

## X.61–84

This next section of X consists of paired hymns, each pair attributed to a different poet, save for X.75–76, which clearly form a pair but are ascribed to different poets. The first three pairs (X.61–66) all consist of hymns to the All Gods, but of very different styles.

## X.61–62

Acadg. to the Anukramaṇī, the poet is Nābhānediṣṭha Mānava, but see the publ. intro. of X.61 for my view of the source of the name. Both hymns are dedicated to the All Gods, but are of very different levels of complexity. Note that Re does not treat these two hymns in his Viśve Devāḥ fascicles, but provides comments (but no tr.) in EVP XVI.

## X.61 All Gods

On the structure and contents of this devilish hymn, see the publ. intro., as well as the elaborate intros. by Old and Ge., though I differ from them on many points – and remain quite uncertain about many details of my own interpr.

X.61.1: This vs. sets the tone for the rest of the hymn by posing a number of puzzles that elude solution.

We can begin with the deictically announced “Rudrian formulation” (*raúdrām ... bráhma*), whose presence in the immediate circumstances is underscored by the annunciatory *idám (itthā)*. It is not obvious what is Rudrian about it (but see below), though both Old and Ge make attempts to account for it. The adj. is found also in vs. 15, there modifying the Áśvins, so one might argue that the “Rudrian formulation” here is one addressed to the Áśvins. But the Áśvins are not a presence in this part of the hymn. A more productive approach, partly flg. Ge, is to note that in the later Vedic versions of the incest myth, with Prajāpati and Uṣas as the main participants, it is Rudra who punishes the offender (see my Hyenas, pp. 288–97). The incest story occupies vss. 5–8 of our hymn, and the presence of this myth in the hymn might account for *raúdra-*. In particular, in vs. 7 the gods, concerned about the brutal rape, “begat a/the sacred formulation” (*janayan bráhma*), presumably to guard against such behavior. To me the most plausible interpr. of *raúdra-* is that, in the context of a brahmodya (signalled by *śácyām antár ājau* in b), a “Rudrian formulation” is one that exhibits the aggressive hostility often characteristic of that god, which the poet can deploy to win the contest. The antagonistic relationship between Turvayāṇa and Cyavana is quite clear in vs. 2. Note that in 3cd Tūrvayāṇa’s verbal skill is likened to arrows that he successfully aims at a target, another war-like Rudra-type image.

The first hemistich lacks a verb – or appears to, on the assumption that the *s*-stem form *gūrtāvacāḥ* is a masculine nom. sg. and *raúdrām ... bráhma* is a neut. acc. We could avoid the need to supply a verb by taking *gūrtāvacāḥ* as a neuter; other *s*-stem cmpds modifying neuters occasionally show the apparent masc. *-āḥ* rather than neut *-aḥ*, esp. pāda-final as here (see Lanmann, Noun Infl. 599 and comm. ad VII.24.2 and II.31.5). We could then have a nominal clause “here is a ... formulation of welcome speech ...” Old considers this (and Re suggests that the cmpd modifies *bráhma*, but as a masc., puzzlingly), but Old rejects this interpr. for the same reason I do, that an unequivocal masc. splv. *gūrtāvacastamaḥ* modifies the poet in vs. 2c. (He is also concerned about the referent of *asya* in 1c.) The masc. splv. in vs. 2 may be considered an ex. of poetic repair, making the masc. gender of *gūrtāvacāḥ* explicit. Given that we need to supply a verb, I suggest a form of  $\sqrt{kr}$ , evoked by the *kr-* forms in the vs., etymologically unrelated *krátvā* (b) and etymologically related but somewhat detached adv. *krāñā* (c).

Pāda b is one of the few clear mentions (as signalled by *śácyām antár ājaú*; see above) of a poetic contest or brahmodya in the RV, an institution that other interpr. are more apt to see in RVic contexts than I am.

On *krāṇā* see comm. ad I.58.3.

The cmpd. *maṃhaneṣṭhāḥ* poses problems in both members. On the one hand, what is the case form of *maṃhane* and to what stem does it belong? On the other, what is the case and number of *-ṣṭhāḥ* and what does it modify? To begin with the 2nd member, Old, Ge, and the publ. tr. take the cmpd as modifying neut. *yád*, which picks up *bráhma* from the main clause. Ge (n. 1c) explains it as a masc. form for the neuter (with [not very strong] parallels but without exploring the morphology). Old simply says “... habe ich als Neutr. übersetzt; doch auch Mask. möglich,” without saying how he finesses the neut. or which masc. he might attach it to. By contrast Scar (652–53) suggests that it is an acc. pl. m. with the consonant-stem ending *-as* < \**m̥s* added to the root-noun stem (depending on the chronological stage, presumably: \**-aH-m̥s* or \**-ā-as*), modifying *hótīn*. Although in this hymn with its many puzzles and blind alleys, a muddled neut. sg. form, as represented in the publ. tr., would not be surprising, I am somewhat attracted to Scar’s interpr. and suggest an alternate tr. “(a formulation) that ... will effectively guide across ... the seven Hotars (who are) standing ready for liberality.” Scar’s interpr. of the 1<sup>st</sup> member is also preferable to the standard, which takes *maṃhane* as the loc. of a putative short *-a*-stem \**mámhana-*, though the only stem attested (mostly in the [admittedly ambiguous instr.] is fem. *mámhanā-*. Scar suggests rather that *maṃhane* here is a dat. infinitive, which allows a more appealing interpr. ‘standing ready for liberality’ than the loc. ‘standing in liberality’. For what this all might mean, see below.

There is also another alternative, not represented in any of the available interpr. as far as I know – that *maṃhaneṣṭhāḥ* is a nom. sg. masculine (the easiest morphological interpr.), modifying the poet referred to in ab, and that *yád* is not a neut. picking up *bráhma*, but a subordinating conj. This would yield another alternative tr. “when he, standing ready for liberality, will effectively guide ...” If the cmpd modifies either the poet (as I just suggested) or the formulation (in the standard and publ. tr. interpr.), ‘standing ready for liberality’ (with Scar’s datival 1st member) would express the poet’s / formulations’ readiness to *receive* liberality; if it modifies *hótīn*, it could refer to the Hotars’ readiness to dispense liberality, though it could also have the meaning suggested for the other two interpr.

Gr and Ge take *pakthé* as a PN, as the stem certainly is in VII.18.7, VIII.22.10, 49.10, but Old reports the suggestion of Wackernagel that it is an ordinal, ‘fifth’, here, construed with loc. *áhan*. So also KH (KZ 65 [1979] = Aufs. I.188–89). Re tentatively accepts this suggestion, though Scar’s tr. maintains the PN. Mayr (EWA, also PN, both s.v.) also accepts it. The “seven” of “seven Hotars” invites a numerical interpr. of the preceding phrase, even if the referent of “the fifth day” is obscure.

I do now wonder if the second hemistich has astronomical reference. Perhaps “two fathers / parents” here does not refer to the poet’s own parents, but, as often, to Heaven and Earth (e.g., I.159.2), and “the Seven Hotars” could be a variant of the Seven Ṛṣis (*saptarṣi*), who are later identified with the constellation Ursa Major. If *pítārā* refers to Heaven and Earth, it could set the stage for the incest episode starting in vs. 5. As for the application in this vs. the poet and/or his formulation would be assisting at an astronomical transit associated with “the fifth day.” This is all very speculative, and I can’t get any further. But it would be unusual for the human parents of the poet to be the beneficiaries of his poetic activity, esp. along with a gaggle of Hotars. Again, if the Hotars are heavenly beings, not earth-bound priests, they might be “standing ready to

(dispense) liberality,” if we accept Scar’s view of the cmpd as an acc. pl. Unfortunately, however, this speculative interpr. seems far from the poetic contest depicted in 1ab and 2.

X.61.2: As disc. in the publ. intro., in my view this vs. characterizes the verbal products of the losing (Cyavāna) and winning (Tūrvayāṇa) opponents in the brahmodya as metaphorical liquids – Cyavāna’s as mere add-ins to soma, Tūrvayāṇa’s as gushing semen (itself often a metaphor for soma). In taking *rétah* ‘semen’ as metaphorical, I part ways with Old, who thinks it’s the real substance, used in a ritual to produce offspring. And in general my interpr. of this vs. differs both from Old’s extensive analysis of it and from Ge’s tr. and notes.

To begin with, the standard interpr. is that the first hemistich has Cyavāna as subject, the second Tūrvayāṇa. But note that *cyāvānaḥ* appears only at the beginning of pāda b, while pāda a begins *sá íd*. While it is certainly not impossible that *sá íd* in context is as a reference to the subject of the previous vs., the *gūrtavacāḥ* poet (1a), who in 2c will be further specified as *gūrtāvacastamaḥ*. This assumption underlies my interpr. of the vs., and it solves several problems in the construal of pāda a that the others must make heavy weather of.

First: in order to have the part. *vanván* ‘winning’ modify Cyavāna, other interpr. encounter difficulties of both syntax and sense. As to the latter, since Cyavāna seems actually to come out the loser in this match, any “winning” he does (by that interpr.) needs to be of a qualified or ironic type. Moreover,  $\sqrt{van}$  ‘win’ does not take the dative, except to express the beneficiary of someone else’s win; certainly the object won is not in the dative, as the standard interpr. of the syntax here requires. The supposed dat. complement leads Gr to create a unique def. of  $\sqrt{van}$  just for this passage (“11) jemandem [D.] wozu [D.] verhelfen”) and Ge also to stray far from the usual sense of  $\sqrt{van}$  (‘sich bemühen’ + DAT: “indem er sich um eine unsichere Gabe bemühte”). Note that the following two vss. each contain a verbal form of  $\sqrt{van}$ : *vanuthaḥ* (3b), *vavanvāmsaḥ* (4d), and these three forms should at least not contradict each other.

My interpr. avoids both these difficulties. Given the triumphant tone of the 2nd hemistich concerning Tūrvayāṇa, pronouncing him a winner in pāda a is unproblematic. I take *vanván* in absolute sense (“winning / a winner”) without expressed object (cf. pf. part. *vavanvāmsā* in the same usage in 4d). As for the dat. phrase *dānāya dābhyāya*, I begin with the fact that dat. *dānāya* is frequently used as an infinitive / quasi-infinitive “to give, for giving”; cf. e.g., I.180.5 *ā vām dānāya vavṛtīya ... gōḥ* “Might I turn you two here to give / for giving (of) a cow.” In fact it is several times found as the complement of  $\sqrt{maṇh}$  ‘be ready (to give), be magnanimous’ (VIII.52.6, 61.8; including in the next hymn. X.62.8 = VI.45.32). Now recall the cmpd *maṇhane-ṣṭhāḥ* in the immed. preceding vs. and Scar’s interpr. of *maṇhane* as a dative infinitive. I tr. that cmpd. “standing ready for liberality” (see above). In our vs. here I suggest that we carry over the *-sthā-* ‘standing (ready)’ and construe it with the syntactically independent dative *dānāya*. The extra twist here is that I take the other dat., *dābhyāya* not as a deprecatory characterization of the type of gift (like Ge’s “eine unsichere Gabe” [with an unjustified extension of the sense of  $\sqrt{dabh}$ ] or Re’s “mesquin”), but as characterizing an animate (‘who can be outwitted’) and the dative agent of the infin., of the familiar type (*īndrāya pātave*, etc.): “for the *dābhyā*-one to give.” The referent of *dābhyāya* is the defeated Cyavāna, and Tūrvayāṇa is waiting for the Cyavāna, whom he outwitted, to give him what is owed. The gerundive *dābhyā-* is found only twice in the RV, and in its other occurrence, X.108.4, it also has animate/personal reference, to Indra “who can (not) be outwitted.” It does not refer to things such as a paltry gift (as others take it here); it is not a synonym of *dabhrá-*, pace Re.

Pāda b describes Cyavāna's losing tactics: he measured out his vedi with *sūda*-s. In the publ. tr. I render the word as “‘sweet’ (dregs),” but see comm. ad VII.36.3, where I come around to favor Pischel's Beisatz, the ingredients added to soma. The point here would be that Cyavāna used only auxiliary materials, not the real substance itself. In terms of a verbal contest, this could mean poetry tricked out with flourishes but without true force, eloquence, or insight. I would now slightly change the tr. to “with sweet admixtures.”

By contrast, Tūrvayāṇa's product is the most forceful and vital substance of all, namely semen (*rétas*). In the metaphorical sacrifice in which he and Cyavāna are competing the *rétas* can stand for soma, as opposed to the add-ins that Cyavāna employed: for the identification of soma as *rétah*, see, e.g., I.164.35. In the verbal contest *rétas* can represent well-formulated words that reflect *ṛtá*- and produce results. And of course in the account of the divine incest myth that follows in this hymn *rétas* is actually semen.

On the problematic *itāūti*-, see comm. ad VIII.99.7.

X.61.3: This vs. enlarges on Tūrvayāṇa's verbal triumph, with his skill not only defeating Cyavāna but also attracting the Aśvins. The second hemistich uses the more familiar trope of words/praise as arrows shot at the target of the praise (see, e.g., my 2020 “The Aim of Praise”) in place of the more jarring eloquence-as-semen of 2d. This arrow image may also harken back to vs. 1 and the Rudrian formulation, which I suggested is meant to evoke the hostility inherent in a verbal contest.

My identification of the unnamed referents in this vs. follows Ge: the 2<sup>nd</sup> du. in b is addressed to the Aśvins (so also Old, flg. Pischel), who are also the addressees in the next vs. In cd Tūrvayāṇa is the referent of both the rel. *yáḥ* and the gen. demon. *asya*, though Pi takes Indra as the subject of cd (see Old). The loc. pl. phrase *yéṣu hávaneṣu* in pāda a is shorthand for *yásya hávaneṣu*, again with Tūrvayāṇa as referent of the gen.

With Old (but not Ge) I take the *mánaḥ* simile with *vípaḥ* ‘inspired words’, not with the Aśvins. And unlike both Old and Ge I think *śácyā* ‘with skill’ must refer to Tūrvayāṇa's skill, not the Aśvins'. The verbal contest (*ājí-*) in vs. 1 was a contest “in skill” (*śácyām*), and it was through his skill that T. won it. I would now slightly alter the tr. to better integrate this instr.: “... inspired words, like thinking sharp with skill.”

On *ásrīṇīta* see Narten, “Ved. *śrīṇāti* ...” (KZ 100 [1987]: 281–82 = KISch 351–52).

X.61.4: As indicated in the pub. intro., I consider this vs. to be a direct quote of Tūrvayāṇa's invocation of the Aśvins; note the 1st sg. verb *huve* (b) and the two forms of enclitic *me* (c). This 1st ps. reference contrasts with the 3rd ps. narration of vss. 1–3 and brings this section of the hymn to a close. As a welcome change, most of the vs. is straightforward.

The black female among the ruddy females is of course Night among the Dawn cows, at a time when the “early-coming” Aśvins are on their way to the sacrifice.

The one problem in the vs. is the final word *ásmṛta-dhrū*, specifically the root affiliation of the 2nd member and the meaning of the whole. There are two older competing views of the root affiliation. Starting with Sāy. (see also Old), *-dhrū* has been connected with *druh* ‘deceive’. Although this derivation makes (sort of) reasonable semantic sense, it encounters two formal difficulties: the initial aspirate *dh-* and the loss of the root-final consonant. To account for this, a two-step process is envisaged: to the root, which has two underlying aspirates (\**dhrugh-*), with the first ordinarily dissimilated by Grassmann's Law. But the nom. sg. would be, and in fact is, in this very hymn, *dhruk* (vs. 14 *ádhruk*), with the first aspirate surfacing when the second loses

its aspiration. The dual form in our verse results from “abnormer Abfall des Endkonsonanten” (AiG II.2.33; see AiG III.326). But the loss of the root-final would be unusual indeed, and the route to getting a dual in *-ū* to an original root noun in final consonant would be quite tortuous. To start with, we should expect a dual to the unmutilated root noun to be *\*-druhā*. The consonant to be lost is not, in this form, an “Endkonsonant.” Moreover, in the expected dual, the root-final remains an aspirate so that the root initial is a plain *d* by Gr’s Law. The only paradigmatic form that could show aspiration on the initial and lose a final consonant, to produce an apparent stem *\*dhru-*, is the just-cited nom. sg. *dhruk*, but it is precisely this form that doesn’t lose its final consonant in this same hymn. But let us assume that was the immediate source: still our problems are not over. If we had a putative intermediate root noun stem ending in short *-u dhru-*, produced by the loss of the nom. sg. ending, it should add the empty *-t* found in other root nouns in short resonants. Only if such a stem were analyzed as containing a *suffixal -u-* could we escape the adding of the *-t* and get a dual masc. in *-ū*. If, by contrast, the result of the loss of the final consonant was (by compensatory lengthening?) *\*dhrū-*, we should expect a dual masc. in *\*-vā*. Getting the form we have from a root noun cmpd in *-druh-* thus requires considerable butchery. The alternative root affiliation is scarcely better. Wh (Rts) tentatively lists it under  $\sqrt{dhvṛ}$ , *dhur*, *dhru* ‘injure’, as short-vowel *dhru* (with ?); KEWA also classifies the form here (s.v. *dhvāratī*). Although the initial aspirate would no longer be a problem, the lack of appended *-t* remains an issue. A third way was suggested by KH (StII 5/6 [1980] 95 = Aufs. 757; accepted in EWA s.v. *DHVAR*), that *dhru-* (and related forms) belong to a separate root  $\sqrt{*dhru}$  ‘deceive’, related to (/extended into) the more familiar  $\sqrt{dhru}$ -*gh*. This does not solve the lack of *-t*, but that turns out to be a problem with several forms in this hymn (*sabardhūm* vs. 17, *raghudrú* vs. 17). More from exhaustion than a deep conviction of its rightness, I adopt the KH solution. For further disc. on this form and related problems in this hymn, see Scar 279 and 226 n. 309.

X.61.5–8: These vss. relate (or allude) to the story of the incest of Heaven / Sūrya and his daughter, Dawn, found widely in the Brāhmaṇas with Prajāpati as the male figure (see my Hyenas pp. 289–302) and glancingly alluded to elsewhere in the RV (I.71.5, 8). No names are named in our passage, but as indicated in the publ. intro., I think the unifying topic of this hymn is Dawn, and therefore it is her story being related here – *pace* Ge (n. 5), who tentatively suggests that a different incest may be meant.

X.61.5: The cmpd *vīrākarmam* is by accent, and sense, a bahuvrīhi: ‘possessing the manly work’, a euphemism for the penis; see Gr, Old, Re. It is surely the subj. of *prāthiṣṭa*. By contrast Ge takes it, apparently, as a tatpuruṣa (“die Mannesarbeit”) and as the obj. of *iṣṇāt* (“nach der Mannesarbeit verlangend”). Note the nonce thematicization of the neut. *-an*-stem *kārman-*, presumably starting from first cmpd members in *karma-*. The thematicization in this context was surely facilitated, perhaps caused, by the fact that *-karmam* is followed by a vowel-initial word, and the *-m* avoids a hiatus between expected *-n*-stem neut. *\*vīrākarma* and *iṣṇāt*. The other two examples of them. 2nd member *-karma-* in the RV, both also late, are not amenable to the same interpr.: *deva-karmébhiḥ* (X.130.1) and *viśvā-karmeṇa* (X.166.4); see comm. ad locc.

With Old I supply ‘semen’ as obj. to the part. *iṣṇāt*; the same participle elsewhere takes a liquid as obj.: I.181.6 *pūrvīr iṣaḥ ... mādharma iṣṇān* ‘dispatching many refreshing drinks of honey.’ As was just noted, Ge instead takes *vīrākarmam* as its object and assigns the meaning ‘desiring’ to the participle. Acdg. to him (n. 5a) *iṣṇāti* “crosses” with other roots  $\sqrt{iṣ}$ , but in fact no forms with nasal have the ‘desire’ sense, only ‘send, dispatch’.

The referent of *yásya* in pāda a is *náryaḥ* in b. Although neither *vīrá-* nor *nṛ-* (and derivatives) is specialized for male-as-sexual-being, the presence of these two words so close together creates an atmosphere of sexual virility.

In b the rapist pulls out his penis, which has already ejaculated. The ppl. *ánuṣṭhitam* modifies the gapped ‘penis’. The not particularly common lexeme *ánu* √ *sthā* generally means ‘follow, attend upon, stand beside’; for some disc. see Scar (644–45). My “attending upon” in quotation marks is meant to convey a somewhat euphemistic sense, but I now wonder if *ánu* √ *sthā* in this context might be the equivalent of the current term ‘stalking’ for unwanted invasive attentions of a male to a female.

Note that pāda-initial *ánuṣṭhitam* somewhat echoes *práthiṣṭa* in the same position in pāda a.

The second hemistich essentially paraphrases the first, esp. pāda b. The verb *ā* *vṛhati* ‘tears out’ doubles *ápauhat* ‘pulled out’ but in the more vivid present tense. The past part. *ánubhṛtam*, again modifying the gapped penis, echoes *ánuṣṭhitam*, but again more vividly – or more graphically: *ánu* √ *bhr* in the RV and AV is erotic slang. See my 1981 “A Vedic Sexual Pun” (pp. 59–60) and for an unambiguous passage AV XI.5.12 *bṛhác chépo ’nu bhūmau jabhāra* “he *ánu jabhāra* his lofty penis in/on/at the earth.” The question is how to translate the idiom. In my 1981 art. I suggest ‘penetrate sexually, stick (one’s penis) in’ and tr. AV XI.5.12 “he stuck (his) great penis in the earth,” which is similar to Whitney’s somewhat more polite “has introduced in the earth a great virile member.” In Hyenas (295–96 with n. 290) I tr. the form in our passage with “what (had been) thrust in.” But I now think it is difficult to get from the literal meanings of the preverb + verb root to ‘thrust in’, and I also think that leering euphemism is more characteristic of the usage than clinical description. The rendering “brought to bear” in the publ. tr., again in quotes, seems better, as being both less literal and more menacing, though in English it has no erotic flavor that I know of.

The unextended imperfect to √ *as*, *āḥ* (i.e., underlying *ās*), is notable here. Is *ā* *ánubhṛtam* a rough-and-ready pluperfect “had been brought to bear”? For further on this impf. form, see comm. ad X.85.6–12.

The 2nd hemistich also presents a syntactic problem. The phrase *kanāyā duhitúḥ* straddling the pāda break can be either gen. or abl., but it makes most sense as an abl. with ‘tears out’, as represented in the publ. tr. and Ge’s “Er reisst es von der jungfräulichen Tochter zurück.” But by word order it should belong in the subordinate *yád* clause, since the *yád* precedes it. Ge (n. 5cd) recognizes the problem, suggesting it’s a mixture of two constructions. It is possible to take the phrase as a genitive loosely construed with *ánubhṛtam* (something like “what had been brought to bear of [=for, with regard to] the maiden”), but an ablative with the main clause verb is far more satisfactory. It may simply be that the six-syllable phrase was too unwieldy to position it in its own clause, whereas the slight (if illicit) preposing of the neut. rel. *yád* allowed the two-word phrase to fit the metrical space. I’m not happy with this explanation, but I’m reluctant to give up the ablative.

X.61.6: This vs. is relatively easy to decode, and it is notable that the English euphemism “make love” (for sex) is closely replicated by *kāmaṃ kṛṇvāná-* in b.

The difficult word in this vs. is *manānág*. In the publ. tr. I render it as “a little,” flg. Ge’s tentative “ein wenig (?)”, which itself follows Sāy.’s *alpam* and assumes some kind of connection with Epic/Classical *manāk* ‘a little’ – a connection that is difficult to motivate in detail (though see Re’s vague sketch of an attempt). There is a competing, very different analysis, represented already in Gr: that it is a root-noun cmpd in *-naś*. This is the interpr.

favored by Old, with  $\sqrt{nas}$  ‘disappear’ (etc.), rather than  $\sqrt{nas}$  ‘reach, attain’, modifying *rétah*. (Ge [n. 6c], in recognizing the root-noun-cmpd interpr., entertains the possibility that *-nas-* belongs to ‘reach, attain’ and suggests a gloss ‘die Absicht erreichend’.) Old first suggests a sense ‘sich der Aufmerksamkeit entziehend’ (escaping attention), but produces a second, and to me more plausible, sense, that the discharge of the semen “die Erregung verschwinden lässt.” The 1st member would be *manā-*, which generally means ‘zeal’ or the like, but could certainly shade into ‘energetic excitement’ and be euphemistically applied penile erection. This would require transitive-causative semantics for the root noun *-nas* (‘cause to disappear’ rather than just ‘disappear’), but this is also necessary for what seems to be an undoubted example of such a cmpd, *jīva-nās-* ‘destroying life/living beings’, in MS I.4.13 (63: 3–4), where it characterizes an oblation (*āhuti-*) that falls in the wrong place. That passage brings up another problem, however: the form in the MS is nom. sg. with a final in retroflex *-ṭ* (*jīvanāṭ*), while our nom. sg. ends in a velar (*manānāk*). Of course root nouns in final palatals show both finals (*-ṭ*: *vīt* to *vís*; *-k*: *dīk* to *dīs*) and the data are messy. I would expect a retroflex here, as in the 3rd sg. s-aor. *avāṭ* ( $\sqrt{vah}$ ) and 3rd sg. root aor. to the homonymous root  $\sqrt{nas}$  ‘reach’, *ānaṭ*. But a velar isn’t beyond the realm of possibility, nor is the interpr. of *manānāk* as containing such a noun. I therefore tentatively suggest an alt. tr. “the two left behind semen, which dissipates excitement.” For a summary of the problem see Scar (282–83), who, however, comes to no conclusions.

That *sukṛtāsya yónau* refers to the ritual ground is clear from the appearance of the same phrase in III.29.8, of the place where Agni is to situate the sacrifice.

X.61.7: Once again, part of this vs. paraphrases what went before. The sprinkling of the semen in 6cd (*rétah ... níṣiktam*) is repeated in 7b *rétah ... ní ṣiñcat*. But the description is more violent and the agency made clear. In vs. 6 the two “going apart, left behind” the semen, as if the semen were a product of both male and female and mutually and tranquilly deposited. Here the father brutally “springs on” his own daughter, and he is the subject and agnet of the VP *rétah ... ní ṣiñcat*. (Because the lexeme is the same in 6d and 7b, I should have tr. it identically: I would now substitute ‘sprinkled his semen down upon the earth’).

HPS (B+I 45, see 44 and 47) takes *kṣmayā* as instr. with *saṃjagmānāḥ* (“sich mit der Erde vereinigend”), indicating that the Earth was the object of the rape. But though we lack another instr. to construe with the middle participle, this interpr. is surely wrong, on grounds both of content and of form. In the other versions of the tale, the female is Dawn; we would hardly expect Earth here, because she and Heaven are joint parents, not daughter and father. Moreover, though it does no doubt have an instr. ending, *kṣmayā* is always used adverbially.

As discussed above (ad 1ab), I consider the formulation (*bráhma*) begotten here to be the same as (or a model for) the “Rudrian formulation” (*raúdrām ... bráhma*) in vs. 1, namely a formulation with the hostile power associated with Rudra, enabling its deployer to overcome his enemy. As noted there, in the Vedic prose versions Rudra is sometimes named as the avenger of the rape depicted here. In our vs. I think the gods create the formula to be used against the violator and also create the being who is to carry out the vengeance. But I do not think this latter is Rudra (despite Ge’s n. 7d); instead I nominate Agni, who, in his guise as Svarbhānu, is the avenger in many versions of this myth (see my Hyenas, esp. 364–73). It would make sense that the gods should fashion Agni out of the semen spilled on the ritual ground since that is Agni’s domain; moreover, in the sg. the epithet *vrata-pā-* is most frequently used of Agni (see comm. ad X.32.6), and *vāstoṣ páti-* “Lord of the Dwelling Place” can be an alternative lexical realization of Agni’s regular epithet *grhápati-* ‘Lord of the House(hold)’. (On the use of this term [almost]

exclusively for Agni, see my 2019 “The Term *gr̥hastha* ...,” pp. 8–9.) As for the other RVic occurrences of the phrase, the identity of *vāstoṣ páti-* in V.41.8 is unclear, but could be Agni; in VIII.17.14 it is probably Indra; and in the other RVic occurrences (in adjacent vss., VII.54.1–3, 55.1) it seems to name the “personified guardian spirit” of the household. These occurrences seem irrelevant to the solemn use of the term here.

The 3rd pl. *janayan* here is one of only two such forms found in the RV, for expected *janayanta*; the other is in X.66.9 (q.v.). See my 1979 *-anta* replacement article, esp. p. 154, which treats the distribution of 3rd pl. forms to the transitive stem *janáyā-*. Though the Pp. gives augmented *ajanayan*, the augment would have to be elided, and I am tolerably certain that in fact the form is underlyingly injunctive.

X.61.8: This vs. is the last one treating the incestuous rape, before the transitional vs. 9. It depicts (bc) the desperate attempts of the daughter to get away from her attacker, an episode found in some versions of the Vedic prose tale, as well as the rueful direct speech of her thwarted father in d.

In pāda a the father is compared to a bull in a contest (*ājauí*, returning from vs. 1b) throwing off foam (*phénam*). In the real-world analogy, the foam presumably results from the bull’s straining hard work and the sweat thus produced, but in the frame the “foam” surely stands for the semen that the father keeps shedding.

Contra Ge, who take the subject in b to be the father, I take it to be the daughter, going in every direction to evade her rapist. The nom. sg. *dabhráčetāḥ* can be masc. or fem.; there is no other sign of the gender or identity of the subject of *ait*. The collection of preverbs with this verb, *ā parā ... ápa* “hither, thither, away,” seem to be summed up by the adv. *smát* ‘altogether’, indicating the almost random zigs and zags of her attempts to escape. Her desperate state of mind is also conveyed by *dabhráčetāḥ*, which I render ‘heedless’ – that is, ‘possessing little consciousness / attention’. In its other occurrence I tr. the cmpd. ‘small-witted’; here it does not reference stupidity but rather distraction: “out of her wits,” “not having her wits about her” would be appropriate.

The depiction of Dawn’s flight continues in c. The lexeme *pārā √ vr̥j*, found here in the root noun cmpd. *parāv̥r̥j-*, needs to be distinguished from the much more common *pári √ vr̥j*, lit. ‘twist around’, but regularly meaning ‘avoid’. The sense of *pārā √ vr̥j* is equally both additive (‘twist aside / away’) and idiomatic (‘shun’), and it does not differ substantially from *pári √ vr̥j* in its idiomatic sense (‘shun’ versus ‘avoid’). The root noun cmpd elsewhere has passive semantics: ‘the outcast’, i.e., the one shunned (see I.112.8, II.13.12, 15.7), but here I see the active semantics more common with root noun cmpds, ‘turning aside, shunning’.

The two words *padā* and *dákṣiṇā* are taken together by Ge and tentatively by Re. Ge takes them as referring to the “southern direction” (zu den südlichen Orten) towards which the outcast daughter runs. Re, pointing out that ‘southern’ isn’t attested for *dákṣiṇa-* till the AV (not a particularly strong argument, given the short chronological span), renders the phrase rather “au pied droit,” with a question mark. But the two words do not have to form a phrase (as Old points out). I take *padā* as instr. sg., but *dákṣiṇā* as nom. sg., referring to the priestly gift (Dakṣiṇā), personified as a Gift Cow. Uṣas is regularly associated with the Dakṣiṇā, since the priestly gifts were distributed at the Dawn Sacrifice in RVic times. That the Gift-Dow is meant here is likely also because *adákṣiṇā-* ‘without a Dakṣiṇā’ is found two vss. later (10d). Here I think Dawn is the personified (or bovinized) Dakṣiṇā, and, as a cow, she flees (*sárat*) on foot (*padā*). This detail plays on the fact that Dawn is elsewhere said to be ‘footless’; see VI.59.6 ... *apād iyám pūrvāgāt*



*padvátibhyaḥ* “This footless one has gone in front of the footed (cattle),” an esp. telling passage because it contrasts footless Dawn with the cattle, which have feet (sim. I.152.3). In her panic Dawn runs away on foot, having transformed herself into the Gift Cow that is associated with her. This transformation is perhaps the original model for the transformation of the victim into a red doe (*rohít-*) in several of the Vedic prose versions (see my Hyenas, 290–93 with n. 276).

Pāda d contains the direct speech of the father, recognizing that his daughter has escaped his clutches. The word *prśanī-* is used of the ‘caresses’ the father wishes to bestow on his daughter also in the other RVic treatment of this incest story, I.71.5.

X.61.9–11: These next three vss. all begin with *makṣū* ‘right away’, which marks them as a unit, even though vs. 9 also tidies up (some of) the loose ends from the preceding narrative. The second pair of vss. (10–11) begin almost identically and are more closely related in content than they are with 9:

10a *makṣū kanāyāḥ sakhyām nāvagvāḥ*

11a *makṣū kanāyāḥ sakhyām nāvīyāḥ*

The first three words and half of the fourth are the same. The close relationship of the two vss. does not make them easier to interpret.

X.61.9: This vs. depicts the birth of Agni. As noted above, ad vs. 7, I consider Agni to be the creature the gods produced after the rape, from the semen spilled on the ritual ground – Agni being suggested by the epithets *vratapā-* and *vāstoḥ pāti-*. This vs. treats the production of Agni in more detail, though without naming him: the only occurrence of the stem *agní-* is in a simile in pāda b, referring to fire the substance.

In pāda a “trampling” (*upabdhī*) is compared directly to the chariot horse (*váhniḥ*), though we might expect the horse to be in the gen., parallel to *prajāyāḥ*. Ge (n. 9a) attributes the nominative case of *váhniḥ* to the reversion of nouns in similes to the nominative, a doctrine that I hope I laid to rest in 1982 (“Case Disharmony in RVic Similes,” IJ 24). I consider our passage to be simply a bold disjunction, with a quality compared directly to a possessor of that quality. Note that the simile particle is wrongly positioned, before *váhniḥ*; it is unlikely that the preceding word *makṣū* is part of the simile, *pace* Old, since it is an adverb and, furthermore, also opens the next two vss. without involvement in a simile.

The “trampling” of the offspring=Agni probably refers to the crackling of the kindled fire.

I consider b to incorporate a pun on the homonymous stems *ūdhar-/ūdhan-*, both ‘udder’ and ‘cold’ (for the latter see comm. ad VIII.2.12 and EWA s.v. *ūdhan-* and *ūdhar*), with one stem used in the frame, one in the simile. The primary reading here is acc. ‘udder’, where Agni takes his seat – the udder presumably being the fireplace. But in the simile *agnīm ná nagnāḥ* I take it as a loc. ‘in the cold’. The simile is very close to VIII.2.12 *ūdhar ná nagnā jarante* “Like naked (ones) in the cold they stay awake.” The simile in our passage is esp. clever because it contains *agní-* designating fire the substance in the acc., while the subject of the frame is the unnamed Fire the god.

In the second hemistich the two occurrences of the root-accented agent noun *sánitar-* with acc. objects *idhmám* and *vājam* (c) respectively are contrasted with a suffix-accented *dhartár-* without complement. Tichy (*-tar*-stems, 297–98) considers our passage as something of an exception to her interpr. of the accentual difference, claiming that *sánitar-* here designates a habitual agent, but *dhartár-* an occasional one. It seems to me rather the reverse, with *dhartā* indicating the role that Agni was born to exercise, and *sánitā* incidental feats that Agni

accomplishes. The rendering of *sānitā* + ACC as a straight past tense (“he gained the kindling ...”) in the publ. tr. is misleading, however. I would change to “he is one who gains the kindling wood and one who gains the prize.” This interpr. conforms to the general characterization of the two accent types by Benveniste (*Noms d’agent ...*, 11) that the root-accented type designates “l’auteur d’un acte” and the suffix-accented one “l’agent voué à une fonction.” However, the data are quite messy and, for any general characterization, require a generous, indeed over-generous, amount of special pleading.

The stable role of ‘upholder’ in *d* may be emphasized by the intensive (i.e., habitual or frequentative) nominal *yavīyúdh-* ‘ever battling’.

X.61.10: There is much disagreement about the referents and sense of this vs. – understandably – though there is general agreement that it has to do with the Vala myth. My own interpr. is quite tentative. The most solid identification in the vs. is that of the *kanā-* (also in 11), who is surely Dawn, since the same word was used of the incest victim in 5c. Since the Navagvas are associated with the myth of the Vala cave, it seems likely that the story has shifted from Dawn’s rape to Dawn’s imprisonment in the Vala cave, from which the Navagvas attempt to free her. Since elsewhere (see, e.g., I.62.4, V.45.7, 11) the Navagvas open the cave with sound, with song, it seems likely that “speaking the truth” (*rtām vādantah*) refers to this activity and the “yoking of truth” (*rtā-yuktim*) to their employment of this spoken truth in the opening of the cave.

The identifications become more challenging in the 2nd hemistich, esp. of *dvibārhas-*, *gopá-*, and *ácyutā(h?)*. As for the first, Gr takes it as a nom. pl., referring to the Navagvas; Ge as gen. sg. referring to the cave; Old as gen., tentatively supplying *rāyāh*. By contrast, I take it as referring to Dawn, who is called *dvibārhas-* in V.80.4. Both Ge and Old think the *gopá-* is the/a Paṇi, while I take it as the Vala cave itself. If I am correct, the phrase “protector of doubly exalted (Dawn)” is ironic, since the “protection” is actually imprisonment (consider the double usage of the root *√rakṣ* ‘protect / guard’).

The interpr. of *ácyutā* is complicated by the ambiguity of its form: out of sandhi it can either be *ácyutā* (so Pp.) or *ácyutāh*. The former is far more likely, and here I think Ge and Old have the right idea: that it refers to the solid rocks, the fastnesses, of the cave; cf. VI.22.6 adduced by Ge. Now, as to *adakṣināsaḥ* ‘without Dakṣiṇā(s)’, modifying the Navagvas – Ge (n. 10cd, flg. Ludwig) thinks this refers to the Paṇi’s theft of the cows that the Navagvas brought to distribute at their sacrifice. I think rather that this refers directly back to 8c, where Dawn transformed herself into the Dakṣiṇā cow and ran away from her rapist. She has now been confined in the Vala cave and the Navagvas are “without the Dakṣiṇā” – namely without Dawn herself. They attempt to “milk” her out of the rocks that form the cave: their aim is to recover the imprisoned Dawn.

X.61.11: It gets worse! This vs. is well-nigh impenetrable, and I am fairly certain that the interpr. given in the publ. intro. and publ. tr. is wrong or at least incomplete. Nonetheless, the continuity of the vss. (if we can dignify it with that term) suggests that the milking the Navagvas attempted at the end of vs. 10 was successful, and the semen/soma/milk of vs. 11 is the tangible result.

A major clue is, or should be, that the second hemistich is identical to I.121.5cd, a hymn attributed to Kakṣīvant, who is also named in our hymn in vs. 16. But unfortunately I.121 does not give us much help, since, like much of Kakṣīvant’s oeuvre, it is bafflingly obscure. In I.121.5 the reference is to soma, the referent of *te* is Indra, but – significantly – it is in the context of the Vala myth, which is treated in the two preceding vss., I.121.3-4. Because our vs. is also found in

the middle of a Vala context (vss. 10, 12–13), I now think that vs. 11 should be interpreted in that context as well and that my claim that vs. 11 concerns, at least in part, the birth of Agni (see publ. intro.) is incorrect. Instead I think that this vs., like I.121.5, concerns the soma that Indra acquired to give him the power to open the Vala cave. Although soma is not usually a necessary ingredient in the Vala myth (as opposed to the Vṛtra myth), in I.121.4 it clearly is: Indra is said to have opened the cave and freed the cows *asyá máde* “in the exhilaration of this (soma).” (Though the word *sómasya* is absent, *máde* makes the reference of *asyá* to soma inescapable.) And the following vs. (the relevant vs. 5) tells how Indra acquired this soma: brought to him by his parents, probably Heaven and Earth (ab), and acquired by sacrifice by unnamed but plural agents (cd = our cd). Other accounts of the Vala myth can also involve Indra’s possession of soma, e.g., VI.17.1–6.

Now let us examine our vs. in a bit more detail, first noting that although, unlike the second hemistich, the first is not identical to I.121.5ab, it has points of resemblance, particularly the opening of b *rāḍho ná rétaḥ*, which is very like the opening of I.121.5b *rāḍhaḥ surétaḥ*. In I.121.5 *surétaḥ* ‘having good semen’ modifies *páyah* in pāda a, which is also identified as a ‘bounty’. The whole phrase, “the bounty, the milk consisting of good semen,” refers to soma. This set of superimpositions allows us to identify the “semen, like a bounty” of our b with the milk, *páyah*, in d and to consider them also all to be soma. But it’s a bit more complicated, in that in pāda d the “milk” is produced by a different, and feminine, being, the “ruddy one who gives sap as milk” (*sabardúghāyāḥ ... usrīyāyāḥ*). The fem. *usrīyā-* ‘ruddy’ is always used of cows, or items conflated with cows, namely Dawns/light. So here we may be dealing both with milk=soma and milk=light, the latter produced by the Dawn confined in the Vala cave. The phrase *sabardúghāyāḥ ... usrīyāyāḥ* also has to be considered in connection with the phrase *sabardhūṃ dhenúm* in vs. 17.

However, contra the publ. tr., I no longer think that the semen is identical to the “truth” (*ṛtām íd*) that immediately follows it in pāda b. Instead I think this is a separate goal (of three) of the verb *turaṇyan*: “they hastened to the fellowship of the maiden, to the semen, (and) to truth itself.” In the immediately preceding vs. the Navagvas are speaking truth (*ṛtām vādantaḥ*) and their goal is the yoking of truth (*ṛtáyuktim*), namely (see comm. ad vs. 10 above) the use of their spoken truth to open the cave. Here they seek the imprisoned maiden, the semen = soma for Indra to use, and their own true song also to use in the opening of Vala.

The verb in this hemistich, *turaṇyan*, is generally taken as transitive (Gr, Old, Ge, HPS [B+I 46], Re), but other forms of this stem (incl. in I.121.1), as well as the derived adj. *turaṇyú-*, are intransitive (*pace* Re ad loc. and EVP XV.166), and I see no reason to impose a transitive sense here. The verb is simply a more insistent rephrasing of *agman* in the preceding vs. (10b), with the same goal, *kanāyāḥ sakhyám*.

In the second hemistich, identical to I.121.5, “your gleaming legacy” is again, surely, the soma. The introduction of a 2nd sg. *te* is surprising in our context, though it fits I.121.5 very well: there Indra is addressed in the immed. preceding vs. (I.121.4), and the first pāda of 5 begins *túbhyam*, which anticipates *te* in c. Old believes that our hemistich has been mechanically adapted from I.121.5 and implies that we need pay no attention to the *te*; HPS (46–47) by contrast thinks that the abrupt introduction of a 2nd ps. reference to Indra in the context of the Vala myth is not surprising, and I am in agreement (though not with the rest of his interpr.), esp. because it’s likely that Indra (or his alter ego Bṛhaspati) is the unnamed speaker in the next vs., 12b.

Indra’s “gleaming legacy” is, once again, the soma – and it is not, in my opinion,

something Indra has left behind, but rather what was left behind for him. As I remark ad X.132.3, *rékṇas*- “is several times used of what we gain from the gods at the sacrifice (e.g., I.31.5, 121.5, VI.20.7); in keeping with its etymology (from the root *ric* ‘leave’), it can be viewed as what was ‘left behind’ by the gods at the sacrifice.” In my view, in our verse the unnamed subjects of *āyajanta* acquired the soma by their sacrifice, for the benefit of Indra. I think it likely that they are the Navagvas.

Although the vs. remains very obscure, I feel I have a better handle on it than in the publ. tr. and I would now substitute the following tr. for the one found there: “Right away they hastened anew to the fellowship of the maiden, to semen [=soma], which was like a bounty, (and) to truth itself -- / (the semen/soma), your blazing legacy, which they acquired through sacrifice, (and) the milk of the ruddy one who gives sap as milk.”

X.61.12: This vs. appears to deal with the departure of the cows from the Vala cave and its aftermath, and it introduces an unnamed single speaker (b), probably either Indra or Bṛhaspati, in addition to the bards (*kārāvaḥ* c), who are surely the Navagvas we have been dealing with for several vss. and who serve as the unnamed subjects of pāda a. The vs. is hardly pellucid, however, and once again I think that the publ. tr. has gone seriously astray – with misinterpretations that I will attempt (no doubt not entirely successfully) to remedy here.

Our problems begin with the Saṃhita form *víyutā*, which is multiply ambiguous. The Pp reads *víyutā*, but *víyutāḥ* is equally possible in this sandhi context. The latter would be the nom. pl. m. of the past part. *ví-yuta*- ‘separated’ and agree with the subj. of injunc. *budhánta*, presumably the Navagvas. (Nom./acc. pl. fem. is also possible but probably contextually excluded.) The former, *víyutā*, has two possible morphological analyses, as neut. pl. to the same past part. (or fem. nom. sg., though this seems excluded contextually) or as loc. sg. to the *-ti*-stem abstract *víyuti*- ‘separation’ (as in IV.7.7). All three possibilities have entered into the discussion. In fact Old weighs all three (in order, *-tā* neut. pl. ppl., *-tāḥ* masc. pl. ppl., *-tā* loc. sg. *-ti*-stem) without making a decision. Gr. takes it as m. pl. ppl.; Lub lists it under the *-ti*-stem. But insofar as there’s a standard view, it is as a neut. pl. — so Sāy., Ge, HPS (B+I 200) — an analysis that is the hardest to fit into the passage, since it requires supplying a neut. pl. referent. All three just-mentioned interpr. take the referent to be the place(s) where the cows were kept, for Ge and HPS the fastnesses of the Vala cave, with Ge adducing the neut. pl. *ácyutā* ‘the immovable ones’ in 10c, referring to the walls/rocks of the cave. In Schmidt’s tr. “Als sie danach erkannten, dass (die Festen) vom Vieh getrennt waren.” Though I originally took *víyutā* as the loc. to the *-ti*-stem (hard as that may be to get from the publ. tr.), I now think that the most likely interpr. is as the masc. nom. pl., modifying the Navagvas, subjects of *budhánta*. They become concerned that the cattle, departing from the cave, had also left them behind. The reassuring voice – and action – of Indra/Bṛhaspati intervenes at that point.

I am somewhat disturbed by the sequence of tense between pāda a, with an apparently preterital injunctive *budhánta*, and b, with present *bravīti*. I suggest that this combination of tenses is meant to remove this vs., which seems to depict the situation *after* the opening of the Vala cave, from the narrative of the besieging of the cave, which occupies vss. 10–11 and returns in vs. 13. This perturbation of chronology is also signaled by *paścā* ‘afterwards’ in pāda a.

Pāda b also contains the problematic form *vaktārī* (read with short *-i* in Pp). The morphological analysis of these *-tārī* forms (e.g., *kartārī* I.139.7, *etārī* V.41.10=VI.12.4) is disputed; see also disc. ad V.41.10. Lanman (Noun infl. 426) considers them simply locatives to the *-tar*-agent noun with metrical lengthening. Old (ZDMG 55.302=KlSch 761 and Noten ad

loc.) is inclined to follow the view that they are nom. sg., and he vigorously disputes the opinion that they are locatives or locatival infinitives. AiG III.205 (with considerable lit.) tentatively opts for nom./acc. sg. neuter, though allowing the possibility of locative, while AiG II.2.673 pronounces them “unerklärt ... bis jetzt.” Tichy (-tar- 59–60) takes them as locatives, but to verbal abstracts. She tr. our passage “So spricht (Bṛhaspati), der beim Reden freigebig schenkt.” Although in some instances her abstract value works reasonably well (see *etārī* V.41.10=VI.12.4), in others the agentive sense seems to be preserved. I would claim that for our passage. Here *vaktārī* serves almost as an improper loc. absolute with the part. *rārāṇaḥ*: “bestowing (gifts) as he talked / when talking.” As for the long final -ī of these forms, much as I dislike the convenient invocation of metrical lengthening, Lanman does make a good case for the metrical positions of the forms that show -ī, and it may be that as their morphological identity lost clarity, the integrity of their final was no longer guarded.

The *īti* in b seems to mark the following pāda(s), c and probably d, as direct speech. There Indra/Bṛhaspati speaks of himself in the 3rd ps.

The publ. tr. of pāda c suffers, I now think, from imposing a “moral” rather than material sense on *vasutvā* and *ānehāḥ*. To begin with the first, the tr. ‘goodness’ for *vasutvā* is misleading. Though this stem (*vasu-tvā-*) occurs only here, the extended stem *vasu-tvanā-* is found 4x in the RV, always in the sense of a mass of material goods. Esp. nice, because of the presence of voc. *vaso* referring to Indra, is VIII.1.6 ... *vaso, vasutvanāya rādhase* “o you who are good for goods and largesse,” where *rādhase* anchors the phrase in a material context. There is no moral or ethical nuance. In our passage the gen. *vāsoḥ* most likely refers to Indra/Bṛhaspati, as *vaso* in VIII.1.6 refers to Indra, and the phrase refers to Indra’s bestowal of a collection of material goods: “by the mass/collectivity of goods of the good one.”

We must also re-evaluate the sense of *anehās-*. Throughout the publ. tr. I have generally rendered this word as ‘faultless, blameless’, flg. EWA s.v. (and KEWA III.656), based on a suggestion of Hoffmann’s. Although I do not dispute KH’s etymology or assessment of the general meaning, I think that, at least in English, the glosses I’ve used are misleadingly located in the moral sphere. In a number of passages – incl., I’d claim, this one – the word falls into the physical sphere, meaning ‘without defect, without flaw, without lack, wanting nothing’. The word is seldom used of animate beings, the referents most likely to have a moral dimension – only V.65.5 (we), VIII.75.10 (Heaven and Earth), VIII.18.5 (Ādityas), X.61.22 (patrons, in our hymn; see below), as well as in our vs. Instead it applies a number of times to the shelter or protection we pray the gods to extend to us (VI.50.3, VIII.18.21, prob. VIII.67.12, 31.12); what we want is shelter that is physically without gaps or weak spots, not shelter that is morally blameless. Similar are the passages referring to paths (I.129.9, VI.51.16=VIII.69.16); again a path is probably morally neutral, but it should be physically without flaw, to allow easy passage. The use of the adj. with “chariot” (VIII.22.2) falls in the same category. Verbal products like *māntra-* (I.40.6) and *stúbh-* ‘rhythm’ (III.51.3) could of course be ‘faultless’, but what is more likely meant is that they are perfectly composed, without flaw. Although the usual trajectory in semantic change is from the physical to the moral, it may be that this word went the other way, partly encouraged by the rhyme form *anenās-* ‘without offense / transgression’. When, in our passage, the bards are said to be *anehāḥ*, the point, I now think, is that they lack nothing, are in want of nothing, because Indra/Bṛhaspati bestowed gifts of goods upon them, in fact probably the cows that had left the cave. The bards were at risk of suffering a *material* lack, but Indra/Bṛhaspati made it up to them. This statement in pāda c follows on the gifting depicted in pāda b.

Our form *anehā(h)* is problematic for another reason: morphology. The stem is otherwise an *s*-stem, but if *anehā(h)* belongs to this stem, it can only be a nom. *singular*. This is in fact how Sāy. takes it, modifying Indra, the putative subject of the next pāda. But not only does the pāda break intervene, but removing *anehā(h)* from pāda c leaves the *kārāvaḥ* with nothing to do: there is no verbal or nominal predicate available to them. I'm afraid we must take it as a nonce nom. pl. masc., as if to an *-a*-stem and chalk it up to the penchant of this poet for deforming morphology.

The subj. of d is presumably the same as that of c, Indra/Bṛhaspati, and identical to the referent of gen. *vāsoḥ* in c. I would refine my tr. of the verb *viveṣṭi* from 'exert control over', for which I now see no evidence, to 'toil/labor for', as in VIII.75.11 *kuvīt sū no gāviṣṭaye, āgne saṃvēṣiṣo rayīm* "Surely you will toil for wealth for us, for our quest for cattle, o Agni." The point in that passage and this one is that the god labors to procure material gain for his dependents.

The last major problem in the vs. is how to interpr. *ūpa kṣū*. The pāda-final monosyllable is concerning. Sāy. takes it as an abbreviation for *makṣū* and Gr as a deriv. of  $\sqrt{ghas}$  'eat', hence 'food'. But the standard current view is that it derives from *paśū*- 'cattle'; see EWA s.v. The question is whether it should stand as an independent monosyllable. Ge considers it short for *kṣumāt* and tr. "aus Vieh bestehende," modifying *drāviṇam*. Another, and to me more persuasive, view is that it forms a cmpd with preceding *ūpa*: \**upakṣū* like *purukṣū*, a view going back to Ludwig and Bloomfield, rejected by Old, positively entertained by Re. This would also take care of the problem posed by *ūpa*. The root  $\sqrt{viṣ}$  does not otherwise appear with the preverb *ūpa*, though Gr creates the lexeme for just this passage, and it is positioned oddly for a preverb in tmesis, neither adjoining a metrical boundary nor right after the verb. I therefore accept the cmpd. interpr., which involves only the erasure of one accent in the Saṃhitā text.

In the first hemistich note the echoic phrases beginning both pādas: *paśvā ... paścā* and *īti bravīti*. Note also that, assuming that *kṣū* is derived from *paśū*-, the vs. begins (*paśvā*) and ends (*kṣū*) with forms of *paśū*-.

After this thoroughgoing rethinking of this vs., I would substitute the following translation:

When afterwards they became aware that they had been separated from the livestock, he [=Bṛhaspati or Indra] speaks thus, bestowing (gifts) as he talked / while talking.

"By the goods of the good one the bards are lacking nothing. He labors for all movable property, up to / including cattle."

X.61.13: This is the last vs. of this section of the hymn, and in my opinion it (still) concerns the besieging of the Vala cave – though there are some problems with this and it is not the standard view (not that there really is a "standard" view). One of the reasons I consider this vs. a continuation of the Vala narrative is the verb *agman* at the end of pāda a, which matches *agman* ending 10b, the first real vs. of the Vala narrative. The subjects in both cases are, in my view, the Navagvas, and the verb match marks an internal ring.

As is well known, in the Vala myth Indra and his helpers (generally the Aṅgirasas, of which the Daśagvas and the Navagvas [here] are subgroups) often open the cave by "sitting a 'session'" (the ritual known later [already AV] as a *sattrā*); see, e.g., III.31.9. The repetition of (-) *sad*- in a variety of forms hints at this ritual reference: *pariśādvānaḥ ... śādanto nārṣadām*. The first two, in the nom. pl., refer to the Navagvas. The problem is *nārṣadām*, which is, in my opinion, a red herring that has distorted the interpr. of this vs. This vṛddhi stem is elsewhere a patronymic ('son of Nṛṣad') that seems to refer to Kaṇva in I.117.8, who is also identified as

“son of Nṛṣad” (*kāṇvam nṛṣadaḥ putrām*) in X.31.11. But Kaṇva is generally favorably viewed, and if *nāṛṣadām* here is the obj. of *bibhitsuṇ* ‘they desired to split’, he would seem to be an enemy. This apparent contradiction has generated much, mostly fruitless, discussion, which I will not reproduce here. I think a way out of the dilemma can be found if we 1) do not take *nāṛṣadā-* as a PN (whether of Kāṇva or someone else) and 2) do not construe this acc. as obj. of *bibhitsuṇ*. A related stem *nṛ-ṣādana-* is used of ‘sitting(s) of men’, that is, ritual sessions, and I now think that *nāṛṣadām* here falls in the same semantic sphere and that it’s the cognate acc. with *sādantaḥ* “sitting (a siege) like/related to a ‘session of men’.” In other words, the tactic the Navagvas use to open the Vala cave both is and is like a (more benign) ritual session. This leaves *bibhitsuṇ* without an expressed object, but the object (Vala) is readily supplied from context. I take *purū* as I did in the publ. tr., as an acc. of extent of time, “for many (days).” In standard śrauta ritual a *sattra* is 12 days or more. I would now emend the tr. of the first hemistich to “They came just then as its besiegers; sitting (a siege) like/related to a ‘session of men’ for many (days), they strove to split (Vala).”

Although the Vala myth and the Śuṣṇa myth tend to be independent, the two are intertwined in I.121, the Kakṣivant hymn that has clear connections to this one (see comm. above ad vs. 11). In I.121.10 we have Śuṣṇa associated with something *súgrathitam* ‘well-knotted’, like *śúṣṇasya sāmgrathitam* here.

As Ge (n. 13c) (*vī*) √ *vid* is used several times of discovering and disclosing the *mārman-* ‘vulnerable spot’ of an enemy, and that must be what’s meant here. In I.121.10 it is Śuṣṇa’s *ójas-* ‘power’ that is ‘well-knotted’ (*súgrathitam*).

X.61.14–15: The opening of the Vala cave and the vanquishing of Śuṣṇa having apparently been accomplished in the preceding vs., the hymn now (re)turns to the sacrifice, where the Aśvins are welcomed in vs. 15. The Aśvins are of course associated with the Dawn sacrifice, so the Dawn thread that runs through this hymn is continued.

X.61.14: With Old, I interpr. the two *utá*’s in a and c as connecting the two naming constructions in a and c, rather than seeing each as internally conjoining pieces of its pāda (as in KH Aufs. 19: “Dessen Name ‘Glanz’ ist und an dessen dreifachen Sitz sich die Götter ... Agni ist dessen Name und Jātavedas” [my underline]). Ge takes the first *utá* as ‘auch’ and the second as conjoining *agnīḥ* and *jātavedāḥ*, but given that they take identical positions in their respective pādas (after #X *ha nāma*), they ought to have parallel functions. The two *utá* are oddly positioned for what I see as their function, but that seems a minor problem in this hymn.

X.61.15: The Aśvins are called *rudrā* a number of times (e.g., I.158.1); what exactly this is meant to convey I do not know. Although the presence of the rare vṛddhi stem *raúdra-* (RV 3x) twice in this hymn (also vs. 1, modifying *bráhma*) is suggestive, esp. with *gūrtáye* (b) echoing *gūrtávacā* (1a), I do not think that there is a strong conceptual link between the two occurrences. For the one in vs. 1, see disc. ad loc.

*arcimántā*, rendered ‘who possess the chant’ in the publ. tr., can also mean ‘possessing rays/beams’ (Ge “strahlend”), and both are probably meant. The ‘ray/beam’ reading would of course be appropriate to their connection with the Dawn sacrifice.

Ge supplies a nom. subj. “ich” for the infinitival *yájadhyaí* (“... will ich ... verehren”), on the basis of parallelism with I.122.4 (adduced by Old; see Ge n. 15ab), which has a nominative subject. His parallel is drawn from the Kakṣivant hymn immediately following Kakṣivant’s

I.121, which shows important points of contact with our hymn (see above). Nonetheless I see no reason to supply an extraneous subject here, since the infinitive(s) can easily be taken as passive.

I take *gūrtáye* as a dative (pseudo-)infinitive parallel to *yájadhyaí*; Ge, by contrast, takes it as a separate dative expression “um mir Beifall zu erwerben.” Although there are no other dative forms to *gūrtí-* to support its infinitival status here, it appears parallel to *yajñá-* in IX.105.1 ... *yajñáñh ... gūrtíbhīh*, which suggests the connection. And it is worth noting that *gūrtí-* in its other three occurrences is something originating from men and destined for the gods, not, as Ge has it, something a mortal might acquire for himself. The part.

*rārāṇā* picks up *rārāṇah* in 12b, used of Indra/Bṛhaspati distributing gifts, probably cows, to the Navagvas. The myth provides the model for the ritual.

X.61.16–19: On my interpr. of these much disputed verses, which differs substantially from those of Old and Ge, see the publ. intro. I am not at all certain that I am right, but am tolerably certain that Old and Ge are not.

X.61.16: As indicated in the publ. intro., I take this vs. as relatively conventional praise of his royal patron by the poet of the hymn – praise that he will soon qualify. The near-deictic *ayám* that opens the vs. suggests that the person in question is present at the sacrifice, which favors my interpr. that it is poet’s patron and the sacrificer (*yáṣṭā* 17a), the sponsor of the ritual.

Ge (n. 16b) takes pāda b as a “schönes Bild” – the subject overcomes all obstacles through his own power (‘being/creating his own bridge’: *svásetuḥ*). Ge is no doubt correct, but I think that crossing the river is meant not only metaphorically but literally, referring to the Āryas’ winning of new territory by crossing the boundary rivers, a feat also often attributed to Indra as leader. Here the king would be assimilated to Indra.

Ge (n. 16c) thinks the king makes Kakṣīvant and Agni both tremble because, as *vípra*s themselves, they fear that the king/ *vípra* will out-perform them poetically. I think the point is rather that he inspires them to create poetry praising him, and poetic inspiration as often sets the poet atremble (as the word *vípra-* indicates). In my view Kakṣīvant is either the poet of this hymn or, perhaps more likely, the poet identifies himself with Kakṣīvant and has adopted some of his lines, as we saw above.

On *raghudrú* as probably not a root-noun cmpd see Scar 243–44, though see his somewhat different opinion p. 226 n. 309.

X.61.17: As I discussed in the publ. intro., I think that the poet follows his praise of his royal patron in vs. 16 by cutting him down to size. Specifically, he hints that the king is not producing the gifts due to the poet and ritualists, even while the poet himself is doing his job by roping in (almost literally) the gods Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman. The poet’s description of his successful attraction of the gods in cd is close to menacing.

As I said in the publ. intro., I think *dvibándhu-* means that the king is related to both gods and men—or thinks he is. It is this term that set both Old and Ge to constructing an elaborate backstory and family tree, and I do not think it should bear that weight Old and Ge put on it.

The agent noun *yáṣṭar-* ‘sacrificer’ in my opinion refers to the same figure as the technical term *yájamāna-*, namely the sponsor of the sacrifice, not a priest. It is not clear that *yájamāna-* has entirely acquired its technical meaning in the RV.

The “sap-yielding milk-cow” (*sabardhúm dhenúm*) echoes the *sabardúghāyāḥ* of vs. 11, which we identified as the Dawn in the form of a cow, confined in the Vala cave. Despite her



circumstances, she produced milk (*páyah*). Here I think the poet is indicating that a cow (or “cow”) assimilated to the sap-yielding cow in vs. 11 is available for the sacrificer to milk. The cow may be the Dakṣiṇā cow herself, the source of the necessary priestly gifts for the poet and other ritual personnel. Though she potentially yields “sap,” she has not yet given birth (i.e., she has not produced the gifts), and it is the sacrificer/king’s job to milk her. This ritual task harkens back to the mythological depiction of the Navagvas coming to the Vala cave and, though lacking the Dakṣiṇā, seeking to milk the cave (vs. 10). They seem to have been successful (vs. 11), a good model for the king’s activity here.

In the 2nd hemistich the poet is properly performing his task. Ge (n. 17c, flg. Sāy.) takes the verb *vr̥ñjé* as a 3rd ps., but there’s no reason to impose an anomalous morphological analysis on it, when the morphologically proper 1st ps. works better in context. As I said above, there is something faintly threatening about the poet’s account of what he does: he “enmeshes” (*sám ... vr̥ñjé*) Mitra and Varuṇa with his hymns. Verbal forms of the lexeme *sám √ vr̥j* are found only twice in the RV; in the other occurrence (VII.3.4) it refers to Agni’s encircling / encompassing food with his jaws. The noun *saṃvārga-* (VIII.75.12, X.43.5) is used of booty or winnings that has been completely encompassed and acquired. In all these passages there is a sense of dominance, which I think is also found here: the gods have been captured by the poet’s hymns, perforce.

But the hymns also act as protective defenses, *várūthaiḥ*, for all those within them, including those same gods, so that the hint of menace is countered by the positive protective association of *várūtha-*, which always has the sense of a protective defense, sometimes found with *śárman-* ‘shelter’ (IV.55.4) and *chardís-* ‘id.’. For the association of *várūtha-* with verbal products, cf. VIII.101.5 *varūthyāṃ ... chándyaṃ váca stotrām* “a speech, a pleasurable, protective praise-song” and VIII.67.3 *ukthyāṃ várūtham* ‘protection worthy of hymns’.

I would now no longer separate Mitra-Varuṇa in c from Aryaman in d and construe each with a different instr. and would therefore emend the tr. to “when I enmesh Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryman with hymns (that are) preeminent defenses.

X.61.18: On my general interpr. of this vs., which is taken very differently by others, see the publ. intro. As I say there, I take the subj. of this vs., the *sūrīḥ* (patron), to be the same as the king in vs. 16 and the sacrificer/sponsor in vs. 17. The adj. *tádbandhuḥ* opening the vs. aligns the subj. with the *dvibāndhuḥ* of 17a. Ge (n. 18a) suggests rather that the subject here is a relative of the *yástar-* in 17.

This leads us to the question of the referent of *te*. For Ge, it’s Agni—also Re, flg. Gonda; further HPS, 47–48; see also Scar 253–54. They also take *te* as an improper locative (e.g., Ge “auf dich im Himmel”). Citing the *te* in 11c and the voc. *indra* in 15b, Old tentatively suggests Indra. I suggest instead that it is the poet and that the *te* is a gen. dependent on *dhiyam* in the cmpd.: “setting your insight in heaven.” The patron is dispatching the poet’s own *dhî* to heaven as part of his sacrificial offering. My suggestion poses several problems. First, by my interpr. the poet was the 1st person speaker of the previous hemistich (17cd), and so we must switch to a 3rd ps. narrator addressing the poet. in the 2nd ps. I can point to numerous abrupt changes of person in the RV in support, but I am still uneasy with this particular one. Further, it is not usually the patron’s task (or privilege) to manipulate or physically position the verbal offerings in the sacrifice, but rather the poet-creators. The referents of this cmpd *dhiyam-dhî-* in I.67.4 and IV.45.4 appear to be the poets themselves – though as Scar points out, the referents of other occurrences are different and the meaning of the compound “schwankt je nach

Kontext.”Moreover there are other passages in which the patrons do seem to provide the motive power to the poet’s productions. See, e.g., I.77.4 ... *yé maghāvānaḥ ... iśáyanta mánma* “our benefactors who propel our prayers at length.” As many times elsewhere in the interpr. of this hymn, I am uncertain about my own choices, but fairly sure that the ones prevalent in the lit. are less justified. In any case the publ. tr. would be easier to interpr. if I had identified the referent, however.

The word *nābhānediṣṭha-* is taken by most as a PN, and that may be one of its values here. But I think its full lexical sense, ‘nearest to the navel’, is in use here – and as a pun. On the one hand, *nābhi-* ‘navel’ is often used for the physical focal point of the sacrifice, namely Agni (as in VI.7.4 *nābhiṃ yajñānām*). When the patron is described / describes himself as *nābhānediṣṭha-* he is accorded or claiming the preeminent position on the ritual ground, beside the ritual fire. On the other, as disc. in the publ. intro., *nābhi-* “is a standard metaphor for origin and close kinship (especially the point of origin of two disparate groups).” This same patron is credited in 17a with two lineages (*dvibāndhu-*), presumably both divine and human, and “nearest to the navel” would situate him high up the family tree of both, close to the point of bifurcation.

It is the latter sense of *nābhānediṣṭha-* that prompts the patron’s speech in cd, which again I interpr. quite differently from others. Ge thinks the *sā* opening the hemistich refers to Agni; it would be feminine by attraction to fem. *nābhi-*. (This exact attraction is, admittedly, found in X.10.4 [see comm. ad loc.].) I take pāda c as a disjunctive question (again unlike others): the patron is asking, in a bit of shorthand, whether his navel is higher than “his” or vice versa, that is, in my view, whether he is closer to the top of the tree of lineage than someone else. The someone else (*asyā*) is Agni; with this identification I am in agreement with HPS, though not Ge, who thinks it’s the *tād* of *tadbāndhu-* in pāda a. Note that *asyā* is accented, though pronominal. This may be because its referent is new to the discourse (which might exclude *te* as referring to Agni in pāda a) or because it is initial in the second half of the disjunctive question.

In d the patron provides the (rather flimsy) evidence for his claim to the higher position: he has a defined place (“the so-many-eth”) in the line of descent. “That one” is presumably the originator of the line.

To make the tr. more intelligible, I would now change the first hemistich to “Setting your [=poet’s] insight in heaven, the patron whose lineage this is, the one “nearest to the navel,” murmurs as he quests.”

X.61.19: In this vs., responsive to 18, Agni is the speaker (here I am happily in agreement with most interpr.), and he decisively refutes the patron’s boasts. Interestingly he does so by claiming both senses of *nābhā-* in *nābhānediṣṭha-* (see above). On the one hand, in the first pāda he emphatically gestures towards the *nābhi-* on the ritual ground: “here is my navel, here is my seat” – namely the fireplace where Agni is situated during the sacrifice. But in the rest of the vs. he claims both the first birth (*prathamajā(h)*), putting him higher than his interlocutor, and also double birth (*dvijā(h)*), responding to the other’s claim of two lineages (*dvibāndhu-* 17a). And of course Agni is both a god and thus divine by nature and kindled by men, thus, by the mechanism of his creation, part of the mortal lineage. For the former, note “these gods here are mine” (*imé me devāḥ*), which, as Ge points out (n. 19d), picks up 14a referring to Agni: *yásya devāḥ* “to whom the gods belong.”

We must assume that Agni is proclaiming all of this in the here-and-now, on the ritual ground: the annunciatory initial near-deictics are insistent: *#iyám ... ihá ..., imé ... ayám ... / ..., idám ...*

The referent of *idám*, the milk of the cow as she was being born, isn't clear. Ge tr. "dieses All"; Klein (DGRV II.118 "creation" (supplying *bhúvanam*). Similarly to Klein, I tentatively supply "world" (rather than the "earth" of the publ. tr.). I now think it probably refers both to the world and all its trappings, and also to the ritual ground right here – which, in some sense, are the same: the ritual ground as the microsmic representation of the universe. Who the cow is, in this instance, I won't venture to speculate – there have been (and will be) more than enough cows in this hymn.

X.61.20–24: The spat between the sacrificial patron and Agni having been decisively settled in Agni's favor, we now turn to the Dawn sacrifice in the five following vss. (20–24). Each begins with *ádha* and each (loosely) treats a different divine figure or figures at the sacrifice (though the patron is not absent), starting and ending with Agni (20, 24). The sacrifice in these vss. is properly conducted, in contrast to the difficulties that beset other sacrifices alluded to in the hymn.

X.61.20: I tr. *aratí*- 'spoked wheel', rather than the 'chariot' favored by Th (Unters. 35) for this passage, because Agni's circular appearance seems always a prominent feature when he is called *aratí*- elsewhere. However, since the *aratí*- is described both as 'unhitching' (*áva syati*) and 'having a double track' (*dvivartanīḥ*), it's an example of pars pro toto – wheel for chariot. The 'unhitching' presumably refers to placing the ritual fire in the hearth, in particular to conveying the fire taken out from the Gārhapatya to the Āhavanīya and settling it there. As Th already suggested (see also Scar [609 n. 873]), the "double track" refers to the course that leads to the gods in heaven and back again.

For *āsu* the publ. tr. supplies 'clans', flg. Old (flg. Ludwig) and Ge. (adopted by Scar). This interpr. can be justified with ref. to 15d *vikṣú yájyū* "the two that seek sacrifice among the clans." However, I am now not certain that it is correct; it could alternatively refer to the cows that are a constant presence in this hymn and will be the focus of the next vs.

Re appositely adduces VI.12.3 *aratír vanerāt* 'the spoked wheel (of the sacrifice), the ruler in the wood' as parallel to our *aratīḥ ... vaneṣāt* -- with rhyming root noun finals, though the underlying roots,  $\sqrt{rāj}$  and  $\sqrt{sah}$ , are quite differently shaped.

Re suggests that the nonce phrase *śísur dán* 'child of the house' is based on the formula *pátir dán* 'lord of the house' (5x, mostly at pāda end). The child is of course Agni, just after kindling, and pāda d depicts his mother (one of the kindling sticks, presumably) giving birth to him, "grown strong with kindness" or, after the comm. ad V.87.4, "with kind attention," probably of the maternal variety.

X.61.21: In my view this vs. concerns the distribution of the Dakṣiṇās at the Dawn sacrifice. The Dakṣiṇā, esp. the lack of one, has been a regular preoccupation of the hymn; see vss. 8 and 10 and my interpr. of 17. But here, in this well-ordered sacrifice, they are properly distributed. The "cows of the maiden" – with Ge I take *kanāyā(h)* with *gāva(h)*, not with *úpamātim* as Old does – can also refer to the light of dawn, as so often, but I think the Gift-cows are the primary referents. Contra Klein (DGRV II.118) I do not think the cows refer to the flames of Agni.

On *úpamāti*- see comm. ad VIII.40.9. The "someone swollen (with wealth)" (*śvāntásya kásya cit*) is, in my view, the patron, who is (/may be) then addressed directly in the 2nd hemistich.

It is not entirely clear who the 2nd ps. addressee in c is. Ge seems to favor Agni, and this

is possible. Re points out that *sudravīṇaḥ* is addressed to Agni in I.94.15. However, *drāvīṇa*-figured earlier in the hymn, in vs. 12. Like our vs. that vs. describes the departure of Dawn's cows, and in that vs. (at least by my interpr.) Indra has control over them, as "moveable property" (*drāvīṇam*), which – crucially – he distributes to the bards. Thus Indra serves in that vs. as the model of a patron bestowing Dakṣiṇās, and here I think the voc. *sudravīṇaḥ* is addressed to the human patron at this sacrifice, distributor of Dakṣiṇās, who has been the subject of the middle part of the hymn. The connection between them is, again in my opinion, signalled by the pāda-final *s*-aor. injunctive *yāṭ*, in imperatival function, which picks up the agent noun *yāṣṭā* at the end of 17a. Both of these are unusual forms: *yāṣṭar*- is found only twice in the RV, while injunc. *yāṭ* is found only here in all of Skt. (though the augmented *ayāṭ* is somewhat more common). As Narten points out (Sig-aor. 200), it substitutes here for the very common *śi*-impv. *yākṣi*; it therefore seems to have been chosen to send a particular message, which, I think, is the connection with the agent noun *yāṣṭā* in vs. 17, tied together by their superficially deviant phonology.

With Ge (and tentatively Old), I take *vāṇṛdhe* as 1st ps., with the poet as subject. This is as close to a dānastuti as he is willing to come.

The name Aśvaghna, lit. 'son/descendent of a horse-slayer', is found only here and is a curious piece of nomenclature. It may refer to the performance of an Aśvamedha by an illustrious ancestor of the current patron. I also wonder if it's not a sly pun on the gambling term \**śvaghna*- 'dog-killing (throw)', found in *śvaghñín*-, a term for a successful gambler. Is the poet subtly implying that his patron owes his wealth to risky speculation?

X.61.22: Both Indra, as the model of a patron, and the patrons themselves return here.

The accent on *viddhī* is unexpected. Old suggests that it might be for emphasis; Ge supplies the impv. "(komm)" before it, presumably to allow *viddhī* to open a new clause. My tr., with a dash after "Indra," is meant to suggest that *ádha tvám indra* "And now you, Indra" strongly signals a referent shift and can be taken as its own quasi-clause.

I would now render *viddhī* by "come to know, take note," rather than the misleading stative "know." The point is that we will come into Indra's ken, so he will be prompted to give us wealth.

On the phrase *mahó rāyē* see comm. ad IV.31.11. The tr. here should be modified to "greatly for wealth."

The adj. *anehásah* in d is morphologically ambiguous: it can be an acc. pl. modifying the patrons in pāda c (so Gr) or a gen. sg. modifying *te*. Although the pāda boundary separates it from the patrons and, in fact, c is a repeated pāda (=I.54.11c), I favor the acc. pl. On *anehás*- see comm. ad vs. 12 above, where I argue that the word refers to the absence of a material lack rather than a moral one. Here I think the point is that the patrons want for nothing and therefore can afford to be especially generous to us. I would therefore alter the tr. to "our blameless patrons who lack nothing ..." If the gen. sg. reading is preferred, it could indicate that Indra, the model patron, lacks nothing. In fact, both readings may be simultaneously meant.

X.61.23: Note that pāda-final *gáviṣṭau* picks up *abhíṣṭau* in the previous pāda (22d) and anticipates *puṣṭau* and *sātaú* in 24 (a and d), all also pāda-final.

The referents in this vs. are quite unclear. Let us begin with dual voc. *rājānā*. There are two (or possibly three) candidates. Ge seems to think that it refers to earthly kings, but this seems quite unlikely, since *rājan*- is not used very often for mortal rulers. The two divine pairs in

contention are Mitra and Varuṇa (so Sāy.) or the Aśvins (so Re, tentatively). Old vacillates between Mitra and Varuṇa and earthly kings. Both M+V and the Aśvins have already appeared in the hymn – the former in vs. 17, the latter in vs. 4 – and there are arguments in favor of each. The strongest support for M+V is that dual forms of *rājan-* almost invariably refer to them, with the exception (in my view) of X.39.11 (see comm. there). On the other hand, the Aśvins fit better in a Dawn sacrifice context than M+V do. Moreover, the rare adj. *saranyú-* ‘hastening’ reminds us that the fem. of this stem, *saranyū-*, is identified as the female who bore (/carried) the Aśvins in the very obscure passage in X.17.2. The use of the adj. here might be meant to conjure up this association. In the end I find it difficult to decide, likewise in vs. 25, but am tolerably sure that a divine pair is at issue.

Then there is the question of the subject of *sárat* in b, modified by the adj. pair *saranyúh ... jaranyúh*, the identity of the dearest vipra (*vípraḥ prēṣṭhaḥ*) in c, and whether the referents in b and c are the same. My tentative answer is that the referents are the same and point to Agni, although this is by no means certain. In favor of this identification is the fact that in the following vs. (24cd) the same referent is characterized both as *saranyú-* and as a *vípra-*.

The pāda-initial *sárat* echoes the same form at the beginning of 8c, whose subject is Dawn. It is tempting to invoke her here as well, but the clear masc. adjectives (esp. since fem. *saranyū-* is attested elsewhere) make that difficult. Another possibility is that the subj. of *sárat* is Soma, who is elsewhere sometimes the subj. of that verb (e.g., IX.62.16), in which case I would say that the subject switches to Agni in c – though given the evidence adduced above from vs. 24, I consider this significantly less likely. The identification is made all the more difficult because pāda b provides no clear cues. The adj. *saranyú-* essentially doubles the verb; the hapax *jaranyú-*, obviously modeled on *saranyú-*, could equally well belong to ‘age’, ‘sing’, or ‘awaken’. I have opted for the last (so also Ge, Old tentatively, JSK DGRV II.118) because of my belief that the hymn is really about the Dawn sacrifice, but ‘sing’ is represented by Sāy., Gr, and Re, inter alia, and a case could be made also for ‘age’.

There is a tendency to interpr. dat. *kāráve* as goal with *sárat* (e.g., Ge “zum Sänger eilt”), but datives should not be straight goals of motion. I think rather that *kāráve* ultimately is the beneficiary of the actions in cd – Agni’s aid and protection for the bard’s patrons, which will ultimately benefit the bard himself.

Agni as *vípra-* is well attested elsewhere.

X.61.24: This is the last of the *ádhā* verses. Several items of vocabulary get recycled here – *saranyú-* (c), *vípra-* (d) – but the vs. is confusingly structured.

No doubt the boldest part of my interpr. has to do with pāda b. In this pāda we singers explicitly “beg” (*īmahe*) for something, but the rest of the vs. is not phrased as a request (though so tr., e.g., by Ge, JSK DGRV II.118). There are no modals; the only finite verb is the indicative *así*. It is therefore hard to see cd as directly continuing b. I suggest that the request in b is postponed until the final vs. (27), with the intervening material establishing the right to have these requests fulfilled (though quite obscurely). Note that the end of our b pāda, *tád ū nú*, is matched by the beginning of 27, *tá ū sū*, which picks up 24b and provides the link to the actual request. Vs. 27 also contains the (likely) modal *bhūta* and so is phrased as a request.

As for the structure of the rest (removing b from consideration), I think it is framed by two locative phrases, joined by *ca*: ... *asya jénasya puṣṭaú* (a) ... *śrávasaś ca sātaú* (d). In between the addressee is characterized, perhaps parenthetically, by two phrases, also conjoined by *ca*: *saranyúr asya sūnúr áśvo, vípraś cāsí*. (Note that this *ca* precedes the one that conjoins the

locatives of a and d and that the two *ca*'s do not interact by my interp. [but see JSK DGRV II.116 for a contrary opinion].) The locative phrases, particularly the first, establish the setting of the request in b as the ritual. I take *asya jénasya* ("of him who is well-born") to refer to Agni: *jénasya*- is several times used of Agni (e.g., I.71.4) (on *jénasya*- in general, see comm. ad I.128.7). His "thriving" (*puṣṭau*) is the successful kindling of the ritual fire. As for the other loc., "at the winning of fame," I think this may refer to the poet's role in the production and conferral of fame on the gods, the patron, and himself.

This leaves c and the first half of d, "you, his son, are a hastening horse and an inspired poet," which I take as essentially parenthetical. What is the referent of "his" and what of "you" (implicit in *asi*)? I suggest (though tentatively) that "his" refers to Agni, also found in *asya jénasya* in pāda a, and the referent of "you" is the poet himself – with the poet addressing himself in the 2nd ps. The strongest evidence for this comes from the immed. preceding vs., 23, where, by my interpr. anyway, "the hastening one" (*saranyú-*) and the inspired poet (*vípra-*) both refer to Agni. Here we have the same two words, predicated of an unidentified 2nd sg. addressee, who is also identified as "his son" – and therefore presumably shares Agni's characteristics. This identification of Agni and the poet is the necessary preliminary to the next two vss., in which I believe that the unidentified subject is *both* Agni *and* the poet. I realize that this interpr. is quite a stretch, for it assumes that the poet is both participating in the plural "we" of the request in b and addressing himself in the 2nd sg. Such things are not impossible in RVic discourse (see my "Poetic Self Reference," Fs. Skjærvø 2005) but in a hymn this obscure it adds significant complications that can't be established with certainty.

X.61.25–26: As indicated in the publ. intro. as well as just above, I think that the unidentified subject of these vss. is Agni=poet, and the poet is establishing his noble lineage and right to the favor of the gods. The syntax of these vss. is clotted and almost impossible to follow: 25 and 26a and part of 26b form a single sentence, with the main clause in 26, which is preceded by the various dependent clauses in 25, seeming almost to constitute a series of false starts.

X.61.25: As was just noted, the syntax of this vs. is an intricate puzzle – or, to be more straightforward, a mess. I take the whole as an "if" clause, introduced by *yádi* in pāda a, which has two parallel verbs, *jujuse* in b and *dāśat* in d. Interrupting this "if" clause are two interrelated dative phrases in ab (*yuvóḥ ... sakhyāya* and *asmé śárdhāya*) and a parenthetical / embedded rel. clause (c and 1st half of d) introduced by *yásmín*, which refers to the subject of the verbs in the "if" clause. There are multiple ways to interpret the vs. (see esp. Old's disc.), which deviate markedly from mine in the overall construal, in the identification of the referents, in the analysis of the morphology, not to mention the purport of it all. I will not attempt to treat them, but concentrate on my own. I think the point of the vs. is that if Agni=poet is doing his ritual job for the sake of communion with the gods (pāda a) and the exchange of praise and material goods (d), then (in vs. 26) he is praised and seen to be "of good lineage," and he properly conducts the ritual.

The reference of dual *yuvóḥ* is much disputed. I think it must be the same two as the *rājānā* in 23 (q.v.), namely the Aśvins or Mitra and Varuṇa. See the standard treatments for other suggestions. In any case I think they are stand-ins for the gods in general, with whom we wish to establish communion by the sacrifice. As for "us, the troop" (*asmé śárdhāya*), I assume these are the same "we" who made the request in 24b, namely the group of poets and ritual performers. I should note, though not pursue, that most interpr. take *asmé* and *śárdhāya* independently, with

the latter referring to the troop of Maruts.

*jujuṣé:* contra Ge, but with Sāy., Gr, Old, and Re, I take this as a 3rd sg., not 1st sg. With Agni as subj., this means that he likes the praise given him; with the poet as subj., that he feels he has produced a good hymn.

The rel. cl. of c expands on the notion of the praise-hymn conferred or produced in b: in fact, it's not a single praise-hymn, but hymns found in all places that converge on him. That is, Agni receives praises from all over; the poet is a hub of poetic inspiration. The point of the relative clause is clarified by the simile found at the beginning of d: the hymns reach their destination along many different routes.

The easiest part of the vs. is the simple second VP *dāśat sūnṛtāya* at the end. I take *dāśat* as a 3rd sg. injunc., which is accented because it still belongs to the “if” clause (and also because it begins a new clausette within that clause) – though others consider it a participle.

X.61.26: Here the good ritual work performed by the subject in vs. 25 is rewarded: he is “sung by the waters” and has the gods on his side. Moreover he is “of good lineage” – the *īti* seems intended to mark *subāndhuḥ* as a title bestowed on him. This is the lineage that his patron was aiming at and failed to achieve in vss. 17–19; note the term *-bandhu-* in 17–18.

I do not understand why he is hymned/sung by the waters (*gṛṇānó adbhiḥ*). It is true that waters are often considered to be noisy, but I assume there is a further ritual reference here.

With Old and Ge, I take the instr. phrase *nāmasā suktaīḥ* in b with the clause in pāda c, parallel to *ukthaīr vācobhiḥ*.

With Old and Re (but contra Ge), I supply an obj. for *vārdhat*. As Re points out, this would otherwise be the only intrans./reflex. form of the well-attested act. stem *vārdhati*.

The brief clause at the end of c, *ā hí nūnām*, lit. “for now here,” lacks both nominal and verbal forms. I think it refers to the accomplishment of the ritual. I supply “he has” and take *ā* as standing for “arrived.” This interpr. follows Ge’s, and it could refer to Agni/the poet. Or simply be the equivalent of “voilà.” In fact, given that the next vs. refers to the departing gods, the latter seems more likely – indicating that the ritual has been achieved – is at a successful end.

That clause is further amplified by d, which in my opinion simply means that the ritual, the ceremonial “course” (*ādhvan-* for *adhvarā-*) that the hymn has traversed, starts from the Dawn, from the “milk,” that is, the milky light at dawn, which is nicely contrasted with the ruddy color of Dawn herself. (See the same phrase *pāya usrīyāyāḥ* in vs. 11.)

X.61.27: With the end of the ritual proper (and the end of the tortured verbal path that led us there), the poet can now express his request with relative simplicity. (See 27b for the initiation of the request.)

The distracted phrase *mahāḥ ... ūtāye* should not have been rendered “for great help,” but, like *mahó rāyē* in 22, “greatly for help.”

## X.62 All Gods

On the structure of this hymn and my disagreements with previous treatments, esp. Ge’s, see the publ. intro. For a complete tr. and disc., see also HPS, B+I 193–99. Its relative simplicity is a considerable relief after X.61. The hymn is metrically quite varied, with six different meters represented in its eleven vss.: the first four are in Jagatī, three others (5, 8, 9) in Anuṣṭubh, but the other four meters are found once each (Bṛhatī 6, Satobṛhatī 7, Gāyatrī 10, Triṣṭubh 11).

X.62.1–4: The four Jagatī vss. are also united by a refrain in the d pādas and very parallel constructions in the c pādas.

X.62.1: The Dakṣiṇā was of course a preoccupation of X.61 as well, and the achievement of companionship / fellowship (*sakhyā-*) was the aim in X.61.25. Although the Aṅgirasas are of course gods and associates of Indra, in this vs. they seem to be acting as if in the role of mortal sacrificers vis-à-vis Indra, exchanging the sacrifice and the Dakṣiṇā for Indra’s fellowship and immortality. For the Aṅgirasas’ attainment of immortality see also X.92.3.

I do not know why “anointed” (*sāmakṭāḥ*) is used here. Schmidt (193) suggests that it expresses the marriage-like (eheähnlich) relationship between the Aṅgirasas and Indra, based on some comments on *sām √ añj* in this vs. by Re , but this seems farfetched.

The c pādas of 1–4 have the structure X [ABSTRACT NOUN] *aṅgirasas vo astu* “Let there be X for you, o A’s.” Our c begins with the dat. prn. *tébhyaḥ*, which ordinarily has 3rd ps. ref. Here, however, I think it doubles the *vaḥ* later in the pāda and therefore has 2nd ps. ref. – like the common nom. phrase *sá tvám* (see my 1992 “*sa figé*”). I suggest that it’s used here to anchor the case value of dative for the multivalent enclitic *vaḥ*. Once the structure of this pāda was established in that way, the subsequent c pādas needed no such help.

Since Ge believes that the speaker is the Mānava named in the refrain, he supplies “me” as the primary obj. of *prāti grbhñta* (so also HPS), but since I think Mānava is related to the poet’s patron (see publ. intro. and vss. 8 and 11), I do not follow him. I think rather that the poet is commending his patron to the Aṅgirasas.

X.62.2: The signature deed of the Aṅgirasas: the splitting of the Vala cave and release of the cows. The signature verb of the release is often *úd √ aj*, as here.

Properly speaking, *dīrghāyutvám* is an abstract meaning literally “long-life-ness,” but no non-awkward English equivalent comes to mind.

X.62.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this set of deeds is more appropriate to Indra than the Aṅgirasas.

As in 2c, we have an nominal abstract that does not go easily into English: good-offspring-ness. The form *suprajāstvá-* is somewhat oddly formed; assuming it’s based on (*su*)*prajā-*, the *-s* before the abstract suffix is intrusive and seems to be based on a case form, probably nom. sg. *-prajāś*, though opinions differ. See Scar (143), who doesn’t pronounce on it but gives clashing reff. to AiG. It is notable that the *s* makes an already over-heavy syllable \**ā-tv-* even heavier.

X.62.4: The first three vss. of this quartet (vss. 1–4) have the same structure in the first hemistich: a relative clause introduced by *yé* treating the past deeds of the Aṅgirasas. In vs. 1 this rel. cl. has 2nd ps. ref. (2nd pl. pf. *ānaśā*) matching the 2nd pl. in cd; in the other two the 3rd ps. of the rel. cl. in ab gives way to 2nd ps. in cd with the same referents. Here in the final vs. the structure and temporal reference of ab change abruptly. The opening *ayám* ‘this one here’ signals that the time is the here-and-now, as well as switching the referent to the singular: the subject can no longer be the Aṅgirasas of long ago.

The interpr. of this vs. has been muddled by the assumption that *nābhā* is a short version of the PN Nābhānediṣṭha, the supposed poet of X.61–62; both Ge and HPS (p. 193) tr. “in der Sippe” (in the clan) and suggest it’s a word play on the name (and therefore presumably on the



lineage). But I think it simply refers to the fireplace on the ritual ground, as it does (in my view) in X.61.19 (q.v.). In this interpr. *ayám* “this one here” refers to the priest/poet, speaking at the sacrificial hearth.

What “in the house” refers to, I’m not certain – it could be a shorthand reference to the ritual ground as Agni’s house, of which he is lord (the title *grhápati-* almost exclusively refers to Agni in the RV). Or it could be referring to a more intimate sacrifice than most, performed in the family household, a *grhya* ritual avant la lettre, in this period that predates the *Grhya* / *Śrauta* ritual split.

Because of the voc. accent, *déva-putrāḥ* can be either a bahuvrīhi ‘having gods as sons’ (<*devá-putra-*) or tatpuruṣa ‘sons of the god(s)’ (<*deva-putrá-*). Gr assigns it to the former, though allowing the possibility of the latter. Ge and HPS take it as the latter, “Göttersöhne.” In the publ. tr. I opted for the bahuvrīhi because it is securely attested in the RV and elsewhere in Vedic, whereas the tatpuruṣa is not found in Vedic at all (unless here), as far as I can tell. However, I now feel I was wrong, on grounds of sense. The *Āṅgirasas* are not known as the fathers of other divinities, but are several times called “sons of heaven”: *dīvās putrāsaḥ* (III.53.7=nearby X.67.2, IV.2.15). Since the tatpuruṣa would have been simple to create (see *rājaputrā-*, e.g.), I would now change the tr. to “sons of the god(s).” Note that the next vs. (5) presents them as sons of Agni, the (sg.) *Āṅgiras*, and that vs. 6 gives both Agni and Heaven as progenitors.

X.62.5–6: These two vss. form a pair, mostly repeating the same information or variation thereon and amplifying 4b. It is not clear to me why this duplication was deemed necessary. It is almost as though the poet was considering two different versions, in different meters, and failed to prune one of them.

X.62.7: The first hemistich repeats the motif of the *Āṅgirasas*, here along with Indra, releasing the Vala cows. Curiously it is not only cows but horses (*vrajám gómantam aśvínam*); the latter are not ordinarily associated with the Vala myth elsewhere, and it is not immediately clear to me why they are found here (but see vs. 8 below). The same pāda is found in X.25.5, not in a Vala context, where Soma is urged to release the animals from their pen. Here I would suggest that the action portrayed provides a transition from the Vala myth to the poet’s current desire for recompense, and he wants horses as well as cows. The mixture of myth and the here-and-now is also found in the 2nd hemistich, where a generous gift to “me” (presumably this very poet) reorients the *Āṅgirasas*’s mythic deeds towards the present time. To make this clearer I would now substitute “have made fame” for “made fame.” Since the subjects of cd are not identified, they can represent the current patrons configured as *Āṅgirasas*.

The act. part. *dádataḥ* in c is interpr. by all as nom. pl., modifying the subj. of *akrata* in d, and I am certain that that is the correct analysis. However, it could instead be a gen. sg. modifying *me*, which adjoins it. Sense speaks against this analysis, but it must be admitted that word order favors it – or, better, tempts the hearer to make the gen. sg. analysis before the more likely nom. pl. one surfaces.

The first member of the adj. *aṣṭakarmīyah* is much discussed; see HPS (194) for lit. The “cut-branded” of the publ. tr. follows the etym. of Kuiper, enlarged by KH, on which see EWA s.v. *AKṢ*.

X.62.8–11: The *dānastuti* that occupies the last four vss. builds on the model of giving provided

by the Aṅgirasas in the previous vs.

X.62.8: The intrusive presence of the horses in the Vala cave in 7b finds its explanation here, where the poet praises the imminent gift not only of the thousand (cows) found in 7b and 8c, but also one consisting of a hundred horses (*śatāśvam*).

The phrase *dānāya māṃhate* picks up *māṃhate* from 6d and thus connects the patron Manu's munificence with the Aṅgirasas; it also reminds us of *māṃhaneṣṭhāḥ* and *dānāya* in the vss. 1 and 2 of the previous hymn X.61.

X.62.10: On *smāddiṣṭi*- see comm. ad III.45.5.

X.62.11: "Aligning itself with the sun" of the Dakṣiṇā in c of course refers to the fact that in RVic ritual the Dakṣiṇās were distributed at the Dawn sacrifice.

### X.63–64

The next two hymns to the All Gods are attributed to Gaya Plāta and appeal to a variety of gods, with the Ādityas esp. prominent in X.63. Neither hymn presents major challenges.

### X.63 All Gods

X.63.1: As Ge points out (n. 1a), the sandhi form *dīdhiṣanta* could represent the act. part. nom. pl. *dīdhiṣantaḥ* rather than the finite med. 3rd pl. *dīdhiṣante*. The desid. stem has both act. and mid. forms. Against the participle suggestion one might object that the act. participle slot is already filled by the *u*-stem (pseudo-)participle *dīdhiṣú-*, but since that stem is specialized in the sense 'desiring to acquire (a spouse)', there would be room for a non-lexicalized participle stem. Still, I favor the Pp medial *-ante* analysis; among other things it avoids the need to posit a predicated pres. participle (not that I object to them).

Ge supplies the verb "kommen" in b to govern *jānimā*, but I see no reason not to construe that noun with *dīdhiṣante* in pāda a. Since the gods have been gratified by Manu (*mānuprītāsaḥ* b) and already in the RV Manu is called Manu Vivasvant and later regularly has the patronymic Vaivasvata (see Macd., Ved. Myth. 139), it makes sense that the gods would wish to help Manu by establishing the races associated with him.

The interest of the 2nd hemistich lies in the mention of Yayāti Nahuṣya, but there is no evidence in the two bare mentions of him in the RV (also I.31.17) of the dramatic episodes concerning Yayāti Nāhuṣa in the MBh (I.70–80); he is merely a minor ritualist in the RV.

X.63.2: Ge (n. 2cd) follows Sāy. in seeing Aditi here as Heaven, which would make sense of the rest of the trio. However, I don't know of any particular support for this identification; the next vs. is not sufficient (see comm. there).

X.63.3: Re points out the double alliteration in pāda a: *mātā mādhumat pínvate páyaḥ*, the latter continued in b by init. *pīyūṣam*. The rest of b, *dyaúr áditir ádrībarhāḥ*, is also a phonetic figure with the repetitions of *d*-s and *r*-s and the initial *ádi* .. *ádri* echo.

Again Ge (n 3ab) considers this vs. to concern "Himmel-Aditi," with *dyaúḥ* being feminine, as it sometimes is. I find this unnecessary and also detrimental to the complexity of the thought. Aditi is instead *compared* to heaven, in an unmarked simile. The basis of comparison is

twofold. On the one hand, as JPB (*Ādityas*, p. 235) points out, Aditi is like heaven in producing liquid nourishment (rain on the part of heaven, milk on hers). On the other, there is a pun on the name *āditi*- lit. ‘without bounds’; in this sense heaven is *āditi*- ‘unbounded’. JPB (pp. 235–36) rejects this pun, which is favored by Bergaigne and Hillebrandt, but I find the suggested pun persuasive.

The sense and semantic application of the cmpd *ādri-barhas*- are hard to discern, in part because *-barhas*- does not occur independently but only in two cmpds, this one (a hapax) and the considerably better-attested *dvi-bārhas*-. In all instances of the latter the publ. tr. renders the cmpd ‘doubly lofty / exalted’ in contrast to the standard rendering ‘doubly strong’ (e.g., Gr “doppelte Festigkeit, Stärke, Grösse habend”. (The publ. tr. of course presupposes a bahuvrīhi ‘having double loftiness/height’.) The sense ‘height, loftiness’ rather than ‘strength’ for the underlying *s*-stem is supported by the YAVes. correspondent *barəzah*- ‘height, mountain’ and by the existence of the extremely well-attested and inherited non-participial *-nt*-stem *brhánt*- ‘lofty’. The latter is ordinarily associated with the Caland system (among the many reff., see, e.g., Lowe, *Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit*, pp. 284–85), and, though I am generally slow to invoke the Caland system, *bārhas*- might well be a Caland *-s*-stem. associated with *brhánt*-. The contexts of *dvibārhas*- are not diagnostic: either ‘doubly strong’ or ‘doubly lofty/exalted’ fits them all without adding much meaning in either case. There are some suggestive collocations, however; see esp. VIII.15.2 *dvibārhaso brhát*, VII.8.6 *úd ... janiṣṭṣta dvibārhāḥ* (noting the *úd*), and IV.5.3 where *dvibārhas*- follows 2 occurrences of *brhánt*- in vs. 1. See also vs. 4 here.

So much for *dvibārhas*-; the form in our passage is actually the other cmpd, the hapax *ādri-barhas*-, likewise a bahuvrīhi. I render it in the publ. tr. by ‘massive as a stone’, which accords more or less with Gr, Ge ‘felsenfest’, Re ‘à la resistance de rocher’, but which attributes a different sense to *-barhas*- than the one we gave to *dvi-bārhas*-. This certainly needs to be rectified, and, assuming the correctness of ‘loftiness’ in *dvibārhas*-, our cmpd should mean ‘having the loftiness of a stone’. What would this really mean, and what would it mean in context? Now *ādri*- refers not only to stone the substance and stone(s) the object(s), but also to mountains or mountain peaks (possible exx. include III.32.16, V.87.2, VI.48.5, etc.), so *ādri-bārhas*- can have the sense ‘having the loftiness of a mountain peak’. Here the adj. would apply to heaven, and though it might seem like a comedown (literally) for the height of heaven to be compared to that of an earthly mountain, the visual effect of soaring mountain peaks actually gives a stronger impression of height than simply looking at the sky. I would now emend the tr. to “(like) unbounded heaven, which has the loftiness of a mountain peak.” Support for the ‘lofty’ rendering of *-barhas*- here comes from the next vs., with *brhát* in 4b and a different word referring to the height of heaven in 4d (*divó varṣmāṇam*). It might be tempting to consider *ādri*- here as a designation of heaven, reflecting the notion of the stony firmament that is prominent in Avestan texts, but it is a temptation that I think should be resisted. I know of no real evidence in Vedic for this concept – the passages under Gr’s def. 5) s.v. *ásman*- “der *Himmel*, der als steinernes Gewölbe gedacht ist” should all be interpr. otherwise, and in any case we would expect *ásman*-, corresponding to Aves. *asman*- (*asan*-), in this sense, rather than *ādri*-.

The sense of the cmpd *vr̥ṣa-bhará*- is unclear. Parallel formations like *vājaṃ-bhará*- ‘bringing prizes’, *sahasram-bhará*- ‘bringing thousands’ suggest that *vr̥ṣa*- should function as object; hence Gr’s “Männer legend,” Ge’s “Stierlasten tragenden,” Re’s “qui portent (des charges de) taureaux,” but none of these seems satisfactory, primarily because *vr̥ṣa* has to be attenuated or manipulated in some way. Moreover, those other cmpds have an overt acc. marker on the first member, whereas this has the stem form. I take *vr̥ṣa*- as a pseudo-adverbial

‘bullishly’. Note also that the compound seems to invite an alternative segmentation *vr̥ṣabha(-rá)* with a different word for bull, *vr̥ṣabhá-*, though this does not yield sense. The 2<sup>nd</sup> member -*bhara-* also scrambles -*barhaḥ-* in the preceding pāda.

Pāda d contains a poetic self-address (so also Ge n. 3d).

X.63.4: For the relevance of *br̥hát* and *var̥ṣmāṇam* to the previous vs., see comm. there.

X.63.6: Unaccented *manuṣaḥ* must be a part of the vocative phrase beginning *vísve devāsaḥ*, but its role is disputed. Gr and Old take it as a voc. pl., presumably (neither translates) parallel to *devāsaḥ* – hence “o all gods (and) men.” Ge takes it as gen. sg. dependent on *vísve devāsaḥ*, and I follow him; the lack of accent on the gen. is regular in tightly constructed voc. phrases of the type *sūno* [voc.] *sahasah* [gen.] “o son of strength.” Ge points out (n. 6b) that taking it as a voc. would require it to refer to the interrog. *káḥ* in pāda a, while *vísve devāsaḥ* would double the subj. of 2nd pl. *jújoṣatha*, a complex distribution of vocc., which would also match a sg. *káḥ* to pl. *manuṣaḥ*. Re also takes it as gen. sg., but supplies additional material: “o tous dieux (et) (fils) de l’Homme,” which seems to combine the drawbacks of both interpr. with no particular benefit. The presence of sg. *mānuḥ* in the. next vs. favors Ge’s (and my) interpr.: since Manu was the first to establish sacrifice for the gods, they can legitimately be termed “the gods of Manu.” Manu is perhaps the (or an) implicit answer to the questions introduced by *káḥ* in pādas a and c, even though those questions refer to the present (*rādhati*) and future (subj. *karat*).

X.63.7: On the morphological and metrical problems of *āyejé* see comm. ad I.114.2. There is also a conceptual one, at least in the standard interpr. Both Ge and Re take *hótrām* as a common noun (Ge “das Opfer,” Re “la ... oblation”; Gr “Opferguss”), but the lexeme *ā́ yaj* means ‘attract/win by sacrifice’, not simply ‘offer/sacrifice [a substance]’ (see comm. ad IX.7.8). In this particular case the obj. *hótrām* is, in my interpr., not merely the libation, but the deified Libation, who is clearly present in the next hymn, also by Gaya, in X.64.15. The point here, as I see it, is that Manu attracted the goddess Libation to his sacrifice by his initial sacrificial performance, and she then contributed a significant element to the subsequent sacrifice, namely the libation. For a similar ambiguity between ritual element and goddess with this verbal lexeme, see I.40.4 *īlām ... ā́ yajāmahe* and comm. ad loc. Note that the goddesses Hotrā and Idā ‘Refreshment’ are found together in the Āprī hymn I.142.9; cf. also II.1.11.

This interpr. has implications for the interpr. of the rest of the hemistich: in b *mānasā* could be construed either with *sāmiddhāgniḥ* or with *saptá hótr̥bhiḥ*. Ge opts for the latter, Re for the former (“ayant allumé le feu avec réflexion”); I think Re is correct. If Manu initially lacked one of the crucial elements of sacrifice, namely libation/Libation, he had to institute the sacrifice, kindle the fire, mentally, before the physical element was attracted to the sacrifice by Manu’s purely mental observance.

X.63.8: This vs. modulates from 3rd ps. in the rel. cl. (*īśīre*, pāda a) to 2nd ps. in the main cl. (*piprtā* d); the modulation pivots on *té*, which opens the 2nd hemistich: *té* can of course be the 3rd ps. correlative to *yé* opening the rel. cl., but it can also have 2nd ps. ref. with the impv. in d. (See my “*sa* figé.”) The ambiguity of pāda c cannot be conveyed in tr.; it is only in pāda d that the voc. *devāsaḥ* and the 2nd pl. impv. *piprtā* unambiguously signal the change in person.

X.63.10: The long accusative phrase in abc of this vs. at first appears to be a continuation of the

accs. in 9cd, which are objects of *havāmahe* in 9a. The surfacing of a well-oared boat in 10a calls this initial interpr. into question, since we would be unlikely to invoke a boat, and in d we come upon a new verb, *ā ruhema* ‘may we mount’, which reconfigures the audience’s interpr. of the verse. Or such is my interpr. – Ge takes ab with vs. 9 and starts a new sentence with 10c. (Re’s punctuation is unclear and a bit incoherent.) Ge’s interpr. is of course possible, but since we try to preserve the integrity of verses when possible and since this poet shows some interest in syntactically misleading the audience (see vss. 8 and later 13–14, both with comm.), I prefer to take 10 as a unit. See further comm. ad vs. 14.

X.63.11: As Re points out, *ādhi vocata* reprises *ādhi bruvantu* in 1d, though with relexicalization. But this echo does not seem to signal a ring or other structural feature, and the tendency for this hymn to keep circling around the same topics makes the thematic repetition fairly unremarkable.

X.63.12: Almost predicatably, Re interprets the first hemistich in a Dumézilian (though his name is not mentioned) trifunctional fashion: disease, absence of oblation, hostility (Functions 3, 1, 2, I assume). I do not see that such a formal structure is needed to appreciate the variety of threats envisioned.

X.63.13: As transmitted, pāda a is a syllable short and would have a rare break of three heavy syllables (*mārto víśv[a]*). Arnold (*Metre*, metrical comm. ad loc. and p. 101) suggests reading \**mārt̥yo* for transmitted *mārto*, a change endorsed by Old and reflected in the HvN edition. Bloomfield (VV ad I.41.2) rejects this emendation on what seem insufficient grounds, but he does draw attention to the fact that our imperfect pāda *āriṣṭaḥ sá mārto víśva edhate* seems based on *āriṣṭaḥ sārva edhate* in I.41.2=VIII.27.16 (in the latter case directly following our pāda b). Although I would not accept Bloomfield’s rather mechanical attempt to generate our pāda from the shorter one (*āriṣṭaḥ sá [mārto víś]va edhate*, with *sá ... va* the disjecta membra of *sārvaḥ*), it does seem as if some effort was made to replace *sārva-* with *víśva-* -- oddly, since *víśva-* is somewhat in retreat in Maṇḍala X, in favor of *sārva-*. But this is a Viśve Devāḥ hymn and forms of *víśva-* are prominent in it (vss. 2a, 6b, 8b, 11a, 13d, 17b). See also Ge’s (n. 13a) and Re’s brief comm. on *víśva-* and *sārva-* in this passage.

Pāda b is also found at VI.70.3 and VIII.27.16; as was just discussed, the latter also has a variant of our pāda a.

X.63.14: The structure of this vs. is very close to that of vs. 10, in that the first hemistich focuses on accusative referents (*yām ... yām*), which seem to continue the acc. reference of 13cd (*yām*), but which in the end can be construed with the acc. phrase in pāda c, headed by *rātham*, which is the obj. of *ā ruhema* in d. This redirection of the accusatives in ab from connection with the end of the previous vs. to what follows in their own vs., the focus on a material means of transportation (*nāvam* in 10c, *rātham* in 14c), and the presence of the same verb governing it in d (*ā ruhema*) in pādas of identical structure (negated acc. sg. pres. part. [*āsrauantīm / āriṣyantam*] *āruhema s<sup>u</sup>vastaye* – all this imposes my interpr. of vs. 10, against Ge’s.

X.63.15: The rendering of *vṛjāṇa-* as ‘precinct’ rather nicely taps into their shared etymological semantics, from ‘enclosure’, then to area or district, inter alia. For more on *vṛjāṇa-* see comm. ad X.27.2. I do not subscribe to Ge’s understanding of *vṛjāṇa-* as “Kampf”; better Re’s tr. of the phrase “dans le district pourvu de lumière solaire.”

On pl. *yóniṣu* see comm. ad X.40.11.

X.63.17: It is possible, but not necessary, to supply *devāḥ* with voc. *vísve* and take *ādityāḥ* as a separate term—“o All (Gods), Ādityas, (and) Aditi”—to signal in this last vs. that the hymn is in fact dedicated to the All Gods

The name, or nom de plume, of the poet Amartya Gaya recalls Aves. *gaiia- marətan-*, the (name of the) first man, and in my view is a pun based on a reminiscence of this Indo-Iranian figure. For a similar, but slightly different view, see KH “Mārtāṇḍa and Gayōmart,” MSS 1957 = Aufs. 422–38, esp. 435. See also Ge’s n. 4.

Ge takes *īśānāso nāraḥ ... jāno divyāḥ* as an (unsigned) conjoined NP: “Die mächtigen Herren und das himmlische Volke,” both subjects of sg. *āstāvi*. Sāy., at least, considers the former to refer to rich human men; Ge does not make his view about the referent known. Although a singular verb for this conjoined NP could perhaps be justified by having it agree with the nearer member, sg. *jānaḥ*. I think it more likely that sg. *jāno divyāḥ* is an appositive to the preceding pl., which would make the sg. verb easier to account for. So, it seems, Re: “Les seigneurs puissants, la gent céleste.”

## X.64 All Gods

X.64.1: Note the etymological figure *sumāntu (nāma) ... manāmahe*; *sumāntu*- here does not seem to have anything to do with *māntavaḥ* ‘counselors’ in the previous hymn, X.63.8. With the *sumāntu nāma* here compare Yama’s *durmāntu ... nāma* in X.12.6, where it is contrasted with one that is *sumāntu*; see comm. ad loc.

Ge takes *yāmani* to well-attested *yāman*- ‘journey’ and construes it with the gen. pl. part. *śṛṇvatām* in b (“die auf der Fahrt erhören”); this is certainly possible. He cites several supposed parallels, esp. X.92.13 *yāmani śrutam* “hear this on your journey” (addressed to the Aśvins). However, though the Aśvins are famous for their travel, the assumption of a journey for the unnamed group of gods, in the first vs. of the hymn, is perhaps less appealing. The publ. tr. “as they listen to my plea” follows Re’s “qui (nous) entendent dans (notre) imploration,” with *yāman*- to *√yā* ‘beg, implore’. Other passages containing *yāman*- ‘plea’ (may) include I.25.20 (also with *√śru*; Ge ‘Fahrt’), VIII.52.5 (Vāl.) *āyāman* (again generally interpr. as ‘journey’). It may of course also be a pun, also in passages like X.92.13. For a semantically similar phrase in this hymn see 4d *śṛṇotu ... hāvīmani* “let him harken to my call.”

X.64.2: Note the matching etymological figures opening pādas a and b: *kratūyānti krātavaḥ ... , vėnanti vėnāḥ*, also with matching syntax (3rd pl. act. pres. + nom pl. masc. subj.). The denom. *kratūyā-* is found only here and in IV.24.4, while the pres. *vėna-* is better attested. On *vėnā-* and its relatives, see esp. comm. ad VIII.100.5, as well as Re’s comm. to this vs. (ÉVP IV.118).

Old seems somewhat inclined to read *ādīśaḥ* here (as also at I.119.2), which would yield a tr. “(Our) aims are flying,” vel sim., which would yield reasonable sense. Evidence in favor of this reading might be found in IX.21.5 *dādhātā vėnām ādīśe* with similar lexicon. However, the *ādīśe* there is infinitival and the *vėnā-* refers to soma, so the similarity is far less than it first appears. It is also the case that 7 of the 9 occurrences of *ādīś-* (all of which are trisyllabic) occur at the end of the pāda, as here. Nonetheless, since the transmitted text makes sense, and as an acc. pl. *dīśaḥ* provides a goal for the verb of motion *patáyanti*, I do not favor emendation. In fact given the preponderance of pāda-final *ādīśe*, etc., it would be hard to explain how an original

*ādīśaḥ* acquired a second accent, since other occurrences of the root noun cmpd. in the same metrical position would favor maintaining the singly accented form.

For a somewhat similar expression of the poet's senses and sense organs flying apart widely in his inspiration, see VI.9.6.

X.64.3: The *vā* in 2nd position in the vs. is a bit surprising, and several emendations have been proposed: to the particle *vaí* (see Klein DGRV II.206), to *vah* (Old). However, the transmitted text makes fine sense: given the long list of divinity names occupying most of the four pādas of the vs., the poet chose to signal early that it was a *disjunctive* list; otherwise a *vā* would have to have been placed after every (or almost every) term (and there are 12 different entities) or would have to be postponed till the end of the last pāda. Ge's "Soll ich vielleicht ...?" and Re's "Dois je éventuellement ...?" both capture the force of *vā* nicely; Klein also slightly favors this solution, though he worries about the lack of parallel usages.

Note that the loose cmpd. *nārā-śāmsam* is split by *vā* taking Wackernagel's position.

The referent of *āgohya-* is disputed and unclear. Gr identifies it as Agni; Macdonell (Ved. Myth. 35) suggests it's an epithet of Pūṣan here, but there is no evidence for that elsewhere, and the other passages suggest that he is an independent figure. Re identifies him with Indra in this passage, but gives no evidence. Ge goes rather for Savitar, which is the default (if there is one); see the parenthetic ident. for most of Gr's entries. JPB (pub. intro. to I.161) suggests the sun, but possibly Savitar, the latter identification being the one he favors in the publ. intro. to IV.33. I do not have my own candidate, but it should be noted that the word appears generally in association with the Ṛbhus (though not here). See I.110.3, 161.11–13, V.33.7; the only passage besides ours outside of this context is VIII.98.4, where it seems to be used in adjectival sense ("who cannot be concealed") of Indra. The Ṛbhu passages concern their twelve-day sleep (IV.33.7) "in the house of Agohya" (I.161.11). This may refer to the intercalary days needed to bring the lunar calendar into synch with the solar cycle. Given some of the other potential recipients of the praise in this vs. – Sun and Moon, (New and) Full ['bright'] Moon, Dawn and Night, all entities that regulate time – I wonder if Agohya here refers to the divinity who oversees the intercalary period (who could, of course, be Savitar or the Sun).

The hapax *abhy ārcase* (1x) belongs to the class of *-se* annunciatory 1st singulars in the realm of praising, of which well-attested *stuṣé* is the standard example and presumable source.

Ge (n. 3c) suggests that the dual *candrāmasā* is a pregnant dual dvandva for "Neu- und Vollmond," though he offers as an alternative a mere pleonastic doubling of *sūryāmāsā*. I find his first alternative quite appealing. Although *candrā-mas-* is attested a number of times in the singular, where it seems simply to refer to the moon, this is the only dual form. The dual could easily refer pregnantly to two forms of the moon (Re's "des deux (formes de) Lune"), full and new, of which the "bright, gleaming" (*candrā-*) full moon would be the more conspicuous of the two and give its name to the duo.

There is some disagreement about the scope of *diví*. Ge (fld by the publ. tr.) takes it with immediately preceding *yamám* ("Yama im Himmel"), but Re with *tritám*, despite the intervening pāda boundary – presumably on the basis of Trita's association with heaven elsewhere (see the passages cited by Ge [n. 3c]: V.9.5, 41.4). To me both these interpr. seem too limited and assume that *diví* can only be construed with one immediately adjoining term. I would suggest that *diví*, which in final position produces a fine Jagatī cadence, is to be construed with all the elements in the pāda or, better, with the two duals referring to heavenly bodies: *sūryāmāsā candrāmasā*. Elsewhere *diví* doesn't have to immediately adjoin the entity whose position it specifies. I would

now slightly alter the tr. to “or the Sun and Moon, (the new and) bright [=full] Moon in heaven, Yama, Trita ...” Note that the pāda-final loc. *sadhāstha ā* in 8c applies to all the terms in its pāda.

Re points out that this is the only passage where *aktú-* is found with *uśás-*, and the phrase *uśásam aktúm* substitutes for the dual dvandva *uśāsānāktā*. Given the two dual dvandvas in c, we might expect that dvandva here as well. But that form would produce a very irregular break, as well a bad cadence and hiatus before *aśvínā*. One might have expected as substitute here *uśásam \*nāktam*, which would have given a somewhat better break (the standard ~ ~ –, rather than the transmitted ~ ~ ~, which, acdg. to Arnold, is considerably less common than the former, but still within his parameters). See VIII.27.2 (ad comm. ad loc.) with the hybrid pāda opening *uśāsā nāktam*, with the 1<sup>st</sup> member of the dual dvandva followed by the sg. of ‘night’. I might almost speculate that a putative original *uśásam \*nāktam* in our passage underwent degemination of *-m n-* and the old *nāktam* was replaced by phonetically similar *aktúm*, which lacks the nasal initial. But this probably goes too far.

X.64.4: The poet Gaya uses almost the same words to describe himself in vs. 16 that he applies to Bṛhaspati here: 4a *kathā kavís tuvīrávān ...* / 16a *evā kavís tuvīrávān ...*, ... *gāyāḥ*, thus clearly identifying himself with Bṛhaspati. I wonder if *káyā* in the instr. phrase ending pāda a here, *káyā girā*, is meant to evoke his name.

The stem *īkvan-* ‘chanters, versifiers’ usually refers to non-humans, several times of a group connected with Bṛhaspati (VII.10.4, X.14.3), so the instr. *īkvan-* here expresses accompaniment, not the agency of human poets creating the call.

X.64.5: The *vā* here seems to add further choices of goods to praise and/or pursue to the ones offered in vs. 4. However, the syntactic structure of the vs. is rather loose. The dual dvandva *mitrāvaruṇā* is acc. with *ā vivāsasi*, generally replicating the syntax of vs. 2: god(s) ACC *abhy ārcase*. But M+Vs’ constant partner Aryaman appears in the 2nd hemistich as nominative, though we might expect him to be a third obj. to *ā vivāsasi*. Since there is no finite verb in cd or any obvious predicate, Aryaman simply hangs there, a notional, but not syntactic, object. I do not like the idea, sometimes floated by Ge., of simple reversion to the nominative. Here I think we must interpr. the dual *mitrāvaruṇā*, ambiguous between nom. and acc., as the pivot to the nominative in cd. Re is obviously disturbed by the syntactic rupture and re-supplies *ā vivāsasi* and re-establishes the acc. pattern, in a parenthesis that supplies all relevant parts of the sentence and rests on nothing in the text: “(veux-tu le gagner à toi).”

On the first pāda, see the disc. of HPS ( *Vrata* p. 74), who strongly asserts Agni as identical to Dakṣa (hesitantly so also Ge, n. 5a); so also tentatively Ge (n. 5a) and JPB (Ādityas, 243), as well as the publ. tr. HPS is himself hesitant about whose *vrata-* it is, but JPB argues persuasively that it is Aditi’s, and the publ. tr. follows his view by implication.

Aryaman is called *ātūrtapanthāḥ* and *pāñcahotā* in V.42.1, *purujātāḥ* in VII.35.2.

X.64.6: As discussed ad VIII.103.3, which contains an almost identical pāda, *tmānā* ‘by themselves / himself’ contrasts the individual effort that goes into the winning with the multiplicity of things won (“thousand(s)”). I do not think, with Ge, that *tmānā* should be construed in the simile with *medhāsātau* (“wie bei dem Kampf um die (Dichter)meisterschaft selbst”). Among other things, in VIII.103 the next vs. also contains *tmānā* juxtaposed with a form containing ‘thousand’ and expressing the same contrast: *tmānā sahasrapoṣiṇam* “who fosters a thousand by himself.”



Re takes *medhāsātāv iva* as a simile with *samithēṣu* in d – in his clotted tr. “... dans les compétitions, comme (d’autres font) dans les (occasions où l’on obtient un) gain (pour prix) de l’inspiration-poétique.” But this requires scooping up the simile from the main clause in c and inserting it in the relative clause in d, which would violate standard RVic syntactic practice.

X.64.7: Note the phonetic figure in d: ... *sácante sacítaḥ sácetasah*, with the last two words also an etymological figure. *sácante* also etymologically echoes *sakhyāya* in b.

Ge takes both *sacítaḥ* and *sácetasah* as nom. pl.; on poetic grounds, I prefer Re’s interpr., with one gen. sg., referring to Savitar, and the other nom. pl. Either of them would in fact fit either morphological role.

X.64.8: A somewhat maladroit phonetic and etymological figure in d, *rudráṃ rudreṣu rudr’yām*, which also serves as a particularly heavy final Behaghel’s Law member.

X.64.10: Ge and Re both give lexical weight to *bṛhaddivā*, both rendering it as an apparent bahuvrīhi (“die im hohen Himmel wohnt,” “celle du haut du ciel”). But it does not have bahuvrīhi accent (as opposed to *bṛhāddiva-*), and it is rather the name of a minor goddess, who appears in company with other such. See II.31.4, where she is found with Iḍā, Rodasī, and Puramdhi, as well as Tvaṣtar and the wives of the gods as here; V.41.19 with Iḍā and Urvaśī; V.42.12 with Sarasvatī and Rākā.

On *devébhir jānibhiḥ* see comm. ad II.36.5 (also VI.50.13).

On the morphologically problematic *rāthaspātīḥ* and the possibly associated metrical issue (11-syllable Jagatī) see comm. ad V.50.5.

X.64.11: The first pāda is identical to I.144.7d. I take it as a continuation of the previous vs., whose final pāda (X.64.10d) also begins with *raṇvāḥ*. Ge and Re by contrast construe it with the following pāda, b. Although we generally aim to interpr. RVic vss. as self-contained units, in this case there is a gender clash between pādas a and b, since the subj. of b is fem. *ūpastutiḥ*, which does not match the masc. *raṇvāḥ* in a. One could explain the masc. as attraction to the gender of the simile (m. *kṣāyāḥ*) or, with Bl (ad I.144.7), consider its lack of fit simply a sign that it was secondarily inserted here. But I prefer to consider it an afterthought to 10d.

X.64.12: The series of vocatives in ab, *máruta índra dévāḥ ... varuṇa mitra* displays odd accentuation: the first three are accented, though their position internal to the pāda should not trigger accentuation; the two in b are unaccented, though they occupy the same position as those in pāda a, namely after an early caesura.

Two of the three 2nd pl. act. verb forms in this vs., *ádadāta* (b) and *pīpayata* (c), are morphologically irregular. The first is surely an imperfect to the redupl. pres. *dádāti*, but we should expect a weak form in the pl.; cf. the equivalent form *ádattana* (I.139.7). (Trying to make it into a pluperfect would gain us nothing, since, as far as I can see, that form should be identical.) Unexpected full grade in the 2nd pl. act. (of all types of stems) is not altogether unusual, esp. in the imperative: see *dádāta* (VII.57.6) and *dadātana* (X.36.10) beside *datta* (2x); here it might have spread from the impv. to the impf. As for *pīpayata*, probably (but not certainly) belonging to the perfect -- in addition to the full-grade root syllable, there is also the thematic vowel. For a 2nd pl. act. impv. to the perfect, we should probably expect *\*pīpita* (cf. *pīpihī* 2x); a thematized stem with full-grade root syllable should belong to the subjunctive. A

subjunctive interpr. might be favored by the undoubted 2nd pl. pres. act. subjunctive *vāhātha* in the next pāda. However, the 2nd pl. act. subj. is supposed only to take the primary ending *-tha*, not *-ta* as here. (Note the undoubted 2nd pl. pf. subj. *bubódhatha* in the next vs., 13b.). Moreover, the pf. to  $\sqrt{pī}$  includes a number of apparent thematic forms, though most are built to the weak stem (e.g., likewise 2nd pl. impv. *pīpyata* II.34.6, on which see comm. ad loc.). For disc. of these pseudo-thematic forms see my 2018 “The Vedic Perfect Imperative and the Status of Modal Forms to Tense-Aspect Stems” (Fs. Lubotsky). As for the full-grade root in our *pīpayata*, I think it likely that the tendency for 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. imperatives to take full grade is at work here; however, it is worth considering Kü’s compromise (p. 300 n. 495): that these impvs. with full grade are “hybride Bildungen zu einem Konjunktiv *pīpáyat*.”

X.64.13: As with 10d and 11a, our pāda a begins like the final pāda of the preceding vs. (12d), with *kuvíd*.

Ge interpr. *yáthā cid* as an indefinite “irgendwie,” followed by Re (“en quelque sorte”) and the publ. tr. (also Hettrich, *Hypotaxe* 149, though without discussion). Such an interpr. fits the context in my opinion: the poet is looking for any kind of acknowledgement of his kinship with the gods. Old argues strenuously against this interpr., on what seem to me fairly weak grounds; he thinks rather that the *yáthā* signals that there’s an intervening syntactic link (“Mittelglied”) between the *kuvíd* and the *yáthā*, which keeps its subordinating function: “Ob doch (es geschehen wird) dass ihr diese Verwandtschaft mit uns wahrnehmen werdet.” I do not see the advantage of this distancing construction, and his rendering seems to ignore the *cit*.

The navel in pāda c is surely, as Ge persuasively argues (n. 13c), a pun, referring both to the Opferaltar, where mortals and gods meet at the ritual, and to the bodily navel as a symbol of kinship, as so often in the RV.

X.64.14: This vs. seems to play on the gendering possibilities and ambiguities of the dual dvandva *dyāvāprthivī* that is its subject. In the first hemistich the cmpd not only displays the feminine grammatical gender that is appropriate to a dvandva with fem. 2nd member: so the introductory fem. du. pronominal adj. *té* and the adj. *yajñīye* (b). But it also aggressively ascribes female characteristics to the pair, identifying the two as dual mothers and great goddesses: *mātārā mahī devī*.

The third pāda is less insistently female, though still grammatically feminine (*ubhé*): the two support/carry/bear both (breeds). The redupl. pres. *bibhṛtaḥ* can express simple non-gendered support; however, it’s worth noting that it can take a mother, esp. Earth as mother, as subject (e.g., X.4.3 *mātā bibharti*; III.55.22 *prthivī bibharti*) and a child or embryo as object (e.g., III.46.5 *gárbham ná mātā bibhṛtāḥ* with both). Given the dual mothers of the 1st hemistich, a female/motherly interpr. might be the first to come to mind.

The final pāda contrastively asserts the masculinity of the same pair, Heaven and Earth. Here both together “sprinkle much seed/semen” (*purū rétāṃsi ... siñcataḥ* -- a decidedly male action and something of a shock after the pervasive motherly focus of the rest of the verse. The participation of the “fathers” (/forefathers/ancestors) is also unexpected and unexplained. I think that they appear here to balance out the “mothers” of the earlier part of the verse and to remind us that Heaven is, outside of this dvandva, both male and the Father par excellence (*dyaús pitā*). By this interpr. the Pitars are sidekicks to the Ur-Pitar in this male activity. A possible clue to this indirect use of *pitṛbhiḥ* for contrastive purposes may be provided by the *ca* that follows it. This conjunction is oddly placed in its pāda and it seems to be doing none of its usual conjoining

work. Klein (DGRV I.103) considers it a clausal *ca* but is hard-pressed to explain what it's doing and why it's so positioned. I suggest that it implicitly – and conceptually -- conjoins *pitṛbhiḥ* with *mātārā* in pāda a, to add up to a dvandva with both genders represented. Admittedly, this is a speculative explanation, but such aberrant usages invite speculation.

The phrase *devāñ jánman-* raises problems in its various appearances – not only here, but I.71.3 and VI.11.3. On the one hand, the existence of a parallel phrase *devāñām jánman-* (I.70.6, VI.51.2 [though see comm. ad loc.], 12; not adjacent IX.81.2) supports the widespread view (Lanman, Noun Infl. 353–54, Old [for some of the passages], Ge, etc.) that *devāñ* is an archaic (or truncated) gen. pl. On the other, I am generally reluctant to posit such a form, if it is possible to construe the acc. pl. that *devāñ* appears to be. In both I.71.3 and VI.11.3 an acc. interpr. is possible, but it is very difficult in this passage. I therefore must accept the gen. pl. interpr. here, and at least as an alternate in the other two passages. Whether the form represents a deeply archaic gen. pl. *devām* < \*-ōm I do not venture to say.

*ubháya-* ‘both’ is found fairly regularly with *jánman-* to refer to “both breeds/races [of gods and men]” (e.g., I.31.7, II.6.7, X.37.11), and I therefore “borrow” *jánman-* from pāda b to be head noun, in slightly different sense, for *ubháyam* in c. Given the emphasis on kinship, esp. the joint kinship of gods and men, in this section of the hymn, I am sure this is the primary reading. However, given also the stress on gender opposition in this vs., ‘both’ here might refer to women and men, or mothers and fathers, with an alternative tr. “... support both (males and females / mothers and fathers) ...”

X.64.15: Note the opening figure *ví śā ... víśva(m)*.

The lexeme *ví√naś* here is generally rendered ‘attains, acquires’ (Ge “erlangt,” Re “atteint”), without registering the *ví*. But in nearby X.67.7 the VP *dráviṇam vy ānaṭ* “he reached through to the treasure” is found in a Vala context, with Bṛhaspati as subject, and ‘reach *through*’ is therefore appropriate. He reaches into the Vala cave from outside to take possession of its contents. Since Bṛhaspati is one of the subjects here, I think the lexeme has its full semantic value in our passage as well. For disc. of other uses of *ví√naś* see comm. ad X.27.20.

The passive *ucyáte* (with passive accent) occurs three times with *grāvan-* ‘pressing stone’ as subj. (our passage = X.100.8, as well as V.25.8 with the same phrase in a simile, *grāvevocyate bṛhát*). This quite well-attested verb form otherwise has undoubted passive value in the sense ‘be called’ or, much less frequently, ‘is spoken’. Neither sense works here; the standard response is to tr. it as a simple intrans. ‘sounds, speaks’ (Ge “erklingt,” Re “parle,” Scar [615] “spricht”), but this ignores the unequivocal passive morphology. It almost seems like the passive to a causative, ‘is made to speak’ (though *vācayati* is not attested till Vedic prose and we would expect its passive to be \**vācyáte*). I tr. ‘is given voice’ to capture the passive formation and the lack of agency of the stone, in contrast to the “inspired thinkers” (*manīśīṇaḥ*) of the next pāda, who bellow.

The rt noun cmpd *madhu-śūd* appears to contain the root *√su* ‘press’ (-*sú-t*), and it is generally so analyzed (e.g., Gr, Scars 615) and so rendered in the publ. tr. (and in the standard tr.). Nonetheless, I wonder if there is semantic overlap with the root(s) *√svad/ sūd* ‘sweeten, prepare’ of ritual offerings. *havya-sūd-* occurs twice, and there is a single occurrence of *sam-sūd-* with short root vowel (VIII.17.6), ordinarily ascribed to *√svad*, but see my doubts ad loc. As Scar (626) says, “Die Alternation °*sūd-* ~ °*-sūd-* ist offenbar metrisch ausgenützt worden.” Since the form in our passage is nom. sg., the final -*d* in sandhi could either be the automatic voicing result of the empty -*t* added to °*su-* ‘press’, or simply reflect the voiced root final of °*sūd*

‘sweeten’. (Though there are two other occurrences of *madhu-ṣút/d-*, none of them is in a phonologically diagnostic position.) Note that a reading with long vowel *-sūd-* here would produce a slightly better break, but not better enough to justify emendation.

It is not possible to decide whether cd form a separate sentence, with c dependent on the main clause in d – or whether they are parallel clauses and both dependent on the main clause of ab. I have opted for the latter, along with Re and HPS (B+I 127), while Ge and Scar (615) prefer the former. Fortunately almost nothing rests on the choice; I went for independent sentences because cd don’t seem integrally connected with ab semantically.

X.64.16–17: The final vs. of the hymn, 17, is identical to the final vs. of X.63, also 17. Our vs. 16 essentially doubles vs. 17, with relexification. Both begin with a hymn-summary *evā* followed by a nom. of the poet (16 *kavīḥ*, 17 *platēḥ sūnūḥ*), who is later identified as Gaya (16d, 17d). Both vss. contain an augmented redupl. aor. with the general sense ‘strengthen’ (16d *ápīpayat* ‘has swelled’, 17a *avīvr̥dhat* ‘has strengthened’) whose obj. is the gods or a subset thereof (16d *divyāni jānma* “the divine races,” 17ab *vo vísva ādityā adite* “you, o all you Ādityas and Aditi” [or “... o All (Gods), Ādityas, and Aditi”; see comm. ad 63.17]), with the *divyāni jānma* of 16d nearly matched by *jāno divyāḥ* in 17d. Vs. 16 fills out the rest of its bulk with qualifications of the poet and his aims, while the second hemistich of 17 rephrases and emphasizes the poet’s act of praising.

X.64.16: The phrase *kavīs tuvīrāvān*, used here of the poet Gaya, is repeated from vs. 4, where it qualifies Bṛhaspati; Gaya is obviously identifying himself with that eloquent god. See HPS (B+I 127) for further spec.

### X.65–66 All Gods

On the poet of these two hymns, Vasukarṇa Vāsukra, and his relatives see the publ. intro. to X.65 – also for the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain that ends both hymns.

### X.65 All Gods

X.65.1: This has to be the easiest RVic verse to translate of all the ca. 10,000 vss. in the text – consisting as it does of a series of divine names in the nom., along with a couple of adjectives. Happily the hymn doesn’t stay at this level of simplicity.

X.65.2: The two nom. sgs. that begin vs. 1, *agnír índraḥ*, appear in reverse order in the dual dvandva that opens vs. 2, *indrāgnī*, which is to be read quadrisyllabically here—as often, but not invariably, elsewhere. In these quadrisyllabic readings, because the distracted syllable is surrounded by heavy syllables (*indr* and *agn*), its quantity cannot be definitely determined. However, almost all the distracted forms are pāda-initial (as here), and heavy 2nd syllables are favored in trimeter vs. A reading *indrā-agnī* following this pattern would contain the dual *-ā* expected in dual dvandvas (like *indrā-vāruṇā*) – but it must be noted that the other dvandva containing Indra that has only one accent, namely *indra-vāyū*, contains the stem form. So a reading *indra-agnī* is far from excluded. For further on this cmpd see comm. ad VII.35.1.

The phrase *mithó hinvánā tanvā* “spurring each other on mutually” is reminiscent of IV.56.6 *punāné tanvā mithāḥ* “purifying their own bodies / each other mutually,” of Heaven and Earth. See also X.28.12 *yé hinviré tanvāḥ* “who urged themselves / each other on,” adduced by

Old -- keeping in mind that X.28 is attributed to Vasukra, and our poet has the patronymic Vāsukra.

The subject shifts abruptly from the dual of ab to pl., signaled only by the 3rd pl. verb *ā papruḥ* in c. The default 3rd pl. referent would presumably be the All Gods or else the enumerated list of gods in vs. 1. The next hymn, by the same poet, contains the same VP: X.66.9c *antárikṣam ... ā papruḥ ...* “they filled the midspace,” where the gods (*devāsaḥ* 9d) are the likely subj. However, since Soma is found independently in our pāda d, it would be possible to interpret the subj. of *ā papruḥ* as Indra+Agni plus Soma, though this seems artificial to me.

Scar (550–51) suggests a number of possible interpr. of *ghṛta-śrī-* (4x), without making a definite decision among them. I opt for the simplest, ‘glorious through ghee’, rather than, say, “durch die Schmelzbutter vollkommen [gemacht].” Two of the four occurrences of this stem modify Agni (I.128.4, V.8.3), and ghee is of course completely at home in Agni contexts. One modifies Heaven and Earth, in a passage (VI.70.4), indeed a hymn, where ghee figures prominently as an attribute of H+E – perhaps a reference to rain? But the relevance of ghee to Soma is less clear; judging from the use of the independent stem *ghṛtā-* in Maṇḍala IX, it is used there to refer to the milk with which the soma is mixed, perhaps to indicate how rich and unctuous that milk is.

X.65.3: My construal of the instr. *mahnā* differs from that of Ge and Re. They take it as a sort of internal instr. with gen. pl. *mahatām* “of those great by their greatness,” while I construe it with the 1st sg. verb “By [or perhaps, because of] their greatness I rouse my praises.” Although an internal reading is likely in I.166.11 *mahānto mahnā*, in the other two passages Gr ascribes this syntax to (nearby X.67.12=X.111.4) the *mahnā* also goes with the verb; the standard tr. agree (see also HPS, B+I, 227).

Note that *iyarmi* responds to the part. *īráyan* in 2d, which is built to the secondary *-áya-* stem arising from the redupl. pres. represented by *iyarmi* (weak form *īr-*).

Note the scrambled phonetic figure of *anarvāṇām* (a) and(-am) *aṇavām* (c); *aṇavām* also participates in a rhyme figure with immed. preceding *apsavām*.

With Ge (n. 3c) I consider *apsavá-* an irregular deriv. to the loc. pl. *apsú*, which, as Ge points out, sometimes serves as a pseudo-stem (*apsu-kṣít-*, etc.). By contrast, Gr considers it a cmpd. with *-savá-*, glossing the cmpd ‘Wasser spendend’ -- with the 2nd member *savá-* ‘impulse, stimulus’ belonging to *√sū* ‘impel’. But ‘water’ does not appear to serve as an object to this verb and the semantics would have to be somewhat attenuated. It’s also worth noting that uncompounded *savá-* ‘impulse’ never appears in a context without at least one other form from *√sū*. Although AiG II.2.96 follows the *-savá-* interpr., Deb does point out that it would have to be a nom. agentis here, though *savá-* and its various cmpds with preverbs are nom. actionis – another argument against this interpr.

However we interpr. *apsavá-*, we must reckon with the absence of a verb in the rel. cl. of c. Ge (n. 3c) supplies the verb from the main cl. in d (*rāsantām*). But this brings the further problem of how to construe the acc. phrase *apsavām aṇavām*. The easiest solution is Ge’s, to take it as obj. of the supplied ‘give’ (“die die Wasserflut (spenden)”), but I think we are hoping the gods will give us something more appealing than water. I take the bahuvrīhi *citrá-rādhās-* lit. ‘possessing bright bounties’ as pregnantly expressing our hope: that the gods who possess these bounties will grant them to us. As for the acc. *apsavām aṇavām*, I take it as an unsigned acc. of extent: “(across) the watery flood” – the space that the gods will traverse in bringing these gifts. Cf., e.g., I.19.7 *tiráḥ samudrām aṇavām*. Re’s solution is even more radical: he seems to

supply the verb ‘possess’ extracted from the bahuvrīhi *citrā-rādhās-* and construe *apsavām arṇavām* as its obj. “eux qui ... (possèdent) l’océan aux (riches) eaux,” a syntactic sleight of hand that stretches the boundaries.

Pāda d poses its own problems. Most importantly, the morphological identity and function of *mahāye* are unclear. The standard view (Gr, Ge, Re) is that it’s a dative infinitive; Gr assigns it to a hapax stem *mahí-* (different from the NA *māhi*), while in contrast Re asserts that the infinitive is built to the *-āya-* verbal stem *mahāya-*. (Ge does not pronounce on the morphology, though his tr. [“um (unseren Mut) zu erhöhen”] reflects an infinitival interpr.) Neither of the morphological analyses is appealing. Though *-ti-* stems regularly build *-taye* infinitives, dative infinitives to straight *-i-* stems are fewer and less well established, save for a few well-known exx. like *ḍṛśāye*; see Keydana’s detailed disc. (*Infinitive im Rgveda* 212–19, which concludes with an indecisive treatment of this very form and passage. But Re’s solution seems to invent a category: treating the *-āy-* of the verb stem as if it were a root noun onto which a dative *-e* could be slapped. He also fails to mention that the standard way to make an infinitive to *-āya-* stems is with *-dhyai-* – e.g., *mādayādhyai*, *vartayādhyai*; we should expect \**mahayādhyai* here. I propose a more radical reinterpret.: to take *mahāye* as a finite verb, the 1st sg. middle of the verb stem *mahāya-* ‘magnify’, beginning a new clause and therefore accented. Though most of the forms to this stem are act., 1st sg. verbs of praising have a tendency towards middle voice, and see also the technically middle *-anta* replacement form in III.3.3. If *mahāye* is a 1st sg., it echoes the semantically similar *stómām̐ iyarmi* in pāda b; see also *maháyantaḥ* in the next vs. (4c).

However, this reconfiguration of the syntax requires a different interpr. of following *sumitryāḥ*, which must then belong to the *mahāye* clause. This form, found only here in the RV, is standardly taken as nom. pl. masc. agreeing with the *té*, subject of *rāsantām*, but that is not possible under my new interpr. of *mahāye*. I take it as a fem. acc. pl., modifying \**vísah* ‘(heavenly) clans’ to be supplied. Although this might seem arbitrary, note that in nearby X.69 (not attributed to the same poet, however), vs. 1 contains the phrase *sumitrā vísah* “well-allied clans,” with the base adj. *sumitrā-*. For divine clans, see, e.g., VIII.75.8 *devānām vísah*.

X.65.4: The phonetic manipulation found in the last vs., with the pair *anarvāṇam ... -am arṇavām*, is continued by the first word in this vs. (*s<sup>d</sup>*) *varṇaram*. Note also the final words of c and d: *surātāyaḥ# ... sūrāyaḥ#*.

On *svārṇara-* see comm. ad IX.70.6.

The opening of b is striking for the *prthivīm* doubling the second member of the dual dvandva *dyāvābhūmī*. As Ge points out (n. 4b), a similar doubling is found in the phrase *dyāvākṣāmā prthivī* in I.102.2, III.8.8 (on which see comm. ad I.102.2). In such configurations *prthivī-* may show its origin as an epithet of the earth (‘the broad one’) rather a word for earth itself.

On *skambhuḥ* see comm. ad VI.72.2, where the competing interpr. as de-redupl. pf. or root aor. are weighed and Kü’s extensive disc. is noted. As indicated there, I do not have a strong feeling either way, but Kü’s desire to see a “generell-zeitlos” sense in the contexts of these verbs, to justify an aor. injunctive interpr., seems to me unnecessary.

On *prkṣá-* see comm. ad II.34.3.

The participle *maháyantaḥ*, though picking up *mahāye* from 3d, has the gods as subject. This may be a playful reversal on the poet’s part, since his audience would expect humans to be the subj. The last pāda also presents the gods in a role generally associated with humans, that of

“(sacrificial) patron” (*sūrī-*), a role they also assume in the next hymn (X.66.2). For the object of *mahāyantaḥ* I borrow the accusatives from ab; Ge supplies “Mut,” Re “l’homme,” with no obvious support for either choice.

X.65.5: Ge (flg. Ludwig) and Re construe *dāśūṣe* at the end of pāda a with the rel. cl. that occupies the next pāda (e.g., Ge: “die gegen die Spender ... nie gleichgütig werden”). This is (barely) syntactically possible: the rel. pronoun *yā* would be in 2nd position flg this dative. However, I think this type of configuration is unlikely (/nonexistent?) when the rel. prn. opens a pāda. Moreover, dat. *dāśūṣe* immediately follows dative *vāruṇāya*, which adjacency suggests they belong together. *Especially* because the very same phrase, *vāruṇāya dāśūṣe*, occurs in the very same position in the following vs. (6c; see also X.113.5), where both Ge and Re bow to the need to construe them together (and in n. 5a Ge expresses doubts about his interpr. of the word in 5). The four-square construction of vs. 5, with a clause occupying each pāda (the last three of which are introduced by rel. prns.) also speaks against their interpr. Obviously the reason Ge/Re separated the two datives in this vs. is that *dāśvāms-* is almost exclusively applied to humans. But we have already noted, in the previous vs. (4), this hymn’s tendency to attribute human ritual roles to gods, and this would be the same phenomenon.

Pāda c is notable for containing both *dhāman-* and *dhárman-*, which, however, seem easy to separate in this context.

On *vīt-* see comm. ad VII.98.4.

*nādhāsī* is a hapax. See Old’s disc. He flirts with the poss. of a long-*ī* loc., but opts in the end for a dual.

X.65.6: Flg. Ge (n. 6a), I tentatively interpr. the cow as the offering ladle; there is similar phraseology in III.7.2, as he points out.

Note the echoes between *vartanīm* (a) and *vratanīḥ* (b), already pointed out by Old – to which we can add immed. flg. *avārātaḥ*. All of these prepare the way for *vāruṇāya* in c.

In the rt. noun cmpd. *vratanī-*, rather than taking *vrata-* as the obj. of *-nī-* (e.g., Re: “qui conduit le voeu (divine),” I interpr. it as an instr. adverbial, “leading according to / by / at the commandment (of Varuṇa).” For a very similar configuration see X.16.2 *devānām vaśanīḥ* “leading at the will of the gods” and comm. ad loc. I supply “of Varuṇa” because he is the standard possessor of *vratas*, and he is quite prominent in this set of vss. (5–6, 8). See esp. 8c *vāruṇāya sāvrate* “(the two) obeying the same commandment to Varuṇa.”

My interpr. of *avārātaḥ* roughly follows Ge’s (who follows Sāy.’s), namely that it is derived from  $\sqrt{vṛ}$  ‘choose’. Both Sāy. and Ge think it means “without seeking something for herself” (Ge: “ohne sich etwas auszubitten”), whereas my “not by choice” is in implicit contrast to *vratanīḥ* “leading by the commandment (of Varuṇa)” – that is, she does not control her own ritual movements but follows what has been established by Varuṇa. However, it is easier to get the Sāy./Ge meaning, from *vāra-* ‘choice (thing), thing of value’ (through accent shift in the adverbial *-taḥ* formation [see, e.g., *ubháya-* : *ubhayátaḥ*]), than from *vāra-* ‘choice’, so ‘not because of a thing of value’ is a possible alternative. It must be admitted, however, that the Sāy./Ge/SJ interpr. of this form is not the standard one, which is as a deriv. of *ávāra-* ‘near (side), with *avārātaḥ* supposedly meaning ‘from here / this side’ (e.g., Re: “de ce côté-ci”). See Gr, AiG III.591, EWA s.v. *ávāra-*; although the long *ā* might seem to be a stumbling block, VS (+) has *avārā-* ‘the nearer (bank)’, *avāryā-* ‘near(er)’, matching the semantic opposite, *pārā-* ‘far bank’ beside *pāra-* ‘farther’ (see esp. AiG III.591). The problem for me is that ‘from this side’, even

interpr. as ‘from this world’, doesn’t make much sense in context.

I take the middle part. *prabruvāṇā* as passive (or possibly reflexive, ‘announcing herself’); so also Re. However Ge supplies “(das Opfer)” as obj., and it is true that most of the forms of this part. take an object. Nonetheless, though the interpr. is possible, I don’t think supplying an object is necessary.

Note the allit. *dāsúṣe*, *devébhyo dāśad dhavísā*, with the allit. of the last word produced by sandhi.

X.65.7–8: The poet takes pleasure in mixing and contrasting forms from the two phonologically similar roots  $\sqrt{kṣi}$  ‘dwell’ and  $\sqrt{kṣā}$  ‘rule’: 7a *divākṣasaḥ*, 8a *parikṣitā*, 8b *kṣayataḥ*, along with, as a wildcard, *sámokasā* to an entirely different root.

X.65.7: The adj. found here as nom. pl. *divākṣasaḥ* (also as gen. sg. in III.7.2; nom. sg. *divākṣā(s)* III.30.21) raises a number of formal and semantic questions. It is ordinarily (Gr, Ge, Re) taken to mean ‘dwelling in heaven’, even though already in AiG II.1 (1905) Wack assigned its second member to  $\sqrt{kṣā}$  ‘rule’ (II.1.127, etc.), an analysis fld by EWA (I.427) and Scar (92–93). If the 1st member *divā-* stands for gen. sg. *divás* (gen. cml. to verb of ruling), as Wack. takes it, the absent final *-s* needs explanation. Wack (loc. cit.) attributes it to the loss of final *-s* before a cluster consisting of stop + sibilant (his three exx. all involve *-kṣ-*), somewhat refined by Scar to dissimilatory cluster simplification (with ? after “dissimilatorische”). If the 2nd member is a root noun, we need also to account for the 1st-member accent and, even more crucially, the apparent *s*-stem gen. sg. / nom. pl. These could be explained by positing not a root-noun 2nd member, but an *-as* stem built to the zero-grade root, as Scar suggests, which seems to me to be the best overall solution. But this makes the nom. sg. in III.30.21 problematic, because it immediately precedes *así* in a pāda that has two many syllables. An asigmatic *divākṣā + así*, contracted to *\*divākṣāsi*, would provide a metrical solution, but neither a root noun nor an *as*-stem should be asigmatic in the nom. sg. (See comm. ad loc. for the likely double-sandhi solution, provided by HvN.) For the various formal problems in these forms see Scar’s disc. (92–93). His positing of a parallel *-an*-stem to account for the nom. sg. in III.30.21 seems de trop, but the *-as*-stem he suggests instead of a root noun seems quite plausible.

On the anomalous accent of the bahuvrīhi *agnī-jihvā*—see AiG II.1.297, which, however, does not give a satisfactory account of it.

The lexeme  $\sqrt{mṛś}$  is found in the RV only here and in X.88.16, in the AV at AVŚ XIII.1.8 = AVP XVIII.15.8. Although the root  $\sqrt{mṛś}$  clearly means ‘touch’, often in a forthrightly physical sense (see the hyper-sexual *úpopa me párá mṛśa* in I.126.7 and the sad fate of the gambler’s wife in X.34.4 *anyé jāyā́m pári mṛśanty asya*), the standard tr. attenuate the meaning here to something like “think about” (Ge’s gloss “überdenkend” of his own tr. “befühlend”; Re’s “considérant-en-leur-pensée”). These mental interpr. are probably based on the other attestation of the lexeme in X.88.16 *mānasā vímṛṣtam* “‘stroked’ by his mind,” but surely the *mānasā* there is meant to signal that the use of  $\sqrt{mṛś}$  is metaphorical, rather than to indicate that the root itself has a fundamental mental rather than physical application. In the same manner that I always argue when the standard interpr. flatten or attenuate the sense of a word or lexeme, I would point out here that the RV has numerous roots that fall squarely in the domain of thinking, considering, etc., and therefore when the poet chooses to use instead a fairly rare root with a specific, non-mental sense, he is aiming to plug that specific sense into a context that might not seem immediately receptive to it – such is the RVic poetic enterprise.



What the gods are stroking is the *ṛtásya yóni-* ‘womb of truth’, a common trope for the ritual ground (see also 8b). Here it probably refers to the part of the ground prepared as seats for the gods, where in fact they are sitting (*āsate*). Although I considered the possibility that *vimṛśānta āsate* is a periphrasis for the present progressive, with  $\sqrt{ās}$  as an auxiliary (“keep stroking” vel sim.), I think we should take *āsate* in its full lexical value here as indicating the gods’ physical location and posture at the ritual.

The 2nd hemistich contains two examples of the *-tvī* gerund, *skabhitvī*(c) and *janitvī*(d). The example in c, *dyām skabhitvī ... ójasā*, echoes 4b *dyāvābhūmī ... skambhur ójasā*, and this echo suggests that *ójasā* in our pāda should be construed with the gerund, not the finite verb, despite the word order (and *pace* Ge, Re, and the publ. tr.): “having propped up heaven with their might, they ...”

The verb in d, *māmṛjuḥ*, belongs to the root  $\sqrt{mṛj}$  ‘wipe’, which is phonologically similar to, and in some derivatives phonetically indistinguishable from,  $\sqrt{mṛś}$ , which we met in b. The roots are semantically similar as well, particularly in idioms like this. For the sense of *nī*  $\sqrt{mṛj}$  ‘clasp (to oneself)’, see comm. ad II.38.2, VII.26.3, X.39.14. The intimate physical relationship between the gods and the sacrifice is strongly signaled in these two pādas (b, d). The post-caesura portion of this pāda, *tanvī nī māmṛjuḥ*, is also found in the next hymn, X.66.9, though with a different object. See disc. there.

X.65.8: The *rt* noun cmpd *parikṣīt-* occurs 3x in the RV, always in the dual. Twice (here and III.7.1) it is used of Heaven and Earth identified as *pitārā*. (The third occurrence, in I.123.7, is usually also interpr. as H+E, but I prefer Night and Dawn there; see comm. ad loc.) How exactly it applies to H+E is a little uncertain. I take it to mean that they ‘encircle’ or ‘surround’ the space between them, that is the surface of the earth where human life takes place and the midspace, here perhaps defined more narrowly as the ritual ground that is the conceptual center of this space. It is mildly noteworthy that the occurrence of this cmpd in III.7.1 is found in a vs. immediately preceding one of the three occurrences of *divākṣas-* (III.7.2), which here is found in similar proximity, in the preceding vs., X.65.7.

Like X.64.14 in the immediately preceding hymn (attributed to a different poet), this vs. plays on the different genders of the gendered pair Heaven and Earth. Their dual designation here, *pitārā* ‘two fathers’ (for ‘(mother and) father’), of course explicitly references the masc., and the preceding dual adj. *parikṣītā* could be equally masc. or fem. But the immediately following adj. *pūrvajāvarī* is not only fem. but has the archaic, inherited, synchronically suppletive fem. *-ar(-ī)* suffix associated with *-an*-stems (type *pīvan-* / *pīvarī-*). Discomfort with the gender mismatch is perhaps conveyed by Re’s curious tr. of *pitārā* as “les deux mères” – or it may be a rare lapse.

The finite verb in b, *kṣayataḥ*, is perfectly ambiguous: it can be the pres. indicative of  $\sqrt{kṣā}$  ‘rule’, as the publ. tr. takes it, or the pres. subjunctive of  $\sqrt{kṣi}$  ‘dwell’: ‘they two will dwell’. Opinions are divided: Ge, HPS (Vrata 97), and Scar (92) opt for “herrschen” (though Ge allows for either in n. 8b); Re and JPB (Ādityas 110–11) for ‘rule’ (though Re doesn’t tr. as subjunctive). I now think that choosing one is unduly restrictive, given the apparently deliberate fluidity of the *-kṣ-* forms in these two vss., and would now slightly emend the tr. to “rule / will dwell.”

The final word of the pāda b, *sāmokasā* ‘having the same house’, appears to echo the first word of vs. 7, *divākṣasaḥ*, esp. for those who interpret the latter as ‘dwelling in heaven’ (rather than ‘ruling over heaven’, as is now the norm; see above). But even though *ókas* contributes to

the *-kṣ-* play in this sequence as well as to the semantic play, it is of course etymologically unrelated to  $\sqrt{kṣi}$ .

I construe *vāruṇāya* with *sávrata* since vratas are Varuṇa's special province. The question then is whether the dat. *mahiṣāya* in the next pāda is coreferential with *vāruṇāya*, as in the publ. tr. (as well as explicitly Gr, Re, JPB [Ādit. 110–11]). If, as Ge and JPB assert, the “ghee-filled milk” is really rain, a substance that H+E do indeed have in their control, then the identification makes sense, esp. given Varuṇa's growing association with the waters. (That the next vs. begins with the dvandva *parjanya-vātā*, two divinities associated with storm and the atmosphere may support the ‘rain’ interpr.) But if the *ghṛtāvat páyah* is more closely tied to the ritual, a different referent might be more appropriate, esp. since, as far as I know, this would be the only passage in which Varuṇa is identified as a *mahiṣá-*. Indra and Soma are both regularly called *mahiṣá-* and both would be likely beneficiaries of the swelling of milk on the ritual ground. It is, of course, quite possible, that *mahiṣāya* is meant to be ambiguous here.

X.65.9: This enumerative vs. seems to return us to vs. 1, though the syntactic frame changes in midstream: ab are presumably in the nominative (though this is signalled only by the last three words, the singulars *vāruṇo mitró aryamā* – the rest is in the dual and could just as well be acc.), but the divinities in c are in the acc. and the objects of *havāmahe*.

As was just noted, the dvandva *parjanya-vātā* seems to pick up the theme of rain from 8d, esp. given the adj. *purīṣīṇā* ‘overflowing’. Ge also appositely cites VI.49.6 on this quality.

The final pāda is an expansion of the enumeration in a relative clause – a variant of the “X and which Y” type, without overt conjunction. It is oddly framed by a rel. prn. at the beginning and the end: *#yé ... yé#*. All three terms in between are locational, but the first two are adjectives in the nom. pl., the last a locative. A slightly more faithful tr. might be “(those) who are earthly (and) heavenly (and) who are in the waters,” with the two *yé*'s associated with the two different constructions.

X.65.10: Another enumerative vs., this time couched entirely in the acc. These accusatives are presumably governed by *īmahe* ‘we beseech’, which is the absolute final word of the vs., though it's possible instead to carry over *havāmahe* ‘we summon’ from the previous vs. (9c); it hardly matters.

The rel. prn. *yá* in the Saṃhitā text could reflect either sg. *yáh* or pl. *yé*. Either would be possible in context, since there are potential antecedents in both sg. (Tvaṣṭar, Vāyu) and pl. (Ṛbhus) and the verb in the rel. cl., *óhate*, can also be sg. or pl. (see below). Most tr. and interpr. (incl. the publ. tr.) opt for the sg. *yáh*, flg. the Pp as well as Sāy., with Vāyu as the likely antecedent (and voc. *ṛbhavaḥ* interposed). I would not rule out a pl. interpr. with *ṛbhavaḥ* as antecedent, since a rel. cl. dependent on a voc., even a rel. cl. in the 3rd ps., does not seem wildly outlandish to me. This would produce an alt. tr. “... o (you) Ṛbhus, who vaunt themselves.” Since the rel. cl. has no specific content – every god is always available for praise or self-praise – there are no contextual clues that favor one interpr. over the other. I favor the sg. interpr., since it avoids the implicit change of person. It is also possible that the rel. cl. identifies another individual who vaunts himself or who (per Ge, Re, JSK [Part. u 162]) considers himself an Ṛbhu, but this seems to introduce further syntactic complications without much gain in content.

The verb *óhate* and its relatives are slippery both morphologically and functionally, as was disc. esp. ad V.52.10. A number of its occurrences belong to a root present; see the

athematic participle, *óhāna-* ~ *ohāná-* and the clear (II.23.16, V.52.10, 11) or likely (VII.66.12) 3rd pl. *óhate*. However, most of the occurrences of *óhate* are singular (as is 2nd sg. *ohase* VIII.80.9; on *ohase* in I.30.4, see comm. ad loc.). These presumably began life as subjunctives to the root present, but subjunctive value is not prominent or necessary in a number of passages (like this one), and it seems likely that the stem *óha-* was reinterpr. as a 1st class present. On the morphology see Narten (Fs. Kuiper 10–12 = KISch 98–100) and Gotō (1st Kl. 81). As for semantics, see comm. ad V.52.10. Although a few forms appear to be transitive with the sense ‘solemnly proclaim’ (esp. I.30.4) like some forms of the corresponding Aves. verb *√aog*, most are either reflexive ‘proclaim oneself (as), vaunt oneself’ or passive ‘are praised (as)’. (Most of the passages Gr identifies as having an acc. obj. should be otherwise interpr.; see the publ. tr. of and comm. on the particular passages.) Verbs of praising have a tendency to slip into reflexive and then passive value.

The epithet *vrtrakhādā-* ‘gnawer of Vṛtra’ occurs 3x in the RV, twice clearly of Indra (as we might expect) (III.45.2, 51.9). Here it appears to modify Bṛhaspati, since it is placed between the name Bṛhaspati and an epithet that is more appropriate to that god, *sumedhās-* ‘of good wisdom’. Since gnawing Vṛtra is distant from Bṛhaspati’s usual sphere of operations, we might interpr. the epithet here as indirectly inserting Indra in the list of invoked deities; or we can simply take the assignment of the epithet to Bṛhaspati at face value. Certainly HPS (B+I 32) takes it as modifying B.

Although *dhanasā(h)* is simply a nom. pl. modifier of the unexpressed subj. (“we”) of *īmahe*, it may implicitly express purpose (“so that / such that we win the stakes”).

I do not understand the position and function of *u*. JSK (Part. *u* 162) suggests that it’s conjoining *havāmahe* (9c) and *īmahe* (10d). I would almost prefer to claim that it connects the morphologically non-parallel purpose expressions *svastāye* (b) and *dhanasā(h)* (d).

X.65.11: This vs. contains three predicated pres. participles (a: *janáyanta(h)*, c: *roháyantaḥ*, d: *visjántaḥ*) in the nom. plural and no finite verb. This structure is particularly clear because the vs. cannot be taken as syntactically dependent on the previous vs., whose 1st pl. subj. “we” cannot perform the cosmogonic deeds described in this vs., or as anticipating the next vs., whose subj. is the Aśvins in the 2nd dual. The plural subject in our vs. is not identified, but presumably it’s the gods in general or some subset of them, perhaps the ones invoked in the previous vs(s).

X.65.12: Four of the Aśvins’ good deeds, briskly summarized one per pāda. The tenses are oddly varied: a: pres. *pipṛthaḥ*; b: aug. impf. *ajīnvatam*; c: pf. *ūhathuḥ*; d: pres. *srjathaḥ*. I have no explanation for this temporal grab bag.

On Viṣṇāpū see Remmer (Frauennamen 39–40) and comm. ad X.39.7.

X.65.13: And now we have a nomenclatural grab bag. On Pāvīravī see Remmer (96), though there is little to say. The name is also found in VI.49.7, which also contains Sarasvatī; the previous vs. in that hymn, VI.49.6, also has the dual dvandva *parjānyāvātā* found in our vs. 9, in similar context.

X.65.14: Pāda a condenses the second hemistich of vs. 13, though eliminating Sarasvatī; the second pāda simply expands on *vísve devāḥ*.

On the *rātiṣāc-* see comm. ad VIII.28.2; on *abhiṣāc-* see Scar (587–88). It’s worth noting that in III.51.2 *abhiṣāc-* is immediately followed by *svarvíd-*, as it is here.

Ge takes *svâr* in d as part of the subject, rather than part of the object as I (and Scar do [Re has a more complex take]). Although removing *svâr* from the object phrase produces a more thematically unified object (songs, formulation, and hymn – all verbal products), the pāda break speaks for the acc. interpr., as does the fact that the subjects are “sun-finders” and so should not include the sun him/itself.

X.65.15: The 2nd hemistich is identical to VII.35.15 (likewise a hymn-final vs.), whose pāda b is identical to our 14b. The final pāda of our vs. and of VII.35.15 is of course the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain, and it is therefore at home in VII.35 in the Vasiṣṭha maṇḍala. VII.35 is an enumerative hymn, like this one, and includes some of the same minor divinities: the Escorts and Gift-escorts (VII.35.11c), Sarasvatī along with insights (11b), and Aja Ekapad (13a). The first pāda of our vs. also identifies Vasiṣṭha as the praiser in our hymn. It is not possible to say whether our poet is borrowing the mantle of Vasiṣṭha or belongs to Vasiṣṭha’s poetic lineage, or perhaps just plundered VII.35. See the publ. intro. for indecisive disc.

### X.66 All Gods

This hymn is even more focused on divine enumeration than the last one and contains a capacious catalogue, including many minor divinities. In this it is even closer to the spirit of VII.35 than X.65 is. Its final vs. is identical to the immed. preceding hymn, X.65.15, and thus also links the hymn to Vasiṣṭha. In fact the penultimate vs. (X.66.14) makes a strong claim to the poetic lineage of the Vasiṣṭhas and their eponymous ancestor.

X.66.2: Since the *yé* at the beginning of the second pāda follows an opening pāda containing only a single constituent, I consider it to have domain over the whole hemistich, which provides a more satisfactory structure.

On *mánma dhīmahi* see comm. ad X.36.5.

With Ge and Re (also AiG II.2.132) I take *māghone* as an abstract, ‘generosity’. It is tempting, however, to interpret this vṛddhi deriv. of *maghāvan-* as more directly related to the usual referent of that epithet, i.e., as meaning ‘associated with the Maghavan=Indra’, and construe it with *vr̥jāne* in c, as a parallel to *marudgaṇe*: “... on the community having the Maruts as their troop and associated with Indra.” This is exactly what Sāy. does (*māghone maghavata indrasya sambandhinī*). Given the pāda break I think the Ge/Re/publ.tr. interpr. is probably better, but the other is at least lurking.

As in its companion hymn X.65, pāda d attributes ritual roles to the gods that are usually filled by mortals; see comm. ad X.65.4.

X.66.4: The first hemistich is couched in the nominative, although only the first term, *áditiḥ*, is unequivocally nom.; the others could alternatively be acc., because they are dual dvandvas, neuters, or, in the case of *marútaḥ*, a consonant stem identical in nom./acc. pl. The second half-verse is entirely and unequivocally in the acc., to be construed with *havāmahe*.

X.66.5: *sárasvān dhībhiḥ* is a variant of *sárasvatī sahá dhībhiḥ* in the preceding hymn (X.65.13; cf. also VII.35.11). The masc. figure *sárasvant-* is of course far less prominent than the goddess/river Sarasvatī. I do not now why he was introduced here as a substitute for the feminine.

The abstract *mahimā* ‘Greatness’ is an anomaly in the list of gods’ names in b, though of course English speakers would have no trouble interpreting (His/Your) Highness or (His/Your) Majesty in such a list. Re’s suggestion that it is the Greatness of Indra seems plausible; see the passages cited by Ge (n. 5b) where *mahimān-* stands in for Indra.

Ge’s suggestion (n. 5c) that the Maruts are the formulation-makers (*brahmakṛtaḥ*) also seems plausible. As we see in passages like V.52.1, 5 the Maruts are praisers as well as recipients of praise.

X.66.6: It is unclear how large the domain of the impv. *santu* is. I take it as extending through the whole vs., or at least the first hemistich (with appropriate adjustment in number), while Ge’s tr. implies that only the 2nd part of pāda a falls under its sway. In a verse of this banality it scarcely matters.

The unbroken predication of *vṛṣan-* in a series is strongly reminiscent of the first part of the Atri hymn V.40, esp. vss. 1–3.

X.66.7: The bulls continue in this vs., but at least they have a little more to do.

X.66.8: The hapax root noun compd. *yajña-niṣkṛt-* is unusual in apparently compding a root noun both with a nominal and with a preverb; this type (NOMINAL–PREVERB √ROOT) is rare to non-existent. See Scar (649 and n. 921) and my 2020 *iṣudhyā-* (Fs. Lamberterie): 486–87. In fact, the next phrase, *adhvarāṇām abhiśrī-*, may illustrate the point (see below). As for this compd., see Scar (78–79), who considers various possibilities, including that the compd. contains the idiom (*n*)*iṣkr-*, which is perceived as a secondary, unitary root, not a preverb-verb combination. This seems an appealing solution to the anomaly.

The compd *abhiśrīyaḥ* is of course plural, but “full glories” does not go well in English; *adhvarāṇām* is also plural, despite the singular rendering in the publ. tr. (a lapse). For this phrase GEN *abhiśrī-* I would now substitute “excelling in glory over the ceremonies,” parallel to VI.70.1 *bhūvanānām abhiśrīyā* “excelling in glory over the creatures.” The root noun *abhiśrī-* is generally construed with a genitive, and the *abhi-* suggests the notion of superiority or dominance over. This interpr. differs somewhat from that given by Scar (547–48) and the lit. cited there. It is striking that, beside our phrase *adhvarāṇām abhiśrī-* (here and VIII.44.7), there exists a compd *adhvara-śrī-* (5x). Scar (545–46) is hard pressed to account for the construction and interpr. of the compd, but I wonder if it represents an underlying \**adhvara-abhi-śrī-*, with both nominal and preverb. The compd. has expelled the preverb because root noun compds can have only two members (see immed. above, on *yajña-niṣkṛt-*). This would be exactly parallel to the expulsion I hypothesize in an original \**iṣu-prati-dhādh-* ‘arrow-aiming’, resulting in \**iṣu-dh-*, in my 2020 article cited above. The full phrase *adhvarā+abhi-śrī-* would be preserved with the gen. pl. of the nominal and the preverb+root noun, as here.

X.66.9: The injunctive *janayan* is one of only two 3rd pl. active injunctives to this stem, where we expect instead the likewise transitive *janayanta* with *-anta* replacment. The other is in nearby X.61.7; see disc. there and my 1979 *-anta* replacement article (IJ 21), esp. p. 154.

The phrase *abhi vrātā* is difficult to parse. Most tr. take it as a separate prep. phrase, loosely construed: So Ge “für die heiligen Werke,” Re “selon les vœux (divins)” (commenting that the phrase “resolves” a compd. \**abhivratam* [no accent given]), HPS (Vrata 63) “um der Gelübde willen.” The publ. tr., “to their commandments,” is of this type, though it might be

easier to interpr. as “according to their commandments” or, with a looser gloss of *vratā-*, “to their standards.” I think some version of this interpr. is probably correct, but it is possible that *vratā* is simply another object to *janayan*; cf. VII.75.3 *janáyanto daívyāni vratāni*. This, however, would leave *abhí* stranded; it’s difficult, though perhaps not impossible, to take it as a preverb in tmesis with *janayan*. For another problematic ex. of *abhí vratā*, see VIII.32.28 and comm. thereon.

Note that *āpah* in b shows the occasional substitution of nom. pl. for acc. pl. in this stem. It is noteworthy here because in the previous vs. the last pāda begins with a correct acc. pl. *apāḥ* (X.66.8d); however, the c pāda of the next vs. (X.66.10c) begins exactly like our pāda, *āpa óṣadhīḥ*, where the nominative is correct. Cf. also other exx. of this pāda opening (V.41.11, VII.34.25 with expected nom. – though cf. also the acc. *apā óṣadhīḥ* in VI.39.5). It is possible that the redactors altered our phrase to match the nearly identical expression in the following verse; since sandhi across the pāda boundary would have amalgamated the final and initial vowels to *vratāpa óṣadhīḥ*, the only change would have been the erasure of the accent on the putative acc. \**apāḥ* (that is, \**vratāpā*).

In c the form *svār* raises questions. Ge (n. 9c) simply pronounces it an honorary instr. and tr. “mit Sonnenlicht” (sim. HPS, Vrata 63). Re attenuates the sense but leaves the grammar intact, tr. “le ciel” as a second obj. to “fill.” I am reluctant to tamper with either morphology or sense, though I’m not sure what filling the sun would actually mean. Kü (372) also takes this austere road.

The last part of d, *tanvī ní māmṛjuḥ*, is found identically in the companion hymn, X.65.7d. There the gods clasped to themselves the sacrifice they had just created; here the object is both more intangible and more comprehensive: their “will” (*vásā-*). I take this to mean that they have fully appropriated and deployed the motivation and ability to effect the actions described in the earlier parts of the vs.

X.66.10: With the gen. phrase *mahiṣásya tanyatóḥ* both Ge and Re supply a head noun ‘master’, modifying the dual dvandva *vātāparjanyaḥ*. This is certainly possible, but I think it is also possible that the relationship between Wind + Thunderstorm and thunder is meant to be more open-ended. Unfortunately the publ. tr., which reflects this idea, is hard to interpr.

X.66.11: The formation of *tanayitnú-* here differs from *tanyatú-* in the preceeding vs. (10b) as well as in the preceding hymn (X.65.13), and I’m not sure what, if any, distinction is meant to be drawn. I tr. *tanyatú-* as “Thunder” and *tanayitnú-* as “Thundering,” but this is simply to register the difference in formation. Note esp. that X.65.13 contains the sequence *tanyatúr ékapād ajāḥ*, which seems a minimal reverse reordering of our *ajā ékpāt tanayitnúḥ*—which might suggest that *tanyatú-* and *tanayitnú-* refer to the same entity. Since sorting out these minor divinities is difficult anyway, I won’t speculate further.

In d we may have two different groups – the All Gods *and* my patrons – or the gods may be identified as my patrons, with patrons an appositive. The position of *utá* could be compatible with either reading, conjoining all of d with the list in abc or conjoining the two terms of d. The standard interpr. (Ge, Re; also JSK, DGRV I.335) opt for the former, but it’s worth noting (as Ge does, n. 11d) that the gods were identified as patrons (same word *sūráyah*) and creators of the sacrifice in vs. 2, and so the second possibility is a strong one.

X.66.12: Ge/Re take *mánavaḥ* as ‘humans’ and as modifying the 1st pl. subject of *syāma* (“may we humans be ...”). The publ. tr. “might we be Manu-s,” with the more specific interpr. of the

stem *mānu-*, which then is predicated of the subject, comes from a suggestion of JPB. The idea is that we all want to enact the role of Manu as first sacrificer at the first instantiation of the sacrifice, which would then be a joint venture between Manu (/us Manus) and the gods, who, as we saw in 2d (and X.65.7d), begot the sacrifice. In b it is surely the gods who are urged to lead the sacrifice east. Re cites Bergaigne as having an interpr. similar to the publ. tr. (“puissions-nous être à vos yeux des Manus ...”).

X.66.13: The divine model for the current sacrifice is further set forth here.

See extensive disc. of *prátiveśa-* (only here in the RV, but common later) and related words ad X.49.5. The literal gloss in AiG II.1.284, ‘die Wohnung gegenüber habend’, and its suggested meaning ‘neighbor’ seem reasonable.

X.66.14: This vs. makes a strong claim on the part of the poet(s) to belong to the poetic lineage of Vasiṣṭha, who is surely the referent of *pitṛvát* ‘like/in the manner of (their) father’. I think it quite likely that the seer embedded in *ṛṣivát* ‘like/in the manner of the/[a] seer’ is also Vasiṣṭha, rather than a generic figure.

The close partnership between us humans and the gods in the sacrificial enterprise is also depicted here, where the gods are referred to as prized and pleased ‘kinsmen’ (*jñātāyaḥ*).

X.66.15: This vs., identical to the final vs. of X.65, also asserts the Vasiṣṭha connection.

### X.67–68 Bṛhaspati

Two hymns dedicated to Bṛhaspati. In addition to the usual treatments, see HPS’s detailed discussions in B+I; Re treats the Bṛhaspati hymns in ÉVP XV. On the supposed poet Ayāsyā see comm. ad X.67.1.

### X.67 Bṛhaspati

X.67.1: The first word of the hymn, *imām*, is a near-deictic “this ... here” and implicitly locates us on the ritual ground, with this hymn (*dhī-* ‘insightful thought’) being recited now. In this particular case, the speaker credits “our father” (*pitā nah*), by implication Bṛhaspati, with finding (that is, composing) the hymn, with an augmented imperfect *avindat*. This is unlike the usual RVic situation, in which the poet claims to be himself composing the hymn, though “in the manner” of a father or ancestor – e.g., in the immediately preceding hymn, X.66.14 *vásiṣṭhāsaḥ pitṛvād vācam akratai* “like their father(s) the Vasiṣṭhas have made speech”; instead it seems to depict something closer to the later śrauta ritual situation in which already existing ritual texts are recited in a fixed liturgy.

On the various possible referents of “seven-headed” (*saptásīrṣṇīm*) see Ge (n. 1a), HPS (228).

The adj. *brhatīm* ‘lofty’ evokes the dedicand’s name, Bṛha(spa)ti; we might also see the anagram in *pitā* (←) *-pāti-*.

The “fourth one” (*turīyam*) in c cannot be directly coreferential with *imām dhīyam* in pāda a because of the gender difference. It could, however, match *ukthām* in d. As noted in the publ. intro., it is strongly reminiscent of the fourth part of speech or the fourth formulation often prominent in Vedic discussions of the nature and powers of speech. Indeed, HPS takes it as the fourth formulation (*bráhma-*)(224).

The adj. *ayāśya*- ‘irrepressible’ is used of various gods (Indra, Soma) and surely here refers to “our father,” that is, Bṛhaspati, as HPS (227–28) argues. The Anukramaṇī has probably extracted it from this first vs. as the name of the poet, to whom not only these two hymns (X.67–68) but also IX.44–46 are attributed, and who becomes an independent figure in the later tradition. On the reinterpretation of the adjective as a PN, see HPS (165–66, 227–28), citing Pischel; Mayr (PN s.v.); and comm. ad I.62.7; and for Ayāśya’s later existence, see Macdonell-Keith, Vedic Index s.v.

X.67.2: This vs. is lexically chained to vs. 1 (see HPS 228): 1d *śáṃsan*: 2a *śáṃsantaḥ* (both pres. participles, in adjacent pādas); 1a *dhíyam*: 2a *dīdhyānāḥ*; 1b *ṛta(-prajātām)*: 2a *ṛtām*; note also *pitā* (1a) contrasted with *putrāsaḥ* (2b). This chaining superimposes the pl. Aṅgirasas (vs. 2) on the sg. Bṛhaspati (vs. 1) as the original joint devisers of the verbal portion of the primal sacrifice. The important connection between *dhī-* (1a) and *dīdhyāna-* (2a) is not signalled in the publ. tr. due to the difficulty of coming up with a non-awkward English verb. Perhaps “seeing insights straightaway” in 2a.

The agreement of the participles *śáṃsan* and *śáṃsantaḥ* also suggests that their objects, *ukthám* (1d) and *ṛtām* (2a), can be superimposed and identified with each other (see Lü 421, Re comm. ad loc.). There is also verse-internal lexical and morphological play: the pres. mid. participles ending pādas a and c, *dīdhyānāḥ* and *dádhyānāḥ*, share not only a suffix and ending (-ānāḥ), but also a reduplicative skeleton, *d\_dh*. And *dhāma* in d picks up *dádhyānāḥ* in c.

The meaning and referent of *vīpram padám* are disputed, as instances of *padá-* often are. Ge takes the phrase as a double acc., with *padám* predicated of *vīpram* and meaning ‘track’: “den Redekundigen zu ihrer Wegspur machend”; he explains (n. 2c) that they follow in their speech the tracks/traces of Bṛhaspati. But most interpr. take *vīpram* as a modifier of *padám*, meaning “inspired word/speech.” See Lü (522 n. 6), Re (ad loc.), HPS (225). I do not see why it cannot be a pun, as the publ. tr. presents it (though perhaps it should be better phrased in the manner of Ge: “laying their inspired word as their track,” in this case the track of the ritual cursus.

Most interpr. take *mananta* to mean “they thought up / devised” the *dhāma* of the sacrifice: Ge “haben ... ersonnen,” HPS (225) “haben ... erdacht,” Re “ont inventé.” Certainly the *prathamám* ‘first’ qualifying *dhāma* supports this view. However, the occurrence of the VP *dhāma mánai-* in X.97.1 *mánai ... dhāma*, where it refers to the various forms of plants, favors a more neutral “think about / bring to mind,” with no sense of creation or invention. Hence my “pondered” – though I do not entirely reject the standard view.

X.67.3–8: The narration of the Vala myth begins here and continues through vs. 8. As noted in the publ. intro., the pattern associated with the name Bṛhaspati in this sequence is significant. The name first appears in vs. 3 at the beginning of pāda c, and this nom. *bṛhaspátīḥ* occupies the same position in 4c and 5c, as well as 8c, with acc. *bṛhaspátim* beginning 9c and 10c after the recital of the myth proper. Bṛhaspati’s variant *bráhmanaspátīḥ* opens the c pāda of 7. But in the center of this sequence, vs. 6, we find instead *índraḥ* at the beginning of the vs., a vs. with no occurrence of Bṛhaspati – structurally imposing, as I suggest in the publ. intro., the superimposition and identification of Bṛhaspati and Indra.

The preverb *ví* figures prominently in this account (3b, 4d, 6b, 7b, 7d).

X.67.3: This vs. is esp. focused on the soundscape of the myth. On the one hand, the two intensive participles, *vāvadadbhiḥ* (a) and *abhikánikradat* (c), both of sounds associated with



animals, convey a sense of the constant cacophony in the background of the mythic actions: the Aṅgirasas' constant vocalizations compared to the disordered honking of geese, Bṛhaspati's continual roaring at the cows like a bovine himself. On the other hand, the final pāda depicts the ritually regulated starting up of the praise song and its hymn tune, the province of the priestly figures the Prastotar and the Udgātar, an oasis of sonic order in the midst of an uproar of voices.

The presence of both *utá* and *ca* in pāda d is curious, esp. since they seem to form a “both ... and” structure, conjoining the two verbs *prāstaut* and *úd ... agāyat*. This kind of subclausal usage is rare with *utá*, as is the mixed construction with *ca*. See JSK (DGRV I.357) for disc. Of course, in pāda-initial position *ca* could not be used, but there doesn't seem any reason why *prāstaut* could not have been separated through tmesis by *ca* (\*#*prā cāstaut ...*), like *úc ca ... agāyat*. Because these finite verb forms are preceded only by participles (*vyāsyan ... abhikānikradat*) modifying the subject, we cannot interpr. the *utá* as a clause connector.

X.67.4: The three feminine entities, divided into two and one in pāda a, but aggregated as three in d, are universally interpreted as “doors” (for which I substituted “gates” as slight more suitable to a cave). As Ge points out (n. 4d), the ‘doors’ (*dúras*) are found in this Vala context in VI.18.5 and X.120.8. Re cleverly suggests that there may have been a (notional) haplology from the sequence *dvā(bhyām) \*dvārbhyām* that resulted in the gapping of the ‘door’ word here.

Note the echo of the first word of the vs., *avāh* (*lavó*) ‘below’, and the last, *āvaḥ* ‘opened up’ (underlying *āvar*).

X.67.5: Here we meet another “three,” but neut. (*trīṇi*), not the fem. of 4d (*tisráḥ*).

Pāda a contains the problematic *śayáthem* (Pp *śayáthā īm*), which has received a variety of interpr., none of them satisfactory. The publ. tr. follows Old (as does Re) in taking *śayáthā* as a neut. acc. pl. (Old “Lagerstätten,” publ. tr. “lairs”) as parallel obj. beside *purám*. The stem is otherwise only found in two passages in adjacent hymns, dat. *śayáthāya* (VI.18.8) and loc. *śayáthe* (VI.17.9). Both those forms appear to have (quasi-)infinitival value ‘to lie’, although only the dative fits this function well morphologically (see comm. ad VI.17.9). Gr suggests we should read *śayáthe* here as well (with no explan. of the *-m*); Ge (n. 5a) reads *śayáthā* (with the Pp, the likely analysis), but claims that the form is an infinitive (with no explan. of the morphology). HPS (B+I 225–26) takes it as an instr. (flg. a correction by Thieme [III 3.15] of HPS's tr. in Vrata 47 n. 84), attributing the sense ‘riverbed’ to the stem: “Nachdem er den zurückgebeugten Wall durch ein Flussbett zerspalten hatte.” I have no idea what this is meant to mean; how can a fortress be split by a riverbed, and how did Bṛhaspati get hold of such an instrument in the first place? In his tr. in Vrata, *śayátha-* is also ‘riverbed’, but (I think) as an acc. pl., expressing what parts the fortress separated into after Bṛhaspati split it (“Die ... Burg ... zerspaltete er in (Fluss-)betten”), which are then the referents of the “three” in pāda b; this interpr. basically follows Ge's alternative, given in n. 5a. Given that that the various tricky manipulations of morphology or meaning don't yield plausible sense, Old's acc. pl. seems the simplest and the least harmful. But I am still disturbed by several features. First, at least in my interpr. the fem. sg. *āpacīm* modifies *púram*, but is separated from it by *śayáthem*. However, this word order might be iconic for splitting *apart* the fortress. More serious is the position of the particle *īm* (assuming that's what's lurking in *śayáthem*). In my treatment of this particle (“Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*,” Fs. Cardona 2002) I point out (pp. 303–4 and n. 23) that *īm* is almost always found either in second, or modified second, position (as in 7a) or directly before the verb. Of the 208 instances of *īm* (per Lubotsky), only nine fail to conform – including this one. After

reconsidering the problems posed by *śayáthem* I now find I cannot accept the neut. acc. pl. + *īm* interpr. found in the publ. tr. The need to posit an out-of-place *īm* seems close to fatal, esp. because the acc. pl. ‘lairs’ doesn’t fit the passage all that well, and further the other two occurrences of the stem *śayátha-* are (quasi-)verbal usage, not concrete. I now find myself sympathetic to Gr’s suggestion that we read \**śayáthe*. This entails assuming that the *-m* was originally a hiatus breaker (notionally *-m̐*) that was reinterpreted as a real *m* – even though (and this is a major problem) this is not a sequence (\*-e a-) where a hiatus-breaking *-m̐* would be introduced. If this dubious analysis is accepted, *śayáthe* would have the same quasi-infinitival use as in VI.17.9 and depict the collapse of the *púr-* and its subsequent position. I would now tr. “Having split apart the stronghold to lie facing backwards,” eliminating “(from front) to back, (having split apart) the lairs” and picking up with “at one blow.” The use of a form of ‘lie’ would thematically connect this account of the Vala myth with the Vṛtra myth, where *√śi* is a signature word (see esp. I.32).

The next problem is the identity of the three (neut. *trīṇi*) in pāda b, which in part depends on the sense of the lexeme *nīṣ√kṛt*. In its only other RVic occurrence, in IX.108.6, the object is something desirable (cows) that one cuts out from its surroundings (stone) (... *áśmano nír gā́ ákṛntat*), i.e., essentially the same context as here. Our *nīṣ√kṛt* seems parallel also to *nīṣ√bhṛ* in a similar context in the next, paired hymn (X.68.8). With Ge (n. 5b) (and Sāy., sim. Re) I identify the three as the dawn, the sun, and the cow found in pāda c (*uśásam sūryam gām*), despite the gender mismatch between neut. *trīṇi* and the assorted fem. and masc. items in c; the neut. may be a cover term for “three (things),” esp. since neither masc. nor fem. would encompass all three. (Re supplies “trésors” with *trīṇi*.) Although together pādas cd name four things (including *arkám*), this last term is in a separate pāda and, as Ge points out (n. 5b), Bṛhaspati had already found it (see 1ab *dhíyam ... avindat*). Moreover, in the parallel in the next vs., X.68.9, the verb ‘find’ (*avindat*) has three objects, and though *arká-* also occurs in that vs., in a separate pāda as here, it is in the instr., not the acc. of the other three.

“Water-holder, reservoir” (*udadhí-*) is a slightly odd way to refer to the Vala cave, but it can hardly have any other referent. The usage is similar to that of “well” in English, which can be used metaphorically as a container for substances other than water (e.g., “well of loneliness”); in fact, we also have metaphorical expressions with this very word – e.g., “reservoir of goodwill,” “reservoir of infection” (apparently a technical term in epidemiology), etc.

X.67.6: On the significance of the vs.-initial placement of *índrah* here, see comm. above ad vss. 3–8 and the publ. intro. Not only is Indra superimposed on Bṛhaspati here, but he has access to the same verb: (*ví*) *cakarta*, like Bṛhaspati’s (*nīḥ* ...) *ákṛntat* in 5b.

As noted in the publ. intro. *rakṣítár-* ‘guard’ is an ambiguous and potentially menacing term. See Re’s comm.

Gr, Ge, and HPS (226) render *kará-* as ‘hand’, a sense well established in the epics and later, but, as Re points out, this is likely the only example in Vedic. (The other RVic occurrence of the stem, in I.116.13, refers to the Aśvins. Ge and the publ. tr. [JPB] take it as ‘hand’, but a more generic ‘doer’ seems more likely. The occurrence in AVŚ XII.2.2 likewise fits its context better with such a sense.) A meaning ‘hand’ here would seem distinctly odd, since the action of ‘cutting apart’ (*ví√kṛt*) is not something a hand by itself can manage (outside of Kung Fu movies) – better a physical ‘doer’, concretized as ‘tool’ or, with Re, “un instrument (à découper)” like a knife.

On sweat as a sign of ritual activity, see my 2015 “Avestan *xšuuīd*.” A more literal tr. of this bahuvr. would be ‘whose ointment/unguent is sweat’. The theme returns in the next vs., 7d.

X.67.7: Note the allit. in *sá ... satyébhiḥ sákhībhiḥ śucádbhiḥ* (also unified by instr. pl. ending) and *(gó)dhāyasam ... dhanasaír (a)dardah*.

The cmpd *gó-dhāyas-* ‘cow-nurturing’ is presumably meant ironically, continuing the ambiguity of *rakṣitāraṃ dúghānām*. It has an Old Avestan cognate *gaodāīah-* (Y 29.2). Perhaps it is not an accident that the Avestan occurrence is in the famous Lament of the Soul of the Cow, when the Cow is complaining that the cow-tending is not entirely satisfactory. The Aves. correspondent supports a rendering ‘nurturing cows’, ‘having the nurturing of cows’ (so Gr). However, most tr. interpr. *gó-* not as an obj. of the 2nd member, but rather as the source of nourishment – Ge “der von den Rindern sich nährte”; Re. “qui tétait [le lait] des vaches”; HPS “dessen Nahrung die Kühe sind.” I assume that all these interpr. are trying to capture the fact that the Vala cave is a sinister, not a nurturing figure towards the captive cows. But this seems to me sufficiently covered by an ironic interpr. of the cmpd. (like *gópati-* in the next vs.). Against the “source” interpr. is the fact that several of the host of X-*dhāyas-* cmpds – *arí-dhāyas-*, *kārú-dhāyas-*, *bhūri-dhāyas-* -- clearly have 1st member objects (‘nourishing the stranger’, etc.). *viśvá-dhāyas-* is ambiguous: either ‘nourishing all’ (with obj.) or ‘having all nourishments’, but it certainly doesn’t mean \*‘deriving nourishment from all’; by my interpr. *hári-dhāyas-* means ‘having golden nourishment’, not ‘nourishing the golden’, but again certainly not \*‘deriving nourishment from the golden’ (see comm. ad III.44.3).

The root-noun cmpd *dhana-sā-* is found 6x in the RV, including in nearby X.65.10; *dhana-sā-* here is a nonce thematization. See Scar 581.

The *gharmá-* in *gharmá-sveda-* may well refer to the gharma pot at the Pravargya ritual; cf., in the frog hymn, VII.103.8 *adhvaryávo gharmíṇaḥ siṣvidānāḥ* and comm. thereon.

For the sense of *ví√naś* here, see comm. ad X.64.15.

X.67.8: *iyāná-* ‘begging’ may be used sarcastically here. They used verbal means, which is like begging, but the words in fact ‘compelled’.

*iṣanayanta* – This hapax, which belongs in the hazy group of *iṣaṇa-*, *iṣanya-* and the nominals *iṣāni-* and *iṣanyā-*, is rendered by Re and HPS as intrans./reflex. But it is surely an *-anta* replacement and so is trans., as Ge (and I) take it.

*mithó-avadya-pa-* is one of the few three-member cmpds in the RV; I have found fewer than 20 (not counting negated two-member cmpds, cmpds with *su-* and *dus-*, and cmpds. with a lexicalized member [like *gopa-*]). This rarity adds to the difficulty of interpreting it. It seems to have been rather casually assembled. The final member *-pa-* is, like *-sa-* in 7 above, thematized from the root noun *-pā-* ‘protect’ (see Scar 308). For *avadya-pa-*, Renou cites the syntagm I.185.10 *pātām avadyāt*. To this “protecting from fault,” the adverb *mithāḥ* ‘alternately, mutually’ would be loosely joined. If ‘protecting each other from fault’ (e.g., Old “einander wechselseitig als Abwehrer von Schande habend”) vel sim. is really the sense of the cmpd., its application to the Aṅgirasas is somewhat puzzling. But there is an alternative. In my copy of HPS’s B+I, which belonged to Stanley Insler, he penciled in the margin “protecting from falsity and disgrace = dvandva.” This seems eminently worth considering, esp. if *mithāḥ* here has a sense closer to that found in Iranian, where it refers to wrong or falsehood. For the Old Persian evidence see R. Schmitt, *Wörterbuch der altpersischen Königsinschriften*, p. 215 with lit. In Avestan the adverb is esp. associated with false speech: Old Avestan *miḍah-uuacah-* ‘having

false speech’, YA *mīṭaoxta-* ‘falsely spoken’, *mīṭō.aog-* ‘falsely speaking’. Here it would be paired with *avadya-*, whose literal meaning is of course ‘not to be spoken’. I now suggest an alternate interpr., based on Insler’s dvandva analysis: “protecting from the false and the unspeakable” – an appropriate description of the Aṅgirasas, whose realm is true and effective speech. Alternatively, it is possible that we are dealing with two words here, with *mīthāḥ* a separate adverb (as in the next hymn, X.68.10, where it means ‘alternately’) and a standard two-member cmpd. that should be accented *\*avadya-pébhiḥ* (cf. *dhana-saḥ* in 7b), with the accent having been erased redactionally. The problem then would be: what does *mīthāḥ* mean in that context? It seems unlikely that Bṛhaspati and the Aṅgirasas alternated in releasing the cows or did so rivalrously. I therefore prefer the dvandva analysis.

*úd usriyā asṛjata* reprises 4d *úd usrā ākar*.

X.67.9: This is the transition vs. back to the present time and the 1st ps. poets – but we don’t find that out till the 1st pl. *madema* in d. Till then it could the subject could be the Aṅgirasas.

Note that Bṛhaspati here is credited with martial, more-Indra-like skills.

X.67.10: With Old, I attach ab to the previous vs. because it seems to continue the victory narrative from there, but this is not necessary. The second hemistich lacks a finite verb; I supply *ānu madema* from 9d.

Pāda c is a mash-up of 9a *vardháyantaḥ* and 9c *bṛhaspátim víṣaṇam*.

My interpr. of d differs from the standard ones, and infuses it with more content – perhaps going beyond the evidence. It is dependent on the interpr. of *nānā*. Ge (n. 10c) follows Sāy. (*nānā dikṣu santaḥ*) in taking it locationally (“da und dort weilend”), while Re seems to project this onto conceptual social location (“bien qu’étant diversement (situés sur le plan social)”). I suggest that the *nānā* refers to the varying capacities of the poets, who each “bring light with their mouth” (*bībhrato jyótir āsā*), but in different ways according to their particular verbal skills.

X.67.11: On the formation of the infinitival *vayodhaí* (also X.55.1), see Scar 261.

X.67.12: The intrusion of the Vṛtra myth (pāda c) and other violent Indraic exploits is surprising in this insistently Bṛhaspati/Vala-oriented hymn. The vs. seems tacked on; on the other hand, the invocation of Heaven and Earth duplicates that of the two world halves in 11d. More to the point, there is some ring composition: *saptá* in 1a and 12c, *mūrdhán-* in 12b recalling *śīrṣan-* in 1a.

## X.68 Bṛhaspati

On the complex style of this hymn see publ. intro.

Like X.67, this hymn has its share of verse-, hemistich-, and pāda-initial occurrences of *bṛhaspāti-*: 1d, 2d, 3c, 4c, 5c, 6b, 7a, 8d, 9c, 10b, 11d, 12c. There is one, and only one, per verse. As discussed below ad vs. 7, it is likely that all these occurrences are extra-clausal and topicalized.

X.68.1: This vs. has three marked similes (a, b, c), each of which presents difficulties of interpretation. In all three cases the comparandum is the chants (*arká-*) directed towards Bṛhaspati in d.

In the first simile the point of comparison is noisy water birds “constantly gabbling” (the intens. part. *vāvadataḥ*; see in the previous hymn X.67.3 where the Aṅgirasas are modified by the same participle). There is some unhappiness among interpreters about the other participle in this simile, *rākṣamāṇa-*. Gr suggests reading *yākṣamāṇa-* (‘appearing, displaying’?); Old favors Brunnhofer’s suggestion *krākṣamāṇa-* ‘howling’ (vel sim.), which is associated with *udaprūt-* in IX.108.7. However, as Ge points out (n. 1ab), this would involve adjusting the sandhi of transmitted *vāyo*. And I for one see no semantic problem with *rākṣamāṇa-*. Flocks of birds on water are often found in fairly tight, noisy groups, which can be seen as (and probably are) mutually protective. I take the middle participle as reciprocal; Re interpr. it as passive (“qu’on tenait enfermés”), but the middle of *√rakṣ* is never passive.

Note that the part. *vāvadataḥ* occurs across the pāda boundary from the birds and sits exactly between the first and second similes. This allows it to be construed with both, as, e.g., HPS (218) sees. With the first it is a nom. pl. masc., with the second it is the homonymous gen. sg., modifying *abhrīyasya*: “of the ever-speaking (lit.) X of the cloud.” Although most interpr. *abhrīya-* as the cloud itself, I prefer to see it as the adj. it is formally, modifying a gapped “thunder.”

The difficulty of c lies in the hapax *giribhrāj-* and within this cmpd there are several problems: 1) what is the second member? and 2) what is the relation of the first member to the second? For a detailed disc. see Scar (373–74). A number of possibilities have been suggested for the etymology of *-bhrāj-*, of which the strongest competitors are *\*bhlegʷ* ‘swell’ (also possibly in the root noun *bhrāj-* AV VII.90.2, possibly meaning ‘penis’) and *\*bhreg* ‘break’ (for a recently suggested alternative root see below). The ‘break’ interpr. is the one favored by most tr. and comm.: Gr, Ge, Re, HPS (218), Mau (155) [Pokorny IEW also includes it there] and generally involves a direct-object function for the 1st member, or at least a goal, though an ablative source is also sometimes considered: e.g., Re “brisant la montagne” (direct obj.) versus Mau “as they break upon the rocks” (goal) versus Gr (alt. gloss; sim. Re’s alt. in n.) “aus ihnen [=mountains] hervorbrechend” (source). For “waves” in a similar direct object context, see VI.61.2 *iyám ... arujat, sānu girīṇām taviṣébhīr ūrmībhiḥ* “She [=the river Sarasvatī] broke the back of the mountains with her powerful waves.” The problem is that there are no other certain (and few if any possible) traces of *\*bhreg* in Indo-Aryan. Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *bhrāj-*) considers it “willkürlich” to involve the ‘break’ root here.

The ‘swell, be erect’ interpr. has the merit of an at least tenuous connection with another Vedic word, the aforementioned root noun *bhrāj-* ‘penis’(?). The publ. tr. follows this interpr. and the exact wording, “stiff-peaked (like) mountains,” was adapted from a suggestion of Darms, reproduced in EWA (“Steifheit wie Berge habend”). Scar also favors ‘swell’, but points out that *giri-* as first compound member often has a locative sense (e.g., *giri-kṣīt-* ‘dwelling in the mountains’; Scar’s suggested gloss, ‘im Gebirge schwellend,’ is more plausible, if less poetic, than the one based on Darms.

Recently (WECIEC 28, 2016; Proceedings publ. 2018: 79–81), R. Ginevra suggested a different interp. of both parts of the cmpd and a diff. meaning for the whole. He glosses it “loud-roaring.” The 2nd member belongs to a root *\*bhr(h₂)g* ‘roar’, of his manufacture, whose nearest Vedic relative is, by his account, *bhūrjāyant-* in X.46.4 – but see comm. ad loc.: it is not at all clear that this stem even exists. As for the first member, he takes it as a reduced form of *\*gʷerh₂* ‘heavy’. This is of course a particularly bold interpr., since ‘heavy’ has *u*-vocalism in Skt. (*gur-ū-*); Ginevra has a complex and ultimately unconvincing way to get to *giri-*, but the real problem is that it’s hard to imagine a *\*giri-* ‘heavy’ surviving the competition not only of the well-attested

*girí-* ‘mountain’, but the even better attested *gír-* ‘song’. That a cmpd ‘loud-roaring’ would have survived with that meaning in Vedic when neither of its members has any support in the attested language, beggars belief.

But Ginevra’s alternative interpr. has the merit of reminding us that the cmpd. should somehow fit the simile in which it’s embedded, and that simile concerns noise. Wave(s) are at least marginally associated with sound elsewhere in the RV: see I.44.12 *síndhor iva prásvanitāsa ūrmáyah* “like the clamorous waves of a river”; IX.50.1 *síndhor ūrmér iva svanáḥ* “like the roar of the wave of a river,” and so perhaps the cmpd *giribhráj-* does not have to contribute semantically to the simile; on the other hand, deploying a hapax cmpd that is irrelevant to the content of the passage seems an unlikely move on the part of a skilled RVic poet. Assuming that it does contribute to the noise simile, I now think that “breaking the mountains” is more compatible with the simile than “stiff-peaked (like) mountains,” since breaking or pounding the rocks is going to produce a certain amount of noise. At least as an alternative, I would therefore now change the publ. tr. to “breaking the mountains” (see VI.61.2 cited above), despite the problematic absence of other reflexes of \**bhreg*.

The collocation of *ūrmí-* and *√mad* ‘be/make exhilarated’ found here (*ūrmáyo mādantah*) is also found elsewhere: VI.44.20, VIII.14.10, passages laconically cited by Ge (n. 1c; see also HPS). The association presumably arose because *ūrmí-* is often used metaphorically of “wave(s)” of soma, whose signature verb is *√mad*.

X.68.2: On the interrelated and developing similes in this vs., see the publ. intro. as well as Ge’s n. 2ab.

The opening phrase *sám góbhiḥ* participates in two different images in the first hemistich. The first, unrecognized by other tr./comm., is triggered by the end of the preceding vs., (*abhí ...*) *anāvan* “they bellowed.” In the Aṅgiras context *góbhiḥ* can be associated with the root *√nu* ‘bellow’. See, e.g., IV.3.11 *sám áṅgiraso navanta góbhiḥ* “The Aṅgirasas roared along with the cows” (also V.45.8), with both *sám* and *góbhiḥ*. The joint bellowing refers to the mutual recognition-by-sound that allowed the Aṅgirasas to free the cows penned up in the Vala cave. (Note also that Bṛhaspati roared at the cows in the previous hymn. [X.67.3], though with a different root: *bṛhaspátir abhikánikradad gāḥ*.)

But *sám góbhiḥ* *√nī* also exists independently; see V.42.4 *sám indra ṇo mánasā neṣi góbhiḥ* “Through your thought, Indra, lead us together with cows,” and the final word of the hemistich, *nināya*, is thus also to be construed with the opening. The object of the frame construction is gapped, but with Ge and Re (and HPS in n.) we can supply. the Aṅgirasas, whom Bṛhaspati reunites with the (freed) cows. In the simile Bhaga leads Aryaman (*bhága ivéd aryamānam*); as I explained in the publ. intro. “Bhaga (Fortune or Good Fortune) leads Aryaman, the “civilizing” god of custom, one of whose roles is patron of marriage, to the marriage ceremony in order to preside.” The ceremony itself is found in the next pāda. That the simile in b relates to the marriage is the view of Ge, Re, and Mau (156 n. 2), though HPS explicitly disavows this interpr. (219 n.).

In my opinion, the verse-initial *sám góbhiḥ* that we’ve already used twice in the first hemistich gets reused in pāda c, as Ge also suggests (n. 2c, tentatively also Re n.). The simile, which dominates the pāda, is of the marriage ceremony, with the officiant (*jāne mitráḥ*) in the nom. “anointing” the married couple in the acc. (*dámpatī*). As Ge points out, this step in the ceremony is ordinarily expressed with the lexeme *sám* *√añj* (e.g., in the final vs. of the wedding

hymn, X.85.47 *sám añjantu víśve devāḥ*; see also Ge's other citations). It is rather nice that *sám* 'together' unites the various pieces of this vs.

Two questions remain about the verse. First, who is the referent of *jāne mitráḥ*? second, how does the frame, which must be entirely supplied, match the simile? As for the first, most take the *mitrá-* to be an actual friend or close associate of the couple (so Ge, Re, Mau), while HPS, with a different arrangement of simile and frame, opts for Mitra. I think instead that it is Agni, who is elsewhere called *jāne mitráḥ* (II.4.1, VIII.23.8; for disc. see my "Rigvedic Svayaṃvara?" Fs. Parpola [2001]: 312). Agni officiates at the wedding by virtue of the centrality of the ritual fire at the wedding ceremony.

My answer to the second question is given in the publ. intro.: "Just as Agni anoints the marrying couple with milk, so Bṛhaspati "anoints" the Aṅgirasas (compared to the couple) with cows." Alternatively, Ge and Re take the Aṅgirasas and the cows as the two parties to the ceremony representing the dual *dāmpatī* 'married couple'; this is also one of the possibilities that HPS entertains. This is possible, but it fails to make use of the instr. *góbhiḥ* as the anointing medium. And the image of the Aṅgirasas and the cows pairing off in marriage might be a bit extreme.

Pāda d breaks this mood, with competition substituting for union. Again, the identity of the object in the frame, to which the swift horses are compared, is unspecified and somewhat unclear; I assume the Aṅgirasas, who are spurred to action to open the cave. (This action is, of course, out of order, since the rest of the vs. assumes the cows have already been freed, but chronological scrambling is scarcely unknown in the RV.)

Another question about d: who is addressing Bṛhaspati? I assume that the abrupt departure from the topic of abc also returns us to the larger context of the hymn, and the poet is the speaker, but both Ge and Re take the address to be internal to the scenario of pāda c and spoken by the officiant (*jāne mitráḥ*). In this case it could not be urging the Aṅgirasas to open the cave, since the cave is already open. If we interpret the impv. clause internally (which, as I said, I am not inclined to do), we might compare Agastya's address to his wife Lopāmudrā in I.179.3 *jáyāvéd ātra śatānītham ājīm* "let us two win here the contest of a hundred strategems," as a programmatic blueprint for marriage. It too contains the word *ājī-* 'contest'. However, I think this is farfetched.

X.68.3: The first hemistich consists entirely of fem. pl. adjs. with no referent specified until pāda d *gāḥ*, but of course the cows are in the discourse and were mentioned in the instr. in 2a.

There is no agreement on the sense or even the formation of the hapax compd *sādhv-aryāḥ*. Glosses range widely: Sāy. *sādhūnām kalyāṇām payasām netrīḥ*, Gr "gerade aus, vorwärts strebend," Old "bei denen die Arier ihr Ziel erreichen," Ge "die einem trefflichen Herrn gehören," Re "très amicales," Th (Fremdl. 87) "in guter Weise (schönstens) fremdenfreundlich (gastlich)," HPS "die gut gastlich sind," Mau "dear to the pious," JPB (Ādityas 162 n. 23) "correctly civilized." Several of these (notably Old and Ge) assume that the compd is a bahuvrīhi, but the accent is an obstacle. Old refers laconically to AiG I.2.296(d), treating bahuvrīhis with 2nd-member accent whose 1st member ends in *-i-* or *-u-*. But even if this rule worked better than it does, all of the cases listed there have 1st members with light initial syllables (*purú-*, etc.), and *sādhú-* decidedly does not (cf. also the bahuvrīhi *sādhú-karman-* X.81.7 with expected accent). Moreover, the simplex *aryá-* is an adjective and should not therefore be the head of a bahuvrīhi unless the adjective has been substantivized (as Ge's Herr and Old die Arier implicitly assume). The publ. tr. follows JPB's interpr. of the adj. *aryá-* as 'civilized/civilizing' (discussed at length

in Ādityas, 155–62), that is, “adhering to or upholding to (*sic*) the rites and customs of the Vedic peoples” (155), who are the others (*arí-*) who belong to the larger Ārya community (on which see comm. ad IX.79.3). The term is used here of cows in the context of hospitallity (see immed. flg. *atithínīḥ* and Thieme, *Fremdl.* 86–87), a cardinal Ārya principle, but I do not think it necessarily has the narrow meaning “fremdenfreundlich” that Th gives it. It could simply emphasize the cows’ status as domestic animals that ordinarily form part of the social group (see JPB’s “they are domesticated and hence a part of the community,” 162 n. 23) and have been reintegrated into it after their abduction and imprisonment outside of it. With Th I take *sādhū-* as adverbial here, rather than as referring to a group of particularly worthy people (e.g., Mau’s “the pious”).

The final word of pāda a, *iṣirāḥ*, makes a bad Triṣṭubh cadence. In fact, though the stem *iṣirā-* generally behaves well metrically when internal, often occurring right after the caesura where two light syllables are at home, there are several pāda-final occurrences like this one, making a bad Triṣṭubh cadence: in addition to this one, II.29.1, V.37.3, IX.96.15, X.98.3 (see also, in dimeter VIII.46.29). In all these cases a heavy second syllable (\**iṣrā-*) would be preferable, but precisely this shape would be anomalous in the post-caesura occurrences.

X.68.4: Judging from the 2nd hemistich, this vs. returns us to the moment of the opening of the Vala cave and the release of the cows. Bṛhaspati split open the enclosure (“the skin of the earth”) so easily that his tool for splitting is compared to water in pāda d; see a similar characterization of the ease of this deed in the next vs., 5d. It is harder, though not impossible, to fit the first hemistich into this picture. I take ab as referring to the ritual preliminaries to the assault on the cave. The phrase *ṛtasya yóni-* is quite common in the RV, used for the ritual ground and esp. for the place where the ritual fire is installed (III.62.13, etc. etc.; see comm. ad X.65.7). The “honey” with which Bṛhaspati is sprinkling it may be milk or soma or even water. Despite Ge (n. 4a) and others (Mau, esp.) I don’t think the liquid is rain, because Bṛhaspati isn’t particularly associated with rain elsewhere.

Pāda b is the real problem, in part because of the ambiguous sandhi form *arká*. The Pp takes this as nom. sg. *arkáḥ*, and this is followed by most interpr. Before assessing that interpr., we should investigate what its referent might be. The stem *arká-* means both ‘chant’ and ‘ray/flame’. Its proximity to *ulkā-* ‘firebrand’ in this pāda has led a number of interpr. to favor the latter identification (e.g., Ge “Wetterstrahl”; also Re, Mau). However in a Bṛhaspati context the word should mean ‘chant’ – as it in fact does elsewhere in the hymn: 1d, 6b, 9b; see also in the previous hymn X.67.5. The chant is the means by which the Vala cave is opened. Old and HPS both recognize that *arká-* must mean ‘chant’ here; they both decide that Bṛhaspati is the personified *arká-* and therefore accept the nom. interpr. of the Pp. This is possible, but I prefer interpr. the sandhi form as loc. *arké*, as a minimal loc. absolute: “when the chant (was chanted),” referring to the moment when the cave is opened. That the chant can be secondarily associated with fire, and so the juxtaposition of *arka* and *ulkām* here is probably not accidental, is shown by 6b *agnitápobhir arkaíḥ* “with his fire-hot changes.”

The problem that I can’t solve is what is the object of *avakṣipán* in the frame, compared to the “firebrand of heaven” (*ulkām ... dyóḥ*) in the simile. In the publ. tr. I tentatively supply ‘honey’ from the first pāda, and in the absence of anything better I will stick with it – but it would depict a fairly aggressive sprinkling of the ritual ground, and I also don’t see what it represents mythologically. Ge gets out of the problem by making the whole of b the simile (violating ordinary simile structuring principles by assuming a different verb in the simile from the frame, which for him is pāda a). Re, HPS, and Mau make the *iva* weakly adverbial (“pour



ainsi dire,” “gleichsam,” “as it were”). This is tempting as an easy way to avoid the problem, but I am reluctant to do this because of the prominence of *iva* and the quite specific similes in this part of the hymn (3d, 4b, 4d, 5b, 5d).

X.68.5: The similes continue. In the first hemistich a four-element frame (gapped subject Bṛhaspati, object *tāmaḥ* ‘darkness’, instr. ‘with light’, abl. ‘from the midspace’) is more or less matched by a three-element simile (subj. ‘wind’, object ‘Śīpāla plant’, abl. ‘from the water’), with only the instr. missing: ‘wind’ can stand in for it as well.

The purport of the simile in the 2nd hemistich is not as clear – or rather, my interpr. differs from the general consensus. The standard interpr. is that the simile goes with the main verb: “brought the cows here like the wind a cloud.” But to me this doesn’t make sense: the wind doesn’t bring clouds *here*; they stay in the midspace, wherever the wind pushes them. I think that the simile instead belongs with the gerund *anumṛśyā*. The lexeme *ānu* √ *mṛś* occurs only here in the RV, and the tr. universally render it as ‘lay hold of, seize’ vel sim. — but √ *mṛś* generally depicts a less aggressive action, ‘touch, stroke, fondle’. In KS XXV.9 (116: 6) the causative *anumarśaya-* is used of healers touching a sick man, where ‘seize’ seems out of place. There is also a brief narrative in TS VI.1.3.6, where Indra seeks to prevent anyone else from being born from the womb from which he has just emerged. He *ānu* √ *mṛś* the womb and splits it: *tāsyā anumṛśya yónim āchinat*. Keith tr. ‘stroking her womb he split it.’ Although “seizing” isn’t ruled out here, the context invites a more intimate, if no less devastating, action. In our passage the object of *anumṛśyā* is generally taken to be “the cows of Vala,” but esp. given the TS passage I think it better to supply ‘skin’ (*tvācam* from the immed. preceding vs. 4d) or even ‘womb’ (for the Vala cave as a womb, see IV.50.2; *yónim* is also found in the preceding vs., 4a, though with a different referent). Note that, like the womb in the TS passage, the “skin” was split in 4d (though with a different root), and Bṛhaspati splits something of Vala’s in the next vs. (6ab) and, by my interpr., splits the *gārbha-* of the mountain in 7c. What does this have to do with the simile “like the wind a cloud”? I think the point is that the wind needs merely to “stroke” a cloud to move it, and this emphasizes how light and minimal a touch Bṛhaspati needed to open the Vala cave, a point also made in 4d.

With the simile of d associated with the gerund in c, the rest of d contains the main VP, whose meaning is straightforward: *ā* √ *kr* in the middle means ‘bring here, make one’s own’. What I don’t understand is the doubling of *ā*. Old (Noten ad I.3.7) says it’s not uncommon and lists some passages, but I would still like an explanation. Perhaps the two *ā*’s convey different senses: ‘make one’s own’ and ‘bring here’; this is what I meant to imply in the publ. tr.

X.68.6: The abstract noun *jāsu-* ‘feebleness’ may seem an odd object for the verb *bhed* ‘split’, which seems to call for a concrete object. However, it neatly summarizes the point of the similes in vss. 4 and 5, that Vala was easily breached. Ge unaccountably renders *jāsu-* here by “das Gefängnis” (prison) without comment, though in its other occurrence (X.33.2) as “Verschmachten.” Perhaps he was swayed by Sāy.’s concrete gloss *āyudham* ‘weapon’ in our passage.

On the pun that structures the 2nd hemistich see publ. intro. As discussed there, the pun is enabled by two ambiguous forms: *pāriviṣṭam* and *ādat*. The former can be the ppl. to either √ *viś* or √ *viṣ*. In the former case, it means ‘surrounded’, in the latter ‘served’. As for *ādat*, it can be the (remarked medial) 3rd sg. root aor. to *ā* √ *dā* ‘take’ (*ā* + (*a*)*da-t*) or a pseudo-thematic imperfect to the root pres. of √ *ad* ‘eat’ (*a-ad-a-t*): the expected athematic form would have been \**āt* (< \**a-ad-*

ṭ), which cries out for remodeling. At least with regard to the publ. tr., only the former would be strictly correct, since the imperfect of  $\sqrt{ad}$ , without preverb, should not be accented in a main clause (see also Ge n. 6c). But secondary readings in puns can be lax about accentuation, and in any case nothing forbids c from being still in the domain of *yadā* in pāda a, in which case both of the proposed verb forms would be accented in the subordinate cl. I therefore offer an alternative translation “When Bṛhaspati split the feebleness of taunting Vala with his fire-hot chants / (and) he took / ate (the cows) ...,” with the main clause represented only by d. Only Mau of the standard tr. takes this option.

As for the pun itself, taking *pāriṣṭa-* to  $\sqrt{viṣ}$  with the sense ‘surrounded, trapped’, the ppl. can be construed with the instr. *dadbhīḥ* as the agent/instrument; the more appropriate main verb would be  $\sqrt{dā}$  ‘take’ (though ‘eat’ is also possible). The image is the familiar and slightly unpleasant one of using the tongue to worry tiny particles of food stuck between the teeth and suggests that Bṛhaspati scoured all the nooks and crannies of the Vala cave for stray cattle. If *pāriṣṭa-* is taken to  $\sqrt{viṣ}$  in the lexeme ‘serve’, the more appropriate main verb would be ‘eat’ (though ‘take’ is not excluded), and the tongue and teeth together do the eating. HPS objects to Ge’s supplying the cows as obj. of ‘eat’ because Bṛhaspati doesn’t eat the cows – but supplying Vala as object, as he, Re, and Mau do, is subject to the same objection: Bṛhaspati doesn’t eat the cave either. Surely “eat” is a metaphor and, in my opinion, works better with cows as object: Bṛhaspati sucks them all out of the cave at one time.

X.68.7: The position of *hī* is at first surprising, coming superficially in 3rd position: *bṛhaspátir āmata hī* ..., but is easily explained if we take *bṛhaspátīḥ* as extraclausal and topicalized, as I suggested above (intro. to hymn comm.) for all occurrences of the name in this hymn. Under this analysis *hī* would be in its standard 2nd position; see the same configuration in 12c *bṛhaspátīḥ sá hī* ..., where the coreferential pronoun *sá* underlines the extraclausality of the immediately preceding name in the same case. Further, in 11d *bṛhaspátir bhinát* ... it is easiest to explain the accent on the verb *bhinát* if it is actually first in its clause (same explanation for the repeated pāda in I.62.3) – the accent on *āmata* in our vs. can be ascribed to the presence of *hī*, though under the extraclausal analysis it would also be clause initial. Finally, in 1d the apparent second position of the preverb *abhi* in tmesis – *bṛhaspátim abhy ārkā anāvan* makes better sense if it is notionally initial after extraclausal *bṛhaspátim*, since preverbs in tmesis ordinarily move to first position (though the position after the caesura, as here, is not infrequent). In the publ. tr. I did not mark off the occurrences of *bṛhaspátī-* typographically (with dash or sim.) because I think it would be distracting.

All the standard interpr. construe *sádane* with *gúhā yát* (e.g., Ge “der an de Orte verborgen war”). I do not, because *gúhā yát* is a pāda-final formulaic tag, at most preceded by *paramám*, which does not further participate in the clause to which it’s attached beyond modifying a neuter noun earlier in its clause (*nāma* in this case). Interestingly the tag is only found in the RV in Maṇḍala X, though *gúhā* and *gúhya-* are common throughout. The occurrences: X.45.2, 61.13, 68.7, 85.16 (=AV XIV.1.6) [*yád gúhā*], 181.2; AV I.13.3, II.1.1, 2.

The simile in c has tied interpr. in knots, primarily because they want to make some bird or other the agent of *bhittvā*, either the baby birds inside the eggs (Ge, HPS, Lu 522) or the mother bird (Re), all these birds being in fact invented. See Mau’s useful n. on the passage, though his English deserts him in his own unparsable tr. In addition to the invented birds, some of these interpr. seem to assume that acc. *gárbham* is the agent of *bhittvā* in the simile, which is syntactically impossible. As Ge says somewhat despairingly (n. 7cd), the simile “ist etwas schief

geraten.” The problem is that they all assume that *gárbham* in c must be part of the simile; the difficulty disappears if we take *gárbham* with the frame, with *párvatasya* in d dependent on it. *gárbham* is then the object of *bhittvā*, parallel to *āṇḍā* in the simile: “having split the *gárbha* of the mountain like the eggs of a bird.” Although *gárbham* is somewhat more distant from its genitive than I would like, the phrase exists; see V.45.3 *párvatasya gárbhaḥ* adduced by Old and see also Ge’s n. 7d. And the “womb of the mountain” is a fine description of the Vala cave with the cows inside.

X.68.8: The simile in c is a bit slippery. From ab, where the cows are simply enclosed by the stone, we expect *nīḥ ... jabhāra* in c to depict a simple removal. But the simile “like a cup from a tree” assumes the shaping and crafting of what was removed into an object of artifice: a cup, not just a block of wood.

X.68.9: Most of the first hemistich is a near variant of X.67.5cd in the immediately preceding hymn: *bṛhaspátir uśásam sūryam gām, arkám viveda ...* versus our *sóṣām avindat sá svàḥ só agnīm, só arkéna ...* This close agreement is all the more surprising since there are very few verbal echoes between the two hymns, despite their kinship and shared subject matter. In our passage “fire” substitutes for “cow,” as the third object of ‘find’, but “cows” should be supplied as the obj. of *nīḥ ... jabhāra* in the second hemistich.

The second simile with *nīḥ ... jabhāra*, flg. directly on the one in 8c, is less daring, though still striking.

X.68.10: The simile in ab is neatly structured: both simile and frame are tripartite, with nom. subj. (woods / Vala), acc. object (leaves / cows), instr. agent of stealing (cold / Bṛhaspati). Connecting the subject and the object is the verb *akṛpayat* ‘lamented’, found overtly only in the frame but shared by simile and frame; connecting the object and the agent is the ppl. *muṣitā* ‘stolen’, found overtly only in the simile but shared by simile and frame.

X.68.11: The first three pādas of this vs. seem at best loosely connected with the Bṛhaspati / Vala theme. Although, as Mau (n.) suggests, Bṛhaspati’s freeing of the cows from Vala can be seen as an act of creation, with the Pitars joining in the cosmogonic fun, the specificity of the decorating of the night sky and the day sky seems different from the usual blaze of dawn after the opening of the cave. It seems possible that the alternate rising of sun and moon in 10d suggested this particular treatment.

The ornamenting of the dusky horse in pāda a is reminiscent of the Aśvamedha when the Wives of the king/sacrificer weave jewels into the hair of the horse just before it is sacrificed (see SW/SW 99–100 with reff.).

Pāda c is a perfect syntactic palindrome: LOC<sub>1</sub> ACC<sub>1</sub> VERB ACC<sub>2</sub> LOC<sub>2</sub>, with the verb equally applicable to both VPs. Or, as Re says dismissively, “chiasme banal.”

The last pāda, which is the final pāda of the hymn before the summary vs., briskly summarizes Bṛhaspati’s accomplishment: “he split the rock; he found the cows,” an abrupt and terse end to an elaborate hymn. For the accent on *bhinát* see comm. ad vs. 7 above and I.62.3, where the pāda is also found.

X.68.12: As indicated just above, this is clearly a summary vs. standing outside the hymn proper, whose content was just boiled down in the last pāda of the preceding vs. (11d). The near-deictic

*idám* and the aorist *akarma* at the beginning of 12 locate the vs. in the ritual here-and-now, referring to the hymn, called an “(act of) reverence” (*námaḥ*), that was just recited.

The vs. also forms a ring with the first vs. of the hymn: the fairly rare word *abhríya-* ‘belonging to a cloud’ is found in both (1b, 12a), and the verb *ānónavīti* (12b) echoes two verbal forms in vs. 1: *anāvan* (1d) by root ( $\sqrt{nū}$ ), *vāvadataḥ* (1b) by morphology (both intensives), as well, of course, as semantics. Interestingly, the referent of *abhríya-* / subject of *ānónavīti* in 12 is Br̥haspati, but that is not the case in vs. 1.

Pāda b has only 10 syllables, and there is no obvious fix. HvN suggest a rest at syllable 4, which seems the best solution: *ānu ānónavīti* handily fills the post-caesura slot.

The referent of *pūrvīḥ* is unclear, at least to me. The standard tr. supply voices or the sounds of thunder vel sim., which Br̥haspati is imitating; see, e.g., HPS (222) “der viele (Stimmen dem Donner) nachbrüllt.” (Similarly, but not identically, Mau sees the “many” as our praise hymns.) This strikes me as a rather distant notion to attach to the unspecified “many” and not in accord with the use of *ānu*  $\sqrt{nū}$  elsewhere. It is possible that *pūrvīḥ* signals a time period, as often (e.g., IV.19.8 *pūrvīr uśasaḥ śarādaś ca* ... “for many dawns and autumns”). However, I think this less likely than that *pūrvīḥ* refers to the feminine beings after which Br̥haspati bellows. The lexeme *ānu*  $\sqrt{nū}$  takes an acc. of the longed-for object in both I.80.9 and VIII.82.33, and it is not difficult to supply the likely fem. acc. here: “cows” (also secondarily suggested by Re in his n.). Surely his freeing of the cows did not end Br̥haspati’s fond engagement with them: he yearned for them still.

On the opening of c, *bṛhaspātiḥ sá*, see disc. ad vs. 7.

The lack of accent on the verb *dhāt* is surprising to me, since it must still be part of the *hí* clause begun in c, given the sequence of *sá* + instr. that unifies cd. Also surprising is the fact that no one comments on the absence (not even Old!). I would explain it by the fact that *váyo dhāḥ* (/ *dhāt*) is a common hemistich ending (II.4.9; III.29.8, 51.6; IV.17.18; VI.40.1, 4; IX.90.6; X.46.10 [also pāda final in X.30.12]), where the verb is never accented. Either the poet simply reverted to this formulaic usage or the redactors adjusted it to that usage.

## X.69–70

One hymn addressed to Agni, the other an Āprī hymn. The Anukr. ascribes them both to Sumitra B/Vādhryaśva, both names extracted from X.69. Although Vadhryaśva and the associated vṛddhied patronymic do appear to be PNs, *sumitrá-*, which occurs 5x in X.69, is best taken in its literal sense ‘good ally, having good allies’. As for *vadhryaśvá-*, that an original bahuvrīhi ‘having gelded horses’ was reinterpr as a PN may be shown by the final accent (*vadhri-aśvá-*); we would otherwise expect \**vādhri-aśva-*, with standard b-v accent like *vādhri-vāc-* (VII.18.9).

## X.69 Agni

On the subject matter of the hymn, see publ. intro. The language is for the most part straightforward, at least superficially, but there are some twists. For much of the hymn the verses proceed in pairs; they are not technically Pragāthas, but they mirror and complete each other thematically and often share phraseology.

X.69.1–2: The first two vss. are not tightly bound, but they share the phrase *ghṛténāhutaḥ* (1d, 2c).

X.69.1: The two supposed PN *vadhryaśvá-* and *sumitrá-* that provide the poet's name in the Anukr. are both found in this 1st vs. As noted above (intro. to X.69–70), *sumitrá-* is better taken in its literal sense.

X.69.3–4: On the shared features of this pair, see disc. ad 4.

X.69.3: The double *yád* phrases, sharing the same verb *samīdhé* but paired with two different nominatives, clearly refer to two occasions in the past when the ritual fire was kindled, starting with the primordial institution of the sacrifice by Manu. The main clause *tád idám nāvīyaḥ* then points to the ritual fire right here and emphasizes both its identity with those previous fires and its novelty. None of the standard renderings (Ge, Re, Proferes) fully registers the repeated *yád* s; Re, esp., seems to have missed the point.

The 2nd hemistich has four occurrences of *sá* with 2nd ps. reference, each matched with an imperative (or imperative substitute like injunc. *dhāh*) by (my) rule.

X.69.4: The first hemistich is modeled on 3ab:

*yát te ..., samīdhé agne tád idám ...*

*yám tvā ..., samīdhé agne sá idám ...*

4a adds another previous (*pūrvam*) kindling of the fire to those in 3ab, but this one is temporally close, since the kindler is Vadhryaśva, whose fire is the focus of this hymn. He is thus associated, in his first kindling, with the primal sacrificer Manu, but he is also responsible for a new kindling, in pāda b.

The referent of neut. *idám* in b is not specified. In the paired expression in 3b, it is Agni's *ānīkam*, and I supply that here as well. Ge suggests rather the hymn and the sacrifice, perhaps basing himself partly on *sá gíro juṣasva* in c, matching 4b *sá idám juṣasva* save for the object. Re supplies "sacrifice," though in his n. he says that *idám* stands for the *gírah* in the phrase in 3c; Proferes just "this." The parallelism of 3ab and 4ab seems to me to impose the *ānīkam* interpr.

Vadhryaśva is "solemnly invoked" (*īlitá-*) at the first kindling in 4a. This ppl. ordinarily characterizes Agni, but Agni esp. in his role as Hotar (see, e.g., VII.7.3 *agnír īlitó ná hótā*). The use of this term suggests that Vadhryaśva must have served as Hotar on that occasion and also implicitly identifies him with Agni, that is, with his own ritual fire.

X.69.5–6: Like vss. 3 and 4, this pair should be read together. It is the near repetition of 5c by 6c that allows us to identify "the son of Vadhryaśva" with Agni, on which see Proferes (40–41).

X.69.5: Note the solemn and ceremonial *prá nú vocam* "I shall now proclaim," which links the announcement to others like it (e.g., I.32.1) and establishes the importance of the *name* of Vadhryaśva's son. The name is presumably "Agni," given in the next, paired vs., but not till pāda d.

X.69.6: The first hemistich flirts with another contender for the name of V's son, namely Indra, who is the usual conquerer of obstacles (*vṛtrāṇi*). And of course Indra is the target of *prá vocam* in I.32.1 just alluded to.

X.69.7–8: The second hemistichs of both vss. are paired: the instr. pl. + pass. phrase in 7c *nṛbhīḥ mṛjyāmānaḥ* is expanded in 8cd to *nṛbhīr dākṣiṇāvadbhīḥ ... sumitrébhīr idhyase devayádbhīḥ*,

with the last two instr. also matching the loc. pl. of 7d *sumitréṣu ... devayátsu* in the same metrical position. The close pairing of the 2nd halves of these vss. draws attention to the sharp thematic contrast between the barren cows (*-starī-*) in 7b and the milch-cow (*dhenú-*) of 8ab.

X.69.7: Once again the phrase *ayám agníḥ* “this fire here” emphasizes the immediacy of the new fire. This suggests that *dīrghá-tantu-*, lit. ‘having a long thread’, should be interpr. with Proferes as referring to the “long line (of ancestors),” some of which we have met in vss. 3–4. The fire in front of us may be new, but it has deep roots.

The lofty bulls (*brhád-ukṣan-*) by contrast are probably his flames, as Ge suggests.

The puzzling descriptor is *sahásra-starī-* ‘having a thousand barren cows’, esp. since the barren cows seem to substitute for the harmless and well-integrated *-cetas-* found in the otherwise identical pāda I.100.12 *sahásracetāḥ śatānītha ṛbhvā* “of a thousand insights and a hundred counsels, skillful.” (Curiously, Bl [RVReps] finds our version “insipid,” an adj. I’d be more likely to apply to I.100.12.) Ge finds no clear reason for the barren cows (n. 7b), while Re and Old are silent on them. The impetus for their appearance here is, I think, to be found in the name of the fire’s owner and producer, Vadhryaśva. Since his name literally means ‘having gelded horses’, his clan fire matches the nomenclatural model with “having a thousand sterile cows’, with equally deficient livestock – a deprecatory model that reaches back into prehistory, most famously in Zarathustra ‘having old camels’ (by most interpr.). Happily we need not worry too much about the reality of this description, since in the next vs. Agni is credited with a ‘milch-cow’ (*dhenú-*), whose fecund productivity is described at length.

X.69.8: On the *dhenú-* see comm. just above.

With Ge and Re (contra Gr, Old, who interpr. it as an instr. sg.), I take *asaścatā* as a dual fem. referring to Heaven and Earth. The same form is used of them in I.160.2 and *ásaścantī* of the same in VI.70.2.

Ge takes *dákṣiṇāvant-* as referring to the dispensers of Dakṣiṇās, namely, the Sūris or patrons, who, in his view, are the referents of *nṛbhiḥ* in 7c, 8c, 9d, and 11b. Since in all these occurrences but 9d (which is non-diagnostic) these men are ritual officiants, kindling (8c) and tending (7c) the fire and providing pressed soma (11b), they should be receiving the Dakṣiṇā, at least by later custom.

X.69.9–10: This pair of vss. don’t share much phraseology or syntactic structure, but they are thematically (and partly lexically) connected. In both, Agni is identified as the son of Vadhryaśva and the beneficiary of his service, which enables Agni to overcome opponents. The patronymic voc. *vādhryaśva* takes the same position in 9b as the name *vadhryaśvāḥ* in 10b. And the nearly synonymous 2nd sg. imperfects *ajayaḥ* and *avanoḥ* take the same positions in 9d and 10d. We can also note two different words that play off the PN. Vadhryaśva: (*tvā*)*vṛdhebhīḥ* (9d) and *vṛādhataḥ* (10d).

X.69.9: As disc. in IV.18.2, I would now tr. *sampīcham* as ‘to consult’. As Proferes (41) points out, the *mānuṣīr víśaḥ* “clans of the sons of Manu” are Agni’s (and Vadhryaśva’s) own people, come to take counsel about an external threat (c), and it is with these men that Agni conquers in d. The publ. tr. makes the clans sound as if they’re the enemy.

I would now slightly emend the tr. of d to “whose strengthener is you,” to match *vṛdhāḥ* in 11d, if that analysis is correct.

X.69.10: In pāda a *abibhar* is better read *abibharr* (< \*-rt). See comm. ad VII.75.1 and Old.

The identity of those whom Agni vanquishes in d is not made explicit, and contextual clues pull in two different directions. On the one hand, the next vs. (11a) proclaims the victory of Vadhryaśva's fire over rivals (*śatrūn*); the default interpr. would probably be of human rivals, enemies outside the domain of Vadhryaśva. This seems to be the Ge/Proferes interpr. On the other, *pūrvān* 'previous, former' echoes *pūrvam* in 4a, where it referred to a fire that Vadhryaśva had kindled previously, to which the current one is superior. This accounts for my tr. "the former (fires)," as also Re "(les Agni) antérieurs," sim. JSK (DGRV I.381). I think both might be meant (as Re rather awkwardly seems to indicate in his n.).

The position of *utā* is somewhat odd, but acdg. to JSK (same ref.) it joins the second hemistich with the first, despite appearing at the beginning of d. He adduces several similar exx.

On the formation and sense of *vrādhant-* see comm. ad X.49.8. We already noted the phonological similarity between this stem and the name *vadhryaśvá-*.

X.69.11–12: These two vss. do not seem twinned. Rather, vs. 11 gathers up a number of the elements of the immediately preceding vss., while vs. 12 is a hymn-summary vs.

X.69.11: In b *nībhīr jigāya* matches 9d ... *nībhīr ajayaḥ*, with both instr. *nībhīḥ* modified by a pāda-final instr. In d there reappear both *vrādhantam* (see 10d) and *vr̥dhá-*, reinforcing the play with Vadhryaśva's name noted above.

The publ. tr., along with Ge and Proferes, tr. *sutásomavant-* as if it were synonymous with the well-attested bahuvrīhi *sutásoma-*, with a pleonastic possessive suffix *-vant-*. However, Re (and in fact Gr) must be correct that *-vant-* here signals accompaniment (like *índra-marútvant-* "Indra along with the Maruts"). I would now alter the tr. to "by means of the (aforementioned) men along with those who have pressed soma." The men (*nībhīḥ*) are the same as those in 9d.

There is disagreement about the identity of *vr̥dháh* in d. The publ. tr. follows Sāy., Gr, and Proferes in taking it as the nom. sg. of the thematic stem *vr̥dhá-*, found also in the cmpd *tvā-vr̥dha-* in 9d. Ge and Re take it rather as the abl. of the root noun *vr̥dh-* and construe it with *vrādhantam*, which functions (for them) as a quasi-comparative: Ge "... die stärker fühlte als selbst der Starke" (see his n. 11d and Re's n.). This would cleverly bring *vrādhant-* and *vr̥dh-* into conjunction and would also account for the position of *cid*. But this otherwise has little to recommend it, since *vrādhant-* is not a comparative, and Ge's supplying of extra material verges on the reckless. True – a nom. sg. *vr̥dháh* is rhetorically a little flat, and the *cid* has nothing to do, but that hardly disqualifies it. The *cid* may have the position it does to emulate the vs.-final *cid* in 10d.

X.69.12: This summary vs. begins with the annunciatory *ayám agnīḥ* "here is Agni," found also, less prominently, in 7a.

Another phonological play on Vadhryaśva: *vr̥tra(-hán-)*. This sonic link may help account for the application of this Indraic epithet to Agni (though this is not the only such occasion), but the emphatic militancy of Vadhryaśva's fire provides another reason. It might be better rendered 'smasher of obstacles', although this would lose the phonological echo.

*vījāmi-*, clearly playing off *ājāmi-*, is a hapax and has been variously rendered. The publ. tr. ‘estranged kin’ (with *vī* ‘apart’) is due to JPB and seems the most persuasive of the possibilities.

### X.70 Āprī

One of the two Āprī hymns in Maṇḍala X (the other being X.110). Re tr. in EVP XIV.47ff. There are connections esp. with the Āprī hymn VII.2.

X.70.1: For reasons unclear to me both Ge and Re tr. the instr. *devayajyā* as a dative.

X.70.2: I take *ṛtasya pathā* in c with ab, as more appropriate with a verb of motion (*yātu* in a) than with *√sūd* in d; cf. I.129.9 *yāhī pathāṁ anehāsā* “drive along a faultless path” as well as exx. with other verbs of motion. However, the existence of other exx. of the sequence *ṛtasya pathā nāmasā* (I.128.2, X.31.2) does give me pause. Ge and Re take the hemistich break as the syntactic break, in contrast to my enjambment, which I still weakly prefer.

With Ge, Old, and Re, I take *miyédhaḥ* as belonging to a neut. *s*-stem, not the thematic *miyédha-* found elsewhere. As Old points out, in other Āprī hymns at the corresponding point we find an obj. *havyām*, *yajñām* et sim.

X.70.4–6: The part. *uśánt-* ‘(being) eager’ figures prominently in these vss. (4d, 5c, 6c [2x]); see also 9d.

X.70.4: Note the pleasing etymological and phonetic figure *dīrghām drāghmā*. On the instr. sg. *drāghmā* (only here) to *drāgh(i)mán-* see AiG III.268. It is striking that the following vs. contains another instr. to a *-mán-*stem, *mahinā* (5c) with a different shape. We might have expected \**drāgh(i)nā* here.

X.70.5: Ge (n. 5a and see Re’s tr.) is quite insistent that *vārīyaḥ* is adverbial and does not modify *sānu*, as I take it. This is possible, but I don’t know what “touch more widely” means, and both Ge and Re have to introduce some extra verbiage to make it make sense. See also 8a.

Contra Pp. but with all standard interpr., gen. *prthivyāḥ*, not instr. *prthivyā*.

The apparent nom. sg. *rathayūḥ* is the problem in b, as also in the very similar Āprī vs. VII.2.5. We should expect a fem. nom. pl. here and a fem. acc. pl. in VII.2.5. Old (ad VII.2.5) simply suggests sg. for pl. (accepted by Wack., AiG III.159). But surely this substitution was occasioned by uncertainty on the part of the poet, or the redactors, as to what the fem. pl. form to such a stem should be. I therefore am sympathetic to Gr’s *-yūs* for \**-yūs*. In any case I don’t know what the chariot is doing here.

X.70.7: Given the position of adverbial neut. *brhāt*, it could go with both NPs. I suggest a minor adjustment to the tr.: “the pressing stone is loftily upright; the fire has been loftily kindled.”

The phrasing of pāda b may seem somewhat opaque, but its purport seems clear. The “lap of Aditi” (e.g., IX.26.1, 71.5, 74.5; X.5.7) is generally a kenning for the ritual ground. The point here is that the ritual fire and the pressing stone both have their places there. (Somewhat different, Ge and Re.) For the kindling of the fire in the lap of Aditi, see X.5.7. In the publ. tr. I would erase the ? after “ground.”



The keyword in this vs. is *ṛtvijā*, substituting for the standard *daívyā hótārā* at this point in Āprī hymns.

X.70.8: As in 5a, *vārīyaḥ* is placed pāda-final, following a neut. noun (*barhīḥ* in this case). I take it as modifying this noun; Ge and Re as adverbial. I doubt that the goddesses are urged to sit as far apart as possible, as a species of social distancing; rather, that the barhis has been widely spread. See, e.g., I.85.6 *sīdatā barhír urú vaḥ sádas kṛtām* “Sit on the barhis; a wide seat has been made for you.”

X.70.9: In the Āprī hymns Tvaṣṭar, as shaper of creatures and releaser of the semen that produces them, is also called on, conversely, to start the journey of one of his created creatures, the sacrificial animal, to its death, a task continued by Vanaspati “Lord of the Forest” (=sacrificial post), who occupies the next vs. in the litany. Because of the taint of death, both the Tvaṣṭar and Vanaspati vss. in Āprī hymns are often euphemistic and/or underdeveloped, and our vs. is no exception. (For further on Tvaṣṭar and Vanaspati and their occasional conflation, see comm. ad II.3.9.) In pāda a “has attained/achieved loveliness” (*cārutvām ānaḥ*) is a reference to Tvaṣṭar’s role as the shaper of creatures, as Ge (n. 9a) points out. Re suggests that the phrase has a loose connection to the epithet *viśvā-rūpa-* ‘having/providing all forms’ that is used of Tvaṣṭar in other Āprī hymns. I do not understand the connection of the Aṅgirasas in pāda b.

Pāda c is almost identical to 10b, addressed to Vanaspati, and so Tvaṣṭar is essentially identified with Vanaspati here, as sending the sacrificial animal “into the fold of the gods.” However, because of its inauspicious nature it contains neither verb nor object. The verb can be supplied from *vakṣi* (‘convey’) in 10b, but the victim is never directly expressed in the Āprī hymns. The object is either gapped or the anodyne ‘oblation’ (*havís-*) is substituted; see *havīṃṣi* in the second hemistich of 10.

X.70.10: The gerund phrase in pāda a, *raśanáyā niyūyā* “harnessing with a halter” comes closer than other Āprī hymns to acknowledging the animal victim. The object is still gapped, but one doesn’t harness a generic *havís-* with a halter.

#### [X.71–72 JPB]

#### X.73–74

Two hymns to Indra attributed to Gaurivīti Śāktya. The Anukr. also attributes to him V.29, another Indra hymn, where the poet names himself in vs. 11, and the first two vss. of IX.108. On possible thematic connections between V.29 and IX.108.1–2 see comm. ad IX.108.1–2; for possible thematic connections between V.29 and X.73 see comm. ad X.73.8.

#### X.73 Indra

On the structure and contents of this difficult hymn, see the publ. intro. Caland-Henry give a complete (though very loose) translation, pp. 301ff., and HPS treats the hymn in a 2002 article, “R̥gveda 10.73” (StII 23).

X.73.1: Note the rhyming forms at the beginning and end of the vs.: # *jāniṣṭhā(h)* ... (d)*hāniṣṭhā*, though they are morphologically distinct: 2nd sg. mid. injunctive and fem. superlative respectively.

The adj. *ugrá-* in pāda a is matched by its superlative *ójiṣṭha-* in b, whose etymological identity would have been clear to Vedic speakers despite their phonological divergence.

On the various meanings of *abhí√man* see comm. ad X.27.11. Here I think the sense is ‘designs on / intentions towards’, i.e., ‘plans’. I don’t know where Ge gets his “von reichlichem Selbstgefühl.”

The pf. subj. *dadhánat* is anomalous in two ways: 1) it appears to be transitive, though most of the other forms of the pf. of *√dhan* are intransitive (with the possible exception of *dadhanvān* in X.113.2) (see Kü 255–56); 2) it does not have the usual value of the perfect subjunctive. As I established in my article on the perfect subjunctive (García Ramón Fs.), the vast majority of these forms supply the only subjunctives to their roots and have simple subjunctive value (“will/shall X”) without any “perfect” nuance at all. However, such an interpr. does not work here: the form is in a subordinate clause, whose main clause has an imperfect (*ávardhan*), and the whole refers to the mythic past, the birth of Indra. As far as I can see, it is not possible to avoid interpr. *dadhánat* as a past prospective (Kü 156: “Prospektiv der Vergangenheit”) “was going to set to running / moving.” Whether the two anomalous features are related is not clear.

We might, however, try to figure out the mythological situation being depicted. And in my view this requires taking a closer look at the superlative that ends the vs.: *dhániṣṭhā*. On the surface, we have a straightforward, somewhat banal, etymological figure *dadhánad dhániṣṭhā* “(she), the best runner, was going to set (him) to running.” However, in this sandhi position, the superlative could also stand for *hániṣṭhā* to *√han* ‘smite’. Recall that Indra’s birth was a troubled one, at least as depicted in the famous hymn IV.18, where Indra in utero declines to be born vaginally and instead comes out of his mother’s side (IV.18.1–2). I wonder if *√han* in a birthing context could refer to what is called “pushing” in modern English: the movements the mother makes to expel the fetus from the birth canal: “slamming” might be what *√han* expresses. Thus “best at pushing/slamming” would identify Indra’s mother as possessing the skill and strength to give birth even to Indra, despite his prodigious qualities. I also wonder if *dadhánat* refers to the movement of the baby through the birth canal: “she, best at pushing, was going to set him in motion.” The perfect subjunctive here might express a potential thwarted: she was going to make him move through the birth canal, but he went out her side instead.

Alternatively, we might consider the rather confused situation depicted later in IV.18. At various points in that hymn it seems that his mother abandons him and goes away (IV.18.3, also 4, 8), which could fit with the reading *dhániṣṭhā* “(she) best at running (away).” But closest to our phrase is the sequence in IV.18.10–11, in which (in my interpr.) his mother “impelled her calf to wander” (10a, c ... *sasūva* ... *vatsāṇ caráthāya mātā*) and then followed after him (11a *utā mātā mahiṣām ānv avenat*). Our *dadhánat* could correspond to vs. 10 and *dhániṣṭhā* to 11a – though I prefer my birth interpr. A final alternative interpr. of *dadhánat* could take it as intransitive, referring to the mother’s own running, following after her son, as in IV.18.11a.

So, to summarize, I have suggested three different interpr. of the obscure pāda d, one depicting the birth itself, two soon after the birth:

1) When the mother, best at pushing/slamming, was going to set the hero in motion [=expel him from the birth canal].

2) When the mother, best at running [/smiting], was going to set the hero to run [=send him away from her].

3) When the mother, best at running, was going to run after the hero [after she had sent him away].

I prefer no. 1.

Any of these interpr. rests on taking IV.18 as a widespread, fairly standard depiction of Indra's birth – an assumption that we can, of course, not count on. One thing that calls into question my use of IV.18 as background for our vs. is the fact that the Maruts do not figure in IV.18, though in X.73.1 they occupy the main clause (c) on which our *yád* clause is dependent. I do not know other references to Indra's birth that involve the Maruts.

X.73.2: This vs. is considerably more baffling than even the one before. But we do have one thing to hang onto: pāda b ... *vāṛdhuṣ tá índram* echoes 1c *āvardhann índram* ... Since the Maruts are the subject in 1c, they are likely the referents of *té* in 2b. This further suggests that the female in 2a is identical to the mother in 1d. The pādas in the two hemistichs are simply flipped: 1cd: Maruts / Indra's mother; 2ab Indra's mother / Maruts. This is essentially Ge's view of the structure too (n. 2a), though I don't quite understand his view of the sense of pāda a.

It further seems that the fine plans that Indra's mother had in 1d have not come to pass, and she is considerably chastened (*nīṣattā* 'sunk down'). I agree with Ge that what has reduced her to this state are the "ways of deceit / the activities of the Lie," referring to harm intended for her infant Indra by enemies, not any hostile actions against him on her part. But the enemy/enemies is/are not identified. Old is in general agreement, though he considers the possibility that it is the mother whose hostility against her son is at issue. He also toys with the female as the Maruts' mother, on the basis of the similarity between the word *prśanī* and the Maruts' mother *Prśni*, but though a phonological play is surely intended, the structure of the passages imposes Indra's mother.

Despite her demoralized state, she still expresses affection for the newborn – or so I interpr. *prśanī*. On the fem. stem *prśanī* as well as related forms, see comm. ad IX.97.54. The two fem. pl. forms *prśanyās* (I.71.5, IX.97.54) seem to mean 'caresses' (Re EVP XVI.137: "gestes d'amour pour attirer"), but our nom. sg. occurrence must refer to a person and hence an agent: caresser, one who caresses. I do not, with Ge and Re (loc. cit.), think it has developed here to mean 'courtesan' or the like: Ge Buhlerin, EWA Liebeslockung, Buhlerin, Kurtisane. Rather, Indra's mother is bestowing affection on her newborn, despite the circumstances.

Starting with the 2nd hemistich of this vs. through the first one of vs. 5, the contents become extremely obscure, though much of it seems to concern prodigious births and Indra's part in them. For my quite speculative interpr. see publ. intro.

With most others I take *tā* as neut. pl. referring to the worlds or beings (see Ge n. 2cd). They are "covered over" (*abhīṣṛtā*) by a great footprint (*mahāpadéna*) that seems to obstruct light and movement, but the same covering seems to have sexual overtones (as in a cow "covered" by a bull), given the immediate production of *gárbhas* in the next pāda. It seems likely that the footprint is Indra's, since his feet feature in the next vs., 3a.

Ge (n. 2d) takes the embryos as everything that comes out of the darkness, esp. rivers and the lights of heaven – which makes it sound like a mash-up of the *Vṛtra* and *Vala* myths. Old suggests d depicts the Maruts' birth, but gives no evidence. I'm more inclined to see the referents as generic living beings, which could be generated by a sexual encounter – since it seems likely that Indra impregnated the worlds when he covered them with his big "foot." But since I really don't know what's going on in these vss., I am not insistent.

X.73.3: As was just noted, Indra's "lofty feet" (*ṛṣvā ... pādā*) here suggest that the big foot of 2a is also Indra's.

In b Indra is once again strengthened (*āvardhan*), but his strengtheners are no longer the Maruts as in 1c and probably 2d), but the Vājas and unspecified others who were on the scene (*utá yé cid átra*). Caland-Henry (302) think these latter are the Maruts, and the repetition of *cid átra* from 1c might support this identification. As for the Vājas, Ge, flg. Sāy., takes them to be the Ṛbhus. It is certainly the case that plural *vāja-* is used of, or at least adjacent to, the Ṛbhus (e.g., IV.36.2–4, 7), but the Ṛbhus aren't, as far as I know, ordinarily implicated in Indra's birth or strengthening.

Pāda c brings the surprising intrusion of the hyenas (*sālāvṛkān*), a thousand of which Indra takes into his mouth. Ge (n. 3c) thinks this is a measure of the great size of Indra's mouth, esp. given the fearsomeness of the jaws of the hyenas. He explicitly denies that the mention here has anything to do with the "bekannte Sage," in which Indra feeds a group of priests to hyenas. As I discuss in my extensive treatment of this "well-known saga" (*Ravenous Hyenas*, 1991), I think Ge is wrong here. The word *sālāvṛká-* and its relatives are rare in Vedic; it only occurs twice in the RV, and only once in connection with Indra. It seems extremely unlikely that the widespread Brāhmaṇa story (already in Saṃhitā prose) of Indra and the hyenas isn't in the poet's mind. I treat this RVic passage in *Hyenas* pp. 78–79 and argue that our RVic passage depicts a scene of parental tenderness: adult hyenas carry their young in their mouths like cats. Here I think the *gārbhas* that Indra generated in 2cd are now being carted around in his mouth.

But the scene shifts abruptly to current-day ritual, and Indra is urged to turn the Aśvins our way, presumably to the early morning sacrifice that they are esp. associated with.

X.73.4: The journey of Indra and the Aśvins continues in 4ab, with 4b a slightly elaborated version of the last two words of 3cd (*aśvínā vavṛtyāḥ*). But in the second half of the vs. we return to matters of procreation in the past.

The adv. *samanā* 'in the same way' must refer to Indra's repetition of his habitual journey to the sacrifice. It may also be meant to play off *sānāmānā* in 6a, likewise vs.-initial. Gr suggests that in this passage *samanā* introduces the first clause in a coordinated structure "sowohl ... als auch," and a similar interpr. seems to underlie Caland-Henry's "En même temps que ..." (302), but this adverb is not otherwise so used, and in any case I think we'd expect the first verb to be accented.

The rendering of *sakhyāya* as 'fellowship' in the publ. tr. would be better as "for comradeship" to harmonize with *sākhibhiḥ* in 5b.

The difficult 2nd hemistich is parallel to the difficult 2nd hemistich of 3:

3cd *tvám indra sālāvṛkān sahasram, āsān dadhiṣe (I) aśvínā ...*

4cd *vasāvyām indra dhārayaḥ sahasrā, (I) aśvínā ...*

The points of contact include the direct object 'thousand(s)' (*sahasram, sahasrā*), a 2nd sg. verb 'take, hold, make fast' (*dadhiṣe, dhārayaḥ*), a loc. indicating where the thousand(s) are held (*āsān, vasāvyām*), and an abrupt shift to a new clause beginning *aśvínā* -- as well as a voc. *indra* (the least important point of contact). Though both half-verses are difficult to interpr., they should be interpreted in tandem, or at least as deliberately contrastive. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think 4cd is another depiction of prodigious birth, with Indra engendering thousands of offspring in a single female. I don't think that these thousands are the same ones Indra was carrying in his mouth in the previous vs. – though that is far from excluded, esp. if we take 3cd as chronologically later than 4cd (as often in RVic recountings of myth). But whether they are narratively connected or not, the point is that Indra is responsible for massive fertility.

The otherwise unknown female *vasāṇvī* can be either the wife of a/the good one (*vāsu-*) or of someone named Vasu (see Mayr. PN s.v.). I favor the former, since Indra's fecundity is clearly viewed favorably.

X.73.5: In my view, the first hemistich summarizes the accounts in the last few vss. of Indra's generative powers: Indra achieved his goal (*ārtham*, b), which was to produce progeny (*prajāyāi*, a; on *prajāyāi* as a quasi-infinitive see also VII.36.9 and possibly the preceding hymn, X.72.9). He did so "from truth" (*ṛtād ādhi*), that is (probably), from his adherence to the sacrificial model and to proper procedures. See I.36.11 where Agni is kindled *ṛtād ādhi*. My interpr. of the sense would be clearer with some rearrangement: "... with his vigorous comrades Indra (went) to his goal, to produce progeny from truth."

Indra reached his goal along with, or with the help of, his comrades (*sākhibhiḥ*). Although Indra has been prominently associated with the Aśvins in the last few vss, (3d, 4b, d) and indeed he conveyed them "for comradeship" (*sakhyāya*) in 4b, the plural of *sākhibhiḥ* cannot be exclusively identified with the two Aśvins. Perhaps, with Sāy., the Maruts (see Ge n. 5b), who figured in vss. 1–2, or all the sidekicks previously named: the Maruts, the Vājas (*Ṛbhus*?) and the others there at the time (3b), as well as the Aśvins.

The topic of procreation is now at an end, and the poet turns to more usual Indraic fare, his great victories over enemies. The first up is a *dasyú-* who may well be Vṛtra, since the foe has *māyāś* (see I.32.4 *māyínām ... māyāḥ* "the wiles of the wily one [=Vṛtra]") and the battle takes place amid mists (*mīhaḥ*) and darkness that have been scattered (see I.32.13), both passages in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32. I do have to note that Namuci is rendered "without wiles" (*vīmāya-*) in 7b, so it is possible that Namuci is the referent here.

Essentially all comm. and tr. supply *māyābhiḥ* with *ābhiḥ* in c, for good reason.

Again with all comm. and tr. (Ge, C-H 302, Lü 180, HPS), I take the *hī* cl. of c with the main cl. of d.

X.73.6: The action and personnel (besides Indra) in the first hemistich are not clear. As for personnel, there are two "of the same name" (*sānāmanā*) as well as a singleton in the dative. If we start with the latter, we can begin to unravel the passage, for the dative is the unaccented *asmai*, which must refer to a referent already in the discourse. In my view, this can only be the *dasyú-* of 5c – though Ge (n. 6a) suggests rather Namuci, who figures in vs. 7, and HPS also considers this possibility. However, unaccented *asmai* speaks against this (unless Namuci is the *dasyú* in 5c, which is possible but less likely than Vṛtra, in my opinion – despite *vīmāya-* in 7b; see disc. just above).

To get closer to an identification of the two "of the same name," we must first tackle the verb *nī dhvasayaḥ*. The stem *dhvasāya-* (3x) belongs to the root *√dhvam*s 'smoke' (in my view), and as I discussed in my *-āya*-Formations monograph (54–55), I consider all three occurrences intransitive, in the sense 'smoke, produce smoke'. The two occurrences of the participle in I.140.3, 5 refer to Agni and his flames respectively, and an intransitive sense seems to me clear, though those who wish to impose a transitive interpr. (like Ge) supply objects. The occurrence here is generally taken as transitive; see not only Ge, but Gotō (1st Class, 60 and 190, with lit. in n. 351). The object is taken to be the dual *sānāmanā*, and the referents are then identified as the two wives of Namuci, who are supposed to be hostilely dealt with in I.104.3 and V.30.9. All of this turns out to be a tissue of speculation, which evaporates on examination. In V.30.9 women are mentioned in the context of Namuci, but these women are *plural* (*strīyaḥ*). Moreover, Indra

does them no damage. In I.104.3 there are indeed *two* females, but there is no mention of Namuci in this hymn; in fact they are called “the two maidens of Kuyava” (*kúyavasya yóṣe*). Though a bad end is wished for them, they have nothing to do with Namuci. (For further on these passages, see comm. ad locc. and publ. intros. to both hymns; in both cases I think we’re dealing with rivers.) Thus, not only is *asmai* unlikely to refer to Namuci on syntactic grounds, but Namuci is not elsewhere associated with a pair of females.

Moreover, *sánāmānā* need not be – and in fact is unlikely to be – feminine. The number of feminines built to *n*-stems is quite limited; see Lanman (Noun Inflection, 528). However, Lanman cites a number of fem. bahuvrīhis built to *-nāman-* in the AV, which are suffixed with *-ī*, e.g., *durnāmnī-*, *pāñcanāmnī-*, etc. Though no such forms are found in the RV, in this late hymn it is likely that the AV practice would have been followed (expect *\*sánāmnī-*). Therefore *sánāmānā* is probably masc. What then are its referents? Old suggests dual body parts of the Dasyu or Indra’s two *hárī*, neither of which is terribly plausible. Ge (n. 6a) reports Fay as suggesting Vṛtra and Dānu. (Sāy. is silent on referents.) We need to ask: in the context of this hymn who would be “the two with the same name”? This produces an obvious answer: the Aśvins ([Nāsatyas], who have been insistently mentioned by name in the dual in 3d, 4b, 4d. What has impeded accepting this obvious answer has been the assumption that the two of the same name must be enemies of Indra subjected to a hostile action expressed by the verb *ní dhvasayaḥ*, and the Aśvins would not fit. But if the verb is neither transitive nor necessarily hostile, the way is cleared. In my view *ní dhvasayaḥ* continues the picture of the immediately preceding pāda, 5d, where Indra scatters mist and darkness to obfuscate the place of battle. Here he sends down smoke for the same purpose; the smoke is “for” the Dasyu (*asmai*), a dative of malefit. But it also beclouds his companions, the Aśvins. Note that the Aśvins are called *dhvasrā* in X.40.3, and since they travel in the early morning, it is not surprising that they become obscured by morning mist and, here, by Indra’s smokescreen.

In c *ṛṣvā-* ‘lofty’, which characterized Indra’s feet in 3a, returns to modify his comrades (*sákhībhiḥ*) of 5b.

Opinion is divided on the morphological identity of *pratiṣṭhā hṛdyā*. The Pp. reads both words with final *-ā*, hence as instr. sgs. Old accepts the Pp. reading, as does Scar (651–52), supplying the enemy as object of *jaghantha*. Gr reads underlying *pratiṣṭhās hṛdyās*, fem. acc. pls., perfectly possible in this sandhi context. In this he is followed by Ge, C-H, HPS, and the published tr. Although either is technically possible, I find it harder to imagine how Indra would wield “firm standing / foundation” as a weapon, so I prefer the acc. interpr.

X.73.7: On Namuci as *vīmāya-* see disc. ad 5c. On the connection of Manu’s path with Namuci, see V.30.7.

The identity of the “seer” in b, for whose benefit Namuci was rendered wileless is not entirely certain. It most likely refers to Manu, also benefited in pāda c. But Ge (n. 7b) alternatively suggests Namī Sāpya, who is associated with Indra in the Namuci battle in I.53.7 (see comm. ad loc.) and VI.20.6 (see also X.48.9).

X.73.8: The expression *nāmāni √prā* “fulfill (your) names” is found also in the next hymn (by the same poet), X.74.6. It must refer to Indra’s performing the deeds encapsulated in his epithets (so also Ge, n. 8a) and gestures towards the complex interrelationship between words and actions in Vedic India. For a similar exploration of this theme, see VIII.80.

The object of *dadhiṣe* in b is most likely the names of pāda a, producing a strikingly physical image of Indra holding his names in his fist.

Pāda c is almost identical to I.102.1, but in scrambled order. As I did there, I take *śávasā* as referring to Indra's power, which incites the gods' acclaim. Ge (and others) take it as semi-adverbial (Ge "mächtig"), referring to the energy with which the gods cheer Indra on.

The puzzling pāda is d, and my interpr. is quite different from the standard, in two ways. The standard assumes that *vanínah* must refer to trees, but, though *vanín-* often has that referent, it literally just means 'wooden, having wood' and, in my view, could refer to any wooden object. My second deviation from the standard is more controversial: I suggest that d should be read with the first pāda of the next vs. (9a), with 9b beginning a new clause. I do not make these departures lightly, but the standard interpr. seems to me to lead to very unlikely scenarios and also produces syntactic problems in 9ab. Ge (n. 8d) suggests that turning the trees upside down, with roots facing up, is just a metaphorical expression "für die umwälzenden Taten des Indra," but the image seems too precise to serve vague metaphorical ends. HPS tr. "You have made the trees aboveground," suggesting that Indra's separation of the two world halves allowed the trees to grow (not a standard result of this standard cosmogonic deed). I think rather that the 'wooden' things are chariots or pieces of chariots, including the wheel in 9a, and that this is another obscure reference to the chariot race between Indra and the Sun, in which Indra tears the wheel off the Sun's chariot and also reverses the position of the chariots (a topsy-turvy image). See the tantalizing hints in the Indra hymns of the Vth Maṇḍala, esp. V.29.5, 9–10 and V.31.11). I unfortunately don't have a precise image in mind, but the sudden reversals in the passages in V and the prominence of the wheel there suggests that this is a promising direction to explore – esp. since the poet of our hymn is also the poet of V.29, per the Anukramaṇī. (One can also think of Karṇa's wheel stuck in the earth in the climactic MBh battle.) Given the uncertainties of the situation depicted, the referent of *asya* is not clear to me, but see below.

X.73.9: For my suggestion that 8d and 9a form a sentence, see immediately preceding disc. One of the further advantages of this interpr. is that, if the *yád* clause of 9a leans backwards, this configuration avoids the awkwardness of trying to make 9b, with its initial *utá*, into its main clause. Both Ge and JSK (DGRV I.453) give *utá* the sense 'also' here, but *utá* is of course a coordinating conjunction and should not connect subordinate and main clauses. (However, see the disc. of problematic *utá* in 10b.) Moreover, the sense Ge and JSK give the whole – that Indra can find the good in any situation, even one like 9a – seems foreign to Indra's character; he is no Pollyanna-esque optimistic stoic.

Note that *nīṣattam* reprises *nīṣattā* in 2a, of Indra's mother.

In the 2nd hemistich Ge (et al.) once again tries to impose a subordinate clause (c) / main clause (d) structure, but once again runs into textual difficulties, because the verb in d (*ádadhā(h)*) is accented. Ge suggests, rather weakly, that it's accented because it's between two vocatives (n. 9cd); Old's account is similarly unsatisfactory. The syntactic solution seems to me obvious – to take d as part of the *yád* clause begun in c, with both of them subordinated to b. I further take *yád* as a neut. rel. prn. (not a subord. conjunction), with *tád* in b as its antecedent. The *yád* agrees with both *ūdhaḥ* and *páyah*.

With the syntax sorted out, we can turn to the sense. The assumption of Ge et al. seems to be that c depicts a bad situation that Indra remedies in d. Exactly what is supposed to be bad in c is not clear, and the fact that the lexeme *áti √ sā* is otherwise unattested doesn't help (see Ge n. 9cd). I think rather that c and d are benefits conferred by Indra: he positioned the udder,

presumably abounding in good things, on the earth and put milk in the cows and plants. All of this seemed should/would seem good (“seem honey”) “to him” (*asmai*), who must be a beneficiary of Indra’s positive actions. The referent of *asmai* is probably the same as that of *asya* in pāda. It could perhaps be Manu (see ad 7), though this is less likely for a than for b.

X.73.10: Note that Old makes no comment on this vs. – surely not because he found it crystal clear!

Leaving aside the content, the structure of this vs. is very challenging and may undercut my argument about *utá* in 9b, as it is difficult to interpret *utá* as a coordinating conjunction in pāda b (though see an attempt below). The most natural way to interpr. ab is with pāda a as a subordinate clause whose main clause is b, expressing two contrastive views of the source of Indra’s birth, one held by unidentified 3rd pl. ‘they’, the other by me. This interpr. is reflected in the publ. tr., with *utá* arbitrarily rendered as ‘rather’. In a similar vein, JSK (DGRV I.447–48) suggests that here and in a few other passages “the scope of *utá* is limited to some constituent of its clause,” here the person of the verb: 1st sg. *manye* versus 3rd pl. *vádanti*. He tr. “When they say, ‘he has gone (forth) from the horse,’ (then) I also (i.e. for my part) think him to be born from strength.” The problem is that there are 752 occurrences of *utá* (per Lubotsky), and at best not even a handful of them need this “scope” interpr. This interpr. also leaves pāda c somewhat hanging: who holds that Indra came from battle-fervor – the “they” of a, the “I” of b, or some other entity or entities? Is c the *real* story of Indra’s birth? Probably not, since d indicates that no one know that but Indra. But the close parallelism between the expressions in a and c, ABL *iyāya*, carries no rhetorical weight in this interpr.

My tentative – and quite arbitrary – attempt to account for the *utá* and for the floating pāda c involves taking b as a parenthetical aside; c then is either what “they” really mean when they say he comes from a horse, or else an alternative, possibly the dominant view. In either case the obvious contrast between the phrases in a and c is properly exploited. I therefore suggest the alternative translations: “When they say ‘he came from a horse’ – and I think of him as born from strength – (they mean) ‘he came from battle-fervor ...’” Or “While they say ‘he came from a horse’ – and I think of him as born from strength – he (really) came from battle-fervor ...”

The sense of *harmyēṣu tasthau* is also unclear. Ge (n. 10c) thinks that the jealous gods imprisoned Indra after his birth, but I see no evidence for this. I think rather that *harmyá-* refers to the womb. It is even possible that the beginning of d should be construed with this VP: “he stayed in a secure house (=womb), from which he came forth,” with “Indra knows this” a separate clause.

In any case this vs. returns us to the 1st vs. of the hymn, indeed the first word: *jāniṣṭhāḥ* ‘you were born’. Since the final vs. (11) is a summary vs. detailing the requests of the poets, vss. 1 and 10 are conceptually ring compositional, but contrastively. It is striking that the beginning of the hymn focuses on Indra’s *mother*’s role in his birth, whereas the various suggestions for Indra’s origin in vs. 10 are either masc. (‘horse’, ‘battle-fervor’) or neut. (‘strength’). There is also more certainty about the facts of the birth at the beginning than in this vs.

X.73.11: As just noted, this is a summary vs., unrelated in content to the rest of the hymn. This is also the only appearance of the Priyamedhas in X; they are more at home in VIII.

*ūrṇuhí* is accented because of its contrastive proximity to *pūrdhí*.

## X.74 Indra



Although Ge suggests that the theme of the hymn is a plea for the dakṣiṇā, I see no evidence for this – nor for his previous view (registered and rejected by Old) that it celebrates a victory in racing.

X.74.1: This vs. provides an unusual number of disjunctive possibilities for objects and instruments of celebration: the vs. contains 5 occurrences of *vā* ‘or’. Perhaps this wide range at the beginning makes the narrowing focus on Indra in the 2nd half of the hymn more pointed.

With Old (implicitly), I supply *sumnām* ‘favor’ as obj. of the part. *īyakṣan*, as in I.153.2, II.20.1, X.50.3. Ge (also Scar 557) instead makes the objects of praise (Vasus, world-halves, etc.) the objects of *īyakṣan* as well as of *carkṛṣe*. This is not impossible, but does require doubling the genitives with *carkṛṣe* with supplied accusatives to serve as objects of *īyakṣan*, which does not take the gen.

As Ge points out (n. 1b), *dhiyā vā yajñāir vā* is reprised in 3c by *dhīyaṃ ca yajñāṃ ca*.

The two pādas in the second hemistich are syntactically parallel: both contain *yé* rel. clauses with the genitive antecedent (complement of *carkṛṣe*) gapped and the nominal expression of it found as nom. pl. in the rel. clause “... pay tribute to (those), which steeds ...,” etc. Needless to say, a literal rendering of these constructions produces non-parsable English.

(*su*)*śrúṇa-* is a hapax; such a *na*-stem is not otherwise found to  $\sqrt{śru}$ . It may have been created to split the difference between *vanúm* and *suśrútaḥ*.

X.74.2: With Ge I interpr. *háva* as loc. *háve*, against the Pp and Old. In favor of Old’s analysis (“asurischer Ruf den Himmel erreichte”) is 3a *īyám eṣām ... gṛh*, with a nom. sg. of a verbal product plus dependent gen. *eṣām*. But I find *ásura-* as a qualifier of ‘call’ unlikely; it is the only such passage registered by Gr. The more likely subj. is Agni; see Ge’s n. 2a for *dyām*  $\sqrt{naś}$  *nakṣ* with Agni as subject and WE Hale (68–69) for Agni as *ásura-*. It is characteristic of Agni that his smoke (and flames) reach heaven while he spreads across the earth.

Of the three finite verbs in this vs., *nakṣata*, *nīmṣata*, and *kṛnávanta*, the last one is an unambiguous subjunctive, and the second one is most likely subj. as well: though Gr classifies it under a them. *nīmṣa-*, the few other forms to this (secondary) root are all athematic (as Gr recognizes): 3rd pl. *nīmṣate*, part. *nīmṣāna-*. (Wh Rts gives only a Class 2 pres.) By contrast *nakṣata* looks like the injunc. to the well-attested thematic stem *nákṣa-*, and this may well be so, since injunctives can mix with modal forms – though an *s*-aor. subjunctive to  $\sqrt{naś}$  can’t be formally excluded.

On the semantics of  $\sqrt{nīmṣ}$  see comm. ad VIII.43.10.

Ge (fld by WE Hale, p. 69) takes *cákṣāṇā(h)* as intrans. ‘appearing’, but med. *cáṣṭe* (etc.) overwhelmingly has the sense ‘see’, even when used absolutely without expressed object. In the publ. tr. I take the dat. *suvitāya* as what the gods are looking out for; it would also be possible to supply an acc. obj. like *viśvā*, as in IX.57.2 *viśvā cákṣāṇaḥ* “observing all,” with the dat. serving as goal: “surveying (all things) for easy passage.”

Ge’s (and Hale’s) interpr. are also unpersuasive because the simile in d is left hanging: “während die Götter ... es sich nach ihren eigenen Wünschen einrichten sollen wie der Himmel”; “while the gods ... will act by their own desires like the sky.” Doing whatever it feels like is not a quality I associate with heaven; instead I think we have an incomplete simile, which lacks an instr. parallel to *vārebhiḥ* ... *svaīḥ*, which, however, is easily supplied: *stīrbhiḥ* ‘with stars’ (cf. for the full simile II.2.5, 34.2, IV.7.3). The use of the medial *kṛnávanta* is idiomatic: ‘make oneself (to be) with, provide oneself with’. The idea is that before their journey to the earth, the gods

provide themselves with desirable things proper to themselves to distribute in return for sacrifice. The ritual reciprocity is described in the following vs. (3).

X.74.3: *kṛpānanta* echoes *kṛṇávanta* in 2d; it's worth noting that this is the only form built to this stem.

X.74.4: The verbal echoes continue, with *pananta* (pāda a) reading like a truncated form of *kṛpānanta* in 3b.

The vs. is notable for containing two desideratives in parallel rel. clauses with the same subject, one subjunctive (*títṛtsān* b) and one injunc. (*dudukṣan* d). It is not clear to me what the functional difference is between the two, and unfortunately Heenen (Le désidératif en védique) does not discuss the functions of modal forms to the desiderative or even list the relevant forms. (For the latter see Avery, Verb Forms of the Rig-Veda 1268–70, and Lanman, Vedic Gr. 389. Unfortunately both omit the injunc. *dudukṣan*.) Of *títṛtsān* Heenen says (149) that the verb “fait référence à un effort intense de volonté, suscité par l'émerveillement pour la récompense,” but this reflects his usual ad hoc imposition of context on morphology. I do think that we must take the modal difference between the two verbs seriously: although, being pāda-final, there is no metrical difference between subj. *-ān* and injunc. *-an*, it is highly unlikely that redactors would have introduced the difference – much more likely that the two endings would have been secondarily harmonized. In trying to figure out what's going on, we are hampered by the fact that the role of the plural *Āyus* is not well defined. Gr considers the pl. to refer to men who are active in the service of the gods. Certainly almost all of the plural occurrences are found in specifically ritual situations, esp. the preparation of soma. Note in particular IX.62.20 *páyo duhanty āyávaḥ* “The *Āyus* milk the milk [=soma],” with the same root as here -- though this may be a red herring (see below).

My suggestions in what follows are extremely tentative. I start with the assumption that the desiderative subjunctive *títṛtsān* expresses an action that the *Āyus* desire to perform that temporally and logically follows the action of the desiderative injunctive *dudukṣan*, even though the rel. clauses are in the opposite order. I further assume that this logically sequential action is drilling into the Vala cave, “the enclosure full of cows” (*ūrvām gómantam*), to reach and acquire/free the cows. The logically prior *dudukṣan* must be what might enable them to do this: the milking of the great lofty (cow) with a thousand streams. As it happens, this cow is found elsewhere in the RV, esp. in two identical hemistichs: IV.41.5cd = X.101.9cd *sā no duhīyād yāvaseva gatvī, sahásradhārā páyasā mahī gauḥ* “She should yield her milk to us like a great cow with her milk in a thousand streams who has gone to the pastures.” (See also X.133.7d, which is identical to the other d pādas.) Who is this prodigious cow? In IV.41.5=X.101.9 it is quite clearly identified as the *dhī-*, the inspired or visionary thought (IV.41.5b, X.101.9a)(in X.133.7 there is no referent, but *dhī-* is certainly not excluded). I suggest that the milking of the *dhī-* is at issue here as well: the *Āyus* must milk all the good out of their *dhī-* in order to penetrate the Vala cave and reach the real (or at least real-er) cows. Note that *dhī-* has occurred twice already in this hymn (1b, 3c); further the *Āyus* are elsewhere associated with ritual speech (I.117.25, 130.6, 131.2, 139.3; II.31.7; VIII.3.7–8). And of course the opening of the Vala cave was effected by speech and song, not by brute force. It is a nice touch that to reach the real cows the *Āyus* have to milk a metaphorical cow. For clarity I would now slightly rephrase the last three pādas of this vs. to “... -- they who will intend to drill through to the enclosure full of cows, who strive to milk the great (cow [= visionary thought]) ...”

It should be noted that the only other occurrence of *dudukṣan* (there unaccented) is in the devilish hymn X.61.10 also in a Vala context, where I take it to refer to the milking of the Vala cave itself (see comm. ad loc.), but not much can be made dependent on the interpr. of that hymn.

X.74.5: With Old (et al.), it is best to take *śácīva(h)* as displaced from a voc. phrase *śácīva indra*, as in I.53.3. This voc. is overwhelming applied to Indra.

X.74.6: There is some disagreement about several words in pāda a: the verb *vāvāna* and the root-noun cmpd. *purāṣāt*. To start with the latter, though the standard view is that the cmpd. consists of adverbial *purā* ‘earlier, previously’ (e.g., Gr, Scar 604), with the cmpd meaning ‘previously victorious’ vel sim., Ge, flg. Sāy., renders it ‘Burgenzwinger’, without providing a morphological analysis. Such an interpr. would require that the 2nd member be a preverb-verb combination *ā√sah*, which does not occur, with the root noun *pūr-* ‘fortress’ as first member. Even if *ā√sah* did occur, root-noun cmpds don’t contain both a nominal 1st member and a preverb, as I’ve discussed elsewhere (Lamberterie Fs.). If the 2nd member is only *śāh-*, then the 1st member would have to be a case form of *pūr-*, but the instr. doesn’t work semantically and there are no other possibilities. I like ‘previous victor’ vel sim. for another reason: it contrasts nicely with *purutāmam*. Although most interpr. take the latter as adverbial (Ge, Scar “am häufigsten”), if we take the *-tama*-suffix as expressing not a superlative but the last of a series (as is common), Indra is identified as a victor both long ago and right this minute.

As for *vāvāna*, in contrast to the near-universal interpr. as the pf. to *√van* ‘win’, Kü (448–49) assigns it instead to *√vanī* ‘love’, for complex reasons that I will not rehearse because I find them implausible.

Note the return of the expression “fulfill his names,” as in the previous hymn X.73.8.

**X.75–76:** The Anukramaṇī attributes these two hymns to different poets, Sindhuṣṭi Praiyamedha and Jaratkarma Airāvata respectively. The contents of the two hymns are also quite distinct. Nonetheless, it is best to follow Old (Prol. 236 n. 3) in assuming the two hymns belong together, since they are found in the midst of the series of dyads (X.61–84).

### **X.75 Rivers**

The first few vss. are dominated by the preverb *prá* ‘forth’: pāda-initial in 1a, c, d, 2a, internal in 2c, 3c).

X.75.1: There is much disc. of the numerical phrase *saptá-sapta tredhā*. In addition to Ge and Re, see Lü (684–86), Mau (203–4), also Kü (146). Mau’s disc. seems the most sensible: he thinks we’re dealing with three geographical groupings consisting of (roughly) seven rivers apiece, rather than a straight multiplicative 3 x 7. The number of rivers named in vss. 5–6 is eighteen (by my count) – close enough to seven groups of three. For a similar expression used of the river Sarasvatī see VI.61.12 *triṣadhāsthā saptādhātuḥ*.

I do not understand the placement of *hí* in c.

Ge (n. 1d) suggests supplying *sasre* in d. Given the repetition of *prá*, I prefer to continue with a form of *√kram* as in c (*prá ... cakramúḥ*).

X.75.2: The gen. pl. phrase *eṣām ... jāgatām* is interpr. by all as referring to the rivers (e.g., Re “... de ces (rivières) mobiles”), and this is quite plausible, esp. given 1d. However, ‘river’ is of course fem., and adjectives modifying the rivers should be fem. too (like *sītvarīṇām* in 1d). But *eṣām* identifies the phrase as masc.; the contrast between *eṣām āgram* here and fem. *āsām āgram* in 4d is quite pointed. I’m afraid we must take *jāgat-* as a quasi-masc. substantive here, though it does presumably refer to the rivers.

X.75.3: On *bhūmyā* as instr., pace Pp., Gr, see Old.

Apropos of *śúṣmam* in b, In VI.61.2 the river Sarasvatī is compared to “a root-grubbing (boar) with its snortings” (*śúṣmebhir bisakhā iva*), see comm. ad loc.

I read *vṛṣṭāyaḥ* both with the simile, as “real” rain, and with the frame, as the spray from the rushing river. “The rains thunder” is a type of synaesthesia or, at any rate, the conflation of two separate phenomena related to a single event: rain and thunder associated with a storm. Re’s “Les pluies (pleuvent) comme (les tonnerres) tonnent” sorts the two phenomena into separate, more logical categories – losing the concentrated poetic focus. Moreover, his rendering is grammatically impossible, as RVic similes always share the same verb.

X.75.4: Note that vs.-initial *#abhī tvā* slightly echoes 3c *#abhrād iva*

The first hemistich presents Sindhu as a helpless calf to whom the motherly cows flock. This might seem like a reversal of the depiction of the power and dominance of Sindhu over the other rivers (1d, 2d), but of course the other rivers are bringing their “milk” to contribute to her strengthening stream.

If there was even a moment of doubt about her dominance, it is dispelled by the second hemistich, with Sindhu as a “battling king” (*rājeva yúdhvā*).

X.75.5–6: These vss. enumerate the names of rivers. As indicated in the publ. intro., much has been made of this list for the geography of NW India, and I refer the reader to such discussions, e.g., that of Mau.

X.75.8: The two hapaxes *sīlāmā(-vatī)* and *madhuvṛdh-* are plausibly taken as plant names. (For the latter see Scar 521.)

X.75.9: The referent of the genitive phrase in cd, *asya ... ādabdhasya svāyaśaso virapśīnaḥ*, is unclear, but the most obvious and desirable referent, Sindhu herself, is excluded by the gender, which must be masc. or neut. This leaves the chariot (*rātha-*), the prize (*vāja-*), or the contest (*ājī-*). Ge, Re, and Mau opt for the chariot, though in his n. Re allows the possibility that it is Sindhu “concu(e) comme masc.” Old is of the same opinion, based on the implicit comparison of Sindhu to a Wettfahrer in ab. I am reluctant to go this direction because of the stress laid on the grammatical gender of ‘river’ words, esp. emphasized for Sindhu in vss. 7–8.

## X.76 Pressing Stones

It is totally unclear to me why this hymn is attributed to a snake (*sarpa*), much less why this snake is called “Having old ears.” As MM (PN s.v. *jāratkarṇa-*) points out, the phrase *jārataḥ karṇa-* is found in nearby X.80.3 as a personal name, but the connection is not straightforward.

X.76.1: On *ṛñjase* see comm. ad IV.8.1. The form expresses an act of reverence, several times in the form of a hymn (*girā* IV.8.1, VI.15.1).

The expression *ūrjāṃ vyūṣṭisu*, assuming the two words go together (as most do, incl. Caland-Henry p. 271, but notably not Ge), is at first glance somewhat bizarre: “at the first dawn flushes of nourishment(s)” (in the publ. tr. I suppressed the pl. of *ūrjāṃ*). But I think it economically combines two different concepts. On the one hand, like “the milk of the dawn cows,” it refers to the visual effect of dawn: the milky white sky at the horizon just before sunrise. On the other hand, the appearance of the dawn inaugurates the soma pressing, that is, the production of nourishment, and so the pressing stones need to be deployed. Ge prefers to construe *ūrjāṃ* with (*ā ...*) *ṛñjase*, (“ich begehre eurer Kräfte”), but *ṛñjase* does not take a genitive elsewhere (and it does not mean ‘desire’).

I take *udbhīdā* as referring to what in English is also called day-break.

It’s not entirely clear what “make every seat spacious” is meant to convey, but I assume that, with the coming of daylight, places appear larger. The particular seats in question may be the ritual ground and its parts.

X.76.2: This vs. provides ample puzzles, though the straightforward first pāda gives no hint of what is to come.

The first issue is *sotāri* in b. This appears to be the loc. sg. of the well-attested agent noun *sotār-* ‘(soma-)presser’, and that is how I take it (also in its other occurrence in X.100.9). But this is a minority view, at least as to function. Ge (n. 2b) cites Ludwig’s view that it is a nom. sg., while Ge himself suggests it might be an infinitive (which he glosses as a functional imperative/modal “soll pressen”); Re follows suit by pronouncing it a hortatory infinitive. Tichy, by contrast, considers the locc. in *-tāri* as verbal abstracts, here “beim Somapressen.” My interpr. starts with the simile *ātyo ná hástayataḥ* “like a steed controlled by the hands.” The stone (*ádriḥ*) is compared to the steed, and, in my opinion, the soma-presser is compared to the hand(s), the first member of the cmpd., the controller of the steed – as often, we have a cmpd. corresponding to a free syntagm. Caland-Henry’s rendering, “comme un cheval tenu en main [est] le Pierre pour le pressureur,” is closest to mine.

One of the questions posed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is the identity/-ties of the subjects of *vidāt* (c) and *tarute* (d), but before tackling that we must figure out how to construe d. Despite the glaring absence of accent on *tarute*, the standard tr. take d as a subord. clause controlled by *yád*. The accent problem is rather casually waved away, even by Old. I am quite unwilling to ignore the lack of accent, and therefore interpr. *yád árvataḥ* as a nominal rel. cl. of the type frequent at the ends of sentences/verse lines (see my Fs. Hale paper). The antecedent of *yád* is *paúṃsyam*, the obj. of *vidāt* and gapped obj. of *taruṣe*. The subj. of *vidāt* is the stone, that of *tarute* the presser, who attains the power that the stone found by virtue of his (presser’s) wielding of the stone. Figuring out what to do with *tarute* is complicated by the fact that it is the only form to this stem (anywhere) and the only middle form of  $\sqrt{tṛ}$  without a preverb (save for *taruṣanta* in I.132.5, which is an *-anta* replacement).

On *mahó rāyé* see comm. ad IV.31.11.

The publ. tr. misleadingly renders both *átya-* (b) and *árvant-* (d) as ‘steed’, implying that the same word is used in both places. Both are marked words, in contrast to *ásva-* -- as ‘steed’ is in English – but I would now substitute ‘charger’ (another marked word) for the second.

X.76.3: The opening of this vs., *tád íd dhy àsya sávanam* ..., is a kind of mash-up of the 2a *tád u x x x sávanam* ... and 2c *vidád dhí* with flip of vowels in the latter. These echoes may underline the fact that 3 continues the theme of 2.

Pāda a presents several problems. One is accentual: *apáh*, so accented, should be the acc. pl. of *áp-* ‘water(s)’; the same phrase, *vivér apáh*, is also found in X.147.1. In both cases, the form is better taken as the wrongly accented neut. sg. *\*ápah* ‘work’; so interpr. by Sāy (with gloss *karma*), Ge, and Old. This interpr. is supported by the same phrase with neut. pl. *vivér ápāṃsi* (I.69.8 and VI.31.3) showing the expected accent. By contrast, Caland-Henry (271) tr. *apáh* as ‘waters’, and Lub seems to accept ‘waters’ not only for this passage and X.147.1 but also for I.69.8 and VI.31.3, judging from the ! that he uses to mark those occurrences of *ápāṃsi*.

Another question is the morphological identity and syntactic function of *sávanam*. With Sāy. and Old, I take it as acc., a parallel object to *\*ápah*; the subject is then the stone. As Old points out, the spressing stones are associated with *ápas-* in vss. 5 and 8. However, Ge takes *sávanam* as the subject, referring not to the action of pressing but its result, the Trankspende; this doesn’t make a lot of sense to me: in what way has the oblation accomplished its work?

Finally, what is the referent of *asya*? For Ge (n. 3a) it is Indra, who was indeed mentioned in 1b; I think rather the stone, with (explicitly) Sāy. and (implicitly) Old. Although by this interpr. *asya* is coreferential with the subject, a reflexive is not required under these circumstances – anymore than in the Engl. tr. “it has labored ... at its task.” As this tr. shows, I think *asya* is actually dependent on *\*ápah*, not adjacent *sávanam*; the enclitic *asya* is taking modified 2nd position after *tád* plus the complex of particles *íd dhí*.

Having dealt with pāda a, we must determine how the rest of the vs. fits together, and once again there are competing views. Ge (n. 3c) takes b as a parenthetical intrusion, with c continuing pāda a and d a separate sentence. Caland-Henry take b with a, with cd belonging together; this seems to be the implicit assumption of Kü (527), in that he tr. cd as a single clause and ignores the first hemistich. My interpr. departs from all these and begins with the fact that the *yáthā* clause of b contains the root aor. *ásret*, which is echoed by the main verb in d, the pf. *asísrayuh*. Although Re explicit states that the two verbs have entirely different senses (without saying what he thinks they are), the root agreement between the two verbs strongly invites an interpr. with *yáthā purā* “just as previously ...” serving as long-ago model and exemplar for the main clause, which expresses action of the more recent past.

The phrase *mánave gātúm* VERB several times has Indra as subj. (V.30.7, X.49.9; once Aśvins I.112.16), and so it seems reasonable to supply Indra as the mythological subject here. It also seems reasonable to attach c to the subordinate clauses in b, with the main clause constituting d. Not only does the mention of Tvaṣṭar in c locate it in the realm of mythology, but syntactically d “presents” as a new clause, with the preverb *prá* in tmesis, followed by an enclitic particle/pronoun *īm*, doubling the obj. *adhvarān*.

What then does pāda c add to the mythological picture begun in c? Here we need to determine whether the vṛddhi derivative *tvāṣṭrá-* refers to anything associated with the god Tvaṣṭar or specifically to Tvaṣṭar’s son, Viśvarūpa. The other occurrences of this stem can refer to either one, but with a decided preference for the latter: in I.117.22 it’s Tvaṣṭar’s honey (*mádhu*), possibly soma, but in the remaining clear passages, II.11.19, X.8.8, 9 [that is, leaving aside III.7.4], Viśvarūpa is the referent and his defeat and the loss of his cows the topic. In our passage I now think either is possible – and neither is particularly compelling. In the publ. tr. I supply ‘wealth’ as the referent of *tvāṣṭré*, in part because one of the other adjectives in this NP, *góarṇas-* modifies *rayí-* in X.38.2. In this interpr. the loc. phrase serves as the goal of Manu’s

course in b. It could also be a loc. absolute: “when Tvaṣṭar’s (wealth) (was at issue).” If *tvāṣṭré* here refers specifically to Tvaṣṭar’s hapless son, the phrase again could either be a goal or a locative absolute: “... course to Tvaṣṭar’s son, who had a flood of cows and a raiment of horses” or “when T’s son ... (was at issue).” Unfortunately I know of no tale involving Manu and Tvaṣṭar’s wealth or son, and so there is no easy (or indeed hard) way to make a decision – except in one particular: the loc. goal is somewhat favored over the loc. absol., because the main clause verb (*prá ...*) *asíśrayuḥ* also takes a loc., which is unlikely to be in absolute function.

It also has to be admitted that the main clause of d provides no help at all. Though I stand by the argument that the two verbal forms of  $\sqrt{śri}$  in b and d impose the structure laid out above, it is difficult to see how bc provides a model or comparandum for d. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that the main clause verb seems to be construed with *prá* in tmesis, but there are no other exx. of *prá*  $\sqrt{śri}$  in the RV [in I.149.2, cited by VB, the *prá* belongs rather with the participle to  $\sqrt{śr}$ ], and the only one anywhere else in Vedic is found in a single passage in KS (XXVI.3), which contributes nothing. My feeling is that in our passage *prá* doesn’t do much work, though perhaps a tr. “set forth ceremonies upon ceremonies” would at least register its presence. Another issue about the perfect is that it’s plural, but there’s no likely plural subject in the immediate vicinity. I think it likely that it’s the pressing stones, who get directly addressed, in the plural, in the next vs. Perhaps the point of all of this is that just as Indra set Manu on the course to acquire Tvaṣṭar’s wealth or Tvaṣṭar’s son, so it’s the pressing stones that set the ritual cursus at sacrifice after sacrifice. The exhortations to the stones in the next vs. may delineate what their relevant actions should be. But this is all very tentative and unsatisfactory.

X.76.4: On *bhaṅgurāvant-* see comm. ad VII.104.7.

In c *sunotana* reprises the same impv. in 2a.

“Carry a tune” for *bharata ślókam* is my playful and not entirely literal rendering, which I found impossible to resist. For the sense of *ślōka-* see comm. ad I.51.12, IX.92.1 (the latter with regard to the pressing stones’ role). The point here is that the stones are so noisy that the sound will reach heaven as a signal to the gods that the soma is ready.

X.76.5: The rigid, four-square pāda structure with a pāda-final comparative in the dat. pl. and a pāda-initial standard of comparison in the ablative (a, c, d), maked by *cid* (*ā*), should impose an ablative interpretation on *vibhvānā*, and indeed a number of comm. (see Old) suggest emending to \**vibhvānaś*. However, as Old asks, how would such a corruption have arisen? He opts for taking it as a “comparative instrumental,” which is a fine description but is not a standard syntactic category as far as I know. I do not have a better solution, however. It is worth noting that the stem to which it belongs is somewhat problematic. It has two different accents: initial *vibhvan-* in well-attested nom. sg. *vibhvā* and suffix accent only in this form and the (infinitival?) dat. *vibhvāne* (VI.61.13, where, it might be noted, it’s found in the same vs. as the superlative *apāstama-* ‘busiest’). The stem is also used in two different senses, as an adj. ‘wide-ranging’ and/or ‘distinguished’ and as the PN of one of the Ṛbhus. In this passage the latter seems the default interpr. (see the standard tr., incl. Caland-Henry and the publ. tr.), given the names in the other three pādas and the fact that *apās-* ‘industrious’ several times modifies the craftsmen Ṛbhus (III.60.3, IV.33.1, maybe V.42.12). It is possible, however, that *vibhvānā* here should also be read in its general sense and with an instr. function “by (your) distinction.” But I suggest this only very tentatively.

Another way in which b deviates from the surrounding pādas is the apparent lack of *ā*: both a and c begin ABL *cid ā*, but though b has a long *ā* flg. *cid*, it is unaccented and belongs to the 1st cmpd member *āsú-*. It would be possible to argue that the accent was removed redactionally, but I think it more likely that it's another way in which b is marked out as different. The *ā* is also missing from d, where an *a*-vowel follows *cid*, but a short one: *agnés cid a[rca]*.

*arca* is also somewhat problematic. It is, of course, on the surface a straightforward 2nd sg. impv. However, it coexists, a bit uneasily, with the 2nd pl. enclitic *vaḥ* in pāda a, referring to the pressing stones -- giving two 2nd ps. with different referents in a single sentence. Therefore a number of interpr. (Ge, Caland-Henry, etc.) silently or explicitly emend to 1st sg. subj. *\*arcā* "I shall sing / let me sing." Metrically this would be acceptable, and the mechanism is easy to see: since 2nd sg. impvs. frequently lengthen their final *-a*, coinciding with the 1sg sg. subj. ending *-ā*, a backformation of the latter to short *-a* would be unexceptionable. However, this reanalysis is unnecessary: poets frequently exhort themselves, in the 2nd sg., to praise or perform other ritual acts, and these exhortations can co-occur with 2nd plurals referring to others, often the poet's ritual colleagues -- as the pressing stones are here. See my 2005 "Poetic Self-reference" (Fs. Skjaervø). Old also resists the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. interpr.

X.76.6: Yet again, this vs. poses some niggling grammatical problems, the most serious of which is *sótu* in pāda a. This appears to be a 3rd singular root aor. impv. to *√su* 'press', which is how Gr classifies it (though with an alternative suggested; see below) and the publ. tr. renders it. However, it follows a 3rd plural impv. (*bhurantu*), whose subj. (*grāvāṇaḥ*) is continued in b. In other words, if *sótu* is a singular impv. it has to be parenthetical (as in the publ. tr.). I still subscribe to this interpr. In its favor I will point out two factors: 1) references to plural stones alternate with singular ones in this hymn; see esp. 2a with pl. impv. *sunotana*, fld. by 2b with a single stone (*ádriḥ*) (and if I'm right, also 2cd and 3a; then 3d, 4 with pl. stones). 2) the 3rd plural impv. of the root aor., to correspond to preceding 3rd pl. *bhurántu*, would be *\*svántu*, almost surely undistracted (cf. the overwhelmingly undistracted med. root aor. part. *svāná-*), which is unattested and, if found, would lose the distinctive root syllable of this root. I think this form would be avoided, and the 3rd sg. would provide a robust substitute (with root syll. *so-*).

However, I seem to be alone in this interpr., so I will briefly consider the alternatives that have been suggested. Old's is the one that requires the least machinery, but it is unlikely for two reasons. After flirting with *sótu* as a loc. he takes it as a neut. acc. *-tu-* stem (presumably meaning 'soma-pressing'), which serves as obj. to *bhurántu* (apparently partially fld. by Scar 44–45, 186). However, as Re also points out, *bhurá-* (and related stems) is otherwise intrans. Moreover, a masc. acc. *sótum* is attested (VIII.19.18) with the same apparent meaning, and it is not exactly parsimonious to posit an identical stem but two different genders, each attested only once -- esp. since masc. acc. *\*sótum* would neatly avoid hiatus here. Gr in fact suggests emending to *\*sótum*, and Ge seems to follow this suggestion (without explicit note), but rendering it as an infinitive "um uns Saft auszuschlagen." This infinitival stem is attested elsewhere, as dat. *sótave* (I.28.1) and abl. *sótos* (X.86.1). The *-tum* infinitive, so characteristic of later Skt., is of course quite rare in the RV, but in this relatively late portion of the text it is certainly thinkable. If the 3rd sg. impv. interpr. is rejected, I would favor the infinitive above the others, tr. "Let the glorious ones clatter for us, to press (soma) out of the stalk." But this still requires emendation, whereas the impv. interpr. does not.



I take *ándhasaḥ* as an abl. of source (“out of the stalk”) rather than partitive gen. obj. (“press of the sap/soma”). On the meaning of *ándhas-* see comm. ad IV.1.19.

On *divít(mant)-* see comm. ad IV.31.11; unsuffixed *divít-* occurs only here, *divít-mant-* only 4x. The *-mant-* suffix seems pleonastic, so a satisfactory and semi-literal tr. is hard to achieve – perhaps “with their heaven-bound voice going to heaven.”

As noted in the publ. intro., I take *náraḥ* in c (and in 7d) to refer to the pressing stones, not human ritualists, since the voc. *náraḥ* in 8a must be addressed to the stones. Among other things, this saves us from taking c here as parenthetical, as Ge does, since he recognizes that d must have the stones as subj. (n. 6d).

I supply “heaven and earth” as obj. to *āghoṣáyantaḥ* ‘causing to heed’, on the basis of passages in the other principal pressing stone hymn: X.94.4 *āghoṣáyantaḥ pṛthivīm* “making earth heed,” as well X.94.12 *ā dyāṁ ráveṇa pṛthivīm aśuśravuḥ* “they have made Heaven and Earth listen by their bellowing.”

On *mithas-túr-* see Scar (186).

X.76.7: The stem *rathirá-* ordinarily modifies gods, and the usual gloss ‘charioteer’ (Gr Wagenlenker) fits those contexts. However, in VIII.50.8 (Vālakh.) it qualifies horses (*hárayaḥ*), and ‘fit for the chariot’ or sim. seems a better rendering. In our passage, too, I would now substitute ‘fit for the chariot, chariot-broken’ for ‘charioteers’, on the basis of 2b, where the stone is compared to the steed controlled by the hand of the charioteer.

With Ge (and Re, Scar 55) I take *gavíṣaḥ* as gen. sg. (with *asya*), not nom. pl. (with Sāy., Gr, Caland-Henry, Ob II.46). The referent of the gen. phrase in b, *asya ... gavíṣaḥ* “of him/the one seeking the cows,” is of course soma, which always seeks mixture with cows’ milk. It is possible, however, that *gavíṣaḥ* could also be read as nom. pl., modifying the stones that are “milking” out the juice.

The simile in d is puzzling. Given the position of *ná*, it should signal that the simile is limited to *havyā* (so “the men groom [X] like oblations”), but this doesn’t make a lot of sense: the milked-out soma *is* the oblation. Nonetheless, this is the interpr. in the publ. tr. Ge silently flips the *ná*, taking it with *náraḥ* (and does not include *havyā* in the simile): “Wie die Herren machen sie das Opfer mit ihren Mäulen sauber.” So also Scar (55), though with a long, puzzled note (n. 68) on the problems with the simile. Although this is an easy solution, I don’t think it is the correct one. For one thing, the stones have already been identified as *náraḥ* (6c) and will almost immediately be addressed as such (8a); they are not like men, but men. For another, there is no metrical or other barrier to the proper positioning of *ná* for such a meaning: *náro* \**ná havyā* is, if anything, metrically better than the transmitted text (see Arnold’s statistics on the rhythm of the opening, p. 188). I reluctantly conclude that this may be one of the few occasions in the RV where the simile particle should be taken with the verb: “they, as it were, groom ...”

X.76.8: The publ. tr. takes the two parallel nominal clauses in the 2nd hemistich as statements of fact; Ge by contrast supplies a modal “sei.” This is possible but not necessary.

**X.77–78:** These two hymns are attributed to Syūmaraśmi Bhārgava and dedicated to the Maruts. They are also unified by an unusual metrical scheme and a tightly controlled stylistic reliance on similes. For both of these features see the publ. intros. to the two hymns; for the meter esp. see Old, Prol. 92ff., as well as the intro. to X.77 in the Noten.

## X.77 Maruts

X.77.1: A dense vs. We can start with the root noun cmpd *abhraprúṣaḥ* and its etymologically twinned verb *pruṣā*. Both of these forms are morphologically ambiguous: the former can be nom. pl., acc. pl., or abl.-gen. sg., the latter 2nd sg. impv. or 1st sg. subjunctive. On the basis of *astoṣi* in d I opt for the subjunctive, and for the cmpd. the nom. pl., to allow the referents of the cmpd. to be directly compared with the subject of *pruṣā*. (These are generally the choices made by other interpr., though the Pp. reads short-vowel *pruṣa*, hence the impv.)

The next question is the relation between the cmpd members in *abhra-prúṣ-*. (For disc. see Scar 342.) An acc. relation is possible; so Re “... qui font-fuser la nuée.” But I favor an ablative, like *abhrāt* in c and, closer in sense, the phrase in nearby X.75.3 *abhrād iva ... vṛṣṭáyāḥ* ‘like rains from the clouds.’ Here as well I supply ‘rain’ as the suppressed object of *-prúṣa-*, parallel to the ‘goods’ (*vásu*) that I, the poet, shower down. The referents of *abhraprúṣaḥ* are surely the Maruts, the dedicands of this hymn, who thus appear, disguised, in its first word. It is a nice touch that the poet compares himself with the very gods he is also praising.

I read *vācā* with both simile and frame. In the frame, of course, it refers to the poet’s speech, but in the simile it can refer to thunder, the Maruts’ speech (cf. I.168.8 [Maruts] *abhríyām vācam* “speech stemming from a cloud”). Scar (342 n. 481) also mentions the ‘thunder’ possibility but stops short of reading *vācā* twice.

Pāda b contains the morphologically aberrant gen. sg. *vijānūṣaḥ*. The standard explan. of this form (see, e.g., Old with reff., AiG II.2.910, more recently Kü 203–4, Lowe [Part. 25, 252]) must be correct: that it is a contamination/blend of the pf. participle of  $\sqrt{jñā}$  (expected weak form \**jājñ-ús-*) and the 9th cl. pres.part. (expected weak form \**jān-át-*). The reason for this blend is not apparent, since the gen. sg. of either stem would fit metrically and should have been morphologically transparent.

The poet is the referent of this gen., and the point of the pāda is that *his* sacrifices, which consist of well-wrought words are just as good as those that consist of physical oblations. There may be a slight asymmetry of expression here. On the surface *havísmantaḥ* in the simile of course modifies *yajñāḥ*, which participates in both simile and frame, with the meaning “(like)sacrifices consisting of oblations,” but in fact well-attested *havísmant-* generally modifies the ritualists who provide oblations, rather than the sacrifice that consists of them. We might almost have expected gen. \**havísmataḥ*, parallel to *vijānūṣaḥ*, with the sense “The sacrifices of a discerning one are like (those)\*of one who provides oblations.” I do not suggest emendation; instead I think the poet is keeping his audience off balance and confounding their expectations.

The syntax and constituency of cd are multiply ambiguous and interpr. in multiple ways: see the very different treatments of Old (at some length), Ge, and Re. I will not examine their versions in detail. As for mine, there are several structural clues that may help to sort out the competing possibilities. First, the dat. *-áse* forms that end each pāda (c *arháse*, d *śobháse*) seem meant to be parallel, though a number of interpr. deploy them differently. Second, given their localization in different pādas, the accusatives of c (*sumārutam (ná) brahmāṇam*) and d (*gānam*) should be kept separate, with the phrase in c being compared to that in d. Again, this is not the universal view.

Pāda d is straightforward, with the 1st sg. *astoṣi* “I have praised,” with *gānam ... eṣām* “the flock of them,” referring to the Maruts, as obj. The dat. *śobháse* ‘for beauty’ belongs to a root,  $\sqrt{śubh}$ , that is characteristic of the Maruts. See esp. the similar use of the root noun dat. *śubhé* in Śyāvāśva’s Marut hymns (V.52.8, 57.3, 63.5,6), also *śubhamyú-* in the next hymn,

X.78.7. Despite the position of *ná*, I think it marks *śobhāse* as the simile, compared to *arhāse* in c. As discussed elsewhere (see, e.g., comm. ad X.21.1), simile-marking *ná* is blocked from pāda-final position and flips with its target if it would take that position.

This now leaves pāda c. Since, per my structural analysis, the acc. phrase in this pāda cannot be identical to that in d (*pace* Re) and it should not be the obj. of *arhāse* (*pace* Ge), we need to identify a referent for *sumārutam ... brahmāṇam* different from the Marut flock in d. Taking *sumāruta-* as adj. with *brahmān-* (*pace* Old, who claims it has to be a noun) points to an obvious referent: Indra, who is, of course, often accompanied by the Maruts (*marútvant-* being one of his standing epithets). And Indra, in his role as *bṛhaspáti-*, is closely associated with the formulation and indeed called *brahmān-* directly (e.g., VIII.16.7).

Now *arhāse* – who is deserving, and deserving of what? Re takes it as passive; Ge’s interpr. I don’t understand, and it is informed by his somewhat peculiar view that this is all about weather; Old takes *sumārutam* as its obj. (“damit er Anspruch habe auf schöne Marutgnade”) and *brahmāṇam* as its subj. I supply soma as the obj., because the soma drink is the most common obj. of *√arh* (see comm. ad VIII.20.18). I am not entirely happy with this intrusion, but it might make sense of comparing the Marut flock with Indra: they both deserve the soma, but Indra especially.

X.77.2: The dat. *śriyē* that opens the vs. picks up the *śobhāse* that ends vs. 1. Both are common elements in the Marut lexicon; for *śriyē* see, e.g., V.55.3, 60.4.

The problematic pāda is b, which contains *sumārutam* like 1c. There is no consensus about its usage here, or even its case form. Re takes it as a neut. nom., collectively referring to the pl. subject *māryāsah* (“en tant que bonne troupe mārutienne”), while Ge takes it as acc. referring to “ihr schönes Marutwetter.” My interpr. differs significantly from these, and depends on three factors: I take *sumārutam* as acc. and supply *brahmāṇam* from the phrase in 1c *sumārutam ná brahmāṇam*; I take the verb *akṛṇvata* in pāda a as controlling a kind of śleṣa, where *sumārutam ná* is structurally compared to *añjñ*, though they have somewhat different relationships to the verb; I take *pūrvīr āti kṣāpaḥ* with the phrase in c, not the simile in d. In c the obj. *añjñ* denotes what the Maruts made/provided for themselves – ornaments -- appropriate to the middle voice of *akṛṇvata*. The phrase *pūrvīr āti kṣāpaḥ* “across the many nights” is also appropriate here, because the ‘ornaments, unguents’ they make for themselves are elsewhere compared to stars. See, e.g. I.87.1 1 ... *añjñbhir, vyānajre ké cid usrā iva stṛbhīḥ* “with their unguents [the Maruts] have anointed themselves ... like the ruddy (dawns) with stars,” In the simile in d *sumārutam* is a predicate adj. modifying the gapped *brahmāṇam*: “(as) they have made (the formulator) well-provided with Maruts.” This latter usage is rather like III.11 4 *agnīm ... vāhniṃ devā akṛṇvata* “The gods made Agni their oblation-conveyor.” My interpr. of this hemistich is not particularly secure, but I think it is better than the other ones available.

On the curious intrusion of the Ādityas, see the publ. intro. I have no explanation; I am somewhat dubious about Th’s view (Fremd. 158) that what the Maruts and the Ādityas have in common is their care for the stranger (expressed by the epithet *riśādas-* of disputed meaning [see comm. ad I.2.7, V.60.7] in 3d and 5c). In any case, the word order, with *té*, ordinarily a first-position pronoun, following *ādityāsah*, seems to me to signal that *ādityāsah* is an unmarked simile.

On *akrā-* see comm. ad I.189.7.

X.77.3: The first pāda of this vs. departs from the already aberrant meter of this part of the hymn: rather than having an opening of 5 ending with a light syllable, followed by a heavy syllable that can count as two lights (see disc. in publ. intro.) allowing a Jagatī cadence, this has an opening of 4. However, the 5th syllable is light and the heavy 6th syllable can “count” as two lights, as elsewhere in this little group. The other 3 pādas conform to the meter elsewhere in these vss., with an opening of 5.

The *ná* in pāda a does not seem to be doing real simile work, since it seems unlikely that earth is being compared to heaven: they usually form a pair. My “as beyond earth” renders the *ná* unobtrusively and not very convincingly. It is possible that it’s marking pāda-final *barhāṇā* as the simile, with the same flip as in 1d, but “as if by might” seems to belittle the Maruts’ power.

In c #*pājasvanto* ... *panasyávo*# echo each other, further taken up by #*prāyasvanto* in 4d.

X.77.4: The first two pādas diverge from the metrical template of this part of the hymn in a different way from 3a: they have light 6<sup>th</sup> syllables. It is also a challenging vs. in structure and content.

In pāda a I take the gen. *yuṣmākam* with *yāmani* and the gen. *apām* with *budhné*, with Old and Re (though not, with the latter, introducing Ahi Budhnya into an already crowded vs.). I also take the simile as consisting of *budhné apām ná* despite the position of *ná*. (As we have seen and will see, the position of *ná* in this hymn can be all over the map.) The point of this first hemistich is that the earth (*māhī*) trembles at the Maruts’ journey, a common image in Marut hymns. In my interpr. the simile in the first pāda compares the earth to something based on water – that is, without a solid base.

Pāda b contains two verbs of parallel formation and near-identical sense, #*vithuryāti* ‘wavers, falters’ and *śratharyāti*# ‘slackens’. Both are hapaxes, but the former is clearly based on the reasonably well-attested adj. *vithurá-* ‘wavering’, while *śratharyá-* has no associated *r*-form, \**śrathara-* or the like, and must be directly based on *vithuryāti*. So also Re, though he cleverly also adduces *śithirá-*, also with *-r-*, as a near-relative. I assume that the accent of *śratharyāti* was also adapted from *vithuryāti*, as there is no syntactic reason for this verb to be accented. For *vithurá-* in this exact context, see I.87.3 [Maruts] *praiṣām ájmeṣu vithuréva rejate, bhūmir yāmeṣu* ... “At their drives, their journeys the earth trembles like one with faltering step” (sim. I.168.6, also Maruts).

The second hemistich is oddly constructed. In c we find a pāda-internal deictic pronoun followed by a Wackernagel particle chain: ... *ayám sú vaḥ*#. This is unprecedented as far as I can tell: *ayám* (etc.) is overwhelmingly pāda (/clause) initial; the few non-initial forms are generally preceded by at most one item, and I have found no other exx. where a mid-pāda *ayám* supports a clitic chain. The referent of *ayám* here is clearly the nom. phrase that precedes it: *viśvápsur yajñó arvāk*. Because of the unusual configuration of *ayám*, in the publ. tr. I took it as introducing a new clause, which continues into d. I now think this is wrong; certainly my English tr. is scarcely parsable. I now think that c is a self-contained nominal cl. with a heavy left-dislocated NP: “the sacrifice close by consisting of all good things -- this is for you.” The simile that opens d, *prāyasvanto ná*, then qualifies the unexpressed subj. of the impv. *ā gata*, the Maruts: “Like dispensers of ritual delight, come here to those who are concentrated (on you).”

On the adj. *viśvápsu-* see comm. ad I.148.1. Th’s ‘breath’ interpr. (see KISch 74f.) “ganz aus Atemhauch bestehend,” which is also responsible for Re’s “consistant entièrement en souffle,” does not make sense in most contexts, as Th’s special pleading for it in this passage demonstrates.

Re pronounces that *satráca(h)* is for \**satrāñcaḥ* [he omits accent] by fiat; Ge (n. 4cd) would like to do the same. But I see no reason why we, the goal of their journey, would not be focused on the arrivals, with the form therefore the acc. pl. it appears to be.

X.77.5: Acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, this vs. is in Jagatī, against the rest of the hymn, which the Anukr. labels Triṣṭubh. For vs. 5 the Anukr. is half right: the first two pādas again have a Jagatī cadence but 11 syllables and do not fit the template of what emerged as the standard such pattern earlier in the hymn. But the 2nd hemistich consists of two entirely well-behaved Jagatī pādas.

This is the last of the simile-laden vss., a structure signaled by ring composition: the last word of 5 is (*pari-*)*prúṣaḥ* ‘showering (all around)’, which matches the first word of the hymn, (*abhra-*)*prúṣaḥ* ‘showering (from a cloud)’ (see also the impv. *pruṣā* also in 1a).

In b it is unclear what ‘light-possessors’ (*jyótiṣmant-*) the Maruts are being compared to. Both Ge and Re fail to provide a referent, while Scar (343) supplies ‘dawns’, which would be difficult, since *jyótiṣmantaḥ* is masc. I suggest rather ‘fires’, on the basis of X.35.1 ... *agnáyo, jyótir bháranta uṣáso vyūṣṭiṣu* “... fires bringing light at the early brightenings of the dawn,” with the same *vyūṣṭiṣu* as here.

In d *prava-* belongs to the root  $\sqrt{pru}$  / *plu* ‘float’; the *r*-form here allows the phonetic figure *pravāsaḥ ... prásitāsaḥ pariprúṣaḥ*.

X.77.6–8: The last three vss. are conventional in content and have proper Triṣṭubh cadences throughout.

X.77.6: The structure of the vs. is somewhat unclear. Both Ge and Re take bc as qualifying the subj. of the *yád* clause in pāda a, with d as the corresponding main clause. I find this unlikely: pāda d is a repeated pāda (=VI.47.13, X.131.7, save for *yuyota* for *yuyotu*, cf. also VII.58.6), and repeated pādas are less likely to be integrated into a subord. cl. / main cl. diptych. Moreover, d has no logical connection with the rest. I instead think bc is itself the main clause, though it lacks a finite verb. We can either supply a verb of motion, as in the publ. tr., or take the participle *vidānāsaḥ* as the predicate of the main cl.

However we choose to take bc, the structure of these two pādas is itself noteworthy. What governs the gen. phrase *maháh saṃváraṇasya vāsvaḥ* in b must be the participle *vidānāsaḥ* in c, which contains another gen., *rādhyasya*, to be construed with the genitives in b. The postponement of the governing verb across the half-vs. boundary strikes me as somewhat unusual, though far from excluded. Note the play on *vāsu-*, which knits the pādas together.

*Pace* Gr, *vidānā-* must belong to  $\sqrt{vid}$  ‘know’, not ‘find’, since, as Re points out, only ‘know’ takes genitive complements.

X.77.7: The *ná* in b seems unnecessary, or at least displaced, since it would be odd to compare some entity to the Maruts in their own hymn. (Ge supplies “[to the singers], as to the Maruts,” since he thinks that b concerns the distribution of the Dakṣiṇā. But this would be an odd use of *ná*, and further I see no evidence of the Dakṣiṇā. Re vaguely adds “pour ainsi dire.”) In a hymn with so many *ná*-s, often in the “wrong” place, a pleonastic *ná* should not surprise us, but in fact I think we can justify it. In my interpr. two factors are at work. On the one hand, it may be playing off 8b:

7b xxxx *ná mān(uṣo)* xxx

8b xxxx *nām̐n(ā)* xxxx

[On the reading of ‘name’ in 8b, see comm. ad loc.] On the other hand, I think there is a suppressed comparison in pāda a. The human priest, descendant of Manu (*mānuṣaḥ*), in b is implicitly compared to the figure who is often “standing up at the ceremony” (*adhvareṣṭhā-*), namely Agni. See Scar’s phraseological parallels (643–44) VI.63.4 *ūrdhvō vām agnīr adhvarēsu asthāt* and X.20.5 *ūrdhvas tasthāv ṛbhvā yajñé*, both of Agni.

X.77.8: As noted ad vs. 7, I read distracted *nām̐nā* (with Gr and, tentatively, Old), which, in my interpr., allows a phonetic play with 7b. Distracting *ādityēna* as HvN do seems far less plausible: this stem is almost never distracted, and in this case it would produce a highly unusual rhythm for the opening, with light syllables in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> positions, and for a late break, with two heavy syllables.

Note the etymological play between *ūmāḥ* (a) and *avantu* (c).

As disc. above, ad 2d, the connection with the Ādityas is puzzling.

The rt-noun cmpd *rathatūr* in c raises several questions: it is a singular used of plural subjects and it doesn’t seem to have any bearing semantically on the Maruts’ activity here: aiding our inspired thought. In my view it must be an unmarked simile, with a horse as underlying referent (see I.88.2 *rathatūrbhir āśvaiḥ*) and generally refer to the Maruts’ swiftness and victoriousness, qualities that might help produce a swift and victorious inspired thought for us. On the pl. Maruts compared to a singular entity, see the next hymn, X.78.2 *agnīr nā*. Contra JSK I do not think *rathatūr* is conjoined with pāda d: “overtaking the chariots [*rathatūḥ* for \**rathatúraḥ*] and finding pleasure in the ceremony in their great course” (DGRV I.95) (sim. Ge). Among other things, the Maruts can hardly enjoy the ceremony if they’re on the road.

As for d and the *ca* therein, I take it as conjoining the two locc., (*mahāś ca*) *yāman* and *adhvaré*, in a modified X *ca* Y construction (with the *ca* following the first word of the first loc. phrase. The standard X Y *ca* construction was avoided here to forestall the double *ca* that would have arisen because of the flg. pf. part. *cakānāḥ*: \**mahó yāman adhvaré ca cakānāḥ*.

Finally, what is the referent of *mahāḥ*? I suggest that it is the Maruts’ “great host”; cf. in the next hymn X.78.6 *mahāgrāmó nā yāman* “like a great host on their journey.”

## X.78 Maruts

On the tight structure of this hymn, see publ. intro.

Though the Anukr. identifies vss. 1, 3, 4, 8 as Triṣṭubhs and 2, 5–7 as Jagatīs, in fact 1, 3, and 4, like many of the “Triṣṭubhs” in the previous hymn, mostly consist of 11-syllable pādas with Jagatī cadences, and though the vss. identified as Jagatīs have Jagatī cadences, at least 6c has only 11 syllables. By contrast, the final vs., 8, begins with a pāda containing 12 syllables but a Triṣṭubh cadence, but then provides three conventional Triṣṭubh pādas to bring the hymn to a settled and metrically safe conclusion.

X.78.1: Pāda c has 10 syllables but a Jagatī cadence.

The first three pādas end in an adj. in *su-*, which furnishes the point of comparison. The first two seem to sketch a ritual progression: the poets (*vīprāsaḥ*) of pāda a have good intention or purpose, are attentive in their ritual activity. Elsewhere such ritualists are depicted as “seeking the gods”: cf. III.8.4 *svādhyò mánasā devayántaḥ*, VII.2.5 *svādhyàḥ ... devayántaḥ*. This is the next step in our vs., with *devāvyàḥ* ‘pursuing the gods’ (with root  $\sqrt{vī}$ , not *-ya*-denom.) opening

pāda b. And the happy result is found at the end of b, *svāpnasaḥ* ‘having good profit’; as we all know, successful ritualist get well rewarded.

Re sees the vs. as embodying the three functions, which seems a stretch to me.

As Ge points out (n. 1d), the Maruts are described as *māryā arepāsaḥ* in V.53.3.

X.78.2: In this supposedly Jagatī vs., d contains only 11 syllables; the other pādas conform. This pāda is also structurally aberrant, in that the shared property, *susārmanah* ‘providing good shelter’, occurs first in the pāda, not last. (Pāda a also deviates in this regard: the shared property is *bhrājas-* ‘flash’ in mid-pāda.)

For the possible senses of *svayūj-* see Scar 433–35. I favor ‘own yokemates’ rather than ‘self-yoking’: the winds and the Maruts can be yoked together because they are equally speedy. (This sense of *svayūj-* also works well in the other two occurrences: X.67.8, 89.7.) This swiftness is underlined by the shared property, ‘bringing immediate aid’ (*sadyāūtayaḥ*): they appear as soon as needed.

In c I would slightly alter the tr. of *prajñātāraḥ* to “who know the way forward.”

I do not know why soma drinks are esp. associated with good shelter. In the IXth Maṇḍala Soma occasionally provides or is asked for shelter (e.g., IX.86.15; see passages in Lub s.v. *śārman-*), but not so often as other gods in other maṇḍalas. The bahuvr. *susārman-* once modifies Agni and Soma in the dual (I.93.7), but this is surely because of Agni, who is the usual referent of this adj. (e.g., V.8.2).

X.78.2–3: As noted in the publ. intro., “winds” are the comparanda in these two adjacent vss., 2b and 3a.

X.78.3: *dhūnayaḥ* can belong either with the simile (so Ge, publ. tr.) or the frame (so Re). The structure of the hymn, with, usually, a single shared property per simile, favors the former, but the fact that *dhūni-* regularly modifies the Maruts (I.64.5, 87.3, etc.) the latter. A possible alternative tr. would be “The boisterous ones who, like the winds, are always on the move.”

Given the metrical patterns established, we should expect pāda c to have a Jagatī cadence despite its 11 syllables. But in fact it has a cadence that fits neither Jagatī nor Triṣṭubh: L H H x (*śīmīvantaḥ*). Elsewhere this stem sometimes has to be read \**śīmīvant-* with light 2nd syllable (see comm. ad X.8.2), but that wouldn’t help here. Best would be \**śīmīvataḥ*, but we need the nom. pl. *-vantaḥ*.

In d we see the same ritual cause-and-effect as in 1ab: the “lauds of the ancestors” (*pitṛṇām ... śāṃsāḥ*) result in lovely gifts, as the proper reciprocal response to praise.

X.78.4: *sānābhayaḥ* is a pun, in that *nābhi-* refers both to the nave of a wheel into which the spokes are fitted and the navel of the human body. The Maruts “have the same navel,” because they are the sons of the same mother, Pr̥śni (also the same father, Rudra, but it’s motherhood that’s relevant to the navel).

In c the *māryāḥ* reappear from 1d (also X.77.3). The common property shared by the Maruts and the “young bloods gone awooing” is *ghṛtaprūṣ-* ‘sprinkling ghee’, which is not directly appropriate for either party – although more for the Maruts than the wooers. The root √*pruṣ* is very prominent in the immediately preceding Marut hymn (X.77), with the rt noun cmpds *abhra-prūṣ-* (1a) and *pari-prūṣ-* (5d), as well as impv. *pruṣā* (1a), so the act of showering/sprinkling is characteristic of them. The ghee that they are showering here must be

metaphorical, representing rain (so also, e.g., Scar 343); the same act is attributed to them in I.168.8 *yādī ghṛtām marútaḥ pruşṇuvánti*, where it clearly refers to rain. Moreover, two other occurrences of *ghṛta-prúṣ-* (VI.44.20, VII.47.1) modify *ūrmí-* ‘wave’ and presumably refer to water as well. But it is hard to envision *máryāḥ* showering either real or metaphorical ghee. Ge’s tr. indicates that in the simile he takes the cmpd to mean “verschwenderisch” (prodigal), and this is possible; Re bleaches it to mean simply “zélé au rite.” I would alternatively point to III.13.4 ... *pruşṇávad vásu* “he will shower goods” and suggest that we supply “goods” as the gapped obj. of *-prúṣ-* in the simile; “goods” would be the potential bridal gifts.

X.78.5: I render *jyēṣṭha-* differently here and in 2c, because neither ‘elder’ nor ‘superior’ easily fits both contexts.

Pāda b can be variously interpr., depending on the sense attributed to the desid. part. *didhiṣú-*. As discussed elsewhere (comm. ad I.71.3, X.26.6 and see my Bühler lecture), *didhiṣú-* can have the developed sense ‘desiring to acquire (a wife)’ = ‘suitor, wooer’. Ge takes it thus (“wie freunde Ritter,” though see his cautious n. 5b), as does the publ. tr. This interpr. has the merit of making sense of *sudānavah* ‘having good gifts’, i.e., providing good bridal gifts, and it also thematically matches 4c *vareyávo ná máryāḥ* “like young bloods gone awooing” in the immediately preceding vs. The charioteers on this bridal errand are (somewhat) reminiscent of the bride-seeking journey in Kakṣīvant’s *dānastuti*, I.126.3, 5, esp. 3b *vadhūmanto dāśa ráthāsaḥ* “ten chariots carrying brides.” However, it would be possible to interpr. *didhiṣú-* literally as ‘desiring to acquire’, without a marital context. In this case, *sudānavah* would be proleptic, expressing the gifts they will acquire. Re’s tr. uses the non-technical sense of the participle, but considers its gapped object to be victory, not gifts: “qui (reçoivent) de beaux dons comme des conducteurs-de-char cherchant à obtenir (la victoire).” I prefer the Ge/publ. tr. version but an alternative would be “who (will) possess good gifts like charioteers seeking to acquire (them).”

Note that *jigatnávaḥ* returns fro 3a.

The question in c is what to do with *udábhiḥ*, and this question can be divided into two: 1) should it be construed with *nimnāḥ*, likewise instr. pl.? 2) does it belong in the simile or the frame? The first is easily answered: though Re takes the two together (“avec les eaux déclives”), *nimná-* is always elsewhere a noun (‘depth, the deep’) and so the two instr. pl.s must be taken separately. The second is more difficult. Ge (as well as Re) takes *udábhiḥ* with the simile (“wie die Flüsse ... mit ihren Gewässern”), and this is certainly possible: though there are two words for ‘water’ in the phrase (Ge’s “Flüsse” is misleading for *āpaḥ*), *āpaḥ* are of course animate and agentive, while *udán-* is neuter and an inert substance. Nonetheless, I think *udábhiḥ* must be at least partially part of the frame, referring to the water the Maruts produce as rain (just referred to in *ghṛtaprúṣaḥ* in 4c), hence my “always on the move with their moisture.” However, I am now willing to entertain the possibility that *udábhiḥ* is shared by simile and frame and suggest the alternative translation “always on the move with their waters [=rain] like the Waters with their waters (moving) through the depths.”

The exact point of d is unclear, though I don’t think Ge helps by making *viśvárūpāḥ* a proper noun qualifier of the *Aṅgirasas*. I see *viśvárūpa-* as the shared property, placed unusually in initial position (but see *susārmāṇaḥ* in 2c). I think the idea here must be that the Maruts are inventive and skilled singers like the *Aṅgirasas* and their *sāmans* are thus ornamented with every possible variation. The Maruts’ “*sāmans*” are quite possibly the sounds of the thunderstorm: the thunder itself and the howling of the wind, often highlighted in Marut hymns.



X.78.6: Once again Re considers this vs. to express the three functions (First Function in ab, Third (?) in c, Second in d – he is only explicit about ab). This seems to me to be in the realm of fantasy.

Pāda a is difficult to interpr. because it is not clear what is the shared property and what belongs to the simile. Ge (at least in his tr., but see his n. 6a) takes *sūrī-* as the shared property, which he tr. as an adj. “freigebig”: the Maruts give abundant rain, the pressing stones abundant soma. In his interpr. *sín̄dhumātarah* exclusively modifies the stones (“wie die sindhugeborenen Presssteine,” though again see his n. 6a). Re also takes *sūrī-* as the shared property (though he properly tr. as a noun, with a certain amount of extra machinery), with *sín̄dhumātarah* exclusively modifying the Maruts: “(Eux qui jouent le rôle de) patrons comme les pierres-presseuses, (ces dieux) dont la Sindhu est la mère.” Klein’s tr. (DGRV I.350) seems to contain no shared property, but identifies the Maruts as *sūrī-* and the pressing stones as Sindhu-mothered: “The lords, like pressing-stones whose mother is the Indus.” In contrast to all of these, the publ. tr. takes *sín̄dhumātarah* as the shared property, with the Maruts identified as *sūrī-* (as in V.52.16). As to *sín̄dhumātarah*, I see the stones as having a river as mother because they have been smoothed as they tumble in the river (though I have no textual evidence for this) and the Maruts are said to have a heavenly river as mother, who would produce the water they distribute as rain. See nearby X.75.3, which establishes a heavenly (3a *divī*), rain-producing (3c... *prā stanayanti vṛṣṭáyah*) Sindhu (3d *sín̄dhur yád éti* ...), and note that this would continue the watery theme of our vs. 5c. Although I think this interpr. is more than defensible, I would also consider an alternate more like Ge/Re, though I then don’t know who to identify as *sín̄dhumātarah*: “Patrons, like the pressing stones whose mother is a river” or “Having a river as mother, they are patrons like the pressing stones” (slight preference for the first).

In b the shared property occupies most of the pāda: #*ādardirāsaḥ* ... *viśvāhāḥ*. The word *ādri-* can also be used to refer to the pressing stones (like *grāvan-* in a), and the image is of their constantly pounding the soma plant, as the Maruts-as-storm pound the earth. Note the phonetic figure *ādardirāso ādrayo*. The use of *ādri-* as subj. of *√dr* is rather cute, because on several occasions it is the object, when it refers to the Vala cave: see IV.16.8 ... *yád* ... *ādrim dārdar*, IV.1.14 ... *dadr̥vāṃso ādrim*.

In c the hapax *śisūla-* seems to be an affectionate, colloquial diminutive (note the *l*-form), though AiG II.2 862–63 doesn’t explicitly recognize such a function for the *-la*-suffix. Note that pāda-final *sumātārah* exactly echoes *s(ín̄dh)umātarah*, which ends pāda a.

There is no agreement on the position and function of *utá* in d. Ge seems to take it as introducing the shared property (which he takes as *tviṣā*) and therefore connecting d with the rest of the vs., though displaced: “und mit ihren Funkeln wie ein grosser Klan auf dem Kriegszug.” Klein (DGRV I.350) also thinks *utá* is conjoining pāda d with the rest of the vs., but without flg. Ge’s linkage of the two words in the phrase *utá tviṣā*, he therefore offers no explanation for the late position of *utá* if it is conjoining pādas. Re and the publ. tr. take *utá* as (unusually) conjoining nouns, in the case-mismatched phrase *yāmann utá tviṣā*. I still think this is the best explan., with *utá* used instead of *ca* perhaps because of the case disharmony. But a tr. like Ge’s “And with their turbulence (they are) like a great host (of warriors) on their journey” would be possible and would offer a different explanation for the unusual position of *utá*.

The use of *mahāgrāmá-* here certainly fits Rau’s interp. of the term *grāma-* as, in the first instance, “a roving band”; see comm. ad X.27.19, though as disc. there I think it has already developed the sense ‘village’ in some occurrences in the RV.

For *tviṣā* here I’d now substitute “turbulence” or “agitation” for “turmoil.”

X.78.7: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. introduces the first finite verbs in this hymn: *vy àśvitan* (b) and *mamire* (d).

I also think that the vs. has loosened up in another way: the rigid independence of pādas found through the rest of the hymn is broken in the second hemistich, by my interpr. (and Re's). By this interpr. the simile of c consists only of *sīndhavo ná yayyàḥ*, with the last word in this pāda, *bhrājadṛṣṭayah*, belonging with d; it does not fit easily with the simile in c. Ge takes it with the rest of c, but not, it seems, as the shared property: "Wie die Ströme eilend mit blinkenden Speeren." In either type of interpr. the problem is *yayyàḥ*, which ought to be fem. and therefore not applicable to the Maruts. Re suggests it's been attracted to *sīndhavaḥ* and, more to the point, adduces II.37.5 *yayyām ... rātham*, where the adj. modifies a masc. I think it likely that it matches / assimilates to masc. *vrkī*-inflected stems like *rathī*- 'charioteer', with nom. pl. *rathyàḥ*.

The last question in this vs. concerns the simile in d, and how we interpr. it depends on the morphological identity of *parāvātaḥ*. Usually this form is an ablative "from the/a distance," but in a minority of cases it is the homonymous acc. pl. This morphological identity is clearest when it is construed with *tisrās* "the three distant realms" (I.34.7, VIII.5.8, 32.22), though it is found elsewhere. I think this is one of those places: acc. pl. *parāvātaḥ* is the comparandum (*nā*) for acc. pl. *yójanāni*, hence my tr. "the stages of their journey (*yójanāni*) like distant realms" – indicating how vast a distance the Maruts can cover in a single stage. If I am correct, this is also the first and only simile in this hymn that is not in the nom. pl. I seem to be alone in this interpr., however: both Ge and Re (in different ways) take *parāvātaḥ* as ablative and the simile is quite recessive.

X.78.8: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. entirely departs from the style and structure of the rest of the hymn, both in content and in meter. It is a conventional hymn-final vs. begging for rewards for the praise conferred. It also contains the only occurrence of the word Marut in the hymn – solving the implicit riddles posed by the torrent of similes. Metrically it is the only standard Triṣṭubh – *except* for the 1st pāda, which has a Triṣṭubh cadence but twelve syllables (the opposite of much of the rest of the hymn with Jagatī cadences and eleven syllables). One of these syllables is entirely unnecessary: the *no* in 4th position, which doubles the *asmān* opening b. But, as sketched in the publ. intro., the *no* is the punning link between this vs. and the rest of the hymn. Almost every previous pāda has the simile particle *nā* in 2nd position, usually in syllable 4 (sometimes 5, occasionally elsewhere). The enclitic *no* in 8a deliberately (in my view) echoes this pattern of *nā*-s, and the fact that it disturbs the meter draws attention to it.

The part. *vāvrđhānāḥ* is rendered as reflexive/passive by Ge and Re. This is the usual function of this form, but it can also be (self-beneficial) transitive. I read it as both; see VIII.96.8, where it is transitive in the frame and intransitive in the simile.

On the slightly awkward phrase *ratnadhéyāni sánti*, see VII.53.3 *utó hí vām ratnadhéyāni sánti* and (with *√bhū*) IV.34.4 *ābhūd u vo vidhaté ratnadhéyam*.

## X.79–80

Two hymns to Agni, both attributed to Agni Saucīka or Agni Vaiśvānara, with Sapti Vājambhara listed as an alternate poet for X.79. This last name is obviously extracted from X.80.1 *sāptim vājambharām*.

## X.79 Agni

On the (pseudo-?)omphalos structure of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.79.1: Unaccented *asya* should not be a demonst. adj. with *mahatáh* (*pace* Re “de ce grand (dieu)” and probably Ge), and it should refer to something already in the discourse, despite being only the 2nd word in the hymn. The ritual fire beside which the poet is reciting the hymn fits the bill – the “discourse” must include the shared ritual situation.

The sense of *nānā* ‘each for itself’ (see comm. ad II.12.8) is rather attenuated here, to ‘alternately’ vel sim. It is notable that *nānā* appears often with duals: II.12.8, III.54.5, 55.11, V.73.4.

With Re, I take *ásinvant-* (and the adj. *asinvá-*) to mean ‘insatiable’, contra Ge (and EWA s.v. *asinvá-*) ‘without chewing/biting’. ‘Insatiable’ fits the contexts better, as well as the derivation from \**seh<sub>2</sub>* ‘sate, satisfy’ (EWA ibid.). Esp. in this context, ‘not biting’ would be directly contradicted by the flg. word *bápsatī* ‘chewing’.

X.79.2: This vs. focuses on body parts – of the fire (head [*śírah*], eyes [*akṣī*], tongue [*jihváyā*]) and of the priests (feet [*padbhīh*], hands [*-hasta-*]). The image of the fire must be standing on its head, with the (top of the) head on or in the ground, where the flames originate and differentiate, and the flames above this source being his tongues. What exactly his eyes are and where they are are unclear to me – much less why Agni has two (and only two?) eyes, but *akṣī* must be dual and is so interpr. by Pp. This puzzle has elicited little or no comment from moderns; Sāy.’s interpr., that Agni’s two eyes are the sun and the moon, may be correct. They are light sources comparable to Agni and roughly eye-shaped. This certainly accounts for the dual, which needs to be accounted for, and they are spatially ‘separate, apart’ (*śdhak*) from the rest of the scene. If this is correct, the visual image conjured up is a kind of Vedic proto-cubism, with the eyes removed from the upside-down face and stuck into the sky, rather than between the top of the head and the mouth/tongue, where they ordinarily are found. So be it – it wouldn’t be the strangest RVic image ever!

And it is already challenged by pāda c. The priests collecting foodstuffs for Agni “with their feet” (*padbhīh*) makes them sound as if they have prehensile monkey-like toes, but surely it just refers to the priests’ walking in the brushland to collect firewood (though I’m quite sure the poet was well aware of the bizarre image he was creating).

Note that the pāda-final verb *sám bharanti* matches *sám bharete* in the same position in 1d.

X.79.3: With the standard tr. going back to antiquity, I interpr. “the hidden place of the mother” (*mātúh ... gúhyam*) to be her breast, which the child /young fire is seeking.

Also with the standard tr., I assume an unsignaled change of subject in cd. Agni must be the one “gleaming” in the acc. (*śucántam*) in c, so the subj. of *avidat* is the priest or another mortal. His “finding” of Agni may depict the moment when the fire-kindling priest perceives the first glimmer of flame in the dried vegetation assembled for the kindling.

There is some difference of opinion (see Ge n. 3c) as to whether *sasám ... pakvám* refers to “cooked food” or “ripe grain(field),” with the former mostly favored (Sāy., Ge, Re), though Old and Kü (429) opt for the latter, as do I. I take *śucántam* as the shared property; most take the simile just with *avidat* (“found him like cooked food”). The image in my view is that of the sun gleaming on the golden heads of ripe grain (see the photos in Google Images of ripe barley).

*ripáḥ* is a problem. With most, I take it as belonging with the phrase *ripó ágram* in III.5.5, which is a variant of the likewise problematic *ágre rupáḥ* in IV.5.7 (see comm. ad loc.). Here *upásthe antáḥ* substitutes for *ágra-* as the location of the mysterious *ri/up-*.

X.79.4: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. structurally functions as an omphalos vs. and is introduced as if with a revelation: *tád ṛtám ... prá bravīmi* “I proclaim this truth” – though the truth is fairly humdrum. Note also that though the poet began the hymn with *ápaśyam* “I saw,” in this vs. he asserts that he, as a mortal, does not perceive (*nāham ... mártyaś ciketa*); only Agni does.

X.79.5: This vs. accomplishes a tricky switch of referents: pāda a contains a dat. sg. m. pronominal *asmai*, c the same, but *tasmai*. The first is a 3rd ps. ref. to Agni, the second a 3rd ps. ref. to the sacrificer, who is represented in ab by *yáḥ* as subject of the three verbs in that hemistich. Meanwhile, Agni resurfaces as subj. of cd but in the 2nd ps. (*ví cakṣe ... ágne ... asi tvám*).

There is a possible alternative interpr. of ab, which does not actually change much. In both the publ. tr. and the standard tr., *púṣyati* at the end of b has the sacrificer as subj. and a (semi-)transitive sense, ‘prosper s.o.’. It owes its accent to being in the relative clause. However, it’s possible to read it as the verb of the main clause to which *yáḥ ... juhóti* is subordinated. It would then owe its accent to being 1st in its clause, and would express the happy result for the hard-working sacrificer: “Whoever sets out dry food for him, pours oblations with melted butter and ghee for him, he [=sacrificer] prospers.” The verb would have the less common intrans. sense. The second hemistich would begin a new sentence. I do not favor this alternative, however.

The puzzling “two eyes” of Agni in 2a are here replaced (/repaired) by a thousand eyes (*sahásram akṣábhīḥ*) more appropriate to a multiply glittering god.

X.79.6: This vs. turns on the pun between the perfects *cakartha* ( $\sqrt{kr}$ ) in pāda a and *cakarta* ( $\sqrt{kr}$  ‘cut’) in d. The first thing to say is that the publ. tr. contains an outright error: *cakarta* is of course a 3rd sg. (‘he cut’) not a 2nd sg. (‘you cut’), however tempting the latter is. The pāda should read “he cut apart (the wood) piece by piece, as a knife does a cow joint by joint.”

The vs. also presents itself in the fashion of an omphalos hymn, with the speaker, confessing ignorance, asking the god for enlightenment (b: *ágne pṛchāmi nú tvám ávidvān* “Agni, unknowing I ask you now”) about a grave offense to the gods (pāda a). This is highly reminiscent of the anguished questioning of Varuṇa by the poet in the famous dialogue hymn VII.86 (esp. vs. 3). But here it’s actually a joke! The poet isn’t asking about his own faults, but Agni’s – and the only evidence that Agni has committed a transgression is that he “eats without teeth,” a natural fact that never slows down Agni’s consumption, as d demonstrates.

As Re points out, *áttave* ‘*dán* is a pun on  $\sqrt{ad}$  ‘eat’ (*át-tave*) and *dánt-* ‘tooth’ (*a-dánt-*), which, if we backproject it far enough, becomes an etymological figure.

X.79.7: The tr. ‘that face in all directions’ is misleading for *viśūcaḥ*, since it sounds as if *viśva-* were involved. Better ‘facing in diverse/multiple directions’; see comm. ad VI.59.5. These horses are of course his flames.

Although Gr glosses *ṛjīti-* as ‘glühend, strahlend’, most modern comm. and tr. take it rather to mean ‘of straight course’ vel sim; see the tr. of the various passages by Ge, Re, as well

as EWA s.v. – though see Kü’s tr. of the phrase in this passage (149) “mit glühenden (?) Zügeln.” Although *īji-* ‘shining’ could easily be a Caland form to *ījrá-* in the part of the latter’s range that means ‘silvery, shining’, a relationship to *ījú-* ‘straight’ is also probable. The formation of *ījīti-* is not clear: though AiG II.2.628 seems to favor a suffixal form, comparable to *dabhīti-* ‘harmful’, it also mentions the possibility of a compd with *iti-* to *√i* ‘go’, which I would favor. See EWA, which mentions both. The stem occurs 4x in the RV; the passage that most clearly supports ‘having a straight course, going straight’ is VI.75.12, where it qualifies an arrow. In our passage, ‘straight’ is better than ‘shining’, though since Agni is involved, ‘shining’ isn’t excluded. X.21.2 of an oblation and X.75.7 of a river are friendlier to ‘shining’, but ‘straight’ works well in both.

With Ge and Re, I take *mitrá-* as a qualifier of Agni (my ‘ally’; their ‘friend’), in contrast to Kü (107, 149), who takes it as a ref. to Mitra. Agni as distributor of the oblation to the gods makes better sense than Mitra as subj. of *caṣṣadé*. The adj. *sújāta-* is also more appropriate for Agni, esp. since his birth featured earlier in the hymn: most of the singular forms of (differently accented) *sujātá-* qualify Agni, as well as the majority of the same to *sújāta-*.

## X.80 Agni

On the insistent repetitive structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. Because of the relentless fronting of Agni in the original, I have tried to keep Agni close to the front in the tr., even when it is awkward.

X.80.1: The compd. *karmaniṣṭhā-* is variously rendered (see the standard tr. as well as Scar 648–49); on my understanding of *niṣṭhā-*, which matches Scar’s, see comm. ad III.31.10 and of further compds using *niṣṭhā-* VIII.2.9; as for root noun compds of the type NOUN – PREV.+ROOT (and their avoidance) see comm. ad I.124.7.

As I have argued elsewhere (see now comm. ad X.28.2, inter alia), *kukṣi-* originally, and in most of its Vedic occurrences, meant ‘cheek’; however, here it shows the transferred sense ‘belly’ in the compd *vīrá-kukṣi-* ‘having a hero in her belly’ (< ‘having a belly with a hero [in it]’). It is surely no accident that this is a pregnant belly, which physically resembles a puffed-out cheek.

X.80.2: The form of Agni that opens pāda a, gen. *agnéḥ*, is the only interruption of the string of nom. sg. *agnīḥ*-s that open every pāda (14 in all) until *agnéḥ* reappears in 4d. Despite the grammatical difference, note that it involves only the change of one vowel.

The problem in pāda a is the gen./abl. *ápnasaḥ*, about which there are many and diverse opinions (see esp. Old). As a neut. noun it cannot modify the other gen., *agnéḥ*. Old and Ge, in different ways, take *ápnasaḥ* as directly dependent on *samídh-* “the kindling of *ápnas-*” – e.g., Old “Das Holzseid der Gabe des Agni sei herrlich.” Re takes it rather as semantically parallel to *bhadrá* despite the case difference: “... soit réjouissante, (soit signe) de bénéfice.” I’m inclined in the Re direction because (as Ge [n. 2a] and Old point out) *bhadrá-* and *ápnas-* are parallel in I.133.9, 20. Here the adj. *bhadrá-* modifies *samídh-* directly, but the noun *ápnas-* must be in an oblique case: “of/for profit.”

Agni “enters” the two world-halves by being kindled and spreading his light between them.

Pādas c and d are obviously contrasted, through the polarized terms *ékam ... purūṇi*. The sense in the publ. tr. would be clearer if I had fld. Ge and Re in tr. *ékam* as ‘alone’. In other

words, Agni gives aid to the warrior fighting alone and against odds, as well as having the power to take on many opponents.

X.80.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is reminiscent of the brisk catalogues of the Aśvins' deeds (so also Re), particularly those found in Kakṣīvant hymns (I.116–20). The similarity extends to the fact that most of the deeds (in pādas a, b, and d) are unknown or barely so. Only the Atri episode (c) is familiar, on which see my Hyenas 228–29; it is worth noting that it's usually the Aśvins who rescue Atri, which supports the notion that this vs. is based on Aśvin models. The destruction of Jarūtha is mentioned twice elsewhere (VII.1.7, 9.6), but with no further details: in VII.1.7 Agni burns him up, but in VII.9.6 it is Vasiṣṭha who smites him (though with Agni apparently present). Nṛmedha figures briefly in X.132.7, but as a rescuer, not a beneficiary. Nṛmedha Āṅgīrasa is also a poet to whom the Anukr. attributes VIII.89-90 and 98-99 (all Indra hymns), as well as IX.27 and 29; see also Śakapūta Nārmedha, the supposed poet of X.132. None of these hymns gives any clue to the role of Nṛmedha here.

As noted in the opening comm. to X.76, the Anukr. attributes that hymn to a snake Jaratkarma. The relationship is clear, the reason for it is not.

In b *adbhyāḥ* could be either dat. or abl.; the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take it as abl., presumably because 'for the waters' makes little sense, and in any case Agni would probably need to get his victim out of the water before burning him. But in the absence of more information about the story, we can't be certain.

X.80.4: On the NP *dráviṇam vīrapeśā(h)* and the gender (dis)agreement therein, see comm. ad IV.11.3. Although in our passage, *vīrapeśā(h)* could be nom. sg. m. and modify Agni, in IV.11.3 Agni is in the ablative: *tvád eti dráviṇam vīrapeśā(h)* and so neut. *dráviṇam* must be the target noun.

X.80.5: Ge (n. 5c) thinks the birds call on Agni "aus Angst"; I'm not sure that this limitation is necessary, esp. since it's not clear to me what Agni could do for flying birds-in-need.

X.80.6: As Ge points out (n. 6a), pāda a is almost identical to nearby X.83.2, except that Manyu (battle fury) is the addressee there. Although I usually render the vṛddhi deriv. *mānuṣa-* as 'stemming from Manu' or the like (so persuaded by JPB), here the more standard 'human' might be better, given *mānuṣaḥ ... jātāḥ* in the next pāda, which would otherwise seem to double *mānuṣa-*.

On *vī* in b see Old.

The interpr. of c is hampered by the absence of a verb and by the unclarity of the phrase "the Gandharvan path of truth" (*gāndharvīm pathyām ṛtasya*). Ge supplies 'knows' and thinks the phrase refers to the right way to sing; Lü (540 n. 2) agrees. Re is rather vague about the purport of the pāda but supplies 'finds' on the basis of III.31.5 *vīśvām avindan pathyām ṛtasya*. Although this parallel lacks the Gandharva connection (Gandharvas in the RV tend to spread obscurity), it otherwise seems close enough to favor supplying 'find' here too. The path Agni finds is presumably connected with the ritual process, perhaps, with Ge, the sung or at least verbal portion of the ritual.

The word *gávyūti-* is regularly associated with ghee, though the ghee is metaphorical for rain, in the phrase "sprinkle the pastureland with ghee" (*ghṛtēna/ghṛtaír gávyūtim √ ukṣ*): III.62.16=VIII.5.6, VII.62.5, 65.4. Here I think this metaphorical phrase is given a literal spin:

Agni's pastureland – the place he forages for food – is in the actual ghee of the poured oblation. (I owe this explanation to JPB.)

X.80.7: As pointed out in the publ. intro., this vs. breaks the rigid structural pattern of the rest of the hymn – first by beginning the vs. with a trisyllabic form of Agni, dat. *agnáye*, and then by addressing him directly in the 2nd hemistich, with two vocc. *ágne*, thus introducing the 2nd ps. for the first time in the hymn.

#### [X.81–82 Viśvakarman JPB]

#### X.83–84 Battle Fury

The next two hymns to “Battle Fury” (Manyu) are attributed to a poet Manyu Tāpasa, whose name is transparently derived from the dedicand of the hymn; for the patronymic see *tāpasā* in X.83.2, 3. Although not as rigidly structured as X.80 with its relentlessly fronted *agní-*, both of these hymns are quite insistent on the name: *manyú-* appears at least once in every vs. in both hymns and once considerably more (4x in X.83.2) -- except for the last vs. in X.83 (in a different meter). The diction and contents are fairly straightforward, but there is considerable sharing of vocabulary both within and across the hymns. Both hymns are found, in opposite order, in AVŚ IV.32–33; also in AVP IV.32 [=RV X.83] and IV.12 [=RV X.84] but not adjacent.

#### X.83 Battle Fury

X.83.1: An etymological figure involving  $\sqrt{sah}$  ‘be victorious’, beginning in b, continued in c, and exploding in d. For other forms of  $\sqrt{sah}$  see below.

X.83.2: I don’t understand the pf. *āsa*; these identifications would be more powerful if they were not set in the past.

As indicated above, c is almost identical to nearby X.80.6a, though with Agni as the addressee.

X.83.4: Note ... *abhíbhūt'y-ojāḥ* and *abhimāti-ṣāhāḥ* ending the two pādas of the first hemistich.

Another flurry of  $\sqrt{sah}$  forms, beginning at the end of b and continuing in c.

X.83.5: It is difficult to ascribe to the nom. part. *sán* its usual concessive force.

For ease of tr. I render the gen. *taviṣāsya* as a voc. beside *pracetaḥ*.

Note the phonetic figure *táva krátvā taviṣasya*.

Note also the contrastive *krátvā* (b) and *akratúḥ* (c).

On nonce act. transitive *jihāḍa* as generated to medial *jihāḍe* ‘is angry’ (as also suggested by the vocalism), see Kü 610–11.

X.83.5–6: Note the repetition of *méhi* (5d, 6a), reminiscent of the more ubiquitous and regimented concatenations in X.84.

X.83.6: Another  $\sqrt{sah}$  form, *sáhuri-*, a Lieblingwort of these two hymns: X.83.4, 6; 84.2, 5.

‘Suckling all’ (*viśvādhāyas-*) seems an incongruous epithet for Battle Fury; it usually characterizes more benign subjects, esp. Agni, but also wealth, the earth, etc. I don’t know what it is meant to convey here—perhaps that the Manyu that sweeps us to victory provides us with the spoils we need to thrive.

With JSK (DGRV I.371–72), I take *utā* as conjoining the two imperatival clauses ... *ā vavartsva* (c) and *utā bodhi āpēḥ* (d), with the first dual subjunctive clause *hānāva dāsyūn* parenthetically inserted.

The impv. clause *bodhi āpēḥ* raises the question: which root does *bodhi* belong to --  $\sqrt{bhū}$  or  $\sqrt{budh}$ ? Re opts for the former, on the basis of VIII.3.1 *āpīr no bodhi* “become our friend” and of the impv. *bhavā* in the next vs. (7a). However, this leaves him floundering in attempting to explain the clear gen.(/abl.) *āpēḥ*. Much better to follow Old, Ge, and Klein (inter alia) and take it to  $\sqrt{budh}$  ‘be aware’, which takes a gen. complement by rule.

X.83.7: This vs., particularly the 1st hemistich, is apparently modeled on VIII.100.2, in a brief dialogue between Vāyu (VIII.100.1) and Indra (vs. 2): the even pādas (100.2d, 83.7b) are identical and the preceding odd pādas very similar: VIII.100.2c *āsaś ca tvām dakṣiṇatāḥ sakhā me* “and you will be my comrade on my right side” v. our *dakṣiṇatō bhavā me* “be on my right side” (with *āpi-* ‘friend’ in 6d). Indra’s offer to Vāyu of the first drink of soma in VIII.100.2ab is similar to our cd, where the poet offers Manyu the best of the soma and suggests they two will drink it together silently. The ritual tech. term *upāmśū* is found only here in the RV; on its sense see Re (Vocab. rit. véd.), Sen (Dict. of Vedic Rituals) both s.v. It refers to a kind of near-silent recitation; the first drawing of soma at the Morning Pressing is done this way. And of course Vāyu gets the first drink of soma.

#### X.84 Battle Fury

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is characterized by verbal concatenation, with the final word of one vs. picked up at the beginning of the next: *agnī-* ‘fire’ in 1d/2a, *ēka-* ‘alone’ 3d/4a,  $\sqrt{ji}$  ‘be victorious’ +  $\sqrt{kr}$  ‘make’ 4d/5a, *ā*  $\sqrt{bhū}$  ‘(come) into existence, be at hand’ 5d/6a, (*dhana-*) *sām*  $\sqrt{srj}$  ‘pour in spoils’ 6d/7a; only 2d/3a lacks this type of concatenation (but see below). In fact, the concatenation carries over the hymn boundary: in vs. 1d *abhī prā yantu* “let them go forth on attack” echoes X.83.7a *abhī prēhi* “go forth on attack” in the last vs. of the preceding hymn.

X.84.1: On the verbal concatenation with the last vs. of the previous hymn, see immed. above.

The adverbial phrase *tvāyā ... sarātham* “on the same chariot with you” is a variant of *tvāyā yujā* “with you as yokemate” in the 1st vs. of the preceding hymn as well as 4c in this hymn.

X.84.3: Although, as noted above, the final/initial concatenation that prevails in the rest of the hymn does not link vs. 3 with vs. 2, vs. 3 is nonetheless tightly bound to the two preceding vss. Initial *sahasva* repeats pāda-final *sahasva* in 2a, and vs.-final *śātrūn* repeats *śātrūn* in 2c. Moreover, *rujān* (3b) echoes *ārujāntaḥ* (1a) and *prēhi* (3b) *abhī prā yantu* (1d).

The VP *sahasva ... abhīmātim* corresponds to the cmpd *abhimātiṣāhā-* in the preceding hymn, X.83.4.

In d both Ge and Re supply a second object in the phrase *vāsaṃ nayase*, namely “them” presumably picking up *śātrūn* in b and the subj. of *ā rurudhre* in c: “bringst du ... (sie) in



deine Macht”; “tu (les) mènes à (la) volonté,” with *vásam* an acc. of goal. I instead take *vásam* as adverbial “at will,” as I do also in the rt-noun cmpd. *vaśa-nī-* in X.16.2. See comm. ad loc. and Scar (290). I do not supply an acc. ‘them’.

X.84.4: Note the juxtaposition of the semantically polarized terms *éko bahūnām* “one/many.” The function of the gen. *bahūnām* is disputed. With Ge I take it as (an irreg.) gen. agent with *īḍitāḥ*; Ge (n. 4a with suppl. n. 1) cites X.93.4 *nṛṇām stutāḥ* as parallel. Re explicitly rejects an agentive reading and tr. “Tu es seul parmi beaucoup ...” (so also Proferes, Sovereignty, p. 18) with a more orthodox use of the genitive. Because of the āmreḍita *viśam-viśam* in the next pāda, I nonetheless favor the agentive interpr.: Manyu performs various services for the many who invoke him. I also can’t imagine who “the many” would be who are not being called upon – gods like Indra? other emotional states?

*sām śīsādhi* echoes *saṃśísānāḥ* in 1a. There the participle took *āyudhā* as object, while here the impv. has *yudhāye* as dative of purpose.

On the voc. bahuvrīhi *ākṛtta-ruk*, see, briefly, Scar (459).

On *tváyā yujā* see comm. ad vs. 1.

On *kṛṇmahe* see comm. ad X.51.7.

X.84.4–5: The final two words of vs. 4 *vijayāya kṛṇmahe* are matched by the rt. noun cmpd. *vijeṣa-kṛt*, which opens vs. 5. Several remarks about this pairing are in order. First, *vijayāya kṛṇmahe* is not a tight syntagm: *kṛṇmahe* has its own direct object (*ghóṣam* ‘cry’) and *vijayāya* is a dative of purpose with the whole predicate. Second, as Scar (80) points out, *vijeṣa-* is not otherwise found in the RV (though it is found non-compounded in AVP V.23.1), though *jeṣá-* is found a couple of times – and, I’d point out, there are *s-aor.* forms *jéṣ(a)-*. Scar considers various possibilities for its formation in this cmpd. (see also Re), but does not mention the clear impetus for its creation: the chaining between 4 and 5. Clearly a nominal form of *vi√ji* was wanted as first member of the *-kṛ-t* cmpd, but simply repeating *vijayá-* is not possible for metrical reasons: \**vijaya-kṛt* would produce an opening of 4 light syllables (since *-kṛd* is followed by a vowel), whereas *vijeṣa-* provides the very desirable heavy second syllable and breaks up the unacceptable sequence of light syllables.

X.84.5: The hapax *anavabravá-* is very difficult to interpr. because the lexeme *áva√brū* does not seem otherwise to exist, nor in fact does *áva* plus a verb-of-speaking, like *áva√vac* or *áva√vad*, in early Vedic. (In the Brāh. *áva√vad* is found [e.g., AB V.22] in the apparent sense ‘speak ill’; one could also point to *áva√man* ‘despise’, although this lexeme doesn’t really show up till Epic/Classical.) Both the context and the preverb *áva* ‘down’ suggest that the lexeme has a negative value, lit. ‘talk/speak down’ – with this negative sense reversed by the privative *an-*. The range of available tr. reflects this assumption, but there is otherwise little or no agreement: Gr “von dem man nichts übles sagen kann,” Ge “keine Absage [refusal] geben,” Re “sans dédire (la promesse),” Scar (80) “untadelig,” Wh (AVŚ IV.31.5) “not to be talked down.” There are no grounds on which to choose among these. The publ. tr. sticks close to the additive/literal, but assumes that the form is active (so Ge, Re), not passive (so Gr, Scar, Wh). In the publ. tr. the unexpressed assumption is that Manyu can become our overlord (*adhipā-*) without verbally demeaning us.

X.84.5–6: The formal concatenation between *ābabhūtha* (5d) and *ābhūti-* (6a) is undeniable; their semantic connection is a different matter. Re explicitly asserts that they have different meanings, and the standard tr. render the verb and the noun differently: Ge “... du entstammst” v. “mit dem Erfolg”; Re “... tu as pris naissance” v. “avec le succès”; Wh (AVŚ IV.31.5–6) “thou camest” v. “with efficacy.” Since *ābhūti-* is found only here in the RV (and very seldom elsewhere), it is embarrassing to attribute to it a sense different from the juxtaposed verb. Consequently the publ. tr. attempts to unify them: “you came to be ready to hand” and “with readiness.” One of the usual senses of verb forms of *ā√bhū* is ‘come into being’, as in the repeated *yāta ābabhūva* “... from where [this creation] came to be” in the famous creation hymn (X.129.6–7). Our clause, *yāta ābabhūtha*, matches the X.129 usage exactly, and I would now emend the tr. to “... whence you came into existence.” Another sense of *ā√bhū* is ‘be at hand, be ready’, and this is the usual meaning of the rt noun cmpd *ābhū-* ‘standing by, ready at hand, available’; see Scar 359–61. Our isolated *ābhūti-* seems to be the abstract ‘readiness’ corresponding to this rt noun adj.; so approx. also Scar. In this instance the concatenation implicitly contrasts two somewhat different senses of the same lexeme.

X.84.6: On *ābhūti-* see immed. above; note that the voc. of another such *-ti*-stem cmpd., *abhibhūte*, is found in the next pāda. The latter is also found in the cmpd. *abhibhūty-ojas-* in the preceding hymn, X.83.4.

On *sahajā-* see Scar 148. The first member is presumably the adv. *sahá* ‘together with’, and this first cmpd member is construed with the instr. *ābhutyā*. However, as Scar points out, a connection with *√sah* ‘be victorious’ is also thinkable, esp. since forms of this root are all over these two hymns, incl. *sāhaḥ* in the next pāda. However, the phrase *krátvā ... sahá* “together with your resolve” in c seems to stabilize *saha-* in *sahajā-* as the adv.

The sequence *vajra sāyaka, sāhaḥ* is found also in X.83.1, likewise split across a pāda boundary.

The rhyming phrase *med'y edhi* is phonologically catchy and recalls the repeated *méhi* of the previous hymn (X.83.5, 6). On the meaning of *medín-* see comm. ad X.38.2.

X.84.6–7: The concatenation of these two vss. is phrasal: *(mahā)dhanásya ... saṃsṛjī* in 6d matches *sāmsrṣṭam dhānam* in 7a.

X.84.7: On *sām√sṛj* see comm. ad X.27.10 and Scar 627–28. My rendering ‘pour in’ may be a bit over-literal. In 7a spoils that are *sāmsrṣṭa-* are contrasted with those that are *samākṛta-*. Ge suggests (n. 7a) inanimate and animate respectively; Re’s interpr. is more elaborate (see below). Although both *sām√kṛ* and *ā√kṛ* are common, *sam-ā√kṛ* is quite rare. I take the preverbs as additive – ‘bring here [=make (to be) here] together’ – and assume that it involves actual collection, whereas *sām√sṛj* may refer to things that have accumulated on their own. This is somewhat like Re’s “celui qui s’est déversé (de soi-même) et celui qu’on a poussé (devant soi pour le faire aller) ensemble” – which seems to be the exact opposite of Ge’s suggestion. I can’t get any further, but I favor something like Re’s solution (without the excess verbiage).

I do not understand why the peaceable Varuṇa is brought in at the last minute, to pair with Battle Fury.

**X.85–191** From here on till the end of the maṇḍala, the hymns are discrete, arranged (roughly and with a number of exceptions) by decreasing number of verses. See Old, Prol. 228, 237, 240–49.

### **X.85 Wedding**

This long and complex hymn is clearly a composite, as suggested by its length (one of the longest hymns in the RV), the abrupt changes in its tone and subject matter, and its metrical variety. It has been treated by a range of scholars too numerous to mention. Most of its vss. are found in the AV (AVŚ XIV.1–2; AVP XVIII), though not in the same order and with many additional vss. interspersed: the RV version has 47 vss., the Śaunaka AV a total of 139. For my overview of the structure and contents of the RV version see publ. intro.

X.85.1–19: This long preamble treats the mythical wedding of Sūryā, daughter of the Sun, and Soma, who here is identified with the Moon, as in later texts but very rarely in the RV. The structure of this hymn-within-a-hymn is

vss. 1–5 Soma’s astronomical qualifications

vss. 6–12 identification of items associated with the wedding with astronomical and other phenomena

vss. 13–16 the pre-wedding: the “wooing”

vss. 17–19 blessings and more astronomy

On the various possible boundaries of this Sūryā hymn, see Old.

X.85.1: This vs. is notable for the parallel hemistich-initial instr. *satyēna* (1a) and *ṛténa* (1c). In keeping with my (perhaps overscrupulous) insistence that *ṛtá-* means ‘truth’ in the RV (flg. Lüders), not ‘cosmic order’, ‘law’, or the like, I tr. *ṛténa* here as ‘by truth’ and *satyēna* as ‘by reality’: in much of the RV the adj. *satyá-* means ‘real, actual, actually present’. However, I now realize that I must reckon with changing semantics in the late RV, and just as Soma here assumes his later role as the Moon, *satyá-* may here have acquired its later meaning of ‘truth’, impinging on the semantic domain of *ṛtá-*, while *ṛtá-* may have narrowed its usage to the principle of truth associated with the Ādityas, as is suggested by their presence in pāda c. (See Re’s remark, EVP XVI.144, that in Maṇḍala X *ṛtá* “coincides” with *satyá-*.) I would now change the tr. to “By (realized) truth ..., by (immanent) truth ...” – or, more simply, “by truth ... by truth,” however against my principles that is.

The next question is why the earth needs to be propped up (*úd*). I have no answer, and it’s not a question that seems to have exercised other commentators.

Though underlyingly and overwhelmingly masc., *dyaúḥ* is fem. here (adj. *úttabhītā*), as it tends to be when associated with reliably fem. ‘earth’.

The nuance of *tisṭhanti* isn’t entirely clear to me – perhaps ‘take their stand’ or ‘stand firm’; the other three pādas in the vs. concern the stable position of the entity in question.

Pāda d establishes Soma in heaven and implicitly as a heavenly body.

X.85.2: A major lapse in the publ. tr.: in pāda b “by Soma” should be substituted for “by truth”!

X.85.3: Having established the celestial and cosmic bona fides of Soma, the poet now distinguishes this Soma from the ritual drink.

On the knowledge possessed by ‘formulators’ (*brahmāṇaḥ*) see comm. ad vs. 16.

X.85.4: This vs. develops the thought of vs. 3: that the Soma under discussion here is not the ritual drink, and he therefore can listen to the sound of the pressing stones with equanimity, since he will not be smashed by the stones and consumed.

So much is clear from the 2nd hemistich; the first one presents interpretational difficulties in the two instr. pls., *āchādvidhānaiḥ* (a) and *bārḥataiḥ* (b) – in both cases the protectors of Soma. The first is a hapax, the second occurs only once in the RV (though it is common elsewhere in Vedic), but their formations are fairly clear: *bārḥata-* is a vṛddhi deriv. of *brhánt-* ‘lofty’, and the two members of the cmpd. *āchād-vidhāna-* are both found elsewhere. But this doesn’t get us very far, nor do the various tr. offered of the cmpd., including the unperspicuous one in the publ. tr. “whose regulation is sheltering.” Perhaps the closest to the mark is Doniger’s non-literal “by those charged with veiling you.” I think this has to do with the phases of the moon. *ví√dhā* can refer to temporal regulation, indeed of the moon. Cf. X.138.6 *vidhānaṃ māsām* “the apportioner of the months”; and in our hymn vs. 18 *ṛtūṃ anyó vidádḥaj jāyate púnāḥ* “The other [=the moon] is born again as he portions out the seasons.” The cmpd should be a bahuvrīhi, and I suggest something like “those who have [=oversee] the regulation of (your) covering” or, a bit less awkwardly, “those who regulate your covering” – i.e., whatever forces control the regular covering and uncovering of the moon in its monthly phases. For further on the cmpd. see Scar 129–30.

As for *bārḥata-* ‘those belonging to the heights’, this could refer to heaven-dwellers (cf. *brhād-dīva-*, etc.) or, since the earthly plant soma grows in the mountains, to mountain-dwellers (hapax voc. *brhad-giri-*). Since the focus in this hymn is on heavenly Soma, the former is more likely.

In c it is possible that *tiṣṭhasi* + PRES PART is a periphrastic constr., “keep X-ing,” though in the standard tr. *tiṣṭhasi* is rendered with its lexical value “you stand, listening ...” The *tiṣṭhanti* in 1c without participle might support the lexical reading, though I am attracted to the periphrasis.

X.85.5: Since the last pāda of the preceding vs. (4d) proclaimed that no earthling consumes Soma, the subject of *prapībanti* must be other – presumably the gods and, in particular, Vāyu, mentioned in c, who receives the first drink at the Soma Sacrifice.

I take “you swell up again” as a reference to the moon’s phases, as I do in 4a.

X.85.6–12: These vss. consist for the most part of bandhus equating parts of Sūryā’s wedding chariot and equipage with astronomical phenomena, inter alia. In several instances identification is difficult because of the specialized lexicon. I also think it likely that we are missing a number of astronomical references.

It is a little surprising how many overt copulas are found in these equational clauses. True, they are all preterital, and technically only present-tense copulas are ordinarily gapped. But still I would have thought that once the temporal situation had been established, the preterital copulas could have been dispensed with. The examples are all impf.: sg. *āsīt* (6a, 7c, 8d, 10a, 10b), du. *āstām* (9b, 10c, 11c), pl. *āsan* (8a), and notably the unextended impf. *ā(s)* (7a, 7b). We (linguists) tend to view this form as a precious relic, the expected 3rd sg. impf. to *√as* (*a+as+t*), which is almost universally replaced by remarking it with the 3rd sg. sec. ending to set roots (*-īt*, as in *ābravīt*). But the RV distribution of *ās* gives me pause: there are 5 exx., all in (late) X and all appearing before vowels, so they appear in sandhi as minimalist *ā* (accented *ā* once in

X.61.5). These seem to me signs of artificiality, and I suggest that *ā(s)* was reverse-engineered as a kind of parlor trick by linguistically savvy poets. This isn't to say that *ās* / *ās* never existed – it must have, on system-internal grounds and to provide the foundation for *āsīt* – just that it had disappeared by the time of the RV but could be recreated as a pseudo-archaism.

A number of pādas in this sequence are semi-duplicates. I don't know the reason for this – it might just be a taste for repetition, but (more likely in my view) it may be that in various circles there were alternative phrasings of the same general vs. for various stages of the wedding enterprise, and when the hymn was assembled, the assemblers kept the alternative versions. These semi-duplicates include

7d *yád áyāt sūryā́ pátim*  
 10d *yád áyāt sūryā́ grhám*  
 12cd ... *sūryā́*, ... *prayatí́ pátim*

8c *sūryā́yā́ aśvínā́ varā́*  
 9b *aśvínā́stām ubhā́ varā́*

10a *māno asyā́ ána āsīt*  
 12c *áno manasmā́yam sūryā́ ...*

as well as other, less precise, echoes. There are other such semi-duplications in other sections of the hymn; see below *passim*.

X.85.6: Raibhī and Nārāśaṃsī are names of particular gāthās that were presumably sung on (or before and after) the wedding journey. The two feminines with which they're equated, *anudéyī* and *nyócanī*, are difficult to identify because of limited attestation: the latter is a hapax and the former almost so. (Fortunately their verbal lexemes, *ánu √ dā* and *ní √ uc*, are a bit more secure.) There is a wide range of interpr. of these two terms, which I will not rehearse. On *anudéyī* see my "Inborn Debts of a Brahmin" (JA 302.2 [2014], esp. 248). In my opinion the two feminines refer to servants/attendants of the bride: the *anudéyī* is one from her natal place, lit. 'to be given along with/following (the bride)'. I interpr. *nyócanī* in light of *nyòkas*- '(being) at home' (*ní √ uc* 'be at home, at ease') and suggest that she is a female servant at the husband's home, who will become the bride's attendant when she comes into the household. This is somewhat similar to Re's suggestions (EVP XVI.144, not Hymnes Spec.) that *anudéyī* is "qqch. qui est à mettre en place" and *nyócanī* "qqch. qui est d'ores et déjà en place" – though he then immediately claims that they are doubtless parts of the chariot. It is impossible to prove my conjectures (or any of the other suggestions floating out there), but the two suggested meanings are compatible with the verbal lexemes, and they also make the two terms explicitly contrastive, which many of the other suggestions do not.

The standard tr. (Ge, Re [HySpec], WD) take cd as a single clause and as if the verb were a copula. E.g., Ge "Das gute Kleid der Sūryā ist mit der Gāthā ausgeputzt." But d clearly contains *eti*, a verb of motion, which is represented in the publ. tr. ("... goes adorned ..."). Although garments don't ordinarily move on their own, the focus on the wedding journey in this section justifies a verb of motion. The standard rendering seems to be the result of a collective Homeric nod.

X.85.7: The logical connections between the terms in each pair elude me (save for b), though c would make more sense if I interpr. *kóśa-* with most, incl. Gr, Ge, and Wh (AVŚ XIV.1.6), as a traveling chest, cask, or coffer, since the cosmic spaces can be seen as hollow containers, which could be compared to a traveling chest mounted on the wagen and containing the bride's possessions brought from her natal family. I would therefore emend the pub. tr. to 'coffer'.

Pāda d depicts a somewhat different model of the wedding from the one we find later (both later in Vedic and later in the hymn), since the bride Sūryā seems to be traveling by herself to her new husband. Ordinarily the bride's wedding journey is taken in company with her husband after the ceremony, to her new home with his extended family. (See my Sac. Wife 125–26, 223–26.)

X.85.8: As generally rendered, the first pāda refers to parts of the chariot, the second to bridal finery. Because of this mismatch Wh (ad AVŚ XIV.1.8) reasonably suggests the *pratidhāyah* "must rather be some article of a woman's dress." None of this can be further determined.

X.85.8–9: As disc. in my Sacrificed Wife (221–24), "wooer" (*varā-*) refers not to a hopeful suitor, the future bridegroom, but to his sidekicks, who accompany him to the bride's house to ask her male relatives for her hand and conduct some of the negotiations.

X.85.10: On the *ānas-* 'cart' as the proper vehicle for a bride, see comm. ad I.126.5 and my 2003 "Vedic *vrā*" (Fs. H-P Schmidt).

*Pace* Re (HymSpec, fld by Don), the two *śukraú* are far more likely to be the Sun and Moon than the two summer months Śukra and Śuci.

Pāda d is almost identical to 7d.

X.85.11: On the disputed sense of *sāmanā-* see comm. ad III.30.9. Here its usage is complicated by the fact that there is a play on *-sāmābhyām* in the preceding pāda. A rendering like "of one accord" fits well here, though it's rather different from what I suggest in III.30.9.

What c is meant to convey baffles me, esp. because of the number disagreement between 'ear' (or perhaps 'hearing') and 'two wheels'. The ear/hearing part fits well with the *īc-* and *sāman-* in pāda a, but the wheels are puzzling – though it is the case that wheels can creak in Vedic. Or perhaps ears are here conceived of as circular, with the various articulations of the outer ear seen as the axle and spokes. Given the shape of most ears, they wouldn't provide a smooth ride!

X.85.12: Here at least a dual is equated with the two wheels, but what exactly *śúcī* refers to is unclear. Since an etymologically related dual *śukraú* occurs two vss. previously (10c), they might refer to the same entities. Indeed, Re (HymSpec, + Don) identify them again as the two summer months. However, perhaps the two oxen and the two wheels ought to be identified with two different pairs — though not necessarily, if these vss. are variants of the type disc. ad 6–12. Re (EVP XVI) points out that *śúcī* is used of Heaven and Earth in X.56.5, and this informed my tentative choice of referents in the publ. tr. However, H+E are not very wheel-like (not that superficial resemblance is guiding the bandhus in this section), so we are back to Sun and Moon, which at least are circular (more so than ears). Ge (n. 12ab) also suggests 'eyes', which would fit the surrounding context better, but I don't think *śūci-* is otherwise so used. On the basis of Sūryā's two wheels in 16 and the regular succession of sun and moon in vss. 18–19, I would now

change the bracketed ident. in the publ. tr. to “[=Sun and Moon].” On the genders of *śukraú* and *śúcī* with further disc. of these passages, see comm. ad X.26.6.

X.85.13: *vahatú-* can mean both ‘wedding’ and ‘wedding procession / journey’, in keeping with its etymology ( $\sqrt{vah}$  ‘convey’) and with the emphasis on the wedding journey in traditional treatments of ancient Indian marriage; see the reff. given above ad vs. 7. Here either would work.

The locc. *aghāsu* and *árjunyoḥ* refer to nakṣatras; for further see, e.g., Ge n. 13c, Wh (n. to AVŚ XIV.1.13). The “cows are killed” presumably for the wedding feast.

X.85.14: On the Aśvins as wooers and the use of the mid. part. *prchāmāna-* see Sac.Wife p. 222.

Pūṣan’s appearance and role in d are puzzling. The med. verb *vr̥ṇīte* in a wedding context is specialized for the bride’s choice in a svayaṃvara ‘self-choice’ marriage. See my 2001 “Rigvedic svayaṃvara” (Fs. Parpola), and for this particular passage p. 306. Elsewhere there are hints that Pūṣan was considered, in certain circles, the husband of Sūryā (see VI.58.4 and comm. ad X.26.6), but even so he should not be the “chooser” (though see the reversal in VI.58.4) and in any case he is choosing his *fathers*, not a spouse. As disc. in the Fs. Parpola art., I think we are dealing with “formulaic slippage”: though *avṛṇīta* has the wrong subject and the wrong object, it covertly signals that we’re dealing with a self-choice marriage, as Sūryā’s marriage is depicted elsewhere in the RV (see Parpola Fs. art. for the evidence).

X.85.14–15: Another semi-duplication: 14ab *yád aśvinā ... áyātam, ... vahatúṃ sūryāyāḥ* // 15ab *yád áyātam śubhas patī, vareyám sūryām úpa*.

On the relevance of the questions in cd to the “wooing,” see SacWife 222–23.

X.85.16: The question of enigmas and who understands them has been ratcheted up a notch. In vs. 3 the ‘formulators’ (*brahmāṇaḥ*) possessed the esoteric knowledge about the real nature of Soma (*sómaṃ yám brahmāṇo vidúḥ*), but here they know only about Sūryā’s two wheels, but not the hidden third (*ékam cakráṃ yád guhā*) – knowledge of which is limited to the *addhātī-*, clearly a more intellectually elite group than mere *brahmán*. The stem *addhātī-*, found only here in the RV though slightly more commonly in the AV, is a *-tī-*stem built to the adverb *addhā* ‘certainly’. As Old points out, the adverb *addhā* appears several times with forms of  $\sqrt{vid}$ , so its derivative fits the context here well. Though, per vs. 12, the two wheels are most likely the Sun and Moon, I have no idea what the third wheel is meant to be; Sāy. suggests it’s the year (see Ge n. 16). Because of the identification of the two wheels as the Sun and the Moon, since vss. 18–19 portray the regular alternation of sun and moon I would now change the tr. of *ṛtuthā* in our pāda b to “in their succession.”

In order to make the connection between this vs. and vs. 3 clearer, I would now also match the translations of *brahmāṇaḥ* in the two vss. The emended tr. of ab should now read “Your two wheels [=Sun and Moon], o Sūryā -- the formulators know them in their succession.”

X.85.17: This vs. seems the rough equivalent of a maṅgala vs. and interrupts the semantic connection I see between 16 and 18–19. In a RVic context it reads like a final summary vs., which in this case might bring the first section of the hymn, the mythical marriage of Sūryā, to a close; in that case vss. 18–19 would seem to constitute a loose appendix. AVŚ separates both our 17 and our 18–19 from the other Sūryā materials, which are transmitted together as XIV.1.1–16.

Our X.85.17 is the far distant AVŚ XIV.2.46; our 18–19 less distant, but still separated from the Sūryā vss., as AVŚ XIV.1.23–24.

X.85.18–19: As noted above, these two vss. concern the regular alternation of sun and moon.

X.85.18: The first hemistich treats the two heavenly bodies together, the second contrasts them as separate entities.

In d the participle *vidádhat* is picked up by *ví dadhāti* in the next vs. (19c), as well as echoing the cmpd *āchād-vidhāna-* in 4a, which in my view concerns the phases of the moon (see disc. there), as it does here.

X.85.19: The subject of this vs. is universally considered to be only the moon. I disagree: I think ab concerns the sun, cd the moon. To begin with, it is difficult to apply b to the moon: both “beacon of the days” and “forefront of the dawns” bring to mind not the retreating moon, but the daylight produced by the rising sun. As Ge points out (n. 19b), *āhnām ketú-* is otherwise used of the sun (III.34.4, VI.7.5) or the dawn fire, not the moon. Pāda a is more easily attributed to the moon, esp. since *nāvo-navah ... jāyamānah* seems a variant of the last words of the preceding vs., *jāyate pūnah*, which do describe the moon. But “becomes ever new as he is born” can just as well characterize the sun rising anew every day: both sun and moon are cyclically renewed, just on different timetables.

With cd we return to the moon and its signature verb *ví√dhā*.

X.85.20–27: On the somewhat various contents of these vss., see publ. intro. It’s worth noting that 20–23 are found scattered in the AVŚ wedding hymns, but 24–27 occur together (in slightly jumbled order) in AVŚ XIV.1.18–21.

X.85.20: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. may be placed here because Sūryā is addressed in it. It also reprises the mounting (*ā roha sūrye*; cf. *sūryārohat* 12cd), the *vahātu-* (13a, 14b), the dat. *pātye* (9c; also acc. *pātim* 7d, 12d), and Sūryā’s journey in general, as depicted in the Sūryā portion of the hymn.

X.85.21–22: These two vss. are variants of each other in lexicon and content, but in different meters (Triṣṭubh and Anuṣṭubh respectively). The first is found in AVŚ XIV.2.33 (more or less), but the second is not part of the AV marriage suite.

X.85.21: Viśvāvasu is the name of a Gandharva; on the Gandharva as the bride’s second supernatural husband (after Soma), see vs.. 40–41.

In c *vyāktām* is usually interpr. as indicating that the girl is post-menarche – though with delicate euphemisms (e.g., Re “pubère,” Don “ripe”), but the use of *ví√añj* in vs. 28 invites a more literal interpr. I also think it’s a pun: she is not only ‘smeared (with menstrual blood)’ but also ‘adorned’, that is, in bridal finery.

In d *sá te bhāgāḥ* looks literally to mean “this [masc.] is your portion,” but the preferable “*she* is your portion” is syntactically possible – on the basis of the syntactic rule, esp. well represented in the Brāh., that in equational sentences pronominal forms are attracted into the gender of the equated noun.



X.85.22: On *prapharvī-* see Narten, “Vedisch *prapharvī-*” (Die Sprache 32 [1986] = KISch 330–39). Acdg. to her it means ‘young, unmarried maiden’ – referring to a short time-period after puberty but before marriage. She plausibly suggests that it’s related to / derived from *phāla-* ‘fruit’.

X.85.23: The universal interpr. of *anṛkṣarā-* is ‘thornless’, based on a supposed *ṛkṣarā-* ‘thorn’. As I have argued at length elsewhere (“Thornless Paths and Others: Vedic *anṛkṣara-* : Greek φθείρω,” Fx. Rix 1993), there is little or no support for an independent *ṛkṣara-* ‘thorn’, and I suggested an alternative segmentation *a-nṛ-kṣarā-* and an alternative interpr. ‘not sweeping men away’ ( $\sqrt{kṣar}$ ), ‘harmless to men’.

Note the archaic nom. plural of *pānthā-*; the AV version (Ś XIV.1.34, P XVIII.4.3) already substitutes the newer form *pānthānas*, which disturbs the meter.

In d I failed to tr. *naḥ*; I would now substitute the tr. “by which our comrades go to woo (her),” with *vareyām* matching the same word in vs. 15.

Aryaman, patron god of marriage, and Bhaga, who represents good fortune, are appropriate deities for the occasion.

X.85.24–27: These vss. treat the wedding ceremony itself, rather cursorily (24–25), the journey to the new home (26), and blessings bestowed on the bride on her arrival (27). This last vs. has the feel of a final vs., and though nearly half the hymn follows, there is an abrupt change of tone and subject after it. These four vss. are also found together in AVŚ (XIV.1.18–21).

X.85.24–25: Another pair of vss. saying much the same thing but in different meters (24 Triṣṭubh, 25 Anuṣṭubh). They are found together in AVŚ (XIV.1.18–19), but in opposite order. The other salient difference between the vss. is that 24 addresses the bride in the 2nd ps., while 25 describes her in the 3rd. On the binding of the bride and her release, see my Sac.Wife 42–48. This action is the equivalent of the Upanayana for women, as Manu says (MDŚ II.67).

X.85.25: The locational designations “from here” (*itāḥ*) and “from yonder” (*amútaḥ*) show that the wedding ceremony is being performed at the bride’s natal place (from which she will be “released”) before she journeys to her husband’s family place, where she will be forever bound. This squares with the treatment of the wedding in the later grhya sūtras.

X.85.26–27: The setting of vs. 26 is still the bride’s natal place, as shown by *itāḥ* ‘from here’ in pāda a, but the scene has changed in vs. 27: the 1st word, *ihá* ‘here’, reinforced by *asmín grhé* “in this house,” now refers to the husband’s domicile. The wedding journey has been accomplished in the meantime. The near and far deictics in this sequence of vss. (25–27) do a lot of the work.

Note also the repetition of the ‘house’ words and their derivatives in 26c and 27b, each in an alliterative VP: 26c *grhān gacha grhāpatnī* (with etym. unrelated [*hasta-*] *grhya* in 26a) and 27b *grhé gārhapatyāya jāgrhi*.

X.85.26: As pointed out by many, Pūṣan is appropriate here because he knows the paths. We saw his association with the Aśvins also in the enigmatic vs. 14.

X.85.28–35: As I say in the publ. intro., “Verses 28–35 are a strange, sinister, and menacing interlude between the generally happy tone of the first part of the hymn and the blessings with

which it closes. These, especially vss. 28-30 and 34-35, are also the most discussed and disputed verses in the hymn.” As I see it, they treat, in somewhat jumbled order,

vss. 28–30 the deflowering of the bride

vss. 31–33 the wedding journey (which logically precedes the deflowering)

vss. 34–35 the wedding feast (?)

There are many areas of disagreement among the standard tr. and comm.; I will not treat them in detail, but give my own interpr. An outlier among modern interpr. is that of Falk (Fs. Risch), which is imaginative though not ultimately convincing -- but still well worth reading.

X.85.28–30: These are the most challenging vss. in the hymn and, in my opinion, display a very astute sense of the psychological effects of sex -- here presented from the groom’s point of view. The three vss. are found together in AVŚ XIV.1.25–27 (in slightly different order).

X.85.28: The bride’s garment is stained with blood, as the first word, *nīlālohitām* ‘dark red’, announces. Although this word is ordinarily taken as a dvandva ‘blue (and) red’, I think *nīla-* here simply means ‘dark’ and modifies *-lohitā-*; cf. the bahuvrīhi *nīla-prṣṭha-* ‘dark-backed’. The stained garment is of course a sign that the bride was a virgin. This is good news for her relatives (c), since the marriage is proved valid, but by the same token it makes it impossible for the husband to legally escape it: he is “bound in bonds” (d).

This background ambivalence is what I think underlies pāda b, whose subject is, in my view, the bride, not the garment. (See more explicitly in the next vs., 29c *kr̥tyaiśā ... jāyā*.) As a (newly) sexual being and the husband’s sexual partner, she becomes the embodiment of the dark magical hold that sex will exert over him: in the publ. intro. I quote the old American song lyrics “that old black magic” describing women’s sexual power, corresponding to *kr̥tyā-* ‘witchcraft’ in b. This word is found in the RV only in this pair of vss. (28–29), but is quite common in the AV. It’s worth noting that in one of the AVŚ hymns against witchcraft, *kr̥tyā-* is compared to “a bride at her wedding” (AVŚ X.1.1 *vahataū vadhūm ivā*).

The other noun in this pāda, *āśakti-*, is variously rendered: e.g., Gr Verfolgung (pursuit), Ge Ansteckung (contagion), Re (HymSpec) empreinte (impression, imprint), Wh (AVŚ XIV.1.26) infection, Falk Anhaftung (attachment); see also EWA s.v. *sañj*, etc. Of these, only Falk’s seems to reflect the presumed derivation from *ā√sañj* ‘hang, fasten on’, as in I.191.10 (the venom hymn): *sūrye viṣām ā sajāmi* “I hang the poison on the sun.” I take *āśakti-* (only in this passage in RV and AV) as an abstract ‘hanging’ developed into the means of hanging, a noose. Like the bonds in which the husband is bound in d, the wife-as-noose symbolizes the emotional and legal ties in which the husband is now trapped. In the publ. intro. I compare another American English (outdated, one hopes) slang expression, “the old ball-and-chain” for a wife.

The last word in this short pāda, *vy ājyate*, also requires comment, since it can be derived either from *√aj* ‘drive’ or *√añj* ‘anoint’. With most (but see Wh ‘is driven away (?)’) I strongly favor the latter. The bride is smeared / adorned with the blood of her deflowering; recall the young girl, just past menarche, in vs. 21, *vyāktā-*.

X.85.29: In the first half of this vs. the stained garment, now called a *śāmulyām*, is disposed of; however useful it was as a sign of the bride’s virginity, the blood stains surely make it inauspicious. In b (other) goods are distributed to brahmins, perhaps those who officiated at the wedding or simply bystanders who lend their own auspiciousness to the scene.

The word *śāmulyā-* (or *-î-*), occurring only in this wedding passage, is obviously related to / derived from JB *śāmūla-* ‘garment’, but there is no good etym.

The second hemistich takes up the plight of the groom again, picking up esp. from 28b. Here (in my view) it is once more said that the bride has become witchcraft -- witchcraft with feet (*padvātī*), i.e., in human form. In d it is paradoxically said that the wife “enters” (*viśate*) the husband, reversing the actual facts of sexual intercourse. But once again this is a psychological, not physical state, and once again American pop culture of a certain vintage offers the perfect correspondence: the 1936 Cole Porter song “I’ve got you under my skin,” which became a signature song for Frank Sinatra. The bride has penetrated the groom’s defenses and become part of him, possessed him.

X.85.30: Opinions diverge even further about what’s going on this bizarre vs. The crux is found in cd, where the groom seems to be intending to clothe his member in the bride’s garment—an act of apparent cross-dressing of stunning oddness, which has provoked interpr. of even more oddness. But I think I have solved the problem: the garment of the bride (*vadhvò vāsasā*) is not an actual piece of clothing -- rather it stands for the body of the bride herself. A standard act of sexual intercourse is envisioned (unlike the reversal in 29b). When he puts his penis into her, it is enveloped, enwrapped, by her flesh as if by a tight-fitting piece of clothing -- clothing that reminds us of the stained garment with which this section began.

As for the first hemistich, with his body “glistening in that evil way” (*rúsatī pāpāyāmuyā*) -- I suggest that the glistening refers to sexual fluids, or perhaps even just sweat produced by energetic intercourse. His loss of splendour (*ásrīrā*) and the evil glistening simply once more refer to his loss of control and autonomy in a sexual relationship. It is good to remember that throughout ancient Indian culture, giving in to sex entails weakness and loss of power for men, while withholding sex builds power -- all those filmily clad Apsarases seducing great ascetics in the Mahābhārata come to mind.

X.85.31–33: A relatively benign interlude (save for the diseases and the highwaymen) about the wedding journey again. This is out of place, since the deflowering must chronologically follow the trip to the husband’s house. These three vss. are not grouped with the equivalent of 28–30 in AVŚ. Instead the equivalent of 31–32 are AVŚ XIV.2.10–11 and 33 = XIV.2.28.

X.85.32: The most natural reading of the first hemistich, followed by all tr. including the publ. tr., takes *dāmpatī* in b as the obj. of *vidan* in a. This makes *yé āśīdanti* an unabashed embedded relative clause with finite verb. In a late hymn like this we can expect some loosening of syntactic restrictions, but it is also possible to produce an unembedded reading. The lexeme *āśīd* essentially always has an acc. complement, including occasional personal acc., as in X.142.4 *ā tvā ... vāsavaḥ sadantu* “Let all the Vasus attend upon you.” It is therefore possible to take *dāmpatī* primarily with *āśīdanti* and supply it with *vidan*: “Let the highwaymen who beset the married couple not find (them).”

X.85.34–35: In AVŚ the equivalents of these two vss. (AVŚ XIV.1.28–29 [in opposite order]) follow immed. on the equivalents of our 28–30 (AVŚ XIV.1.25–27). This is a more satisfactory arrangement, since the two sets of vss. share a tone of menace and seem to take place in the same general setting (as opposed to the intervening journey vss.). The AVŚ ordering certainly supports the notion that our 31–33 are an intrusion.

Most tr. and comm. consider these vss. to refer still to the stained bridal garment, and the fact that the vss. most likely immediately followed vss. 28–30 strengthens that interpr. The idea is that the inauspicious aspects of the garment are treated and neutralized, and it is then purified and given to a learned brahmin. However, the actions performed on the referent -- eating (or non-eating) in 34b, various types of carving in 35ab -- are hard to square with the interpr. that they are performed on a piece of cloth. I suggest rather that the focus has now shifted to the wedding feast, in particular to the cow(s) killed for this purpose (remember 13c *aghāsu hanyante gāvah*). True, the referent must be neut., which eliminates ‘cow’, but *māmsā*- ‘flesh, meat’ or *krūrā*- ‘bloody (flesh)’ would work fine, or even just *ānna*- ‘food’ (I favor the first). The point is that eating meat unsanctioned by ritual makes it distasteful, even dangerous, esp. for brahmins -- a sentiment we should not find surprising in such a late hymn, as restrictions on meat-eating begin to develop.

What renders the meat fit to consume is “knowing Sūryā” (34c *sūryām ... vidyāt*); this is taken by many to refer to the Sūryā hymn (e.g., Ge “das Sūryā-lied”), that is, as a meta-reference to the hymn we’re in the middle of. I find this unlikely, esp. because *sūryāyāḥ* in the next, paired vs. cannot have such a reference. I think the referential domain is broader -- it’s knowing the cosmic significance of the goddess Sūryā and her mythical relation to marriage.

X.85.35: In my view the first hemistich is a graphic depiction of the carving up of the wedding-feast cow, but this violent dismemberment is, in some sense, the public display of the private (sexual) violence just enacted in the bridal chamber (in vss. 28–30). This accounts for pāda c, “behold the forms of Sūryā!” (*sūryāyāḥ paśya rūpāṇi*) -- in other words, “marriage,” as represented by Sūryā, is not only the joyful, festive occasion everyone is celebrating, but has its dark and brutal side. Happily it only takes a brahmin (or a learned brahmin) to neutralize the latter. (See comm. ad X.26.6 for speculation that the garments may be included in this purification -- though I am not particularly convinced by my own tentative suggestion there.)

X.85.36ff.: From here until the end of the hymn, the interpr. is fairly straightforward and the tone generally sunny.

X.85.36–41: The speech of the husband, followed by the famous sequence about the previous divine husbands of the bride.

X.85.36: The 1st ps. / 2nd ps. cast of this vs. and the following one seems to connect them with the set of vss. that preceded the dark interlude, esp. 23–27. But it is striking that in the same formula “grasp the hand,” the 1st ps. declaration in our vs., *grbhṇāmi te ... hástam*, has the older *bh* form of ‘grasp’ (*√grabh*), while the compounded gerund *hasta-gṛhya* in 26a has the newfangled *√grah* that is only just beginning to creep into usage in the late RV. This suggests that *grbhṇāmi te hástam* is the quotation of a traditional formula, which would not be surprising.

There are other lexical connections between this vs. and 23–27 just mentioned: *saubhagatvāya* (a) echoes *subhágā* (25d; also *saubhāgyam* 33c), *máyā pátyā* (b) *sahá pátyā* (24d), *yáthāsaḥ* (b) *yáthā ... á sati* (25cd); *gārhapatyāya* is repeated from 27b. ‘Reaching old age’ (*jarádaṣṭi-*) is lexically different but semantically similar to *jívrī* ‘elderly couple’ (27d). And the divine actors, Bhaga, Aryaman, Savitar, Puramdhi (36c, with Pūṣan in 37a), are mostly the same: Bhaga and Aryaman in 23c, Savitar 24d, Pūṣan 26a; only Puramdhi is absent from the earlier section.

X.85.37: Don renders *śívátamām* proleptically as “rouse her to be most eager to please,” which is appealing.

Given the context, my “humans” for *manuṣyaṅ* in b might seem jarring, and inferior to the “men” of the standard tr. (save for Re’s lapsus [HymSpec] “les dieux,” which indirectly supports my “humans”). But *manuṣya-* and related forms are never gender-focused: the contrast is humans/men v. gods, not men v. women. Taking it in its standard sense (“humans”) works here because the next vss. concern the previous *non*-human husbands; see *manuṣya-jāḥ* in 40d, of the fourth, human, husband after the first three.

In cd “eagerly” might be better than “willingly.”

X.85.39: This vs. presents a minor syntactic problem, which has led to divergence of interpr. By my interpr, cd is a rel. clause hanging off ab, which lacks an overt antecedent to *yāḥ*. It seems to me an easy matter to supply *tásmāi* in ab “has given (to him), who ...” -- not an unusual phenomenon in the sometimes loose world of Rigvedic relativization. Other tr. separate ab and cd syntactically. As far as I can see, Ge’s interpr. “Langes Leben werde dem, der ihre Gatte ist” is syntactically impossible because it requires taking unaccented *asyāḥ* as the first word of the relative clause. He also appears to be taking *dirghāyuh* as a karmadhāraya ‘long life’, rather than a bahuvrīhi ‘having long life’, as does Re (fld. by Don). However, the latter two split the hemistich differently, with *dirghāyur asyāḥ* being the first clause and the second beginning with *yāḥ* (Re: “Longue durée de vie soit à elle! Et l’époux, puisse t-il vivre cent automnes!” He simply suppresses the rel. prn.) By this interpr. the long life is the wife’s. It is not possible to determine the nature of the cmpd *dirghāyus-* by accentuation: because *dirghá-* and *āyus-* are accented on the final and initial respectively, *dirghāyus-* can have either underlying karmadhār. *dirgha-āyus-* or bahuvr. *dirghá-āyus-* accent. However it’s worth noting that essentially all the other *dirgha-* cmpds in the RV (rt. noun *dirgha-śrūt-* is a bit of an outlier) are bahuvr. and that both the other two occurrences of *dirghāyus-* (IV.15.9–10) and the lone voc. *dirghāyo* (stem -*āyu-*) (VIII.70.7) are bahuvrīhis. I thus favor the bahuvr. analysis, which is reflected in the publ. tr.

X.85.41: The contrast between *dadat* (a, b) and *adāt* (c) is noteworthy and the reason not clear to me -- though the augm. aor. may cast this action as the recent past (see also the near deictic *imām* referring to the wife) as opposed to the further past of ab. The publ. tr. reflects this. Redupl. *dadat* itself is something of a mystery: though it should belong to the redupl. pres. *dádāti*, it can’t be a straightforward injunctive, which should of course be *\*dadāt*. Interestingly, injunctives to the redupl. stem with long root vowel (i.e., the type *\*dadāt*) are not attested, though imperfects of the type *adadāt* are. The slot is filled by forms like this, which look like thematizations, but which are probably old short-vowel subjunctives, reinterpr. as injunctives. Hoffmann (Injunc. 134 n. 53) tries to claim that the type *dadat* is always subjunctive, but that’s not possible here, since the sequence ends with the augmented *adāt* in c.

X.85.42–47: Generalized blessings and good wishes posing no rhetorical challenges.

X.85.43: The almost featureless god Prajāpati, who has a great future ahead in Middle Vedic, only begins to make his appearance in the late RV. Here he enables an etymological figure: *prajām janayatu prajāpatiḥ*.

Pl. *naḥ* ‘for us’ presumably refers to the whole extended family, not to the dual married couple.

*ádurmaṅgalīḥ* picks up *sumaṅgalīḥ* in 33a.

X.85.44: *devākāma*:- a bahuvr. that can mean either ‘loving the gods’ < ‘having love for the gods’ (approx., objective genitive) or ‘having the love of the gods’ (i.e., loved by the gods) (subjective genitive). Renou does it the latter way: “aimée des dieux,” though most, incl. the publ. tr., go for the former. But given the fact that the gods are asked to provide blessings – and the fact that god-loving piety (in the mode of later bhakti) isn’t particularly characteristic of Vedic religion, perhaps Renou is right.

X.85.45: The first hemistich ends with *kṛṇu*, the second with *kṛdhi*. Although ingenious arguments could be constructed to explain the use of metrically equivalent 2nd sg. act impvs. to the pres. and aor. stems respectively, I think this would be taking ingenuity too far.

The phrase “her husband the eleventh” is probably not an indication that her immature husband is going to behave for the rest of his life like an overgrown teenager, lounging around playing video games and eating pizza while she indulges him. Rather it probably reflects the notion, commonly expressed later, that the husband enters his wife’s womb and is reborn as a son.

X.85.47: The actors in the last hemistich, Mātariśvan, Dhātar, and (fem.) Deṣṭrī, do not figure in the standard wedding line-up. Mātariśvan is ordinarily the fire-bringer or fire itself, later wind. None of these roles overlaps significantly with the wedding. Dhātar “the Placer / Disposer” is at least in early Vedic an abstract sum of his derivation: agent noun to √*dhā*. Deṣṭrī occurs only in this context.

## X.86 Vṛṣākapi

This justly famous hymn consists of a sometimes raunchy dialogue between Indra, his wife Indrāṇī, and a monkey (Vṛṣākapi). It has received a vast range of interpr.; besides the standard, see Re, Hymnes spec.; Don; Schnaus, Dialoglieder. I tr. and discussed it at length in *SacWife* (74–88), where I introduced my own interpr. of the hymn as reflecting a mock-Aśvamedha (see also publ. intro.). I will not reproduce all this disc. here, though I still strongly believe it, nor engage in detail with other interpr.

X.86.1–23: All 23 vss. of this hymn end with the refrain *vísvasmād indra úttaraḥ* “Above all Indra!” Since there are many places in this hymn in which Indra’s fortunes seem to be at a low ebb (starting with vs. 1), the refrain can sometimes seem out of place. But if the hymn depicts an Aśvamedha for Indra, all actions would ultimately glorify him.

X.86.1–2: In *SacWife* (p. 76) I suggest that these first two vss. represent the year-long journey of the Aśvamedha horse before it returns to be sacrificed.

X.86.1: The standard interpr. ascribe this vs. to Indrāṇī, but I think it makes more sense in the mouth of Indra, esp. the ref. to *mātsakhā* ‘my comrade’ identifying Vṛṣākapi.

Because *ásṛkṣata* (a) is accented and *amamsata* (b) is not, the domain of *hí* is only pāda a, with b the main clause, a syntactic distinction that is elided in some tr.

In *vṛṣākapi*- both the accent and the length of the stem vowel of the 1st member are anomalous. Assuming the 1st member is *vṛṣan*- ‘bull(ish)’, the 2nd-syllable accentuation deviates from its base form (rather like the troublesome simplex *vísva*- versus cmpded *vísvá*-), and 1st-member accentuation for a tatpuruṣa is also unusual. For description / recognition of these issues, without real explanation, see, e.g., AiG II.1.42, 251 (with Nachtr. 73), 266 and KH, Aufs. 356.

The thieving, intoxicated *Vṛṣākapi* is reminiscent of the monkeys drunkenly wrecking the grove in *Rāmāyaṇa* V.59–61.

X.86.2: Here I follow the general view that *Indrāṇī* speaks this vs. She is trying to match *Indra*’s rhetoric, which may account for the unusual use of *hī* in the first hemistich, matching his *hī* in 1a. Her *anyātra* also echoes his *yātra* in 1c.

X.86.3: There are various ways to construe the parts of this vs., esp. pāda d. I (and others) take d as an afterthought disjunctive object to *cakāra*, parallel to the more important *tvām* in pāda a. Positioning it as a sort of appendix to the rest of the sentence not only downplays its importance (as I just suggested), but also reinforces the structural parallelism of this dialogue: 1d *aryāh puṣṭēsu mātśakhā* is partly matched by 3d *aryō vā puṣṭi-māt vāsu*. JC pointed out the *māt* immediately following *puṣṭi*- in both pādas but with quite different grammatical identities.

The pāda-final sequence *u nū* in c is a close mirror-image of pāda-initial *nā ū* in 2c.

X.86.3–4: The rhetorical matching is esp. tight at the beginning of these two vss.:

3a. *kīm ayām tvām vṛṣākapiḥ*

4a. *yām imām tvām vṛṣākapiḥ*

Note also that forms of *vṛṣākapi*- are found in all 4 vss. so far, 3x at the end of an odd pāda (1c, 3a, 4a), once at the beg. of an even one (2b).

X.86.5: The rhetorical echoes continue, linking 4 and 5: the first word *priyā* picks up *priyām* at the beginning of 4b; pāda-final *kapiḥ* (a) matches the three previous pāda-final ( *vṛṣā*-)*kapi*- (1c, 3a, 4a); the c pādas are structurally the same:

4c *s<sup>u</sup> vā n<sup>u</sup> asya jambhīṣat*

6c *śīro n<sup>u</sup> asya rāviṣam*

This rhetorical template may explain why the sigmatic aor. of  $\sqrt{ru}$ , an apparent aniṭ root (ppl. *rutá*-; see EWA s.v. *RAV*<sup>2</sup>), shows up here as an *-iṣ*-aor. This is the only verb form to the root in the RV; however, it must be admitted that there are other set forms, including aor. *rāviṣṭa* in a widespread mantra in Vedic prose. See Narten 225.

The root  $\sqrt{duṣ}$  ‘spoil’ can be used elsewhere in Vedic and later for specifically sexual misbehavior.

X.86.6: *Indrāṇī*’s boasting about her sexual prowess may seem jarring; in fact scholars like Thieme (see *SacWife* p. 278 n. 156) deny that *Indrāṇī*, the wife of the great god *Indra*, could speak like this and assign the vs. elsewhere. But there is a precise analogue in the *Aśvamedha* -- when the chief wife lies down with the dead horse and speaks a verse that contains the complaint *nā mā yabhati kás cana* “no one at all is fucking me,” while her female entourage is engaging in sexual banter with the priests (see *SacWife* 78–79 for the comparison with our vss. here; 66–72 for the fuller *Aśvamedha* script).

On the style of Indrāṇī's speech, see comm. ad vs. 7.  
On -*yāśu*- see comm. ad I.126.6.

X.86.7: This is the first vs. spoken by Vṛṣākapi, and it is in a markedly lower register than the dialogue so far -- even vs. 6, which, though vulgar in content, is morphologically and syntactically elevated: Indrāṇī punctiliously distinguishes between the primary and secondary comparative and uses the injunctive (/subjunctive *bhuvat*) against Vṛṣākapi's finite future *bhaviṣyāti*.

In addition to this verb form (finite futures being relatively rare and late-ish in the RV), other signs of the register difference are the intimate and informal voc. *amba* (twice), the popular/diminutivized voc. *sulābhike* to the *I*-form of  $\sqrt{rabh}$  ( $\sqrt{labh}$  being late and rare in the RV), and the use of *iva* to qualify a verb, not mark a simile -- also surely the initial *uvé*, whatever it may be (see below). My tr. tries to represent the abrupt register shift; in most of the standard tr. Vṛṣākapi might as well be speaking like an Oxbridge don.

The initial word of the vs. *uvé*, found only here in Skt., is disputed: the leading contenders are the older one, that it is an exclamation/interjection, or what is probably the current one, that it is the 1st sg. of a verb  $\sqrt{u}$  'see' (= Hittite *au-/u-* 'see'). I share the latter view. See EWA s.v. *uvé* (with lit.) and LIV s.v. *\*h<sub>1</sub>ey*. However Kloekhorst in his 2008 *Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (p. 229) disputes this connection, in part because the meaning of the hapax *uvé* cannot be independently verified, and revives the exclamatory explanation. He fails to cite the Pkt. (Ardhamāgadhī) *ua(ha)* 'see!' adduced by W. P. Schmid, whose sense is pretty clear and which supports the interpr. of *uvé* here as a verb 'I see'. On the Pkt. form, esp. the apparent thematic -*a*-, see v. Hinüber *Überblick* §430. That the only Indic correspondent to RV *uvé* is found in Pkt. is another indication that Vṛṣākapi's speech is low register.

X.86.8: Indra, the speaker, seems to be trying to wrench the discourse back up to a higher level. Though Indrāṇī's physical charms continue to be praised, the adjectives are quite decorous -- see Thieme's demonstration (1985: 244) that they correspond almost uncannily to descriptors of Greek goddesses. Closer to home, the phrase *subāhūḥ svaṅgurīḥ* modifies the minor goddess Sinīvalī in II.32.7, who appears with Indrāṇī in the last vs. of that hymn (II.32.8). Note the *r*-form of the 'finger' word, *aṅgūrī*-, against parallel *aṅgūla*- — perhaps an indication of the elevating of the discourse; stronger evidence is the cmpd *pṛthu-ṣṭu*- 'broad-braided', a truncated form of *pṛthu-ṣṭuka*-, which characterizes Sinīvalī in the hymn just cited (II.32.6). The word for 'braid' is simply *stūkā*-; there is no evidence that it's a diminutive or popularly suffixed form, but Indra seems to be reacting to Vṛṣākapi's *sulābhike* by lopping off what he may have perceived as the "low" suffix -*ka*-. EWA calls *pṛthu-ṣṭu*- a false archaism.

X.86.9: On the suffix -*āru*- in *śarāru*- see comm. ad III.30.8.

On the possible double sense of *abhī*  $\sqrt{man}$ , both 'have designs on' and 'disrespect', see comm. ad X.27.11.

X.86.10–11: Most tr. and comm. assign these next two vss. to Vṛṣākapi and his supposed wife Vṛṣākapyī respectively. I very much doubt the existence of a separate figure Vṛṣākapyī, as I discuss in *SacWife* (pp. 81–82); for my interpr. of the voc. *vṛṣākapyī* in 13a, see comm. below. And I find it difficult to believe that after his slangy informal speech in vs. 7, Vṛṣākapi could so easily code-switch to the solemn hieratic diction of vs. 10. Instead, as disc. in the publ. intro., I



think 10–11 are spoken by the narrator, who affirms Indrāṇī's exalted status -- not only as Indra's wife, but as the central figure of the ritual, the Aśvamedha, that will ensure Indra's prosperity and long, indeed unbounded, life. In other words, after the vulgar and unseemly sexual squabbling between Indrāṇī and Vṛṣākapi (the "sacrificed horse" figure), we are reminded that it was all in service of the greater good and that we should glorify Indrāṇī for her (selfless) act.

X.86.10: The standard tr. and comm. take this vs. as temporally unified: the glorification of Indrāṇī (cd) happens/happened at the gatherings depicted in ab. I instead think her habitual past behavior (ab) is contrasted with her exaltation now (cd). In the past she went to and participated, as Patnī, in the normal recurrent rituals (perhaps the Patnīsaṃyajas), but at the Aśvamedha she has taken on a much more central role, allowing her to be magnified (*mahīyate*) not only as the possessor of a hero (*vīrīṇī*) and one whose husband is Indra (*īndrapatnī*), but as the "Adept of Truth" (*vedhā rtāsya*), an august Indo-Iranian title, here surprisingly applied to a female. (For further disc. see SacWife p. 80 and nn. 160, 161.)

X.86.11: The tone of solemn celebration continues here. Note the fronted name *indrāṇīm* and the 1st person aorist *aśravam* "I have heard of Indrāṇī (as) ...," which has an archaic and ceremonial air. The 1st ps. speaker is the poet/narrator, by my interpr. For similar phraseology, cf. IV.39.6 *dadhikrāvṇo akāriṣam* "I have celebrated Dadhikrāvan." Or, for that matter, I.32.1 *īndrasya nū vīryāṇi prā vocam*, etc.

I do not understand who "these women" (*āsú nāriṣu*) are. Perhaps Indrāṇī's female attendants at the Aśvamedha, or -- more likely -- (all) women here on earth?

X.86.12–14: In my view, all three of these vss. are spoken by Indra. (The standard view assigns 13 to Vṛṣākapi.) In 12 Indra laments the loss of his friend -- who (again in my view) has now been sacrificed and is going, in the form of an oblation, to the gods. But the happy result of this sacrifice is indicated in 13–14: Indra is once again receiving abundant offerings, after the hiatus noted in the first hemistich of the first vs. of this hymn. I take this to be the direct result of the successful Aśvamedha. On these vss. see SacWife (81–82).

X.86.12: Note that two of the words used to describe Vṛṣākapi in the opening of the hymn, -*sākhi*- (1b) and *priyā*- (4b) recur here.

The pronom. adj. *idám* qualifying *haviḥ* suggests that the sacrifice is happening here and now.

On "watery" (*ápya*-) see disc. in SacWife (pp. 278–79 n. 165).

X.86.13: The voc. *vṛṣākāpāyī* that opens this vs. is singlehandedly responsible for sending so many interpr. off the rails. A figure, Mrs. Vṛṣākapi, has to be invented for it, and she then needs to have things to do and vss. assigned to her to speak -- even though there is otherwise no evidence for her existence, her actions, or her words. Within my Aśvamedha model there is a simple explanation that avoids these unconvincing excursions: because Indrāṇī has copulated with the (now dead) monkey, Indra can address her as "wife of Vṛṣākapi," right after he addressed her as Indrāṇī in 12a. Ritually she fills both roles, and it is in her role as (temporary) wife of Vṛṣākapi that she has brought about the rich feast of oxen on which Indra will gorge himself, as well as providing herself with good progeny.

X.86.14: On *kukṣī* as ‘cheeks’, see comm. ad X.28.2, etc.

X.86.15: This vs. reaffirms that soma is being offered to Indra again, in implicit answer to 1a *vī ... sotór āsrkṣata* “they have left off pressing (soma).” For the evidence that soma is referred to here (*pace* most interpr., who seem willfully to misinterpr. the words), see SacWife (82–83). Most assign this vs. to the wife of Vṛṣākapi. I am inclined to think that it belongs to the narrator, but if the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. address to Indra calls that into question, I would suggest Indrāṇī as alternative.

X.86.16–17: These two verbally responsive and sexually explicit vss. carry the message of the hymn, in my view. See disc. in the publ. intro. and SacWife (83–84). The first of them expresses what might seem to be a self-evident statement: the sexually successful male dominates (“is master” *īśe*). This is what in later Sanskrit might be called the *pūrvapakṣa*. The following vs. exactly reverses the statements of the first: all the words in the same order are found in both; only *nā sēśe* “he is not master” and *séd īśe* “just he is master” are flipped, each acting as main clause to the other relative clause. This second statement is counterintuitive: the sexually unsuccessful male is the one who dominates. We can see this as the *siddhānta*, in later terms. And it is fitting and perfectly appropriate exactly in the Aśvamedha: the king and sacrificer stands aside, impotently, while his wife copulates with another (a horse, as it happens). But the horse is killed: sacrificed and offered to the gods -- much good its sexual “success” did it! And the sexually inactive king receives all the benefits of the sacrifice and his power and dominance significantly increase after an Aśvamedha.

This pair of vss. is the climax of the hymn; the remaining vss. seem like an appendix, with 19–22 forming a little group that treats the year-long travels of the animal-to-be-sacrificed that chronologically precedes the action of the rest of the hymn.

X.86.18: On this vs. see my disc. in SacWife (84–85). Flg. Old (somewhat contra v. Schroeder), I interpr. it with ref. to charm for virility in AVŚ (VI.72) in which a *pārasvant-* with an esp. big penis serves as model. In a sense this vs. summarizes the ritual in advance: Vṛṣākapi finds ritual paraphernalia and a slaughtered animal that represents virility, just as he will, likewise slaughtered, at the end of the ritual involving him. This vs. introduces the journey vss. 19–24.

X.86.19–24: As indicated above, I believe these vss. describe Vṛṣākapi traversing the year-long circuit prescribed for the horse in the Aśvamedha. This journey was briefly alluded to in vss. 1–2. Vṛṣākapi (vs. 19) embarks on his journey with a noble purpose: to distinguish between Ārya and Dāsa, between wise and foolish -- establishing the boundaries, as the Aśvamedha horse does in the later ritual, between “our” domain and that of outsiders. In the succeeding vss. Indra and Indrāṇī attempt to lure him back to his fate.

X.86.19: Most assign this vs. to Indra, but it then has little or no narrative connection with what follows. See disc. SacWife (85 and n. 175).

X.86.20: Pāda a contains an “X and which Y” construction, which I have not represented in tr. As JSK points out (DGRV I.135), we should have expected the order ... *yác \*ca kṛntátram*. On *kṛntátra-* see comm. ad X.27.23, where I suggest ‘cleft’ would be better than ‘chasm’ here.

Since the pl. of *ghá-* is often used to refer to a single homestead (presumably consisting of a number of buildings), this could also be tr. “to the nearer house.”

X.86.21: With most I assign this vs. to Indrāṇī, adding her encouragement to the preceding vs. (20), which I think Indra speaks. There is sinister ambiguity in everything she says. Although superficially it sounds like an enthusiastic “welcome home,” promising delights on Vṛṣākapi’s return, under the surface it alludes to Vṛṣākapi’s impending sacrifice and death.

To begin with, the 1st du subjunctive *kalpayāvahai* can be either inclusive (I and you = Vṛṣākapi) or exclusive. In the former case she’s suggesting that she and Vṛṣākapi can together arrange pleasures for each other. In the latter case, the other subject would obviously be Indra, her husband and, perhaps more important, the Yajamāna of this Aśvamedha. The obj., *suvitá-* ‘easy going, easy passage’, is reminiscent of *sugá-*, which we met in 5d. And more to the point the same *sugá-* is found in a telling passage in the RV Aśvamedha hymn, at the moment when the horse is put to death, with the death and the subsequent journey to the gods euphemistically expressed: I.162.21 *ná vā u etán mriyase ná riṣyasi, devāṁś íd eṣi pathíbhiḥ sugébhiḥ* “You do not die nor are you harmed. You go to the gods along easygoing paths.” In our pāda b it certainly sounds as if Indra and Indrāṇī would arrange similar paths for Vṛṣākapi. This impression is strengthened by the last pāda, *ástam eṣi pathā́ púnah* “you go home again along the path” -- *eṣi path* [INSTR] being exactly the expression in I.162.21. Here ‘home’ can stand for ‘heaven / the gods’.

Even the cmpd *svapna-nāṁśana-* can be read doubly. If *nāṁśana-* belongs to  $\sqrt{nas}$  ‘disappear / perish, (transitive) destroy’, ‘sleep-destroying’ could be read as Indrāṇī’s invitation to Vṛṣākapi to continue their sexual relationship, but if to  $\sqrt{nas}$  ‘attain’, with ‘sleep’ = ‘death’, it can identify Vṛṣākapi as one about to attain his final “sleep.”

X.86.22: The last of the journey vss. The grammatical puzzle it poses, not evident in tr., is that, though only two entities are addressed, Vṛṣākapi and Indra, the 2nd ps. verb (*ajagantana*) is plural, as is the adj. modifying the subjects, *údañcaḥ*. I discuss this in SacWife (86 and n. 178) without finding a satisfactory answer. Perhaps, Indrāṇī is an unexpressed third, or perhaps all the victims of the Aśvamedha are included.

I do think the vs. refers both to the sacrificial procedure and to the death journey. The directional adj. *údañc-* can mean both ‘northward’ and ‘upward’: the latter can refer to the same journey to the gods in heaven as I suggest for vs. 21. As for the former, as I point out in SacWife, the place where the horse is killed in the Aśvamedha is north of the Mahāvedi, and it is led there just before the killing. The same double sense may be found in *-yopana-*. It can be a pun on *yūpa-*, the post to which sacrificial animals are tied. But a form of  $\sqrt{yup}$  is found in one of the funeral hymns, X.18.2, where the living turn away from the dead and take up their lives again: *mṛtyóḥ padám yopáyantah* “effacing the footprint of death.”

I don’t quite know why the last hemistich is framed as questions, but perhaps the uncertainty created by the double reading is the reason.

Note the *l*-form *pulu-* for standard *puru-*. It may be telling that the only other occurrence of *pulu-* is at the end of another dialogue hymn, I.179 (Agastya and Lopāmudrā), whose vs. 5 contains the cmpd *pulu-kāma-* ‘having many desires’.

X.86.23: This vs. notoriously has no obvious connection to the rest of the hymn. However, there are some verbals echoes with other parts of the hymn (see SacWife 86–87). More important, the prodigious fertility of Manu’s wife in this vs. resonates with at least one of the aims of the later Aśvamedha, namely to remedy childlessness and produce sons (as at the beginning of the Rāmāyaṇa).

For disc. of the larger Indo-European context of this vs., see Watkins (Dragon, p. 53).

### X.87 Agni Demon-smiter

Not surprisingly given the subject matter, both recensions of the AV contain versions of this hymn: AVŚ VIII.3 and AVP XVI.6, with somewhat different vs. orders.

X.87.1: The hymn opens with the word ‘demon-smiter’ (*#rakṣohāṇam*), setting the tone for what follows. As if to contrast Agni’s roles, or to soften the effect of that first word, the second pāda opens with the oppositional *mitrām* ‘ally (→ friend)’.

Re rejects ‘sprinkle’ for *ā jigharmi* in favor of his ‘attirer à soi’—on which see my objections ad X.6.4. He claims that the context doesn’t favor ‘sprinkle’ here, but rousing Agni to smite demons requires kindling him and, indeed, producing a roaring fire. The ritual sprinkling (with ghee) in this first vs. readies Agni for his aggressive actions in the rest of the hymn.

On *mūra-deva-* see comm. ad VII.104.24. I realize that the alternative interpr. ‘having roots as gods’ is given some support in this hymn by the occurrence of *mūla-* ‘root’ in 10d (and possibly *sahāmūra-* in 19c), but I still find this alternative unlikely.

X.87.2: This vs. nicely depicts a sequence of actions involving Agni’s mouth. The sequence is set up by the first word in the vs., *āyo-daṁṣṭrah* ‘having metal jaws’: first he “brushes / touches” the foes with his flame (ab), his flame often being likened to his tongue; then he “seizes” them with his tongue (c), and finally puts them in his mouth (d).

The root affiliation of *vr̥ktvī* is disputed: Old and Wack favor *√ vraśc* ‘hew’, while most (incl. the publ. tr.) opt for *√ vr̥j* ‘twist, wrench’. Because of the mouth imagery, I find ‘hew’ unlikely.

X.87.3: Given the continuing focus on Agni’s mouth, Sāy’s equation of *ubhayāvin-* as *ubhayā-dant-*, reflected in all the standard tr., seems correct, even though in its other occurrence in VIII.1.2 it has a more general sense. The point here is to contrast Agni as predator animal with peaceable ruminant *paśu-*s like cows that have teeth in only one jaw.

X.87.4: As Lub convincingly argues ad AVP V.8.4, the evidence of the Paippalāda demonstrates that *śalyā-* means ‘tip, point’ of an arrow, not the shaft. Given this, *aśāni-* in the same pāda should not also mean ‘(arrow) point’. Ge takes *aśāni-* as whetstone here: “die Pfeilspitzen (wie) an Schleifsteinen streichend.” But *√ diḥ* ‘smear’ is an odd action to perform with a whetstone, esp. if poison is what is being smeared. Better to take *aśānibhiḥ* as an instr. of accompaniment, indicating a different if similar weapon -- quite likely slingstones for a slingshot. I would now emend the tr. to “smearing their tips, along with slingstones ...” Both sharp projectiles would “pierce” their targets and introduce poison into their bodies.

X.87.5: Notice *bhindhi* in pāda a, echoing *bhāndhi* in 4d.

If *aśāni-* is ‘slingstone’ in 4, it must be here as well: I emend the tr. to “Let the murderous slingstone smite him ...” Although “with its blaze” (*hārasā*) might seem inappropriate to a slingstone (or an arrow point), we should keep in mind that it is Agni / fire that lies behind all these weapons. *hāras-* is quite common in this hymn: vss. 5, 10=14, 16, 25. For further on this word, see comm. ad X.16.7.

In the special register of this hymn, it can be hard to determine the particular nuances of lexemes found elsewhere, and *ví√ci* is no exception. Ge “verstreuen,” Re “sépare (ses membres) déchiré(s).” Although I think Re is in some ways closer to the mark, the problem with his rendering is signalled by the final parenthesis “(s),” sneakily making the singular obj. *vr̥knám* into a plural that can be separated into parts. My own “open up” is based on the use of *ví√ci* for clearing / opening up paths. See comm. ad I.90.4. After hewing apart the body, the aggressor pulls it apart to get to the bloody flesh.

X.87.6: The *yád* opening c is pleonastic, functionally doubling the *yátra* that opens the vs.; it also provides a useful prop for enclitic *vā*.

X.87.7: Whether what is recovered is inanimate (my “what was seized”) or animate (most other tr., e.g., Klein [DGRV I.390] “... the one seized ... from the sorcerer seizing (him)”) cannot be determined from *ālabdham* -- nor does it really matter.

As Re points out, the *l*-forms *ālabdha-* and *ālebhānā-* contrast with the *r*-forms of the same lexeme in vss. 2 and 8: *ā* (...) *rabhasva*. Besides the two forms in this vs., there is only one other occurrence of *√labh* in the RV, also in the late Xth Maṇḍala (X.130.7).

The phonologically marked animal name *kṣvīṅka-* occurs only here in the RV, though it is marginally attested in the BYV Saṃhitās as well as in the AV versions of our hymn. A carrion-eating bird of some sort makes contextual sense.

X.87.8: Unlike the rest of the hymn, where Agni is urged to perform direct violent actions, here in the first hemistich he is asked to “proclaim” (*prā brūhi*) who the sorcerer is, in a quasi-legalistic way -- though direct action returns in the 2nd hemistich. This brief switch to the verbal may prefigure the emphasis on the deceptive, untruthful qualities of the foe in some of the following vss.: 9d, 11b, 12d, 13ab, 15.

The theme of true and false speech may also be indirectly reflected in the use of the epithet *nṛcākṣas-* ‘having his eye on men’ in this section: 8d, 9d, 10a (and 17b), since this cmpd is often used of gods, esp. Sūrya, witnessing (and then judging) the behavior of mortals. Because the other three occurrences of *nṛcākṣas-* in this hymn clearly modify Agni, the genitive in the phrase in d, *nṛcākṣasaś cākṣuṣe* most likely refers to Agni too (so explicitly Ge and Re), even though it would be awkwardly coreferential with the implicit 2nd sg. subj. of the impv. *randhaya*: “(O Agni,) make him subject to the eye/gaze of the one [=you] with his eye on men.” However, it is possible that this instance actually refers to the Sun, with whom Agni is then conflated in the next vss.

X.87.9: The re-use of *cākṣus-* from 8d, clearly identifying Agni’s eye, supports the standard view that the *cākṣus-* in 8d is also Agni’s, despite my comm. above.

The ambiguity of value of the root *√rakṣ* is on full display in this vs. On the one hand Agni is urged to *rakṣ* the sacrifice (pāda a), but his enemies are identified as *rākṣas-* in c (and 10a).

X.87.10: Ge (n. 10b, fld by Re) plausibly suggests that the phrase “three points” (or “tops”) *trīṇi* ... *agrā* actually represents “top, middle, and root,” as in III.30.17 *úd vr̥ha rákṣaḥ sahāmūlam indra, vr̥ścā mādhyam prāty agrām śṛṇīhi* “Tear out the demonic power, root and all, Indra;

cleave its middle; shatter its top.” Note that our passage contains two of the three verbs in III.30.17: *śṛṇīhi* (2x) and *vṛśca*.

X.87.11: *sphūrjāyan* is the only form of this root in the RV, though it occurs later. Here it phonologically anticipates *śaphārújam* in 12b and *dhūrvantam* in 12d. For a recent etymological proposal see comm. ad X.46.5.

X.87.12: On the formation of *śaphārúj-* see comm. ad X.44.9. As there, I would here consider an alternative tr. ‘breaking with the hoof/hooves’.

X.87.13: Pādas a through c each identify a different kind of speech that Agni can weaponize in d. The coreferential pronoun *táyā* in d simply picks up the last of these, fem. *yā* in c.

The *vācās tṛṣṭām* “harshness of speech” uttered by the *rebhāḥ* supports my interpr. of *rebhā-* as ‘hoarse-voiced’, against the standard anodyne ‘singer’. See comm. ad VI.3.6, etc.

X.87.14–15: All four pādas of 14 and the first of 15 begin *pārā*, which is echoed by the first word of 15b *pratyāg*. The 1st three pādas of 14 also have the same verb, 2nd sg. impv. *śṛṇīhi* (which should also be supplied in d), and the first pāda of 15 has the 3rd pl. equivalent *śṛṇantu*.

On *mūra-deva-* see vs. 2 above.

X.87.15: As noted in the publ. intro., this is one of two vss. that lack direct address to Agni and grant other gods a piece of the action.

Both  $\sqrt{\text{śap}}$  ‘curse’ and *tṛṣṭā-* ‘harsh’ are reprised from 13ab, here construed together.

X.87.16: The standard tr. take *ásvyena pásunā* as referring to two entities: “horse (flesh) and cow(’s flesh),” while I take it as single, with *ásvya-* modifying *pásu-*.

X.87.17: The root affiliation and meaning of the desid. *títṛpsa-* are unclear. On the one hand, the only root  $\sqrt{\text{tṛp}}$  with a full repertoire of forms, including verbal forms, is  $\sqrt{\text{tṛp}}$  ‘be satisfied / satiated’;  $\sqrt{\text{tṛp}}$  ‘steal’ is confined to the root noun, found in cmpds like *pásu-tṛp-* ‘cattle-stealing’, *asu-tṛp-* ‘life-stealing’. On the other hand, an instance of the latter cmpd is found in our 14d, which sets up the presumption that a verb form containing this root syllable three vss. later should belong to the same root. Moreover, Ge (n. 17c) points out that  $\sqrt{\text{tṛp}}$  ‘be satisfied’ generally takes a gen. complement, not the acc. found here. And indeed Ge and Re, as well as Heenen (p. 150), interpr. *títṛpsāt* as ‘seeks to steal’, in contrast to Wh (AV VIII.3.16 “would fain enjoy”). The publ. tr. takes it as a pun, an interpr. I still think is correct.

X.87.18: The second hemistich brings another pair of pāda-initial *pārā*, like vss. 14–15.

X.87.19: The cmpd *sahámūra-* potentially connects with two different pieces of this hymn. The 2nd member *-mūra-* is phonologically identical to the 1st member of *mūra-deva-* in 2c (on which see comm. ad loc.). As noted there, I take the *mūra-* in *mūra-deva-* with *mūrā-* ‘dumb, doltish’; others, however, consider it an *r*-form of *mūla-* ‘root’. At least with regard to the cmpd in this vs., that is a reasonable hypothesis, for *sahá-mūra-* has a doublet *sahá-mūla-* in III.30.17, a passage quoted above ad vs. 10. Vs. 10 contains simplex *mūla-*, referring to the base or foundation of the sorcerer, which should be ripped out (“rooted out,” in the English phrase). I

think that is the primary sense of the cmpd *sahámūra-* in our vs.: Agni is supposed to destroy the sorcerers entirely, “root and all.” But I also think that the use of the *r*-form deliberately evokes *mūra-deva-* in 2c: destroy the sorcerers along with their foolish (gods). Note that *sahámūrān kravyādaḥ* in our vs. echoes *mūradevān ... kravyādaḥ* in 2cd.

X.87.21: After pāda a, which is an abbreviation of 20ab, this vs. is structured by a series of etymological dyads: *kavīḥ kāvyaena* (b), *sákhe sákḥāyam* and *ajāro jarimṇé* (both c), *mártāṃ ámartyaḥ* (d).

The verse is characterized by the absence of the imaginative violence urged on Agni in the rest of the hymn. In particular, “as a poet with your poetic skill” is a far cry from the hewing apart, burning up, and eviscerating that Agni has engaged in earlier in the hymn (and later).

X.87.22: As in 21b, we find Agni in his role of poet (here *vípra-*). In both passages Agni-the-poet is conceived of as a protective enclosure (*pári*).

On *bhaṅgurā-vant-* see comm. ad VII.104.7.

X.87.24: On *kimīdín-* see comm. ad VII.104.2.

Once again Agni as poet (*vípra*), and in this vs. “we” also figure in that role.

## X.88 Sūrya and Vaiśvānara

On the structure and contents of the hymn see publ. intro.

X.88.1: The first hemistich of this vs. is straightforward syntactically and semantically, but the elements in the second hemistich can (and have been) construed in a variety of different ways. Among the questions are 1) are *bhármaṇe* and *dhármaṇe* syntactically parallel, and if so are they infinitives? 2) if either or both is/are infinitives, is *tásya* to be taken as subj. or obj. of one or both? 3) what is the syntactic function of dat. *bhúvanāya*? 4) whose *svadhā-* is in question? 5) is *paprathanta* injunctive or subjunctive, and in either case is it transitive (with *-anta* replacment) or a medial intransitive contrasting with the well-established transitive active? 6) If transitive, what is its object? The answers to these questions crucially affect what cosmic situation we think is depicted. I will not explore the various, quite distinct, answers that have been given (besides Ge, Re [EVP XIV], Old, see also, for ex., Kü 320 and Köhler [RV *kavi* 117, 131–32]), but will simply detail my own interpr. -- which does not agree in its entirety with any other, though it does agree with some on a number of points.

In my interpr. the two *-maṇe* forms are parallel infinitives, whose logical subject is *tásya*, referring to Agni. Their object is *bhúvanāya* ‘world’, which has been attracted into the dative by its governing infinitives. The *svadhā* is the gods’, since it’s closer to their verb *paprathanta* than to words relating to Agni. The verb is an injunctive, referring to cosmic origins; it is transitive and takes a gapped acc. *bhúvanam* as object (i.e., the same word that has been attracted into the dative [see above]). As I interpret it, the point is that in the beginning the gods spread out the world by their inherent power, but it is now Agni’s responsibility to maintain it (through the ritual associated with him).

X.88.2: The second hemistich begins with *tásya* and ends with *asya*, both with the same referent, namely Agni. Re takes them as contrastive: “de cet (Agni) là, de cet (Agni) ci,” But this seems unlikely: if the first form were meant to refer to the celestial, distant Agni, we should expect a

form of *asaú*, viz. gen. *amúśya*. Ge's (n. 2cd) explanation of the doubling as tautological is more persuasive. In fact *tásya* is in the standard position for an anaphoric *sá/ tám* form, and it is doubled by *asya* adjacent to the noun on which it's dependent (*sakhyé*). This doubling might be an argument against taking *tásya* in 1c with *svadháyā* in 1d, since, to match 2cd, we might have expected an *asya* in 1d close to its noun.

X.88.3: On the clash of gender and deixis in *pr̥thivīm dyām utémām*, see comm. ad VIII.40.8d. The phrase is repeated in vs. 9.

X.88.4: I take the subj. of *samāñjan* in d to be the gods at the primal installation of the ritual fire, when they chose (*vṛṇānāḥ*) Agni as their Hotar -- *pace* Re, who supplies "prêtres," presumably referring to human priests. This action of the gods is in harmony with my interpr. of 1cd, where I suggest that the gods, having spread out the world in the beginning, left it in Agni's charge.

X.88.5–6: In these vss. Agni first *stands* "at/on the head of the world" (*bhúvanasya mūrdhán* 5a) and then "*becomes* the head of the world" (*mūrdhā bhavaḥ* 6a). I take the first to refer to the location of the fire on the ritual ground and the second, of course, to the fire itself. Agni is elsewhere referred to as "the head of heaven"; see disc. ad X.125.7. That Agni becomes the head of the world "by night" (*náktram*) in vs. 6 results from the lack of competition from the sun during the night; the sun's appearance in the early morning presumably dethrones Agni from his exclusive position.

X.88.5: The two clauses of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich imply that our ritual praise of Agni was necessary to enable him to become *yajñíyah*.

X.88.6: The standard tr. (see also Köhler, Kavi 118) take *tátah* as "from him [=Agni]"; though Ge's parallel (n. 6b) from AB VIII.28.13 *agner vā ādityo jāyate* is telling, I think the source here is left vaguer.

The acc. phrase in c, *māyām* ..., needs a governing verb; "behold, see" seems reasonable on the basis of passages like X.55.5 *devásya paśya kávyam* ... See Ge n. 6c.

The referent of d is not specified, and as far as I can see, it could be Agni or Sūrya -- or both, though some identify it specifically as Agni (Gr s.v. *tūrṇi*-, Re; neither Ge nor Old weighs in). Since Agni is once elsewhere modified by *tūrṇi*- (III.3.5) and is several times qualified as *prājānan* (II.3.10, etc.), Agni is a good candidate, but not the only one, esp. since the sun is arguably more perceptibly "swift" than the ritual fire.

X.88.7: "Whose womb is in heaven" (*divíyoni*-) of Agni seems a mirror image to the birth of Sūrya from Agni or his general environs in the immed. preceding vs. (6b).

The morphological identity and referent of *tanūpāḥ* have elicited more dissension than seems warranted. The question is whether it modifies the gods (*devāḥ*) or the oblation (*havīḥ*), with the former position taken by Sāy., Gr, Re, and the publ. tr.), the latter by Ge and Köhler (Kavi 118m 333), while Old and Scar (305) consider both options, though Old leans towards *havīḥ*. The ending *-āḥ* speaks strongly for nom. pl. m.; it is difficult to see how it could be straightforwardly a neut. sg. Ge's (n. 7d) invocation of X.61.1 is no support: his attempt to make *maṃhaneṣṭhāḥ* in that passage a neut. sg. is quite dubious; see comm. ad loc. The contextual argument for taking *tanūpāḥ* as modifying *havīḥ* rests on the next vs., which contains a masc. sg.



phrase *yajñáh ... tanūpāḥ* -- the thought being that if the sacrifice in that vs. is *tanūpā-*, then the oblation in the previous vs. must be too. But I see no problem with a conceptual evolution: the gods being *tanūpā-* transfer this quality to the sacrifice that they create. In fact the evolution is expressed by the first hemistich of the next vs., 8ab.

X.88.8–10: The impfs. *ajanayanta* (8b), *ájanayanta* (9a) and aor. *ájījanan* (10b) have the same subject (gods) and object (Agni) and appear to refer to the same long-past event; there is no “aoristic” coloring of the third verb. The only syntactic difference is that *ájanayanta* in 9 is in a rel. cl., but this should not condition a difference in tense/aspect stem (and doesn’t in 8b). In this particular case, the two forms seem to be interchangeable. The medial ending *-anta* is of course an *-anta* replacement (see my 1979 IJ article), functionally equivalent to an active. Cf. act. *ajanayan* in 13b, again with the same subj. and obj. referring to the same event.

X.88.8: In c Ge (n. 8c) takes sg. *sá* as attraction to the number of the predicate *yajñáh* but representing a plural -- so notionally “*these* became their sacrifice” -- a construction that would follow the practice of Vedic prose in nominal clauses. Although I think the three elements that the gods created in ab do go into making the sacrifice of c, I’m not sure we need to invoke this syntactic rule, since a summary “this” would work as well. By contrast Re takes *sá* as referring to Agni: “C’est (Agni) protecteur de nos corps qui est devenu pour eux le sacrifice (même).” Since Agni is only one of the elements that the gods create in ab, this seems to violate the logical structure of the vs.

Note that the last phrase in the vs., *tám āpah*, somewhat echoes *tanūpāḥ* closing pāda c, as well as 7d.

X.88.9: *bhúvana-*, which earlier in the hymn is sg. and means ‘world’ (vss. 1, 2, 5; see also 12a), here transitions to pl. ‘beings, creatures’ (also vss. 11, 16).

On *prthivīm dyām utémām*, see above ad vs. 3.

X.88.10: Köhler (35) identifies this vs. as an omphalos vs., referring back to the 1st vs. and forward to the end of the hymn, vss. 18–19.

There are a few points of difference between the various interpr. of ab. Ge (fld by Scar 334) construes *diví devāsaḥ* (a) together as “die Götter im Himmel,” whereas I (with Re and Köhler 334) construe *diví* with *ájījanan*, referring to the location where the gods created Agni. That *diví devāsaḥ* is found in the next vs. (10d), where it must refer to the gods’ placemenet (*ádadhuh*) of Agni in heaven (so also Ge), supports my (/ Re’s / Kö’s) interpr., as does the cmpd. *divíyoni-* ‘whose womb is in heaven’ used of Agni in 7b.

Another question of deployment of an adjunct involves *śáktibhiḥ*. Ge construes it with *rodasiprām* “der mit seinen Kräften die Welt erfüllt,” while Re, Scar, Kö, and I assign the powers to the gods. Since *rodasiprā-* is found in 5d without an instr., it seems likely that the same usage of this root noun cmpd is found here, and their powers are what the gods use to create Agni.

Gr, Ge, and Re take *bhuvé* in the phrase *bhuvé kám* as an infinitive: more or less “made him to become threefold.” But “to become” seems pleonastic; I prefer (with Kö) to interpr. “for the world,” which anticipates the fuller *vísvasmai ... bhúvanāya* “for the sake of the whole world” in 12a. I do acknowledge, however, that *kám* appears twice elsewhere in the hymn with an infinitival dative: 1d *dhármaṇe kám* “to support” and 18d *vidmāne kám* ‘to know’.

The threefold nature of fire encompasses the sun, lightning, and the earthly fire, acdg. to Ge (n. 10c), but it could in addition (or even instead) refer to the three ritual fires.

X.88.11–14: The phrases *bhúvanāni víśvā* “all living beings” (11d) and *víśvasmai ... bhúvanāya* “for the whole world” (12a) trigger the suite of repetitions of Agni’s *vaiśvānara*- in 12b, 13a, 14a.

X.88.13: The negated pres. part. *áminant*- occurs here without expressed object. I supply *daívyāni vratāni* “divine commandments,” on the basis of I.92.12=I.124.2 (both of Dawn), where the neut. acc. pl. phrase is object of *áminatī*. Ge (n. 13c) supplies *díśaḥ* ‘directions’ as object on the basis of I.124.3, while noting *vratá-* as a possible alternative. Both possible objects are found frequently with  $\sqrt{mī}$  and both here would indicate that Agni Vaiśvānara moves unerringly. With *vratá-* as object, the expression would indicate that though he wanders (*carīṣṇū*), he moves the way he’s supposed to, not contrary to the cosmic order. Supplying *díśaḥ* produces much the same result: he doesn’t confuse the direction he’s supposed to go in.

X.88.15: This vs. has been much discussed, seeming as it does (perhaps misleadingly) to refer to the *devayāna* and *pitryāna*, already found in the RV and important conceptually later. One of the problems confronting such an interpretation for this passage is that in this vs. there are two routes (*dvé sruṭī*) but three genitives: *pitṛñām* (a), *devāñām utá máṛtyāñām* (b). Given the formulaic nature of “gods and mortals” and the separation of this phrase from the gen. of ‘forefathers’, it is hard to match the Pitars and the gods with the two paths and sideline the mortals. The disposition of the three genitives and its theological implications are much discussed (see Ge’s long n. 15, Old, etc.). I follow Ge (and Kō 335) in construing *pitṛñām* with *asṛṇavam*, as the source of my information, not as owners of either path. Since the Pitars are explicitly asked for esoteric cosmic knowledge in 18c, this seems reasonable. I have no particular views on the nature or ownership of the paths.

X.88.16: Vs.-initial *dvé*, matching *dvé* opening vs. 15, invites the identification of the two entities, with the two routes of 15a referred to here as well. But this is not the standard view: Ge takes *dvé* as Heaven and Earth, Re, similarly, the two cosmic masses, and it is the case that the du. adj. *samīcī* can have such a reference; see, e.g., III.30.11, VIII.6.17. Moreover, since H+E appear in the last pāda of the preceding vs. (as Father and Mother) and since the vs. seems to concern Agni as the Sun making his daily transit (cf. *tarāṇīḥ* in d), the two world halves make sense as defining the space through which he journeys. But I would not rule out a reference to the routes of vs. 14, esp. since one can conceive of the Sun traveling along a fixed route. Perhaps the two routes in this vs. are the (visible) one from east to west and the opposite, unseen one from west to east that brings the Sun back to his starting point.

Pāda b seems deliberately obscure. The root affiliation of the 2nd ppl., *vīmṛṣṭa-*, is uncertain: it could belong to either  $\sqrt{mṛṣ}$  ‘touch’ or  $\sqrt{mṛj}$  ‘wipe’, which in this lexeme are in fact semantically quite close. With Gr, Ge, Re, etc., I take it to  $\sqrt{mṛṣ}$ . However, unlike them I would insist on the literal meaning of the root, not a watered-down mental equivalent (e.g., Re’s “scruté-distinctivement”). On this lexeme and its literal interpr., see disc. ad X.65.7.

Pāda c is almost identical to II.3.1, of Agni, as Ge points out (n. 16c), while *tarāṇīr bhrājamānaḥ* is found in VII.63.4b of Sūrya (Ge’s n. 16d). The hemistich thus captures the dual identity of Agni in this hymn.

X.88.17–19: On these vss. and esp. the participants in the dialogue, see publ. intro. As disc. there, I consider the dialogue to be at first between Heaven and Earth, who have figured prominently in the past few vss. and who are spatially identified by *ávaraḥ páraś ca* “the lower and the higher” (17a). The standard view (in addition to Ge, Re, Old, see Scar 289 n. 408, Kö 336) is that the participants are two priests on the ritual ground, on the basis esp. of 19cd. Although these interpr. discount the implicit vertical axis of *ávaraḥ páraś ca* in favor of “nearer and further,” the vertical orientation is clear in the related phrase *avástāt ... parástāt* in 14d; see also *ávaram páram ca* in the immed. preceding hymn (X.87.3). As indicated in the publ. intro., I think the participants silently morph into the priests found in 19cd. This would fit the oscillation between the divine primordial instantiation of the sacrifice and its present-day performance of it that structures the rest of the hymn.

X.88.17: My interpr. of this vs. differs significantly from the standard in another respect: I consider the two clauses in cd between the *kátaraḥ* question in b and the *káḥ* question in d also to be questions. In other words, everything from 17b through 18b belongs to the question sequence, even though the *ā śekur* clause in 17c and the *nákṣanta* clause in 17d do not contain explicit interrogatives. These two questions, with the subject *sákhayaḥ* ‘comrades’, concern the success both of the gods in their original creation of the sacrifice and the priests who perform it now.

X.88.18: As Sāy. already pointed out (see Ge n. 18ab), the answer to these *káti* questions -- “one” -- is given in the Vāl. hymn VIII.58.2.

The impossible hapax *upaspíj-* has received more than its share of attention. Its general sense and tone are clear: it refers to a frivolous or insulting question. Its phonological similarity to *sphíj-* / *sphigť-* ‘buttocks’ suggests something in the latter, rude or contemptuous, realm. In addition to the lit. cited in EWA s.v., see Scar (664–65) and most recently J. T. Katz, “The Riddle of the *sp(h)ij-*: The Greek Sphinx and Her Indic and Indo-European Background” (in Pinault and Petit, eds., *La langue poétique indo-européenne*, 2006). Katz takes it as a dvandva “lap-buttock” (*upa(s)-sp(h)ij-*) referring to a trick or double-sided question. Like most attempts at etymologizing this word, it is more clever than persuasive.

X.88.19: As indicated in the publ. tr., I think this vs. asserts that the (daily) performance of sacrifice will continue as long as the cycles of the natural world do -- an assertion that may be esp. important to establish the neologistic *brāhmaṇa* priest as an eternal figure.

Ge somewhat perversely takes *ná* as the negative here despite being in a position strongly associated with the simile particle and in fact in the same phrase in VI.50.8 *uśáso ná prátikam*, where Ge does take it as a simile marker. No other interpr. follow his lead.

The fem. pl. adj. *suparnyàḥ* surely refers to Agni’s flames, as is generally agreed. The question is why it is feminine. I think the ref. is to metaphorical mares, as in IX.86.36 *harítaḥ suparnyàḥ* “fine-feathered golden mares,” there used of soma drops.

The flames “clothe themselves as if in the face of Dawn” because flames are red-gold like the dawn sky.

## X.89 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., this is an old-fashioned well-made hymn, making use of familiar rhetorical devices like patterned repetition: e.g., the negatives in 6ab, the pāda-initial perfects in 7, the preverb *prá* in 8cd–9ab and again in 11, *índrah* + GENITIVES in 10, *ánu* in 13.

X.89.1: Instead of *stavā* the Pp reads *stava*, which Old pronounces (persuasively) “wahrscheinlich falsch.” As disc. in the publ. intro. this hymn almost self-consciously locates itself in the Ilr. praise-hymn tradition and would follow the convention of the annunciatory 1<sup>st</sup> ps. at the beginning of a hymn (as in I.32.1a *índrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam*) – here 1st sg. subj. *stavā*. Note that, as in I.32.1, Indra is the first word of the hymn: *índram stavā*.

Pādas a and d end with the alternative instr. *mahnā* and *mahitvā*; I render them both as ‘greatness’, as I don’t think the poet is attempting to draw a semantic distinction, but simply reacting to different metrical circumstances (disyllabic v. trisyllabic cadence end) and perhaps aiming for variety.

With Ge (n. 1c) I take *várobbhiḥ* as referring to the dimensions of the worlds, not of Indra; see IV.21.8 *vārāṃsi párvatasya*. As Ge points out, 2a supports this interpr.

X.89.2: At first glance the sun (in pāda a) and Indra (b) appear to be identified, since both appear in the nom. and there is only one overt verb – so Old (flg. Bergaigne). However, this makes for both syntactic and conceptual problems in the rest of the vs. My interpr. is similar to Ge’s: I take a and b as separate clauses, and supply an intrans. form of  $\sqrt{vrt}$  with *pári* in a, partly matching the trans. idiom  $\hat{a} \sqrt{vrt}$  in b. The object of this transitive verb is then found in c, which describes, without naming, the sun of a in the acc. In other words, the sun is doing its daily circuit in pāda a, and Indra is urged to turn the sun more in our direction in bc. The simile of Indra’s turning chariot wheels is, of course, quite apt, given the sun’s circular shape.

X.89.3: Old suggests that *arca* is a misunderstanding for *\*arcā*, matching *stavā* in 1a, and Ge tr. as a 1st sg. subj. without comment. So also Scar (508 with n. 708). Yet I see no reason not to take it as the 2nd sg. impv. it appears to be, as an ex. of poetic self-address.

Although *samānām* can modify *bráhma* in the following pāda (and is so taken by Gr, Ge, and Scar), I do not see why a formulation chanted by a single person and directed at a single god would be ‘common’ or ‘joint’ (e.g., Ge “das gemeinsame Erbauungswort”; he thinks it’s held in common by the group of singers [n. 3a]). I prefer to take it as a neut. adv. ‘in the same way’, contrasting with *návyam* ‘new’, in the usual Rigvedic productive paradox concerning praise poetry, that it is both traditional and new. The word also phonologically resembles, and so contrasts with, negated *ásamam* ‘without equal’.

The root noun cmpd *ánápāvrt* is potentially multivalent syntactically: it can be an adv. (as the other occurrence in V.32.5 is, in my view; see comm. ad loc.), or it can modify either the subj., i.e., the chanter, or the formulation. With Ge and Scar (508), I take it with the last: the formulation that goes directly, without swerving, to its goal, the god Indra, but the other possibilities cannot be ruled out.

The expression *kṣmayā diváh* seems to show the same case disharmony as is found in paired temporal expressions like *divā náktam* “by day and by night.” Scar (508 n. 708) tentatively suggests rather that it is underlyingly *kṣmayā \*divā u*, with matching instrumentals, and means “mit der Erde und mit dem Himmel nicht zu vergleichen.” But this seems overfussy; moreover it unnecessarily deprecates the formulation in question: that is, it implies that the

formulation cannot be compared to H+E and is therefore not as good – but why would it be compared to them in the first place?

Our *vī yāḥ prṣṭhēva jānimāni aryāḥ ... cikāya ...* is very like IV.2.11 ... *cinavad vī ... prṣṭhēva vītā vrjinā ca mātātān* “he will distinguish ... like backs, straight and crooked, (like) mortals” (a parallel that is generally remarked). Although the owners of the backs under comparison are not identified, I assume that they are horses (so also Ge) and that Indra is being presented as, in the first instance, a judge of horseflesh. Note that though our passage lacks “straight and crooked,” *vrjinā* ‘crooked’ appears in 8b. Th. (Fremdling 64–68) disputes this interpr. of *prṣṭhá-* and derives it instead from *√pras* ‘ask’, with the meaning Rätselfrage, for both our passage and IV.2.11: “Welcher Indra gesondert hat (=auseinander kennt) wie Rätselfragen die Ursprünge des Fremdlings, keinen Freund sich wünscht.” Although this is clever and the morphological derivation itself is unimpeachable, it is unnecessary, and he still must reckon with numerous undoubted exx. of *prṣṭhá-* ‘back’.

X.89.4: The bahuvrīhi *āniśita-sarga-* ‘having restless surges’ echoes the phrase *ātiṣṭhantam apasyāṃ nā sárgam* “like a busy surge that never stands still” in 2c. I consider *āniśitasargā apāḥ* in our vs. to be an unmarked simile (so also Ge) matching the explicit simile in 2a.

There is phonetic play between *-sargā(h)* (a) and *ságarasya* (b).

As Ge points out (n. 4ab), “the depths of the sea” can refer to the heart, the source of poetic inspiration, as in IV.58.5 (cf. 11) *hṛdyāt samudrāt*, etc.

The wheels in c (*cakrīyā*) pick up those in 2b *cakrá*. I suggest that the pf. *cikāya* in 3d phonologically mediates between these two, esp. resembling *cakrīyā* with flips of vowel quality and quantity.

X.89.5: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. seems intentionally designed to mislead. The subj. of the hymn is of course Indra, whose name has appeared in all four of the previous vss. in prominent pāda-initial position (1a *#indram*, 2b *#indraḥ*, 3d *#indraḥ*, 4a *#indrāya*). The string of nom. sg. masc. descriptors in 5ab invites the audience to assume the same referent, esp. since 4cd has Indra (though unnamed) in the nom. as well. But when we reach the beginning of the 2nd hemistich we find instead *#sómah*, and we must scramble to shift the adjectives of the 1st hemistich to this new referent. The adjectives are in fact applicable to both referents, though with slight adjustments of sense. For ex., the hapax bv *āpānta-manyu-* if applied to Indra would mean ‘deriving battle-fury from the drink’, whereas Soma ‘provides battle-fury in/from his drink’.

The first member of the next hapax cmpd *trpāla-prabharman-*, *trpāla-*, is found independently in IX.97.8, modifying *manyú-* (which precedes it here). See comm. ad loc., where I accept Mayr’s tentative connection to *trprá-*, found only once in RV (VIII.2.5; see comm. ad loc.), characterizing soma, but also occasionally later. With Mayr I tentatively take *trprá-* to mean ‘sharp’, a well-known quality of soma (though usually expressed by *tīvrá-*), an interpr. supported by some later Iranian evidence. The second member, *prábharmān-*, is found independently (along with other nominal derivatives and numerous exx. of the verbal lexeme *prá√bhr*), referring to the presentation of ritual offerings. My “first impression” is a bit loose; Ge’s “Anstich” (first draught) is better, capturing the *pra* while maintaining the physical quality of the soma offering.

The adjectives in b are less rarified than those in pāda a, and the first and last (*dhūni-* ‘bositerous’ and *rjīśín-* ‘possessing the silvery drink’) are frequently applied to Indra. In fact *rjīśín-* is overwhelmingly an Indra word – applied to soma only once elsewhere (VIII.79.4). So

just before introducing Soma as the subject, we get a qualifier that seems to clinch the Indra reference.

The construction of the second hemistich is unclear. Ge takes c as an independent clause, which requires him to supply, indeed invent, a verb (wiegt ... auf 'outweigh'). Not only is there no support for this verb, but having *sómaḥ* lean forward into a new clause diminishes the drama of the surprise introduction of this subject for the expected Indra. I therefore take *sómaḥ* as the enjambed final word of the nominal clause of ab, with a new clause (comprising the rest of c along with d) starting immediately after. The syntactic isolation of *sómaḥ* allows the referent switch to reverberate. This suggested disposition of the hemistich is essentially that of Ludwig's (see Old's disc. and partial endorsement). The neut. pl. phrase *viśvāny atasā vānāni* "all the [other] bushes and trees," subject of *debhuḥ*, is picked up by *pratimānāni* 'counterparts, equivalents' in d as a sort of secondary predicate. Although Old hesitates somewhat to accept Ludwig's interpr. because of the "etwas harte Satzteilung," note that there has to be a pāda-internal clause break in the next vs., 6b.

As Ge points out (n. 5d), this indicates that already in the (late) RV there may have been ritual substitutes for the soma plant – however we interpr. the syntax of cd.

There is some debate about the meaning and function of *arvāk*. Ge (flg. Ludwig) interprets it first as locational 'below' and then by metaphorical extension 'lesser'; Old in addition suggests temporal 'until now'. I take it in its standard sense 'nearby', here characterizing *pratimānāni*.

My only hesitation about the interpretation of the hemistich championed here is that it involves a "all ... did not" construction (*viśvāni ... ná .... debhuḥ* "they all did not deceive ..."). Some time ago I made a study of the interaction of quantifiers and negatives in Vedic (which I thought I had published long ago but evidently did not) in order to assess the scope of the quantifier in such contests (total "all do not" versus partial "not all do"). In the RV there are essentially no examples of *viśva-* / *sārva-* plus *ná*; the only apparent exceptions involve the All Gods (*viśve devāḥ*) (see, e.g., III.32.8), where the total interpr. is the only one possible, since the All Gods are a corporate entity and could not participate in a "not all do" construction. In the AV the apparent restriction against such constructions is slightly loosened, but they are still quite rare; early Vedic prose has a few more, but it still seems to be avoided. In positing an "all do not" reading here, I would point out that this is a late hymn; moreover the sequestering of the "all" phrase in pāda c, taken up by a non-quantified *pratimānāni* in d and with the neg. opening d, may have made the construction acceptable: "All the bushes and trees – (as) near counterparts, they do not deceive ..."

X.89.6: The first hemistich consists of a rel. clause (*ná yasya ...*) that lacks not only a finite verb but any predicate at all, followed by brief main clause: *sómo akṣāḥ*. These two words cannot belong to the rel. cl. because the verb is unaccented. As was just noted, the mid-pāda clause break here supports the similar interpr. of 5cd.

As to the predicate in the rel. cl., Ge supplies a verb "gewachsen sind," with no justification given; in fact in n. 6ab he suggests importing *pratimānāni* from 5d, as does Old --- and the publ. tr. concurs. There is a subtle shift in sense, however: in 5cd the bushes and trees were not quite counterparts / equivalents of soma; here no cosmic geographical features are counterparts / equivalents of Indra.

I am taking *yásya* as referring to Indra; though both Old and Ge consider soma another possible referent, they both seem to opt for Indra, and he seems the only possible one to me. To knit the two clauses together we should expect *tásmai* or *indrāya* to begin the main clause.

Ge (see also Kulikov 142) takes cd as a single cl. dependent on the main cl. of b. This is certainly possible but it requires seeing *manyúh* as the subj. of the two verbs in d, *śṛṇāti* and *rujāti*. I prefer to interpr. cd as another depend. cl. (c) / main clause (d) dyad, with Indra as the subj. of the two main cl. verbs, which are accented because each is initial in its claus(ette) and *śṛṇāti* is also init. in its pāda. This interpr. means that the pres. part. *adhinīyāmānaḥ* is predicated in the c-clause. Kulikov (142) tr. the part. “being enhanced,” Ge “gesteigert.” The lexeme *ádhi* √*nī* is found only once elsewhere in the RV (VIII.30.3) and, acdg. to MonWms, nowhere else in Skt. In VIII.30.3 it means ‘lead /from out of’ (though it is likely that *ádhi* there, flg. an abl. and not in a normal preverb position, is actually simply a postposition). I think the same sense may be found here: the *manyú-* is being drawn out of Indra, enabling him to perform the violent deeds in d and the following vs. (8).

Note that the two verbs in d are reprised in the next two vss.: *rurója* (7b), *śṛṇāsi* (8b).

X.89.7: The first three pādas begin with fronted perfects *jaghāna*, *rurója*, *bibhēda*.

X.89.8ff.: As disc. in the publ. intro. and see also Ge n. 8, the focus of the hymn shifts to the punishment of those who break alliances (*mitrá-*) or have no alliances at all – a theme with deep Indo-Iranian roots, as Ge also points out.

X.89.8: On the strongly emphatic use of *ha tyád* with 2nd sg. prn. see I.63.4–7, VI.18.3, VIII.96.16–18 and comm. ad locc.

In d I take the object *yújam ... mitrá*m as inanimate: “a bound alliance” (see also JPB, *Ādityas* 30: “a union (or) an alliance”), while for Ge it’s animate: “einen verbündeten Freund” (which in my terms would be “yokemate (and) ally”). In favor of the JPB/SJ interpr., *prá* √*mī* almost always takes an inanimate obj. (though this argument may be undercut by the following vs. [however see below]), and, as the obj. in this simile, the phrase is parallel to inanimate *dhāma* ‘ordinances’ in the frame. In favor of Ge’s rendering, the root noun *yúj-* is otherwise overwhelmingly animate. I would consider an alt. tr. “yokemate (and) ally” here, but see comm. on 9 immed. below.

X.89.9: As was just noted, *prá* √*mī* almost always takes an inanimate obj. Here the verb has four distinct objects, each marked out by the repetition of the preverb *prá* immediately before. One of these, *saṃgírah* ‘agreements’, is definitely inanim. (and in its other occurrence is also the obj. of *prá* √*mī* [IX.86.16]), while *mitrá-* can, of course, be either the divine name or the common noun ‘alliance’. Thieme (M+A 62–63) takes all four objects as inanimate nouns: “... who deceive/betray ... a contract (*mitrá*), a [*sic*] *hospitality* (*aryamán*), [friendly] agreements (*saṃgír*), true speech (*váruṇa*).” JPB (*Ādityas* 86–87) follows Th in taking all four nominals in an appellative sense, though with different renderings of *aryamánam* (“custom”) and, esp., *váruṇam* (“commandment”). His argument for the appellative sense in part rests on an observation similar to that made above, that “the object of *prá mī* is never a god or a man, but rather a principle” (87). Although I’m not sure I want to go so far as to eliminate the gods from this passage entirely, esp. given the undoubted presence of Mitra and Varuṇa in the preceding vs. (8c), I now see that the presence of clear inanimate *saṃgírah* and ambiguous *mitrá*m invites or

requires at least a secondary inanimate reading for *aryāmaṇam* and *vāruṇam* too and I would now tr. the VP “... who transgress against Mitra [/alliance] and against Aryaman [/custom], against agreements and against Varuṇa [/commandment].” In other words, to transgress against the god is to transgress against the principle he embodies – or, perhaps better, vice versa.

The rel. cl. in ab is either dependent on *amitreṣu* in the main clause (c) (“on those without alliance who ...”) or covertly conjoined with it (“on those without alliance (and those) who ...”).

Note the acc. *vṛṣāṇam*, with *vṛddhi* in the suffix, against the overwhelming number of forms to this stem with *guṇa* in the suffixal strong forms (acc. *vṛṣaṇam*, etc.). There is only one other such form (in IX.34.3; see comm. ad loc.). It is not surprising that such *n*-stems would be attracted into the dominant *vṛddhi* type; what is a bit surprising in this passage is that it’s in the same vs. with *aryamāṇam* which maintains *guṇa* in its suffix.

X.89.10: Acdg. to Schindler (Root noun s.v. p. 45), the root noun *vṛdh-* is only a Nom. act. “Vermehrung” (etc.): “An keiner Stelle ist *vṛdh-* Adj. oder Nag.” Although this statement is accurate for the numerous singular occurrences of the stem, it cannot apply to this gen. pl., parallel to the gen. pl. *médhirāṇām* “of the wise (ones)”; it must mean “strong (ones).” Perhaps the presence of them. adj. *vṛdhá-* in the next vs. influenced the usage, though this is not much of a hypothesis.

Pāda d has both a rare break (—) and a bad cadence (∪ ∪ — ×) (see, e.g., HvN metr. comm.). Arnold (322) suggests flipping *yóge háv<sup>i</sup>ya* — × to *háv<sup>i</sup>yo yóge* — ×, which would fix both problems – and would also distribute the paired terms *kṣéme yóge* in a way more in keeping with the other three pādas, where the pairs are broken up. Although Arnold’s suggestion neatly solves two problems, my hesitation is that it is difficult to see why the word order would have been disturbed redactionally. Old also is not convinced.

X.89.11: This vs. contains 8 occurrences of the preverb *prá*, each with an associated ablative. The verb with which they are construed and which provides the idiom that controls the abl. (“project beyond”) is *ririce*, which is found only in the break of the last pāda. Note also that *prá* is teasingly doubled by the *s*-stem abl. *práthasaḥ* in c.

X.89.12: The preverb *prá*, so prominent in 11, has one last gasp at the beginning of 12, but in a different verbal lexeme (*prá* √*vṛt*), a small ex. of the poet’s sly misdirections.

The simile in c, *ásmeva ... divá á srjānāḥ* “like a stone being launched from heaven,” seems at first to connect with the last word of b, *hetih* (“... missile like a stone”), but the 2nd sg. impv. *vidhya* in c redirects the comparison: it’s Indra, the implicit subject of the impv., who’s being compared to the stone, not his missile – yet another ex. of the subtle shifts and red herrings that this poet cleverly indulges in.

The cmpd *drógha-mitra-* is generally taken as a tatp., e.g., “ein arglistiger, falscher Freund” (Gr), with unexpected accent (AiG II.1.266), or, with Ge (n. 12d), as a cmpd with a governing 1st member (“die Freundbetrüger”). Old sensibly wants it to be a bahuvr. and suggests the somewhat less sensible gloss “den Trug zum Freund habend.” Given the abstract use of *mitrá-* elsewhere in this hymn, I suggest rather the bv ‘whose alliances are deceitful’.

X.89.13: Like vs. 11, in which the repeated *prá*-s culminate in the last pāda with the withheld verb *ririce*, here repeated *ánu*-s (6, this time) find their verb in *ajihata* in d. The obj. of this verb is also withheld till the 2nd hemistich: *índram* in c.



Gr, Lub, and the publ. tr. take *áha* as the particle *áha* (of unclear function), but Ge (see n. 13a) as the neut. pl. of ‘days’. An argument against Ge’s interpr. would be that in the rest of the vs. each *ánu* is associated with only a single element, whereas here there would be two: “days (and) months” – and a similar one-to-one relationship is found in vss. 8cd-9ab and 11 with repeated *prá*. However, in this vs. the various nominals associated with the preverb are ill-assorted: “months” is the only temporal designation, with the others being features of geography/landscape: trees (a), plants (b), mountains (b), world-halves (c), waters (d). If the first *ánu* syntagm contains both days and months, the conceptual imbalance would be considerably lessened. I therefore would now substitute the tr. “The days (and) months gave way ...” For another short-vowel pl. *áha* see I.92.3.

X.89.14: The root affiliation of the hapax *cetyā-* is disputed: to  $\sqrt{ci}^3$  ‘avenge, requite’ or to  $\sqrt{cit}$  ‘perceive’ (Gr); see Old, EWA s.v. The tone of the hymn certainly favors the former, and this is reflected in most tr. (Ge, Scar 88, publ. tr.).

Ge construes *aghásya* with *cetyā*, but the *pāda* boundary is (weakly) against that, and it works perfectly well with *rákṣaḥ*.

Although Gr assigns *éśat* to a separate root  $\sqrt{eṣ}$  ‘gleiten, schleichen’, it is better analyzed as *īṣat* + *ā* to the them. pres. *īṣa-* (so Old, Ge, Gotō [1st Cl, 109 n. 84]).

The cmpd *mitra-krū-* (Gr. *-krú-*) and esp. its 2nd member are much discussed; see esp. Scar 88–89, EWA I.414–15. The word is obviously related to *krūrā-* ‘bloody’ (AV+), *kravis-* ‘bloody flesh’; the question is whether *krū* is a verbal root or pseudo-verb root or is simply a nominal ‘blood’ (vel sim.). In my view, whether or not there was a “real” root  $\sqrt{krū}$  ‘be/make bloody’, in this hapax cmpd the second member is treated as such. Only this interpr. accounts for the accent and the likely meaning.

As disc. in the publ. intro., I consider *pāda* d an intertextual reference to two famous phrases in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, both describing the slain Vṛtra: I.32.5 ... *śayata upapṛk prthivyāḥ* “... will lie as the embracer of the earth” (like our *prthivyā āpṛk ... śayante*) and I.32.8 ... *amuyā śayānam* “... lying in that way” (like our *amuyā śayante*). (Both passages are also adduced by Ge, n. 14d.) Because of the strong similarities between I.32 and our passage I think it likely that our *āpṛk* is a simple substitution under different metrical conditions for *upapṛk* in I.32.5 and it is therefore unnec. to seek a special sense of the root noun cmpd here – as in Ge’s “... nur so platt auf die Erde liegen werden” [I’m not sure how he gets that] or Scar’s “als ein die Erde anfüllender Haufen derart daliegen.”

X.89.15: The hapax *ogaṇá-* is taken by Gr (etc.) as derived from *\*avagaṇa-* lit. ‘von seiner Schar verstossen’. Both the deriv. and the proposed sense were vigorously disputed by Old, with ample ref. to previous lit. Old suggests a connection with SV *úgaṇa-* and the sense ‘strong’, which is reflected in current tr. (Ge, Kü 205, publ. tr.). The likely deriv. was sketched by KH (Aufs. 397–98 [MSS 8 (1956)]; see also EWA s.v.), from a putative *\*ogṛ-ná-* with MIA dev. of syllabic *\*ṛ*; cf. Aves. *r*-stem *aogarə* ‘power’. This is very likely and is reflected in the publ. tr., but it should be pointed out that these enemies should not *be* powerful, but think themselves so – the word must somehow fall under the domain of *vrādhanta(h)*. See KH’s tr. (397) “die sich als Machtvolle sehr hochgemut fühlenden.”

*Pādas* c and d present contrastive images: the unallianced associated with “blind darkness” in contrast to “the nights with their good lights” (*sujoyotiṣo aktávaḥ*) that overcome the enemies. But why are the nights the agents here? Old suggests that the nights stand for our allies,

who prevail over the darkness of the foe. Possibly, but a more standard RVic image would be for the day (/dawn/sun) to prevail over the darkness of night – not to compare the victorious side with the only comparatively brighter night. In fact Ge (n. 15d) asserts that the sense is “Das Licht soll über die Finsternis triumphieren,” so the emphasis in d is on the *lights* of the nights. This still doesn’t seem to me entirely satisfactory.

X.89.16–18: Starting with vs. 16 the hymn winds down with standard hymn-ending clichés: urging Indra to come to *our* sacrifice (16) and expressing the hope that we may reap the benefits of his presence (17). There here-and-now of the ritual is expressed by *imām ... sáhūtim* “this common call here” (16c) and *nūnām* “now,” the final word of 17. The *evá* opening 17 is a common way to introduce the final summary vs. of a hymn. And as often in final verses, the poet explicitly identifies himself and his lineage with “(we) Viśvāmitras” in 17d. In fact 17 is the real final vs.: vs. 18 is borrowed from III.30.22, the final vs. of an Indra hymn in the Viśvāmitra maṇḍala -- another way of stamping the Viśvāmitra signature on this Xth Maṇḍala hymn attributed to a Viśvāmitra descendent, Reṇu Vaiśvāmitra.

X.89.17: The poet’s presentation of the Viśvāmitra signature just discussed is somewhat complicated by this vs. As just noted, he borrows a final vs. (18) from the Viśvāmitra mantra (though it does not mention the Viśvāmitras directly), and he associates himself explicitly with the Viśvāmitras in 17d. But 17cd is a direct borrowing of (or, to be more circumspect, is identical with) VI.25.9, another hymn-final vs., *except* that for *viśvāmitrā(h)* in d, VI.25.9 has *bharādvājā(h)*. In other words, our crafty poet’s most direct claim for his Viśvāmitra identity is made by boldly manipulating (/stealing) the signature vs. of a different poetic lineage – another sign of the intertextuality disc. ad vs. 14.

On the syntactic issues in cd, see comm. ad VI.25.9. As I suggest there, the problematic *utá* may be connecting the two temporal expressions *vāstoḥ* and *nūnām*, and the tr. could be altered to “as we sing at dawn and also now.”

## [X.90 Puruṣa JPB]

### X.91 Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn resembles X.89, as a well-crafted consciously traditional poetic product, even though the poet to whom it is ascribed is not the same as that of X.89 and the starkly innovative X.90 intervenes between them. The composition is nicely balanced with pleasingly intricate patterns of repetition and variation.

X.91.1: This vs. is crammed with both etymological figures and figures of sense (that is, synonyms or near-synonyms that are not etymologically related). The former include *dāme dāmūnā(h)* (b), *suśākhā sakhīyaté* (d), and possibly *hótā haviṣaḥ* (c) [it’s hard to know whether a Rigvedic audience would perceive an etymological relation between the two]. Figures of sense – in many ways more interesting – are *jāgrvādbhir jāramāna(h)* (a) and *iṣáyann ilāḥ* (b) (on the assumption that to the Vedic Sprachgefühl the root nouns *id-* and *iṣ-* [with its verbal form *iṣaya-*] were etymologically unconnected). A third type is exemplified by *vibhúr vibhāvā* (d), in which the near phonological identity overcomes lack of etymological or semantic identity.

X.91.2: The dominant stylistic feature in this vs. is the āmreḍita, with one per pāda: *grhé-grhe* (a), *váne-vane* (b), *jānaṃ-janam* (c), *viśaṃ-viśam* (d), which are tightly patterned. Those in the first hemistich are both in the loc. and are adjacent to each other, at the end of a and the beginning of b. Those in the 2nd hemistich are in the acc. and maximally distant, at the beginning of c and end of d.

The āmreḍita is not the only stylistic feature. The first hemistich contains two nom. sg. rt-noun cmpds in *-īr* (in sandhi), *darśataśrīr ... takvavīr*, with nom. sg. *ātithir* also participating in this phonetic figure. The 2nd member *-śrīr* (a) is echoed by *śīśriye* (b), though they are etymologically and semantically unrelated (so also Ge n. 2ab). The second hemistich goes in for etymological figures connected to the āmreḍitas: c *jānaṃ-janaṃ jānīyaḥ* and d *viśaḥ ... viśīyo viśaṃ-viśam*. And we might note that *jānīya-* and *viśīya-* are similarly formed and similarly related to the root syllable of their respective āmreḍitas.

On *darśata-śrī-* see Scar 552 and for the general challenges of interpr. *-śrī-* cmpds 546.

On *takva-vī-* see comm. ad I.151.5, 134.5, also Scar 497–98. Note that *váne-vane* is read differently in simile and frame.

X.91.2–3: Almost like a textbook demonstration, these two vss. showcase the contrasting presents to the roots  $\sqrt{kṣi}$  ‘dwell’ and  $\sqrt{kṣā}$ , *kṣi* ‘rule, own’, both in the active indic. sg. for convenient comparison: 2d *kṣeti*, 3c *kṣayasi*.

X.91.3: The first three pādas are defined by etymological figures of a straightforward sort: *sudākṣo dākṣaiḥ* (a), *krátunā ... sukrātuḥ* (a), *kaviḥ kāvyena* (c), *vásur vásūnām* (c). Again there is internal patterning. All three pairs in the first hemistich have a nom. / instr. pairing; the nominatives in pāda a are compds with *su-* and the pairs in a are chiastically arranged. In c the 2nd term is gen., not instr. All three pairs in ab have parallels elsewhere (see Ge’s nn.), though not all together or so densely arranged.

In c (*ék*)a *íd*# provides a rhyme for b (*viśv*)*avít*#, which make help to account for the unusual, though by no means unprecedented, position of *íd*.

X.91.4: *ilāyās padé* picks up *ilās padé* in 1b. Note the close sandhi in both phrases.

On the sandhi of *ivétayaḥ* (prob. *iva étayaḥ*) see Old with further lit.

X.91.5: In pāda a *śríyaḥ* picks up (*darśata-*)*śrīḥ* of 2a.

The phrase *cikitra uśásām* recurs in 5b from 4c; in both cases of course *uśásām* is not directly construed with the verb. In 5b the verb also enters into an etymological and phonological figure: *citrāś cikitra* (in sandhi).

X.91.6: After Agni’s attack on the plants in 5c and his consumption of them as his food in 5d, this vs. depicts the temporally / logically prior actions whereby the plants, with the help of the waters (here probably the rains that foster plant growth or the water [=sap/juice] internal to the plants), conceive Agni/fire and give birth to him.

Pāda-final *rtvīyam* is repeated from 4a; see also 10a below.

The second hemistich contains three instances of *ca*. The one in c is an inverse *ca* connecting the nominals *vanīnaḥ* and *vīrúdhah*. The second pair, in d, conjoin the two predicates *antārvatīḥ* and *súvate*. As JSK (DGRV I.172) points out, we should supply a finite form of  $\sqrt{bhū}$  vel sim. with the adjective *antārvatīḥ* (though correct his sg. [*bhavati*] to [*bhavanti*]). *súvate* is

presumably accented because it is a contrastive predicate (see Old as well as Re's n. on the passage).

Ge (n. 6d) adduces as parallel III.55.5c, which in fact adds a new wrinkle in the form of a paradox. It too concerns the birth of fire from plants: *antárvatīḥ suvate ápravītāḥ* "Having (him) within, (though) unimpregnated they give birth to (him)." In that passage *antárvatīḥ* contrasts with *ápravītāḥ* -- the presumable difference is that though the plants have embryonic fire within and are in that sense pregnant, they are not so because of sexual activity.

I consider *samānām* (c) and *viśvāhā* (d) as conceptually contrastive, despite their distance from each other. Hence my tr. "who is just the same everywhere." This is not the standard interpr.: JSK (172) takes *samānām* as an acc. sg. m. emphasizing the identity of the preceding *tām* with the two *tām*-s opening pādas a and b; Ge and Re take it as an adv. (gleichmässig / en commun) loosely applied to the woody plants and sprouts. I think my interpr. yields richer semantics and reflects the standard trope that there are many fires, which are also the same fire. However, the repetition of *samānām id* in 8c may lend some support to JSK's interpr.

X.91.7: This vs. returns to the theme of 5cd, with the mature Agni consuming the plants (that gave birth to him in 6).

The position of *yād* is at least a minor violation of the usual rules; see also vs. 12 below.

X.91.8: In Engl. the vs. seems to veer abruptly from the 3rd ps. to the 2nd at the very end (see also Old, who remarks on the switch), but the Skt. of the first 3½ pādas does not *have* to be read as 3rd ps. It consists of a string of acc. singulars, so there is no obligatory ps. marking, and could simply take up the 2nd ps. ref. to Agni in vs. 7. However, the repeated *tām*-s in cd, as well as the acc. *agnīm* in b, would incline the audience to a 3rd ps. reading. See also comm. on the next vs., 9.

I do not understand the case mismatch between the contrastive pair *árbhe* (loc., c) and *mahé* (dat., d). Perhaps the surface identity of the case endings in *-e* outweighs their grammatical disharmony.

X.91.9: The first hemistich of this vs. closely tracks vs. 8, with the differences between them seeming to force a 3rd ps. interpr. on most of vs. 8 (see disc. just above) contrasting with the overt 2nd ps. of 9ab: instead of *tām id ... vṛṇate* (8cd) we have *tvām id ... vṛṇate tvāyávaḥ* (9a); instead of *agnīm hótāram* (8b) *hótāram agne* (9b) – both with explicit 2nd ps. readings.

X.91.10: This vs. is identical to II.1.2. In his usual quest to identify the original locus of repeated vss. (a quest we would not undertake in this post-Parry-Lord era), Bloomfield (RR, ad 2.12) suggests that ours is the original: "The stanza is rather abrupt in 2.1, whereas in 10.91 its sequence is peculiarly fit." Presumably he is referring to the three mentions of Agni as Hotar in the two preceding vss. (8b, 9b) and the following vs. (11c) and the occurrence of the rare denom. *adhvarīyāsi* in 11d – but one could argue in reverse that these occurrences invited the insertion of a stock vs. containing *hotrām* and *adhvarīyāsi* on the principle of concatenation. Note also that pāda-final *ṛtvīyam* (a) matches those in 4a and 6a.

X.91.11: Re suggest that this vs. is a gloss of 10; as I just indicated, I would argue in the opposite direction, that 10 is a ready-made vs. that was inserted between 9 and 11 on the basis of lexical and conceptual similarities.

X.91.12–13: The vs.-initial *imāḥ*, *imām* usher in the last section of the hymn, in which the poet announces the here-and-now of the current ritual and esp. the praise the poet himself is offering to Agni. To emphasize the parallelism of the two vss., the tr. of 13 should begin “this good praise here would I proclaim ...”

X.91.12: The first hemistich piles up an impressive array of ritual speech types.

The second hemistich returns to the etymological figures that were prominent in the early vss.: *vasūyávo vásave* (c), recalling *vásur vásūnām* in 3c, and *ṽṛddhāsu ... vārdhanaḥ* (d). The position of *yāsu* in d is a more egregious violation of the usual placement of relatives than the one noted in 7. It may have been displaced to the right in order to accommodate the etym. figure that opens the pāda.

Re claims that *vārdhana-* must be intrans. here, contrary to its other occurrences (and, I’d add, to the standard trans./caus. function of *-ana-*nominals), but there is no necessity for this view. *vārdhana-* responds implicitly to *vasūyávaḥ*: Agni strengthens the already strong ritual praises he receives by awarding them goods.

X.91.13: The extravagant list of domestic animals in ab is structurally parallel to the list of ritual speech types in 12ab. However, I don’t understand what actually happens to these beasts. With Ge and Re, the publ. tr. takes *āhutāḥ* to be the equivalent of ‘offered’ (/ ‘sacrificed’), but these are not standard Vedic sacrificial animals – even the horse, whose sacrifice is rare and special. Although it might be possible to interpret the animals as standing for sacrificial substances they produce – like “cows” for “milk” – none of them is associated in that way with an offering substance. Moreover the juxtaposed ppl. *avasṛṣṭāsa āhutāḥ* seem self-contradictory, since *áva* √*sṛj* means ‘release’; cf. the internal contradictions of Ge’s “... freigelassen geopfert werden” and Re’s “... sont offerts après avoir été mis en liberté” (though see Scar’s tr. [311], which harmonizes them: “... [zum Opfer] losgelassen, geopfert werden”). I now think that *āhuta-* must be used as it is when Agni is the referent – that it means, literally and actually, ‘bepoured, besprinkled’ (see the same usage of *prāhuta-* in the next hymn, X.92.3). If *avasṛṣṭā-* ‘released’ refers to a situation like that in the Áśvamedha in later śrauta ritual where multiple *wild* animals are tied to yūpas as if to be sacrificed but then released, perhaps our passage alludes to a similar situation but with domestic animals. Perhaps at their release they were sprinkled with a token portion of ghee that sacralized them. I would feel more comfortable about this hypothesis if there were any other evidence for it that I am aware of. It also makes some trouble with *yāsmín*: *yāsmín ... āhutāḥ* can most easily be interpr. as “into which/whom (they are) offered.” But perhaps it refers to the animals’ proximity to the ritual fire: “at which ...” In any case, I would now change the tr. to “at whom/which horses, bulls, oxen, mated cows, rams are released (and) anointed (with ghee),” though without a lot of confidence in its correctness.

It is possible that this parade of domestic animals is related to the hapax epithet of Agni in c, *kīlāla-pā-* ‘k.-drinking’ (on which see Scar’s minimal disc., 311). Although *kīlāla-* is found only here in the RV, it is common in AV (both Ś and P) +. As its phonology also suggests, this drink seems to belong to a lower-register domestic sphere and is sometimes associated with farm animals. See, e.g., AVŚ VII.60.5 (≅ AVP III.26.5) *úpahūtā ihá gāva úpahūtā ajāváyah / átho ánnasya kīlāla úpahūto grhēsu nah* “Called on here are the cows, called on the goats and sheep; then called on is the *kīlāla* of food in our houses.” In Ś IV.11.10 (/P III.25.12) the draft-ox (*anaḍvāh-*) and plowmen “go to” *kīlāla-*, while in P VIII.11.3 two draught-oxen are involved.

Although I can't (yet) construct a scenario that provides a function for the list of animals in ab, I now think this unusual ritual assemblage must be connected to the unusual *kīlāla*-drink – though I don't know why this association is found in the penultimate vs. of an otherwise traditional Agni hymn.

X.91.15: *āsyè* returns from 5d.

## X.92 All Gods

On the (lack of) organization of this hymn, see publ. intro. Ge suggests that it is not correctly transmitted.

X.92.1: With Ge and Re, I supply a 1st ps. verb of speech to govern the acc. phrase of ab. This phrase has a stately traditional feel. Though Agni is not named, the descriptors unambiguously identify him: *yajñāsya* .. *rathyām* closely resembles *rathīr adhvarāṇām* “charioteer of the ceremonies” used of Agni in I.44.2=VIII.11.2 and VI.7.2; *viśpāti*- *viśām* is a standard epithet of Agni (e.g., III.2.10, V.4.3). Hotar is of course his regular role (and is heavily present in the preceding hymn; see comm. ad X.91.10); *ātithi*- ‘guest’ is also standard for Agni and appears in the preceding hymn (X.91.2). *vibhā-vasu*- is only used of Agni, and cf. *vibhāvā* in X.91.1.

The description of Agni switches to the nom. in the 2nd hemistich, capped by the finite injunc. *asāyata* of which Agni is the subj. On this stem see comm. ad VI.33.2. IH suggests that this injunc. should have presential value, and an alt. “reaches heaven” is certainly possible; so KH (Injunc. 119).

The two word pairs in c, *śocañ chūṣkāsu* and *hāriṇīṣu jārbbhurad*, are syntactically parallel though chiasitic: nom. sg. m. pres. part. / loc. pl. f. // loc. pl. f. / nom. sg. m. pres. part. They also have a pseudo-etymological feel enabled by phonology: *śoc* and *śuṣk* / *hār* and *jārbbhur*.

X.92.2: Both Ge and Re construe *akṛṇvata* with two acc.: “make Agni (into) X.” Although this is certainly possible, I prefer to take this mid. verb in the meaning ‘make (their) own’, a meaning found elsewhere, with the other acc.s further descriptors.

The 2nd member of the rt noun cmpd. *añjas-pā-* is variously interpr. Old and Re take it to  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘protect’, Scar (317) to a third (and in my opinion unnec.) root  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘gehen, sich bewegen’. With Gr and Ge, I assign it to  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘drink’. The point, as Ge notes (n. 2a), is that Agni consumes the oblation without intermediary, unlike the (other) gods, who have Agni as their mediating mouth. In its other occurrence, in nearby X.94.13, the cmpd modifies the pressing stones, who get the (literally) first crack at the soma.

Agni's role as supporter (*dharmān-*) reminds us of nearby X.88.1, where, at least in my interpr., Agni is charged to “support the world” (*bhūvanāya ... dhārmaṇe*). In the publ. tr. I implicitly construe *dharmāṇam* with *vidāthasya* (also dependent on *sāadhanam*), but in light of X.89.1 an alt. might be “supporter (of the world), furtherer of the rite.” This alternative might be favored by the appearance of the parallel phrase *vidāthasya prasāadhanam* in the preceding hymn (X.91.8), suggesting that it is a (semi-)fixed phrase with the gen. locked in. And indeed most occurrences of *sādhana-* have a gen. sg. of the sacrifice / rite, etc.

For my defiant maintaining of the sense ‘kiss’ for  $\sqrt{nims}$ , see comm. ad VIII.43.10. What does it mean for the dawns to “kiss” Agni like night? The simile is easier to decode: as dawn breaks at the horizon, it is in intimate physical/visual contact with the dark sky, contact that

could be likened to kissing. Dawn's kissing of the ritual fire is more conceptual and temporal: the moment of dawn's appearance is when the fire is roused: this can count as contact. It is also possible, if the fire in question is the offering fire (as *puróhitam* implies), that the light of dawn spreading from the east first encounters and, as it were, touches that fire, which is of course stationed at the east end of the ritual ground.

The phrase *tánūnápātam aruśásya* is, in my interpr., a piece of tricky syntax. The stem *tánū-nápāt-* is otherwise used as an epithet for Agni, almost always in the 2nd vs. of Āprī hymns, where the figure has taken on a (quasi-)independent existence. Here I think we should read it literally, with the sense 'descendant of (him)self / his own body'. In conjunction with immediately preceding *puróhitam* 'set in front / to the east', this is a designation of the offering fire, which has been *taken out* of the household fire to the west and carried eastward to be established there – it is a descendant of itself. I take gen. *aruśásya* as doubling the cmpd's 1st member, *tánū-*: *aruśá-* 'ruddy' frequently modifies Agni. Here it is an independent case form that has the same referent as the cmpd member *tánū-*.

X.92.3: The first two vss. having been conceptually consistent and well-crafted, we now encounter the non sequitur quality that will characterize much of the rest of the hymn. The exclamation *bád* that opens the vs. may signal this change of direction.

I am utterly baffled by the first pāda: I don't understand what the Paṇi / niggard is doing here. Who would ever think that we would confuse the *nīthā* of wise Agni with those of a Paṇi, and what is the point of contact between Agni and this figure, who belongs to a different mythic complex? The Paṇi finds a phonological near-match in *pānīyasī* 'more/very admirable' in the next vs. (4b), but this gets us nowhere.

Never mind – this theme disappears; the rest of the vs., incl. the next pāda, is unrelated. Pāda b concerns the pouring (of ghee) onto the wood for kindling. The pāda is notable for a periphrasis with an overt copula, *práhutā āsuḥ*, which is quite unusual esp. in a main clause (see my Predicated Past Participle); we would expect the bare ppl. What the ppl. + perfect is meant to express is unclear to me; one could speculate that it aims at a plupf. "had been bepouring," but there's no contextual support for this. Perhaps the publ. tr. ("have been bepouring") is correct, and the *āsuḥ* is meant to guard against both "are" and "were" and inforce an immediate past reading (with a perfect because *√as* lacks an aor.).

There is some uncertainty about *vayā(h)*, my "twigs." Gr splits the stem into two (unnecessarily), with our form belonging to his "Opferspeise"; Ge (n. 3b) asserts that *vayā-* are otherwise not used as Brennholz, and we should perhaps read *avayāḥ* "Sühnopfer." Since *vayā-* is not particularly frequent, I do not see the lack of other attestations in the sense of Brennholz as an impediment. Moreover, anyone who's ever tried to build a fire knows that twigs are far more useful in the early stages than logs. Perhaps Ge is reluctant to accept that *práhuta-* can modify the goal or target upon which something is poured rather than the substance poured, but Agni himself is often so designated (though usually with *āhuta-*); see disc. above ad X.91.14.

But never mind again – the second hemistich appears to be entirely unrelated to either a or b; instead we have unnamed fearsome ones (*ghorāsaḥ*) reaching immortality and praising the gods. Old (fld. by Ge n. 3c and Re) identifies the subj. as the Aṅgirasas, with good parallels, but the connection of cd with pādas a and b escapes me. On the A's reaching immortality see also X.62.1. As I comment there, the Aṅgirasas "seem to be acting as if in the role of mortal sacrificers vis-à-vis Indra," and a similar situation may be depicted here, which would at least connect pāda c with the ritual fire kindling in b. For possible connections to 4a see comm.

immed. below. I would make a small change in the tr. of c, to “they attained immortality,” to better match 7a below.

X.92.4–5: Several phrasal (near-)repetitions knit these two vss. together, without giving significant help in the unraveling of the puzzles: *urú vyācaḥ* (4a) is a near-equivalent to *urú jráyaḥ* (5c), both pāda-final, and *mahy ārámatih* (4b) appears as *māhīm arāmatīm* in 5b.

X.92.4: Ge and Re both take the whole vs. as a single sentence with *sām cikitrire* (c) as the main verb and a miscellaneous list of subjects. This is syntactically impossible for the transmitted text, since *cikitrire* is unaccented and pāda a contains *hí*, which conditions verbal accent. Since 10d also contains *sām cikitrire*, it could be argued that the verb here has lost its accent redactionally, to match 10d. But there is little to be gained by taking all of vs. 4 as a unit and perhaps a bit to be gained by imposing some internal structure.

The *hí* in pāda a could look either back (to the preceding vs.) or forward (to the rest of 4). I will tentatively and speculatively try the former. Since in 3cd the Aṅgirasas attained immortality, which may have involved their moving to heaven, and they praised the divine race (*jānasya daívyasya*), I suggest that heaven in 4a picks up this theme, and I take pāda as an equational nominal sentence: Heaven (is) the *ṛtasya prāsitiḥ*.

And what is this? Ge (n. 4a) claims that it is only a poetic paraphrase for *ṛtām*, but it seems unlikely that the poet would use a highly specific and fairly uncommon word like *prāsiti-* in an essentially empty locution. On *prāsiti-* and the two separate words it may represent, see comm. ad IV.4.1. As I say there, the dominant meaning is ‘onslaught’ derived from PIE *\*seh<sub>1</sub>(i)* ‘loslassen’, but it seems in some contexts to mean ‘(hunting) net’ (< *√sā*, *si* ‘bind’). IV.4.1 contains two occurrences of *prāsiti-*; the first is qualified as ‘broad’ (*pr<sub>1</sub>thvīm*) and is the comparandum to *pājāḥ* ‘leading edge’, and I take it in the “net” meaning, with the net spread as wide as possible to catch as much as possible. Here too broadness is at issue: the *prāsiti-* is equated with heaven “the broad expanse” (*urú vyācaḥ* [pace Re, I don’t think the latter phrase evokes the earth]). I therefore suggest that Heaven is “the (hunting) net of truth” (Ge also “das Netz des Gesetzes”) – what this means (in my view) is that Heaven captures and keeps the “truths,” the true formulations and praise hymns directed its way. I would now therefore change the tr. to “For Heaven, the broad expanse, is the (hunting) net (/snare) of truth.”

This interpr. leaves pāda b at loose ends. The two entities in it, Reverence and Devotion, could be lumped in with the gods listed in c and d, but these pious abstractions are of a different type from the well-known gods in cd. In the publ. tr. I take the pāda as locating the two in heaven, and I have nothing better to offer here. Reverence and Devotion certainly have more in common with truth than with the embodied gods of cd, and the location of Devotion in heaven may be at issue in 5b (q.v.).

The comparative *pānīyasī* echoes the mysterious *paṇés* in 3a, but I can’t do anything with this fact.

The verb *sām cikitrire* could be interpr. either as passive/intransitive “they are jointly perceived” or transitive in absolute usage “they jointly perceive.” The former is adopted by Re (“... se sont signalés de concert”) and JSK (DGRV II.86: “have shown themselves (to be) together”), against the publ. tr. and, probably, Ge (“sind eines Sinnes”). The latter sense is favored also by X.30.6 *sām jānate mānasā sām cikitre* “They are agreed in mind and they perceive alike.” Although the middle pf. of *√cit* often has pass./intrans. sense, the preverb *sām* probably conditioned the middle voice of *cikitrire* despite its “active” semantics.



X.92.5: Although I usually disdain Lü’s celestial rivers, in this case the *síndhavaḥ* seem to be located in heaven / the midspace. If (as I suggest) Aramati in 4b is located in heaven, that’s where the rivers need to be to run over her in 5b. And in cd they seem to be the source of the water with which the Earth-circling one besprinkles everything.

In pāda a the appearance of “journeying Rudra” (*rudréṇa yayínā*) associated with the rivers is a bit unexpected, but if it is (as I think) a reference to the Maruts, it fits the general sense of the verse better. Note first that “the Rudras, the Maruts” (*rudrā marútaḥ*) appear in the next vs. (6a). Note also a phrase in X.78.7 with rivers and an adj. ‘coursing’ (*yayĩ-*) formed very like *yayín-*, but with the Maruts as referents, *siṇdhavo ná yayyāḥ* “(the Maruts) coursing like rivers.” Although a grammatically singular *rudrá-* standing for the Maruts would be unusual, it would, I think, be interpretable (esp. since the Maruts are often referred to in the sg., as a *gaṇá-* ‘flock, throng’ or *śardha(s)-* ‘troop’) – and in the rainstorm context of the 2nd hemistich the Maruts make sense.

I don’t know why the rivers “run across” (*tiráḥ ... dadhanvire*) Aramati; it sounds disturbingly as if they run her over. But perhaps the idea is that they go beyond the boundaries of heaven (where I’ve located Aramati in vs. 5) and into the midspace to become rain.

The choice of possible referents for *párijman-* is fairly wide: Ge favors Vāta (on the basis of VII.40.6), Sāy. Indra, but Ge (n. 5c) also suggest Parjanya, which I prefer. The phrase *párijmā pariyán* is almost an anagram of his name, and the description *róruvaj jaṭharé* “constantly rumbling in his belly” is more characteristic of a thunder god than a wind god.

X.92.6: Pace Old and Ge (n. 6a), I separate *krāṇā* here from the adv. (old instr.) *krāṇā* ‘successfully’ (see comm. ad I.58.3) and follow the Pp. reading *krāṇāḥ* as a nom. pl. m. root aor. middle part.

With Gr (apparently) and Ge, I take the referent of *ásurasya* to be Heaven, contra W.E. Hale (78), who suggests Rudra.

Most take *caṣṭe* as pass./intrans. ‘is seen, appears’ (Gr, Ge, Re, Hale), but as argued in comm. ad X.74.2 (see also VIII.19.16), med. forms of *√cakṣ* are overwhelmingly transitive ‘see’, even when used without expressed obj. Forms of this root without preverb (as here) are quite rare, but are standardly transitive. Taking *caṣṭe* as ‘sees’ harmonizes it with (my interpr. of) med. *sám cikitrīre* (4c, 10d), to a different root but having the same general semantics. As for the sense here, I interpr. it as an interesting variant of the common trope that Varuṇa + Mitra (etc.) see the activities of men through the eye of the sun, who travels the sky as their spy looking down. Here the Maruts, who journey through the midspace, serve as alternative eyes of the Ādityan trio. As for the singular number of the verb, the RV allows either a plural or a singular verb for multiple singular subjects.

The stem(s) *árvaśa-* / *arvaśá-* is found only here. It is ordinarily taken as a deriv. of *árvan(t)-* ‘steed’ (see, e.g., AiG II.2.919–20, EWA s.v. *árvan-*). I don’t understand the reason for the accent difference, and the sec. lit. (incl. AiG) offers no explanations.

X.92.7: The publ. tr. interpr. the loc. phrases in a and b as parallel, contra Ge and Re. I now think they are correct to separate them. Pāda b is identical to IV.41.6b, where it forms part of a series listing the elements at stake in a battle. I would now substitute “... they obtained their benefit in Indra, when the sight of the sun and the masculine nature of the bull (were at stake).”

The larger question is – who are the subjects of this vs.? There is a curious silence on this in all the sec. sources, save for Sāy., who identifies them as *stotārah*. I suggest rather the Aṅgirasas for several reasons. First, in 3c they obtained immortality (*amṛtatvām āśata*), with the same verb as here. Although “benefit” and “immortality” are obviously different, the phraseology is structurally the same. Furthermore, assuming that *nṛṣádana-* refers to the multiday ritual type known later as *sattra* (‘sitting’), in the Vala myth the Aṅgirasas participate in *sattras* that lead to the opening of the Vala cave. Against this identification is the fact that they are credited here with fashioning Indra’s vajra; this is not otherwise a deed of the Aṅgirasas, as far as I know – and in fact no other pl. entities perform this action that I know of.

X.92.8: Ge and Re interpr. *sūrah* as nom. sg. to *sūra-* and subj. of *rīramat*, Old (also Lub) instead as gen. or abl. to *svār-*. Ge allows possibility of gen. in n. 8a; Gr seems not to register the form at all. Scar (559) allows both interpr. I take it as gen. to *svār-*, with Indra the unnamed subj. Not only does it immediately follow a vs. with that same form (*sūrah* 7b), but the 2nd sg. subj. in the parallel I.121.13 *tvám sūro harīto rāmayah* ... “you brought to a halt the tawny mares of the Sun” clearly slots *sūrah* into the gen. Cf. also *sūryasya harītaḥ* (V.29.5, etc.) with unambig. gen. In our passage gen. *sūrah* is somewhat inelegantly picked up by coreferential *asya*, but this can’t be helped.

In c my distribution of the ablatives and genitives in a chain of dependencies follows Scar (559).

In d *stan* is good candidate for a general pres. reading of the injunc. (see KH 137).

X.92.9: For “show forth (praise)” for  $\sqrt{diś}$  see A. Nikolaev, “Showing Praise in Greek Choral Lyric and Beyond” (AJP 133 [2012]: 543–72), where he argues persuasively that this is an IE poetic idiom, found also in Greek, Latin, and possibly Hittite.

In the main clause in ab a dat. *tébhyaḥ* needs to be supplied, parallel to *rudrāya*, as antecedent to *yébhiḥ* in c. The referents are of course the Maruts, the sons/associates of Rudra. The adj. *evayāṁvabhiḥ* also picks them out exclusively: the pl. forms of the rare stem(s) *evayā(van)-* only characterize the Maruts, and see also the curiously formed *evayā-marut-* in the refrain of V.87 (1–9); see also V.41.16.

The adj. *śivāḥ* here implicitly modifies Rudra – the only such occurrence in the RV, though it is used of other gods. The exclusive application of this adj. to Rudra and its transfer from epithet to god’s name are post-RVic developments.

With Old I take *divāḥ* as a gen. characterizing the Maruts (see his parallels), rather than as an abl. specifying where Rudra is coming from (Ge, Re).

X.92.10: I take the point of this opaque vs. to be that because Bṛhaspati and his associates pass their fame on to their progeny (ab), the primal priest can perform the next step (c) – leading to the situation in d, where the gods and the Bhṛgus, legendary fire-priests, think and perceive alike. They are, as it were, on the same page because of the transfer of sacrificial know-how from the gods to mortals (or semi-mortals). But I am by no means certain of this interpr. In any case note the parallel verb forms in a *ābharanta ví* and c *ví dhārayat*, which suggest similar sequential actions. HPS (B+I 55–57) has a rather different interpr., though also generally centered on the primal priesthood.

With Old (and apparently HPS 55], in pāda a I read dat. *prajāyāi* against Pp. gen. *prajāyāḥ*.

‘Fame’ (*śrávas-*) seems to have an extended meaning here – perhaps the knowledge/actions they are famous for.

‘Those akin to soma / having soma as their relative’ (*sómajāmayah*, a hapax) are universally (Ge, Re, HPS) identified as the *Āngirases* (Sāy. as the All Gods); I have nothing better to offer, though the link between soma and the *Āngirases* does not seem to me to be strong. It is clearly the presence of *Bṛhaspati* that undergirds the identification.

The verb *vi dhārayat* in c lacks an overt object. I supply *śrávaḥ* from pāda a; as just indicated, I think the verbs signal sequential actions of the same type. Ge supplies “die Ordnung” (presumably an underlying cognate acc. *\*dhārmā(ṇi)*), though the passages he cites (n. 10c) provide no support (and do not contain *dhārman-*); Re “les arrangements diverses (du monde),” without argument; HPS (55) “(die Welthälften).” All of these possibilities seem to me plucked from thin air, and I prefer to stick with an object that can be supplied from context.

As indicated above, I think that d expresses the harmony of mind and perception between gods and the mortal or semi-mortal *Bṛhas*, but it would help if I were surer what exactly the *Bṛhas* are doing here. Their standard role is as primal installers of the ritual fire (e.g., I.58.3, II.4.2, VI.15.2), but this signature action is not in evidence here. However, they do seem to be associated with the *Atharvan* and the first institution of the sacrifice in c and to share their sacrificial skill with the gods.

On *sām cikitrire* see comm. ad vs. 4.

X.92.11: This vs. presents us with the same syntactic problem as vs. 4: a first pāda containing *hí*, a long list of ill-assorted divinities in the nominative, and a single finite verb (*arhire* in d) that lacks an accent. Once again most tr. take the vs. as a single sentence, despite the disharmony between the particle *hí* and the unaccented verb, and in this case the publ. tr. succumbed to the same temptation. Unfortunately it is more difficult to impose internal structure than it was in vs. 4 (see comm. there). The vs. also seems an intrusion between 10 and 12, which both, however obscurely, seem to concern priests and sacrifice. Because of the jumble of divine names and the lack of any connection to the surrounding context, I am therefore more willing to assume that the vs. is a haphazard assemblage of gods inserted into an All God hymn, where it would find a natural home, and that syntactic niceties were not honored. The fact that the verb *arhire* is morphologically anomalous – a perfect apparently without redupl. and medial to a root otherwise active – contributes to the sense that the vs. was carelessly produced. On this verb form see Kü (108); though he entertains the possibility that it might exhibit archaic reduplication, in the end he favors an analysis as an ad hoc formation, possibly influenced by neighboring forms in *-ire* (by which he presumably means *cikitrire* in 10d [/ 4c]). The presence of *hí* in pāda a may result from simple repetition of the opening of vs. 10 (*té hí*), which is reproduced at the beginning of 11. There is also a little formula *#té hí dyāvāprthivī* ... (I.160.1, X.64.14), which may have contributed.

The b.v. *bhūri-retas-* ‘having abundant semen’ occurs 3x in the RV, always modifying *dyāvāprthivī*. As Re implies by his parenthetical tr. “(divinités féminines),” the application of this epithet to a grammatical feminine is a nice paradox.

The identity / application of *cāturaṅgaḥ* ‘four-square’ is unclear: Gr implies that it modifies *nārāśaṃsaḥ*; Sāy and Bergaigne in different ways apply it to fire (see Ge n. 11b), while Ge himself expresses no opinion. Re claims that it’s *Varuṇa*, because he has the epithet *cāturanīka-* ‘four-faced’. However, this word occurs only once, in V.48.5, where it in fact

characterizes Agni (Varuṇa appears in a different pāda), so that the Sāy. / Bergaigne intuition seems closer to the mark. But in a list like this, the referent scarcely matters.

I tr. Rodasī (contra Ge and Re: Heaven and Earth / the two Worlds) because of the accent (*rodasī*, not *ródasī*) and because Heaven and Earth are already represented in this list. Rodasī is also the consort of the Maruts, who are adjacent to her here – but in a list of such chaos their adjacency is almost an argument against!

X.92.12: A different priestly title, Uśij, appears here, identified with “us.” If, as I suggest ad vs. 11, this vs. should follow directly on 10, the transfer of priestly skill and knowledge has passed from gods to legendary priestly figures (in vs. 10) to us of the present day. The *utá* opening this vs. would signal this chaining with vs. 10, and the *syá* may suggest that the referent is current.

All the standard renderings take pāda a with b and c, all loosely construed with the sg. verb *śṛṇotu*. By contrast I separate pāda a as a nominal clause – for several reasons. For one thing, b is identical to X.64.4d, which speaks against integrating our pāda a into it, with Ahi Budhnya identified as the *kavī*. Moreover the adv. *urviyá* in pāda a hints at internal structure. I take the *kavīḥ* to be Agni (as so often) and *urviyá* as signaling an unexpressed verb. Cf. *urviyá vy àdyaut* of Agni in III.1.18, X.45.8; *urviyá ví paprathe* of him in X.69.2. In the publ. tr. I supply “is widely perceptible,” but, on the basis of those passages, “has shown widely” or “has spread widely” is also possible. The gen. *naḥ uśijām* marks Agni as our own sacrificial fire.

In the publ. tr. I take the call (*hávīman-*) in b to be Agni’s; I now think it’s quite possibly that of us, the Uśij priests (so explicitly Re), since the Uśij priests are elsewhere associated with the production of a *śámsa-* ‘laud’, incl. in the related vs. II.31.6 (see below); see comm. ad II.31.6. I suggest a marginally altered alternative “listen to (our) call.”

With most tr., I take the dual phrase in c as an expansion of b, with Sun and Moon the afterthought subjects of the 3rd ps. impv. *śṛṇotu* in b, with number mismatch. Alternatively the pāda could connect with d, which has a dual verb that fits the number of *sūryāmāsā* better, but in that case we would prefer a voc. Sun and Moon. (Of course, a simple erasure of the accent on *-māsā* would produce a voc.)

In d *śamīnahuṣī* is a problem. At least since Roth, the verse has been compared with II.31.6 and the opening of this pāda compared with the phrase in II.31.6d *dhiyá śamī*#, a phrase that also occurs in X.40.1 (also pāda-final) and pāda-initial with non-shortened final vowel in IX.74.7 #*dhiyá śamī*. Roth’s invocation of II.31.6 is esp. apposite because the vs. contains other elements found in our vs. (as he notes) – particularly the Uśij priests (a) and Ahi Budhnya (b). It is therefore tempting (and, I think, correct) to read *dhiyá \*śamī nahuṣī* ..., with word boundary and accentuation of *śamī*, tr. the first two words as “with visionary thought and ritual labor.” (In the publ. tr. an asterisk should be inserted before “ritual labor.”) The alternative is to take *śamī-nahuṣī* as a voc. dvandva “o Śamī (and) Nahuṣī” (so Ge and Re) – but though Nahuṣī at least is a PN elsewhere (though not Nahuṣī), Śamī is not. Ge (n. 12d) suggests that it’s personified Ritual Labor, but given the existence of the bipartite instr. formulaic phrase *dhiyá śamī*, this seems unnec. and farfetched. What then to do with *nahuṣī* – if that’s the correct form (Roth emends to *náhuṣo*)? I would like to (and in fact do in the publ. tr.) interpret it as an elliptical dual dvandva in the voc. to the stem *náhus-*. The problem is the gender: we should expect masc. du. voc. *\*nahuṣā*. The only explanation I can offer for the *-ī* is perseveration from *śamī* in an unclear context, which I realize is weak. (Ge and Re simply assume a name Nahuṣī; I suppose this is possible, but it simply multiplies elements and also assumes a feminine addressee, which is unlikely if not impossible.) If, as I think, *nahuṣī* is an elliptical dual, what is the other member?

In the publ. tr. I suggest Manu, on the basis of X.80.6, where people born from Manu and Nahus (*mānuṣo náhuṣo ví jātāḥ*) invoke Agni (cf. also X.99.7). Here they would be legendary performers, who both engage in ritual activity (through their *dhī-* and *śāmī-*) and take cognizance of the ritual of today.

The referent of accented *asyá* is not clear. I'm now somewhat inclined to accept Ge's suggestion (Nachtr.. ad loc.) that it is the singer (sim. Re), who has not yet been mentioned in the discourse. However, given the relatively frequency of expressions like I.147.2 *bódhā me asyá vācasah* "take heed of this speech of mine," with gapping of the noun in, e.g., the refrain of I.105 *vittám me asyá* "take heed of this (speech) of mine," it may instead be a reference to the speech/poem itself.

X.92.13: In the first hemistich I take *carátham* (a) as obj. of the inf. *iṣṭáye* (b) ("to seek our movable goods"), despite their distance, because *carátha-* in the acc. is generally used of "moveable (goods)" → "livestock." This is contrary to the Ge/Re interpr., both of whom take *carátham* and *iṣṭáye* as separate complements of *prá ... avatu*, with *carátha-* an abstract meaning something like "movement." Although I recognize that the two words I construe together are far apart, my interpr. avoids the problem that Ge/Re face: to supply something else as complement of the inf. *iṣṭáye* ("dass wir rasch (zum Ziele) kommen"; "pour (faire réussir notre) quête (de biens)").

The stem *ātmán-* here has its original (?) meaning 'breath' (see EWA s.v.), appropriate to its identification with Vāta 'Wind', as is agreed by all standard tr.

Although the neut. of the comparative *váśyah* ordinarily means 'better state', the machinery that Ge and (esp.) Re ("pour (qu'il nous obtienne) un (sort) meilleur" – a lot of words to tr. one) require to employ that sense here makes me prefer my economical adverbial interpr. "all the more."

X.92.14: As is generally agreed, the main object of praise in this vs. is Agni, save for pāda c, where we find Aditi and the Wives (of the gods).

On *adhikṣít-* see esp. Ge (n. 14) and Scar (94). Although I agree that this rt noun cmpd belongs primarily to  $\sqrt{kṣi}$  'dwell', I think there is some crossover with  $\sqrt{kṣā}$  'rule' – hence my tr. 'preside over' (borrowed from Re), which splits the semantic difference. Although verb forms of this lexeme sometimes just mean 'dwell' (I.126.1, 154.2), 'preside over' works better for VII.96.2 and VIII.40.2, 41.9.

On *anarváṇam*, see esp. comm. ad VIII.31.12 as well as other loci noted in the lexical commentary. The problem is that this adj. several times modifies, or seems to modify, feminines despite its masc. appearance. Although in these cases ad hoc fixes can be contrived by finding (or inventing) a masc. for it to modify, the fact that there is a group of such passages strongly suggests that the adjectives in each case are actually fem. On this passage esp., see JPB (Ādityas 218–19), where he convincingly argues that acc. *anarváṇam* is built to a fem. \**e*-grade *n*-stem like *yóṣan-* 'young woman', whose nom. pl. is *yóṣaṇaḥ*. Our *anarváṇam* would be the correct acc. sg. to such a stem, next to nom. sg. fem. *anarvā* (II.40.6, VII.40.4).

*áktoḥ* is formally a genitive, and it is universally (incl. in the publ. tr.) taken as dependent on *yúvānam* ... *pátim* here. However, the form is often used adverbially ("by night"), as in our own 1b, and I think that usage is possible here.

*nṛmāṇā(h)* is most likely a nom. sg. (but see Old for other poss.) and is taken by most as the name of the poet, while I (and Scar [94]) prefer to take it in its usual adjectival sense ('of

manly mind'). By either interpr. we must reckon with an unsignaled change in number from 1st pl. *gr̥nīmasi* in b, either to 1st sg. or 3rd sg., and must supply the appropriate verb ("I/he hymn(s)"). With Scar, I prefer the first alt., because it involves changing only one grammatical category (number), not two (number + person), but Ge and Re opt for 3rd sg.

On *ádha* conjoining two nominals (here *áditim* and *yúvānam ... pátim*), see JSK (DGRV II.128–29).

X.92.15: On my interpr. of the meaning of  $\sqrt{ribh}$ , see the various reff. listed in the lexical comm.

Both Ge and Re consider the *pūrho āngirā(h)* to be Bṛhaspati, but in the sg. *āngiras-* is almost always Agni, who is also the subject of the previous vs. (14) and so the default referent in context. The identification with Bṛhaspati is vigorously disputed by HPS (B+I 38, 56), who favors Agni or possibly Soma.

In c, because of the agency of the stones and because of the insistence on *vī* (*vīhāyā(h) ... vicakṣaṇāḥ*), I render *vīhāyā ábhavat* as "became widely extended," flg. Re's "a pris toute son extension" rather than my usual tr. of *vīhāyas-* as 'of extensive power'. The point is surely that when pounded by the stones, the soma plant and its juices spread out physically, just as its power more extensive because it has been transformed into the deified ritual drink.

The final pāda of this hymn is, as Re says, "finale mystérieuse." Syntactically it must consist of two nominal sentences of two words each. Ge (n. 15d) plausibly suggests that it has to do with an animal sacrifice. As he points out, *pāthah* 'fold' (as in 'sheepfold'), 'pen' is associated with the animal sacrifice in the horse sacrifice hymn (I.162.2) and in the Āprī hymns, where after being sacrificed the animal victim "goes to the pen of the gods" (*áthā devānām ápy etu pāthah* II.3.9, et sim.) The second clause, *svádhitir vānanvati*, is the positive equivalent of the negative *ná svádhitir vānanvati* in VIII.102.19 (as is generally remarked). In that context it seemed simply to indicate that the speaker did not have firewood for kindling the ritual fire; whether the axe here has more sinister associations (with the killing of the animal) isn't clear.

### X.93 All Gods

On the manifold difficulties in this hymn and the universal near-contempt for it (which I'm afraid I share), see publ. intro. I will not engage with the numerous metrical problems, and will scant many of the morphological and syntactic issues.

X.93.1: On the problematic *máhi*, see esp. Old, Ge (n. 1a).

The instr. pls. *tébhiḥ ... ebhiḥ* most likely refer to the gods; see Ge (n. 1c).

The hapax *śūṣāni* is unclear. Ge takes it as a loc. inf. to  $\sqrt{śū}$  (flg. Gr), tr. "... schützt uns, um überlegen zu sein" (cf. Keydana, *Inf* 111: "damit wir gedeihen"). But can loc. infinitives express purpose, and, if we are its subj. (most clearly in Keydana's tr.), why do we need protection? Re's interpr. is quite similar ("pour que (nous soyons) gonflés (de biens)"), though he analyses it as "une variante inorganique de *śūṣá*" (whatever that means) rather than an inf. By contrast, Th (see EWA s.v. *śūṣá-*) derives it from < *\*(p)śū-ṣa* = YAvs. *fšū-ṣa-* 'winning cattle'. Clever – but again, why would we need protection in those circumstances. I (tentatively) suggest that the referent is the same as that of *sáhyas-* 'one more powerful', the person from whom we needed protection in the preceding pāda, and it's a loc. absol. referring to circumstances ("when he [=the more powerful one] is swollen with strength"). Ge suggests a similar alt. in his n. 1d.

X.93.2: This vs. is syntactically and morphologically well-behaved; not so its meter.

X.93.3: Although the default assumption would be that the two pāda-initial gen. pl. #*viśveṣām* ... #*devānām* should be construed together, esp. in an All God hymn, the parallel in VIII.46.16 *viśveṣām irajyāntam vāsūnām* (pace Ge's "nur zufällig") suggests a different configuration, with *viśveṣām* dependent on the voc. *irajyavaḥ* and *devānām* on *vār* (as in the publ. tr). Very little is at issue, however, if the two are taken together and construed with *vār* as in Ge's "Aller Götter Schutz ist grossartig, ihr Gebieter." I do not see how Re gets a voc. "o tous dieux" out of this gen. phrase; he clearly thinks it's coreferential with *irajyavaḥ*, which he tr. "O vous qui commandez," but how?

Note the four occurrences of *viśva-* (/viśvá-X) in the vs.

X.93.4: Pāda b is identical with I.79.3c. The referent of *párijmā* is unclear. It could be an epithet of Varuṇa, but in I.79.3 I take it as Wind on the basis of VII.40.6 (see comm. ad loc.). But here the word needs to be evaluated in the context of the preceding hymn (X.92.5), which contains an occurrence of *párijmā*. As disc. in the comm. on that vs. above, I identify that occurrence with Parjanya, but other referents have been suggested. Since it is found in a god list here, there's nothing that depends on a precise identification.

It is not clear whether the scope of the question particle *kád* extends over all the gods listed in the 2nd hemistich (Ge, Re) or only Rudra (publ. tr.) – nor is it clear why there is any question about him/them. Perhaps Rudra is singled out because his nature is not completely benevolent, as opposed to the others on the list; c could be a parenthetical "Is Rudra praised of men?" Such special treatment of Rudra may be supported by 7a below.

The form *pūṣānaḥ* is of course surprising: formally it could be nom. pl. (so Re: "Pūṣan-et-autres"), but is far more likely (so Old, citing Lanman; see Ge n. 4d) to be a nom. sg., backformed from the acc. *pūṣānam*; see esp. the matching expression *pūṣānam bhāgam*# in X.125.2 cited by Old.

X.93.5–7: These three vss. begin *utá no* and appear to form a trīca. All three also concern the Aśvins (at least by my interpr.).

X.93.5: Ge calls this a "fast unverständlichen Str.," and it has received a wide variety of interpr. (see esp. Old's multiple alternatives). I will primarily deal with my own, by no means certain, account.

Let us begin with the voc. *vṛṣaṇvasū*. This fairly common form, always in the dual, is overwhelmingly used of the Aśvins. Given the Aśvin theme of the following two vss, which are linked to this one by their opening (see immed. above), that is surely the referent here, despite the dual dvandva *sūryāmāsā* that opens the next pāda.

The two words in the middle of this 1st pāda, *náktam apām*, give trouble. Ge's interpr. (n. 5) is the most radical: noting that Apām Napāt is found often (his term; the occurrences don't seem that numerous to me) in conjunction with Ahi Budhnya, he suggests emending *náktam* to \**náptam*, yielding the acc. phrase \**náptam apām*. The problem (or one of them) is that \**náptam* is not the acc. to *nápāt-*, which is always (20x) *nápātam*. Although it is true that nom. *apām nápāt* is found in the preceding hymn (X.92.13), directly after a vs. containing Ahi Budhnya (X.92.12), this does not seem sufficient reason to make a radical emendation yielding a non-existent form. I take *náktam* as an adverbial acc. 'by night', as so often, and supply its formulaic partner 'by day', to match up with the Sun-and-Moon dvandva in b.

As for *apām* Old construes it with the voc. *vṛṣaṇvasū*, on what seem to me weak grounds. Re, while not accepting Ge's emendation, nonetheless sneaks in *nápāt-* in parentheses: "... la Nuit, (le Fils) des eaux ..." Flg. Gr's laconic indication, I take this gen. instead with *sádanāya* in the next pāda (so also Scar 29), though this connection is explicitly rejected by Old). For a similar phrase, see *apām sadhásthe* (I.149.4, II.4.2 = X.46.2, VI.52.15). The gen. *apām* may have been moved from the immed. vicinity of its head noun to enable the phonetic figure *sádanāya sadhanyā* (/ ... *śādi*) in b (/c).

Now, what is the overall structure of the hemistich? Most interpr. supply a verb: "bring" (Ge, JSK [DGRV I.426]) or "protect" (Old tentatively, Re), with Sun and Moon (+/- other acc.s) as acc. obj. By contrast but with Scar (291), I take the hemistich as a nominal clause, with *sūryāmāsā* as subj. and *sadhanyā* 'joint guides' predicated of them. There are problems with this: first, it requires separating *sadhanyā* here from forms like *sadhanitvá-* (see comm. ad IV.1.9, VI.51.3, also X.50.3), which I now take as deriv. from *sa-dhána-* (flg. Scar), and maintaining the root noun cmpd analysis *sadha-ní-* 'leading jointly'; it also assumes a dat. (*sádanāya*) goal with this cmpd, which is syntactically shaky; and it posits an unusual configuration: Sun and Moon leading us to the seat of the waters. I am not certain what this refers to – but Agni is elsewhere associated with the seat of the waters, and so perhaps this describes the daily ritual round as defined by the alternation of Sun (day) and Moon (night).

The referent of *eṣām* is undetermined; it cannot be the waters, the only plural entity in the 1st hemistich, because of gender mismatch. Old and Ge suggest the gods, which is a reasonable default.

X.93.6: A relaxingly straightforward vs. The only real question is what is the referent of *sá* in c. The pāda is identical to I.149.1 (or, rather, is the dimeter version of a Virāj pāda there). The standard, and most likely, view of our pāda is that the (or a) (mortal) whom the gods protect in ab is the referent of *sá* (Ge, Re, Bl [ad I.149.1]), but in I.149.1 the referent is most likely Agni, who is not excluded here.

X.93.7: The agglomeration of gods in this vs. becomes more random. The first puzzle is found in pāda a, where the Áśvins are called on for mercy, "even though (*cid*) [they are] Rudras." The Áśvins are called Rudras a number of other passages (e.g., I.158.1, II.41.7), as Ge points out (n. 7a), but without the deprecatory concessive of this passage. This (positive/neutral) identification must be via the Maruts, who as Rudra's sons are also called Rudras (pl.). The Áśvins share the midspace with the Maruts and on several occasions (e.g., VIII.22.1, 14) are called *rudrá-vartanī* 'following the course of the Rudras [=Maruts]'. Since the Rudra=Áśvins identification is mediated through the positively viewed Maruts, there are no bad associations. Here, by contrast, the ambivalence about the Áśvins as Rudras seems to connect with 4c, where I suggest there is some question about whether Rudra is/should be praised, given his often hostile spirit and behavior. See comm. above. With regard to this vs. one might note that Rudra is not known for his mercy.

On *ráthaspati-* see comm. ad V.50.5.

The Earth-encircler (*párijmā*) recurs from 4b (q.v.), as well as X.92.5.

The voc. *viśvavedasaḥ* in d is a semi-scrambling of *viśve devāsaḥ* in b.

X.93.7–8: There is chaining between 7c *ṛbhúr vāja ṛbhukṣaṇaḥ* and 8a *ṛbhúr ṛbhukṣā ṛbhúḥ*.



X.93.8: The standard tr. take *te* [=Indra] in b as the antecedent of the rel. *yásya* introducing cd. Although this is the most straightforward analysis, I disfavor it because the clauses in cd seem to characterize a ritual performer, not Indra. I therefore take b as a parenthetical interjection, supplying an impv. “(let ... come),” with Ge and Re. The *yásya* then is coreferential or parallel to the gen. *vidhatáh* in pāda a: “of the one who does honor (and) of whom ...” In d the sacrifice and its accoutrements of the present sacrificer are compared to those of the first sacrificer, Manu.

X.93.9: Another fairly hopeless vs., of which I’ve made what sense I can.

In pāda a, with Old, Ge, and apparently Re, I take *áhrayaḥ* as a negated neut. *s*-stem, next to the them. adj. *áhraya-* (11x, not counting this one) ‘immoderate, unabashed’. This *s*-stem is also probably found in IX.54.1 (q.v), though there it is usually taken as a nom. pl. m. to a hapax stem *áhri-*. Here *áhrayaḥ* would have to be a nom. sg. if to the them. adj.; it would then have to modify the addressee, Savitar, and would deprive *kṛdhī* of an obj. As an *s*-stem deriv., it could be either a noun ‘immoderation’ or a bahuvrīhi adj., as Ge points out (n. 9a). (The occurrence in IX.54.1 is an adj. modifying *páyas-*.) In either case it is likely to reference n. *rādhas-* ‘wealth, largesse’, which is modified by *áhraya-* 5x (though in our passage Ge, Re, and JSK [DGRV I.228] take it simply as the abstract ‘lack of shame’). As a minor alt. to the publ. tr. “immoderation (of wealth)” with *áhrayaḥ* as noun, we could have “immoderate (wealth)” with an adjectival form. For the accent, cf. the b.v. *án-āgas-* ‘without offense’.

In b the grammatical identity and function of *stuṣe* are in question. Ge, Re (explicitly), and JSK take it as a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. passive ‘is/should be praised’ (or [JSK 229] possibly a “falsely unaccented infinitive”). The subj. would be *sá*, but its referent is unclear: the consensus is that he is one from among the (gen. pl.) *maghónām* ‘patrons’. I prefer to take *stuṣe* as the form it usually is, one of the well-known group of *-se* 1st sg.s with “active” sense in the domain of praising (*grñīṣe*, etc.). See comm. ad I.122.7–8, X.22.1.

The *sá* could be one of the extremely rare RVic examples of the *sá/tám* pronoun doubling the 1st ps., rather than the far more common 2nd (see my 1992 [HS 105] “*sá figé*” article, esp. pp. 217, 230–31). However, given that the function of *ca* in this pāda is uncertain (see JSK 229) and further that JSK (272 n. 110) lists this as one of only four passages in the RV containing the sequence *sá/tá- ca*), I suggest that instead of *sá ca* we read *\*sácā* ‘along with, in company with’, here to be construed with the gen. *maghónām*. See *sácā ... eṣām* in 5c. The emendation is slight: the erasure of the notional word boundary of course means nothing in the Saṃhitā text, and since the 2nd vowel precedes a cluster (*st-*), a redactional shortening would be easy and have no metrical consequences. In the publ. tr. there should be an asterisk before “in company with.” A *\*sácā* here could parallel the *sahá + u* that opens the next pāda (as *sahó*) and indeed give the *u* there something to do. In fact, JSK (Part. u, 169 n. 3) classifies our *sahó* among forms where the existence of an *u* is unlikely because it is found in a passage lacking a proper syntactic environment for *u*; however, if it links *sácā* and *sahá*, it belongs with JSK’s *u* linking a series of adverbs (his Chap. 7) and the *u* has much better contextual support.

The second hemistich is fairly impenetrable; Ge says of his tr. (n. 9cd) “Nur versuchsweise übersetzt.” My tr. rests on a double interpr. of the lexeme *ní √yu*. On the one hand, it can be used with the object ‘wealth’ (*ráyim* vel sim.) in the sense “hitch up wealth (like a team)” – see VII.92.3 (*niyúdbhiḥ ...*) *ní no rayím ... yuvasva* “with your teams, hitch up wealth for us” (sim. VII.5.9, also VII.40.2). On the other hand, *ní √yu* can mean ‘rein in, control’, as in X.42.5, where “rivals” (*śátrūn*) are the obj.; see also *úd √yu*, with the oppositional preverb to *ní*, in the opposing sense ‘give free rein to’ (VI.57.6). Both the positive and the negative semantic

extensions of *ní* √*yu* start from the etymological figure *niyútaḥ ní* √*yu* ‘team/hitch up teams’, as in VII.91.5 *niyuvānā́ niyútaḥ*. My “Indra keeps hitching up (wealth) for these (patrons) of ours and keeps hold of “the wheel of the domains” like a rein” represents both idioms. Unfortunately in the “wealth” idiom the object has to be supplied; in my view the gen. pl. *eṣām* refers to the patrons from b (so also Ge, n. 9c) and is distinct from the gen. pl. *carṣaṇīnām* immed. flg. the pāda break. As for “the wheel of the domains” (*carṣaṇīnām cakrām*) Ge (n. 9d) takes the wheel as “das Symbol der Herrschaft,” as in later Indic. Although the first idiom is minimally represented here, I find it difficult to render the whole hemistich without incorporating it.

X.93.10: Again with Ge (n. 9c), I take *eṣu* as referring to the patrons; however, I do not consider it coreferential with *vīreṣu* as Ge and Re do, but as identifying two distinct groups. I also take *asmé* not as another term in that series (like Re’s “en ces hommes-d’élite, en nous-mêmes”), but as defining the larger group in which the *vīrā-* are found. However, little rides on this distinction.

The position of *utá* in d is somewhat disquieting. It conjoins the two bipartite dative purpose NPs *vājasya sātāye* (c) and *rāyā́ ... turváṇe* (d), but takes second position in the second phrase, as if it were *ca*. JSK (DGRV I.301) simply says it “takes enclitic position within its phrase,” which is a description, not an explanation. However, I don’t see any other way to construe it, and in the context of this hymn it’s a minor issue. (On instr. *rāyā́* see Old.)

X.93.11: The first hemistich lacks a verb. It’s possible to borrow *pāhi* from c, as Re does. But I prefer to supply a verb of motion, probably \**yāhi*, rhyming with *pāhi* – both because *asmayú-* is several times found with this impv. (I.135.2 (2x), IX.14.8, 64.18; also (dual) VII.74.4, VIII.26.14) and because *kūcit śántam* “wherever it may be” invites a verb of motion.

Pāda d can be (and has been) variously interpreted. The standard view (so Ge, Re) sees *medātām* as a 3rd sg. mid. impv. to a hapax 6th cl. pres. with anomalous full-grade root vocalism (or else what should be a 1st cl. pres. with anomalous suffixal accent – see Ge’s n. 11d, where he suggests *medātām* is an error for \**médātām*), beside the *ya*-pres. *médyati*, which has a broader attestation (on which see Kulikov, *ya*-pres. 599). By contrast, Old suggests that it’s a *tā*-abstract and hesitates whether it belongs with *medín-* ‘pal’ (not his gloss!) or *médas-* ‘fat’, tr. “beschütze unser Genossentumswesen (unser fettes Gedeihen?) entsprechend unserm Weisheitswese.” The nominal interpr. has been widely accepted; see EWA s.v. *médas-*, Lub. In *-āya*-Formations (142 n. 78) I accept Old’s interpr. and tr. “For (our) superiority do thou always protect our prosperity with wisdom” (in both tr. the verb *pāhi* of c reapplies). In the publ. tr. I revert to the older view of *medātām* as a verb, but interpr. *vedātā* as a nom. sg., not the instr. sg. others take it to be, belonging to √*vid* ‘find, acquire’ rather than √*vid* ‘know’. (Note that, like *medātām*, *vedātā* is a hapax: the forms seem to have been created to mutually interact with each other.) My reversion was in great part caused by the position of the 2nd *abhiṣṭāye* at the end of c (the first ending b). This “final” dative seems to me to be rhetorical final, and a new clause should begin in d. Nonetheless I have had partial second thoughts about positing a hapax pres. stem beside an already existent one, and so I now suggest as alt. the tr. cited above from my *-āya*-book (with “dominance” substituted for “superiority”).

X.93.12: Another challenging vs. Its opening, *etām me stómam*, echoes that of the previous vs. (11a), *etām śámsam*. This parallelism was not, regrettably, signaled in the publ. tr.

The rest of the hemistich is disputed. Ge (n. 12a, fld. without remark by Re) takes *tanā́* as a nom. sg. fem., which in the phrase *tanā́ ... sūrye*, is the Daughter of the Sun (equivalent to *sūre*

*duhitā́*, acdg. to him). This seems extraordinarily bold, in fact reckless. There exists no *tanā́* ‘daughter’ (or other such female figure); *sū́rye* has no claim to a genitive interpr., unlike *sū́re*; and the Daughter of the Sun has no obvious role in this vs. (though Ge claims she has a relationship to poetry). There has to be a better way, although I admit that mine has its share of awkwardness. I take the simile *tanā́ ná sū́rye* as an unusually constructed comparandum to the b.v. *dyutád-yāman-* ‘whose course is dazzling’. I take *tanā́* as the instr. of the rt noun *tán-* ‘extension’. Although the instr. sg. of this stem generally has root accent (*tánā́*) and an adverbial sense (“in full measure,” “at length,” etc.), I suggest that the form here retains the expected ending accent because it has the full nominal sense “by stretching.” In this reading, *sū́rye* is the goal, and the point is that as the praise-song is sent towards heaven, its trajectory is as bright as a sunbeam or a flame of the fire reaching aloft.

The subj. of *vāṛdhanta* is unexpressed. Because this vs. contains the poet’s praise of his own composition (in my view) and because it provides the transition to the *dānastuti*, I suggest it is the patrons, who have been gestured to in recent vss. (9–10) and return (in 13, as well as 14–15). They “strengthen” the poet’s praise hymn by their material gifts to him.

Despite the two simile particles (*ná* c, *iva* d), the 2nd hemistich must be a single simile, as Old points out. *saṃvānana-* is generally (and surely correctly) understood as a piece of horse or wagon tackle; its literal sense, ‘harmonizer, conciliator’, is probably euphemistic for something that keeps horses under control.

X.93.13: With Ge (see n. 13ab), fld. by Re (Old’s speculations seem off the mark), I take the unidentified gen. pl.s *yéṣām* and *eṣām* as referring to the patrons and the unidentified nom. sg. f. (on the basis of the f. adj. *yuktā́* and *hiraṇyáyī*) as the Dakṣiṇā. This vs. thus introduces the *dānastuti*, which becomes more explicit in the flg. vs. Both *vāṛta* and *yuktā́* suggest that the Dakṣiṇā here is conceived of as a chariot or wagon.

It is the second hemistich that provides the problems in this vs. It consists of two (or possibly one: see comm. ad 12cd) similes, to which the fem. entity in the 1st hemistich is presumably compared, but everything else is up for grabs. See the despairing floundering of Old, Ge (n. 13cd), and Re, to which I have nothing particularly useful to add. The general impression I get from the two similes is that the feminine subj. of ab is being deliberately compared (and thus contrasted) with hypermasc., aggressive, and successful entities, esp. in c with *paúṃsyā́* ‘manly, masculine’. As with *paúṃsyāni* in I.169.6 I take this as referring to manly forces, i.e., troops. Here the ending *-ā* can be either a fem. sg. or the short neut. pl. On *nemá-dhiti-*, here in the loc. as in its other 3 occurrences, see comm. ad I.72.4. It is used of battle arrays drawn up against the enemy. In other words, the Dakṣiṇā of ab seems to be compared to troops in a state of combat readiness – I have no idea why.

The sense of d is even harder to fathom because the b.v. *viṣṭá-anta-* is multiply ambiguous and the morphological identity and meaning of *vṛthā́* are disputed. As for the former, *viṣṭá-* can of course be the ppl. either of  $\sqrt{\text{viś}}$  ‘enter’ or  $\sqrt{\text{viṣ}}$  ‘toil, accomplish’. Gr takes it to  $\sqrt{\text{viś}}$ , glosses ‘hindurchgehende Enden habend’, and applies it to an axle, presumably qualifying the chariot that is the hidden metaphor in ab. This doesn’t get us very far, esp. since it leaves *vṛthā́* dangling. Old tries out several possibilities but doesn’t settle on one. Ge refuses to tr. My rendering is closest to Re’s (for the whole pāda) “semblable à des choses accomplies de bon gré,” but I think both of our interpr. rest on a dubious cross-linguistic slippage: the assumption that ‘end’ (*ánta-*) can also mean ‘goal’. Nonetheless this is reflected in the publ. tr. “whose ends have been accomplished” (with *viṣṭá-* from  $\sqrt{\text{viṣ}}$ ). However dubiously achieved, this interpr.

makes more sense than introducing an axle, and it fits fairly well with c, in comparing the Dakṣiṇā to something successful. It also allows *vṛthā* to have its usual adverbial sense ‘at will’, rather than taking it (with Sāy. and Ge; see Ge’s n. 13cd) as a separate fem. noun, which Ge renders as “Schöpfрад” (whatever that may be).

Thus, piece by piece the 2nd hemistich can be tentatively teased out, but the point of the two similes still escapes me.

X.93.14: The first hemistich consists of a list of patrons’ names in the loc., summed up by *maghāvatsu*. This stem first appeared in gen. pl. *maghónām* in 8d; in between the patrons have been regularly alluded to, but not overtly identified. The reappearance of *maghāvan(t)*- here almost defines a ring.

The syntax of cd is problematic. It should consist of a rel. cl. introduced by *yé* picked up by a main cl containing the referent of *yé*, namely *eṣām* (both referring to the patrons) (see the similar configuration in 13ab). The problem (or one of them) is that the “main” clause in which *eṣām* finds itself has an accented verb, *viśrāvi*. The various treatments attempt various makeshifts. In mine, I supply a transitive verb of motion in the rel. cl. (“send”), because *yuktvāya* ‘having yoked’ assumes a subsequent journey, as does *pathā* (if it belongs in this clause), and *asmayú* also favors a verb of motion (see comm. ad 11).

As I just implied, I am inclined to breach the pāda boundary (not much of a problem in this metrical messy hymn) and include *pathā* in the rel. cl., though it could belong to my second clause (“... widely famed along the path”).

I take the subj. of *viśrāvi* to be the Dakṣiṇā (so also Re): for the patrons the point of all this giving is for it to be noisily celebrated by the poet-recipient. What I would like is for this to be a straightforward main clause: “of them (the Dakṣiṇā) is widely famed.” But no such luck in this hymn. Barring an emendation to \**vi śrāvi*, this little clause must also be subordinate. I have adopted the trick used by Ge and Re and made it an unsignaled purpose clause, on no better basis than desperation.

## X.94 Pressing Stones

On the supposed authorship of “the snake Arbuda Kādraveya” see Ge’s headnote.

X.94.1: Note the four verb forms of √*vad* in the 1st hemistich, with their initial *va*’s reinforced by *vayām* and *vācam* (and indeed [*grā*]/*va*[*bhyo*]). The addressees of the 2nd pl. *vadatā* in b are presumably the priests (so also Ge), while those of *bhāratha* in d are the stones.

On the meaning of *ślōka*- see comm. ad I.51.12.

X.94.2: I take *śatāvat sahasravat* as indicating that the (limited number of) stones make as much noise as hundreds and thousands of them -- not that they speak in a hundred or thousand different ways (as it is generally interpr.) or a hundred or thousand separate utterances. The emphasis in this hymn is on how much noise they make.

As Ge points out (n. 2b), they have golden mouths because they are stained with the golden soma.

Note hemistich-final *āsābhiḥ* (b) / *āsata* (d).

Pāda c is almost identical to III.60.3 (R̥bhus), with *śāmībhiḥ* there substituting for our *grāvāṇaḥ*. Though they are rendered differently in the publ. tr. (III.60.3 [JPB] “... by applying

themselves to their labors, ritually acting well by good ritual action”), the divergence seems justified by the lack of agreement on the 2nd word in the pāda.

The Hotar in d is surely Agni (as so often). The point is that even before the oblation is poured into the ritual fire, the stones have tasted it because they are pressing it.

X.94.3–4: The repeated phrase *ávidann anā mādhu* (3a, 4b) could also be rendered with an aoristic immediate past “they have found,” which would fit with the generally presential context.

The sense and/or function of adverbial *anā* is difficult to determine. It occurs four times (counting this duplicate phrase only once): here, IV.30.3, VIII.21.13, 47.6. In none of these passages (incl. the phrase here) does “in this way / because of this” fit particularly well (despite the publ. tr. here). In this passage the stones do not find the honey *because* they speak; rather the reverse: their speaking (in both 3 and 4) signals that they have found the honey. I now think that *anā* means something like ‘evidently, clearly’, deriving ultimately from ‘by this’ (=previous action) the actuality of the current action/state can be inferred. I would now alter the tr. to “evidently they have found the honey.” That is, we hear them and figure they must have found it. For the other passages see comm. ad locc.

X.94.3: In the sequence *vadanti ávidann* the two verbs have a quasi-palindromic relationship.

In later Vedic, *nyūñkha-* (and associated denom. forms) refers to a particular alteration in the recitation of the Hotar, whereby an *o* is substituted for the 2<sup>nd</sup> vowel of each hemistich (see, e.g., Re’s *Vocabulaire du rituel védique* s.v.). This is the only attestation of this lexeme in early Vedic, and it is hard to imagine that the exact later technical sense is meant here (though see G. Thompson’s tr. [unpubl. handout, Leiden Vedic Workshop, 2002] “they chant ‘O’ over the well-cooked delicacy”). Given the content of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich as well as the obj. of the verb here (“cooked flesh”), the context seems to involve powerful animals devouring meat. Since later *nyūñkha-* has to do with sound, our *ny ũñkhayante* should express some sort of vocalization appropriate to such a scene. I’ve chosen ‘growl’ (like dogs [vel sim.] jealously guarding their piece of meat), but I wish I knew why this oddly formed, very precise technical term was imported into this context. (Perhaps *o* as a mid back vowel sounds most like threatening animal noises from the throat?) Re seems (rightly) not to have taken his own definition of the ritual term into account in *Hymnes spéculatifs*, where he tr. “mordent en grondant” (bite while growling: why use one verb when two will do?); Ge “schlampfen” (slurp), Gr “gierig brummen oder grunzen” (roar or grunt greedily).

It is noteworthy that soma, or rather the soma plant, is conceived of as *cooked* (*pakvá-*) flesh; *pakvá-* can’t have its other sense, ‘ripe’, because *āmiṣ-* is unambiguously an animal product (‘raw flesh’), not a vegetable one. Ch. Malamoud in his *Cuire le monde* (1989) claimed that every Vedic sacrifice involves the offering of cooked food, but he had to make soma a special case, since it is not cooked in any conventional sense. In my review of the 1996 English tr. of this collection (*Hist. of Religions* 39 [2000]: 384–86), I drew attention to this problem. But as it turns out, at least on the basis of this passage we were both wrong about soma: soma does count as “cooked” to the ritualists themselves, presumably because of the elaborate nature of its preparation. And this makes Malamoud righter about the larger principle than I was willing to allow at the time.

The “branch of the reddish tree” (*vrkṣásya śákham aruṇásya*) must again be the soma stalk, but this time in more natural guise as a member of the vegetable kingdom.

In IX.79.4 the stones gnaw (*bapsati*) the soma, as here. The part. *bápsat-* modifies a dog in VII.55.2, which might support my conjecture that dogs are growling over meat in pāda b. In fact, nothing forbids taking c with b rather than d.

On *sūbharva-* see EWA s.v. *BHARV*, with lit.

X.94.4: The participles *krósantaḥ* (b) and *āghoṣáyantaḥ* (d) are partial rhymes, and *āghoṣáyantaḥ* picks up *ghóṣam* in 1d.

Note the repetition of *ávidann aná mádhu* here. On this phrase and esp. *aná* see comm. ad vss. 3–4 above, where I suggest an altered tr. for both occurrences of the phrase. Here the shrieking to Indra signals that they have found the honey.

Contrary to standard gr. and tr., I take *saṃrābhyā* not as a gerund but as a gerundive (pausal form *saṃrābhyāḥ*) because of the instr. case of the agent *svásṛbhiḥ*. Although in later Sanskrit gerunds can take instr. agents, the conditions for this are clear: the matrix clause in which the gerund is found is passive (see, e.g., Speyer, Skt. Syn. p. 297, Wh Gr. §994c), and *anartīṣuḥ* “they have danced,” though intrans., is not passive. Moreover, it’s not clear to me that the instr. agent with a passive matrix clause is found at all in Vedic: a quick look through Delbrück (AIS) and Speijer (Ved. u. sansk. Syn.) didn’t turn up any; Wh. (§994c) only provides Classical examples; Macdonell (VGS pp. 332–33) doesn’t mention this usage.

X.94.5: The first hemistich compares the stones to two very different animals: the eagle because their noise soars upward; the antelope because of their trampling of the plant on the ground. The root accent of *kr̥ṣṇa-* identifies it as the animal (the black antelope) as opposed to the suffixally accented color term *kr̥ṣṇá-* ‘black’.

Phonetic figure, *n̥yaṇ ní yanti* in c.

On neut. singular *purú* see comm. ad V.33.4. As I say there, all of the supposed occurrences of this form can be otherwise interpr. (as neut. pls.) – except for this one: it is difficult to find any other function for it here except as a modifier of *rétaḥ*. In this late hymn, the fact that both *-u* and *-ū* can be used for neut. plural may have allowed a nonce spread of *-ū* to the singular, where *-u* is the only regular form. I also wonder if the immed. flg. *r-* had anything to do with it – as if though a degeneration and compensatory lengthening of *\*-ur r-*, though it’s hard to see how this would have come about.

In d *sūrya-śvitaḥ* could be either nom./acc. pl. or abl./gen. sg. Both have their advocates: Old favors nom. pl.; Scar (560) allows either; most others (incl. the publ. tr.) prefer the sg., though even there there is disagreement about whether it’s gen. or abl. (the latter, acdg. to the publ. tr.). I favor the sg. because the source of the semen should be indicated.

X.94.6: I don’t understand the usage of *samāyamuh*. Act. forms of the fairly rare lexeme *sám / ā́yam* are otherwise transitive, in the meaning ‘hold fast (reins, vel sim.), guide’, but this form appears to have no obj. I take it as absolutive or reflexive ‘hold (themselves?) fast’, despite the act. voice. It’s also possible that *dhúraḥ* ‘chariot poles’ is the obj. not only of part. *bíbhṛataḥ* but also of this verb.

X.94.7: Both Ge and Re (Hymnes spec.) refuse to tr. *dásāvani-*, a failure that seems over-scrupulous. The simplex *aváni-* means ‘stream’ or ‘streambed’; from the latter one can generalize to ‘course, track’. Gr renders the cmpd “zehn Bahnen durchlaufend.” Although the following four b.v.s with *dása-* refer to particular pieces of horse tackle (also *dásayantra-* in 8a),

it would not be surprising for the first in the series to refer to something more general, namely the track that the harnessed stones (/horses) will follow. The “ten” of course refers to the fingers in all instances.

X.94.8: Apropos *ādhānam*, for *ā* √ *dhā* used of hitching up horses see VII.34.4.

It’s a bit of a challenge to distribute the five gen. sg.s in cd: *sutāsya somyāsya āndhaso, aṁśóḥ ... prathamāsya*. I have grouped the three in c and the two in d together, with the latter two dependent on the former three. On the distinction between *āndhas-* and *aṁśú-* see comm. ad IV.1.19. The problem is the “first” – and as Ge points out (n. 8d), it would better if it modified *pīyūṣam* ‘beestings’, i.e., first milk – as in II.13.1 *aṁśóḥ pīyūṣam prathamám*; our variant shows a displaced modifier, of the “cold glass of milk” (for \*“(glass of cold milk)” type. It should be “the first beestings of the pressed somyan stalk of the plant.”

X.94.9: On my view of √ *nims* (contra Gotō, etc.) see comm. ad VIII.43.10. Although it might seem odd to assert that the pressing stones “kiss” the two horses of Indra, as Ge points out (n. 9a) Indra’s horses are given the soma dregs, the pressed-out soma-plants, as fodder. “Diese fressen also Mund an Mund mit den Steinen” – an appropriate image of kissing.

Ge (n. 9b) calls b a śleṣa: the stones sit on the cow(hide), as milkers sit by a cow.

X.94.10: The *vṛṣāyáte* that ends the previous vs. is picked up by the first word of this vs.: *vṛṣā*, which is predicated of *aṁśúḥ* ‘plant’.

There is also a referent shift, which is not entirely clear in the publ. tr. Indra was the 3rd ps. subj. of the previous hemistich (9cd), and we might expect that the “your / you” of vs. 10 refers to Indra, with the very common switch from 3rd to 2nd ps. However, all the 2nd ps. forms in 10 (4 finite verbs, plus enclitic *vah*) are plural and must refer to the pressing stones, which were also in the 3rd ps. in the previous vs. This identification is made clear only in 10d by the voc. *grāvāṇah*.

It’s worth noting (though I don’t know quite what to do with this observation) the concentration of 2nd pl. act. endings enlarged by *-na*: *riṣāthana* (a), *sthana* (b and c).

I’m not sure why the stones need to be reassured that they won’t be harmed. Perhaps the point is that their plant is a powerful bull and can therefore protect them. The similar reassurance in VII.33.4, given to the Vasiṣṭhas, rests on the protective power of Indra.

The problem in the 2nd hemistich is *raivatyéva* — starting with the grammatical identity of the form. Gr sets up a stem *raivatyá-* “Reichtum,” to which this would be the neut. pl., an analysis fld by Caland-Henry and Delbrück, acdg. to Old. The only other such *vṛddhi* form in the RV is masc. *raivatá-* in V.60.4, to which this could, alternatively (and I think correctly), be a fem. *raivatī-*. Both Ge and Re accept the fem. interpr. (Ge: “die Tochter eines Reichen”; Re [Hymnes spéc] as a plural: “comme les filles du Riche”), but they both seem to take it as a nom., without indicating how they arrive at their grammatical identifications. (Ge’s n. 10c on possible irregular sandhi just throws more sand into the gears.) I am fully sympathetic to this tactic, because a nom. works better in context, but feel that I must agree with Old that it is most likely instr. (*raivatyā*). The masc. *vṛddhi* form in V.60.4ab throws some light on our passage, in that it establishes a marital wooing context: *varā ivéd raivatāso hīranyair, abhī ... tanvāḥ pipīṣre* “Just like wealthy wooers, with golden (ornaments) they have emblazoned their bodies.” The referents are the Maruts, compared to richly ornamented suitors; later in the same vs. (d) they put “marks of greatness” (*māhāṁsi*) on their bodies – cf. our *māhasā*. In V.60.4 the *raivant-* are the wooers

come to seek a bride. In our passage the *raivatī* belongs presumably to the other side of the negotiations: the daughter of a rich man (per Ge, Re) on offer to a suitor or suitors. This casts the pressing stones in the role of the father (/male relatives) of this girl, who pleases the suitor by bestowing his daughter who comes with a rich dowry. The well-pleased suitor is not overtly present in the main clause, but must be supplied as antecedent to *yāsya* in d — or such is my interpr. Re (fld. by Don.) takes the referent of *yāsya* to be the rich man; Ge seems to take *yāsya* as standing for *yād* (“wann”) with the gen. expressing an indefinite (“an de Opfer jemandes”).

As for the ceremony the stones have enjoyed, this may refer to pāda b, where the stones are well-fed and satiated.

X.94.11: Ge couches the first hemistich in the 3rd ps. (“... sind die Steine”), presumably because of accented *ádrayaḥ*, which cannot be voc; he then switches to 2nd ps. (“... seid ihr”) because of 2nd pl. pres. *stha* in c. Re (fld. by Don.) simply uses the 3rd ps. throughout, ignoring the *stha*. Because the stones are insistently addressed in the 2nd ps. throughout the immediately preceding vs. and this 2nd ps. is again overt in our pāda c, I take it all as 2nd ps. I see no problem with a nom. *ádrayaḥ* in a 2nd ps. context.

The pair *tr̥dilā átr̥dilāsaḥ* have been variously interpr. Because the only difference between the two is the privative *á* (and consequent accent shift), I think these refer neutrally to different shaped stones, both of which types are equally good at the work required.

X.94.12: Acdg. to Ge (nn. 12a, 12cd), the first hemistich concerns the (stony) mountains, conceptualized as the fathers of their miniature versions, the pressing stones, while the second half of the verse returns to the pressing stones. The publ. tr. accepts this interpr., but I now think that pāda c is an ambiguous transition, which can be applied both to the mountains and the stones. The reason for the identification of mountains and stones is pretty clear. The willed immobility of the mountains is implicitly contrasted with the dynamism of the pressing stones. Since we are nearing the end of the hymn, when the stones will be unhitched and return to immobility, the mountains provide a sort of grand model for this state.

As I just said, pāda c seems applicable to both mountains and stones: *ajuryá-* ‘unaging, undecaying’ in fact fits the mountains better than the stones. Both mountains and stones can be “companions of the golden (soma)” – the mountains because soma famously grows in the mountains, the stones because they press the plant (see their “golden mouths” *hárítebhir āsábhiḥ* in 2d).

The next word, *harídrava(h)*, is glossed by Gr “den gelben Rossen nachrennend,” but the standard interpr. now (e.g., Old, Ge, Re, Don, Scar [295 and n. 845], EWA s.v. [though with a diff. botanical ident.]) is that this refers to the Haridru tree (*Adina cordifolia*), a tree with yellow-colored wood and yellow flowers (per internet), much used later in Āyurveda. Why either mountains or stones would be compared to this tree isn’t clear to me, but the *hari-* of course carries it a long way.

Pāda d definitely applies to the stones. The use of the redupl. aor. *aśúśravuḥ* ‘made listen’ with an acc. of the listener and an instr. of the sound reprises the same construction, with different verb *āghoṣáyantaḥ*, in 4b.

X.94.13: The locc. *vimócanē yā́man*, adjacent across the pāda boundary, must be contrastive: “on their unhitching and/or on their course.” Given that rhetorical structure and given that *añjaspā́(h)* doesn’t work well as a simile, I have interpr. *iva* as a sort of hypercorrection for *\*vā* ‘or’. Since



*iva* sometimes needs to be read 'va in late RV (including nearby X.97.10), the poet thinks *vā* can be optionally realized as *iva*. The verbal complex *vā ghā* is fairly common in the RV (I.161.8, 162.8; III.28.2; V.85.8 [=X.139.5]; VIII.12.16, 21.17, 44.23, 47.15; X.61.18), while I find *iva gha* (as *iva ghéd*) only in VIII.43.3. The publ. tr., complete with asterisk, reflects this emendation. I am concerned about the position of the phrase, which should be in 2nd position; however, this is a problem also if we read *iva*, since *ghā* is overwhelmingly a 2<sup>nd</sup>-position (or after *vā*, etc., a modified 2<sup>nd</sup>-position) particle. (Ge [n. 13b] is also disturbed by the particle placement.)

On *añjas-pā-* see comm. ad X.92.2. Here the point is that the stones have the first direct contact with the soma; they do not drink an already prepared beverage.

*upabdiḥ* is repeated from 4d.

The standard tr. effectively take *vápantaḥ* as belonging only to the simile (despite the position of *iva* after *bījam*); that is, the simile is “like grain-producers scattering seed.” But it seems as if this action should correspond to something performed by the stones as well – in other words, it should express the shared characteristic. I therefore take *bījam* as a pun, to be construed with both simile and frame. In the simile it is grain-seed, but in the simile it is (metaphorical) semen. For *bīja-* as semen, see, e.g., X.85.37 (the wedding hymn) *yáśyām bījam manuṣyā vāpanti* “in whom [=the bride] men scatter their seed.” As for the metaphor, see 5d *purū réto dadhire* “they [=stones] have themselves produced much semen.” That “semen” is of course the liquid pressed out from the plant, but it can be configured as the semen of the stones themselves, which in our vs. is then reinfused into the soma (*prñcānti sómam*). This idea is then restated in another image in the post-caesura portion of d: the stones do not make the soma smaller by eating it.

Gr analyzes *dhān'yākṛt-* as *dhān'ya-* + *ākṛt-*, but this is impossible, since root noun cmpds can have as prior member a nominal or a preverb, but not both. (See disc. in my 2020 “*iṣudhya-*” [Fs. Lamberterie]: 486 with n. 5.) Better, with Scar. (74–75), to take *dhānyā-* as a collective pl. or as. metrical lengthening in the cadence.

X.94.14: The stones are unhitched and return to their desacralized inanimate state as mere stones. The vs. has several puns that have not been previously recognized.

*vācam akrata* is found also in 5a; nonetheless I tr. them slightly differently, preferring ‘speech’ in 5 and ‘voice’ here. (There is of course no difference in the Skt.)

As Re points out (EVP XVI ad loc.), soma is *tunná-* by the pressing stone in IX.67.19–20 – hence the simile here in b.

In c *vī ... muñcā* reprises *vimócane* in 13a.

The pf. part. *suṣuvúṣaḥ* is taken by the standard tr. as gen. sg., referring to the priest who has produced the *manīṣām* (‘inspired thought’). But it can equally well be acc. pl. m., referring to the stones, and I think both are meant. This double interpr. entails a double interpr. of *vī ... muñcā*: with the stones as obj. it means ‘unhitch’ (or horses; see, e.g., V.53.7), but with the thought as obj. it means rather ‘release (into the world), set free’.

In V.53.7 *vī √muc* is followed immed. by *vī √vrt*, as here. In that passage it seems to refer to turning aside from the road to rest, after unhitching. That sense works here as well.

The last pāda has been various interpr., esp. because the sense of *cāyamānaḥ* is not agreed upon. On this participle, see comm. ad VII.18.8. In our passage I find Ge’s interpr. the most compelling: that it is intrans./pass. ‘appearing (as), being perceived (as)’, indicating that the dynamic protagonists of our hymn are now just seen as inert stones. But I also think *cāyamānāḥ*

is a pun: it could also be interpr. as *ca áyamānāḥ*, that is, with a negated mid. part. to the root aorist of  $\sqrt{yam}$  (see act. *samāyamuḥ* in 6a), ‘not being harnessed (anymore)’. The *ca* would of course be oddly placed, but I would not be surprised at such a manipulation to enable the pun.