V.29 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is punctuated by expressions of soma-drinking, each slightly different and generally found in the 2ⁿᵈ half of an even pāda:

2b ... *papivā́ṃsaṃ sutásya*
3b ... s*ómasya súṣutasya peyā́ḥ*
3d ... *papivā́m índro asya* [rhyming with 2b]
5b ... *somapéyam* [cf. 3b]
[7d *sutám pibat ... sómam*]
8b ... *somyā́pā́ḥ*
11d ... *ápibaḥ sómam asya*

V.29.1: I follow Brereton (Ādityas, 165–66), who in turn followed Thieme (Mitra and Aryaman, 78–77), in taking *aryamā́* not as nom. sg. masc. (as it is normally and as taken by the standard tr.), but as acc. pl. neut. construed with *trī́* (like *trī́ rocanā́* in the next pāda). Against Thieme's "three hospitalities," Brereton plausibly suggests that in this context the three *aryamā́* must refer to "what governs the ritual," perhaps the three soma-pressings or the three fires.

Pāda-initial *trī́*, found here in a and b, recurs in 7c, 8a, b (also non-initial in 7b).

In c *pūtá-dakṣa-* (/*pūtá-dakṣas-*) is ordinarily Ādityan vocabulary (though used of the Maruts also in VIII.94.7, 10). Ge (/WG) supply the Ādityas as the subj. of *dhārayanta* in b and of course take Aryaman as the subject of pāda a. By contrast, I think the Maruts are subjects of all three pādas -- but they are identified with the Ādityas throughout, as the use of *pūtádakṣa-*, ordinarily a qualifier of the Ādityas, makes clear.

V.29.2: Ge (/WG) take *abhí yád áhim han* as subordinate to *ā́datta vájram* in the same pāda. Although this fits the metrical scheme slightly better, it makes some trouble with the logical sequence of events ("he took the mace when he smashed the serpent," almost implying that the smashing occurred first). It works better as subordinate to the main clause of d.

The word order *áhim hán* and the lack of augment on the verb scrambles the standard formula, producing almost a syncopated effect, which is repaired in 3d.

V.29.3: Ge (/WG) take *havyám* as the subj. of *ávindat*: "the oblation found the cows for Manu." This interpr. accounts for the accent on *ávindat*, which would be generated by *hí*. But it is otherwise bizarre: *gā́ḥ √ vid* 'find the cows' is a standard formula in the Vala myth, and the subject of the verb is always Indra or his agent(s)/companion(s) (e.g., Aṅgirases I.62.2, Saramā V.45.7, 8); for Indra himself cf., e.g., I.101.5, II.19.3, VIII.96.17, and in a variant of the formula in the next hymn V.30.4 *vidó gavā́m ūrvám*. I know of no passages in which the oblation is credited with finding the cows, and in fact soma plays far less of a role in the successful outcome of the Vala myth than in that of the Vṛtra myth (though see 12a below). I therefore take *tád dhí havyám* as a nominal sentence completing b, with a clause break in the middle of c. I attribute the accent on

ávindat to contrast with the immediately following verb *áhan*, which opens the next pāda. This hymn in fact shows a penchant for pāda-internal clause breaks: cf. in the immediately preceding vs. 2c, as well as 8d, 9d, 11d, 13b, all except the last right after the caesura as here.

V.29.4: For Indra enwrapped in the earth, cf. I.173.6 *sáṃ vivya índro vṛjánaṃ ná bhū́ma* "Indra has enwrapped himself in the earth like a girth." Cf. also his wearing the earth III.32.11, VIII.4.8. Although here the enwrapping seems presented as a handicap, esp. given the *cid*, in the just cited passages the images seem rather to emphasize Indra's vastness.

   As noted also by Ge, Schaeffer, and WG, *jígartim … apajárgurāṇaḥ* is a word play, but the words presumably belong to different roots. The first is universally assigned to √*gṝ* 'swallow', but the root affiliation of the second is disputed. Ge and EWA (s.v. *GAR^Í* p. 470) assign it to a √*gṛ* 'hold out', but I follow Schaeffer (Intens., 116–22) in taking it to √*gṛ* 'greet, extol', with the negative sense contributed by the preverb *ápa*. So also WG and Oberlies (Relig. I.401). See also nearby *apagū́rya* (V.32.6).

   The etymological separation of *jígartim* and *apajárgurāṇaḥ* invites further scrutiny of the hapax *jígartim*. As noted above, this word is generally grouped with √*gṝ* 'swallow' and interpreted as an agent noun 'swallower' (my 'gulper'). However, with *apajárgurāṇaḥ* off the table, there is no particular contextual support for this interpr., though it is certainly semantically acceptable. Far more troubling are the serious formal problems. For one thing, *-ti-* is by no means an agent-noun suffix; it normally of course forms feminine abstracts, though AiG II.2.636–37 does register a number of such stems that have been reanalyzed "zur Bez. der persönlichen Träger des Verbalbegriffs zu verwenden." Debrunner himself identifies our form as a 3rd sg. verb form inflected as a -*ti*-stem (AiG II.2.638), but this interpr. has nothing to recommend it. Not only is such a morphological transfer not a feature of the RV, but there is also no such verb stem available to be nominalized. The root √*gṝ* 'swallow' does not have a redupl. pres. or in fact any redupl. stem save for the pf. *jagā́ra* and the intensive subj. *jalgulas* (I.28.1); the single form of the redupl. aor. *ajīgar* (I.163.7) supposedly belonging to this root (see Gr, and Whit. Roots) actually belongs with the other forms of this stem to the root √*gṝ* 'awaken', and we just discussed intens. part. *járgurāṇa-* above. It is, further, a seṭ root; it's hard to know what its pre-C full grade should be in a redupl. pres. formation since there are no parallel formations to roots in -*ṝ* that I know of (*jígarīti? cf. VS *galgalīti* and EWA s.vv. *GAR^Í2*, *GAL*), but presumably not simply *gar*. In short, neither the nominal morphology nor the root formation of *jígarti-* is easily accounted for under the standard hypothesis, but I have nothing better to substitute. I therefore retain the rendering in the publ. tr., though with full awareness of its fragility. My thanks to Veronique Kremmer, who drew my attention to *jígarti-* and its many problems and discussed the issues at length with me. See also the illuminating disc. in Vine 2004 "PIE Full Grades in Some Zero-Grade Contexts," p. 375.

V.29.6: Indra's two actions in this vs. are expressed by injunctives (*vivṛścát* b, *bā́dhata* d), as in the preceding vs. (*kaḥ* 5d), but the middle verb, *árcanti* in c, is emphatically present. The configuration here, #*árcantíndram marútaḥ*, matches that of 1c #*árcanti tvā marútaḥ*. See Hoffmann (Injunk. 165) on this vs., who seems to think the "timeless, mentioning"

function of the injunctive can be so distant from a real preterite that it can drag in present indicatives. I would attribute it rather to the attempt in this hymn to associate the heroic deeds of the past with the activities of the present sacrificers. It is also barely possible that the text originally read *árcantíndram, that is, *árcant índram with the underlying 3rd pl. ending -nt preserved before vowel, but later reinterpr. as pres. -nti after -nt regularly became -nn. The -í- could then have been lengthened, as if a sandhi product of árcanti índram, with no metrical consequences. The change would have been facilitated by the model of likewise pāda-initial árcanti in 1c, as well as arcanti in 12b. Still, on balance I find this unlikely. Other examples of preserved -nt because of early misparsing as -nti occur before the enclitic pronoun īm, and the result in either case would be -ntīm. See disc. ad I.67.4, etc.

V.29.7: On neut. pl. mahiṣā́ in conjunction with the numerical expression trī́ śatā́ni see Old. Note the alternative phrasing with gen. pl. in 8a trī́ ... śatā́ mahiṣā́ṇām.

V.29.8: Gr and Ge [/WG] take both ághaḥ and ápāḥ as 3rd sg. Since ághas belongs to the root pres. to √ghas, either 2nd or 3rd sg. is grammatically possible. But for ápāḥ to be 3rd sg., an s-aor. stem ápās- has to be posited, for which there is no other support save for a med. pāsta in a mā́-prohibitive in the AV (XII.3.43). Nevertheless, Narten does set up such a stem (Sig.Aor. 168). I see no reason to do so; the presence of nom. sg. maghávā, adduced as evidence by Narten, is not sufficient, since nom. sg. appositives to 2nd sg. subjects are common. Also common is abrupt shifting between 2nd and 3rd ps., found already in this hymn between vss. 1 and 2, 4 and 5, 5 and 6. In our vs. we must assume that a shift happens between the hemistichs, given the 3rd sg. jaghā́na in 8d, but this is hardly unprecedented -- and note that it returns abruptly to 2nd ps. in vs. 9. I therefore prefer to interpret 8ab as couched in the 2nd sg., as in the publ. tr. But if a 3rd sg. reading of ápāḥ is really desirable, I would prefer to consider the -s ending a local analogy to the precative peyāḥ at the end of 3b, reinforced by the ambig. parallel ághaḥ, rather than setting up an s-aorist stem to account for a single form.

 I follow Ge in taking both kārám and bháram as the direct speech expression of a victory cry. The former is appropriate to gaming contexts, while the latter is at home in battles. Our ahvanta ... bháram has a compositional equivalent bhára-hūti-, for which see comm. ad I.129.2; for kārám √kr̥, see I.131.5. It may be convenient to assemble here some passages containing both bhára- and kārá- (or derivatives): I.112.1 yā́bhir [ūtíbhiḥ] bhāre kārám áṃśāya jínvathaḥ; VIII.66.1 (likewise an Indra hymn): (índram ... ūtáye/ ....../) huvé bháram ná kāríṇam; IX.16.5 mahé bhárāya kāríṇaḥ; IX.14.1 kāráṃ bíbhrat puruspŕ̥ham. See also Wackernagel KlSch. 340ff.

V.29.9: On uśánā as an indeclinable, see my 2007 "Vedic Uśanā Kāvya and Avestan Kauui Usan: On the Morphology of the Names" (Fs. Jasanoff).
 On the basis of other mentions of this myth, 2nd du. áyātam must conceal a Vāyav Indraś ca type construction, with the other subject, beside voc. indra, being Kutsa. Cf. nearby dual dvandva indrā-kutsā (V.31.9). The gapping of Kutsa in the first half of the verse is repaired by cd sarátham yayātha, kútsena, with the same root √yā as in áyātam. I do not understand the change in tense stem.

V.29.10: In the publ. tr. I take *kútsāya* primarily with pāda a, though syntactically and metrically it should go with b. I would now emend the tr. to "the other you made into wide space for Kutsa to drive" or "... for Kutsa for driving." I'm not sure how a wheel can become a wide space -- what sounds like a kind of highway -- but the addition of Kutsa doesn't make it any less comprehensible.

I take *anā́saḥ* 'mouthless' as proleptic, describing the state of the Dasyus after Indra has finished crushing them (sim. to I.32.6 **anā́ḥ pipiṣe*), while Ge [/WG] take it as a standing characteristic of the Dasyus ("mouthless Dasyus"). There is no way to tell.

V.29.11: The etym. fig. *pácan paktī́ḥ* is also a proleptic expression of sorts, "cooking (food, so that it is) cooked," though since *paktí-* is not an adj./participle, but a noun identifying a type of food, the parallel isn't exact. For other exx. of *paktí- √pac*, see IV.24.7, VII.32.8.

V.29.12: This vs. brings the third repetition of *arcanti* (1c, 6c [or *árcan(t)*; see above]; cf. *árcan* 2b).

I don't quite understand the double *cid* construction in cd, where even one *cid* seems somewhat superfluous. Ge (/WG) take it as concessive and logically to be construed with *apidhā́navantam* ("the cowpen, although it had a cover" [Ge: "obwohl verschlossen," sim. WG]). This is possible, though I don't like the position of *cid*, and I would also note that #*gávyaṃ cid ūrvám* is also found in VII.90.4, where a concessive value is harder to wring out.

V.29.13: Gr, Ge (/WG), and Klein (DGRV I.219) interp. *pári √car* as 'serve'. Although this sense is found in later Vedic, the RVic instances of this lexeme only have the literal meaning 'go around' (e.g., III.7.2) with the developed sense 'encompass'. (I.127.9 comes closest to 'serve', but the 'surround' sense is dominant.) Interpreting *pári carāṇi* here as 'serve' requires the part. *vidvā́n* to take an obj. ("knowing your heroic deeds ..."), but pāda-final *vidvā́n* is almost always used absolutely. Moreover *áparītaḥ* (*pári √i*) in the next vs. continues the thought of conceptual circumscription.

Ge (/WG) and Klein divide the vs. syntactically into ab / cd, with the rel. cl. of c expressing the obj. of d. By contrast I think the lexical parallelism and the conjunction *co* [=*ca u*] of ... *yā́ cakártha / yā́ co ... kṛṇávaḥ* of bc mark those relative clauses as tightly conjoined, and I take them as subordinate to pāda a. Further, the last pāda *préd u tā́ te vidátheṣu bravāma* strikes me as a self-contained (pseudo-)refrain, reminiscent of the Gṛtsamāda refrain in II: *bṛhád vadema vidáthe suvī́rāḥ* (II.1.16d etc.).

V.29.14: This vs. is structured somewhat like vs. 13, with (a) *etā́ víśvā cakṛvā́n* corresponding to (13b) (*vīryà*) ... *yā́ cakártha*, though with pf. participle not rel. cl., and (c) *yā́ cid nú ... kṛṇávaḥ* corresponding even more closely to (13c) *yā́ co nú ... kṛṇávaḥ*. I would therefore now slightly emend the publ. tr. to reflect this parallelism more closely: "By your nature you cannot be circumscribed in heroism -- you, Indra, (as one) having done all these many (deeds) (as well as) those (deeds) that you will do even now in your daring. There exists no one to obstruct this power of yours." In other words I take pādas a and c as parallel adjunct expressions, with b as their joint main clause, and d (like 13d)

independent. Note that d has no overt referent for *yā́* in c. The English is awkward, but this structure corresponds better to the Skt.

V.29.15: On the sandhi in *návyā́ ákarma* see Old.

V.30 Indra

There are a number of paired repetitions of words and phrases in earlier and later parts of the hymn, but not enough to define an omphalos: e.g., -*senaḥ*# 3d / *sénāḥ*# 9b; X Y *cakr̥ṣe* 4a / X Y *cakre* 9a; *yudháye* 4b / 9d; *áśmānam cid* 4c / 8c; *gávām ... usríyānām* 4d / 11d.

V.30.1: Despite the distance between them and the syntagms in between, I take *rāyā́* and *ūtī́* as parallel polarized instr. to be construed primarily with *gántā*. Ge and WG differently, though also differently from each other.

It is tempting to interpr *gántā* in d as a periphrastic future, a temptation yielded to in the publ. tr.

V.30.1–2: Note the reciprocal 'seeking' (*ichán*) of Indra (1c) and his devotee (2b).

V.30.2: WG take *sasvár* as 'in sleep', against the standard interpr. 'in secret', arguing that the latter does not make sense with *bubudhānā́ḥ* in d. But pāda d is not directly associated with pāda a, which, with b, compares the poet's pursuit of Indra to the stealthy tracking behavior of a hunter. Moreover, the other three exx. of *sasvár(tā)* (in a tight knot in VII.58.5, 59.7, 60.10) clearly mean 'in secret', as opposed to 'in the open' (cf. the contrast in VII.58.5 with *āvír* 'openly'). It is true that the standard etymology of *sasvár* takes it from √*sas* 'sleep' (see EWA s.v. *SAS*), but the semantic development to 'in secret' isn't difficult to imagine -- esp. if Skt. √*sas*, which violates standard root structure constraints, was onomatopoetic for the shushing/hushing verbal gesture (English "shh," etc.). From "keep quiet" to "keep secret" is a short step. Although √*sas* is clearly an inherited root, with cognates in Avestan and Anatolian, the onomatopoetic interpr. could be regularly (re-)actualized by association with the (near-universal?) living "shh" interjection.

The position of *anyā́n* in b should, by my rules, make it definite ("the others"). Though both Ge and WG render it as indefinite, there is no reason why it can't be definite: the poet consults with his priestly/poetic colleagues or with those "who know" (*vidvā́ṃs*-) Their answer, referring to "we men," suggests that it is a defined group, quite possibly the priests performing the morning ritual. The action that qualifies them for attaining Indra -- waking up (early) -- is surely not simply reflecting a general sentiment like "the early bird gets the worm," but refers to Indra's attendance at the morning pressing; cf., e.g., IV.35.7 *prātáḥ sutám apibo haryaśva* "Early in the morning you drank the pressed (soma), you of the fallow bays."

V.30.3: The syntax in the first hemistich is a little rough. *yā́ te kr̥tā́ni* in pāda a appears to be an embedded relative clause, a construction that is rare to non-existent in the RV. Its position between the preverb and the verb of the main cl. (*prá ... brávāma*) makes it difficult to interpret it any other way. The fact that it is a nominal clause, an NP serving

as direct object, may make the embedding seem less of a syntactic violation. See my forthcoming art. on the proto-izafe construction. (Note that Ge simply ignores the rel. prn.) The main verb *brávāma* is accented because it is effectively in pāda-initial position: the initial accented voc. *índra* is extra-clausal.

The second rel. clause *yā́ni no jújoṣaḥ* "which of ours you will enjoy" appears to be parallel to the embedded NP, but it is a little skewed semantically. Indra should not *enjoy* his deeds, but rather enjoy *hearing* our recital of them (see Ge "die du von uns gern *hören* wirst" [my italics], with 'hear' silently supplied). Alternatively it would be possible to assume that the 2nd rel. is (covertly) conjoined to the first and refers to different deeds, "(and) which (deeds) of ours you will enjoy" -- but it is hardly likely that Indra cares about what we do (besides pressing soma), so this interpr. is pragmatically blocked. WG supply "(in) unseren (Worten)" as the antecedent to the second rel. prn., such that what Indra will enjoy is our words, not his deeds ("(in) unseren (Worten), an welchen du Freude hast"); this seems to me to deploy too much machinery to repair what is simply a somewhat loose expression.

It would be technically possible to take the first hemistich as consisting only of relative clauses, with the main clause represented by c with an unexpressed resumptive "(those deeds)": "Which deeds of yours we shall now proclaim at the pressing, which you will enjoy, (those deeds) he will learn ..." The accent on *brávāma* would then be because it is in a dependent clause. Although this interpr. would save us from an embedded relative (see above), the rhetoric of the 1st hemistich, with *prá nú vayám ... brávāma* reminiscent of I.32.1 *índrasya nú vīryā̀ṇi prá vocam* and similar passages, strongly suggests an annunciatory declaration rather than a subordination.

V.30.4: Ge (/WG) assume that c, like d, refers to the opening of the Vala cave. They therefore either take *didyuto ví* 'flashed forth' as a stand in for 'broke/split apart' (Ge, flg. Sāy.'s *vyabhinaḥ*) or disjoin *didyutaḥ* from *ví* and supply another verb with the preverb (or so I understand WG's "... blitzend, zer(sprengt)"). But c and d do not have to refer to a single feat: a and b do not, and the recital of *kṛtā́ni* promised in 3ab covers a number of different deeds in the vss. to come. Moreover, though *áśman-* 'stone' can refer to the Vala cave, it has a number of other possible referents (see 8c where Namuci's head is equated/compared with an *áśman-*), including Indra's own weapon. Cf. IV.22.1 *yó áśmānaṃ śávasā bíbhrad éti* "who [=Indra] keeps bearing the stone with his power," with the *śávasā* found also here. Since √*dyut* is very commonly found with *ví* (including the common and lexicalized root-noun cmpd. *vidyút-* 'lightning') and since one of the sites to which a preverb in tmesis moves is directly after its verb (and here also adjoining a metrical boundary), it seems very likely that preverb and verb belong together -- and have their normal sense. In my interpr. this lexeme incorporates a simile: 'cause to flash like lightning' / 'cause to lightning' (unfortunately English does not have such a verb). In other words, with his power Indra can make even the dull and homely material stone flash like a lightning bolt.

V.30.5: The Pp. interprets *paramá* as nom. sg. m. *paramáḥ*, and Ge (/WG) follow suit. I prefer the equally possible reading *paramé*, on the basis of several 'born' passages with this expression. Cf., e.g., I.143.2 *sá jā́yamānaḥ paramé vyòman* (though the subj. is Agni there).

In my view *cid* often takes Wackernagel's Law position, even when it seems to limit a different word in the clause. Hence my "even the gods," though *devā́(ḥ)* is at the end of the pāda. Its positioning there may be to take advantage of its adjacency to *víśvā(ḥ)* across the pāda boundary. Although the latter is fem. and must modify acc. pl. *apáḥ* 'waters', its position evokes the common locution "all the gods / the All Gods." In fact, the expression "all the waters" is vanishingly rare — besides this passage I have found only VII.95.1 — and so "all" belongs more naturally with the immediately preceding "gods" than with its grammatical partner.

Note the switch from 2nd ps. ref. to Indra (rel. cl. 5ab) to 3rd ps. ref. (main cl. 5c, new cl. 5d).

V.30.6: Referent shift continues: 2nd ps. in ab, 3rd in cd.

V.30.7: There are several uncertainties in this vs.

As often the function and syntactic affiliation of *janúṣā* are unclear. I construe it with *mṛ́dhaḥ*, but Ge and WG (in different ways) take it with Indra. This is also possible.

The participial phrase *dā́nam ínvan* "stimulating giving" seems oddly embedded in the distracted VP *ví ṣú mṛ́dhaḥ ... áhan* "you hewed apart the negligent ones." The positioning between the preverb and its verb in tmesis may be a kind of iconic reflection of the separation sense of the preverb ('apart'). For a similar ex. see I.103.2. On the participial phrase see further below.

I have been puzzled by the phrase *gávā ... saṃcakānáḥ*, though I think I now see a solution (see below). For one thing, √*kā* [/*kan*] is not otherwise found with *sám* (anywhere in Sanskrit, at least judging from Monier-Williams); for another, this root is not construed with the instr. (*pace* Gr, whose supposed exx. should all be interpr. otherwise). And finally I cannot think of a (solitary) cow that figures prominently in Indra mythology, either as a companion (as I took it in the publ. tr.) or as a source of enjoyment. Ge remarks (n. 7a) that Indra gives abundantly as long as he is "im Genuss der erbeuteten Kühe." I suppose this is possible but it assumes a fairly extensive backstory. Like me, Kü (143) takes the cow as comitative: "mit Rindvieh ... dich zusammenwünschend." I was happy to have company in this tr., but I frankly didn't understand what either his or mine is actually meant to express. WG also seem to have a comitative reading, which is similarly opaque: "du erpicht darauf wirst, mit dem Rind beisammen zu sein."

On reconsideration of the passage I now see a possible solution. It is striking that *gávā* is the only apparent occurrence of the instr. sg. to this stem in the RV. In context it appears directly before *maghavan*. I now think the original form may have been gen. pl. **gávām*, with simplification of the double -*m m*-. The meter is unaffected, and a gen. pl. would fit the sense much better, as I will now show. This hymn contains four other examples of this very gen. pl. (4d, 11d, 12b, 13b), as well as nom. pl. *gā́vaḥ* (10a). The examples in 12 and 13 are in a dānastuti, but the others refer to the cows that Indra freed from the Vala cave (and are in the same metrical position as our form). I see two possible ways to construe my putative **gávām*. Since forms of √*kā* can take the genitive as a source of enjoyment (e.g., X.54.16 *dráviṇasaḥ*), it may go with *saṃcakānáḥ*: "enjoying the cows," referring to Indra's pleasure in his deed and its products. But in vs. 11 Indra, having drunk soma, *púnar gávām adadād usríyāṇām* "gave again of the ruddy cows."

This seems to refer to a redistribution on the ritual ground of the cows that Indra had freed. Bringing together 11d *gávām adadāt* with 7ab *dắnam ínvan ... *gávām*, I am inclined to think that the cows are the content of the gift and would now alter the tr. to "setting in motion the gift *of cows" vel sim. Under this interpr. *saṃcakānáḥ* is used without complement: "taking pleasure, enjoying yourself" (for a similar absolute use of this participle, see IV.16.15 and Kü 143). Thus the hemistich contains a brief précis of the myth: Indra hews apart those who block his freeing of the cows [I would now probably change my rendering of *mṛ́dhaḥ* as 'negligent' here], which allows him to set in motion the ultimate giving away of the freed cows, and he thoroughly (*sám*) enjoys the whole process. The occurrences of *gávām* in the dānastuti (esp. 12b *gávāṃ catvắri dádataḥ sahásrā*) simply replicate the mythic model provided by Indra's generous sharing out of the freed cows.

I am not certain what pāda d is conveying. How is it that Indra's setting Namuci's head to rolling involves "seeking a way for Manu"? Unfortunately we can glean too little about Namuci from the RV (where he is mentioned only 9x) to know what threat he posed that required Indra to kill him. On the other hand, judging from the usual troubles caused by Dāsas and, particularly, from vs. 9 (see publ. intro.), these foes stand in the way of Ārya movement into new territory. Thus Indra by eliminating Namuci would open the way for Manu and the rest of the advancing Ārya.

V.30.8: Though this vs. follows thematically on vs. 7, it seems disjointed and has given rise to much discussion (see esp. Old and his skepticism about Ge's interpr.; Bl RR) and incompatible interpretations, which I will not treat in detail further here.

The first question that arises is who is the 1st-ps. speaker in pāda a. Ge suggests that it is Namuci himself, a suggestion rejected by both Old and Bl. I think the root aor. *ákṛthāḥ* is the clue. It is rare that the aorist, esp. the root aorist, is used as a narrative tense, esp. to a root well outfitted with other preterital possibilities. I take pāda a as a parenthetical interruption of the Namuci story, prompted by the last pāda of vs. 7, esp. the mention of Manu. With Old I take "me" as referring to the present-day priest, and in my view he is asserting his ancestral and vocational connection with the primal priest and representative Ārya, Manu. The speaker suggests that Indra's current partnership with him ("for you have made me your yokemate" with the aorist of the recent past) is evidence of Indra's active concern for his ancestor Manu in the mythological past. After this interruption *ất íd* functions as a resumptive expression, returning us to and carrying on the story of the myth narrated in 7cd.

In 8c the referent of the "whizzing stone" (*áśmānam ... svaryàm*) is disputed. I very much doubt that it is a mountain, despite the occurrence of the same expression in V.56.4, where it definitely is a mountain, and despite Old's championing of this identification. I think it more likely that the phrase resonates with I.32.2 *vájraṃ svaryàm*, where *svaryà-* refers to Indra's mace. Namuci's whirling head is being compared to a weapon whirling through the air and making a whizzing sound.

The "rolling, whirling" image is carried further in the next pāda, with the simile "(rolling forth) like two wheels." The simile makes fine sense with *vártamāna-*, but what are the two world-halves (*ródasī*) doing there? As it turns out, though it may seem counter-intuitive in real-world terms, the two worlds (under various designations) are regularly associated with the root √ *vṛt* (cf., e.g., V.43.2, VI.8.3, VII.80.1, VIII.6.5). In

some of these passages the rolling out of the two worlds is part of a cosmogonic exercise; in some it refers to the visual (re-)appearance of differentiated earth and sky at dawn.

I have no idea what the Maruts are doing here.

V.30.9: For women as weapons see not only I.104.3 mentioned in the publ. intro. but also X.27.10 and disc. ad loc.

For my interpretation of the sense of this vs., see publ. intro. I am tolerably certain about my reading of the first hemistich, but pāda c is more challenging and has given rise to some curious interpretations. Ge tr. "denn er hatte darunter seine zwei Frauenbrüste entdeckt," commenting (perplexingly, at least to me) "Die beiden Milchbrüste für seine beiden Frauen" (n. 9c). (One would assume there would be four in all, at any rate.) Old thinks the two *dhéne* refer to the two liquids in the Namuci myth and ultimately (see his ref. to his own NGGW 1893 art. [=KlSch. 635ff.]) to the Sautrāmaṇī ritual and its two separate oblations, milk and surā. Schmidt (Ged. Nyberg), more or less flg. Bloomfield, suggests that Indra recognizes two streams within himself, songs and libations, but this linkage of the literal and metaphorical through an elliptical dual seems quite unlikely. WG's "Darunter aber hat er dessen beide Ströme erblickt" is literally close to mine, but they provide no guidance on what they mean by "his two streams."

My own tr. ("distinguished both his [=Dāsa's?] streams") is also not as informative as it might be. One problem is the meaning of the lexeme *antár √khyā*. To √*khyā* 'see' *antár* should add the sense of either 'look within' or 'distinguish between'. The similarly formed *antár √paś* seems to have both these meanings: 'look within' in I.132.3 and 'distinguish between' in II.27.3. (In the latter passage JPB tr. 'look within', but I consider that the less likely sense in context.) In the only other occurrence of *antár* √*khyā*, I.81.9, I tr. 'detect' (flg. Ge's 'endecken' for this passage, V.30.9), a sense that can be somewhat tenuously derived from 'look within a mass of stuff — and visually locate'. It's also possible in that passage, which concerns the possessions of the impious, which Indra is supposed to bring to us, that he is distinguishing between those possessions and the ones that belong to deserving people and should stay put. In our passage here we might in the first instance think that 'distinguish between' would be a promising candidate, given the dual object. But I don't think Indra is supposed to be seeing a difference between the two streams, but rather perceiving that they are just streams and therefore not formidable weapons -- thus encouraging his advance to fighting in pāda d. I am tempted to emend the publ. tr. to "detected/recognized both of his (weapons) as (just) streams." Though the weapons (*ā́yudhāni*) were plural in pāda a, I think that is a general statement about turning women into weapons, whereas pāda c concerns the particular situation Indra confronts, the two barrier rivers -- the same situation as in I.104.3, which also contains two troublesome rivers.

V.30.12, 14: The Anukr. takes *ṛṇaṃcayá-* as the PN of the king, and the standard interpr. follow this, incl. the publ. tr. I now wonder if it is at least a speaking name – and perhaps not a name at all but a descriptor: "requiting debts." The royal patron who distributes largesse to poets and priests at a sacrifice is, from the point of view of the ritual economy, requiting his debts to them, who attracted the gods to the sacrifice and entertained them, leading them to grant tangible and intangible rewards to the patron.

V.30.13–14: The two pāda-final sequences *páritakmyāyāḥ* (13d) and *páritakmyā yām̐* (14a) in adjacent pādas are puzzling. The publ. tr. reflects emendations of both forms to loc. sg. *páritakmyāyām.* This loc. occurs 6x, always pāda-final, including in the next hymn, V.31.11 -- by far the most common form to this stem. Moreover, VI.24.9d is identical to 14d, save for having the loc. *páritakmyāyām* -- a variation that Bl (RVReps) finds "baffling." The arguments in favor of emendation are the dominance of the loc. sg. and its appearance both in the next hymn and in the otherwise identical pāda in VI.24.9. However, these arguments cut both ways: it is difficult to understand how these forms would have become mangled – *especially* given the dominance of that same loc. sg. It cannot be claimed that the redactors misunderstood the forms because they had never seen their like. I therefore now feel that we must accept that the forms were in the urtext, deliberately produced by the poet, who was playing games with this well-known pāda-final temporal expression. I still believe that the intent of both forms is the same as the loc., but that the loc. has been deliberately altered, in two different ways, conditioned by the immediate context.

In 13d *aktór vyùṣṭau páritakmyāyāḥ* the form has been given a genitive ending to conform, superficially, to the gen. *aktóḥ.* Gr takes it to an adjectival stem (*páritakmya-*, which doesn't exist) as a modifier of *aktóḥ*, which, as Old points out, would then have to be fem. here, rather than its normal masc. Old suggests it might be a gen. of time, though he prefers to supply *rā́tryāḥ* or to have it depend on *vyùṣṭau.* I consider this over-thinking: the poet gives us the loc. form we expect, right up to the very last segment (-*ḥ* rather than -*m*) and then springs the surprise, capitalizing on the superficial resemblance to the gen. sg. *áktoḥ.*

In 14a *aúchat sā́ rā́trī páritakmyā yām̐* the final syllable of the loc. has been truncated and given an accent. The anunāsika can be taken as hiatus-breaking nasalization of a final -*ā́* before *r̥*; this is the standard interpr. (see esp. Old, Noten, with ref. to Prol.). This yields the nom. sg. fem. rel. prn., which allows an interpr. as a nominal rel. clause *páritakmyā yā́*, which specifies immediately preceding *sā́ rā́trī.* A pāda-final rel. pronoun and the resulting nominal rel. clause ("... the night, which is *páritakmyā́*") would be highly unusual, but as a poetic trick involving re-segmentation of a well-known form it shows a proto-*śleṣa* sensibility.

The fact that the poet alters the expected form in two different ways in succeeding pādas should alert us to the fact that he is playing verbal tricks, secure in the knowledge that his audience would expect and interpret both as underlyingly locatival. For a different manipulation of the stem, see comm. ad I.31.6. In any case the publ. tr. should have an * before "at its final turn" in both instances.

V.30.14: The primary reading of *ajyámānaḥ* is surely "being driven," as the standard interpr. have it. But it could also be the passive of √*añj* 'anoint' and inhabit the same semantic realm as "well-ornamented with thousands of cows" in 13ab: he would be anointed with prize cows.

V.30.15: The idiom *ā́* √*dā* 'take' is ordinarily in the middle, whereas *ā́dāma* here is active. I consider this active form a secondary formation based on the (pseudo-)active *ā́dat* 'took', for which see comm. ad V.32.8.

V.31 Indra

V.31.1: Against the Pp., which reads *vy ùnoti*, and despite Old's objections, I read *ví yunoti*, that is, *ví yunoti* 'keeps separate' -- an idea that goes back to Wh's Roots (s.v. √*u*)(see also Old's other reff.) and is accepted by EWA (s.v. *YA V²*); see also Gotō IIJ 31 (1988) -- even though this 5th class pres. is not otherwise attested to this root. Note the same lexeme, *ví √yu*, in the immed. preceding hymn, V.30.10 *... gā́vaḥ ... vatsaír víyutā yád ā́san* "since the cows were separated from their calves." This interpr. is, not surprisingly, reflected in WG's tr., but not Ge's 'mustert' (survey, inspect, further glossed in n. 1c as "er wählt den rechten Wagen aus"), whose root affiliation is not clear to me.

This verb seems to work slightly differently in simile and frame. In the simile the herdsman is separating flocks, sorting them on some principle or other (sheep from goats? flock belonging to A from that belong to B? young animals from older? etc.). In the frame I supply *rátham* as object (from 1a) and, as I see it, Indra keeps his chariot separate from the other chariots in the race or chariot drive in order to be first, a position reflected in pāda d. WG slightly different: Indra drives the other, opposing chariots apart.

V.31.2: WG take *píśāṅga-* in the cmpd *píśāṅga-rāti-* as referring to the color of cows ("Gabe rötlichbraune (Kühe)"), whereas I follow Gr, Ge in taking it as a reference to gold. Either is possible, and it is true that the adj. qualifies other animals -- a dog (VII.55.2), horses (I.88.2, V.57.4) -- though not cows. Nothing rides on the choice.

V.31.3: Ge and WG take *sáhaḥ* as the only subj. of *ájaniṣṭa*, while I take *sáhaḥ* as an appositive qualifying the unexpressed subj. *índraḥ*. Again the difference is minor, but I favor my interpr. because the birth of Indra and the prodigous feats he performs immediately thereafter are frequent topics in the RV.

V.31.5–6: Vs. 5 is syntactically problematic, in that it has two subordinate clauses, one marked by *yád* in pāda a and one marked by *yé* in pāda c, but no obvious main clause. The rel. cl. beginning in c must extend through d, which contains the accented imperfect *ávartanta*, but the extent of the *yád* clause is unclear. It must go as far as the end of pāda a because of the accented subjunctive *árcān*, but the status of b is in question. Since the vs. otherwise lacks a main clause, Ge and WG make b the nominal main clause, e.g., Ge "..., da waren die Presssteine, die Aditi einverstanden." This is possible, but seems conceptually weak, and both Ge and WG fail to render the subjunctive value of the verb in the *yád* clause -- Ge silently changing it into a preterite ("anstimmten") and WG using a simple pres. ("singen").

But I think the subjunctive should be taken seriously, esp. given its contrast with the impf. *ávartanta* in d. My solution is to assume the main clause is postponed till vs. 6, whose first pāda contains the familiar annunciatory pseudo-subjunctive *prá ... vocam* "I shall proclaim." Thus, vss. 5–6 depict a ritual situation in which the noise of the pressing stones is, as so often, configured as ritual speech (see, e.g., vs. 12c *vádan grā́vā* in this same hymn), to which the poet responds in vs. 6. I now think that *vṛ́ṣaṇaḥ* in pāda a is not a separate subject ("the bulls and the pressing stones" of the publ. tr.), but instead qualifies the stones ("the bullish pressing stones"; for pressing stones as bulls, see, e.g., III.42.6, VI.44.20), and I would change the tr. to "When for you the bull, o Indra, the

bullish pressing stones will chant a chant ..." Sāy., cited approvingly by Ge in n. 5a, identifies the bulls of pāda a as the Maruts, and WG also accept this identification, but again the subjunctive makes difficulties: the actions of the Maruts should not be prospective, but located in the mythic past (hence, presumably, Ge's switch to the preterite).

So the skeleton of the sentence spread over two vss. is "When the pressing stones will chant a chant to you, I will proclaim your deeds."

A few loose ends remain in vs. 5. The presence of Aditi in b at first takes one aback, but as Ge points out (n. 5b), soma is said elsewhere to be prepared "in the lap of Aditi," so her proximity to the pressing stones is a ritual given. I take *áditiḥ sajóṣāḥ* as a separate mini-constituent, with the nom. sg. of the -*s*-stem adjective serving for the fem. as well as the masc., as usual. The second hemistich detours into a conceit -- involving an unexpressed comparison of the pressing stones with deadly wheel rims that have crushed the enemy; cf. a similar passage in X.27.6 *ádhy ū nv èṣu vavṛtyuḥ* "The wheel rims should now roll over them." In part the conceit responds to the chariot-focused theme of this hymn, esp. the chariot conflict depicted in vs. 11; in part it highlights the pressing stones' demon-killing power, found, e.g., in X.76.4.

The subjunctive *vibhárā(ḥ)* in the *yád* clause is potentially troublesome for my interpr. of *árcān* in 5a, for it seems to refer to past, cosmogonic deed(s) of Indra's -- the separation of the two world halves and the winning of water for mankind (two events not usually connected). This surprising usage of the subjunctive is noted by Delbrück (AiSyn 322: subjunctive where we expect the indicative of a narrative tense). Old is undisturbed by the subjunctive and points to 5a as similar, which is exactly what I would prefer to point away from; see my explanation of *árcān* above. Hoffmann (244–45) classifies it as "Konjunktiv in präteritalem Sachverhalt" and suggests that the subjunctive in its prospective use can take on a timeless sense ("... einen ausserzeitlichen Sinn annehmen kann"). Ge simply translates it as a preterite (trenntest) without comment, but WG take the subjunctive seriously here (though not in 5a): "... dass du ... trennen und ... gewinnen willst," without further comment. I do not have an entirely satisfactory answer, but I think the *yád* clause must be evaluated in the context of what precedes: 6ab announces that I will proclaim Indra's previous deeds (*pū́rvāṇi káraṇāni*) and "the current ones which you have done" (*nū́tanā ... yā́ cakártha*). This latter expression, which is found identically in VII.98.5, seems temporally incoherent: if they are his current deeds, he should not have already done them; *yā́ cakártha* should limit only the first phrase, *pū́rvāṇi káraṇāni*. A fuller expression of this proclamation announcement, with the time of action correctly sorted, is found in nearby V.29.13 *vīryā̀ ... yā́ cakártha / yā́ co nú návyā kṛṇávaḥ* "The heroic deeds that you have done and the new ones that you will do," with the perfect *cakártha* qualifying the deeds already done and the subjunctive *kṛṇávaḥ* the new ones. Immediately afterwards it is said *prá ... tā́ ... bravāma* "we shall proclaim these," like our *prá ... vocam*. I think we should interpret our 6cd in the light of V.29.13. The rel. clause *yā́ cakártha* should, properly speaking, limit only the *pū́rvāṇi*, while the *nū́tanā* 'current (deeds)' are further specified by a single example (or perhaps two), expressed by the *yád* clause in cd using the subjunctive. A problem remains: as noted above, the separation of the two worlds is one of Indra's standard cosmogonic deeds as is, in the Vṛtra myth, his winning of the waters. We should expect these to be classified among the *pū́rvāṇi*. But of course one of the reasons for celebrating older, mythic deeds

is to persuade / compel the god to perform these deeds again in the present for our benefit, and we can interpret the *yád* + SUBJUNCTIVE clause here in that way. The separation of the two world halves is, on a smaller scale, accomplished every morning when dawn reveals the horizon where the darkness had kept earth and sky undifferentiated. And winning waters is something that needs to be repeated at least yearly. The subjunctive here indicates that our focus is on the re-creation of these older deeds, not simply on celebrating their original performance. In this context *mánave* 'for Manu' would have the extended sense 'for mankind'.

V.31.7–8: The recital of Indra's deeds now reverts to the past tense, to a series of insistently augmented imperfects: 7b *ámimīthāḥ*, 7c *agr̥bhṇāḥ*, 7d *asedhaḥ*, 8b *áramayaḥ*, 8c *ayātam*, *ávahaḥ*. (In 8d the Pp. reads unaug. *áranta*, but in its sandhi situation [*uśánā́ranta*] it could as easily be *ā́ranta*; the accent should be on the augment because it's in a subordinate cl., but *ā́* + *áranta* would come out this way. Either way, it's not an imperfect, but either a plupf. or a root aor., but this is a minor quibble.) However, note that this series is introduced by 7a *tád ín nú te káraṇam* "Just this now is your deed," where the current situation (*nú*) remains in the forefront of the poet's mind.

　　With Ge (and contra WG, who suggest Śuṣṇa), I take the strong one (*ugrám*) in c as Uśanā. This is the usual, if wispy, account of Indra and Kutsa's journey to Uśanā's house for advice before the Śuṣṇa battle; cf. X.22.6.

　　The 2nd sg. *ávaho ha kútsam* "you (sg.) conveyed Kutsa," following immediately on the 2nd du. *ayātam* "you two drove," seems a quick correction or explanation. The 2nd du. *ayātam* may have seemed to suggest an equality and mutuality between Indra and Kutsa that might have seemed insulting to Indra's divinity and greater power -- though the return of *vām* in d and the dual dvandva *índrākutsā* and dual verbs of vs. 9 show that the attempt to reestablish hierarchy was momentary.

V.31.8: With Sāy. I was tempted to take *pārá-* in sandhi for loc. *pāré*, against the Pp., since well-attested *pārá-* otherwise just means 'far shore' and is common in the loc. But I was persuaded by Ge (n. 8b), who points out that the verb *pāráya-* is used several times in this same myth with Indra as subject, and by Old, who notes that *supārá-* is used several times of Indra (III.50.3, VI.47.7), in the sense 'providing good passage, deliverance'. I would therefore take the simplex *pārá-* 'deliverer, transporter' here as a nonce extraction from the fairly common *supārá-*.

V.31.9: I take this as the direct address of Uśanā to Indra and Kutsa, with his advice and encouragement before they take on Śuṣṇa. In b both Ge and WG have complex and fanciful interpretations of the phrase *ápi kárṇe*. In VIII.97.12 the same expression seems to indicate close, intimate contact -- perhaps close enough to whisper into someone's ear. In my interpr. Uśanā is recapping their journey to him, suggesting that they should come close enough to hear his intimate counsel.

　　Although of apparently identical (thematic) formation, *dhámathaḥ* and *varathaḥ* are modally distinct, the first being an indicative present, the second a subjunctive. Although it is tempting to take them both as subjunctives (as WG do), the stem *dháma-* is robustly enough supplied with diagnostic forms (a number of augmented 2nd/3rd sg.) that it would be hard for a poet to mistake the morphology. I therefore assume there is a

reason for the distinction in mood. Perhaps *dhámathaḥ* presents a successful attack on Śuṣṇa as a given (though it has not yet happened), and this success will have the further happy effect stated in d.

V.31.10: Ge supplies a separate verb ("Lenke") in pāda a, but this seems unnecessary, since the subj. of b, the sage poet (*kavíḥ*) can have gone (*ajagan*) to the horses of a as goal. The identity of the *kaví-* isn't made clear, but I think the best candidate is Indra. In I.121.12 he is urged to mount (*tíṣṭhā*) the easily yoked (horses) of the wind (*vā́tasya suyújaḥ*, as here), while in I.130.9, addressed as *kave*, Indra went (*ájagan*) to Uśanā, just as here. Indra is also said to be 'seeking help' (*avasyú-*) in IV.16.11 in connection with the same story, also as here. In other words, all the phraseology points to Indra as subject, with the sly twist that he is called *kaví-*, which evokes the patronymic of one of the other participants, Uśanā Kāvya, who is also on many occasions referred to as *kaví-*.

      The plupf. *ajagan* may have anterior sense here. Kü (159) allows a value of "fernere Vergangenheit" in this passage.

V.31.11: The mixture of tenses and moods in this vs. is at first glance bewildering, but I think the uses can be sorted out. We get, in order, a root aor. subj. (*karat* b), a pres. injunc. (*bhárat* c), a pres. indic. (*riṇāti* c), and a future (*saniṣyati* d), as well as a pf. part. (*jūjuvā́ṃsam* b) and a redupl. pres. part. (*dádhat* d). The vs. seems to be a sort of "color commentary," recounting the chariot race or contest with vivid immediacy. The first hemistich, as I see it, contains a general prediction of what is going to happen. Since *karat* is a subjunctive expressing prospective action, the perf. part., generally used to express anteriority, does so here, but as a present action/state ("[now] speeding") anterior to the future expectation of *karat* (rather than a past anterior as is usual). The second hemistich lays out in sequence a past action (*bhárat* 'bore'), a present action (*sám riṇāti* 'restores'), and a future one (*saniṣyati* 'will gain'), with the participial (*puró dádhat* 'putting in front') reprising what has gone before. Beyond this I cannot go, as I still do not understand what happens in the Etaśa and sun's chariot passages. The perplexing nature of this fragmentary myth can be seen in the diametrically opposed translations it receives, with WG exactly reversing the change in position of the chariot in b (from behind to in front, contra Ge and me: from in front to behind). I cannot judge which is right.

      Adding to the uncertainty is the lexeme *sám √ri*, which occurs in the RV only here and three times in I.117 (4, 11, 19) of miraculous repairs of the Aśvins. Since √*ri* means 'let flow, dissolve', I take *sám* as a preverb that both implicitly reverses that action and expresses unity: 'put back together' → 'restore'.

      This is the last vs. before the return to the here-and-now, and the verbal fireworks may mark a poetic climax.

V.32 Indra

      As indicated in the publ. intro., although this hymn focuses on the Vṛtra myth, the standard formulaic encapsulation of that myth -- *áhann áhim* "he/you slew the serpent" -- does not appear in it. Instead there are formulaic transformations in the early verses: 1d *áva* (*dānaváṃ*) *han* / 2cd *áhim ..., jaghanvā́n ...* (the closest to the standard formula,

involving only morphological transformation of the verb) / 3b (*mṛgásya vádhar) jaghāna* / 4d *ní jaghāna (śúṣṇam)*, (*tám …*) *jaghāna* (6cd).

V.32.1: Old is disturbed by *aramṇā́ḥ* 'brought to peace / to a stop', when we would expect Indra to releasing the waters to flow. I'm not sure this is a problem: since the floods were hard pressed (*badbadhānā́n*), Indra could be soothing and quieting the tormented waters. Cf. also in the previous hymn V.31.8 *apáḥ … áramayaḥ* "you brought the waters to rest," the same sentiment with the same root. However, it could also be an example of alluding to a sub-surface word by the overt use of its opposite, like *bodháya-* for **svāpáya* in I.103.7; see comm. ad loc. In other words, *aramṇā́ḥ* could be signaling 'set in motion' by opposition to its literal sense 'bring to a stop'. In any case the expected action is expressed later in the vs.: d *sṛjó ví dhā́rā(ḥ)* "you set loose the streams," in a species of poetic repair. See also comm. on vs. 2.

        Note the stylistic quirk of post-verbal preverb in *ásṛjo* [/ *sṛjó*] *ví* OBJ (pādas a, d) versus *ví … váḥ* (c) and *áva … han* (d). The latter VP also contains a phonetic figure in *áva dānavám*.

        In c the usual placement of the rel. pronoun after at most one constituent is precariously observed (if at all), and in any case the *yád* is descriptively found deep in its clause. However, its placement (almost) conforms to the letter of the law: the voc. *indra* is extraclausal for these purposes, and *mahā́ntam … párvatam* though heavy is a single constituent. It's the *ví* that may tip the balance towards non-compliance. On the other hand, the configuration PREV *yá-* VERB is so standard that this may determine the position of *yád* here.

        Technically speaking the opening clause of d may be part of the dependent clause in c ("when you pried apart … (and) set loose …"), with *áva dānavám han* the sole main clause, but since in Vṛtra narratives there's usually a cause-and-effect relationship between opening the mountain and letting the waters flow, I think the publ. tr. is the better choice.

        Note the echoing in *áva … avá(m)* and the abrupt final near-rhyme *…vám han*. This is the first variant of the basic dragon-slaying formula *áhann áhim*, and the unfamiliar preverb *áva* almost allows *áhan* to emerge: *á(va dānavám) han*.

V.32.2: The first hemistich redeploys vocab. from the 1st vs.: 1) The two members of the NP *útsān … badbadhānā́n* in pāda a were both found in 1ab, but not in the same constituent. 2) *áraṃhaḥ* 'you sent speeding' in b rhymes with *aramṇā́ḥ* in 1b and is its antonym. This antonymic pairing might support the suggestion floated just above, that *áramṇāḥ* is meant to evoke its semantic opposite.

        The function of the instr. *ṛtúbhiḥ* is unclear. I take it as an instr. of extent of time with the part. *badbadhānā́n* (so approx. also Ge; see his n. 2a, though I doubt that a ref. to menses is involved: *útsa-* is one of the few masculine nouns for water and water sources, so if the poet wanted to make that sort of reference, he could have his pick of fem. nouns). WG take the instr. with the main verb ("sent speeding"), with the sense that after their release the waters now flow regularly ("Du liessest die … Quellen nach geregelten Zeitabläufen … auslaufen"). This is certainly possible, though I somewhat favor the former because *ṛtúbhiḥ* is nestled in the middle of the NP *útsān … badbadhānā́n*.

The form *ū́dhaḥ* is contextually problematic. Formally it is the well-attested nom./acc. *ū́dhar*, but I find it difficult to construe an acc. in this sentence. As an acc., it should be the obj. of *áraṃhaḥ* 'sent speeding', but the udder of the mountain should not be subject to such an action, whereas it makes perfect sense as a locatival expression. Both Ge and WG tr. as an acc. obj., but don't explain what they think is actually happening. I am inclined to take the form as a nonce locative, though I recognize the strong arguments against this: 1) *ū́dhar* is very well anchored as a nom./acc.; 2) this *r/n* stem has two reasonably well-attested locatives already, *ū́dhan* and *ū́dhani*. Nonetheless, I wonder if *ū́dhar* could have been taken as belonging with the sporadic -*ar* locatives like *vanar* 'in the wood', *uṣar* 'at dawn' (though the presence of undoubted neut. acc. *vádhar* in the next vs. [3b] might make this harder). It might be worth noting that *ū́dhan(i)* is confined to pāda end (except one late Xth book ex.), whereas *ū́dhar* here is medial. Alternatively, and on second thought, if we take 'udder' as referring to the contents of an udder, namely milk, it *is* possible to interpret it as the acc. it appears to be. For a somewhat similar use of *ū́dhaḥ* as 'milk', see IV.1.19. I would therefore suggest an alt. tr. by deleting the parenthetical "(in?)" and adding a comma after "seasons": "you ... sent speeding the wellsprings that had been hard pressed through the seasons, the udder [=milk] of the mountain."

The ppl. *práyuta-* is variously rendered: Gr 'achtlos, sorglos', Ge 'nachlässig' (careless, negligent), WG "(alle und alles) verscheuchend" (scaring away). However in all its occurrences it seems to mean 'spread out, dispersed'. There are four attestations in the RV. Two passages involve cows wandering without a herdsman (III.57.1, X.27.8); in the third (III.55.4) Agni has been dispersed into various hearths and lies spread out at a distance (*śáye ... práyutaḥ*), very much like here (*práyutaṃ śáyānam*). Since this root √*yu* means 'separate, keep apart', my suggested meaning is closer to the root meaning than the suggestion registered above. It is also possible that it does mean 'scattered, dispersed' here, if it is interpreted proleptically: after having been smashed, the various parts of the serpent's body lie spread across some distance. A similar picture is given in I.32.7 *purutrā́ vṛtró aśayad vyàstaḥ* "Vṛtra lay there, flung apart in many pieces," with a form of √*śí* as here. I would then suggest an alternative tr. "having smashed the serpent (so it was) lying dispersed."

V.32.2–3: An etymological sequence -- *táviṣīm* (2d), *táviṣībhiḥ* (3b), *távyān* (3d) -- that also builds to a climax, from singular '(a) power' to plural 'powers' to the comparative 'more powerful', all associated with Indra.

The sequence of vs.-init. *t(i)yá- cid* 'that very one' discussed in the publ. intro. begins in 3a with *t(i)yásya cid* (and continues with *t(i)yám cid* in 4a, 5a, 6a, 8a). Note that it follows distracted vs.-init. *t(u)vám* in 2a and second-position *cid* in 2c: combining the two produces, by variation, *t(i)yám cid*. That *cid* in 2c follows *áhim* 'serpent' provides the referent for the *t(i)yá-* forms to follow. The sequence comes to a temporary close in vs. 6, with *tám cid* opening pāda c a variant of *t(i)yám cid* opening 6a. There is then a brief revival of the phrase in 8a, after skipping a vs.

V.32.3: In c *ékaḥ ... apratíḥ* "alone (and) unopposable" applies to (the unnamed) Vṛtra, but these two words appear elsewhere similarly juxtaposed but applied to opposing referents: IV.17.19 *bhū́rīny éko apratī́ni hanti* "alone he smashes the many unopposable

things" and VIII.90.5 *tvám vṛtrā́ṇi haṃsy apratī́ny éka íd* "You, alone, smash the unopposable obstacles." This is another example of this hymn taking standard phraseology and turning it on its head. Note that an almost identical phrase, *ékaḥ ... ápratītaḥ* (again with the two words in the same case with the same referent), is applied to Indra in 9b in the triumphant announcement of his universal superiority (see publ. intro.). Though Vṛtra *thought* (*mányamānaḥ*) he had these qualities in our 3c, Indra possesses them for real -- as shown by the phraseological transfer from the one to the other.

V.32.4: The major problem in this vs. is the identity and syntactic affiliation of the gen. pl. *eṣām*. The standard opinion, found in Ge, Scar (100), and WG, takes it as referring to the gods and construed with *svadháyā*. There are several arguments against this. First, the gods are never mentioned or even alluded to elsewhere in the hymn (though goddess(es) are found in 9c and 10a). Second, though *svadháyā √mad* is a remarkably common locution (I.64.4, 108.12, 154.4; III.4.7=7.8; VII.47.3; X.14.3, 7, 15.4, 124.8), *svadháyā* never has a dependent gen. in those passages. The standard opinion is also hard-pressed to make sense out of the phrase. Ge takes *svadhā́*- here as 'Lebenselement' and further glosses this as water, but even if "reveling in the Lebenselement/water of the gods" were a possible tr. of this phrase, it is a notion that seems foreign to the Vṛtra myth. Scar and WG have a more reasonable interpr. -- that Vṛtra is reveling in what actually belongs by nature to the gods, that is, as WG say in their n., "Der Dämon usurpiert die Natur der Götter." But this still requires conjuring up the gods out of thin air and assuming that the audience could do so too, on the basis of an unemphatic, unaccented gen. pl. pronoun. And again the image produced is not a standard part of the Vṛtra myth.

My solution starts, appropriately, by seeking a referent in the context; *dānavásya* in the 2nd hemistich seems a reasonable choice. Although *dānavá*- never appears in the plural in the RV, this stem (related to *dā́nu*-, the name of Vṛtra's mother, which I consider a backformation from the demonic ethnonym; see comm. ad I.32.9) names "eine Dämonen-Klasse," as Mayrhofer remarks (EWA s.v. *dā́nu*-), and fluctuation between sg. and pl. can happen in such cases (as with the Maruts, plural, versus the Marut flock, singular). The pl. is found in the AV (AVŚ IV.24.2 [with vs. 1 referring to Indra as *vṛtrahán*-), X.6.10; AVP IV.39.3 [≅AVŚ IV.24.2], VII.12.8, XVI.43.2) and elsewhere in early Vedic as well as later (esp. epic) Skt., and the corresponding Avestan *dānauua*-, also the name of an inimical group, is found in the pl. in Yt. 5.73 and 13.37–38. In the latter it is associated with *vərəθra*- (*vərəθrəm dānunąm*). It therefore seems likely that even in the RV *dānavá*- is not simply a designation of Vṛtra but of the class of beings to which he belongs, and the absence of the plural in the RV is either due to accident or a desire to concentrate on the arch-Dānava, Vṛtra. The gen. here may be construed either with *t(i)yám cid* ("this one of theirs") or be a free-floating indication of appurtenance, as the publ. tr. takes it. Or indeed, because *eṣām* is in (modified) Wackernagel's position, it could have originated with any of the descriptors of Vṛtra found later in the verse.

With *svadháyā* freed from its supposed genitive dependent, the phrase *svadháyā mádantam* now makes sense in a Vṛtra context. He is "drunk on his own power" on the basis of his faulty assessment of this power presented in 3c. The locution recalls a similar one in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, where in 6a Vṛtra is described as *ayoddhéva durmádaḥ* "like a non-warrior badly drunk" (lit. 'having bad intoxication'), foolishly challenging a far more powerful opponent. (I use 'drunk' in both instances, instead of our

more usual 'exhilarated', because it better captures in English the state of mind of the one so affected.)

The sense of *vṛ́sa-prabharmā* is secured by 5c *prábhr̥tā mádasya* "at the proffering of the invigorating (soma)" -- hence, as Gr takes it (sim. WG, Scar, and me), "dem der kräftige (Soma) vorgesetzt ist." This also makes sense in context -- Indra needs to receive the soma before smashing Vr̥tra -- and is reinforced by the usual sense of the lexeme *prá √bhr̥* 'bring forward, present'. However, Ge renders it "wie ein Bulle angreifend (?)," and I was tempted somewhat in this direction, to 'having the bearing/deportment of a bull'; *prá √bhr̥* can, esp. in the middle, mean 'display, present oneself'. I think both possibilities are latent in this word, and we can view the anchoring 5c *prábhr̥tā mádasya* as another example of poetic repair -- or perhaps a poetic thumb on the scales, pressing the choice of one of the options over the other. It is then itself somewhat undercut by 7c *vájrasya prábhr̥tau* "at the proffering of the mace."

In c note the echo ... *-prabharmā ... bhámam*.

The last word of this vs. is *śúṣṇam*. Generally, of course, this is the name of a different opponent of Indra's, and a number of tr. take it so here. But I think it has its etymological sense 'snorter' (√*śvas* 'snort'; cf. EWA s.v.). Our poet is once again toying with us: withholding the real name of the opponent in this hymn, Vr̥tra, he is falsely offering a different possibility here.

V.32.5: Unlike 4a where I separate the identically positioned enclitic gen. from the following instr., I do take *asya* here with *krátubhiḥ*, which, unlike *svadháyā*, is frequently found with a gen. With Ge I think the referent is Indra (contra WG, who take it to be Vr̥tra-Śuṣṇa).

I take *níṣattam* as proleptic, depicting Vr̥tra's position after the action of *ní jaghāna* in the immediately preceding pāda (4d). With Ge I consider 5a essentially a continuation of 4d and supply the same verb.

In b I supply 'thinking himself' with *amarmáṇaḥ* on the basis of 3c and of the almost identical III.32.4cd ... *viveda, amarmáṇo mányamānasya mármā*. The verb in b, *vidát*, is accented because of the following *íd* (see Gr s.v. *íd* 5, though there are fewer clear examples than he presents, since many of them are also pāda-initial).

The Indra-reference shifts from 3rd to 2nd between the first and second hemistich, but this is scarcely novel.

V.32.6: Though Gr refuses to tr., *katpayám* seems to contain the pejorative *ka-* prefix; see EWA s.v. *ká-*[1], p. 285.

For *ápa √gr̥̄* 'taunt' see comm. ad V.29.4. As Oberlies (Relig. I.401) points out, this gerund depicts a pre-battle boasting/insulting match -- trash talk (needless to say, this last is not Oberlies's formulation), flyting.

What to do with *uccaíḥ* is unclear. Most take it with the gerund *apagūrya*; so Ge "hoch ausholend," with his interpr. of the gerund as belonging to a √*gr̥̄* 'hold out'; with the assignment to *ápa √gr̥̄* 'insult', Schaeffer "nachdem er laut Schmähreden geführt hat"; Oberlies "nachdem er ihn [zuvor] mit lauter Stimme geschmäht hatte"; WG "indem er ihn von oben herab verspottete." The Schaeffer / Oberlies interpr. of the adverb as 'loud' is appealing, but *uccá* is always positional in the RV. The WG interpr. recognizes this fact, but insulting *from above* seems an odd activity. I take it rather with *jaghāna*. A fatal

blow is more likely to come from above than a taunt, and it is notable how often in the hymn it is emphasized that Vṛtra was smashed *down*: 1d *áva ... han*, 4d *ní jaghāna*, 5a *níṣattam,* 7d *adhamám*, 8d *ní ... āvṛṇak*. To depict Indra as correspondingly acting *above* provides the thematic complement. Note also *úd ... índraḥ ... vádhar yámiṣṭa* ("... held up ...") in the next hemistich, 7ab.

V.32.7: *vádhar* appears here in the same metrical position as in 3b. There the weapon was Vṛtra's (which Indra struck away), while here it is Indra's. Another example of vocab. first used of Vṛtra reassigned to Indra -- like *ékaḥ ... apratíḥ* in 3a and the similar expression in 9a. Indeed, *ápratītam* appears here in b, characterizing Indra's weapon, which is 'might' itself *(sáhaḥ)*. The use of *sáhaḥ* as an appositive here supports my view of the same usage of this word in V.31.3 (contra Ge [/WG]). There it characterizes Indra himself. It is even possible that *sáho ápratītam* here is nominative and an appositive to *índraḥ*, rather than an acc. and appositive to *vádhar*, though the juxtaposition of the two terms in b makes that unlikely. In any case note the similarity in phrasing: 31.3a # *úd yát sáhaḥ* ... 32.7ab # *úd yád ... sáhaḥ*; the verbs in these clauses are also rhyming: 31.3 *ájaniṣṭa*, 32.7 *yámiṣṭa*. On the injunc. *yámiṣṭa* see also comm. ad V.34.2.

As noted ad vs. 4, the poetic repair effected by *prábhṛtā mádasya* in 5c is somewhat muddied by 7c *vájrasya prábhṛtau*. What exactly this latter phrase means is not clear. I doubt that Ge's "im Schlag mit der Keule" is correct, since 'strike' is not a standard sense of *prá √ bhṛ* (the closest we get is 'bear down on'). WG's "beim Vorführen des Vajra" is similar to my "at the proffering of the mace" ('proffer' having been chosen to match the tr. of this lexeme in 4c and 5c). The English idiom "present arms" is a direct correspondent, though the action in the English phrase is a gesture of respect, not (as here) of intimidation. The point of both *úd ... vádhar yámiṣṭa* "held up his weapon" and *vájrasya prábhṛtau* seems to be to show Vṛtra the unbeatable power of the *vájra-*. See also the *mahatā́ vadhéna* in 8c.

V.32.8: The verb *ā́dat* 'took' is superficially active, though the idiom *ā́ √ dā* 'take' is ordinarily middle. As was seen already by Wackernagel, the form must be a re-marked form of the older 3rd sg. middle root aor. The underlying form would be **ā́da*, which can represent either an old *-t*-less 3rd sg. mid. ending (as in impf. **áduha → áduha+t*) or, more likely, the simplification by degemination of an old **ā́d+ta* with an originally *-t*-full ending. Of course this preform should have yielded **ā́tta*, but the fact that all other forms of the root aor. have a single *d-* (*ádāt*, etc.) could have induced the geminate to simplify (in this metrically non-diagnostic position after *ā*) and restore the *d* of the root. (Kü [*Stativ* 50–51] bases the *-d*-form on 3rd pl. *ā́diran**.) In any case the *t*-less **ā́da* would have been activized like the *t*-less middle imperfects of the *áduhat* type. The resulting "active" stem could spread elsewhere; cf. 1st pl. *ā́dāma* in nearby V.30.15. For disc. and previous lit. see Kü ref. above. The form is very differently explained by Old, who assigns it to *ā́ √ dṛ* 'tear out' by way of the sandhi form **ā́daḥ* (< 2nd/3rd sg. **ā́dar*) and what seems to me a somewhat sketchy remarking with *-t* (as if 2nd sg. = **ā́das*, so 3rd sg. should = **ā́dat?*). The morphological machinery required seems too complex for its purpose, to avoid a slightly aberrant use of *ā́ √ dā*, and since *ā́ √ dṛ* doesn't take personal objects (Old finds one late ex.), its usage here would be aberrant as well. Ge assigns it to *ā́ √ dā*, as do WG (with ref. to Kü, *Stativ*).

For the third time in the hymn, Vṛtra is described as *śáyānam* 'lying', each time in the same pāda-final position (2c, 6a, 8a), and pāda-final *níṣattam* (5a) 'sunk, lit. sitting, down' may be a sort of semantic pun on this positional characterization. In I.32, the Indra-Vṛtra hymn with clear phraseological and thematic parallels to this one, √*śí* 'lie' is also Vṛtra's signature verb, esp. describing his position after his defeat, rather than before, as here.

Ge suggests that *árṇam* is an anticipatory haplology (not his term) for **arṇapám* 'drinking the flood', immediately before *madhupám.* He is followed by Scar (313 n. 444) and WG. I see no reason to accept this. The stem *árṇa-* exists; the stem **arṇapá-* (/-pā́-) does not. More importantly, Vṛtra is known for confining the waters, not drinking them. As was just noted, √*śí* 'lie' is a defining verb for Vṛtra in both I.32 and this hymn. In the former he lies there as the released waters stream over him (I.32.8ab *... amuyā́ śáyānam, ... áti yanty ā́paḥ*; cf. also 8d, 10). Here, in complementary fashion, he is depicted as lying over them before his defeat.

Although most take *atrá-* as a PN, I still prefer the older derivation (see, e.g., Gr) from √*ad* 'eat' with simplification of the geminate (**at-trá-*), *pace* EWA s.v. *átri-*. It does not have to have anything to do with the seer Atri (*átri-*), but *átrin-* 'voracious' is, in my opinion, derivationally connected.

V.32.9: As noted in the publ. intro., the question *káḥ ... varāte* "who can obstruct ...?" covertly introduces Vṛtra, the defeated enemy who remained unnamed in the first 8 vss., by way of the verb built to the root √*vṛ* 'obstruct' that furnishes Vṛtra's transparent name. The implicit answer is "no one, since Obstacle himself could not."

V.32.10: The *devī́ svádhitiḥ* in pāda a is much disputed, and for good reason. The stem *svádhiti-* means 'axe, hatchet', but the presence of such an implement here is puzzling. Ge, flg. Sāy., wants to take this instance of the stem as independent and equivalent to *svadhā́-* 'autonomous power'. Given the occurrence of *svadhā́-* in 4a and the derived possessive adj. *svadhā́van-* in pāda d of this same vs., it is hard not to suspect some connection. On the other hand, *svádhiti-* 'axe' is too well established for that sense not to be the first reading, or at least to intrude, and, furthermore, pāda a is twinned with b, which also contains a thing not a quality (and is also a pun).

I therefore think we are dealing with a pun. On the one hand, even the "heavenly hatchet," which sounds like a formidable weapon, bows to powerful Indra. The hatchet's submission to Indra is a measure of his might and may also put this weapon into his hands. There may even be another intertextual reference to I.32, as Teigo Onishi suggested to me. In I.32.5c Vṛtra lies "like branches hewn apart by an axe" (*skándhāṃsīva kúliśenā vívṛkṇā*). Though this is a simile, not a direct reference to the narrative, and though a different word for axe, *kúliśa-*, is used, this imagery may be a common trope in the Vṛtra story. As for the reading "the goddess Autonomous Power," the phonological similarity and possible identical formation of *svádhiti and svadhā́-* (with *sva-* looking like a first cmpd member in both, and -*dhi-* resembling -*dhā́-*, with connection to √*dhā* at least possible [the etymology of *svádhiti-* is "nicht klar" acdg. to EWA s.v.]) make such a reading very easy in this context.

As just noted, pāda b also seems to contain a pun. The way (*gātú-*) yields to Indra, but, acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, Gātu Ātreya is also the poet of this hymn -- though since

only this one hymn in the RV is attributed to him, the name may have been plucked from this context.

   This vs. contains another example of the transfer of vocabulary from Vṛtra to Indra. As we saw, in 4a Vṛtra was intoxicated by (his false assumption about) his autonomous power (*svadháyā mádantam*), but here it is Indra who possesses autonomous power (*svadhā́van-*) for real. With *svádhiti* in pāda a also (partly) expressing Indra's acquisition of this power, his triumph is complete. This sets the stage for the transition to the last two verses, where the poet announces his own contact with Indra's fame and what that will mean for his own good fortune.

V.32.11: I think that this vs. is structured by the implicit contrast between *jātá-* and *náviṣṭha-*, both used of Indra, but I seem to be alone in this (though see Gr's lapidary comment s.v. *náviṣṭha*). Ge (/WG) take *náviṣṭham* as adverbial (Ge "aufs neue," WG "zum letzten Mal"). This is certainly possible, but if it is taken as modifying Indra, the sense becomes more complex and interesting. In the first hemistich "I" announce the famous stable Indra of myth and authority, born (*jātám*) for these roles and continuously occupying them, but in the second hemistich it is the Indra of the ritual who's the focus -- the Indra who is newly brought to every new ritual and whose epiphany is like a new creation every time, caused by the ritual actions themselves.

V.32.12: I take *maghā́* as object of both *yātáyantam* and *dádatam*; it is neatly positioned between the two participles. Ge renders *ṛtuthā́ yātáyantam* as "dass du pünktlich vergilst" (repay, requite), but this is not a standard meaning of √*yat*. WG's "dass du ... die (verdiente) Stellung verschaffst" is closer to the sense of the root, but lacks the obj. one expects with an *-áya*-transitive. A locution very close to my interpr. is found in IX.39.2 *jánāya yātáyann íṣaḥ* "arranging the refreshments for the people."

   Contra Old, who assigns *garhate* to √*grabh*, I take it to √*gṛh* 'complain'; see EWA s.v. *GARH* and esp. Hoffmann "Vedisch gṛh 'klagen" (MSS 14 [1959]: 35–38 = Aufs. 439–41) cited there. There is likely a phonological play between this verb and *jagṛbhre* in the previous, twinned, verse.

V.33–34: Indra

   These two hymns attributed to Saṃvaraṇa Prājāpatya are full of puzzles, many insoluble.

V.33 Indra

   Although the general outline of this hymn is pretty straightforward, it is full of interpretational problems and grammatical and syntactic obscurities, and the meter is very messy.

V.33.1: The first hemistich begins and ends with an etymological figure: #*máhi mahé ... taváse átavyān*#. The *taváse* also repeats the same form from the preceding pāda.

   I supply *śrávaḥ* 'praise' with *máhi*, since this is a frequent collocation. Sim. Ge, though Kü (258) and WG take it as adverbial.

With Ge (/WG uncertainly) I reluctantly interpr. pāda-final *nṝn* as a gen. pl. (or standing for a gen. pl.), as is sometimes necessary. Old interpr. it rather as a dat. pl., which I don't understand.

With Ge I construe *itthā́* with *taváse*; I assume it adds strengthening to that repeated word. Kü (258) instead takes it as an expression of the method of praise: "auf diese Weise," so apparently also WG, though muted ("also").

In the 2nd hemistich the referent of *asmai* is at issue. The standard view (Ge, Old, WG) is that it refers to the singer, the "not so strong" I. In Ge's interpr. this involves rendering *asmai sumatím ... cikéta* as "der ... diesem (Sänger) seine Gunst zugedacht hat." That *sumatí-* could refer to Indra's benevolence is easy, but 'zudenken' as an interpr. of *cikéta* is hard. This pf. stem ordinarily means either 'take note of' or 'appear as' (latter generally middle). WG give the pf. its usual meaning but this leaves *asmai* without much to do in the clause. By contrast, I take Indra as the referent of *asmai*. It is not rare for enclitic forms of this pronoun to refer to the subject: a reflexive is not necessary. Under this interpr. *sumatí-* has its common meaning 'good thought' = poem, and Indra takes cognizance of this *sumatí-*, which is "for him." Cf. VII.31.10 *prácetase prá sumatím kṛnudhvam* where the *sumatí-* of the poets is intended for a god (Indra, in fact) in the dative who is characterized as *prá √ cit.*

V.33.2: The (pseudo-)participle *dhiyasāná-* clearly patterns with *dīdhⁱye* in 1a, hence my complementary 'being conjured up'. I take it to mean that Indra's epiphany at the sacrifice is brought about by our chants (*arkaíḥ*), that his appearance there is literally "thought up" by our thoughts. This notion is close to what is found in the previous hymn V.32.11 (at least by my interpr.), that every sacrifice brings a "newest Indra," that the Indra of the sacrificial epiphany is newly created by sacrificial activity every time. The standard interpr. of *dhiyasāná-* by Ge [/WG] is more pedestrian: Indra becomes attentive ("aufmerksam geworden") through our hymns. The other occurrence of the stem, in X.32.1, in my opinion fits my interpr. (see comm. ad loc.), but, to be honest, neither passage is absolutely clear. As for the stem itself, *dhiyasāná-* does not pattern with the majority of *-asāná-* stems discussed ad IV.3.6, and I do not have a satisfactory account of it.

The *sá tvám* phrase does not conform to my rules for the use of *sá* with 2nd ps. reference (see my "Sá figé"), and I likewise can't account for it.

The *yā́(ḥ)* beginning the 2nd hemistich is problematic. If it is a rel. prn. it has to be a fem. pl., and there is no obvious referent in the context (*hárīṇām* in b belongs to a masc. stem *hári-*). Therefore with Ge (/WG) and, very cautiously, Old, I take it as a verb form, belonging to √*yā* 'drive'. (Note the past part. *yātā́ḥ* in 5b.) Because it is followed by two subjunctives, *vákṣaḥ* and *sakṣi* (the latter a "*si*-imperative" derived from a subjunctive), I take *yā́(ḥ)* as subjunctive as well. Indeed, if it is read *yā́ah*, the extra syllable would fix the meter of this pāda -- but since the hymn is full of metrical disturbances, this is not a strong argument. Neither Ge nor WG indicates how they interpr. the morphology, but both tr. as an imperative, as they do the two following verbs.

Both Ge and WG take *aryáḥ* and *jánān* as parallel acc. pl., while I make *aryáḥ* a gen. sg. dependent on *jánān*. There is no way to tell; Thieme (Fremdl., 11 n. 2) refuses to deal with the passage at all.

V.33.3: The sense of the first hemistich -- that by reciting the (yoking-)formulation we will do our part to ensure that your (Indra's) horses will be yoked -- is fairly clear, but the syntax is messy. First, it's couched as a triple negative construction: "it is *not* that X will *not* happen because of *not*-Y," which already puts it on the edge of parsability. The parsing problem is slightly increased by the fact that the content of the negative "that" clause is expressed through a periphrasis involving a negated participle+copula (*áyuktāsaḥ ... ásan* "will be/remain unyoked"). Then, the position of *yád* is utterly non-standard, being found deep in the clause, after several different constituents, right before the final word. I tried various ways to produce a conforming subordinate clause from the text, but failed. The publ. tr. "if it's for lack of a (yoking) formulation" (as if *abrahmátā yád* were a separate embedded clausette) gives the appearance of (almost) succeeding, but it doesn't accurately represent the text (though I still think it might represent the purport of this odd word order). A more accurate tr. would be "Since these horses .... because of a lack ...," as the dependent clause for the main clause in cd. I remain disturbed by the structure of this dep. cl.

A separate problem is the *abhí asmád* in pāda a. The *abhí* is stranded in the middle of the pāda (though immed. after the caesura) and in any case has no verb from which it could have been separated in tmesis. In the absence of anything else to do with it, the default option seems to be to construe it with *asmád*, and this phrase has long (see Old's reff.) been compared to I.139.8 *asmád abhí*, likewise in the middle of the pāda though in opposite order. The problem is that *abhí* as a preposition seems otherwise only to take the acc. Nonetheless, connecting the two seems the best bet, with a meaning such as "with regard to us" or, better reflecting the ablative, my "because of us." So Old, WG. Cf. also Humbach et al. (*Gāthās... and the Other Old Avestan Texts*, II.118), ad Y 35.5 (Yasna Haptaŋhaiti) *ahmaṭ hiiaṭ aibī*, a phrase meaning (in his view) "which is with us," with which he compares both our passage and I.139.8. However, Narten (*YH*, 271–72), fld. by Hinze (*Zoroastrian Liturgy*, 77-78), interprets this three-word phrase, occurring twice in the YH (Y 35.5, 40.1), as containing a postposition *aibī* governing the neut. acc. *hiiaṭ* not the abl. *ahmaṭ*, with the whole meaning "from us towards which," thus "as far as we are concerned" (Hintze, 78).

V.33.4: Another troubled vs., though the first hemistich is more transparent than the second. The first thing to notice is that the accent on *cakártha* in b indicates that b must still be under the domain of *yád* in pāda a, as parallel dependent clauses. Ge (/WG) attempt to make initial *purū́* a single-word main clause on which they both depend ("Viel ist, was ..."). This assumes that *purū́* is a neut. sg. here. Although the existence of a neut. sg. in -*ū* is standard doctrine (see Lanman, *Noun Inflec.*, 406–7, AiG III.145, etc.), this grammatical truism rests primarily on Gr's identification of twelve forms of *purū́* as sg. (see Lanman and AiG), but in only one instance, the late X.94.5, does this seem the likely interpr. (There is also one form of *urū́* and, for Lanmann, two of *míthū*, which is better taken as an adv.) I do not therefore think that -*ū* is a possible neut. sg. ending, except, perhaps, in X.94.5. Here the most obvious way to construe *purū́* is with pāda-final neut. pl. *ukthā́*, the subject of *sánti*. The attempt to impose a singular interpr. on *purū́*, as antecedent for the following relative clause with plural subject, yields the awkward rendering of Ge: "Viel ist, was deine Preislieder sind" with mismatch of number (WG more elaborate, but not less clumsy).

For b the only adjustment is to carry *purū* over from pāda a and supply a term like *kṛtā́ni* or *kármāṇi*, easily generated from *cakártha*: "many are (the deeds) you have done ..."

The 2ⁿᵈ hemistich is more problematic. The first question is how to relate pāda c and d. Ge takes them as parallel independent clauses with the same verb *tatakṣé*, while WG takes it as a single cl. (also Kü 207). With Ge I take them as two clauses and agree that they share a verb, but think that c is a dependent clause still under the control of *yád* in pāda a and parallel to ab, with d the main clause resuming them all.

A related issue is the apparent change of person from 2ⁿᵈ sg. address to Indra in ab and (supposed) 3ʳᵈ sg. reference to him in cd. The only evidence for this 3ʳᵈ ps. reference is the verb *tatakṣé*, which is one of only two medial forms of this pf. in the RV. It has no obvious medial value here, and in fact the presence of a dat. of benefit (*sū́ryāya*) eliminates one possible way of accounting for the middle form. (Kü [207] suggests a "Bedeutungskomponente" '(auch) in seinem eigenen Interesse', which seems a bit desperate.) The puzzle of the middle is somewhat reduced if we interpret the form as *second* sg. mid. The presumed preform **tatakṣ-ṣé* would surely come out as our *tatakṣé*, and it would make sense to substitute this nonce middle form for the non-transparent *active* 2ⁿᵈ sg., which should be **tatákṣ-tha* → **tataktha* -- whereas the active *3ʳᵈ* sg. *tatákṣa* is non-problematic and indeed well attested. So the supposed change of person and the middle form can be accounted for by the same explanation.

After confronting these formal issues, there remains the very knotty problem of what the hemistich is expressing, and part of this depends on whether the relations between Indra and Sūrya here are friendly or hostile: elsewhere they are sometimes one, sometimes the other. (Here I think they are friendly.) A syntactic questions is whether *nā́ma* is the only object of *tatakṣé* or if the clause in c (if it is a separate clause) has a different object. Ge opts for the former choice, I for the latter, and I also think that the verb is used in different senses in c and d, positive in c, negative in d.

In c I supply *purū* again from pāda a and tentatively supply 'paths' as the object, bringing to mind the various passages in which a god (usually Varuṇa) makes or digs out paths for the sun to follow through the sky -- e.g., I.24.8 *urúṃ hí rā́jā várunaś cakā́ra, sū́ryāya pánthām ánvetavā́ u*, VII.87.1 *rádat pathó váruno sū́ryāya*. In one late passage (X.111.3) it is Indra who is named as *pathikŕt sū́ryāya* "pathmaker for the sun." It's also worth noting that, leaving aside this one, 5 of the other 10 occurrences of the dat. *sū́ryāya* occur in a path-making context. Though, admittedly, I have no parallels using the root √*takṣ* 'fashion, carve', it seems in the right general semantic range. As for *ókasi své* this can refer either to Indra's or to Sūrya's "own home," since both of them inhabit the same celestial realms; I favor the Sun's.

As for d, as is recognized by all, the similarly phrased X.23.2 *áva kṣnaumi dā́sasya nā́ma cit* must be compared. In that passage Indra says "I whet down even the name of the barbarian," in my tr. Though this passage is the obvious comparandum, it is hardly transparent in itself or in its bearing on our passage, and in fact I think the two passages are less close semantically than their joint isolation invites us to think. In X.23.2 Indra seems to be boasting about his victory over the Dāsa, which is so complete that even his name is obliterated or at least violently ground down. But √*takṣ* generally refers to creating something by carving off bits or fashioning in some other way. Perhaps here it means that Indra, just by fighting (and presumably defeating) the Dāsa, has still made the

latter's name conspicuous, as if by carving it into a surface. (Or perhaps, closer to X.23.2, Indra has obliterated the Dāsa's name as if by gouging it out of a surface.) But either of these interpr. raises a crucial question: what would it mean literally to carve a *name* into (or gouge it out of) a surface before the existence of writing?!

In any case I think that the contrastive positive/negative use of √*takṣ* in c and d makes the verb sit uneasily in both and poses special challenges to the audience to decode the metaphor in each pāda.

As should be obvious, I do not consider my interpr. of this vs. or most of its part settled and sure. I also don't understand the sequence of ideas. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think that the first pāda, positing many hymns for Indra, may refer to the existence of competing (Ārya) sacrifices. The second pāda cites his activities as a warrior on earth; the dat. "for the cow" may either mean that Indra has fought in order to obtain cows (for the Ārya warriors he is fighting beside) or that he has won meadows for (the Āryas') cows to graze in -- in either case advancing the Ārya cause. In contrast c sets out his beneficial cosmic activity -- keeping the sun on track (if my interpr. of the details of the pāda is correct), which in turn is beneficial to mankind. In at least the first two cases I think there's an implicit Ārya presence, which contrasts with the explicit Dāsa in d.

V.33.5: What constitutes the predicate in ab is disputed. Flg. Old and the model of VII.30.4, I take ab as constituting an "X and which Y" construction, with doubled "and which Y" (more accurately schematized as "X and which Y and (which) Z"). The predication is simply *te* "of you, yours," an assertion of possession. It is predicated of us (*vayám té*) as well as "which men" (*yé ca nárah*) and "(which) chariots" (... *ca ráthāḥ*) -- literally "we and which men and (which) chariots are yours." Both of the latter two are further characterized in b, the men by a participial phrase (*śárdho jajñānāḥ* "having been born as a troop"), the chariots by a simple participle (*yātāḥ* 'driven, driving'). WG seem to follow this interpr. as well, though with some filigree in the middle that seems over-elaborate. Klein (DGRV I.49 n. 10) sets out the schema as above and tr. sim. (I.196). Ge by contrast takes the predication to be *śárdho jajñānāḥ*, applied to both us and the men, with the chariots left hanging: essentially "we and the man are born as your troop, and the chariots." Besides the syntactic isolation of the chariots in Ge's rendering, it also unduly extends the reference of *śárdho jajñānāḥ*. The "men" of pāda a must be, as often, the Maruts, and it is only they who "have been born as a troop," not also us. The word *gaṇá-* is almost exclusive to the Maruts, and the birth of the Maruts is a common topic (e.g., I.64.2, 4).

The phrase *rátho ná yātáḥ* appears in I.141.8. See comm. there, where I suggest that a *yātá- rátha-* is a particular kind of chariot, perhaps one meant for long journeys, rather than referring to the current state of motion of any specific chariot(s).

The problem with pāda c is the clash between the voc. *ahiśuṣma* and the 3rd sg. verb *jagamyāt* with its nom. subj. *sátvā*. The stem *sátvan-* in the sg. is almost always used of Indra, and in this context -- a hymn dedicated to Indra and both praising his powers and begging him to deploy them on our behalf -- it is difficult to imagine that we would then express a wish that some indefinite or at least unidentified warrior should come our way instead (as in Ge's "Uns möge ... ein Krieger kommen"; WG almost identical). Surely Indra is the warrior we want! This would require a shift from 2nd to 3rd ps. ref. between ab and cd, but this is not problematic. What is problematic is the voc., which

should also refer to Indra. Gr solves this by positing a bahuvr. *ahiśuṣma-sátvan-* 'whose warriors have a serpent's hiss' ('dessen Helden wie Schlangen zischen'). Unfortunately the accent is definitively against this interpr. I have no neat solution, but am firm in my belief that the *sátvā* is Indra. For a similar vocative/nominative cross, see *vasavānaḥ* in the next vs. (6a); these two problems may be connected.

I take the simile in d as an elaborate pun, playing on the double sense of the three members, *bhága-*, *hávya-*, and *prabhṛthá-*. The first can be both the name of the god Fortune and a common noun 'portion'; *hávya-* can belong to √*hū, hvā* 'call' or √*hu* 'pour, offer'; *pra* √*bhṛ* can refer either to the presentation of arms (and the carrying off of booty) in a hostile situation or to the presentation of offerings at a sacrifice. Cf. the double sense of *prá* √*bhṛ* in nearby V.32.4–5, 7 and comm. there. The first meanings just given for the three items coalesce into one simile, the second ones in another.

V.33.6: The first question about this vs. is the structure of the first hemistich. The standard interpr. (Ge, WG, also Old, Klein [DGRV I.263–64]; see also Kulikov -*ya-pres.*, 580) takes the two pādas as separate clauses with *ca* conjoining them. There are several problems with this division: 1) *ca* is not comfortably at home as clause-conjoiner and usually conjoins NPs; 2) with *nṛmṇā́ni* in the domain of the 2nd clause, it must be the obj. of the participle (or pseudo-participle; see below) *nṛtámānaḥ*, but non-causative forms of √*nṛt* 'dance' are never transitive. Both difficulties disappear if we take *nṛmṇā́ni ca* as conjoined with immediately preceding *ójaḥ* as joint subject of the first clause in the hemistich (so also Lowe, 251; see below). The phonological play between *nṛmṇā́ni* and *nṛtámānaḥ* may account for the postponing of *nṛmṇā́ni* till the second pāda, inserting a pāda break between the two conjoined nouns. This phonologically driven positioning may also help account for the very late positon of *hí*. The loc. prn. *tvé* ordinarily takes initial position in its clause/verse line, and *hí* would be expected to follow in Wackernagel's position. But the whole structure may have been shifted rightwards to allow *nṛmṇā́ni* to neighbor *nṛtámānaḥ*.

nṛtámāna- presents difficulties of its own, even after its supposed object has been eliminated. This participle is the only occurrence of the supposed them. aor. (or 6th cl. pres.) in all of Sanskrit. Although, since all forms of this root are poorly attested in the RV, this is not necessarily problematic on its own, the -*ya*-present (1x in RV) does continue post-RV (see Kulikov, *Vedic -ya-presents*, 578-80), and moreover all other verb forms to this root in Vedic are active. Lowe (*Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit*, 250–51) suggests that it is an artificial form based on the well-attested splv. *nṛ́tama-* 'most manly, most heroic'. This is an attractive hypothesis -- among other things, Indra is frequently called *nṛ́tama-*; the word regularly appears in immediate post-caesura position, as *nṛtámānaḥ* does here; and it would be playing not merely phonologically but also etymologically with *nṛmṇā́ni*. Lowe (p. 152) tr. "being the most heroic," reflecting its nonce jury-rigged participial form. I do think, however, that the form also consciously references √*nṛt* 'dance'. Indra is regularly called a *nṛtú-* 'dancer, prancer', and note the pun involving *nṛ́-* 'man' in VI.63.5 *nárā nṛtū* (of the Aśvins). I would therefore modify the publ. tr. to "As the most manly [/ the prancing] immortal ..."

In c *rayím* must be fem., as occasionally elsewhere, given the fem. adj. *énīm*.

The stem *vásavāna-* 'possessing goods, winning goods' (?) is attested 5x, once as an unaccented voc. sg. *vasavāna* (X.22.15), otherwise accented and with orthodox -*a*-

stem forms, incl. nom. sg. *vásavānaḥ* (I.174.1). The form here looks of course like a nom. sg. but lacks accent. Gr calls it "fälschlich unbetont"; Lub. gives it an accent and a rightward star (*vásavāno**). This seems the best course; I think an attempt to assign it to different stem (perhaps an aberrant *-as* stem) is too elaborate, esp. in this hymn with numerous "off" forms: see esp. the voc. *ahiśuṣma* for expected nom. in 5c. The publ. tr. pays more attention to the lack of accent and tr. as voc.; it would be equally possible to weigh the nom. sg. ending more heavily and tr. it as an appositive subject: "as winner of goods, give us dappled wealth." Despite the tr. "winner of goods," I do not think the stem contains a form of √ *van* but is rather a pseudo-participle (another one, but athematic) built to *vásu-* 'good(s)'. Elsewhere I render it 'goods-lord' and the like.

In d *prá ... stuṣe dā́nam* "I will start up the praise for the gift" is an analytic expansion of the noun *dānastuti*, which, however, is not attested in Vedic or, it seems, anywhere else in Sanskrit lit., though the term is in common use in Vedic scholarship. The last three (or possibly four) vss. in this hymn constitute such a dānastuti, and the poet seems to signalling that it is coming up. In the publ. tr. I identify the *arí- tuvimaghá-* as Indra; I now would be more circumspect, since I now think the phrase applies both to Indra and to the patrons praised in vss. (7 or) 8–10. See also *aryáḥ* in 9d.

V.33.7: This vs. provides a transition between the praise-hymn proper and the dānastuti. On the one hand, it straightforwardly makes requests of Indra, as hymn-final vss. tend to do, and it begins with *evā́*, a frequent introducer of the final summary vs., but it also turns its attention in cd to those who facilitate the sacrifice, i.e., the patrons. The participle *dádataḥ* 'giving' that characterizes them is telling. Ge suggests that the dānastuti begins with 7c and notes that like 7c the vss. of the dānastuti begin with *utá*.

The meter of the first hemistich is badly mangled. Old blames the poet "dessen Formgefühl unzweifelhaft schwach war." But it may be a good strategy to mark the new section with a metrical jolt. Curiously the vs. is mostly free of the verbal knots that bedevil the earlier parts of the hymn.

Ge suggests plausibly that the "skin of the honey" is the skin on which the soma is prepared.

V.33.8–10: As just noted, 7c begins with *utá* as do vss. 8–10, but those vss. of the dānastuti proper are further unified, all beginning *utá tyé mā*.

V.33.8: It is unclear whether the horses in ab and those in c are the same or different. In the publ. tr. they are treated as the same; the standard tr. take them as separate groups. The two occurrences of *mā* (a, c) may support the standard view, in which case *vahantu* needs to be supplied in the first hemistich (so Ge, etc.).

I take *saśce* in pass. sense: "I am followed/accompanied." Ge (/WG, also Klein I.425) take it to mean "be in agreement with," but I do not know of other occurrences of √ *sac* with this meaning. (Ge's overelaborate set of explanatory glosses in n. 8d and n. 2 to that n. may attest to his discomfort with it.) The 'intentions" by which I am attended are G's intentions to give; see the expansion on *krátu-* in 9b. I think the point is not that the poet thinks it's a good idea for G. to give horses to him (that is, agrees with G), but that G's intentions to give are the poet's escorts, as it were. (One is reminded of the curious beings known as *rātiṣā́c-* 'Gift-escort'.) Indeed these "intentions" may be the

actual horses given; see 9b where the "bounties" produced by such intention are also actualized as horses.

V.33.9: In pāda a the publ. tr. reads "And (let) these (convey me)"; the "me" should not be in parens.

The bahuvrīhi *krátvāmagha-* is curiously formed, with instr. *krátvā* as its first member, and the publ. tr. "the bounty of his intentions" oversimplifies its structure in order to avoid impossibly awkward English: a full tr. of b would be "(the horses displaying/constituting) the bounty (produced) by his intention at the time of giving in[/of] the ceremony." In other words, the horses that the poet receives possess (that is, embody) Mārutāśva's bounty effected by his intention (to give). See 8d.

Ge takes *vidáthasya* as a PN, the patron whose patronymic is Mārutāśva, and Mayrhofer (PN s.v.) seems to agree. But there seems no reason not to interpr. it as an example of the well-attested common noun 'ceremony (of distribution)', esp. since it fits this context so well. WG do not follow Ge.

The part. *dádānaḥ* appears to be the predicate of this clause. Though rare, med. forms of √*dā* without *ā́* seem to mean 'give of oneself / one's own goods'. See also IX.52.3.

I don't entirely understand d. *ānūkám* is a hapax, but I follow Old in taking it as an adverbial meaning something like 'afterwards'; so apparently also WG. Ge, fld. by Klein (I.425), takes it as the obj. of *ā́rcat*, as 'last (song)'. See Ge's n. 9d.

The standard interpr. (Ge [/WG], Old, Klein I.425) take *aryáḥ* as nom. sg., referring to Cyavatāna of c, and Thieme (Fremdl. 85) also thinks it's probably nom. sg., but declines to discuss the passage because of the obscurity of *ānūkám*. But a patron like Cyavatāna should not be chanting or singing; that is the province of the poet-priests he is patronizing. Moreover, *aryáḥ* echoes gen. sg. *aryáḥ* in 6d, which announced the dānastuti to come, and I think the form should be interpr. in the same way in the absence of evidence to the contrary. In 9d I think that the gift of the *arí-* is still in question (as in 6d). The unnamed poet praised ('sang' *ā́rcat*) his gift for the wonder (*vápuṣe*) of it -- of its over-the-top munificence.

V.33.10: As in 9a "me" should be removed from parens.

The notion of enclosure in cd puns on the name of the Poet Saṃvaraṇa 'entirely enclosing' vel sim.

V.34 Indra

V.34.1: A personified (/divinized) form of Svadhā 'autonomous power' is found in this set of hymns; cf. the apparent ref. to her also in V.32.10.

V.34.2: The overall structure of the vs. is the first issue to address. The first hemistich begins with a rel. clause (in a) with accented verb *ápiprata*; the second pāda begins with another accented verb, *ámandata*, which can owe its accent either to its pāda-initial position or to being part of the rel. cl. of pāda a. I choose the former interpr., making b into the main cl. of the vs. (so also Hoffmann, Injunk., 244). Ge and WG choose the second, with ab containing two parallel rel. clauses. Since the 2nd hemistich consists of a

dep. cl. beginning with *yád* in c, with its accented verb *yámat* in d, this leaves the vs. without a main cl. WG remedy this by providing a main cl. frame "Zur Stelle (war er) ..." This posited main clause consists entirely of the preverb *ā́* that begins pāda a (see their n.), a slender reed indeed. Offhand I cannot think of any other examples where a preverb by itself constitutes a clause. This interpr. is esp. unlikely because *ā́* is an extremely common preverb with √*pr̥* / *prā* 'fill', and its default interpr. here is as a preverb in tmesis with *ápiprata*.

This structural question is connected with the problem of *yámat* in the *yád* cl. of the 2ⁿᵈ hemistich. This form should be a subjunctive to the root aor., but it is difficult to construe it as such, viewed in conjunction with the augmented imperfects of ab. In order to hold onto the subjunctive interpr., Hoffmann (Injunk., 244) takes cd as a purpose cl. ("Der Freigebige ... berauschte sich .... auf dass ihm ... Uśanā ... die tausendspitzige Waffe reiche"), but Indra doesn't drink soma *so that* Uśanā will give him a weapon, but does so at the same time and occasion when Uśanā gives him the weapon (see, e.g., I.121.12). WG's "Zur Stelle (war er)" is obviously designed to provide a better pragmatic foundation for the purpose cl. (see their n.), but I have just treated the weakness of their interpr. I therefore think that *yámat* here has to be a nonce injunctive with preterital value, rather than the subjunctive it appears to be. Two pivotal forms allow this reanalysis – 1ˢᵗ sg. *yamam* and 3ʳᵈ pl. *yaman*. The latter form is morphologically ambiguous: it could be a subjunctive or an injunctive. Although those forms are normally differentiated by the grade of the root (e.g., subj. *gáman* versus injunc. *gmán*), a zero-grade injunc. *imán is too radical and would be blocked. In fact, *yaman*, which occurs 4x (once as a rep.), is only found in *mā́* prohibitives and therefore must be an injunc. in every case. As for 1ˢᵗ sg. *yamam*, it has to be an injunctive (subjunctive would be **yamā[ni]*). Since both *yamam* and *yaman* could also be injunc. to thematic stems, a 3ʳᵈ sg. thematic-type injunc. *yámat* can be backformed. It is important to note that *yamam* is found in this very myth of the weapon used to kill Śúṣṇa: cf. X.49.3 *... vádhar yamam*# (1st sg. subj. = Indra) beside our *vádham yamat*, with Uśanā Kāvya as subj. For a more clearly marked injunctive in this phrase see nearby V.32.7 *vádhar yámiṣṭa* with secondary *-iṣ*-aor.

On them. *ápiprata* see Narten 1969 = Kl. Sch. 108–24, esp. 109, 121–24.

V.34.3: On *ū́dhar* / *ū́dhan*- as 'cold', beside the homonym 'udder', see comm. ad VIII.2.12. Note the phonological echo at the end of pādas a and c: *ū́dhani*# / *ūhati*#.

There is considerably more phonological play in the 2ⁿᵈ hemistich: **tatanúṣ**ṭim *ūha*ti, **tanū́śubhram**, enclosed within unbroken *a*'s: *ápāpa śakráś ... maghávā yáḥ kavāsakháḥ*. This phonological pattern may help account for some of the difficulties of interpr. this hemistich.

Before addressing the three hapaxes in cd, *tatanúṣṭim*, *tanū́śubhram*, and *kávāsakhaḥ*, note that the āmreḍited preverb *ápa-apa* (that is, *ápāpa*) superficially reads as a stem 'not evil'. I doubt if that is accidental, esp. since doubled preverbs are quite rare; we will return to it below.

The first two of the hapaxes form the object of *ápa ... ūhati*. The lexeme *ápa* √*ūh* means 'pull away'. It is used of the extended penis in cosmic incest in X.61.5; more to the point, in AV XVIII.2.57 it is used of a garment that is to be removed (*... vásaḥ ... ápaitád ūha yád ihā́bibhaḥ purā́*). A garment could well be described as *tanū́śubhra-*

'resplendent on the body'; cf. I.85.3 *tanū́ṣu śubhrā́ḥ* of the Maruts' ornaments. I therefore supply 'garment' as the obj. here. (For a possible variant of this see disc. below.)

Ge refuses to tr. or discuss *tatanúṣṭi-*; AiG is entirely silent on it; Old is non-committal. Nonetheless, the formation of *tatanúṣṭi-* looks fairly transparent, if quite unprecedented. As WG also suggest, it appears to be a *-ti-* abstract built to the weak grade of the pf. part. to √*tan* 'stretch'. WG gloss 'die Sich-ausgebreitet-haben-schaft', which in their interpr. is then also applicable to someone who has this quality. They thus assume a personal object for *ápa ūhati*, a dandy (Geck): "den, der sich ausgebreitet hat ... den Geck." I'm not sure what a "sich ausgebreitet" person would be, and there are other reasons to prefer supplying 'garment' or something similar as the referent of these two acc. First, there is the AV passage just cited, where 'garment' is the obj. of *ápa √ūh*. Second, garments are objects of √*tan* elsewhere (I.115.4, 134.4; X.106.1). And third, a personal object requires the meaning of *ápa √ūh* to be seriously attenuated (WG's abschieben: 'push away, get rid of'). I therefore take 'spread-out-ness' to be a quality attributed to a garment or garment-like object. However, this analysis causes problems of its own. For one thing, why not simply use the pf. part. alone to qualify the underlying 'garment'? Forming a derivational monstrosity -- a *-ti-*abstract based on a pf. part. -- and then turning this stem into a possessive adj. seem a tremendous amount of bother to go to when the participle by itself would convey the sense. Further, the standard words for garment are neut. (*vásas-*, *vástra-*), and *tatanúṣṭim* must be masc. (see the adj. *tanū́śubhram* agreeing with it). A proper neut. sg. adj. built to a *-ti-*stem should end in *-ti* (though as far as I can tell, there are no exx. in the RV), so if *tatanúṣṭim* is an adj., it is in the wrong gender for the posited noun it modifies. On the other hand, if we try to take *tatanúṣṭim* simply as the *-ti-*abstract, not an adj. based on it, the masc. gender of the qualifier *tanū́śubhram* clashes, since *-ti-*abstracts are fem. I have only an ad hoc answer to these problems: assuming the form is an adj. whose underlying referent is neut., the bare neut. *-ti* ending may have seemed anomalous and a more orthodox looking acc. substituted for it, encouraged also by the fact that the next word begins with a vowel and an inserted *-m* would avoid the hiatus. Meter would be unaffected, and *tanū́śubhram* can of course be neut. instead of masc. But I do not find this explanation compelling, and a different possibility is discussed below.

I have discussed the third hapax, *kavāsakhá-*, in some detail in Fs. Jasanoff (2007: 163), reviving the old, but generally now rejected, analysis of the first member as the old nom. sg. of *kaví-* matching the Aves. nom. sg. *kauuā* with its hysterokinetic inflection. That this inflectional type may be preserved here may be signalled by the 2nd member *-sakháḥ*, whose inflection remains hysterokinetic in Vedic and whose nom. sg. is ordinarily *sákhā*. The current standard interpr. of *kavā-* here assigns it to a stem (*)*kava-* 'humiliating, degrading' (see EWA s.v. *kavatnú-*). So, e.g., Ge's rendering of the cmpd as 'falsch Freund', with some semantic weakening.

How one analyses the cmpd. depends on what one thinks is going on in the hemistich in general. The first question is who is the referent of the cmpd.? It is found in a two-word nominal rel. cl. *yáḥ kavāsakháḥ*. Both Ge and WG take its antecendent to be the obj. of the verb *ápa ... ūhati* (e.g., WG "... den Keck, der die Genossen geringschätzt"), but as was just discussed, it is not at all certain (and in my opinion unlikely) that the object of that verb is a person. Moreover, word order -- an often helpful,

though of course not sturdily reliable guide in the RV -- favors Indra as referent: the verse ends ... *maghávā yáḥ kavāsakháḥ.*

If my analysis is correct -- that the cmpd. contains *kaví-* 'poet' and that it characterizes Indra -- how can I fit it together with the rest of the vs.? I think the cmpd. has a double sense. On the one hand, the *kavā* part refers to Uśanā Kāvya, who figures in vs. 2. In fact, note that in 2d *uśánā* appears in its usual position, immediately after the caesura following an opening of 5. If we superimpose 3d over 2d, *kavā-* would immediately follow *uśánā*: [x x x x x / *uśánā kavā(-sakha)*], the composite yielding a simulacrum of his full name. And of course, as vs. 2 shows, Indra and Uśanā are partners and companions. Uśanā is referred to as *kaví-* elsewhere, with *kaví-* a substitute for his patronymic; see, e.g., IV.16.3, 26.1.

But the other sense I see here is more sinister and requires considering vs. 3 in connection with the flg. verse. Vs. 4 is a curious, counter-intuitive, and indeed dispiriting vs.: even if Indra kills all your relatives, he still expects you to continue to offer to him. The usual comforting notion in the RV -- that Indra will do well by you if you do well by him, while the non-offerer will get badly treated -- is overturned here. Indra can act cavalierly and arbitrarily to ruin your life no matter how devotedly you serve him. I think the same unsettling idea is presented in vs. 3. Though the standard interpr. of vs. 3 (see, e.g., Ge's n. 3cd) is that the first hemistich depicts the pious man happily rewarded, while cd shows the impious one getting his just deserts, I take the whole vs. as referring to the ups and downs of the pious soma-presser. First, his labors pay off: he becomes *dyumán* 'heaven-bright'. But in the second half Indra snatches away this brightness, which is spread across him like a garment, "resplendent on his body" (*tanū́śubhra-*), an appropriate characterization of such brightness. In this reading *kavāśakháḥ* is ironic; Indra was indeed a companion and partner of the poet, until he wasn't.

If this interpr. is correct, it may help explain the use of the peculiar formation *tatanúṣṭi-* discussed at length above. In pāda b the lucky soma-presser is *dyu-mánt-*, lit. 'possessing *dyu-*'. And by my analysis, it is this purported *dyu-* that is resplendent on his body. But the well-attested possessive adj. *dyu-mánt-* has become lexically separated from *div-/ dyu-* 'heaven'; there is no independent *dyu-* 'brightness' that can become the property of a person. (The root noun *dyút-* is rare without preverb and means yet again something different.) It may be that "spreading-ness" is an attempt to capture the quality of heavenly light without having a firm grammatical base, an identifiable independent noun, to found it on. One of the standard tropes using the root √*tan* is light or a source of light spreading through heaven and other cosmic realms; cf., e.g., X.88.3 of Sūrya *yó bhānúnā pr̥thivī́ṃ dyā́m utémā́m, ātatā́na ródasī antárikṣam*. And so *tatanúṣṭi-* may embody this whole complex of heavenly light spreading across the man's body as if through heaven. By this analysis the *tatanúṣṭi-* is not a garment, as I first suggested, but *like* a garment.

Another piece of evidence may support my view of cd as expressing the undeserved and capricious reversal of fortune of the soma-presser who was riding high in ab. Remember that cd begins with the double preverb *ápāpa*, which could also be the voc. of an adj. 'not-evil'. I suggest that this is a despairing address to the soma-presser of ab: "o un-evil [/blameless] one, see what can happen to you anyway."

V.34.4: As noted in the publ. intro. and in the disc. of vs. 4 immediately above, the sense of this vs. -- which seems surprisingly clear -- is hard to square with our usual notions of Rigvedic reciprocal responsibilities, for the vs. states that Indra can kill all your relatives and still demand your offerings, with no attempt even to deny or distance himself from what he did. Ge and Old pass over this unsettling doctrine in silence; WG suggest that the vs. shows that Indra doesn't fear a blood feud (Blutrache), but this seems to let Indra off too easily. There is no sign of the reciprocity that "blood feud" implies: the hapless man whose relatives have been slaughtered does not seem to have done anything injurious to Indra, nor did his dead relatives -- at least as far as the vs. allows us to see. The killings appear to be the arbitrary acts of a powerful god just because he *can*. It may be no accident that Indra is called *śakrá-* 'able' here and in 3cd, where he also arbitrarily exerted his power. (Of course, *śakrá-* is a common epithet of Indra in the RV and later, and I would not suggest that it is always used with this nuance -- only that our poet exploited the literal sense of the word.) The fact that the word *kílbiṣa-* is used of Indra's deed supports the view that what he did was simply wrong; see publ. intro.

I take *práyata-* in its usual sense, referring to offerings or bounties 'held forth' or 'presented'. Cf. nearby V.30.12 *práyatā maghā́ni*, X.15.12 *práyatā havī́ṃṣi*, etc. I cannot get anything else out of this sentence than that Indra still wants the aggrieved man to keep making giving him oblations. WG tr. "Darreichungen," but suggest in their n. that it refers to "Reparations-, Satisfaktionszahlungen." But what right would Indra have to seek reparations when he was the one who inflicted the damage?

yataṃkará- is a hapax, and the identity of neither of its parts is as sure as the standard interpr. take them. Gr suggests *yataṃ* belongs to the ppl. of √*yam*, therefore morphologically identical to the immediately preceding *(prá-)yatā*, but this analysis is rejected, rightly in my view, by Ge and WG, who take it (the former implicitly, the latter explicitly) as the acc. sg. of a root noun to √*yat*, found also in the cmpd *saṃyát-* in 9c. Although the uncompounded root noun is not found elsewhere and it is not mentioned by Schindler in his Root Noun diss. or Scar in his disc. of √*yat* (403-4), I think this must be the correct analysis, with the noun meaning '(proper) arrangement' or the like. The publ. tr. 'arranger' reflects this analysis of *yataṃ*, while taking 2nd member *-kará-* from √*kṛ*, hence 'make arrangements' → 'arranger'. I now think this interpr. of the 2nd member is wrong. This pāda-final compound matches final *ākaráḥ* of the next pāda, which, construed with preceding *vásvaḥ*, means 'distributor of goods'. This *-kará-* does not belong to √*kṛ*, however, but to √*kṝ, kir* 'scatter', which occurs with *ā́* in just this phrase: cf. IX.81.3 *ā́ naḥ ... kirā́ vásu* "scatter/distribute goods to us." This strongly suggests that the parallel cmpd *yataṃkará-* contains the same form, which leads to a sense 'scattering the arrangement' -- viz., destroying it, blowing it to smithereens and scattering the resulting particles. This accurately reflects what Indra has done in this vs. -- violating the arrangement between men and gods -- worship and offerings in return for protection, aid, and material goods -- by smiting the family of his devotee, though he still provides goods. I would therefore change the publ. tr. from 'the arranger' to 'scattering/destroying the arrangement'.

V.34.5: The usual arrangement beween Indra and mortals is re-established in this vs., where Indra's punishment comes only to the stingy and the non-worshipper, and the pious man gets rewarded.

There is a difference of opinion about the sense of pāda a, because of different interpr. of the acc. inf. *ārábham* and of the numerical expressions. Ge takes *ārábham* as 'sich verbinden' and the expressions of numbers as referring to people or gods -- the sense being that Indra doesn't want to team up with others because he's strong enough on his own. But *ā́ √rabh* does not have that meaning, but only 'to grasp, grab hold of'. WG also take the numbers as personal: "Nicht wünscht er mit fünf, mit zehn (Leuten) das Erraffen (von Beute)," which I confess I don't understand. Is the intent that he wants to pile up his booty all by himself? By contrast, I take the numbers as referring to the means of grasping the offerings/goods -- either by the number of gifts (=in increments of five or ten) or by handfuls: one (=five fingers) or two (=ten fingers) -- and he doesn't want to acquire the goods in such trifling installments.

In c the question is the function of *amuyā́*. I cannot identify a part of the WG tr. that represents *amuyā́*. Ge's interpr. is minimalistic: *íd amuyā́* "nur so," which Klein (II.160) helpfully expands to "only in that circumstance (viz. when a wealthy person does not have soma pressed for him)." This may well be right. However, I compare X.135.2 *cárantam pāpáyāmuyā́* "going along yonder evil way." In our passage this may refer to highway robbery: the offending non-presser gets robbed as he makes his way along the road. Or it may be metaphorical: if the non-presser continues to pursue this behavior he'll be punished.

V.34.6: There is puzzling agreement about the meaning of the hapax *cakramāsajá-*. The standard interpr. run counter to the clear structure of the cmpd: a tatpuruṣa with the first member the acc. sg. of *cakrá-* 'wheel' (the acc. blocking hiatus before a vocalic 2nd member) and the 2nd derived from *ā́ √sa(ñ)j*. The lexeme *ā́ √sa(ñ)j* means 'attach, affix, hang' (I.191.10, X.124.7); yet this cmpd is universally interpr. as meaning 'impeding/stopping the wheel' (Gr, Ge, AiG II.1.183, EWA s.v. *SAÑJ*) or, acdg. to WG, 'die Wagen bremsend' with *cakra-* as pars pro toto. I do not understand this consensus that the verbal portion should be given a meaning not found with the verb itself, particularly since the context does not impose it. (Sāy.'s gloss *rathacakrasyāsañjayitā* does not seem to be responsible for it either.) Only WG attempt to trace a semantic pathway to the meaning attributed to *āsajá-*, but it is not persuasive. I suppose all these interpr. are thinking of the myth in which Indra tears the wheel off the sun's chariot, but there is no other indication in context that this myth is at issue -- and tearing off and stopping are quite different actions. Given these objections, I prefer to stick with the standard meaning of *ā́ √sa(ñ)j* and assume 1) that it refers to the *restoration* of the sun's wheel mentioned in regard to Etaśa in nearby V.31.11, or 2) that is refers to an incident in an unknown story, or 3) that it refers to some pre-batttle preparation or battle tactic. I prefer the first.

V.34.7: The lexeme *sám √aj* is used elsewhere of 'driving together' cattle (I.33.3); here the *bhójanam* of the niggard is presumably livestock. Though *paṇéḥ* here is used oppositionally to *dāśúṣe* in b (see Ge's n. 7ab), the word also summons up Indra's opponents, the Paṇis, who stole his cows -- so stealing them back (*muṣé*) is only justice.

The syntax of c is quite challenging. Let us begin with *víśva ā́ purú*. The phrase *purú víśva-* appears to be an idiom, or at least is found twice in the RV, meaning "all the many": I.191.9 *purú víśvāni* "all the many (bugs)," VII.62.1 *purú víśvā jánima* "all the

many tribes." Here, however, the words are in opposite order, with the preverb/adposition *ā́* intervening, and the referent is singular (*víśva[ḥ] ... jánaḥ*). Nonetheless, I think the locutions are essentially the same, though I tr. "each and every" to capture the singular number.

I do not know what to do with *ā́*. It is possible that it is a preverb with *dhriyate*, but 1) though *ā́* is found with √*dhṛ*, it is not common, and 2) preverbs in tmesis generally move to metrical or syntactic boundaries, and *ā́* is not so placed here. The standard interpr. do not comment on it. I have no solution.

The last issue is the use of *caná.* Ge (/WG) take it as neg. 'nicht einmal' (not even). The sense of the clause, acdg. to them, is that a people that has provoked Indra's anger can't hole up for a long time even in a place that's hard to penetrate. Thus by their interpr. *durgá-* is a desirable, fortress-like location for the offending people, but they can't hold onto it. But *durgá-* is always otherwise an undesirable place, where no one wants to be -- where we wish Indra to send our enemies (VII.25.2) but from which we want to be rescued. I therefore think that the point of this clause is that Indra's antagonists get confined to such a place and therefore *caná* does not have a negative sense here. Twice loc. *durgé* is followed by *cid* 'even' (VIII.27.18, 93.10), and *durgé caná* here may be a variant of this usage. Although he unfortunately does not discuss this passage, Klein's general disc. of *caná* (DGRV I.285–92) as essentially borrowing negative value from the negative contexts in which it's ordinarily found allows for an original underlying positive value 'even'. For further disc. see comm. ad X.49.5, VIII.1.5, X.56.4. The publ. tr. should be slightly altered to "Even in a (place) ...," though I'm not sure what sense 'even' adds -- perhaps that not only are the people confined but they are confined in a really nasty place.

V.34.8: The identity of the verb *ávet* in b is disputed. Gr takes it as an opt. to √*av* 'help'; Old rejects that analysis but suggests that either √*vid* 'know' or √*vī* 'pursue' is possible. Ge and WG (see also Oberlies RdV I.535) opt for √*vid* and take the rest of the ab as indirect discourse controlled by this verb ("when he found out that ..."). This is possible, but I find it hard to integrate subordinate *yád* clause in ab (with plupf.) with the *hí* cl. of c (with root aor.) and the main cl. of d (with pres. indic.). I find that the sequence of tense works better if ab is a separate unit, with subord. *yád* cl. in a and main clause in b (*ávet* accented because pāda-initial). Then c is the causal grounds for the main cl. in d and expresses immed. past.

My analysis requires supplying a verb in pāda a, linked to the preverb *sám* (which by the other interpr. must be construed with √*vid*, a combination not found with 'know', though it is with √*vid* 'find'). A good candidate for a verb to supply is given by *sámṛti-* 'clash' in 6a, and verbal forms to this idiom (*sám* √*ṛ*) are fairly common. Cf. VII.25.1 ... *yát samáranta sénāḥ* "when armies clash together." My analysis also depends on a different analysis of *ávet*, which I assign to √*vī* 'pursue'. Note *véti* opening 4c.

The def. *anyám* 'the one' in c, referring to one of the two opponents in ab, more or less demands a responsive 'the other', as Ge and I supply in d.

Old questions the existence of the stem *pravepanín-*, suggesting that *pravepaní* is an adverbial instr. to a *pravepanī́-* (fld. by WG). I don't see that a stem *pravepanī́-* is appreciably better than an -*ín*-stem and follow the older analysis.

V.34.9: The sense of *saṃyát-* 'continuous(ly)', root noun cmpd. to √*yat* (see *yataṃ-* in 4c and disc. there), must have developed from 'taking their places together, one after the other'. For further disc. of the stem, see comm. ad IX.86.15.

V.35 Indra

V.35.3: *ābhū́bhiḥ* 'ready at hand' lacks an overt referent. I supply '(forms) of help' from context -- *ávas-* is the signature word of this part of the hymn. Ge takes it as a nominalized 'Kräfte', though he suggests the Maruts as an alternative referent in n. 3d; WG personified 'helpers'.

V.35.4: The syntactic boundaries do not coincide with the pāda boundary in ab -- a welcome syncopation in this otherwise simple hymn. The hemistich is divided into three clauses: *vŕ̥ṣā hy ási / rā́dhase jajñiṣé / vŕ̥ṣṇi te śávaḥ*, but the pāda boundary breaks the second into two one-word halves. It might be possible to fold the third proposed clause into the second ("you were born as bullish strength"), if we were willing to be cavalier about the position of *te* and indeed its presence ("you were born as your bullish strength"?), but the nominal clause in VIII.3.10 *tád indra vŕ̥ṣṇi te śávaḥ* supports the analysis as a separate unit, if more support be needed.

On the anomalous form *vŕ̥ṣṇi* (for expected *vŕ̥ṣṇ(y)am*), see comm. ad VIII.96.19.

satrāhám is a neut. sg. qualifying *paúṃsyam*. It looks like a them. neut. and is in fact classified under *satrāha-* in Gr and Lub (see also Scar 697). Nonetheless, it belongs with the class of root noun cmpds with *-hán-*. The neut. sg. of such a stem should probably be **-ha* (like *nā́ma* to *nā́man-*, assuming radical *-n-*stems work like, or get assimilated to, derived *-n-*stems). I might tentatively suggest that the final *-m* was first inserted (as anunāsika) to avoid the hiatus **satrāhá indra* and then reinterp. as a them. neut. ending (see also Lanman, *Noun inflection* 478, AiG III.239). But it is the case that such nasalizations are rare within pādas and almost always concern long *-ā* (see Old, Prol. 469–72). Moreover, the similarly formed neut. *vr̥trahám* in VI.48.21 precedes a consonant with the *-m* making position.

V.35.5: Ge takes *adrivaḥ* as 'du Herr des Presssteins', but in context a stone as weapon seems more likely (so WG 'du mit den Schleudersteinen', flg. Gr).

I interpr. *sarvarathā́* as an adverbial accompaniment to the victim whom Indra runs over: "(him), chariot and all." It is not clear from Ge's "mit ganz Wagenzug" whose chariot he thinks it is, but WG take it to be Indra's chariot, interpr. *sarva-* in its stronger lexical sense 'hale, healthy': "... so, dass dein Wagen heil bleibt." This purpose-clause reading attributes more, and more unambiguous, structure to this single word than I think it can properly bear, and I also don't understand the intended sense: should Indra endeavor to keep the victim's blood from splashing his wheels or his body from making dents?

V.35.6: Note the phonol. figure *pūrvī́ṣu pūrv(í)yám*, though the words belong to diff. stems. The referent of fem. *pūrvī́ṣu* is not clear. Gr suggests *ājíṣu* from 7b, and this seems to have met general acceptance (Ge, with ?; WG; Bloomfield RReps, 256), even though *ājí-* is actually masc., a fact no one remarks on. (Gr cites a single. fem. form, in I.116.15,

but nothing in that passage signals that gender.) We could, of course, suggest a different word for 'battle' with fem. gender, like *pṛtanā* or *samád-*; there is weak support for both (/either) of these because they both are construed in the loc. pl. with *ugrá-*, which is also found here: *ugrám ... samátsu* in an oft-repeated pāda (III.30.22, etc.); VII.56.23 *ugráḥ pṛtanāsu*, VIII.61.12, 70.4 *ugrám* (...) *pṛtanāsu*. An entirely different referent is also possible: 'peoples' comes to mind, picking up the *jánāsaḥ* of pāda b, with several different possible fem. stems as substitute: *kṣití-* from 2c or the developed sense of *carṣaṇí-*, extractable from 1c (cf. III.43.2 *pūrvīḥ ... carṣaṇīḥ*) or *víś-* (cf. VII.31.10 *víśaḥ pūrvīḥ*).

V.35.7: This vs. has a riddle structure: the accusative qualifiers pile up until their referent, the chariot (*rátham*) is given at the very end, immediately preceded by the verb (*avā*) on which the preceding accusatives depend. It proved difficult to capture this effect in tr.

     sayā́van- means 'drive along with' (the useful German 'mitfahren', for which there is no precise English equivalent). It is ordinarily either construed with an instr. of the fellow traveller or is in the instr. qualifying the fellow traveller(s). Here there is no such overt expression, but we can assume it is Indra.

V.35.8: The structure of ab mimics that of 7, which has (a) #*asmā́kam ...* / (d) *... avā́ rátham*#, while 8 has (a) #*asmā́kam ...* (b) #*rátham avā́ ....* Another verbal expression is inserted within this structure in pāda a: *éhi naḥ*. Ge tr. as two separate clauses, silently postponing the *asmā́kam* to the second one ("komm zu uns, begünstige unseren Wagen"). WG take *éhi naḥ* as an insertion: "Unserem -- Indra, komm her zu uns! -- (unserem) Wagen hilf ..." This interpr. seems possible -- save for the position of the voc. *indra*, which is unaccented and precedes *éhi naḥ* so cannot belong to that phrase. (A slightly altered tr. would be "Ours, Indra -- come to us! -- (our) chariot ...") By contrast I take *éhi ... avā́* as a pseudo-serial verb construction ("come help"), though I admit that the *naḥ* might be problematic for that interpr.

    Ge (/WG) take both *diví* as 'today', but outside of *diví pāryé* 'on the decisive day', a phrase characteristic primarily of VI and VII, *diví* always refers to heaven, as far as I can tell. 'Heaven' makes fine sense here, and cf. the similar expression V.13.2 *... stómam manāmahe ... divispṛ́śaḥ* "we shall conceive a praise-song (for Agni), who touches the sky."

V.36 Indra

V.36.1: The publ. tr. takes the phrase *vásūnām ... dā́mano rayīṇā́m* as nested genitives (*vásūnām* and *rayīṇā́m* depending on *dā́manaḥ*), whose head noun is *dā́tum*. Both Ge and WG break up the nouns into two phrases (though in different ways), with WG taking the verb *cíketat* in two different ways (pf. subj. / plupf. injunc.) with two different complements: "... der auf das Schenken von Gütern [i.e., *vásūnām ... dā́tum*] achten soll, weil er sich ja auf die Schenkung von Schätzen [i.e., *dā́mano rayīṇā́m*] versteht." This is more elegant than my pile-up of gifts and may well be right, though I'm not sure there's sufficient signalling of the double meaning.

V.36.2: The simile in ab depends on the double meaning of the root √*ruh*, which means both 'climb, mount' and 'grow'. It also hinges on two different senses of *sóma-*, as the prepared ritual drink and the plant from which it is extracted.

   In cd there is mismatch in number between the simile in the singular and the frame in the plural, whose number is emphasized by *víśve* 'all'. The point of the simile is that the person "driving his steeds" would be verbally urging them on to greater speed.

V.36.3: The slightly "off" nature of the similes in this hymn continues here. In ab the point of comparison between the rolling wheel and the poet's mind is the trembling (*vepate*). The cause of the trembling -- fear -- is applicable only to the mind, not the wheel.

   As disc. in the publ. intro., *ráthād ádhi* "from the chariot" is a curious phrase, and the standard treatments struggle with it. Both Ge and Old think that the singer is expressing a wish for a chariot, but it is hard to see how to make that work syntactically. WG (in n.) suggest that it's either Indra's chariot or that it represents the poet's hymn, but neither of these fits the context well. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this is a punning allusion to the poet's patron Śruta-ratha (lit. 'having a famous chariot'), praised in the dānastuti in vs. 6. In this scenario the hemistich-initial ablative, referring to the patron, is linked to the hemistich-final word *purūvásuḥ*, referring to the poet. Though Ge (/WG) take this as a PN, giving it its full lexical meaning ('having many goods') makes the verse work better. The singer praises Indra on behalf of his patron Śrutaratha, in order to become "One of many goods" -- from/because of (Śruta)ratha. As Mayrhofer points out (PN, s.v. *purūvásu-*), *purūvásu* is synonymous with Prabhūvasu, the name of the poet acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, so the vs. puns both on the name of the poet and on that of the patron. This might be clearer in the publ. tr. if it were reordered: "Surely the singer will now praise you ... (to become) one possessing many goods from the (Famous-)chariot?

V.36.4: The semantically complementary expressions referring to giving with the left and right hands have different morphological realizations: instr. *savyéna* and the hapax adv. *dakṣiṇít*. The latter is, of course, anomalously formed; it appears also in the cmpd. *pradakṣiṇít* (6x), which may be the basis here as well -- note immediately preceding *prá*. Thieme (KZ 69 [1951] = KlSch 71) suggests that it's a cmpd with the root noun to √*i* 'go' (with the expected empty -*t* stem final); others that it contains the relic of a PIE instr. ending in -*t/d*. For a full disc. see Scar (42–44). Since the first is not straightforward functionally ("going to the right" is not its sense) and the second depends on a highly dubious morphological reconstruction, I withhold judgment on the source of the form, but see *ubhayāhastí* (or -*ī́*) in V.39.1 below. The lack of morphological parallelism in this passage is not surprising, since the hymn tends towards slightly skewed expressions.

V.36.5: I take cd as a single clause (contra Ge [/WG]), because the *sá* with 2nd ps. ref. that opens c is easily explained if it's construed with the imperatival 2nd sg. injunctive *dhāḥ* at the end of d, but would otherwise be anomalous. See my "sa figé."

   Strictly speaking, *vṛ́ṣakrato* is of course a voc. In the publ. tr. I render it as nom., because of the parallelism *vṛ́ṣā vṛ́ṣarathaḥ ... vṛ́ṣakrato vṛ́ṣā*, with 2 nom. *vṛ́ṣā* adjoining 2 bahuvrīhis with *vṛ́ṣa-* as 1st member.

V.36.6: The sudden intrusion of the Maruts here is somewhat puzzling, but final vss. often open out to a wider set of gods.

V.37 Indra

V.37.1: As was noted in the publ. intro., the first pāda of this first hymn attributed to Atri provides the clue to the solution of the mythical puzzle posed by the narrative in Atri's V.40.5–9 in which Svarbhānu (*svàrbhānu-*) pierces the sun with darkness and Atri restores the sun to heaven. The name Svarbhānu means 'having the radiance of the sun', and here Agni aligns himself "with the radiance of the sun" (*bhānúnā ... sū́ryasya*). As I demonstrated at length in my book *The Ravenous Hyenas and the Wounded Sun*, Svarbhānu is simply an epithet of Agni, who inflicted the wound on the sun for cause (cosmic incest). This pāda signals the underlying connection of Agni and Svarbhānu with a minimum of fuss.

       The dawns are 'non-neglectful' (*ámṛdhra-*) because they never fail to appear every morning.

V.37.2: Both Ge and WG take *jarāte* as 'be awake', even though Gotō himself (1ˢᵗ Klasse, 151 and 154) identifies this particular attestation of *jára-* as ambig. between 'be awake' and 'sing'. Although both meanings are probably present, I think 'sing' is the primary one. The subject's yoked pressing stones speak (*grā́vāṇaḥ ... vadanti*) in the next pāda (2c), and throughout the RV there is generally an equivalence between the noise of the pressing stones and the speech/singing of the priests. See in particular in the immediately preceding hymn, V.36.4 *grā́veva jaritā́ ... íyarti vā́cam* "Like a pressing stone, the singer raises his voice," with the agent noun belonging to the same root.

       On the Adhvaryu's trip to the river to fetch water on the morning of the pressing day, see Ge's n. 2c.

V.37.3: See the disc. of this vs. as omphalos and riddle in the publ. intro. As indicated there, I identify the bride as Dawn and the husband as the Sun, while the dominant opinion (see Ge [/WG]) is rather Speech and Indra. The latter is certainly not excluded, and the fact that the stem *iṣirá-*, used to qualify the speech of the pressing stones in 2c, also characterizes the wife in 3b may give some support to that view. Cf. also IX.84.4 *vā́cam iṣirā́m uṣarbúdham* "the vigorous speech awakening at dawn." Still, the Dawn/Sun interpr. follows naturally from the dawn ritual setting in the first two vss., and the long journey in d would refer to the daily trip across the sky.

       As also noted in the publ. intro. *śravasyā́d ráthaḥ* "the chariot will seek fame" recalls the name of the patron in the immed. preceding hymn, V.36.6, Śrutaratha, which was also punned on in V.36.3.

       With Ge I take *purū́ sahásrā* as a measure of distance and *pári vartayāte* as intrans./reflex., based on its middle form. This is disputed by WG, who take the verb as transitive (but "affektive" [whatever that means], the value that accounts for its middle form). They supply 'men' as the referent of *purū́ sahásrā*. The idea is that the noise of Indra's chariot will cause many thousands of them to turn around and look at it. I suppose this is not impossible, but again it requires supplying much more than is found in the

context: a huge crowd of people and the presupposition that "cause to turn" implies "turn to look."

V.37.4: "Whose comrades are cows" (*gósakhāyam*) modifying soma refers of course to the milk mixture added to soma to make it less unpalatable. (It is somewhat surprising that *sóma-* is also called *tīvrá-* 'sharp' in the same pāda, since this is usually of unmixed soma.) But the *gó-* 'cow' of this cmpd provides a clever transition to the next pāda. Pāda c contains a verb (*ā́ ...*) *ájati* 'drives', which ordinarily takes an object -- and indeed frequently that object is cows: e.g., I.83.5 *ā́ gā́ ājat*, V.2.5 *ā́jāti paśváḥ*. I therefore supply 'cows' as the object in c, extracted from a different use of the 'cow' word in b. This then produces a reference to the Vala myth, with the *satvanaíḥ* 'warriors' representing the Aṅgirases as elsewhere (cf. III.39.5, also nearby V.34.8 for association with cattle raiding). Thus pāda c depicts the king protected by Indra as performing a Vala-like deed (*ā́ satvanaír ájati*) as well as the/a Vṛtra slaying (*hánti vṛtrám*), ascribing (equivalents of) the two signature deeds of Indra to this earthly king. Neither Ge nor WG make much sense of the *ájati* clause.

      The accent on *ájati* is contrastive with the adjacent *hánti*.

      Both Ge and WG take *kṣitī́ḥ* with *kṣéti* ("er bleibt in seinen Sitzen" and "weilt sicher in seinem Reich" respectively; see also Oberlies Relig. RV I.441, II.171–72), but √*kṣi* 'dwell' without preverb does not otherwise take the acc., whereas √*puṣ* 'prosper, thrive' can take a personal acc., and so I construe *kṣitī́ḥ* with *púṣyan*. In my interpr. the poet juxtaposes the cognate words (*kṣéti kṣitī́ḥ*), but separates them syntactically.

V.37.5: The pāda-framing #*kṣéti ... púṣyan*# of 4d recur adjacent at the beginning of 5a #*púṣyāt kṣéme* in different morphological form; *kṣéme* 'peace(ful dwelling) is also paired with its opposite *yóga-* 'hitching up, war', with two contrastive clauses framed by the subjunctives #*puṣyāt ... bhavāti*# predicting success in both peace and war.   The war theme is further developed in the following pāda. I take *ubhé vṛ́tau saṃyatī́* as an implicitly subordinated clause with pres. part. as main verb (an interpr. that WG come close to as an alternative considered in their n.). It would be possible to take this phrase as acc. obj. of *sáṃ jayāti* (so Ge, WG, Oberlies [Relig. RV II.172]), but it doesn't make sense that the king would conquer both clashing forces, when one of them is likely his own. Rather I think the point is that Indra will favor him over the opponent and therefore his side will prevail. See V.34.8, where Indra links himself to one of two opposing troops and helps his clients win.

V.38 Indra

      For the general contents, see disc. in publ. intro. WG interpr. it as plea to Indra for rain -- a purpose that I find very hard to discern and that results in farfetched interpr. of details.

V.38.1: The first hemistich is somewhat awk., with (by my interpr. and Ge's) a genitive phrase *uróḥ ... rā́dhasaḥ* "of your broad largess" dependent on an almost synonymous nom. phrase *vibhvī́ rātíḥ* "extensive giving." WG apparently take the first not as gen., but as abl., indicating the source of the giving: "Von deiner ... weitreichenden Gunst aus entfaltet sich die Gabe." This seems like a good idea and mitigates the awkwardness. I

would then change the publ. tr. to "Your extensive giving (comes) from your broad generosity."

V.38.2: As in several instances in the last few hymns, WG impose extra structure on the first hemistich that is not supported by the phraseology. They supply a verb to govern *śravā́yyam*, which then forms the foundation for a 2nd subordinate cl. consisting of *íṣam ... dadhiṣé*: "Was du ... Ruhmvolles (zustande gebracht), dass du dir die Labung ... verschafft hast." In their introduction to the hymn they explain what lies behind this interpr., adding even further unsupported assumptions. The 'praiseworthy' thing that Indra accomplished was his action of freeing the life-giving liquid (*íṣ-*), which they presumably take both as the waters imprisoned by Vṛtra and (proto-)rain. But they give no justification for dividing ab into two clauses, separating the apparently parallel objects *śravā́yyam* and *íṣam*, and providing a verb to govern the first that cannot be generated from context or formulaics. It is worth pointing out that *śravā́yya-* is never used of a deed or action and most often modifies *rayí-* 'wealth' or *vā́ja-* 'prize'. Although I can't see any obstacle to qualifying a deed as *śravā́yya-*, there are no familiar phrases containing that notion that would come to mind when encountering an undefined *śravā́yya-*. Though I confess I can't identify the referent(s) here, I find the WG interpr. implausible and forced. For further on this vs. see comm. ad V.39.2 below.

V.38.3: The WG interpr. becomes even more forced in this vs., which is summarized in their intro. by "Die Maruts lassen es regnen," despite the absence of any reference to the Maruts or any verb for 'rain' -- the operative word for 'rain' is supposed to be the adverbial instr. *mehánā* generally taken as 'in profusion'. The single word *śúṣmāsaḥ* is supposed to incorporate "Sturm, Drang, Blitz," and the Maruts are supposed to be the other half of the dual expression *ubhā́ devā́u* "both you gods" -- that is, Indra and the Maruts -- a highly unlikely use of the dual. The distortion of the text to fit the interpretational preconceptions goes much too far.

To stay closer to the actual wording, the question is how to distribute the various pādas in relation to each other. Ge takes ab as the subject of a clause whose object is in c, though with an unexpressed verb: "Deine Kräfte ... (bringen) beide Götter zur Übermacht." I prefer to take ab as an extension of vs. 2, adding another quality of Indra's (his tempestuous force) that extends itself along with fame. Then the two gods of c can be the subject of *rājathaḥ* in d, with *abhíṣṭaye* an infinitival complement. A similar interpr. is given by Scar (598), who takes ab as a nominal clause, "Die ungestümen Kräfte, die dir [sind, sind] in Menge [vorhanden] und gehorchen deinem Willen," and cd more or less as I do.

As for who the other god is, besides Indra -- Old refuses to speculate, saying it's an unknown ritual situation. Ge suggests Varuṇa, and this seems the likeliest possibility. Dual forms of √*rāj* generally have Varuṇa as one half of the subject, the other usually being Mitra; cf., e.g., in this maṇḍala V.63.2, 7. But VII.83.5, a hymn to *Indra* and Varuṇa, the verb has those two as subject: *yuváṃ hí vásva ubháyasya rā́jathaḥ* "For you two rule over goods of both sorts."

V.38.4: The brief excursion into the dual in vs. 3 is over, and Indra is the sole subject again.

The first hemistich is again syntactically incomplete. The standard interpr. construe the genitive phrase *asyá kásya cid dákṣasya táva* loosely with *nṛmṇám* (e.g., Ge "von welcher deiner Geisteskraft es auch sei, ... bring uns Mut"). This is possible, but I prefer to take ab as an extension of 3cd (as 3ab was to 2cd), supplying 'rule' to govern the genitives, using slightly different senses of 'rule'.

V.38.5: I tr. slightly differently from the standard, supplying another form of *syāma* for ab, rather than making the whole vs. into a single cl. The difference is trifling.

Notice that *abhíṣṭibhiḥ* echoes *abhíṣṭaye* in 3c.

WG suggest that this vs. is a joke: asking Indra to be in his *śárman* ('protection, shelter'; German 'Schirm') is like asking to be under his umbrella (Regenschirm). This is a joke that may work in German but seems to have little to do with Sanskrit, which, as far as I know, does not have the concept of a rain-repelling umbrella. Shelters of that physical type are more likely used against the sun, and certainly I know of no use of *śárman-* in a rain context.

V.39 Indra

As was noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is twinned with V.38 in Vālakhilya fashion, though it does not give as much help as it might in interpreting the previous hymn.

V.39.1: The poet re-uses *mehánā* from V.38.3 and *rā́dhaḥ* from V.38.1, as well as *adrivaḥ* (though that voc. is quite common in this run of hymns). Because of their commitment to *mehánā* as 'rain' in 38.3, WG are forced to insert rain here, though the context is hardly favorable.

The Pp. reads *ubhayā́hastí* with short *-i*, which is assigned to an *-i*-stem by Gr, as a neut. modifying *rā́dhaḥ*, though he also suggests that it might be read *-í*, as the masc. nom. sg. of an *-ín*-stem. The latter works better morphologically than the former: *hastín-* is well attested and well formed, whereas there is no straight *-i*-stem *hastí-* and no easy mechanism for producing one -- though a nonce back-formation from the well-formed adj. *-hastíya-* might be possible. See esp. *ubhayāhastíyā́ vásu* in I.81.7. (A neut. to the *-ín*-stem would likewise probably come out as *-i*, and this may be an easier solution). I nonetheless tentatively suggest that *ubhayā́hastí* here (if that is the reading) might be compared with the problematic *dakṣiṇít* 'with the right (hand)' in nearby V.36.4, which appears in the same kind of context, concerns hands, and has a problematic suffixal short *-i-*, followed there by a morphologically mysterious dental final.

V.39.2: Although this vs. is lexically and syntactically quite distinct from V.38.2, they seem to share a thematic core. First, note that *váreṇiyam* at the end of pāda a is positioned identically to *śravā́yiyam* in 38a, with the same type of formation and roughly the same meaning, and both are introduced by *yád* 'which' at the beginning of their pādas. Here the adj. clearly designates some good thing that Indra should bring us; recall that *śravā́yia-* also usually refers to wealth of some sort. In the second half-verse Indra's limitless capacity for giving is expressed in a vivid image -- Indra as unbounded ocean -- while in 38.2cd the unidentified praiseworthy thing spreads itself out longest, also an

image of unbounded expanse. The means of expressing the concept are quite different, but the concept itself seems the same.

V.39.3: I take ab as nominal rel. clause with a predicated grdv. *prarā́dhyam*, while Ge (/WG) simply take it as a nom. cl. ("what is your thought..."). My tr. should be modified slightly to make it clear that the *ásti* is accented: "Which thought of yours, famed and lofty, eager to give, is to [/should] be realized, with it ..."

In cd both Ge and WG separate the two pādas and supply a second verb (or, as far as I can tell, a 2nd exemplar of the overt verb *ā́ darṣi* in different usage). I interpr. *ā́ darṣi* as taking a double acc. in a condensed expression: "split X for (its contents) Y." The lexeme *ā́ √dr* can take as obj. either the container or the contained; for a similar double acc. with both see III.30.21 *ā́ no gotrā́ dardṛhi ... gā́ḥ* "Split open the cowpens for the cows."

V.39.4: Ge [/WG] take the enclitic *vaḥ* exclusively with pāda a where it is located (Ge: "Euren Freigebigsten der Freigebigen..."). In light of the next vs., I think that it refers to the Atris, who strengthen Indra with their words in 5, and that they are the subject of the infinitival dat. *práśastaye* in c. It has migrated to Wackernagel's position in the larger clause (as often), which accounts for its distance from *práśastaye*.

As I have discussed elsewhere (e.g., *Ṛgveda between Two Worlds*, Chap. 4, esp. 146–48), the genre of *práśasti-* and the verbal lexeme *prá √ śaṃs* are associated with the praise of kings already in the RV; *praśasti* is the standard term for royal panegyric in later Sanskrit and MIA. Note that here the term is used for Indra as king (pāda b *rā́jānāṃ carṣaṇīnā́m*).

With the standard interpr., I supply a verb of calling in c.

In d Ge takes *pūrvī́bhiḥ ... gíraḥ* as co-referential, with *gíraḥ* acc. rather than instr. metri causa. This seems too tricky as well as unnec. With most (incl. Gr, Old, and WG) I supply *práśasti-* with *pūrvī́bhiḥ* (cf., e.g., VI.45.3 *pūrvī́ḥ ... práśastayaḥ*). WG in their n. suggest that *pūrvī́bhiḥ* is a "predicative instr" to *gíraḥ*, a construction that I don't understand and that also seems unnec. Why not an instr. of accompaniment -- hymns along with eulogies? If I am correct that *práśasti* is a specialized verbal product already in the RV, the differentiation between it and *gír-* here would be perfectly understandable.

V.39.5: The distinction between verbal products continues here, with *kā́vyaṃ vácaḥ* 'poet's/poetic speech', *ukthám* 'solemn word', *bráhman-* 'sacred formulation', and *gíraḥ* 'hymns' all offered to Indra. For the connection between *práśasti-* (here, 4cd) and *kaví-*, *kā́vya-* see *ṚV between Two Worlds* cited above.

V.40 Indra and Svarbhānu

The hymn given as V.40 consists of two metrically and, more important, thematically ill-assorted pieces, vss. 1–4 and 5–9. The first three vss., in Uṣṇih, are a banal celebration of the word *vṛ́ṣan-* 'bull' addressed to Indra. The fourth is in Triṣṭubh and does not contain any form of the word *vṛ́ṣan-* (though see *vṛṣabhá-* in 4a), but the thematic connection is clear and it climaxes with the appearance of Indra at the Midday Pressing. The second part, vss. 5–9, is the exquisitely crafted account of the Svarbhānu myth, which on its own constitutes a perfectly balanced omphalos hymn. Metrically it

consists of two framing vss. in Anuṣṭubh (5, 9), with the three internal vss. (6–8) in Triṣṭubh. Further evidence of the omphalos structure: the two outer vss. are multiforms of each other; the middle verse (7) is the only direct speech; the immediately surrounding vss. (6, 8) both mention Atri in the sg., both deal with the *māyā́* of Svarbhānu, and have complementary vocab.: *diváḥ / diví, sū́ryam / sū́ryasya, gūḍhám / aghukṣat, bráhmaṇā / brahmā́*.

All of the evidence points to a pair of originally independent hymns, which were later redactionally combined, and this hypothesis also fits their position in the maṇḍala. At four vss., the first part (V.40.1–4) would be the appropriate length to follow on the five-vs. V.39 as an independent Indra hymn, in accordance with the usual principles of Saṃhitā arrangement. The Indra cycle of V would come to an end there; the seams between cycles are where later Anhangslieder get inserted, and V.40.5-9 can be such an Anhangslied, with no original connection to 1-4 at all. Although Indra has a bit part in the Svarbhānu saga (see 6ab, possibly 7c), the story is otherwise independent.

The idea that the two parts of V.40 were originally two separate hymns has a long scholarly history, going back at least to Bergaigne and Lanman, who both thought the division was rather 1–3 / 4–9. See Old, Proleg. 198 and, in detail, Noten ad loc. In the Noten Old seriously considers the possibility that the two parts formed an originally unitary hymn, primarily on the basis of V.78, which he sees as having a similar bipartite structure. I think this is unlikely: V.78 falls into three parts, not two, and in our hymn the Svarbhānu portion is far more intricately structured than anything in V.78. Nonetheless, it is possible that the two separate hymns were joined into V.40 on the model of V.78. For a possible reason for the introduction of the Svarbhānu account just here, see below ad vs. 4.

I treated the Svarbhānu portion at great length in my 1991 *Ravenous Hyenas* in conjunction with the brāhmaṇa prose versions of the myth, and I will not repeat all the details found there. In *Hyenas* (264–67) I identify Svarbhānu, the piercer of the Sun, as Agni, who is frequently said to have the *bhānú-* ('radiance') of the sun. For support for this identification see disc. there, as well as comm. ad V.37.1 above.

V.40.1–3: In the refrain (1–3cd) the pl. 'bulls' (*vṛ́ṣabhiḥ*) accompanying Indra were identified with the Maruts already by Sāyaṇa. Since this section culminates in the Midday Pressing (4d), this identification makes sense, since that pressing is shared by Indra and the Maruts.

V.40.4: In *Hyenas* (pp. 249–51) I suggest that the Svarbhānu section is introduced after this vs., because there are several connections between the Midday Pressing and the Svarbhānu story. In later śrauta ritual a descendant of Atri (an Ātreya) is given gold at the Midday Pressing of the Aśvamedha. The gold is clearly a symbol of the sun (as often), and the Svarbhānu story is often told in brāhmaṇa prose texts to justify this ritual action. There is also a disguised ritual reenactment of the freeing of the sun (also symbolized by gold) at the Midday Pressing. The suggested connection still seems to me reasonable, but I was more inclined in that book to accept V.40 as a unitary hymn, not a secondary composite. I now think that the independent Svarbhānu hymn was slipped in here at the end of the Indra cycle because of the mention of the Midday Pressing in the final vs. of the originally separate hymn, now V.40.1–4.

V.40.5: On vs. 5 as a variant of vs. 9, see *Hyenas* 140–41.

V.40.6: On the "fourth formulation," see *Hyenas* 251–60.

    The "circling magic spells" (*māyā́ḥ ... vártamānāḥ*) of Svarbhānu are the plumes of Agni's smoke rising to heaven and obscuring the Sun's light (*Hyenas* 271–73).

    ápavratena 'against commandment' is generally taken to refer to the darkness deployed by Svarbhānu, but I argue (*Hyenas* 297–300) that it actually refers to the Sun's original action, incest with his daughter, that led to his punishment by Agni Svarbhānu.

V.40.7: On this speech of the Sun's, see *Hyenas* 281–88.

    This vs. is usually taken as evidence for the "eclipse" theory of the Svarbhānu story, which aligns it with the later Rāhu myth in which Rāhu swallows the sun. But there is no other evidence for this connection in Vedic, and 'swallow' can be accounted for by inner-Vedic parallels. See the cited disc. in *Hyenas.*

    Although Atri is usually considered the addressee of the entire vs., for reasons having to do with the Vāyav Indraś ca construction in cd, I suggest (*Hyenas* 284–86) that Indra is the referent of the 2nd ps. in c, conjoined with Varuṇa in d.

V.41 All Gods

    As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn consists of verses dedicated to a sequence of gods, both major and minor, seemingly unordered. The full list consists of 1 Mitra and Varuṇa / 2 Mitra, Varuṇa, Āyu, Indra, Maruts, Rudra / 3 Aśvins, Rudra / 4 Trita, Wind, Agni, Pūṣan, Bhaga / 5 Maruts / 6 Vāyu / 7 Night and Dawn / 8 Men (Maruts?), Lord of the Dwelling Place, Tvaṣṭar, trees, plants, Holy Place / 9 Mountains, Āptya / 10 Trita, Apām Napāt, Agni / 11 Maruts, Bhaga, waters, plants, woods, mountains / 12 Agni, Waters / 13 Maruts / 14 Indra (maybe) / 15 Shielding Goddess, Rasā / 16 Maruts, Ahi Budhnya / 17 gods / 18 gods, goddess / 19-20 Iḍā, Urvaśī. The Maruts regularly recur in this sequence, and though, as noted in the publ. intro., there is little Marut imagery (though perhaps more vocab. than I recognized at the time), if there is focus in this hymn, it is probably the Maruts, who dominate much of the rest of the maṇḍala after the All God hymns.

V.41.1: The conjunction *vā* 'or' dominates this vs.: there are 4 overt occurrences (twice in b, once each in c and d), as well as covert encodings, beginning with *vā́(m mitr)āv(aruṇ)āv* (the latter two inverted) in pāda a and ending with the last word of the vs., *vā́(jān)*. The end of the 2nd pāda, *vā dé*, with two monosyllables that, inverted, produce *dévā(ḥ)* (though with wrong accent for **devā́ḥ*), draws further attention to *vā*. As noted in the intro., the prominence of *vā* may establish a theme of choice or alternatives appropriate to the mass of gods mentioned in the rest of the hymn, and *vā* also echoes the last syllable of the phrase *víśve devā́ḥ* "All Gods," to whom the hymn is dedicated.

    Given the plethora of *vā*-s and the absence of any finite verb, save for intrusive *trā́sīthām* in c, it is not surprising that interpretations of the structure and syntax of the vs. are all over the map. In addition to the standard tr. (Ge, Re [EVP IV, V], WG), see also Old, Lü (Varuṇa 585–86), Schindler (Root nouns, 24–25), Klein (II.203–4), Scar (581), Keydana (Inf. 155 n. 142). I will not rehearse them all here. Like many of these interpr., I

take the three *vā*-s of bc as defining a tripartite structure of roughly parallel entities. I then assume that the *vā* of d is situated on a higher level of structure and is contrasting abc with a new clause inaugurated in d. The two clauses (abc and d) are separated by the independent interjection *trāsīthāṃ naḥ* closing c. As Ge points out (n. 1c), *trāsīthāṃ naḥ* has a similar role elsewhere (IV.55.1, VII.71.2); IV.55.1 is especially similar, since it is in the first vs. of an All God hymn that begins *kó vaḥ* (like *kó nú vām* here), with Mitra and Varuṇa as the subjects of *trā́sīthām.*

My interpr. of the larger structure rests on taking *dé* at the end of b as an infin. (with many, but not all) and assuming that the poet has exploited the voice neutrality of infinitives to give it passive value in abc ("[is] to be given") and active value in d ("[is] to give"). This further assumes that *káḥ* refers to the (mortal) recipient in abc and, resupplied in d, to one of the gods. With these assumptions in place, the case relations in the two syntactically distinct parts of the vs. fall into place: the nom. *káḥ ... r̥tāyán* "who, performing the truth ..." of pāda a is the mortal worshiper and recipient of the gods' largess; his counterpart in d is the dat. *yajñāyaté.* The *vām* of pāda a is to be interpr. two different ways: in the first part it expresses the divine beneficiaries of the mortal's service; resupplied in d, it should be construed with likewise resupplied *káḥ* (or better *kataráḥ*) "which of you two?"

The tripartite *vā* structure of bc details the three sources of gifts that may be given to the worshiper: heaven, earth, and the ritual ground. They are subtly unparallel: 'heaven' is a straight noun, either in abl. (as in the publ. tr.) or gen.; earth is represented by a deriv. adj. 'earthly' in the gen. (*pā́rthivasya*). It is a partitive gen., and if *diváḥ ... máhaḥ* is gen., it too is partitive. If it's an abl., it expresses the source. The third term, "at the seat of truth" (*r̥tásya ... sádasi*), expresses the place where the gift is to be given. Scar supplies 'at the seat' for all three terms. This is not impossible, but the poet seems to be aiming for slightly skewed and off-balance phraseology, and three different types of expressions for three parallel terms would suit his purposes admirably.

In the new structure of d, with active value of the infinitive *dé*, *vā́jān* is its object. The last grammatically unparallel functional parallel is *yajñāyaté ... paśuṣó ná.* Assuming that it is a gen. sg. (Old and Re take it as acc. pl.), *paśuṣáḥ* 'of one who wins cattle' is in some sense parallel to *yajñāyaté* 'for the one who sacrifices', in that the *vā́jān* ('prizes') come to both. But *paśuṣáḥ* is a gen. dependent on *vā́jān*, while *yajñāyaté* is the indirect object with the infin. *dé.*

V.41.2: After the cat's cradle of vs. 1, this vs. comes as a welcome relief -- or at least in its first half, which consists of a list of gods in the nom. and a verb they can all serve as subject to. With 6 gods (and an epithet -- or 7 gods if *r̥bhukṣā́* is taken separately) to fit into 22 syllables, the poet can't get into too much trouble.

The 2nd hemistich is slightly more complex. It consists of an elliptical *vā* rel. cl.: "or (in those) who ...," with the gapped 'those' parallel to enclitic *naḥ* in pāda a. The final word *sajóṣāḥ* I take as referring to the gods; the stem(s) *sajóṣa(s)-* is generally used of gods (see *sajóṣāḥ* in 4b), and note that their verb *juṣanta* ends the first hemistich. But, with the standard tr., it may refer to the mortals providing the gods' praise.

V.41.3: I take the passively used inf. *huvádhyai* with a gapped agent "by the priests" vel sim., to match the implicit 2nd pl. subj. of *prá ... bharadhvam* in the 2nd hemistich. The use

of a passive inf. in the 1ˢᵗ half, contrasting with an active usage (though not an inf. here) in the 2ⁿᵈ half, recalls the structure of vs. 1. In our vs. there is a switch of 2ⁿᵈ ps. reference from the (two) gods in ab to the (pl.) mortal officiants in cd.

The use of the derived adj. *ráthya-* 'belonging to the chariot' rather than its base noun *rátha-* recalls *pā́rthivasya* in 1c substituting for a form of the noun *pṛthivī́-*.

Ge (flg. Sāy.) identifies the "lord of heaven" (*divó ásura-*) as Rudra, on the basis of parallels (see his n. 3c).

V.41.4: The parade of ill-assorted divinities and semi-divinities continues. The sequence is made more muddled by the fact that Trita is always a shadowy figure, who is probably (but not certainly) the same as Āptya in vs. 9 (Āptya being Trita's usual patronymic) and Trita in 10 and who is probably (but not certainly) the referent of pāda a here: "the heavenly victor with Kaṇva as Hotar." If he is the referent of pāda a, it is slightly odd that he is both qualified as 'heavenly' (*divyáḥ*) and said to be 'from heaven' (*diváḥ*, pāda b). It might be best, with Ge (/WG) to take *diváḥ* as the place-from-which of all the figures mentioned; however, Wind and Agni are normally associated with the midspace and the earth respectively, and Pūṣan and Bhaga are not particularly heavenly deities. It's worth noting that *divyá-* continues the poet's habit of using deriv. *-ya-*adjectives in place of (or perhaps here beside) their nominals, and so the doubling *divyá-* / *diváḥ* might not be so odd after all.

I do not know exactly what to do with *prá* initial in the vs., but it is noteworthy that it fits into a sequence of *prá*-initial expressions, where the preverb is in tmesis, beginning with 3d *prá ... bharadhvam* and continuing with 5a *prá ... bharadhvam* again and 6a *prá ... kṛṇudhvam* (followed by initial *prá* in 6b and 7b). In our vs. there is no finite verb to construe it with in tmesis, but note the loc. *prabhṛthé* in c. My assumption is that vs.-initial *prá* simply reinforces *prabhṛthé* in a vs. sandwiched between two full *prá ... bharadhvam* expressions. It could also be construed with *jagmuḥ* in d, though one might expect a more prominent, metrical-boundary-adjoining *jagmuḥ* in that case.

The loc. *prabhṛthé* and the acc. *ājím* both serve as goal with *jagmuḥ* -- another ex. of the poet's penchant for slightly off-balance parallels.

V.41.5: The first hemistich consists of a syntactically "active" 2ⁿᵈ pl. verb ('present!' *prá ... bharadhvam*, though it is morphologically middle) paired with a passive ('should be produced' *dadhīta*) without overt agent, structurally similar to vs. 3 with a passive infinitive (*huvádhyai*) without agent and the same "active" 2ⁿᵈ pl. *prá ... bharadhvam*. This structure is further reminiscent of vs. 1 with passive and act. uses of the same infinitive *dé*.

In this vs. it is not altogether clear who the 2ⁿᵈ pl. subject of *prá bharadhvam* is. Ge thinks this is about the dakṣiṇā and suggests as subj. either the Opferveranstalter or the Maruts. I don't see the dakṣiṇā connection, and given the reciprocal relationship between gods and men depicted already in the hymn (vss. 1 and 3), in the next vs. (6) with *dhiyé dhuḥ* playing off *dadhīta dhī́ḥ* in our 5b, and elsewhere, I think it likely that the 2ⁿᵈ pl. addressees here are the (All) Gods in general, who are asked to provide tangible wealth in exchange for the praise embodied in the *dhī́-* 'visionary thought' produced by the poets. The use of the exact same verb *prá bharadhvam* in 3 and 5, with opposite but complementary subjects (priest-poets / gods), is a neat reversal.

The standard tr. take *auśijásya* as a PN and construe it with *hótā*. This is not impossible, but since, as we've seen, the poet is fond of using *-ya*-deriv. adjectives for nouns, I think it more likely that it stands for *uśij-* '(type of) priest' in the pl. Assuming as usual, that the Hotar is Agni, who mediates between men and gods, it is reasonable that he would be pleased both by the activities of this priestly group and by those of the gods, represented by the Maruts. For the association of Hotar and *auśijá-* see also IV.21.6–7, though that passage is exceptionally opaque.

The vs. contains several instances of phonological and morphological play. In b the pāda-final phrase *dadhīta dhíḥ* shows tight phonological similarity though the two words belong to different roots. The same play is found in the next vs. (6d), likewise pāda-final, in *dhiyé dhuḥ* -- same noun *dhí-*, verb to the same root √*dhā* -- though the phonological relationship is not as tight. In 5b *dadhīta dhíḥ* yields a very bad Triṣṭubh cadence, whereas 6d *dhiyé dhuḥ* provides a completely orthodox cadence. This may be an example of metrical poetic repair, where the metrical violation of the first calls attention to the phrase, which is satisfactorily resolved in the next vs.

In the second hemistich we find # *(suś)éva éva(ir)* ... # *(y)é va évā*, evoking *(d)eva-* again. Pāda d lacks a syllable. It is tempting to emend the opening to *yé* * *vā va évā*, given the prominence of *vā* in the hymn -- as Old also suggests. But this emended sequence makes less sense and also disturbs its phonological echo of pāda c. It should also be noted that *yé va évā* is also found in 13a in a different metrical position and cf. also scrambled *evayā́* in 16b. If *vā were to be inserted, the tr. could be changed to "is well disposed because of the ways of the ... Priests or (those) which are the ways of you powerful ones, o Maruts."

V.41.6: There are again a number of ways to construe this vs., and I will concentrate on my own. Given the alternation I see in this hymn between the actions of gods and men, I think (with most) that the 2nd pl. subj. of *prá ... kṛṇudhvam* is back to the mortal ritual officiants (as in 3cd), rather than the gods (as in 5a). I also take *prá kṛṇudhvam* to be the verb of all of abc, reinforced by *prá* opening b. This further means that the nominatives of c (*iṣudhyáva ṛtasā́paḥ*) refer to the mortals and the *púraṃdhīḥ* is acc. pl., not nom. as many take it. Crucial to this interpr. is the parallel cited by Old, X.64.7 *prá vo vā́yuṃ rathayújaṃ púraṃdhim, stómaiḥ kṛṇudhvam sakhyā́ya pūṣáṇam.* "Set in front with your praises Vāyu, who hitches up the chariot, Plenitude, (and) Pūṣan for partnership," with clear acc. *púraṃdhim* a parallel obj. with *vā́yuṃ rathayújam* (as here) to *prá ... kṛṇudhvam.*

I then take d as displaying the usual reciprocity found elsewhere in the hymn, but with a grammatical twist. The last set of divine beings honored by mortals, the acc. object *púraṃdhi-* of c, are, in my opinion, the unexpressed subjects of d and participate in a grammatical play. The noun *púraṃdhi-* is fem., though it is at most the animatization of an abstract 'plenitude, abundance'. Furthermore, it looks synchronically like a cmpd. with a form of √*dhā*, even though that is not the current standard etym. (cf. EWA s.v.). I therefore think that the pl. obj. *púraṃdhīḥ* of pāda c, reconfigured as subjects of d, are depicted as explicitly female -- as 'good wives' (*vásvīḥ ... pátnīḥ*) -- and serve as subject to a form of √*dhā* (*dhuḥ*) folk-etymologically extracted from *púraṃdhi-*. The unexpressed obj. is then (mis-segmented) *púram *'plenty'. As was discussed ad vs. 5, *dhuḥ* also participates in a figure with *dhiyé* that reverses *dadhīta dhíḥ* in 5d.

I do not entirely understand the position of *ā́*, which appears to be a preverb with *dhuḥ* (so Gr), but appears to have been moved in tmesis to a position adjacent neither to a metrical boundary nor to a syntactic one (though this would be easier to argue). It may have been flipped (from a putative **dhiyé ā́ dhuḥ*) to allow the figure just discussed (*dhiyé dhuḥ* picking up 5b *dadhīta dhíḥ*).

On *iṣudhyú-*, see comm. ad I.128.6 and my 2020 art. "Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išuidiia-*: The Aim of Praise" (Lamberterie Fs.).

V.41.7: The hymn contains three exx. of *éṣe* (5b, 7a, 8d). Though Lub classifies them all as locc. to the thematic stem *éṣa-*, I follow the standard tr. in taking the one in this vs. as a 1st sg. pres., while the other two are locc. in the phrase *rāyá éṣe* "in the quest for wealth." The parallel for 7a cited by Ge, I.186.4 *úpa va éṣe ... uṣā́sānáktā*, seems to clinch this interpr., and the next vs. (8), beginning *abhí vo arce*, also PREV *vaḥ* 1st-sg. VERB, reinforces it.

In d I read *ā́hā* not *ā́ hā* (a change only in the Pp. not the Saṃhitā text), and analyze this sequence as *ā́ + áhā*, the neut. pl. of 'day'. This is one of only two supposed exx. of the particle *ha* with long vowel; the other one (IV.31.5) also follows *ā́* and is susceptible to the same analysis. See disc. there.

V.41.8: Ge takes *nṝ́n* as gen. pl. rather than acc., but this is unnec. The stem *nṛ́-* is regularly used of gods, esp. the Maruts, so there is no reason that they cannot be addressees here (so Re, WG).

The standard tr. take *dhánya sajóṣā dhiṣáṇā* as nom. sg. and parenthetic; e.g., Ge "—einverstanden ist die reichmachende Dhiṣaṇā—" But the instr. sg. in *-ā́* to fem. *-ā́-* stems is still quite common in the RV, and that is how I construe the phrase here.

V.41.9: *svaítu-* in b is a hapax. Following a tentative suggestion of Ge's (n. 9b), I take it as a vṛddhi form related to Aves. *xᵛaētu-* 'family', *pace* Narten (YH 266 n. 59), who, however, does not give reasons for her rejection of the association (though it's true that we should really expect a thematic **svaitava-* or the like). I confess, however, that my rendering of ab is merely a guess (as, it seems, are the other divergent tr.). I don't know why the mountains should be associated with our production of offspring; the sexual connotation WG suggest in their n., that mountains are felsenhart and knotig, seems farfetched. My own tentative suggestion is that the progeny here belong to the mountains, not to us, and refer to the material goods originating from mountains that we will enjoy: see I.55.3 *párvataṃ ná bhójase* "like a mountain to be enjoyed" and Ge's parallels adduced there; also passages like VII.37.8 *ā́ rā́yo yantu párvatasya rātaú* "let the riches of the mountain come here at (the time for) giving"; II.24.2 *vásumantam ... párvatam* "the goods-filled mountain." If I am correct, the simile, in which the mountains are said to be *vásavo ná vīrā́ḥ* "like good heroes" may be a bit of a pun, with *vásavaḥ* actually referring to the material goods of the mountains. To make my interpr. clearer, I might slightly emend the tr. to "to thrust out their progeny for us."

The alternative etym. of *svaítu-* found in Gr, favored by Narten, and represented in the tr. of Re and WG analyses it as *svá-etu-* 'having their own going', which seems singularly inappropriate. It is regularly emphasized that mountains can't be moved — except when they're in fear of some greater force (like the Maruts) — so "going" should

not be one of their properities. It could refer to the myth of the winged mountains (the wings then clipped by Indra), but this does not seem the context for a reference to this myth. WG attenuate the sense to a figurative "die ein Eigenleben führen," which avoids the mountain-movement problem, but essentially denies the force of the etymology. By contrast, a reference to 'family' fits comfortably with the production of progeny.

I don't know what Āptya is doing here, either. Again, the sexual connotation suggested in WG's n. is invisible to me. It does seem likely that he is the same figure as Trita in 10b, since both are associated with the production of praise. Trita in 4b is less clearly tied in.

Note *śáṃsaṃ náryaḥ*, which reminds of *nárā-śáṃsa-* (though they don't belong to the same syntagm here) and also continues the poet's fondness for *-ya*-derivatives.

V.41.10: WG take Trita as the persona of the 1ˢᵗ ps. speaker of *astoṣi* ("ich, als Trita ..."), whereas I follow Ge and Re in supplying a 3ʳᵈ ps. form of √*stu* for b.

The form *etárī* is, of course, problematic, but is most likely a loc. sg.; for disc. see Tichy (-tar-stems, 59–61). Tichy considers such forms locatives to verbal abstracts; though some such forms seem simply to be straight agent-noun locatives (see, e.g., *kartárī* in I.139.7), Tichy's analysis fits *etárī*. It is found only here and in VI.12.4, in the same pāda-final phrase *etárī ná śúṣaíḥ*. In our passage there is some phonetic justification for the form (though not in VI.12.4); note the *ni/ri* sylls: g*ṛnīté ag*n*ir etárī* ... / ... *ní ri*ṇāti.

V.41.12: This vs. presents a number of difficulties. The first is the easiest solved: who is the referent of ab? Although this is almost universally taken to be the Wind, I think it is more likely Agni. Only Agni is called *ūrjā́m páti-* "lord of nourishments" (otherwise only in the voc. *ūrjām pate*), also *ūrjó nápāt* "child of nourishment." Given this exclusive identification, it seems unlikely that the audience would assign a different referent, esp. since *ūrjā́m pátiḥ* is the first epithet encountered and sets the frame of reference; the others only show up in pāda b. Moreover, though *párijman-* 'earth-circling' is used of the Wind, it also refers to other entities, including, fairly often, Agni (VI.2.8, VI.13.2, VII.13.3, I.127.2, III.2.9). The other descriptor in b, *iṣirá-* 'vigorous', is applied to a variety of beings and things, including the Wind, but also Agni (III.2.14, 5.4). The only activity posited of the subject of this hemistich is *nábhas tárīyān* (for which see below), which is also applicable to either.

The pāda-final *sá* in pāda a is quite unusual. A cursory glance through Lub for parallels yields only II.35.1, III.13.3, (VII.86.6 *sā́*), IX.71.8, IX.79.3, X.108.4 (a careful search might produce a few more). All of these exx. are either rhetorically contrastive, or *sá* takes its proper position in a new clause. Although it is possible that the *sá* here also begins a new, purely nominal clause with b, this seems clumsy. I have a quite speculative suggestion about it, linking it with the immediately following *nábhas tárīyān*. The standard — and quite persuasive — interpr. of this phrase is "quicker than a cloud," but this imposes an abl. sg. interpr. on *nábhaḥ*, which should then belong to a root noun *nábh-* 'cloud', beside the standard *s*-stem *nábhas-*. This root noun does not otherwise exist: the supposed root noun *nábh-* (glossed 'Zerspalter, Zerbrecher' by Gr) in I.174.8 is more likely a verb (see comm. ad loc.). And in any case we should expect an accent *nabhás*. Re's suggestion that *nábhas* is simply haplology for *nábhasas* is probably correct, but I suggest that it left a trace of its vanished final *-as* in the pāda-final *sá* immediately

preceding — a tangible sign of the effects of speed: the final syllable got cut off and left behind.

The second hemistich is very puzzling and has given rise to very different and incompatible interpr. (WG being esp. distant from the rest). Mine more or less follows Old (or one of his alternatives), who discusses the passage with his customary acuity; I will not discuss other renderings in detail. I am not at all certain that mine (/Old's) is correct, however. The framework of the passage compares the waters, subjects of the verb, with fortifications (*púraḥ*), the point of comparison being their resplendant appearance (*śubhrá-*). So far also Ge; Re also follows this structure, but floats the possibility that *púr-* can mean 'corps', which would be convenient but is of course unsupported. With Old and Ge (we now lose Re, who takes d as a separate clause with the ladles as subj.), the fortifications are those of a mountain (*ádreḥ*), and this mountain is characterized as *pári ... babṛhāṇá-* 'enclosing' (*pári √ bṛh* has this meaning in the Brāh.). Although we would not ordinarily expect tmesis of a participle, esp. a part. in an oblique case, the tmesis here is iconic: the enclosed object is located between preverb and participle. This object is *srúcaḥ* 'offering ladles'. Now of course in a literal interpr. a mountain enclosing a bunch of ladles sounds very odd, Old cleverly suggests that the ladles stand for cows -- living ladles, as it were, from which ghee comes as it does from the offering ladles. These cows are then the cows trapped within the Vala cave. The hemistich thus starts jointly in the physical world and on the ritual grounds, since the listening waters are probably both "real" natural waters and the waters standing by for the soma sacrifice. It then moves, via the simile, to the natural world (mountain fortifications) and the world of myth (the Vala cave), and back to the ritual ground, with the enclosed ladles. If this interpr. is correct, it is a very condensed and clever expression.

V.41.13: Another opaque vs., whose difficulties begin with the first word *vidā́*. This is taken as the 2nd pl. pf. by Gr, Ge, WG. (Re unaccountably takes it as a 1st sg. 'Je sais ...', without comment -- presumably a careless error for *véda*.) I follow Old in taking it as the instr. of the root noun to the same root.

The phrase *yé va évā(ḥ)* recurs from 5d though in a different metrical position. Here as there it refers to the "ways" (*évāḥ*) of the Maruts (so Ge, Re, flg. Sāy., contra Old's tentative Ādityas) -- the ways which by our knowledge (*vidā́*) we are in a position to proclaim (*brávāma*), presumably in the form of a hymn, for which we expect reward (*vā́ryaṃ dádhānāḥ* "acquiring what is choice") -- just as in vs. 5 a visionary thought (*dhī́ḥ*) was to be produced in return for wealth (*rāyā́ éṣe ávase* "for help in the quest for wealth"). The part. *dádhānāḥ* has almost a purpose function, and to make the reciprocal action clearer I might emend the tr. from "as we acquire" to "while acquiring ..." or even "for acquiring."

The first sticking point in the second hemistich is *caná*. This is universally taken as negative (as *caná* generally is). However, in this case I think that it is simply equivalent to *ca ná* (so also Klein I: 289–91 with n. 8) *and* that the *ná* here is serving as the simile-marking particle, not the negative. *váyaḥ* is often used in a simile at the beginning of a pāda: I count 7 #*váyo ná* passages, incl. V.59.7 in this maṇḍala, where it's the Maruts who are compared to birds (cf. also I.87.2 #*váya iva marutaḥ*) — though I do have to admit that 2 #*váyaś caná* passages (I.24.6, 155.5) contain the negative.

Therefore, contra all the standard tr./interpr., I take the subject of cd not as 'birds' (*váyaḥ*), but as the Maruts compared to birds (like V.59.7, I.87.2). The adj. *subhū́-* 'of good essence' is regularly used of the Maruts in this maṇḍala (V.55.3, 59.3, 87.3) and would identify them as the referent to an alert audience. In this 2nd half-vs. we make good on our promise to proclaim the ways of the Maruts -- this exploit is one of these ways.

Unfortunately exactly what that exploit involves is unclear. That the Maruts should come down like birds is unproblematic: they regularly fly through the midspace and come down to interact with mortals, generally at the ritual. But the target of their descent, expressed in pāda d, has no parallels, as far as I can find. In my interpr. the mortal (*mártam*) to whom they come is in distress and receives their help. Unlike the standard tr. I take the hapax root noun instr. *kṣubhā́* as characterizing the Maruts' movements (fluttering like birds), not the state of the mortal, which is expressed by *ánuyataṃ vadhasnaíḥ* "held/controlled by murderous weapons." I assume that he is under attack by hostile forces and requires the Maruts' assistance to free him.

The phonological play with *va/ā* that we noted earlier in the hymn (particularly vss. 1, 5) has returned here: *... yé va evā́, brávāma ...vā́ryaṃ ... váya(ḥ) ... subhvà(ḥ) ... vadhasnaíḥ* — which draws attention to the thematic connection between this vs. and vs. 5.

V.41.14: Since Indra is several times called *súmakha-*, I assume he is the referent here -- though nothing much depends on it in this generic vs. and both Ge and Re take it to be the sacrificer or the patron of the sacrifice.

WG suggest that *candrágrā(ḥ)* modifies both 'days' and 'hymns'; this is a good idea, with 'gold, gleam' used in two slightly different senses. The days begin with the gleaming of the golden sun, while the hymns offered to the gods are metaphorically tipped with the gold given by the gods in response to praise.

In d *udā́* is generally taken as the instr. sg. of a root noun 'water' (so, e.g., Gr and all the standard tr., though Ge hesitates), beside the more common oblique *n*-stem instr. *udnā́.* However, I follow Schindler (Root nouns, 12–13), who argues that it is better taken as the nom./acc. pl. to the same *-n*-stem.

The somewhat curious expression *abhíṣātā árṇāḥ* "conquered floods" finds its formulaic match in nearby V.50.4 *árṇā ... sánitā* 'winner of the floods'; this may well be a general reference to the progress of the Ārya into the Punjab, winning territory river by river. Ge cites as parallel I.131.5 *té anyā́m-anyāṃ nadyàm saniṣnata* "They kept winning one river after another."

V.41.15: The action in pāda a is a positive one: the speaker is assured to make it to old age. See 17de and disc. there, as well as X.59.4, which will be disc. further below.

The construction in b, which expresses the agent of *ní dhāyi*, is complex. Its underlying model is the "X and which Y" construction, but it is inverted, with the rel. cl. member first: "(by her) who is ... and by the protectors." Moreover, it contains both *vā* and *ca.* As Klein says (II.174–75), "the construction should most likely be viewed as a conjunctive anacoluthon in which the poet begins by intending alternative conjunction and finishes with an additive sequence. Within each member the conjunction occupies its normal enclitic position: (várūtrī vā śakrā yā́) (pāyúbhiś ca)."

On *ṛjuvániḥ* see Scar 467–68. Note that this form produces a bad cadence.

On the connection between cd and vss. 19–20 see disc. below.

V.41.16: *upamātivániḥ* in 16e also produces a bad cadence. On this form and on the meter of both -*vániḥ* forms, see Scar 467. On *úpamāti-* see comm. ad VIII.40.9.

 The opening of the vs., *kathā́ dāśema,* echoes 11a *kathā́ ... bravāma.* In both cases the object/goal of our action is the Maruts. Another echo is found in *evayā́(ḥ),* which is a scrambling of *yé va évā(ḥ)* of 5d and 13a (though *yé* and -*yā(ḥ)* are completely different grammatically), in both cases of the Maruts. The sequence in our pāda b, *evayā́ marútaḥ* "the Maruts traveling their ways," is also matched by the punctuating exclamation *evayā́marut* found in every vs. of the Anhangslied to the Maruts that ends this maṇḍala (V.87.1–9, tr. there "Maruts on the march").

V.41.17: As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 16–17, in a different meter from what precedes (and follows), seem to provide a summary of the preceding hymn, esp. 17, with its self-conscious internal quote *íti cin nú* "in just these (words) now." See Janert (Dhāsi, pp. 16–17), who argues this position in some detail.

 All the standard tr. (as well as Janert, 42) agree in taking d and e as separate clauses and supplying a verb for c. All consider the clauses contrastive: in d I hope to be granted a pleasant or benevolent *dhāsí-* for my body, while in e I express the wish that Nirṛti should swallow my old age. But this is directly contrary to what was said in 15ab, where the securing of his old age was an occasion for celebration by the poet. It is true that two different words for 'old age' are involved: *jarimán-* in 15, *jarā́-* in 17, but these words do not contrast semantically elsewhere as far as I can see (cf. X.32.5, 8, which contains *jarā́-* followed by *jarimán-*)—even though Re remarks "noter l'opposition." An important parallel is provided by X.59.4 *dyúbhir hitó jarimā́ sū́ no astu, parātaráṃ sú nírṛtir jihītām* "Throughout the days let our old age be secured for us. -- Let Dissolution move herself further away." There old age is 'secured' (*hitáḥ*) as it was in our 15a *jarimā́ ní dhāyi* (both to √*dhā*), and Dissolution (*nírṛtiḥ*) is urged to move away. (It should be admitted that that pāda is a refrain to the first three vss. of X.59 and so not necessarily as closely tied to the preceding pāda as it might be.) I therefore doubt that in our vs. the poet is hoping that Dissolution will swallow the old age that he (and other poets) elsewhere want to keep safe. Instead I think de is the expression of his fear that if he fails to win the gods (abc) Dissolution will succeed in depriving him of his wished-for old age. I have pushed *átrā* perhaps a bit too much -- to 'otherwise'; I would prefer a 'lest' (*néd*) clause or even a *mā́* clause, but *néd*, which becomes well developed in Vedic prose, barely exists in the RV and the poet may have been casting about for a way to express this modality.

 A further piece of evidence in favor of my interpr. is the word *dhāsí.* Although this word often means 'well-spring' or 'source' (see comm. ad I.62.3, 140.1), in some cases it seems to mean 'place, depository' and be associated with (/derived, at least synchronically, from) √*dhā.* Here the *dhāsí-* seems to be the nominalization of *ní dhāyi* in 15 (cf. *hitáḥ* in X.58.4) — that is, the place in which old age is securely held. I therefore take it as coreferential with *jarā́m* in e.

V.41.18–20: If, as suggested above, 16–17 are the finale of the hymn proper, these 3 vss. (or 2 ¼) were tacked on. They certainly lack the complications of the rest of the hymn. The dominance of female figures is striking.

V.41.18: Despite the word order, I follow Janert (contra the standard tr.) in construing pāda-final *góḥ* with *íṣam*, rather than with immediately preceding *śásā*, which saves us from determining what the recitation or instruction of the cow is.

V.41.19–20: The single pāda of 20 simply continues vs. 19 thematically and syntactically, as Old points out. They constitute a single vs.

The signature word of the beginning of the hymn, *vā*, returns in force: *urváśī vā ...urváśī vā bṛhaddivā́ ... ūrṇvānā́*. Note also *urváśī ... urváśī ... abhyūrṇvānā́ ... ūrjavyàsya*.

This vs. sequence seems inspired by 15cd. Vs. 15 has a similar focus on female figures, and 15c #*síṣaktu mātā́ mahī́ rasā́ naḥ* is echoed by 20a #*síṣaktu naḥ*, whose subject is likewise a female. The 'mother' *mātā́* of 15c is matched slightly earlier in this vs. sequence, in 19a, and there she is accompanied by rivers (*smán nadī́bhiḥ* 19b), even as the mother of 15c is identified as the river Rasā.

In fact 19–20 depict a matriarchal lineage of sorts, as Ge points out (n. 19bc). Besides Iḍā, explicitly "the mother of the flock" (*yūthásya mātā́*) here, there is Urvaśī, twice: 19b and 19c. I am not entirely sure what to make of this doubling. I doubt that two different Urvaśīs are meant, rather the familiar Urvaśī in two different guises (so Ge). In 19b she is associated with rivers. This reminds us of the attendance of her fellow Apsarases and of the rivers on the birth of Urvaśī's son in X.95.6–7, with Urvaśī herself qualified as 'watery' (*ápyā* in X.95.10b) and her son as "born from the water" (*jániṣṭo apáḥ*, X.95.10c). Urvaśī Bṛhaddivā ('of lofty heaven'; on the accent *bṛhaddivā́*- see AiG II.1.109, 120) in 19c may refer to a return to her residence in heaven after breaking with Purūravas (the return not, however, mentioned in X.95). In any case, Urvaśī's son is named Āyu; his paternal grandmother is Iḍā, the mother of Purūravas (addresed as *aiḍa* in X.95.18), so the title 'mother' given to Iḍā in 19a has another resonance. Because of Urvaśī's relationship to Āyu, with Ge and Re I supply 'mother' in 19d and 20a to govern the various genitives. Thus with Iḍā, Urvaśī, and Āyu we have a three-generational family.

I am uncertain what to do with *ūravyàsya* in 20 (PN or not), and I also do not know what *abhyūrṇvāṇā́* in 19d is conveying.

V.42 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., like V.41 this hymn enumerates a number of divine dedicands with no apparent ordering, save for the middle vss. (7–9), where Bṛhaspati dominates. The list includes 1 Varuṇa, Mitra, Bhaga, Aditi, Aryaman / 2 Aditi, Mitra and Varuṇa / 3 Savitar / 4 Indra / 5 Bhaga, Savitar, Aṃśa, Vāja, and Puraṃdhi / 6 Indra / 7-8 (-9) Bṛhaspati / 10 Maruts / 11 Rudra / 12 Sarasvatī, Bṛhaddivā, Rākā / 13 Tvaṣṭar (+ Viśvarūpa?) / 14 Parjanya / 15 Maruts / 16 Earth (etc.) / 17 gods / 18 Aśvins. Note no Agni, unless he's hidden in 1cd. The hymn is much more straightforward, and less interesting, than V.41, but provides a relaxing interlude in the overheated rhetoric of the All God hymns of V.

V.42.1: As Ge (etc.) point out, *átūrtapanthāḥ* is the clue to the identification of the referent of cd, since this epithet only occurs once elsewhere in the RV, in X.64.5, where it is explicitly used of Aryaman. In that passage he is also qualified as *saptáhotā* 'having

7 Hotrars', like *páñcahotā* here. And of course Aryaman makes sense in this highly Ādityan context. Nonetheless, I think pāda c (*pṛṣadyoniḥ páñcahotā*) flirts with a different identification -- of Agni -- before sealing that of Aryaman by *átūrtapanthāḥ* in d. Agni could plausibly have a womb of dappled (ghee) (*pṛṣadyoni-*), similar to *ghṛtáyoni-* 'having a womb of ghee' used of Agni in V.8.6, as Ge points out (n. 1cd), and of course Agni is both associated with Hotars and is the Hotar par excellence himself. Since, as noted above, Agni is not otherwise found in this hymn, the poet may have gestured towards him covertly in 1c.

V.42.2: This vs. is quite straightforward until we reach pāda d, where the nom. *ahám* 'I' demands a verb that isn't there. Keeping in mind the theme of divine/human reciprocity that runs through the last hymn and the rest of this one and employing our usual method of attempting to supply missing material from context, it seems best to supply a form of *práti √grabh* complementary to *práti ... jagṛbhyāt* in a with Aditi as subject. The poet wishes to grasp the *bráhman-* produced by the gods (c) in order to turn it into praise (*stóma-*) for the gods (a). This reciprocal relationship may be signaled by the first word in the vs. *práti* 'in return, in response'.

      The other question in d is what to do with the untethered locc. *mitré varuṇé*. I have followed Ge in loosely construing them with *mayobhú* 'joy itself', even though this stem does not elsewhere take a loc. Ge (n. 2d) cites a series of parallels with locc. *mitré váruṇe* that seem to have similarly loose beneficial value.

V.42.3: Note the distinction in no. between the two 2nd ps. impvs. in ab: sg. *úd īraya* and pl. *unátta*. As commonly, the sg. is probably a self-addressed by the poet to himself; that his object is "the best poet of poets" (*kavítamaṃ kavīnām*) simply emphasizes the closed loop of reciprocity. The pl. impv. is presumably addressed to his fellow celebrants, in this case the priests charged with the physical activity (the Adhvaryu and his helpers, quite possibly). The pl. impv. *unátta* has a strong stem form where we properly expect weak, but the expected form *und-ta → *untta → (probably simplified to) *unta would have been difficult to parse.

V.42.4: Ge thinks it's *our mánas-* that's at issue, but context makes it more likely to be Indra's (so also Re and WG).

      Pāda c is a minor variant of 2c and in fact makes clear what the structure of 2c is and where the rel. cl. begins. A minor example of syntactic repair.

V.42.5: In pāda a it is unclear with what noun to construe gen. *rāyáḥ*. Ge and Re take it with *savitā́* (Ge: "der Zuweiser ... des Reichtums"), while WG seem to agree with me in taking it with *áṃśa(ḥ)*. Since Savitar is a far more defined divine being with a name that, though having the literal sense 'impeller', is normally used just as a name, I think Aṃśa, whose animatization is fairly shaky, is more likely to be used in a literal abstract value and construed with a gen. of the same type.

      The problematic form in the vs. is *saṃjítaḥ*. Properly speaking, this should either be an abl./gen. sg. or a nom./acc. pl. of the root noun cmpd *saṃjít-* 'complete victor'. Gr analyzes it as gen. sg., modifying *vṛtrásya*, as, apparently, does Re, while Ge and WG take it as nom. pl., presumably applicable to all the gods listed singly before. All construe

the gen. pl. *dhánānām* with it (e.g., Ge "die Erbeuter der Schätze"), but this leaves *vṛtrásya* stranded, since it would be perverse to attribute the victory over Vṛtra to Bhaga, Savitar, and Aṃśa in addition to Indra. Therefore all the standard tr. supply sg. *hántā (vel sim.) as an appositive to Indra, to govern *vṛtrásya*. I consider this unnec. Our pāda seems to be based on a much-repeated pāda, couched in the acc. sg., in the Triṣṭubh refrain vs. of the Viśvāmitras' Indra hymns: III.30.22 (etc.) *ghnántaṃ vṛtrāṇi saṃjítaṃ dhánānām*. I consider our pāda a nonce adaptation of the orig. pāda, construed as if orig. *saṃjítam* belonged to a them. stem -- in other words *saṃjítaḥ* is a thematic back-formation, nom. <u>singular</u>, that allows the formula to remain metrical. The last part of 7b, with sg. *sanitāraṃ dhánānām*, gives some support to this interpr., and note that Indra alone is called *jiṣṇú-* 'victor' in the next vs. (6a). Of course, it must be admitted that in III.30.22 *vṛtrāṇi* is the obj. of a form of √*han* and so supplying such a form here (as the standard tr. do) also gets some support. But *vṛtrá-* has been transformed from acc. (pl.) to gen. (sg.) in our passage and should be parallel to *dhánānām*.

V.42.7: The splv. *śámbhaviṣṭha-* recalls *śáṃtama-* in 1a. Both stems are reasonably well attested, though *śáṃtama-* has the edge. They do not seem to be consistently distinguished in usage, but *śáṃtama-* seems more common qualifying inanimates while *śámbhaviṣṭha-* and its base *śambhú-/-ū-* are more common with animates. Such is the case in this hymn, where *śáṃtamā* in 1a modifies 'hymn' (*gī́ḥ*) and *śámbhaviṣṭhaḥ* in 7c modifies Bṛhaspati. Nonetheless, the tr. of the two forms should be harmonized.

V.42.8: The standard tr. (incl. also Schmidt, B+I 84 and Scar 202) take ab as a separate nominal cl. The difference is trivial.
      Less trivial is the difference between my rendering of the last part of d and that of all the others. They take *subhágās téṣu rā́yaḥ* as the nominal main clause to the rel. cl. (*yé aśvadā́ḥ ...*) that occupies the rest of the hemistich. Cf., e.g., Ge "denen gehören die beglückenden Reichtümer." In contrast I take *subhágāḥ* with the rel. cl., qualifying the givers, and *rā́yaḥ* as acc. pl. in the main cl., and in the main cl. I supply a verb 'confer' (vel sim.) extracted from *ratnadhéyam* in 7a. In favor of the standard tr. are the facts that by accent *rā́yaḥ* is better analyzed as nom. than acc. (though acc. pl. so accented are not rare) and that no verb need be supplied. Although I am usually reluctant to supply material, in this case there are countervailing factors. First, with the exception of one late passage (X.140.5), *subhága-*, which is quite well-attested, is only used of animate beings, not of wealth or the like. Moreover, the standard rendering leaves Bṛhaspati with little to do. The givers are "accompanied by your help" (*távotíbhiḥ*), but otherwise seem to do quite nicely on their own -- whereas we might expect him to be acting on their material behalf by giving to them, just as in the next vs. he is asked to strip the niggardly of their possessions and do worse by other anti-ritualists. By my interpr. the vs. expresses the usual Rigvedic trickle-down theory of material redistribution: the gods give goods to the patrons of the sacrifice (kings, etc.), who then confer them on the priests and poets.

V.42.9: The stilted nominal syntax with dummy verb √*kṛ* + acc. masc. abstract (*visarmāṇaṃ kṛṇuhi*, lit. "make dissipation"), which together govern a neut. acc. *vittám*, must result from the lack of a transitive pres. to √*sṛ* 'flow, run' -- *pace* Narten ("Ai. *sṛ* ..." 1969: 83 and n. 16 [=KlSch 130 and n. 16]), who characterizes several forms of *ví* √*sṛ* as

"transitiv," though the acc. expresses the goal/place-through-which, not a real transitive object.

The expression *prasavé vāvṛdhānā́n* is not entirely clear and is variously rendered — Ge "'die im Befehl gross sind," Re "qui (se croyant) renforcés pour la compétition," Schmidt (B+I 85) "bei (unserer) Regsamkeit wachsen," WG "obwohl sie in ihrem Unterfangen erstarkt sind" — differing primarily in what *prasavá-* is taken to mean. By my interpr. these foes, who violate all the norms of Ārya society by refusing to participate in reciprocal exchange, by acting contrary to *vratá-* (the chains of command that structure Ārya society), and by hating the verbal formulations that express the Ārya view of the cosmos and their place in it, nonetheless show their strength on the attack, the forward thrust. All the tr. reflect this notion one way or another: the regretable strength of the enemies despite their antisocial behavior.

V.42.10: This vs. continues the theme of the impious foe, though the divine ally the poet calls on to destroy the foe has changed from Bṛhaspati to the Maruts. Here (pāda a) the enemy chooses to praise demons (*rakṣásah*) when gods (*deva-*) are being invited to the ritual and (c) mocks the ritual labor of the devotee. Because of the strong association of sweat with ritual labor in the RV (see my "Avestan *xšuuīd*: A Relic of Indo-Iranian Ritual Vocabulary," *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 25 [2011 (2015),] and for √*śam* 'labor' with √*svid* 'sweat' I.86.8), I assume that the enemy himself is engaging in (what we hope will be fruitless) ritual in pāda d, perhaps in service of the demons, not the gods (cf. pāda a). In post-RVic texts the Asuras would probably serve as the polar opposition to the gods, not the Rakṣasas, an indirect piece of evidence for the well-known fact that the Asura-Deva opposition almost entirely postdates the RV.

In the publ. tr. *óhate* in pāda a is tr. as an indicative ('whoever lauds'), but it should really be a subjunctive ("whoever will laud"), both on the basis of the morphology (it belongs to a root pres., whose 3rd *plural* is also *óhate*) and of the parallel subjunctives in the passage, cd *yáḥ ... nindā́t, ... karate*.

V.42.11: One of the striking passages in which the same divinity, in this case Rudra, is called both *devá-* and *ásura-* (*námobhir devám ásuraṃ duvasya* "with acts of reverence offer friendship to the god, the lord"), strong evidence that the strict division and eternal enmity between Devas and Asuras in later texts has not yet developed.

V.42.12: The grammar of this vs. is quite straightforward; what difficulty it presents lies in the uncertain and permeable boundary between PNs and common noun/adjectives. In b *vibhvataṣṭā́ḥ*, modifying the rivers, is universally taken as containing the PN Vibhvan, hence 'fashioned by Vibhvan'. Since the referents of pāda a are the Ṛbhus and Vibhvan is the name of an Ṛbhu, this makes some contextual sense. However, fashioning *a river* seems beyond even the Ṛbhus' expertise, and, further, in VI.61.13 Sarasvatī, a river after all, is *vibhváne kṛtā́* "made for wide extension / wide ranging." I think that sense is meant here as well, and there is simply some sly play on the Ṛbhu's name.

I am less certain about what to do with *bṛhaddivā́* in c. In the immediately preceding hymn (V.41.19) I take the same form as an attributive adjective with *urváśī*: Urvaśī Bṛhaddivā "Urvaśī of lofty heaven." Here it could likewise be attributive to

Sarasvatī or it could be a separate goddess. See Klein (I.328–29, 337) on this mild dilemma. If Bṛhaddivā *is* a distinct entity, she is featureless, so there is little at stake here.

V.42.13: The phrase *návyasīṃ jáyamānam* "the newer (hymn), being born," with comparative of 'new' and the pres. participle seems designed to refer to the current hymn in the process of composition.

      Tvaṣṭar is both the possessor and producer of "all forms" (cf. I.13.10 *tváṣṭāram ... viśvárūpam*) and the father of a being called Viśvarūpa (likewise *viśvárūpa-* 'possessing all forms' (cf. II.11.19, X.8.9 *tváṣṭrá- viśvárūpa-* with the patronymic *tváṣṭrá-*). In one sense the second hemistich seems to be an attempt to reconcile these two aspects: Tvaṣṭar as a lone creator god, the fashioner of all forms, "(ex)changing his forms" (*rūpā́ minānáḥ*) as sole agent -- but doing so "bulging (?) in the body of his daughter" (*āhanā́ duhitúr vakṣáṇāsu*)(if that's what it means), which introduces a sexual (indeed incestuous) element that would be appropriate to the fathering of a son. On the one hand, we seem to have a model of primitive embryology, with the fetus changing and developing within its mother's womb; on the other hand, the half-vs. mirrors the later Sanskrit notion that the father enters the body of the mother and is reborn as the son. Unlike the incest of Dyaus and of Prajāpati, the story of Tvaṣṭar's incest (if that's what this is) is otherwise muted and not securely attested elsewhere.

      The meaning and etymology of the *s*-stem *āhanás-* are deeply uncertain. In context it seems to mean 'swollen, bulging, luxuriant, lubricious'. As for the etym. see EWA s.v. and, for a recent etymological attempt, Kulikov in the Lubotsky Fs. (2018). The word has gained a certain notoriety in IEist discourse because it is argued that it preserves the old suffixal accent of *s*-stem bahuvrīhis (see Stüber, *s*-stems [2002] 27, 189). However, it is dangerous to pin the reconstruction of a whole category on a word whose meaning, structure, and etymology are radically uncertain. For disc. of the word, as well as demolition of the accentual theory it is supposed to support, see JL "αἰνοπαθής."

      On *vakṣáṇā-* 'belly' as a pl. tantum, see comm. ad X.27.16.

V.42.14–16: This trio of vss. echoes vs. 1 and ring-compositionally seems to bring the hymn to a close, with the single pāda of 17 and the final vs. 18 tacked on (and indeed the 2nd hemistich of 16: see below). The template is *prá* [HYMN, etc.] [GOD] *nūnám aśyāḥ*, realized in 1ab as "May the hymn (*gī́ḥ*) now reach Varuṇa (etc.)." In 14ab we again have all the elements, while 15ab omits the initial preverb *prá* in favor of *úd* immediately preceding the verb and omits *nūnám* entirely and 16ab reinstates *prá* but still lacks *nūnám*:

    1ab   *prá ... váruṇam* (etc.)*... gī́r ... nūnám aśyāḥ*

    14ab *prá suṣṭutíḥ ... iḷás pátim ... nūnám aśyāḥ*
    15ab *eṣá stómo mā́rutaṃ śárdhaḥ* (etc.)*... úd aśyāḥ*
    16ab *praíṣá stómaḥ pṛthivī́m* (etc.) *... aśyāḥ*

The impression given by this sequence of syntactic and lexical parallels -- that this is the finale of the hymn -- is supported by the fact that the rest of the hymn, 16cd–18, is repeated as15cd–17 in the next hymn, V.43.

V.42.14: Despite the position of *prá*, opening a pāda that ends with the part. *ukṣámāṇaḥ*, I take the *prá* not with that participle but with immediately preceding pāda-final *íyarti*. For one thing, *prá* is found elsewhere with *íyar-* while it is not with √*ukṣ*, and in addition tmesis of preverb + participle is fairly uncommon (though certainly not unheard of). Ge and Re seem to follow the other route, taking it as license to interpr. *íyarti* as intrans. or at least objectless (Ge 'heraufzieht', Re 's'avance'). But *íyar-* is otherwise always transitive, and though we would prefer the two world halves not to be in motion, the point here is that Parjanya's thunderstorm is powerful enough to shake them. WG's interpr. is like mine.

V.43 All Gods

This listing impulse so evident in the last two hymns (V.41–42) is less pronounced here, though a variety of gods receive praise -- with Agni especially prominent, as indicated in the publ. intro.: 2 Heaven and Earth, 3 Vāyu, 5 Indra, 6 Aramati, Agni, 7 Gharma pot, 8 Aśvins, 9 Pūṣan and Vāyu, 10 Maruts, 11 Sarasvatī, 12 Bṛhaspati as Agni, 13 Agni?, 14 Agni?, 15 Agni, Earth.

V.43.1: On *mahó rāyé* see comm. ad IV.31.11. Again the publ. tr. carelessly follows Ge's tr., which takes the two forms together, as if they were an adjective-noun syntagm despite the difference in case. I would now take *maháḥ* adverbially with Old. See further ad VI.1.2.

The seven lofty and joy-bringing feminine beings (*bṛhatī́ḥ saptá ... mayobhúvaḥ*) in cd, the target of our invocation, are not further specified. I have supplied 'cows' on the basis of ab and IX.86.25, which contains *saptá dhenávaḥ*, but this is by no means certain. See other suggestions in Ge's n. 1. The problem is that there is no reason for the cows to number exactly seven; either 'seven' is, as Oberlies (Rel. RV II.74) suggests, simply an indication of totality, or some more standard group of seven, like the rivers, is being referred to (either via the image of cows or directly).

V.43.3: The subject of the impv. in c must also be Vāyu, because he regularly receives the first drink of soma.

V.43.4: In b the agent noun *śamitár-* most naturally belongs with the forms of √*śam* referring to ritual labor. See, e.g., in the preceding hymn V.42.10 *śámīṃ śaśamānásya* "the (ritual) labor of the one laboring." However, already in the Aśvamedha hymn of the RV it has acquired the euphemistic meaning 'queller', that is, slaughterer, of the sacrificial beast; cf. I.162.9–10, as well as the simile in V.85.1 *ví yó jaghā́na śamitéva cárma* "who like a butcher a hide split apart ..." in this maṇḍala. I think it likely that both senses are meant here; in post-RVic ritual texts Soma is regularly presented as a sacrificial victim.

In the 2nd hemistich Ge and WG (cf. also Old) take c and d as separate clauses, utilizing the verb *duduhe* for both and supplying a priest (Ge: Adhvaryu) as subj. of c.

The reason is nom. *sugábhastiḥ* lit. 'having good fists', which must otherwise modify *aṃśú-* 'plant'. With Re, in the publ. tr. I take cd as a single clause with *sugábhastiḥ ... aṃśúḥ* a single NP, assuming that 'having good fists' of the soma plant means that the plant has received good handling from the fists of its preparer. (Re, by contrast, tr. "aux beaux rameaux," with *gábhasti-* referring metaphorically to the growth habits of the plant.) I now think my interpr. pushes the bahuvrīhi further than it should go, so I would now emend the tr. to "(The priest,) having good fists, has milked out the sap of the honey that dwells on the mountain; the plant has milked out its own shimmering, pure (sap)." It is likely that the verb underlying pāda c should be active (perhaps **dudoha*); when middle forms like *duduhe* take an object, the subject is usually a cow or cow-substitute (as here) producing milk from itself.

V.43.7: On the position of this vs. in the hymn and its significance, see publ. intro. If the vs. is an omphalos, it may focus attention on the mysteries of the Pravargya ritual. The vs. is structured as a riddle, with the referent of *yám* (pāda a) withheld till d, with three similes and several technical references to ritual activities in between.

  The first simile (pāda a) is oddly structured, in that one expects something to be compared to the unidentified acc. *yám* but there is no overt acc. expressed. Instead we must supply this acc., as the most likely object of the participle *pratháyantaḥ* 'spreading' (transitive), which, in default of the acc. obj. itself, carries the simile particle *ná*. The object to be supplied is *barhíḥ* 'ritual grass', which at every ritual is spread as a seat for the visiting gods. Generally the verb in the expression "spread (barhis)" is √*str* 'strew', not √*prath*, but, as Old points out, √*prath* can also be used, generally for the intransitive sense "(barhis) spreads" (V.5.4, X.70.4, etc.). The object of transitive √*prath* is generally something much more prominent, like 'earth'. It may be that √*prath* was used here to give a cosmic resonance, but it may also be partly ascribed to the alliteration in the vs.: **pra**thayanto ... **ví**prā, va**pā́**vantam ... **tá**pantaḥ / pitúr ná putrá upási **prá**yiṣṭha(ḥ). The barhis is also sometimes anointed; cf. II.3.4 *barhíḥ ... ghṛténāktám*. Thus, the absent *barhíḥ* is at the intersection of the two ritual verbs 'spread' and 'anoint', and supplies the missing point of comparison in the simile "They anoint 'which one' (*yám*) like X." The poet is inviting his audience to solve for two variables -- the identity of the focus of the vs. expressed by the rel. prn. *yám* and the object to which it is compared, but he makes the second riddle easier by providing two verbs that could govern it. The overlap of the two produces the answer.

  The next simile, in b, targets a different ritual substance to compare with the still unidentified *yám*. This time an accusative does appear on the surface, but it in the form of an associated adjective, *vapā́vantam* 'possessing the/an omentum." In classical śrauta ritual the omentum (*vapā́*) is the first and probably the most important part of the sacrificial animal to be dealt with; after the death of the animal, the omentum is removed and heated on two different fires, first preliminarily singed on the Śamitar's fire (NB: see vs. 4 and comm. thereon), then cooked on the Āhavanīya fire (see my Hyenas, pp. 104–5). Here we can assume that what is identified as 'possessing an omentum' is the sacrificial animal (an identification supported by the occurrence of *vapā́vantam* in ŚB XIII.7.1.9), which itself is cooked on the fire. Sacrificial animals are also anointed; see IV.6.3 *paśvó anakti* in a hymn that treats the animal sacrifice in some detail. Once again, the incompletely identified target of the simile is at the intersection of two ritual actions:

'heat' and 'anoint'. In this case the similarly unidentified *yám*, the gharma pot, is also subject to both these actions in the Pravargya ritual.

The third simile, in pāda c, is the only one with all its parts, and is also the only one without a ritual reference. It is a version of a standard trope.

V.43.8: The last pāda is difficult, primarily because of *dhúram*. This would ordinarily be the acc. of the root noun *dhúr-* 'chariot pole', and indeed that is how I take it. Ge interprets it rather as an acc. infinitive ('festzuhalten') to √*dhṛ*. But that aniṭ root has no seṭ forms in *dhur-* (unless *dhúr-* 'chariot pole' itself; so Whitney Roots, but see now standard alternative etymology in Schindler, Rt nouns, and EWA, both s.v.). WG's semantic interpr. ('zur Sicherung') is similar to Ge's, though derivationally distinct: they see it as a secondary abstract(ion) from the 'chariot pole' word. Either of these analyses eases the interpr. of the pāda. But given the chariot-part vocab. in the rest of the pāda (*āṇí-* 'axle-pin, peg', *nábhi-* 'wheel-nave'), it seems highly unlikely that a standard word for a part of the chariot would in just this context *not* be so used -- and cf. *sudhúr-* 'amenable to the chariot pole' a few vss. back (5c). I think *dhúram* has to be an unmarked simile, an acc. goal parallel to *nidhím*. The Aśvins are asked to go to the *nidhí-* as draft animals come tamely to the *dhúr-*, then to enter it as the pin enters the nave.

I supply 'honey' with *nidhím* on the basis of the phrase *nidhí- mádhūnām* used twice in Aśvin hymns with sim. vocab.: I.183.4 *ayáṃ vām bhagó níhita iyáṃ gír, dásrāv imé vām nidhávo mádhūnām* "Here is the portion deposited for you, here the hymn, o wondrous ones, and here the deposits of honey for you" / III.58.5 *éhá yātam pathíbhir devayánair, dásrāv imé vāṃ nidhávo mádhūnām* "Travel here along the paths leading to the gods. Wondrous ones, these stores of honey belong to you two."
Since 'honey' is thematic in the previous parts of this hymn (1b, 2c, 3a, d, 4c, 6c), supplying it here (esp. in Aśvin context) is easy.

V.43.9: The function of *utá* in the pāda-final phrase *utá tmán* is unclear. Klein (I.347, 349) treats it as an example of an X Y *utá* construction (suggesting several diff. possibilities), but does not consider the positional tendency of *tmán(ā)* or the dossier of rhetorically similar phrases. Both *tmán* and *tmánā* have a distinct preference for pāda-final position, with a word consisting of two light syllables preceding as here -- frequently *iva*, also *úpa*, etc. As a parallel to our passage, cf. esp. IX.88.3 ... *draviṇodá iva tmán*. I'm inclined to think that *utá* is in fact empty here (though perhaps orig. adapted from places where it made sense) and Klein's piecemeal attempts to make sense of the various passages misplaced. Here the *utá* was perhaps slotted in because *iva* was inappropriate. One can also keep in mind that *-a tmán-* recalls (and replicates metrically) *ātmán-*. Re's characterization of *utá tmán* as "type de clausule inert" seems close to my "empty."

V.43.10: The instr. pl.s *námabhiḥ* and *rūpébhiḥ* identically positioned in pādas a and b seem both to refer to indiviuated Maruts and also to make reference to the concept later to be called *nāmarūpa* 'name and form' referring to the pairing of words and things differentiating the separate entities of creation. This unusual distinguishing of individual Maruts is then countered by the insistent repetition of *víśve* 'all' referring to them as an undifferentiated class in pāda d. In that pāda I take the first *víśve* as voc. pl. with *marutaḥ*

(accented because pāda-initial) and the 2nd as a nom. with the verb, but this grammatical separation may not be nec. if the two *víśve*-s are there to match 'names' and 'forms' respectively. Viśve Marutaḥ also semi-equates them with the Viśve Devāḥ.

V.43.12: *sādát-yoni-* belongs to the cmpd type with a verbal-governing 1st member (*sanád-rayi-*, etc.), and given the referent, who was just the object of the caus. phrase *sádane sādayadhvam* "make him sit on his seat." it must mean "sitting on the yoni." The problem of course is the long vowel in *sādát-*. This has been taken as a reflex ofo an old lengthened-grade present or similarly lengthened-g aorist (for reff. see AiG I.2 Nachtr. 88, EWA s.v. *SAD* p. 693). For a contextually driven hapax like this, reaching into deep antiquity seems unnec. and likely wrong. Old suggests we should perhaps read **sadát*, with the long vowel introduced (redactionally) from the immed. preceeding *sādayadhvam*. I would suggest alternatively that it might indirectly reflect the pres. *sī́dati*, matching the heavy root syllable of that present, even though marked present stems (outside of *-áya-* formations) seem blocked in this cmpd type.

V.43.13: In d *tridhā́tu-śṛṅga-* 'having tripartite horns' may refer to the three hearths, though see the tripartite cows (*tridhā́tavaḥ ... gā́vaḥ*), probably of Agni, in nearby V.47.4.

V.43.14: On *rāspirá-* see comm. ad I.122.4.

V.43.15: Both Re and WG take pāda a as a separate nominal clause. This is certainly possible, and an alternative tr. of the hemistich could be "to you, the lofty one, there (belongs) lofty vigor, Agni. The ... (priestly) pairs attend upon (you)."

V.44 All Gods

On the manifold difficulties of this hymn and a possible framework in which to interpret them (as a hymn simultaneously applicable to Agni and Soma), see publ. intro.

V.44.1: Save for the fronted pronoun *tám*, this hymn opens with a remarkable series of universalizing adverbs, identically formed with *-(á-)thā* suffix and linking the current ritual situation (the final one in the series, *imáthā* 'in this way here', a hapax) to that of every time and place: *pratnáthā pūrváthā viśváthā*. This may give us a foretaste of the poet's laying bare the underlying identity of the two central ritual substances, fire and soma, and of the service accorded them in the sacrifice.

The poet then, in my opinion, produces a red herring: most of the descriptors found in this vs. could apply to Indra -- esp. *āśúṃ jáyantam*, cf. *āśúṃ jétāram* of Indra in VIII.99.7. And most interpreters fall into this trap: as Ge says in his n. 1, "all commentators" identify *tám* as Indra -- incl. Ge himself, Re, and Old (WG forego referents). However, both Agni and Soma receive these or similar descriptors elsewhere. Agni and Soma are both located on the ritual grass (Agni: III.14.2, etc.; Soma: I.16.6, etc.); both are called *svarvíd-* (more often than Indra; Agni: III.3.5, 10, etc.; Soma: VIII.48.15, etc.), *jyéṣṭha-* (Agni: I.127.2, etc.; Soma: IX.66.16, etc.), and *āśú-* (Agni: IV.7.4, etc.; Soma: IX.56.1, etc.). Soma is qualified as *jáyant-* (I.91.21, etc.), and though Agni is not modified by this participle, he is the subject of verbal forms of √*ji* (e.g.,

VI.4.4). All of these are, of course, fairly generic characterizations; the point here is that nothing requires us to leap to the conclusion that Indra is the referent.

Another way to approach the question of the referent of *tám* is to consider what referent is appropriate as an obj. to *dohase* 'you will milk' -- which first may require us to identify the subj. of this 2nd sg. verb (by most lights: Re takes it as a sigmatic 1st sg., which seems unnec. and doesn't fit the semantic profile of -*se* 1st singulars). With Sāy. and Ge., I take it as the self-address of the poet, who will perform his milking task 'with song' (*girā́*). The middle of √*duh* generally takes milk (either real or metaphorical) as its object, and both Agni and Soma can be conceived of as milk products -- the churning of the fire sticks and the pressing of the soma plant both involve physical actions not unlike milking and what is produced is a fluid or something (fire) that behaves rather like one. Indra is not entirely excluded, however; he could be configured as a cow, "milked" with a praise hymn for him to produce goods. However, as I just said, the milk itself, rather than the cow, is the typical obj. of medial √*duh*, and so the substances fire and/or soma are more likely referents.

Let us now turn to pāda d. This also contains a 2nd sg. med. present, *várdhase*, in a relative clause whose rel. prn., fem. loc. pl. *yā́su*, has no possible referent in the rest of the vs. Before turning to that problem, I will first say that I do not consider the 2nd sg. subj. of *várdhase* to be the same as that of *dohase*. Instead I think we have switched to the unidentified god/ritual substance referred to by the acc. sg. in the rest of the vs. Although this introduces an interpretational complication, I would point out that in the next vs. (2cd), the god/substance definitely appears in the 2nd person, and note also 8b, which contain a similarly structured rel. cl. ... *yā́su nā́ma te*#, where the 2nd ps. refers to the god/substance. And, most important, the rel. cl. of 1d shows a closer affinity to Agni and Soma than the generic epithets in the rest of the vs. But first we must identify a possible referent or referents for the fem. *yā́su*. The standard ploy, which I think is basically correct, is to supply a fem. pl. obj. to *jáyantam* 'winning' -- generally 'cows' (Ge, Re, WG). Old suggests rather 'waters', which Ge argues against (n. 1d). Certainly both 'cows' and 'waters' (both fem. pl.) occur as objects to √*ji* -- and I see no reason to choose between the two; in fact the reason for not specifying either one is to allow both to be understood, under the neutralizing rel. prn. *yā́su*. Both Agni and Soma have connections to both cows and waters: Agni is nourished by the streams of ghee (a milk product) poured into the fire, and in a well-known myth he ran away and entered the waters. Soma is mixed with cows' milk, as is endlessly emphasized in the IXth Maṇḍala, and before soma is pressed, it is soaked in water to swell the stalks. A third possible fem. pl. referent connected with Agni is plants, in which he is invisible and inherent until kindled. Let us consider some passages whose phraseology resembles our own. In II.13.1 ... *apáḥ ... ā́viśad yā́su várdhate* Soma, unnamed, "entered the waters among which he grows strong." (Note the nearly identical rel. cl.) For Agni cf. I.95.5 ... *vardhate ... ā́su* "he grows strong among/in them" (here prob. = plants); I.141.5 *ā́d ín mātṝ́r ā́viśad yā́su ... ví vāvṛdhe* "Just after that he entered into his mothers, within whom .... he grew widely" (again prob. plants; note that *vāvṛdhe*, as transmitted without accent, is not part of the rel. cl. If the transmitted form is correct). The connection of a fem. loc. pl. and a form of √*vṛdh* in these passages is striking, and it is Agni and Soma who participate in this phraseology.

Thus, in my opinion, by the end of the vs. the poet has narrowed down the possible referents and set up the rhetorical situation that will dominate the rest of the

hymn: an unidentified masc. sg. referent, who can be simultaneously Agni and Soma, and a set of fem. pl. attendants, likewise unidentified, who are connected to the masculine figure.

V.44.2: The first hemistich of this vs. contains those same personnel, again without overt identification, and with the further complication that there is no finite verb until pāda c. Pāda a contains fem. plurals, at least partly in a relative clause (here nom. pl. *yā́ḥ*, versus loc. *yā́su* in 1d); pāda b has an unidentified masc. sg. as subject. This is the same configuration as 1d. Again I think the duo Agni / Soma is lurking under the masc. sg., and the fem. pl. refers to phenomena associated with each. In addition I take the gen. *kakúbhām* (a fem. cons. stem) in b as the referent of the fem. rel. prn. *yā́ḥ* in a, rather than attempting to construe it one way or another with *acodáte*, as most interpr. do.

Most take Agni as the referent of the masc. sg.; I think this is correct, but doesn't go far enough. Certainly Agni is an appropriate referent for *virócamānaḥ* 'shining forth', as he is elsewhere (e.g., I.95.2), and the lovely fem. pl. entities of pāda a can easily be his flames (or, in my scenario, the tips [*kakúbh-*] of his flames). Their collectivity can be identified as "the sun of the lower realm" (*úparasya ... svàḥ*). (I see no reason, with Ge [and, at least in tr., with Re] to take *svàr* here as gen., referring to Agni.) But the same phraseology can also be applied to Soma. Although nowhere near as commonly as Agni, Soma can also serve as subj. of √*ruc* (e.g., IX.11.1 *dhā́rā sutásya rocate*), and the streams of soma are often compared to the rays of the sun (usually with masc. *raśmí-*, but cf. fem. *tvíṣīḥ ... sū́ryasya* "the glitterings of the sun" IX.71.9). Moreover, pāda c, whose subj. is most likely the same as that in b, is almost identical to IX.73.8a *r̥tásya gopā́ ná dábhāya sukrátuḥ* of Soma, which strongly invites a Soma identification here.

Another problem is *acodáte* in b. This form looks like a dat. sg. to a negated participle, but the accent is wrong (expect *ácodate), a discrepancy that leads Lowe (Participles in RV, 274 n. 81) to reject this interpr., in favor of a *t*-stem *acodát-*. I'm not at all sure that in this hymn one can make arguments of the type "can't be X because of some grammatical feature that usually holds," and in any case Lowe does not seem to suggest a different case/no. interpr. or different semantics. For further disc. of the accent see AiG II.1.216 and Old ad loc. Because I construe *kakúbhām* elsewhere, I supply *rā́dhaḥ* 'largesse' as the obj. of this apparent part., since *rā́dhas-* is frequently the obj. of √*cud*. The idea would be that the ritual fire and ritual soma shine for the generous and stingy alike. However, the supplied obj. may not be nec., and the sense would be something like "for the unrousing / unstirring one."

In d I borrow *hitáḥ* from 3d (see also *dhā́yi* in 8c), producing "was (set/placed) in truth," but the pāda can certainly be interpr. simply with the pf. *āsa* "was in truth." I take "your name" (*nā́ma te*) to refer to both Agni and Soma.

V.44.3: Some of the challenges of this vs can be approached by noting the series of phonetic plays it contains: *saca*te **sác ca** *dhā́tu* **ca** / **dhā́tu** *ca, áriṣṭa***gātuḥ** / **sá hót**ā **saho**bhā́riḥ / **saho**bhā́riḥ ... **barhíḥ**.

Let us begin with the first. The curious double *ca* phrase *sác ca dhā́tu ca* is difficult to render on its own. On the surface it appears to form part of a conjoined NP with the subj. *havíḥ* 'oblation', but its ill-assorted nature comes out in tr. like Ge's "die Opferspende und das Seiende und das Element (?)." Moreover, though *dhā́tu-* does not

otherwise occur uncompounded in the RV, after the RV it is masc., while this form must be neut, which would be anomalous if it is a noun here. Ge suggests (n. 3a) emending to the bahuvrīhi *saptádhātu* 'having 7 parts' (RV 3x), though this is not reflected in his tr. As a bv the neut. gender would be proper, as a modifier of *havís-*. Re suggests rather that *sác ca dhā́tu* "resolves" an old cmpd. **sad-dhā́tu*, tr. "et (sa) foundation est réelle." I am in accord with his rendering but analyze the underlying form differently: I take *sác ca* as a play on MIA *sacca-*, the Middle Indic product of *satyá-*. (That Middle Indic phonological developments are already to be found even in the RV family books needs no further demonstration.) The whole sequence gestures towards a bahuvrīhi **sacca-dhātu-*, whose neut. gender would be appropriate. Note that very similar *satyá-dharman-* (RV 5x) is found at V.51.2 [in this VD seq] and V.63.1, the only attestations in the family books. The putative first member *sacca* here is then provided with an alternative Sanskritic analysis, *sác* [i.e., *sát*] *ca* -- I'm not suggesting an emendation here, but a word play. The second *ca* connects the underlying bahuvrīhi to the noun it modifies, *havíḥ*, hence an underlying sequence *havíḥ ... *saccá-dhātu ca*. I further suggest that this word play is actualized in a different word in the first word of the pāda, *átyam*, which rhymes with *satyá-* (save for accent).

As just noted, pāda b participates in a number of phonetic plays: *-gā́tuḥ* echoes *dhā́tu* in pāda; *sá hó(tā)* anticipates immediately following *saho(bhárīḥ)*, and *-bhárīḥ* is a scrambling of *barhír* in the next pāda. This last is particularly worth noting because -*bhári-* is a Vedic hapax (Whitney, Rts., lists it as RV.C., and its only RV occurrence is here) of somewhat unusual formation (see AiG II.2.295). It is clearly a contextually inspired nonce here and should be given no weight in considering *i*-stem morphology.

The last lexical problem in the vs. is *visrúhā* in d, otherwise found only in VI.7.6. Gr glosses 'Strom' and connects it with √*sru* 'flow', which is phonologically impossible (where would the -*h* come from?). Ge tr. 'Arm', which is just a contextually inspired rendering, as far as I can see. Re tr. 'flamme' (fld. by Kellens, Noms rac. 82–83), though ad VI.7.6 (EVP XIII.127–28) he floats (only to reject) the possibility that it is a variant of *vīrúdh-* ('sprout, shoot, growth') on the basis of the similarity between VI.7.6 and II.35.8, which contains a form of *vīrúdh-*. This suggestion fits with Sāy.'s gloss *oṣadhi-* 'plant' (for this passage; in VI.7.6 Sāy. glosses the pl. *visruhaḥ* as *nadyaś ca gaṅgādyāḥ* "rivers, Gaṅgā, etc.'). The word has received the most attention from Scar, first in his Root noun book (464–65) and then in the n. to V.44.3 in WG (in which Scar is responsible for Maṇḍala V). In the former Scar pronounces *visrúh-* "ganz unklar," echoed by the somewhat less pessimistic "unklar" in WG, where he tr. "Reisig und Zweigen" and suggests it's derived from **vi-sr-u-* 'sich weit erstreckend', contaminated with -*rúdh-*, -*rúh-*, with the result reminiscent of *vīrúdh-*. I also believe that the word is in the semantic realm of plant growth and that it should be connected with √*ru(d)h* 'grow'; this is esp. clear in VI.7.6, which contains a verbal form of that root: *vayā́ iva ruruhuḥ saptá visrúhaḥ*. However, I do not think that √*sru* or √*sṛ* needs to be brought in, at least directly. Instead I attribute the extraneous -*s*- to a sort of analogical backformation involving the preverbs *ví*, *ní*, and *nís*, starting from the form *vīrúdh-* cited above. Although the lengthening of the preverb *ví* in that form results from the initial laryngeal of the etymon of √*rudh* (see EWA s.v. RODH), it appears synchronically to result from the sandhi form of a byform **vis* before *r*-, just as there is a *nís* beside *ní* (with different meanings in that case of course). In particular note the form *nīrohá-* in a TS mantra repeated 3x (III.5.2.5, IV.4.1.3,

V.3.6.3 *saṁrohò 'si nīrohò 'si*), which could be derived either from *ni+√ruh* (cf. Keith's tr. 'descender') with the same lengthening as in *vīrúdh-* or from *nis+ruh* (so Viśva Bandhu). I therefore explain our *visrúh-* as a learned (and/or playful) but false "restoration" of the putative **vis-* underlying *vīrú(d)h-*. It is here that √*sru* may have played a part, by facilitating a false segmentation of *vis-rúh-* into *vi-srúh-* (on the basis of the phonological similarity of the roots) and thus blocking the application of morpheme-boundary sandhi between **-s* and *r-*. I tr. 'outgrowth'. On a separate but related note, I do not think we need to emend the form to gen. pl. **visrúhām*, an idea that goes back to Sāy., tempted Old inter alia, and is accepted by Scar in WG.

Having dealt with the details of this vs. piecemeal, we should now consider whether it too can be applied to both Agni and Soma, and the answer is yes. *átya-* is regularly used of both in passages too numerous to cite. Though Hotar is an esp. characteristic role of Agni's, Soma is also compared to a Hotar sometimes (IX.92.2, 6, etc.). Both are called both *vṛ́ṣan-* and *śíśu-*. We have already noted their positioning on the barhis ad 1b. Both are called *yúvan-*. The 'outgrowth' can be the flames of Agni and the traces of the spreading of the soma juice on the filter, often depicted on IX. However, it does seem that Soma is never qualified as *ájara-* 'unaging' -- a minor lack. The vs. situates both substances on the ritual ground at the moment of the offering.

V.44.4: My interpr. of both the syntax and the referents of this vs. generally differs from those of others. I will not undertake a detailed disc. of these differences. However, I will note that Ge (n. 4) suggests that both Agni and Soma may be the topic of the vs., in agreement with my general thesis.

In my opinion, a new element enters the ritual scene here, namely ritual speech, referred to by the unidentified *eté* of pāda a. Given the masc. pl. pronoun, the exact referent must be masc. -- perhaps *stómāḥ* 'praises' (cf. nearby V.42.15 *eṣá stómaḥ* ..., 16 *praíṣá stómaḥ* in the same All God cycle, reminscent of our *prá va eté* ...). These praises are conceived of as horses, which are easy to yoke (a: *suyújaḥ*) and directed by easily controlled reins (c: *suyántubhiḥ ... abhíśubhiḥ*). As Ge points out (n. 4c with reff.), the reins of priests are their speeches, an association that makes the identification of 'praises' as the subject of pāda a all the more likely. The 2nd ps. enclitic *vaḥ* refers in my view to the priests who are launching/driving the praise-horses. The *prá ... yǎman* "forth on the course/journey" invites a verb of motion to be supplied, perhaps a form of √*sṛ*, suggested by *prasársrāṇaḥ* beginning the 2nd hemistich of the previous vs. (3c).

The other question confronting us in pāda a is the identity of the datival inf. *iṣṭáye*, which is of course multiply ambiguous: it could belong to √*iṣ* 'seek, desire', √*iṣ* 'send', or √*yaj* 'sacrifice' (on this issue, see Old, ZDMG 62: 473-78 = KlSch 282-87). With Old, I take it to the first, but I also think it takes an acc. goal/obj., and that that acc. is the fem. acc. phrase in b, *nícīḥ ... yamyà ṛtāvṛdhaḥ*. Old also takes this phrase as acc., though he supplies a different verb to govern it; the other interpr. take the phrase as nom. and the subject of an independent nominal clause. With Ge (n. 4b) I take the downward-facing twinned sisters to be both the streams of ghee offered into the ritual fire and the streams of water with which soma is rinsed (the milk streams with which soma is mixed could also be in play). The praises' seeking of these streams expresses the union of verbal and physical activity in the sacrifice, with the hymns accompanying the pouring of the liquid into/onto the ritual substance. The dat. prn. *amúṣmai* I take as the goal of this pouring: the

fire and the soma respectively. The use of the comparatively rare distal deictic *asaú* is noteworthy, since this stem generally refers to the upward or heavenly world or items located there, esp. the sun (for the sun, cf., e.g., I.105.3, 191.9, VIII.12.30). Yet here the streams are going 'downward' towards it. This paradox can be resolved by recalling the phrase in 2a *úparasya ... svàḥ* "the sun of the lower realm," which made reference to well-known conceptions of Agni and of Soma. Agni is frequently considered the earthly counterpart of the heavenly sun, since both blaze brightly and they also make their appearance at the same time (dawn) of the ritual day. Soma, likewise, is often compared to or identified with the sun because of its bright gleam, and there are both a heavenly Soma and his earthly counterpart depicted in the IXth Maṇḍala. Here, in my opinion, *amúṣmai* makes implicit reference to the heavenly Sun [=Fire] and heavenly Soma, while depicting the ritual activity centered on their earthly embodiments, thus erasing the distance between heaven and earth and the distinction between the entities found therein.

 Pāda d, which I take as a separate clause, brings its own set of problems, not least with the always enigmatic word *krívi-* (on which see also comm. ad I.30.1). First, however, note the phonological echo of b *amúṣmai* / d *muṣāyati*, though this does not help with the interpr. As for *krívi-*, I take it here as a conflation of two putative stems. On the one hand, at least once (I.30.1) *krívi-* seems to refer to a race horse (there compared with Indra). Since the intertwined Agni/Soma figure in this hymn was just referred to as a steed (*átya-*) in 3a, *krívi-* here seems to be picking up that joint referent. Ge [n. 4d] makes the same identification of *átya-* with *krívi-*, and he also suggests that the pāda expresses the entry of the butter offerings into the fire and/or the streams of water in the soma. I think he is correct as far as he goes, but I think there is a third referent, the poet who is responsible for the praises I suggest are the subject of pāda a. In this case *krívi-* can be seen as a hyper-Sanskritization of *kaví-* (as if from **kṛvi-*) with the *ri* that interchanges with *ṛ* in words like *kṛ́mi-/krími-* 'worm' (cf. AiG I.33 and Nachtr. 19, 21), aided of course by the *krívi-* already referring to Agni/Soma. See also disc. ad 9c below.

 What does it mean that this *krívi-* "steals (their) names"? Here Old's suggestion is surely correct for the Agni/Soma *krívi-* (for Old, only Soma): that the streams (of ghee/water) lose their identities when they merge into Agni/Soma, and the result is simply called fire/soma. As for the poet whom I consider the third referent of *krívi-*, he may "steal their names" by using them in his poetry, or perhaps by referring to them but not naming them, as he does in this vs. (and throughout the hymn).

V.44.5: As usual in this hymn, this vs. swarms with difficulties (Re calls it "une suite de *cruces*"), but it continues to depict a relation between a singular masc. entity and a group of feminines. I see this as the thread that leads us through the labyrinth of this hymn. Note also that, as in vs. 3, there are phonetic figures: ab: *saṃjárbhurāṇas tárubhiḥ ... susváruḥ* / *su**tegŕ̥bham ... cittágarbhā**su* (with mirror-image *su*).

 The instr. *tárubhiḥ* in pāda a is a hapax, obviously built to a stem *táru-*. Both Ge and Re both take it as 'tree', which is tempting given the following *vayākín-* 'twiggy'. But II.39.3 *járbhurāṇā tárobhiḥ*, with the instr. pl. to the better-attested *s*-stem built to √*tṝ* 'endure, etc.', suggests that *táru-* is more likely connected to that root (see on this point EWA I.630). However, I confess that my tr. "quivering with your powers of endurance" conveys little sense. I think the instr. here may do little more than reinforce the intensive

(that is, frequentative) value of the participle: the subject keeps quivering with continued force ("staying power").

As usual, I think the subj. of the participle *samjárbhurāṇaḥ* is simultaneously Agni and Soma. Agni is elsewhere subject of this intensive (e.g., II.10.5), clearly with reference to his flickering flames. The semantic connection with Soma is not as strong, and Soma is nowhere the subject of this verb, but the scintillating, undulating waves of soma are a common trope in Maṇḍala IX.

Both these substances are aiming towards the *vayākín-*. The most sensible interpr. of that word is as an *-ín*-possessive built to an unattested diminutive **vayāká-* 'little branch, twig' to *vayā́-* 'branch', hence 'twiggy' (see Scar's n. in WG, referring to his treatment in Rt Noun Cmpds). For Agni this twiggy substance can be brushwood or kindling; the association with Soma is again less straightforward, but it can either refer to the twigs of the soma plant itself or, more likely in my opinion, refer metaphorically to the tufts of wool on the sheep's fleece filter that catch the impurities in the pressed soma juice. This suggestion is supported by the cmpd modifying it, *sute-gŕbh-* 'grasping at the pressing'. If the *vayākín-* is the fleece filter, it most definitely 'grasps' the solids that accidentally end up in the pressed juice. For Agni, 'grasping at the pressing' is less clear, but the firewood may seem to hold onto the fire burning in it, and the ritual fire burns during the soma pressing.

The rest of the first hemistich consists of *cittágarbhāsu susváruḥ*. The standard interpr. all analyze the latter word as containing *sváru-* '(sacrificial) post' (though note that Gr does not provide a gloss for it). Although this analysis works formally, it does not fit easily into the vs. semantically. I am inclined instead to take it as containing a form of √*svar* 'sound'; cf. *svará-* (2x, unfortunately with different accent), *svarí-*, etc. Ge (n. 5b) in fact suggests an alternate tr. 'schön tönend' (vaguely following Sāy.). *-sváru-* would show the same conversion to a *u*-stem as the hapax *táru-* in pāda a and perhaps follows that word in accent as well. The noise-making capacities of both Agnia and Soma are well known.

On *cittágarbha-* 'visibly pregnant' see Ge's n. 5b and the TB passage cited there. These females would be, in the Agni realm, the pieces of firewood, which are frequently depicted as having an embryonic Agni inside; for Soma most likely the waters in which the soma plant is soaked, swelling him as their embryo, or perhaps the cows whose milk is mixed with him.

I follow Old (ZDMG 62 [=KlSch 284 n.1]) in taking *dhāravākéṣu* as referring to a particular ritual moment, the litanies or recitations when the streams of the oblation are offered, but the equational metaphorical interpr. "recitations (like) streams" found in most tr. is also possible.

The voc. *ṛju-gātha* 'whose song is straight' is somewhat puzzling. I think it is best illuminated by II.26.1 *ṛjúr íc cháṃsaḥ*, a phrase I take as a decomposed bahuvrīhi (see comm. ad loc.) meaning 'whose laud is straight on target'. I would now slightly alter the tr. here to 'whose song is straight on target' to make the voc. a little less opaque.

The last pāda is surprisingly straightforward, at least for this hymn. The subject of *várdhasva* is once again Agni/Soma, who derive their strength from their wives (*pátnī*), the plants/firewood and waters/cows' milk respectively.

V.44.6: As I pointed out in the publ. intro., the first pāda is both a cruel joke -- insisting on the utter transparency of the subject of the hymn -- and a claim on the poet's part that his verbal formulations about the subject are in complete conformity with the underlying reality, however obscure they may at first seem.

My interpr. of the rest of this vs. differs significantly in both syntax and semantics from the standard ones, which I will not treat in detail. I take pāda b as having an unexpressed masc. sg. obj., with cd further characterizing that obj. The object is simultaneously Agni and Soma, and it is in this pāda that the identification of the two is most clearly expressed in the hymn (until the last 2 vss.). The unidentified subj. 'they' -- most likely the poets and/or priests -- put together / unite the one (of Agni and Soma) with the other, his counterpart or 'shadow' (chāyā́-). As the two central deified ritual elements, they are mirror images of each other. The union takes place in the waters (apsú) for several reasons. Both Soma and Agni have significant presence in the waters -- Soma of course through the ritual use of waters both to swell the dessicated soma plant and to rinse it, Agni in two mythological guises, both as Apā́m Napāt and as the runaway ritual fire that hid in the waters. Moreover, it is also the case that water reflects and was indeed probably the only reflective material readily at hand in this period, so the uniting of one substance and its conceptual equivalent as visual reflections of each other would most naturally take place in water.

The clearest part of pāda c is the cmpd. uru-ṣā́m 'winning wideness', which I take as a modifier of the unexpressed masc. sg. obj. of b (that is, Agni/Soma). (Since the 2nd member is the rt. noun sā́-, the cmpd can be masc.) I take the other accusatives in cd, mahī́m, urú jráyaḥ, and sáhaḥ with its modifiers, as objects of an underlying form of √sani/sā, extracted from uru-ṣā́-. For a similar play between a root noun cmpd with 1st member obj. and an independent acc. obj., see VIII.1.2 and comm. thereon. Although this syntactic interpr. may seem over-tricky (to others, not to me), it saves us from positing an extraneous creation myth as Ge and Re do. In my interpr. the various objects won are well within the powers of Agni and Soma to deliver to us. Note that Agni is once called urujráyas- (V.8.6, in this maṇḍala) and both Agni (III.5.8, V.24.3 [this maṇḍ.], X.176.4, etc.) and Soma (I.91.15) can be subj. of the verb uruṣyá- 'make wideness'.

V.44.7: Again my interpr. differs markedly from those of others. Again I think the unexpressed subj. of the whole vs. is Agni/Soma, not the sun (sū́ryaḥ) with most others. The nom. sū́ryaḥ is instead used to characterize both, since both Agni and Soma can be identified with the sun; that is, each is (equivalent to) the sun in his own way. Cf. "the sun of the lower realm" in 2a with reference to phenomena related to both Agni and Soma.

In pāda a I take the two adj. ágruḥ 'unmarried' and jánivān 'possessing wife/wives' as expressing two stages in the development of Agni/Soma, rather than as paradoxically simultaneous with Ge and Re (WG interpr. resembles mine). The position of vaí supports an interpr. with two clauses. In the first stage Agni/Soma pursues females/wives; cf. VII.96.4 janīyánto nv ágravaḥ "bachelors in search of wives." Again we have unidentified (and here unexpressed) plural females -- in Agni's case I surmise they are the plants that supply firewood and/or the streams of ghee poured in the fire; in Soma's the cows, with whose milk he is mixed, or even the waters that swell him. Once Agni and Soma have "married" these females and are jánivān 'possessed of wives', each

can use the extra power acquired from these females to best his rivals. In this second clause I supply a second verb, perhaps a form of √*tṝ*, because √*vī* does not otherwise occur with *áti*, whereas *tuturyāma+áti* is found in the next hymn (V.45.11).

In cd I take the verb *vanavat* in two senses, negative and positive, both well represented for this stem. With the obj. *ghraṃsám* 'heat', the verb has the sense 'win' = 'vanquish', as in nearby V.29.9 *ávanor ha śúṣṇam* "you combatted / vanquished Śuṣṇa"; with the obj. *śárma* 'shelter', 'win' = 'gain'. I take *rákṣantam* as a qualifier of *śárma* (more or less; see below), with the participle itself taking the obj. *gáyam* ("shelter ... protecting our patrimony"). In taking *gáyam* as obj. of *rákṣantam* I am flg. Old, who cites as parallel I.74.2 *árakṣad dāśúṣe gáyam*, which seems pretty conclusive to me. There are also two passages (VI.71.3/X.66.3) in which *gáyam* is the object of the semantically parallel verb *pári* √*pā* 'protect all round' (e.g., X.66.3 *... pári pāhi no gáyam*); note *pári* immed. flg. *rákṣantam* here. By contrast, Ge, Re, WG all take *gáyam* as an immed. object of *vanavat*, modified by *rákṣantam*, which itself governs *ghraṃsám* (cf., e.g., Re "Qu'il nous assure une demeure protégeant de toutes parts de (son) ardeur ..."). This interpr. not only ignores the √*rakṣ* + *gáyam* parallel, but also requires a significant attenuation of the meaning of √*van* (see Re's n. on the pāda), and I also don't know of parallel uses of √*rakṣ* meaning 'guard *against* / *from*'. Against this we must balance one clear defect in my interpr., that *śárman-* is neut. and the part. *rákṣantam* is masc. To account for the gender discrepancy I would suggest that the immediate referent of *rákṣantam* is not *śárma*, but a different, underlying, *masc.* noun to which *śárma* is an appositive -- perhaps *kṣáyam* 'peaceful dwelling', as in I.133.7 *vanóti ... kṣáyam*. Or it might be enough to invoke the distance between *rákṣantam* and *śárma* in the hemistich, which might account for the gender mismatch. (I prefer the former, grammatically blameless, possibility. In this case the tr. might be slightly changed to "will win (peaceful dwelling) as shelter for us, protecting (our) patrimony on all sides.")

V.44.8: Old's stark statement about this vs., "Ich wage keine Erklärung," is somewhat lowering to the spirit. Nonetheless, I think some sense can be wrung from it. As I said in the publ. intro., I think a new figure enters the scene at this, the midpoint of the hymn -- namely the poet, learning and perfecting his craft -- and in my opinion he is the subject of the vs., though Agni and Soma are still very much present.

By my interpr. the unnamed would-be poet "pursues/proceeds towards/practices" (*carati*) "the older (/superior) sonority of the seers" (*jyā́yāṃsam ... ṛṣisvarám*), that is, he imitates and aspires to the sound of the legendary poet-seers who preceded him. He does so by means of *asyá yatúnasya ketúnā* "by the beacon of this *yatúna*." Unfortunately *yatúna-* is a hapax, and there is no agreement on its meaning or etym. (see, e.g., EWA s.v.). However, we can approach the sense of this phrase from several angles. The most promising of these, in my opinion, is the recognition that the phrase *yajñásya ketú-* "beacon of the sacrifice" is a very common expression in the RV (I.96.16, I.113.19, etc. etc., incl. in this maṇḍala V.11.1). Moreover, both Agni and Soma are identified as *yajñásya ketú-*; Agni: the three passages just cited, plus I.1127.6, III.11.3, etc.; Soma: IX.86.7. I take *yatúna-* as a nonce substitute for *yajñá-*, with vaguely similar phonology, built to √*yat* 'arrange'. (This is the root affiliation suggested by most [cf., e.g., AiG II.2.485].) Unfortunately this root does not seem to be generally used in ritual context, but a generalized abstract 'arrangement' can stand in for the more specific 'sacrifice'.

This hapax *yatúna-* echoes immed. following instr. *ketúnā* (though obviously the morphology is different) and also reminds us of the two unexpected -*u*-stems in 5: *táru-* and -*sváru-*. Putting all this together, I would claim that the poet is pursuing the model of the previous poets by means of the beacon of the sacrifice (/'arrangement'), and that this beacon is actually the usual amalgam of Agni and Soma, who, as we just saw, can be so called. In other words, the shimmering leaders of the sacrifice, the two ritual substances fire and soma, provide the (en)light(enment) as the poet follows the progress of the sacrifice as it leads him to his poetic goal.

Unlike most interpr. I take the loc. rel. cl. ending b (*yā́su nā́ma te*) as parallel to the one beginning c (*yā́dṛśmin dhā́yi*), also with a loc. expression. Both remind us of 2d ... *ṛtá āsa nā́ma te*; besides the identical final *nā́ma te*, note the echo between *yā́su* and *āsa*. The fem. loc. *yā́su* refers to the now familiar mix of fem. plurals -- waters, cows [=milk], streams of ghee -- with the possible addition of fem. words for mental and verbal products: insights, hymns, etc. In any case the poet finds the *jyā́yāṃsam ... ṛṣisvarám* he is looking for at the place where the names of Agni and Soma have been set -- that is, at the heart of the sacrifice. I take the referent of *tám* to be *ṛṣisvára-* of b. To find it he needs not only the beacon provided by Agni/Soma but also his own industry (*apasyā́-*).

The final pāda reiterates that the poet must rely on himself: he must make the journey to poetic mastery by himself, and if he does, he will get it (that is, the poetry) right. The phrasal verb *áraṃ karat* of course reminds us of *alaṃkāra*, the later technical term for poetic ornament. Cf. already in the RV VII.29.3 *kā́ te asty áraṃkṛtiḥ sūktaíḥ* for a connection between hymns and proper preparation. (Contrary to the standard tr., I do not think that *yá u svayáṃ váhate* has anything to do with marriage and bringing the bride home.)

V.44.9: In my interpr., the first half of this vs. depicts the offering of ritual oblations, while the second one connects the poet, whom we first met in the previous vs., with this ritual activity.

The fem. phrase *āsā́m ... agrimā́* "the foremost (fem.) of these (fem.)" must refer yet again to the females we've met before: waters, cows, streams of ghee, as was just noted above. In pāda a the first such female goes down into the ocean (*samudrám*); this could be the ocean of soma as often or the undulating flames of the ritual fire (see I.71.7 where the offerings entering the fire are compared to streams entering a *samudrá-*). In pāda b the word *sávana-* 'pressing' limits the reference to soma, but throughout the hymn we have seen phraseology that is more appropriate to one of the gods than to the other (generally, in fact, in favor of Agni). That b is a clear soma pāda does not, in my opinion, invalidate the general interpr. of the hymn as applicable simultaneously to the two gods. It is also worth noting in passing that *sávana-*, which occurs approx. 100x in the RV, is found only once in the IXth Maṇḍala.

Why it is necessary to state that the pressing is not harmed when the female enters it is not clear. Perhaps it is meant as understatement: it is not only not harmed, but is positively benefitted. Or perhaps there is a whiff of the fear of contamination caused by females.

Pāda c brings us another impenetrable hapax, *kravaṇá-*. The first thing to notice, perhaps, is that it rhymes with *sávana-* (though it does not match it in accent). As with the hapax *yatúna-* in 8a beside *ketúnā*, one of the contributors to the formation of the hapax

may be phonological echo. There is, as usual, no consensus on the etym. or sense of the word; Ge and Re (inter alia) take it as a PN -- a convenient strategy, but in a hymn that contains no other PNs (at least in my opinion) an unlikely solution. WG take it as 'Opferschlächter', related to *kravís-*, a suggestion mentioned but not endorsed by Old (see also EWA s.v.). My own tentative suggestion has no better support. I consider it, like *krívi-* in 4d, to be another phonologically scrambled encoding of the word *kaví-*, here perhaps crossed with a form of √*kr̥*, hence my tr. 'working poet'. (A putative participial -*āná-* might have been remodeled under pressure from *sávana-* in b.) Although I will not attempt a spirited defense of this despairing attempt, it does have certain points in its favor. First, if *krívi-* in 4d and *kravaṇá-* here are both deformations of *kaví-*, which itself appears in 7b, we have a little ring of references to the poet in the midsection of this hymn. More important, reference to a poet in 9c fits well with the subordinate clause in 9d. Just at the time when oblation is made and the soma is prepared (9ab), the poet who is not intimidated ("his heart does not tremble") finds the poetic expression (*matí-*) that connects him to the purified ritual substances soma and fire. (Though *pūtá-* almost always refers to soma and never to fire directly, other forms derived from the root √*pū*, like *pāvaká-*, are standard qualifiers of Agni.) If I am correct that vs. 8 depicts an apprentice or neophyte poet embarking on his journey to poetic mastery, then 9cd shows him achieving his first success at a climactic moment in the sacrifice, which provides inspiration to his undaunted heart.

V.44.10: Ge and Re deal with the difficulties of this vs. by taking all (or almost all) the genitives as PN, a solution going back to Sāy.: (Ge) Kṣatra, Manasa, Yajata, Sadhri, and Avatsāra, to which Re adds Evāvada. (Note that the Anukr. ascribes this hymn to one Avatsāra Kāśyapa, but this is, in my opinion, based on a later misunderstanding of this vs.) Since all of these forms, on the one hand, either are, or bear a strong resemblance to, real words in the language and, on the other, are not used as names elsewhere, the Ge/Re PN strategy seems like an evasion of responsibility. It is to the credit of WG that this makeshift is not resorted to; all these forms are given full lexical weight. And the WG interpr. of ab is not too distant from mine, in that they take the subject to be a/the poet, who has some connection to the *cítti-* of the figures mentioned in the gen. (WG: "Denn er is es [ein Ṛṣi?] durch die Einsichten dessen ..."), though our treatments of the genitives differ.

My interpr. of the relation between *sá* and *cíttibhiḥ* calls upon the 'bond' (*bándhanī*) of 9d, where the poet found the thought that binds him to the ritual substances soma and fire. I think 10ab elaborates on this notion, by ascribing the insights to Soma and Agni themselves.

The second set of genitives, *evāvadásya yajatásya sádhreḥ* in pāda b, by my interpr. refer to Agni and Soma simultaneously. Both Agni and Soma are elsewhere described as *yajatá-* 'worthy of the sacrifice' (Agni, e.g., I.128.8; Soma, e.g., IX.86.14). Assuming that the hapax *evāvadá-* has the sense 'speaking thus' it transparently presents, it can apply to both Agni and Soma because both substances are often said to speak or sound: for Agni cf., e.g., VI.4.4, 13.6; for Soma cf. esp. IX.113.4, 6. As for *sádhreḥ*, the obvious connection with *sadhryàñc-* 'directed towards the same goal' is affirmed by Gr, AiG II.2.154, EWA s.v *sadhrím*, etc. It is the morphology that is puzzling, made more complex by the fact that it should be trisyllabic with a short penultimate, hence

*_sádhriyaḥ_? (so approx. Gr). (HvN simply pronounce the pāda as having 11 syllables, but since this would be a metrical irregularity in a Jagatī hymn and since there is no independent stem *_sádhri-_ to which _sádhreḥ_ would obviously belong, it seems better to perform the metrical distraction.) I have no answer for the morphology or for the accent, but given the morphological flexibility in the rest of this hymn, this is not surprising.) The "same goal" that Agni/Soma are aiming at is the eloquence that the poet is also seeking to harness.

I take this second set of genitives, referring to Agni/Soma, as dependent on, not parallel to, the first pair of genitives, _kṣatrásya manasásya._ My "mental lordship" refers to the mastery those two gods have of the poetry and the insights that produce it. The adj. _manasá-_ is a hapax, but it fits a common pattern of deriving suffix-accented thematic adjectives to _s_-stems; cf., e.g., _vacasá-_ 'eloquent' to _vácas-_ 'speech' and AiG II.2.136.

The second hemistich takes advantage of the double meaning of _ráṇa-_ and its derivatives (_ráṇa-_ 'joy / battle', _raṇvá-_ 'delightful / battle-lusty', etc.). I take the referent of the pl. _ráṇvabhiḥ_ to be poems (or perhaps the 'insights' _cítti-_ of pāda a). As warriors fighting alongside us they allow us to win the prize (_spṛṇavāma ... vájam_), but as poems they are also delightful or joy-bringing. That winning the prize requires wisdom, not just brute strength, is expressed by _vidúṣā cid árdhyam_ "to be brought to success only by the wise," a signal that it is insights or their products, poems, that are being deployed.

It remains to identify "the stealthy one" (_avatsārá-_), assuming as I do that it is not a PN. As I just noted, not only do Ge and Re (but not WG) take it as a PN, but the Anukramaṇī ascribes this hymn to Avatsāra Kāśyapa, who is also purported to be the Soma hymns IX.53-60, a group of short Gāyatrī hymns with no obvious connection to V.44. It seems obvious to connect the word with the lexeme _áva √tsar_ and the root √_tsar_ 'creep' more generally. The root is poorly attested, and _áva √tsar_ only occurs once (I.71.5 in the notorious heavenly incest story). Agni is once the subject of √_tsar_ (I.145.4), and the occurrence of _áva √tsar_ is found in an Agni hymn (though not with Agni as subject). Soma is never subject of this verb, but its rarity makes this unsurprising. Both Agni and Soma can be conceived of as creeping or stealthy because of their slow and gradual movements -- Agni as the fire slowly catches in the kindling, Soma as the juice spreads across the filter.

V.44.11: If it is possible for this hymn to get _more_ obscure, it does so in this vs. (Note that Old simply gives up in vss. 11–13.) Nonetheless, I think a consistent interpr. can be constructed and one that fits well with the increasing pace of the depiction of the ritual in the last few vss. The theme that unifies the vs. is that of ritual binding and unbinding -- conveyed by the words _áditi-_, which I take as the abstract 'unboundedness' not the name of the goddess, _kakṣyà-_ 'girding', and _viṣáṇa-_ 'unharnessing'.

The first half of pāda a (_śyená āsām áditiḥ_) refers to the pre-ritual situation. While Soma is still a falcon, swooping about in freedom before the sacrifice begins, he is/represents freedom also for the classes of females we keep encountering: waters, cows, hymns. Neither the waters nor the cows (=milk) have taken on their ritual roles, and the words have not yet been pressed into service as ritual speech. (It's important to note that Soma himself is often called a _śyená-_ in IX; the bird is not simply the conveyor of the stolen soma.)

In the second half of pāda a (*kakṣyò mádaḥ*) Soma has been transformed into the *máda-*, the exhilarating ritual drink, and that change in turn brings about the girding of the female entities in question. They are hitched up in their various ritual roles, and the sacrifice begins. This ritual commencement is both for the benefit of and involves the active participation of the two gods, Soma and Agni. It is thus that I interpret the genitives in pāda b (*viśvávārasya yajatásya māyínaḥ* (note the recurrence of *yajatásya* from 10b), also referring, in my opinion, to Agni/Soma. (Once again both Ge and Re take all three genitives as PNs; once again WG do not.)

In pāda c I take the priests as the subject of *arthayanti* 'cause to seek as goal'. They are now directing the ritual proceedings. The first object of *arthayanti* is unexpressed, in my view: it is the female ritual elements, waters, milk, hymns. The priests send them to their ritual tasks, the waters and the cows' milk to soma, the hymns to Soma and Agni. The two gods are here represented by the āmreḍita *anyám-anyam* 'the one, the other; one after the other'. So far in the hymn the two gods have been fused into one, verbally speaking; here the āmreḍita is an intermediate step towards separating them, a step that allows for the introduction of a third god, Indra, in the next vs.

In pāda d the priests realize that with the mobilization of all the elements of the ritual performance -- the soma, the ritual fire, the waters, milk, and hymns -- the climax of the sacrifice has been reached. The unharnessing of these elements can take place because all that remains is for the prepared soma to be drunk. This sets the stage for the premier soma-drinker, Indra, to appear on the scene, which he does in the next vs. The parallel forms *viṣāṇam paripānam* are both best taken as *-ana*-nouns to *-ā́*-roots, although Gr identifies the first as a root participle. Cf. AiG II.2.193.

V.44.12: As I just said, I think this vs. represents the epiphany of Indra, come to drink the just-prepared soma. Although, in keeping with the practice of the hymn, he is not named, the presence of a new actor in the hymn is strongly signaled by the verb phrase in pāda a: *ví dvíṣo vadhīt*: Indra is almost always the subject of verb forms to the root √ *vadh*. Although the subject of pāda a is also called *yajatá-*, a word used in the two preceding vss. (10b, 11b) of Agni/Soma (in my opinion), 'worthy of the sacrifice' is a generic descriptor of gods, is used elsewhere of Indra (e.g., II.14.10), and can be so applied here. And 'always giving' (*sadāpṛṇa*, though a hapax, is a good description of Indra -- or at least as we wish him to be.

In b Ge and Re take the three words *bāhuvṛktáḥ śrutavít táryaḥ* as PNs yet again. I think they are all further qualifications of Indra. The first depicts the physical actions of the priest, who by the ritual activities performed by their arms (*bāhú-*), "twist" Indra to the ritual ground. (For the use of √ *vṛj* to refer to bringing a god to one's ritual, see VIII.76.1.) There is also a sly echo of the common bahuvrīhi *vṛktá-barhis-* 'having twisted ritual grass', a ritual action that would indeed by performed by the priests' arms. Indra is also easily qualified as *śruta-víd-* 'finding [/knowing] what is heard (=praise)'. The third term *táryaḥ*, a hapax, is more difficult. It may simply be a *-ya-* deriv. to √ *tṝ* (see WG "der Überwinder [?]"), though this isn't terribly satisfying morphologically. I tentatively take it as a primary comparative to √ *tṝ*, with the short suffixal form *-yas-* rather than *-īyas-* (*tárīyas-* 1x in nearby V.41.12); cf. *návyas- / návīyas-*. In that case it would be an adverbially used neut. ('surpassingly') and the predicate is the *vaḥ sácā* "(is

in) partnership with you." For another predicated pāda-final ENC + *sácā* see VIII.92.29 *ádhā cid indra me sácā* "And so, Indra, (you are) in partnership with me."

The second hemistich begins with an explicitly marked dual *ubhá̄ ... várā*, separated by a nom. sg. *sá*. Here we have the triad that has just, in this vs., interrupted the fused identification of Agni and Soma. With Indra represented by *sá*, the two other gods are for the first time in the hymn separated into a grammatical pair (though see the forerunner *anyám-anyam* in 11c), rather than sharing grammatically singular descriptors applicable to each. (For *ubhá̄ ... várā* referring to animate beings, see X.85.9, where the two are the Aśvins -- though in that case *vára-* means 'wooer'.) Indra "comes in response" (*práty eti*) to these two, i.e., to the ritual fire where offerings will be made to him and to his own ritual drink. The second verb *bhá̄ti* 'is radiant' is not a typical Indraic verb, but pāda d with its reference to the *gaṇá-* 'troop, throng' easily brings the rhetoric back to Indra and his close ties with the Maruts, so often identified as a *gaṇá-*. The lexeme *prá √yā*, found here in *suprayávan-* 'driving forth easily', is also particularly associated with the Maruts; cf. III.29.15 *marútām iva prayáḥ*, and verbal instantiations like I.37.14 *prá yāta*, also I.165.13, V.53.12, 58.6. I've supplied 'chariots' because *rátha-* several times used in a simile with *pra √yā* (IV.19.5, VII.74.6, IX.69.9).

V.44.13: As indicated in the publ. intro., in this last real vs. of the hymn I think the poet, who has been learning his trade, is extravagantly celebrated as the figure on whom the whole sacrifice depends and the representative of various sacrificial personnel and equipment. By contrast, Ge and Re once again opt for a PN, this time Sutambhara whom they consider to be the patron of the sacrifice. I take *sutambhará-* as the transparent cmpd it appears to be, conforming to the model of other *-bhará-* tatpuruṣas (cf., with acc. 1st member, *puṣṭim-bhará-*, *vájam-bhará-*, etc.) For the underlying syntagm see VIII.66.7 *sutám bhara*, where the subject is a priest or similar figure (also IX.6.6 *sutám bhárāya*). I construe the gen. *yájamānasya* with the 1st member *sutam*, though it could also be a gen. of benefit ('for the sacrificer') and loosely construed with the whole cmpd. I do not think it is dependent on *sátpatiḥ*, pace Ge, Re, and WG.

The 2nd pāda identifies the poet with the source (the cow's udder, *ú̄dhaḥ*) and distributor (the ladle or scoop, *udáñcanaḥ*) of all poetic visions (*víśvāsām ... dhiyá̄m*), which are here equated with ghee oblations. (For *ud √añc* meaning 'turn / scoop up', see V.83.8, AV X.29.8, etc.; in AB and ŚB *udañcana-* is a 'dipping vessel'.) The conflation of poems with liquid offerings we have already met before in this hymn, though it is only here that the *dhí̄-* is explicitly referred to.

In c the Pp and the standard interpr. take *dhenú̄* as the sandhi form of nom. sg. *dhenús* before *r-*. This is of course perfectly possible; however, I take the form as given, as the dual nom./acc. of the same stem. By this interpr. the poet who was the subj. of ab remains the subj. here, with the *-bhará-* of the cmpd in pāda a extracted and converted into a finite injunctive *bhárat*. Who are the two milk-cows he bears? It is of course tempting to identify them as Agni and Soma, the pair that has been hiding in this hymn all along. And in part I think that is the correct answer: the poet, whose verbal formulations are the foundation of the sacrifice, thereby supports the two ritual substances (/gods) that provide the material realization of the sacrifice. Agni and Soma would be called *dhenú̄* because of the benefits they provide through sacrifice. But dual *dhenú̄* is several times used of Heaven and Earth (of the other four occurrences, at last

III.6.4, IV.23.10), so that the poet through his sacrificial labors may be supporting the whole cosmos. Moreover, the milk of Heaven and Earth has a special connection with poetry. Cf. the curious passage I.22.14 *táyor íd ghṛtávat páyo, víprā rihanti dhītíbhiḥ* "The inspired poets lick the ghee-filled milk of this very pair [=Heaven and Earth; see vs. 13] with their poetic insights," though the meaning of this vs. is obscure (see comm. ad loc.).

In any case their milk is brought to perfection (*śiśriyé*) in the rest of the pāda. Contra Narten (1987: 281) and Kümmel (p. 528), who follows her, in the publ. tr. I take this med. pf. as passive, contrasting with the act. trans. *aśiśrayuḥ* (2x). However, it is possible that the verb is transitive, as they take it, and the poet remains as subj.: "he brings/has brought their milk to perfection." This might be preferable, in that it emphasizes the poet's control over the sacrifice and its cosmic resonances.

The final pāda of the vs., and thus of the hymn, brings us back, abruptly and somewhat reductively, to the poet's training: "pay attention to your teacher; don't nod off or go wool-gathering." The lexemes *ánu √brū* and *ádhi √i* belong to pedagogical vocabulary (for the latter see Apālā VIII.91.3 and comm. ad loc.). The final phrase *ná svapán* "not the one who sleeps" provides a transition to the final two responsive verses with their insistently repested *jāgāra* 'is/stays awake'.

V.44.14–15: As was just noted, the final *ná svapán* of 13d provides a segue into this two-verse appendix with its 6 occurrences of *jāgāra* 'is/stays awake'. The two vss. are strictly responsive -- so strictly responsive that the replacement of *yó* in abc by *agnír* produces an awkward set of 12-syllable lines with Triṣṭubh cadence, an awkwardness surely meant to call attention to their tight twinning. The vs. pair is structured as a riddle + solution, though, given what we have just waded through, not a very challenging puzzle. The focus seems to be on Agni, since he is the solution to the riddle; the balance of the two ritual substances found in the rest of the hymn (if I am correct) thus appears to be disturbed. But I do not think that this means that Agni is the sole subject of the hymn, as Scar suggests in his final comment (in WG). Rather the final word is found in the last pāda of both vss., the direct address of Soma to Agni (*tám ayám sóma āha* "to him does this Soma say"): *távāhám asmi sakhyé nyòkaḥ* "I am at home in fellowship with you." It is the fellowship of Agni and Soma, intimately joined here and identified by name, though neither of them was named previously in the hymn, that we are left with and that allows us to revisit the many obscurities that preceded this statement.

V.45 All Gods
On the structure of the hymn and the grammatical patterning that supports that structure, see publ. intro. Note that this patterning imposes presential renderings of the injunctives in the first three vss.

V.45.1: The Pp. interprets *vidā́* as *vidā́ḥ*, and this interpr. is followed by Sāy., Gr, Ge, Re (EVP XVI.107), and WG inter alia. It has the merit of providing a verb form for the opening pāda, but the 2nd sg. subjunctive it appears to be does not fit well in context. I prefer to take it as instr. sg. of the root noun *víd-* (*vidā́* against the Pp.), as tentatively suggested by Old and, in different ways, adopted by Lüders (*Varuṇa* 325), Thieme (rev. of Lüders, ZDMG 101 (1951) 417 [=KlSch 652]), Schmidt (B+I 175–76), and Hoffmann (Inj. 173–74). My interp. follows Hoffmann in particular in taking pāda b as parenthetical,

with the singular verb appropriate to pāda a postponed until *ápāvṛta* in pāda c. I far prefer this solution to allowing the sg. part. *viṣiyán* in pāda a to be construed with the pl. phrase *arcíno gúḥ* in b, with Lü et al. The sg. subj. of a,c is most likely the sun.

In b *arcín-* is interpr. either as 'having chant, singing' (by most) or 'having rays, bright'. Again with Hoffmann, I prefer the latter. Hoffmann (174 n. 125) suggests supplying *ketú-* 'beam', regularly associated with the dawns, and this seems contextually appropriate.

Pāda c contains another -*ín*-stem, this time a hapax, *vrajín-* 'possessing enclosures', in the fem. acc. pl.. Gr, Ge, Hoffmann, and WG take the referent to be 'cows', but the usual obj. of *ápa* √ *vṛ* is the cow-enclosure (often the base of *vrajín-*, namely *vrajá-*) or the doors thereto, and 'door' is also fem. This noun, *dúraḥ*, is found in the next pāda as the obj. of the nearly identical lexeme *ví ... āvaḥ*. In taking 'doors' as obj. also of *ápāvṛta* I am in agreement with Lü, Thieme, and Schmidt.

With Hoffmann and against the Pp. I take *ápāvṛta* as an injunc. *ápā + vṛta*. The verb of d, *ví ... āvaḥ*, is undeniably augmented, however; I take it as a summary comment on the description found in the rest of the vs. See Hoffmann's disc. 174–75.

V.45.2: On *ámati-* see comm. ad I.73.2.

The problematic pāda is c. The rivers who are its subject are not, in my opinion, either real-world rivers (so, it seems, Ge) or the heavenly streams so beloved of Lü. Rather, to fit the context, they must be, metaphorically, the outpourings of light at dawn, which are so intense that they threaten to destabilize the world with their floods -- a threat countered by the solidity of Heaven described in pāda d. The two bahuvrīhis in c, *dhánv-arṇasaḥ ... khádo-arṇáḥ*, have been much discussed. Noteworthy first is the fact that they have (almost) the same final member: if both cmpds are nom. pl. the 2nd members are -*arṇas-* and -*arṇa-* respectively. Thieme rejects the variation in stem, taking both as containing -*arṇas-*, which requires the 2nd form to be nom. singular. In his interpr. the many rivers described by *dhánvarṇasaḥ* have joined into one, modified by singular *khádoarṇáḥ*. It is a clever solution, but rather over-clever and in fact unnecessary. Both *árṇas-* and *árṇa-* exist independently, and the plural built to a cmpd. with *árṇas-* as final member (that is, -*arṇasaḥ*) would not fit a Triṣṭubh cadence, while one built to the parallel stem -*arṇa-* does nicely, as if truncated from a Jagatī cadence with -*arṇasaḥ* (see such a cadence in I.182.7).

What then do the cmpds mean? Again, a variety of interpr. have been suggested. I take *dhánv-arṇas-* as an equational bv., 'whose floods are *dhánu-*'. A *dhánu-* appears to be a high flat plain or steppe; two of its five occurrences in the RV are characterized as *bṛhatī-* 'lofty'. In our context I think it refers to what we often call a "wall of water," a mass of oncoming water far above flood stage, perhaps already flooding over the banks and across the adjacent land. As for *khádo-arṇáḥ*, it should mean something like 'whose floods are a biting/devouring'; in this case, I think Ge (flg. Sāy.) is correct that the rivers are devouring their banks, eating away at the solid ground. The sturdy pillar of heaven in d provides a bulwark against this featureless undulating torrent of light.

V.45.3: This vs. describes dawn as happening in response to and as a result of the hymn recited at this very moment (hence *asmai*) at the dawn sacrifice. The two heavy dative phrases, polarized at both ends of the first hemistich, *asmá ukthâya* and *janúṣe pūrvyâya*,

have different functions in the clause. The gaping mountain is an allusion to the opening of the Vala cave, metaphorically applied to the advent of dawn from the night darkness.

In the second hemistich, in c "heaven achieves success" must, in my view, allude to the successful emergence of dawn's light from the heavenly realm. This is contrasted with d, where an unnamed plural subject is desiring to win the earth (*āvívasantaḥ ... bhū́ma*) -- in my opinion, this refers to the fact that features on the earth come only slowly to visual definition at dawn, even as the light comes streaming out of the sky. The unknown subjects are probably the poets responsible for "this hymn here" (*asmā́ ukthā́ya*) in pāda a; they must continue their verbal efforts, "exhaust themselves" (*dasayanta*), in order to bring the earth into focus. Supplying 'poets' as subj. generally follows Hoffmann, who thinks esp. of the Aṅgirases (174 n. 126), contra Ge, who takes *bhū́ma* as subj. (sim. Lü). On *dasayanta*, see my -*áya-Formations*, p. 59. Some take the verb rather to √*daṃs* 'work wonders'; see esp. Thieme (loc. cit., n. 7), fld. by Schmidt, WG. This cannot be excluded, but I find the 'exhaust' meaning more poetic compelling.

V.45.4: The *vaḥ* in Wackernagel's position can be construed in a number of different ways. I take it as the poet's address to his colleagues to praise and importune the two gods. Since the next two vss. (5–6) consist of 1st pl. exhortations to proceed with the sacrifice and achieve effective ritual poetry, my interpr. fits the larger context well. Ge also seems to assume the referents are human, but are rather the potential beneficiaries of the poet's own plea to the gods (sim. WG). By contrast Schmidt (and less clearly Lü) take it as direct address to the gods; Schmidt "... wollen wir jetzt euch, Indra und Agni, zur Hilfe rufen." Given the number discrepancy between pl. *vaḥ* and the dual dvandva *índrā ... agnī́*, this seems unlikely. Note also that the non-initial accent on *agnī́* precludes a voc. interpr. of the dvandva, though that alone would not prevent *vaḥ* from referring to them.

I do not understand the intrusion of the Maruts here. They are not gods of the dawn sacrifice, nor are they associated with the Vala myth or with the Aṅgirases. Perhaps their prominence elsewhere in the Vth Maṇḍala (esp. V.52–61) is responsible for their brief appearance here, prompted by the mention of Indra. They are presumably not only the objects of *yájanti* but also of *āvívasantaḥ*: "winning" them would involve persuading them to come to our sacrifice.

V.45.5–6: As noted in the publ. intro., these two vss. form an omphalos and are structurally parallel, with the poet addressing his priest-poet colleagues with hortatory subjunctives. The immediacy of the vss. and the sacrificial context of the hymn make this a more likely scenario than Sāy.'s suggestion that the Aṅgirases are speaking these vss. For strenuous arguments against Sāy.'s interpr., see Lü p. 327.

V.45.5: As suggested already by Ge (n. 5b) and, independently, Thieme (ZDMG 95 [1941] 82–83 [=KlSch. 7–8]) and accepted by all subsequent tr., a better reading is obtained by segmenting *duchúnām inavāma*, against Pp. *duchúnā minavāma*. This requires no emendation to the Saṃhitā text.

V.45.6: Unlike the first hortatory vs., this second one is not entirely tied to the here-and-now; rather it provides three separate historical/mythological models for the effective poetic vision (*dhī́-*) that we are aiming to create now (pāda a). The first model (b) appears

to be a variant of the Vala myth so prominent in the rest of the hymn, but those in c and d are obscure.

In b the first question is the grammatical identity of *yā́*. It is generally taken as nom. sg. fem., but Old suggests that it might alternatively be a (short) instr. sg. fem. In the former case the referent of *yā́* would be the *dhī́-* of pāda a, which would be the subj. of *ṛṇuta* and identified with the "mother of the cow" (*mātā́ ... góḥ*); in the latter it would be parallel to the two instr. sg. fem. *yáyā* opening c and d. I favor the second interpr.; although the former is not impossible, I find the syntactic parallelism a stronger argument, and *yā́* could owe its abbreviated form to being displaced from initial position by the preverb *ápa*. If the instr. interpr. is correct, this leaves the subj. of *ṛṇuta* and referent of "mother of the cow" open. Old and Ge both consider it to be Uṣas. Again, this is not impossible, but I think it may be Saramā, whose finding of the cows is treated in vss. 7–8 -- though Dawn as "mother of cows" (*gávām mātā́*) is found in vs. 2 and is also a strong candidate.

Ge remarks apopos of pāda c "sonst unbekannte Sage" (see also Lü, p. 329), and it is likely that we will not get further than that. Ad VII.99.4 Old tentatively suggests that the name of a Dāsa, *vṛṣaśiprá*, that occurs in that passage might have something to do with our *viśíśiprá-*, but even if so (and it's certainly possible), this is a deadend, since all we know of Vṛṣaśipra is that he's a Dāsa and killed by Indra and Viṣṇu. Like the Maruts in 4d, the fleeting intrusion of Manu here is unexpected and unexplained.

Even more so the "wandering merchant" (*vaṇíg vaṅkúḥ*) of d. On *vaṅkú-* see comm. ad I.51.11 and, esp., I.114.4. Although the standard rendering is 'flying' (see, e.g., Ge, Schmidt), its derivation from √*vañc* 'move crookedly, meander' makes 'meandering, wandering' more likely. In I.114.4 it modifies *kaví-*. I suggest there that it refers to an itinerant poet, and merchants are at least as likely as poets to be itinerant, following a meandering course as they peddle their goods. But who this particular merchant is meant to be and how and why he needs a *dhī́-* to attain his *pū́rīṣa-* remain unclear. If I had Dumézilian tendencies, I might suggest a trifunctional interpr.: pāda b = 1st function, c = 2nd function, and d = 3rd function (at least the latter two might work -- 1st-function b is a bit of a stretch). But even if this interpr. were persuasive, it doesn't explain what the material is doing in this hymn at this point.

V.45.7–8: Here the mythic model of the dawn accompanying the dawn ritual, the opening of the Vala cave through the verbal efforts of the Aṅgirases, is spelled out.

Note the variant versions of the phrase "Saramā found the cows": 7c *sarámā gā́ avindat*, with augmented imperfect; 8d *sarámā vidad gā́ḥ*, with aor. injunctive (per Pp.) or aor. indicative (*sarámāvidad*, with augmented *avidat* is a possible reading). For Hoffmann's interpr. of this vs. pair see Injunk. 164–65.

V.45.7: Note that 3 of the 4 verbs are augmented (*ánūnot, ā́rcan, avindat*), the 4th a preterital pf. (*cakāra*).

V.45.8: The subordinator *yád* comes quite late (2nd position pāda b) in the subordinate clause presumably occupying the first hemistich, and it is preceded not only by the subj. (*víśve*) but by a heavy temporal loc. expression (*asyā́ vyúṣi mā́hināyāḥ*) -- in violation of standard RVic subordinator placement. This anomaly may have led WG to take pāda a as

a nominal main clause: "Sie alle (waren) ... (zugegen)." I am sympathetic, but think the clause division is unnecessarily radical. It is possible that b is a conversion into a subordinate clause of IV.3.11b *sám áṅgiraso navanta góbhiḥ* with pāda a acting as a preposed afterthought.

The 2nd hemistich brings another syntactic problem: in c the Pp. interprets *útsa* (before a vowel) as nom. *-aḥ*, a grammatical ident. that in turn requires that c be an independent clause. The Pp. reading is defended by Old and fld. by many, incl. Ge, Hoffmann (Injunk. 165), WG. With Lü (385 n. 2; fld. by Schmidt p. 177, Janert p. 10) I prefer the loc. *útse*, parallel to *paramé sadhásthe*, and defining the place where Saramā found the cows in d.

V.45.9: The first hemistich is metrically problematic. HvN put the pāda break after *saptā́śvaḥ* and distract *sū́ryo*, *yātu*, and *saptā́śvaḥ*; their 2nd pāda, beginning *kṣétram*, has a caesura after 3 (though see their n.). It is also possible to take *kṣétram* as the last word of pāda a (see Schmidt's layout, p. 178) and to restrict the distraction to a single word, either *sū́ryaḥ* or *saptā́śvaḥ*, though this produces a bad cadence. In that case I would suggest that the 2nd pāda orig. began *yád yád, reading *yád yád asya produces an opening of 4 and, with post-caesura *urviyā́ dīrgayāthé*, makes a fine Triṣṭubh. The 2nd (or 1st) *yád* would be the neut. sg. N/A participle to √*i*.

Even if this possible emendation is not accepted, it is still possible to take *yád* as the neut. participle, not the subordinator: this interpr. is represented in my tr. by "stretching" and by the lack of a relative cl. With double *yád* the tr. would read "to the tract of land which is stretching widely at (the end of) his long course."

The 2nd hemistich contains a pres. injunctive, *patayat*, and a pf. [/redupl. pres.] subjunctive *dīdayat*. In the publ. tr. they are both rendered as imperatives, matching the pattern set by *yātu* in pāda a. I now think that this interpr. lacks refinement and should be altered. The vs. in general concerns the coincidence between the sunrise and the ritual activities of the dawn sacrifice. We hope for the sunrise (hence the impv.), which is in fact realized in the next vs. By contrast, the ritual activities in the 2nd hemistich are under our (=priests') control and can therefore simply be described. Exactly what the referents of the falcon (c) and the young poet (d) are is disputed (see the various interpr., incl. those that do not consider them ritual referents at all [notably Lü 329–31]). Starting with d, *yúvan- kaví-* is frequently an epithet of Agni and √*dī* is a typical Agni verb, so it seems likely that this is a reference to the kindling of the fire at the dawn ritual. Although "going among the cows" sounds more like soma (mixing with milk), the cows here can be the ghee oblations poured into the fire, which will cause it to flame more brightly. If d refers to Agni, then c is likely to refer to Soma; certainly the *ándhas-* 'stalk' is Soma vocabulary, and the falcon is Soma's vehicle in the Somaraub. What exactly is going on eludes me, however. As for the tense/mood distinction between *patayat* and *dīdayat*, it may be that the distinction is illusory: one of them was simply brought into superficial harmony with the other, so that both end in *-ayat*, though they should be inj. and subj. respectively. Or it may be that the injunc. is followed by a subj. to indicate that the 2nd action follows the first ("the falcon flies to the stalk; the young poet will shine ...").

V.45.10: The structure of this vs. matches that of the last one: the first half describes a cosmic event outside of human control; the second ascribes control to the ritualists. What

is striking is that the *same* event is treated in both halves: the rising of the sun. In ab the Sun has agency; he yoked his own horses and mounted the sky. But in c it is the priest-poets ("the wise" *dhī́rāḥ*) who guide him, through the waters that stand still for this progress, "giving heed" (*āśṛṇvatī́ḥ*) presumably to the poets' words. (I owe the germ of this interpr. to Dieter Gunkel [p.c.].)

V.45.11: Most interpr. construe *apsú* with *dadhiṣe* and tr. the latter as 'you have placed', hence "you have placed your *dhī́* in the waters." But med. forms of √*dhā* generally mean 'acquire, assume', and furthermore the standard interpr. is either nonsensical or requires a substantial backstory -- such as Old's "[ein] Zauber für Wiedererscheinen der Sonne nach langen Regengüssen." I follow Ge in taking *apsú* with *svarṣā́m* "das ... die Sonne im Wasser gewinnt"; the sun was manifestly in the water(s) in the immediately preceding vs. -- however metaphorically we wish to interpret those waters (I would take them as the floods of dawn light we encountered in vs. 2). Thus "winning the sun in the waters" is simply an expression for causing the sun to rise at dawn. For further disc. on the place of this vs. in the hymn, see publ. intro.

The number discrepancy between 2nd pl. *vaḥ* and 2nd sg. *dadhiṣe* is easily accounted for in the same general manner as the *vaḥ* in vs. 4 (see comm. thereon): *dadhiṣe* is the poet's self-address to himself, while *vaḥ* is addressed to his colleagues. As in vss. 5–6, these two distinct 2nd ps. references are joined in a joint 1st pl. in cd (*syāma ... tuturyāma*).

V.46 All Gods

On my hypothesis concerning the reason for this hymn, viz., support for the ritual innovation of the Patnī, see publ. intro. Save for the final two vss. devoted to the wives of the gods, there seems no rationale for the deities included or excluded from the enumerative vss. or for the repetition of some and not others.

V.46.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this preliminary vs., preceding the apparently unconnected series of enumerative vss. calling on various gods, esp. female divinities and the wives of the gods, sets up the scenario: in pāda a the poet-sacrificer has yoked himself to the chariot pole (*dhúr-*) along with his wife, the recently introduced ritual Patnī, an image found elsewhere for the same pairing. Since *dhúr-* is feminine, the remaining feminines in this vs. (b *tā́m ... pratáraṇīm avasyúvam*, c: *asyā́ḥ*) can refer both to the chariot pole and to the Patnī. In b the feminine obj. is said to be "furthering (the sacrifice)"; though the default obj. of *prá* √*tṝ* is *ā́yus-* 'lifetime', *yajñám* can also serve as obj.: cf., e.g., III.17.2 *yajñám prá tira.* (On *avasyúvam* see comm. ad vs. 7 below. One might also note that, while 'seeking help' makes sense in context, esp. when read with vs. 7, this word could also be taken as a phonological scrambling of *ā́yus-*.) In c the speaker asserts that he does not wish to revert to the old ways or be released from the yoked pairing. In other words, he has accepted the ritual innovation of the Patnī.

Most interpr. take *patháḥ* as gen. sg. with *vidvā́n.* Since that pf. part. is generally used absolutely ("[as] knowing one"), I take *patháḥ* rather as acc. pl. extent of space with *néṣati.* For a clear acc. of the path with *néṣa-* see I.91.1 *tvám rájiṣṭham ánu neṣi pánthām.*

V.46.2: Among this group of mainly male divinities we find the Wives (*gnā́ḥ*, a word only used for the Wives of the Gods in the RV) and Sarasvatī in the 2nd hemistich.

The first pāda consists only of vocatives, each accented since there is no inherently accented word preceding. In b the accent on *mā́ruta* (modifying pāda-initial *śárdhaḥ*) is surprising, however, since it follows the verbal lexeme *prá yanta* with accent on the preverb, and the following voc. *viṣṇo* lacks accent following *utá*.

Notice the coincidence of verbal endings for two different person / number / voice combinations: *yanta* 2nd pl. act. impv. √*yam*; *juṣanta* 3rd pl. med. injunc. √*juṣ*.

V.46.3: The previous vs. consisted of vocatives in ab and nominatives in cd. Here we find accusatives, with the governing verb *huvé* postponed until the beginning of the 2nd hemistich. The first four divinities in vss. 2 and 3 are the same, but the four individual vocc. *ágna índra váruṇa mítra* of 2a are arranged in 3a in two dual dvandvas *indrāgnī́* and *mitrā́váruṇā*, in opposite order. The Maruts, Viṣṇu, Pūṣan, and Bhaga (*bhága-*) are also repeated from vs. 2. Otherwise the emphasis is on divinized natural elements. As for female divinities, we find Aditi immediately after her offspring Mitra and Varuṇa, as well as the waters (*apáḥ*).

Unfortunately the repetition of *bhága-* is obscured in the publ. tr. by its rendering as "Fortune" in 3d, though both 2d and 6c call him Bhaga. "Fortune" in 3 should therefore be changed to "Bhaga."

V.46.4: In pāda a *asrídhaḥ* is clearly pl., though it occurs in dual context (*utá ... víṣṇur utá vā́to asrídhaḥ*). There seem to be 3 possibilities: 1) it also modifies the gods in pāda b, the Treasure-giver (*draviṇodā́ḥ*) and Soma; 2) it refers to the gods in general, as in I.3.9 *víśve devā́so asrídhaḥ*; 3) it refers to goddesses or the trio of goddesses so denominated in I.13.9 *íḷā sárasvatī mahī́ tisró devī́r mayobhúvaḥ / ... asrídhaḥ* (note *mayobhúvaḥ* like *máyas karat* in our pāda b). There is no clear way to choose, and it scarcely seems to matter. I would of course prefer the third possibility, since it involves a female presence in this vs., but the support for this possibility is not strong.

The vs. contains the 3rd mention of Viṣṇu and the 2nd of the Aśvins; the other divinities are newly named.

V.46.5: The Maruts recur for the third time (the 2nd time in the corporate entity, the Marutian troop [*mā́rutaṃ śárdhaḥ*]), as does Pūṣan, with Bṛhaspati substituting for the Brahmaṇaspati in 3c. Varuṇa and Mitra also make their 3rd appearance, this time with their regular companion Aryaman, rather than the Aditi of 3a.

V.46.6: The mountains of 3b reappear here; the waters, their companions in 3b, are replaced by the rivers (*nadyàḥ*), also feminine of course. Bhaga also recurs from 2d and 3d. It seems significant that Aditi is the last divinity named before the "wives" vss.

V.46.7: The help for which the wives of the gods are insistently entreated (*avantu naḥ, prā́vantu naḥ*) reminds us of the adj. qualifying the chariot pole / Sacrificer's Wife in 1b, *avasyúvam* 'seeking help' and provides a type of ring.

With Ge and WG, I take *tujáye* as referring specifically to the propagation of children, a function appropriate to the wives of the gods, against Re's insistence that it

refers to the production of inspiration (though in his long n. he admits that there is "une certaine association entre *túj* et la notion de procréer").

V.46.8: This last vs. is in a diff. meter and also shows some metrical irregularities (see HvN notes). It seems tacked on, to allow an enumeration of the gods' wives in question, most of whom (save for Indrāṇī) have a very shadowy existence. It is also not clear whether *aśvínī* and *rā́ṭ* refer to a single individual or two.

   The last phrase, *yá ṛtúr jánīnām* "which is the regular season for women," is somewhat puzzling, made more so by the fact that there is no overt referent in the main clause for the *yáḥ*, since the verb *vyántu* lacks an object (also in pāda a). I follow Ge (flg. Sāy.) in taking this as a reference to the *patnīsaṃyāja* offering (or its forerunner), and I therefore supply 'offering' as obj. for *vyántu* (*havís*-, etc., is a common, though not invariable, obj. to this root). The rel. cl. is then also a pun: it refers not only to this offering, which is the ritual "time/season" allotted to women, but probably also to their menstrual periods, since *ṛtú*- is regularly so used later. For a similar pun, using the adj. *ṛtvíyāvatī*-, see VIII.12.10, 80.7.

V.47 All Gods

V.47.1: As noted in the publ. intro., I take the subj. of this riddling vs. to be *manīṣā́* 'poetic inspiration', but until this word appears (end of pāda c), the vs. both invites an identification of the subject with Dawn and makes that impossible. The nom. sg. participles *prayuñjatī́* and *bodháyantī* are characteristic Dawn vocabulary, but Dawn is also regularly identified as "the daughter of heaven," which phrase is here in the genitive: *diváḥ ... duhitúḥ*. It is her "great mother" (*mahī́ mātā́*) who is the grammatical subj.

   My interpr. generally follows that of Old. Others (Ge, Re, WG) seek to make Dawn subj. at least of the first hemistich and are thus forced into awkward interpretations of the phraseology and into division of the vs. into two clauses. Assuming (with Old and me) that *manīṣā́* is the subj. of the whole vs., the point would seem to be that the inspiration that produces the poetry of the early morning ritual has the power to beget even Dawn herself -- the usual semi-hubristic boast by the poets that even the cosmos is regulated by the ritual performance and the poetry recited there. The phrase "(coming) from the fathers" (by my interpr.; some others take *pitṛ́bhyaḥ* as dative) reflects the transmission of the poetic tradition from older generations to younger ones. For *manīṣā́* 'constantly calling' (*jóhuvānā*), see VII.24.2 *jóhuvatī manīṣā́*, also adduced by Old.

V.47.2: Again I take the vs. as having one referent, while Ge, Re, and WG split it into two sentences with two different subjects. In my view, the intent is again to mislead -- that is, in this riddle hymn, to suggest one referent to the audience and then spring a different one on them towards the end of the verse, in this case the very last word *pánthāḥ* 'paths'. These are presumably the paths that connect heaven and earth and enable the gods to come to the sacrifice and the sacrificial offerings to make their way to heaven. Although paths are not ordinarily credited with much agency -- and the descriptions in the first hemistich attribute bustling activity to their referents -- the lively traffic between heaven and earth can spill over onto the paths that bear this traffic.

tádapaḥ is most likely adverbial here (so already Gr), though Ge suggests it is nom. pl. "mit Abfall der Endung," for which there is no motivation.

The "nave of the immortal one" (*amŕtasya nā́bhim*) can refer both to the ritual ground and to the height of heaven, again suggesting the connection between those places that is established by the paths.

For *anantá-* see disc. ad vs. 4.

For the formula *viśvátaḥ sī́m pári* and the unusual placement of *sī́m*, see my "Rigvedic *viśvátaḥ sī́m,* Or, Why Syntax Needs Poetics" (1998, Fs. Watkins).

V.47.3: In this riddle vs. the referent is not explicitly named, and in fact an initially bewildering set of incompatible identifications comes pouring out: a bull, the sea, a bird, a stone. But all of them are possible aspects of the sun (for similar vocab. see IX.83.3), and esp. in the 2nd hemistich the position specified ("in the middle of heaven") and the actions depicted point strongly to the sun -- a referent generally agreed upon by interpreters.

The "womb of the age-old father" (*pū́rvasya yónim pitúḥ*) is a gender-bending, though understated, paradox. It is likely that the sun's age-old father is Heaven (Dyaus Pitā) -- on the parental relationship of Heaven and Earth to Sūrya, see esp. I.160 -- in which case the womb is probably (lower-case) heaven, the place through which the sun travels. In the next pāda he is unambiguously situated there: *mádhye divó níhitaḥ*, so at least in this instance one of the side-riddles of the vs. is solved almost as soon as it is posed.

V.47.4: As often elsewhere in the RV, numerology begets obscurity. Nonetheless, the most likely referent here is Agni. As Ge points out, the four and the ten in the 1st hemistich may well refer to the four priests (so already Sāy.) or the four arms of the two main priests, the ten, as often, to the fingers. The "bearing" by the four might refer to the transport of the new Āhavanīya to the east end of the ritual ground and the depositing there (hence the "rest"); the ten (fingers) are making offering into the fire ("giving it suck"), to cause it to flare up. Hence the balanced opposition of rest and motion in ab.

The threefold cows of pāda c are puzzling, but three is of course a number closely associated with Agni: the three ritual fires, his three births (e.g., X.45.1), the three pressings, etc. For Agni's triads, cf. X.45.2 (right after the three births just referred to) *vidmā́ te agne tredhā́ trayā́ṇi* "we know your threefold triads" (also VIII.39.9 for his three domains). See also *tridhā́tu-śŕṅga-* 'having tripartite horns' of Agni in nearby V.43.13, where it may refer to the three hearths – not candidates for our tripartite cows, I'm afraid. For these threefold cows Sāy (see Ge n. 4c; so also Re) suggests sun's rays, WG milk-streams, but 'threefold' is not a standard characterization of either set. Note also *tridhā́tubhir áruṣībhiḥ* "with threefold ruddy (cows)" in IX.111.2, where the phrase refers to accoutrements of Soma, and Soma is a possible, if somewhat unlikely, referent for this vs. as well: the ten (fingers) are a common trope in the soma maṇḍala, referring to the priests pressing and preparing the drink. Pāda a is harder to apply to soma, beyond the generic notion of four priests. The circling threefold cows could, I suppose, be the streams of the heavenly soma. Still, Agni seems a better, though not perfect, candidate.

Pāda d, with *diváḥ ... ántān#* "the ends of heaven," echoes 3d *rájasaḥ ... ántau#* "the two ends of the airy realm," and both contrast with the "endless" (*anantā́saḥ*) paths

of 2cd. The dual in 3d points to a straight trajectory from one end to the other, reinforced by the verb *ví cakrame* 'he strode' (though it's not in the same clause with the ends): the sun's journey across the sky from one horizon to the other. The plural in 4d is more diffuse, as is the verb *caranti pári* "they wander/circle around." The phrase *divó ánta-* [pl.] "the ends of heaven" is quite common, but I am not sure what the plural conveys -- that there are numerous divisions of heaven, each with its own boundaries? that heaven is effectively end-less (like the *anantá-* paths of 2) because there are always more ends? In any case the sun's purposeful trip from one place to another in vs. 3 seems contrasted with the more comprehensive travels of the subject of *caranti* in 4d. Is that subject the threefold cows of 4c? If so, many of the possible triads suggested above are eliminated. Save for the 'threefold' (and, I guess, the cows), Agni's plumes of smoke would make the most sense in d. But I confess bafflement.

V.47.4–5: Note the parallel openings of 4a *catvā́ra īm bibhrati* ... and 5c *dvé yád īm bibhṛtáḥ* ... But this parallelism gains complexity from the fact that √*bhṛ* is used in two different senses: in 4 it means 'carry', but in 6 it refers to the bearing of children.

V.47.5: The opening *idáṃ vápur nivácanam* "Here is the wonder, the enigma" announces this vs. as potentially even more obscure than what precedes. Each of the three following pādas is presented as a paradox, but the contents do not seem significantly more enigmatic than the rest of the hymn; in fact, the explicit paradoxes point the way to their solution.

The first -- the rivers move, but the waters stay -- seems unconnected to the themes of the hymn, simply presenting a wonder of the natural world: no matter how much the rivers flow, there is always water in them (see Ge n. 5b). The verb *cáranti* repeats that of 4d (and see *cárase* in 4b), but does not echo its meaning there.

The second hemistich does continue the ritual and cosmic focus of the rest of the hymn (see the parallel openings of 4a and 5c cited just above). It treats the surrogate parentage of an unidentified figure. Ge (n. 5cd) suggests that this figure can be both Agni and the sun, with two different mother-substitutes referred to depending on the original identification of *īm*. In Ge's view, Sūrya's "real" mother is Dawn, but the two other females who bear him are Heaven and Earth; for Agni, the kindling stick is the mother, but the two other females are Night and Dawn. In both cases the two have different places of birth, but form a twin pair. Although I am not overwhelmingly convinced by Ge's identifications, I do not have better ones. Of his two suggestions, Agni seems significantly more likely than the sun. The sole passage he cites as evidence for Dawn as the sun's mother (VII.63.3) does not seem to me to say that, and of course Dawn is more commonly his lover. The evidence for Night and Dawn as Agni's surrogate mothers is much more robust; the two passages he cites (I.95.1, 96.5) both depict the two giving suck to Agni using the same verb as found here (4b), though not in this vs. : I.95.1 *anyā́nyā vatsám úpa dhāpayete*; I.96.5 *náktoṣā́sā ... dhāpáyete śíśum ékam*.

V.47.6: This is the last real vs. of the hymn, preceding the meta-reference to the hymn itself and wishes for its efficacy (vs. 7).

In the first hemistich the subj. of *ví tanvate* appears to me to be the poets/ ritualists; I am not sure of the identity of *asmai*, but given its lack of accent, it should be

someone already present in the discourse -- probably the *īm* of 5c, which, as was just discussed, can be either/both Agni or/and, less likely, Sūrya. Pāda b continues the motherhood theme of 5cd. With Re, I consider the mothers here to be an unmarked simile: the production of ritual poetry by the poets is implicitly compared to the weaving of baby clothes by mothers.

      The "paths of heaven" of vs. 2 return in the phrase *divás patháː* (6d) "along the path of heaven" (note the close sandhi). Who the referents are and what is going on in the 2nd hemistich are unclear, made more so by the grammatical multivalence of the principal actors in the 2nd hemistich: *vŕṣaṇaḥ* can be nom. pl. or, less likely, acc. pl. (or, even less likely though the solution of most [Ge, Re, WG], gen. sg.: the gen. sg. is otherwise *vŕṣṇas* and, as far as I know, never read trisyllabically); *vadhvàḥ* can be nom. pl. (Ge, Re, WG), acc. pl., or gen. sg.; the part. *módamānāḥ* can be nom. pl. masc. or fem. or acc. pl. fem. Ge in his Nachtr. does confront the morphological problem of *vŕṣaṇaḥ*, suggesting that it's an irregular gen. sg., but he also provides an alternative transl., with *vŕṣaṇaḥ* as nom. pl., that my own tr. follows. In this interpr., acdg. to Ge., the gods are the bulls on their way to unite with their wives, "die Dichtungen der Sänger." Assuming that the referents of *vadhvàḥ* are the *dhíyaḥ* of pāda a, the sexual union of these thoughts and the gods for whom they're composed seems plausible (in a RVic universe). The only question is who is going to whom, and the two-way street of Vedic ritual allows movement in either direction: the hymns going to heaven to unite with the gods, or the gods coming from heaven to the ritual ground to unite with the hymns. I have gone for the latter. See disc. of the paths ad vs. 2.

      With Old I take *upaprakṣé* as loc. to a them. stem *upaprakṣá-*

      If this interpr. of the vs. is correct, it provides the hymn with a thematic ring compositional structure. The first two vss. provide the materials that will return in vs. 6. Vs. 1 introduces the inspired thought coming from heaven and established at the sacrifice, thus linking the divine and human worlds, and vs. 2 sketches the highway linking these two worlds, the encircling paths. In vs. 6 the inspired thought of vs. 1 is represented by the *dhíyaḥ* (insightful thoughts) produced by the unnamed priests (ab), and these thoughts are configured as the new brides of the bullish gods who have utilized the paths of vs. 2 to come to the sacrifice and unite with them. The interior vss. present the sun (vs. 3) but concentrate on the ritual fire (vss. 4–5). Given the emphasis on the ritual and its connection to heaven, I'm not quite sure why the sun intrudes in 3—perhaps its journey across the sky is compared or contrasted with the journey between heaven and earth we find elsewhere in the hymn.

V.48 All Gods

V.48.1: My interpr. follows that of Old in most particulars, but is also informed by my view that the hymn as a whole is a Dawn hymn (see publ. intro.). I therefore think that in the 1st hemistich the dative recipient of the poets' compositions is Agni, not, per Old, Varuṇa, nor, per Re, Indra. (Ge and WG do not identify the recipient.) Although the descriptors in b are not strongly typical of Agni, the "own dear foundation" (*priyā́ya dhā́m(a)ne*) in pāda a would be appropriate for the establishment of the offering fire at the beginning of the morning sacrifice.

  With Old I take the subject of cd, identified as feminine by nom. *māyínī*, as Dawn, and I also follow him in considering the hapax *āmenyá-* as dissimilated from **āmemyá-*, a thematic nominal deriv. of the intens. to √*mī* '(ex)change', formed like *vitarturá-*, *ādardirá-*, as he suggests. Modifying *rájas-* '(dusky) realm', it would express the constantly changing color of the sky at dawn, and is comparable to the intens. part. in I.96.5 *náktoṣā́sā várṇam āmém(i)yāne* "Night and Dawn, ever exchanging their color," as Old also points out. Whatever the etymology of *māyā́-* (whose possessive deriv. *māyínī* closes the vs.) -- I favor Thieme's connection with √*mī* '(ex)change', which, however, is rejected by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v.) -- the polarized initial and final words of the hemistich, #*āmenyásya ... māyínī*#, provide a phonological and, if Thieme is correct, an etymological frame for the hemistich.

  And what happens within that frame? In my view the image is that of dawn in a partly cloudy sky. The conceit is that the rays of Dawn spreading across the cloudy sky look like streams of water -- water that Dawn has appropriated from the cloud ("choosing the waters in the dark cloud" *abhrá ā́m̐ apó vṛṇānā́*). Since the image makes sense with the transmitted *apáḥ* 'waters', I see no reason to follow Old (and partly WG) in assuming it stands for *ápaḥ 'work'. The same phrase "choosing the waters" is also found in IX.94.1, though in a very different context. I explain it there as a deliberate poetic deformation of the common expression *apó vasāná-* "clothing oneself in the waters."

V.48.2: The image in 1cd is repeated with variation in 2ab. The fem. sg. subj. of 1d has been replaced by the fem. pl., easily interpr. as plural Dawns, as often. The verb is held constant, though the root aor. *atnata* substitutes for the pres. *vitanóti*. The waters/rays of light that the Dawn spread out in 1cd are now characterized as forming a pattern or tracery across the dusky realm (*víśvam ā́ rájaḥ*) that also figured in 1cd. The spreading performed by the Dawns is done "along the same course" (*samānyā́ vṛtáyā*) by my interpretation -- that is, the same course that the successive Dawns follow day after day. I do not understand why their pattern of light is "hero-strengthening" (*vīrá-vakṣaṇa-*). Perhaps this is simply a reference to the usual trope that dawn rouses all people to undertake their daily labors.

  The adjective may also prepare for the more human-oriented 2nd hemistich, in which the pious man seems to do battle with time itself, embodied by the ever advancing dawns. The interpr. of the hemistich is complicated by the shifting senses of the words *ápara-* and *pū́rva-*. If these have temporal reference here, the sense would have to be that the man repels later dawns, while lengthening his life with earlier ones (so in fact both Ge and Re). But this does not accord with Rigvedic conceptions of time: there is no preventing the dawning of each new day; even a hero cannot contravene the cosmic laws of time. It would also be somewhat odd to say that a man lengthens his life with *past* dawns; this would seem to indicate that he has no future, unless he can fight off the dawns to come. It therefore seems preferable to follow Old (also fld by WG), who takes the two adjectives as spatial: *ápara-* 'behind, to the west', *pū́rva-* 'in front, to the east'. With these values in play, the man sends each new day behind him -- the dawn facing backwards as she passes from east to west -- and piles up his future with the dawns in front of him, to come.

This vs. is full of alliteration and sound play, esp. in pāda c: a: **tā́ atnata** va**yú**naṃ vīrávak**ṣa**ṇam / c: **áp**o **áp**ācīr **áp**arā **áp**ejate (noted also by Watkins, Dragon 109) / d: **prá pū́**rvābhis.

V.48.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is the hardest in the hymn and, as the middle vs., serves as an omphalos. It contains several temporal expressions and thus continues the theme of the passage of time found in the 2nd half of vs. 2, but the rest is rather unclear. My rendering is tentative and also differs considerably from those of others, the details of which cannot be fully covered here.

Already in pāda a the alternation of days and nights is alluded to with the polarized expression *ahanyèbhir aktúbhiḥ*. Although the adjectival form of *ahanyà-* seems to invite an interpr. whereby the word modifies the adjacent instr. pl. *grā́vabhiḥ*, the result, "with the daily pressing stones" (Ge "mit den täglichen Presssteinen"), doesn't make sense, and I prefer to follow Re in considering it "une variante probable de *áhabhir aktúbhiḥ*." Cf. *áhobhiḥ ... aktúbhiḥ* X.14.9 and, with lexical substitution, *dyúbhir aktúbhiḥ* (I.34.8, I.112.25, III.31.16).

A more serious problem is figuring out what action is being performed in the first hemistich. In literal terms, the subject, whoever it is, sprinkles the/a superior mace, along with or by means of the pressing stones. Assuming we take the verb *ā́ jigharti* seriously -- unlike Ge and Re, who tr. contextually ('schleudert' and 'brandit' respectively), with Ge suggesting a possible derivation from √*hr̥* not √*ghr̥* -- the action is difficult to interpret, whoever the subject is. Why would one 'sprinkle' a mace? Old, flg. Bergaigne, suggests that the mace is really soma, but although we might think this would get us out of the difficulty, in fact the object of (*ā́*) √*ghr̥* is never the liquid sprinkled, but the object that is sprinkled with it.

Working backward from vss. 4–5, which have pretty clear references to Agni, I take Agni as the subject of *ā́ jigharti* here. He prepares the mace by "sprinkling" it with his sparks, a sort of final or symbolic forging, while the soma produced by the pressing stones is sprinkled on the weapon at the same time. The two acts of sprinkling make the weapon ritually fit for use. (Agni's 'streaming' *rītí-* is found in 4a—another configuration of Agni as a liquid or as controlling liquid.) Under this interpr. the three apparently anomalous forms of *ā́* √*ghr̥* in the RV, here and in IV.17.14 and X.6.4, can be given a unified interpr. All three have Agni as subj. (in my view), and in all three Agni "sprinkles" an object with his sparks. See comm. on the two other passages.

The loc. *māyíni* is a separate problem. The standard view is that it refers to an enemy at whom the vajra is wielded, hence tr. like Ge's "... schleudert er die beste Keule auf den Zauberischen," which, as we saw, requires the verb *ā́ jigharti* to be semantically twisted. But the near rhyme *māyínī* at the end of vs. 1 refers to a positively viewed figure (in my interpr.), the goddess Dawn, and I suggest that *māyíni* here, which occurs in the same prominent hemistich-final position, also identifies a positive figure -- in fact, Indra. Indra is called *māyín-* in VIII.76.1 and his *māyā́-* are often referred to (see the passages listed by Grassmann, s.v., including V.30.6 in this maṇḍala). If it is Indra, the loc. does not have to refer to the goal of a brandished weapon, but can simply be a type of loc. absolute: "when the *māyín-* (is there)," that is, when Indra attends the sacrifice.

The doubled preverb *ā́*, found both at the beginning of the hemistich and directly before the verb, seems to be a case of redundant repetition.

The second hemistich also contains a temporal expression, *saṃvartáyanto ví ca vartayann áhā* "rolling up the days, they unroll them (again)." The idiom *sám/ ví √ vṛt* is used of rolling up or out hides (*cárma*, VI.8.3, VIII.6.5), and this action is then metaphorically applied to darkness (*támas-*)(cf., e.g., V.31.3). The rolling up and out of darkness is thus a way of expressing the alternations of darkness and light, night and day -- in other words, a more poetic instantiation of the phrase in pāda a *ahanyèbhir aktúbhiḥ*. The problem is how to connect this fairly straightforward expression to pāda c, if it *is* connected. Although it is an easy assumption that cd has a subord. clause / main clause structure (so Ge and Re), it is possible to take c as attached to the first hemistich and d independent (so WG and me). The next question is whether the pl. subject of *pracáran* and that of *ví ca vartayan* are coreferential, and if so, who are they? and whose "own house" (*své dáme*) do they enter? The latter question is easier to answer: (*své*) *dáme* is almost always Agni's. I therefore think that *yásya* also refers to Agni, and this is indirect evidence for my identification of Agni as subj. of *ā́ jigharti*. But who enters Agni's house "by the hundred" (*śatám*) and rolls up and unrolls the days? In the publ. tr. I tentatively identify the subj. as "dawns," with full awareness that this is grammatically problematic: the pres. part. *vartáyantaḥ* in d is masc., and so the only way to make this work is to assume that dawns are the subj. of c, but the subj. of d reverts to a generic masc. I suggested the dawns as subj. because they are the standard regulators of time (for this see VII.79.2, 80.1 with *sám √ vṛt* and *ví √ vṛt* respectively). Others (explicitly WG) suggest the gods or some subset thereof, but the gods don't really have the role of causing the alternation of days and nights. I must leave the identity of the subject uncertain, although I am still inclined to think that it is at least an indirect ref. to the dawns.

I do not understand the function of *vā* in c; JSK does not discuss this passage. As for the *ca* in d, I think it contrastively conjoins the preverbs *sam* and *ví*, even though the morphological formations to which these preverbs are attached are not parallel. The *ca* also enables a sort of syncopated phonological figure, with *(pra)cáran* in c deconstructed to *(ví) **ca vartayan***.

V.48.4: This vs. is characterized by words regularly (though not exclusively) associated with Agni: *ánīka-* 'face', *várpas-* 'form', *rátnam √ dhā* 'establish a treasure'. This vocabulary gives support to my suggestion that Agni is also the subject of vs. 3, esp. since the *asya* in pāda a (and b) should refer to something already present in the discourse.

As for the *tā́m ... rītím paraśór iva*, most comm. appositely compare V.7.8 *prá svádhitīva rī́yate* "(Agni) streams forth like an axe." I consider the *rītím* to continue the liquid imagery of 3b. The abstract *rītí-* in its 4 other occurrences is either construed with the gen. pl. *apā́m* (VI.13.1, IX.108.10) or implicitly with other liquid vocabulary; cf. also the cmpd. *rītyàp-* (2x). The attempts by most interpr. to impose a different sense (e.g., Re 'l'élan-destructeur') on this transparent deriv. of √ *rī* 'flow' seem to stem from discomfort with the image, and esp. the simile of the axe. But the arc of sparks that sprinkle the mace in 3b (by my interpr.) would look like a stream, and anyone who has ever watched a person swing an axe (properly) would recognize the image: the fluent movement in a stream-like curve. (There are numerous You-tube videos.)

For *bhárahūti-* see comm. ad I.129.2, V.29.8.

Ge, flg. Gr., reverses 4cd and 5ab. I do not see the necessity for this. It puts the two forms of *(-)ánīka-* in the same vs. and continues the description of Agni begun in 4ab,

but leaving the hemistichs in their transmitted order certainly causes less thematic disruption than most changes of topic in the RV.

V.48.5: Ge emends *váruṇo* to *áruṇo* 'the reddish one', but this seems completely unnecessary. Although putting people in their places (generally *jána- √yat*) is ordinarily Mitra's duty not Varuṇa's, these closely linked gods trade off qualities. That there is no simile marker is not surprising; gods are often equated directly with other gods when they perform the others' functions. See, e.g., the series of identifications of Agni with other gods in II.1.

V.49 All Gods

V.49.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the first hemistich seems to pick up the last one of the previous hymn (48.5cd), where Bhaga and Savitar are identified as the givers of desirable things. Āyu is always a somewhat mysterious figure in the RV, and in this case it is difficult to tell whether the gen. *āyóḥ* dependent on *rátnam* (also in 2d) is in possessive or indirect object use -- that is, are the two gods distributing treasure to Āyu or Āyu's treasure to others. Ge seems to opt for the former, Re and WG the latter. In this case, the end of the last hymn may be helpful: V.48.5cd *ná tasya vidma ... yáto bhágaḥ savitā́ dā́ti vā́ryam* "We do not know that from which Bhaga and Savitar will give what is choice." The ablatival *yátaḥ* 'from which' indicates the source from which they will acquire what they then distribute. If 49.1 is in some way responsive to this, *āyóḥ* should likewise indicate the source not the recipient of the treasure.

In the 2nd hemistich I tr. the vocc. *narā purubhujā ... aśvinā* as if acc., to avoid extra fuss.

V.49.2: The standard tr. construe *vidvā́n* with *prayā́ṇam ásurasya* (e.g., Ge "'Der Ausfahrt des Asura gewärtig," with a slightly odd rendering of *vidvā́n*, perhaps because he construes it with *práti*?). But pāda-final *vidvā́n*, which is quite common, is generally used absolutely, without an object (and tmesis would be unusual, though not unprecedented, with a participle). The absolute usage would be reinforced by likewise pāda-final *vijānán* 'discerning' in c; the two participles define the subject as a sagacious and perceptive poet/sacrificer.

The referent of the acc. sg. adj. *jyéṣṭham* is entirely ambiguous: it can be neut. and modify *rátnam* or masc. and modify *vibhájantam*. Since *jyéṣṭha-* 'distinguished, pre-eminent' is used of both animates and inanimates, there is no way to tell -- and the decision hardly matters. More interesting is the *ca* in d, which must link the phrase *jyéṣṭham ... rátnaṃ vibhájantam āyóḥ*, which refers to Bhaga (see 1b), with a gapped Savitar, who, though present in pāda b and conjoined with Bhaga in 1ab, is not found in the clause in 2cd. See Klein DGRV 127.

V.49.3: The hapax *adatrayā́* is universally taken as an adverbial instr. built to a fem. **adatrā-* with the meaning 'ohne Geschenk empfangen zu haben' (Gr), 'ohne ein (Gegen)geschenk zu verlangen' (Ge), 'nicht geschenkweise' (AiG III.76), etc. But the morphology rests on very little (there is no independent fem. *-ā́* stem), and, so interpreted, the word is also hard to make sense of. If it means 'in a non-giving/distributing fashion',

it is immediately contradicted by the statement that the gods do distribute good things (*dayate vā́ryāṇi*). To make it work somewhat better, most interpr. sneak in the notion of *counter*-gift: that is, the gods distribute good things without expectation of getting something in return. But this hardly fits the Vedic conceptual universe any better. Gods don't selflessly hand out "free gifts"; they expect praise and oblations in return. This is, after all, the reciprocal arrangement that the whole RV rests on! I therefore suggest an entirely different analysis of the word, as *adatra-yā́-*, a root noun cmpd. with √*yā* 'travel, drive' as 2nd member, hence 'traveling to those (so far) without gifts'. The accent is correct for such a cmpd. We need a nom. sg. with underlying final -*s*, but *-*yā́s* in sandhi would yield the -*yā́* found in the passage, so only the Pp. would need emendation. The cmpd. would refer to the standard journey of gods to the sacrifice, bringing goods to distribute to the sacrificers; note the presence of the same root √*yā* in *prayā́ṇam* 'advance' in the preceding vs. 2a, referring to the same advent of the god(s) at the sacrifice.

As noted in the publ. intro., the vs. seems to refer to the distribution of dakṣiṇās, a ritual event that in RVic times happened at the dawn sacrifice (as here: *vásta usráḥ*), not at the Midday Pressing as in classical śrauta ritual.

This phrase *vásta usráḥ* is found 3 other times, all pāda final, with the other three occurrences (IV.25.2, VII.69.5, VIII.46.26; cf. also VI.3.6 *vasta usrā́ḥ*) containing *usráḥ*. Although Gr classifies *vásta* as the 3rd sg. med. pres. of √*vas* 'wear' (that is, pausal form *váste*; so Pp.), it is clear from the phraseology that it must belong with √*vas* 'dawn', and is most likely a form of the loc. to *vástu-* 'dawning'; see AiG III.153–54 with lit. cited there. I do not entirely understand the mechanism that produced the form we have, and in fact several different pathways have been suggested. Wackernagel simply attributes it to shortening of -*ā* in **vástā usr...* < **vástāvusr...*, but I find the shortening hard to motivate. Others (e.g., Oldenberg) suggest that it rests on a *u*-stem loc. sg. **-av / -o*, which would yield the sequence directly. Although I was dubious about Old's suggestion becasuse of the cost of positing an alternative loc. sg. that is not directly attested, I have been persuaded by TY's view that it continues an IE endingless loc. (in full grade), and this archaism was preserved in a cadential formula that enforces a light syllable in this position.

V.49.4: The standard tr. supply a verb (such as 'grant') in pāda a, but this seems unnecessary. The clause can be an equational expression; gods are called upon to be *várūtham* 'defense' elsewhere: cf. I.59.8 *bhávā várūthaṃ gr̥ṇaté* ... (Agni); sim. VII.32.7 (Indra), VIII.67.3.

V.49.5: There is no overt referent in the main clause (c) for the *yé* in ab, but 'they' (namely the poet/sacrificers) are clearly to be the beneficiaries of the good actions in c, who, in d, appear in the 1st ps.

V.50 All Gods
As often, the poet embellishes a fairly simple message by playing with personal reference, cycling through all three persons in very short compass. See the disc. in the publ. intro. as well as more details in the comm. on individual vss. below.

V.50.1: The vs. (and hymn) opens cleverly: the 1st two words are *víśvo devásya*, and until we encounter the genitive ending on the 2nd word, we expect the "every god" that would be appropriate to an All God hymn. Instead, the 2nd pāda opens with the real referent of *víśvaḥ*, namely the polar opposite of 'god', *mártaḥ* 'mortal'.

On *iṣudhyati* see comm. ad I.128.6 and my 2021 "Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-, išūidiia-*: The Aim of Praise" (Fs. Lamberterie). In the course of re-examining the members of this word family, I have somewhat changed my interpr. of this passage. In the publ. tr. I take "wealth" as the target or goal of *iṣudhyati* 'aims at'; however, insofar as the Vedic and Avestan verbs express the target, it is in the acc. (see VIII.69.2), and it is the divine recipient of praise, not the desired countergift to the praise. The Pp. interpr. *rāyá* as dat. *rāyé*, which is neither the desired case nor the desired goal. It would be possible to read it as acc. pl. *rāyáḥ* 'riches', which *could* be an acc. goal ("everyone desires riches"), but since this still deviates from the preferred expression with *iṣudhyá-*, I now prefer to supply "god Leader" as the goal, with dat. *rāyé* expression what we hope for in return: "Everyone aims (praise) (at god Leader) for wealth."

Pādas b and d both contain a 3rd sg. mid. to √ *vṛ* 'choose', in the same metrical position and with the same metrical shape: root aor. *vurīta* and 9th cl. pres. *vṛṇīta*. The first is clearly an optative, though it has a somewhat unexpected shape and is quite rare (only twice in the RV); its unusual root syllable (*vur* < *u̯ṛH*; expect *ur* as in part. *urāná-*) is found elsewhere only in *hotṛ-vū́rya-* (2x, with pre-C outcome). The second, *vṛṇīta*, is formally ambiguous: it can be an optative parallel to *vurīta*, as I have taken it (so also at least Re), or simply an injunctive. I would suggest that the poet first deploys the rare but unambiguously optative *vurīta* to set the modal tone and then uses the more common *vṛṇīta* as its morphological parallel. But it would of course be possible to argue that the poet wishes to contrast the two modalities; so I interpr. Ge. IH (diss.) suggests that the poet is deliberately allowing both readings – aorist optative and habitual present – and tr. "(everyone) would choose brilliance – and does so – in order to thrive."

V.50.2: As discussed in the publ. intro., this vs. effects a transition from the undefined 3rd ps. sg. "every mortal" (*víśvaḥ ... mártaḥ*) of vs. 1 to a 1st ps. pl. referring to us. This has been definitively accomplished by pāda d, which opens with the finite 1st pl. *sácemahi* 'may we be accompanied', but earlier in the vs. this plural is carried by the insistent masc. nom. pl. pronominal forms *té ... yé ... té ... té*. These forms invite a 3rd plural reading ("they ... who ... they ... they"): although the *sá/tám* pronoun is capable of having both 1st and 2nd ps. reference, 3rd ps. is the default. The first 3 pādas of the vs. cleverly avoid forcing the reference by using predicated dative infinitives (*anuśáse ... āpṛ́ce*), which leave the person unfixed, rather than finite verbs, which would force such a reading of the person. The poet draws attention to his syntactic modulation through the singsong effect of *té te de(va) ..., yé ca ... / té (rāyā́) té (hí āpṛ́)ce, sáce(mahi) saca(thíyaiḥ)*.

The syntax is further complicated by the parenthetical expression embedded in pāda c, *té hy ā̀pṛ́ce*.

The thematic continuity with vs. 1, despite the fancy referential footwork, is emphasized by d *sácemahi sacathyaìḥ*, which echoes *sakhyám* in 1b.

V.50.3: The reference-shifting game continues here and also pulls in some polarized lexical choices. The 1st pl. of vs. 2 becomes the 2nd pl. of the impv. in 3b *daśasyata* '[you

all,] show favor', but a trace of the 1ˢᵗ pl. is left in the enclitic *naḥ* 'our, for us' in 3a. This is the familiar scenario whereby the poet addresses his fellow officiants in the 2ⁿᵈ pl., urging them to do something on behalf of 'us' -- with 'you' and 'us' coreferential but distinguished pragmatically.

Although the identity of the addressees -- the officiants -- and the recipients of their favor -- the gods and their wives -- is ultimately clear, the lexicon complicates this interpr. The verb *daśasyá-* generally has a god or gods as its subj. and a mortal (vel sim.) as its obj., often *naḥ* (e.g., VI.11.6 *daśasyā́ naḥ purvaṇīka hotaḥ* "Be favorable to us, o Hotar of many faces [=Agni]"). Here we must reverse the verbal arguments. The 1ˢᵗ object in the 1ˢᵗ pāda, *nṝ́n* is ambiguous: although it of course means 'man' (or 'superior man'), it is frequently used of gods as well as mortals; it would be possible to interpr. *naḥ* ... *nṝ́n* as 'us men', rather than taking *naḥ* as a genitive (as I and the standard interpr. do). What helps clinch the divine reference is the 2ⁿᵈ acc. in that pāda, *átithīn* 'guests'. This is the only pl. form of this stem in the RV; the sg. forms are exclusively used of Agni, thus skewing the word towards the divine, and of course the model of the sacrifice as guest-reception for the visiting gods is always conceptually present.

The presence of the gods' wives, *pátnīḥ*, in b may allude to the shadowy "God Leader" (*devá- netár-*) who opens (vss. 1–2) and closes (vs. 5) this hymn, since an agent noun to the same root √*nī* 'lead', namely *néṣṭar-*, is the leader of the wives of the gods and, later, of the sacrificer's wife in classical śrauta ritual.

On *pathéṣṭhā́-* see comm. ad X.40.13.

V.50.4: This vs. is quite obscure, but seems metaphorically to depict the soma sacrifice. The problems are, as usual, conpounded by the fact that the two (or one?) principal actor(s) are not identified. Interpr. of the vs. differ, and I will not discuss them all in detail.

In the first hemistich I take the draft animal (*váhniḥ ... paśúḥ*) to be soma, as often; the adj. *dróṇya-* 'belonging to/seeking the *dróṇa*' seems to clinch this, since *dróṇa* is always the soma cup. The action depicted is the standard flowing of the soma towards and into the soma vessels, regularly conceived as a (male) animal running (here √*dru*) to a goal. The verb *dudrávat* is a pf. subj.; as I have established elsewhere (García Ramón Fs.), pf. subjunctives are simply subjunctives in value, with a future (not a future perfect) sense.

I take the 2ⁿᵈ hemistich as the main clause construed with the dependent *yátra* clause in ab. Its predicate is the agent noun *sánitā* lit. 'winner'. Because of the future-value subjunctive in the dep. clause, *sánitā* looks to me like a good prospect for a periphrastic future use of the agent noun (so, it seems, Ge; in contrast cf. Tichy, 229: "Wo sich ... beeilen wird, *gewinnt* ..." [my italics]).

The subject in cd is, in my opinion, Indra. The adj. *nṛmáṇas-* 'manly minded' is used most often of him, and of course it is Indra for whom the soma is destined. *vīrá-pastya-* is a hapax, but it seems a bahuvrīhi of the type *vájra-bāhu-* 'having an arm with a mace in it', hence 'having a house with heroes in it', presumably referring to both divine and mortal warriors that Indra can muster in battle -- his household.

The first two words in the last pāda, *árṇā dhī́reva*, are problematic, the 2ⁿᵈ more than the first. For *árṇā* we must assume a neuter substantivization ('flood[s]') of the adj. *árṇa-* 'flooding, undulating', here in the pl. Given its sandhi position it could in principle

instead represent *árṇās*, a feminine substantivization; since *árṇa-* several times modifies fem. *áp-* 'waters', this might work better -- but it makes it harder to explain the difficult *dhīrā́*, which is most easily taken also as a neut. pl. These floods are surely the floods of soma that are racing in the first half-verse.

As just noted, the simile *dhī́reva* [= *dhīrā́ / iva*] is problematic. It is tempting to take it as *dhī́raḥ* with irregular sandhi (so Roth; see Old), but this is of course not a legitimate interpretational technique. It is also tempting to leave it untranslated, as Ge does. Sāy. takes it as a fem. nom. sg., but who would this wise woman be? Ge considers the possibility of an instr. sg., but not seriously enough to tr. it so. Reluctantly, with a similarly reluctant Old, I take it as a neut. pl., meaning 'wise (thoughts)'. This is unsatisfying because the adj. *dhī́ra-* otherwise only refers to animates. There are partial parallels for √*san* with thoughts/wisdom as obj., e.g., IX.9.9 *sánā medhā́m*, X.143.3 *síṣāsataṃ dhíyaḥ*, but not with *dhī́ra-*. A possibly more promising interpr. is suggested by Re, who points out that the only other neut. form of *dhī́ra-* is found with *janū́ṃṣi* 'races' in VII.86.1; this also seems to underlie Tichy's "wie verständige (Wesen)." I would now emend the publ. tr. to "... like the wise (races)." This isn't a great deal better, but it at least deals with the problem of animate/inanimate.

V.50.5: As all comm. remark, the meter in pāda b is flawed. Curiously enough, the other two occurrences of *ráthaspátiḥ* (in the closely related X.64.10, 93.7) are also found in metrically wanting pādas—each missing a syllable— as Old notes. The metrical problem may (or may not) be connected with the morphological anomaly in this cmpd.: the 1st member *ráthas-* to the extremely well-attested thematic stem *rátha-*. We would of course expect **rátha-páti-*, but the problem with this form emerges immediately on constructing it: 4 light syllables. On this form and similarly anomalous hapax *ṛtas-pati-* (VIII.26.21; voc., so unaccented) see Wackernagel's rather elliptical treatment (AiG II.1.241, 246–67), where he classifies the two forms with gen. *páti-* cmpds, without explaining how he analyzes the *-as* forms morphologically. I would suggest that the putative, metrically difficult form with stem as first member was "fixed" by analogy to the common genitival *-páti-* cmpds to athematic noun stems (or opaque ones), most esp. *bṛ́haspáti-*, which is very common and phonologically similar. However, this does not address the metrical problem. Arnold (101) suggests reading *ráthasas, which fixes the meter but at the high cost of inventing an *s*-stem to *rátha-*, which makes no sense derivationally (rightly rejected by Old). Old attributes the metrical disturbance to "laxe metrische Praxis," which is, at best, a description, not an explanation. I do *not* think *ráthas-* represents an archaic gen. form—all the less so since it's not clear that the form was correctly transmitted. In any case, Old considers the *ráthaspáti-* a divine being of some sort; the "Lord of the Chariot" here joins another very marginal figure, God Leader. *ráthaspáti-* is found with Bhaga elsewhere (X.64.10, 93.7), and such an association would fit the emphasis on 'wealth' (*rayí-*) in b and c.

The forms *iṣastútaḥ* and *devastútaḥ* in d and e can either be nom. pl. root noun agentive cmpds or acc. pl. tatpuruṣa action nouns (both with 2nd member *-stú-t-*); see Scar 636–7. Although most interpr. (Ge, Re, WG) opt for the former, I have chosen the latter, on the basis of a number of passages in V where a praise song (vel sim.) is the obj. of *manāmahe*: V.13.2 *agné stómam manāmahe*, V.35.8 *diví stómam manāmahe*, V.66.3 ... *suṣṭutím ... stómair manāmahe*; also VII.82.10 *devásya ślókaṃ savitúr manāmahe*.

V.51 All Gods

On the structure of this composite hymn, see publ. intro. It is bland and featureless throughout, reminding us that there must have been a lot of mediocre Rigvedic poets and/or ritual occasions that did not require (or pay for) the best of what the poets had to offer.

V.51.1: The eponymous phrase *víśvaiḥ ... deváíḥ* opens successive pādas here (b, c), but the adj. is in fact more narrowly construed with immediately following *ū́mebhiḥ*. This is rather like (or, rather, opposite to) the manipulation of the phrase in vs. 1 of the preceding hymn (50.1).

V.51.3: On the basis of VIII.38.7 *prātaryā́vabhiḥ ... devébhiḥ* I construe those two instr. most closely together.

V.51.4: On the loc. *camū́* see AiG III.188. It belongs to the category of endingless locatives discussed by TY; see comm. ad VII.102.3.

V.51.5-10: These next 6 vss. are in Uṣṇih, divided into 3 (vss. 5–7) and 3 (vss. 8–10) by their refrains: *abhí práyaḥ#* of 5–7 and the full-pāda *ā́ yāhy agne atrivát suté raṇa* of 8–10. In fact vss. 8–10 are rigidly -- and boringly -- structured, with each of the first two pādas containing a form of *sajū́ḥ* 'jointly' and as many god-name instrumentals as can be fit in.

V.51.5: This vs. begins the second hymn in this conglomeration. Note that it repeats pāda-final *havyádātaye* from 1c, and the infinitive at the end of its first pāda, *vītáye*, rhymes with *pītáye* at the end of 1a.

V.51.11–15: Considered by Old to be an Anhang even to this set of appended hymns. Its lexical hero is *svastí-*, a form of which appears in every pāda between 11a and 15a. The poet seems to be trying to show how many different syntactic constructions he can plug *svastí-* into. Unfortunately this is not sufficient to hold our attention.

V.51.11: *anarváṇaḥ* receives far more attention than I think it deserves. See esp. Old. However, now see the abundant references to my own comments on the various *anarvá(n)(a)-* stems in the lexical commentary index. JPB (Ādityas 218–19) has a convincingly scenario for this form as a backformation from *anarvánam*, which he sees as the proper acc. sg. of a fem. *n*-stem.

V.51.12: My tr. of ab differs from the standard, which take *bhúvanasya yás pátiḥ* as a rel. cl. limiting *sómam*. Since the acc. of the god name seems to correlate with "call upon *for* well-being (*svastáye*)," and the rel. cl. is preceded by *svastí*, which is found as acc. in the "establish/mete out well-being," I supply "mete out" here and take the rel. cl. as the subject without overt antecedent.

V.51.12: Bṛhaspati's "whole flock" (bv. *sárva-gaṇa-*) may refer to the Aṅgirases. In any case note *sárva-* rather than the older *víśva-*, esp. notable in a Viśve Devāḥ hymn (though *víśve devāḥ* opens the next vs.).

V.52 Maruts

The pattern of the mention of the Maruts' name in this hymn is worth noting: it might be called a "versified paradigm" (à la I.1) with a hole in it. The various oblique forms of the plural stem *marút-* are densely clustered at the beginning of the hymn: instr. *marúdbhiḥ* (1b), gen. *marútām* (3c), loc. *marútsu* (4a), dat. *marúdbhyaḥ* (5d), and acc. *marútaḥ* (6d) -- each oblique case represented (if abl. is lumped with dat.), each once only. In addition there are three forms of the vṛddhied *mā́rutam* in the neut. acc. sg. later in the hymn (8a, 13c, 14a). However, though these gods are frequently referred to in the nom. pl. in the hymn, beginning with *yé* in 1c, and once in the voc. (*dhṛṣṇavaḥ* 14c), there are no forms of the nom. *marútaḥ* or the voc. *márutaḥ / marutaḥ*, although these are the most common forms of this stem in the RV. After the paradigm has been established in the early part of the hymn (1–6), there are no further occurrences of the simple stem in the 11 remaining vss. (7–17), only the three vṛddhi forms. I don't know what, if anything, to make of this, but it does not seem by chance.

On the responses and ring-compositional structure of vss. 1–5, see the publ. intro. and my "Poetic 'Repair' in the Rig Veda" (2006: 133–36), as well as *The Rigveda between Two Worlds* (2007: 112–13). The responses and the versified paradigm are most likely related; as I argue in "Poetic 'Repair'" the instr. in the phrase *árcā marúdbhiḥ* ... in vs. 1 is somewhat anomalous, but it is "repaired" by the substitution of the expected dat. in 5d *... arcā marúdbhyaḥ*. To summarize those discussions briefly, in a hymn devoted to the Maruts, beginning with the self-exhortation of the poet "chant forth," we might expect the Maruts to be the recipients (dat.) of the chant, not, as it seems, fellow-chanters (instr.) with the human poet. But putting them in the instr. emphasizes an important part of their profile, that they are also known to chant, a feature that is alluded to by the hemistich-final adj. *ŕ̥kvabhiḥ* 'possessing the chant'. Thus the beginning of the hymn seems concerned with the Maruts' contrastive and mediating functional roles as expressed by the oblique cases of the paradigm.

V.52.1: On the somewhat anomalous expression in the first hemistich, see reff. given just above.

The 2ⁿᵈ hemistich is also syntactically somewhat compromised. Forms of uncompounded √*mad* that mean 'take pleasure in / enjoy' seldom if ever (possibly VII.49.4) take the acc. (as also noted by Re), in preference to instr., gen., or loc.; yet *mádanti* here seems to take acc. *śrávaḥ* as obj. It might be possible to extract *ánu* from the cmpd *anuṣvadhám* 'according to their own nature' and construe it with *mádanti*, since *ánu* √*mad* 'cheer on' does take an acc. -- but a personal acc., not the neut. inanimate 'fame' that it would govern here. So an unresolvable syntactic tension has been set up. I think the tension reflects the double role of the Maruts already encountered in pāda b. As recipients of Śyāvāśva's praise chant, they would "take pleasure in their fame," but as participants in the chanting they would "cheer on" the fame of other(s).

Ge and Re seem to take *adroghám* as an adv., a possibility also mentioned by WG. However, the other apparent adv. form has initial accent (*ádrogham* VIII.60.4), and

furthermore the existence of a bahuvrīhi *ádrogha-vāc-* (2x) and the syntagm *adroghá-vácas-* (III.14.6) support a collocation with semantically similar *śrávas-*.

V.52.2: It is not clear why the rel. cl. of ab contains *sánti*, as the clause seems a simple equational one ("since they are comrades"), and such clauses generally lack an overt copula. Ge takes *dhṛṣṇuyā́* as a predication with *sánti*, as, it seems, do WG. This is in principle appealing, but given that we get untethered adv. *dhṛṣṇuyā́* in the previous and following vss. (1a, 4b) and a similar equational (rel.) cl. in 13ab (*yé ... kaváyaḥ sánti* "who are poets," it does not seem compelling.

     Ge takes *dhṛṣadvínaḥ* as acc. pl. with *śáśvataḥ*, but he seems isolated in this interpr., starting from Sāy., who takes it as the nom. pl. that otherwise universally prevails.

V.52.3: As Ge points out, the verb *áti* √*skand* 'spring across/beyond' is reminiscent of *ádhi* √*skand*, which refers to sexual mounting. He supplies a parenthetical "(auf die Kühe)" in the simile (so also Re), and I would now also do so: "they spring across the nights, as streaming bulls spring (upon cows)."

     The meaning 'night' for the rare and etymologically unclear (see EWA s.v.; also WG n., with more confidence in the etym.) *śárvarī-* seems established by later Vedic and MIA evidence, but I do not know why the word appears in this passage. A fem. word for night is necessary to make the implicit sexual pun work, but the better attested *rā́trī-* is of course also fem. It somewhat responds phonologically to likewise pāda-final *śáśvataḥ* in 3b, and it therefore might form a web, along with *syand(rā́saḥ) ... ṣkand(anti)* earlier in the hemistich -- but the phonological connections seem too slight. Maybe Śyāvāśva just likes words that begin with his initial.

     I am not certain what image is being conveyed. Ge suggests that the Maruts' storms calm down at night and then take on renewed energy in the morning, but the two passages he adduces don't seem to support that interpr. Moreover, 'spring across/beyond' seems to me the opposite of what Ge envisions: it's a vigorous action not a relaxation into tranquility. I tentatively suggest that it refers to the fact that thunderstorms (or, rather, the associated lightning flashes) are especially visible at night and appear to streak across the dark sky.

V.52.5: This is the vs. in which the problematic instr. of 1b is resolved -- "repaired" -- but, as discussed in my 2006 paper, the poet produces a new conundrum, though this one can be, as it were, pre-repaired. The obj. *yajñám* 'sacrifice' is unexpected with the verb *prá ... arcā* 'chant forth'; we expect a verbal product as object. But the *yajñám* here is picking up the conjoined phrase *stómaṃ yajñáṃ ca* of 4b, whose *stómam* would be an appropriate obj. of *prá ... arcā*.

V.52.6: This vs. is in Paṅkti; that is, it contains five 8-syllable pādas rather than the four of Anuṣṭubh, otherwise the meter of the hymn until the end, where the final two vss. are also in Paṅkti. Here the slight shift in meter seems to mark a boundary: on the one hand it brings the versified paradigm to a close, with the acc. *marútaḥ* in d; on the other it announces the advent of the gods with their storms and inaugurates the descriptive passages that dominate the remainder of the hymn.

The first pāda lacks a verb; Ge makes a valiant effort to construe *asṛkṣata* of b with pāda a as well, in two different senses (see his n. 6; '... sind ... herangesprengt' for a, 'haben ... geschleudert' for b), but the former would be a unique sense for *ā́* √*sṛj*. Gr also invents a unique sense 'decorate X with Y' to allow the two pādas to be construed as a single construction. To avoid such ad hoc contrivances it seems best to follow Old in supplying a verb of motion with the insistent *ā́* in pāda a.

The adj. that begins pāda b, *ṛśvā́(ḥ)*, can be either acc. pl. fem. modifying *ṛṣṭī́ḥ* 'spears' (so Gr, apparently also WG) or nom. pl. masc. modifying *nára(ḥ)* 'men'. The pāda break preceding it might favor the former interpr., but 13a, where the Maruts are definitely called *ṛśvā́(ḥ)*, favors the latter, esp. since the Maruts are also *ṛṣvá-* elsewhere (e.g., I.64.2). Note that in 13a the adj. is also followed by 'spear', but safely bound in a cmpd: *ṛṣvā́ ṛṣṭívidyutaḥ*; this bahuvrīhi 'whose spears are lightning flashes' combines the independent words *ṛṣṭī́ḥ* and *vidyútaḥ* of our vs. (pādas b and c respectively) and enforces their identity. This resolution in 13a of the ambiguity of 6ab can be seen as another example of "repair." Partly because the poet seems to be drawing attention to the phrase by resolving it in 13a I am now inclined to take *ṛśvā́(ḥ)* in 6b with both of its possible referents and emend the tr. to "the lofty men have launched their spears aloft." It would be one of the reasonably many examples where a grammatically ambiguous descripter is positioned exactly between its two possible referents.

The hapax fem. part. *jájjhatī́ḥ* 'giggling' is, of course, phonologically quite striking. As discussed by Hoffmann (Aufs. 306 and n. 3 = KZ 83 [1969]), the form is based on the redupl. pres. to √*has* 'laugh' with a Middle Indic ("dialectal") development of the cluster **gh-s* (rather than the expected *-kṣ-* found in the masc. part. to the same redupl. pres. *jákṣat-* in I.33.7). The use of such a phonologically exotic word is reminiscent of the equally exotic *akhkhalī́-* in the frog hymn (VII.103.3). The latter, as Thieme has convincingly argued, is an importation from pedagogical discourse, conducted for young boys in a preform of Middle Indic. Our form here seems adopted from vernacular "women's language" and brings a whiff of family life: little girls running after their brothers or parents with little-girl giggles -- a life that would, of course, be conducted in a vernacular (pre-) Middle Indic.

Pāda e has several parallels, given by Ge in his n. 6e. The question in our passage is whether *diváḥ* is gen., as I've taken it (so also Ge and somewhat differently Re), or abl. ("The radiance arose ... from heaven"; so WG). The parallels cut both ways: V.25.8 *svānó arta tmánā divaḥ* and VII.34.7 *úd asya śúṣmād bhānúr nā́rta* seem to favor an abl. interpr., but IV.1.17 *úd devyā́ uṣáso bhānúr arta* a genitive. In the end, I don't think the choice materially affects the sense of the passage: whether the radiance is 'of heaven' or 'from heaven' the result is pretty much the same.

V.52.7: This vs. consists of a single rel. cl. (*yé ... yé*) with no main cl. It is most probably preposed to vs. 8 with its correlative the neut. sg. *śárdho mā́rutam* "the Marut troop," despite the mismatch in number and gender. The end of vs. 6 has no reference to the Maruts, and, as I noted above, it serves as a boundary vs. The same structure with number disharmony envisaged here across pāda boundary (7a *yé ...*, b *yé ... //* 8a *śárdho mā́rutam ...*) is found, more clearly, within a vs. in 13: 13a *yé ... /* 13c *tám ... mā́rutaṃ gaṇám ...*, perhaps another example of repair.

The usual tripartite division of the cosmos (earth, midspace, heaven) is here complicated by the intrusion of a fourth, "the precinct of the rivers" (*vrjána- nadī́nām*). Re also notes this, but suggests that c does nothing but "enjoliver" (embellish) a -- that is, that the rivers are a variant of the earth. In a basic sense he is correct, but I would add that what we have here may be the clash of two formulaic expressions of contrastive geographic totality -- the standard tripartite model and one, barely attested, in which a nearer or lower *vrjána-* is contrasted with something more distant. Cf. esp. I.101.8 (with mention of the Maruts) *yád vā marutvah paramé sadhásthe, yád vāvamé vrjáne mādayasva*, a bipartite phrase where a seat (*sadhástha-* as here) that is *paramá-* 'high/distant' is contrasted with *avamé vrjáne* 'lowest/nearest enclosure'; a *vrjána-* is similarly *ávare* in II.24.11. Thus, though pāda c may refer to the same general geographical location as a, namely earth, it also evokes a paired, rather than tripartite, contrast like that in I.101.8 just cited.

The pf. injunc. 3rd pl. *vāvrdhánta* (see Kü 471) is attested several times elsewhere and manifestly belongs to a redupl. stem. It is worth noting, however, that the poet seems to be playing with its long reduplication. The *vā* is positioned exactly where we would expect *vā* 'or' to be (Wackernagel's position: #*yé vāvrdhánta ...*), anticipating the two *vā*'s in pādas c and d, also in Wackernagel's position. I am not suggesting a re-segmentation as *vā vrdhánta*, simply pointing to Śyāvāśva's penchant for verbal play and for making single forms do double duty. To extend this analysis, note the beginning of pāda b, *ya uráv ...*, with *áv* that could be taken as a metathesis of *vā*.

V.52.8–9: I don't understand the force of *utá sma*, which opens 8c and 9a, with *utá* opening 9c. Klein (DGRV I.416–17) says that they introduce parallel statements about the Maruts and represent "concatenation across the stanza-boundary," halfway between intrastanzaic and interstanzaic usage. But the role of *sma*, whatever it may be, seems downplayed in this description.

V.52.8: Ge takes *syandrā́(h)* as acc. pl. fem. and supplies antelopes as the obj. of *yujata*. This is not impossible, but *syandrā́(h)* was already used of the Maruts in 3a (cf. also V.87.3).

V.52.9: The phrase *párusnyām ūrnā́ vasata* is similar to IV.22.2 *párusnīm usámāna ūrnām*, but while in the latter *párusnīm* modifies 'wool', here it must be a loc. sg. The 'wool' in both passages is best understood as a metaphor for 'foam'. The stem *párusnī-* is the fem. corresponding to *parusá-* 'gray'. It is also a river name, presumably so called because it is covered with grayish foam. For disc. see Old, Hoffmann (Aufs. 333–35 [=Die Sprache 1974]). The mediating image in this picture is provided by *śundhyávah*; I follow Thieme (KZ 79 [1965] = Kl Sch. 219ff.) in interpr. this form as 'preening [waterbird]' (to √*śudh* 'clean'). As pointed out in the publ. intro., the density of imagery is remarkable: the Maruts swathed in clouds (not explicitly mentioned) are compared to birds in a river covered with foam, with the foam (again not explicit) characterized as wool.

The instr. sg. *pavyā́* to the masc. stem *pavi-* shows the older *-ā* ending, which becomes limited to fem. *-i*-stems when the masc./ neut. adopt *-inā*.

V.52.10: The first half-vs. consists of fanciful names of the individual Maruts (never otherwise named), summed up with the instr. phrase *etébhiḥ ... nā́mabhiḥ* "with these names" in c. The rest of the second hemistich is unclear, however, primarily because the formal identity and meaning of *ohate* are disputed. The former issue is the easier to solve: though Gr identifies the verb as a 3rd sg. and Re hesitates, it must be a 3rd pl. to the root pres. (of √*oh*/*uh*) (see EWA s.v. *OH* and esp. Narten [Kl Sch. 98–100 =1969]). The basis for considering it a 3rd sg. is the Pp's interpr. of *viṣṭārá* as nom. sg. *viṣṭāráḥ*, but a loc. sg. in -*é* is equally possible. It is highly unlikely that *ohate* would be 3rd singular in 10d but 3rd plural in 11a, b, as Gr, for ex., takes them. The questions then are who is the subj. and how does the verb fit with the rest of the material in the half-verse. Most interpr. take *yajñám* as the obj. and tr. "praise the sacrifice," with either the Maruts or unidentified priests/poets as subj. This is not impossible, but given the two *ohate* in the next vs., which lack objects (unless *yajñám* is supplied, so, e.g., Gr), I prefer to seek a consistent interpr. of the verb forms. The root is used on a number of occasions as a passive 'be lauded' / reflexive 'vaunt oneself' (cf., e.g., V.30.6, VIII.5.39). Here I take the Maruts as subject and the names in ab to be the verbal content of the Maruts' vaunt. (Note that the threefold repetition of *ohate* here is matched by the three occurrences of *vocanta* in vs. 16, also with the Maruts as subj.) Under this interpr. the dat. *máhyam*, which is problematic in most interpr., expresses the verbal recipient of the boast. This leaves *yajñám viṣṭāré*. For most interpr. the latter word characterizes the Maruts as they come to the sacrifice -- e.g., Ge 'in breiter Schar'. Again, not impossible. However, the root √*str̥* 'strew' is almost always closely associated with the ritual, esp. with the strewing of the barhis, and I suggest that *viṣṭāré* is a infinitival locative that takes verbal rection, hence "at the bestrewing of the sacrifice." However, I realize that this interpr. has some problems: -*stāré* is an unlikely infinitival form, and √*str̥* doesn't elsewhere take *yajñám* as object. Moreover, one nominal form of *ví* √*str̥*, namely *viṣṭíraḥ* in II.13.10, does seem to have spatial force (JPB 'far-flung'). I don't have a good solution.

V.52.11: My interpr. of this vs. follows from that of 10 and diverges from those of others. By my interpr. the nom. plurals are further names the Maruts call themselves, shown most clearly by the *íti* ending pāda c. Most interpr. take c with d, syntactically and semantically divorced from ab -- e.g., Klein (DGRV II.102–3, closely flg. Ge) "(And) the men proclaim it (as worthy) and (their) teams proclaim (it so), and wondrous (are their) forms, worthy of being seen, (of whom they say,) "(They are) from the distance." But the *ádhā*'s that open pādas a, b, and c impose, or at least beg for, a parallel interpr. of the three pādas, esp. with the *íti* closing the last, and the parenthetical "(of whom they say)" is ad hoc, generated only from the *íti* of c.

One of the problems not mentioned by the standard interpr. is the intrusive *ní* in pāda a. The verb √*uh* does not otherwise occur with this preverb, and since *ohate* is surrounded by identical forms without preverb (10d, 11b) it seems unlikely that only the middle one would have the preverb. It might be loosely inspired by the *ni* in *niyúta(ḥ)* in b, but Śyāvāśva does not seem the type of poet to throw in verbal fragments without function. I suggest rather that it continues but varies the naming pattern of 10ab with PREV-*pathí*-, here with the *ní* a very minimalist predication of *náraḥ* "men down."

V.52.12: This vs. bristles with difficulties. The first to present itself is the least of them: the root noun cmpd *chandastúbh-*. Thus the transmitted form, but it is analyzed by the Pp and all subsequent treatments as *chandaḥ-stubh*, with the *s*-stem *chándas-* 'rhythmic chant'. This makes sense and the phonology is impeccable. However, this *s*-stem has decidedly late distribution (X, 1x Vālakh., with the deriv. *chandasyà-* once in late IX), and I now wonder if it contains a thematic stem instead.

The next word, the hapax *kubhanyú-*, is more troublesome. There are several competing interpr. of this word, though Ge refuses to tr. it at all. Re tr. "voués à un rite communiel," which he derives from Benveniste (BSL 52 [1956] 11–12 [not yet seen by me]), who connected it with Ossetic material: see KEWA III.676; the Ossetic connection was disputed by Szemerényi; see KEWA ref. and EWA s.v., and seems in principle farfetched. Another, going back to Neisser (see EWA s.v.) and followed by Scar (640) and WG, is 'yelling, shouting', from √*bhan* 'speak', with the pejorative prefix *ku-*. (Remmer [Frauennamen, p. 48] also follows this basic analysis, but takes the *ku-* in positive sense: "welche Redner!" hence "wortgewaltig.") More likely is an analysis stemming ultimately from Sāy.'s *udakecchavaḥ* (see Ge's n. 12a "Wasser wünschend"). Ge cites similarly formed *udanyávaḥ* 'water seeking' in nearby V.54.2, 57.1 (latter also has an *útsa-* 'wellspring' as here). The Kubhā river also figures in this Marut cycle, in the next hymn V.53.9 in a list of river names. A derived adj. **kubhā-yú-* 'seeking the Kubhā' can easily have been formed. Given the common interchange of *-ā-yá/ú-* and *-an-yá/ú-* derivatives (type *vṛṣāyá-*, *vṛṣaṇyá-*), **kubhāyú-* could have been reformed as *kubhanyú-*, esp. under the influence of *udanyú-*; see also *iṣaṇyata* in 14d. Here it can mean either 'seeking the Kubhā River' or 'seeking water' more generally. Since their goal in the following pāda is a wellspring (*útsam*), seeking some sort of water source makes good sense in the passage.

The meaning of the word *kīrí(n)-* is disputed, with the two leading contenders 'bard' and 'weak, poor'. The former, the only sense given by Gr, seems to be currently in the ascendancy after eclipse -- e.g., KEWA glosses it only as 'gering, niedrig, arm', but EWA as 'Dichter, Lobsänger', with 'weak' banished to the small print -- perhaps because it is easier to etymologize (√*kī* 'celebrate'). But the contexts, esp. the fact that it is regularly followed by *cid* 'even' and often refers to a person receiving divine aid despite his condition, favor the latter. See also my brief disc. in Hyenas (251-52). The sense 'weak, poor' fits our context less well, since the Maruts are powerful and outfitted with enough bling to make them rich. But if 'weak' can be interpreted as 'lightweight, light on their feet', it can work: the Maruts are *dancing* to the wellspring. Another issue is the status of the stem *kīrín-* to which this form is assigned. The only other forms possibly belonging to this stem are 3 instr. sg. *kīríṇā* (I.100.9, V.4.10, 40.8), but they can also of course belong to the reasonably well-attested simple *i*-stem *kīrí-*. Mehendale ("Two Vedic Notes: (1) *kīrín*?" BSOAS 1974: 670–71) attempts to eliminate the *-ín*-stem entirely by analyzing our form as instr. sg. *kīríṇā* + *u*, with *u* replacing the usual *cid*, and this interpr. is tentatively followed by WG. But *u* is hardly equivalent to *cid* and it is highly unlikely to be placed here, in the middle of a pāda and a clause. Our understanding of Rigvedic particle usage has advanced considerably since 1974. If we want to eliminate, or limit, *kīrín-*, it should first be noted that of the three instr. sgs., two are in Maṇḍala V (V.4.10, 40.8), and so it is possible that the poets of V reinterpr. *kīríṇā* as belonging to an

-*ín*-stem; there are no unambig. exx. of the plain *i*-stem *kīrí-* in V. Certainly there is no possessive sense associated with the putative *kīrín-* forms as far as I can see.

The 2nd hemistich also presents difficulties: how to construe the indefinite expression *ké cid*, why the Maruts are compared to/identified with thieves, and whether c and d form a single expression or two. These questions have been addressed in various ways in the standard transl.; I will treat only my own. My rendering assumes that c and d are separate clauses (contra the standard view) depicting a two-step process. For c I start with the fact that what thieves mostly do in the RV is hide. I assume that the Maruts are likened to thieves because on their first approach, enveloped in clouds perhaps, they are indistinct and unidentifiable; this is also conveyed by the indefinite *ké cin ná* "like who knows who." (I do not take *ké cid* directly with *tāyávaḥ*, but interpr. them as two different ways of referring to the stealthy Maruts, again against most interpr.) In d the Maruts suddenly flash out (*āsan dŕśí tviṣé* "came to glitter in my sight") as the storm, or specifically the lightning. As they become visible in this way, it also becomes clear that they are 'helpers' (*ūmáḥ*); as usual, the assumption behind this is that the storm, though violent, brings fructifying rain -- rain which is previewed in the first hemistich, where the Maruts seek water and prance to the wellspring, while chanting in rhythm, presumably a reference to thunder.

V.52.13: On the phrase *ṛṣvā́ ṛṣṭívidyutaḥ* see disc. ad vs. 6; for the number disharmony in *yé ... tám* see disc. ad vs. 7; for the seemingly unnecessary copula *sánti* see disc. ad vs. 2 as well as immediately below.

This vs. serves as another boundary. The Maruts of the thunderstorm, dominating the middle of this hymn, are reconfigured as ritualists, appropriate guests and participants at our sacrifice. The ritual context now takes over for the rest of the hymn. This thematic transition may help explain the *sánti*. In pāda a the Maruts are still lofty ones with spears of lightning -- untamed forces of nature -- but in b they are asserted to be poets and ritual adepts (*kaváyaḥ ... vedhásaḥ*). Perhaps the *sánti* marks the two forms in b as predicate nouns in an equational sentence (X IS Y), where X and Y belong to very different domains.

The address or, as seems likely, self-address to the seer (*ṛṣe*) returns us to the very beginning of the hymn, with Śyāvāśva's clear self-address in 1ab.

V.52.14: The self-address of 13c seems important enough to repeat here in pāda with minimal variation, though the syntactic function of the acc. *mārutam gaṇám* is different and the rest of the vs. much less clear.

The first hemistich lacks a verb; the parameters of what to supply are set by the nominal arguments in a -- the seer is commanded (/commands himself) to [DO SOMETHING] to(ward) (*ácha*) the Marut flock -- and further limited by the simile in b, with the nom. maiden (*yoṣáṇā*) roughly corresponding to the seer and the acc. friend/ally (*mitrám*) to the Maruts. I have supplied 'approach', others 'invite, address, turn', etc., all more or less acceptable.

The question then is what the simile in b is conveying. Most of the renderings attribute bolder action to the maiden than I think gently bred Vedic girls would ordinarily undertake (see esp. Klein, DGRV II.183–84: "... like a maiden entices a friend"). My solution is to read *dānā́* twice in two different morphological interpr. First, with the

standard interpr., as the instr. sg. of 'gift' (on the possible stems, see EWA s.v. *dāná-*). But also as a root aor. mid. participle in the nom. sg. fem. with passive value. Although such a participle is not recognized by the standard grammars, it is exactly the form we would expect and fits the gift-marriage model perfectly. The *mitrá-* to whom she is given is presumably her spouse; on *mitrá-* in a wedding context see X.27.12 and my "The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara" (Fs. Parpola 2001), 309–13.

The final word of b, *yoṣáṇā,* is anomalously accented (vs. standard *yóṣaṇā*). See below comm. ad 15b for a possible explanation.

The second hemistich seems to be presented as a disjunctive alternative to the first, introduced by *vā.* The "or" does not make much sense; it is tempting to follow Re's judgment: "*vā* irrationnel." But Klein (II.184) may have rightly divined the rationale: "the poet first beseeches the Rishi to entice the Maruts to the worship, but then, as an alternative, appeals directly to the Maruts themselves to come." I would tweak this slightly by suggesting that the action to which 14cd is presented as an alternative is not 14ab, but rather 13cd, of which 14a(b) is a variant. The ṛṣi orders himself to stop the Maruts with a song (13cd) but then suggests to them that they initiate the journey themselves (14cd).

The voc. *dhṛṣṇavaḥ* addressed to the Maruts again reminds us of the beginning of the hymn, with *dhṛṣṇuyā* (1a, 2b, 4b) and *dhṛṣadvínaḥ* (2c).

V.52.15: This vs. is a variant of 14, with the parts somewhat differently distributed. The phrase *devā́m̐ áchā* in b resembles *áchā ... mā́rutaṃ gaṇám* in 14a, and it therefore seems prudent and economical to supply the same verb as in 14a.

Although in 14ab *dānā́* belonged to the same syntagm as *áchā ... mā́rutaṃ gaṇám,* here it is construed with a different part of the sentence, with the opt. *saceta* 'would/might/could keep company'. In 14 the poet was offering a gift to the Maruts; here he "keeps company with a gift" -- that is, receives it -- bestowed by the Maruts. The situation is the standard reciprocal exchange of praise and worship for the gods for material benefits from the gods. The givers are first identified as *sūrí-*s 'patrons' (c), and one could think of the human patrons often so called, but pāda d makes it clear that the Maruts are meant, and the identification of the *sūráyaḥ* with the Maruts is even clearer in 16b.

The two instr. in d are off balance: *yā́maśrutebhiḥ* 'famed on/by their course/journey' modifies the Maruts, but*, pace* Gr, Ge, and WG, *añjíbhiḥ* should not, because *añjí-* is only a noun 'unguent, adornment' (see in the next hymn V.53.4), not the adj. their tr. require. Re recognizes the problem and suggests that it is an "instrumental of identification": "en tant que (porteurs d') ornements." I think rather that *yā́ma-* and *añjíbhiḥ* are functionally parallel, both to be construed with *śrutá-*, but one in a cmpd and one in an independent syntagm. For similar interplay between cmpd member and independent word, see comm. ad VIII.1.2.

The real problem in this vs. is *vakṣáṇā.* In the publ. tr. I follow Ge and Re in taking it as an acc. pl. of *vakṣáṇā* 'udder', but of course this stem is fem. and the acc. pl. form here should be *vakṣáṇāḥ.* Ge (n. 15b) casually suggests that it is exceptionally neuter or else a mistake for *vakṣáṇāḥ,* Re that it's a "nt. insolite." Others provide different morphological analysis: Gr sets up a special stem *vakṣáṇā* 'Darbringung' and must take it as a nom. sg.; Old suggests emending the accent to **vákṣaṇā,* allowing it to belong to the

stem *vákṣaṇa-* 'strengthening' and takes it as a neut. nom. pl. ("wie zu den Göttern die Stärkungen"); WG maintain the 'udder' analysis but take it as a nom. sg.: "Der ... (wendet) sich den göttlichen (Maruts) zu wie ein Schlauch (der gefüllt sein will)." This last is the most ingenious and does the least violence to the morphology / repertoire of stems, but the image is an odd one, to say the least.

My explanation, admittedly rather weak, starts from the similar patterning of vss. 14 and 15: 1) the *ácha* + acc. gods noted above (though *ácha* differently positioned), in each case requiring a verb to be supplied; 2) *dā́nā* (beg. of 14b/15c); 3) the parallel endings of the b pādas: 14b ... *ná yóṣáṇā* / 15c ... *ná vakṣáṇā*. The final word of each of these pādas is problematic: *yóṣáṇā* has the wrong accent, *vakṣáṇā* has the wrong ending. I suggest that the words were mutually adjusted to each other, either in composition or redactionally. Oldenberg already suggested (in his n. 2) that *yóṣáṇā* might owe its accent to *vakṣáṇā*, but the suggestion was half-hearted since he really wanted to emend the accent of *vakṣáṇā* to **vákṣaṇā*, as I just noted. However, this seems the best explanation of the accent of *yóṣáṇā*, and conversely this allows us also to assume that acc. pl. **vakṣáṇāḥ* lost its *-ḥ* to match *yóṣáṇā*. Although this may seem no different from Ge's and Re's arbitrary conferral of neut. gender, my explanation is contextually tied and has some possibility of being correct.

V.52.16: This Paṅkti vs. is the last real vs. of the hymn, since 17 (also Paṅkti) is a dānastuti. It begins with *prá*, just as vs. 1 did, and continues with the insistent repetion of the verb of speech *vocanta* (pādas b, c, e). The vs. is also reminiscent of repeated *ohate* 'vaunt themselves' in 10–11; as there, the recipient of the Maruts' speech here is "me." The structure of the vs. would be clearer if the tr. read "Those who proclaimed ... they proclaimed P. their mother, then they proclaimed their father ..."

On *iṣmín-* see comm. ad I.87.6.

V.52.17: By all standard interpr. the Maruts are the subjects of this dānastuti, but it is worth noting that they are not named -- and so it is possible that a set of human patrons, assimilated to the Maruts and thus endowed with their prestige, are the actual donors praised.

Note the etymological chaining between the subj. of 16e *śíkvasaḥ* and 17a *śākínaḥ*, both deriv. from √*śak*. This could be evidence of the identity of the subjects (Maruts both), or it could be another way of conferring Marut qualities on the human patrons.

The unbalanced āmreḍita *ékam-ékā* is curiously formed. AiG III.395 (fld. by Klein, Āmreḍitas," p. 791 [JAOS 123 (2003)] suggests that the pl. *ékā* has been attracted to the following *śatā́*, whose attribute it is. It also seems an attempt, utilizing both sg. *ékam* and pl. *ékā*, to express the awkward distributive, of *one* hundred per each of seven Maruts, producing a total of plural hundreds.

V.53 Maruts

For the complex metrical structure of the hymn, see publ. intro. Despite the numerous different names for the meters, with few meters repeated in adjacent vss., they are all combinations of 8- and 12-syllable pādas, and so the hymns is metrically more harmonious than the long list of meters implies.

V.53.1: Like V.52.14 in the immediately preceding hymn, this vs. contains a *vā* 'or' whose disjunctive alternatives do not seem parallel. While it is true that both alternatives are questions beginning with *káḥ* 'who', the questions seem ill-matched. Re's assessment here is "illogisme de *vā́* [*sic* -- he prints it with accent]." Perhaps the point is that if no one knows as far back as the Maruts' birth, there may still be someone who has had long association with them and their habits.

V.53.2: In b *kathā́ yayuḥ* could be resolved as *kathā́ ā́ yayuḥ* "how did they drive here?" This interpr. might be favored by *āyayúḥ* in 3a, although it is disfavored by *prá yayuḥ* in 12b.

 The sandhi form *āpáya* at the end of c is universally interpr. as the nom. pl. *āpáyaḥ*, referring to the Maruts; it could, however, be just as easily dat. sg. *āpáye* and refer to the good giver (*sudā́se*) immediately preceding. In fact, I think it should be read as both, as reflected in the publ. tr. This double reading is favored by the way the vs. is structured, a striking pattern discovered by Natalie Operstein (in class, early 2000s). In general in this verse syntactic constituency is alternating and interlocked -- that is, constituents have the pattern X Y X' Y', etc. So, pāda a:

  ā́ *ráthesu*
   etā́n   *tasthúṣaḥ*

with the acc. pl. *etā́n ... tasthúṣaḥ* interrupted by the loc. pl. *ráthesu*, which is governed by *ā́* preceding the acc. pl. The pattern is similar in cd:

kásmai   *sudā́se*   *íḍābhir*   *sahá*
  sasruḥ   *ánv*   *vr̥ṣṭáyaḥ*
     āpáya

The datives *kásmai ... sudā́se* form a constituent, interrupted by the 3rd pl. verb *sasruḥ*, whose preverb *ánu* follows the dat. *sudā́se* and whose overt subj., nom. pl. *vr̥ṣṭáyaḥ* itself interrupts the postpositional phrase *íḍābhiḥ ... sahá*. In this configuration *āpáya* is not definitively paired: it could go with dat. *sudā́se*, separated from it by the prev. *ánu*, or with the nom. pl. *vr̥ṣṭáyaḥ*, likewise separated from it by a single word, instr. *íḍābhiḥ*. Note also that it is the final word of a 12-syllable pāda, in a verse whose other pādas are 8-syllables, so it is metrically almost isolated and could almost (not quite -- it's only 3 syllables) attach itself to d rather than c. Since *āpí-* 'friend' is an inherently reciprocal word, its double application is especially appropriate.

V.53.3: The referent of *té* in the opening phrase *té ma āhuḥ* "They say to me" is not entirely clear. It is universally taken as the Maruts, and that is probably correct. Among other things it is reminiscent of the Maruts' proclamations "to me" in the previous hymn: 52.10 *... máhyam ... ohate* and 52.16 *... me ... vócanta*. However, it is possible that the subj. is instead unidentified human associates of the poet. This would avoid the awkwardness of having the Maruts refer to themselves in the 3rd ps.: "They say to me, 'When you see them [expect "us"], praise.'"

 In pāda a note the figure *āhur yá āyayúr*.

 As Re points out, *yá āyayuḥ ... máde* is the implicit answer to *kathā́ yayuḥ* in 1b. The two instr. in b *dyúbhir víbhiḥ* have provoked more commentary than they probably deserve. Ge (fld by WG) takes the former as referring to daybreak and the birds are then the birds that start stirring at that time. This is not impossible, but *dyúbhiḥ* (incl. *úpa*

dyúbhiḥ VIII.40.8) generally means 'through the days, day after day', and that is fine here. The Maruts would then fly "with the birds" because they come through the midspace, where birds are at home.

V.53.4: The vs. consists entirely of a nominal rel. cl. without verb, presumably hanging off vs. 3.

   The problematic form is the hapax *śrāyā́* (Pp. *śrāyā́ḥ*). It is generally taken as a nom. pl. thematic deriv. of √*śri*, so 'resting in', attenuated by some to 'provided with' (with loc.). I cannot find particular fault with this analysis, save for its banality and the unclear source of the root-syllable *ā*. I am inclined instead to take it as an instr. sg. (*śrāyā́*, equally possible in this sandhi situation) to a derivative of √*śrī*, parallel to *śriyā́*, which is regularly used of the Maruts. But I confess I do not know why *śriyā́* wouldn't have been used instead or exactly what the derivational mechanism would be, incl. again the source of the vṛddhi.

V.53.5: The construction of this vs. is very problematic and has been much discussed (see, e.g., Old's long consideration). In the end my interpr. is closest, but not identical, to Re's, though perhaps not arrived at by the same means.

   To deal with the easiest issue first, *pace* Gr and Ge I do not construe *ánu ... dadhe* together. For one thing *ánu* √*dhā* barely exists; moreover a preverb in tmesis is unlikely to move to the end of the preceding pāda (so also Re). Rather, it surely governs preceding immediately *ráthān*, like similarly pāda-final *ródasī ánu* in 6c. It can be further noted that *ánu* is a signature word of this hymn, occurring 6x: 2c, 5a, 6c, 10c, 11c, 16c. With *ánu* otherwise assigned, the simplex verb *dadhe* 'I take my place' is then easily construed with the purpose dat. *mudé*.

   The real problem in the verse is what to do with pāda c. The easy sense that Ge extracts from it ("die wie die Himmel (Tage) mit Regen kommen") makes a hash of the grammar. Assuming that he means *dyā́vaḥ* to be compared with the chariots, with the point of comparison found in the part. 'coming' (*yatī́ḥ*),

   1) *dyā́vah* must be taken as an acc., which is simply impossible; or

   2) the alternative to 1) is to assume the whole simile has reverted to the nominative, something that doesn't happen in RV, as I long ago demonstrated ("Case disharmony...") though Ge asserts it here (his n. 5c referring to his n. to I.180.3d);

   3) the fem. part. *yatī́ḥ* should modify masc. *ráthān* or else, by attraction, *dyā́vaḥ*, which latter is only fem. in the meaning 'heaven', not 'day'.

   A way to a solution (or partial solution) comes from recognizing that the fem. pl. part. *yatī́ḥ* regularly modifies 'waters'; cf. *ā́paḥ ná pravátā yatī́ḥ* VIII.6.34 = 13.8 = IX.24.2, *ā́po ádṛśram ā́yatī́ḥ* X.30.13, *apā́m ártham yatī́nām*. It is therefore quite likely, esp. in this rainy context, that 'waters' is gapped here, solving the gender problem -- and also the case problem, because, adding another nominal element to the syntagm allows *dyā́vaḥ* to take its expected nominative role and respond to the acc. represented by (*apó*) *yatī́ḥ*. Re's tr. reflects this: "comme les cieux (agréent les eaux), qui vont avec la pluie."

   The question is then what is the mediating verb? Re's 'agréent' makes sense, but he doesn't explain where he got it. I think it is possible to generate it from the datival *mudé* of b, either by simply switching emphasis from the finite verb *dadhe* to its infinitval complement or, in a trickier move, reading *mudé* a 2nd time, but this time as a 1st sg. mid.

to a root present: √*mud* has a hapax med. root opt. *mudīmahi*, and though it is generally classified as a root aor., a root pres. is certainly not excluded. It is worth noting that this opt. is construed with the preverb *ánu* (VIII.1.14 *ánu stómam mudhīmahi*). Assuming this lexeme in our c would simplify the rendering of the simile. I therefore suggest a slight alteration to the published translation, to "(I delighting/delight) like the heavens (in the waters) when they come with their rain."

See also disc. ad 10c, which in some ways repairs this problematic passage.

V.53.6: As noted by most comm., masc. acc. sg. *yám*, presumably modifying *kóśam*, has no referent in the main cl. Such "improper" relativization is not rare in the RV.

ánu at the end of c can also, secondarily, be read with d: *ánu, dhánvanā*.

V.53.7: In c I construe *ádhvanaḥ* as an abl. with *syannā(ḥ)* rather than a gen. with *vimócane*. The effective difference is trivial, but the image seems more dynamic if the horses, unhitched, rush off into the roadside pastures (perhaps in pursuit of the "dappled females," though if the latter are antelopes, this would lead to species crossbreeding).

V.53.8: The abl. *parāvátaḥ* is somewhat odd with *māva sthāta* "don't stay away"; we would expect loc. *parāváti*, which is quite well-attested. It may be that *parāvátaḥ* has simply been harmonized with the ablatives in ab: *divá(ḥ) ... antárikṣād amāt*. However, it's also possible to take *māva sthāta* in c as a parenthetical exclamation and *parāvátaḥ* as a continuation of the abl. phrase of ab: "Drive hither, Maruts, from heaven, from the midspace, from nearby -- don't stay away! -- and from a distance." This might also explain the unusual pāda-final *utá* of b. I therefore offer this as an alternative to the publ. tr.

There is also the question of what the lexeme *áva* √*sthā* means here. Generally it means 'descend', often into a river or the like (see Re ad loc.). But that doesn't make sense here: if the Maruts are to come here from heaven or the midspace, as they are invited to in ab, they will *have to* descend. If we take the *áva* seriously, perhaps the idea is that the Maruts shouldn't perform their descent somewhere else than here-- at a distance -- perhaps into the rivers named in the next vs. But this seems overly complex.

V.53.8–9: Note the phonological modulation of #*ā́* ... (8a) to #*māva*...(8c) to #*mā́ vo* (9a) / *mā́ vaḥ* (9bc). The *vaḥ* then migrates to the end of 9d.

V.53.10: In some ways this vs. is both a variant and a repair of vs. 5. Like that vs. it begins with an acc. phrase referring to the Maruts' chariots. Following (*ánu*) them come the rains: *ánu prá yanti vṛṣṭáyaḥ*, a variant of 5c *vṛṣṭī ... yatīr iva* "(fem. pl.) coming with their rain," where I supplied 'waters' as the referent of the participle. The syntax is somewhat different, but the elements are there. In this passage the relationship between the metaphor and the natural world is drawn more clearly: the chariots and the flock of Maruts represent thunder and lightning (see below), which are regularly followed by rain.

While a, c may function as repair, the phrase in b, *... gaṇám mā́rutam návyasīnām*, introduces a new poetic complication. It is found identically in V.58.1, where it is even more troublesome. The problem is what to supply with gen. pl. fem. *návyasīnām*. Ge and Re, rather bizarrely, choose to supply Maruts -- e.g., Ge "der ... marutische Schar der

neuesten (Marut)." This not only contravenes the unmistakable gender of *návyasīnām*, but it produces an awkward and clunky pleonastic expression. It is also unclear to me who the "newer" or "newest" (latter both Ge and Re) Maruts would be: it is generally emphasized that the Maruts are indistinguishable and "there is no last one" (V.58.5). Nonetheless the view that *návyasīnām* refers to the Maruts is well entrenched. There is no masc. gen. pl. comparative attested in Vedic, and both Lanman (Noun Inflec. 515) and Macd (VG 234) state that the fem. form is used instead in these two passages "in agreement with *marútām*" (Macd, as if gen. pl. *marútām* were actually in the passage), due to "metrical exigencies" (again Macd, but same view expressed by Lanman). The metrical argument is strikingly weak: although neither a putative masc. gen. pl. **návyasām* nor **návīyasām* built to the alternative comparative stem would fit this exact metrical slot even with distraction of the gen. pl. ending (as here), neither form would have any trouble fitting into other parts of a Vedic metrical line (including the cadence), and it's difficult to believe that a poet like Śyāvāśva would set his heart on putting a comparative *just here* and then seriously distort the grammar to shove it in. (Sāy., it should be noted, does not supply Maruts, but still ignores the gender of *návyasīnām* by glossing it with the grammatically ambiguous *nūtanānām* and then connecting that gen. pl. with *ráthānām* in pāda a.)

WG have the merit of supplying a fem., namely 'rains', borrowed from the *vṛṣṭáyaḥ* of c. But this again seems pleonastic: why would the rains follow the rains, and indeed why would the (temporally unmarked) rains follow the newer rains? I start by considering what is regularly called 'newer'. To this there is a ready answer: hymns, songs, formulations, thoughts, etc. -- the standard verbal products celebrated in RVic discourse, several of which are fem. In fact, note that in the next vs. (53.11) two such words are prominently positioned at the ends of pādas: *suśastíbhiḥ* (11b) 'good chants' and *dhītíbhiḥ* (11c) 'poetic thoughts', both of which are elsewhere modified by *návyasī-*: VIII.5.25 *návyasībhiḥ suśastíbhiḥ*; I.143.1 ... *návyasīṃ dhītím.* I therefore propose that we should supply such a word with *návyasīnām* in 10b. (In the publ. tr. it is 'hymns'.) But this produces an odd locution, "the Marut flock of newer (hymns)," with semantically ill-assorted elements joined -- or so it seems at first glance. But remember that the poet is depicting a metaphorical thunderstorm: the rains, undisguised, come last, but I think we have both thunder and lightning earlier in the vs.: the flock is *tveṣám* 'glittering' (though, I must admit, the word sometimes just means 'turbulent': see *vā́ta-tviṣ-* 'turbulent as the wind' in the next hymn, V.54.3), which can represent the lightning. And the flock also consists of "hymns," which in this context can be the regular booming of thunder claps.

V.53.11: The Maruts' thunder-hymns are then met with our reciprocal offered praise hymns.

In pāda a *va eṣām* is taken by all standard tr. as a doubled gen. pl., essentially "of these you," though not so tr. I think rather that *eṣām* refers to the chariots, and *vaḥ* is the gen. dependent on the whole NP *śárdhaṃ-śardham ... eṣām*, which simply reprises 10a *táṃ vaḥ śárdhaṃ ráthānām*, with gen. pl. of the chariots.

V.53.12: The question *kásmai ... prá yayuḥ* "to whom have they driven" returns us to the questions in vs. 2: *kathā́ yayuḥ / kásmai sasruḥ* "How have they driven? To whom have

they flowed?" The referent of *kásmai* in 2, the "good giver" (*sudā́se*), is further specified here as "one who has given an oblation" (*rātáhavyāya*), though with different roots 'give'. This ring-compositional reprise brings to a close the descriptive portion of the hymn, and the poet turns to requests.

V.53.13: With the standard tr. I take *yéna* in pāda as referring to *enā́ yā́mena* in the previous vs. (12c).

I tr. *dhānyà-* lit., 'related to grain (*dhānā́*), as 'granular', because I think it refers both to the raindrops, shaped like grain, and the actual grain that results from the rain.

I.57.1 *rā́dho víśvāyu* suggests that *viśvā́yu* belongs to what precedes, rather than to *saúbhagam* as Ge and Re take it.

V.53.14: The standard tr. take *usrí* as having temporal domain over the whole of pāda c: "when it rains, the waters at dawn are luck, lifetime, and medicine." I don't see any way to tell, and in fact I don't see why dawn should limit any of these predicates.

V.53.16: Unaccented *asya* should not modify *stuvatáḥ* as WG take it. Better the solutions of Ge and Re, esp. the latter, who separate these two genitives, with Re supplying "Marut troop" with *asya*.

V.54 Maruts

V.54.1: The first word of the hymn is *prá*, as it was in V.52, the first of Śyāvāśva's Marut hymns. It would at first appear to be in tmesis with *anajā* in b (so Gr and see Re's bizarre tr. "je veux lancer-avec-onction"), but √*añj* does not otherwise appear with *prá*. I think it rather belongs with the last word of the vs., *arcata*. The syntagm *prá* √*arc* is quite common and, more to the point, began the first hymn in this cycle: V.52.1ab *prá ..., árcā*. The rest of our vs., from *śárdhāya* to *dyumnáśravase*, is set into this celebratory frame.

anajā is the 1st sg. act. nasal infix pres. subjunctive, as all the standard tr. take it, *pace* its assignment to the pf. by Gr, Wh, Macd.

My tr. of *gharmastúbh-* 'with the rhythm of the gharma-pot' sounds like a bahuvrīhi, which it is not. Better would be 'chanting rhymically (like) the gharma-pot' (cf. *chandastúbh-* in nearby V.52.12). The point of comparison, as is noted by most comm., is the regular bubbling of the gharma-pot.

My "sacrificing on the back of heaven" agrees with Ge and Re in taking *diváḥ* as limiting the first member of *pṛṣṭhayájvane*. Old allows both this and a syntagm *divá ā́* "from heaven," while WG follow Old's 2nd alternative and suggest that the Maruts are sacrificing on the back of the earth (to be supplied). It is difficult to make a judgment here.

V.54.2: Like the 1st vs. this one begins with *prá*. Also like the first vs. the first hemistich of this one is dense with cmpds, here describing the Maruts' chariots.

The repetition of *párijrayaḥ* at the end of both hemistichs seems a bit clunky and perhaps especially so because, if the forms are nom. plurals (as generally taken), the supposed stem *pári-jri-* is ill-formed: we expect an empty final *-t-* on what looks like a root noun in short resonant. This supposed stem *párijri-* occurs once outside of this hymn,

also pāda-final, also as apparent nom. pl. of the Maruts (I.64.5), and the root noun *-jri-* is also supposed to be found in *urujrí-* twice, again as nom./voc. pl. *urujráyaḥ* (accented VIII.70.4, unaccented voc. VII.39.3, the only form not pāda-final). Thus all attested forms of the supposed *-jri-* stem are in the shape *-jrayaḥ* (accented or not). The 2ⁿᵈ cmpd exists beside an *s*-stem bahuvrīhi *urujráyas-* (twice in acc. sg. *-asam*), and a simplex neut. *s*-stem *jráyas-* is well attested (approx. 15x), with Aves. and OP cognates *zraiiah-* and *drayah-* respectively. All of this makes the stem *-jri-* seem very fishy. Debrunner (AiG II.2.44) explains the forms, which, as we saw, all end in *-ayas*, as haplologies from *-ayasas*, making ref. to Wackernagel's AiG III.80, which presents other possible haplologies to *-s*-stem *-asas* forms. Though I am leery of systematic haplologies, I think this has a reasonable chance of being right, esp. in this pāda-final position. However, in our passage I think there is another contributing factor. Ge (n. 2ab) adduces two passages containing *jráyas-*: X.92.5 *pariyánn úru jráyaḥ* (IX.68.2, not cited by Ge, is identical) and I.95.9 *urú te jráyas páry eti*, with *pári* (+ VERB OF MOTION) collocated with the *-s*-stem *jráyas-*. In V.54.2 *párijrayaḥ* seems almost like a univerbation of a prepositional/adverbial phrase *pári *jráyaḥ* "around the (broad) expanse." It is even possible that one of the forms in this vs. is meant to represent the adverbial phrase -- so, possibly, ab "forth (go your chariots) around the expanse," referring to the Maruts' circling the earth or the midspace -- while the other is a nom. pl. (by old haplology), to be rendered as in the publ. tr.: "the waters swirling in their stream bed." This would alleviate the clunkiness of the repetition, which would then be only apparent.

As Ge. remarks (n. 2c), "Trita's Beziehung zu den Marut ist dunkel." Trita is associated with the Maruts also in II.34.10, 14. In vs. 10 of that hymn Trita seems to be associated with making noise, as here; that is as far as I can get.

V.54.3: Pāda-final *parvatacyút-* returns here (from 1b) but in a different form: nom. pl. *-aḥ* rather than dat. sg. *-e*.

V.54.4: The vs. sets up pairs of antitheses: nights/days (a), midspace/dusky realms (b), with the third only indirectly implied: fields [=dry land]/ *water [via boats] (c).

The *īm* that interrupts the simile *nā́vaḥ ... yathā* in c is superficially puzzling, but I think it is related to the implication just noted: it stands for the acc. 'waters' in the full realization of the phrase "like boats (through waters)." It is also worthy of note that the cadences of pādas c and d are phonologically similar, esp. at beginning and end, though they achieve this through very different grammatical means: ... *nā́va īṃ yathā #* ... *nā́ha riṣyatha #*.

V.54.5: Note the phonetic echoes: (*mahi*)*t(v)aná(m)* ... (*ta*)*tā́na* ... (*é*)*tā ná* ... (*áyā*)*tanā*.

I take "greatness" (or "heroism [and] greatness") to be the unexpressed subj. of *tatāna* in b, rather than *yójanam* with Ge. The latter is an acc. of extent of space, and the phrase #*dīrghám ... yójanam*# is iconically positioned to express the distance traversed.

In the second hemistich contra Ge and Re I take c as a separate nominal main clause, with d a temporal dependent cl. This allows the *yád* to be properly positioned, rather than occurring deep in the dependent cl. (The WG treatment is similar to mine.) The shared characteristic in the simile in c, 'having ungraspable brilliance' (*ágṛbhītaśocis-*), presumably refers to the combination of speed and timidity that

characterizes antelopes, deer, and their ilk and makes them hard to catch. If we were to speculate more narrowly, the 'brilliance' might refer either to the conspicuous white spots on the coat of the chital deer or the white sides, underbelly, interior legs, and hindquarters of the blackbuck -- both species that seem native to the right location.

The puzzle in d is the phrase *ánaśvadām ... girím* "the non-horse-giving mountain." In order to approach it, we might first tackle the verb that governs it, *ny áyātanā*. The lexeme *ní √yā* is generally hostile; cf. nearby V.42.10 (also of the Maruts) *yá óhate rakṣáso devávītāv / acakrébhis tám maruto ní yāta* "Who(ever) will laud the demons at the invitation to the gods, run him over/down, Maruts, with your wheel-less (chariots)." In our passage the sense seems to be that the Maruts trample down or overrun a mountain whose behavior deserves it. But what is a non-horse-giving mountain? On the one hand, it may simply refer to a stingy mountain, comparable to a stingy patron, contrasted to *aśvadā́-* 'horse-giving' used of generous patrons elsewhere. But still, why horses? Mountains can be the source of nourishment and wealth; cf. I.65.5 *gírir ná bhújma* "a source of benefit like a mountain" (also VIII.50.2 and comm. ad I.55.3). But mountainous terrain is not particularly friendly to horses, which are most at home in open, relatively flat grasslands. I therefore wonder if the operable segmentation of the cmpd is *anaśva-dā́-* 'giving non-horses' (rather than *an-aśvadā́-* 'not giving horses'). This might then be an oblique reference to the Vala myth and the mountain that yields up cows (that is, non-horses). However, since the Maruts are not generally associated with the Vala myth, this may be farfetched. The safest interpr. is Old's deflection, that the phrase is "auf unbekannte Erzählung anspielend."

V.54.6: My interpr. follows that of Narten (Sig.Aor. 195–96), with the first pāda consisting of the *yád* clause, the 2nd the main cl. Both Ge and Re take the first part of pāda a as the main cl., with the dependent clause starting with *yád*. Although *yád* is better positioned in their interpr. than in Narten's, they must make *arṇasám* an obj. of *móṣathā* (in unconvincing fashion) and the sequence of tense/mood is badly off: aug. aor. *ábhrāji ...* aor. subjunctive *móṣathā*, lit., "it has flashed when you will steal ..." Ge simply renders the subjunctive as a preterite, while Re's parenthesis in "vous dérob(i)ez" is masterfully evasive even for him.

As I just said, I am not happy with the position of *yád* in Narten's/my interpr., since it follows both the verb and part of the subject (plus a voc., but that doesn't count). There is another possibility, that *yád* functions here as a sort of izafe, connecting *śárdhaḥ* and *arṇasám*: "the troop, which is a flood." In this case *ábhrāji* would be a main-cl. verb, and the two pādas, a and b, would be syntactically unconnected: "The troop that is a flood has flashed; you will plunder ..." *arṇasá-* is a hapax. Narten takes it as an adjectival deriv. of *árṇas-* 'flood', but it could have been (re-)substantivized as 'flood'.

The point of comparison in b between the Maruts and the caterpillar is that violent storms also strip the leaves off trees.

The sequence *vṛkṣáṃ kap(anéva)* is oddly reminiscent of Vṛṣākapi, the randy monkey in X.86, but this must be accidental.

In the publ. tr. the voc. *sajoṣasaḥ* is not rendered as a voc., since the Engl. would be awkward.

The *s*-aor. subj. *neṣathā* 'you will lead' is particularly appropriate to the obj. *arámati-*, the personified feminine Proper Thinking, since the verb √*nī*, esp. in sigmatic

forms, becomes specialized for leading females in ritual settings; cf. the priestly title Neṣṭar. Although *néṣṭar-* probably owes its *-ṣ-* to crossing of the agent noun *nétar-* with Tvaṣṭar (*tváṣṭar-*), who is also associated with ritual females (see EWA s.v. *néṣṭar-*), its apparent coincidence with the *neṣ* of the *s*-aor. could spread the semantics.

V.54.7: In d the sequence *ŕ̥ṣim vā* must have been fronted around the rel. *yám*, since the phrase as a whole *ŕ̥ṣim vā yám rā́jānam vā* does not mean "either the seer or which king" but "which seer or king" -- or even better "which one, whether seer or king."

   I take the thematic stem *súṣūda-* as ultimately deriving from a pf. subjunctive, despite accent. In this particular form, the 2nd pl. indic. pf. *súṣūda, with the rarely occuring 2nd pl. act. pf. ending *-a*, would have simply been extended by the prim. ending.

V.54.8: In the cmpd. *grāmajít-* the 1st member could have either an acc. or an instr. relationship with the root noun. Both would be possible: 'conquering roving band' (so Gr, Ge, Re, Thieme [M+A 81]) or 'conquering with/in roving bands'. Although in such root noun cmpds an acc. relationship is more common, indeed also among cmpds in *-jít-*, I follow Scarlatta's preferred interpr. (156) found also in his tr. (=WG), although the acc. interpr. is hardly excluded. The parallel I.100.10 *grā́mebhiḥ sánitā*, cited by Re, is suggestive.

   My interpr. of b follows Thieme (M+A 81), esp. of *aryamáṇaḥ*, which he takes as "hospitable ones (hospitable householders who refresh the stranger)." Others take it as a pregnant pl. referring to "(Mitra, Varuṇa, and) Aryaman."

   The dep. cl. in c, *yád inā́so ásvaran*, can be construed either with what precedes or what follows, but sits uneasily with either because of its augmented *ásvaran*, which doesn't match the pres. indic. *pínvanti* (c) or *undanti* (d). I chose to connect it with d, as thunder before rain.

V.54.9: *dyaúḥ* is clearly fem. here, given the adj. *pravátvatī*, but this gender choice must be conditioned by its standard formulaic partner, fem. *pr̥thivī́*, in the preceding pāda, modified by the same adj. in the same position.

   The nom. pl. *jīrádānavaḥ* 'having lively drops' in d must modify the mountains (*párvatāḥ*), but in the immed. preceding hymn it is found in the voc. of the Maruts (V.53.6, in the same metrical pos.; cf. also I.34.4 a nom. pl. of the Maruts in the same position). There are no grounds for emending the text by deleting the accent and making it into a voc. (which would also entail a switch from 3rd to 2nd ps. ref.); how would it have acquired the accent here? Rather it must be word play: mountains produce torrents of water when it rains.

V.54.10: The *s*-stem adj. *sá-bharas-* (so accented in X.101.3, though it is an accentless voc. here), tr. here 'of equal gravity', is a bahuvrīhi with the lit. sense 'having the same burden / weight', with the same *-bharas-* as in *viśvá-bharas-* 'bringing all', i.e., lit. 'having/bringing all burdens' in IV.1.19.

   sᵘvarṇaraḥ at the end of pāda a picks up *náraḥ* at the end of 8a and 10b and *asvaran* at the end of 8c.

V.54.12: Note the repetition of *ágṛbhīta-śocis-* from 5c; this cmpd is found only once elsewhere in the RV (VIII.23.1, of Agni).

The first hemistich is discussed in some detail by Thieme (Fremd. 68–70), whose interpr. I basically follow. I would add that the (heavenly) brilliance that cannot be grasped by the Ārya on earth is shaken down as rain by the Maruts.

There are two basic interpr. of c, depending on what the subject of *sám acyanta* is taken to be. For Ge the subj. is the Maruts, with *vṛjánā* the grammatical obj. referring to their girthbands: they are girding themselves for battle. WG's interpr. also takes the reference to be to the Maruts, but with *vṛjánā* as the subj. referring to the closing of the ranks (Reihe) of the Maruts, again before some warlike manoeuvre on their part. In both these interpr. the referent of the subj. of *sám acyanta* and *átitviṣanta* is the same: the Maruts. With Re I instead consider the verbs to have different subjects: the subj. of *sám acyanta*, *vṛjánā*, refers to the circles or communities of the Ārya, while the Maruts are the subj. of *átitviṣanta*. I think the two hemistichs contrast the Maruts' effects on the Ārya communities: in ab the Maruts bring them the welcome rain they cannot get themselves, but in cd they cling together during the violence of the Maruts' storm. (I cannot decide which strain Kü's tr. (224) follows, though WG's paraphrase of it in their n. leans towards the Re/JB side.)

V.54.13: The verb in d, *rāranta*, presents difficulties both morphologically and semantically. Formally it has received a variety of analyses: Gr classifies it (impossibly) with √*radh* 'subdue'; as Old notes, in context it would best belong to √*rā* 'give', but it is hard to make this work formally. Given the long redupl. characteristic of the pf. to √*ran* 'enjoy', the form most likely belongs there. Lub. classifies it as a med. (3rd sg.) injunc. to that root, but there are no other med. forms to this stem or indeed to the root (*raṇáyanta* being an -*anta* replacement). I think we are therefore stuck with the formally most likely analysis, given by Kü, as 2nd pl. pf. impv., with (as often) irregular full grade (see also Ge n. 13d). This poses problems semantically. It should mean 'enjoy', with the Maruts as subject. The gapped obj. is qualified by *sahasrín-* 'possessing/in thousands'; as Re points out, this is a stable epithet of *rayí-* 'wealth'. And this is the problem: the Maruts have just given us wealth; we should be the ones enjoying it. Gods never enjoy wealth -- they distribute it. Ge suggests in his n. that the thousandfold wealth they enjoy is "in Gestalt von Opfern," which is certainly a good try (probably the best available). Old tries to make the verb into what looks like a reflexive causative: "macht [den Reichtum] bei uns sich erfreuen" -- that is, the Maruts should make the wealth be happy to stay by us. WG go one step further in the causativization process: "(An diesem Reichtum) ... macht, dass man sich hier bei uns daran freue ... am tausendfachen." But these last two attempts to separate the Maruts from the enjoyment are unconvincing, because no other forms to this stem show this causative tendency. I think we probably should stick with the meaning imposed by parallel forms (so also Re) and deal, perhaps as Ge does, with the Maruts enjoying riches. The possible transitivization of *rārandhi*, built to the same stem, in X.59.5 (q.v.), via reinterpr. as a redupl. aor., is not really available here because *asmé* is not acc. and so the phrase cannot straightforwardly mean "make us enjoy wealth." However, it might be possible to interpr. it as "make wealth enjoyable to us."

V.54.14: The problematic wealth of 13d reappears in 14a as the obj. of a gapped verb whose subj. is the Maruts, but in this case we can borrow the verb from the next pāda, *avatha* 'you aid'. Ge unaccountably supplies a verb ("gewähret") that matches neither what precedes nor what follows.

The pāda-final words in the first hemistich, ... *spārhávīram#* and ... *sā́mavipram#* are phonologically similar. This partial match may help explain the odd hapax *sā́mavipra-*. Although my tr. 'inspired in his melody' is structurally similar to the other standard renderings (e.g., Re 'inspiré par la mélodie-sacreé'), the cmpd should not mean that. For one thing the 2nd member *vípra-* is almost never used adjectivally (*pace* Gr), but almost always as a noun referring to a type of poet. Moreover, the accent strong suggests a bahuvrīhi. A literal rendering of such a bahuvrīhi would be something like 'whose inspired poet is the melody' or 'whose inspired poet has the melody' (latter like *vájra-bāhu-* 'having an arm that has a mace (in it)'), which do not work as descriptors of a seer. I wonder if the phonological play just noted didn't flip the order of the cmpd members, and the underlying form would be **vípra-sāman-* 'having the melody of an inspired poet'. Exact parallels are *vípra-manman-* 'having the thought of an inspired poet / having inspired thought' in VI.39.1, where it modifies *kaví-*, and *vípra-vacas-* 'having the speech of an inspired poet / having inspired speech' in VIII.61.8.

V.55 Maruts

V.55.1: The question about *práyajyu-* is how technically it is meant; I here follow Re.

The first hemistich recalls vs. 11 in the previous hymn, esp. in the bahuvrīhi *rukmá-vakṣas-* 'with brilliants on their breasts' (lit. 'having breasts with brillants on them', of the *vájra-bāhu-* type), which matches the nominal phrase V.54.11b *vákṣassu rukmā́*, but also in *bhrā́jad-ṛṣṭi-* 'having glinting spears', whose members are distributed differently in 54.11a *áṃseṣu ... ṛṣṭáyaḥ* and b *agníbhājasaḥ*.

The idiom *śúbham √yā́* is used of the Maruts elsewhere, in nearby V.57.2 as well as I.23.11; cf. also the cmpds *śúbhaṃ-yā́(van)-*. My "drove in beauty" is of course a conscious echo of Byron's "She walks in beauty, like the night." A different kind of English resonance would be offered by "gone to glory."

V.55.2: The verb *ví rājatha* can mean either 'shine forth' or 'reign over'; both fit the context and the subject, though given pāda a "you assumed your power," perhaps 'rule' has the edge. The root noun cmpd *virā́j-* seems confined to the 'rule' sense, when it does not refer to the meter by that name.

V.55.4: I take *ābhūṣéṇya-* as a quasi-desiderative gerundive, parallel to *didṛkṣéṇya-* 'desirable to be seen' -- hence 'desirable to become' → 'to be emulated'. However it may simply mean 'to be attended upon'.

The *utá* introducing the impv. in c is awkwardly rendered as 'and'. Klein (DGRV I.454) says it means rather 'therefore', which works better in English. However, 'therefore' for *utá* does not have much support (3 passages cited by Klein out of over 750) or a clear path of development, and a closer look at the context does not yield a causal "X, therefore Y" interpr. It is possible that the morphologically ambiguous *dadhātana* is not an imperative but an injunctive, which would yield a more acceptable

pendant "and you establish us in immortality." And it is also possible that the *utá* here loosely matches the other 3rd-pāda *utá*-s in 2c, 7c, while anticipating 5a #*úd.*

V.56 Maruts

V.56.1: Ge (/WG) supply "bring," an impv. addressed to Agni, in the first hemistich. There seems no particularly reason to do so, since the acc. phrase of ab can be construed with *áva hvaye* in c. Perhaps it's on the basis of the *ā́* in pāda a, but this is in the wrong position to be a gapped preverb. I don't actually know what *ā́* is doing, but note that in the ring-compositional expressions in vss. 8–9, the 'call' verb is construed with *ā́.*

V.56.2: The question in this vs. is who is the 2nd sg. referent of *mányase* (a), *te* (c), and *vardha* (d). Acdg. to Sāy. it is still Agni, but Ge suggests alternatively that it could be the self-address of the poet, a view shared by Re. (WG think Agni, but with a very peculiar tr. of pāda a). I think poetic self-address is excluded because of the *me* in b: the poet is unlikely to refer to himself as "you (sg.)" and "me" in successive pādas (and then back to "you"), so Agni is the more likely. The point must be that both Agni and the poet want the same thing -- for the Maruts to come to the sacrifice. The identification of you as Agni requires that he possess/produce *hávana-* 'calls' in c. This can refer to the crackling of the fire. Alternatively, flg. Gr, *hávana-* could belong to √*hu* and mean 'oblations', but *pace* Gr none of the occurrences he adduces need to have that meaning.

V.56.3: The gender politics of this vs. would not bear modern scrutiny: the idea seems to be that the Earth enjoys rough sex because she gets nice presents. But it is a powerful image.
    The poss. adj. *mīḷhúṣmant-* occurs twice in the RV; the other form is found in VI.50.12, where it is masc. and seems barely distinct from *mīḷhvás-* 'giving rewards, generous'. Here in this fem. form the possessive value of *-mant-* does have force, assuming the correctness of Ge's and Re's interpr. as 'possessing a generous (man/lord/spouse)'. WG take it rather as 'Soldatenbraut', interpr. *mīḷhvás-* as 'one who has *mīḷhá-*' (booty, etc) and further suggesting that the woman in question was part of the spoils of war. This is appealing in some ways, but it does not fit well with the last word of the hymn, *mīḷhuṣī́.*
    As Ge points out (n. 3a), *párāhatā* may have two senses -- simply 'beaten aside' by the onslaught of the Maruts and '(sexually) penetrated', for which sense he cites ŚB XI.5.1.1 *vaitaséna daṇḍéna hatāt* [*sic*, not Ge's *hatā*], the ŚB paraphrase of Urvaśī's ... *mā ... śnathayo vaitaséna* (X.95.5) "you pierced me with your rod."

V.56.4: *ní* √*ri* means 'make flow', hence 'liquefy, dissolve'. In I.127.4 the very similar *sthirā́ cid ánnā ní riṇāti ójasā* has 'sturdy foods' as obj., but since Agni is the subject, the food is presumably wood of some sort. In nearby V.58.6 a middle intrans. of √*ri* (though without preverb) takes trees as subj.: *riṇaté vánāni* "the trees dissolve." I therefore supply them as obj. here.
    What then does the simile in b have to do with this? Even unruly oxen are unlikely to dissolve trees. Because the images don't easily harmonize, I now think that the simile in b should go with the 2nd hemistich: unruly oxen *can* cause the ground to

shake. This is somewhat difficult to convey in tr. -- I might rearrange it to "like oxen averse to the yoke / they shake ..."

The phrase *gā́vaḥ ... durdhúraḥ* echoes *dudhró gaúḥ* of 3d phonologically, even though the adjectives are entirely unrelated.

As often Ge takes *cid* in c as a simile marker, a function for which there is no good evidence.

V.56.5: Ge takes the impv. *út tiṣṭha* as another self-address of the poet; again the presence of a 1st ps. sg. in the vs. (*hvaye* in d) makes that unlikely. I think it is directed rather at Agni, like the direct addresses in vss. 1 and 2. For the same impv. cf. IV.4.4 *úd agne tiṣṭha* (sim. VIII.23.5): the ritual fire is blazing up while the Maruts are called to the sacrifice. In this case Agni may be commanded to rise up with praises (*stómaiḥ*) -- praises like his calls in 2c. Alternatively, there may be a clause break after the impv., with a new clause beginning with *nūnám* and continuing to the end of the vs. (This division was suggested by Natalie Operstein in class in the early 2000s.) The praises will then be those produced by the 1st ps. poet who is the subj. of *hvaye* at the end of the vs.

In b *sámukṣita-* can hardly be separated from nearby V.55.3 *sākám ukṣitā́ḥ*, and V.57.8 *br̥hád ukṣámāṇāḥ* also supports the root etym. to √ *vakṣ/ukṣ* 'be(come) strong', against Gr's conection with √ *ukṣ* 'sprinkle'.

V.56.6: As Bl (RVReps) and Ge point out, this vs. appears to have been constructed from textual blocks found in I.14.12 and I.134.3. Our pāda a *yuṅgdhvám hy áruṣī ráthe* is identical to I.14.12a except for the sg. impv. *yukṣvá hí* rather than our pl. *yuṅgdhvám hí*. If our pāda is modeled on I.14.12 (or a similar source) it could explain both the *hí* with no obvious function and the sg. chariot *ráthe* for the plural Maruts; this mismatch in number is repaired in the next pāda *yuṅgdhvám rátheṣu rohítaḥ*. This latter pāda has no close parallels in the RV, though I.14.12b ends with *rohítaḥ*, which is a further obj. to *yukṣvá* in pāda a (I.14.12b *haríto deva rohítaḥ*) and so may be a distant source. Our 2nd hemistich *yuṅgdhvám hárī ajirā́ dhurí vóḷhave, váhiṣṭhā dhurí vóḷhave* closely follows I.134.3bc *vāyū́ ráthe ajirā́ dhurí vóḷhave, váhiṣṭhā dhurí vóḷhave* (whose pāda a contains the 'yoke' verb: *vāyúr yuṅkte ...*). What I don't understand is why Śyāvāśva has made these clumsy adaptations just to produce a vs. that in context is just treading water -- there's no need for a yoking vs. here.

Note that *váhiṣṭhā vóḷhave* "the two best pullers to pull" is an etymological figure, with both words built to √ *vah*, though it is not at all transparent. Perhaps this is what attracted Śyāvāśva.

V.56.7: Whatever the reason for the previous vs., *syá vā́jy àruṣaḥ* "*this* reddish race horse here" contrasts with the *áruṣī(ḥ)* 'reddish (mares)' in 6a. Although in the publ. tr. I identified the referent as Agni (and I still think he is a possible secondary referent), I now accept the view of Sāy., Ge, and Re that it is the Beipferd of the Maruts (see the parallels adduced by Ge in n. 7a); otherwise the 2nd half of the vs. makes little sense.

The *mā́* prohibitive in c contains what looks like a root aor. subjunctive *karat*. Flg. Wackernagel (Fs. Jacobi), Hoffmann (Injunk. 55–56; see also 92) explains this potentially embarrassing form as the injunctive to a thematized root aor., which thematization began from the ambiguous 1st sg. *ákaram*. He (somewhat disingenuously)

notes that outside of *mā́* clauses the *kara-* forms are otherwise only subjunctives, and he further suggests that his two exx. are found in idiomatic expressions that belong to the Volkssprache, which could explain the earlier thematization (cf. also Aufs. II.344 n. 2). (His other ex. of *mā́ ... karat* in VIII.2.20 I explain differently, as not belonging to the *mā́* clause at all. See comm. ad loc.) Hoffmann's thematic aor. explan. has been apparently accepted by Lub, who classifies the two forms identified thus by Hoffmann under "A-AOR.inj." I am generally dubious, because the root aor. of √*kr* is so well entrenched in the RV and the -*a*-forms are otherwise found in clear subjunctive usage. However, I am somewhat sympathetic to the "idiomatic" explanation, esp. combined with a metrical observation: the injunc. *kaḥ* expected here is found almost entirely at the end of Triṣṭubh pādas, but would not work here at the end of a Jagatī pāda. Nonce thematization, esp. perhaps in a low-register expression, would be a quick fix.

WG produce a curious hybrid of prohibitive and subjunctive: "Nicht *soll und wird* er ... (euch) langsam *machen*" (my italics). I do not understand the explanation given in the n., or at least do not understand what sort of grammatical category is envisioned: "Uns scheint ein expekativer oder voluntativer Konjunktiv deutlich mitzuschwingen: >(Auf keinen Fall erwarten wir), dass er euch langsam mache< bzw. >Dass er euch ja nicht langsame mache!< This clearly builds on Tichy's analysis of the function of the subjunctive as "expectation," but I do not understand how the subjunctive would interact with the *mā́*.

V.56.8–9: These two vss. essentially duplicate each other The main verbs of the two vss., *ā́ huvāmahe* (8b) and *ā́ huve* (9b) resonate with the verb in the 1st vs. (*ā́...*) *áva hvaye*.

The battered-woman Earth who received presents (*mīḷhúṣmatī*) in 3ab is balanced here by the glorious Rodasī, standing in apparently equality with the Maruts, dispensing presents herself (8c *suráṇāni bíbhratī*, 9d *mīḷhuṣī*). I see no merit on flg. Ge's acceptance of Sāy.'s interpr. of *mīḷhuṣī* as the name of the wife of Rudra.

V.57–58 Maruts

As Old (Proleg. 204–5) points out these two hymns are parallel and share a final vs. He attributes their position at the beginning of the four 8-vs. Marut hymns to this twinning. Otherwise V.58, in Triṣṭubh, should follow V.59, in Jagatī.

V.57 Maruts

V.57.3: After *dyā́m* in pāda a we expect **pṛthivī́m*, but get phonologically similar *párvatān* instead. This disappointed expectation is "repaired" in pāda c, where *pṛthivī́m* appears as the obj. of a different but semantically similar verb.

V.57.6: The pf. that ends the vs., *pipiśe*, produces a bad cadence that would be fixed by a heavy redupl. syllable. The metrical problem is not mentioned by Old or Kü; HvN note it but do not suggest a solution. I wonder if it is for intens. **pepiśe*; the act. intens. is found once in the late RV, while the middle begins to be attested in the AV, with a sense not appreciably different from non-intens. forms. Of course, the *t*-less ending -*e* would have to be accounted for, but several 3rd sg, med. intensives have such an ending; see Schaefer 44. Of course, this might all be more trouble than it's worth for a metrical violation.

V.57.7: The sentiment in pāda c is somewhat puzzling, though the grammar is straightforward: *práśastim naḥ kṛṇuta rudriyāsaḥ*. This should mean "make a eulogy for us, o Rudras," with the VP *práśastim √kṛ*. Though the three other occurrences of this VP, in I.113.19, 181.1, and II.41.16, do conform to expectations, taking it that way here would reverse the sacrificial bargain. As detailed in the first hemistich, the Maruts have given us bountiful riches of all sorts; in return we should be producing a *práśasti-* for them -- not they for us. In fact, of course, it is never the gods' job to produce praise for humans. In order to make sense of the phrase, I have pushed the sense of √*kṛ* from 'make' to 'make good' -- that is, act such that the praise we are giving you is true. (You have given us many things; do it again.) Re's "faites nous (aujourd'hui une récompense digne du) panégyrique" is similar, despite the overstuffed parenthesis. There is another, less likely, alternative. As I have argued elsewhere (RV between Two Worlds, pp. 146–48), even in the RV the *práśasti-* was probably a genre of praise appropriate to kings and only secondarily applied to gods. It might be that the poet is asking the Maruts to render his patron and king deserving of his [=poet's] *práśasti-*, either by redistributing the wealth that they showered on the king or by the king's performing some worthy feat. But this seems overly complex and far less likely, and since *práśasti-*s in the RV are often directed at gods, it is unnecessary.

V.57.8: The vs. consists almost entirely of accented vocatives. Only the last phrase *bṛhád ukṣámāṇāḥ* escapes the voc. and that probably because accent conversion would be tricky.

    The juxtaposition (across hemistich boundary) of *ṛ́ta-jñāḥ* and *sátya-śrutaḥ* is striking -- and in my opinion telling with regard to the difference between *ṛtá-* and *sátya-*, both often tr. 'truth'. Here *ṛtá-* is something one knows, but *sátya-* is something one hears. In my view *ṛtá-* is the immanent truth -- the principles and relations that lie underpin the world as we know it -- while *sátya-* is the realized truth. In some contexts this can be simply palpable reality, but here I think it refers to how *ṛtá-* is realized verbally, in the formulations of poets, available to be heard.

V.58 Maruts

V.58.1: On the phrase *... gaṇám mā́rutaṃ návyasīnām* with its problematic fem. gen. pl. *návyasīnām*, see the extensive disc. ad V.53.10.

    There is complete fungibility between the collective sg. *gaṇám mā́rutam* "Marutian flock" and the plural *yé* in the 2nd hemistich referring to the individual Maruts, which picks up *gaṇám mā́rutam* by sense though not strictly by grammar. The *eṣām* at the end of pāda a seems clumsily pleonastic, however. It must refer also to the pl. Maruts and depend on the acc. *gaṇám* ("the flock of them"), doubling the vṛddhi deriv. *mā́rutam*. It should *not* be construed with the fem. *návyasīnām.*

    āśvàśva- shows phonological play, as well as being a buried etymological pun, if the old connection between *āśú-* and *áśva-* holds. It is also a kind of anagram for the poet's name *śyāvā́śva-*. Note that both words must be distracted to 4 syllables (*āśú-aśva* and *śyāvá-aśva* respectively).

The sequence *utéśire* is entirely ambiguous between *utá ī́śire* and *utá ī́śire*. The Pp. reads the unaccented verb, but the *utá* suggests that the verb is conjoined with *váhante* and belongs to the rel. cl. and should therefore be accented.

V.58.2: In my opinion the same switch in number happens in this vs. as in the preceding one, exactly in the same way -- with *yé* in c picking up *gaṇám* in the first hemistich. The standard tr. take the rel. cl. of c with d: the pl. *yé* matches the number of its putative antecedent *nṝ́n* in d exactly. Although connecting with c thus appears to be the easier syntactic course, the exact parallelism between 1abc and 2abc makes that structure more appealing, and in addition the pāda-init. impv. *vándasva* in d seems to be marking a syntactic break.

The first hemistich, which consists entirely of an acc. phrase, obviously simply continues vs. 1, skipping back over the rel. cl. in 1cd to the *gaṇám* phrase in 1ab.

The bv *dhúni-vrata-* 'possessing a turbulent commandment' has, at first glance, a curious sense, but the point is that, as the thunderstorm, the Maruts' job -- their *vratá* -- is to be noisy, boisterous, and tumultuous.

The orig. *s*-stem *máyas-* has become a frozen, synchronically uninflected form in the RV. Therefore, the accent shift that makes possessive adjectives out of many neut. *s*-stems (type *yáśas-* 'glory' → *yaśás-* 'glorious') was probably not an available derivational strategy -- hence the somewhat clumsy cmpd with *bhū́-*.

The phrase *mayo(-bhúvaḥ) ... ámitāḥ* appears to be an etymological play but of course is not. Note also *māyínam ... mayo-*.

It's worthy of note that the vs. contains four nominal forms with 1st member ending in *-i*, with three different explanations: *khā́di-hasta-*, *dhúni-vrata-* (both bahuvrīhis with regular *-i*-stem 1st members; for the latter see AiG II.2.296), the somewhat mysteriously formed (see below) *dā́ti-vāra-*, and *tuvi-rā́dhas-* (Caland compounding *-i*-). To which we might add *mayínām*, as well as *mahitvā́* and the immediately preceding *ámitā(ḥ)* with mirror-image phonology.

The cmpd. *dā́ti-vāra-* occurs 3x in the RV (and nowhere else): here, I.167.8, and III.58.2, but its repetitions in the Indo-Europeanist literature must number in the thousands. It is there generally taken as a representative of an archaic cmpd type with a verbal governing first member, found also in Greek forms like βωτι-άνειρα 'nourishing men'. The proposals for the identity of the first member vary wildly, though probably the current favorite, due to the prestige of J. Schindler, who championed it, is a *-ti*-stem nominal. This is not the place to explore the history of this cmpd., but two things are worth noting: 1) the evidence for the other Vedic cmpds that are supposed to belong with it is very weak; see esp. the remarks on *rītyā̀p-* and *vṛṣṭí-dyu-* ad IX.106.9; 2) the three occurrences of the cmpd. have to be assessed in the context of apparent syntagms closely connected to it formulaically. The cmpd. always occurs as the final in a Triṣṭubh line; the VP *dāti vā́r^iyam* is found at the end of Jagatī/dimeter lines at VII.15.12, 42.4, with accented *dā́ti* at V.48.5, with impv. *dā́tu* at VII.15.11; with semantically similar obj., *dā́ti vā́jam* (Triṣṭubh) at VI.24.2, and non-adjacent with semantically similar obj. *dā́ti ... vásu* at IV.8.3. It is hard to know what to make of this assemblage. The *dā́ti* forms are clearly finite verbs (note the lack of accent on several, as well as the impv. form *dā́tu*) in the independent syntagm, but they are not standard forms of √*dā*; at best the *dā́ti* forms are aorist subjunctives. But their appearance in the syntagm, with adjacent VO order, is

obviously not independent of the cmpd. It is quite possible that *dā́ti* was extracted from the cmpd. and reinterpreted as a finite verb, but at the very least this means that the *dā́ti-* in the cmpd was not synchronically interpr. as a *-tí*-stem nominal. In any case, I am dubious about the antiquity of *dā́ti-vāra-* itself and even more so about the existence of a "type *dā́tivāra*," as I have discussed elsewhere. On *vītí-hotra-* see comm. ad II.38.1, on *rītyā̀p-* and *vṛṣṭí-dyu-* comm. ad IX.106.9

V.58.3: The enclitic 2nd pl. *vaḥ* in pāda a must refer to the assemblage of ritual celebrants and its referent is not the same as the 2nd ps. ref. to the Maruts in the 2nd hemistich (voc. *marutaḥ*, impv. *juṣadhvam*, vocc. *kavayo yuvānaḥ*).

　　As JL observed, pāda d has only one accented syllable (the first word *etám*). The voc. phrase that ends it, *kavayo yuvānaḥ*, recurs in the final vs., 8c [=V.57.8c], but with voc. accent because it is in a string of such vocc.: *kávayo yúvānaḥ*. As noted ad V.57.8, that verse consists almost entirely of accented vocc., so the poet seems to be playing with extremes of syntactically driven accent here.

V.58.4: The wrong sandhi in d *yuṣmā́d sádaśvo* is found in both Aufr. and HvN, but the Max Müller ed. has the correct *yuṣmā́t*. So, a copying error going back to Aufr., presumably generated from the *yuṣmā́d* beginning c, as well as immediately following *sád-*.

　　The two cmpds in c are a little aberrant in their semantic/morphology "interface." Given the sense of the phrase, it's possible that we're dealing with a lower linguistic register with somewhat looser cmpding practices. *muṣṭi-hán-* (3x RV): as a root noun cmpd we might expect the 1st member to have object relationship with 2nd – and mean 'smiting fist(s)' like, e.g., *vṛtra-hán-* 'smiting Vṛtra'. Scarlatta (690) suggests some (not very convincing) ways around this. In *bāhú-jūta-* we might expect agent+passive semantics: 'sped by the arms', like *índra-prasūta-* 'impelled by Indra' (etc. etc.).

　　Like 3d, 4b has only one accented syllable: *vibhvataṣṭā́ṃ janayathā yajatrāḥ* -- though the lack may be less noticeable since the accented syllable comes closer to the middle of the line.

　　The sense of *írya-* is disputed, and it has no secure etym. (see EWA s.v. *írin-*). Schlerath (Königtum) suggests that it's a deriv. of *írā́-* 'refreshing drink', meaning 'Nass spendend', and this suggestion has been adopted by Oberlies (RdR II.178). However, this does not work in all passages, nor with *írin-* (V.87.3) if that is related. It seems best to follow the old standard gloss 'regsam, rührig', etc., and the posited connection to √*ṛ* 'arise', etc. (see EWA loc. cit.).

　　There are two approaches to the interpr. of *vibhva-taṣṭá-*. One assumes that the first member is a PN, the name of one of the Ṛbhus (so Re, WG). One of the occurrences of the cmpd is in a Ṛbhu hymn, IV.36.5, in a vs. with both a form of the word *ṛbhú-* and the name of another Ṛbhu, *vā́ja-*. There the PN interpr. seems correct or at least a pun. However, in the other passages, III.49.1, V.42.12, and this one, all lacking a strong Ṛbhu presence, it seems best to see a more general meaning. Ge seems to follow this course (here and III.49.1, though not V.42.12) but his "vollendeten" doesn't give much hint as to how he interprets the first member.

　　The hapax *sád-aśva-* appears to be the only RVic cmpd with the first member *sa(n)t-* -- assuming, with most, that *sát-pati-* contains a reduced form of *sádas-* 'seat' (see

EWA s.v.). I take it as semantically related to the derived adj. *sátvan-*, of warriors 'the real thing'. So '(having) true horses' in the sense of "good men and true"; English "trusty" works well. We might have expected *s(u)váśva-* 'having good horses' parallel to *suvīra-* at the end of the pāda, but perhaps the poet wanted to vary the expression – though the pun on his name in 1c *āśⁱvaśva-* would suggest differently.

V.58.5–7: Sustained phonetic play, esp. with *p* and *r/r̥*, in *prá-pra* (5b), *pŕ̥śneḥ putrā́(ḥ)* (5c), *prā́yāsiṣṭa pŕ̥ṣatībhiḥ* (6a), *práthiṣṭa ... pr̥thivī́* (7a).

V.58.5: Note the phonetic play on initial *a* and final *ā̀: arā̀ ... ā́caramā́ áheva ... ákavā̀.*
        The syntactic break in the middle of pāda a, after *ivéd*, and the enjambment across the pāda boundary, with *áheva* in pāda a the subj. of the verb *prá-pra jāyante* in b, give the sense of unstoppable motion that the similes also provide.
        Flg. Hoffmann (Aufs. II.413 [=MSS 10 (1957) 61–62]), WG and Re (though Re rather mutedly) take *ákavā(ḥ)* as meaning that the Maruts do not become reduced in power, and Ge's rather vague 'vollkommen' is in the same realm, though obviously without the benefit of Hoffmann's disc. I prefer to take the adj. as outer-directed -- 'not stingy, unstinting' rather than inner-directed 'not retracting'.
        The VP *sváyā matyā́ ... sám mimikṣuḥ* "They have equipped themselves with their own poetic thought" seems implicitly to contrast with the opening of the previous hymn, V.57.1 *iyáṃ vo asmát ... matíḥ* "This poetic thought from us for you." This should remind us that the Maruts are both recipients and producers of praise poetry. See the disc. of the opening of this Marut cycle, V.52, where much is made of this dual role. A number of tr. take *matí-* as the equivalent of 'will' or 'intention' (van Bradke [Fs. Roth (1893) 119] Will, Ge, Kü [386] Absicht, WG Antrieb), but this stretches the meaning of this word unacceptably. In any case the locution must harmonize with the very similar one in I.165.1 adduced also by Ge: *káyā śubhā́ ... marútaḥ sám mimikṣuḥ / káyā matī́.*

V.58.6: Although the adjacency of *pŕ̥ṣatībhir áśvaiḥ* might seem to lend credence to the supposed shifting gender of *áśva-* 'horse' due to the clear fem. form of the preceding adj., it is better to follow the standard tr. in taking the two words as separate, with the fem. refering to dappled antelopes or simply dappled mares that serve as the horses for the Maruts' chariot. Note that this type of double ref. to their draught animals is found in the next vs., 7c, where the Maruts yoke "the winds as their horses" to the chariot pole.
        Pāda c is cleverly constructed: *ā́paḥ* 'waters' would be a perfectly acceptable subject of the following verb *riṇaté* 'flow, dissolve', but it is "bound" to *kṣódante* with the accent on *riṇaté* making the syntactic break clear. But the *real* subject of *riṇaté*, *vánāni* 'trees', is a much less appropriate subj. than what preceded.
        VIII.7.26, adduced by Ge, makes it clear that Heaven is roaring with fear, but the roaring must also represent thunder.

V.58.6–7: The final word of vs. 6 is *dyaúḥ*, while *pr̥thivī́* appears in the 1st pāda of 7, implicitly linking this standard pair, although they are contextually separate.

V.58.7: The first hemistich has distinct sexual overtones, with the Earth spreading herself to receive the Maruts' "embryo" -- though it is more decorously phrased than V.56.3.

It is difficult to get a causal reading from *hí* in c. It cannot be connected with the preceding pāda, and the action of c seems irrelevant to d, so connection with the following pāda seems unlikely. I have settled for the craven 'certainly'.

Note that *dhurí* here was anticipated by injunc. *dhuḥ* at the end of b. Moreover, verse-final *dyaúḥ* in 6d resonates with hemistich-final *dhuḥ* of 7b. One could almost wonder if the primal incest of Heaven and Earth is being subtly alluded to.

V.58.8: See comm. above on the identical vs., V.57.8. Although it is a repeated vs., it fits nicely into this hymn: 1) *ámṛtā ṛtajñāḥ* has ring-compositional relationship with 1d *amṛtasya svarā́jaḥ*; note the twisted phonetic relationship between *svarā́jaḥ* and *ṛtajñāḥ*. 2) *túvīmaghāso* echoes *tuvirā́dhaso* of 2d; 3) Pāda c: the accented voc. *kávayo yúvānaḥ* repairs the unaccented identical phrase in 3d. Perhaps this internal quotation is responsible for the metrical problem, 10 syls. with rest after caesura.

V.59 Maruts

V.59.1: As was indicated in the publ. intro., the referent of the 'spy' (*spáṭ*) is unclear. Ge suggests a number of possibilities, none compelling; WG take it as the singer. Most bizarrely, Old interprets the word as an interjection. I think it possible that it is the sun. One clue is the repetition of the phrase *suvitā́ya dāváne* "to give good faring," which is used of the Maruts in 4d. I therefore think the 'spy' must be a being that can function in the same way as the Maruts and provide the same type of benefit. The sun is elsewhere called a spy (X.35.8), provides light for creatures to move about, and appears before and, more importantly, after a storm.

Part of the solution to the foregoing question depends on another problem in the first pāda, the interpr. of the 3rd sg. verb (*prá ...*) *akran.* It is regularly assigned to √*krand* 'roar' (so, e.g., Gr, Lub), and the standard tr. all interpr. it so. But this interpr. is by no means universal: both Wh (Rts) and Macdonell instead assign it to √*kram* 'stride'. (Old, again bizarrely, takes it to √*kṛ.*) Narten sides with the √*krand* contingent (Sig. Aor. 99 n. 254), though without argument, simply asserting "... kann nicht ... zum Wz.-Aor. von *kram* gestellt werden." On the one hand, of course, the argument against √*kram* is obvious: it is a seṭ root -- its 3rd sg. root aor. should be, and in fact is, *ákramīt.* But there are countervailing arguments. √*krand* is found with the preverb *prá* in the RV only in IX.77.1 and, at least acdg. to MonWms., nowhere else in Skt., whereas *prá* √*kram* is common. Vs. 4d, containing the other occurrence of *suvitā́ya dāváne*, also contains a verb of movement (at least acdg. to me and Ge), *prá bharadhve* 'press forward'; moreover, *suvitā́ya* elsewhere in the RV regularly appears with verbs of motion (cf., e.g., nearby V.57.1 *suvitā́ya gantana*), whereas it does not fit easily with verbs of proclaiming (though cf. VIII.27.10 *prá naḥ pū́rvasmai suvitā́ya vocata*). As for the morphological problem, from the fairly common (9x) 3rd pl. root aor. *(á)kramuḥ*, an aniṭ-type *kran* could easily be backformed. If the verb does belong with √*kram* and the spy therefore *strides* forth, rather than *roars* forth, an entity like the sun makes good sense.

The pāda-initial *árcā* exactly matches pāda-init. *árcā* in the opening vs. of the opening hymn in the Marut cycle, V.52.1. As there, so here, we can read the preverb *prá* with that verb, borrowing it either from the vs. initial form or from the third word in the 2nd pāda. In fact this 2nd *prá* can be read as a preverb in tmesis either with *árcā* or with

final *bhare* (or both), and in the former case, it could be interpr. as having moved to the end of its clause *árcā divé prá* right before the caesura with an opening of 5, rather than being the first word of the 2ⁿᵈ clause *prá pṛthivyā́ ṛtám bhare* right after the caesura with an opening of 4. In other words, *prá* is ambiguously positioned both syntactically and metrically.

Another ambiguous form is *tárusanta* (in sandhi) in c, which can be resolved either as finite 3ʳᵈ pl. med. *tárusante* (so Pp, Gr, etc.) or an act. pres. part. masc. pl. *tárusantaḥ*. In the first instance it owes its accent to its clause-init. position; in the latter, because it's a participle. Since this stem has exactly 3 forms in all of Skt. -- this one, an active *tarusema*, and a med. 3ʳᵈ pl. (*-anta* replacement?) *tarusanta*, there is no way to tell, though, since *tarusanta* could also belong to an underlyingly active stem, I'm somewhat inclined towards the act. part.

V.59.2: The publ. interpr. of d follows Thieme (Untersuchungen, p. 39). WG draw attention to Th's revised interpr., in Kl. Sch. II.998–99 (and 834), in which he takes *mahé* as a dual and *vidathé* as a final dative: "sie halten inne, um den Regen zu verteilen," closely followed by WG "... haben zwischen den zwei Grossen (Himmel und Erde) zur Verteilung (des Regens)." Some of this seems worth adopting. Because of the *antár* a dual interpr. of *mahé* is attractive, but rather than separating *vidáthe* from *mahé* syntactically (the interposition of the caesura, invoked by Thieme and WG, does not seem sufficient reason) and making it a dative (though the stem is otherwise only thematic and a dat. should be excluded), it seems best to return to Old's suggestion that *mahé vidáthe* is a dual acc. phrase, as it is in VIII.39.1. I would then emend the tr. to "the men have taken their places between the two great divisions [=Heaven and Earth]." This is in fact where the Maruts as thunderstorm are positioned -- in the midspace.

V.59.3: The various tr. configure these four similes somewhat differently; I won't comment in detail on these versions. The most puzzling one is the first, in great part because it is not clear what the Maruts' horn would be -- perhaps the superstructure of their helmets? or their lightning bolts? (Sāy. takes it as their turban.) Ge suggests that it has a double meaning, horn and Selbstgefühl, but we still need some physical aspect of the Maruts that could be compared to cowhorns, so the second abstract sense doesn't help much.

Most interpr. take *sū́ryo ná cákṣuḥ* either as a mistake for gen. *sū́raḥ* (so Gr, e.g.) or as a decomposed bahuvrīhi, both yielding "like the eye of the sun." I see no reason to adopt either interpr. The suggested phrase, with a proper gen., is found in 5d *sū́ryasya cákṣuḥ* (and, of course, elsewhere) in the same metrical position. If Śyāvāśva had wanted to say that here, he would have. Instead he must be comparing the Maruts' eye to the sun, with both in the nom. Since *sū́ryasya cákṣuḥ* is a fairly common expression, its appearance in vs. 5 can be seen as poetic repair of the double nom. in our vs. In my view the quality held in common by sun and eye is the light emitted in the journey through space, but this depends on one's interpr. of *visárjane*. Ge gives it a later sense not otherwise found in the RV (Aufhören 'stopping', sim. WG Schwinden); Re takes it as 'expansion'. I see it as a variant of *ví√sṛ* 'stream/run/spread through'. Cf. *rájaso visāré* I.79.1, used of Agni compared to the sun. In fact, we might consider the two phrases to be

variants of each other; both are pāda final, with I.79.1 in a dimeter (hence iambic) cadence, while ours provides a Jagatī cadence.

V.59.4: Pāda b succinctly summarizes the special skills of the Maruts, which lie in their ability both to produce praise poetry and to perform hypermasculine feats.

The sandhi of *kás kā́vyā* is irregular, but connected to similar irregular sandhis before *kaví-* elsewhere. See comm. ad VII.18.2.

V.59.5: The simile in pāda a requires a hidden term of comparison. The "reddish horses" (*áśvāḥ ... aruṣā́saḥ*) must be, covertly, the flames of a fire; that is why they have the same lineage, because they all flare up from the same source. I doubt that the poet was telling us that all red horses have the same bloodlines.

The two middle similes (b, c) seem redundantly phrased, in that in each case one of the terms applied to the subject also provides the verb: *prayúdhaḥ prá ... yuyudhuḥ* (b), *suvŕ̥dho vāvr̥dhuḥ* (c). I do not understand the stylistic point of this redundancy, but since it's repeated in adjacent pādas it must be deliberate.

I also don't understand the *utá* in b, placed between preverb and verb (*prótá yuyudhuḥ*) and with nothing obvious to conjoin. Klein (DGRV I.373–74) takes it as conjoining b with a, but gives no explanation for its position, whose extreme rarity he notes. For another ex. of *utá* between preverb and verb, see X.53.7.

Another anomaly in b is the metrical shape of the verb, in pāda-final position: *yuyudhuḥ* would be far better read **yūyudhuḥ*. Although no forms of this poorly attested perfect are transmitted with long reduplication, it's worth noting the hapax redupl. *i*-stem *yū́yudhi-* (X.149.4), a variant of *yúyudhi-* (2x).

V.59.7: This vs. contains several syntactic ambiguities of not much moment. The rel. prn. *yé* in the 1st hemistich can in principle be picked up by either *áśvāsaḥ* 'horses' or *eṣām* 'of them [=Maruts]', and in fact either the horses or the Maruts could easily be compared to birds. I don't see any way to decide, though it's true that the default ref. of any masc. pl. in a Marut hymn is the Maruts.

In b *br̥táḥ* can in principle be acc. pl., gen. sg., or abl. sg., so that it could technically modify any of the three nouns in that pāda: acc. pl. *ántān*, gen. sg. *diváḥ*, or abl. sg. *sā́nunaḥ*, and it is found with both *diváḥ* and *snóḥ* (alt. form of *sā́nunaḥ*) elsewhere. With the standard tr., I take it with 'back'. Flg. Ge and Re, I assume that the 'back' is heaven's -- and in fact the gen. *diváḥ* could be read both with *ántān* and with *sā́nunaḥ*, between which it is positioned. WG suggest rather that it's the back of the earth, namely the mountains, and this is worth considering. If they're coming from the mountain, it may explain why/how they have stirred the *nabhanú-* of the mountain. Still, the clear phrase *diváḥ ... sā́nu* in the next hymn (V.60.3b) favors 'heaven'.

On *nabhanú-* see comm. ad IV.19.7.

V.59.8: The second clause of pāda a, *áditir vītáye naḥ*, is underspecified and has been variously interpr. Since *vītáye* is frequently used in stereotyped passages of gods 'pursuing' the oblation, often with a verb of motion, I supply this context here. For parallels, cf., e.g., VIII.20.10 *havyā́ no vītáye gata*.

The nom. pl. demon. *eté* is pāda-final, which seems an odd position for such a pronoun. But a glance at Lub's Concordance shows that *eté* is found in just that place fairly commonly -- e.g., in the next hymn, V.60.5a.

V.60 Maruts

V.60.1: The opening of the hymn, *ī́ḷe agním*, is a flipping of the opening of the first hymn in the RV, I.1.1 *agním ī́ḷe*, but since this phrase, in both orders, is found a number of times in the RV, we should perhaps not make too much of it. However, it's worth noting that this is the only other place where it opens a hymn.
    This is the only occurrence of the ppl. *prasattá-* 'seated to the fore/in front', and it here seems a substitute for the standard *puróhita-* 'placed in front', of Agni as the offering fire on the ritual ground. If *ī́ḷe agním* is a conscious evocation of RV I.1.1 (or a templatic Agni hymn), then *prasattáḥ* could be evoking the third word of I.1.1 (*agním ī́ḷe)* *puróhitam*.
    However, the gambling phrase that follows goes off in a very different direction; as is recognized by all standard tr., the phrase *ví cayat kṛtám* is dicing vocabulary. For the VP see I.132.1 and Falk (1986, *Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel*, pp. 126–28).

V.60.2: The parallelism between the two loc. phrases *pṛṣatī́ṣu śrutā́su* (a) and *sukhéṣu ... rátheṣu* (b) seems clear, but this entails that the Maruts are mounted both on their horses and on their chariots. This is a price that most tr. are willing to pay, but Re avoids it at the price of the parallelism, by attaching the dappled females to the chariots: "... qui sont montés sur les chars aisés conduit par les (antilopes) tachetées." Since the Maruts are clearly astride horses in the next hymn, V.61.3, I think we can have them there here as well.
    The person changes between hemistichs from 3rd (ab: *yé tasthúḥ*) in the rel. cl. to 2nd (cd: voc. *ugrā́ḥ ... vaḥ*) in the main cl.. This is hardly unusual in the RV. The standard tr. register this anacoluthon in various ways, WG most sharply, by supplying a main cl. for ab: "(Sie sind es), die ..." and separating the two hemistichs into two sentences. This seems unnec.

V.60.2–3: Note the concatenation: 2d ... *párvataś ci*# // 3a #*párvataś cit* ... The two vss. also hold the verb *rejate/rejata* steady (2d, 3b, though in slightly different metrical position, both post-caesura, with one pres. and the other injunc.), but in the first instance it's earth (*pṛthivī́*) that trembles and in the 2nd (the back of) heaven (*diváḥ*, initial in its pāda like *pṛthivī́*). So the standard pair heaven/earth are contrasted and identically positioned, but they are grammatically non-parallel. There is also a repetition of 'fear', though again in different forms -- nominal *bhiyā́* in 2c, pf. *bibhāya* in 3c, both pāda-final. This kind of patterned and varied repetition may not reach the heights of poetic art, but it is a pleasing demonstration of the way a RVic poet infuses freshness into the clichés that are his bread-and-butter.

V.60.4: The "marks of greatness" of the publ. tr. follows Re's "signes-de-grandeur"; *máhāṃsi* must refer to something that can be visible on their bodies.
    On the wooing context of this vs. see comm. ad X.94.10.

V.60.5: The standard tr. (all ultimately deriving from Sāy.) take Rudra and Pṛśni as the joint subj. of a verb to be supplied ("prepared," vel sim.), with *sudínā* as obj. (e.g., Ge "Ihr ... Vater ... (und) ... Pṛśni (haben) den Marut schöne Tage (bereitet)"). This seems unnec. The first part of this hemistich (through *pŕśnih*) seems simply to define the Maruts' parentage: *pitắ ... rudráh* is answered by *pŕśnih*; no 'mother' is necessary, because her role as their mother is virtually her only function in the RV and because the bahuvr. *pŕśni-mātar-* 'having P. as their mother', modifying the Maruts, is used three times by Śyāvāśva in this cycle (V.57.2, 3, 59.6). As for *sudínā*, it is used several times in the kind of nominal cl. envisioned in the publ. tr.; cf. IV.4.7 *víśvéd asmai sudínā* ... "All (days) (will be) day-bright for him"; VII.11.2 *áhāny asmai sudínā bhavanti* "for him the days become bright shining," both with dat. as here.

The epithet *sudúghā* used of Pṛśni may be somewhat ironically meant. At least in VI.66 it is said that Pṛśni only once produced milk (vs. 1), that is, she milked out her sons the Maruts, but that she did not give milk to them (vs. 5).

V.60.6: The second hemistich has a few complications. We can start with the *utá vā*: what is it conjoining? Ge and Re seem to take it as conjoining the vocc. *rudrāh* and *ágne*, and Klein (DGRV II.170) explicitly follows this interpr., though giving no other exx. of conjoined vocatives. But esp. given the various choices of place given in ab, conjoined by *vā*, the more natural reading is to assume it offers another alternative to *átah* 'from there' in c; the most natural of those choices would be "or (from) here." WG, by contrast, recognize that a choice of locations is what is probably meant, but have to supply the 2nd alternative complete: "von da aus ... oder (von wo ihr euch) auch nun (befindet)." My solution may be too tricky to be acceptable, but I think the 'here' is implicit in the *asya/asyá*. First, note that the cross-pāda sandhi *... asyágne ...* is compatible with either an unaccented or an accented gen. sg. pronoun. The Pp. takes it as the former, but if it is to be construed with *havíṣah* in the next pāda, as the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take it, as an adjective it should be accented (*asyá*). I do think it has an adjectival role with *havíṣah*, but I also think this near-deictic is a substitute for an adverb of place like *ihá* or *itás*, and the possibility of non-accentuation is an indirect indication that it can also be taken independently of *havíṣah* to express the potential location of the Rudras here and now on the ritual ground with Agni. I would slightly adjust the tr. to "from there, o Rudras, or (here and) now, o Agni, be cognizant ..." The awkwardness of folding Agni into the Maruts' actions is also on view in the next vs.

I do not understand the presence of the future impv. *vittất*. Perhaps with Sāy. (... *āgacchateti śeṣah*), we should supply a verb of motion that implicitly precedes the action of *vittất*: "from there (come here and) take cognizance ..." The following hymn, V.61, gives some support to this scenario. In V.61.17 Night is ordered to carry off the speaker's hymns to his patron, with an ordinary impv. *párā vaha*, while the flg. vs. contains a future impv. *vocatāt* (V.61.18) ordering her to speak for him once she gets there. It may also be that the future impv. was used here for convenience because the future impv. neutralizes number (also person, but that's irrelevant here) and thus can be applicable both to the plural Rudras and the singular Agni. It's accented because it follows an extrasentential voc. and therefore counts as being pāda-initial.

The standard tr. take *yád* as the neut. rel. prn. with *havís-* as antecedent ("… the oblation that we sacrifice"), but √ *yaj* never takes the offering as object, but rather the god who is the recipient. I therefore prefer to take *yád* as the subordinating conj.

V.60.7: The first pāda, *agníś ca yán maruto viśvavedasaḥ*, is a particularly complex ex. of a reverse *vāyav índraś ca* construction, with the subordinator *yád* placed, in modified Wackernagel's Position, after the first term and a voc. adj. attached to the second. This sequence of three vss. (6–8) contains three different versions of the awkward pairing of singular and plural entities in a voc. phrase: vs. 6 with its independent non-adjacent vocc. *rudrāḥ … ágne*, this *vāyav índraś ca* construction, and 8a *ágne marúdbhiḥ* with an instr. of accompaniment. Note that the adj. *viśvavedasaḥ*, which, since it's voc., should technically only modify the Maruts, is more commonly applied to Agni in the RV, and so he should probably be included in its domain.

   The problematic epithet *riśādas-* has already been discussed; see comm. ad I.2.7. As indicated there, the publ. tr. weakly favors Th's 'caring for the stranger' over Hoffmann's 'fastidious'. The original meaning is difficult to get to, because by either etymology (or any other one) the word would by this time be entirely opaque and, with no synchronic lexical anchoring, it would have been free to float semantically and get attached to other words secondarily. It is often used of the Ādityas, both collectively and individually, for whom 'caring for the stranger' is a quite congenial reading. But it is also, as here, often used of the Maruts, where it is not so good a fit. But generally when it is applied to the Maruts, it is either with reference to their benevolent and generous aspect (as here, where they are *viśvavedasaḥ* 'affording all possessions' and are urged *vāmám dhatta* "establish a thing of value") or is found nearby occurrences with the Ādityas (so here and V.61.16, with Mitra and/or Varuṇa V.64.1, 66.1, 67.2; cf. also I.186.8 *riśādaso mitrayújaḥ*) or both (cf. Agni, the Ādityas, and the Maruts all as both *viśvávedasaḥ* and *riśādasaḥ* in VIII.27.4).

V.60.8: The publ. tr. takes *āyúbhiḥ* in c as a PN (as often), thus identifying a separate group of co-soma-drinkers. The standard tr. take the instr. phrase in c as a further characterization of the Maruts, with *āyú-* as 'langlebig' (Ge, WG), 'vigilants' (Re). I now think this is the better course and would emend the tr. to "along with the pure, lively ones who set all in motion."

V.61 Maruts

   For the structure of this hymn and its place in the series, see publ. intro. Although there is an *itihāsa* in the Bṛhaddevatā (V.50) that supposedly recounts the circumstances of Śyāvāśva's composition, it was clearly constructed secondarily and fancifully on the basis of the Rigvedic text (see both Old and Ge).

V.61.1: Note the doubly marked superlative *śréṣṭhatama-* (also I.113.12), which therefore ought to be rendered as "the most fairest." It must be nom., not voc., because of its accent, since in a standard voc. phrase it would be unaccented flg. unaccented *naraḥ*.

   It is somewhat notable that the Maruts are referred to *éka-ekaḥ* "one by one," since they are usually not differentiated at all.

V.61.1–2: These two vss. contain a fairly high percentage of the total number of RVic 2nd pl. active pfs., with the poorly characterized ending -*a* on the weak stem: *āyayá* (1b), *śeka*, *yaya* (2b). Macd. (VG p. 358) lists only twelve forms in all of Vedic (some of which have more than one token) of the 2nd pl. act. pf., and one of these (*anāha*) is better interpr. otherwise (see comm. ad VIII.48.5).

V.61.2: *kathā́* can be read thus or as *kathā́ ā́*, with the same preverb as in the univerbated *āyayá* in the rel. cl. of 1b. The Pp. does not read the preverb. It is possible that the variation between *kathám* in the first question of the pāda and *kathā́* is meant to enable the preverb reading, and the publ. tr. reflects that.

 With Ge and Re I assume a gapped *kvà* in c and in 3a. WG simply take them as questions without an explicit interrogative ("Ist ein Sattel auf einem Rücken ...?" etc.). The difference is unimportant rhetorically.

V.61.3: For this vs. see publ. intro.; as pointed out there, the simile in c can either refer to sex or to childbirth.

 It is interesting that *sakthā́ni* is plural. Although there are plural 'men' (*náraḥ*) and therefore twice as many thighs as men, in Classical Sanskrit it is my impression that the dual would ordinarily be used in such a situation, where a number of men each spread their two thighs. RV seems more flexible.

V.61.3–4: The final word of vs. 3 is *jánayaḥ*, while the final word of the 1st hemistich of 4 is (*bhadra-*)*jānayaḥ*, showing the standard distribution of the 'wife' word, with simplex *jáni-* and *jāni-* as 2nd cmpd. member. The distrib. here is complicated by the fact that 3c *... ná jánayaḥ* produces an unusual cadence of four shorts, which **jā́nayaḥ* would easily repair. But since the long-vowel variant never shows up as a simplex, we should presumably resist the temptation to emend.

V.61.4: The 2nd pl. impv. *etana* shows an unexpected full-grade root syllable in the Saṃhitā text, but is read with metrically problematic but morphologically "correct" zero-grade in the Pp (*itana*). Of course, such full-grade 2nd pl. impvs. are found elsewhere, but in this case I wonder if it's a secondary extraction from forms cmpded with the preverb *ā́*, as in V.87.8, also a Marut hymn, with pāda-final *étana*. See also disc. ad VI.42.2.

V.61.5: As noted in the publ. intro., the standard tr. (now incl. WG) take *sánat* as meaning 'gave' (Ge schenkte, Re a donné, WG geschenkt hat), not 'gained'; Indeed Re claims that the stem *sána-* means 'give' in dānastutis, but provides no parallels. I have found none in any of the occurrences of this stem, but by contrast quite a number of exx. of *sána-* in dānastutis with the expected meaning 'gain' (I.126.3, V.30.14; VIII.25.22, 24; 46.22, 29; 68.17; X.62.11). Note, however, the honorable exception of Klein (DGRV I.431) "That one *has obtained* [my italics] a herd consisting of horses ..."; Grassmann likewise gives the verb in this passage its standard meaning 'erlangen'. The only possible reason I can imagine that this array of skilled philologists resolutely turned their backs on the very clear evidence of the semantics of this root is that they couldn't imagine that a female could have won or gained these prizes -- though, as noted in the publ. intro., it would be just as anomalous for a female to *give* them. If I am right that the woman in

question is a favored concubine, or even the Favorite Wife (*Vāvātā*) of later Vedic ritual, of Śyāvāśva's royal patron, then he may have indulged her with a little gift at the time of the general distribution of bounty. She does, after all, perform services for him, as pāda d shows.

     śatā́vayam is almost universally interpr. as 'consisting of a hundred (/hundreds of) sheep', with the 2ⁿᵈ member derived from *ávi-* (so Gr, Ge, Re, Klein; also AiG II.2.140 and II.1 Nachtr. 34), and certainly sheep fit nicely into a sequence with horses and cows. WG demur, suggesting that such a cmpd should rather be **śatāvya-* and proposing an alternate analysis on the model of *cátur-vaya-* 'fourfold' (2x) -- hence "livestock in horses and cows a hundred fold." However, the *-vaya-* of *cátur-vaya-* is not otherwise found in such cmpds and has no obvious source (see AiG II.2.906), and the long final vowel of the first member *śatā́-* would not be quite as easily explained (though stems like *śatā́magha-* and *śatā́vant-* also show unetymological long vowels). I do think WG's point is well-taken that **avaya-* is an unlikely deriv. to *ávi-*, esp. since that stem shows "closed" inflection, but -*vaya-* '-fold' has its own problems. I suggest rather that the cmpd orig. contained the well-attested deriv. *avyáya-* 'sheep-y, ovine' (hence **śatāvyaya-*), which has undergone haplology of the first *y*. Note that there's a lot of phononological play in these vss. (sibilants and *v*'s, with *a*'s), inspired by the poet's name Śyāva-aśva: 5a *sā́ aśvᶦyam* ... b *śatā́vayam* ... c *śyāvá-aśva* [or HvN's *śyāvāśᵘva*] ... 6a *śáśīyasī* ... b ... *vásyasī*, which could have contributed to the deformation of the underlying cmpd. I would therefore keep the older meaning, but with a different analysis of the 2ⁿᵈ member.

     Note also that the end of c, (*-stut)āya yā́*, is nearly identical to the ends of 1b *āyayá* and 2b (*kath)ā́ yaya*.

V.61.6–8: As indicated in the publ. tr., I consider these vss. a digression reflecting on the character of women in general, motivated by the introduction of the winning woman in vs. 5.

V.61.6: The comparative *śáśīyas-* is attested only twice in the RV, here and in IV.32.3. Though they have different senses in the two passages ('more reliable' here, 'more numerous' there, at least by my interpr.), the semantic dev. from the positive *śáśvant-* 'regularly recurring, in unbroken sequence, each and every' to the two senses of the comp. is fairly straightforward. Here, regularly recurring > constant > reliable. In VIII.1.34 this development takes a sexual turn, with a *śáśvatī nā́rī* being one who is "ever ready" for sex (in my interpr.), and a sexual nuance is not ruled out in our passage either -- though here the emphasis is on her dependable qualities compared to the unsatisfactory man.

V.61.7: The relativization is loose, at least in the Eng. rendering. Literally it should be "More reliable than a man is a woman who discerns the thirsting one ...," etc.

     The lexeme *ví √jñā* means 'discern, recognize', and a full rendering of the implication of these VPS would be something like "who recognizes (that a particular man) is famished ..." -- the idea presumably being that, having recognized their plights, she then sees to them, each in his own need. I have folded this two-step process into 'pay attention to'. If she does see to the needs of each, the third in the series *kāmínam* 'the desirous / lusting one' again introduces the sexual: she feeds, clothes, and has sex with the three in turn, at least by my interpr. The standard tr. have a tendency to attenuate the

third term -- e.g., Klein (DGRV I.432) "the one desiring (aid)" -- but in this saucy hymn I think sex is never far from the surface. I do have to admit, however, that *kāmín-* is not otherwise used of sexual desire, but has a more general application, incl. to the Maruts in this same cycle (V.53.16).

V.61.8: On *vaíradeya-*, lit. 'what is to be given for a man/hero', as Wergeld or blood money, see Roth (ZDMG 41: 672–76) and Macdonell-Keith Vedic Index s.v. *vaira*. Another indirect ref. to the same phenomenon is found in II.32.4 *vīráṃ śatádāyam* "a hero (for whom) a hundred (cows) are to be given." In our case the person in question is hardly worth the name 'man' and would be better off dead than alive, since his relatives would still receive the standard recompense for a *vīrá*, whatever his personal failings had been. It is telling that he is called a *paṇí-* 'niggard', a reminder to Śyāvāśva's patron that stinginess is a grave flaw.

V.61.9: On this vs. see publ. intro. As detailed there, I take the vs. as an elaborate pun. On the one hand a young woman (*yuvatíḥ*) is narrating the course of a race (or perhaps the progress of the horses that are to be given to the poet as his prize) to the poet -- thus the word *vartaní-* 'course, track' in b and the two chestnut (horses) (*róhitā*) in c. (Note also that *śyāvá-* is not only the short form of the poet's name but also, more usually, a horse color term.) But a more intimate scene is signalled by her low voice (√*rap* is ordinarily used of murmuring or muttering; see the esp. telling passage in the Yama/Yamī hymn X.10.4, where it is contrasted with √*vad*), her use of a nickname "Dusky" (*śyāvá-*), and esp. the pf. part. *mamandúṣī* 'having intoxicated, beguiled, seduced' (I follow Kü [366–67] in taking the pf. as transitive and supplying 'me' as its obj.). And the whole vs. can be read as a description of sexual intercourse. The 'course' would be the course of the sex act, and the two ruddy ones in c can be any paired female body parts; given the use of the same verb *ví* √*yam* here as in 3b, where men spread their thighs, they may be thighs, but the labia and breasts are also possible. Both Ge and Re take the dat. *purumīḷháya* in c as a PN and therefore not coreferential with *śyāváya* in b. But it makes more sense to interpr. *purumīḷhá-* in its full lexical sense 'having many rewards' (so also WG), describing the poet (*víprāya* in d) who has received his dakṣiṇā from his patron and who is in fact Śyāvāśva -- and implying that part of this dakṣiṇā is the seductive woman in this very vs. On Purumīḍha in later Vedic see comm. on the next vs.

   As a number of others have noted (e.g., Hoffmann, Injunk. 150), though the Pp. reads *arapat*, the actual form may be the injunctive *rapat*; the Pp's augment is not realized metrically or in the transmitted text. This doesn't affect the interpr. one way or the other. Though Gr lists *práti* as a preverb with *rapat*, this lexeme is not otherwise found (in all of Skt., if Mon-Wms is to be believed), and given the distance between the two words and what would be an unusual position for a preverb in tmesis (pāda-initial but in the pāda *after* the verb), I think it unlikely that they are to be construed together. I take *práti* as adverbial, reinforcing the intimacy of the scene, hence my 'face to face'.

V.61.10: My interpr. of the dānastuti vs. proper differs from the standard, which has in my opinion been unduly affected by the later Vedic rationalization of the passage. Both JB (I.151) and PB (XIII.7.12) briefly narrate a tale in which Purumīḍha and Taranta figure as the two sons of Vaidadaśvi, but as we just saw, *purumīḷhá-* is better taken in its

literal sense. I also take *tarantá-* not as a PN but in lexical value. In either case it is likely a thematization of the pres. participle *tárant-* (cf. AiG II.2.211), showing the same accent shift as AV *jīvantá-* from *jīvant-*, and it should mean 'overcoming, victorious' → 'victor'. By contrast I do think *vaídadaśvi-* is a PN, but a speaking name, as the vṛddhi deriv. of **vidád-aśva-* 'finding / acquiring horses' (cf. *vidád-vasu-*), an appropriate name for a patron. It is worth noting that both names Śyāvāśva and Vaidadaśvi have Iranian counterparts; see Mayrhofer Personennamen s.vv.

How to distribute *yáḥ* and *yáthā* and whether to interpr. the latter as a subordinator or a simile marker are the syntactic problems in this vs., and diff. tr. have diff. solutions. I take *yáḥ* as marking a generalizing rel. cl. ('whoever …') and *yáthā* as a simile marker, with c a nominal cl. functioning as the main clause to ab. The verb in b, *dádat* is a short-vowel subjunctive ("whoever will give …") but can also be interpr. as a thematized injunc., which in turn can be read with Vaiśvadaśvi ("as V. did"). If I had had the courage of my convictions, "did" would not be in parens. in the publ. tr.

V.61.11: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. marks the beginning of the second, more conventional hymn in this composite, at least in my analysis.

Technically speaking 'horses' should be in parens.

It is not clear if *īm* has its usual acc. function: it could anticipate *mádhu* in b, though that seems somewhat distant and that participial phrase is otherwise fully contained in b; it could function as a reflexive marker ("drive *themselves*"); or it may be one of the rare instances of functionless *īm*.

I have silently depluralized *śrávāṃsi*, since 'fames' is not English. Perhaps the point here is that each Marut has his own *śrávas*, though, since they are seldom distinguished, this may be overthinking it.

V.61.12: This vs. has produced more consternation than it deserves, because of the reluctance of many interpr. to allow *yéṣām* to be coreferential with the subj. of *vibhrájante*. In these interpr., if the subj. of that verb is the Maruts, then another referent for *yéṣām* must be found; if *yéṣām* refers to the Maruts, then another subj. of the verb must be found. See Old's lengthy disc., which includes the differing suggestions of numerous scholars (incl. also interpr. *yéṣām* as **yé eṣām*) but doesn't reach firm conclusions. Of modern interpr., Re takes *yéṣām* as the Maruts and makes *ródasī* the subj. of the verb: "les Deux Mondes brillent au loin"; in a fractured sense this goes back to Max Müller's tr. in SBE 32, but Müller emended the verb to **bhrájate* and took *ródasī* as sg., whereas Re mentions no such emendation and seems to be taking *ródasī* as dual, which will certainly not work grammatically with a pl. verb. WG seem to have accepted the **yé eṣām* interpr. Ge, surprisingly, is more relaxed and allows coreference under the rubric of "der reflexive Gebrauch des Relativs," which seems perfectly plausible to me: they flash with their own splendour.

The "bright ornament" of c is the sun: *rukmá-* is so used elsewhere in clearer context (VI.51.1, VII.63.4).

V.61.13: I have taken the two negated adjectives at the end of b and c, *ánedyaḥ* and *ápratiṣkutaḥ*, as predicated, in contrast to all the standard tr. There is, of course, no way to tell.

V.61.15: Whose *dhī́-* is it? Ge, Re, and WG all assume it is the mortal's (e.g., Ge "Ihr ... führet den Sterblichen recht nach seinem Sinn"), but the placement of the phrase *itthā́ dhiyā́* right after *praṇetā́raḥ* and at some distance from *mártam* at least weakly suggests that it is the Maruts's. Since, as I have had occasion to remark many times, the Maruts sometimes have the role of verbal praisers and sometimes are the recipients of the same, I think both readings are possible and the poet may have wanted it to remain ambiguous. Tichy's tr. (-tar-stems, 300–301) seems to attribute the *dhī́-* to the Maruts or at least remains neutral: "Ihr bringt den Menschen vorwärts ... recht mit Bedacht."

Note that in the cmpd *yāma-hūti-* it is the Maruts' journeys (*yā́ma-*, 1st member) but the mortal's invocations (*-hūti-*, 2nd member).

V.61.17–19: As noted in the publ. intro., the patron's name Rathavīti ('pursuit of the chariot'?) in 18, 19 is punned upon. In 17 (before he is explicitly mentioned, though the patronymic Dārbhya would presumably evoke him) Night is asked to carry the hymns "like a charioteer" (*rathī́r iva*); in 18 the 2nd cmpd. member *-vīti-* is derived from the same root √*vī* 'pursue' that supplies the verb *ápa veti* 'goes off track'.

V.61.17: I do not understand why the goddess Night acts as the intermediary between the poet and his patron; see Ge's n. 17–19, which doesn't seem to me entirely satisfactory.

V.61.18: The Rathavīti phrase is in the loc.; the publ. tr. renders it as if the addressee, which is technically incorrect. It is either a loc. absol. without participle or a "chez/bei" expression: "speak for me thus when R. (is present) / at R's." Since the net result is the same, I have kept the easier-to-parse addressee tr.

V.61.19: Ge and Re take *gómatīḥ* as a ref. to the Gomatī river; WG to "cow-rich lands." I think it's likely a pun, and I supply *víśaḥ* 'clans' for one half of the pun.

[V.62-78 JPB]

V.79 Dawn

The meter of this hymn is Paṅkti, with five 8-syllable pādas. The fifth in all vss. is the refrain, a voc. phrase *sújāte aśvasūnṛte* "o well-born lady, liberal with horses," which is essentially detachable. So the hymn comes across as standard Anuṣṭubh, with an appended and superfluous refrain. As indicated in the publ. tr., the contents are for the most part uninspired, contrary to most Dawn hymns, though closer inspection reveals more intricate patterns than a superficial reading turned up.

V.79.1–3: These three vss. follow the same pattern: Dawn is urged to repeat for us now a previous action she performed in the presence of and for the benefit of a previous patron. The name Satyaśravas Vāyya appears in all three vss. (The Anukr. attributes the hymn to Satyaśravas Ātreya, but as Ge points out [n. 1d] he is surely the patron, not the poet.) Curiously in vss. 1 and 3 Satyaśravas Vāyya is identified as the previous patron, while in vs. 2 he is the current patron and the previous patron has a different name. This chronological slippage is somewhat confusing -- and is emphasized by having identical

clauses differing only in the tense/mood of the verb and the demonstrative vs. relative pronoun:

> 2cd *sā́ vy ùcha sáhīyasi, satyaśravasi vāyyé*
> 3cd *yó vyaúchaḥ sáhīyasi, satyaśravasi vāyyé*

The insistence on this generous patron of the past has a purpose: there is a parallel insistence on the patrons of today in the rest of the hymn. Although only Dawn is addressed, the poet is clearly sending a message to the patrons, to generously redistribute the wealth that Dawn will bestow on them, on the model of Satyaśravas.

V.79.1: The phrase *mahé … rāyé divítmatī* is very reminiscent of IV.31.11 *mahó rāyé divítmate*, with an adverbial *maháḥ* but a dat. *divítmate* modifying *rāyé*. See comm. ad loc. It seems likely that our fem. *divítmatī* is a nonce adaptation to the fem. context. As for *divítmant-*, I now tentatively accept the analysis of *divít-* as containing the root noun -*i-t-* and would alter the tr. to "as one coming from heaven" or "as heaven-sent one."

V.79.2–3: Is the comparative 'mightier' (*sáhīyas-*) used to assert that Satyaśravas Vāyya is mightier than Sunītha Śaucadratha?

The Pp. reads accented *ví* even directly before accented *aúchaḥ* (2b, 3c), where we might expect univerbation and loss of accent on the preverb. The Saṃhitā text (*vyaúcho*) is of course ambiguous. I would read the sequence with unaccented and univerbated *vi*; the verb *aúchaḥ* owes its accent to its presence in a rel. cl. The Pp. may have accented *ví* on the model of the impv. *ví ucha* (2c, 3b; *vy ùcha* in the Saṃhitā text).

sā́ with the 2nd ps. impv. *ucha* simply shows the common use of the *sá*/*tám* prn. with 2nd ps. impvs.; see my 1992 "Vedic 'sá figé': An inherited sentence connective?" Elaborate semantic/functional interpr., like Re's "de la même manière, dans les mêmes conditions (heureuses)" (EVP 3, ad loc.) or WG's *yā́ … sā́* … "welche du … als solche du" are unnec.

V.79.3: *yó* beginning pāda c represents *yā́* + *u* (note Pp. *yó íti*), but the apparent masc. form causes a momentary stir.

V.79.4: With the standard tr. I take cd as the main cl. corresponding to the rel. cl. in ab, despite the lack of a resumptive pronoun and of a verb. The pattern established in the first 3 vss. of alternating rel. and main clauses makes this interpr. likely, even though the subjects have changed.

Contra Ge, who takes ab as referring to the singers and cd to the patrons, I think both hemistichs refer to the singers. So also Re and WG, an interpr. that goes back to Sāy. (see Ge's n. 4). Here the circulation of wealth appears to be a two-way transaction: the poets praise Dawn and receive bounties. How that happens is laid out in the next few vss., which complicate the two-way model.

V.79.5: The two-party sketch in vs. 4 gives way to a three-party model: when Dawn gives them the go-ahead, as it were, the patrons, who have not yet been mentioned in the hymn as a class, bestow bounties on the poets.

This vs. presents some difficulties, not least the referent(s) of the various plurals and their grammatical identity. With most, I take the *gaṇā́ḥ* to be the priest/poets who

were also the subj. of the preceding vs. and who greeted Dawn with praise in 4ab. The first hemistich of this vs. expresses the potential reciprocity for this praise: Dawn considers its producers worthy to be given bounties, the same bounties referred to in 5c.

I part company with the standard tr. in the 2nd hemistich. Most take the subj. here to be the patrons, who either physically surround the priest/poets (so I read Old) while giving to them or have succeeded (using a sense of *pári √dhā* ['conclude' not found till later]) in giving, finished giving to them (Ge, Re, WG). By contrast I consider the subject still to be the priest/poets. They surround the patrons, who are giving to them. *dádataḥ* is of course grammatically ambiguous: I take it as acc. pl., while the rest interpr. it as nom. pl. The use of the word *gaṇá-* 'throng' to refer to the poets in ab helps explain the surprisingly physical verb 'surround' in cd: the picture is of the over-eager (*váṣṭi-*) ritual recipients almost ganging up on the patrons.

V.79.6–7: Here the patrons, who have properly compensated the priest/poets, receive their own reward from Dawn. Interestingly it is not material, but rather *yáśas-* 'glory' -- though glory consisting of heroes (*vīrávat*), meaning, narrowly, sons, but also men belonging to our side who will perform well in warfare and acquire battle glory. The emphasis on non-material rewards for the patrons continues in vs. 7 with "lofty brilliance and glory" (*dyumnǎ bṛhád yáśaḥ*), while the poets receive material gifts, *rádhāṃsi áśvyā gavyā* "benefits consisting of horses and cows." For a similar split between material rewards for the singers and non-material ones for the patrons see V.86.6, where the patrons get "lofty fame" (*śrávo bṛhát*) and the singers get wealth and refreshment (*rayím ... íṣam*).

V.79.8: The two-party model returns here, with Dawn bringing the gifts directly to the priest/poets.

V.79.9: The last vs. before the summary vs., this one brings the hymn ring-compositionally back to its beginning with its opening impv. *vy ùcha* 'dawn forth', a lexeme found 4x in vss. 2–3 (2b, 2c, 3b, 3c).

As noted in the publ. intro., this prohibition and its striking simile are the most notable features of this hymn. The *mā́* clause contains a present injunctive, not an aorist. Hoffmann (79) explains it as an inhibitive, not a prohibitive -- his standard explanation for the use of present injunctives in such contexts. Although IH has demonstrated that this explanation of the use of pres. injunctives with *mā́* doesn't hold -- they are generally used when an aor. injunc. is not available -- in this case, Hoffmann's analysis may be correct. There is a perfectly fine root aor. to √*tan* and it in fact occurs once with *mā́* (I.91.23), so we may need to seek a functional explanation somewhat in the manner of Hoffmann's. On the other hand and after further thought, I wonder if the pres. stem is used in this context in order to express a *durative* prohibitive, rather than an inhibitive. That is, *starting now*, when you dawn, don't dawdle at your work. She's just been ordered to dawn, which makes the start time now, not in the past, but the poet fears that once she starts she's going to draw it out longer than she should. It shouldn't be inhibitive in KH's sense, because that would mean she's already started the work. On still another hand, however, since this is functionally the final vs., which refers back to the beginning

of the hymn, perhaps the poet *is* saying that Dawn has been at work since that beginning and should finish it up.

It is difficult not to take *sū́raḥ* as a nom. sg. to a thematic stem (so, e.g., Ge and Re), although many occurrences of *sū́raḥ* are better interpr. as gen. sg. to *svàr-* -- incl. in this same sequence *sū́ro arcíṣā* in VIII.7.36. WG take it as a gen., but then must identify a different subj. for *tápāti*, leading them to introduce Varuṇa and a superstructure of explanation that seems over-elaborate. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think the point of contact is the assumption that thieves work at night and if the sun rises on them, they will be caught out.

V.79.10: *pramī́yase* is variously rendered, but 'diminish' or the like fits both the root and the context. Thieme's principled insistence on 'tauschen, täuschen' (ZDMG 41 [1941] 107–8 = KlSch 32–33) produces an unconvincing interpr., requiring further shoring up: "... die du ... nicht getäuscht wirst (= du, deren Absicht zu schenken nicht vereitelt wird)." That Dawn does not diminish in cd harmonizes with the increase in gifts that the poet urges in ab.

The dat. *stotŕ̥bhyaḥ* may be construed with *uchántī* rather than *pramī́yase*, thus "dawning for the praisers, you do not diminish" (so Re, Th), but this would have no appreciable effect.

V.80 Dawn

As noted in the publ. intro., every vs. but the first begins with *eṣā́* 'she, this one here'.

V.80.1: In contrast to the relentless nominative representation of Dawn in the rest of the hymn, this 1st vs. begins with 3 full pādas of accusative describing her.

V.80.3: I previously accepted the standard view that *áprāyu-* is a root noun compound derived from *prá √yu* (√*yu* 2 'keep away') and is essentially a variant of *áprayuchant-* (cf., e.g., EWA s.v. *YA V²*, p. 404 with lit.). There are, of course, two formal problems with this analysis: the long *ā* of the preverb, which, notably, is not found in *áprayuchant-*, and the lack of the empty *-t-* suffixed to root nouns ending in short resonants (cf. *dveṣo-yú-t-* to this same root). It should also be noted that the Pp. analyzes *áprāyu* as *ápra-āyu* (also in I.89.1); although the Pp. is not always a reliable guide, its evidence should be considered. The issue has recently been discussed in detail by Scar (439–40), who in the end rejects the *prá √yu* interpr. in favor of a bahuvrīhi with *ā́yu-* 'youth, lifespan', a neut. noun that is less well-attested than both the neut. *ā́yus-* 'id.' and the derived adj. *āyú-* 'lively'. The semantics of this cmpd. are a little tricky: Vedic people always pray to have their lifetimes lengthened, using the preverb *prá* (generally with √*tr̥̄*), so **prā́yu-* should mean 'having a lengthened lifetime', a good thing, and *áprāyu-* the reverse, hence a bad thing. However, Scar suggests 'nicht alternd, ewig jung', a good thing. Although it's somewhat disturbing that the usually positive collocation of *prá* and *ā́yu(s)-* remains positive when negated, Scar's reconstruction of the semantic development seems plausible. A further development from 'ever young' → 'lively' → 'not slacking, unremitting' can be envisioned -- esp. if, as I think likely, the word ceased to be transparent and got partially captured by *prá √yu* and its negated adj. *áprayuchant-* (a

scenario also sketched by Scar). Note *áprayuchan* nearby in V.82.8. Though I do not feel that the publ. translations of *áprāyu-* need to be altered, my analysis of the form now starts in a very different place. A somewhat different value is proposed for *áprāyuṣ-* in I.127.5, but starting with the same basic elements; see comm. ad loc.

V.81 Savitar

The hymn falls into three symmetrical sections (vss. 1–2, 3, 4–5) based generally on their verse/pāda-initial elements, but these sections do not correspond to thematic divisions. The first section, vss. 1–2, is marked by *ví*. Though the first pāda of vs. 1 lacks *ví*, the repetition is insistent starting with pāda b *víprā víprasya ... vipaścítaḥ*, followed by hemistich-initial *ví* in 1c *ví*, 2a *víśvā*, 2c *ví* along with other, internal *ví*'s: 1c *vayunāvíd*, 2a *kavíḥ#* / 2b *prásāvīd ... dvipáde* / 2d *ví rájati#*. The *ví* may play on the middle syllable of the god's name *savitár-*, and it also ties him to the *vípra-* he is identified with in 1b. Given that the next hymn (V.82) plays on the first syllable of his name (*su*/*sav*) and the root from which it's derived, it may not be farfetched to suggest that this section focuses on the 2nd syllable.

Both hemistichs of the next vs. begin with the rel. prn. (3a *yásya*, 3c *yáḥ*), a relatively low-energy repetition between the *ví*'s of vss. 1–2 and the *utá*'s of 4–5. In these last two vss. the repetition of *utá* explodes: every pāda save for the last (5d) begins with *utá*, seven occurrences in all. Beside these patterns of repetitions, it is striking that the first and last pādas of the hymn do not participate; the last pāda serves as an extra-hymnic summary pāda.

The name Savitar is found once in each vs.

V.81.1: With Ge I take *vipaścítaḥ* as nom. pl. qualifying the (human) *vípra*-s, who attend to the inspiration of "the lofty inspired poet," namely Savitar (sim., but not ident., WG). By contrast, Gr, Re, Th (Unters. 21) take *vipaścítaḥ* as gen. sg., modifying Savitar. The latter interpr. requires that the gen. phrase *víprasya bṛható vipáścitaḥ* is dependent on *mána utá ... dhíyaḥ* in the previous pāda. In other words, the poets hitch up the mind and insights of Savitar, not their own. This would not be impossible but is less likely in the context of Vedic poetic composition, and the middle voice of *yuñjate* suggests that the objects of the verb are the poets' own.

The word *párişţutiḥ* is a hapax, and the lexeme *pari √stu* is otherwise only late and rare. I do not know exactly what it refers to, but it is likely a technical ritual term.

V.81.2–3: Just as Savitar follows the lead (*prayáṇam*) of Dawn in 2d, the other gods follow his lead (also *prayáṇam*) in 3a. The masc. rel. prn. *yásya* beginning 3 makes it clear that the referent has changed -- which is not clear from the English.

V.81.3: The publ. tr. takes instr. *ójasā* as belonging to the gods, whereas the standard interpr. assign this *ójas-* to Savitar. Although there is no way to tell from the Skt., I think "with/through his power" is the better choice, esp. given the parallel instr. *mahitvanā* in d, which is definitely Savitar's. I would so emend the tr.

The second hemistich at first appears quite straightforward syntactically, but the syntax clashes with what we expect the sense to be -- and on further inspection the syntax turns out to be skewed, too. I'm afraid that in the publ. tr. this has produced regrettable

incoherence. Looking at the syntax first, we seem to find a textbook case of a relative / correlative construction: *yáḥ ... sá ...*, with an accented verb in the rel. cl. *vimamé*, hence "who measured out the earthly (ones), he ..." But there is a problem, because the direct object of the rel. cl., *pā́rthivāni*, should be completed by *rájāṃsi*, which is technically in the main clause beginning with *sá*. This does not bother Ge or Re, who tr. the two acc. pls. together in the rel. cl. (e.g., Ge "der die irdischen Räume durchmessen hat ..."). WG by contrast do notice the problem and tr. *pā́rthivāni* in the rel. cl. and *rájāṃsi* in the main cl. and supply all the missing parts in each cl.: "(er), der die irdischen (Räume) durchmessen hat, er ist Etaśa, der ... die (irdischen) Räume (durchmessen hat) ...," which is similar to my publ. tr. -- though a bit more coherent -- but also a bit clumsier. The publ. tr. assumes that the 2nd set of spaces are 'heavenly'; cf. IV.53.3 *ā́prā rájāṃsi divyā́ni pā́rthivā* "(Savitar) has filled the heavenly and earthly spaces." The semantic problem is posed by the phrase *sá étaśaḥ* smack in the middle and apparently starting the main clause, coreferential with the *yáḥ* in the rel. cl., which we all had good reason to think was referring to Savitar. One solution has been to take *étaśa-* as an adj., 'dappled' vel sim (so Sāy.: *etavarṇaḥ śubhraḥ śobhamānaḥ*) or 'hastening' (so Gr, though not for this passage). But most take it as the PN Etaśa, the famous, if often enigmatic, horse of the sun. Following that tactic, as far as I can see we must take it as an identification or a simile, with Savitar equivalent to Etaśa -- not as a complete change of subject. There are two ways I can see to do this -- 1) take *sá étaśaḥ* as a parenthetical interjection within the relative clause, which otherwise occupies all of cd: "Who measured out the earthly spaces -- he is Etaśa! -- with his greatness -- god Savitar ..." or 2) to keep the rel./corr. structure but fold *étaśaḥ* in as unmarked identification / simile: "Who measured out the earthly (spaces), he, (like/as) Etaśa, measured out the (heavenly) spaces with his greatness: god Savitar." I prefer the latter, because it allows us to supply 'heavenly' in the main clause, and surely the point of contact between Savitar and Etaśa in this context is that Etaśa crosses the heaven daily, "measuring it out," as he pulls the sun's chariot. Etaśa as a measurer of earthly spaces makes little sense. I would therefore emend the publ. tr. to the 2nd alternative. That Savitar is identified with Etaśa in one of his aspects may be supported by the explicit identifications with other figures in the next two vss.: *mitró bhavasi* (4d), *pūṣā́ bhavasi* (5b).

V.81.4–5: 4b and 5d are entirely parallel in structure:
    4b *utá mitró bhavasi deva dhármabhiḥ*
    5d *utá pūṣā́ bhavasi deva yā́mabhiḥ*
This strict parallelism should extend to the two final instr. pls. -- that is, Savitar should become the god in question by virtue of a quality/entity held in common and expressed in the instr. I therefore think it unlikely that *dhármabhiḥ* is the vague "nach deinen Eigenschaften" of Ge or "par (tes) dispositions-naturelles" of Re; it needs to refer to an actual thing, like Pūṣan's journeys. In the publ. tr. I render it as 'supports' (sim. WG "durch deine Unterstützungen"), keeping in mind that Savitar often holds up his arms, which may function as literal supports. But it may rather be something like 'institutes, ordinances', referring to the regulation of time and activity that Savitar performs.

V.82 Savitar

As noted in the publ. intro. as well as just above ad V.81, this hymn contains numerous verbal and nominal forms of the root √*sū* 'impel', whose agent noun 'Impeller' Savitar is grammatically. Every vs. in the hymn contains a form of the name *savitár-*, but play on the root doesn't start till vs. 3. There are eight such forms, with a concentration on the impv. in the middle: pres. subj. *suváti* (3b), aor. injunc. *sāvīḥ* (4b), pres. impv. *suva* (4c, 5b, 5c), them. loc. *savé* (6b), them. acc. (*satyá)savam* (7c), with a return to the original pres. subj. *suváti* (9c). Starting with vs. 3, only vs. 8 lacks such a form -- but *sᵘvā(dhīr)* with distracted *suvā* fits phonologically, though not etymologically. We might also note that the first two vss., which lack the punning root forms, do contain forms that might be considered phonological precursors: 1c *sarva(-dhátamam)*, 2a *sváyaśastaram*, 2c *svarájyam*. With so much concentration on form in this hymn, we should not be surprised that the content is not particularly stimulating.

V.82.1: As Re points out, this vs. is reminiscent of the Gāyatrī mantra, III.62.10. Putting them side-by-side, it is difficult not to assume that one of them (presumably this one) is a deliberately fractured version of the other:

> III.62.10 *tát savitúr várenyam, bhárgo devásya dh   īmahi*
>   *dhíyo yó naḥ pracodáyāt*
> V.82.1 *tát savitúr vṛṇīmahe, vayám devásya bhójanam*
>   *śréṣṭham sarvadhátamam, túram bhágasya dhīmahi*

Note esp. the first pādas, whose 1ˢᵗ 2 words are identical and whose last words both belong to √*vṛ* 'choose'. In the 2ⁿᵈ pāda *devásya* is identically positioned, and the phrase *bhárgaḥ ... dhīmahi* is echoed by our pāda d *bhágasya dhīmahi*, but with a diff. noun (*bhága-*, not *bhárgas-*). The remainders of the vss. diverge, but the tone is certainly set by pāda a and the similarities of b/d. It is difficult to know what to make of this -- whether the Gāyatrī mantra had already achieved some sort of local fame that lent itself to parodic imitation or whether the similarities are just the result of the usual formulaic underlayer (though there are no other vss. that begin *tát savitúr*). It's also somewhat striking (and could be used as an argument either way) that the vs. in our hymn is not a Gāyatrī but an Anuṣṭubh -- and it is the only Anuṣṭubh in a Gāyatrī hymn. If III.62.10 was already known as the (or a) Gāyatrī mantra, our poet could be slyly tweaking that reputation. Or this can all be my post-hoc invention.

V.82.8: With regard to *áprayuchan* see disc. of *áprāyu-* ad V.80.3.

V.82.8–9: There are no overt main clauses in these last two vss., whose vs.-init. rel. prns. *yáḥ* hang off the accs. in vs. 7, but it is possible that the vs.-final *savitá* (or in 8 *deváḥ savitá*) in both cases constitutes a de facto main cl.

V.82.9: A further question concerns the last clause of 9c, *prá ca suváti savitá*. Ge (fld. by Klein [DGRV I.248 n. 93, 251]) takes *cá* as subordinating, tr. 'wenn', thus producing a dependent clause dependent on another dependent clause "who ..., when he ..." (Re has a fussy interpr. involving an ellipse that I find puzzling.) I see no reason for Ge's interpr., but take the *ca* as conjoining the two clauses ab and c (or their verbs). The accent on *suváti* is already accounted for by its presence in a rel. cl., and I think it more likely that

the poet would end the hymn with a ringing announcement of what Savitar is going to do rather than a conditional uncertainty about whether he's going to do it.

The phrase *āśrāváyati ślókena* is technically an etymological figure, somewhat obscured by the *l*-form of *ślóka-* and its highly lexicalized state.

V.83 Parjanya

V.83.1: The verb *dadhāti* can be read with both *rétaḥ* and *gárbham*, the latter in the idiom *gárbham √ dhā* 'impregnate', found again in 7a.

V.83.2: This vs. quickly modulates from the physical to the moral, with Parjanya the scourge not only of the trees but of demons and evil-doers.

V.83.3: We might expect **rathī́r iva* here, to the *vṛkī́-*stem *rathī́-*, but the ending *-ī́* must belong instead to the *-ín*-stem *rathín-*, which does have an independent existence. See Old ad loc.

I take the whip in the simile to be lightning; both a whip and a lightning flash are slender, fast, unpredictable, and have a non-straight trajectory. The flash of lightning would also do the revealing in pāda b. Note also that thunder is covered in pāda c and rain in b and d, so lightning is what's otherwise absent.

"Rain-bearing cloud" (*varṣyàṃ nábhaḥ*) in d seems like a quick and a bit half-hearted poetic repair of "rain-bearing messengers" (*dūtā́n ... varṣyàn*) in b. The two pādas hold the verb *kṛṇute* constant.

V.83.5: Note the unusual geminate in *nánnamīti*, dissimilated from **námnamīti*.

In pāda b the question is whether the scene is set during the thunderstorm, with frightened quivering livestock, or afterwards, as they gambol in new growth. Pāda a speaks for the former, c for the latter. Ge (and, it seems, WG) opt for the latter, while I favor the former, though without strong grounds.

The first three pādas of this vs. begin with *yásya*; the fourth does not, but ends with a close phonological match, *yacha*.

V.83.6: The default referent of *ásuraḥ pitā́ naḥ* "the lord, our father" here is of course Parjanya, since this is a Parjanya hymn and the subject is urged to pour out water (cf., e.g., Hale, *Asura*, 46–47). However, I wonder if this is not rather a reference to Dyaus Pitar, or at least an identification of Parjanya with Dyaus Pitar. For Heaven as *pitár- ásura-*, see X.124.3 as well as disc. and other related passages in my "The Divine Revolution of RV X.124" (Ged. Staal, 2016), 294, and of course Zeus famously 'rains' in Greek.

V.83.7–8: These two vss. ring changes in the oppositional pair *úd* 'up and *ní* 'down': 7c *n̐áñcam*, 7d *udváto nipādáḥ*, 8a *úd acā ní ṣiñca*. Note that 7b *udanvátā* might seem to belong with this sequence, but *udan-* there is the 'water' word.

V.83.8: Hoffmann's positing (Aufs. I.164 = KZ 79 [1965]) of a separate root *√ añc* 'scoop, draw (water)' seems unnec., at least for this passage.

V.84 Earth

For a discussion of this hymn as an implicit riddle, see my "A Sanskrit Riddle in Three Movements: Rig Veda V.84," in *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, ed. Billie Jean Collins and Piotr Michalowski, 2013, pp. 155-58. Its placement immediately after the Parjanya hymn, to which it is attached as a kind of pendant, is important. Note also that all three standard words for 'earth' are found in the hymn: *pṛthivî* (1b), *bhûmi-* (1c), and *kṣám-* (3b), though in different cases and usages. The riddling middle vs. lacks such a word.

V.84.1: The exclamation with which the hymn opens, *báḍ*, has a very un-Indo-Aryan shape, with a plain *b* and an unmotivated retroflex *ḍ*. This *ḍ* becomes *ḷ* before words beginning with a vowel, showing the standard Ṛgvedic intervocalic change -- which, interestingly, operates across word boundary here and in the 7 other passages in which *báḍ* is followed by a vowel; in VIII.101.11 it becomes *n* before a nasal, in VIII.101.12 a *ṭ* before *s*. In 4 of its occurrences, incl. this one, it is immediately followed by *itthā́*; the combined sense of the two particles escapes me. The non-Sanskritic phonology of *báḍ* suggests that there is a colloquial flavor to the word, but it is hard to capture exactly what that is -- esp. as the rest of the vs. doesn't show markedly low register features.

Note the phonetic figures *párvatānām*# ... *pṛthivî*# (ab), #*prá ... pravatvatî*# (c), and #*mahnā́ ... mahinî*# (d), all positioned at pāda boundaries and all involving a fem. voc. as the 2nd word. The first two pairs of course also play off each other.

This first verse presents an unsurprising picture of the earth, weighed down by mountains whose slopes define her and providing support for the life that flourishes upon her. This vs. serves as scene-setter and contrast to vs. 2.

V.84.2: *vicāriṇi* is generally taken as 'far-wandering' vel sim. (e.g., Ge 'du Wandelbare'), but cf. X.173.2, where the mountain to which the newly installed king is compared is *ávicācaliḥ* 'unwavering'; remember also that earth is said to 'bob up and down' (*nánnamīti*) during the thunderstorm in the preceding hymn (V.83.5).

This is the riddle vs.: the puzzle involves positing a number of qualities of the earth that don't appear to be characteristic of her -- quite unlike the first vs. -- and implicitly asking under what circumstances these unlikely attributes would be true of the earth. who is not explicitly named. In this vs. she is addressed as a 'wobbler' (*vicāriṇi*), she is associated with nights (*aktúbhiḥ*), she is said to "fling moisture forward" (*perúm ásyasi*), and she is silvery (*arjuni*). Neither the unsteady actions nor the silver color and association with night are earth-like.

As Thieme already suggested (Gedichte, 58), the nights can represent the darkness of monsoon clouds and her wobbling results from the thunderstorm. She is also 'silvery' with rain, which she 'flings' in the forms of streams and rivulets down her slopes, the slopes mentioned in verse 1.

V.84.3: The first half of this verse restores to us the familiar steady, sturdy Earth of vs. 1, while the second half identifies the special circumstances that held in vs. 2. Because it is made up of two subordinate clauses, it must be attached to the previous verse and the 2nd person referent must be the same. This verse, with its straightforward

diction and balanced construction, provides the answer to those dullards in the audience who failed to solve the implicit challenge of vs. 2.

The standard tr. all supply a verb for *vidyútaḥ* -- e.g., WG "wenn ... die Blitze (blitzen) ..." -- but I don't see why the lightning bolts can't 'rain' -- in particularly violent thunderstorms lightning flashes can seem to come as thick and fast as raindrops.

Note that 'earth' is reunited with her usual formulaic companion 'heaven' in the final pāda of the hymn. It should be kept in mind that this is the only hymn dedicated only to Earth in the RV, instead of to Heaven and Earth.

[V.85 JPB]

V.86 Indra and Agni

The hymn begins with the voc. dual dvandva *índrāgnī*, and a form of that cmpd is found in 2d, 4b, 6a; vss. 3 and 5, which lack the cmpd., begin with dual pronouns (*táyoḥ* and *tā́* respectively), while dual forms of both the demonst. and the rel. pronoun are also common elsewhere in the hymn.

V.86.1: The 2nd hemistich is a little tricky. As noted in the publ. intro. it seems to concern the Vala myth, though with Trita as hero -- an odd substitution in a hymn at least half dedicated to Indra. Moreover, there's a functional slippage in the accusatives with the verb *prá √bhid* 'split (forth)'. The first acc., neut. pl. *dṛḷhā́*, is of course very common, used of fastnesses or strongholds (which usually get split or otherwise breached). The standard interpr. (Gr, Old, Ge, Re) take it with *dyumnā́* (e.g., Old "feste Herrlichkeiten"), but this is an uneasy collocation. The *dyumnā́* should be the brilliant things desired to be obtained; they are more likely to be held within strongholds than to be strongholds themselves, and the consistent use of *dṛḷhá-* as 'fastness, stronghold' makes it unlikely that it can here refer to the thing held rather than what holds it within. I assume that *prá √bhid* can take a double acc.: 'split X (to release) forth Y', with X the container and Y the contained. Old is quite dismissive of a variant on this explanation, but I do not see the objection -- particularly as whatever *vā́ṇīḥ* refers to, it is more likely to be the contained than the container. As for *vā́ṇī-*, this stem usually refers to music or voices. Ge's tentative suggestion, that these are the voices of the cows released from the Vala cave, makes the most contextual sense -- even though, as Ge points out, the word is not otherwise used of animal noises. On the other hand, as he also points out, it *is* used of rivers, so that application to non-human sounds that are comparable to a choir of human voices is possible. That *vā́ṇī-* is also sometimes used of the choir that encourages Indra in a Vala context (e.g., III.30.10) might add an additional resonance to the usage here, but I do not think it is the primary reading.

V.86.2: The publ. tr. starts the vs. in the 2nd ps. ("you two who") and ends in the 3rd ps. ("these two"). This does not represent the text entirely fairly, because the grammatical person is entirely unclear until the last pāda, which contains an acc. dual dvandva and a 3rd ps. dual acc. prn. (*tā́*) and a 1st ps. pl. verb. Until pāda d Indra and Agni are represented only by the insistent rel. du. *yā́* (a, b, c). The vs. could therefore be couched entirely in the 3rd ps. ("the two who ..."), as the standard tr. do. I stand by my modulatory tr. because, based on vs. 1 with its voc. dual dvandva and 2nd du. verb *ávathaḥ*, we start vs.

2 assuming the 2nd ps. context carries over, and nothing disturbs that assumption until the very end of the vs.

V.86.2–4: Vs. 3 is the middle vs. of the hymn, since vs. 6 is in a different meter and is an extra-hymnic summary vs. It has the marks of an omphalos, esp. semantic and syntactic obscurity. The real difficulties lie in the central 3cd along with 4a, which is verbally related to 3cd by the problematic *eṣ*-forms (see below). The omphalos is framed, in classic omphalos fashion, by *indrāgnī́ (tā́) havāmahe* in 2d and 4b.

V.86.3: 3cd has elicited much disc.; see esp. the lengthy treatment of it by Old, with several different possible tr. supplied, Ge's n. 3cd, and a fairly detailed disc. in WG's n. (now supplemented by an even lengthlierand somewhat ill-tempered treatment by Slaje [Vájra, 92–94]). Among the problems are 1) what is the referent of the 'wood(en)' in instr. *drúṇā*, 2) who is the subj. of the verb and is it his hands (*gábhastyoḥ*) that are in question; 3) what is *gávām* construed with; 4) what case is *vṛtraghná*, that is, what is its pausal form?

　　I will begin with 3): flg. Ge (n. 3cd), I supply a loc. *éṣe to govern *gávām* "(in the quest) for cattle." This is supported by *éṣate* in this pāda, *éṣe ráthānām* "in the quest for chariots" in the next pāda (4a) likewise with gen., and X.48.9 *gávām éṣe*. As Ge suggests, *éṣe éṣate may have been simplified by a sort of word-haplology. However, this interpr. is slightly complicated by the fact that I, at least, take *éṣe* and *éṣate* to different roots: *éṣe* as a loc. sg. to a thematic deriv. to √*iṣ* 'seek' and *éṣate* (with most) as the stem *īṣa- + ā́*, which I take to be the orig. desid. to √*i* 'go' (see Gotō 1st Cl. p. 77, citing Hoffmann; Heenen Desid. 96ff.). The publ. tr. "goes questing (in his quest) for cattle" seems, however, to connect the two etymologically. I meant rather that the 'seek' sense of nominal *éṣa-* "bled" into the desid. sense 'desire to go', on the basis of their shared phonology and the fact that 'seek to go' is very close to 'quest'. The verb form *éṣa-* must, of course, have a preverb, because it should not otherwise be accented.

　　As for 4), the underlying form of *vṛtraghná* — contra the Pp and most interpr., who take it as dat. *vṛtraghné* — I think it is a genitive (*vṛtraghnáḥ*), dependent on *gábhastyoḥ* -- a possibility floated but ultimately rejected by Old. A parallel passage with a weapon (in fact, a *didyút*; see our 3b) being wielded in the arms of a man is found in VII.25.1 *pátāti didyún náryasya bāhóḥ*. A dat. does not make much sense here because *ā́* √*īṣ* doesn't ordinarily take a dative, nor does *práti*, so we are left with no way to fit a dat. *vṛtraghné into the existing syntax of the sentence, save as a free-floating dat. of benefit. (Re, curiously, seems to take it as a loc. "chez Vṛtrahaṇ" [*sic* the retroflex *ṇ*]. This seems to go back to an idea of Hillebrandt's that it belongs to an otherwise unattested thematic stem; see Old. This has nothing to recommend it.) In answer to 2), if I am thus correct that the hands are those of Indra, it seems likely that he is also the subject of *éṣate*. Otherwise the subject is an unidentified other party or (so most interpr.) is the missile (*didyút*) of pāda b. What then to do with *drúṇā*? This is the most problematic of the problems. Most interpr. take it as the handle of the *didyút* (which, acdg. to WG, might be a sort of Vedic boomerang). In VIII.96.11 and IX.98.2, the same instr. seems to refer to a wooden paddle or the like. A similar wooden implement, usable as a weapon, may be meant here -- though it seems a come-down for vajra-wielding Indra. More likely it is equipment esp. suitable for cattle herding -- a prod or goad, and this would account for

Indra's trading in his usual weapon for something more appropriate to a quest for cows. Of course, since soma is usually poured into wooden cups, this may also depict Indra with a wooden soma cup in his hands, preparing to drink before he goes out on his quest. I might emend the publ. tr. to "With the wooden (goad / soma-cup) in the hands ..."

I am not at all certain of the correctness of any of these answers to the questions posed above. Nor do I have any explanation for *práti*, beyond pointing out that 4c begins with rhyming *pátī*. And, most especially, I don't understand why this cramped and obscure half-verse is found in this otherwise rather anodyne hymn.

V.86.4: As noted above, the *éṣe* + GEN. here helps explain 3cd. It is also integrated into the omphalos-framing (semi)repeated pāda *indragnī́ havāmahe*. Most standard tr., however, render *éṣe* here not as 'in quest of, in pursuit of', but as 'rush, run, course' (e.g., Ge "im Rennen der Wagen," Re "pour la course de chars", WG "anlässlich eines Wagenrennens"), implicitly accepting Gr's separation of *éṣa-* into two stems 'das Hineilen, Eilen' and 'Aufsuchen, Begehren'. *éṣe* + GEN is found three times elsewhere in V -- V.41.5, 8 (both *rāyá éṣe* "in quest of wealth") and this very pāda in V.66.3 -- and it seems uneconomical to give these similar syntagms in the same maṇḍala two entirely different meanings. Old (ZDMG 62: 477–78 [=KlSch 286–87]) makes similar points, arguments accepted by Bl (RReps ad V.66.3).

With the phrase *turásya rā́dhasaḥ* compare the cmpd. *tuvi-rā́dhas-* (3x, incl. V.58.2). This pair, cmpd. and free phrase with *tuvi-* and *turá-* respectively, confirms at least a synchronic connection between the Caland cmpding form *tuvi-* and the *-rá-* adjective, even though from √*tū* we should expect long-vowel **tūrá-*. Contamination with *turá-* 'swift, impetuous' surely contributed to the vowel shortening, as is generally supposed: the two adjectives would be hard to sort out in many contexts where vague and general flattery was being conveyed. For *turá-* and √*tū*, see also *taváse turā́ya* (3x) with a different derivative of √*tū*.

V.86.5: The verb *puró dadhe* gives a more Agni-esque cast to the vs. than the more Indraic vss. that have preceded.

The standard tr. separate c and d into two clauses, but I think the two expressions are meant to be balanced against each other. The idea seems to be that though (*cid*) the two gods deserve portions (*árhantā*), I have set them out as if they theselves were portions (*áṃśā-iva*), prizes for a prize-winning steed. What it means to "set them out" I don't know. It's worth noting that √*arh* regularly takes *pītím* 'drink(ing), share of drink' as object (e.g., V.51.6), so the reciprocal notion would be familiar to the audience.

V.86.6: *havyá*, so accented, is generally 'oblation', as opposed to *hávya-* 'invocation'. However, in this case it is difficult not to see a pun, with the hymn just completed counting both as an oblation ("*like* ghee ...," pāda c) and an invocation, accompanying the physical oblation. The pun is further enabled by the adj. *śū́ṣyà-* 'forceful', which in its other two occurrences (I.54.3, VII.66.1) modifies types of speech (*vácas-* and *stóma-* respectively).

This pun may help explain the curious expression "like ghee purified by stones" (*ghṛtáṃ ná pūtám ádribhiḥ*). The problem of course is that it is soma, not ghee, that is purified by stones. It is very doubtful that stones could play a role in preparing melted

butter (pity the poor cow), and although the root √*pū* is occasionally used of *ghṛtá-* (e.g., VI.10.2 and esp. the very similar VIII.12.4 *ghṛtám ná pūtám adrivaḥ*) -- and consider the English term for ghee, "*clarified* butter" -- it is overwhelming characteristic of soma. The standard tr. deal with the disharmony in this simile by separating it into two -- e.g., Ge "durch die Presssteine (gepresst), wie Schmalz geklärt." By contrast, I think the ill-assorted technology in the simile was deliberately introduced, to match the same punning lack of fit in the frame, where the forceful/noisy *havyá-* has been poured (*áhāvi*): the jarring "ghee pressed by stones" calls attention to the more subtle mismatch in the frame. We might almost call this ritual synaesthesia.

V.87 Maruts

Re nicely characterizes this hymn (in his comm. on vs. 5) "l'hymne est fait de débris empruntés au cycle ancien des M." Certainly there is a sense that the vss. are constructed of loosely connected phrases, which may well be connected with the unusual meter.

As disc. in the publ. intro., the final word of the 2ⁿᵈ pāda of each vs., *evayā́marut*, appears to be an exclamatory internal refrain without syntactic connection to the rest of the vs. Ge by contrast takes it in each case as forming a nominal sentence with unexpressed Viṣṇu (usually, but see below): "(Viṣṇu is der) mit dem die Marut gern kommen." But though Viṣṇu is surprisingly prominent in this hymn, I don't think he outranks the Maruts, and the formation of *evayā́marut* is too peculiar to be folded into a conventional (if invisible) nominal clause. Though sg., I think it must refer to the Maruts, who, after all, appear in the collective sg. in the rest of the vs. (pādas cde) as a troop (*śárdha-*). For the phrase on which this is built, see V.41.16 *evayā́ marutaḥ*.

V.87.1: The grammatical identity of *girijā́* (in sandhi) 'moutain-born' is problematic (see Old's disc.). The Pp. takes it as *girijā́ḥ*, which could be nom. pl. fem. (so Gr and Re) and modify 'thoughts', but this makes little sense: the thoughts in question are surely home-grown, as it were, not outsourced from a mountain. (Though Old's offhand suggestion that the cmpd might mean "in der Rede geboren," with otherwise unattested loc. sg. of *gír-* 'hymn', is worth considering as a second punning reading, suitable for 'thoughts'. See *girā́* in 3a.) *girijā́ḥ* could likewise be nom. sg. masc. and refer to Viṣṇu. This is the basis for Ge's first Satzparenthese "-- er ist der Berggeborene, mit dem die Marut gern kommen --" and he is followed by Scar (136). But switching the ref. to Viṣṇu from dative (... *mahé ... víṣṇave, marútvate*) to nominative in the middle of a pāda right at the end of the dative phrase is highly unlikely. Although the morphology doesn't entirely work, I think it must be a dative. The problem of course is that the dat. to this -*ā́*-root noun should be underlying **girijé*, which should appear in sandhi as *girijá*, not -*jā́*, as here. It should be noted, however, that datives in -*é* to root nouns in -*ā́*- are exceedingly rare (see Macd., Vedic Gr. p. 252; AiG III.125), and beside them exist infinitives in -*aí* to roots in -*ā* (Macd. loc cit.; AiG III.129) like *pratikhyaí, vayo-dhaí*. Esp. in this sandhi situation, I see no reason why this extended dat. sg. would not have been available even to a non-infinitive. In favor of a dat. referring to Viṣṇu is the very similar passage I.154.3 *prá víṣṇave śūṣám etu mánma, girikṣíta urugāyā́ya víṣṇe*, with the semantically corresponding dat. root-noun cmpd. *girikṣíte* 'mountain-dwelling' in a lengthy dat. phrase referring to Viṣṇu and *prá ... etu mánma* matching our *matáyo yantu* almost exactly.

(Curiously WG tr. *girijā́* as if a dat. parallel to *marútvate* "... zum grossen Viṣṇu, der in Begleitung der Maruts ist, der in den Bergen geboren ist," but Scar, who was responsible for this vol. of WG, seems to hold onto the nom. sg. interpr. in his n. -- though the n. is a bit incoherent.)

The hapax cmpd *bhandád-iṣṭi-* is variously rendered. Both Ge and WG (latter flg. Gotō, 1ˢᵗ pres. cl., 224) interpr. *-iṣṭi-* as "sacrifice" (hence Ge's 'opferliebend', WG 'deren Opferungen erfreuen'). But *-iṣṭi-* is far more often 'desire, quest, seeking' than 'sacrifice' in the RV, and notice the concentration of such forms of √*iṣ* in the previous hymn (V.86.3, 4, at least by my interpr.). As Lowe points out (*Participles*, 270–71), *bhandát-* and its ilk result from reanalysis of governing cmpds, producing pseudo-act. participles to roots without an active paradigm (like √*bhand*, which is otherwise only middle). The cmpd is exactly parallel to rhyming *krandád-iṣṭi-* (X.100.2), whose interpr. also varies. Although both cmpds have the look of governing cmpds, neither √*bhand* nor √*krand* is transitive; I therefore think we have more or less standard bahuvrīhi semantics 'having a fortunate quest' and 'having a roaring quest' respectively, whose English I have adjusted to something more palatable.

The adjectivally accented *taváse* beginning d points up the nominally accented rhyming *śávase* at the end of e. With Re I think the Maruts are being equated with *śávas-* itself, but it would be possible to take *śávase* as a separate purpose dative 'for strength' (with or without *távase).*

On *dhúni-vrata-* see comm. ad V.58.2.

V.87.2: This vs. is quite loosely constructed. To begin with, the rel. cl. of ab has no obvious main clause, though the two *yé*'s do, of course, refer to the Maruts, who show up in the voc. in c. The rel. cl. could also hang off vs. 1, with pl. *yé* picking up the collective sg. *śárdha-* in 1cde.

The next question is what belongs with each *yé*. The easiest solution and the one taken by the standard tr. (as well as Klein DGRV I.118) is to take the first as a nominal cl. *yé jātā́ mahinā́* and the 2ⁿᵈ as containing the accented verb *prá ... bruváte.* But there are several factors against this. For one thing the *prá* that begins the 2ⁿᵈ pāda is actually a repeat of the one that begins the vs. (#*prá yé jātā́ḥ ... yé ca ..., prá ... bruváte ...*); that is, the first *prá* seems to have been extracted from the second *yé* clause and fronted around the first, which may well be a violation of RVic clause structure and at best is highly unusual. If we take *prá ..., prá ... bruváte ...* as the verb for both *yé* clauses, as I do, it is considerably less problematic. Moreover, the *yé ... yé ca* construction is far more at home in expressing complementary pairs (see Klein I.115–16) than in conjoining coreferential entities with semantically unconnected predicates, as the standard tr. requires (e.g., Klein 118: "Who were born with greatness and who now themselves proclaim (their might) with knowledge."). In my interpr. the *yé ... yé ca* construction expresses two types of Marut birth, "born/produced by might" and "self(-produced/born)," with the *svayám* signalling the 2ⁿᵈ type. The Maruts are called *svajā́ḥ* in I.168.2; cf. also I.64.4 *sākáṃ jajñire svadháyā ...* "They [=Maruts] were born all at once by their own power." I see only two arguments against my interpr.: 1) the *nú* in the second *yé* clause, which might mark a chronological progression (as in Klein's tr. [also WG]; Ge and Re both ignore the *nú*, and it's certainly true that *nú* need not be temporal); 2) the apparently required underlying assumption that there are two groups of Maruts. As to that, I don't think the

complementary pairing needs to indicate that there are two distinct groups of Maruts sorted by their means of birth, but rather that we can view their births in different ways.

The next question is how to construe *prá ... bruváte*. Ge and WG both take it as reflexive "announce themselves," but *prá √brū* is not elsewhere reflex./pass., even in the middle. Re supplies as object "leur naissance," which can be justified, but I prefer Klein's "their might." The resonant word *śávas-* is found on either side of this phrase, at the ends of 1e and 2c and is the focus of 2cde, and *prá √brū* elsewhere takes such objects (*indriyám* I.55.4, *bálāni* X.54.2).

The rest of the vs. consists, in my opinion (flg. Re), of two parallel clauses, each beginning with instr. of respect, followed by *tád* and a gen. referring to the Maruts (2nd ps. in c, 3rd in d), and, as predicate, a negated form of √*dhr̥ṣ* 'dare (against), assail'. The *tád* is specified as *śávas-* in the first clause, which identification carries over into the second:

> *krátvā   tád vo (maruto) nā́dhŕ̥ṣe śávaḥ*
> *dānā́ mahnā́ tád eṣām ádhr̥ṣṭāso (nā́drayaḥ)*

This striking parallelism makes the interpr. of Ge and WG unlikely: they take *krátvā* as the weapon that someone might try to use, unsuccessfully, against the Maruts' *śávas-*, whereas *dānā́ mahnā́* they take as instr. of respect. Actually, Ge's treatment is more complicated: his tr. reflects the interpr. I just paraphrased ("Diese eure Macht ist nicht durch Einsicht zu erzwingen"), but in his n. 2c–e he describes the three instr. as parallel: "Der Sinn ist jedenfalls, dass keiner wagt, es ihnen an Umsicht, Freigebigkeit und Grösse gleichzutun."

As Ge points out (n. 2e), masc. pl. *ádhr̥ṣṭāsah* has been attracted to the number and gender of the simile (*ádrayah*); it is still specifying *śávah* in the frame.

It's also worth noting that pādas c and d both contain *ná* in sandhi with a following vowel in quite similar phonological sequences: *nā́dhŕ̥ṣe ... nā́drayaḥ*. The first *ná* is the negative (matched by *a-* in *ádhr̥ṣṭāsah* in the next pāda); the 2nd is the simile marker.

V.87.3: Like vs. 2 this vs. begins with several relative clauses (*yé* pāda a, *yéṣām* c), with no clear main clause.

The first pāda of this vs. is syntactically straightforward, but we might wonder why the Maruts are heard "through a/their hymn." In answer, there is the fact, often referred to above, that the Maruts are singers as well as sung-to. Further, in this context their "hymn" may be a metaphorical reference to thunder. It is also possible that it is a pun, as indicated in the publ. tr. and also implicitly by Scar (537), with the *-ā* variant form of the *i*-stem loc. sg. of *girí-*. (Interestingly Scar's alternative "mit einem Lied (/im Gebirge)" in the root noun book is not reflected in his tr. in WG, which limits itself to "mit ihrem Lied.") Of course, such a loc. sg. would be wrongly positioned: it is the *-au* loc. sg. form that is overwhelmingly found at pāda end (see, e.g., Lanman, Noun Infl., p. 385), but as a secondary punning reading the "wrong" form could be acceptable, esp. as it precedes a consonant, as most forms of loc. sg. *-ā* do. Thus the Maruts would be heard "on a mountain" -- as their storm often is.

The hapax nom. sg. *írī* is problematic formally and semantically. In this sandhi sit. the long *ī* final can only belong to a devī-type *-ī* stem or an *-in*-stem. It is usually cited as the latter (e.g., Gr, EWA), but this analysis seems excluded formally because *-ín*-stems are always suffix-accented. An underlying *-in*-stem is emphatically denied by AiG

II.2.328 ("Die Barytona v. *írī* ... gehören nicht hierher"; see also Old's serious doubts). Debrunner (AiG II.2.407–8) seems to favor (if "favoring" means sticking it in that section but then calling it "ganz unklar") a masc. devī-type *-ī*-stem, but of course such stems are rare and problematic in all their occurrences. Nothing in the passage actually excludes an analysis as a *feminine -ī*-stem, but who would such a feminine be? The other question of course is what is it derived from and what does it mean. I follow the line of least resistance that has been fld. by a number of others and connect it with *írya-*, which is better attested though not much clearer, and is found in another Marut hymn in V, V.58.4; see comm. ad loc. If the basic sense is something like 'energetic', the form of *írya-* in V.58.4 is positive in sense, while *írī* is negative.

I do not understand the pāda-final *ā́*. Assuming that *íṣṭe* belongs to √*iṣ*, that root does not otherwise appear with *ā́* (or any other preverb). It's worth noting that *íṣṭe* here is the only *t*-full 3rd sg.; the usual and very well-attested 3rd sg. is, of course, *íṣe*. We might try to connect the form with √*īṣ* or √*iṣ*, but neither is promising formally or semantically.

The last pāda, *prá syandrā́so dhúnīnām*, confronts us with a lexical conundrum: it contains two plurals, one nom., one gen., both of which are good Marut words. For the Maruts as *syandrá-* see V.52.3, 8; for *dhúni-* see *dhúni-vrata-* in this hymn (1e) and V.58.2, as well as the simplex adj. in numerous passages (e.g., V.60.7). So which one modifies the (unexpressed) Maruts, and what should we do with the other? The poet seems to be messing with our minds: we encounter the first, *syandrā́saḥ*, and understandably assume it refers to the Maruts, then come to the second, *dhúni-*, which is an even more characteristic Marut word, and have to readjust. Ge supplies 'chariots' (Wagen, sim. WG Fahrzeuge) with the nominative, and the publ. tr. tentatively follows that. Re manages to make both words refer to the Maruts, "(dieux) bruyants qui rapides (vont) de l'avant," breezily remarking "il n'est pas indispensable de sous-entendre « les chars »." But, though I'm sympathetic to his intuition that both words should refer to the Maruts, the grammatical difference is unambiguous. In Max Müller's tr. of this hymn (SBE 32), he tr. "the rushing chariots of these roaring Maruts come forth" and notes that "chariot" was Oldenberg's suggestion (presumably in their consultation on the SBE translations; the suggestion is not registered in the Noten). One of the problems with supplying "chariots" is the preceding pāda (d), also in the nom. pl., which seems clearly to describe the Maruts. If *syandrā́saḥ* does not refer to the Maruts but to their chariots, we must either assume that the flashing entities in d are also chariots or put an unsignalled break between the two pādas. The publ. tr. essentially does the latter, but it is unsatisfactory. Ge does the former, which isn't satisfactory either, and WG stir the pot even further by supplying 'weapons' as the comparandum in d.

V.87.4: The "common seat" (*samānásmāt sádasaḥ*) is presumably one shared by Viṣṇu and the Maruts and is also presumably the same as the *sadhástha-* in the previous vs. (3c) -- perhaps the midspace? The standard interpr. (incl. mine) also assume the same seat (or a similar place) is the referent of *svā́t* 'from his own' in pāda c. For other exx. of the idiom √*yuj* + ABL. 'yoke from' with 'seat' in the abl., see Old.

Similar to *áyukta tmánā* is V.52.8 *prá ... yujata tmánā*; in the latter passage the verb is used absolutely, without expressed obj. That is possible here too, though it is also possible, and indeed more likely, to take *víspardhaso vímahasaḥ* in d as the obj. (so also Re and WG), referring to horses, an interpr. that saves supplying a verb to govern that

phrase, as Ge does ("lenkt"). (See Max Müller's solution below.) It should be noted, however, that neither of these adjectives is otherwise used of horses: *víspardhas-* is found twice elsewhere, once of human contenders (I.173.10), once of, apparently, flames (VIII.23.2); *vímahas-* is only attested once elsewhere, in I.86.1 of the Maruts. Max Müller in the SBE 32 tr. takes the two adj. as a voc. phrase addressed to the Maruts. This seems unlikely in the middle of a sentence devoted to Viṣṇu and only turning to the Maruts in its last word, *nŕbhiḥ*, and so a 'horse' interpr. seems the best course.

The publ. tr. renders *ádhi ṣṇúbhiḥ* as "upon the (mountains') backs," but in accord with the standard sense of this phrase (e.g., V.60.7) and in harmony with the standard tr. I would now alter this to "along the (mountains') backs." This complicates the rendering of the rest of the clause, because there is no verb of motion, just 'yoke'. Both Re and WG supply an expression to provide this motion: Re "(pour courir) à travers les hauteurs" and WG "(zur Ausfahrt) über die (Berg-)Rücken." Reluctantly I would join them and supply something like "(to travel) along ..."

The standard explanation of *śévŕdha-* as a haplology of **śéva-vŕdha-* (already Gr, endorsed by AiG I.279, tentatively also by EWA s.v. *śéva-*) seems correct, but this does not settle its sense. Cmpds in *-vŕdha-* have a range of senses, both transitive and intransitive, and of relationships to their 1st member, and none of the quite varied contexts in which *śévŕdha-* appears is sufficiently diagnostic. Several of them apply to Agni as the ritual fire just kindled (X.46.3, X.61.20 [the latter accented *śevavŕdhá-*]); once (I.54.11) it is used of 'brilliance' (*dyumná-*) and once (III.16.2) of 'riches' (*rấyaḥ*). The preponderance of the evidence, esp. the two "fire just born" passages, seems to point to an intransitive/passive reading of *-vŕdha-* and an instr. reading of *śé(va)-*, hence 'growing strong through kindness/benevolence' or, perhaps better in English, 'through kind attention' (to which I would now change this tr.). Although an intrans. reading of the publ. tr.'s "strengthening with kindness' is possible, this English expression is more likely to be read as transitive, and I would therefore alter the tr. to the clearer 'growing strong ...' What this descriptor means in our passage is entirely unclear to me -- that the Maruts are treating Viṣṇu well and he thrives?

V.87.5: Note the chiastic phonetic figure that begins the vs.: *svanó ná vo*.

The caus. injunc. *rejayat* needs an obj. I supply 'earth' on the basis of intrans. *rejate* passages with *bhū́mi-*, *pṛthivī́*, et sim. as subj., but any standard cosmic feature will do (Re 'l'univers', WG 'alles').

Pace Gr, *ṛñjáta* is better analyzed as a 3rd pl. mid. athem. form than a 2nd pl. act. them. All the standard tr. follow the 3rd pl. mid. interpr.

The source of *sthấraśman-* is disputed. First note that this peculiar form can be partially motivated contextually: 6c begins *sthấtāro*, so there was some incentive to begin our pāda with a word of similar shape. We can begin by dismissing the odd Pp analysis of this cmpd, *sthāḥ'raśman-*. It is difficult to know what this is meant to represent. AiG II.1.316 and II.2.9 take *sthấ-* simply as the cmpded root or root noun, and Wackernagel (II.1.316) classifies it with verb-first verbal governing cmpds, an analysis that has been taken up by others (see e.g. Tribulato, *Ancient Greek Verb-Initial Compounds*, 164 and passim), though there are no transitive forms to √*sthā* except the *p*-causative. Bloomfield (RVReps ad loc.) suggests that it's "a kind of haplology" from *sth(ir)ấraśmānaḥ*, with *sthirá-* 'firm' as 1st member (note Sāy.'s gloss *sthiraraśmayo*), and this is accepted by Ge

(n. 5d). It is not clear where the long ā- of his posited *sth(ir)ā́*- would come from, however; is he thinking of a nom. pl. syntagm **sthirā́ raśmā́naḥ*, with univerbation and loss of the noun's accent? Moreover, in the Nachtr. to AiG II.1.316 [=Nachtr. 87] Debrunner points out that haplology of Bl's posited form should produce **sthirā́śman*- (undoubtedly why Bl calls it "a kind of haplology"). Re proposes a 1st member adj. *sthāmán- 'bien en place' or 'solide', internally derived from the noun *sthā́man*- 'station, standing place', but this requires several more steps derivationally and semantically, and the haplology (if that's what he sees it as) would involve loss over an intermediate syllable and loss of a heavy consonant-final syllable, both of which are problematic: *sthāmán-raśman*-. Certainly *sthirá*- makes the most sense semantically, but, as noted above, Bl's haplology runs into formal difficulties. However, if we begin with my observation that 6c #*sthā́tāro* makes a *sthā* opening desirable, an irregular reduction of *sthirá-raśman- may be the best option. In fact if we operate with a slightly different form of the 1st member, the development may be easier to explain. I suggest positing a reduced form of *sthirá*-, namely *sthrá-, showing the same *-irV*- ~ *-rV*- alternation as *índra*- ~ *índira- (metrically guaranteed, but not transmitted in the Saṃhitā; cf. AiG I.55) and the 3rd pl. med. pf. endings *-ire* and *-re* (AiG I.23). *sthrá- would thus show the loss of an apparent svarabhakti vowel, rather than the insertion of one. The posited cmpd *sthrá-raśman- would then undergo liquid dissimilation, not haplology. This still doesn't explain the long ā́-, but the parallel *sthā́tāraḥ* might help there.

V.87.6: Note #*sthā́tāraḥ ... sthana*#.
This vs. reprises some of what came before. The focus on *śávas*- earlier in the hymn (1e, 2cde) is emphatically revived with ab *... vṛddháśavasaḥ ... śávaḥ*; the hapax epithet *suśukvan*- in the nom. pl.. *suśúkvānaḥ* in 3b is cleverly echoed by the pf. part. *śuśukvā́ṃsaḥ*, where the redupl. *śu*- matches the prefix *su*-; and the simile in 3d *agnáyo ná svávidyutaḥ* appears in reverse order (and a different shared quality) in *śuśukvā́ṃso ná-agnáyaḥ*. There is also a local repetition of *tveṣá*- in 6b, echoing the same stem in the same position in 5b.

V.87.7: This vs., too, reprises earlier material: there is a 3rd "fires" simile, this time marked with *yathā*, not *ná*, and extended over the pāda boundary (*agnáyo yathā́, tuvidyumnā́ḥ*); *avantu* in b echoes *avatu* in 6b in the same metrical position; the 'seat' returns for the third time (pāda c), with yet a different word: *sádman*- versus 3c *sadhástha*- and 4b *sádas*-.
The last two pādas present several problems. One is how to reconcile *yéṣām* and *śárdhāṃsi*, which are presumably coreferential and refer to the Maruts. Simplest is to accept Ge's "der reflexive Gebrauch des Relativs" (n. 7d); cf., e.g., V.61.12 and comm. thereon. The publ. tr. does not render *yéṣām* literally, but as "when ... of them," for the sake of English, since "at whose drives" is awkward in context.
The causal connection between the journey of the Maruts (d) and the spreading out of the earth (c) is clear in V.58.7, also adduced by Ge: *prátiṣṭha yā́man pṛthivī́ cid eṣām* "Even the Earth has spread herself at their journey," but pāda c cannot be brought into the domain of the relative in d (though Old tries) because of the lack of accent on the verb *paprathe* in c. Instead d and e must together make a circumstantial clause dependent on c. With Ge and Re I supply a verb of motion 'ap(proach)'; this can be partly generated

from the *á* in c, though that *á* is primarily a postposition with the loc. and is not in the right place for a preverb in tmesis. The *étana* in the next vs. (8a) may support the supplying of a verb of motion here.

The next question in de is the grammatical analysis and reference of *mahā́ḥ*, which presents us with entirely too many possibilities: abl./gen. sg or nom./acc. pl. of *máh-*, nom. sg. of *mahá-*, adv. *mahás*. On the basis of the gen. phrase in the next vs., 8c *víṣṇor mahā́ḥ* (cf. also 1a *mahé ... víṣṇave*), I take it as gen. sg. and supply Viṣṇu: the Marut troops are here said to be Viṣṇu's. This more or less follows Ge; Re takes *mahā́ḥ* as adv., WG as nom. sg. See also Old's disc.

The final problem is the bahuvrīhi *ádbhuta-enas-*, which is found once elsewhere (VIII.67.7). The problem is to find some plausible overlap between the senses of the two members and a plausible reason why whatever is so constructed should apply to the Maruts. The standard sense of *énas-* is 'offense, transgression, outrage'; *ádbhuta-* is famously problematic, but probably the most widely accepted analysis currently is as a negated form of √*dabh* 'deceive, trick, harm' (see EWA s.v.), hence 'infallible, unerring', shading (probably because of loss of transparency) into 'wonderful, astonishing'. Put these together and you get the highly unconvincing 'having infallible offenses' or the like -- not a good epithet for a favored group of gods. Clearly something has to give, and in most interpr. it's the semantic integrity of the parts; e.g., Re decides that *énas-* here preserves an earlier sense, derived from its relationship to *inóti* and means 'élan', yielding a cmpd "à l'élan extraordinaire," which fits smoothly into the context by virtue of suppressing the semantics of both cmpd members. In the other occurrence of the cmpd in VIII.67.7 I take it as applying to the Ādityas (most others see it as a gen. sg.) and meaning 'whom (others') offenses cannot mislead'. That is, the stripped-down sense is 'possessing unmisleading/misleadable offenses', but the offenses are committed by others and the Ādityas are not tricked by them. This may provide more tricky structure than a bahuvrīhi can quite manage, but it does preserve the lexical senses of both members. It may mean this here as well -- the Maruts are not more trickable than the Ādityas -- and I propose that as an alternate tr. But the publ. tr. takes a different route, with the sense 'harm' for √*dabh*, hence 'whose offenses are beyond harm' -- meaning, perhaps, that the violence and turmoil attendant on the Maruts' stormy passage on the one hand leave no lasting damage and on the other cannot be held against the Maruts. They are not moral lapses.

Note the figure in c: *pṛthú paprathe ... pā́rthivam*, which is both phonological and etymological

V.87.8: The first word in the vs. *adveṣáḥ* must be adverbial; it of course resonates with the 2nd to last word in the vs., *dvéṣāṃsi*.

The construction of the gen. (or possibly, in principle, abl.) phrase *víṣṇor mahā́ḥ* isn't entirely clear. Old is insistent that it belongs with the voc. *samanyavaḥ*, hence "of equal fervor with Viṣṇu," but this adj. is not otherwise construed with a third party but rather indicates that those so described are equally fervent with each other. Moreover, the genitive is not the most likely case for the proposed meaning, and we might also expect the gen. phrase to lose its accent or take vocative accent if it were part of the vocative phrase. The standard tr. take the gen. as simply identifying the Maruts as "Viṣṇu's," and this may well be the best way to do it. The publ. tr. construes it with *smát* 'together with'

at the beginning of d, as Gr also indicates. The genitive case is problematic, however: *smát* takes the instr. Further, as Ge points out, rather than *smát* we should expect *asmát, the 1st pl. abl. prn. to be construed with *yuyotana ... ápa dvéṣāṃsi* "keep hatreds away <u>from us</u>"; see parallels cited by Ge in n. 8d. Unfortunately *asmát* does not work metrically. WG cleverly suggest that the end of c and the beg. of d, underlyingly **yuyotanā̆ *asmát*, were combined in sandhi as *yuyotanāsmát and then decoupled first into **yuyotanā, smát* and then, with shortening of the variable final vowel of the impv., to the transmitted *yuyotana, smát*.

The instr. *daṃsánā* must belong with the simile: cf. VIII.101.2 *tā́ bāhū́tā ná daṃsánā ratharyataḥ* "With their wondrous skill as if with their arms they drive their chariot," also adduced by Ge.

V.87.9: The first two pādas of this vs. are essentially variants on the first two pādas of the previous vs., with 8a *gātum étana* corresponding to 9a *gántā* and *śrótā hávam* identically opening both b pādas. The adverbial *adveṣáḥ* 'without hatred' in 8a is matched by *arakṣáḥ* 'undemonically' in 9b, though the adv. has been moved to the second cl. (With Re I take it as an adv.; Gr takes it as an adj. with *hávam*, which requires him to identify only this occurrences of *háva-* as a neut.; WG see it as a nominative in a stand-alone nominal sentence. The patterning of vss. 8–9 just laid out makes the adverbial interpr. the strongest one.)

The final word of pāda, *suśámi*, makes both metrical and morphological trouble. The pāda is short a syllable (11, not 12) and the cadence is bad even for a Triṣṭubh, with a light penultimate syllable. Gr proposes to fix the first of these problems by reading *suśámiyā*, but though this gets us 12 syllables, it makes the cadence worse -- not to mention that there's no reason why the textual change would have occurred. Old proposes to read *suśámī*, matching the other two instr. occurrences of this stem; the same phenomenon is found with the simplex, where an instr. *śámi* with short final occurs at the end of the pāda, while *śámī* is found pāda-internal. Since in our passage the next pāda begins with a cons. cluster, the original length of the final vowel would be obscured anyway. However, this suggestion does nothing to fix the cadence or the deficient syllable. See also the disc. in WG; in the WG tr. they take it as a neut. acc., but the disc. in the n. is more equivocal. I have no solution. Of course, those who wish to see laryngeal effects preserved at this stage would argue that the problematic short penultimate could be explained by the fact that √*śam* is a seṭ root and the root syllable would originally have been heavy (*śamH in a bastardized notation).

The rest of the vs. is more opaque, or rather it is difficult to reconcile the simile in c with the directive to the Maruts in de. The problem is similar to the one posed by *ádbhuta-enas-* -- that the two parts of the expression are semantically disharmonious. The wish expressed to the Maruts is that they should be *durdhártu-*, which should mean 'difficult to maintain or uphold' or, extending the sense of √*dhṛ* a bit, 'difficult to restrain'. This works pretty well in the directive: the Maruts should not hold back from punishing someone who insults one of us. The gen./abl. *nidáḥ* is not the ideal case, but it may well refer back to the same form in 6d *té na uruṣyatā nidáḥ* "deliver us from insult," with a highly condensed expression. In the publ. tr. I have tr. the form in 9e as "at an insult" rather than "from an insult," because "difficult to restrain from an insult" sounds as if the Maruts are itching to insult *us*. The question is -- why are they like ancient

mountains (*jyéṣṭhāso ná párvatāsaḥ*) when they are acting thus? As a class of objects, mountains are among the least likely to need restraining: they are fixed and stable. Ge gets out of this problem by supplying, out of whole cloth, a different quality that the Maruts and the mountains have in common, the parenthetical "(ragend)," but there is no basis for this. WG take *jyéṣṭha-* itself as the point of comparison (despite the fact that it should really be part of the simile proper) and push its sense: "sehr mächtig wie die Berge." I think the clue to the solution is the location of these mountains, *vyòman* 'in distant heaven'. There are of course no mountains in heaven, at least in the usual Vedic cosmological picture -- but there *used* to be: the winged mountains that flew around until Indra clipped their wings. The splv. *jyéṣṭhāsaḥ* 'most ancient' may refer to this primal, unclipped state. Although this interpr. may seem farfetched, I think it best accounts for the odd expression -- and this may be Re's view too, based on his tr. "comme de très puissantes montagnes (qui circuleraient) dans l'espace" (he has no disc.). Note in any case that the mountains here recall the mountain(s) in vs. 1 (*girijā́-*) and possibly vs. 3; the agreement in sense with vs. 1 provides another example of non-lexical ring composition.