59.7: I take pāda a as a nominal clause separate from b, with predicated pres. part. *śumbhamānāḥ*. The hemistich cannot form a single clause because *apaptan* in b is unaccented despite the *hí* in pāda a. I take the sense of the first pāda to be that storms come out of nowhere, fully beautified as it were, so the beautification must have been done “in secret” (*sasvár*). The dark-backed geese of b are the storm clouds. The next hymn, dedicated to Mitra and Varuṇa, has a similarly structured vs., VII.60.10 *sasvās cid dhí sámṛtis tveṣy eṣām apīcyèna sáhasā sáhante* “Because their fiery attack is even in secret and they are strong with hidden strength ...” (JPB tr.). In that vs. the finite verb in b, *sáhante*, is accented and therefore falls under the domain of *hí* in pāda a.

VII.59.8: *tiráś cittāni* is a striking expression, without obvious parallels. In interpreting it, we can begin by noting that *tiráś cid* is a reasonably frequent pāda opening (IV.29.1, V.75.7, VIII.33.14, 51.9, 66.12), including in the next hymn, VII.60.6. Although I toyed with the possibility of reading *tiráś cit tāni* here, with the neut. pl. prn., this does not seem to be productive. However, the fact that *tiráś cid* is a formulaic expression may help account for the fact that our *tiráś cittāni* seems to be only loosely connected syntactically to the rest of the clause. Ge takes the expression as meaning “against/contrary to expectation” (wider Erwartung), but I’m not at all sure that *tiráḥ* can mean ‘against’ (though see X.171.4 *devānām cit tiró vásam* “even

athwart the will of the gods”). And in any case we would surely want to punish someone who tried to kill us, whether we expected him to or not. Re’s “en croisant (nos) pensées” is better; I have adapted an English idiom “cross-purposes,” which is practically a calque on the Skt. phrase. Here it reflects the hostility between the would-be attacker and “us.”

VII.59.8–9: Although, as noted in the publ. intro., the last four vss. of the hymn (9–12) must be late additions, there is a verbal link between vs. 8 and vs. 9: *tápiṣṭhena* “with the most scorching ...” opening 8d is echoed by the Maruts’ ritual epithet *sāmtapanāḥ* opening 9a. This link may help account for why these Sākamedha vss. were attached just here.

VII.59.9–12: For the Sākamedha rites reflected in these vss., see publ. intro. and, e.g., ŚB II.5.3, esp. 3ff.; ĀpŚS VIII.9; sec. lit. including Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, 117–19; Keith, *Religion and Philosophy*, 322–23, etc.

VII.50.9: With the standard tr., I supply “come” in c, anticipating *ā gata* in 10a.

VII.59.11: The āmreḍita *ihéha* echoes that in vs. 1, *idám-idam*, forming a superficial ring. Given the apparent composite nature of the hymn, this apparent ring is presumably not a sign of a hymn conceived originally as a unity, but perhaps a hasty adjustment to try to integrate the separate pieces.

Pāda c appears to mean “I choose the/your sacrifice” (*yajñám ... ā vṛṇe*), as in Re’s “je choisis votre sacrifice.” But this doesn’t make a lot of sense in its baldest form. Although *ā √vṛ* normally just means ‘choose’, in this passage the *ā* appears to be used as it is with *√yaj*: *ā √yaj* means ‘attract through sacrifice’ (sim. *ā √pū* ‘attract through purification’), hence my “I will you (to come) here to (my) sacrifice,” that is, I attract you to it by the force of my will.

[VII.60–74 JPB]

VII.75 Dawn

VII.75.1: Although the Saṃhitā form *āvo* in pāda a (Pp. *āvaḥ*) is assigned to *√vṛ* ‘cover’ by Gr, it clearly belongs to *√vas* ‘shine, dawn’. See, e.g., AiG I.335. It is rightly glossed by Sāy. with *vyaucchat*. Both roots occur regularly with the preverb *ví* as here (‘dawn widely’ / ‘uncover’) and both are regularly found in dawn contexts. Here *ví ... āvas* explicitly contrasts with *āpa ... āvar (√vṛ)* ‘uncovered’ in c.

The latter form makes a bad Triṣṭubh cadence: ... *āvar ājuṣṭam#*, where we would expect *-var* to be a heavy syllable. Old (Prol. 424 n. 1) persuasively suggests that this apparent light syllable may actually represent **āvarr* (from original 3rd sg. **āvart*), with the same doubling of final resonant before initial vowel that we find in *-nn* from older **-nt*. He suggests the same for *kar* (IX.92.5) and *abibhar* (X.69.10), both of which would be metrically better as **-arr*.

āv- is something of a signature of this vs.: *āvo* ..., *āviṣ(kṛṇvānā)* ... / *āvar*, reinforced by numerous other *a-/ā-*initial words: *āgāt* / *āpa* ... *ājuṣtam*, *āṅgirastamā* ... *ajīgaḥ*.

The ‘truth’ (*ṛténa*) of Dawn must refer to her conforming to the standard patterns of the cosmos by dawning every day and indeed her embodiment of these patterns, since the regular alternation of night and day is the most salient sign of cosmic laws. The word here contrasts with *drúhaḥ* ‘deceits’ in c.

Corey Barnes (class, 12/15) pointed out the repeating pattern (*drúh*)*as táma* ... (*ājuṣ*)*tam*, (*āṅgir*)*astamā*, which showcases ‘darkness’.

In d I take *pathyā* as standing for acc. pl. *pathyāḥ* in harmony with the Pp. and the standard views. Scar (137 and n. 191) tentatively suggests taking it rather as an instr. *pathyā* (“gegen den Text”), modelled on *pathyā* (*jānānām*) in nearby VII.79.1, where either instr. sg. *-ā* or acc. pl. *-āḥ* is possible. Although “awaken the paths” with the acc. pl. is not an entirely straightforward expression, his instr. interpr. not only goes against the text but also requires supplying an obj. (“der Menschen”), and in addition “awaken (the men) along the path” doesn’t appreciably improve the sense. (Were they sleeping by the roadside?) I assume that “awaken the paths” is shorthand for “filling the paths with (newly awakened) people moving hither and thither and thereby making the paths lively.” An instr. in VII.79.1 fits the context better.

VII.75.2: Like the *āvaḥ* forms (see vs. 1), *bodhi* is ambiguous, and either interpr. could be made to fit the context. Gr takes it to \sqrt{budh} ‘be aware, be awake’, but most later interpr. assign it to $\sqrt{bhū}$ (Old, Ge, Re, Lub). However, I opt for \sqrt{budh} for several reasons. For one thing, as I have shown elsewhere (1997 “Syntactic Constraints on Morphological Change,” 69–74), *bodhi* to $\sqrt{bhū}$ is in virtual complementary distribution with the parallel impv. *bháva*, with *bodhi* confined to pāda-medial position, against *bháva*, which occurs initially and finally. A pāda-final *bodhi* here would violate this distributional rule. Moreover, the last word of the preceding vs. is *ajīgaḥ*, belonging to \sqrt{gr} ‘awaken’, and I think the poet is playing off these two ‘awaken’ roots. Although Old gives numerous supposed parallels with $\sqrt{bhū}$ and the syntactic construction in our pāda, most of these involve dat. infinitives. However, two give me pause — III.54.3 *mahé śu ṇaḥ suvitāya prá bhūtam*, VII.85.4 *ásad ít sá suvitāya* ... — both of which contain the dat. *suvitāya* and a form of ‘be(come)’. On the basis of these passages, I admit the possibility that *bodhi* here belongs to $\sqrt{bhū}$, but still think it likely that the poet is slyly playing with the ‘awaken’ roots. If it does belong to $\sqrt{bhū}$, I would explain its wrong positioning on the basis of strict parallelism between the semantically and syntactically parallel clauses of a and b, with the latter ending with the impf. (*prá*) *yandhi*.

Ge and Re construe *márteṣu* with *śravasyúm* (“... Reichtum, der unter den Sterblichen nach Ruhm strebt”; “... la richesse ... qui crée le renom parmi les mortels,” with Re adding a “creative” dimension to *śravasyú-* that does not seem to me to be justified, though it makes the tr. make more sense). I think rather that the sequence *dévi márteṣu mānuṣi* is meant to draw attention to two different relationships that Dawn, a goddess, has with the human world: on the one hand, she

comes among mortals (*márteṣu*) every day, awakening the whole human world; on the other, she has a special relationship with the descendents of Manu, that is, the Ārya sacrificial community, a much more restricted set of humans to whom she is more tightly bound by ritual activity.

VII.75.3: The focus shifts from the sg. Dawn of vss. 1–2 to her pl. beams (*bhānāvah*), but with lexical repetition linking them: *āguḥ* at the end of b echoes *āgāt* similarly positioned in 1b, *citrāḥ* repeats *citrām* (qualifying ‘wealth’) in 2c. And the nom. pl. beams and gen. sg. goddess are syntactically intertwined: *eté tyé bhānāvo* [nom. pl. m.] *darśatāyāś* [gen. sg. fem.] *citrā* [nom. pl. m.] *uśāso* [[gen. sg. fem.] *amṛtāsaḥ* [nom. pl. m.].

The phrase *janáyanto daívyāni vratāni* “generating the heavenly commandments” seems to expand on the *rténa* of vs. 1: by her dawning, Dawn every day recreates in visible form the rules that govern the cosmos.

VII.75.4: The initial *eṣā syā* “this very one” (fem.) matches *eté tyé* “these very ones” (masc.) opening the previous vs., referring to her beams.

As Old points out, pāda a lacks a syllable (even reading, as expected, *s’yā*). He tentatively suggests **yuyujānā*. It is certainly the case that *yujānā-*, which is fairly common, never appears in this post-caesura position, while the four occurrences of *yuyujānā-* are all post-caesura. But it is difficult to explain why the corruption would have occurred -- perhaps haplology in the sequence (*s’yā* **yuyu(jānā)*)?

The “patterns of the peoples” (*vayúnāni jánānām*) seem almost to be the human equivalent of the *daívyāni vratāni* of 3c.

The pāda-final pres. *jīgāti* picks up the aor. forms to the same root, also pāda-final, *āgāt* (1b), *āguḥ* (3b), but it also plays against the likewise redupl. *ajīgaḥ* at the end of 1d, belonging to the separate root \sqrt{gr} ‘awaken’.

VII.75.5: *citrā-* reappears in b (cf. 2c and 3b).

The polarized position of the phrases *ṛṣiṣṭutā* (beg. of c) and *vāhnibhir grṇānā* (end of d) helps anchor the application of *vāhni-* ‘conveyor’ to ‘conveyor of ritual offerings’, since ‘praised by seers’ is unambiguous. Cf. also I.48.11 *yé tvā grṇānti vāhnayaḥ*.

VII.75.6: And *citrā-* again, for the third time opening a b pāda.

The metaphorical use of *vāhni-* found in the previous vs. contrasts with the literal use (well, as literal as the RV gets) of the participle *vāhantaḥ* ‘conveying’ referring to Dawn’s horses (*ásvāḥ*).

VII.75.7: The first hemistich consists of four consecutive etymological figures, all nom. sg. fem. + instr. pl. masc. — simple but effective.

On cd see Hoffmann (Injunk. 134).

VII.75.8: Since it directly follows *vāvaśanta* ‘(the cows) keep bellowing (7d)’, *nū* no opening the vs. is surely meant to evoke the root \sqrt{nu} ‘bellow, roar’, also used of bovines, with its (pseudo?) intensive (*ā*)*nūnot* (also *nónuv-*), though of course it really consists of particle followed by enclitic pronoun.

VII.76 Dawn

On the intricate structure of this hymn and its relationship to verb tense, see publ. intro. As noted there, vss. 1–2 have augmented aorists referring to the immediate past (*ásret* 1b, *ajaniṣṭa* 1c, *akar* 1d, *adṛśran* 2a, *ābhūt* 2c, *āgāt* 2d); vss. 3–4 have augmented imperfects and one perfect referring to the more distant past (*āsan* 3a, 4a, *dadrkṣé* 3d, *avindan* 4c, *ajanayan* 4d); and vss. 5–7 have present indicatives and imperatives stating general truths and urging action (*sām jānate* ... *yatante* 5b, *minanti* 5c, *īlate* 6a, *ucha* 6c, *jarasva* 6d, *ribhyate* 7b).

VII.76.1: Unlike the previous hymn, which contains no other divinities, this vs. introduces two (though one without name) before mentioning Uṣas, who enters only as the very last word of the vs. The two other gods are Savitar (b) and Sūrya in his role as “eye of the gods” (*devānām* ... *cákṣuḥ*, c).

The two virtually synonymous adj. *viśvājanya-* ‘belonging to all people’ and *viśvānara-* ‘belonging to all men’ are juxtaposed across the pāda boundary (a/b); they refer to two different entities: the immortal light (*jyótir amṛtam*), presumably the sun, and god Savitar (*savitā devāḥ*). As such they may also subtly allude to the well-known group, the All Gods, with their first member(s) *viśvá-* and the ‘men’ words implicitly summoning up the opposite, *devá-*. The pl. gods then show up in c, with another occurrence of *viśva-* in d.

In c it is not possible to determine whose *krātu-* is being referred to. Ge takes it as the gods’, and certainly the adjacency of the two words (*krátvā devānām*) is suggestive. Re seems to favor Uṣas. However, given that it is Savitar’s action in ab that raised the light, I think it likely that the *krātu-* is his.

VII.76.2: On the relation of this vs. to its paired frame vs. 5, see publ. intro. Their relationship is signalled in the first instance by patterned repetition, with 2b and 5b almost identical: *āmardhanto vásubhiḥ* x x x x. This patterned repetition also involves poetic repair. The qualifier *āmardhantaḥ* ‘not negligent’, used unusually of paths in vs. 2b, returns in 5d with a far more appropriate referent, the Fathers or their modern-day representatives, the Vasiṣṭhas. The standard tr. either ignore the identity of the two words, found in the same metrical position, and tr. each in a way that fits the context as the tr. sees it (so Ge “unfehlbar” 2b versus “nicht zurückstehend” 2d) or choose an anodyne tr. that doesn’t reflect the act. transitive morphology of the form (Re “impeccable” in both places). But forms of the root \sqrt{mrdh} generally take an acc. obj. (or an enclitic prn. that is likely acc.) in the sense ‘neglect X’, and we would expect the participle, even negated, to reflect the same usage. As usual, I think it is incumbent on us to follow the morphology, even when it leads us to interpretations that seem, at first, awkward. Here I would first point out that Dawn

“awakened” the paths in the previous hymn (VII.75.1d *pathyā ajīgaḥ*), so paths in this group of hymns appear to have more animacy than might be expected. The paths in our vs. are the ones that lead to the gods (*devayānāḥ*), and in this context “non-negligent paths” could be ones that don’t fail to lead us there, perhaps because they stay in good order, as is implied by the qualifier *īṣkṛta-*. As often with such semantic mismatches, the sense that comes from apparently incompatible words construed together is hard won, but it also leads to a deeper understanding of what the poet intended.

In the ppl. *īṣkṛta-* here and in a number of other locutions involving *īṣ* + \sqrt{kr} (*īṣkartār-*, *īṣkṛti-*, etc.), *īṣ-* behaves like a pseudo-preverb. The most likely default source for this *īṣ-* is the root noun of the same shape meaning ‘refreshment, nourishing drink’ (so EWA s.v. *īṣ-*), although the semantics makes difficulties: the additive meaning we might expect (‘prepare nourishment’ vel sim.) is not found. Instead it seems to mean something like ‘set in order, set to rights, restore’. Although some interpr. the idiom as ‘heal’ (see EWA loc. cit.), I see no good evidence for this in the RV; certainly “healed paths” here would be even more aberrant than “non-negligent” ones. The form here is the only occurrence of the lexeme *īṣ* \sqrt{kr} in the Family Books; otherwise it is limited to the late RV: the finite verb *īṣkṛṇudhvam* X.53.7, the past participle here and in the cmpd. *īṣkṛtāhāva-* X.101.6, as well as negated *āniṣkṛta-* VIII.99.8 and IX.39.2, agent nouns *īṣkartar-* VIII.1.12 and *īṣkartār-* VIII.99.8, X.140.5, and the fem. abstract *īṣkṛti-* X.97.9. Besides its possible etymological connection with *īṣ-* ‘refreshment’ (textually hinted at only in IX.39.2), it also seems to form an antonymic pair with *nīṣ* \sqrt{kr} ‘expel’; see the hymn to healing herbs, X.97, where *īṣkṛti-* is contrasted with *nīṣkṛti-*, *nīṣ kṛtha*. This rhyming contrast may account for the ‘restore’ sense, antonymic to ‘expel’. Our passage also contains interaction with a different pseudo-preverb: *īṣ-kṛta-* can be seen as picking up (*āv*)*īr akar* in 1c. Though the augment induces *-r* sandhi, the underlying idiom is *āvīṣ* \sqrt{kr} (e.g., IV.4.5 *āvīṣ kṛṇuṣva*) with *-īṣ* matching *īṣkṛta-* here.

purāstāt / *pratīcī* “from the east, facing west” is another example of a paired contrast across a pāda boundary.

VII.76.3–4: As noted in the publ. intro., these two vss. are defined as an omphalos, and this relationship is signaled by the patterned repetition of their first pādas: 3a *tānīd ... āsan* / 4a *tā īd ... āsan* “just those were ...”

VII.76.3: Despite the straightforward, indeed ballad-like opening (“those were the days ...”), the syntax of the rest of this vs. is difficult to entangle. The problem is that there appear to be two subordinating expressions (*yā* in b, *yātaḥ pári* in c), though it is difficult to identify more than one subordinate clause; if there are two subordinate clauses, one of them would have very sketchy clausal structure. Nonetheless, Ge and Re opt for the latter solution, supplying a verb in b, both taking *yā* as neut. pl. nom. and the subject of this clause (e.g., “Nombreux furent ces jours en vérité qui (surgirent) autrefois ...”); for them cd is then a new subordinate cl. marked by *yātaḥ pári* referring to these same days (e.g., “à la suite desquels ...”). Something like this

is possible, and in my many fiddlings with this vs. over the years I have more than once hovered over something like it. But the stumbling block is *prācīnam* in b, which both Ge and Re must take as an adverbial temporal expression (“vorher” and “autrefois” respectively), even though this stem is otherwise only locational ‘forwards / towards the east’, often in a ritual context. I can see no way to integrate the standard use of this stem into a nominal clause consisting only of pāda b. I therefore take bcd as a single subordinate clause with two markers of subordination, *yā* (b) a neut. pl. acc. extent of time (“through which ...”) and *yātaḥ pári* (c) referring to the place from which Dawn comes, picking up *purástāt* in 2c. The *yā* is more narrowly construed with the finite verb *dadṛkṣé* in d (“... the days through which you became visible” -- that is, dawned over and over), the *yātaḥ pári* with the participle *ācārantī* “faring forth thence [= from the east].”

I further take *prācīnam* as the goal of that participle (“faring forth ... towards the east-facing [sacrifice]”). As I just noted, *prācīna-* is often found in a ritual context, modifying *yajñá-* (VII.7.3) or *barhís-* (I.188.4, IV.5.4, X.110.4). Either would be possible here, and the point would be that Dawn is hastening from the east towards the sacrifice that, like an expectant lover, is facing towards her. Assuming with most comm., beginning with Sāy. (see esp. Old’s argumentation) that we should read loc. *jāré*, contra Pp. *jārāḥ*, the acc. *prācīnam* in the frame would be the functional equivalent of *jāré* in the simile -- GOAL -- despite the mismatch of cases, a nice example of case disharmony in a simile (as discussed in my 1982 IIJ article).

Although I realize that this is a very fussy solution, I cannot see any other way to deal with the troublesome *prācīnam*. And it is, after all, an omphalos vs., where perturbations are common. Strictly speaking, my tr. fails to render both subordinators as such: “thence” should be “whence.” But the tr. is hard enough to parse as it is.

The contrastively paired similes, “like (a maiden) faring forth to her lover, not like one going (home) again” (*jārā ivācārantī ... ná púnar yatīva*), are well understood by the standard comm. and nicely indicate that Dawn dawns with as much speed as she can muster, eager for reunion with her lover, rather than lingering like one reluctantly leaving a tryst. For the first cf. I.123.9 ... *yóṣā ná ... niṣkṛtām ācārantī* “going to the appointed place like a maiden to a rendezvous,” also of Dawn (see also VI.75.4 in the weapon hymn). The *iva* is wrongly placed in the 2nd simile, but the poet had too many elements to fit in as it was.

VII.76.4: Although this vs. begins in the same way as vs. 3, the syntax is quite straightforward, with no dependent clauses and the Fathers as subject throughout. Once again we might consider this an example of poetic repair, given the syntactic difficulties the previous vs. posed.

VII.76.5: As noted above, this vs. marks the transition to present-tense verbs and imperatives from the distant past of vss. 3–4. Who the subject of these verbs is in vs. 5 is not entirely clear. Until the very last syllable of the first hemistich, it is impossible to know even the gender, but the oddly positioned *té* at the end of pāda b identifies the subject as masc.; up until then, since *sámgatāsaḥ* could be either masc.

or fem., the fem. Dawns are a possibility. The second hemistich repeats the *té* immediately (c), and adds an unambig. masc. adj. *ámardhantaḥ* (as well as potentially ambig. *yādamānāḥ*). Once *té* restricts the subject to masc., our immediate thought would be the Fathers, who are the subject of vs. 4. This is the solution of both Ge and Re. However, the temporal switch between 4 and 5 might speak against that. In vs. 6 the Vasiṣṭhas are explicitly identified as the subject (6a). My own view is that the subject of vs. 5 is deliberately left unspecified, to allow a transition between, and identification of, the Fathers and their latter-day representatives the Vasiṣṭhas. That the Fathers are at least arguably present is suggested by *samāná ūrvé* “in a common pen,” since *ūrvá-* frequently refers to the Vala cave where the cows/dawns are confined and therefore could set the action of the vs. in mythological time when, as the preceding vs. notes, the Fathers “found the hidden light” and “generated the dawns,” as in the Vala myth. As for a contemporary reference, “common pen” could refer to the sacrificial ground, where the Vasiṣṭhas would be acting in concert.

In addition to specifying the gender of the subject of ab, the final *té* also repeats the final syllables of the two verbs that precede it in the pāda, *jānate ... yatante*.

VII.77 Dawn

On the structure of this hymn, as signaled by its verb forms and personal reference, see publ. intro. The first three vss. contain a series of sg. augmented aorists (started with a perfect), all but *ābhūt* with Dawn as 3rd ps. subj.: *úpa ruruce*, *ābhūt*, *ákar*, *úd asthāt*, *ásvait*, *aroci* (which last almost forms a ring with the opening pf.), *adarśi*, into which fem. sg. pres. participles have been interspersed: *prasuvántī*, *bādhmānā*, *bíbhṛatī*, *vāhantī*, *náyantī*. Following that we get in vss. 4–5a an equally insistent series of imperatives: *ucha*, *kṛdhi*, *yāvaya*, *ā bhara*, *codāya*, *ví bhāhi*, with Dawn as 2nd ps. subject. In 5b the fem. pres. parts return: *pratirántī*, *dádhatī*. In the last vs. the pattern is broken again: a pl. present *vardháyanti* with the Vasiṣṭhas as subject, found in the only subordinate cl. in the hymn, and in the last pāda before the clan refrain an aor. injunctive in imperativial usage, *dhāḥ*.

VII.77.1: \sqrt{ruc} appears with the preverb *úpa* only here. I connect it with the simile *yuvatír ná yóṣā* “like a young maiden”: *úpa* generally connotes ‘up close, intimate’, and *úpa* \sqrt{ruc} may suggest the beguiling radiance of a beloved young girl close by.

As Re points out, $\sqrt{bhū}$ + dat. inf. is rare. Here *ābhūt ... samídhe* seems to be the intrans./pass. equivalent of a periphrastic causative $\sqrt{kṛ}$ *samídhe*, as in I.113.9 *úṣo yád agníṃ samídhe cakārtha* “O Dawn, since you have caused the fire to be kindled,” adduced by both Ge and Re. For a periphrastic caus. nearby, see VII.75.8 *mā ... nidé kar* “Don’t put to scorn ...”

I do not know why we have pf. *ruruce* in a vs. containing two augmented aorists, *ābhūt* and *ákar*, with two more in the next hemistich (2a *asthāt*, 2b *ásvait*); the passive aor. (*a*)*roci* would have been possible, and is in fact found in 2d.

VII.77.2: Whatever the reason for the pf. *ruruce* in vs. 1, its semi-repetition in the aor. *aroci* in 2d inaugurates a pattern of lexical chaining in the first part of this hymn.

viśvam opening the vs. may pick up *viśvaṃ jīvám* “every living thing” of the previous vs. or anticipate *viśvam* in 3d, where I supply ‘world’.

In c the bahuvrīhi *sudṛṣṭika-saṃdrś-* ‘having an appearance lovely to see’ is an internal etymological figure, ... *dṛṣṭika-* ... *dṛś-*. Since the final segment of the cmpd, underlying *-ś* (or rather the product of nom sg. *-ś+s*), appears as *-g* in sandhi, it echoes the *-k-* of the prior member: *sudṛṣṭika-saṃdr̥g*.

VII.77.3: More chaining: the compound etym. figure with *dṛś* in 2c is echoed not only by a repetition of the entire first member of the cmpd. *sudṛṣṭika-* (3b) but also in the pass. aor. *adarśi* (3c), while the fem. agent noun *netrī* of 2d returns as a participle *náyantī* (3b), likewise fem., and the aor *aśvait* of 2b matches the adj. *śvetá-* in 3b.

VII.77.4: On the abrupt change of tense/mood and of person here see above and publ. intro. Notably, the lexical chaining stops here as well.

In pāda a *ánti-* ‘nearby’ contrasts with *dūré* ‘in the distance’, though the first is in a cmpd. and the latter is not. The ‘away’ / ‘here’ contrast is also found in c, though *yāvāya* means ‘keep away’ without benefit of preverb or adverb, while *ā* serves for ‘here’. The objects of the antithetical pairs are similar in the two pādas: “(bring) nearby” takes *-vāma-* ‘valuable things’ (a), *vásuni* ‘goods’ (c); “keep/send away” *amítam* ‘foe’ (a), *dvéṣaḥ* ‘hatred’ (c). Re comments similarly. *ánti-* may also implicitly refer back to the semantically similar *úpa* opening the first vs. and mark the beginning of the 2nd section of the hymn. For the complementary opposition *ánti* / *dūrá-* in a similar passage, cf. IX.78.5 *jahí śátrum antiké dūraké ca yáḥ* “Smash the rival nearby and the one who is in the distance.”

The VP *dūré amítam ucha* “dawn the foe into the distance” displays an apparent transitive sense of \sqrt{vas} ‘dawn’. This transitive sense is otherwise limited to *ápa* \sqrt{vas} ‘dawn (X) away’, as in nearby VII.81.6 *uṣā uchad ápa srídhaḥ* “Dawn dawns away failures” (=I.48.8; cf. VII.104.23, VIII.47.18). In our passage the locational adverb *dūré* ‘in the distance’ fills the role of the preverb *ápa* ‘away’, a point also made by Re. Baum’s interpr. (Impv. in RV, 164) of *amítam* as an acc. of goal, in the sense “‘illuminate the enemy (when he is) far away,’ i.e. prevent him from hiding,” is unlikely, and he does not mention the *ápa* \sqrt{vas} passages.

VII.77.5: I take the two *ca*’s in cd as marking a “both ... and” construction: *íṣaṃ ca ... gómad áśvāvad ráthavac ca rādhah* “both refreshment and largesse in cattle, horses, (and) chariots.” Though ordinarily we might expect the 2nd *ca* to be placed after the first term in the second constituent (hence* *gómac ca ...*), I explain its late position as resulting from treating the three parallel *-vat* adjectives as a unitary qualifier; it also allows the complementary placements of *ca* in cd: #X *ca* ..., ... *ca* Y#. Klein interprets the passage very differently, taking the two *ca*’s as independent: the first as conjoining the two participial clauses in bc (... *pratirántī* ... / ... *ca* ...

dádhatī ...)(DGRV I.104–5) and the second as an XYZ *ca* construction, conjoining the -*vat* adjectives (86 and *passim*).

VII.78 Dawn

On the lexical marks of this hymn, see publ. intro. The signature word *prāti* opens the hymn and is repeated at the beginning of the first two pādas of vs. 2 and in the middle of 3a; it returns at the beginning of the last vs. (5), thus sketching a ring. The other signature word, fem. pres. part. *vibhātī*- ‘radiating widely’ is concentrated in the latter part of the hymn, ending the pādas 3b, 4b, and 5c.

VII.78.2: The lexeme *āpa* √*bādh* appears, as often, in tmesis. This tmesis appears to be regular even when the lexeme appears, as here, in the participle (univerbated as *apabādhmāna*- only in the late X.103.4; in tmesis I.35.3, 90.3, V.80.5, IX.97.43 as well as here). But in our passage *āpa* is oddly positioned for a preverb in tmesis (which may account for Gr’s failure to register the preverb, as also in V.80.5): immediately following the object and not adjacent to a metrical boundary, ... *bādhmānā, víśvā támāṃsi duritāpa devī*. Although this aberrant position might suggest that *āpa* is not a preverb here but a postposition or adverb, this would require separating the expression from the well-attested verbal lexeme, which I prefer not to do. I should however note that in vs. 1b *bādhmānā támāṃsi* is found without *āpa*.

VII.78.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. departs from the practice of the rest of the hymn by referring to plural Dawns.

prāty adṛśran in the middle of pāda a repeats the opening of the hymn (1a), with polarized #*prāti* ... *adṛśran*#. The plural subject in vs. 1 are Dawn’s “beacons” (*ketāvah*).

VII.78.5: As noted in the publ. intro., the hapax denom. *tilvilāyādhvam* is the most notable feature of this hymn. This verb is clearly built to the adj. *tīlvila*-, found in V.62.7, where it appears to mean something like ‘fertile’: *bhadré kṣétre nímitā tīlvile vā* “(the pillar) fixed in the good or ___ field/land.” Note not only the *l*-s, but the rhyming *til-vil*-, a word-formation tactic not otherwise found in standard Vedic; the standard assumption is that it is a non-Indo-Aryan word (see, e.g., Kuiper, Aryans 14). The standard interpr. take it as a (presumably more specific) synonym to *bhadrá*-, though of course the *vā* ‘or’ construction could identify it as a contrast or even opposite to *bhadrá*-. If the word belongs to the agricultural sphere (as *kṣétra*- ‘field’ suggests), a non-IAr origin makes sense. It is sometimes connected (see EWA s.v.) with *tilá*- (AV+) ‘sesame’, which also lacks an IAr etym. The word *tīlvila*- is found in later Vedic; most of the occurrences are in similar passages in the gṛhya sūtras for the erection of a housepost and are clearly dependent on RV V.62.7 (e.g., ĀśGS 2.8.16, ŚāṅkhGS 3.3.1), but a ŚB passage seems to place it in the ‘fruitful, fertile, rich’ sphere. The passage concerns a cow let out to wander; whichever direction she goes will predict what will happen to the sacrificer. ŚB IV.5.8.11 *yādi*

pratīcīyād ībhyatilvīla iva dhānyatilvilo bhaviṣyatīti vidyāt (Eggeling) “If she goes westwards, let him know that he will be rich in dependants and crops.”

VII.79 Dawn

As noted in the publ. intro., *vī* is the signature word of this hymn. The first and last hemistichs of the hymn (1a, 5c) begin with *vī* and a form (indeed two, in the etymological figure in 1a) of \sqrt{vas} : 1a *vy uṣā āvaḥ* and 5c *vyuchāntī*, forming a ring, and *vī* opens 1d, 2a, 3c, 4d as well. This preverb also gets played with in various ways: 2b opens with *vīso* ‘clans’, whose 1st syllable falsely promises the preverb. The regular oppositional counterpart of *vī*, namely *sām*, opens 2c and provides the 2nd syllable of 1c (*susamdṛgbhiḥ*). The alliteration of 3c is also set in motion by its opening *vī* (see below).

VII.79.1: This vs. echoes the 1st vs. of VII.75 in several ways, and VII.75.1 is helpful in resolving the verbal ambiguities in this one. Our vs. contains two occurrences (pādas a, d) of *vī ... āvaḥ* in exactly that sandhi form. The 3rd sg. augmented root aor. form *āvaḥ* is entirely ambiguous between \sqrt{vas} ‘dawn’ and \sqrt{vr} ‘obstruct, cover’, and the preverb *vī* does not help, since *vī* \sqrt{vas} regularly means ‘dawn widely’ and *vī* \sqrt{vr} ‘uncover, open’. VII.75.1 also contains two such forms, but both of them are in sandhi forms that allow their root affiliation to be unambiguously identified. VII.75.1 opens exactly like our vs., *vy uṣā āvaḥ*, but in VII.75 the sandhi form of the verb is *āvo*, which must belong to \sqrt{vas} . Pāda c of VII.75.1 contains *āvar* (though in tmesis with *āpa* rather than *vī*); again, the sandhi form *-ar* makes it clear that this verb must belong to \sqrt{vr} . Given the parallelism of the two vss., it seems almost as if VII.75.1 is providing a guide to the ambiguities of our vs. In any case the standard interpr. all distribute the *āvaḥ* forms in this vs. as just laid out.

There is another echo between the two vss.: pāda a here contains *pathyā*, which could represent either instr. sg. *pathyā* (so Pp.) or acc. pl. *pathyāḥ* out of sandhi, recalling *pathyā* in VII.75.1d, which must represent acc. pl. *-āḥ* before a vowel. In this passage I favor the instr. sg. Note also that *pāñca ksītīḥ* opening our b pāda opens VII.75.4b.

VII.79.2: Whatever the etymology of *aktū-* ‘night’ -- I favor the connection with PIE **nok^wt-* ‘night’, pace EWA s.v.; see most recently LIN 505 and n. 20 -- it is here at least secondarily associated with $\sqrt{añj}$ ‘anoint’ (which for some, e.g., EWA, is its etymon), since *aktūn* serves as obj. of *vy añjate*. My “glossy nights” is an attempt to capture the pun. For those who consider *aktū-* a derivative of $\sqrt{añj}$, *aktūn* here would be an internal obj. / cognate acc.; cf. Oberlies (Relig. v. II.111): “Die [rotglühenden] Morgenröten verstreichen ihre Farbe ...”

In any case, *aktūn* participates in two phonetic figures: *añjate ... anteṣu aktūn* and the near-mirror-image *aktū(n) ... yuktā(h)*.

As in the previous hymn (VII.78), Dawn is sg. in this hymn, except in one vs., in this case this one; in VII.78, vs. 3.

VII.79.3: #*ábhūd uṣā(h)* is reminiscent of #*ábhūd agníh* in VII.77.2, though there the construction involved a predicated infinitive. See also VII.76.2 #*ábhūd u ketúr uṣásaḥ*.

Dawn is *índratamā* because she is *maghónī* ‘bounteous’ as he is *maghávan(t)-*. The splv. suffix *-tamā* echoes *támaḥ* ‘darkness’ in the previous vs., 2c.

As Re points out, *suvitāya* in b recalls *duritā* in VII.78.2.

Pāda c displays heavy alliteration: *ví divó devī duhitā dadhāti*. The pattern is set in motion by the preverb *ví*, which, as was noted above, is the hymn’s signature word. The first three words in c have *ví* itself, its inverse (*d*)*iv(ó)*, and a long-vowel variant (*de*)*vī*, but in the meantime the *d* pattern has asserted itself and carries through to the end of the pāda. The elements of this sequence are found nearby each other in other hymns in this cycle, though not with the same intense concentration. Cf. esp. VII.77.5–6: 5b *devi*, 5c *dádhatī*, 6a *divó duhitā*.

VII.79.4: As slowly becomes clear, this vs. concerns the Vala myth, as the last pāda, describing the opening of “the doors of the firm-fixed stone,” illustrates. This slipping into the Vala story accounts for the otherwise puzzling *āṅgirastamā* ‘best / most like the Aṅgirasas’ in the previous vs. (3d; found also in nearby VII.75.1, also in a potential Vala context). The Aṅgirasas, of course, were responsible, along with Indra, for opening the Vala cave and releasing the imprisoned cows; they did so by singing. As Ge points out, the praisers who benefit from Dawn’s largesse in 4b are most likely the Aṅgirasas, and they would also then be the subjects of c.

Note the phonetic echo between *rādhō* (a) and (*á*)*rado* (b), which is then found scrambled in d (*dú*)*ro ádr(eḥ)*. Pāda d also contains internal phonetic play with *d*’s and *r*’s, as well as *a*, *u*, and *o*: ... *dṛḷh(asya) dúro, adr(e)r āūr(ṇ)o(h)*. This is the only trisyllabic reading of the augmented stem *aurṇo-* and the vowel hiatus *a-ū* (or *a’ū*?) emphasizes the phonetic figures.

The verb in c, the pf. *jajñúḥ*, is perfectly ambiguous between $\sqrt{\text{jan}}$ ‘beget’ and $\sqrt{\text{jñā}}$ ‘recognize’. It is now standardly taken to the former, though Ge previously (Ved. St.) assigned it to the latter, a stance criticized by Old and silently given up by Ge in his tr.

VII.79.5: As noted in the intro. above, *vyuchántī*, which opens the last pāda of the hymn (save for the clan refrain), forms a ring with the opening phrase (1a) *vy uṣā āvaḥ*. This reinforces the affiliation of *āvaḥ* in 1a with $\sqrt{\text{vas}}$, not $\sqrt{\text{vr}}$.

VII.80 Dawn

VII.80.1: This vs. reprises various parts of the other dawn hymns in this cycle. The first hemistich *prāti ... uṣásam ... abudhran* echoes VII.78.5a *prāti tvā ... budhanta*, with each having the mortal worshipers as subject. (Note augmented *abudhran* versus injunctive *budhanta*.) In c Dawn is “unrolling” the two world halves (*vivartáyantīm*), while in VII.79.2c her cows “roll up” the darkness (*sám ... táma ā vartayanti*) with the preverb *sám* complementary to *ví*. In our vs. *sám* is found in the

same pāda in the adjective describing the two world-halves, *sámante* ‘adjoining’. Finally, Dawn’s role in “revealing all beings” (*āviṣkṛṇvatīm bhúvanāni víśvā*) reminds us of her revealing her own greatness (*āviṣkṛṇvānā mahimānam*) in the first vs. of this cycle (VII.75.1b). The act. part. in our vs. is externally focused, while the middle part. in VII.75.1 properly captures the internal focus of that expression. The act. expression is also found in VII.76.1 *āvīr kar bhúvanam víśvam uṣāḥ*.

Ge takes du. *rājasī* as referring to the Dark (and Light), i.e., Night and Day. But du. *rājasī* ordinarily refers to the two world-halves and is often used in conjunction with *ródasī* (e.g., I.160.4, IV.42.3), and I see no reason to seek a different referent here. Dawn’s action of ‘unrolling’ the two world-halves would refer to the visual effect of the gradual revealing of their features as the dawn’s light strengthens. For a similar notion, though with *ví√vr* ‘uncover’, see the previous hymn VII.79.1 *ví sūryo ródasī cákṣasāvaḥ* “The Sun has uncovered the two world-halves with his eye.”

VII.80.2: Because of the middle voice of the part., I interpr. *návyam āyur dádhanā* as referring to Dawn’s new life, which she would then assume every day. The middle voice contrasts with VII.77.5 *pratirántī na āyuh* “(she,) lengthening our lifetime.” Both Ge and Re seem to imply that in our passage the new life is established for others.

The sg. *abodhi* at the end of the first hemistich matches the pl. *abudhran* in the same position in vs. 1.

Pāda d *prācikitat sūryam yajñám agním* is exactly parallel to VII.78.3 *ājjanat sūryam yajñám agním*, which suggests that *ācikitat* is felt as a redupl. aor. to the caus. *cetáyati*, despite the obvious drawbacks of form (we would expect **acīkitat*).

VII.80.3: This vs. is identical to VII.41.7, though it may fit better here.

The three *-v/matī-* adj., *áśvāvatīr gómatīḥ ... vīrávatīḥ*, modifying the pl. ‘dawns’ reprise the sequence at the end of the first hymn in this cycle, VII.75.8 *gómad vīrávat ... áśvāvat*, where they qualified *rátanam*.

VII.81 Dawn

VII.81.1: Note the adjacency of *támaḥ* and *jyótiḥ*, though here across the pāda break.

VII.81.3: The stem *vānanvant-*, in my opinion, must be separated into two separate words on semantic grounds, neither of which is entirely clear morphologically. In VIII.102.19 and X.92.15, where it is associated with an axe (*svádhiti-*) in the identical phrase *svádhitiḥ vānanvati*, it appears to belong with *vāna-* ‘wood’. Cf. for the association IX.96.3 ... *svádhitiḥ vānanām*, X.89.7 *svádhitiḥ váneva*. But in VIII.6.34 it modifies *matīḥ* ‘thought’ in a context in which ‘wood(en)’ seems effectively excluded. In both VIII.1.31 and our passage I also find it difficult to make ‘wooden’ work, though Ge, for example, thinks our voc. addressed to Dawn (may -- he tag it with ? --) mean “Wagenbesitzende,” on the assumption that the wagon is

wooden and the material has come to refer to the object made of it. In VIII.1.31, where it modifies ‘horses’ (*áśvān*), he takes it as referring to their wooden yokes. (He refuses to tr. the form in VIII.6.34.) Mayrhofer (both KEWA s.v. *vānam* and EWA s.v. *vān-*) favors the ‘wood’ connection as well, and in EWA suggests that *vānan-* is the *-n-*form of a heteroclit, whose *-r-* is found in the locative 1st cmpd member *vanar-* (though one would of course not expect the *-r-* in the oblique). Re, having written in favor of the ‘wood’ connection (BSL 37: 19), disavows it in his n. to this passage in EVP III, in favor of “gracieuse,” on what seem firm grounds. Old discusses the problem with his customary acuity and decides for a derivation from \sqrt{van} ‘win, hold dear’, with a pun on ‘wood’ in VIII.102.19 and X.92.15. Although I generally favor seeing audacious metaphors in the RV, in this particular case I find that putting all the forms of *vānanvant-* under one rubric unduly stretches the metaphorical fabric -- though I might be open to Old’s suggestion that in VIII.102.19 and X.92.15 there is a pun on ‘wood’, but the form belongs with \sqrt{van} . This does not, however, help with the morphology. I tentatively suggest that the form derived from \sqrt{van} is the result of the further derivation or contamination of originally participial forms. The 8th class present to \sqrt{van} *vanóti* has an act. part. *vanvánt-*; if this acquired a *-vant-* suffix, the result would be in the first instance **vanv-án(t)-vant-*, which by dissimilation of the middle *-v-* could develop into our form (though with accent shift). Or the pf. part. *vavan-váms-* could have dissimilated to **vānan-váms-* (again accent is a problem). Or, starting with the pres. part. *vanv-ánt-*, we could imagine a perseverative form **vanv-an(t)-ant-*, with migration of the 2nd *-v-*. Or we can concoct an intens. stem **vanvan-* with participle **vanvan-a(n)t-*, again with flip of the *v*. But all of these scenarios are pure fantasy, I’m afraid. As for the form putatively derived from ‘wood’, I have even less idea, though I suppose it’s worth pointing out that all attested forms from both stems *vanánvant-* actually have the weak form of the suffix *-vat-* and **vāna-vatV*, built directly to *vāna-*, would be metrically unfavorable.

VII.81.4: This vs. presents several minor syntactic problems. Pāda b contains two apparent dative infinitives, the almost synonymous *prakhyai* and *dṛśé*, most likely to be construed with *kṛṇóṣi* in pāda a. The standard interpr. take the two infinitives as separate parallel constructions, though the details of these constructions differ acdg. to tr. (cf., besides Ge and Re, Scar [353] and Keydana [Inf., 167, 203]). As a typical ex., see Scar’s “... die du ... machst, dass man sieht und man das Licht schaut.” Although as far as I know there is no way to tell, I prefer to take both the datives with *svàr*; the standard expression *svàr dṛśé* indicates that the sun is visible, available for seeing, while *prakhyai* is used in a similar fashion to *cákṣase* in 1c.

The 2nd hemistich is more problematic. The first question is the grammatical identity of *ratnabhājah*, which could be gen. sg. and modify immediately preceding fem. gen. *táśyās te*, or nom. pl. and modify the implied pl. subj. ‘we’ of immediately following 1st pl. *īmahe*. Ge opts for the latter (“... die du Belohnungen austeilst”), but Old, Re, and Scar favor the nom. pl., as do I. For one thing other *-bhāj-* cmpds have similar syntacto-semantic value (“having a share of X”), rather than the transitive sense (“sharing out X”) required by the gen. interpr. It is of course possible that the

positioning between the gen. sg. and the 1st pl. was deliberate, and the form is meant to be ambiguous.

The other problem lies in the interpr. of the two verbs *īmahe* (c) and *syāma* (d). The standard interpr. take the pāda break as a clause break (“as sharers of your treasure we beseech you; may we be like sons ...”). I find this mildly problematic, in that *ratnabhājaḥ* would be better construed with *syāma* (“might we be sharers ...”) than with *īmahe*, and I have therefore taken it that way, with *īmahe* parenthetical and the simile in d an adjunct. This interpr. is supported by VI.71.6 *vāmabhājaḥ syāma* “May we be partakers of the valuables” (sim. III.55.22 *sákhāyas te vāmabhājaḥ syāma*). However, my interpr. not only complicates the syntax slightly, but the lack of accent on parenthetical *īmahe* might be troublesome -- though I don’t have strong intuitions on how verbal accent works with parentheticals. (The one example I can come up with, however, does accent the verb that interrupts the clause: X.95.1 *mānasā tīstha ghore vácāṃsi miśrā kṛṇavāvahai nau* “Thoughtfully -- stand still, fearsome woman! -- let us two now exchange words.”) In any case it might be better to follow the standard interpr. and tr. something like “we beseech you ([for us] to be) sharers in your treasure; may we be like sons to a mother” -- though as the tr. shows, taking *īmahe* with *ratnabhājaḥ* requires more semantic machinery.

In c *táśyās te* is a fairly unusual ex. of the double *sá tvám* construction. As is sometimes the case with oblique forms of this construction, I think it likely that the *táśyāḥ* is there to indicate the gender of the personal pronoun -- though, given the Dawn context, the fem. gender of *te* could hardly be a secret.

VII.81.6: *codayitrī maghónaḥ* is perfectly ambiguous, since *maghónaḥ* could be either gen. sg. or acc. pl. In the former case it would refer to Indra, the archetypal *maghávan-*, in the latter to the pl. patrons (the *sūrī-* referred to in pāda a). According to the standard distribution of cases, suffix-accented *-tár-* agent nouns should take the gen.; indeed our stem does just that in I.3.11 *codayitrī sūnftānām*. However, this distribution is not absolute, and given the recent mention of the pl. patrons and the absence of Indra from this hymn (and mostly from this hymn cycle), a pl. reading is quite possible as well.

sūnftātvatī at the end of c forms a faint ring with *sūnārī* at the end of vs. 1. Note that it also recalls I.3.11 just cited.

[VII.82–89 JPB]

VII.84 Indra and Varuṇa

VII.84.3: Note that JPB tr. *tiretam*, an opt., as an impv.

VII.86 Varuṇa

VII.86.7b: ‘god’ omitted → “to the ardent god”

—

Re treats VII.90–92 in EVP XV.105–9.

VII.90 Vāyu / Indra and Vāyu

VII.90.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn plays on the two senses of *niyút-* in Vāyu context: his teams of wind-horses and our teams of poetic thoughts. This ambiguity is fully on display in pāda c *váha vāyo niyúto yāhy áchā*, where acc. pl. *niyútaḥ* is stationed between the two imperatives. *váha* and *yāhy*. The latter is interpr. by the Pp. as accentless *yāhi*, but in this sandhi situation, followed by initially accented *áchā*, it could also represent *yāhí*. If this impv. is unaccented, *niyútaḥ* should be construed with it, with a clause boundary after preceding voc. *vāyo*. If it is accented, it should begin a new clause and *niyútaḥ* should be construed with *váha*. The situation is complicated by the semi-parallel passage I.135.2 *váha vāyo niyúto yāhy asmayúḥ*, where unaccented *yāhi* is the only choice because the following word does not begin with an accented vowel. If *niyútaḥ* is to be construed with *yāhy*, it is an acc. of goal and refers to our teams (poetic thoughts); if with *váha*, it should refer to Vāyu's teams. Curiously, both Ge and Re in both passages choose to construe *niyútaḥ* with *váha* (e.g., “Fahre, Vāyu, die Niyut-Rosse, komm here!”), even though in I.135.2 this interpr. should be excluded. Old (ad I.135.2) opts for the other construction and tr. “fahre, Vāyu; zu (unsern) *n.[iyút-]* komm.” This interpr., the only one strictly possible in I.135.2, is further supported by III.35.1=VII.23.4 *yāhí vāyúr ná niyúto no áchā* “Travel like Vāyu to our teams” where *niyútaḥ* is clearly construed with *yāhí*. However, just because *niyútaḥ* needs to be construed with *yāhy* in our passage and in I.135.2, construing it also with *váha* isn't excluded -- so an alt. tr. of this passage and of I.135.2 could be “Drive (your teams), Vāyu; travel to our teams.” See also 3c.

VII.90.2: The rel. *yāḥ* in pāda a may be somewhat deeper in the clause than we would like, following both the indirect obj. *īśānāya* and the direct obj. *práhutim*.

VII.90.3: I take *dhāti* as a root aor. subjunctive (as apparently also Kü, judging from his tr. “... soll ... führen ...,” p. 186); unfortunately it does not have a distracted root vowel.

Note the extreme alliteration of b: ... *devī dhiṣāṇā dhāti devám*, with mirror-image plain and aspirated voiced stops, as well as the etym. figure *devī ... devám* enclosing the whole.

The *niyút-* in this vs. are explicitly identified as Vāyu's ‘own’ (*svāḥ*), which supports the view that the *niyút-* in 1c are not Vāyu's but ours.

The question in d is the referent of *vásudhiti-* ‘treasure-chamber’. Both Gr and Ge identify it as Vāyu himself, though this seems pretty much excluded by the fact that acc. *vásudhitim* is conjoined with the other acc. *vāyúm* (c) by *utá* (see Klein DGRV I.323–24, though he also suggests Vāyu could be the referent). Old suggests Indra (flg. Pischel), and Re so renders it in tr. To me Agni seems more likely than either Indra or Vāyu, since Agni is actually called a *vásudhiti-* in I.128.8, and *śvetá-*

‘gleaming’ is more appropriate to Agni than to either of those gods. (For Agni as *śvetá-* see, e.g., V.1.4.) However, to my mind the most likely referent is Dawn, a possibility also floated by Re. Dual *vásudhiti-* occurs twice (III.31.17, IV.48.3), both times of Night and Dawn. In both cases the noun is modified by dual *kṛṣṇé* ‘black’, which of course characterizes only one of the pair and evokes the opposite, suppressed quality, ‘bright’ (see comm. ad IV.48.3). In IV.48.3 the two treasure-chambers are intimately associated with Vāyu and his journey to the sacrifice. Note also that the dawns show up in the very next pāda in our hymn (4a). The one obstacle to identifying *vásudhitim* here as Dawn is that the accompanying adj. *śvetām* is masc., but this would be problematic in any case, if it modifies *vásudhiti-*, because the noun itself is fem. (see du. fem. *kṛṣṇé* just cited)—though it can have a masc. referent (e.g., I.128.8 *agnīm hótāram ṛlate vásudhitim* “They invoke Agni, the Hotar, [as] treasure-chamber]”). I assume that **śvetām* has been redactionally shortened (without metrical consequences, since it precedes a consonant-initial word) on the basis of such equational passages, or perhaps on the basis of such passages *vásudhiti-* was simply interpr. as masc. here.

VII.90.4: In the publ. tr. the injunc. *uchán* is rendered as a preterite; I’d now be inclined towards a pres. “the dawns dawn,” if the vs. depicts the ritual scene unfolding. If, however, it is an account of the Vala myth, a preterital *uchán* would be better. Since there is probably split temporal reference here, describing the actions both of the mythical Aṅgirasas originally opening the Vala cave and of the priests reenacting this mythic model, the injunctive *uchán* can fit both scenarios—likewise the perfects that follow (*vividuḥ* b, *ví vavruḥ* c, *sasruḥ* d), since that tense can be used both for both distant and immediate past. Unfortunately English does not have a temporally un- (or under-)marked tense like the injunctive, and so a choice between present and preterital translations has to be made.

On the basis of the next hymn, VII.91.4 *náraḥ ... dīdhyānāḥ* (and see also our 5a), the subject of b should be ‘men’ or the Uśij-priests in the next pāda, though the ‘dawns’ of the previous pāda would technically be available.

I did not render *cid* in c in the publ. tr. Cf. V.29.12, where the same phrase opens the pāda and *cid* likewise appears to be functionless. It could perhaps mean ‘also’ here, as a second action after finding the light.

On *ānu pradīvaḥ* see Old’s extensive disc.

VII.90.5: If the previous vs. had two temporal reference points, this one seems completely focused on the ritual here and now. As noted in the publ. intro., the priests have become the draught animals that draw Indra and Vāyu’s chariot -- alluding to the trope of sacrifice as chariot.

VII.90.6: As noted in the publ. intro., the use of *īśāná-* ‘having dominion’ here cleverly assimilates the patrons modified by this participle with Vāyu (2a) and Indra-Vāyu (5d), who receive the same modifier.

Ge (n. 6a) persuasively suggests that the striking phrase “confer the sun on us,” with the patrons as subject, refers to “the great light of the Dakṣiṇā” (priestly gift). This is reminiscent of the biblical quotation “Let your light so shine before men ...” that always preceded the taking up of the collection in the Episcopal church of my youth.

VII.91 Vāyu / Indra and Vāyu

VII.91.1: For my interpr. of the context of this vs. see the publ. intro., where I suggest that the vs. depicts the primal situation before the ritual was first instituted, with the gods existing without a sacrificial compact. I take *purā* ... *āsan* as existential, “existed previously,” as I do almost the same construction (but with pf., not impf.) in IV.51.7 *purāsuḥ* -- but not *purā-āsitha* in VI.45.11, where the *purā* is contrasted with *nūnām* in disjunctive *vā* clauses. The existential reading seems to me preferable to a predicative one, whether *vr̥dhāsaḥ* or *anavadyāsaḥ* were to be predicated.

The construction of *kuvīd* is unusual, in that it appears on the surface that the *kuvīd* construction consists of a rel. clause introduced by *yé* without a main clause. Old’s first suggested rendering is of this type (“Bewiesen sich wohl einst die Götter als tadellos?”); similarly Hettrich (Hypotaxe, 145). But Old alternatively suggests supplying a main verb with *kuvīd* with the relative clause subordinate to that clause (“Wie denn (verhielten sich) die Götter, welche ... waren?”), a syntactic solution silently adapted by Re. In either case *āsan* would unproblematically be accented because it belongs to the rel. cl. Although my interpr. differs somewhat from Ge’s, we both take *āsan* as the verb of the main clause with *kuvīd* (“Ganz gewiss waren es schon früher die untadeligen Götter ...”), with the rel. clause either requiring a verb to be supplied (Ge) or simply being a nominal rel. cl. (me). By this interpr. the accentuation of *āsan* would contradict Gr’s rule (s.v. *kuvīd*) that the verb introduced by *kuvīd* is accented only when it is in the same pāda -- but see comm. ad II.35.1 for further violations of this “rule.” The construction I envisage runs into another problem, that the rel. cl. (*nāmasā yé vr̥dhāsaḥ*) would seem to be embedded in the main clause *kuvīd* ... *āsan*). But we have seen elsewhere (e.g., VI.21.2, 22.5, 64.5, 6) that *nominal* relative clauses can function as pseudo/proto-izafe constructions and be embedded in the matrix clause. Here the rel. cl. would, further, precede the main clause proper, beginning with *purā*, and be preceded only by the rhetorical introductory *kuvīd aṅgá*, so its “embedding” is slight.

For “hard-pressed Manu” see VI.49.13.

VII.91.2: Ge (n. 2a) suggests that *ná* in pāda a stands for haplologized **ná ná*, with both the simile particle (“Willig wie Boten”) and the negative (“... nicht zu hintergehen”). Certainly it must represent the negative with infinitival dat., since *ná dábhāya* occurs twice elsewhere (V.44.3, IX.73.8) with *gopá-*, but it is less clear that we need the simile marker. Though Indra and Vāyu are probably not technically messengers in the way that Agni is, I see no real problem in identifying them thus

when they come to the sacrifice from the heavenly world, rather than simply comparing them to messengers.

I do not entirely understand why *pātháh* is accented, and, unusually, Old makes no comment in the Noten. I assume that it falls roughly in the category of expressions with a single verb and “zwei Subjekten, Objekten u. s. w.” (specifically here the u. s. w.) treated in Old’s lengthy article on Verbalenklisis in the Rig Veda (ZDMG 60 [1906]:707–41 = KISch 182–216; cited phrase p. 708=183), though in a rather cursory scan of the article I did not find this passage. The triggering phrase here would be *māsás ca ... śarádaś ca pūrvīḥ* “though the months and many autumns,” with the accented verb in the middle, even though the conjoined NPs are not contrastive.

Ge tr. the just cited phrase with “viele Monaten und Herbst,” though technically speaking fem. *pūrvīḥ* can only modify *śarádaḥ*, to which it is also adjacent. Klein (DGRV I.134) echoes Ge’s interpr. forcefully (“... *must* be taken with both conjoined nouns” [my ital.]), and no doubt this is the ultimate intent, though I find preferable the rendering that matches the grammar (so also Re without comment).

VII.91.3: As discussed in the publ. intro., I differ from the standard tr. (which consider Vāyu the subject of ab and the referent of the acc. pl. in pāda a to be the sacrificers) in considering this first hemistich a disguised reference to the soma offered to Vāyu. Although the Vāyu identification might seem the default -- and it indeed may be correct -- both the vocabulary and the ritual situation seem to point in another direction. The descriptor *sumedhás-* is never otherwise used of Vāyu, but it is applied 3x to Soma or his drop (IX.92.3, 93.3, 97.23); the only figure who receives this epithet more often is Agni. Similarly *śvetá-* is not used of Vāyu (for the supposed application in the immed. preceding hymn, VII.90.3, where I think it refers to Dawn, see comm. ad loc.), but does apply to a drop (*drapsá-*) in nearby VII.87.6, while Soma makes himself a *śvetá- rūpá-* in IX.74.7. The adj. is also used of horses (VII.77.3), and perhaps, in conjunction with *niyútām abhiśrīḥ* “the full glory of the teams,” Soma is configured here as the lead horse of the “teams” of offerings we will make to Vāyu. The beings (acc.) that the subject accompanies (*siṣakti*) are called *pīvoanna-* ‘whose food is fat’, a hapax. It seems an unlikely epithet of human sacrificers, as the standard interpr. requires. It might describe the ritual fires, but it is most clearly reminiscent of X.100.10 *ūrjam gāvo yāvase pīvo attana, ṛtāsya yāḥ sādane kóśe aṅgdhvé* “O cows, eat nourishment in the pasture, eat fat, you who are anointed in the cup, at the seat of truth,” addressed to the milk to be ritually mixed into the soma. The masc. gender of *pīvo-annān* is something of a stumbling block to this interpr., but it might result from the variable gender of the underlying referent *gó-* ‘cow’ or reference a masc. term for milk or liquid in general. The other acc. pl. in this pāda, *rayivīdhah*, is a hapax, though reminiscent of *námasā ... vṛdhāsaḥ* in 1a. Like the numerous other cmpds in *-vīdh-* the root noun 2nd member could have either intransitive/passive value with the 1st member in an instr. relationship (‘strong/increased by wealth’) or transitive value with an acc. 1st member

(‘increasing wealth’) -- though most *-vṛdh-* cmpds conform to the former type. Ge interpr. it as transitive (“die ... ihre Reichtümer mehrend”), Gr as intrans.; Old fails to comment, and Re takes refuge in vagueness (“ayant ... une richesse abondante”), which seems to lean towards the intrans. Scar (521) allows both possibilities in his gloss, though his tr. of the passage follows the transitive path, “die ihren Reichtum mehren,” echoing Ge. For my larger interpr. of the passage, either would more or less work, but neither adds much or seems particularly apt.

To sum up, though I don’t reject the Vāyu / human ritualist interpr. of the nom. / acc. in ab out of hand, I think an identification of the nom. as Soma and the acc. as the cows(’ milk) with which soma is mixed works better in the passage. (I do have to admit that Indra and Vāyu drink *clear*, unmixed soma in the very next vs.) Alternatively we might consider the ritual fire (specifically the one that receives the offerings, later called the *Āhavanīya*) the subject and the libations themselves the acc. And, on the basis of VII.92.3 in the next hymn I also now wonder if the acc. referents in ab might be the teams of wealth we meet in that vs. Basically, no single interpr. of this vs. can account for all the elements of it.

My interpr. of c follows from that of ab. I take the pl. subj. to be the drops of soma, extending themselves as offering to Vāyu -- not the priestly sacrificers. Only in d do these sacrificers make their appearance (*nárah*).

VII.91.4: Both Ge and Re take ab as a series of subordinate clauses truncated without a main cl. By contrast, as I indicated in the publ. intro., I think that the *yāvat* ‘as long as’ clauses in ab project the future temporal limit to the institution of sacrifice, with cd inviting the gods to participate as long as it will last.

dīdhyanāḥ in b matches the same word in the same position in the immed. preceding hymn VII.90.4b, though the contexts are different.

The 2nd du. act. aor. impv. *pātam* in c echoes the 2nd du. act. pres. *pāthāḥ* in 2b, but these two root forms belong of course to two different roots $\sqrt{pā}$, ‘drink’ and ‘protect’ respectively. Both of them are anchored to their roots by root-noun cmpds closely preceding them, *go-pā* ‘cow-protectors’ (2a) and *śuci-pā* ‘drinkers of the clear (soma)’ (4a), both dual and both subject of the following verb. In fact *śuci-pā* looks both left and right, with elementary etymological figures on both sides: *śucim* (*sómaṃ*) *śucipā pātam*

VII.92 Vāyu / Indra and Vāyu

VII.92.2: For *sómaṃ* as obj. of *prá* $\sqrt{sthā}$, see parallels cited at VI.41.2.

VII.92.3: I assume that the object of Vāyu’s quest in our house is soma. Other interpr. take *iṣṭáye* differently: Ge “um gern in sein Haus zu kommen,” which seems quite loose; Re “pour (aller le) chercher en (sa) demeure,” with the referent of “le” apparently *dāśvāmsam* of pāda a, which I suppose is possible.

As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. makes clear the equation between the teams (*niyút-*) in ab that Vāyu drives to the sacrifice, his wind-horses, and the teams

of wealth he hitches up (*ní ... yuvasva*) for us in cd. In cd we would expect an accusative resumptive prn. *tān* or the like, picking up the rel. phrase *yābhiḥ ... niyúdbhiḥ* of ab and serving as obj. of *ní ... yuvasva*. The absence of this prn. is presumably what led Ge to pronounce the *yābhiḥ* of a as “die freie Verwendung des Relatives” (n. 3) and to tr. the subordinator with “Wenn.” But I think rather that the objects in cd stand for the missing **niyútaḥ*. Though the noun *niyút-* doesn’t appear explicitly in cd, elsewhere that noun can be obj. of its etymologically twin verb; cf., e.g., I.180.6 *ní yád yuvéthe niyútaḥ ...* and, in the immediately hymn, the passive phrase *niyuvānā niyútaḥ ...* (VII.91.5). Therefore the accusatives in cd expressing wealth and its material realizations are implicitly equated with *niyút-*. The important complementarity of the two forms of *ní √yu* in the two hemistichs is disguised by Ge’s bland translation of the verb in c: “gib uns”; similarly Klein (DGRV I.26) “grant to us.”

In the phrase in d *vīrām gavyam ásvyam ca rādhah* “(a) hero and bovine and equine bounty,” the sg. *vīrām* is superficially unsettling and disharmonious: surely we want more than a single hero! But *vīrām* most likely is meant to characterize *rādhah*, along with the common adjectival collocation *gavyam ásvyam*. However, an adjectival *vīryá-* *‘consisting of heroes’ is blocked, because that stem has been frozen as a neut. substantive meaning ‘heroism, heroic deed’. I would now be inclined to reflect what I consider the substitution of *vīrá-* for the non-functional adjectival stem and tr. the acc. phrase as “(teams that are) well-nourishing wealth for us, bounty in heroes, in cows and horses.”

VII.92.4: The standard interpr. (Old, Ge, Re) take the nom. pl. rel. *yé* of ab to be coreferential with the instr. *sūrībhiḥ* ‘with the patrons’ in c. This is certainly possible, but I follow Thieme (Fremd. 20) in taking it rather with the 1st pl. subj. of *syāma* in c, hence “(we) who ...” There is no morphosyntactic way to tell, as the rel. cl. of ab has no finite verb, so the person of *yé* is unspecified. I favor “we” because cd seems to set up a contrastive pair of the two instr. pl. in c / d (*sūrībhiḥ* / *nṛbhiḥ*), with which we accomplish complementary feats: smashing obstacles along with the patrons (c), conquering in battle with the superior men (=warriors) (d). If the first hemistich refers exclusively to one of these instrumentals the rhetorical balance is disturbed.

I do not follow Thieme (Fremd. 20 n. 1) in accepting the old suggestion (conjectured by Gr; see Old for further lit.) that the *Samhitā vāyáva* should be taken as a nom. pl. *vāyávaḥ*, against Pp. dat. sg. *vāyáve*, as an adj. ‘serving Vāyu’ vel sim. As Old points out, the dat. is supported by *té vāyáve* found twice in the preceding hymn (VII.91.1, 3), like our *yé vāyave*, and in any case the posited adjectival form would be morphologically dubious (see, e.g., Re’s remarks inter alia). Most supply another nom. pl. adj. to construe with dat. *vāyáve*; cf. Ge’s “die dem Vāyu (opfern),” Re’s “(étant) au (service de) Vāyu.” But I think this is unnecessary: I take the phrase *vāyáva indramādanāsaḥ* as an example of the fungibility of compounds and free syntagms with the same structure. In other words, I would extract the *√mad* form from the cmpd and construe it also with dat. *vāyáve*. Although transitive forms of *√mad* generally take the acc., cf. IX.25.1 *marúdbhyo vāyáve madaḥ* “exhilarating

(drink) for the Maruts and for Vāyu” and, with the same nominal form as here, VII.31.1 *prá va índrāya mādanam, háryaśvāya gāyata* “Sing forth your exhilarating (song) to Indra of the fallow bays,” though the dat. there is more likely controlled by the verb *prá* √ *gā*. The connection between Vāyu and √ *mad* is reinforced in the next vs.: 5c *vāyo ... mādayasva*.

With Old, Re, Thieme (loc. ci.), I take *aryáh* as gen. sg. of *arí-*, construed with *nitósānāsah*, not as nom. pl. with Gr, Ge.

In cd the opt. *syāma* seems to serve as a modal-establishing auxiliary to the participles *ghnántah* (c) and *sāsahvāmsah* (d), perhaps a more economical and less clumsy alternative to two separate optatives (*hanyāma* and *sāsayāma*) or else a makeshift attempt to express repeated modal action (expressed by my parenthetical “be (always) X-ing”).

In d *amitra-* seems deliberately positioned verse-final to contrast with *aryáh*, which ends the previous hemistich, and therefore most likely has its full etymological sense -- ‘(one) without alliance (to us)’ -- in opposition to *arí-*, which identifies members of our larger sociopolitical community, even if unknown to us personally.

Re treats VII.93–94 in EVP XIV, starting p. 55.

VII.93 Indra and Agni

Both Ge and Re remark on the prominence of the word *vāja-* in the hymn (“Das Schlagwort ist *vāja*”; “Thème du *vāja*”). Although I would certainly not deny that, the word does not seem to call attention to its dominance in the way that other signature words often do: not only is it absent from three of the eight vss. (4, 5, 7), but especially at the beginning (vss. 1–3) it is not prominently positioned (not at a pāda boundary or after the caesura) nor positioned in the same place in the vs. line -- both being ways in which a word can assert itself -- nor does it repeat the same case and number. In vss. 6 and 8 it is hemistich-final (6d, 8b) and so becomes slightly more salient. In other words, it’s certainly a theme, but a somewhat muted one.

VII.93.2: The first hemistich is hyper-alliterative, with sibilants *s* and *ś* and, esp. in the 2nd pāda, *v* and *u*, all tied together by alternations of short and long *a*: *tā sānasī śavasānā hí bhūtām, sākaṁvṛdhā śavasā śūśuvāmsā*. This phonological effect is reinforced by the etymological figure of *śavasānā ... śavasā śūśuvāmsā*, all belonging to the root √ *śū*, *śvā* ‘swell’. To capture the etymological relationship I would be inclined to adjust the publ. tr. to “o swelling ones .. swollen with swelling (strength).”

It is difficult to say which of the qualifiers is/are being predicated of Indra and Agni with the *bhūtām*, but Ge, Re, and I seem all to have settled on *sānasī*.

vāja- is modified by *ghṛṣvi-* in IV.32.6, 9 and by *sthāvira-* in VI.1.11, 37.5. The two adjectives seem, if not contradictory, at least slightly incompatible, but note that Indra is qualified by the same two adjectives in the same order, case, and metrical location as here in III.46.1, VI.18.12. In keeping with the Indraic slant to

this hymn (on which see publ. intro.), it seems as if a phrase more appropriate to Indra has been transferred to the prize.

VII.93.3–4: There is no main clause in vs. 3: the three co-referential participial phrases (... *ichámānāḥ* b, ... *nákṣamānāḥ* c, ... *jóhuvataḥ* ...d) all simply expanding on the dependent cl. of pāda a, *úpo ha yád ... gúḥ* “When they have come”).

However, the first pāda of vs. 4 echoes 3b exactly, save for number: 3b ... *víprāḥ prámatim ichámānāḥ* (pl.) versus 4a ... *vípraḥ prámatim ichámānāḥ* (sg.), vs. 4 seems to continue vs. 3. Interestingly enough, it is not possible to determine whether his new start in 4 is a main clause or continues the dependent cl. in vs. 3 -- though Ge, Re, and I all take it as an independent cl. The problem is that the finite verb *îṭte* opens the second pāda; its accent then can be owing to its metrical position and it can be a main-cl. verb (as we all interpret it). However, the accent could also signal that it’s the verb of a dependent cl., and the whole complex of vss. 34 could be interpr.

“When the prize seekers have come, (when) the inspired poet ... invokes, (then,) o Indra and Agni, further us ...” -- in other words 4cd would supply the main cl. for all of 3–4ab.

VII.93.7: In d the verb is pl. (*śís Rathantu*), but only two gods, Aryaman and Aditi, are mentioned in the pāda; the subjects must therefore include the gods found in b.

VII.94 Indra and Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is made up of four ṛcas, which were probably originally independent, since four 3-vs. hymns would fit the standard pattern of hymn arrangement, but a single 12-vs. hymn following one with 8 vss. would not. There is little sign of unity within the separate ṛcas, but the content of the hymn as a whole is so generic that it would be hard to identify features that would either unify or distinguish the various parts. Also, there may be a faint, probably secondary, ring between the 1st vs. (1c) and the last (12d) (see comm. ad vs. 12), which may suggest that the four ṛcas were combined into a single hymn even before the redaction of the Saṃhitā text. The first ṛca (vss. 1–3) also has a faint sign of internal unity: the dual dvandva voc. *indrāgnī* beginning the b-pāda in each vs. However, the 3rd ṛca (vss. 7–9) also contains the same form in every vs. (7a, 8c, 9c), and 10b also begins with this cmpd., though there it is not a voc. but an acc., and it requires a distracted reading (*indrā-agnī-*).

VII.94.1: Both Ge and Re take *ajani* ‘has been born’ in c as the main verb for ab, while I take ab as a separate nominal cl. Either is possible. I would be more inclined towards the Ge/Re solution if *mánmanah* were an ablative, parallel to *abhrāt* in the simile (“has been born *from this conception, like rain from a cloud”). But though *mánmanah* itself could be abl., it is anchored as a gen. by *asyá*, which must be adjectival (and hence go with *mánmanah*) because of its accent. In fact, at least in tr. “this ... praise hymn of this conception” is a clumsy expression, though both Ge and Re make it slightly less so by adding ‘mine’ (“of this conception of mine”). Though

the 1st ps. ref. is not found in the text, it does ameliorate the tr. The point is the usual one, that the verbal product, the hymn, arises from the poet's mental functions.

VII.94.2: This vs. traces the genesis of the praise hymn further back: the poet's insight (*dhī-*) / conception (*mānman-*) that produces is the hymn is itself the product of the gods' stimulation, here expressed by *pipyataṃ dhíyaḥ* "swell his insights."

VII.94.4: The loc. phrase *indre agnā* beginning this *ṛca* echoes the repetitive voc. dvandva *indrāgnī* of the 1st *ṛca*.

VII.94.5–6: Both vss. begin with the dual pronoun *tā*, but the first is 3rd ps. ("these two") and object of a 3rd ps. verb (*īlate ... víprāsaḥ* "the inspired poets invoke those two"), while the 2nd, followed by 2nd ps. enclitic *vām*, has switched reference to 2nd ps. and is object of a 1st ps. verb (*havāmahe* "we call upon you two") -- thus effecting a relationship of considerably more intimacy.

VII.94.7: On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

VII.94.8: On my reading **akáśya* for *káśya* after *mā*, see comm. ad IV.3.13.

VII.94.10: This vs. is a fragment, a *yád* clause without a main cl. It also contains an augmented intensive *ájohavuh*; this preterital form seems out of place in a hymn that lives almost entirely in the ritual present (our actions for Indra and Agni) and immediate future (via the imperatives we address to those same gods). (Only *ajani* in vs. 1 is preterital, but this aorist refers to the immediate ritual past.) The verse is also one of the few in this hymn that lacks parallel *pādas* or near repetitions elsewhere. (See Ge's nn and Bloomfield, RReps for some of the details, though Bloomfield does not list partial repetitions.)

VII.94.11: This vs. is likewise a fragment, a nom. dual dvandva (*vṛtrahántamā*), which supports a rel. clause characterizing Indra and Agni, but no main clause. By my interpr. (and those of Ge and Re), this rel. cl. is nominal, with a predicated part. *mandānā*. Old takes the ambig. *āvivasataḥ* as a dual finite verb (but cannily doesn't tr.); this interpr. requires an anomalous meaning for the form, whereas the interpr. as a gen. sg. participle, shared by Ge, Re, and me, allows the form to have its usual sense ("seek to win [the gods]").

VII.94.12: The 3rd ps. ref. of the nom. du. in vs. 11 is transformed into 2nd ps. ref. by the 2nd du. impv. *hatam* in 12b, mediated by the dual prn. *tāú*, which in this context, with a flg. impv., can have either 3rd or 2nd ps. ref. (see my "sá figé").

Ge and Re take *ābhogá-* and *udadhí-* as PNs, which seems odd since both words are easily interpretable. The latter is in fact attested in other passages as a common noun meaning 'water-holder, reservoir' and its components are clear. I assume that the reason for assuming a PN is that a 'water-holder' is considered to be

a positive entity, and since it is to be smashed, it must be negatively viewed here. But “holding” water can shade into “withholding” water, a negative action. We might here also invoke the first vs., where the hymn is produced “like rain from a cloud.” A cloud can be considered a ‘water-holder’, and the positive and negative aspects of water-holding may be contrasted in the 1st and last vss.. As indicated above, although I do think the *ṛcas* in this hymn were originally independent, some sense of ring composition might have gone into their combining.

As for *ābhogá*, Old seriously doubts the gloss ‘snake’ found, e.g., in Gr. But I’m somewhat puzzled as to why. There is certainly a root \sqrt{bhuj} ‘bend, coil’ distinct from \sqrt{bhuj} ‘enjoy, benefit’, and *bhogá-* definitely means ‘(snake’s) coil’ in reference to *Vṛtra* in V.29.6 ... *bhogān sākāṃ vājreṇa maghāvā vivṛścāt* “the bounteous one hews apart his [=Vṛtra’s] ... coils at one blow with his mace.”

VII.95 Sarasvatī

VII.95.1: The problem in this vs. is *rathyèva* in c. Contextually the most obvious interpr. is as a nom. sg. fem., subject of *yāti*, but assuming the correctness of the Pp. reading, *rathyā iva* (and there is no other viable alternative), it is difficult to find a way to get there morphologically. If it belongs to the *vṛkī*-inflected *rathī-* ‘charioteer’, the nom. sg. should of course be *rathīs*. Gr assigns it to this stem, but as an instr. sg., but who would this other charioteer in the instr. be? Ge/Re also interpr. as an instr., but to a stem *rathyā-* ‘Fahrstrasse’ / ‘une route-carrosable’. See Ge’s somewhat opaque comm. in the 4th vol. of his tr. (p. 252, col. 3, ad II.4.6b) and Old’s more illuminating one, interpreting a previous, but similar formulation of Ge’s (ZDMG 61 [1907] 831–32 = Kl.Sch.262–63). Old himself prefers an interpr. as an acc. pl. *rathyāḥ* with double application of sandhi (to nom./acc. pl. **rathyās iva*). Here the acc. pl. would presumably be parallel to “all the other waters” that *Sarasvatī* pushes ahead of her, but the simile would ill fit the passage. (Old does not transl.) The sequence *rathyèva* occurs several times elsewhere: II.39.2, 3, III.33.2, 36.6, VII.39.1. In all but III.36.6, *rathyā* is clearly the correct dual nom./acc. to the *vṛkī*-stem, and in III.36.6 I interpret it also as a dual (contra most interpr.), for reasons given in the comm. ad loc. But here that solution, wedding morphology and sense, will not work. My ad hoc and admittedly entirely unsatisfactory “solution” here is to take it as a nonce fem. nom. sg. in *-ā*, perhaps based on *asuryā* (also nom. sg. fem.) in the 1st vs. of the next hymn (VII.96.1), also of *Sarasvatī*. The hymns are twinned and can be read against each other.

VII.95.2: By my interpr. (as well as the standard ones), this vs. contains two forms of the act. pres. stem *céta-*, 3rd sg. *cetat* (or *acetat*: see immed. below) in pāda a and part. *cétantī* in c. The first is found in the sequence *ékācetat*, analyzed by the Pp. as *ékā acetat*. This is perfectly possible, but an injunctive form is equally possible on textual grounds and in my opinion would fit the presential/resultative context better. See Gotō (1st cl., 138 and n. 181), who so interprets it. In any case, I take it as intransitive ‘shows / appears’, with *súciḥ* as the predicate adjective. In c the participle *cétantī* has

the sense ‘perceives, takes note’ and governs the gen. *rāyāḥ*. Given the semantic multivalence of the root \sqrt{cit} and the pleasure poets take in manipulating and juxtaposing its forms, this functional shift within a verse is not surprising. (Gotō [p. 138] also assigns different functions to the two forms.) The intrans. use of *cetat* is supported by *cetati* in the same usage in the next hymn (VII.96.3).

VII.95.3: The male subject of this vs. is not identified, but the Anukramaṇī identifies him as Sarasvant. This seems correct (despite doubts raised, e.g., by Old), given that half of the following hymn, the 2nd ṛca (VII.96.4–6), is devoted to him and he is mentioned by name in all three vss. The two hymns VII.95 and 96, despite being in different meter, should be read against each other. See comm. ad vs. 1 above.

I take med. *māmṛjīta* as reflexive, with Sarasvant both subj. and obj. (so also, apparently, Kü 373), though Ge thinks that the obj. is the racehorse and Re that both subj. and obj. are the racehorse.

VII.95.4: On *mitā-jñu-* see comm. ad VI.32.3.

The *sākhibhyaḥ* of the final pāda must be Sarasvatī’s sister rivers. As Old points out, the stem *sākhi-* can be used of females as well as males; fem. *sākhī-* is absent from the older language. See also Re ad loc. For the glorification of Sarasvatī over the other rivers, see vs. 1 and implicitly vs. 2, as well as the 1st vs. of the next hymn (VII.96.1) and VI.61.9, 10, 13. The formulation “higher than ABL” is identical to the boast of the victorious co-wife in X.145.3 *úttarāhām ... úttaréd úttarābhyah* “I am higher, higher even than the higher ones (fem.).”

VII.95.5: My interpr. of the syntax and the reference in this vs. differs considerably from the standard. Most (Ge, Re; see also Old) take b as parenthetic, with pāda a parallel to c, both containing nom. pl. m. med. participles with 1st ps. subjects, *júhvānā(h)* and *dádhanā(h)* respectively. The first part. is transitive with *imā* as object. Hence, “Offering these (oblations, vel. sim.) ... , setting ourselves in your shelter, we ...” Under this interpr. according to Re, the *yusmāt* in pāda a refers to the patrons, already found in vs. 3 -- rather loosely construed (“de votre part”). Ge fails to identify the 2nd pl. referent, while Old considers both the patrons and the rivers possible and makes no decision.

Although the Ge/Re(/Old) interpr. is certainly possible -- and has the parallelism of the two participles in its favor -- I am reluctant to bring in patrons, who figured only in the Sarasvant vs. 3, and I also prefer to avoid parenthetical clauses if at all possible. I therefore go against the Pp. in taking the first participle as *júhvānā* and neut. pl., rather than *júhvānāḥ* and masc. pl. As a nom. pl. neut., the part. is passive and forms a nominal clause with *imā*, with the participle predicated (as is not rare). The part. stem *júhvāna-* is found with both transitive and passive interpr. (Note that Gr takes this form as passive, but as a nom. pl. fem. in *-āḥ* modifying his supplied *gírah* ‘hymns’, represented by *imāḥ* [requiring him to go against the Pp reading *imā*].)

By my interpr. of pāda a, the 2nd pl. refers to the (other) rivers just featured in 4d, and in the expression *yusmād ā, ā* means ‘all the way to’, though it must be admitted that *ā* in that usage usually precedes (see Gr col. 169). Old himself suggests as one of his possibilities “bis zu euch hin” of the rivers or waters. The ambiguous position of *ā* in the expression in 2b *girībhya ā samudrāt* “from the mountains all the way to the sea” also has *ā* directly before an abl. expressing goal.

VII.95.6: Ge and Re seem to take *vājān* as the obj. of *vārdha* as well as *rāsi*, while I supply Vasiṣṭha, the subject of the preceding hemistich.

VII.96 Sarasvatī (1–3), Sarasvant (4–6)

VII.96.1: With Gr, Ge (etc.) I take *gāyīṣe* as a 1st sg. -*se* form of the *stuṣé* type; Old, fld by Re, takes it as a 3d sg. passive. Besides separating the form from the standard usage of *stuṣé* and the like, this leaves *bṛhāt ... vācaḥ* syntactically untethered. Old takes it in instr. sense, but it’s hard to get the neut. acc. to function that way.

Re also takes *mahayā* in c as a 1st sg. subjunctive, but an impv. works better with the voc. *vasiṣṭha* (d), an example of poetic self-address (treated in my 2005 Fs. Skjaevø article).

VII.96.2: On the interpretational problem posed by du. *ubhé ... ándhasī* “both stalks,” see publ. intro. As indicated there, I do not subscribe to the interpretation that takes this as a metaphorical expression of political geography. Rather I assume that the usual sense of *ándhas-* ‘soma stalk’ → ‘soma’ allows the dual to refer to two liquids. Ge (n. 2a) points out that in ŚB V.1.2.10 this dual is used for soma and surā (the profane intoxicating drink), and since in the Sautrāmaṇī ritual surā is mixed with milk, the second liquid could also be the more benign milk. Old makes a good case for the connection of soma and surā with Sarasvatī and also suggests that the formulation is meant to indicate that the Pūrus make use of profane drinks as well as soma. Re favors soma and surā without disc. Two textual passages nearer to hand suggest other possible solutions. As was noted ad VII.95.1, 3, these two adjacent hymns to Sarasvatī, VII.95 and 96, show twinning tendencies. In VII.95.2 (that is, the vs. corresponding to this one in position) Sarasvatī milks out “ghee and milk” (*ghṛtām páyaḥ*) for Nāhuṣa, probably the designation of a human family group or lineage (see Mayrhofer, Personennamen s.v. *nāhuṣ-*); here the Pūrus (another such designation) preside over two liquids, which could be those very two. Alternatively, in this same hymn, VII.96.5, Sarasvant’s waves are characterized by honey and ghee (*mádhumanto ghṛtaścútaḥ*), and this pair is another possibility, esp. if ‘honey’ stands for soma, as often. These two vss. (2, 5) match each other in another way; see ad vs. 5 below. In the end, Ge’s interpr (at the end of his n.) that the Pūrus, living beside the Sarasvatī, inhabit a land rich in soma and milk seems to suggest the most likely image: whatever the two liquids are, they are indications of a place rich in nourishment -- in biblical terms, a land of milk and honey.

I do not know why the Maruts would be the particular companions of Sarasvatī, unless their storms swell her waters.

VII.96.3: The subjunctive *kṛṇavat* seems to have a more strictly modal sense than most subjunctives; I am tempted to tr. “should do good” or “may she do good.”

VII.96.4: Why Sarasvant should receive the pleas of bachelors seeking wives and sons is utterly unclear to me, and the standard tr./comm. don’t address this issue.

VII.96.5: The third pāda of this vs., which is the 2nd vs. in the ṛca addressed to Sarasvant, the masc. equivalent of the far more prominent Sarasvatī, parallels that of the 2nd vs. in the ṛca addressed to Sarasvatī that opens this hymn:

2c *sā no bodhi avitrī marútsakhā*

5c *tébhir no avitā bhava*

Re suggests that this parallelism attests to the secondary character of Sarasvant. The difference between the two impvs. *bodhi* and *bhava*, both to $\sqrt{bhū}$, conforms to the positional distribution of these two forms discussed in my 1997 “Syntactic constraints on morphological change: The Vedic imperatives *bodhi*, *dehi*, and *dhehi*” (*Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes*, ed. E. Pirart).

VII.96.6: The acc. phrase in ab *pīpivāṃsam ... stānam* is the object, or one of the objects of *bhakṣīmāhi* in c, which makes the rel. clause *yó viśvadarśataḥ*, referring to the *stāna*-, technically an embedded rel. But as we have often seen, *nominal* rel. cl. -- pseudo-izafes -- are regularly found embedded.

The expression “share in the breast” seems somewhat odd, but this “swelling breast” is presumably swelling with the honey and ghee in vs. 5. As noted in the publ. intro., it is also odd to attribute this breast to the male figure Sarasvant. The more appropriate association between the breast and Sarasvatī is found in I.164.49, a passage adduced by Ge (n. 6ab).

VII.97 Indra and Bṛhaspati

Re treats this hymn in EVP XV.66–69. For the structure of the hymn and the covert identification of Bṛhaspati (/Indra) with Agni, see publ. intro. This identification is argued for extensively by Schmidt (B+I, 62–67, which also contains a complete tr. and philological comm.).

VII.97.1: This vs. plays on the ambiguity of reference of the noun *nṛ*-, which can refer both to superior (mortal) men and to gods. It also cleverly but uninsistently identifies the sacrifice as the meeting place of men and gods, the *nṛśádana*- ‘seat of men’ who come from / belong to both heaven and earth (*divāḥ ... pṛthivyāḥ*) -- though see Ge’s n. 1a for other, in my opinion less likely, possibilities. The *náraḥ* in pāda b, however, seem only to be men proper, that is mortals, who seek the gods at the sacrificial common ground.

In c *sunvé* is one of the rare exx. of a singular verb with neut. pl. subj. (here *sávanāni*), a construction that is of course supported by comparative evidence. Gr interprets the verb rather as a 1st sg. transitive. This is not impossible -- and note the 1st pl. verb in 2a -- but *sunve* is otherwise passive, with 3rd pl. *sunviré* likewise passive.

In d the verb *gáman* (in sandhi) could represent either 3rd pl. *gáman* or 3rd sg. *gámat*, but both the context, with Indra mentioned in the preceding pāda, and the parallel I.178.2d *gáman na índraḥ sakhyā váyaś ca* support the 3rd sg.

The pāda is also marked by case disharmony: dat. *mādāya* and acc. *váyaś ca* appear to be joint complements of *gámat*, conjoined by *ca*. Such case disharmony is rare in *ca* collocations (see Klein DGRV I.56–57), but at least in this example poses no obstacle to understanding: the dat. expresses purpose, the acc. goal. Although neither Klein nor I find the construction problematic, Re supplies a second verb to govern *váyaḥ* (“obtenir”), and HPS interprets the acc. as an Inhaltsakk.

A more problematic issue, at least for me, is the position of *ca*, unmentioned by any one, incl. Klein. The standard tr./interpr. take the 2nd term of the conjoined NP to be *prathamām váyaḥ* “first vitality/youth,” but we should then expect the *ca* to follow *prathamām*, the first word of the second member. Although such positioning is not an unbreakable rule, it is remarkably regular. To avoid the problem I take *prathamām* as an adverb here, as I do in the parallel I.83.4 (*prathamām ... váyaḥ* without a *ca*), cited by Old and Re, for which see comm. ad loc.

VII.97.2: The problem in this vs. is *maha* (sandhi form) in b *bṛhaspatir no maha ā sakhāyaḥ*. The Pp reads this as *mahe*, as do most subsequent interpr. -- though *mahaḥ* is possible and is in fact the interpr. of at least one tr.: HPS takes it as the voc. pl. of *máh-*, construed with *sakhāyaḥ*, hence “ihr grossen Freunde.” But this seems unlikely: there are no voc. forms to this stem in the RV (though the derived fem. *mahī-* does have some), and the intrusion of *ā* in the middle of the voc. phrase seems unlikely. Others accept the Pp *mahe* and generally take it as a 3rd sg. verb, but opinions differ on its root affiliation and meaning. I will not detail these disagreements; see the disc. in Old, Ge’s n. 2b, Re ad loc., and Gotō 243–44. My interpr. is closest to Gotō’s: he assigns this to a root \sqrt{mah} ‘bring about’, separate from \sqrt{mah} ‘magnify’, with a *t*-less 3rd sg. of the *sáye* type (see also comm. ad I.94.1) and tr. “Bṛhaspati ist für uns imstande.” I differ from him in the interpr. of the rest of the pāda: he takes *ā* as the trigger of an unexpressed verb of motion, “[kommet] o Genossen herbei.” This seems to assume that the friends addressed are not coreferential with *naḥ* earlier in the pāda, or the referents of the 1st ps. verbs in pādas a and c. I do not entirely understand the position of *ā*, but it may show the occasional positioning of a preverb immediately after its verb or simply be an adverbial ‘here’, as in my tr.

As Re points out, the optative (*bhávema*) is quite unusual in a *yáthā* purpose cl., where the subjunctive is standard. See Gr s.v. *yáthā*, cols. 1083–84, nos. 6–8.

VII.97.3: Both Ge and Re take great pains to avoid indentifying Indra in c with *bráhmanas pátim* in b and the elaboration on this phrase in d, but as discussed in the publ. intro. and extensively by HPS, the identification is the point.

VII.97.4: The second pāda contains an equational rel. cl. with expressed copula *ásti*; main cl. equational expressions almost always lack copula (when *asti* is found, it is generally existential), but overt copulas are not uncommon in dependent clauses. It is of course optional; see the nominal rel. cl. in the preceding vs., 3d, which lacks copula.

Pāda c contains a phrase in the nominative, *kāmo rāyāḥ suvīryasya* “desire for wealth in good heroes,” which is picked up abruptly by the acc. prn. *tām*, object of the immediately following verb *dāt*. There seems no other way to interpret it -- and it goes perhaps too easily into English -- but both the syntax and sense are slightly off. The fronted expression seems like a topicalized phrase, but in Vedic topics would not default to the nominative but remain in the appropriate case for the larger syntactic frame; see in the next vs. the acc. phrase that occupies the whole of pāda a, which is the obj. of the verb in b. Moreover, one doesn’t *give* wishes/desires but rather the contents of those desires, so that the referent of *tām* may be *rayí-*, not *kāma-*. Both concerns suggest that the relationship between the *kāma-* phrase and the abbreviated *tām dāt* clause is less close than it appears. Re supplies some structure to the first phrase -- “(En nous est) le désir ...” -- and something like that might produce the necessary distance.

VII.97.5: On *pastyā-* see comm. ad I.40.7. As noted ad I.40.7 HPS in that passage renders the stem as ‘stream’ but here as ‘house’, the interpr. I prefer. Note that in our passage HvN should be corrected from *pastiyanām* to *pastíyanām* (that is, *pastyānām*).

VII.79.6: The construction of the vs. is uncertain in several regards, which center on the 2nd hemistich. The first is whether neut. *sáhaḥ* belongs in the rel. cl. or not; the position of rel. *yasya* is compatible with either answer. I take it as an independent qualifier of acc. *bṛhaspátim* in b, hence an acc.: Bṛhaspati is identified with the abstract noun ‘strength / force’ itself. I therefore assume that the rel. cl. begins with *yasya*. This also seems to be the Ge solution. The sense of Re’s tr. is similar, but he puts *sáhaḥ* in the, or a, rel. cl. as a nominative -- taking c as containing two nominal rel. clauses: “lui dont la force-dominante (est réelle, dont) le séjour-commun (est) noir.” HPS makes *sáhaḥ* the subject of an equational rel. cl.: “dessen Gewalt eine schwarze Stätte ist.” Since I think it more likely that Bṛhaspati is identified as strength itself than that his seat is, I find Schmidt’s interpr. less likely, though it does have the merit of not inserting a syntactic break in the middle of a pāda. If Bṛhaspati is identified with *sáhaḥ* here (as I think), Schmidt’s claim that Bṛhaspati is identified with Agni in this hymn -- an identification esp. clear in this vs. (see publ. intro.) -- is strengthened, since Agni is so often called “son of strength” (*sūnú-* *sáhasaḥ*, e.g., in this maṇḍala VII.1.21, 22, 3.8, etc.).

A more interesting question is what to do with d. The pl. *vāsānāḥ* is universally, and plausibly, taken as referring to the horses of ab: in pāda they are called ‘ruddy’ (*aruṣāsaḥ*); in d they “clothe themselves in ruddy form” (*rūpām aruṣām*). The question then is whether d is simply a continuation of the main cl. in ab, the part. *vāsānāḥ* modifying *áśvāḥ* in pāda a, with the rel. cl. of c embedded in it. This is perfectly possible and seems to be the standard interpr. Although we prefer to avoid interpr. with embedded relatives, once again the rel. cl. in this instance is nominal (whichever finer grained interpr. we follow), and nominal relatives are systematic exceptions to this rule. However, I prefer to take d as a continuation of the rel. cl. introduced by *yáśya*, with oppositional nominal expressions, contrasting Bṛhaspati’s dark seat with his horses which take on “ruddy form.” This interpr. allows the ‘ruddy’ in d to be more than a pleonastic repetition of the same word in pāda a and gives more punch to the *nīlavat sadhástham* of c by making it part of a contrastive pair. If this interpr. is correct, the part. *vāsānāḥ* would be predicated.

Ge (n. 6bc) notes the word play between semantically and etymologically distinct *saha-* (b) and *sāhaḥ* (c). In fact the play is more tightly constructed than he indicates, with the chiasmic figure *saha-vāho vahanti / sāhaḥ*, with the hemistich boundary isolating the semantically non-conforming word.

VII.97.7: It is difficult to wring a causal sense out of *hí* here. The vs. continues the depiction of Bṛhaspati as Agni: the hundred feathers of the preening bird are the flames dipping and rising much like the action of preening; the golden axe or axes are likewise flames; while the descriptions in cd are focused on the role of Agni in the ritual.

On *śundhyú-* see comm. ad V.52.9.

I would now be inclined to tr. the bahuvrīhi *híraṇya-vāśīḥ* (for the inflection see AiG II.2.408) as implicitly pl. (‘having golden axes’, rather than the publ. ‘having a golden axe’ flg. Ge/Re) because it seems to refer to Agni’s flames. HPS tr. “mit hundert goldenen Äxten bewaffnete” without comment; he seems to have silently transferred the *śatá-* from *śatá-patraḥ* in pāda a, presumably an oversight.

svāvesá- is somewhat difficult and disputed. HPS specifically rejects Velankar’s “easy of approach” and Re’s “d’accueil favorable”; Schmidt’s “mit seinem gute Eintritt” is closer to Ge’s “bringt Glück mit seinem Eingang.” HPS (p. 66) suggests that *svāvesá ṛṣvāḥ* simply evokes the image of a fire flaring up, but I don’t see what ‘entrance’ has to do with that. I take it as ‘providing good/easy entrance’; here this would refer to the entry of the libations into the offering fire, an interpretation that is in harmony with d, which concerns the subject’s superior ability to provide *āsutí-*, the ‘pressed drink’, to his comrades, presumably the gods who consume the oblations through Agni as their mouth.

VII.97.8: I take the ‘comrades’ addressed by the voc. *sakhāyaḥ* to be different from those mentioned in the dative in the preceding vs. There the comrades of the god were the (other) gods who receive the oblation from Agni; here they are the

comrades of the poet, who urges them to tend to the god. The identity of comrades obviously depends on who they are comrades *to*.

Pāda d implicitly echoes 4d.

VII.97.10: On *kīrī-* see comm. ad V.52.10.

VII.98 Indra

VII.98.1: Verbal forms of the root $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’ do not appear with the preverb *áva* in the RV or, indeed, elsewhere in Skt. But this noun stem *avapāna-* is found 5x in the RV (I.136.4, VII.98.1, VIII.4.10, X.43.2, 106.2); in 3 of these passages (all but I.136.4, X.43.2) it is used of a wild beast come to drink; cf. (besides our passage) VIII.4.10 *īṣyo ná tīṣyann avapānam ā gahi* “like a thirsting antelope, come to the drinking (hole).” These specialized contexts suggest that rather than meaning simply “das Trinken, der Trunk” (Gr), the stem refers to a drinking hole frequented by wild animals (so already MonWms). The preverb *áva* ‘down’ would refer to the physical stance of animals lowering their heads to drink. The image of Indra beating buffalos to a watering hole is rather charming.

VII.98.2: With Ge I take *yád* as a neut. rel. prn. rather than as the subordinating conj. *yád*, though this poses some minor syntactic difficulties. If the referent is ultimately soma, we would expect a masc. form (*yám*); the neut. can be explained as “attraction” to the predicated “food” (neut. *ánnam*) in the same cl. (“what you made your food ...”). As a resumptive pronoun in the main cl. we might also prefer **tásya* to *asya*, though this is a small problem.

VII.98.3: I might now slightly alter the tr. of the pf. part. *jajñānāḥ* to ‘having (just) been born’ to put emphasis on Indra’s prodigious actions immediately after his birth.

VII.98.4: On the *s*-aor. of \sqrt{sah} see Narten (Sig.Aor. 264–67) and on the lengthened grade of some forms of this aor., as well as elsewhere in the root, see Narten (op. cit.) Gotō (1st Kl. 325–26), EWA s.v. *SAH*.

On the root noun *vṛt-*, see Schindler (Rt.Nouns s.v.); it belongs with $\sqrt{vṛ}$ ‘obstruct’ (etc.), not, with Gr, $\sqrt{vṛt}$ ‘turn’. In this passage a derivation from ‘obstruct’ makes sense for the defensive forces that provide an obstacle to the attacking army.

VII.98.5: The first hemistich *préndrasya vocam prathamā kṛtāni, prá nūtanā maghāvā yā cakāra* is a variant on the famous opening of I.32: I.32.1ab *índrasya nú vīryāni prá vocam, yāni cakāra prathamāni vajrī*. The two contain almost all of the same elements (*prá vocam, índrasya, prathamā(ni), yā(ni) cakāra, nú / nūtanā*), with variation only with *vīryāni* \cong *kṛtāni* and different epithets of Indra, *maghāvā / vajrī*. Nonetheless the distribution of elements between clauses and the word order in each clause are significantly different. This variation is typical of RVic formulae, which

generally do not follow a fixed template and are not sensitive to meter alone (both vss. in question are Triṣṭubhs).

Re comments on VII.99–102 in ÉVP XV: 99–100 pp. 39–43, 101–2 pp. 113–14.

VII.99 Viṣṇu, Viṣṇu and Indra

VII.99.1: Re supplies “other gods” as the subj. of *ánv aśnuvanti* in b. This seems perfectly acceptable, though not strictly necessary. And since in vs. 2 it is, presumably, mortals (since they are ‘born’) who fail to reach the limit of Viṣṇu’s greatness, mortals could also be the subject here. See remarks below on the formulatic connection between the two vss.

As Re points out, both the case of the complement (acc. versus gen.) and the voice (act. versus mid.) differ between 1st pl. *vidma* in c and 2nd sg. *vitse* in d. The middle voice of *vitse* makes sense, since Viṣṇu knows *his own* farthest realm; the variation in case is harder to account for. Perhaps the two earthly realms are subjects of direct knowledge, while the farthest realm is something even Viṣṇu only knows *of*.

VII.99.1–2: The b-pādas of these two vss. are variants of each other, using two different roots for ‘attain’ ($\sqrt{naś}$, $\sqrt{āp}$) and two different formulations of ‘greatness’, the 2nd an elaboration on the first:

1b *ná te mahitvám ánv aśnuvanti*

2ab *ná te ... mahimnáḥ páram ántam āpa*

Another example of the freedom of RVic formulaics; see comm. ad VII.98.5 in the previous hymn for further on this.

VII.99.2: Ordinarily the pres. part. should express ‘being Xed’, in contrast to the past part. ‘Xed’. But in this context *jāyamāna-* must refer not to someone in the process of being born, but more likely someone who is still alive, against *jātá-*, someone born in the past and presumably now dead.

VII.99.3: With Ge I take the first hemistich as Viṣṇu’s quoted speech. This, however, does not solve the puzzle posed by *hí bhūtám*. Is *bhūtám* an impv., as Ge takes it -- or an injunctive, with Re? If an imperative, how does it square with *hí*? This particle is not rare with imperatives, but it always seems somewhat problematic. Often it appears with the first impv. in a series, and the *hí* clause can command the action on which all subsequent actions depend, with the following impvs. often introduced by *áthā* -- see comm. ad I.10.3, 14.12, etc. -- but here there is no following imperative. In the publ. tr. I manage a syntactic sleight-of-hand, reading *bhūtám* twice, once as an injunctive in a causal *hí* clause, to be construed with the two adj. in pāda a, *írāvatī dhenumātī*, and once as an impv. in a main cl., to be construed with the adj. in b, *sūyavasínī* (schematically “because you are X Y, become Z”). Although this works, it seems somewhat artificial and requires separating the three apparently parallel adjectives into two clauses. This interpr. was based in part on I.93.7, which contains

a clause ADJ ADJ *hí bhūtám* followed by an *áthā* cl. with an impv. to a different verb. In the publ. tr. of I.93.7 I take *bhūtám* as an injunc (with Ge, Re). “Since you are X Y ..., therefore ...” But in the comm. I cast doubt on that interpr. and prefer an impv. interpr. “Become X Y, then ...” Therefore, I.93.7 is not necessarily a support for my publ. interpr. here; I still weakly prefer it because of the absence of a following impv., but now consider the alternative possible: “Become full of refreshment, rich in milk-cows, affording good pasture ...” The following impv. may be missing because Viṣṇu’s direct speech is truncated. (Despite their distance in the text, comparing I.93.7 to our passage is justified by the fact that the first pāda in the very next vs. in our hymn, 4a, is identical to I.93.6d, adjacent to the vs. under comparison.)

VII.99.4: As was just noted, the first pāda of this vs. is identical to I.93.6d, where Agni and Soma are the dual subjects. Indeed, the identity of the dual subjects in this vs. is left hanging throughout the vs., and the poet may have left a false trail: the last du. 2nd ps. referents were the two world halves (*ródasī*), addressed by Viṣṇu in 3ab. Assuming that the hymn as we have it is a unity (rather than consisting of two separate ṛcas, plus summary vs., as is possible), *ródasī* would remain a live possibility for the subj. of this vs. until the final pāda (d), where the 2nd du. subjects are addressed as *nārā* ‘superior men’, suppling a gender that clashes with fem. *ródasī*. But since *nī-* has a wide range of reference, this still does not definitively identify them. Even the dual number leaves the identity open: *nārā* is used of the Aśvins (mostly), Indra-Vāyu, Indra-Agni, Indra-Varuṇa, Mitra-Varuṇa -- and only once (here) of this pair. It is only with the first word of the following vs. (5a), the voc. *indrāviṣṇū*, that the question is settled.

All of the deeds recounted in this vs. can be attributed to Indra alone (see publ. intro.), although Viṣṇu’s role in enlarging and defining cosmic space may be alluded to in pāda a, with the creation of space for the sacrifice. Re’s claim that ab belong more to Viṣṇu, cd more to Indra is overstated: the cosmogony in b has little to do with what we know of Viṣṇu but is associated elsewhere with Indra.

As Old points out, the name of the Dāsa in c, Vṛṣaśīpra, seems akin to Viśīśīpra in V.45.6, whom Manu defeats (note that Manu figures in our vs. 3b) -- a connection not registered in Mayr.’s *Personennamen*. However, as noted in the comm. ad V.45.6, this gets us nowhere, since we know nothing further of either of these figures. More interesting is the potential relationship between these names and Śīpiviṣṭa, the epithet of Viṣṇu found in the RV only in this hymn (vs. 7) and the next (VII.100.5, 6). The first member of this epithet, *śīpi-*, looks like a Caland form of the 2nd member of the two names, *śīpra-*, while the 2nd member, *viṣṭá-*, is esp. close to the 1st member of the name found in V.45.6, *viśi-*; *vṛṣa-* in our passage is a plausible re-Sansritization cum folk etymology of a possible MIA form **visi-*, underlying *viśi*.

VII.99.5: Both Śambara and Varcin are Indra’s targets elsewhere, with no involvement of Viṣṇu. They are conjoined objects (*varcīnaṃ śambaraṃ ca*) of Indra’s smiting (*áhan*) in VI.47.21.

There is numerical play between the two hemistichs: in c the numbers are raised both by a digit (9 → 10) and by a factor of 10 (9 [/10] → 100; 90 [/100] → 1000). The connection is emphasized by the parallel structure of the numerical expression: b: #náva X navatīm ca / c: #śatām X sahasraṃ ca. Varcin is credited elsewhere with the same number of forces: II.14.6, IV.30.15.

I do not know why the verb is in the present in the second hemistich (*hathāḥ*) but aorist in the first (*śnathiṣṭam*). In the passages containing the other three occurrences of Varcin (II.14.6, IV.30.15, VI.47.21) the verbs are all preterital.

VII.99.6: The adj. *urukramā-* ‘wide-striding’ is otherwise used only of Viṣṇu (5x), but here encompasses Indra as well, in the dual.

The dual dvandva voc. *īndrāviṣṇū* that opened vs. 5 is here divided into two pāda-final vocc. in c (*viṣṇo*), d (*indra*). Presumably because they belong to separate clauses, the dvandva doesn’t decompose into a vāyav *indraś ca* construction, but it does follow such constructions in placing the 2nd member of the dvandva first (see my 1988 “Vāyav *indraś ca* revisited,” MSS 49: 13–59).

VII.99.7: On *śipiviṣṭa* see comm. ad vs. 4.

VII.100 Viṣṇu

VII.100.1: The meter of the first pāda is badly off and is not easily fixable. See Old. He suggests a distracted reading of *nū* and records the suggestion that *mārto* should be emended to *mārt’yo*, which HvN print as their text. If both are adopted (distracted *nū* and *mārt’yo*; so Arnold p. 310), the line achieves 11 syllables, but the price may be too high, esp. as the light fourth syllable would be unusual.

Although *dāyate* generally means ‘distribute (goods to someone else)’, e.g., I.68.6 *tāsmāi ... rayīm dayasva*, in a few passages it seems to have adopted the more “middle” meaning ‘receive/take a share’, perhaps adjusted to the model of other words of sharing, esp. *bhājate* ‘receive a share’ versus act. *bhājati* ‘share out, distribute shares’. See Gotō (1st Kl., 172–73), whose tr. of this passage is close to mine. As noted ad II.33.10, I do not subscribe to Gotō’s separation of forms of *dāyate* into two separate roots.

The three subsequent pādas (bcd) state the conditions under which the mortal in pāda a will receive the longed-for share. They are marked by the rel. prn. *yāḥ* in b and c; adopting Re’s strategy I have rendered them as conditionals (“if”) for clarity, rather than as straight rel. clauses (“who”). Unfortunately I don’t think my tr. makes it clear that cd are parallel to b, rather than being part of a resumed main clause, and I would now slightly emend the tr. to “..., if he will set ... and will seek ...”). The apparent non-parallelism is exacerbated by the fact that the verbs of c and d (*yājāte* and *āvīvāsāt* respectively) are subjunctives, whereas *dāśat* in b should be the injunctive to the thematic pres. *dāśati*, which elsewhere attests a real subjunctive (*dāśāt*). KH discusses just this passage (Inj. 238), suggesting that in such contexts the indicative present, injunctive, and subjunctive overlap in usage.

VII.100.3: Flg. a suggestion by Ge (n. 3a, though not reflected in his tr.), I take *eṣá-* in pāda a (also 4a) as belonging to the stem *eṣá-* ‘quick’, which is used several times of Viṣṇu in the gen. expression *vīṣṇor eṣásya* (II.34.11, VII.40.5, VIII.20.3), in which confusion with the nom. pronominal *eṣá(h)* (possible here) is excluded.

The hapax *śatārcas-* is problematic. The Pp analyses the 2nd member as *arcasam*, but Wackernagel (AiG I.318) points out that the sandhi between the cmpd members would require rather *-rcasam*. However, Old disputes this, claiming that it would then have to be written (“... geschrieben werden müssen”) **śatārcasam*, though it’s not clear to me why. Interpr. differ significantly: Sāy. glosses with *arcis-*. Old posits a masc. *s*-stem **arcás-* ‘singer’, comparing VI.34.3 *yádi stotāraḥ śatām yát sahásraṃ grṇānti* “When a hundred, when a thousand praisers sing to him ...,” an interpr. followed by Ge -- though the connection between the two passages seems tenuous to me. By contrast, Re tr. “au cent éclats,” perhaps flg. Sāy.’s *arcis-*. Since an infinitival dat. *ṛcāse* ‘to praise, for chanting (praise)’ is found in VI.39.5 and VII.61.6, it seems reasonable to take the underlying stem *ṛcas-* as the base here, as Gr does, glossing ‘hundertfach zu preisen’. My ‘worth a hundred verses’ is close to that, though perhaps ‘praises, chants’ would be better.

Because of the lack of accent on *asya*, it should be pronominal, not adjectival; I would adjust the tr. to “of him, the stalwart.”

VII.100.3–4: As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 3 and 4 are responsive. The first pāda of 4 concentrates the essence of the 1st two pādas of 3, substituting *vī cakrame* (of 3b) for *trír deváh* (in 3a) at the beginning of the pāda. This phrase, *trír deváh*, is short a syllable; Old suggests reading *t-rír*, but this seems unlikely: I don’t know of any other disyllabic readings of this extremely common numeral (either as 1st cmpd member *tri-* or adverbial *trís*). I suggest rather that the metrically disturbed opening draws attention to the beginning of this set of paired vss. by being flawed and is “repaired” by 4a. See similar remarks about 3c and 5c ad vs. 5.

VII.100.4: By concentrating Viṣṇu’s strides in the first pāda of 4, the poet is free to express the aim of Viṣṇu’s action -- creating space and dwelling places for the people -- in the rest of the vs.

As Ge points out (n. 4c), *asya* can refer either to Viṣṇu or to Manu, although in actuality this may not matter. It may be an instance of “trickle-down” ownership: Viṣṇu makes a dwelling place for Manu, and in turn Manu’s people also get firmly planted. Or, Manu *and* the people may both be under Viṣṇu’s auspices.

VII.100.5: On the name Śipiviṣṭa, see comm. ad VII.99.4. Note that Viṣṇu’s name was already celebrated in 3d, though the actual name is not mentioned there.

The syntactic affiliation of *aryáh* is disputed: the question is whether it depends on *vayúnāni* or simply picks up *te* in the previous pāda. With Ge and Re I follow the latter course; Re argues cogently that *vayúna-* $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ does not normally have a “régime extérieur” (though I.72.7, II.19.3 appear to be exceptions). I would

further add that since Śipiviṣṭa seems a type of “secret name,” referring to Viṣṇu as a stranger (*arí-*) might fit with that. By contrast Thieme construes *aryáḥ* with *vayúnāni*, in two somewhat different ways: Fremdling (1938, p. 41) “... kennend die Ordnungen, die für den Fremdling gelten,” later corrected in Unters. (1949, 22 n. 1) to “... kennend die Geheimnisse des Fremden.”

The end of pāda c *tavásam átavān*#, with the *s*-stem adj. followed by a (negated) comparative to the same root, nicely echoes the end of 3c with the same configuration but the comparative not negated: *tavásas távīyāni*. The employment of longer and shorter forms of the comparative (i.e., with or without the linking vowel -*ī-*) allows the phrases to make an almost exact metrical match -- except that the cadence of 5c is faulty (... -*sam átavān*), with a light syllable at the beginning (and in fact 5 light syllables in a row (... -*ī tavásam a-*), starting right before the caesura and continuing through the break and into the cadence. As in the paired vss. 3–4 the metrical disturbance may call attention to the formulaic match. *átavān* also picks up *kīráyaḥ* ‘(even) the weak’ in 4c semantically.

In d the pres. part. *kṣáyantam* is rendered by both Re and Th (Fremdl.) as if it belongs to $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘dwell’ (“qui réside” and “... [dich,] der da wohnt”), but the part. to the root pres. of that root is *kṣiyánt-*; the part. here must belong to $\sqrt{kṣā}$ ‘rule over’ (them. pres. *kṣáyati*). Ge may be trying to have it both ways with his “der ... thron,” if my German dictionaries are correct in glossing thronen as “sit enthroned.”

VII.100.6: Exactly what this vs. is trying to tell us is unclear. Most tr. and comm. take *paricákṣya-* as referring to something blameworthy (tadelnswert); so, e.g., Ge (“Was war an dir zu tadeln ...?”), Old, KH (Injunc. 78–79). But the other example of this gerundive in VI.52.14 modifies *vācas-* specifically and seems to mean ‘to be disregarded, overlooked’: *mā vo vācāṃsi paricákṣyāṇi vocam* “let me not speak words to you that can be disregarded.” Esp. because the verb in the dependent cl. belongs to \sqrt{vac} , pf. *vavakṣé*, it seems reasonable to supply ‘speech’ here as well. The point seems to be that we should have paid attention when he called himself Śipiviṣṭa, and that even when he appears in other form(s), he should not keep the *form* of Śipiviṣṭa concealed from us, any more than we should not notice the name. But what these statements are in service of, I have no idea -- and the hymn ends here (save for the repeated vs. 7, which, however, makes a point of addressing Viṣṇu as Śipiviṣṭa).

VII.101 Parjanya

VII.101.1: As was noted in the publ. intro., this hymn has a penchant for triplets, but it is not always clear which three entities are referred to -- as in this vs., at least for me, with “the three speeches.” As Ge points out (n. 1a), the identities of the speeches depends on the identity of the addressee of the impv. “speak forth” (*prá vada*). If it is Parjanya, the dedicand of the hymn, they probably refer to thunder(claps) (so, e.g., Lü, Va 392 -- three because they sound in the three heavenly domains) or thunder, lightning, and rain (so, e.g., Doniger 174). I am inclined to follow Lü but for reasons

differing from his. I suggest that this could be an early version of the triple utterance “*da da da*” of Thunder in BĀU V.2, made famous in the West by T. S. Eliot in the section of *The Wasteland* entitled “What the Thunder Said.” Note that in BĀU V.2.3 Thunder or the thundering one (*stanayitnuḥ*) is identified as *daivī vāk* (like the three *vāc*- here).

If the impv. is the self-address of the poet, it would refer probably to the three types of ritual speech (*ṛc*-, *sāman*-, *yájus*-), or, on the basis of VII.33.14 (which contains *prá vadāty āgre*, similar to our *prá vada [jyótir]agrā*), solemn speech (*ukthá*-), melody (*sāman*-), and the sound of the pressing stone -- or, less likely in my view, with Ge three dynamic levels of sound, soft, medium, loud. Needless to say, both sets of referents may be meant. In the natural world interpr., the “light at the front” would of course be lightning; in the ritual interpr. it would be the ritual fire.

The three speeches milk the udder of pāda b. Again the identities of the referents of the udder and the liquid it produces depend on the referents in pāda a. In the natural world interpr., the udder would be heaven or the clouds therein, the liquid the rain; in the ritual the udder would probably be the soma plant and the liquid the soma -- though the udder could possibly be the sacrifice as a whole and the good things that result from its performance.

On *vād*- *prá* \sqrt{vad} see comm. ad VII.103.1.

In the publ. tr. of the 2nd hemistich it was not made clear which nouns go together -- since Engl. lacks the convenient tool of case. The calf (*vatsám*) is the same as the embryo of the plants (*gárbham óṣadhīnām*); both are objects of the participle ‘creating’ (*kṛṇvān*), whose subject is the bull (*vṛṣabháḥ*), which is also the referent in the phrase “as soon as he is born” (*sadyó jātáḥ*) and the subj. of “sets to bellowing” (*roravīti*). The calf, embryo of the plants, is most likely Agni, who is so called elsewhere (see Ge n. 1c). Ge suggests that it is Agni as lightning, which is possible, but I assume that lightning and the ritual fire are here assimilated, via a trope whereby the sound of thunder, likened to ritual speech, kindles the ritual fire. The bull is surely Parjanya, as is confirmed by the identical phraseology of vs. 2 of the next, related hymn (VII.102.2): *yó gárbham óṣadhīnām ... kṛṇóti ... / parjánayah*.

VII.101.2: Multiple candidates have been suggested for the three lights of d, but it should be pointed out that there is actually only *one* light (*jyótiḥ*), which has three *vartu*-s (*trivártu*). Unfortunately this adj. is a hapax, but it is most likely related to the better attested *trivṛt*-. For the relationship between these two and the uncertainty of the root affiliation ($\sqrt{vṛt}$ [which I favor] or \sqrt{vr}), see Scar (511). If the form does belong with $\sqrt{vṛt}$ we should properly expect **trivarttu*, but of course *rTT* and *rT* clusters can generally only be distinguished on etymological grounds (see AiG I.112–14). As for our form, AiG II.2.663 (with lit.) suggests that *trivár(t)u* in this passage is a nonce creation modeled on well-attested *tridhātu* found in the preceding pāda (c).

In any case the triply layered shelter and triply turned light conform to the triadic focus of this hymn; I’m not sure they need to be more specifically identified.

VII.101.3: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. is full of gender ambiguity and gender switching, in service of the Vedic love of paradox. Although the subject of the first hemistich is surely Parjanya, he is not identified by name, and a masc. gender pronoun only appears as the very last word of the half-vs. (... *eṣāḥ*) -- while the state and activity ascribed to the subject of pāda a are quintessentially female.

In the 2nd hemistich the referents probably align well with the implied genders, unlike pāda a: by most interpr. the mother is Earth, the father is Heaven, as usual. But the action, at least in pāda c, is paradoxical, since it is the “milk” (*pāyaḥ*) of the *father* that the mother accepts. This milk is of course a metaphor for rain. In d it is said that both the father and son grow strong on it, another apparent paradox. Assuming that the father is Heaven, this is probably an early ref. to the water cycle: rain produces plants, which ultimately produce the offerings sent to heaven via the smoke of sacrifice, swelling the clouds that then again produce rain. By most accounts the “son” who is also strengthened in d refers to mankind, the offspring of the earth.

VII.101.4: This extravagant claim of Parjanya’s cosmic centrality -- all creatures, the three heavens, and the waters all take him as their basis -- must derive from his control of the rain, as the second hemistich suggests and 5cd further develops. The vs. is also made up of pādas with either exact (a, d) or near repetitions (b, c) elsewhere in the RV (see Ge’s nn. 4a, 4c, 4d and for pāda b partial reps. in I.35.6, VII.87.5; VII.90.4, X.111.8), which may account for the generic impression it gives.

VII.101.5: The subjunctive *jujoṣat* in b would fit the context better with a modal reading (“let him enjoy it / may he enjoy it”), surrounded as it is by impvs. (*astu* b, *santu* c) -- though the standard rendering of the subjunctive, as given in the publ. tr., is certainly not excluded.

VII.101.6: With Lü (506), I take the first hemistich as a truth-formulation, summarily referred to by *tād ṛtaṃ* “this truth” beginning c.

VII.102 Parjanya

Although the Anukr. identifies the meter of vs. 2 as Pādanicṛṭ (7 7 / 7), it is clearly a Gāyatrī like the other two vss., with distraction of the gen. pl. ending *-nām* at the end of pādas a, c.

VII.102.2: This vs. consists only of a rel. cl; it could be attached either to vs. 1 or to vs. 3, both of which have pronouns in pādas adjacent to vs. 2 that could serve as referent (*sá* 1c, *tásmai* 3a). I prefer attaching it to vs. 3, since this configuration would fit the standard model of definitional relative clause / ritually based main clause.

On *gárbham ósadhīnām* see VII.101.1c and comm. thereon.

VII.103 Frogs

My interpr. of this hymn relies on the treatment of it in my 1993 article “Natural History Notes on the Rigvedic ‘Frog’ Hymn,” *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 72-73 (1991-92 [1993]) [=Amṛtamahotsava Volume, for 75th anniversary of the BORI], pp. 137–44. Since this article is not universally accessible, I will reproduce much of the commentary here (without particular ref. to pg. nos. or to the sec. lit. that is excerpted there). The hymn is one of the most popular in the RV and has been constantly tr. -- e.g., besides the usual, Macdonell (VRS and *Hymns* ...), Renou (*Hymnes spéculatifs*), Thieme (*Gedichte*), Maurer, Doniger.

VII.103.1: This first vs. is in Anuṣṭubh, as opposed to the rest of the hymn, which is Triṣṭubh, and it reads like a scene-setting introduction. Old suggests that it’s an addition.

The natural history phenomenon corresponding to the “year-long vow” (*saṃvatsarām ... vrata-[cārīṇaḥ]*) undertaken by the frogs is surely estivation, as was already suggested by H. H. Bender in 1917 (“On the Naturalistic Background of the ‘Frog-Hymn,’ RV VII. 103,” *JAOS* 37: 186–91). The rains (here embodied in Parjanya) trigger the emergence of the frogs, in a frenzy to mate—what is known as “explosive breeding.” A loud chorus of male vocalizations attends the mating, calling females to the breeding place.

The pf. of $\sqrt{śi}$ ‘lie’ is represented in Vedic only by the med. part. *śasayāná-*, found twice in the RV (also V.78.9). It has full-grade for expected zero-grade in the root syllable, matching the full-grade forms of the archaic root pres. *śáye*, part. *śáyāna-*.

The presence of the stem *brāhmaṇá-* is of course a sign of the lateness of this hymn, since it is restricted to only the latest layer of the RV.

I now think the phrase *brāhmaṇā vratacārīṇaḥ* “(like) brahmins following their commandment” may be a sly reference to *brahmacārya-* (first found in the AV, but cf. *brahmacārín-* in late RV X.109.5), which refers not only to the studentship phase of life stages, but also, specifically, to celibacy. The frogs, by virtue of their estivating state of suspended animation, have perforce been celibate, but they now go about energetically remedying the situation.

The phrase *vācam ... prá√vad* is reminiscent of nearby VII.101.1 *tisró vācaḥ prá vada* in a hymn to Parjanya, who is the instigator of the frogs’ speech here.

VII.103.2: The comparison of the estivating frog to a “dried-out leather bag” (*dṛtiṃ ná súṣkam*) may reflect a natural phenomenon: a 1932 “Notes on Indian Batrachians” by one C. McCann in the *Bombay Journal of Natural History* recounts an experiment undertaken by him that involved depriving frogs of water until they became shrunken and dried out like pieces of wood and then rehydrating them, at which point they began behaving normally.

It is difficult to interpr. *sarasī* as anything but a loc., but its morphology is a bit problematic. To the well-attested -s-stem *sáras-* ‘pond’, the loc. sg. is the expected *sárasī* (IX.97.52), but our form not only shows an unusual ending with a long *ī*, but it also bears the accent. No other forms to a putative stem *sarasī-* (so Gr,

etc.) are found. Wackernagel-Debrunner (AiG II.1.306; II.2.384) also posit a *sarasî-* stem, a *vrkî-* type fem. with collective meaning, with loc. sg. in *-î* (AiG III.170; see also Lanman, *Noun Inflection*, 389), by way of a contraction of **sarasî-i*. Though *vrkî-* loc. sgs. are rare, see *nadî* (I.135.9) and *gaurî* (IX.12.3) to better established *vrkî-* stems. On balance, it seems best to posit a stem *sarasî-* with Gr, Lanman, Old, Wackernagel-Debrunner, etc., but I do so reluctantly because of its extreme isolation and the widespread attestation of the *-as-* stem *sáras-*.

VII.103.3: This vs. contains the famous hapax *akhkhalīkṛtya* with the otherwise non-occurring (in Skt.) cluster *-khkh-*. The word was brilliantly explained by Thieme (KZ [1951] 109 = KISch 138). He sees it as the first attested *cvi* formation in Sanskrit. The base noun is *akṣára-* ‘syllable’, and the sense would be ‘making syllables’ -- a reference to the Indian pedagogical technique, still in use today in traditional instruction, of students repeating the text after the teacher, syllable by syllable, word by word. Here the teacher would be the father, as was most likely the original situation -- hence *pitāraṁ ná putráḥ* “like a son to his father.” Since even in RVic times the language used in instructing young boys would surely have been an early form of Middle Indo-Aryan, it would not be surprising that this technical pedagogical term should appear in MIA garb: *akṣára* should yield **akkhara-* in early MIA -- and in fact does; cf. Pāli *akkhara-*. This has simply been transformed into the more “froggy” sounding **akhkhara-* → *akhkharī-* in the *cvi* formation. This onomatopoeic rendering of a frog call is worthy to take its place beside the better known imitation in Aristophanes’s *brekekekex koax koax*. In fact, because the word does double duty in this passage -- imitating frog vocalizations directly, while implicitly comparing the frog chorus to the call-and-response style of childhood instruction -- our word seems even more ingenious and well chosen than the Greek. And it is quite striking that both the Greek and the Sanskrit immediately convince as froggy, though they are phonologically very distant from each other.

VII.103.4: The verb in the first pāda, *ānu gṛbhṇāti*, is generally rendered with an anodyne ‘greet’ (Macdonell, Maurer, Doniger; sim. Re ‘salute’), ‘support’ (unterstützt, Ge), or is given a specifically ritual interpr. (Thieme, *Gedichte*). But the lexeme has a straightforward literal sense ‘grasp in following, grasp from behind’, and this literal meaning exactly describes the posture of frog mating (“amplexus”), with the male grasping the female around her middle with his forefeet (sometimes facilitated by so-called “nuptial pads” developed during the mating season). Since once achieved, this posture is held for long periods—hours, days, even weeks or months—it would be visually salient to any Vedic bard outdoors during the rainy season, which is also the frog mating season. The only potential problem with my interpr. is that the obj. of the verb is masc. *anyām*. However, the expression here *anyó anyām* “the one ... the other” is already stereotypical in the RV for any mutual activity and will soon be frozen as the adverb *anyonyam* ‘mutually’. Moreover it is not impossible that the original text had a fem. **anyām* (*anyó *anyām ānu gṛbhṇāti enoh*): four-syllable openings almost always have a heavy fourth syllable (see Arnold,

188), whereas the transmitted text has a light one. Thus **anyām* could have been changed redactionally to *anyām* on the basis of the later adverb.

Note the phonetic echo ... *āmandiṣātām* / *maṇḍūkāḥ*.

The intens. *kāniṣkan* in c, ‘hopped and hopped, continually hopped’, is a nice description of the apparently random and chaotic “scramble competition” of male frogs seeking partners.

VII.103.5: The pedagogical model seen in vs. 3 is made more explicit here: the repetition of one frog’s call by another is likened to that of a pupil and his teacher (*śāktāsyeva ... śikṣamāṇaḥ*).

With Maurer, I take *sārvam ... pārva* as referring to a group of frogs, not to the section of a lesson with most others.

VII.103.6: This vs. reflects the natural fact that different frogs have different cries, which allow the females to differentiate conspecific males from those unsuitable for their mating.

VII.103.7–9: With the behavioral model of the frogs established in the first 6 vss., the next three treat the ritual application of this model.

VII.103.7: The first ritual application is that of the Atirātra or “Overnight” soma ritual. Frogs are generally nocturnal; they are active during the day only if the weather is rainy or very humid. So, the first signal to humans of the frogs’ emergence from estivation would be the *sound* of the nocturnal frog chorus when the rain supplied them with the impetus to emerge. Hence they are compared to brahmins at an Overnight ritual speaking around a soma vessel configured as a pond. The similes are complexly intertwined: the frogs are compared to brahmins, but those hypothetical brahmins are then implicitly compared to frogs around a pond – in other words to the original target of comparison.

VII.103.8: But as the day dawns, the frogs become visible, with their drive to mate overriding any instinct to flee or conceal themselves. This visibility is insistently conveyed by “[they] become visible; none are hidden” (*āvīr bhavanti gūhyā ná ké cit*). The frogs are compared to two different kinds of priests: brahmins (7a, 8a), who are here responsible for ritual speech, and Adhvaryus (8c), the priests who do the physical labor in Vedic ritual. They are “sweating” (*siṣvidānāḥ*): sweat is a sign of hard ritual labor in Indo-Iranian religious terminology (see my 2011 [2015] “Avestan *xšuuīd*: A Relic of Indo-Iranian Ritual Vocabulary,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 25: 19–29). Here, once again the image does double duty -- the frogs would be covered with water drops from the rains, but they are also compared to the hard-working priests officiating at the Pravargya ritual. The Pravargya is an especially sweat-inducing ritual, since it involves a hot milk drink (*gharmā-*), which must be tended as it is heated over the fire. Other features of the Pravargya conform to aspects of the hymn: there is a year-long *dikṣā* (period of consecration for the sacrificer), reflected

in both 1a (*saṃvatsarām śaśayānāḥ* “lying for a year”) and 8b (*brāhma kṛṇvāntaḥ parivatsarīṇam* “creating their yearly sacred formulation”); this dīkṣā involves a taboo on water or moisture of any kind. But the most crucial intersection between the Pravargya and frog behavior is found in the next vs.

Note in passing the non-etym. figure *vācam akrata brāhma kṛṇvāntaḥ* with two forms of \sqrt{kr} governing two words for speech, with the subject, *brāhmaṇāṣaḥ* in a derivational relationship to the 2nd form of speech.

VII.103.9: The year-long preparation for the Pravargya rite is again emphasized here in the first three pādas.

In b the *ná* is potentially ambiguous. The first reading is no doubt the negative: the ritualists/frogs do not fail to observe the proper ritual calendar. The VP *ná* (...) (*prá*) *minanti* is quite common (e.g., II.24.12, III.28.4, X.10.5). But *ná* could also be a simile marker in the phrase *náro ná*, for, after all, the subjects are frogs, compared to men. Since *ná* occupies the fifth syllable of the pāda, either reading is compatible with its position: an early caesura, followed by *ná*, for the negative reading; a late caesura, preceded by *ná*, for the simile.

The final pāda of the vs. is the ritual climax: the *gharmá*-drinks, heated on the fire, bubble up and overflow their vessel, as milk does when it’s been left too long on the stove. The “obtain their own release” (*aśnuvate visargám*, note the middle verb), a phrase rendered rather generically by many tr. (e.g., Doniger “the hot fires come to an end”; Maurer “the heated receptacles get emptied out”), is in my view a rendering of the dramatic moment when the bubbling mass boils over. I further suggest that its analogue in the natural world is the female frog’s release of her masses of eggs (up to 2000+ in some species), which are fertilized by the male as they are released – which must be a visually striking event. It may also refer to the practice of some frogs of making a “foam nest” in which to deposit the eggs, liquid albumen whipped up by the frog’s hind legs into a “dense light foam” -- a process that also might appear like milk boiling over.

VII.103.10: The frogs’ release and fertilization of masses of eggs in the preceding vs. serves as a model for the fertility and increase of the ritualists that are major aims in Vedic rituals. This is surely the sense conveyed by the final vs. of the hymn, describing various types of frogs as “giving” goods and hundreds of cows to us, as well as lengthening both their and our lifetimes. They do so “at a pressing of thousands,” which can literally refer to the release of the frogs’ eggs. The prodigious fertility of frogs (no matter what happens subsequent to the thousands of eggs produced) is an encouragement to our own..

The publ. tr. renders *prá tiranta āyuh* as “they lengthened (their / our) life.” But the verb is of course *tirante*, a present indic., out of sandhi and the tr. should be corrected to “lengthen.”

VII.104 Multiple divinities, to destroy demons and ward off evil

See the publ. intro. for an intro. to this complex composite hymn and its parts. Complete translations are given by Norman Brown (“The Rigvedic Equivalent for Hell,” JAOS 61 [1941]: 76–80) and Herman Lommel (“Vasiṣṭha und Viśvāmitra,” Oriens 18-19 [1965/66]: 200–27), as well as Doniger.

VII.104.1: The verse contains a remarkable eight verbs of violence, with three in the last pāda alone -- all quite different.

VII.104.2: The syntactic function of *aghām* in pāda a is ambig. It could be an acc. sg. masc. parallel to *aghāśaṃsam*, the object of *yayastu*. So Wh (tr. of AV VIII.4.2) “against the evil plotter, the evil ...” The pāda break following it might support this reading. However, it can also be a neut. sg., modifying *tāpuḥ* and therefore the subject of *yayastu*, as in the publ. tr., flg. Ge, followed also by most subsequent tr. Ge’s cited parallel, VI.62.8, where *tāpur aghām* belong together, seems decisive here. See also V.3.7, where *aghām* is used as a weapon against an *aghāśaṃsa-*: *ādhiḥ aghām aghāśaṃse dadhāta* “set evil upon him, the speaker of evil.”

The simile particle *iva* in the simile *carūr agnivāṃ iva* is postposed, but such late placement of simile markers is not uncommon in the RV.

The hapax *anavāyā-* is unclear. Old approvingly cites Bergaigne’s gloss ‘qu’on ne peut détourner par des supplications’, and this interpr. seems to inform most subsequent tr., including mine. But this interpr. should rest on the lexeme now understood to be *áva √yā* ‘appease’, and I do not see how the morphology would work. *√yā* has a zero-grade *ī*, but no *ay-* forms -- but (*an-*)*avāya-* can only be broken down into *ava+ay-a*, containing no elements of *√yā/ī*. AiG fails to treat this form. Re (EVP XVI.114) tries briefly to get it from *áva √ī*, but decides that *áva √ī* is “simpler.” This is certainly the case morphologically, but the semantics are harder: *áva* is not a particularly common preverb with *√ī* and when it appears, the lexeme generally means ‘go down’ (with ‘down’ the physical direction), occasionally more generally ‘go away’. Re cites V.49.5 *ávaitu ábhvam*, claiming that the verb there means ‘céder’, thus allowing our form to mean ‘qui ne cède pas’. But I do not see a ‘cede’ sense in that passage, just ‘go away’. This is, in fact, the interpr. found in RIVELEX (I.181), which glosses the stem *anavāyā-* as ‘nicht weggehend’ -- ‘not going away’ (metaphorically ‘nicht vergehend, verbleibend’, 181 n. 1) and analyses as a “Verbales Rektionskompositum/Dete<r>minativkompositum” *an-* + *avāya-* ‘weggehend’ (< *áva* + *√ay¹-*). This must be the correct analysis, though I am sorry to abandon the richer semantics of a derivation from *áva √yā*. My publ. tr. ‘unrelenting’ can still probably stand, as a strengthened expression of ‘not going away’. (Note in passing that RIVELEX I.394 [s.v. *ay¹-*] glosses verbal forms of *áva* + this root as ‘herabsteigen; Abbitte leisten — descend; apologize’; the second terms of the German and English glosses must result from confusion with *áva √yā / ī* and should be stricken.)

The rendering ‘worm-eater’ for *kimīdín-* here and in the following vs., as well as in X.87.24, is based on a suggestion of Schindler and Werba recorded in EWA s.v. and also entertained by Scar (41). Note that in X.87.24 it is associated with

yātudhāna- ‘sorcerer’, which stem figures prominently later in our hymn as well as in other parts of X.87.

VII.104.3: The first hemistich of this vs. contains 2 locative phrases, *vavré antár* (a) and *anārambhaṇé támasi* (b). Essentially all tr. are agreed that the two phrases are parallel and refer to the same place -- and this is reasonable and probably would be the default reading. This interpr. in turn leads some (see esp. Norman Brown and Oberlies I.473) to take this as a description of Hell, or the RV equivalent thereof. My interpr. is syntactically bolder, and perhaps less well supported, but it arises from my discomfort with equating the enclosed space denoted by *vavrá-* (which is several times used of the Vala cave, e.g., IV.1.13, V.31.3) with “ungraspable darkness.” Because these locales seem incompatible, I take *vavré antár* as referring to the place where the evil-doers are hiding / taking refuge, and the action enjoined on Indra and Soma in b is to roust them from this hole and thrust them into a dark void with no handhold, the very opposite of an enclosure. A similar use of *vavré antár* as a place from which creatures are ejected is found in the account of the Vala myth in V.31.3 *prācodayat sudúghā vavré antár* “(Indra) impelled forth the good milkers (who were) within the cave.” The action there is of course benign, but the loc. phrase also refers to the original location of the cows, not their destination. I must confess, however, that vs. 17 in our hymn, with the phrase *vavrāṁ anantān* “holes without end” into which the villainess is to fall, does give me pause. (On the other hand, vs. 17 is in a portion that was probably a late addition to the hymn; see publ. intro.)

VII.104.4: The lexeme *úd √takṣ* (lit. ‘fashion up’) that opens the 2nd hemistich occurs only here in the RV, and at least acdg. to Monier Wms nowhere else in Skt.; it was clearly artificially generated to contrast with the verb *nijūrvathaḥ* (‘grind down’) at the end of the hemistich, to highlight the *úd* ‘up’ / *ní* ‘down’ contrast.

VII.104.5: *pársāna-* occurs only 3x in the RV (and nowhere else in Skt.), here and in VIII.7.34, VIII.45.41. It has no good etymology (see EWA s.v.). The sense of ‘deep place, chasm’ is thus entirely dependent on context. Such a meaning is compatible with all three passages; the strongest support for it is VIII.7.34 *girāyaś cin ní jihate pársānāso mányamānāḥ* “Even the peaks bend down, thinking themselves depths.” Parallel locatives in VIII.45.41 make it likely that it refers to a place, but not what sort of place it might be: *yád vīlāv indra yát sthire, yát pársāne párábhṛtam* “What is in a firm place, what in a solid place, Indra, what has been borne away (in)to a *pársāna*” In our passage the *ní* ‘down’ does suggest that the destination is a depth, but I also think that this interpr. has been somewhat uncritically embraced by those with preconceptions about the Vedic hell/underworld.

nisvarám ‘in silence, to silence’ contrasts with *svaryà-* ‘reverberant’, used of the weapon in 4c.

VII.104.6: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. closes the first section of the hymn, at least as I understand the structure.

The preverb *pári* appears with \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’ only here in the RV (and, acdg. to Mon Wms., all of Skt.). It seems to have been suggested by the *pári* in pāda a, construed with $\sqrt{bhū}$, in the meaning ‘encircle’. The idiom *pári* \sqrt{hi} ‘impel around’ does not make much sense, unless the image is of *hótrā-* compared to horses made to circle a race track. Re thinks rather that it reprises *pári bhūtu* in a: “l’offrande que (je ceins) autour (de vous en la) poussant” -- but this seems more trouble than it’s worth: he is forced to supply the crucial verb (je ceins: ‘gird, buckle on’) while relegating the actual verb stem *hinomi* to a participial adjunct (“en ... poussant”).

hótrā- is of course completely -- and not very interestingly -- ambiguous between ‘libation’ and ‘invocation’.

In the last pāda Indra and Soma are compared to *nṛpātī*. Some interpr. (Brown, Doniger) take this as a ref. to the Áśvins, and it is true that the other three occurrences of this dual refer to the Áśvins (VII.67.1, 71.4, X.106.4), as duals often do. However, I think it’s more interesting to assume that the poet is comparing these two great gods to *human* ‘lords of men = kings’, a sly switching of the hierarchy of roles. (Of course he just compared the gods to horses, so being compared to humans may be a step up.) I think Ge is correct in his interpr. of this simile: the gods should encourage our poetic formulations in the way that human kings do, by providing us with material goods. If *nṛpātī* = Áśvins, the simile doesn’t work.

VII.104.7: See publ. intro. for the init. *prāti* here echoed by that beginning 11c and forming a ring defining vss. 7–11 as a subsection. Since *prāti* ‘against’ is not otherwise found with $\sqrt{smṛ}$ (or with $\sqrt{śuṣ}$, see vs. 11), I think the preverb has been stationed at both ends of this section to focus attention on the targeted victim. See disc. in publ. intro.

The NP *rakṣáso bhaṅgurāvataḥ* is entirely ambiguous between gen./abl. sg. and acc. pl. It is almost universally taken as acc. pl. here, as parallel obj. to *druháḥ* ‘deceits’, but I prefer gen. sg. for several reasons. For one thing “deceits (and) demons” is a somewhat off-balance coordination (though certainly not impossible in RVic discourse). More important, the second hemistich defines a single enemy who shows hostility “with his deceit” (*druhā*); it makes sense to identify this single foe as the singular demon of pāda b, who owns the deceits mentioned there. In favor of the acc. pl. interpr., in X.76.4 (cited by Ge, n. 7b; cf. also X.87.23) the same phrase must be acc. pl. obj. of a form of \sqrt{han} , as here: X.76.4a *ápa hata rakṣáso bhaṅgurāvataḥ*. On the other hand, in IX.71.1 (also cited by Ge) in the two-word sequence *druhó rakṣásah*, which we also find here, *druhāḥ* is an acc. pl. (as here), obj. of the verb *véti*, but *rakṣásah* belongs to a different syntagm and is abl. sg., construed with *pāti* “protects from the demon.” The point of citing all these parallel passages is to demonstrate that even identical word sequences can function differently syntactically in different contexts: the poets were not locked into a morphological template.

The poss. adj. *bhaṅgurā-vant-* (to *bhaṅgurá-* [AiG II.2.487], to $\sqrt{bhañj}$ ‘break’; see EWA s.v. *BHAÑJ*) modifies *rakṣás-* 3x and *hantár-* once. I choose to render its possessive morphology by tr. ‘with his wreckage’ (lit. ‘having breakage, wreckage’), referring to the damage that a demon brings in his train -- in contrast to

looser and more colorful tr. like Brown's (reproduced almost verbatim by Doniger): "Slay those who employ demons, who hate us, who would break us to bits," where he manages to turn both the root noun *druh-* and the poss. adj. *bhaṅgurāvant-* into verbs qualifying *rakṣāsaḥ*. Others attenuate the meaning of *bhaṅgurāvant-* to 'crooked', and then by easy metaphorical extension 'tricky, malicious' (see Gr's 'tückisch, trügerisch', also EWA's 'trügerisch, mit krummen Wegen'; Ge, Lommel, Lü 419 'hinterlistig'). This interpr. is based on the second of BR's glosses of the base adj. *bhaṅgura-* 1) zerbrechlich, vergänglich, 2) krumm, kraus, gerunzelt; see Gr's reproduction of the 1st word of each in his gloss of (*bhaṅgurá*). This base word is not found in Vedic -- and *bhaṅgurāvant-* is found outside the RV only in passages based on RVic passages -- though *bhaṅgura* is fairly widespread in Classical Skt., where it generally means 'breakable', but occasionally 'curved' esp. in connection with eyebrows (cf. AiG III.195 in addition to BR s.v.). Since the 'curved, crooked' sense seems to be a late and specialized development, I see no reason to impose it on this RVic word, esp. since I see no clear line from 'break' to 'be crooked' except in such a specialized application.

VII.104.8: The lexeme *abhí√caks* here seems almost a substitute for *abhí√car* 'conjure against', and note that the object ("me") is qualified by the part. *cárantam*. Re notes that this is the only RVic pejorative ex. of well-attested *abhí√caks*, which generally means 'look upon, look towards, oversee' in neutral or positive sense. It is notable that in our passage the action of this *visual* idiom is accomplished by *verbal* means ("untruthful words" *ánṛtebhir vácobhiḥ*). Re remarks that it coincides "avec le passage de «voir» à «dire»" -- without specifying what he means.

VII.104.9: The hapax *pāka-śamsá-* is taken by some as a bahuvrīhi (implicitly, Gr 'arglos redend'; cf. Whitney [AV VIII.4.9] "him of simple intent," Brown "him of pure and single heart," Doniger "the man of pure heart" [with *śamsa-* = 'heart'?!]), but by accent it should be a determinative compd, contrasting explicitly with the bahuvrīhi *aghá-śamsa-* 'having evil speech' with 1st member accent, found in vss. 2 and 4. It is surely *my* guileless speech that is in question, since I was "acting with guileless mind" (*mā pākena mānasā cárantam*) in the immediately preceding vs (8a). As Re points out, *ví√hr* probably refers to distortion of ritual speech.

Since *pāka-śamsá-* is a thing, not a person, the parallel *bhadrám* in b should also likewise be a thing (so Ge, Whitney, Lommel, Brown), not, as the publ. tr. ("an auspicious one") has it, a person. I would thus take the form as a neut. acc. sg., not a masc. and slightly emend the publ. tr. to "something auspicious." This something is probably also connected with ritual performance.

VII.104.10: I take *ní ... hīyatām* as belonging to *√hā* 'change position'; in most passages *ní√hā* means 'bend down' (e.g., VIII.27.2), but here and in VI.52.1, also a curse, I take the passive as 'be bent double'. Most tr. are unsatisfyingly generic ('perish' and the like).

VII.104.11: See disc. in publ. intro. and ad vs. 7 on the use of *prāti* to define this section of the hymn and call attention to the victim. As noted ad vs. 7, *prāti* √*śuṣ* is found only here.

VII.104.12: The prim. comp. *ṛjītyas-* here (=AVŚ VIII.4.12; also in AVŚ V.14.12), to *ṛjū-* ‘straight’, should of course have a full-grade root syllable **rājītyas-*, like the superlative *rājīṣṭha* (RV 7x, = Aves. *razišta-*). Re plausibly suggests that it has adopted the root syllable of the base adjective -- though why other primary comparatives and superlatives tolerate root ablaut is not addressed. It’s worth noting that if we were to restore the expected form, it would fix a problematic cadence (*yatarád *rājītyaḥ* ← *ṛjītyaḥ*), by producing a heavy syllable four syllables from the end. As it is, the cadence is ∪ ∪ – ×, rather than expected – ∪ – ×. I am reluctant to emend, however, since it is not clear how the erroneous zero-grade would have been introduced.

VII.104.13: Most interpr. (Ge, Oberlies [Rel. RV I.441], Re, Doniger, Wh [AV]), take *kṣatríyam* here as masc. personal ‘ruler’, modified by the part. *dhāráyantam*, while I take it as neut. ‘rule’ (as it sometimes is; cf. IV.20.3, V.69.1) and the obj. of the participle. The problem with the standard interpr. is that the part. has nothing to govern, and in fact a number of interpr. supply a second *kṣatríyam* (or *kṣatrám*; see Re) to occupy that role. Cf., e.g., Ge “... den Herrscher, der fälschlich (die Herrschaft) führt.” However, Lü (419), Lommel, and Brown interpr. as I do.

VII.104.14: The disjunctive “if” clauses that occupy the first hemistich are more complicated than they first appear. In the publ. tr. I took the first half, *yádi vāhám ánr̥tadeva āsa*, as a contrary-to-fact expression “if I were ...” The general context speaks in favor of this interpr.: in the 2nd hemistich the speaker asks indignantly why Agni is angry at him, so the implication is that the speaker has *not* done what would occasion such anger. This assumption presumably accounts for Ge’s tr. “als ob ...” (fld. by Lommel), which is strenuously disputed by Old. But the grammar makes problems: the indicative perfect *āsa* should not express contrary-to-fact modality, but a fact in the past (that may or may not have present relevance). For contrary-to-facts of this sort, the pres. opt. usually serves; cf. VII.44.23 *yád agne syām ahám tvám, tvám vā ghā syā ahám* “If I were you, Agni, or you were me ...” Note also that the AV version has an indicative *present*, *āsmi* (Wh “If I am one of false gods ...”). So we must reckon with the real possibility that “I” did have false gods, at least in the past, and I would slightly alter the tr. to “If I was (previously) a man with false gods ...”

The parallel verb in b is the perfect *apy ūhé*. In the publ. tr. I take this as presential -- and this is quite possible, since the other forms of this pf. are so used (see Kü 489–90) -- but Kü takes it as preterital, and, given my slight reinterpret. of pāda a, this might be best: “if I called upon ...” Kü accepts Insler’s 1996 positing of a root √*vāh* ‘respect’ separate both from √*vah* ‘convey’ and from √*ūh* ‘laud’ (which latter has a full-gr. root med. pres. → them. pres. *óh(a)-*). I am not convinced of the

need for this separate root and would simply group the pf. *ūhé* with the pres. of $\sqrt{ūh}$, despite Kü's argument that unless the pf. is clearly distinguished from the pres. by meaning or function, they should not belong to the same root.

What exactly this pāda is conveying is not clear. Did the speaker call upon the true gods but in a false (that is, ritually faulty or with false intent or a false heart?) way? Such is the interpr. of most comm. -- e.g., Ge "nur zum Schein" -- but Lü (420) suggests equating *mógham* and *devān* ("oder wenn ich das Falsche als Götter ... auffasste ..."), though he also gives the alternate "in falscher Weise." And Re is more radical in his interpr. of the verb: "si j'ai une compréhension (fausse des) dieux." Given the appearance of the same adverb *mógham* in 15d, with the sense of false speech, the standard interpr. of the occurrence in this vs. seems the correct one, esp. as it contrasts nicely with the false or untrue gods in pāda a.

The question in d is where to construe *te*. Ge (fld. by Scar 469, but with ?) takes it as a quasi-agent: "Die Falschredenden sollen dem Tode *durch dich* verfallen." Given that *te* is an enclitic and that the verb is not passive, this seems a stronger statement than the text would seem to support. I take *te* with the *drogha-* of the compd *drogha-vāc-* "deceitful to you," but I admit that it might rather go with *nirṛthām* "your dissolution" (so Brown, Doniger "your destruction"; sim. Lü) -- that is, dissolution stemming from you. Not all tr. render the *te*: it is absent from Lommel's rendering.

VII.104.15: I use the standard English rendering of *yātudhāna-* (with cognates well attested also in Old and Middle Iranian) as 'sorcerer' (German Zauberer), without any implications about what practices this figure might engage in. Since in the RV the word is found only in "popular" discourse, he presumably doesn't work his ill through orthodox ritual means.

VII.104.17: The standard rendering of *khargālā-* is 'owl'; see, inter alia, Gr, EWA, and the various tr. of this vs. But I find this unlikely for several reasons. The 'owl' is found as *ūlūka-* in 22a, so it is already represented in this sequence of vss. But, though one could argue that there are numerous types of owls, which could have different designations, there are other arguments against this identification. For one thing, if the word is onomatopoetic, as EWA suggests, *kharg(a)* is not a particularly owl-ish sound. I tentatively suggest the nightjar. A number of species of nightjars are found in the proper geographical area. As for behavior and appearance, judging from information aggregated from the internet, nightjars are nocturnal ("goes forth by night" *prā ... jīgāti ... náktam*), feeding esp. at the twilights; the sexes are similar, and the birds are small and therefore could be considered typically female (hence the fem. *khargālā-*). They stay hidden on the ground by day ("concealing her own body by deceit" *āpa druḥā tanvām gūhamānā*): images on the internet show them visually almost indistinguishable from the ground and one YouTube video is entitled "Indian Nightjar -- Master of Camouflage"; acdg. to Wikipedia "During the day, the Indian nightjar lies still on the ground, concealed by its plumage; it is then difficult to detect, blending in with the soil." Moreover, their cries are much easier to connect with

kharg(a) than an owl's, being described as "a continuous churring" (the internet provides numerous recordings of various types of nightjars). Note that etymologically the "-jar" of nightjar is derived from its churring song -- and *jar* and *kharg* are reasonably close phonetically. Moreover, their genus name is *Caprimulgus* "goat-sucker," based on the old belief that the birds suck milk from goats; if a similar belief was also found in India, it might seem to be the habit of a sinister or at least uncanny creature -- accounting for its inclusion here among the sorcerers in animal form.

The ability of the soma-pressing stones to smash demons, referred to in d, is also found in the pressing stone hymn X.76.4 *āpa hata rakṣāso bhaṅgurāvataḥ* "Smash away the demons with their wreckage," which incidentally contains one of the three other occurrences of *bhaṅgurāvanta-* in the RV, besides the one in vs. 7 above. The demon-destroying ability of ritual implements, especially the noise made by their clashing, also reminds me of "Manu's Cups," whose clattering destroys Asuras. See the various Vedic prose versions of this in my *Sacrificed Wife*, pp. 21–26.

VII.104.18: I am not entirely certain why it is the Maruts who are tasked with the destruction of these creatures, though it is probably because the demons in question have taken the form of birds and therefore are moving in the midspace, which is the Maruts' domain. Re also cites the well-known relationship between the Maruts and the *vīś-* (see *vikṣū* here), and these animal demons may be associated with the "folk."

The root noun *rīp-* is otherwise used of cheats and swindles (cf. also *ripú-* 'cheating, swindler'), and I am reluctant to allow a sense 'defilements' only here -- though it is the almost universal solution of other tr. (Wh, Brown, Klein [DGRV II.149: "impurities"], Lommel "Unsauberes," but cf. Ge's "Unredlichkeit" [dishonesty], which has a moral nuance). Deception and cheating are also characteristic of the animal-demons in this section: see the *khargālā* who conceals her own body "with deceit" (*druhā*) in 17b, the flying dog-sorcerers that want to deceive Indra in 20b, and the oblation-stealers in 21b -- so the standard sense of *rīp-* fits the larger context. However, I do have to acknowledge that the root \sqrt{rip} does mean 'smear', and so 'defilement' is not out of the question.

It is difficult to avoid taking *devé* here as an adjective 'divine', modifying *adhvaré* 'ceremony', a temptation that all tr. (including me) have succumbed to and that is endorsed by Old.

VII.104.19: The "mountain" with which Indra smites the demons must be Indra's *vájra-* 'mace', identified with a mountain elsewhere, as Re points out: in VII.22.6, as well as in the curious dvandva *indrā-parvatā* (3x, only in voc.: I.122.3, 132.6, III.53.1). See comm. ad locc.

VII.104.21: I have rendered the impf. *abhavat* in pāda a as an immediate past ('has become'), though this is not ordinarily a usage of the impf. But this sense fits the context better than a simple past.

Note the echo of *parāśaró* in *paraśúr* in c.

As Re remarks, this is the only negative use of the desid. *vívāsa-* (\sqrt{van} ‘win’), usually ‘seek to win, covet, coax’. The negative sense must be attributable to the confrontational preverb *abhí*.

How to distribute and construe the two similes in cd is the question. I take both similes, *paraśúr yáthā vānam* “like an axe a tree” (c) and *pātreva* “like pots” (d), with the pres. part. *bhindán* (d) in two slightly different senses, ‘splitting’ and ‘breaking’ respectively (sim. Brown, Doniger). This pres. part. is anticipated by the preverb complex *abhīd* that opens the hemistich, looking like an aberrant form of \sqrt{bhid} -- a low-level ex. of poetic repair. Others (notably Ge, Wh, Lommel) take *bhindán* only with the 2nd simile, with the first controlled by *eti* in d (e.g., Ge “Śakra fährt auf die Dunkelmänner los wie die Axt in den Baum”). But axes are more likely to “split” than to “advance,” and I take *eti* only with the acc. pl. (*satāḥ* ...) *rakṣasaḥ* as goal. It would also be possible to take *bhindán* + *eti* as a verb phrase with auxiliary, ‘keeps splitting’ or the like.

The function, and indeed the morphological identity, of *satāḥ* is unclear. With Gr, I take it as a pres. part. to \sqrt{as} in the acc. pl., modifying *rakṣasaḥ*. In my interpr. it means ‘real, really being X’, though that could extend to ‘really present’. Re by contrast suggests that it’s an adverb, meaning here ‘tout à fait’, also probably found as 1st cmpd. member in *sató-mahant-* (‘entirely great’ VIII.30.1) and *sató-vīra-* (‘entirely heroic’ VI.75.9). Although Re does not pronounce on the morphological analysis, AiG II.1.237 implies that it contains the adverbial ablatival suffix *-tas* / *-tās* and thus does not belong to the pres. part. of \sqrt{as} . See also EWA s.v. *satās*. Old (ad VII.32.24) allows several possibilities, incl. the adverb, which he considers assured in the cmpds. cited above. Although, with Old, etc., I think that an adverbial *satāḥ* is found in those cmpds., I do not find that interpr. *satāḥ* as adverbial here improves the sense, though I grant that the acc. pl. pres. part. doesn’t really either.

VII.104.22: The *śuśulūka-*, occurring beside *ulūka-*, must be some species of owl, and it is tempting to take it as a deformation of **śīśu-ulūka-* ‘baby owl, little owl’, hence presumably the diminutives found in many tr. (incl. mine).

Sāy. takes *kóka-* as the cakravāka bird (see Ge n. 22b), Gr, Wh, Lommel, Brown, Doniger as the cuckoo, presumably on onomatopoetic grounds. The reinterpret. ‘wolf’ is owing to Lü (see Re and EWA s.v.) and has MIA support. Despite the dominance of birds in pādas a and c, ‘dog’ and ‘wolf’ make a natural pair in b.

VII.104.23: Acdg. to Re, Mehendale interpr. the curious formation *yātumāvant-* in pāda a (also I.36.20, VII.1.5, VIII.60.20) not as a metrical variant of *yātumānt-* (so AiG II.2.775) but as a haplology for **yātu-māyyāvant-*. I assume (I have not seen the art.) that his posited form contains *-māyā-* in one form or another and anticipates the next vs. where the female sorcerer is “exulting in her magic power” (*māyāyā śāśadānām*), though I don’t know why the form posited is not just **yātu-māyāvant-*, containing attested *māyāvant-* ‘possessing māyā’ (IV.16.9). If we accept this

suggestion, or modified suggestion, the tr. could be slightly altered to “the demonic power of those possessing the magic power of sorcerers.”

The *kimīdīn-* was singular in vs. 2, but a dual matched pair (*mithunā yā kimīdīnā*) here. Why the dual is not entirely clear, but the next vs. specifies both male and female sorcerers as Indra’s target, and the *mithunā-* here suggests a sexual pairing.

VII.104.24: *vīgrīva-* ‘with no / broken neck’ is ambiguous: is it descriptive of a pre-existing condition and thus a species, ethnic, or personal slur (in English “no-neck” is an insult, referring to a burly and stupid thug or goon)? or is it used proleptically here, to indicate what will happen to those who “shake to pieces” (*ṛdantu*). I’ve taken it as the former, but opinion is divided and either would work in the passage.

mūra-deva- is also contested. Acdg. to EWA (s.v. *mūla-*), flg. Wack., it is an *r*-form of **mūla-deva-* ‘whose gods are roots’ (Wurzelnbeter)(see also Brown). This excursion into exotic anthropology seems unlikely to me -- not the sort of divinity that Vedic people would posit even of their worst and most primitive enemies. Most tr. take it as ‘idol-worshiper’ (e.g., Ge Götzenbeter), without, however, indicating what the ‘idol’ rests on: ‘root’ → ‘root as representation of god’ → ‘idol’ (not a semantic chain that seems reasonable to me)? Or, more likely to me, based on *mūrā-* ‘stupid, foolish, dumb (i.e., non-speaking)’. My own ‘with feckless gods’ is rests on this association, but is closer to the sense of the original adjective. I do not, however, have an explanation for the accent.