

Commentary IX.68–114

IX.68–86

The trimeter portion of the IXth Maṇḍala begins with IX.68, and the Jagatī section goes through IX.86.

IX.68–70: The theme of these three hymns, particularly insistent in the first and last, is the difference between and ultimate unity of earthly and heavenly Soma.

IX.68

On the architecture and thematics of this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.68.1: The position of *ā* in b is distinctly odd, breaking up the simile *gāvah ... ná dhenāvah* and not even placed at a metrical boundary; indeed, the pāda has an unusual break (~ / – ~) after late caesura. It is all the more puzzling because *ā* has no apparent function in the vs.: *√syand* does not otherwise appear with *ā*, and the usual nominal cases to which *ā* serves as adposition are absent. Perhaps it's a clumsy attempt to convert the simile *gāvo ná dhenāvah*, which fits well at the end of a dimeter line (see VI.45.28 and nearby IX.66.12), into a Jagatī cadence. It's also worth noting that a more conventional order ... / **ā gāva ná dhenāvah*, with *ā* at the metrical boundary and the simile unbroken, would produce both a worse break and an impossible cadence. So perhaps this was the best the poet could do – though why does he need an *ā* in the first place?

Old suggests (ad II.3.3) reading **barhiṣ-śādaḥ* with restored sibilant cluster. However, of the six occurrences of this cmpd a heavy second syllable would make the meter worse in II.3.3, V.44.1 (bad breaks), though admittedly the other 4, which open the vs., might be somewhat improved by a heavy 2nd syllable. However, the evidence of the break should weigh more heavily than that of the opening. See Scar's disc. p. 570 and esp. n. 806.

The mirror-image sequence (*par*)*isrú(tam) usrí(yā)* is rather nice.

usríyāḥ in d can be either nom. or acc. pl. (see Old, who doesn't decide). Flg. Ge and Re, I take it as an acc. pl. fem., taking part in a double acc. construction with *nirñíjam* *√dhā* "assume X as garment." As Ge points out (n. 1d) this is a paradox: the (masc.) soma drops are likened to cows (b) and provided with udders (c), but clothe themselves in cows ('milk) in d. By contrast, Scar (675) takes it as nom. pl., which is certainly possible, but less poetically fruitful.

IX.68.2: *ā váram* "at will" may recall *vāram* (in the common Somian phrase *ávyo váram*, etc. "sheep's fleece") referring to the filter.

IX.68.3: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. significantly enlarges Soma's domain: in vs. 2 he circles around the filter at the ritual; in vs. 3 he journeys across the two world halves, Heaven and Earth -- and in fact makes them swell up with his "imperishable milk" (the soma juice itself, presumably).

ākṣitā is most likely instr. sg. with *páyasā*, on the basis of IX.31.5 *páyah ... duduhré ākṣitam*, though Old suggests the possibility that it would be dual nom./acc. Although this would make reasonable contextual sense -- the two imperishable worlds --

it would need to be fem. and therefore **ákṣite*. Old floats the possibility that the preceding dual adj. *sākaṃvīdhā* could have influenced the ending. But on the whole, since *pāyas-ákṣita-* is found elsewhere, it seems best to stick with that grammatically acceptable alternative.

The root affiliation of the intens. part. *vivévidat* is disputed. Though Gr assigns it to \sqrt{vid} ‘find’, Ge, Re (explicitly in his n.), Lü (228–29) take it to \sqrt{vid} ‘know’ (“Der ... genau kennt”; “qui discernes”). I follow Schaefer (183–84) (and Gr) in taking it to \sqrt{vid} ‘find’; the point, I think, is that at every soma-pressing Soma re-finds and re-defines the domain he crosses, here encompassing the whole universe. It should be noted that the middle part. to this same intens. stem also governs *rājasī* in I.72.4 *ā ródasī brhatī vévidānāh*, though I tr. it ‘ever possessing’ there. See comm. ad loc.

IX.68.4: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. carries on and develops the themes of vs. 3. In that vs. Soma moves across the two worlds, implying a horizontal axis, while here, in my view, we shift to the vertical -- with Soma’s head in heaven and his foot(print) on earth. This vs. is much discussed by Lü (228–32), who also emphasizes the cosmic, but because he always strictly separates the heavenly and the earthly soma, I think in a way he misses the point.

My image of the vertical Soma depends on taking *padām* in b as his ‘footprint’, but this is not the standard interpr. in this passage, where *padām* is generally taken simply as ‘place’ vel sim. (Ge Stätte, Re séjour), with Ge further specifying it as the cup. His identification of the *padá-* with the cup then leads Ge to a somewhat aberrant tr. of *pinvate* (‘overflow’: “... macht ... seine Stätte überquellen”). But the middle voice of *pinvate*, contrasting with act. *pinvat* in the previous vs. (3b), encourages a self-beneficial (*/*-involved) interpr. of the verb, as does the instr. *svadháyā* ‘by his independent power’ -- which supports my interpr. of *padām* as referring to Soma’s own footprint.

And what does it mean that he “swells his own footprint”? I connect this with *vājáyann apáh* “stirring the waters” in pāda a. Here I would agree with Lü that these are the heavenly waters, and I further suggest that these waters, stirred up by the heavenly Soma and fallen from heaven as rain, are what swells his footprint and the earth on which it’s emplaced. This rain may also be indirectly alluded to in pāda c. The grain that ornaments the soma plant is probably, on the one hand, a reference to the variety of soma drink into which grain is mixed (see IX.55.1 and comm.; also Ober II.55), but I think it also likely alludes to the fecundating power of rain and the vegetation it produces.

There are two finite verbs in d, both accented (adjacent ... *násate rákṣate* ...), with no overt mark of subordination. With most interpr. I take the *násate* clause as implicitly subordinated, with *rákṣate* beginning the main cl., but contrastive verbal accent of adjacent verbs could as easily be invoked (and would make little diff. in interpr.: “he joins ... he guards ...”). Lü makes much of the last clause, and in fact takes *śírah* as subj. of *rákṣate* (which seems unlikely on rhetorical grounds), but I think the sense is fairly straightforward: even while soma is being pressed by the fingers at the earthly ritual, he keeps his head safe in heaven.

IX.68.5: As disc. in the publ. intro., this is an omphalos vs., which provides the solution to the paradoxes set up in the earlier vss. of the hymn, albeit in veiled form -- veiling that has kept its actual contents obscure (and may still do).

The first half is fairly clear, until almost the end: it refers to the birth of Soma, here called both a *kaví* and “the embryo of truth” (*ṛtásya gárbhaḥ*) (see further below). This embryo was deposited, presumably at its birth or even its conception, “beyond the twins” (*yamá paráḥ*). Given the two previous vss., which contain duals that refer to the two world-halves, Heaven and Earth (so identified by Ge and Re, e.g.), the most sensible interpr. of “the twins” here is as a reference to the same pair -- esp. since H+E were referred to by the fem. of the ‘twin’ word in 3a (*yamyā*) (in addition to 3c *mahí apāré rájasī* and 4a *mātārā*). But this interpr. is somewhat clouded by the fact that the next pāda (5c) contains both a dual phrase *yūnā ... sántā* and a dual verb *ví jajñatuḥ*. It is of course the default interpr. that all three of these duals (the two NPs and the verb) should refer to the same pair. What is somewhat baffling to me is that Ge (followed by Re) decides that this pair is the Aśvins (see esp. his n. 5bc). The Aśvins do not otherwise appear in this hymn, and indeed Re outlines firm grounds to reject this identification in his hesitant n.: “la participation des Aśvin au cycle du Soma étant faible et le contexte cd insuffisamment précis.” (Curiously, though Ge’s more overreaching mythological interventions often stem from Sāy., Sāy. in this case provides the far more sensible interpr. of the two as Soma and Sūrya.) I think the Aśvins can safely be dismissed as candidates for the dual reference (so also Lü 275). Let us then return to the more likely referent for *yamá* in b: Heaven and Earth. Pāda b seems simply to be saying that Soma (or part of Soma) was deposited as an embryo beyond Heaven and Earth, giving him cosmic reach indeed.

The trickier pāda is c. The presence of a dual nom./acc. and a dual verb of course invites the former to be taken as subject of the latter, and the standard interpr. understandably follow this path, with the sg. subj. of ab supplied as obj. of the verb -- e.g., Ge “Als Jünglinge haben sie ihn zuerst ausfindig gemacht.” This is obviously possible, and it need not involve identifying the two youths as the Aśvins; Heaven and Earth could be the pair in question. However, the dual NP raises several questions. For one thing, are Heaven and Earth really young? And even if so, what does this have to do with the action in question. Further: why *sántā*? The pres. part. of *√as* in the nominative is usually concessive, but “although being young” doesn’t make much sense here. I assume Ge’s “Als” is his only recognition of the participle; Re’s “jeunes encores” must be his (see also Lü’s “Als sie jung waren,” 275). But none of these renderings really accounts for why the participle is there, or for why H+E are identified as youths.

I have a less straightforward interpr. of this pāda -- inspired in great part by Ge’s interpr. of pāda d, which he takes (n. 5d) as depicting the two births of Soma, the heavenly and the earthly. I think these two forms of Soma are already present in pāda c, in the *accusative* phrase *yūnā ... sántā*, and the subj. of the dual verb *ví jajñatuḥ* is Heaven and Earth, not overtly present but referred to as the *yamá* in b (as well as in vss. 3–4). Under this interpr. the participle *sántā* has a reason to be there: it is an existential in a predicated proposition after *ví√jñā* ‘recognize’ -- rendered in the publ. tr. by “that there were two youths.” And of course it makes sense that Heaven and Earth would be the first to notice this, because the two births were located in those two places. It also makes sense that the two forms of Soma would be identified as ‘youths’, since they were recently born.

Following Ge on pāda d, the first mentioned birth “deposited in secret” (*gúhā hitám*) is the heavenly one (picking up *nīhito yamá paráḥ* in b), while a bit paradoxically

(because of the *úd* ‘up’), the one “held aloft” (*údyatam*) is the earthly one, referring to the ritual presentation of the soma.

Given this interpr. of the 2nd hemistich, it is quite possible that pādas a and b refer to these two different births: the poet born with skill and mind (a) would be the earthly Soma, equipped for his ritual role, while the one deposited beyond the twins (b) would obviously be the heavenly one.

IX.68.6: The famous Somaraub, i.e., the stealing of Soma from heaven effected by a falcon and treated esp. (though obscurely) in IV.26–27, is rarely mentioned in Maṇḍala IX, as Ober (II.162) points out. Here it serves to bring the heavenly Soma to earth, to join with and super-charge the earthly, ritual Soma—the difference between the two Somas having been treated in vs. 5.

As noted in the publ. intro., the omphalos vs. 5 is encased in lexical rings. Here *vividuḥ* responds to *vivévidat* in 3c (and both relate semantically to *víjjñatuḥ* in the omphalos vs., 5c), *aṃśúm* (6d) and its semantic doublet *ándhas* (6b) to *aṃśúḥ* in 4c, *pariyántam* (6d) to *pariyán* (2c) (cf. also *pariprayántam* 8a), and *suvṛdham* (6c) to *sākaṃvṛdham* (3b).

In addition to lexical rings, there is chaining: 6c *marjayanta* is picked up by 7a *mrjantí* (with no semantic or functional difference between the stems or the voices: *marjayanta* is an *-anta* replacement); 6a *manīśīṇaḥ* ‘possessing inspired thoughts’ by 8b *manīśāḥ* ‘inspired thoughts’.

IX.68.7: The fingers of the pressers are found both here in pāda a and in 4d, though with different lexical realizations and different functions in the vs. There is also an exact, though mirror-image, resposion: *yató nṛbhiḥ* (4d): *nṛbhir yatáḥ* (7d). On the other hand, *hitám* in 7b almost surely belongs to *√hi* ‘impel’, while *hitám* in 5d belongs to *√dhā* ‘place, deposit’.

IX.68.8: Ge (see his n. 8a) takes *vayyām* as the PN of a hero aided by Indra to whom Soma is compared: “(einem zweiten) Vayya.” Although a hero of that name does exist, his presence seems limited to passages where he is mentioned with the better attested Turvīti (I.54.6, II.13.12, I.19.6) or, once, in a list of clients of the Aśvins (I.112.6). The du. form in II.3.6 *vayyè* (or *vayyā*; see comm. ad loc.) belongs to a separate stem *vayī-* ‘weaver’. Despite Ge’s energetic attempt to justify it, the introduction of a minor hero from the Indra cycle makes no sense here (any more than his introduction of the Aśvins in vs. 5). I therefore adopt Re’s suggestion (disc. in detail in his n.) that *vayyà-* here is a deriv. of *vayā-* ‘branch, twig’, which could easily describe the soma, esp. as the pressed juice is circling the filter (see immed. preceding *paiprayántam*) and leaving its twigs behind.

On the other hand, Ge’s explan. of *susāmsádám* ‘keeping good company’ is persuasive; it refers either to the gods and priests or to the water and the milk (or, I would add, both).

The standard tr. (not, however, Scar [608]) construe *diváḥ* in c with *vācam* in d; cf., e.g., Re “... lance la voix (venue) du ciel,” which is then further interpr. as thunder (see Ge’s n. 8d, Ober II.209). But I prefer to take *diváḥ* with immed. preceding *ūrmīnā* for several reasons: 1) a pāda boundary and the verb intervene between *diváḥ* and *vācam*;

2) the *ūrmí-* from heaven is found in IX.49.1 *apām ūrmīm divás pári*; 3) the formulaic VP *íyarti vācam* (II.42.1, III.8.5, 34.2, IV.21.5, etc.) does not otherwise appear with a source of the speech specified. Surely the point here is that when the soma is being ritually prepared he/it inspires ritual speech.

IX.68.9: Here again the standard tr. supply ‘speech’ as obj. of the chained *íyarti*, as is very probable, but make *diváh* dependent on this gapped obj. (e.g., Ge “(die Stimme) des Himmels”); again I construe *diváh* elsewhere, here with *rájah* ‘realm’. For the phrase cf. *divó rájah* I.62.5, 110.6. The further point here is that the ritual speech inspired by Soma is impelled all the way to heaven.

The VP *várico vidat* “finds wide space” (d) responds in sense (and partially etymologically) to *urú jrāyah* “wide expanse” in 2c.

IX.68.10: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. functions as an extra-hymnic summary vs., signalled by the initial *evā*, which often begins summary vss. It is distinguished from the rest of the hymn by being in Triṣṭubh not Jagatī. Its 2nd hemistich also reaches beyond Soma: in c we call on Heaven and Earth, and d is addressed in the 2nd pl. to the gods in general, not to Soma. This pāda has the feel of a refrain, though it is found only once elsewhere, at X.45.12. However, its major elements are found in various permutations in other passages, e.g., I.85.12 *rayīm no dhatta vṛṣaṇaḥ suvīram*. For a similar finale see the next hymn, IX.69.10. On the reason for the focus on Heaven and Earth see comm. on that vs. and on IX.70 passim.

IX.69

IX.69.1: The first pāda of this vs. has an overt subject, *matīḥ* ‘thought’, as does the last, *sómah*. The intervening pādas have only similes to which the missing subject is compared. In my view both the thought and the soma are possible in b and c, and the double reading is deliberate. Ge (1b) suggests that Indra is another possibility in b, but introducing Indra seems gratuitous.

The referent of init. *ásya* in d is uncertain. Since *sómah* is the overt subject of the pāda and is performing his action “under the commandments of this one” (*ásya vratéṣu*), it might seem that soma is excluded as a referent. Re suggests a priest, Ge the singer or the sacrificer, or perhaps soma, Old (fld by Schmidt, *vrata* 76) soma, with the *ásya* reflexive. Since most forms of *vratá-* in IX are specifically Soma’s (e.g., IX.53.3 *ásya vratāni nādhīṣe, pávamānasya* ... “The commandments of this self-purifying one cannot be ventured against”), that seems the likeliest solution here, esp. as no ritual personnel have been mentioned as yet. However, I think it likely that we’re dealing once again with the double identity of soma/Soma: heavenly Soma the god has *vratá-*; earthly, ritual soma obeys them.

The verb of d, *íṣyate*, is assigned by Ge (fld. by Kulikov 459), to $\sqrt{íṣ}$ ‘desire’; among other things this requires interpr. *vratéṣu* in a very forced manner, as ‘work’: “Zu den Werken dieses ist der Soma erwünscht.” Better is the ascription to $\sqrt{íṣ}$ ‘send’ (e.g., Gr, Re, Lub). The verb is unaccented, but (*pace* Gr, Wh Rts, Lub) it probably does not belong to the same stem as the act. transitive *-ya*-pres. *íṣyati* (once 1st sg. mid. *íṣye*

IV.33.1, also transitive), but rather to a separate pass. stem with underlying accent **iṣyáte*. It is functionally parallel with *úpa sarji* ‘is/has been released’ in b.

IX.69.2: The accent of the two adjacent verbs *pr̥cyáte sicyáte* suggests that the first clause is implicitly subordinate. The two subjects of vs. 1, the thought (*matí-*) and soma, are both found here (soma as ‘honey’ [*mádhū*]), but each as subj. of one of the verbs, rather than, as in vs. 1, as simultaneous subjects of verbs without overt subjects. Most tr. take *úpa ... pr̥cyáte* as ‘is fertilized, impregnated’ vel sim; see the full treatment in Kulikov 152 and n. 372. Because the actions of the two verbs in the pāda are presented as complementary, I prefer the more physically explicit ‘is engorged’: as the thought is filling up and swelling with eloquence, as if with liquid, the liquid soma is being disgorged, poured out.

With the Pp as well as most tr. (see inter alia Ge’s n. 2b), I take *mandrājanī* as a karmadhāraya, *mandra-ājanī-*, rather than the equally possible bahuvrīhi *mandrá-ajanī*. But its sense, as a metaphorical reference to the tongue, is best illuminated by the bahuvrīhi (obviously based on a karmadh) *mandrá-jihva-* ‘having a gladdening tongue’.

The stem *saṃtaní-* is found 3x in the RV (here, V.73.7, IX.97.14), always with regard to loud noise. It seems generally to be assumed that it’s derived from \sqrt{tan} ‘stretch’ (though Gr [s.v.] ascribes it to his 2 *tan* ‘thunder’ not 1 *tan* ‘stretch’, that seems to be a mistake: see his comment under 1 *tan* + *sám*) – hence tr. like Re’s “concert.” It is true that the ppl. *saṃtata-* to \sqrt{tan} ‘stretch’ is a later (ŚS) tech. term describing “stretched and continuous recitation” (see Re’s Vocabulaire, Sen’s Dictionary of the Vedic Rituals, both s.v.), hence applied to sound, and ‘a stretching together’ for *saṃtaní-* could perhaps refer to strings sounded in unison. But a more likely root is ready to hand: \sqrt{tan} ‘thunder’, the *s*-less form of \sqrt{stan} ‘id.’, which can be used metaphorically of the sound of ritual speech, etc. (e.g., VI.38.2). I therefore render *saṃtaní-* as ‘thunder, thundering’ in all three occurrences. The preverb *saṃ* probably contributes its frequent intensifying sense ‘entirely’.

The sense of the simile *praghnatām iva* is not entirely clear. *prá* \sqrt{han} occurs only three times in the RV: here; in the enigmatic hymn, X.27.1, where, however, it has the fairly clear violent meaning ‘smite, smite off’, as it does in a number of passages in the AV; and in the negated root noun cmpd *áprahan-* (VI.44.4) also meaning ‘not smiting’. But here it must refer to the noise (“thundering,” *saṃtanīḥ*) produced by the action of *prá* \sqrt{han} , not the associated violence (*pace* Scar 689, who places it in the ‘zuschlagend, losschlagend, kämpfend’ realm). Perhaps *prá* \sqrt{han} here refers to the beating of drums, or perhaps it is an early reference to the practice of hunting with “beaters” driving the game in the direction of the shooters. On the whole, the former is more likely; we know essentially nothing about hunting practices in ancient India, and furthermore it’s not clear to me that the beaters themselves would make much noise, though the flushed game might, in combination with any dogs the beaters had with them.

IX.69.3: Ge plausibly suggests that the wives Soma is seeking (*vadhūyúḥ*) are the waters and the milk.

The ritual action referred to in b is quite clear, but the referent of the metaphorical subject is harder to decode. The act in question is the sluffing off of the twigs and other detritus as the juice runs across the filter, as is clear from the more explicit passage in the

immediately preceding hymn, IX.68.2 *upāruhaḥ śratháyan svādate háriḥ* “loosening his shoots, the tawny one becomes sweet,” whose verb *śratháya-* is of course derivationally related to our verb *śrathnīté*. The problem is that the subject is feminine, *naptīr áditeḥ* “the granddaughter (/niece/descendant) of Aditi.” As Ge (flg. Sāy.) notes, the actual referent is most likely the soma plant. But the words for soma plant (*aṃśú-*) and soma stalk (*ándhas-*) are m. and n. respectively. The best gender match would be *ósadhi-* ‘plant’, but the soma plant is never so called, as far as I know, and the word is very rare in IX, where the few occurrences do not refer to the soma plant. I can only suggest that the sexualized image of the plant loosening its garments, combined with the surrounding feminine imagery (esp. 3a, 4ab) encouraged the use of an explicitly female subject – and perhaps an underlying fem. *ósadhi-* was conjured up. But I am not particularly satisfied with this. Old suggests instead that the referent is the cow, “die ... ihren Verschluss locker macht d. h. Milch gibt.” Though this would solve the gender problem, it would distance the passage from the parallel in IX.68.2.

The subject is all the more puzzling because the female in question is (possibly – see below) identified as the descendant of Aditi. Now Aditi is of course famous for her motherhood, but her children are also famously sons. Brereton (*Ādityas*, 234–35) thinks that Aditi is here because of the reference to ‘truth’ (*ṛtá-*), with which she is associated elsewhere, but does not address the question of the gender of Aditi’s offspring here. Again I have no good explanation, but see below for another way of construing *áditeḥ*.

The referent of the dat. part. in the phrase *ṛtám yaté* is also disputed. Ge, I think plausibly, takes it as the soma juice, which, having shed the detritus of the plant in the filter, can flow to its goal. Lü (484 n. 1), fld. by Re, thinks rather of the mortal offerer, which is certainly possible. The issue is made more complex by the parallel in IX.74.3, whose b pāda ends, like here, *áditer ṛtám yaté*. One troubling feature is that in both cases the standard interpr. (incl. the publ. tr.) construes *áditeḥ* with what precedes, although it is found in the repeated phrase and therefore might be expected to belong with what follows. Moreover, the referent of *ṛtám yaté* in IX.74.3 is no more – indeed less – clear than it is here. It could be soma or it could be the mortal worshiper. In IX.74.3 I suggest, somewhat unsatisfactorily, that it could be read both ways; here I think soma as referent makes better sense. In IX.74.3 I also suggest that we should take the repeated phrase seriously and construe *áditeḥ* to the right, not the left, yielding “for him who goes to the truth of Aditi.” If we do that here as well, we are spared the problem of why the plant is the descendant of Aditi, though without a genitive of relationship, “granddaughter” is oddly underdefined. Nonetheless I suggest a possible alternative tr.: “The granddaughter loosens (her garment [=shoots of the soma plant]) for him who goes to the truth of Aditi.” Of course it would be possible to read *áditeḥ* twice, both with what precedes and with what follows.

IX.69.4–5: There is considerable chaining between these two vss.: *pári ... avyata* (4d), *pári vyata* (5b); *niktám* (4d), *nirñijānāḥ* (5b), *nirñije* (5c), all referring to Soma’s clothing himself in milk. On the connections with the next hymn, see comm. ad IX.70.1.

IX.69.5: The 2nd half of this vs. once again portrays Soma as reaching through the midspace to heaven. On the technicalities see Ge’s long n. 5cd.

IX.69.6: The form *prasúpaḥ* to the hapax root noun cmpd *prasúp-* is potentially multivalent; it has been analyzed as a nom. pl., modifying the soma juices, an acc. pl. obj. of *drāvayitnávaḥ* ‘causing to run’, or as an abl. infinitive (see Ge, Re, Old; Gr takes it as nom. pl.). Although most interpr. think it has to be one or the other, I see no reason why this ambig. form can’t be read twice in the passage: I take it as both acc. pl. and abl. sg. Re’s view is similar to mine, in that he wants it to serve as acc. pl. with the causative adj. as well as nom. pl., but he suggests this is the result of “haplologie à distance,” which seems unnec. to me. There are numerous examples of poets exploiting morphological ambiguity to allow a word to have two (or more) different functions in a clause.

With Ge I take the “stretched string” as a reference to the filter.

The final pāda is uncertain. Both Ge and Re take *dhāma* as the subj. of *pavate*, though with different interpr. of the resonant word *dhāman-*: “Ohne Indra läutert sich kein Ding”; “Sans Indra, nulle structure (sômique) ne se clarifie (valablement).” However, I find it unlikely that a *dhāman-*, whatever it refers to, can purify itself, and I am reluctant to take *pavate*, which in its overwhelming number of uses is reflexive, as a passive. Instead I take Soma as subject, as he essentially always is (incl. in vs. 3), with *dhāma* as the object of a transitive self-beneficial, a slight expansion of the usual reflexive usage. The sense (whatever the interpr. of *pavate*) is of course that the ritual soma-pressing is pointless without Indra, the archetypal soma-drinker, to consume the product. I think it possible that *dhāman-* ‘domain’ here refers to the filter, as in IX.63.14.

IX.69.7: The “bulls” of b (*vīṣa-cyuta-*) are generally and persuasively taken as the pressing stones (Ge, Re), but it is also possible that it’s a reference to Indra, given 6d. The presence of Indra gives impetus to the ritual preparation, just as his absence robs it of motivation.

IX.69.8: The *naḥ* in pāda a was omitted in tr.; it should read “bring us (wealth) ...”

Soma is addressed in the sg. (voc. *soma*), but the rest of the clause is couched in the pl. (“you [pl.] are ...”: *yūyám ... sthana*), with the common vacillation between the sg. substance / god and the pl. juices / pressings.

IX.69.10: The last pāda of this vs., like the 2nd half of the final vs. of the previous hymn (IX.68.10cd), enlarges the divine range beyond Soma (and Indra). It is addressed to Heaven and Earth, along with the (other) gods – the same set of divine personnel found in X.68.10cd. The focus on Heaven and Earth in both IX.68.10, and this vs. may have to do with the theme of heavenly versus earthly soma explored in these two hymns, esp. IX.68. The theme is continued in IX.70, which focuses even more on Heaven and Earth in the hymn itself, not merely the summary vs.

IX.70

On some of the difficulties in the hymn see publ. intro. Much of the problem lies in the fact that the referents of many of the crucial elements are not identified and are not easily supplied from context; it is worth noting, for example, that the word *sóma-* does not appear till vs. 7c. Framing the whole as an extended treatment of the relationship between the earthly and the heavenly soma aids in interpr. The insistence on the word *ubhé* ‘both’ (vss. 2-5) noted by Ge (n. 2–5) may underline this double vision.

IX.70.1: The opening pāda of this hymn shows the power of the ritual hic et nunc: the 2nd word, *asmai*, is unaccented, which indicates that the referent is something already in the discourse. This “something” is of course soma/Soma, both present on the ritual ground and the acknowledged dedicand of the hymn. There is no need for a prior mention. See also IX.11.1a and with *asya* IX.29.1a and IX.30.1a.

The first pāda has 11 syllables and a Triṣṭubh cadence, though the rest of the hymn (until the final vs. 10) is Jagatī. The SV parallel reads *duduhrire*, which would provide the extra syllable and the Jagatī cadence. Nonetheless Old cautions against adopting this reading too hastily, as the SV arrangers may have corrected the original RV reading (Noten ad loc., and esp. Prol. 278). See also X.44.7.

As noted in the publ. intro. (and see Ge’s n. 1), this vs. surely concerns the heavenly soma, whose real (*satyām*) milk mixture is produced for him in distant heaven. I do not think this necessarily requires the cows of pāda a to be the celestial rivers, as Lü predictably does (250); it may involve the interplay between earthly cows and heavenly milk.

The making of Soma’s garments was something of a preoccupation of the previous hymn, IX.69, esp. vss. 4–5, using some of the same phraseology, though the hymns are attributed to different poets from different lineages. Note esp. IX.69.5c *divās pṛṣṭhām ... nirṇije kṛta* “he has made the back of heaven for his raiment” and our 1c *catvāri anyā bhūvanāni nirṇije, cārūṇi cakre* “he made the four other dear worlds for his raiment” (in my tr.), both with ACC *nirṇije* √ *kṛ*. Both Ge and Lü (438, 566) take *bhūvanāni* here as “beings” (Wesen), while Re attenuates it to “essences,” but given the cosmic imagery of IX.69.5, I think that it more likely refers to Soma’s clothing himself in “worlds.” Furthermore, I am not at all sure that the substances that Ge (n. 1c, partially flg. Sāy.) considers the referent of *bhūvanāni*, namely (various) water(s) and milk, would be called *bhūvana-* in Vedic. Although German *Wesen* can cover ‘nature, essence’ in addition to ‘being’, I doubt that *bhūvana-* has the same semantic range. It does give me pause, however, that in the next vs. (2c) Soma wraps himself in the waters.

There is another problem in this little phrase – one of my own making. By my rules (“Vedic *anyā-* ‘another, the other’: Syntactic disambiguation,” in *Sound Law and Analogy* [Fs. Beekes], ed. A. Lubotsky, 1997: 111–18), 2nd position *anyā-*, the position *anyā* takes here, should be definite. I have so translated it (“the four other ... worlds”), though I cannot identify which four other worlds these would be. Neither five (1+4) or four is a standard number for cosmic divisions in the RV. The standard tr. take it as indefinite (e.g., Ge “vier andere schöne Wesen”), and I admit that an indefinite reading is less problematic (though scarcely *un*problematic). Perhaps the presence of a numeral in first position may displace *anyā-* to the right, or perhaps it even performs a quasi-definitizing function. The quantifier *viśva-* always occurs with non-initial *anyā-*, though usually pāda-final (1997: 112, 114). In any case I would now favor an alternative tr. “He made four other dear worlds to be his raiment,” though in the absence of an understanding of what the “four” are—no good solutions have so far been suggested—a definite interpr. remains a possibility.

Though Ge renders *ṛtaḥ* as “nach den Regeln,” Lü (438, 566) is surely right that *ṛtā-* here refers to hymns (Kultlieder), which are in some sense true speech. Re points out the presence of both *satyā-* (b) and *ṛtā-* (d) in the vs.

IX.70.2: The phrase *amṛtasya cāruṇaḥ* recurs in the same position in vs. 4 and must have the same referent. (See also IX.108.4, 110.4.) What that referent is is disputed. Unlikely is Lü's interpr. (237), fld. by Re, that it refers to a celestial seat: Soma separates Heaven and Earth in order to make a place for himself, from which he can create the heavenly streams. Ge tr. "Göttertrank," and (n. 2a) equates this with the heavenly Soma. In this I think he is correct, with *amṛta*- here the nominalized neut. '(drink) of immortality', hence the neut. form of the adj. *cāruṇaḥ*. (On supposed masc. *cāruṇaḥ* in VIII.5.14, see comm. ad loc.). The subject who seeks the share of the heavenly Soma is of course earthly Soma. He has the power to separate H+E because of his *kāvya*- 'poetic skill'; recall that earthly Soma was born as a *kavī*- in IX.68.5a, and it may be that what earthly Soma has going for him that heavenly Soma does not is his way with words and kinship with the human poet.

The lexeme used to express the separation, lit. the "loosening," of Heaven and Earth is *vī√śrath*. The same root is used in IX.68 and IX.69 to characterize Soma's sluffing off of his stems and twigs on his journey across the filter (IX.68.2b *śrathāyan*, IX.69.3b *śrathnīte*). Although the action here is very different from that in those two passages, it is worth noting that the same root, a not particularly common one, is used.

The instr. *mamhānā* is a bit difficult to fit into context. The stem ordinarily means 'liberality, generosity'. Ge (Lü) tr. "bereitswillig," following Gr's gloss, Re "avec majesté." If we stick with the base meaning 'liberality', I think it's possible to extend it to 'lavishly' – as in "sprinkle liberally with salt," etc. Here it would refer to the generous amount of Soma's covering.

In d *yādī* must surely be decoupled into *yādī*, as seems to be tacitly recognized by all the standard tr. "If" would not work in context.

I do not really understand the last pāda, in part because it is unclear who the subj. of *vidūḥ* is. Ge (n. 2d) tentatively suggests either the waters or the gods, Sāy. (fld. by Lü) the priests; Re's tr. implies the waters, but he alternatively suggests priests in his n. Since no priests and no gods have been mentioned so far, and the waters are found in the main cl. to which this subordinate cl. is attached, the waters seem the most likely candidate. But what is the point? Does Soma get to appropriate the waters as his garment when they come near because they know he's there (because of his fame) and recognize his seat? And which Soma are we talking about – earthly (which I weakly favor, because the waters are likely to be the ritual waters) or heavenly? The problem is compounded by the verb: the pf. *véda* is generally stative ('know'), but my tr. (and those of others) implicitly assumes a dynamic change of state, 'recognize' vel sim.; see Ge's "in Erfahrung bringen," Re's "elles eurent (re)connu (son) siège." A more stative interpr. would be possible if *yādī* is rendered 'since', not 'when'. I confess to puzzlement.

IX.70.3: The dichotomy between the earthly and the heavenly continues here, with Heaven and Earth being replaced by their proxies, gods and men – implied in b by "both races" (*januṣī ubhé*) and explicit in c in *ṇṛmṇā ca devyā ca*. The *ketú*- in pāda a also has double reference in my view: on the one hand, *ketú*- can be used of the beacon(s), that is, the ray(s), of the sun (e.g., I.50.3, VII.63.2); on the other hand, in two of the very few other occurrences of this stem in IX (IX.86.5–6) Soma's *ketávaḥ* circle around the filter, an apparent reference to the glinting soma drops. So we have a joint reference to the heavenly Soma as sun's rays and the earthly soma sparkling in its ritual progress; the two

together can pervade the two races of gods and men (b) and purify what is associated with them (c).

In d *manánāḥ* is problematic. It is a hapax, and assuming it is an *-ana*-stem, it shows aberrant accent, since such stems either have root or final accent (on the accentuation of such stems in general see AiG II.2.180–82 and on the rarity of this accent pattern 182; cf. 187 for neut. nouns with this accent). It's generally taken as a primary deriv. of \sqrt{man} in the meaning 'thoughtful'. My 'zealous' rests on an invented connection with *manā-* 'zeal', which in fact rests on nothing beyond my feeling that 'thoughtful' doesn't particularly fit the context, and in any case there are many ways to express 'thoughtful' that would not involve creating a nonce stem with a peculiar accent. But I hold no brief for my own stab in the dark and simply think that we are all missing something. On the other hand, it's likely that there is a primary or secondary connection to \sqrt{man} 'think', so most tr. fall within acceptable limits.

IX.70.4: In the first pāda we are firmly in the realm of earthly ritual soma: the grooming by ten is a clear reference (clear to those familiar with soma rhetoric) to the fingers of the presser at their task.

The question is what is happening in pāda b, and determining this depends in part on the analysis of *pramé*. This is almost universally taken as a dative infinitive or quasi-infinitive to *prá* $\sqrt{mā}$ 'measure forth'. Cf., e.g., Ge "... (fließt er), um unter den mittleren Müttern als Richtschnur zu dienen" and see, in addition to Old and Re, Lü (242–43), Scar (377–78), Keydana (Inf. 201). There are several problems with the dominant analysis: 1) the lexeme *prá* $\sqrt{mā}$ 'measure forth' is not otherwise found in the RV, except in the late X.130.3, 7, where it has been generated to *pratimā-*; 2) it is not at all clear what the pāda is supposed to mean or refer to. The standard view is that "the middle mothers" are the rains (e.g., Ge, Re; middle because they are in the midspace), but this doesn't actually help with the sense – nor does Lü's interpr. as (guess what!) die Himmelsflüsse. In fact plural "mothers" in IX, and mostly elsewhere, generally refers either to cows or to waters. None of those who favor 'rains' provides evidence for mothers=rains in the RV, and rain would be out of place in this context. Nor do I see what the "measuring" would consist of.

I suggest instead that *pramé* belongs to $\sqrt{mā}$ 'bellow' (a possibility considered, but not favored, by Scar). Although *prá* does not appear with this root in the RV, it is attested with other verbs of roaring; cf. nearby IX.77.1 *eṣá prá kóṣe ... acikradat* "This one has cried out in the bucket." Soma's propensity for noisemaking is often highlighted, indeed in this very hymn; see in the next few vss. 6b *nānadat* 'roaring again and again', 7a *ruvāti* 'bellows' (and by implication 5c *śúṣmeṇa* 'with his blustering'). Under this analysis of *pramé* the pāda can make sense in the ritual context established by pāda a: the *prá* opening b invites a verb of motion to be supplied ("[goes] forth"), depicting the journey of Soma after his pressing, which was treated in pāda a. He bellows on this journey, as he passes first among the waters and then the cows [=milk]. The "midmost mothers" are, in my view, the waters with which he mixes before reaching the milk – "midmost" because of their position between filter and milk.

As for *sácā*, as disc. ad IV.31.5 *sácā* is generally a pleonastic marker of a loc. absol. Here though I do not interpr. *madhyamāsu māṭṛṣu* as an absol. construction, I would still consider *sácā* essentially functionless, just pleonastically accompanying the

loc. phrase. If we want to assign lexical value to it, however, it could express Soma's bellowing *in company* with the mothers: waters also frequently make noise.

In c the earthly soma is still at issue – here protecting the commandments (*vratāni pānāḥ*) of the heavenly Soma, once again designated *amṛtasya cāruṇah* as in 2a; see comm. ad loc. A similar relationship between the earthly soma and the commandments of the heavenly Soma is found in the previous hymn, IX.69.1d.

IX.70.5: The repetition of a passively used part. to $\sqrt{mṛj}$, intens. *marmṛjānā-*, matching *mṛjyāmāna-* in the opening pāda of the previous vs. 4a, situates us in the same ritual context as that vs. Again Soma sets out on his journey beyond the filter, through the territory that here is configured as “between the two worlds” (*ubhé antā ródasī*).

Forms of the root $\sqrt{hr̥ṣ}$ sometimes take dat. infinitives; cf. VIII.19.19 *āgne hār̥ṣasva dātave* “O Agni, be roused to give” (sim. IV.21.9). Contrary to the standard tr., I therefore construe *indriyāya dhāyase* with *har̥ṣate*. The adj. *indriyā-* lit. ‘Indriyan, relating / appropriate to Indra’ has personal reference here (as also in the same phrase in IX.86.3): “for Indra’s suckling.”

On *śurúdh-* see, inter alia, KEWA, EWA both s.v., Thieme 1941 (=KISch 338–49), Scar 63, 464. The etymology is disputed, in part because the segmentation of this disyllable is unclear: *śur-údh* or *śu-rúdh-*. The former is supposed to be parallel to a putative **iṣ-údh-* found in the denom. *iṣudhyá-*, but I have suggested a different etym. for that word: see comm. ad I.128.6 and my 2020 “Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūidiia-*: The Aim of Praise” (Fs. Lamberterie). The latter segmentation is favored by Thieme, who derives it from **(p)śu-rúdh-* ‘das Vieh mehrend’. Scar (464) objects that we would then expect **śū-rúdh-* (like *anū-rúdh-*, *vī-rúdh-*), but that is precisely what needs to be read here (see already Gr); otherwise the cadence is the very bad – ∪ ∪ ∪ x. No other forms of the stem occur in the cadence; of the other 9 attestations, 5 are found after an early caesura, where a heavy first syllable would change the standard break ∪ ∪ – to a still very common – ∪ –; the other 4 occur after a late caesura ending with a heavy syllable, where – / – ∪ would definitely be less acceptable than the normal – / ∪ ∪ produced by reading a light first syllable. On the whole I am inclined to accept Thieme’s etymology, at least in preference to one based on a 2nd member *-udh*, and to assume an original **śūrúdh-*, at home here and possibly in the 5 forms after early caesura, whose first syllable was ultimately shortened by analogy to compds in *su-*.

IX.70.6: Both Ge and Re assume that the *ná* in a is wrongly placed and that the simile really targets *usríyah* (though they both somehow work the two mothers into it). I think rather that *mātárā ná* is the complete simile and the “two mothers” are being compared to the gapped goal “Heaven and Earth.” Cf. IX.97.13 *nadáyann eti pṛthivím utá dyām* “roaring he goes to H+E” to our *nānadad eti*. The “two mothers” as stand-ins for H+E are found in our little group of hymns in IX.68.4 *sá mātárā vicáran*.

The 2nd hemistich is difficult to sort out because it is unclear how to distribute the series of acc. sgs. in c: *ṛtám prathamám yát s^úvarṇaram*. I take all three together, with *ṛtám* modified by *prathamám* and further specified by *yát svàrṇaram*, a nominal izafe-type construction, all as obj. of *jānán*. Ge (and Re) take everything up to *yát* as obj. of *jānán*, but *svàrṇaram* as obj. of *avṛṇīta*. Lü (396) has *ṛtám* as obj. of *jānán*, *yát svàrṇaram* as obj. of *avṛṇīta*, and *prathamám* as adv. All three take *svàrṇara-* as a place name: for Ge

a place famous for its soma, for Lüders the Himmelsquell of soma. But, as disc. ad IV.21.3, *svàṛṇara-* is a name only in VIII; otherwise it seems to refer to a “realm of solar glory,” different from Heaven and Earth, as shown by IV.21.3 and X.65.4, where Heaven and Earth and various other places appear parallel to *svàṛṇara-*.

However we distribute the accusatives, each of us has to decide what this hemistich is trying to say, and I would not say that any of us has succeeded in this. With regard to my own interpr., I tentatively suggest that once again its subject is the earthly, ritual soma; in his cosmic journey to and through Heaven and Earth he recognizes the sun as “the first truth” and chooses it as his alter ego, his cosmic doublet, which resounds to his own glorification. In this paraphrase I realize that it is unclear why this is the “first” truth, and I therefore consider it possible that *prathamám* is adverbial, as Lü takes it – and suggest an alternate tr. “first recognizing the truth that is the realm of solar splendor ...” But all this is very sketchy.

IX.70.7: Once again the *nirṇíj-* (see above, ad vs. 1), here firmly anchored in the ritual here-and-now as the sheepskin filter. The bovine skin (*gavyáyī tvák*) either refers to the milk mixture or the cowhide on which the pressing apparatus is set up.

IX.70.8: Although the med. part. *punāná-* is generally passive or at least used absolutely, as opposed to reflexive *pávamāna-* ‘self-purifying’, here it must be reflexive-transitive, with *tanvām*. The construction is in fact proleptic: “purifying his body/himself (so that he/it is) spotless.”

On the isolated *-iṣ-*aor. *adhāviṣṭa* and its deriv. from $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘run’ not $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘rinse’, see detailed disc. by Narten (Sig.Aor. s.v. *dhāv*), also Ge n. 8b, Re n.

In the publ. tr. I interpr. “threefold” (*tridhātu*) as a reference to the soma at the three soma pressings, even though the three pressings are actually not terribly prominent in this maṇḍala. The same phrase is found in IX.1.8 and similar ones at VI.44.23, IX.86.46. However, this is not the standard, or even a standard, view. Sāy. thinks it refers to three additives with which the soma is mixed: water, sour milk/curds (*dadhi*, not an additive in the RV soma ritual), and milk (*payas*), though at IX.1.8 he suggests rather three (later) soma vessels: *dronakalāśa*, *ādhavanīya*, and *pūtabhṛt*, none of which is found in the RV (though *drōṇa* and *kalāśa-* individually are both soma vessels). Ge in both passages (IX.1 n. 8c, IX.70 n. 8d) suggests soma juice, milk, and water. Re tr. “est fabriqué de trois manières,” but does not pronounce on what they are. Since *mádhu* ‘honey’ is normally a stand-in for *sóma-* in this maṇḍala, “the honey is made threefold” (*tridhātu mádhu kriyate*) seems to refer to a three-part division of the soma itself. However, the similar phrase in IX.86.46, *mádaḥ pári tridhātuḥ ... arṣati* “the exhilarating drinks rushes around threefold,” gives me pause, in that it seems to refer to a single incident of soma’s rushing and is difficult therefore to parcel out to the three pressings. I therefore think that Ge’s suggestion that it refers to a liquid made up of three parts—soma juice, water, and milk—is probably correct, certainly at IX.86.46 but probably here and in IX.1.8 as well. “Three-backed” (*tripṛṣṭhá-*) in nearby IX.71.7 may belong here too and also perhaps the three heads (*trín ... mūrdhnáḥ*) of IX.73.1.

IX.70.9: The last pāda is a nice ex. of what appears to be a semi-gnomic expression.

IX.70.10: Pāda b is oddly phrased: it contains the idiom *ā pavaśva*, which ordinarily means “attract X-ACC here through your purification” (see comm. ad IX.7.8 and passim), but though it has an acc. (*jaṭhāram*), it would seem quite odd to say “attract Indra’s belly here through your purification.” It seems rather to be a variant of 9b *īndrasya hārdi ... ā viśa* “enter the heart of Indra.” And the lexeme *ā pavaśe* does seem to have a variant construction with acc. of goal. Cf. *ā pavaśva ... pavītram* IX.25.6, 50.4 “purify yourself in(to?) the filter.”

IX.71

On the structure of this hymn see publ. intro. As indicated there, it is structured as a series of more or less concentric responsions. These include *āsādam* 1a / 6b; *nī riṇīte* 2a / *ā ... riṇānti* 6c; *vārṇam ... asya tām* 2b / *vārṇo asya śā* 8a; *girā* 3c / 6c; *nāsate* 3c / 8d – as well as others less narrowly lexical. However, these responsions don’t seem to define an omphalos.

The hymn continues the preoccupation with the clothing and coverings that Soma assumes in the course of the ritual preparation, particularly in the first two and last two vss.

IX.71.1: The first pāda poses difficulties if *dākṣiṇā* is taken as a nominative., with Sāy, Old, and apparently Re, requiring the hemistich to be chopped up into very small clauses and across the pāda boundary (acdg. to Old, *ā dākṣiṇā sṛjyate / śuśmy āsādam, vēti / druháḥ rakśāsaḥ pāti jāgrviḥ*) and soma not to be the subj. of passive *ā ... sṛjyate*, against standard phraseology. The syntactic difficulty disappears if, with Ge, we take *dākṣiṇā* as an instr., leaving soma as the subject throughout. This leaves us with the question of what is meant; since *dākṣiṇā* is not otherwise found in IX (though *dākṣiṇāvanta-* occurs once, IX.98.10), we are on our own. I suggest that, since *dākṣiṇās* are distributed at the Morning Pressing, this is a reference to that ritual moment.

Once again there is a question of Soma’s *nirṇij-* as in recent hymns (see comm. ad IX.69.4–5, 70.1). The phrasing here—*nábhas páya, upastíre camvòḥ ...*—is esp. reminiscent of IX.69.5d *upastáraṇam camvòr nabhasmáyam* “... an underlayer made of cloud in the two cups” and makes it quite likely that “cloud (and) milk” (that is, cloud = milk) are the underlayer here as well. In his tr. Ge makes them both to be both the headdress (*opasám*) and the underlayer and in n. 1cd suggests that the milk is the headdress and the cloud the underlayer. But, as Old points out, the close sandhi of *nábhas páyaḥ* speaks against separating them syntactically, and *opasá-* can simply be construed with *kṛṇute* without a second object; cf. VIII.14.5 *cakrāná opasám divi* “making himself a headdress in heaven” (though Old thinks this passage is not typical). My tr. is closest to Re’s; Old’s notion that the poet heaped up all the items he had to mention higgledy piggedly (not his term), without sorting them, seems unlikely.

IX.71.2: In b the question is whether he *removes* his *asuryam vārṇam* (Ge, WEHale 95) or *reveals* it by letting it spill down (Old, Re, Scar 686, as well as publ. tr.). The lexeme *nīri* here (*nī riṇīte*) is used twice in Dawn hymns (I.124.7, V.80.6) when she “lets her breast spill over” (*nī riṇīte āpsaḥ*), in other words, when she reveals her body. The same usage is surely found here, with even more justification for the liquid imagery, since soma is indeed a liquid. Presumably with the “covering” (*vavīm*), i.e., the twigs and the

like, removed (pāda c), the golden color of the juice shows brightly – a color that could easily be associated with lordship. As Old points out, Soma is several times identified as an *ásura*-, incl. in nearby IX.73.1, 74.7. I see that in the publ. intro. I say that “Soma shed his original form and color” in this vs.; I now no longer believe that he sheds his color.

In c *pitúḥ* has two competing analyses, each of which is grammatically possible. Ge (flg. Sāy, fld. by Hale 95, Scar 341, 686) takes it as the nom. sg. to *pitú-* ‘food’ (Ge “... kommt er als Speise”). Although grammatically impeccable, this interpr. is thematically dubious: *pitú-* is not otherwise found in IX and soma is never identified as *pitú-* elsewhere. Preferable is the analysis as gen. sg. of *pitár-* ‘father’ (Re, Lü 211, publ. tr.). As Lü points out, *niṣkṛtá-* ‘rendezvous’ generally takes a gen. of the being(s) being met, so ‘of [=with] the father’ would met the expectations for such a genitive. With Lü (though without necessarily accepting all of the Lü baggage that goes with it), I think it likely that the father here is Heaven (the standard Father Heaven), once again an indication of the cosmic ambitions of the ritual Soma.

The ‘floating’ (*upaprút-*) substance he makes into his garment is universally, and convincingly, taken to be the milk mixture.

IX.71.3: This vs. is characterized by an accumulation of finite verbs, esp. in the 2nd hemistich, which contains five: ... *modate násate sād̥hate ... nenikté ... yájate*.

The cloud in b can be read in two ways, ritually as the milk mixture (see *nábhas páyaḥ* in 1c; also *nabhasmáyam* in IX.69.5d, both as ‘underlayer’; also Ge’s n. 3b), but cosmically as a rain cloud. This latter sense connects nicely with the verb *vṛṣāyáte*. Soma, as often, is depicted as acting like a bull, but this verb can also be associated etymologically or folk-etymologically (on the likely etym. connection see EWA s.v. *vṛṣan-*) with $\sqrt{vṛṣ}$ ‘rain’ (see Re’s n.). Gr and Lub both classify this form with *vṛṣāya-* ‘(make) rain’, while Ge tr. it “... wird er wie ein Bulle” (sim. Re). I consider it a pun, like the sim. form *vṛṣāyase* in X.44.4; see comm. ad loc.

Pāda c is more intricately structured than at first appears. On the one hand all three verbs, *modate násate sād̥hate*, appear to be construed with the final instr. *girā̃*; cf., e.g., Re’s “Il jubile, caresse, réussit grâce au chant,” as well as the publ. tr. However, only the central verb *násate* is regularly construed with an instr.; *modate* is found once (X.30.5) with an instr., while the relatively rare medial *sād̥hate* ‘succeeds’ generally lacks complements. Moreover, when *násate* takes the instr., it appears with the preverb *sám* – as it does in fact in vs. 8: *sám INSTR násate sám INSTR*, with the *sám* insistently repeated. In our pāda I would suggest that there is a ghostly trace of this *sám* in the opening sequence *sá modate*, which could reflect an older or underlying **sám modate*. Though this would have metrical consequences, they would be slight, since the quantity of pāda-initial syllables is always indifferent. This posited **sám* cannot be read with the immediately following verb *modate*, since \sqrt{mud} never appears with *sám* in the RV (although the rt noun cmpd *svādú-sammud-* [so accented] is found twice in AVŚ), but “skips” to the 2nd verb in the sequence. The repeated *sám* in 8d can then be interpr. as a type of poetic repair.

The verb *nenikté* ‘washes’ is of course etym. related to *nirñíj-*, the word for garment that figures so heavily in these hymns (incl. in the immed. preceding vs., 2d), but their developed meanings are too divergent to allow the connection to be represented in Engl.

pārīman- is a hapax, but, as is generally agreed (see EWA s.v., Re’s n.), it most likely belongs to $\sqrt{p\bar{r}}$ ‘fill’. It may have been formed on the model of better attested *vārīman-* ‘broadness’, which ends the next vs. and occupies the same metrical slot. Both these words function in much the same way as *tānā* ‘in its full measure/extent’, which ends vs. 2.

IX.71.4: The first hemistich contains two untethered genitives, *sāhasaḥ* and *mādhvaḥ*. The first of course evokes the common phrase *sūnū- sāhasaḥ* “son of strength,” and ‘son’ is easily supplied (see Old, Ge n. 4a, etc.). *mādhvaḥ* is more problematic. In fact Ge identifies it instead as a nom. pl. fem. (presumably to a stem **mādhū-*? though we might expect trisyllabic reading *mādh^uvaḥ*), referring to the Apsarases, who in IX.78.3 (which contains the other ex. of the phrase *harmyāsya sakṣāṇim*) do prepare the soma. Despite this parallel, his suggestion has little to recommend it: the Apsarases are not otherwise called ‘sweet, honied’, and *mādhv-* is so typed as a synonym/descriptor for soma and its gen.-abl. *mādhvaḥ* so well attested that it is hard to image how an audience could force the fem. pl. interpr. on this word with so little to go on. In the publ. tr. I sneaked it in as parallel to *sāhasaḥ*, but this is not very satisfactory. Old suggests supplying *rāsam* ‘sap’ or *ūrmīm* ‘wave’, both of which appear with dependent *mādhvaḥ*, with *rāsa-* more common. I would now tr. “(sap) of honey” (so also Re, Scar 39).

Ge (n. 4b) plausibly suggests that the “secure house” (*harmyā-*) is the plant’s husk.

The second hemistich depicts a somewhat outlandish situation: cows preparing their milk on the “head” (*mūrdhān-*) of Soma. IX.93.3 contains a similar picture: cows preparing Soma’s head with milk, using both *mūrdhān-* and *śrīṇanti* as here. Both clearly refer to the mixing in of the milk; if the mixing involves pouring the milk into a vessel containing soma, the upper surface of the soma could be considered his “head.”

With Ge (fld. by Scar 39), contra Pp., I read dat. *suhutāde* not *suhutādaḥ*. The dat. would refer to Indra, while the *suhutādaḥ* as nom. pl. would modify the cows, who are not typically eaters of oblations, or as abl.-gen. sg. would have no obvious referent. See Old’s efforts in that direction.

On *vārīman-* see disc. of *pārīman-* in vs. 3.

IX.71.5: On *bhurīj-* see comm. ad IX.26.4.

Though chariot-making is a common trope and regular comparandum in the RV, it is not usual (at least as far as I can recall) to compare the preparation of soma with the assembling of a chariot. It may appear here because the thus-prepared Soma is about to follow the track of the cow, at least in my interpr.

The grammatical identity of *jīgāt* in c is disputed. It appears to be, and is usually taken as, an injunc. to the redupl. pres. *jīgāti* (Gr, Macd [VGr, p. 342], Lub, Hoff. [Inj. 271 n. 12, but hesitantly]; by implication Ge and Re), but Old (and by implication Lü 252) suggests that it’s a nom. sg. pres. part. and, on the grounds of *pānt-* and *yānt-*, sees no difficulty with this analysis. But, of course, for a redupl. pres. the weak form of the participial suffix is expected even in “strong” forms, and is in fact found in participles to other redupl. pres. to roots in *-ā*, $\sqrt{dā}$ and $\sqrt{dhā}$, with well-attested nom. sg. m. *dādat-*, *dādhat-*. Though I accepted Old’s word (as I so often do) in the publ. tr., I now think *jīgāt* is better taken as an injunc., though this need not change the actual tr.: “As he goes, he

extends ...,” with implicitly subordinated 1st verb in a two-verb sequence. “He goes, he extends ...” is of course also possible.

The interpr. of the rest of the hemistich is uncertain, due to differing opinions about the sense and syntactic position of *padám*. With regard to its sense, *padá-* is of course multivalent: ‘footprint, track, place’ and ultimately ‘word’. As for its syntax, does it belong in the main clause beginning in c, modified by *apīcyām*, with *yád* in d beginning a new cl., or does it belong to the *yád* cl. of d? Ge follows the latter tack, with two NPs, *gōḥ apīcyām* and *padám*, in two separate clauses: “er stürzt sich auf das Geheimnis der Kuh, wenn die Andächtigen(?) seine Stätte bereitet haben,” with *padá-* = ‘place’. The Geheimnis der Kuh is the milk (n. 5c). There is nothing impossible here, but the adj. *apīcyā-* ‘secret’ invites association with *padá-*, on the basis of the semantics of the formulaic phrase “hidden track,” which is found in IX in IX.102.2 *gúhā padám* and IX.10.9 *divás padám ... gúhā hitám*. Both Re and Lü take *apīcyām padám* together, but Re interprets *padám* as ‘word’ (“le mot secret de la vache” – though ‘word’ for *padá-* is barely found in the RV if at all) and Lü as ‘place’, which he further specifies, in his usual style, as the “Milchflut im Himmel.” On the basis of the formula just cited, I prefer ‘track’, with the verbs of motion in c indicating that Soma is following this track (which, on the basis of 102.2 I think is the track through the filter) to his rendezvous with the milk.

matútha- is a hapax whose formation is unclear, but a derivation from \sqrt{man} ‘think’ is the default (see EWA s.v. *MAN*¹). It merits no mention in AiG (at least acdg. to the index thereto), but see Re’s plausible suggestion that it is connected to *mántu-*.

IX.71.6: Act. trans. (*ā*) *riṇanti*, with priests vel sim. as subj. and soma as obj., contrasts with medial (*nī*) *riṇīte* in 2, with soma as subj. and a self-involved, reflexive-type meaning.

I supply ‘stall’ as the goal in the simile on the basis of passages containing *ápi* \sqrt{i} with *pāthah* as goal (I.162.2, II.3.9, III.8.9, VII.47.3). It is not necessary, however.

IX.71.7: A complex vs. esp. in the 2nd hemistich.

In the publ. tr. I take *pāda a* as a nominal sentence with *pārā* as predicate: “far away is ...” I now think a verb of motion, almost surely from \sqrt{i} , should be supplied: “Away (goes) the ruddy poet ...” The lexeme *pārā* \sqrt{i} is matched by *parāyatī(ḥ)* in *pāda c*, by my analysis (for which see below). The reference is once again to Soma’s journey from the filter to the rendezvous with the milk.

“Three-backed” (*tripṛṣṭha-*) is probably to be interpr. like *tridhātu* in nearby IX.70.8. Pace Lü (708–9) I very much doubt it refers to his threefold heavenly Soma.

Pāda c lacks a syllable, which is not easily recovered. This simply adds uncertainty to an already problematic *pāda*. The subject is *yātīḥ*, taken by all (incl. me) as a *-ti-* stem deriv. to \sqrt{yam} ‘hold, control’. It should in origin be a fem. abstract ‘control’ vel sim., but like other exx. of the formation has acquired a personal agentive sense (on which transference see AiG II.2.637) – hence my ‘marshall’ (for awk. ‘holder-fast, controller’).

More puzzling is *parāyātī* (Saṃhitā), beginning with what its underlying form is. The Pp gives *parāyātīḥ*, which is accepted by all the standard interpr., but also possible in this sandhi context would be *parāyātī* and *parāyātīḥ*. The standard view is that the form is

composed of *parā* and the selfsame *-ti*-abstract *-yāti-* that immediately precedes it and that it also is a nom. sg. masc. referring to Soma – hence Ge’s “abseits lenkend(?),” Re’s “poussant en arrière,” etc. But the lexeme *parā* √*yam* doesn’t exist in the RV – or anywhere else for that matter. What does exist, and fairly commonly, is *parā* √*i* ‘go away, depart’. In fact in the pres. part. it is used once of the Dawns, the same Dawns who appear in our pāda d: I.113.8 *parāyatīnām ānu eti pāthaḥ* “She [=current Dawn] follows the troop of those who go away [=previous Dawns].” I suggest here that we have an acc. pl. fem. pres. part. It should be accented **parāyatīs*, but it is not difficult to imagine that its accent could have been retracted redactionally to match preceding *yātiḥ*. This pres. part. then modifies *pūrvīr uśāsaḥ* in the following pāda and is part of the simile *rebhó ná* in that pāda. I take *rebhá-* ‘hoarse-voiced (singer)’ (on which gloss see comm. ad VI.3.6) here as referring to Agni as often (incl. I.113.17, in the hymn just cited). Like Agni, Soma ‘radiates’ (√*rājati*). With Lü (708) and Gotō (1st cl., 268 n. 612) I take the verb to √*rāj* ‘shine’, not, with Gr, Ge, Re, to √*rāj* ‘rule’.

IX.71.8: On the responsions between 8a and 2b and between 8d and 3c, see comm. ad locc.

On the basis of 9b, “the glittering form” seems to be appropriated from the sun.

The sequence of tense in b is somewhat troubling. The main cl. contains a pres. *sédhati*, which seems to express a general truth. The condition on this truth is expressed by the subordinate *yātra* cl., but we should then expect either a pres. “when he lies down” or an aor. or pf. of the immed. past “when he has lain down” – as I in fact tr. *āśayat* -- but this is not a normal use of the imperfect.

Properly speaking we would expect the acc. pl. to be accented **srídhaḥ*, as it normally is. Formally this should be an oblique sg., but that analysis simply doesn’t work in context.

IX.72

In contrast to the contorted thought and metaphorical flights of the first few hymns in the trimeter group (IX.68-71), this one is relatively straightforward, with the major exception of vs. 3.

IX.72.1: The accent on *īráyati* and its juxtaposition with another finite verb, *hinváte*, marks the former as implicitly subordinate.

On the hapax *pariprī-* see Scar 337–38.

IX.72.2: The subordinating *yád* appears fairly late in its clause in b, though what precedes it all belongs to the predicate (though consisting of two NPs).

In c *yádī* must clearly be dissolved into *yád ī*, esp. given the parallelism between the subordinate clauses of b and cd.

IX.72.3: Although the major problem in this vs. is the impossible hapax *vinamḡrsáḥ* in c, the puzzlement begins with b. What does it mean that Soma goes “across the dear bellow of the daughter of the Sun” (*sūryasya priyám duhitús tiró rávam*), and in particular what is the daughter of the Sun doing here? She is found twice elsewhere in IX in the full phrase *sūryasya duhitár-*: at IX.1.6, where she purifies the soma, and IX.113.3, where she

brings soma in the form of rain, as well as, most likely, named only as *duhitár-* in IX.97.47 (for which see below). Ge (see esp. n. 3b to IX.113.3) considers her “die Rede- und Gesangeskunst selbst,” on the basis of a dubious reading of III.53.15 (see comm. ad loc.), and so in our passage he interpr. her bellow as the song of the priests, which the noisy soma “übertönt” (n. 3b); Re partially follows him by supplying “au chant des prêtres” to gloss “à la chère rumeur de la Fille du soleil” in his tr., but supplies a verb of motion with *tírah*: “(passant) outre,” though without comment. But Ge’s interpr. requires that *tírah* ‘across’ when construed with a noun referring to noise can mean something like “(sing) over, drown out.” But when independent, *tírah* always governs an expression of space, e.g., in IX *tírah rájāmsi* “across the realms” (IX.3.7–8), *tírah pavítram* “across the filter” (IX.68.2, 109.16). Tellingly, *tírah* is once used with an acc. of noise, calls, but these are conceived of spatially, as the calls of other sacrificers which the Aśvins should travel across to arrive at my sacrifice: VII.68.2 ... *gantam havíšo vītáye me / tiró aryó hávanāni* “come to pursue my offering / across the calls of the stranger.” There is, however, another, idiomatic, use of *tírah*, with the root $\sqrt{dhā}$ in the meaning ‘hide (oneself), disappear’. An example is found in the next hymn, IX.73.3 *maháh samudráṃ vāruṇas tiró dadhe* “As great Varuṇa, (Soma) has hidden himself in the sea.” Another is found in conjunction with the word *duhitár-*, identified above as another example of daughter (of the Sun) by most (incl. Ge, Re): IX.97.47 *tíro várpāmsi duhitúr dádhānaḥ* “hiding himself in the forms of the daughter (of the Sun).” In that passage I identify the “forms of the daughter (of the Sun)” as the milk, so called because it is white and gleaming like the Sun; in other words, this is yet another version of the mixing of soma with milk. And I now further suggest that that is what we have here as well – that we should supply a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ to produce the same idiom we find more clearly in the next hymn and in IX.97.47. The sticking point is then *rāvam*: what does it mean to “hide himself in the *bellow* of the daughter of the Sun”? I would suggest that it is an example of standard RVic brevilouquence as well as synaesthesia. The “bellow” refers to the characteristic sound of cows, who were already mentioned (*gāh*) in the preceding pāda, so the phrase “the bellow of the daughter of the Sun” collapses the sound and the visual appearance associated with the milk=cows. I would now tr. the hemistich “Not stopping, he goes beyond (the filter) toward the cows, hid(ing himself) in the dear “bellow” of the daughter of the Sun [=milk].”

There is comparatively little sensible to say about the hapax *vinamṅṛsá-*, though it is possible to indulge in speculation. Perhaps the only truly sensible thing to note is that it is a partial anagram of the patronymic of the poet (Harimanta) Āṅgīrasa: (*vin*)*aṅṅṛsa-*, and such phonological associations often drive the appearance of problematic forms. Sāy. glosses it *stotā* ‘praiser’ on the basis of context and a rather perfunctory stab at etymology. Ge renders it ‘arm’ on the basis of Naigh. 2.4 and, again, context: the mention of the fingers in the following pāda would support that interpr. But the word as we have it does not look analyzable acdg. to Indo-Aryan morphological structure: save for the initial *vi* there is no sign of internal structure, and segmenting the *vi* does not produce anything that looks promising on the surface. As Ge points out (*pace* Old), the context is erotic. The initial *ānu* certainly belongs with *jōsam* in the standard idiom *ānu jōsam* “according to (one’s) pleasure,” with unaccented *asmai* intervening in Wackernagel’s position. But with Ge (n. 3c) I would now also read it with *abharat* in the erotic idiom *ānu √bhr* ‘penetrate sexually, stick (one’s penis) in’, as discussed in my 1980 “A Vedic Sexual

Pun: *ástobhayat, anubhartrī*, and RV I.88.6” (*Acta Orientalia* 42) – though in that article (p. 59 n. 4) I more or less discounted this passage. Acdg. to this reading, *asmai* would be Soma and the recipient of the sexual act, while the *vinamṛśá-* is the sexual actor. As noted in the publ. intro., erotic contexts often contain slang and twisted expressions that we cannot access.

At this point we leave the realm of even shaky evidence and enter that of pure speculation. Although the word we have cited is *vinamṛśáh*, in its sandhi context it might also begin **dvi-*: *abharad vinamṛśáh* could be a degeneration of *abharad* **dvinamṛśáh*, of the type I have recently discussed in several publications (esp. “False Segmentations and Resegmentations in the Rigveda: Gemination and Degeneration,” 2021, Fs. Pinault; also “Hidden in Plain Sight: Some Older Verbal Endings in the Rig Veda, 2019, Fs. Yoshida). There are no metrical implications. If we segment off *dvi-* ‘two, bi-’, *namṛg-* (/ *naṅg-*) could be analyzed as a metathetic taboo deformation of *nagná-* ‘naked’, of a type that the ‘naked’ word has often received across Indo-Europea. A compd with the meaning ‘having two naked ...’ could refer to the arms of the presser (per Naigh. cited above, which cites *vinamṛśau* as a dual and glosses *bāhū*) or to the pressing stones, and the sexual act would be the violent pressing itself. (If there is anything to this, the phrase *nṛbāhubhyām coditáh* “driven by the two arms of men” in 5a might be a reparative paraphrase.) Even by this flight of fancy I cannot figure out what to do with *-rsa-*, whose lack of ruki is another peculiar, non-Indo-Aryan-looking feature. And just to throw in another off-the-wall suggestion, in my 1980 article I suggested that the *anubhartrī-* of I.88.6 was a veiled reference to the musical instrument, the *vīnā-*, and the beginning of our word *vinam(-ṛśa)-* could be a play on that. None of this is worth much, which is why I leave the word untransl.

Having pronounced the word uninterpretable, Re simply ignores it in his tr., though curiously provides a fem. subject, presumably the daughter of the Sun: “elle lui offrait ses charmes,” a tr. of extreme erotic delicacy.

IX.72.4–5: These two vss., in the center of the hymn, are constructed in parallel. To begin with, the post-caesura portion of 4d and 5b are identical: *pavate sóma indra te*. Both vss. also begin with a sequence of AGENT/INSTR. + past part. expressions: 4a has the compds *nṛ-dhūto ádri-sutaḥ*, while 5a has the analytic expressions *nṛbāhubhyām coditó dhārayā sutáh*, with the 1st member of the 1st phrase (*nṛ-*) and the 2nd ppl. (*sutá-*) repeated. The last of the phrases contains a non-agentive instr. *dhārayā* ‘in a stream’ that nonetheless fits the morphological template. The two vss. diverge otherwise, though the beginnings of 4c and 5c, *púram(dhivān)* and *āprāḥ* respectively have an etymological connection that would no doubt be clear to the audience. As noted in the publ. intro., no particular message seems to be conveyed by this omphalos-like structure, unless it is to put the abruptly addressed Indra in the center of the action. It is also the case that this is the first instance of $\sqrt{pū}$ ‘purify’ in the hymn, and the quintessential IXth Maṇḍala med. verb *pávate* ‘purifies himself’ appears in these two matching phrases and in vss. 7–9 (7d *pavate*, 8a *pavasva*, 9d *pavamāna*).

IX.72.4: Although both Ge and Re tr. *-dhūta-* as ‘shaken’, I prefer the more technical soma-ritual sense ‘rinse’. On $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ($\infty \sqrt{dhav}$ $\infty \sqrt{dhū}$) ‘rinse’ as a semantic

specialization of the same root meaning ‘shake’, see EWA s.v. *DHAV*¹, Gotō [1st Cl. 186–89]). This root complex is distinct from $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘run’. See further ad vs. 8 below.

Both Ge and Re take *pradīvaḥ* with what precedes; this is entirely possible and impossible to determine. Not much rests on it.

IX.72.5: On 3rd sg. *ajais* and its AV replacements, see Narten (Sig.Aor. 119–20).

IX.72.6: There is a sharp split of opinion on the grammatical identity of *punarbhūvaḥ*. Gr, Scar (361), and the publ. tr. – as well as, probably, Ge (his “immer aufs neue” is not totally clear) – take it as a nom. pl. fem. with the cows and the thoughts; Re and Lü (224–25), the latter cited verbatim by Ober (II.149), as gen. sg. masc. dependent on *sādane* and referring to Soma. Not surprisingly Lü is esp. adamant and sees the whole vs. as a depiction of Soma’s “Aufstieg in den Himmel,” where he is reborn. I am open to either grammatical analysis. The word order might favor the dependence on immed. preceding *sādane* and thus the gen. sg. interpr. On the other hand, the two other attestations of *punarbhū-* are fem. (though neither is pl.), and in conjunction with *samyātaḥ* ‘in uninterrupted array’, it could describe the constantly new, but always similar, sequence of milk-mixtures and hymns in the soma ritual. However, it is possible to adopt the gen. sg. interpr. without subscribing to the journey to heaven: Soma can be considered reborn or regenerated because the pressing has rendered a new substance from the plant. I would therefore entertain an alt. tr. “The cows and thoughts ... go together to him in the womb of truth, in the seat of the regenerated (soma),” though I favor the fem. pl.

IX.72.7: The first pāda gives a classic description of Soma as a pillar reaching from earth (specifically the ritual ground) to heaven, as the support of the latter.

In d *cāru* is probably adverbial, although, since *cāru* in the gen. appears four times with *amṛtasya* ‘(drink of) immortality’, it’s possible that we should supply neut. *amṛtam* here and tr. “purifies himself (as the drink of immortality) dear to the heart.”

IX.72.8: This is the first time in the hymn that Soma appears in the 2nd ps.; the previous 2nd ps. address was to Indra (4d, 5d). It is also the first appearance of the 1st ps. ‘we’ of the human worshippers.

The nasal pres. *dhūnoti* is generally considered to express only the ‘shake’ meaning of the root complex $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ($\infty \sqrt{dhav} \infty \sqrt{dhū}$), on which see comm. ad vs. 4 above, while *dhāvati* is considered the only pres. to ‘rinse’. Therefore the pres. part. *ādhūnvaté* should mean ‘shaker’ here. Gotō (187) seems to see in this passage a sort of play on words with *-dhūta-* in 4a, tr. “dem Preisenden und dem ‘Schüttelnden’ hilfreich seiend,” with ‘shaker’ in quotes. But I think the nasal pres. was available in a context like this to express the specialized ‘rinse’ sense; I find it difficult to believe that *-dhūta-* in 4a and *ādhūnvaté* here are meant to belong to different roots, esp. since they both refer to humans’ ritual activity in preparing soma. Note that this is the only form of *dhūnoti* that appears with *ā*, which is the standard preverb with *dhāvati* ‘rinses’. The preverb here may be participating in a type of repair: the compd. in 4a *nī-dūta-* does not have the preverb, quite possibly because **nrādhūta-* by losing the syllabic quality of its 1st member would be hard to parse and lose the symmetry with *nībāhubhyām* in 5a. The nasal pres. may

have been used here so the root syllables of the two forms could be matched (*dhū*) and also to avoid confusion with *dhāvati* ‘runs, streams’, which is quite common in IX.

IX.73

On the key to this hymn, see publ. intro. Old argues that it is a hymn for rain, but I don’t see that (nor does Ge), despite the presence of Varuṇa. Both Ge and Old properly remark on the repeated phrase *sām asvaran*.

IX.73.1: As noted in the publ. intro., I consider it significant that the repeated phrase *sām asvaran* never has an overt subject, allowing for double ref.: the soma streams roaring as they cross the filter and the priest-poets accompanying this journey with hymns. I therefore would reject the various subjects supplied here by various tr.

I interpr. *drapsāsya dhāmataḥ* as a species of gen. absol., though it could be dependent on one of the implicit subjects of the verb, namely the soma streams.

I am not entirely sure what b is telling us. In the immediately preceding hymn (IX.72.6) as well as elsewhere in IX, the “womb of truth” (*ṛtāsya yóni-*) is the place where the soma and the milk mix; the verb *sām aranta* “have joined together” invites us to interpr. this as expressing that mixture here as well. If so, then what are the “ties of lineage” (*nābhayah*)? I would tentatively suggest that it refers to the ultimate kinship of cow and bull (that is, of milk and soma). This may be supported by a passage in the next hymn, IX.74.4, where soma, after this mixture, is referred to as “the navel of truth” (*ṛtāsya nābhiḥ*). It is also possible that it’s a reference to the unexpressed double subject that “sounded in unison” in the preceding pāda – that is, the roaring soma streams and the singing poets. Their “ties of lineage” would be based on their joint vocalization, and they meet and join together on the part of the ritual ground where the soma is readied for offering to the gods. Others of course have different opinions: for Ge it’s gods and men, for Lü (234–35, fld. by Re) the heavenly and earthly soma.

In c, acdg. to Ge and Re, the *ásura* created (*cakre*) for himself three heads, either (Ge; see also WEHale 79) so he could seize the soma (probably; see Ge’s n. 1 cd) or (Re) so he could be more easily seized. By contrast, I interpr. *cakra ārabhe* as a periphrastic caus.: “made/caused his three heads to be seized,” with the *ásura-* = Soma, as also in the next hymn, IX.74.7; note also his *asuryàm váṛṇam* in nearby IX.71.2. It would help, of course, to know what the “three heads” are, but I suggest that since *mūrdhán-* is often a ‘peak’, it may be the same as Soma’s three backs (see the bahuvr. *tripṛṣṭhā-* twice nearby in IX.71.7 and 75.3). As for these expressions of triplication, see the speculations ad IX.70.8. Whatever the identity of the heads, I think the point is that, after the various stages of preparation, Soma is making himself available for ritual use, allowing himself to be “seized” and distributed into the cups. This interpr. is supported by 3d, which contains the acc. inf. *ārabham*, matching *ārabhe* here.

In d note *satyāsya* opening the pāda, which contrasts with *ṛtāsya* in the same position in b. Although I am given pause by IX.89.2 *ṛtāsya nāvam* (like our *satyāsya nāvah*), I think the two genitives must be interpr. differently. I suggest that it is Soma who is *satyá-* here: ‘trusty’ as in the publ. tr., or even ‘really present’, referring to the prepared soma on the ritual ground. Sāy’s notion that the boats are the soma cups is quite plausible, though Ge (n. 1d) prefers the hymns.

IX.73.2–4: Ge considers these vss. “doppelsinnig,” with ref. both to the priest-poets and the soma juices. This seems quite reasonable, and his individual notes are worth the attention.

IX.73.2–3: The three even-numbered pādas 2d, 3b, 3d all end with an augmented 3rd pl. redupl. aorist: *apīparan*, *avīvipan*, and *avīvrdhan* respectively.

IX.73.2: As Ge (n. 2a) points out *ahēṣata* can be either transitive (‘have propelled [soma]’) or intransitive/passive (‘have surged / been propelled’); both usages are paralleled in IX – see the passages cited by Ge. Moreover, as he also points out (and see again his cited passages), *mahiṣā-* ‘buffalo’ can refer either to soma or to the priests. Thus, to spell out the two senses: “the buffalos [=soma streams] have been propelled / the buffalos [=priests] have propelled (the soma).” The choice of both a noun subject and a verb form that allow double interpr. is unlikely to be accidental, esp. in this hymn of floating reference.

In b the subj. *venā-* can elsewhere refer either to soma (though usually in the sg.) or to priest-poets; see comm. ad VIII.100.5. The unexpressed element in the pāda is the obj. of *avīvipan* ‘have set atremble’. Both speech and soma (streams) are appropriate objects. If soma (streams) are the referent of the subject *venāḥ*, then speech is likely the object. Cf. IX.96.7 *prāvīvipad vācā ūrmīm nā sīndhur, gīraḥ sōmaḥ* “Like a river its wave, self-purifying Soma has sent the wave of speech, the hymns, pulsing forth.” If the priests are the subject, then soma is most likely the obj. Although there are no transitive forms of \sqrt{vip} that take soma as obj., note that in nearby IX.71.3 soma is the subj. of the intrans. *vēpate* ‘he trembles’.

In the 2nd hemistich again the unexpressed subj. can be priest-poets or soma streams. Both can “give birth to chant” – the priest-poets directly, soma by inspiring ritual speech -- and both can strengthen Indra’s body.

As Ge (n. 2c) appositely points out, *arkā-* can refer to the roar of the rushing soma, but it can of course also refer to the hymns of the poets. In c pāda-final *íd* seems relatively functionless: “just the chant / the chant alone” does not seem to add to the sense – unless it somehow underscores the double reading just suggested. Perhaps it’s simply there to convert a putative Triṣṭubh cadence to a Jagatī.

IX.73.3: Again, the subject of the verb in pāda a is unexpressed. On the basis of *pavītravant-* ‘provided with the filter’, one might expect that the referent is the ritual officiants, but note that the other occurrence of this *-vant-* stem in IX, at IX.101.4, modifies *sōmāḥ*. Again, I think both readings are meant.

On *tiró dadhe* see comm. ad IX.72.3. Though Ge and Old take it as transitive (Ge “... hat den Ozean verborgen (?)”), Re and Lü (268) interpr. it as reflexive ‘hid himself in x’, correctly in my view; Old explicitly rejects the reflexive interpr., but the middle voice makes this the more likely one. Old is motivated by his unconvincing interpr. of the hymn as a rain charm. In the ritual context the “hiding” refers to the post-pressing mixing of soma with water: the soma disappears into it.

In d *śekuḥ ... ārabham* “they have been able to seize” responds to 1c *cakra ārabhe* “caused to be seized.” Their connection would have been clearer in the publ. tr. if they were tr. with identical renderings of $\tilde{a}\sqrt{rabh}$, rather than “to take hold of” here. I would

therefore emend the tr. to “have been able to seize.” The questions then are what is the referent of *dharúṇesu* and how does it relate to *ārābham*? In the flanking hymns, IX.72.7 and 74.2 sg. *dharúṇa-* is the soma itself. I am inclined to take the pl. here as referring to the soma configured in parts – in particular to the ‘heads’ of 1c, which soma caused to be seized (by my interpr.). The shared verb *ā√rabh* certainly encourages this identification. The point would be that only the insightful know how to separate soma from the cleansing waters. This interpr. requires that *ā√rabh* can take a loc. of what is grasped, in addition to the more common acc. (as in 1c). For a passage with such a loc. see I.168.3 and comm. thereto. By contrast Ge takes the *dharúṇa-* not as parts of soma but as instruments in which to seize him, namely the soma cups (n. 3d; apparently fld. by Lü [268]). The use of the stem *dharúṇa-* in the sg. to refer to soma makes his interpr. difficult to sustain.

IX.73.4–5: See comm. on IX.41.1–2 on the similarity of phraseology in these two pairs of vss. These vss. usher in the use of ritual speech against a variety of enemies.

IX.73.4: The first hemistich seems clearly (at least to me) to contrast the ritual soma streams on earth (a) with those in heaven (b), though curiously it does not seem to have caught Lü’s attention. That pl. *asaścátāḥ* elsewhere (IX.57.1, 62.28) explicitly modifies *dhārāḥ* ‘streams’ makes that identification in b quite likely. See also IX.74.6 in the next hymn, with similar phraseology, where ‘streams’ is also the likely referent of *asaścátāḥ*, and at least one reading involves a contrast between earthly and heavenly soma.

As pointed out also by Ge and Re, the mention of spies in c extends the Varuṇa identification from the preceding vs.

The binding snares in d are surely the curls of the sheep’s wool of the filter that can obstruct the progress of the liquid.

IX.73.5–6: These two vss., almost in the center of the hymn, have a similar structure. Their first pādas are nearly identical: ABL ABL *ādhy ā yé samásvaran* “Those who sounded in unison from X X.” The second pādas simply further describe the unspecified subject of the first pādas, while their second hemistichs present what happens to evil beings as a result of the sounding in unison of the first. See also Old on the symmetry of the vss. and how this affects their interpr.

IX.73.5: With Sāy. and Re but contra Ge, I consider the father and mother of pāda a to be Heaven and Earth, matching that same pair in d. The reference is to the earthly and heavenly soma of 4a and b, which “sound in unison,” though also including the priest-poets, as disc. in the publ. intro. They marshal their joint power, embodied in the *māyā* associated with Varuṇa, against those “without commandments” (*avratān*); *vratā-* are of course esp. associated with Varuṇa, and by virtue of their presence in both heaven and earth can banish enemies from both places.

Note the return of *√dham* ‘blow’ from 1a. In its earlier occurrence this root simply expressed the action of the drop (*drapsāsya dhámataḥ*), but here the verb has been weaponized, as it were, against enemies.

IX.73.6: Ge interpr. *māna-* as “Tonweise” and then imposes a musical-mode interpr. on the whole 1st hemistich, an interpr. that infects Re as well. With Old I find this “zweifelhaft.” In the publ. tr. it is rendered ‘edifice’; for *māna-* as some sort of building see VII.88.5, where JPB tr. ‘mansion’. Because of the structural parallelism with 5a (see comm. above), I would prefer that this abl. phrase refer to a place. The “ancient edifice” can be both soma’s seat in heaven and the place, or seat, on the ritual ground where soma mixes with the milk and the priest-poets sing their hymns. For a similar phrase see I.107.5 *pratnām sadhástham āsadat* “he [=Soma] has taken his ancient seat.”

As for *ślōka-yantra-*, in my view it simply expresses the fact that sound – both the sound of the soma streams and the sound of the hymns of the priest-poets – guides and accompanies the soma along the journey of its preparation.

I am less certain about what to do with *rabhasāsya mántavaḥ*, in part because the exact nuance of the fairly rare word *māntu-* is not clear. (Old’s disc. here seems off the point.) Although in cmpds (*sumāntu-*, etc.) it seems to have the quasi-infinitival sense ‘... to think about / contemplate’ (see AiG II.2.663), as a free-standing noun it generally is glossed as ‘counsel, counselor’ corresponding to Old Avestan *maṇtu-* (e.g., Gr, AiG II.2.663). This works reasonably well for *mántavaḥ* in X.63.8 (All Gods), but the other two passages containing *māntu-* (I.152.1, X.32.4) are too obscure to shed any light – though ‘counsel, counselor’ is not entirely excluded. The poss. deriv. *mantumant* (3x, always voc., never accented) is compatible with a sense ‘possessing (wise) counsel’ in all three passages (esp. VI.56.4), though the case is not overwhelming, given the semantic independence of vocatives. Since *rabhasá-* is elsewhere used of the pressed soma drinks (I.82.6 *sutāso rabhasāḥ*), I take sg. *rabhasāsya* as referring to soma here as well, but this leads to a possible contradiction: if the soma streams are one of the subjects of *ā ... samásvaran*, then how can they be counselors of themselves / -ves? The phrase would work better if it applied only to the priest-poets who form the other part of the subject of the verb. Since *ślōkayantra-* also works better if it applies only to one part of the subject, namely the soma streams, I now think that pāda b involves a non-overtly conjoined NP: “those with a signalling call for their reins [=soma streams] (and) the counselors [=priest=poets] of the wild one [=Soma].” I would therefore emend the tr. to what was just suggested. This is the closest we have come to specifying who the subj. of the repeated verb is, though both NPs are so opaque that nothing much is given away.

IX.73.7: The first hemistich now begins to solve the riddle of the double reference, by situating the poets in (or at) the filter, purifying their speech like the soma streams that cross the filter.

I do not know why the Maruts appear here, esp. as spies – quite distinct from Varuṇa’s spies in 4c, as Ge (n. 7d) also asserts. Ge’s explanation for bringing in the Maruts is dependent on his musical mode interpr. of vs. 6 and therefore not helpful.

I would change the tr. of *svāñcaḥ* in d to “of lovely outlook” (from “well directed”). See comm. ad VI.15.10.

IX.73.8: The subject here is of course Soma, though tricked out with Varuṇian vocabulary (see, e.g., Lü 402–3).

It is not clear what the three filters (*trī ... pavitrā*) are; the phrase recurs in IX.97.55 with equal lack of clarity – though there all three don’t have to be fitted into the

heart. The three filters here recall the three heads of 1c, though I do not think the referents are the same.

IX.73.9: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs., esp. its first hemistich, provides the solution to the implicit riddle of the hymn, by associating “the thread of truth” (*ṛtásya tántuḥ*) both with the filter and therefore the soma streams on their ritual journey and with the tongue tip and therefore the priest-poets’ hymns. See disc. there. Note also that *ṛtásya tántuḥ* forms a slight ring with *ṛtásya yónā* in 1b.

The vs. is very similar to IX.83.1, a mystical hymn also treating the filter and attributed to the same poet.

*pavítram te vítatam brahmaṇas pate, prabhúr gātrāṇi páry eṣi víśvátaḥ
átaptatanūr ná tá āmó aśnute, śrtāso íd váhantas tát sám āśata*

The filter is outstretched for you, o lord of the sacred formulation. Advancing,
you circle around its limbs on all sides.

A raw one, with unheated body, does not attain it [=filter]; only the cooked ones,
driving along, have attained it entirely.

Note esp. *pavítram ... vítatam* matching our *vítataḥ pavíttra ā*, *prabhúr* matching our *áprabhuḥ*, and the emphasis on attainment, *ná ... aśnute, ... sám āśata*, matching our *anínakṣanta āśata*. For further disc. see also the publ. intro. to IX.83.

In d *padāti* must be a double marked subjunctive to the root aor, which is otherwise only middle. The model for its creation is not clear to me.

IX.74

Curiously, a much translated hymn, found in Doniger 121–24, Maurer 85–88, despite its difficulties.

IX.74.1: Contra the standard tr. (Ge, Re, Lü [265], Doniger, Maurer), I take b with c, not with a, since the logical relation between a and b is weak and there are two ostensibly different subjects, while c follows from b. In b Soma, configured as a racehorse, seeks to win the sun, which in its brightness is the cosmic equivalent of the milk that is the goal of the ritual soma’s journey (see also IX.76.2). In c he “keeps company with” (*sacate*) the semen of heaven (*divó rétasā*). On the cosmic plane this is the rain; in the ritual it is the water with which the soma is mixed after filtering and before the mixing with milk – though here the two acts of mixture, with water and with milk, may be conflated, with rain/mixing water referred to as *payovídh-* ‘milk-strong’. For a slightly clearer passage see IX.84.5. The fact that the verbs of b and c, *síṣāsati* and *sacate*, recur in the climactic vs. 7 (see below) supports my view of the structure of this vs.

In d most tr. take *sumatí* as ours (e.g., Doniger “with kind thoughts we pray ...”), whereas I assign it to Soma. In general *sumatí-* can belong either to mortals or to gods, and very little is at stake here – though I still favor my interpr.

IX.74.2: The soma plant as pillar connecting heaven and earth and filling the midspace (ab) gives way to the plant as sacrificer (c)—an abrupt conceptual transition somewhat jarring to modern sensibilities.

In b Re supplies both the world and the filter as complement to *paryéti*. This seems reasonable, though the verb would have slightly different senses: “encompass (the world)” / “circle around (the filter).” I would now favor making this explicit in the tr.

The standard tr. take *āvṛtā* as instr., with a variety of interpr.: Ge “nach dem Herkommen” (sim. Scar 509), Re “par le processus-rituel” (sim. Maurer), Doniger “by tradition.” I take it rather as a fem. du. modifying *ródasī* (so Gr Nachtr.).

Pāda d contains the only ex. of *sám √ dhṛ* in the RV (and one of the few in Vedic). I would now be inclined to give it a more literal tr.: “the poet holds together ...” The poet in this case is of course Soma.

IX.74.3: Pāda b is problematic, and it shares some of its difficulties with IX.69.3, which ends identically: *áditer ṛtām yaté*. See comm. ad loc. In both cases the standard tr. (incl. my publ. tr.) take *áditeḥ* with what precedes, despite its being in the repeated phrase. The other problem is the referent of the dat. part. in the phrase *ṛtām yaté*. Is it Soma, as Ge (and the publ. tr.; also probably Maurer) take it, or the mortal worshiper (Re, flg. Lü; Doniger)? Determining this depends in part on deciding what “the wide pasture-land of Aditi” means. It is possible that it refers to the expanse on the ritual ground between the filter and the place where the soma meets the milk, in which case *ṛtām yaté* could refer to the soma traversing this expanse, as in the publ. tr. However, in the other two passages containing *gávyūti-* in IX (IX.78.5, 85.8), “wide pastureland” is the reward for mortals. See esp. IX.78.5 *urvīm gávyūtim ábhayaṃ ca nas kṛdhi* “make wide pasturage and fearlessness for us.” In the other passage, IX.85.8, the phrase occurs with *sárma sapráthaḥ* “extensive shelter/protection,” which is found exactly in our vs. 1d. I therefore now inclined to think that this pāda concerns the mortal worshiper – *but* this causes problems with the 2nd hemistich, which consists only of two rel. clauses, whose referent must be Soma. If *ṛtām yaté* does not refer to Soma, there is no antecedent in the first hemistich (or in the following vs.) for the double *yáh* of c and d. Re gets out of this by supplying “(C’est le *soma*),” which does the trick but contravenes the apparent structure of the vs.; Doniger simply tr. part of d as a main cl. I find myself torn and take refuge, as often, in double reading – suggesting that at least one referent of *ṛtām yaté* is Soma, and therefore there is at least a partial antecedent for the *yáh*-s of cd.

While fiddling with pāda b, I also wondered if we should take the pattern of repetition seriously and construe *áditeḥ* with what follows, rather than what precedes. Although *urvī- gávyūti-* is found several times elsewhere – in addition to here and the two passages in IX just cited, also V.66.3, VII.77.4 – it is nowhere else associated with Aditi. And Aditi, as mother of Varuṇa among others, is associated with *ṛtā-*, so “for him who goes to the truth of Aditi” would not be a jarring expression, though its exact sense is hard to pin down. I therefore suggest an alt. tr. “wide is the pasture-land for him who goes to the truth of Aditi.” See also IX.69.3.

As multiple comm. have remarked, Soma is both associated cosmically with rain and in the ritual preparation drips like rain from the press and off the filter.

All the standard tr. render *itáūtīḥ* with the older, now obsolete tr. ‘helping from here’ vel sim., rather than ‘eternal, ageless’, on which see comm. ad VIII.99.7 and EWA s.v. However, in this passage it certainly plays off *itáh* ‘from here’ in the previous pāda in the same metrical position; note the pattern c *itá u(sr)í(yo) / d itáū(t)i(r)*, with the vowels

ũ ... i replicating the 2nd half of the word. This pattern is also anticipated by (*gávy*)*ūtīr* in b (though in a different metrical slot).

IX.74.4: This vs. sets out the identification between soma and rain most clearly (which is, nonetheless, not all that clear). In pāda a the “embodied cloud” (*ātmanván nábhaḥ*) is, on the one hand, a cloud, which produces rain (called ghee and milk); on the other, it must refer to something from which soma (called ghee and milk) is produced – most likely the soma plant, with Ge (n. 4). The milk (*páyah*) here seems not to refer to the actual milk mixture.

The word *ātmanvánt-*, which I render ‘embodied’ (others ‘living, breathing’), is found only three times in the RV, once in another Kakṣīvant hymn (I.116.3 to the Aśvins) and once in another Aśvin hymn, I.182.5. In both those passages it refers to a boat, and I suggest ad I.182.5 that this describes a boat with a cockpit, a substantial body. Here it would indicate that the cloud had enough substance (“body,” as in the Engl. metaphor) to yield significant amounts of liquid, and it may also sketch the rounded contours of a cloud.

In b, with most, I take soma to be the referent of *ṛtásya nābhiḥ*. See comm. ad IX.73.1.

The subj. of cd are in the first instance the priests, but in d esp. there is a double reading, with the Maruts pissing rain, as the priests “piss” down streams of soma by their ritual activity.

On *péru-* see EWA s.v.; ‘swelling’ is based on Lü, Phil.Ind. 751ff. -- see reff. in EWA.

IX.74.5: A variety of identifications have been suggested for the various elements in this vs. See the various tr.

In pāda a *sācamāna ūrmīnā* “keeping company with the wave” echoes 1c *divó rétasā sacate* “keeps company with the semen of heaven,” though here the presence of the subj. *aṃśúḥ* ‘plant’ seems to anchor the expression to the ritual, without cosmic dimensions. In the ritual realm it probably refers to a slightly different part of the ritual from the one depicted in 1c, despite the presence of water in both cases. There it most likely referred to the mixing of the soma juice with water, after the pressing. Here because of *aṃśúḥ* I think it refers to the initial soaking of the plant before pressing. This is supported by b, where it, namely the soaking water, swells the skin (*pīnvati tvācam*) – the skin being, in my view, the outer surface of the plant. The adj. *devāvī-* modifying ‘skin’ usually modifies soma itself (see Scar 498), referring to the juice’s journey after pressing to the place where it will be offered to the gods. Here the various moments in the ritual are collapsed: it is not the skin, but the juice pressed from the skin, that seeks the gods.

However, in b the skin may also be the waterskin=cloud from which rain is produced (see, e.g., V.83.7) and in that case the plant of a could also be a cloud, roaring with thunder.

The 2nd hemistich is bookended by verb forms of $\sqrt{dhā}$: #*dádhāti ... dhāmahe*#. This etymological connection cannot easily be captured in English because each verb has an idiomatic sense: the first for the setting of an embryo, i.e., impregnation; the 2nd in the middle in the sense of ‘acquire’. Both ritual and cosmic readings are available here.

It is not clear to me whether Aditi here has any meaningful connection with the Aditi in 3b or is simply a reference to the ritual ground.

IX.74.6: The first pāda, *sahásradhāré ‘va tāḥ asaścatāḥ* is an abbreviated version of IX.73.4ab *sahásradhāré ‘va té sám asvaran, ... aśaścatāḥ*. As in that vs. the earthly soma streams in the filter (a) are contrasted with (b) those in heaven (“the third realm” *ṛtīye ... rájasi*, comparable to 73.4b *divó náke*), though the latter are also probably rain.

The interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is complicated by the unclear hapax *nābhaḥ* in c. Numerous suggestions have been made about its meaning: clouds (von Schröder, etc.; see Schindler), openings (Old, fld. by Maurer), teats (Ge), spurts (Re), springs (Lü 285, Doniger); for disc. see Schindler, Rt Nouns, s.v. *nābh-* and EWA s.v. *NABH*. Before focusing on the sense, it’s useful to observe that *nābh* is a favorite phonological configuration for this poet: see nearly matching 4a *nābho*, in the same metrical position as our *nābho*, as well as 4b *nābhir* likewise in that position. We can also, at least in my view, eliminate the supposed root noun *nābh-* in I.174.8 from consideration and potential connection, since I take *nābhaḥ* there as a verb form. See comm. ad loc. With many (e.g., tentatively EWA), I connect *nābhaḥ* here with the root \sqrt{nabh} ‘burst’, and suggest that it has the adjectival sense ‘bursting’; the underlying noun subject is surely ‘streams’ again, referring to both the heavenly soma and the rain. The union of those two with the earthly soma is described in d. Why “four” is not entirely clear. Our passage might be illuminated by IX.89.5 *cātasra īm ghṛtadúhaḥ sacante* “four, yielding ghee as their milk, accompany him” if there is any illumination to be gotten from that passage. Cf. also I.62.6, VIII.100.10, both with fem. ‘four’ and varieties of liquid nourishment. The most likely explanation for the “four” is suggested by Ge’s tr. of *nābhaḥ* as “Zitzen(?)” (see also his n. 6c). Although I do not think that *nābh-* means ‘teat’ directly, I think the number four suggests that the streams here are likened to them: cows generally have four teats.

Another similarity between this passage and IX.89.5 leads me to alter the publ. tr. here. The four in our passage are *nīhitāḥ (ní√dhā)*, which, with Re, I tr. “hidden.” But this ppl. is paralleled in IX.89.5 by the fuller phrase *samāné antár dharūṇe níṣattāḥ* “set down within the same support,” with an almost synonymous ppl. compd *ní-ṣatta-*: *ní√sad*, also characterizing the four. There I take *níṣatta-* in its literal sense and suggest that the “same support” might be the udder itself. I now wonder if *nīhitāḥ* should also be taken literally here and mean “the four, deposited (in the udder), bursting ...”

IX.74.7–8: These two vss. seem to resolve the situation set up in vs. 1, esp. 1bc: the racehorse that was striving to win the sun (=milk) there (1b) has achieved this goal and “keeps company” with ritual speech and labor, as it did in 1c (and 5a) with more physical features of the ritual process. The repetition of the desid. *síṣāsati* from 1b in 7a and the resolution of the desid. into an achieved state via a pf. part. *sasavān* (8b) signal the relationship between vss. 1 and 7–8 – as does the repetition of *sacate* from 1c (*/sacamānaḥ* 5a) in 7c.

IX.74.7: As just noted, *yát síṣāsati* is identical to *yád ... síṣāsati* in 1b, and *śvetām rūpām* “white form” seems the equivalent of *svár* ‘sun’, the obj. of *síṣāsati* in the earlier vs. – both referring to the milk mixture. It might be possible to take *yád* here as neut. rel. with

rūpām and tr. “he makes for himself the/a white form that he is striving to win,” although I’m not sure that’s an improvement. In any case, I think the point is that Soma has attained the milk he was striving for.

Pāda b seems something of a non sequitur, and it may be that *bhūman-*, which has a range of senses, should be tr. differently (Ge tr. Natur) – although in the preceding hymn, IX.73.5, in the phrase *bhūmano divás pári* it clearly means ‘earth’. Perhaps it contrasts with *diváh* in d and should be tr. “Soma ... knows the earth” – the point being that the earthly Soma is fulfilling his ritual tasks, which will enable him to make contact with the heavenly soma and bring it as rain from heaven in d. Note that this is the first time that the word *sóma-* appears in the hymn, and the only occurrence outside of the extra-hymnic vs. 9.

As just noted, *sacate* reprises the same verb in 1c and its equivalent participle in 5a *sácamānah*. In both those cases soma was “keeping company” with a physical element of the ritual, namely water. Here the instr. express the human activity in the sacrifice: *dhī-* ‘insight’, perhaps better here ‘insightful/visionary thought’ – that is the hymn – and *śámī-* ‘ritual labor’. This acknowledgement of the human contribution to the soma sacrifice is also found in the next vs.; otherwise it is absent from the hymn, except passingly and enigmatically noted in 4cd. Through most of the hymn Soma is presented as the only actor and agent of the ritual.

The problem in this pāda is *pravát*, which has received various analyses. See esp. the possibilities laid out by Old, as well as the nn. of Ge and Re. Of the choices, I prefer the nom. sg. Since the stem *pravát-* is fem. this requires reading *sá / īm* against Pp *sáh / īm*, but this actually improves the reading, since with the masc. prn. we would expect *sá īm* in the Saṃhitā text (cf., e.g. IX.88.2). I take *sém abhí pravát* as a self-contained, almost parenthetical clause: it explains what precedes in the same pāda, namely that the hymns and physical ritual labor of the sacrificers are the way to approach Soma.

And this in turn will lead to his producing rain in d, by splitting open the cask of heaven. This “splitting” (*áva darṣat*) is perhaps thematically related to the “bursting” down from heaven (*nābhah ... avó diváh*) in 6c, if that’s what *nābh-* means. It is difficult to render the *áva* in the lexeme *áva darṣat*, but *áva* is a Lieblingswort of this poet: see 1a, 4d, 6a, as well as *aváh* in 6c – all presumably in service of the “rain down from heaven” theme.

IX.74.8: This is the triumphant realization of the quest set in motion in vs. 1. The race horse (*vājī*) of 1b reappears here having won (*sasavān*) at the finish line (*kārṣman*) what it was seeking to win (*śiśāsati*) there – namely the milk, here given a very full expression: *śvetám* [recurring from 7a] *kalásam góbhīr aktám* “the gleaming white tub anointed with cows.”

This first hemistich plus pāda c is the actual end of the hymn, and so this successful resolution of vs. 1 provides a thematic ring. Pāda c reintroduces the human ritual personnel, who propel Soma in his guise as racehorse—thus allowing the priest-poets to take some credit for the successful conclusion of the sacrifice, after having been shut out for most of the hymn. Pāda d is a snatch of a *dānastuti*, and vs. 9 seems an afterthought tacked onto the hymn. Or such is my analysis; most of the other tr. attempt to link the second hemistich with the first, syntactically and thematically. Most radically Ge (fld. by Doniger), who makes d dependent on *sasavān* in b, with c a parenthetical

intrusion. Maurer, by contrast, makes d the obj. of c, which does less violence to the order of elements but is still, to my mind, unsatisfactory. Among other things soma is the usual object of \sqrt{hi} in IX, which contains multiple exx., and so making the cows (somehow) the object violates formulaic expectations. Cf. esp. IX.106.11 *hinvanti vājīnam*, with soma identified as a *vājīn* as here.

On *sasavān*, which should be read with a heavy root syllable, see comm. ad X.29.2.

It is easy to understand the attempts of others to link d with *something* else in the vs., because it consists only of a dative phrase (*kakṣīvate śatāhimāya*) and a gen. pl. (*gónām*). However, as I just remarked, this pāda seems to be an abbreviated dānastuti, with the dāna specified and no stuti given, but the poet and would-be recipient emphatically named. In such circumstances condensed phraseology is not surprising. Ge appositely cites as parallel I.126.2 *śatām kakṣīvān āsurasya gónām* “A hundred cows of the lord (have I,) Kakṣīvant, (taken).” In our passage the “hundred” is cleverly tucked into the adj. *śatāhima-*, which otherwise presumably expresses Kakṣīvant’s proleptic *wish* for a 100-year lifespan; it seems unlikely that he is already that old.

IX.74.9: As I just noted, this vs. seems to be an extra-hymnic afterthought and is stylistically and thematically detached from the rest of the hymn. It is the only one containing 2nd ps. reference, which is insistently carried here by four vocc. (a *soma*, b *pavamāna*, c *madintama*, d *pavamāna*), an enclitic prn. *te* (a), and an impv. (d *svādasva*). It also contains only the 2nd naming of soma (cf. 7b) and the only forms of the root $\sqrt{pū}$, as well as other standards of the somic lexicon (a *rāsa-*; b *āvyo vāram*, *vī√dhāv*; c \sqrt{mrj} , *madintama*; d *indrāya ... pītāye*). In other words, all the clichés – maddeningly absent from the rest of the hymn – are trotted out, like a global example of poetic repair, as if to say, “if you were too dim to figure it out, *this* is what it was about!” It is not possible to decide whether Kakṣīvant himself added this magic decoder ring or whether it was appended secondarily. IX.74 is the last of the 9-vs. trimeter hymns, so it could have originally been an 8-vs. hymn to which the clarifying vs. was added. The fact that vs. 8 is in Triṣṭubh in an otherwise Jagaṭī hymn might indirectly suggest that, since final vss. are sometimes in a different meter from the rest of their hymn and, if we remove vs. 9, vs. 8 would be the final vs., ending with Kakṣīvant’s plea for dāna. But it is certainly possible to imagine Kakṣīvant having his little joke by supplying the key to the hymn in an appendix vs.

IX.75–79

This next group of hymns is attributed to Kavi Bhārgava, also the poet of the Gāyatrī hymns IX.47–49. They are refreshingly free of the puzzles and contortions of the first set of trimeter hymns.

IX.75

IX.75.1: The opening *abhī priyāṇi pavate ... nāmāni* is reminiscent of IX.62.25=66.1=107.23 *pāvasva ... abhī vīsvāni kāvyā* “purify yourself towards all products of poetic skill,” where in all cases I take the *abhī* ACC phrase as goal. See comm. ad IX.62.25. The point is that Soma in the course of his ritual preparation aims his

journey towards the place where the hymns are being recited – in this case the hymns mentioning his names and epithets. Like the other RVic gods (esp. Indra), Soma “grows strong” on praise. In contrast, Ge thinks that the “names” are “die Formen oder Phasen des zubereiteten Tranks”; sim. Lü (526) “Erscheinungsformen.” I don’t see why the physical needs to replace the verbal here, esp. given the emphasis on the verbal, and indeed on names, in the next vs.

On *cánohita*- see comm. ad III.2.2.

Properly speaking, *yahváḥ* should be part of the main cl., in order for *yésu* to take its proper place in the rel. cl. A slightly revised tr. would be “Delighted, the youthfully exuberant one purifies himself towards his own dear names, upon which he grows strong.”

The 2nd hemistich implicitly contrasts the heavenly soma with the earthly, ritual one of ab, as so often.

The adj. *vícakṣanaḥ* ‘wide gazing’, characterizing Soma, is a partial match for acc. *vísvañcam* ‘facing in many directions’, used of the sun’s chariot.

IX.75.2: The publ. tr. contains a clear error — ‘father’ instead of ‘lord’, for *pátih* in b — a regrettable lapse. It should be corrected to “speaker and lord,” and “father” in the publ. intro. should likewise be changed.

Old finds “tongue” as a descriptor of Soma “bizzarr,” but given how much emphasis is placed in IX on Soma’s noise-making capabilities and association with speech, I don’t see why. This vs. depicts Soma as the origin and controller of speech and name-giving, while in vs. 1 (ab) in complementary fashion he aims towards and is nourished by the names given him by others, or so I interpr. it.

As Ge points out, cd is (partially) illuminated by I.155.3cd, whose d pāda is identical to ours: *dádhāti putró ávaram páram pitúr, nāma ṛtīyam ádhi rocané diváḥ* “The son [=Viṣṇu] sets in place the lower and the higher (names) of the father and the third name in the luminous realm of heaven.” In both cases the entities in question in the c pāda are surely Heaven and Earth (so for our passage both Ge [n. 2cd] and Re). The “luminous realm of heaven” must be the realm beyond the nearer sky; the “third realm” (*ṛtīye rájasi*) appears in the preceding hymn (IX.74.6), though the same geographical area may not be in question. In any case Soma’s ability to name these cosmic entities emphasizes his global mastery of speech, and the paradox of the son naming his parents makes the wonder all the greater.

IX.75.3: The same phrase *ṛtásya dohánāḥ* is found in I.144.3. In our passage I think it refers both to the cows=milk and to the poets.

On *tripṛṣṭhá*- see disc. ad IX.70.8, 71.7.

I take *ví rājati* with both ‘shine’ and ‘rule’.

IX.75.4: On *cánohita*- see comm. ad III.2.2.

In IX.98.9 Ge suggests that the world-halves (*ródasī*) are the jaws of the soma-press, which could account for their being called his mothers (*mātárā*) here.

On *samáyā* (*ví dhāvati*) see comm. ad I.113.10.

IX.75.5: Ge (n. 5c) insists that *āhanāso vīhāyasaḥ* is gen. sg. with *te*, rather than nom. pl. with *mādāḥ* (Gr, Re, publ. tr.). That is of course possible, but the difference is fairly minor whether the phrase modifies Soma or his exhilarating drinks.

IX.76

As noted in the publ. intro., the martial tone is reminiscent of that of another of Kavi Bhārgava's productions, IX.47, though there is little or no overlap in phraseology.

IX.76.1: On *pājas-* see comm. ad I.58.3. For a god making or assuming his *pājas-*, see, with medial forms of \sqrt{kr} , IV.4.1 *kṛṇuṣvā pājaḥ* (of Agni) as well as IX.88.5 *vṛthā pājāmsi kṛṇute nadīṣu*, identical to our passage except with a Triṣṭubh cadence, and, with $\tilde{a}\sqrt{dā}$, IX.68.3 *pāja ā dade*. Presumably in our passage and 88.5 it depicts the swelling of the soma stalks in the waters.

IX.76.2: The participial phrase *svāḥ sīśāsan* “striving to win the sun” is a match for *svāḥ yād ... sīśāsati* in nearby IX.74.1 “when he strives to win the sun” (also IX.7.4), where I suggest that the sun stands for the gleaming milk with which the Soma will unite at the end of his ritual journey. This association would be emphasized in our passage by *gāvīṣṭiṣu* ‘in the cattle raids’, with cattle standing for milk, as usual. For further on sun=milk see comm. ad vs. 4.

As Ge points out (n. 2d, not reflected in his tr.), *ajyate* has a double sense, since it can be the passive both of \sqrt{aj} ‘drive’ and $\sqrt{añj}$ ‘anoint’. Both are appropriate here.

IX.76.3: The extreme dislocation of hemistich-initial *indrasya* from *jaṭharēṣu* on which it depends must result from the desire to match the initial *indrasya* of 2c.

The simile-marking particle *iva* is late here, since the simile must consist of *vidyūd abhréva*.

On the quasi-independence of *śásvataḥ* in the NP *vājān ... śásvataḥ* see comm. ad X.48.1.

IX.76.4: The hapax rt noun cmpd *ṛṣi-śāḥ-* ‘vanquishing the seers’ (or, as Scar [600] suggests as an alternative, ‘unter den Ṛṣis siegreich’) is, on first glance, a surprising collocation, since we generally expect \sqrt{sah} to take more obvious enemies as object. Yet, of course, poetic competition is an important feature of RVic culture, and the rest of the vs. asserts Soma's dominance in this competition – esp. the final, decisive *ásamaṣṭa-kāvyaḥ* ‘whose poetic skill is entirely unattainable’, but also his role as “father of thoughts” (*pitā matīnām*), and his ability to make “the vision of truth” (*ṛtāsya dhītīm*) bellow (presumably louder than the other ṛṣis can). The point of the cmpd might be clearer if tr. “vanquishing the (other) seers”; as Scar points out, Soma is elsewhere identified as *ṛṣi-*.

ásira- in c is a hapax. It is plausibly derived from \sqrt{as} ‘throw, shoot’: see, e.g., Gr., AiG II.2.361, as well as, more hesitantly, EWA s.v. *As²* – with a metaphorically transferred meaning ‘ray, beam’ < ‘missile, spear’; cf. Engl. ‘shaft’ for both shaft of a spear or similar weapon and shaft of light. Say. glosses it first with *kṣepakeṇa* to $\sqrt{kṣip}$ ‘throw’ and then with *raśminā*, the more usual (also metaphorically transferred) word for the sun's rays. Gr's gloss combines the literal and the transferred sense in

‘Strahlengeschoss’, while Ge (“Strahl”) and Re (“rayon”) render only the transferred sense. Mayrhofer (EWA 144–45) is more tentative: he questions the connection of the word to the ‘throw’ root, and his gloss also expresses doubt about the transferred meaning: “‘Strahl’ (<‘*Geschoss’ [der Sonne]?).” On both etymological and contextual grounds – what does it mean to “be groomed by the lance/ray of the sun”? – it is worth asking what this hapax is doing here. Acdg to Lü (704), the sun is the heavenly *pavitra-* and so naturally its beam(s) would perform the purification of soma. Although I agree that the sun can sometimes be equated with the filter (see, e.g., IX.83.2), I doubt if that’s what’s going on here. For one thing, the root \sqrt{mrj} is not generally used for purification across the filter (though it can be; cf. e.g., IX.86.6, 107.11), but refers rather to the ritual operations involving water (esp.) and milk; cf., e.g., IX.68.9 *adbhir góbbhir mrjyate* “he is groomed with waters, with cows.” Moreover, the parallelism with *raśmí-* is not as exact as is implied; most importantly *raśmí-* is almost always plural, whereas our form is sg., and soma is never “groomed” with/by even pl. *raśmíbhīh*.

Bearing in mind that I interpret “seeking to win the sun” in 2b as expressing Soma’s intention to unite with the milk mixture (metaphorically the sun), as well as the fact that \sqrt{mrj} ‘groom’ can be construed with an instr. referring to the waters and milk used to prepare the soma, we can now consider a different interpr. of *sūryasyāsireṇa*. It does not depict the sun’s (single) ray as filter, but the “sun’s shaft” (or even “sun’s shot”) as the milk infused into the soma – referring either to the sun’s light (‘shaft’) as gleaming milk or the infusing itself (‘shot’). The latter would have the merit of requiring fewer semantic steps by simply using the literal meaning of the root in an extended sense; cf. English ‘shot’ used of a small amount of usually powerful liquid, generally alcohol, also (for slightly different reasons) used of espresso. Once this interpr. is considered, the reason for the creation of the hapax becomes apparent (at least to me). The technical term for the milk mixture is *āśír-* (see nearby IX.75.5); our *ásir-* is phonologically very close, and I would suggest that it was created as a pun on the standard term. In fact the phonology might be closer still: the Samhitā text reads *sūryasyāsireṇa*, which is resolved by the Pp. into *sūryasya ásireṇa* (the extra syllable is metrically necessary); **āsireṇa* would also be possible. However, unfortunately I think this latter reading unlikely because it would convert the standard break after late caesura, two light syllables, into a far less common one with heavy - light. Another factor that may have contributed to the creation of this hapax is the presence of *ṛṣi(-ṣāḍ)* in the same metrical position in the preceding pāda, with *ṛṣi-* a scrambling of *ásir-*.

Not much changes in the tr., though I would now emend it to “He who is groomed by a “shot” [/a shaft] of the sun [=milk] ...” However, this analysis shows once again that when encountering a hapax we should not just seek a plausible meaning and a plausible etymology, but try to figure out *why* the hapax was introduced in the passage, which often opens the way to better understanding of the other two questions.

IX.76.5: The *sá* in c with 2nd ps. reference (*sá ... pavase*) violates the rule that such reference is found only with imperatives. (See my “Vedic ‘sá figé’: An inherited sentence connective?,” *Historische Sprachforschung* 105 [1992] 213–39.) I think it likely that it has been modeled on the numerous *sá (... pavasva* exx. in IX (15 by my count, e.g., nearby IX.72.8=107.24); an imperative would in fact work better with the *yáthā* purpose cl. in d. The indic. *pavase* may have been substituted because **pavasva* would produce a

very abnormal break. An almost identical pāda is found in IX.97.32 *sá índrāya pavase matsarāvān*, inexpertly adapted to Triṣṭubh (note the bad cadence [though see comm. ad loc.]).

The splv. *matsaríntama-* is somewhat oddly formed, with the possessive suffix *-ín-* added to an adj., with no change in sense. The stem occurs 4x (once in a repeated pāda), always at the end of a pāda. AiG II.2.340 considers it the equivalent of **matsara-tama-*, based on *madín-tama-*. Given the metrical unfavorability of the stem **matsaratama-*, this seems a plausible explan.

IX.77

The word *sóma-* is absent from this hymn, although four of the five vss. (all but c) open with a nom. sg. masc. referring to the soma and inviting that word.

As mentioned above, Kavi Bhārgava briefly treats the Somaraub here (vs. 2) and in his dimeter hymn IX.48 – a myth otherwise rarely mentioned in Maṇḍala IX.

IX.77.2: The gen. obj. of *ā yuvate, mádhvaḥ*, is hard to interpret; it certainly doesn't seem likely to be a partitive.

I don't know what to do with the particle *āha*, which is oddly positioned in the middle of a pāda interrupting an NP. Re's "d'un coeur, ah! rempli de crainte" is appealing, but *āha* doesn't ordinarily have such an exclamatory value (though see comm. ad VII.20.2), as far as I can see – and it's a little too conveniently superimposable on our (both French and English) "ah!"

IX.77.3: Both Ge and Re take *pūrvāsa úparāsaḥ* as temporal designations: the earlier and later drops. If so, it is hard to understand how we can order both types (esp. the earlier ones, which should be beyond our control) to run. I prefer to see them as spatial. For such a usage cf. V.31.11 *pūrvam karad úparam* "(what is) in front ... he will put behind."

As has long been known (see Old, citing Barth., as well as EWA s.v.), *ahī-* is etymologically identical to Aves. *azī* (OA, YA), which characterizes cows – contra Gr's 'Schlange'. It's not clear to me why Ge and Re seem so uncertain about it, esp. as Ge cites Aves. *azī* in n. 3c.

IX.77.4: As noted in the publ. intro., the vs. seems to contain a paradox, whereby the masc. Soma conceives an embryo, most likely of himself. See Ge's n. 4c.

The hapax *urubjá-* is puzzling. Gr's suggestion that it derives from a phonological deformation of **ud-ubjá-* seems reasonable, esp., as Mayrhofer points out (EWA s.v. *UBJ*), with the interference of *urú-*. Verbal forms of *úd√ubj* are found in AVŚ and TS.

IX.77.5: Soma is notably identified with Varuṇa and Mitra in this vs. – the former because he cannot be deceived by the crooked (*hurúg yaté*), the latter because (implicitly) he mediates between the ritual communities (*vijána-*).

With Mayr. (EWA s.v. *híruk*), I take *hurúk* to \sqrt{hvar} 'go crookedly' (also in a moral sense). The expression *hurúg yaté* contrasts with *rtám yaté* "going to truth" in the same metrical position in nearby IX.69.3, 74.3 and four other times.

IX.78

A remarkably straightforward hymn. Oberlies tr. it in Relig. RV II.125.

IX.78.1: Pace Gr, who identifies it as fem. nom. sg., the adj. *tānvā* is most likely acc. pl. n., parallel to *riprām*. On the basis of IX.14.4 *jáhac charyāṇi tānvā* “leaving behind the stems that belong to his body,” *śaryāṇi* should be supplied, as indicated by Ge (n. 1c) and Re.

IX.78.2: A causal rendering of *hí* in c, as in the publ. tr., is somewhat jarring: it is hard to see how cd provides the causal basis for pāda b or for ab together. Moreover the thousand horses in d is a surprising number to be crowded into the soma cups and the identity of those horses is not clear. Although the standard tr. (Ge, Re, as well as Ober [II.125/160] and the publ. tr.) all take c and d as parallel and both under the domain of *hí*, I would now separate c and d, with d a main clause for which c supplies the causal basis. The amended tr.: “because there are many courses for you to travel, there are a thousand fallow bay horses sitting in the cups.” The point here, I think, is that the poured soma forms multiple rivulets as it crosses the filter, and these separate drippings of soma are conceived of as horses as they go into the cups.

A minor question in d is the grammatical identity of the rt. noun *camūśadaḥ*, which can be gen. sg. or nom. pl. Both Ge and Re take it as gen. sg., referring to Soma; the publ. tr. and Oberlies as nom. pl.; Scar allows either and doesn’t decide. In fact it doesn’t really matter and the other attestations, both sg. (1x) and pl. (4x) refer to soma (drinks), which in this case could be either the metaphorical horses or a supplied “you [Soma].”

IX.78.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the Apsarases, who are rarely mentioned in the RV, unusually stand here for the waters with which the soma is mixed. Although “sitting within ... have streamed” seems slightly contradictory, it must be that they first streamed and then took their seats in the cups. This could be conveyed by a tr. “The Apsarases ..., (now) sitting within, streamed towards Soma.”

On the phrase *harmyāsya sakṣāṇim* “conquerer of the secure house,” found also in IX.71.4, see comm. ad loc.

Pāda-final *sakṣāṇim* echoes *manīṣiṇam* at the end of pāda a, in addition to participating in another phonetic figure with b and d, as noted below.

In d it is unclear what *ākṣitam* modifies, since both *sumnām* and *pāvamānam* are possible. Both Ge and Re take it with the former (e.g., “une faveur impérissable”), while Ober (II.125) and I take it with the latter. Although “imperishable favor/grace” might seem closer to the famous expression “imperishable fame,” word order favors the connection with *pāvamānam*, as does an expression like IX.26.2 *sahásradhāram ākṣitam* “the imperishable one of a thousand streams,” definitely referring to soma. I would note, however, that the word order argument may be weak, since *ākṣitam* may have been placed in final position for the phonological echo of pāda-final *akṣaran* (b) and *sakṣāṇim* (c). The stem *ākṣita-* is also almost always pāda-final (15 out of 18 occurrences). Of course, it would be possible to read the adjective with both acc.

IX.79

IX.79.1: I take the loc. *brhāddiveṣu* in b as referring to the gods, who inhabit lofty heaven (so also Ober II.60; see also alternative in Ge’s n. 1b). I take it as referring to the destined recipients of our pressed soma. The standard view is rather that it is a personal name and refers to the human pressers, to be construed with *suvānāśaḥ* (e.g., Klein DGRV I.241 “being pressed among the Bṛhaddiva’s”). But this PN is only certain in a single passage in the late RV, X.120.8–9, in the sg.; elsewhere, and esp. in the plural, the stem refers to gods or other heaven-located substances. Cf., e.g., II.2.9 *amṛteṣu ... brhāddiveṣu*. Mayr (Pers.Nam.) considers the PN possible here (“vielleicht”), but does not commit to it.

The real puzzles in this vs. are found in the 2nd hemistich, which has been much discussed, esp. by Old. See also Ge, Re, and Hoffmann (Aufs. 363). Before considering the problems of interpr., we should first note that pāda c is metrically disturbed: it has only 11 syllables in this Jagatī hymn, and in order to produce the proper Jagatī cadence the final *ó* in the pāda-final sequence *iṣó árātayaḥ* must be read long, despite its position in hiatus. (A Triṣṭubh cadence for this 11-syl. verse is excluded.) There is no obvious way to fix either the undercount or the anomalous long *o*. Note in particular that nothing can be added in the opening *ví ca náśan na(h)*, because it is an opening of 5 and the enclitic *naḥ* must be part of it, since pronominal enclitics never follow the caesura. So a potential easy fix is impossible: to read **náśan[ta] na(h)*, with the verb matching *naśanta* in b but having undergone a species of haplogy. (For a different possible fix, see below.) It is therefore possible that pāda c is corrupt in some way. On the other hand, the poet may have wanted to draw attention to the similar openings—*x x náśan na(h)* and *x x naśanta*—by this metrical disturbance.

In order to approach the sense of the hemistich there are a number of clues we should note: 1) the near-coincidence of verbs: (*ví*) *náśan* / *naśanta*; 2) the accent on the first verb, which must result from the subordinating use of *ca* as ‘if’ here; 3) several parallels, which unfortunately pull in different ways. See esp. X.133.3 *ví śú víśvā árātayo, aryó naśanta no dhíyaḥ*; also II.35.6 *nārātayo ví náśan nānṛtāni*. A feature that we might expect to be a clue, the different voices of the two verbs, act. (*ví ...*) *náśan*, med. *naśanta*, does not turn out to be helpful, since *-anta* replacement is always a possibility in 3rd pl. injunctives, and *naśanta* also immediately precedes *sániśanta* and could have adapted itself to that verb. The two passages just cited, with (*ví ...*) *náśanta* and (*ví*) *náśan* respectively and at least possible identity of meaning (see below), demonstrate the problem with using voice as a criterion.

Old’s analysis of the situation, incl. the close parallel in X.133.3, is acute, and he suggests several quite different solutions, without, however, deciding for one. His first question is whether the two verbs belong to the same root. If so, the likely one is \sqrt{nas} ‘reach, attain’, but, in his opinion, this makes trouble for pāda c; moreover, in X.133.3, which he considers an abbreviated reworking of our passage and in a way its oldest commentary, an affiliation with \sqrt{nas} ‘disappear, perish’ makes better sense for the first part of the clause (“all hostilities will disappear”). Old’s first stab at interpr. thus assumes that the two verbs belong to different roots, with ‘disappear’ in pāda c and ‘reach, attain’ in d: “Hinweg mögen schwinden von unsrer Nahrung die Kargheiten: so mögen denn die Geizigen [Akk.] treffen.” This interpr. must take *iṣáḥ* as an ablative sg., *aryáḥ* as an acc. pl., and supply *árātayaḥ* in c as the subj. not only of *ví ... náśan* in c but also of *naśanta* in d. What doesn’t seem sufficiently represented in his interpr. is the subordinating value of conditional *ca*. Old’s second alternative interpr. takes into account the missing syllable in

c (though not the problematic quantity of *o* in hiatus). He suggests remedying the undercount by inserting a negative after the caesura: *vī ca náśan *ná na ...*, which would avoid the problem of an enclitic following the caesura we noted above. In his emended pāda there would be an opening of 4; accented neg. *ná* would immediately follow and host the enclitic. Haplology would easily account for the transmitted text. The sequence with negative would be very like II.35.6 cited above: “hostilities shall not reach [him].” This solution is very clever, and it would allow both verbs to belong to the same root, ‘reach, attain’. He paraphrases (but doesn’t tr.) it as “die *árātayaḥ* sollen nicht uns treffen; wir wollen die *arī* treffen.” But the problem once again is that he does not represent the conditional *ca*. “If the hostilities do not reach us” is significantly worse than his paraphrase. He himself is disturbed by the unusual position of *ná* (though I think that could be acceptable) and the fact that X.133.3 clearly means something different, perhaps because this passage was misunderstood by the poet of X.133.

My own—quite uncertain—interpr. is that the two verb forms belong to different roots, just as I take the single verb *naśanta* in X.133.3 as a pun involving the same two roots. But, unlike Old’s first alternative, I think the *first* verb is ‘reach’ and the 2nd ‘perish’. I take *iśāḥ* as acc. pl. (as do Ge, Re, Hoffmann, Klein, and Ober, in their diff. interpr.), even though root-accented **iśāḥ* is expected (though ending-accented acc. pl. in this stem is not rare). I then supply ‘refreshments’ as subject of *naśanta* in d, with *aryáḥ* gen. sg. depending not only on this supplied subj. but also on the *árātayaḥ* of c. The point is: if the stranger’s hostilities go after our things, theirs will be destroyed as well. It is also possible that the subj. of *naśanta* in d is the same *árātayaḥ*: if their hostilities come after us, those hostilities are doomed. As I just said, I don’t have a high degree of certainty about the correctness of this interpr. Those produced by the others just named, which all assign both verbs to ‘reach, attain’, are certainly not out of the question. Unfortunately I can’t endorse either of Old’s alternatives, however.

IX.79.1–2: The opening of this vs. *prá ṇo dhanvantv índavaḥ ...* echoes that of vs. 1 X *no dhanvantv índavaḥ, prá* but with the preverb in tmesis relocated to a more standard, preverbal position.

Although (*a*)*codásah* (1a) and (*mada-*)*cyútaḥ* (2a) obviously belong to different roots (\sqrt{cud} , \sqrt{cyut}), they have similar semantics, ‘impel, urge on’ and ‘arouse, set in motion’, and similar phonology. So the negated *acodás-* ‘without impulsion, without being impelled’ and positive *mada-cyút-* ‘arousing exhilaration’ (by my interpr., but see below) function as a virtual polarized pair, describing the drops as not themselves needing any impetus to move, but providing impetus to others. A pseudo-etymological figure.

IX.79.2: The rt. noun compd *mada-cyút-* (on which see also above) is taken by Ge as having passive semantics (“rauscherregt”), in contrast to the active transitive semantics of my ‘arousing exhilaration’ and Re’s “mouvant l’ivresse.” Scar (128–29) allows both for the compd in general, without deciding on particular passages. Since, all things being equal, rt noun compds to roots with transitive value tend to display that (type *vṛtra-hán-*), and most of the other *-cyút-* compds are transitive (*acyuta-cyút-* ‘shaking the unshakeable’, *parvata-cyút-* ‘shaking the mountains’), a transitive interpr. seems to me the default. For the five attestations of *madacyút-* in IX, all modifying soma or soma drops, as here, a

transitive interpr. is the more natural: soma is, after all, what produces *máda*-. However, the cmpd. elsewhere also modifies Indra or similar entities, who are more likely to *be roused* to exhilaration than to rouse it (e.g., I.51.2), and the passive value should be allowed there. Indeed in I.81.3, by my interpr., there are two potential referents (Indra / soma) and two different readings of the cmpd.

Pāda b poses problems: what is the disjunction signaled by *vā*; where does the rel. cl. with *yébbhiḥ* begin; what is the referent of *yébbhiḥ*; how should *dhánā* be construed? Ge starts the rel. cl. with *yébbhiḥ*, leaving the disjunctive phrase *dhánā vā* in (or attached to) the main cl. Since there is nothing in that cl. with which to construe *dhánā* he must supply a verb parallel to *dhanvantu*: “... sollen rinnen ... oder die Kampfpreise (gewinnen).” Sim. Klein, DGRV II.205. There is nothing objectionable about this solution – ‘win’ regularly takes *dhána*- as obj., and in fact soma or its equivalent is sometimes the subj. Cf., e.g., IX.65.9 ... *te ... víśvā dhānāni jigyúṣah* “of you [presumably = soma] having won all the stakes” (though it’s worth noting that the exact half-vs. is found in VIII.14.6, applying to Indra). But nothing in the context invites or supports supplying a verb here. Re’s solution is more economical, in using *dhánā* as an alternative subject for *prá ... dhanvantu*, though running forth is less natural action for stakes to perform. Ober (II.248) also takes the disjunction as belonging to the main cl., but with *dhánā* as an alternate goal for the running drops: “... sollen vorwärts laufen oder hin zu den Siegespreisen.” All of them, Ge (/Klein), Re, and Ober start the rel. cl. with *yébbhiḥ* and make its antecedent *dhánā*. By contrast, I take all of pāda b as the rel. cl. (the position of *yébbhiḥ* is of course perfectly compatible with this), with *dhánā* a 2nd acc., of goal (rather like Ober), with *junīmāsi*. The antecedent of *yébbhiḥ* is then the soma drops, which give us (and the horses) the energy to race to the prizes.

Ge, Re, and Ober take c with d. This is certainly possible, but I prefer taking it with b, to express the potential hazards and dirty-dealing facing our horses in this race.

IX.79.3: Both *árāti*- and *arí*- return from 1cd, but given the uncertainties in that passage, the return is not terrible useful.

What is most notable here is the carefully balanced construction of ab, with double *utá* opening the pādas, the following parallel but contrastive gen.-abl. expressions *svásyā árātyā(h) ... anyásyā árātyā(h)*, and finally the similarly parallel but contrastive nominal clausettes *arír hí śá(h)* and *vīko hí śah*. It is (almost) impossible to escape concluding that the poet was contrasting two similar but very distinct sources of hostility. Unfortunately, Thieme (Fremd. 45–46) does escape this conclusion, deciding that the two gen. phrases and the two annunciatory nominal clauses are merely a way of generalizing to “everybody.” His tr. simply ignores the signposted construction of the two pādas and jumbles the parallel phrases together. This was not Thieme’s finest hour. Without an *idée fixe* to prove (as was the case of Th), the construction imposes an analysis: a hostile person belong to our side is an *arí*, one on the other is a wolf. Now elsewhere in Indo-European and indeed elsewhere in the RV, “wolf” can be used of a human who is outside social boundaries, an outlaw (see, e.g., my “Function of Animals in the RV, 2016: 208–9). Here the outlaw is contrasted with the *arí*-; with Th. I take him as a “stranger,” but, against Th., as a stranger who belongs to the larger Ārya community, who is “one of ours.” For a clear presentation of this view of the *arí*- as a member of the same culture, see JPB, Ādityas, pp. 150–54, esp. 152, in great part flg. Dumézil contra Th. The hostile

person outside of that community, the “other,” is a wolf. With Th. again, I’d say that the ultimate intent of ab is universal, to counter the threats from any possible source, but this universality is achieved by an implicitly conjoined contrast between the two opposites that make up the whole, a merism.

By my rules (“Vedic *anyá-*, Fs. Beekes 1997), *anyá-* here should be definite because it is in non-initial position – hence “the other.” This works well with the interpr. just elaborated, that the two contrastive phrases define the whole.

One further syntactic issue: what is the gen.-abl. in *svásyā árātyā(h) ... anyásyā árātyā(h)* doing? Ge supplies “protect” to govern an abl., on the basis of VIII.71.1 *pāhí vísvasyā árāteh*. This is certainly possible – and is endorsed by Old. However, because of the starkness of the expression, which underlines the contrasts between each matching element, I am reluctant to introduce any extraneous words and take the two phrases as independent gen.-abl. in loosely causal/circumstantial usage. Not very satisfactory, I admit.

IX.79.4: On this vs. see publ. intro.

The first pāda is problematic. The standard interpr. is that Soma’s navel is tied either to the navel in heaven (Ge, Old, Ober [II.13], Kü [242]) or Soma’s navel in heaven is tied to our navel (Re). E.g., Ge: “Du, dessen höchster (Nabel) an den abel im Himmel geknüpft ist.” Before even considering what this would really mean, there is a simple grammatical problem: this interpr. (and those of the others) requires masc. *paramāḥ* and *yáḥ* both to refer to fem. *nābhi-*. Disc. of this gender clash is remarkably cavalier. Old suggests that *nābhi-* may be masc. here; Ge (n. 4ab) registers this suggestion but also suggests that the synonym *bāndhu-* could be supplied in substitution (not a bad idea, though *bāndhu-* is rare in the RV and doesn’t seem to show up in the vicinity of *nābhi-*). The push to have two forms of *nābhi-* in this pāda is clearly based on very similar IX.10.8 *nābhā nābhim na ā dade* “He has bound his navel to our navel” and the idiom *sám/ ā √ dā* ‘tie’ with two forms of ‘navel’, on which see comm. ad I.139.1. There is another slight problem, that the rel. prn. *yá(h)* is rather too deep in its clause, if the whole pāda forms the rel. cl., as in most interpr.

I don’t have a good solution to this pāda. I would first point out that init. *diví te* matches up with init. *pṛthivyās te* in b, and at least the disturbance in word order in the pāda may result from the desire to locate heaven and earth in parallel positions. Otherwise, instead of assuming a masc. *nābhi-* I supply ‘form’ with the masc. *paramó yáḥ* in the publ. tr., but there is no particular support for this, and if I was thinking of *rūpá-* at the time, this doesn’t work because *rūpá-* is neut. There are no masc. nouns that are regularly qualified by *paramá-*, while *nābhi-* is qualified as *paramā* (with a fem. form) in X.61.18. The upshot is – I’m fairly sure my rendering is wrong, or at least not right, and I’d be inclined to go with the standard, despite the distressing gender clash: “It was in heaven, to its navel, that your highest (navel) was bound.” As to what this means, presumably it is another instantiation of the “heavenly soma” trope: no matter that the physical plant is earthbound (as in pāda b), it has a heavenly analogue. One thing that is clear is that *ādadé* belongs to *√ dā* ‘bind’; see comm. ad I.139.1 and Kü 242.

Fortunately the rest of the vs. is relatively straightforward. The “fingers” that grow on the earth are the parts of the plant: if soma is ephedra intermedia (which grows in the Himalayas), it has slender upright shoots that could be conceived of as fingers.

IX.80

IX.80.1: The rhyming verbs *pavate* and *havate* take identical positions in pādas a and b respectively. See also 2d *pavase*, 3a *pavate*, 3b *śrāvase* in the same position.

Pāda c compares soma to a thunderstorm, producing a roar like Bṛhaspati's while flashing forth (*vī didyute*) like lightning.

In pāda d the value of *nā* is disputed: is it the simile particle or the negation? The problem prompted a 5-pg. digression by Old on the positioning of the two elements. He comes out strongly for the simile marker here, a view shared by Ge, Re, Kü (250, 503), and the publ. tr., while the negative is favored by Lü (99 and n. 2), Ober (II.216), and Schmidt (B+I 79)(with Ge considering it in n. 1d). Lü recognizes that the position favors the simile particle, but prefers the negative since there's no obvious element to supply to fill out the simile. Ge suggests that subj. to be supplied is either the soma vessels or the gods, with both Old and Re favoring the gods, who came on the scene in pāda b. I think instead that it is the waters with which the pressed soma is mixed; this would fit the comparison to 'seas'. Cf. I.173.8 ... *sāvanā samudré* "the pressings in the sea," which I also think refers to the mixing water. (Of course *sāvanāni* could also be the subject of *vivyacuḥ*, but this would require supplying an obj.)

On the full grade of *vivyacuḥ* (for expected **vivicuḥ*) see Kü 503 n. 1000. One might also note that the expected form would yield a terrible cadence. Acdg. to Kü, the indic. pf. to *vyac* is always a presential stative, and he considers the indic. necessary in this context to express that value. Otherwise, the full-grade 3rd pl. could belong to the plupf. (here as injunc.); cf. the augmented plupf. *avivyacuḥ* (X.56.4). Kü considers the injunc. excluded here, but in fact I think it's quite possible: "they have enveloped the pressings," parallel to *vī didyute* 'has flashed forth' in c, and might alter the tr. in to the preterital one.

IX.80.2: On *áyo-hata-* see comm. ad IX.1.2.

IX.80.3: On *kukṣí-* as 'cheek', not 'belly', see comm. ad III.36.8, VIII.92.24. Here the context is not diagnostic and might in fact slightly favor 'belly', esp. given vs. 1 of the next hymn (IX.81) by the same poet, which contains *jaṭhāram* 'belly'. However, the preponderance of evidence for 'cheek' elsewhere is pretty strong.

IX.80.4–5: Both vss. open with *tám tvā*, echoing *yám tvā* beginning vs. 2.

IX.80.4: Pādas a and b share a verb, *duhate* in b. Each pāda contains a contrastive pair: *devébhyaḥ* ... *náraḥ* "the men for the gods" and *sahásra(dhāram)* ... *dása (kṣípaḥ)* "thousand(-streamed) ... ten (fingers)."

IX.80.5: The first two pādas have the same structure as 4ab: they share a verb form of *duh*, *duhánti* in b, with two different subjects, *hastínaḥ* (a) and *dása kṣípaḥ* (b) again. The "stones" of 4c (*grāvabhiḥ*) return, but with different lexical realization (*ádribhiḥ*).

IX.81

IX.81.1: *īm* in c anticipates *sūram* in d.

IX.81.2: With Old I see “of gods” (*devānām*) in the phrase “the double birth of gods” as pregnant for “of gods (and men),” very much as a pregnant dual like *dyāvā* “two heavens” or *pitārā* “two fathers” implies its opposite number. As Old points out, the locational adverbs in the next pāda *amúta itás ca* “from yonder and from here” strongly suggest heaven and earth as their spheres. Ge considers “gods and men to be the sense, but, in order not to supply a 2nd gen. pl., he achieves this by way of the unlikely “(heavenly and earthly) gods,” that is, gods and men. Ober (I.391) thinks that the double birth is of Devas and Asuras, but this is anachronistic.

IX.81.3: The vs. contains a play on *vásu*, which further puns on the poet’s name. In pāda a the acc. *vásu* refers to the material goods we ask Soma to provide for us, while in c the dative *vásave* appears to refer to a good person, the recipient of Soma’s aid. Since the Anukramaṇī attributes this hymn (along with IX.80 and 82) to Vasu Bhāradvāja, the recipient is presumably the poet himself. (Because Re has a particular, and peculiar, view of *vásu*, his tr. does not reflect the pun.)

pārā sicaḥ ‘pour away’, which appears only here in the RV, must play on the very common soma verb *pāri √ sic* ‘pour around, pour in circles’, of the circular motion of pouring the soma juice onto the filter. See *pāri √ i / pāri √ yā* of soma’s journey around the filter in vss. 1–2 of the next hymn (IX.82), attributed to the same poet.

With Old I read **sucetúnā* (also in V.65.3) for transmitted *sú cetúnā*. The former cmpd. is pretty well attested, while *cetú-* doesn’t otherwise exist. And in both instances the phrase/cmpd. is pāda-final, which would put an independent particle *sú* in an unusual location: it otherwise generally takes Wackernagel’s position.

IX.81.4: Ge, Re, and Ober (I.526) take *surātáyah* as referring to a separate group of divinities (e.g., Re “les (divinités) aux beaux dons”), but there is no such corporate entity as far as I am aware. In other passages the stem simply modifies the gods in general (X.65.4) or the Maruts (X.78.3). Here I think it applies to the listed gods as a group, and as a summary adj. was stationed at the end of a pāda, here matching the position of **sucetúnā* at the end of 3c in the previous vs.

IX.82

IX.81.1–2: As Ge points out (nn. 1d, 2d), ghee (*ghṛtá-*) in these two vss. stands for the milk mixture.

IX.82.1: The simile in b is also found in X.43.2 *rājeva dasma* (with voc.), as Ge (n. 1b) points out. The simile is likely to be self-contained, not a necessary part of the rest of the clause, contra Ober (II.214–15), who sees it as expressing a peculiar trope, “der ‘brüllende’ König.”

IX.82.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. marks a departure from the first two conventional vss., with richer imagery, esp. in the first pāda. The first hemistich must

refer to the soma plant, growing in the mountains. The god of the thunder(storm), Parjanya is his father because rain produces plants. The qualifier *parṇín-* means, in the first instance, ‘feathered’ (e.g., VIII.5.33 *váyah ... parṇínah* “feathered birds”), but of course *parṇá-* ‘feather’ has already undergone widening in the RV to mean ‘leaf’ as well, and so it must be interpr. here.

The scene shifts back to the ritual ground in cd: the two additional ingredients of prepared soma, water and milk, are found in c, with the pressing stones in d (the actual order of ritual preparation would be the reverse, of course).

In c *utá* is in an unusual position and its function is unclear. Klein (DGRV I.380–81) simply describes the situation as involving “nonparallel clauses and weak nexus,” remarking further that cd “bears little cohesive relationship to ab,” though that’s what he thinks *utá* is connecting. Ge and Re both tr. as “also,” and the publ. tr. follows this interpr., which seems more likely than Klein’s near-null hypothesis. Perhaps contributing to its unusual position is the parallelism of *abhí gā utáśaran#* and 1b *abhí gā acikradat#*, with the verbs trisyllabic *śaran* and quadrisyllabic *acikradat* respectively. The *utá* supplies the necessary extra syllable and, by coalescing with the augment, the heavy antepenult needed for the cadence.

In d “unite with the stones” may be a little strong: better “come together with.”

IX.82.4: Since *śéva* in pāda a must be a vocative morphologically, its accent is unexpected in this pāda-medial position. There are two factors that might have contributed to it, which, however, cancel each other out. On the one hand, the point of contact between the simile “like a wife to her husband” and the frame is this very adj. ‘kindly’, and so an underlying fem. nom. sg. **śévā* must also be assumed. This overlap between an expected nom. and the voc. addressed to the correspondent of the wife, namely Soma, may have led to the anomalous accentuation. On the other hand, if the simile was felt to be a self-contained clause, *śéva* would begin a new clause or at least a new syntactic unit. I’m not sure that either is sufficient, but I weakly favor the second.

The voc. phrase in b, *pájrāyā garbha*, likewise causes a problem, though not of accent: *garbha* is properly unaccented, and its dependent gen. *pájrāyā(h)* shows the expected shift to initial accent in this pāda-initial voc. phrase, from the suffixally accented stem *pajrā-*. The question is the referent of this fem. *pajrā-*. Ge, Re, Ober (I.530) take it as a PN (e.g., “O Kind der Pajrā”). It is certainly true that *pajrā-* can be a PN (see Mayr [PN], though he doesn’t include this passage in his list), but usually in the pl. of a family of poets. It is never otherwise found in the fem., and it would be very strange (in my opinion) for a named *mother* to be specified in this kind of context, unless she is a goddess. Far more likely is Sāy.’s identification of the referent as the earth. The stem *pajrā-* as an adj. means ‘sturdy, steadfast’, a reasonable description of the earth. Earth as Soma’s mother would fit nicely also with 3a, which names Parjanya as his father. The rains generate the plant, but it grows in the earth.

The standard interpr. of *prá carā* in c is as 2nd sg. impv. addressed to Soma, and this is certainly possible. But I think it is equally possible that, in this 1st ps. context, it’s a 1st sg. subjunctive, and the contents of the poet’s direct speech announced in immed. preceding *brávvīmi te*. This is how it is rendered in the publ. tr.

The *sú* in c is in an unusual position, but it is in the same position as *sú* in the preceding hymn, IX.81.3, attributed to the same poet. There Old suggested (and I

followed) reading it with the following noun as cmpd. **sucetúnā*. I follow the same path here, reading **sujīváse*, though this time without Old's imprimatur. The case here is not as strong. With regard to IX.81.3 the putative cmpd *sucetú-* exists independently, while the transmitted stem *cetú-* does not. Here the opposite is true: the infinitival dat. *jīváse* is quite well attested, whereas *sujīváś-* is not found. This gives me pause about the emendation, but even without it, I think that *sú* should be read with *jīváse* and with its lexical value, not merely as a particle: "... to live well."

IX.82.5: In b *paryáyā(h)* is the augmented impf. to $\sqrt{yā}$; so correctly Gr, Ge. But Re in a rare grammatical lapse seems in his n. to take it as a subjunctive (presumably to \sqrt{i}), but that form should be (and is) *áyah*.

IX.83

On the structure of this hymn and my interpr. of its enigmatic contents, see the publ. intro. Here I will not treat in detail the interpr. of others.

IX.83.1: As indicated in the publ. intro. and above, ad IX.73.9, this vs. is very like the last vs. of IX.73, a hymn also focused on the filter, both physical and mystical.

The identity of the 'limbs' (*gātrāni*) in b is not entirely clear. I take it as referring to the metaphorical limbs of the filter, though the visual picture thus conjured up is imperfect, unless the fleece filter comes not only from the back but from the legs of the sheep. I do not think it is the limbs of the soma-drinkers, with Re.

I take *tād* in c to be the filter, again both physical and mystical. As I say in the publ. intro., "raw" versus "cooked" in this hemistich refers to the transformation effected on the soma plant by its ritual preparation, even though "cooking" is not technically involved. The pl. in d is presumably the soma drops or drinks, as opposed to the mass sg. in c referring to the as-yet-unprepared plant.

IX.83.2: The identification of sun and soma, with the rays of the sun across the sky (the cosmic filter, as it were) compared to the tracks of soma across the ritual filter.

The \bar{i} of *pavītár-* is anomalous and may in fact be suspect. The stem only occurs twice in the RV, the other time at IX.4.4, where the \bar{i} is not metrically guaranteed. In our passage, as Gr. points out, the SV [also JB] reading *pavitāram* is metrically better. The stem with \bar{i} is confined to the RV, except that the repetition of IX.4.4 in SV also has the \bar{i} (as opposed to the SV rep. of our passage). The expected *pavitár-* is found in the AV and later. Given extremely common *savitár-* to the parallel root $\sqrt{sū}$, it is hard to understand how *pavītár-* acquired its unetymological \bar{i} . I tentatively suggest that it is a metrical analogy to the far more common *pavitra-*, with heavy 2nd syllable because of the cluster. As this hymn shows, *pavitra-* occurs in the same contexts as *pavītár-*. It might also be influenced by the weak forms of the associated 9th class present (suffix *nī*), which immediately follows the form in IX.4.4: *pāvītārah punītāna*.

IX.83.3: Further identification of soma and the sun. For *pṛśni-* and *ukśán-* used of the sun, see, e.g., V.47.3; for the sun supporting the worlds, see X.170.4 (dedicated to Sūrya) *yénemā visvā bhúvanāny ābhṛtā* "by whom all these worlds are borne."

As indicated in the publ. intro., I take the 2nd hemistich as expressing a reciprocal paradox: the forefathers were created as masters of artifice (*māyāvín-*) by the artifice (*māyā-*) of Soma/the sun, but they also engendered him. I take the pf. *mamire* as passive, with Gr. The standard tr. (and incl. HPS, B+I, 78) take the verb as transitive, supplying *bhúvanāni* from b as obj. (I do have to concede that the pf. is otherwise generally transitive.) But under their reading I don't understand how the forefathers as possessing their own *māyā* (*māyāvínah*) needed "his *māyā*" (*asya māyāyā*) to accomplish the task.

If there is any difference in meaning between *māyāvín-* (3x) and the far better attested and more orthodoxly formed *māyín-* I cannot detect it.

IX.83.4: For my view of the Gandharva as another instantiation of soma/the sun see publ. intro. This more or less agrees with Ge (n. 4a: the sun, acdg. to Sāy.) and Re (Soma-Gandharva). I do not see this vs. as referring to the Somaraub as Ober does (II.162).

As indicated in the publ. intro., with the 2nd hemistich we return to the world of ritual and to the filter specifically.

nīdhā- clearly means 'snare'; see the other occurrence in X.73.11 *nīdhāyeva baddhān* "bound as if by a snare." But the semantic dev. from the presumed source *nī√dhā* is not clear. That lexeme generally means 'set down, deposit, keep safe/secure'. Perhaps 'snare' develops from this last meaning: a device used to secure an object. On this problem see detailed disc. by Scar (255). It would be nice to connect it with *nī√dā* 'bind', but pesky phonology gets in the way.

IX.83.5: The garment of cloud in b is presumably the milk in ritual terms, a real cloud for the sun identified with soma.

IX.84

IX.84.1: Acdg. to Ober (I.526), this vs. is concerned with the "landerobernde Funktion (König) Somas," which makes sense. Pāda c directly asks Soma to provide us with wide space, and his epithets *vīcarsaṇi-* 'unbound(ari)ed' and *apsā-* 'water-winning' in ab belong to this conceptual realm. In d *urukṣitau* 'in the wide dwelling place' may as well, if it refers to our (newly acquired) dwelling, per Ober. Re takes it rather as the dwelling place of the divine folk, but given the context Ober's view is more persuasive.

IX.84.2: The territory-winning theme of vs. 1 may be continued here, but on the cosmic level, with Soma mounting all the worlds. This is also probably a reference to Soma as the sun, as Ge suggests (n. 2a).

As noted in the publ. intro., the "knotting and unknotting" probably has both a ritual and a moral reading. Ritually it presumably refers to soma's passage across the woolly tangles of the sheep's fleece filter. But Ge cites as potential parallel IX.97.18 *granthīm ná ví sya grathitām ..., ṛjūṃ ca gātūṃ vṛjīnaṃ ca ...* "Untie like a knot the straight and the crooked way (which are) knotted up, when you are being purified," which implies a moral dimension as well, since "straight" and "crooked" are often used in that sphere.

Pāda d lacks an acc. in the frame to be construed with *siṣakti* as parallel to *uśásam* in the simile. Perhaps the gods in general (the *daívyam jānam* of 1d and 3d), or the three

gods named in 1b, Indra, Varuṇa, and Vāyu. Re supplies Indra, and the parallel he cites, I.56.4 *īndraṃ sīśakti uśásam ná sūryaḥ*, supports this suggestion, esp. since Indra recurs in vss. 3 and 4.

IX.84.3: The ritual and/or real world situation depicted in pādas a and c is unclear. In particular, in pāda a what plants does soma (+ milk) pour onto? Ober (II.42) may well be right that it depicts soma as rain, though we would still lack a ritual analogue to the plants receiving rain in the real world. Rain in this pāda would fit with the lightning imagery in c. Soma him/itself flashed forth (*vī didyute*) in IX.80.1, and “ever-flashing light” (*dāvidyutatī- rúc-*) is associated with the soma drinks in IX.64.28.

The publ. tr. construed *dhārayā* with *sutāḥ*, because this expression (IX.51.5, 72.5, 100.6, 108.5) or minor variants (IX.3.10=42.2, 10.4, 97.45) are fairly common in this maṇḍala. However, both Ge and Re take it with *pavate*, parallel with *vidyūtā* (e.g., “Der ausgepresste Soma läutert sich mit Blitz (und Regen)guss”), and this may be preferable in the rainstorm context.

IX.84.4: Notice the return of the god Vāyu of 1b in the guise of the common noun ‘wind(s)’ (*vāyúbhiḥ*) in c, juxtaposed with Indra in d.

IX.84.5: The last pāda is notable for the concentration of poet words: *vīpraḥ kavīḥ kāvyaena*, a role not otherwise attributed to Soma in this hymn.

IX.85–86

On the structure of the last two hymns of the Jagatī group, see the publ. introductions to IX.85 and 86. In brief, after a series of hymns of 5 vss. (IX.75–84), these last two have 12 vss. and 48 vss. respectively. However, they are clearly composites: IX.85 consists of three groups of four vss. apiece, IX.86 of 16 ṭṛcas. The standard principles of hymn arrangement can thus be restored.

IX.85

For the four-vs. sequences and their contents, see publ. intro.

IX.85.2: In pāda c the preverbs *abhy ā* are oddly positioned, after the caesura, and, more important, the two apparent acc. objects *śātrūn* ‘rivals’ and *bhandanāyātaḥ* ‘those seeking blessings’ are antithetical, with only the first an appropriate obj. to *jahī*. The problems disappear if, with Ge, we supply a second verb to go with the preverbs and to govern the 2nd acc. A verb of motion fits well, and \sqrt{i} , \sqrt{gam} , and $\sqrt{yā}$ all appear with this combination of preverbs, whereas \sqrt{han} does not. Ge goes for slightly richer semantics: “(komm) ... zu (Hilfe)” – without specifying what verb he supplies, but note that \sqrt{av} does not appear with those preverbs.

The identities of Soma and Indra appear to bleed into each other in the course of the vs. In ab the 2nd ps. subject is clearly Soma, on the basis of voc. *pavamāna* (a) and *priyó mādah* (b). The assumption then is that the impv. *jahī* in c is also addressed to Soma. But in d we get direct address of Indra and at the end of the pāda *he* is the subj. of a second *jahi*. Therefore pāda c, which contains no lexical clue to the addressee, could be addressed either to Soma or to Indra (or both).

IX.85.3: The blending of identities in 2cd is made explicit in pāda b here, where Soma is called “the very self of Indra” (*ātméndrasya*).

On the meaning of the secondary root \sqrt{nim} s see comm. ad VIII.43.10. There I stated my preference for maintaining the older gloss ‘kiss’, against the colorless ‘seek out’, which was suggested by Gotō and adopted by EWA, etc. However, I must admit that, at least superficially, ‘seek out’ works better here than ‘kiss’ and it is reflected in the publ. tr. But a ceremonial kiss signaling fealty is certainly possible – like kissing the pope’s ring or the widespread custom of kissing someone’s feet as a gesture of respect. So Ober (I.531–32) “Sie küssen den [Fuss des] König[s] dieser Erde.” Both Ge and Re render the phrase without interposing a bodypart, e.g., “ils baisent le roi de ce monde.” I am now inclined towards the more precise and physical “they kiss the king,” rather than the publ. tr.’s “They seek out the king.” This interpr. is made the more likely because “kissing” Soma in the ritual can well indicate consuming soma by mouth, that is, drinking it.

IX.85.5: The passive *ajyase* has, as often in this maṇḍala, a double meaning, ‘is anointed’ ($\sqrt{añj}$) and ‘is driven’ (\sqrt{aj}).

On the meaning (‘all at once’, not ‘in the middle’) and the formulaic construction of *samáyā*, see comm. ad I.113.10.

IX.85.7–8: Pādas 7c and 8a have almost identical structure:

pāvamānā abhy àrṣanti su(ṣtutīm)

pāvamāno abhy àrṣā su(vīryam)

which effects the transition from 3rd pl. to 2nd sg.

IX.85.8: The somewhat awkward tr. “constricting pressure” reflects the literal, additive sense of *pāriṣūti*:- *pāri* ‘around’ + $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘impel, thrust’. Maybe something like “squeezing” would sound a bit more idiomatic, though it is hard to find any English idiom that more or less represents the etymology *and* fits with the verb. Of course, narrowness and constriction are particularly feared and avoided in the Rig Veda. Perhaps “claustrophobia” might work, though of course the -phobia part is absent; “constriction” is probably the best choice in English. It is also not clear what threat *pāriṣūti*- poses to the ritual soma, which, after all, has been subjected to serious pressing (via the phonologically similar but unrelated root \sqrt{su}) and therefore has nothing left to fear in that regard. In real world terms it of course refers to the opposite of the “wide pasturage and great, extensive shelter” that Soma is urged to rush to in pāda b. In this regard it is similar to the words *aṃhatī*-, *áṃhas*- ‘constriction, constraint’. The other occurrence of *pāriṣūti*- (I.119.6) is found in a similar context, with a contrast between constraint and wide space: *yuvám rebhám páriṣūter uruṣyathaḥ*. JPB tr. “You give Rebha space from being besieged,” but in my opinion the sense is more particular: “you give Rebha wide space from (/out of) constriction.”

On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

IX.85.9–12: As noted in the publ. intro., these four vss. treat the identification of Soma and the sun and are similar to the very enigmatic Vena hymn, X.123, which is attributed to the same poet, Vena Bhārgava.

IX.85.9: The double vision of both heavenly Soma/Sun and earthly ritual soma is clear here, with pādas a, b, d all having a celestial orientation, each containing a form of *div-/dyu-* ‘heaven’, while the filter of pāda c brings us back to the ritual. The subj. of d is probably, on the one hand, the ritual officiants, who perform the ritual action of milking (that is, pressing) the soma. But the substance obtained is “the beestings [colostrum, first milk] of heaven” (*pīyūṣam ... diváh*), and the next vs. makes clear that those performing the milking here are also the *venāḥ* ‘seekers’ in 10b, where they are located “in the vault of heaven” (*divó nāke*).

IX.85.10–11: The two tr. of *vená-* in 10b ‘seekers’ and 11b ‘trackers’ respectively should be harmonized. I would now tr. ‘seekers’ for both.

IX.85.10: The cosmic/natural and the earthly/ritual double vision is played out simultaneously throughout this vs. In ab the seekers milk the streams “in the vault of heaven” (*divó nāke*) but milk them out of “the mountain-dwelling ox” (*ukṣáṇam giristhām*), the earthly soma plant. In c the drop grows strong not only “in the waters” (*apsú*), presumably the ritual waters used to swell the plant, but also “in the sea” (*samudrá ā*); in d it is both “in the wave of the river” (*síndhor ūrmā*) and “in the filter” (*pavíttra ā*).

On the basis of the shared verb (*duhate* in 9d, *duhanti* in 10b) the *venāḥ* here appear to be identical to the subjects of 9d, as suggested above.

Pāda b is identical to IX.73.4. As noted in the comm. thereon, there is good reason to supply “streams” (*dhārāḥ*) as the referent for the pl. adjs. *mádhujihvā(h)* and *asaścátah*, which are therefore fem. acc. pl. Curiously Ge takes the former as nom. pl. m. here, though fem. in 73.4, while Ober (II.13149–50,) takes them both as nom. pl. m.; Re tr. as I do.

IX.85.11: I would now take the pf. part. *upapaptivāmsam* as explicitly anterior to the impf. *akṛpanta*: “the eagle that had flown to the vault.”

IX.85.12: This final vs. is esp. close in phraseology to the Vena hymn, with pāda a identical to X.123.7a and pāda c almost identical to X.123.8c. Note also that *ádhi nāke asthāt* unites *ádhi ... asthāt* of our 9a and *nāke* of our 10a.

Ge takes the part. *praticákṣāṇaḥ* as transitive/causative “seine Farben alle offenbarend” (though he questions this in n. 12b); sim. Ober (II.13) “erscheinen lassend.” Re’s tr. is like mine (“regardant-en-face toutes les formes siennes”), although in his n. he considers the opposite possibility, citing passages with *práti √ cakṣ* that supposedly have this transitive sense. But his exx. are not probative, and the middle voice of the participle makes it esp. unlikely to have this sense.

IX.86

As noted above, an assemblage consisting of 16 three-vs. units, attributed to a variety of poets and poetic groups and showing no particular unity of structure or special poetic merit. However, there is often patterned repetition both between *ṛcas* and within them.

IX.86.1–3: The first two vss. of this *ṛca* begin identically (*prá te*), and all three vss. concern the swift journey of the soma drinks, which is compared to that of swift animals. Vss. 1 and 3 share the same verb ($\sqrt{ṛṣ}$: 1b *arṣanti*, 3a *arṣa*; *áṣṛkṣata* in 2b is semantically similar) and the same goal, the *kóśa*- or ‘cask’, while vss. 1 and 2 both contain *āśvaḥ* ‘swift’. Of course none of these features is unusual in the soma corpus, so they are not strong evidence for *ṛca* unity.

IX.86.1: The rt noun cmpd *dhī-jū-* (also in vs. 4) could have two different readings, ‘sped by insight(s)’ and ‘speeding insights’; see Scar 170–71. The publ. tr. opts for the passive interpr., as does Re, while Ge chooses the transitive one. Either is possible in this ritual context, and parallels cut both ways. On the one hand, there is the parallel cmpd *dhī-jávana-* (3x), which must have transitive value; on the other, IX.64.16 ... *āśávaḥ / dhiyā jūtāḥ* ..., with *āśávaḥ* as here, supports the passive reading. And of course both might be meant.

The standard tr. (Ge, Re, also Scar 170) supply ‘horses’ with *raghujāḥ*, and this of course is quite possible. The adj. *raghú-* and its cmpds do modify horses elsewhere (e.g., V.30.14). However, the cmpds. *raghu-pátma-jamhas-* ‘having plumage (fit) for rapid flight’ (VI.3.5), *raghu-pátvan-* ‘rapidly flying’ (2x) reference flying, and various related forms reference birds: V.30.9 *raghúḥ śyenāḥ*, II.19.4 *váyo ná paptū raghuyá*. The specification of flight in these forms suggest to me that *raghú-* (etc.) was originally specialized for the swift flight of birds and then generalized to other fast things, and I therefore supply ‘birds’ in the simile. On the other hand, since vss. 2 and 3 both contain likely (*ráthyāsaḥ* 2b) or explicit (*átyaḥ* 3a) horses, *ṛca* unity might favor ‘horses’ in the simile here as well.

IX.86.2: It seems a little odd to say that chariot horses go “each separately,” since one would think that the horses would be attached to the same chariot and efficient movement would require them to pull together. But almost the same phrase occurs in X.91.7 ... *rathyò yáthā pīthak*, though there referring to charioteers, and so the words must belong together. Perhaps it refers to separate chariots, each with its own set of horses—or that each horse in a chariot team has its own place in harness and each individually contributes to the speed of the whole?

IX.86.3: Pāda a is metrically disturbed, despite apparently having 12 syl. With Arnold and HvN, best to read **hyānáḥ* for *hiyānáḥ* (as sometimes elsewhere), to avoid a too early or too late caesura and a bad Jagatī cadence. The pāda is then a fine Triṣṭubh.

Although, as noted above, vss. 1 and 3 share the same goal, the *kóśa-*, the physical referent has changed between 1 and 3. In the former, the cask is presumably the soma vessel on the ritual ground, but in 3b it is characterized as *kóśam divó ádrimātaram* “the cask of heaven, whose mother is the stone”—in other words the vault of the sky (or the soma container in the sky). So the subject is the heavenly soma, not merely the earthly

ritual substance, even though the ritual details are re-asserted in cd. For the heavenly cask, see V.53.6, 59.8, IX.88.6. Old reports without enthusiasm a potential emendation to nom. *ádrimātā*, modifying soma, with *ádrī-* the pressing stone. This would yield another Triṣṭubh pāda. However, since heaven (or at least the container of the heavenly soma) may be made of stone, there seems no reason to emend.

In the publ. tr. for ease of English parsing I moved the tr. of *svarvíd* from b to cd, but this mixes the levels: the sun-finding Soma is the one that reaches heaven, while the soma of cd is the substance purified in the sheep’s filter. Better (if somewhat awkward): “... rush to the prize, as the sun-finder (rush) to the cask of heaven ...”

The phrase (*ádhi*) *sāno áv(ya)ye* “on the sheep’s (lovine) back” occurs 9x in a fairly tight cluster in this maṇḍala (IX.86.3, 91.1, 92.4, 96.13, 97.3, 12, 16, 19, 40: all but this one in Triṣṭubh hymns). Given loc. *áv(ya)ye* and the loc. of ‘back’ in other variants of the formula (*ávyē ... sānavi* IX.50.2, 70.8), *sāno* should be a loc., even though loc. **sāno/av* is not independently attested. See the inconclusive disc. in AiG III.153–54, which flirts with but does not explicitly endorse such a form. TY has persuasively argued that this form is a relic of an IE endingless full-grade loc.; another such relic is found in the phrase *vásta usrāḥ*, on which see comm. ad V.49.3. Both of these formulaic expressions occur exclusively in cadences, which preserved the light syllable of prevocalic loc. *-*au* V from remodeling.

IX.86.4–6: The first vs. of the new ṛca is in part a distillation of the previous ṛca. The next two vss. end their first hemistichs identically: 5b, 6b GEN *satáḥ pári yanti ketávaḥ* “The beacons of the one being X circle around.” But as in the first ṛca, this identity conceals a fundamental difference of reference, with both a cosmic and a ritual dimension.

IX.86.4: As just noted, this vs. seems to distill the first ṛca and is esp. similar to vs. 1. Like both 1 and 2 it opens *prá te*, and the 2nd hemistich also begins with *prá*, with *prántár* echoing *prá ta*). Even more strikingly the first pāda matches 1a almost exactly:

1a *prá ta āśávaḥ pavamāna dhījávaḥ*

4a *prá ta āśvinīḥ pavamāna dhījávaḥ*

The only difference is the third word, and the two are phonological multiforms of each other – or rather, *āśvinīḥ* must have been formed as a variant of *āśávaḥ*, since the vṛddhi deriv. *āśvina-*, -ī is found only here in the RV (though it occurs elsewhere in Vedic), while *āśú-* is quite common. In addition, *asṛgran* (4b) and *asṛkṣata* (4c) reprise *ásṛkṣata* of 2b, and *páyasā* (4b) recurs from 2c.

However, these similarities once again mask conceptual differences.

The first question to confront is what the referents are for the fem. pls. *āśvinīḥ* in pāda a and *sthávirīḥ* in c, and are they the same? Ge and Re both supply different nouns for the two – *dhárāḥ* ‘streams’ for the first (already Sāy.) and *gírah* ‘hymns’ for the second. (Sāy. supplies *dhárāḥ* for the second as well.) Although this split reference is perfectly possible – and at least *páyasā* ‘with their milk’ might favor a liquid interpretation in ab – I prefer to supply *gírah* for both. In the 2nd hemistich the passage adduced by Old to explain pāda c, I.181.7 *ásarji vām sthávirā vedhasā gīḥ* “A substantial song has been sent surging to you, o ritual experts,” resembles our passage very closely, with fem. *gīḥ* and with verb, adj., and voc. matching elements in cd. There is only one

fem. form to the adj. *sthāvira-*, namely the one just cited modifying *gír-*. The pleonastically vṛddhied adj. in our passage, fem. *sthāvīrī-*, is a hapax in the RV – and in fact I would suggest that it owes its vṛddhi to an attempt to match that of *āśvinīḥ*. Moreover, I.181.7 passage is in an Aśvin hymn (the referents of *vām ... vedhasā*), and to my mind the unusual *āśvinīḥ* ‘destined for the Aśvins’ in the first hemistich invites us to supply a form of praise as the fem. pl. referent. We might also cite other exx. of the Aśvins’ association with praise hymns (not, I realize, unusual for Vedic gods!): VII.72.3 *stómāso aśvīnoḥ*, VIII.9.7 *aśvīnoḥ ... stómam*, VIII.9.16 *vācā aśvīnaḥ* (though none of these is fem. pl.). Thus in my view the entities “destined for the Aśvins” in pāda a are more likely to be hymns than streams.

In the first hemistich the fem. subj. (whatever it is) surges “into the support” (*dhārīmaṇi*), which I take to be the soma vessel. I supply the same loc. with *antár* in the 2nd hemistich. Cf. nearby IX.89.5 *samāné antár dharúṇe níṣattaḥ* “set down within the same support,” with *dharúṇe* an etymological and semantic match for *dhārīman-*.

As noted above, *asṛkṣata* in c repeats *ásṛkṣata* in 2b, but they are functional opposites: the first verb must be intrans. ‘have surged’ (or pass., ‘have been discharged’) with the soma drinks as subject, while our verb is trans. with the seers as subj. and hymns as obj. The intrans/pass.. function is taken over in vs. 4 by *asṛgran* in b. The aor. of \sqrt{srj} is overwhelmingly medial and overwhelmingly intrans./pass. in function, including the numerous exx. of 3rd pl. *ásṛkṣata*. There are only two transitive occurrences of this form, this one and one in V.52.6. In our case I think it likely that in this vs. *asṛkṣata* has been made to contrast functionally with likewise 3rd pl. *asṛgran*, which patterns with the aor. passive and therefore has more title to intrans./pass. function. Narten (Sig.Aor. 270–71) discusses the functional issues in the *s*-aor. paradigm of this root, but she holds the (to me) unlikely position that the medial forms should be fundamentally transitive (though she hedges here) and the intrans. use is secondary, despite the clear numerical superiority of the intrans. usage. I think it makes more sense to consider the transitive usage, at least here, as forced on a normally intrans. form by the pressure of *asṛgran*.

The formation of the hapax voc. *ṛṣiṣāna* is opaque. Gr’s gloss ‘dem Sänger freund’ reveals nothing about his analysis of the 2nd part; sim. Re’s ‘propre aux Prophètes’ without further comment. With Ge, the publ. tr. assigns the 2nd member to \sqrt{san} ‘gain, win’, hence ‘winning seers’. If we maintain that analysis, the sense might be compared to *ṛṣi-sáh-* in IX.76.4, which means ‘vanquishing (the other) seers’, in poetic competition or the like. However, given the set nature of \sqrt{san} and the persistent short vowel (-)san- in most of its nominal forms, this analysis is not entirely persuasive, esp. since the semantics are not absolutely compelling. AiG II.2.926 posits (without conviction) a suffix *-sāna-*, but also suggests a connection to the (pseudo-)part. *-asāna-* type (which is treated at AiG II.2.236–37), but it doesn’t fit the general profile of this group (on which see comm. ad IV.3.6). Perhaps *-sāna-* is better connected to $\sqrt{sā}$ ‘bind’; cf. the noun *viṣāna-* V.44.11, which has the merit of existing and whose long vowel is predictable. Hence ‘binding seers’ or ‘having the binding of seers’ – that is, holding them fast, commanding their loyalty or attention, as in pāda c. But in the absence of any further information, accentual, contextual, or formulaic, we can’t get much further.

IX.86.5–6: As noted above, these two vss. have parallel structures in the crucial 2nd pāda. Although Ge notes this, his tr. does not reflect the parallelism of the two genitive

phrases with pres. part. *satáh*, nor does Re’s. Although taking account of this somewhat complicates my tr., I think it must be done. Vs. 6 is the clearer one: the pres. part. to \sqrt{as} is, as often, concessive: *although* Soma stays fixed, his beacons (continue) to circle. A concessive sense is harder to excavate from vs. 5 – hence the somewhat awk. rendering in the publ. tr. – but I think it is rhetorically called for. In both vss. the GEN *satáh* phrase specifies the spatial position of Soma. In 6 he is fixed; he has completed his journey to the soma vessels, as pāda d tells us. Vs. 5 is chronologically earlier than 6: Soma is advancing (*prabhú-*) on his journey, which is still in progress, as he “reaches through” *vyānaśi-* the domains, i.e., the filter and subsequent locations. Cf., for *prabhú-*, nearby IX.83.1 *pāvitraṃ te vītatam ..., prabhūḥ ... páry eṣi víśvátaḥ* “The filter is outstretched for you, o lord of the sacred formulation. Advancing, you circle around it on all sides.” The lexeme *pári√i* in soma contexts describes the movement of the soma juices around the filter. I think the point of both our vss., 5 and 6, is that, though Soma has moved on beyond the filter (5) and finally settled in the vessels (6), his beacons continue to circle around the filter. I am not entirely sure what that means in physical terms – perhaps the residual soma, caught as drops in the wool of the filter and glinting as the final drops drip down? or are the beacons pieces of ritual equipment? I think the former is more likely, given the reoccurrence of sg. *ketú-* in vs. 7 referring to Soma himself, but I am tolerably certain that the pl. in 5–6 distinguishes the vanguard of the soma, Soma proper, from the rest of the liquid that follows.

IX.86.5: As should be clear from the immed. preceding discussion, as elsewhere in IX I take *dhāmāni* ‘domains’ as referring to the filter and subsequent locales that the soma traverses, not, with Ge, Soma’s forms. (What Re means by “structures” is uninterpretable to me.) The physical locations on the ritual ground can also be viewed as the cosmic domains over which Soma has dominion – hence the hyperbolic statement in d, attributing universal rule to Soma.

On *víśvasya bhúvanasya rājasī*, see the identical phrase in 28b.

vyānaśi- belongs with the redupl. *-i-* stem type of *cakrí-*, etc. (cf. weak pf. *vy-ānaś-* to $\sqrt{(n)as}$); see AiG II.2.292. It can therefore govern the acc., like other instances of this formation type, and we can easily supply *dhāmāni* from pāda a, strongly supported by the parallel later in the hymn: IX.86.15 *yó asya dhāma prathamám vyānaśe* “who has reached through his first domain,” with the medial perfect to *ví√(n)as*.

IX.86.6: The referent changes from 2nd ps. (vs. 5) to 3rd (vs. 6), although this is not clear until the 3rd sg. verbs in the 2nd hemistich.

“On both sides” (*ubhayátaḥ*) probably reflects the double reference just noted: the ritual and the cosmic, or the earthly and the heavenly. See Ge n. 6ab.

I read *yádī* as *yád ī* (with enclitic *prn.*), since “if” does not work well here.

IX.86.7–9: The beginning and end of this *ṛca* echo the preceding one: *ketúḥ* in 7a picks up the pl. *ketávaḥ* in 5–6, and the end of vs. 9, *kaláśeṣu sīdati*, is identical to the end of 6. The *ṛca* traces a trajectory from the ritual journey—the filter and the cask in 7—to a cosmic one, with Soma as king (8a) traversing first earthly natural features (seas, rivers, streams, waves 8ab) and then bridging the distance between earth and heaven (8d, 9ab), ending back on the ritual ground (9d). Of course the equivalence of the ritual and cosmic

features is always in the foreground, as when in 8c he mounts the sheep's back (=the filter), which is immediately (8d) then identified as “the navel of the earth” (*nābhā pṛthivyāḥ*), with the same word for ‘back’ (*sānu*) used in 8c for the filter and in 9a for heaven.

IX.86.9: The rel. cl. of b lacks a verb. I think that whatever is supplied must be able to be construed with *dhārmabhiḥ* “according to (his) ordinances.” My ‘abide’ is a slight elaboration on Ge’s ‘sind’: “durch dessen Bestimmungen Himmel und Erde sind,” which I think is fundamentally correct. This is another hyperbolic statement of Soma’s cosmic power. Re’s “lui à qui (appartiennent) le ciel et la terre avec les choses-à-maintenir” separates *yasya* from *dhārmabhiḥ* and finds little work for the instr. pl. to do. The two instances of *dhārmabhiḥ* (here and 5c) should be more or less in harmony.

IX.86.10–12: Following a pattern we’ve met earlier, the first vs. of the new ṛca echoes the previous one. In particular, the beginning of 10a *jyótir yajñāsya pavate* is almost identical to 7a *yajñāsya ketúr pavate* , with *ketú-* = *jyótis-* semantically and the order of the first two elements flipped. As for intra-ṛca connections, 10b #*pitā devānām* is picked up by 11b #*pátir divāḥ*. There is also a fair amount of repetition of vocabulary and even phraseology from earlier in the hymn (e.g., 6cd ... *mṛjyáte háriḥ ... kaláśeṣu sīdati* and 11cd *háriḥ ... sádaneṣu sīdati, marmṛjānāḥ*), but most of this involves material so ubiquitous in soma discourse that it doesn’t mean much.

IX.86.10: Ge notes the parallels between our vs. and IX.75.2:

IX.75.2a. ... *pavate mādhu priyám, ...*
2cd *dádhāti putráḥ pitrór apīcyám, nāma ...*

IX.86.10a ... *pavate mādhu priyám, ...*
.10c *dádhāti rátnaṃ svadháyor apīcyám*

But he doesn’t seem to take the parallelism too seriously. In particular, though both 75.2c and 86.10c have a dual gen./loc. to be construed with a VP in which the subject deposits / establishes a secret X [name in 75.2, treasure in 86.10], Ge takes the dual as loc. in 75.2 (where there’s a parallel loc. sg. *rocané*), but gen. here (“Er bringt das verborgene Kleinod der beiden Eigenmächte”)(sim. Re), with a somewhat forced interpr. of *dádhāti* as ‘bringt’. Since the dual seems to have the same referent in both passages, Heaven and Earth (so both Ge and Re), and the passages are otherwise so similar, it seems to me very likely that they are structured in the same way. I therefore take *svadháyoḥ* as loc.

It’s worth noting that this is the only du. form of the stem *svadhā-*

IX.86.11: I do not know why the seats are identified as those of Mitra. I doubt that Lü is correct that it is only because Mitra’s seat is in highest heaven (210), much less that Mitra is at this stage in Vedic being identified with the sun (605).

IX.86.12: The vs. is structured by three pāda-initial forms of *ágre* + GEN, reinforced by *agriyáḥ* in b.

IX.86.13–15: This *ṛca* is characterized by increasingly larger claims for Soma’s cosmic reach. It has fewer connections to previous *ṛcas*, save for the echo in 15b *dhāma prathamām vyānaśe* of 5a and c, on which see comm. there.

IX.86.13: Ge identifies (n. 13a) and tr. *matāvān* as a real past active participle (“Nachdem er sich bedacht hatte ...”) (sim. Lü 243). This seems highly unlikely to me; Whitney’s statement (Gr. §960) should be noted: “Derivative words of this formation [= *tāvant-* sj] are found in RV., but without anything like a participial value. The AV. has a single example ... In the Brāhmaṇas also it is hardly met with.” See also Re’s n. The fact that the base, *matá-*, is not found independently as a ppl. in the RV, but only once (besides here) in the cmpd. *matavacas-* (voc., so unaccented, I.46.5), makes the building of a past active part. to it even less likely. Instead *-vant-* must have its usual possessive sense and in context mean ‘accompanied by thoughts’ (like *marútvant-*), referring to the praises given to Soma at the ritual. These act as a spur to set the soma in motion, hence the following simile.

The 2nd hemistich opens with a form of the 2nd sg prn., *táva*, followed at intervals by two vocc., *kave* at the end of c and *indra* in d, followed immediately by vs.-final *te*. It only becomes clear in d, with the 3rd ps. phrase *pavate sómaḥ*, that the 2nd ps. cannot be Soma, as it was earlier in the hymn (vss. 1–3, 4–5). The *kave* is a bit of a red herring, since it could, and often does, refer to Soma, and though Indra is sometimes so designated, other gods are far more commonly so called. The voc. *indra* at the end settles the matter, but our poet seems to tease us with other possibilities.

The image of Soma purifying himself “between the two world-halves” of course reflects the cosmic reach of the Soma, but it may also have a narrower ritual application. In IX.98.9 Ge suggests that the world-halves there are the jaws of the soma-press, which would fit nicely here. See also IX.75.4, where the world-halves are called the mothers of Soma.

IX.86.14: I would now tr. the pf. part. *jajñānāḥ* with past value, “once having been born.”

The standard tr. (and incl. Ober II.76; Lowe, Part. 158) take *svár* as nom. with the pf. part.: “having been born as the sun.” This is of course quite possible. But I would expect a goal with *abhí √ kram* and therefore take *svàr* as acc. in that function (see also Scar 330).

I take *nábhasā* as instr. of extent of space, rather than accompaniment (Ge, Lowe) or, even less likely, agent (Re “s’est élané par la nuée,” despite the absence of any verbal form that could be interpr. as passive).

The identify of the “age-old father” isn’t clear, and various candidates have been suggested: Sāy.: Indra; Ge (n. 14d): Parjanya or Heaven; Re: Heaven. I’m generally inclined towards Heaven, though of course bringing Heaven here is not physically possible.

IX.86.15: The gen. *asya* of pāda a could depend instead on *visé-* or indeed on both *visé* and *śárma*. Since I don’t know what ‘clan’ is in question, it is hard to determine if it belongs to Soma.

On *dhāma ... vyānaśe*, see comm. ad vs. 5. I do not think, with Ge, that the *dhāman-* refers to the first “form” of soma in the phases of soma-preparation.

In d note the play in the phrase *sám yāti samyátaḥ*, which belong to different roots ($\sqrt{yā}$ and \sqrt{yat} respectively). The latter has been rendered in quite different ways: Ge: “... gelangt er zu allen Stufenfolgen”; Re “il parcourt toutes les confluences”; Lü (702) “... geht er zu allen Treffpunkten”; Scar (404) Nomen act. ‘feste Aufstellung’. But *samyát-* is generally an adj., usually in the pl. of liquids (V.34.9 *āpaḥ samyátaḥ*, VIII.100.9); esp. pertinent are two passages in our own hymn: vs. 18 in the next *ṛca samyátam pipyúṣīm iṣam* “continuous, swelling refreshment” and, by implication, in vs. 47 *dhāráḥ ... samyátaḥ* “continuous streams.” On the basis of these passages, I supply “streams” here as well. See, e.g., vs. 8.

IX.86.16–18: The first two vss. of this *ṛca* begin with *prá* with a verb of motion, but otherwise there is little that unifies the *ṛca*. Nor is there much that connects with the rest of the hymn, save for 16a ... *ayāsīt ... índrasya niṣkṛtám* / 7b=32d ... *úpa yāti niṣkṛtám* and the repetition of *samyát-* in 18a (cf. 15d and disc. there).

IX.86.16: Pāda b strikes me as the quotation of a well-known general truth or proverb, providing the basis for the particular action of pāda a: Soma cannot let Indra down, because (of the old saw) “a comrade ...” It’s also worth noting that the other occurrence of *samgír-* (X.89.9) is also the obj. of *prá* $\sqrt{mī}$. Re also adduces IV.25.7 *ná ... sakhyám índraḥ ... sám grṇīte* “Indra does not agree to companionship (with ...).”

IX.86.17: The publ. tr. does not make it clear that “your” is pl. (enclitic *vaḥ*) and must refer to the poet/officiants.

What is striking stylistically in this vs. is the sequence of three heavy nom. pl. fem. *-yu-*adjectives: *mandrayúvo vipanyúvaḥ, panasyúvaḥ*, the latter two derived from the same root. Though morphologically parallel, they are somewhat disharmonious: *mandrayú-* is a hapax, *vipanyú-* is reasonably well attested and generally modifies the human officiants (gods a few times), while the rather fewer occurrences of *panasyú-* (and the related verb *panasyá-*) refer to gods. Hence the “thoughts” of our vs. seem both to “express admiration,” as humans do to gods, and “invite/require admiration,” as gods do from humans – so the thoughts’ purposes seem to be various, both to praise the gods and be admired for their fine crafting?

I’m not exactly sure what *samvāsana-* (a hapax), lit. ‘dwelling together, joint dwelling’ is expressing here. Ge seems similarly puzzled, tr. “in den Sitzungen” with a question mark; Re’s “dans les sessions-rituelles” is more definite and appealing, but I don’t see where he gets it. Perhaps it doesn’t indicate that the thoughts are dwelling with each other but that they, as a group, are dwelling with something/one else – perhaps the soma, perhaps the milk and other non-verbal parts of the ritual machinery?

IX.86.18: Note the functional contrast between *ā ... pavasva* and adjacent *pávamānaḥ*.

IX.86.19–21: No obvious signs of unity. The instr. *manīṣbhiḥ* is found at the end of 19 and immediately afterwards at the beginning of 20. The dawn(s) and the rivers are found in both 19 and 21, but not in mutually reinforcing ways. As for external connections, the “partnership” (*sakhyá-*) of Indra and Vāyu in 20 is reminiscent of the companions/partners (implicitly Soma and Indra) in 16b. There are various lexical echoes

(e.g., *vicakṣaṇāḥ* 19a = 11b), but the limited vocab. of the Soma hymns makes this unremarkable.

IX.86.19: “Bull of the thoughts” (*vīṣā matīnām*) is a slightly odd expression, but it fits the pattern of IX.76.4 *pitā matīnām*, 96.5 *janitā matīnām*, 103.4 *netā matīnām*, though without obvious agentive content here —although Ge interpr. ‘bull’ as ‘Befruchter’.

The three genitives with *pratarītā* by all the standard accounts (incl. the publ. tr., also Ober II.53) consist of two temporal expressions (day, dawn) and a spatial one (heaven). It is not clear to me what “lengthening/extending heaven” would involve, and so, though gen./abl. *divāḥ* is almost always ‘heaven’ rather than ‘day’, I now wonder if it here refers to ‘day’. Other passages containing both ‘day’ words include III.56.6 *trīr ā divāḥ savitar vāryāṇi*, *divé-diva ā suva trīr no āhnaḥ* “Three times a day, every day, o Savitar, impel valuables to us, three times daily”; X.7.4 *dyúbhiḥ ... āhabhiḥ*; X.12.4 *āhā yād dyāvah ... āyan* — and, interestingly enough, two expressions in this very hymn, vss. 41 and 42, on which see further ad locc. The question is what, if anything, is the semantic distinction between the two ‘day’ words *div-* / *dyu-* and *āhar* / *āhan-*. In principle “daytime” (versus night time) could be distinguished from the 24-hour day. Which, then, would be which? Assuming that PIE **d̥ieṷ-* (and its descendents) referred esp. to the *bright* sky, we might expect the ‘day’ occurrences of *div-* / *dyu-* to refer to the *bright* day, i.e., day versus night, leaving *āhar* for the 24-hour day. And the numerous exx. of *nāktam* (...) *divā* (and reverse order) “by night and by day” (I.24.10, 12, 34.2, 98.2, etc., etc.) seem to bear out this prediction. We also find *div-* / *dyu-* contrasted with other words for ‘night’: e.g., in the instr. pl. *dyúbhīr āktúbhiḥ* (I.34.8, 112.25, III.31.16), and in other case/no. pairs I.116.24 *dāśa rātrīḥ ... nāva dyūn*, VI.49.10 *rudrām divā vardhāyā rudrām aktaú*. However, *āhar* is also commonly found in these contexts. Cf. the compd. *ahorātrā-* ‘day and night’ and expressions like *rātryā āhnaḥ* (X.129.2), *tisraḥ kṣāpas trīr āhā* (I.116.4), *vy āktūn ... vy āhāni* (V.54.4), *rātrībhiḥ ... āhabhiḥ* (X.10.9), *āhobhiḥ... āktúbhiḥ* (X.14.9), *aktúbhyaḥ ... āhabhyaḥ* (X.89.11). Also passages in which light is put into or created for *āhar* / *āhan-* — e.g., IX.92.5 *jyótir yād āhne ākṛnot*. An esp. telling example is X.68.11 *rātryāṃ tamo dadhur jyótir āhan* “They put darkness in the night (and) light in the day.” I therefore find myself at something of an impasse, since both words are used contrastively with ‘night’, and in a passage containing both ‘day’ words assigning one sense to the one and the other to the other seems arbitrary. In any case, I now do think that *divāḥ* means ‘day’ here, and would substitute the tr. “... the lengthener of the day, of dawn, of the daytime” (having made the arbitrary choice).

On *krāṇā* see comm. ad I.58.3. In addition to the adv. sense (‘successfully, effectively’) discussed there, this old instr. can be used with true instr. value: ‘by the action’, as here. In his 1903 art. (cited ad I.58.3) Old (p. 35=Kl Schr. 1113) identifies *krāṇā* here as a neut. pl., not instr. sg.: “die Werke der Ströme, die Kufen hat er brüllen gemacht.” But by the time of the Noten he instead takes it as instr.: “durch das Tun der Flüsse.” This is in fact the standard interpr. of *krāṇā síndhūnām* here: Ge “Unter Mitwirkung der Ströme”; Re “Par l’action des fleuves”; Lü (254) = Ge, but with (?) inserted after “Mitwirkung.” But this pāda is regularly compared by these very same scholars with IX.102.1 *krāṇā síśur mahīnām*. And it is generally agreed that *mahīnām* in that pāda refers also to the rivers. But there is a split about where to construe this gen. Ge (and perhaps by implication Old) follows the pattern of our passage: “Unter Mitwirkung

der grossen (Ströme),” but Lü argues (239, 242), rather persuasively, that *mahînām* belongs rather with *sísuh*, as “child of the great (rivers),” in part on the basis of *sín̄dhumātar-* (IX.61.7) ‘whose mothers are the rivers.’ He is followed by Re. In the interpr. of the two passages only Ge is consistent, in taking the gen. with *krāṇā* in both cases. Lü, Re, and the publ. tr. all construe the gen. differently in the two places. I now think this is wrong and a consistent interpr. should be made, but I make the opposite choice to Ge’s. In the passage here I would supply ‘child’ as headnoun for *sín̄dhūnām* and change the tr. to “Through his action, (the child) of the rivers ...” There are several reasons for my change of heart besides a desire for consistency. For one thing *krāṇā* is never elsewhere construed with a gen. For another, Soma is otherwise the sole subj. of *āvīvaśat* and doesn’t need any assistance in this action.

IX.86.20: Ge interpr. *pavate* as a passive, with *manīṣibhiḥ* as agent (“Von den Verständigen wird der allerste Seher geläutert”), but *pāvate* is so insistently reflexive in the Soma maṇḍala that I strongly resist a passive here. Re’s tr. is like mine, though he doesn’t comment.

Trita is the ur-Soma presser. See disc. ad IX.37.4. Here, as Ge (n. 20c) suggests, Soma re-creates him for the current pressing, to ensure that Indra and Vāyu will get their soma.

IX.86.21: The first three pādas of this vs. begin *ayām* ‘this one here’.

The thrice seven cows here are also found in IX.70.1, as Ge (n. 21c) points out. See the seven cows in vs. 25.

On pāda d see comm. on the identical pāda ad IX.72.7.

IX.86.22–24: The *ṛca* seems to be characterized by augmented imperfects, though three of the five could be injunctives instead: *ārohayaḥ* [maybe] 22d, *abhavaḥ* 23c, *avṛṇoḥ* [maybe] 23d, *amadan* 24b, *ābharat* [maybe] 24c. It is also characterized by mythic allusions, esp. the Vala myth and the opening of the cowpen for the Aṅgirasas (23d) and the stealing of soma from heaven (24c), as well as the cosmogonic act of raising the sun into heaven (22d). Both this latter deed and the opening of the Vala cave are deeds usually attributed to Indra.

As for phraseology, in 22c and 23b the soma is “in the belly of Indra” (*indrasya jaṭhāre(su)* – sg. in 22c, pl. in 23b); *pavitra ā* is found in both 22b and 23a. With regard to external connections, 22d *nṛbhir yatāḥ* is also found in 20b, and 23b *indrasya jaṭhāreṣv āviśān* echoes 19d *indrasya hārdy āviśān*, with a different body part.

It may also be that 22 continues the theme of 21: in 21a Soma made the dawns shine forth (*vī rocyat*), while in 22d he made the sun mount in heaven (*sūryam ārohayo divī*). The two verbs are not only identical in formation (both *-āya*-transitives) but phonologically similar.

IX.86.22: Although the Pp. analyzes *ārohayaḥ* as containing an augment (*ā/ arohayaḥ*), it could equally well have an injunc.: *ā/ rohayaḥ*. The latter would fit better with the injunc. *vī rocyat* in 21a, just disc.; the former with the other augmented forms of this *ṛca*.

IX.86.23: The augmented impf. *abhavaḥ* is somewhat surprising in this context, because, at least in the publ. tr., it seems to refer to the recent past, rather than to the mythic past of the following (*a*) *vṛṇoḥ*. Perhaps, however, it opens the telling of the Vala myth continued in d (and possibly 24ab; see below).

The augment in (*a*) *vṛṇoḥ* is quite insecure: the Pp restores it, but it is not found in the Saṃhitā text and is metrically de trop.

IX.86.24: Both hemistichs open with a distracted 2nd sg. acc. pronoun (*t^uvām*). The accusative of this pronoun is, of course, historically monosyllabic, though distraction is not uncommon in the RV. Here the distraction may have resulted from matching the distracted nominative sg. form that opened the 2nd hemistich of the previous vs., 23c.

The impf. *amadan* in b is wrongly tr. as a present in the publ. tr.: correct to “did ... applaud.” This may continue the account of the Vala myth, with the “very attentive poets” being the Aṅgirasas themselves. It seems unlikely that it is the first action of the soma-stealing myth found in c.

Once again the Pp. analyzes *ā* / *abharat*, but the sequence could instead be *ā* / *bharat* with an injunc.

IX.86.25–27: Cows (that is, the milk-mixture) are esp. prominent in this ṛca: there are seven in 25b (recalling the “thrice seven” that produced the milk-mixture in 21c), here called *dhenávaḥ*, with *gāḥ* in 26c and *góbhiḥ* in 27c. Other miscellaneous animals: the sheep’s fleece (*ávyē ... vāre* 25a), buffaloes (*mahiṣāḥ* 26d), a steed (*átyaḥ* 26d), as well as the tawny one (*hāriṃ* 25b, 27b), if that is specifically a tawny horse or, as in 31b (*vṛṣā ... hāriḥ*), a tawny bull.

25b and 27b both open *hāriṃ navante*, each followed by a diff. preverb to be construed with the verb (*abhí, áva*). In 27a *asaścátaḥ* recalls 18c *ásaścūṣī*.

IX.86.26: The two pres. participles to $\sqrt{kṛ}$, act. *kṛṇvān* (b) and med. *kṛṇvānāḥ* (c), provide almost a textbook example of the functional distribution of voices: in b Soma makes X (into) Y for someone else (dat. *yájyave*), while in c he makes X (into) his own Y.

IX.86.27: On the likely pun on *abhiśríyaḥ*, see Ge (n. 27ab), also Scar 547–48.

It is not entirely clear what “the third back” (*tṛtīye pṛṣṭhé*) refers to, but most likely the highest (third) realm of heaven. Cf., for the back of heaven in general, *divás pṛṣṭhé* in IX.66.5.

IX.86.28–30: As noted in the publ. intro., this ṛca shows a high degree of unity. To start with, every pāda but 2 (of 12), begins with a form of the 2nd sg. prn.: mostly nom. *t^uvām* (28b, d, 29a, c, 30a) but also gen, *táva* (28a, 29b, d), with the final hemistich breaking the pattern with a single acc. *t^uvām* (distracted; see comm. ad vs. 24 above) in c and a single dat. *túbhya* in d. Only 28c and 30b fail to open with such a form (and 28c has the enclitic *te* later in the pāda). In addition, all 3 vss. contain the voc. *pavamāna* (28c, 29d, 30b), and all three also have forms of *vísva-* 28b, d, 29a, 30d). Note also that *vísvasya bhúvanasya* in the first vs. (28b) is echoed by *vísvā bhúvanāni* in the last (30d), and that *vidharmaṇi* (29b) is taken up by better specified *rájaso vidharmaṇi* (30a); cf. also *távemāḥ* (28a, 29b) varied by *túbhyemāḥ* (30d).

In terms of contents, the ṛca insistently asserts Soma's universal rule over all cosmic elements.

IX.86.28: Ge and Re (also Ober II.43) construe *táva* with *rétasaḥ* (e.g., Ge “Von deinem himmlischen Samen sind diese Geschöpfe”). I am reluctant to do so because of the parallelism of *távemāḥ* (*túbhyemāḥ*) just noted: all three expressions should be rendered in the same general way. In addition Ge's tr. essentially assumes *rétasaḥ* is abl., but its companion adj. *divyásya* is stubbornly gen. I would therefore stick to my tr., though slightly modified for clarity to “Yours are these offspring of (your) heavenly semen.”

For ... *viśvasya bhúvanasya rājasí*, see 5d, which is identical, and 36d ... *viśvasya bhúvanasya rājáse*, in an acc. + inf. phrase.

Pāda c is essentially a restatement of b.

Since *dhāma-dhā-* is an etymological figure, I have rendered it as one, rather than ‘establisher of domains’, vel sim.

IX.86.29: The cmpd. *viśva-vid-* is ambiguous here. Ge and Re both tr. as ‘all-knowing’, and that is favored by the context, since it is immediately followed by the voc. *kave* (‘sage poet’). But the cmpd recurs in the very similar pāda, 39c *tvám suvīro asi soma viśvavít*, and that vs. contains three similarly formed cmpds that surely belong to *√vid* ‘find’: IX.86.39a *govít ... vasuvíd dhiranyavít*. There the context favors ‘all-finding’. (Scar treats the two roots *√vid* together [489], so he is not forced to distinguish.) I suggest, as usual, that it's a pun.

IX.86.30: On the expression *pavítre rājaso vídharmaṇi* and its more succinct variants see comm. ad IX.64.9.

IX.86.31–33: After the tight structure of the preceding ṛca, we have returned to the lax stringing together of soma tropes. There is a lot of noise-making in 31 (b *cakradat*, c *vāvaśānā anūṣata*), which is slightly echoed in 33 (b *kánikradat*). Otherwise I see nothing particularly unifying.

As for external connections, GEN *niṣkṛtām √yā* in 32d is found also in 7b and 16a, and of course much of the soma lexicon is repeated elsewhere.

IX.86.32: Although the standard interpr. of *yáthā vidé* here makes Soma subj. of the verb (e.g., Ge “wie er es versteht”), pāda-final *yáthā vidé* is a common tag (I.127.4, 132.2, etc.) with a passive reading of the verb: “as is known, in the way that is known.”

The “directives of truth” (*ṛtásya praśíṣaḥ*) are convincingly identified as the hymns by Lü (469–70), as the adj. *nāvīyas-*, a standard descriptor of hymns in the fem., suggests.

I assume that the “threefold thread” (*tántum ... trivṛtám*) refers to the three soma pressings.

IX.86.34–36: Nothing much in the way of internal unity or external connection, beyond the obvious soma themes.

IX.86.34: The publ. tr. does not make sufficiently clear (or clear at all) that *pávamāna* is a voc. Better tr. “Self-purifying one, as a great flood you run ...”

With Ge and Re I take *máhy árṇaḥ* “great flood” as a nom., coreferential with the 2nd sg. subj. The statement “you are the sea” (29a *tvám samudró asi*) gives semantic support to the coreferential reading, though the two words (*samudrá-* and *árṇas-*) are different. By contrast, Lü (204, 239; sim. Ober II.152 n. 111) takes it as acc. of extent, indicating the space that the soma traverses, with the “filters” of b parallel to it in a simile: “du durchläufst die grosse Flut, wie die strahlende Sonne die wollenen Seihen.” This interpr. requires that the *real* filter (the sheep’s fleece) that the *real* soma ordinarily traverses be part of the simile, expressing what the sun crosses, while the metaphorical filter (“the great flood”) is part of the frame, where the real soma is crossing it. This is either very clever poetics, with several levels of metaphor below the surface simile – or an indication that his interpr. is incorrect. I’m afraid that I incline towards the latter view.

The expression in c *gábhasti-pūto nṛbhiḥ* is somewhat curious, since it essentially provides two agents, or agent-like elements, for the *pūtá-* ppl.: the 1st cmpd member *gábhasti-* and the indep. instr. *nṛbhiḥ*. (Of course, the men are the agents whose hands are the instruments.) Without the ‘hand’ (*gábhasti-*) we would expect **nṛ-pūta-*, like *nṛ-dhūta-* (1x), *nṛ-ṣūta-* (1x) (which, oddly enough, both rhyme with our putative form). Re has a slightly different interpr., but it has the same configuration. His “pressé par les seigneurs à l’aide des pierres” construes *nṛbhiḥ* with what follows, the instr. *ádribhiḥ* and the ppl. *sutáḥ*, with the two instr. filling the agent and instrument slots respectively. Since *nṛbhiḥ* is stationed exactly in between the two instrument+ppl. expressions, there’s no way to tell – though it seems to me somewhat more elegant for *nṛbhiḥ* to double a cmpd. member rather than morphologically doubling another instrument. Note that *ádri-ṣuta-* is also attested (2x) and that the same *ádribhiḥ sutáḥ* as here is found in this hymn in 23a..

IX.86.35: The accumulation of \sqrt{mad} derivatives is striking: *mádvā mádyo mádaḥ*. The last, *máda-*, is of course extraordinarily common, and the 2nd *mádyā-* reasonably well established (13x). But *madván-* is found only twice.

IX.86.36: Who the seven sisters (bzw. mothers) are is a matter of dispute: Sāy.: the streams or rivers, Ge: thoughts, Re (flg. Lü 246): celestial streams/rivers. No one seems to cite the seven milk-cows (*saptá dhenávaḥ*) in vs. 25 of this same hymn, or their multiplied number (thrice seven) in 21. But in this hymn “cows” seems the mostly likely immediate referent, esp. given the image of maternal care, whatever those cows may otherwise represent (beyond the milk-mixture).

On the expression in the last pāda, see similar phrases in vss. 5 and 28.

IX.86.37–39: For the first time in this hymn (save for briefly in vs. 18), this *ṛca* shows some interest in what Soma might do for *us*, particularly in the 2nd two vss. Note in 38 first the enclitic *naḥ* and then the 1st pl. opt. *syāma*. The poet both asks for benefits directly and by implication, in the cmpds with 2nd member -*vid-* ‘finding’: *góvid-*, *vasuvíd-*, *híraṇyavíd-*, *viśvavíd-* “cow-finding, goods-finding, gold-finding, all-finding” and the bahuvrīhi *suvīra-* ‘possessing good heroes’. If Soma finds or possesses these things, he can distribute them to us. The connection between vss. 38 and 39 is nicely signalled by the near identity of 38c and 39a:

38c ... *pavasva vásumad dhíraṇyavat*

39a ... *pavasva vasuvíd dhiranyavít*

where the suffix of possession (-*mant-*, -*vant-*) subtly gives way to the phonologically similar root-noun -*víd-*, suggesting that Soma possesses those things, which he can now find for us. The epithet *nṛ-cákṣas-* ‘having his gaze on men’, found several times previously in this hymn (vss. 23, 36), seems finally to take on its full lexical value in 38, where it is predicated of Soma (*nṛcákṣā asi*) and strengthened by *viśvátaḥ* ‘on every side’, to express Soma’s interest in us and our welfare. The reciprocal relationship between us and Soma is also expressed by the parallel pādas 38d and 39b, both containing *bhúvaneṣu* as the location of both us (38d) and Soma (39b).

IX.86.38: I take the -*mat* and -*vat* forms adverbially.

IX.86.39: On *viśvavíd-* see comm. ad vs. 29. Ge takes it as ‘all-knowing’ here, but the other -*víd-* cmpds in the vs. favor ‘all-finding’. Re, like me, ‘all-finding’ here, though ‘all-knowing’ in 29.

IX.86.40–42: The focus on our welfare found in the last *ṛca* is found here in vs. 41 but is otherwise muted.

IX.86.40: *vanánā-* is a hapax, though there seems to be general agreement that it means something like ‘desire’, derived from the *seṭ* root \sqrt{van} ‘love, hold dear’. There is an Old Avestan hapax of the same shape (Y. 44.15) that seems unconnected, in that, contextually, the standard tr. ‘victory’ seems correct, and it should therefore be derived from *aniṭ* \sqrt{van} ‘win’. But Kellens-Pirart in their OA lexicon (1990) equate it directly with our *vanánā-* and gloss it ‘charme’ – which makes no contextual sense and can, I think, easily be dismissed. In any case it is easy to see how our form came to be built. It is the object of the verb *úd ... atīṣṭhipat* ‘made to stand up / raised up’. The next vs., 41a, has a very similar VP, *bhandánā úd iyarti*, where the verb is semantically equivalent to our verb and has the same preverb, and the nominal object is a fem. acc. pl. -*ánā-* form, which provided the template for *vanánā-*. Given this parallelism and given the fact that the phrase in vs. 41 has to do with granting blessings to us, I think it likely that the desires Soma raised in 40a are our own (so also Ge, Re), which he will fulfill in the next vs.

ví gāhate as in 8a; cf. also *áti gāhate* in 26a.

Soma is presumably “thousand-spiked” (*sahásrabhrṣṭi-*) because of the knobs, thorns, or similar extrusions on the plant.

IX.86.41: On the relation between the first hemistich and vs. 40 see immed. above.

The publ. tr. “... all blessings, consisting of offspring and easy to bear” is awkward and hard to parse. It might be better as “... all blessings, consisting of offspring – a light burden –,” with *subhára-* used in almost jocular fashion. It can simultaneously also refer to “easy birth,” with ref. to *prajāvatīḥ*.

The unusually formed (pseudo-)āmreḍita *áhar-divi* ‘every day, day upon day’ is esp. interesting in light of the discussion of the two ‘day’ words ad vs. 19 above. It must be a substitute for the more orthodox āmreḍita *áhar-ahar* (6x) for metrical reasons: the

standard cmpd. is metrically awk. With three light syllables in a row, it certainly won't fit in any cadence and would be difficult anywhere in the vs. line but where it's always found, pāda-initial (which isn't all that great either – openings with light syllables in both 2 and 3, not to mention 1 and possibly 4, are quite irregular; see Arnold pp 194–95). It is puzzling, however, that the well-attested (47x) (also somewhat aberrantly formed) āmreḍita to the second 'day' stem here, namely *divé-dive*, was not used in our vs., since it would fit the cadence perfectly and is quite common in Jagatī cadences. In any case, at least *āhar-divi* suggests that there's no clearcut difference of meaning or reference between *āhar-* and the forms of *div-/dyu-* that mean 'day'.

In the 2nd hemistich, Soma is not asked directly for benefits, but rather urged to intercede with Indra – to beg him for our sake – for offspring and wealth. This displacement is made all the stranger by the use of a “future imperative,” *yācatāt*, which properly should follow another impv. Perhaps the displacement in time that such an impv. represents – that is, there should be an intervening impv. before it – indirectly reflects the displacement in person – that is, Soma is the middleman, intervening between us and Indra. I suppose it is bad form to ask Indra directly in a hymn devoted to Soma.

There is further displacement here. The “sacred formulation bringing offspring” (*bráhma prajāvat*) that we want Soma to get Indra to give us is not a direct request for Indra to bestow offspring on us, but rather for him to inspire in us a formulation that we can then offer to him, which will, only then, result in offspring. It's a long and winding road to what we want!

The interpr. of the hapax bahuvr. *ásva-pastya-* is disputed. My tr. “consisting of horses in the homestead” essentially follows Gr's ‘Rosse im Stalle habend’, though it would be more lit. as ‘having a homestead that has horses in it’ – a *vájra-bāhu-* type cmpd. Ge's tr. “an vielen Rossen” seems to evade the issue, but his statement in n. 41c “wie später *-sālin-*” is more forthcoming: *-sālin-* means lit. ‘having a house/room’, but develops to ‘abounding in’. Nonetheless, I find it hard to believe that a RVic poet would go to the trouble of using a fairly rare word as 2nd member, only in order to bleach it of its particular meaning. Re's “la richesse qui réside dans les chevaux” (and Ober's “dessen fester Wohnsitz Pferde sind” [I.537 n. 111]) employs an abstract sense of *pastyà-* to characterize where *wealth*'s dwelling is: it resides in – that is, is founded on / consists of – horses. Whereas my interpr. assumes a concrete homestead, which belongs to the speaker and/or his associates, that is stuffed, as it were, with horses. The difference between the abstract and the concrete interpr. is small but significant, and I continue to prefer the concrete one.

IX.86.42: This vs., too, contains the two 'day' words, gen. pl. *āhnām*, dependent on *ágre*, and the adverbial instr. expression *ánu dyúbhiḥ*. See comm. ad vss. 19, 41.

I take *prá ... cetayate* as a reflexive trans./caus. ‘makes oneself perceived’, contrary to the intrans. interpr. in my *-āya-* book (p. 163).

As is generally recognized, *nārā ca śámsam* shows a species of tmesis, from the cmpd *nārāśámsa-*.

On *dhartári* as one of the few likely exx. of a loc. inf., see Keydana (Inf. 197–99).

IX.86.43–45: This tṛca seems more artful than most of the other, with metaphor layered upon metaphor (vss. 43, 45), varied by similes (vs. 44).

IX.86.43: The first hemistich is striking with its series of identical verbs in pāda a, with pāda b ending with the same verb: *añjāte vy añjate sám añjate, ... abhy añjate*. The first pāda lacks a syllable (rest at 4); as Old suggests, the metrical irregularity is most likely meant to call attention to the word play.

Ge, Re, Lü (239) take the various verbs as reflex., with Ge (n. 43ab) taking the subj. as the soma-drinking singers and Re as the waters. But though mid. $\sqrt{añj}$ is probably more often reflex./pass. than trans., it can be the latter, and that makes more sense here. Cf., e.g., IX.97.57 *sám añjate rūpám* “they jointly anoint his form,” and recall the many times in this maṇḍala in which soma “is anointed,” using the true passive *ajyāte* (-se) (often as a pun with ‘is driven’ to \sqrt{aj}). See especially in the next ṛca of this hymn 47c *góbhiḥ ... samajyāse*, in the same metrical position as *sám añjate* here. I supply the default Soma as obj. throughout the first hemistich; he is found as explicit (though metaphorical) obj. in the 2nd hemistich. As for the subj. of all these verbs, I agree with Re that it is the waters.

The “ox flying in the burbling up of the river” of pāda c is an ex. of the layers of metaphor just alluded to above: it compresses three different representations of Soma into a single image.

I take the subj. of *grbhñate* and referent of *hiranya-pāvāḥ* in d still to be the waters, with *āsu* functioning as reflexive. Re explicitly changes his subj. here to “les hommes.”

IX.86.44: Ge, Re, Ober (II.54) take *ándhaḥ* as nom., parallel to *dhārā* in the simile. But insofar as it is possible to narrow the referent of this word, it is used of the stalk of the soma (see comm. ad IV.1.19). I take it here as acc., construed with *āti*. This pāda, like the following one, depicts the soma juice leaving behind the solid parts of the plant, and *āti* ‘beyond’ is used in both pādas to express the material beyond which the soma juice has gone.

The simile in d, *átyo ná krīlan*, is also found in 26d.

IX.86.45: In a *agre-gáh* echoes *ágre áhnām* in 42a; in our vs. *áhnām* appears in the following pāda, dependent on something else (*vimānaḥ*), though Re supplies it with *agregáh* as well.

bhúvaneṣv árpitaḥ also in 39b.

In d I construe *rāyé* with *okyāḥ*, although I cannot find any parallel usage. But on its own, *okyāḥ* is hard to fit semantically into the vs.; cf. Ge’s “gern bleibend” and Re’s “(ce dieu) domestique,” which seem like afterthoughts..

IX.86.46–48: The hymn ends with a ṛca no more unified than most of those that preceded it, repeating the same tropes oscillating between ritual and cosmic images.

IX.86.46: In pāda a *skambhó divāḥ* reminds us of 35d *divó viṣṭambhāḥ* with a diff. lexical real

On *tridhātu*- see comm. ad IX.70.8.

Pāda c *aṃśúm rihanti matáyaḥ pánipnatam* is identical to 31d, save for the first word, which in 31 is *sísūm*.

In d *yádi* would be best read *yád *ī*, both for sense and for meter, since an opening with light syllables in positions 3 and 4 before an early caesura is very rare (see Arnold 194).

Ge tr. *nirñjam ... yayúḥ* as “Staat machen” (make a show), based, he says (n. 46d), on *śúbham yā*. I see no reason to attenuate the sense of *nirñj-*. As Scar (284–85) argues, this stem can be both a concrete noun ‘garment’ and an infin. ‘to array’. The infinitival usages he cites are mostly the dat. *nirñje* (which, in all quoted cases, I take as a noun) and he is uncertain about the usage of this acc. ex. But since the analysis just proposed of *yád *ī* provides us with an acc. obj., infinitival usage seems best here.

IX.86.47: Pāda b is awk. in English. The sense is that the streams of the soma being purified go charging forward continuously, with *rámhayah* ‘charges, speedy forward movements’ subj. of *yanti*.

IX.86.48: The aggressively hostile command in pāda c comes as something of a surprise in this otherwise ritually and cosmically focused hymn.

The last pāda is the Gṛtsamada refrain from Maṇḍala II. This tṛca is attributed by the Anukramaṇī to Gṛtsamada, but perhaps only on the basis of the refrain.

IX.87–97

The section containing Triṣṭubh hymns

IX.87–89

These three hymns are attributed to Uśanas Kāvya, probably on the basis of the mention of his name in 87.3.

IX.87

IX.87.1: In b Soma is urged to run for the prize (*vājam*); in c he is then *compared* to a prize-winning horse (*ásvam ... vājīnam*), a nice ex. of how description shades into simile. It is made somewhat more complex by the fact that the simile (probably) surrounds the target ‘you’: *ásvam ná tvā vājīnam*, so that *vājīnam* could technically be part of the frame, not the simile (“... you, the prize-winner, like a horse”), though in fact *tvā* is in modified Wackernagel’s position. Soma is directly called a *vājīn-* in 4d.

IX.87.2: This vs. contains two links to the preceding hymn, despite their difference in meter: most of pāda c *pitā devānām janitā ...* is identical to IX.86.10b, with each closing with a word that conforms to its cadential template; the first two words of d, *viṣṭambhó divó*, are identical to IX.86.35d *divó viṣṭambháḥ*, but in opposite order, with minimal metrical difference. (Our pāda is repeated in IX.89.6, while the order in 86.35 is repeated in IX.108.16.)

IX.87.3: The first hemistich contains three resonant words in the realm of poet / wordsmith / seer: *ḥsir vípraḥ ... kāvyena*, with *kavī-* represented by the vṛddhi deriv. This deriv. is similar, but not identical to the patronymic *kāvya-* associated with the immed. preceding *uśānā*, and by its difference in accent and in case, it cleverly plays on the full

name Uśanā Kāvya. (On the tricky morphology of the name, see my 2007 “Vedic Uśanā Kāvya and Avestan Kauui Usan: On the Morphology of the Names,” in *Verba Docenti* [Fs. Jasanoff].) As Ge suggests, the Anukramaṇī’s attribution of this hymn to the legendary Uśanas Kāvya is no doubt based on this vs.

The Engl. tr. does not make clear that “of theirs” is fem. (*āsām*) and must anticipate the cows (*gónām*) in the next pāda.

IX.87.5: In pāda b the HvN text reads *mahé vājāyām ṛtāya śrāvāmsi*, with word break after putative *vājāyām*. But it should instead read *vājāyāmṛtāya* without break (as in both the devanāgarī text and the transliterated text of Aufrecht), to be analyzed, with Pp., as *vājāya / amṛtāya*. Undoing the vowel contraction at the caesura in this way produces too many syllables (12, with a Triṣṭubh cadence). Old is uncertain whether to opt for that analysis or for contraction over the caesura, which seems to be Arnold’s (not very clearly expressed) view (p. 192, §215 iii).

Given the importance of *vāja-* ‘prize’ (1a, 5b, 6d) and *vājín-* ‘prizewinner’ (1c, 4d) in this hymn, the tr. of the dat. phrase in pāda b should be corrected to “for the great immortal prize.”

In keeping with my view that medial forms of the them. stem *pávate* are always reflexive, not passive, the tr. should be corrected to “purifying themselves through the filters” – esp. because of the contrastive undoubted passive *pūyámānaḥ* in the next vs.

IX.87.6: The gen. *jánānām* is best construed with *puruhūtáḥ* as (pseudo-)agent. See the same phrase, though with accented voc. *púruhūta*, in IX.52.4, 64.27 – though in the former passage I construe the gen. with another noun in the publ. tr. I now think that may be wrong.

The accentuation of the athem. part. *túñjāna-* is puzzling; the other ex. of this part. (IX.57.2) has the expected accent *tuñjáná-* as do finite forms like *tuñjánti*. There also exists a single form of a thematic med. part. *túñjamāna-* (III.1.16) also with unexpected accent on the root syllable. Gotō (1st Kl, 78) suggests this form is “metrical” for the athem. form, but does not treat the accent.

The finale of d, *abhí vājam arṣa*, is identical to the end of 1b.

IX.87.8: On the mixture of myth and ritual in this vs., see publ. intro. Given the fem. subj. prn. *sā*, the mythological allusion to Saramā would be available to the audience on the basis of the phrase *gā viveda* “found the cows”; cf. V.45.7 *sarámā gā avindat*, .8 *sarámā vidat gāḥ* -- though it must be admitted that *gāḥ* √ *vid* has other gods as subject elsewhere. See comm. ad V.29.3.

Notice that the pf. *viveda* returns here from 3c, which was also, if less clearly, about the Vala myth.

IX.87.9: The publ. tr. takes pāda c as a second complement of *pári yāsi* in pāda a, parallel to *rāsím ... gónām*. By contrast both Ge and Re take c as the obj. (or pseudo-obj.) of *síkṣā* in d: e.g., “Suche uns ... viele grosse Labsale zu erwirken.” But the lexicalized desid. stem *síkṣa-* does not take an obj., but only a dative of benefit (see comm. ad VI.31.4), and so that interpr. seems blocked to me. However, it may be an independent nominal clause: “many are (your) lofty refreshments,” the interpr. I would now favor. Scar’s (636–37)

interpr. is similar, though he then sneaks c in as an understood obj. of *śīkṣā*: “Viel, gross sind die Labungen ... verhilf [zu diesen]” or “... verhilf uns [dazu],” which seems unnec.

All the standard interpr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take the last three words as a separate clause, but this short phrase poses several problems. First, *tāḥ* is a nom. (/acc.) plural fem. demonstr., but the following word, the hapax root noun *upaṣṭút*, is by all appearances singular. Several solutions have been proposed to this mismatch. Ge simply says (n. 9d) that *upaṣṭút* at the end of the hymn represents pl. *upaṣṭútaḥ*, which is not very satisfactory. He tr. “Dein sind diese Lobpreisungen.” Old has two suggestions: 1) *upaṣṭút* is adverbial: “in einer zu den *stútaḥ* gerichteten Bewegung,” citing phrases like *stutīr úpa* (I.84.2). But he gives no parallels for such adverbial formation (maybe the likewise problematic *dakṣiṇí?*), and it is also hard to see how this would work in context (“these are in the direction of your praise”??). 2) *upaṣṭút* is an agent noun: Soma as praiser. But he rejects this even as he suggests it. Scar (636–37) discusses previous suggestions and suggests further possibilities. Re’s solution as embodied in his tr. “Ces (avantages sont) ta louange (même),” with an equational sentence equating *tāḥ* with *upaṣṭút*, seems to me the best way to deal with the number disharmony – though in his n. Re floats several other, less compelling possibilities. The question then is what is the reference of *tāḥ*. I’m not sure what Re means by “avantages.” I think the most likely referent is the fem. pl. in the immediately preceding pāda: *īṣaḥ* ‘refreshments’, and Re’s n. gives what I consider the clue to the interpr. of the whole in his citation of the cmpd. *īṣa(h)stút*- in V.50.5 (though in fact he cites it in service of a different solution). In V.50.5 *īṣa(h)stúto manāmahe* I tr. “Let us conceive praise-songs as refreshment” (see comm. ad loc.). Here I suggest that we are announcing our praise-song as Indra’s refreshments, the counterpart to the refreshments he offers us. The publ. tr. does not convey this sense; it should be changed to “These (refreshments) are (our) praise for you.”

The retroflexion in *upaṣṭút*- is extremely puzzling, esp. given the non-retroflexed *úpastuta-* (*upastutá-*), *úpastuti-*, *upastútya-*. AiG I.237 registers the form, but simply says that sometimes -ṣ- in cmpds spreads beyond its proper domain, which isn’t terribly helpful.

IX.88

On the thematic structure of the hymn, see publ. intro. The similes that begin the middle vss. 3–5 are all further defined by the syntactic structure GOD *ná yó*. In the first two of these Soma is in the 2nd ps., but in the 3rd ps. in vs. 5.

IX.88.1: The vs. is notable for the dense repetition of the 2nd ps. sg. prn., with five exx. in the first three pādas.

The initial annunciatory *ayám* should probably be more clearly represented in the tr.: “this soma here ...”

For the metrically bad *vavṛṣé* see Kü (459) and comm. ad VI.4.7. As Kü points out, we would expect this *ṣṛ* root to have a pre-C weak perf. stem **vavūr-*, which would fit the cadence here much better.

The publ. tr. renders *mádāya yújyāya sómam* as “the soma to be yoked for exhilaration,” falsely giving the impression that dat. *yújyāya* modifies acc. *sómam*. I now realize that the five occurrences of dat. *yújyāya* should be taken as nouns expressing purpose, not as adjectives. Interestingly four of the five passages have as main verb a

form of \sqrt{vr} ‘choose’: VII.19.9 ... *vṛṇīṣva yújyāya* ..., VIII.4.15 *prá* ... *vṛṇīmahe, yújyāya* ..., IX.66.18 *vṛṇīmáhe yújyāya*, and our ... *vavṛṣe, ... yújyāya*. There thus appears to be a fixed syntagm X *yújyāya* \sqrt{vr} “choose/select X for yoking (/for use),” and I would now tr. this passage “... the drop, the soma, which you have chosen for yoking for exhilaration.” I would not construe it directly with the adjacent dative *mádāya*, which is a separate expression of purpose.

IX.88.2: The “yoking” theme of 1d is immediately taken up in 2a by the passive aor. *ayojí*, with concrete sense at least in the simile.

On the unexpected short vowel in the hapax *bhuri-ṣāt* (for *bhūri-*), see the not entirely satisfactory disc. by Scar (607).

nāhus- must be a PN (see Mayr. PN); it is generally, but not exclusively, found in the sg. The deriv. *nahuṣyà-* here is best interpr. in conjunction with nearby IX.91.2 *kavyaīh... nahuṣyèbhiḥ*, where it refers to poets. That interpr. would fit the context here as well, since the Nahusian creatures are roaring at the soma on the ritual ground. However, Nahus (and his ilk) are not only poet-ritualists, but fill a number of roles – e.g., as patron in I.122.8, 10–11. The phrase here, *nahuṣyāṇi jātāḥ* should also be compared with X.80.6 *mānuṣo nāhuṣo ví jātāḥ* and possibly with X.99.7 *nāhuṣaḥ ... sújātaḥ*, if that is the constituency (see comm. ad loc.).

IX.88.3: Both Ge and Re take *iṣṭá-* in the cmpd. *iṣṭá-yāman-* as belonging to the root $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send’ (e.g., “[d]er seine Fahrt beeilt” and see Ge’s n. 3a). But as Old (ZDMG 62 [1908] 473–74) points out, we should then expect **iṣitá-yāman-*. (Like me, Old attributes *iṣṭá-* here to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’, though his interpr. of the cmpd. differs from mine.) The parallel passages with *iṣṭáye* in conjunction with $\sqrt{yā}$ that Ge adduces in his n. (and others he doesn’t cite) all belong, in my opinion, to ‘seek, desire’, not ‘send’.

IX.88.4: In order to connect the comparison with Indra more clearly to the whole vs., I would now be inclined to tr. “Like Indra, who is the doer of great deeds, you are a stronghold-splitting smiter of obstacles,” though this now makes it less clear that Soma is being compared to Indra also in his general capacity of doer of deeds. The Sanskrit is more forgiving.

Pāda c is metrically defective; see esp. Old for disc. After suggesting, and rejecting, various fixes, he considers the possibility that the pāda ended with *hantā*, which was redactionally eliminated by word haplogy, since the next pāda begins with *hantā*. This would get us the proper syllable count, though, as Old notes, the cadence would be bad, in that the antepenult would be heavy: ... *āhināmnām *hantā#*. Despite the problem of the cadence, this seems like the most attractive solution, and I would now slightly alter the tr. to “Because, like Pedu’s (horse) (you are) *the smiter of those with serpents’ names, you are the smiter of every Dasyu.”

On the serpent-smiting horse that the Aśvins gave Pedu, one of their clients, see I.117.9, 188.9. Unfortunately this is all we know about the horse’s exploits.

IX.88.5: Because the finite verb *kṛṇute* in b is unaccented, the rel. cl. must be confined to pāda a, and this in turn means that *srjyāmānaḥ* is a predicated pres. participle. On the phrase in pāda b, see comm. ad IX.76.1.

The loc. *vāne* must be read twice, in both simile and frame, with different senses. Just as Agni/fire is set loose in the firewood, Soma is set loose in the wooden cup.

IX.88.6: The simile in b is somewhat odd. It is in the nom. pl., and its comparandum should therefore be the soma juices (*etē sómāḥ*) in pāda a. But the sense of the simile, “like heavenly buckets” (*divyā ná kósāsaḥ*), doesn’t fit the soma juices, but rather the containers that hold the soma liquid. When the word *kósā-* is used in ritual context, it refers to a bucket or cask, towards which the soma is generally moving. I therefore think that the comparison here is between the heavenly *kósā-* and the sheep’s fleece filters in pāda a, from which the soma drips as if from a cloud. The third word of the simile, *abhrā-varṣāḥ* “possessing/holding the rain from clouds,” is the clue: soma is regularly compared to rain (see, e.g., Ober II.40–42) esp. as it comes off the filter, but here the comparison is to containers that are the source of rain. If this analysis is correct, a syntactic problem arises: the simile should be acc. pl. matching *vārāṇy ávyā*. I suggest that pāda b is parenthetical, that it does refer to the fleece filters, and that the fact that the latter is neut. facilitated the switch to the nominative parenthesis.

The simile in c also has a slight twist, but is hardly as problematical as b. The simile particle here is positioned late, assuming that the simile consists of *samudrám síndhavo ná nīcīḥ* “like rivers downward to the sea,” with *samudrám* corresponding to *kalāsān* in d. However, because *samudrá-* is regularly used in soma hymns as a (perhaps faded) metaphor for the waters that the soma enters, it may be that *samudrám* is not felt to be part of the simile here. Cf. the parallel passage IX.64.17 *vīthā samudrám índavaḥ / ágman* “The drops have come at will to the sea,” without overt simile marking.

IX.88.7: Ge and Re take the simile in c to be *āpo ná makṣū* (Ge: “rasch wie das Wasser”), but *makṣū* is an adverb, and so the simile would not be well formed. Re deals with this problem by supplying a participle, “(agissant) promptement comme les eaux.” I take *makṣū* rather with the imperatival clause that follows: *sumatír bhavā naḥ*. It is worth noting that *makṣū* is almost always initial, and if we detach the simile *āpo ná* it could be so here as well.

So what quality of Soma’s is being compared to that of the waters? I take it to be *sahásrāpsāḥ*, which opens pāda b, a word whose meaning is not transparent. Sāy. glosses it *pururūpaḥ* ‘having many forms’, which is featureless enough to qualify almost anything; Ge and Re follow him. But *āpsas-* means ‘breast’, and the cmpd *dīrghāpsas-* (I.122.15), modifying a chariot, is generally rendered by ‘having a long front’ – presumably a long forward projection. Our cmpd is rendered in EWA [s.v. *āpsas-*] as ‘tausendfrontig’, but it is hard to conjure up a such a picture, particularly with reference to soma, much less the waters. More promising is the context in which the two independent forms of *āpsas-* (I.124.7, V.80.6) are found. (The third form usually grouped here, found in VIII.45.5 *girāv āpsaḥ*, is better segmented as *girā vāpsaḥ*; see comm. ad loc.) Both passages have a female as subject, with the VP *nī riṇīte āpsaḥ* “she lets her breast spill over,” describing a young woman (/Dawn) displaying her charms. Here the breast is conceptually a liquid, and it seems to refer to the pliant flesh, breast tissue, that spills out of her garment (a metaphor alive in 21st c. US). Starting from this picture of a liquid or liquified breast, I suggest that *-apsas-* in our cmpd. refers to forward projections,

esp. those that could appear in a liquid – in short, ripples – which fits both the waters and the soma reasonably well.

The final simile of the vs., “like a sacrifice that conquers in battle” (*ṛtanāṣāṅ ná yajñāḥ*) is unusual; the other 8 occurrences of the compd. *ṛtanāṣāḥ*- qualify gods, the qualities of gods, or a hero. However, the purport of the simile is not difficult to construct: if we mortals perform the sacrifice correctly, it will attract and gratify the gods, particularly Indra, who will provide the divine aid needed to prevail in battle. Note that *ṛtanāṣāt* forms a ring with *bhurīṣāt* in 2a.

The retroflex initial of *-ṣāḥ*- in this compd is the result of the assimilation of *-s-* to the retroflex final in the nom. sg. *-ṣāt*; see Schindler (Rt. Nouns p. 48): 5 of the 9 forms of this compd are nom. sg. The retroflex is then spread throughout the paradigm (acc. sg. 3x, gen. sg. 1x) and also into the deriv. *ṛtanāṣāya-* (III.37.1). On the variable length of the root syllable in the oblique (*-ṣāham* 1x, *-ṣāham*, *-as* 3x), see Scar (612–13).

IX.88.8: This vs. is identical to I.91.3, also a Soma hymn. Unfortunately the publ. tr. of the two vss. differ in pāda b. In I.91.3 I tr. “lofty and deep is your domain.” I now think this should be harmonized with the tr. here “yours is his lofty, deep domain.” The vs. attributes to Soma some of the salient characteristics of the three principal Ādityas overtly in a, c, d, and it seems unlikely that one pāda would deviate from this pattern. Both Varuṇa (I.123.8, IV.5.4) and (more often) Varuṇa + Mitra (I.152.4-5, VII.61.4, X.10.6, X.89.8) possess *dhāman-*. Here Soma’s *dhāman-* can be identified with that of just-mentioned Varuṇa (so the publ. tr.) or anticipate Mitra (pāda c) in addition to Varuṇa.

On *dakṣāyya-* see comm. ad I.91.3.

IX.89

IX.89.1: The explicitly conjoined loc. phrase *mātúr upáste vána ā ca* “in the lap of the mother and in the wood” is a bit puzzling; the *ca* implies that the two terms belong to a natural or reasonably comprehensible constructed class. Ge (n. 1d) suggests that “mother” refers to the earth, that is, (he further specifies) the surface of the ground or the Vedi, while “wood” refers to the wooden cup. The latter is quite likely, but I prefer Ge’s 2nd suggestion for the former – that “mother” here refers to Aditi. The phrase *upáste ádíteḥ* is found 3x in IX (26.1, 71.5, 74.5) as well as 2x in X. Although the exact referent is not entirely clear (see JPB, Ādityas 238–41), it obviously refers to something on the ritual ground or to the ritual ground itself. Aditi is of course the archetypal mother, so “of the mother” is an easy substitute “of Aditi” in the phrase. The referent would be more specific that simply “of the earth,” which could cover a lot of ground, as it were. Alternatively, if the mother = earth, this could be a reference to the soma plant growing on the earth, but the ritual setting of the vs. seems too insistent to allow that – though see 2d.

IX.89.2: Pāda a could also mean “the king has donned his garment of the rivers,” but IX.86.33, which also opens *rājā síndhūnām*, where the constituency is clear, eliminates that possibility.

Note the chiasmic *#rājā ... rájiṣṭhām#* opening and closing the first hemistich.

Pāda d contains one of the paradoxes beloved of RVic bards. The identities of the subj.s and obj.s of the two *duhé* are disputed. Old, for ex., thinks that Father Heaven yields Soma in the first clause, while Soma yields Dawn in the second – because *pitúr jā́m* in X.3.2 refers to Dawn. But this seems to take us too far afield: the strict parallelism of the two mini-clauses—*duhá īm pitā́ / duhá īm pitúr jā́m*—sketches a closed loop, and introducing an entity not already implicit in the discourse seems unlikely. Ge’s interpr. (n. 2d) seems closer. The subj. of the first *duhé* is in my opinion Heaven (*dyaúṣ pitā́*), with half of his name represented by *pitā́* and the other found earlier in the simile *divó ná vr̥ṣṭh̥* “like the rain from heaven.” This simile is also the clue to the identity of the object: soma as rain. Then this soma/rain is the subject of the 2nd *duhé*; it yields soma itself, in the form of the plant whose growth is due to rain. This soma(plant) or the soma juice itself can also be reckoned as the “offspring of his father,” namely of Heaven. This could be a reference to the heavenly soma or simply to the soma juice assimilated to rain.

IX.89.3: Gr, Ge, and Old (flg. Lanman, Noun Inflec. 414) take *mádhvah* as a nom. pl. Lanman and Gr (supplying *drapsās* or sim.) identify it as masc. (Old says nothing further), while Ge seemingly as a fem., since he supplies “Milchkühe.” This gender switch (and adjectival interpr.) is unrec.; in all cases of supposed masc. or fem. pl. *mádhvah* (see the list in Gr) the form can be interpr. as a gen. sg. to the neut. noun. In our passage Re supplies a pl. subj. “streams” on which gen. *mádhvah* depends: “(Les coulées) de miel ...” But I simply take it as a gen. of material, dependent on *siṃhám* (“lion of honey”). The compd. *mádhupr̥ṣṭha-* ‘honey-backed’, lit. ‘having a back of honey’ (in my interpr., contra Gr/Ge ‘having honey on his back’) supports my interpr., and note that 6d contains a *mádhvah* that is universally taken as gen.

As subj. of *nasanta* I supply cows or waters, probably the former, since they appear in c and implicitly in d.

Ge seems to take *ayāsam* with *pátim* rather than *siṃhám*, but given that the adj. appears in the same pāda with the lion and given that another animal, the horse, is described as *ayāsam* in the next vs. (4a), “unbridled lion” seems more likely.

IX.89.5: The *cátasrah ... ghr̥tadúhah ... níṣattāḥ* “four (fem.), yielding ghee as milk, set down ...” is highly reminiscent of IX.74.6 *cátasro nā́bho níhitāḥ* “four hidden (lit., ‘put down, deposited’) (streams) bursting out ...” See comm. ad loc., where, flg. Ge, I suggest that “four” is a metaphorical reference to the four teats of a cow’s udder. In our passage I don’t understand what “set down within the same support” (*samāné antár dharúṇe*) refers to, unless it’s the placement of the teats in/on the udder, which would be the *dharúṇa-* here. I also don’t know if there’s a secondary reference to some piece or pieces of ritual equipment from which (pitcher with 4 spouts? 4 pitchers?) the mixing milk is poured, or if an actual cow is stationed nearby. But here, as in IX.74.6, I think the immediate physical referent is to the streams of milk that emerge from the teats, rather than their source(s).

The *īm* in c was omitted from the tr., where it presumably expresses the goal of *arṣanti*. I would now tr. “They rush to him while being purified ...” The parens. around “him” in the next pāda can be erased, since that pāda also contains *īm*. The concentration of forms of *īm* in this hymn should also be noted: 2d (2x), 4c, 5a, 5c, 5d.

IX.89.6: The placement of *utá* in b is unexpected: it should not break up the NP *viśvāḥ ... kṣitāyaḥ*, which it is conjoining to the two nominal expressions in pāda a. We would expect #**utá viśvāḥ kṣitāyaḥ*. Perhaps the metrically distasteful initial two light syllables prompted a flip. Klein (DGRV I.330–31) does not discuss this placement in his treatment of the passage.

Pāda c *ásat ta útso gr̥naté niyútvān* is somewhat puzzling, at least on the literal level: “your wellspring will be possessed of a team for the singer.” Ge’s rendering, “Dein Quell sei freigebig ...,” is overly free, but it probably captures the sense fairly closely. The semantic pathway is clearer in Re’s “Que ta source ... procure un attelage (de biens).” Cf. III.49.4 ... *vásubhir niyútvān* “teamed with goods.” Perhaps the tr. should be altered to “will provide teams (of goods) ...” Although *niyútvant-* is also found in the preceding hymn (IX.88.2), its use there seems unconnected with this one.

IX.89.7: The dat. *indrāya* opening pāda b echoes the dat. *indriyāya*, which closes the preceding vs. (6d). It is also piquant that Soma adopts “Vṛtra-slayer” (*vṛtrahān-*), Indra’s own epithet, when he acts on behalf of Indra.

The two aims of Soma’s purification *abhí devāvītim* and *indrāya* “towards pursuit of the gods” and “for Indra” are grammatically non-parallel.

IX.90

IX.90.1: The fut. part. *sanīṣyān* in b potentially contrasts with the desid. part. *sīṣāsan* in 4c, though I have tr. them the same, and it is not clear whether they are expressing truly different nuances. Nonetheless the future part. here could be tr. “being about to win the prize.”

IX.90.2: As Re also notes, the vs. is strongly marked by *v*-alliteration, esp. in c: ... *vīṣanam vayodhām* (a), ... *avāvaśanta vāñīḥ* (b), *vānā vāsāno vāruṇo* ... (c), *vī ... vāryāñi* (d). Note also the parallel root-noun cmpds *vayo-dhām* (a) and *ratna-dhā(h)* (d), which latter also alliterates with *dayate*. For *vayo-dhā-* see also vs. 6 below.

IX.90.3: This vs. also shows alliteration, this time of sibilants, esp. in pādas a (*śūrāgrāmaḥ sāravīraḥ sáhāvān*) and d (*áṣāḥaḥ sāhvān pītanāsu śátrūn*). It also contains forms from three different roots meaning (roughly) ‘conquer, win’: $\sqrt{\text{sah}}$ (*sáhāvān*, *áṣāḥaḥ sāhvān*), $\sqrt{\text{ji}}$ (*jētā*), $\sqrt{\text{san}}$ (*sánitā*).

IX.90.4: *ābhayāni* in pāda a is the only neut. pl. to this stem. The idiom *ābhayaṃ* $\sqrt{\text{kṛ}}$ is quite common (and cf. *ābhayaṃ-karā-* 1x). This idiom is formulaically connected with “broad pastures”; see esp. VII.77.4 *urvīm gāvvyūtim ābhayaṃ kṛdhī naḥ* “create broad pastureland and fearlessness for us” and nearby IX.78.5 *urvīm gāvvyūtim ābhayaṃ ca nas kṛdhi* “Make wide pasturage and security for us.” I have supplied ‘places’ because of the association with pasturage.

The apparent transitive value of *sám cikradaḥ ... vājān* “you have roared together prizes ...” is anomalous, but hard to avoid. The idiom is similar to IX.64.3 ... *cakradaḥ ..., sám gāḥ ... sá árvataḥ*. See disc. ad loc. In that passage I found a way to avoid a transitive reading in the publ. tr., but in the comm. consider a transitive alternate. In our

passage here the publ. tr. has a transitive reading, but it would also be possible to make *mahāh ... vājān* another object of *sīśāsan* and tr. “Striving to win the waters, also the dawns, the sun, the cows, and great prizes, you have roared at them all together.” Note *vājam sanīṣyān* in 1b, and see the disc. ad vs. 1.

IX.90.6: Note that the VP *vāyo dhāh* “impart vitality” reprises the compd. *vayodhām* in 2a in the same metrical position.

In d *sūktāya* was omitted from the tr., which should be changed to “impart vitality to our well-spoken speech” or, perhaps less likely, “... to our hymn [*sūktā*], to our speech.”

IX.91

IX.91.1: As discussed in several places in the comm. (see lexical list), the root $\sqrt{vañc}$ refers to a number of types of non-linear motion: undulate, curl, coil, etc., with these meanings also distributed among the derivatives of the root, esp. *vākvān-*. Here my tr. ‘billowing’ refers to the motion of the waves of the liquid soma; cf. X.148.5 *ūrmīr nā ... vākvāh* “billowing like a wave.”

The publ. tr. doesn’t adequately represent the two divergent derivatives of \sqrt{man} ‘think, bring to mind’, *manótar-* and *manīṣī-*. The latter, by itself, means ‘possessing inspired thought, inspired thinker’. The former, a rarer derivative, means, in my view, someone who pays mental attention, a ‘minder’. See comm. ad II.9.4. I would emend the tr. here to “the minder, the foremost inspired thinker with his insight.” The point here, I think, is that Soma not only has inspired thoughts of his own but pays attention to those of the human celebrants.

The ten sisters are, as usual, the fingers of the officiant.

IX.91.2: The main clause of this vs., pādas ab, contains a predicated aor. part., *svānāh*, while the rel. cl., pādas cd, may contain a predicated intens. part., *marmījānāh*. However, given the *prá* opening c, it’s quite possible that we should supply a verb of motion “(go) forth” as the main verb, with the part. simply a modifier (“the drop [goes] forth, being groomed ...”). However, I prefer the publ. tr., which does supply ‘go’ but as an oblique expression of purpose. Alternatively *prá* may actually belong with the part. *marmījānāh*, as Gr takes it – though there’s only one other possible ex. of *prá* $\sqrt{mīj}$ that I know of, at X.96.9.

On *nahuṣyā-* see also IX.88.2.

IX.91.3: Both Ge and Re take *īrte* as transitive (‘set in motion’, e.g., “... met en branle ... le blanc lait”), but this medial stem is standardly intrans., and the milk here can be, as so often in IX, the goal of Soma’s motion.

In c *vaco-víd-* could of course also mean ‘who finds speech’. See Scar (487), who allows both senses for the stem and tr. the occurrence here as “der die Reden findet.” In this ritual context there is little difference between ‘knowing speech’ and ‘finding speech’.

Pāda d cannot be separated from IX.10.5 *sūrā āṇvaṃ ví tanvate* “the suns stretch out across the fine (fleece).”

IX.91.4: The syntax of the 2nd hemistich, esp. pāda d, is clotted and has been variously interpreted. Ge takes the problematic *upanāyám* as obj. of *vṛścá* (as I do), but considers the referents of *yé ... eṣām* to be the *vājān* of b: “... der sie sich holt, mögen sie nah (oder) fern sein.” Sāy.’s interpr. (see also Ge’s n. 4d) seems a more sensible version of Ge’s: he glosses *upanāyám* as ‘master’ (*svāminam*) and takes the plurals to refer to demons. Re seems to make *upanāyám* an appositive or parallel to the pl. *yé ... eṣām*, which he (semi-)configures as the obj.: “Fends ... (les démons) qui sont près (ou) loin, le chef de ces (démons).” All of them take *ánti durāt* as a constituent, “near (or) far.” But the contrastive expression “near (or) far” generally matches cases (or adverbial equivalents thereof): ablatival *ántitaḥ (...)* *dūrāt* (II.27.13, etc.) or locatival *ánti dūrē* (I.79.11, etc.; see esp. IX.19.7 *dūrē vā sató ánti vā*, IX.67.21 *yád ánti yác ca dūraké*). Our passage, by contrast, has locatival *ánti* and abl. *durāt*, and I therefore separate them and assign them to different syntactic units. I take *yé ánti* as a minimalist rel. cl. “who (are) near,” while *durāt* is construed with *upanāyám*. I take the latter as meaning ‘leader’, like simplex *nāyá-* (2x: VI.24.10, 46.11), and the whole sequence *durād upanāyám eṣām* to mean lit. “leader of those from afar” (rendered in English as a rel. cl. “... the one who lead ...” for the sake of intelligibility). Cf. for directional *durāt* with $\sqrt{nī}$ VII.33.2 *dūrād índram anayann ā ...* “From a distance they led Indra here.” In other words, I interpret *upanāyám* as the obj. of the impv. *vṛścá* at the beginning of c, and it is preceded by a brief nominal rel. cl. *yé ánti*, whose referent in the main cl. is *eṣām*. Nominal rel. clauses seem to be exempt from the prohibition on embedding that is evident for full relative clauses. It may be so positioned to allow *ánti* to be adjacent to *durāt* though belonging to different clauses.

Lowe (Part. 289) claims that *tujánt-* is a Caland adj. meaning ‘eager’ rather than a participle ‘thrusting’, but the passages, esp. this one and I.61.6 (with two exx.), favor a more dynamic rendering, and in particular *tujatā vadhéna* “with your thrusting weapon” recalls IX.57.2 *tuñjáná āyudhā* “brandishing his weapons,” with an undoubted participle. I don’t actually see what is gained by reclassifying these forms as Caland adjectives.

IX.91.5: It is not entirely clear what to supply as the referent for the rel. in c; Re ‘les succès,’ Ge the *vājān* from 4b. Pāda c closely resembles IX.63.11 *yó dūñāśo vanuṣyatā* “which is difficult to attain by one who craves it,” with instr. *vanuṣyatā* matching our *vanuṣā* and a different lexicalization of the ‘difficult to obtain’ (*duṣ-√naś/sah*) compd. The referent in that passage is *rayí-* ‘wealth’, and note also the compd *bṛhád-rayi-* (only 1x) and the regular use of *bṛhánt-* as a modifier of *rayí-* (e.g., nearby IX.97.21). I therefore supply a pl. form of *rayí-*, though Ge’s *vāja-* would also work.

IX.92

IX.92.1: The injunc *sarji* would probably be better tr. “has been sent surging,” per IH.

In c *āpac chlókam indriyám* seems illuminated by X.94.1 (one of the pressing stone hymns) *ślókam ghóṣam bháráthéndrāya* “you bear your signal-call, your cry to Indra.” The *ślōka-* ‘signal call’ is the audible sign to Indra that soma is being prepared for him; in our passage I assume that the noisy journey of the soma after the filtering produces this *ślōka-*, just as the noise of the pressing stones in X.94.1 serves that purpose.

The lexeme *prāti √juṣ* sometimes seems to mean what the simplex does: ‘enjoy’ with an acc. of the substance enjoyed, as in I.101.10 *uśán havyāni prāti no juṣasva* “(Indra,) being eager, take pleasure in our oblations” (cf. VII.34.21). But sometimes this idiom takes a personal object, with the subject giving enjoyment to the object – a reversal of the usual situation. See III.33.8, VII.54.1, 2. In the latter hymn, we find in vs. 1 the dyadic *yát tvémahe prāti tán no juṣasva* “When we entreat you, favor us in return,” which suggests that *prāti √juṣ* comes as a response to a request of some sort. In vs. 2 *pitéva putrān prāti no juṣasva* “Like a father his sons, favor us in return,” the acc. *putrān* in the simile shows the case of the obj. of the verb, which the enclitic *naḥ* conceals. The personal acc. is also found in our passage: *prāti devāṃ ajuṣata práyobhiḥ*. As these tr. show, I have generally tr. this idiom ‘favor in return’, but ‘favor in response’ might be better. I confess, however, that neither ‘in return’ or ‘in response’ quite works in our passage.

IX.92.2: Note that this vs. contains the three most resonant “poet” terms: *kaví, řiṣi, vípra-*. The first applies to Soma, the other two to the seven seers who approach him.

In b I take *kavíḥ* as a pred. nominative or an embedded quotation, providing the name that Soma has acquired – though it must be admitted that we might expect an acc. Both Ge and Re take *kavíḥ* as an independent descriptor (though see Ge’s n. 2b, where he allows the possibility of my interpr.). The name Soma assumes is, for them, “Soma” itself, or so I understand it. By my interpr. Soma gets called “Kavi” because of the noise he makes on his journey; at the end of the journey he becomes (like a) “Hotar” when he sits down (/is installed) in the cups – another human ritual participant. Ge (n. 2b) suggests that he has just become the Soma-drink (by virtue of the pressing?) and thus takes on the name.

IX.93.3: The periphrasis in c *bhuvát ... rántā*, with the aor. injunc. (∞ subj.) to $\sqrt{bhū}$ + root-accented *-tar-* stem, must be signaling some special nuance. Ge tr. “Er pflegte ... zu verweilen” (is accustomed to); Tichy (168–69) cites his tr. with apparent approbation and characterizes the use of this periphrasis as expressing “eine gewohnheitsmässig wiederholte Handlung.” Her own rendering (pp. 314, 336) is “er pflegte bei allen Darbietungen der Seher haltzumachen.” My own “is one to take his rest” is close to this view, but lays more emphasis on the agentive aspect of the *-tar-* stem.

There is also the question of which sense of \sqrt{ram} is found here, the orig. ‘(come to) rest’ or the developed ‘be content, enjoy’. Re opts for the latter (and see his n.): “qui se complaît ...,” but given the emphasis on Soma’s taking his seat (vss. 2–3), it seems best, with Ge (/Tichy), to operate with the first.

Having been called *kaví-* himself in 2b, Soma now finds himself in the midst of all *kāvya-* -- presumably mostly the poetic effusions of the ritual participants, but also the sounds that he made on his journey that afforded him the *kaví-* title. This joining of different types of *kāvya-* may account for the ‘all’.

Ge’s rendering of pāda d is quite free: “Der Kluge macht die fünf Völker zu seinem Gefolge.” Tichy’s (336) is more accurate: “überall bei den fünf Völkern nimmt der Weise seinen Platz ein.” A proper interpr. of this pāda must first recognize that the lexeme is not *ānu √yat*, *pace* Gr: there are no other exx. of this supposed combination in the RV (nor any other registered by Mon-Wms). Instead *ānu* must be construed with the

immediately flg. noun, not the verb: we must be dealing with the fairly common expression *jānām ānu* (I.50.3, 6, 120.11, etc.), though with flipped order, “through(out) the peoples.” The finite verb *yatate* then has its normal sense ‘take one’s place, ‘arrange oneself’; here the point is that Soma is common to the whole Ārya community, whatever limited place he occupies on the ritual ground.

I render *dhīraḥ* as ‘steadfast’ rather than ‘insightful, wise’, because of the emphasis on Soma’s taking his seat.

IX.92.4: As was suggested in the publ. intro., this vs. may constitute a weak omphalos. In particular, the purport of the first hemistich is not clear to me: what does it mean to say “the gods are in your secret”? Re supplies ‘domain’ with *nīnyé*, but doesn’t elucidate. Ge floats two possibilities in his n. 4a. The first, which he says is illuminated by IX.95.2, is that the gods are Soma’s secret, which only he can reveal. This is not quite what IX.95.2 says; there Soma reveals the hidden names (*gúhyāni nāma*) of the gods, with an acc. pl. not a loc. sg. I am more convinced by his 2nd proposal, that we supply loc. *nāmani* with *nīnyé*, and interpr. it to mean that Soma’s “secret name” is *amīta*- ‘immortal’ (‘ambrosia’), a word indeed regularly used for soma. Since this word is also, of course, a standard descriptor for the gods, they are/exist, in the verbal sense, “in your secret (name).” Although the loc. *nāman(i)* is not found in the RV, this seems an accidental gap. The multistep mystery—1) figure out what, if anything, to supply with *nīnyá*:- *nāmani*; 2) solve for what the “secret (name)” is: *amīta*; 3) then apply the resultant name to the gods—is worthy of an omphalos. To make the tr. clearer I would substitute “it is in your secret (name [= (drink of) immortality]) that all these gods [= the immortals] are ...”

IX.92.5: Re tr. pāda a “Que cet (acte) de Pavamāna se réalise donc ...” I would prefer this rendering of *satyām* to the “true” of Ge and the publ. tr., but it is even harder to square with the augmented impf. *ākṛnot* (c) (and probably augmented *prāvat* in d, since \sqrt{av} has no injunctives) that expresses the content of the *satyām* (“true” is bad enough). Perhaps the poet is suggesting that some have expressed doubt that Soma accomplished the deeds described in cd, even though *kārú*-s are agreed that he did, and that he (our poet) wants them to be true. This covert skepticism might well be justified, since all the deeds in cd are attributed elsewhere to other gods. On the other hand, see nearby IX.94.5, where Soma is urged to “make broad light” (*urú jyótiḥ kṛnuhi*).

Another word for poet or the equivalent, *kārú*- ‘bard’, is added to the trio in vs. 2.

I do not know if we should see a difference in nuance between the augmented impf. *ākṛnot* in c and the injunc. aor. *kar* in d; the latter is in the same clause as the (probably augmented) impf. *prāvat*.

The stem *abhīka*- ‘close quarters, face-to-face’ is elsewhere used in contrast to ‘wide(ness)’, VII.85.1 ... *uruṣyatām abhīke*, X.133.1 *abhīke cid ulokakṛt*, and this contrast is evident here as well, with the positive *ākṛnod ulokām* ending c, and the negative *kar abhīkam* in d.

As Old points out, *kar* would be better as a heavy syllable; he suggests underlying **karr* (< **kar-t*). See comm. ad VII.75.1.

IX.92.6: Pāda a contains one of the few technical references to the animal sacrifice in the RV. See the almost identical expression in IX.97.1.

Note that *satyá-* returns here, where ‘true’ or ‘actual, real’ would both work.

IX.93

This hymn is attributed to Nodhas Gautama, the skillful poet of I.58–64. This hymn does not particularly display his verbal agility, but its last pāda (5d) is his refrain, found in I.58.9, etc.

IX.93.1: Notice the alliteration in b: *dása dhīrasya dhītáyo dhánutrīḥ*.

The stem *dhánutar-* occurs 3x in the RV, twice as a fem. pl. *dhánutrīḥ* (here and III.31.16), once as a masc. du. *dhánutarau* (IV.35.5). Although it is not strictly relevant to our occurrence here, the surprising short suffixal vowel in that strong form requires comment. The form occurs after an early caesura, thus producing a break of three light syllables. Such a break is by no means uncommon (see Arnold, p. 188), but a reading **dhánutārau* would produce Arnold’s “normal” break (light light heavy). Old (Noten ad loc.) tentatively suggests that if the form is corrupt, it was altered because it was perceived as a comparative in *-tara-* or a cmpd with *-tara-* ‘crossing, overcoming’. Old’s suggestion is tentatively accepted by Wackernagel (AiG III.199), Gotō (1st cl., 179 n. 311). The misparsing of the form would of course be aided by the fact that it is built not to the root, like most agent nouns, but to an enlarged pres. stem **dhan-u-l-va-*, which has spawned a secondary root \sqrt{dhanv} . See, e.g., EWA s.v. *DHAN*, Goto 178–80 with nn. By contrast, Tichy (*-tar-*stems, 58–59) adduces nearby IV.38.4 *sánutaraḥ*, which is not originally a *-tar-*stem, but which, like *dhánutarau*, modifies a horse. She suggests that since beside the comparative *sánutara-* (whatever its source: see my comm. ad loc.) there exists an (independent) fem. agent noun *sánutrī-* (I.123.2, X.7.4), *dhánutarau* was backformed to the parallel fem. agent *dhánutrī-*. The suggested string of causation here seems stretched too thin.

As for our fem. pl. form, both Ge and Re take *dhánutrīḥ* here as effectively transitive, with objective genitive *dhīrasya*: “die den Weisen ablaufen lassen”; “animatrices du (soma) habile.” But neither of the other occurrences of this stem have such a sense; they simply mean ‘running’; Gotō (179 and n. 313) concurs with the intrans. reading I see here. The fact that an intrans. form of the pf. to \sqrt{dhanv} , *dadhanve*, is found in the next vs. (2b) supports this interpr. Another (weak) support is the case of the supposed obj., since root-accented *tar-*stems ordinarily take acc. However, there are enough counterexamples that this is not a clinching argument.

Ge takes *dása* with *dhītáyah* “die zehn Gebete,” but, despite the pāda-boundary, I think it goes with the sisters=fingers in pāda a, as usual. It has been drawn into b because of the alliteration.

Contra Old, Ge, Re, and Schindler (Rt. Nouns), I analyze *jāḥ* as a nom. sg. (with Gr), not an acc. pl. (Ge allows for the nom. sg. alternative in n. 1c). In their interpretations, “the children of the sun” refers to the insightful thoughts of b. But this is a distinctly odd way to refer to thoughts, and no convincing parallels are given. Ge’s interpr. of the phrase “daughter of the sun” as a reference to hymns I have discussed (and dismissed) ad IX.1.6 and esp. IX.72.3. Moreover, pāda c describes Soma as dashing around these children, but in IX *pári* + VERB OF MOTION normally, perhaps exclusively, refers to Soma’s journey around the filter. I do not know what it would mean for him to “dash around” thoughts, much less “children of the sun.” As a nom. sg., *jāḥ* in the phrase

“offspring of the sun” makes perfect sense as a description of Soma; Soma’s similarity to and often identification with the sun is well attested, and the use of kinship terms to model such similarity/identification is also well known. If, nonetheless, we want to interpr. *jáh* as an acc. pl., I would take it as a reference to the milk; cf. comm. ad IX.72.3, where I explain “daughter of the sun” there as referring to the milk because of their shared gleaming color.

IX.93.2: In d *sám* \sqrt{gam} is of course a euphemism of sex, a theme already broached in c.

IX.93.3: The tr. “prepare” for *abhí śrīṇanti* in b does not harmonize well with the simile *vásubhir ná niktaiḥ* “as if with freshly washed goods.” Nor does the interpr. put forth by Narten (“Ved. *śrīṇāti* ...,” KZ 100 [1987] = KISch 340ff., at 349), “vollkommen machen” (complete, perfect). The developed sense of the root noun *śrī-* ‘excellence, splendour, beauty’ and esp. the rt. noun cmpd *abhiśrī-* ‘excelling in splendour’ (etc.) seems to have affected the meaning of the verb, and I would now tr. something like “they beautify his head ...,” which is not far from ‘bring to perfection’.

IX.93.4: Ge takes *vāvasānāḥ* in b to ‘desire’ (\sqrt{vas}), but the same form in the same metrical position in 2b to ‘bellow’ ($\sqrt{vās}$). Given the formal identity of the participles, I think they should be rendered in the same way (‘bellowing’; Ge’s n. 4b recognizes this alternative). But the proximity of *usātī* ‘desiring, eager’ in our pāda c teases us with the other root, and it is quite possible that our form should be taken as a pun. For a similar conjunction see IX.95.3–4.

The hapax *rathirāyātām* (3rd sg. mid. impv., with Old, etc., not gen. pl. pres. part., with Gr) is baroque in formation. It’s worth noting that 3 of the 11 forms of its presumed base *rathirā-* ‘charioteer, chariot rider’ are found in nearby IX.97 (vss. 37, 46, 48) with a further occurrence in IX.76.2.

IX.93.5: The vs. shows a number of metrical disturbances; see Arnold p. 317, Old ad loc., HvN p. 649. Arnold suggests reading **māsvā* in pāda a, which would fix the cadence. Pāda b has an opening of 3; note, however, that the apparently bad cadence *viśváścandram* with four heavy syllables is not in fact a problem, since all cmpds in *-ścandra-* are better read **-candra-* (see comm. ad I.165.8), yielding the light antepenult required. On the metrical shape of *vātāpyam* see immed. below and comm. ad I.121.8. Pāda c has 10 syllables. Pāda d, the Nodhas Gautama refrain (I.58.9, etc.), has an unusual break.

The adj. *vātāpyam* presents problems of both form and meaning. There are three (or more) possible scansions of this stem—*vāatāpya-* (or *vaatāpya-*), *vātaāpya-*, and *vātāpīya-*—each of which has its champions. See comm. ad I.121.8. The sense of the stem is likewise in doubt. It seems obviously related to the voc. *vātāpe* ‘o friend of the wind’ in I.187.8–10, and in I.121.8 Ge tr. “... den Windbefreundeten,” in X.26.2 “die mit dem Vāta befreundet (?) ist.” However, in our passage and in X.105.1 he suggests a different analysis entirely, since (acdg. to his n. 5b to our hymn) that sense “will hier nicht passen.” His alternative involves the ppl. *vāta-* to \sqrt{van} ‘long for, crave’ (otherwise attested only as 2nd cmpd. member), with the sense “whose friendship is desired” (dessen Freundschaft begehrt ist). The question is somewhat hard to decide (if it needs to be

decided: a pun is also possible, as displayed in the publ. tr.). On the one hand, giving up the connection with *vātāpi-* (whatever its underlying accent would have been: *vātāpe* has voc. accent) is unappealing. Moreover if the scansion should be *vāata-*, this would favor ‘wind’, which can be so scanned, whereas the root syll. of the ppl. should not be distracted. (However, that scansion is declared by Old to be the least likely one.) Ge’s certainty that “wind-befriended” wouldn’t work here is also open to question. We are asking for wealth – and “wind-befriended” wealth could be wealth that comes quickly, on a powerful gust of air. All this favors the “wind” analysis. *But* there is another consideration: accent. The cmpd is clearly an adj.; just as clearly it has a neut. noun *āpya-* ‘friendship’ as 2nd member. Therefore it should be a bahuvrīhi “having X friendship’ / ‘having the friendship of X’. If the 1st member is the ppl. to \sqrt{van} , it should be accented **vātā-* (though it actually never appears accented elsewhere). This would allow an analysis *vātā-āpya-* with expected first-member bahuvrīhi accent (of the *sutā-soma-* type). But ‘wind’ is accented *vāta-*, and so, if it contains ‘wind’, the cmpd. must be analyzed with 2nd member accent, *vāta-āpya-*, which is not standard bahuvrīhi accent. Nonetheless, weighing these contravening factors, I favor ‘wind-befriended’ as the 1st reading, with Ge’s ‘whose friendship is sought’ as a 2nd punning reading—though I cannot explain the accent.

Although pāda d is the Nodhas refrain and therefore tacked onto the hymn in some sense, note that *dhiyā* responds to *dhīra- dhītī-* of 1b.

IX.94

This hymn is attributed to Kaṇva Ghaura, the poet of I.36–43.

IX.94.1: Note the unaccented *asmin* in pāda a, referring to Soma, who is the default referent even without a previous mention in the hymn.

The vs. contains three similes, each of which presents at least some interpretational challenges to the audience. The first two are in ab and match the frame “the thoughts contend over him” (... *asmin ... spārdhante dhīyah*), which presumably refers to the thoughts produced by poets at different and competing rituals (see Ober I.407 and n. 64). The second simile, in b, is the easier to interpret: “like clans over the sun” (*sūrye nā vīśah*). Like the competing thoughts that each seek to appropriate Soma, different clans all seek to secure their place in the sun, a symbol, acdg. to Ober (I.457), of *Leben* and *Lebenskraft*, of *Lebensraum*.

The first simile, *vājīnīva śubhaḥ*, reads slightly askew. It should mean “as adornments (contend over) a prizewinner” – but what would that really mean? The passages adduced by Ge in n. 1a are not helpful, and no one else that I know of attempts to elucidate it. I think the poet has deliberately misdirected us. To begin with, although the loc. *vājīni* appears to match *asmin* in the frame as the object of contention, I think that may not be the case or may not *only* be the case. The vs. begins with *ādhi*, which therefore appears to be in tmesis with *spārdhante* in b, but there is only one other instance of *ādhi* \sqrt{sprdh} in the RV (VI.34.1, where – I must admit – it seems to have the sense attributed to our passage: ‘contend over’ with loc. *indre* as the object of contention). The word *ādhi* is more often an adposition, most commonly with the loc., and so I think it is here. Although *ādhi* is separated from *vājīni*, what intervenes is Wackernagel’s position material: subordinating *yād*, which frequently takes 2nd position, and the enclitic *asmin*,

which would lean upon it. So effectively *ádhi ... vājīni* can be a prepositional phrase interrupted by the interpolation of those two Wackernagel's position words. Under this interpr. the prizewinner is no longer the object of contention but the locus of it. Now as to *śúbhaḥ*: this root noun is quite well attested (over 40 occurrences, incl. the common voc. *śubhás páti-*), but only two attestations are plural – our passage and V.54.11, which describes the many appurences and adornments found on the Maruts and their equipage, incl. pāda b *vákṣassu rukmā maruto ráthe śúbhaḥ* “your breasts brilliants, o Maruts, on your chariot charms” (per the publ. tr.). The *śúbhaḥ* here are ornaments of some sort, quite possibly sparkly or otherwise eye-catching, that jazz up the chariot to which they're affixed. I suggest that our loc. (*ádhi ...*) *vājīni* fulfills the same function as *ráthe* in V.54.11, and that the *śúbhaḥ* in our passage are not vying *over* or *for* the prizewinner, but, located *on* him, they are vying with each other to best catch the eye of observers.

The phrase that opens the 2nd hemistich, *apó vṛṇānáḥ* “choosing the waters,” is a little odd. The waters are surely the ubiquitous waters for mixing found regularly in IX, but why would Soma “choose” them? In a soma context we would expect rather *apó *vasānáḥ* “clothing himself in the waters”; this exact phrase opens the pāda in IX.78.1, 86.40, 96.13, 107.4, 18, 26, and with acc. sg. of the participle IX.16.2, 109.21. I suggest that our poet is knowingly playing on this standard formula, using a different root but identical formation to throw the expression off-kilter. Note that *vasāna-* (nom. pl.) is found in the same metrical position in 4c. The identical expression, *apó vṛṇānáḥ*, is, however, found in V.48.1; on this opaque passage see comm. ad loc.

Interpretation of the third simile in the vs. is complicated by the fact that it is unclear which part of the clause to construe it with. The frame consists of an acc. *mánma* ‘thought’ (→ ‘poem’), which is compared to *vrajám ná paśuvárdhanāya* “a stable for raising livestock.” But where these acc. expressions fit in the sentence is disputed: Ge (see n. 1d; also Tichy, *dvitā* 222 = KISch 213) takes *mánma* as a second obj. with *vṛṇānáḥ*. But the simile then makes little sense: although Soma might well “choose a thought,” choosing a stable is a different proposition. By this interpr. the domain of the comparison would only be the acc. *mánma*; it could not fit with the verb (despite Tichy's odd “wie (man) eine Hürde ... [wählt]”). Although such similes, detached from the syntax of the rest of the clause, do exist, syntactic integration, esp. of non-nominative similes, is more usual and desirable. By contrast, Old takes the acc. as the obj. (or semi-obj.) of *pavate*. This latter suggestion seems particularly unlikely, given the stereotyped use of *pavate* in IX, and Old's rendering shows how he struggles to make it work: “er verwirklicht durch sein Sichreinigen das *m*°, wie (man) einen Stall ... (reinigt).” Differing from both these interpr., following a remark of Re's in his n. (“*mánma* dépendant librement de *kavīyán* ...”), which is not entirely reflected in his tr., I take it with the act. denom. part. *kavīyán*. The stem *kavīyá-* occurs only twice in the RV (and nowhere else), once as an act. part. (here), once as a middle part. *kavīyámāna-* in I.164.18. Nothing therefore forbids us from assuming a direct obj. with the act. form, as I have done here. The content of the simile, which compares the building of a stable or livestock enclosure to the composing of a poem, rests on the commonality often asserted in the RV between physical and mental craftsmanship and thus fits nicely with the verb.

IX.94.2: The nom. part. *vyūrṇvān* in pāda is sg., while the finite verb *prathanta* in b is pl. Old and Ge attribute this to anacoluthon, with the nom. of pāda a coreferential with the dat. *svarvīde* in b, while acdg. to Tichy (loc. cit., n. 35) the participle is the predicate of pāda a (“Partizip im Nominative an Stelle eines Verbum finitum”). With Re, I instead take pāda a as a continuation of vs. 1, with a new construction beginning in b.

The referent of *amṛtasya* in the phrase *amṛtasya dhāma* is not clear. Ge: the drink of immortality, Re: the immortal principle, Lü (257) and Tichy (loc. cit.): immortality. By contrast I think it may refer to the sun (as I also suggest in the nearby passage IX.97.32); the immediately following description of Soma as ‘finder of the sun’ (*svarvīd-*) supports this interpr. “Disclosing the domain of the sun” may refer to the Dawn-like behavior of Soma at the morning pressing (see Ge’s n. 2b “Wie bei Sonnenaufgang”), or to his plunging into the milk mixture that is often assimilated to the sun – probably the latter. The adv. *dvitā* ‘once again’ expresses the regular repetition of the sacrifice.

IX.94.3: This vs. does not contain a main cl., simply a subord. *yād* cl. in ab, extended by a participial expression in cd. The vs. can depend either on the previous vs. or the following one – or (though in my view less likely) the part. *bhūṣan* in c can be the predicate of the main cl.

The cadence of pāda a is bad; Gr suggests reading subj. **bharāte*, which would fix the problem, but as Old comments, this is “natürlich ganz unsicher” – esp. since both the opening and the break are likewise irregular (see HvN metrical comm. ad loc.).

Note the emphatic return of the poet, with *kavīḥ kāvyā* in pāda a picking up *kavīyān* in 1a.

Pāda b and the simile it contains raise some problems. First, the nom. subject *śūro nā ráthaḥ*. The stem *śūra-* is of course a masc. noun ‘champion’, here juxtaposed with another such noun, *rátha-* ‘chariot’. Re renders them as distinct subjects: “tel un héros, (tel) un char-de-guerre,” but I think a blended “champion chariot” works better. The phrase also presents another possibility, which Old flirts with but ultimately dismisses: *śūraḥ* is phonologically almost identical to *sūraḥ*, the gen. sg. of *svàr-* ‘sun’, and the “chariot of the Sun” (*sūraḥ* [...] *rátha-*) is found elsewhere (I.50.9 [see comm. ad loc.], V.31.11; also *sūraḥ* [...] *cakrām* “(chariot-)wheel of the Sun” I.174.5, VI.56.3). Although I do not propose emending *śūraḥ* to **sūraḥ*, I do think that phrase is lurking in the background, esp. given the presence of the sun in 2b (*svar-*[*vīde*]) and, if I’m correct, also 2a.

Assuming this double reading of the subject of the simile helps interpr. the rest of pāda b. Ge and Re take *bhúvanāni víśvā* “all the worlds” as belonging to the frame, as a parallel obj. to *kāvyā* in pāda a (e.g., “Quand le (*soma*) poète porte autour de lui les pouvoirs-poétiques (et) tous les mondes ...”). This leaves the acc. slot of the simile unfilled: Re leaves it blank, while Ge supplies “(die Feinde?).” I instead put *bhúvanāni víśvā* in the simile, matching *kāvyā* in the frame. This interpr. is facilitated by the “chariot of the *Sun” reading that I think is implied here, since the Sun’s daily chariot journey across the heaven puts all worlds in his jurisdiction. Soma’s journey across the ritual ground gives him the same kind of control over poetic skill and its products, both his own and those of the officiants. It may also be that “all the worlds” can secondarily be re-read into the frame. The *bhúvanāni* that stretched out for sun-finding Soma in 2b

(presumably both the cosmic worlds and the worlds of the ritual ground) fall into this control in 3ab.

As pointed out by Old inter alia, in c the transmitted *mártāya* is best emended to **márt'yāya*, since a four-syllable reading is called for.

The dual focus on the cosmic and the ritual continues in c, where Soma exerts himself “among the gods” (that is, in his cosmic dimension) on behalf of glory for the mortal, presumably the priest or poet. The expression (*yáso*) **márt'yāya bhūṣan*# may play off *amítāya bhūṣan*# (III.25.2, 34.2) “exerting oneself for the immortal (one).”

The rt. noun cmpd *puru-bhū(-tama)-* is otherwise used of the Aśvins (4x); I interpr. it to mean ‘appearing in many places’ (see comm. ad IV.44.4). The apparent loc. pl. occurrence here has been variously and only tentatively interpr.; see Ge, Re, Ober (II.229), Scar (362). Given the context, in a participial clause headed by *bhūṣan*, I suggest that our *purubhūṣu* does not in fact belong to *puru-bhū-* but rather to an otherwise unattested *puru-*bhūṣ-* -- hence **puru-bhūṣ-ṣu*, with the geminate sibilant simplified to -*ṣ-*. Although a root noun to the secondary root $\sqrt{bhūṣ}$ is not found elsewhere, it would not be difficult to generate in this context.

IX.94.4: In pāda a the Pp reads *śriyé* for the Saṃhitā *śriyá ā*. Ge concurs, but Re tr. “... est issu de la gloire,” with an apparent ablative – which is how I interpr. the form. The lexeme *nír√i* ‘come out, come forth’ generally takes an abl., and the gesture towards a versified paradigm (*śriyé ... śriyás* [a], *śriyam* [b]) speak in favor of the abl.

The pl. subj. of c may be the singers, the only plural entity overt in the vs. so far. So Sāy. and by implication (see his n. 4c) Ge. However, I think that Re is correct is supplying instead “les sucs-de-soma,” since *vasāná-*, common in IX, is applied only to soma. The interchange between sg. and pl. in reference to soma and its streams/drops, etc., is of course ubiquitous in this maṇḍala.

The final pāda is quite unclear and its interpr. depends in part on identity of the ref. of the loc. *mitádrau* ‘of measured pace’. Ge and Re both take it to be Soma. Acdg, to Ge, the loc. is to be construed with *samithā* (“Die Kämpfe um ihn, der einen festen Schritt hat ...”), but as far as I am aware, *samithā-* is not found with a loc. elsewhere. Re makes this loc. into a loc. absolute, by virtue of supplying a near paragraph of extraneous matter, which has a whiff of desperation in it. My interpr. begins with the fact that of the 5 occurrences of the stem *mitádru-* the two other singular ones both refer to Agni (IV.6.5, VII.7.1). I therefore suggest that he is also the referent here. The “encounters” (*samithā*) that are to be realized (*bhāvanti satyā*) take place *at* the ritual fire; the loc. is simply recalling us firmly to the ritual ground. The encounters in question I take to be the encounter of the soma streams/drops (etc.) with the gods who are to consume them – or possibly the encounters with the water and milk mixtures.

IX.95

This hymn is attributed to Praskaṇva Kāṇva, the poet of I.44–50, the group of hymns that follow those of Kaṇva Ghaura, the poet of immediately preceding IX.94.

IX.95.1: Ge takes the participles in b (*śīdan ... punānáḥ*) as implicitly predicated (“er läutert sich und setzt sich ...”), but there seems no reason to do so. They are surely

parallel to the part. in pāda a (*srjyāmānaḥ*) and detail the various circumstances under which Soma keeps roaring.

The verb in b, 3rd sg. mid. *janayata*, seems to be a true middle with self-involvement of the subj. -- “he generates (his own) thoughts through his own powers.” – not dependent on the purely formal 3rd pl. *-anta* replacement *janáyanta* (see my “Voice fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial 3rd plural *-anta* in active paradigms,” *IJJ* 21 ([1979] 146–69). The self-involvement of the subj. is even clearer in the near-twin passage I.95.4 *vatsó māṭṛ janayata svadhābhiḥ* “The calf [=Agni] begets his (own) mothers with his own powers.” See comm. ad loc.

IX.95.2: The opening of this vs., *háriḥ srjānáḥ*, echoes 1a ... *hárir ā srjyāmānaḥ*#. I do not know if the root aor. part. here is meant to convey anterior value, as opposed to the pres. pass. part. in 1a, or if it’s just a variant.

For the infinitival use of the dative of this rt. noun cmpd *pravāc-* see Scar (470).

IX.95.3: Pada b *prá manīṣā īrate sómam ácha* “The inspired thoughts press forward to Soma” is the intrans. equivalent of 2b *íyarti vācam* “He [=Soma] directs his speech,” with act. transitive redupl. pres. *íyarti* corresponding to its weak form, medial intrans. *īrte*. This connection is obscured by the Engl. tr.

The deployment of *ca*, first conjoining two preverbs enfolding their joint verb (c ... *úpa ca yánti sám ca*), and then in the next pāda conjoining a new preverb, but with a different verb (d *ā ca víśanti*), is a striking effect. The contrastive preverbs in c of course account for the accent on the main-cl. verb *yánti*.

IX.95.4: The ‘back’ (*sāná*) is the back of the filter; the fuller expression is *sāno ávye* “on the sheep’s back,” as in nearby IX.97.3 *mṛjyate sāno ávye*. On this latter phrase see disc. ad IX.86.1.

Ge renders *vāvasānám* as “dem Verlangenden” (to *√ vaś* ‘desire’), in contrast to Re and the publ. tr., which take it to *√ vās* ‘bellow’. In actual fact it is probably a pun. On the one hand, in this vs. Soma is strongly typed as bovine (a: *mahiśám* ‘buffalo’, b: *ukṣánam* ‘ox’), which favors ‘bellow’. On the other, the end of the previous vs. contains a reciprocal expression from *√ vaś*: 3d *uśatīr uśántam* “(they) desiring, (him) desiring.” So both roots are in play here and equally applicable to Soma. For a similar situation see nearby IX.93.4 and comm. thereon.

For Trita as the archetypal soma-preparer, see comm. ad IX.37.4. Here Soma is identified with Varuṇa because of Varuṇa’s (developing) association with water and the sea. See Lü (52, 268), Ober (II.100 and n. 406).

IX.95.5: The Upavaktar priest prompts the Hotar to speak. On this priestly title and its relationship to the Maitrāvaruṇa priest, see Minkowski, *Priesthood in Ancient India*, 118–27. It may be no accident that this priestly title, found only 3x in the RV (IV.9.5, VI.71.5, and here), occurs directly after a mention of Varuṇa.

IX.96

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. Although the larger structure involves a series of independent four-vs. hymns, there are a number of echoes across these hymns, noted below, that may have influenced their being grouped together

IX.96.2: The publ. tr. doesn't make it sufficiently clear that "without resting" qualifies the "tawny (horse)."

Ge and Re construe gen. *índrasya* with the chariot, while I take it with the comrade – and Ober vacillates (comrade II.100, chariot II.204). Since *índrasya* is positioned between chariot and comrade, word order doesn't help. In my view 'comrade' is inherently relational and generally needs to be defined with reference to another being or beings, as comrade to *someone*, hence my tr. See also nearby IX.101.6 *sákhéndrasya*, which both Ge and Re construe together.

IX.96.3: The phrase *dyām utémām* raises a number of questions. First, what is *utá* conjoining? Although it is tempting to suggest "heaven and this (earth)," this would produce the pragmatically unlikely "causing ... this (earth) to rain." Moreover, there are numerous exx. of *pr̥thivīm dyām utémām* "earth and this heaven" (III.32.8, 34.8, X.88.3, 9, 121.1). It seems that the last part of that phrase, containing only the second NP, has been extracted from the fuller expression and inserted here, with the *utá* pleonastic, or loosely conjoining the participial phrases *kṛṇvānn apáh* and *varṣáyan dyām utémām* despite its position within the NP. On the clash between the near deictic *ayám* 'this here' and heaven, which is generally qualified by the distal deictic *asaú* 'that yonder', see disc. ad VIII.40.4 – also for the fem. gender that *dyām* must show here. In all cases of fem. *dyaúh*, I think the ultimate source is the misunderstanding of dual "Heaven and Earth" / *ródasī* passages with a dual fem. adj. modifying.

Ge tr. d as implicitly comparative, "mach uns die Bahn noch breiter als breit," presumably because of the abl. *uróh*. But *ā* with preceding abl. almost always expresses the source and is not used with a comparative. The few passages, grouped in Gr's 7) "vor andern, d.h. in höherm vorzuglichern Grade als andere" (p. 169), that do show something like that sense (several in that category are best interpr. otherwise) depend on *ā váram* "the choice from among ..." Moreover, *varivasyá-* does not have a comparative sense 'make wider space' but merely 'make wide space'. In our passage the point seems to be that Soma is already positioned in a wide place, from which he can act to provide us with the same.

IX.96.4: As Old points out, *br̥haté* is a masc./neut. form apparently modifying two (or at least one) fem. nouns, *svastáye sarvátātaye*. Re takes it as a third term: "pour ... le haut (rang)," but in his n. he acknowledges the Old/Ge acceptance of gender mismatch here, noting also that that interpr. produces two pairs of paired datives, the negated violence words in pāda a and the positive *-tī*-abstracts in b. In my view pattern may trump gender here. It's also worth noting that the cadence produced by *br̥haté* is bad, and it would be fixed by a fem. **br̥hatyai*, so it is possible that *br̥haté* was introduced redactionally – but why?

IX.96.6: Though the syntax is kept absolutely constant – nom. sg. + gen. pl. – there is a shifting functional relationship between the head noun and its genitive in the seven

phrases here: the first two are roles Soma performs for the group identified by the gen., the next three a particular, and superior, individual token from the group (though the third pairing, “seer for/of the inspired poets,” is ambiguous between the first type and the second), and the last is sort of a negative version of the role he plays for the group.

In the phrase *padavīḥ kavīnām* (see also vs. 18) the gen. pl. may depend on the first cmpd. member, “blazer of the poets’ trail,” as sometimes elsewhere.

IX.96.7: In pāda a, along with Ge and Re (see also Old’s comm. ad loc.) I read *ūrmīm* twice, with both simile and frame; *vācāḥ* so accented should be gen. sg., not acc. pl., and is therefore not parallel to the two acc. pls. in b, *gīraḥ ... manīṣāḥ*.

The standard tr. interpr. the *vijānā* phrase as obj. of *antāḥ pāsyan* (e.g., Re “Regardant à l’intérieur ces sectes (de fidèles) proches”). I instead take the part. in absolute usage (“looking within”; cf. I.132.3) and construe the acc. with *ā tiṣṭhati* ‘(sur)mounds’. This makes some spatial sense: if they are ‘below’ (*āvarāṇi*) it is easy to mount them.

Re and Ober (II.211) think that pāda d refers to copulation. Cf. esp. Ober’s “Der Bulle besteigt die Kühe, [die Kopulation] kennend.” Although “mount” is a standard Engl. term for animal copulation, I am not at all sure that *ā√sthā* serves the same function, and I would esp. wonder about using the locative for the female participant(s). And I also doubt that it would need to be added that the bull knew how to do it!

IX.96.8: Ge takes *iṣanyān* in d to mean ‘desiring’ (“nach den Kühen verlangend”) as in the sim. passage he cites, III.50.3. But this verb stem always means ‘drive, send’ (see Re’s n. ad loc.) and is, one way or another, derived from *iṣṇāti* ‘impels, sends’.

IX.96.8–9: Although these two vss. belong to two different hymns within the larger structure of IX.96, it is notable that the a-pādas of both end with a form *-vātaḥ*; it is not impossible that the hymn consisting of 9–12 was attached here because of this concatenation, esp. given that the etymological figure in 8a is repeated in 11c of the other hymn. But the *-vāta*-forms belong to two different roots: 8a (/11c) *āvāta*- to *√van* ‘win, vanquish’ and 9a *devāvāta*-to *√vanī* ‘love, cherish, long for’. The root affiliation of *āvāta*- is assured by the etymological figure in which it’s found, *vanvānn āvātaḥ* “vanquishing but unvanquished” (cf. also VI.16.20, 18.1, IX.89.7 as well as the two occurrences in this hymn, 8a and 11c). But *√van* is an aniṭ root, and we might expect a ppl. **-vata-*, which does not occur; *-vāta-* is only phonologically proper to the seṭ root *√vanī*. Gotō (1st Kl. 283–84 with n. 656), fld. by EWA (s.v. *VAN*), suggests that *āvāta*- (and, per EWA, other apparent seṭ forms of *√van*) are analogic to the synonymous, rhyming but seṭ root *√sanī* (*sātā-*, etc.). I certainly think the parallel forms of *√sanī* may well have contributed, but I think it’s a mistake to discount potential confusion and conflation of forms of *√vanī* and *√van*, esp. since under certain circumstances ‘love, long for’ and ‘win’ can shade into each other.

IX.96.9: In addition to its echoing *āvāta*- in 8, *devāvāte* is reminiscent of *devātāte* in 3a.

My “for Indra’s exhilaration” is a somewhat loose rendering of the double dative *indrāya ... mādāya* “for Indra, for exhilaration.”

IX.96.11: As Ge (see n. 11c) and Ober (I.311 with n. 791) point out, the first hemistich depicts the Vala myth, with “forefathers” (*pitáraḥ*) a reference to the Aṅgirasas – made clearer by a similar but more explicit passage in the next hymn, IX.97.39. This mythic episode – the forefathers opening the Vala cave with the help of soma – provides the model for the appeal in c, for Soma to open the *paridhí-* (*paridhīm̐r̥ áporṇu*): *paridhí-* is used explicitly of the barriers of the Vala cave in I.52.5. But as Ge suggests (n. 11c), the poet here is calling on Soma to open up the livestock pens and provide us with the animals therein.

IX.96.12: As pointed out in the publ. intro., this vs. is strongly marked as a hymn-final vs., with complementary *yáthā* ‘even as’ (ab) and *evā* ‘in just this way’ (cd) clauses, bringing this 4-versed hymn to a close. The matches between clauses are more explicit than in some such structures: the two finite verbs, impf. *ápavathāḥ* and impv. *pavasva*, match exactly save for tense/mood, and the root noun cmpd. *vayo-dhāḥ* of pāda a is recast as a syntagm *dráviṇam dádhānaḥ* in c with the same root $\sqrt{dhā}$.

The final pāda consists of two brief clauses, both somewhat aberrant. The first contains an idiom I have not found elsewhere, *sám* $\sqrt{sthā}$ + LOC. My tr., “stand side-by-side by Indra,” is meant to capture this slightly off expression. The second clause, “beget/generate weapons,” is syntactically fine but semantically odd.

IX.96.12–13: The first vs. of the new hymn (13a) begins *pávasva* (see also *pavasva* in 14a), just as the last vs. of the previous hymn ended with *pavasva* (12c). Again, this concatenation may have led to the attachment of 13–16 at this point. Of course, *pávasva* is hardly a rare form in this maṇḍala.

IX.96.14: The *pavasva* in this vs. is construed with an acc. phrase, *vṛṣṭīm diváḥ*. Ge treats it as if it were a straight transitive: “Läutere ... den Regen ... herab,” while Re supplies a participle to govern the acc.: “clarifie toi (nous donnant) la pluie.” It is possible that something like Re’s solution is correct: that we should supply the preverb \tilde{a} to form the lexeme $\tilde{a}\sqrt{pū}$ ‘attract through purification’ (see comm. ad IX.7.8); on occasion (see, e.g., IX.13.4 and comm. ad loc.), \tilde{a} is missing, but the passage seems to require it. However, here I suggest that something different is going on: it is not that we want Soma to bring rain through his purification, but to *become, turn into* rain. See IX.97.44, 108.10

IX.96.15: I don’t know what *íd* contributes in b, beyond inducing accent on the verb *táratī*.

The standard tr. (Ge, Re, Ober [I.232]) take “(the milk) of Aditi” as the frame, with the simile limited to *páyo ná dugdhám*, e.g., “Tel le lait trait, (le lait) d’Aditi est fort.” I find this puzzling because Aditi has little to do with soma and has no reason to figure here. (On the phrase “in the lap of Aditi” in IX, see comm. ad IX.89.1.) Instead I think that it is soma that is being compared to the milk milked from Aditi; in other words, Aditi belongs to the simile. Since she is the archetype of motherhood, the milk of Aditi would be esp. rich and nurturing – “mother’s milk”; indeed this might be a reference to the beestings or “first milk” (*pīyūṣa-*), with which soma is often compared (see comm. ad IX.85.9).

Old, Ge, and Re all make more of the gender mismatch in the simile *urv iva gātúḥ* than I think is justified. Since the target of the simile is milk (*páyah*), and milk is neuter, I see no problem with attributing the neut. *urú* to its “attraction” to the neut. *páyah*, even though, given the position of *ná*, the simile should rightly be “like a broad way” rather than “broad like a way.” The masc. *suyámaḥ* in the next simile may result from the more animate quality of the content of the simile itself, the draught-horse.

IX.96.16: The bahuvrīhi *sv-āyudhá-* ‘having good weapons’ echoes the odd command that ends the previous hymn in this structure, 12d *janáyāyudhāni* “beget weapons!” This echo may have contributed to the attachment of 13–16 at that point in the text.

Soma’s goal in b, “the dear hidden name” (*gúhyaṃ cāru nāma*), has a surprisingly large number of possible referents. Lü (526) suggests the sun, Ge (n. 16b) *amṛta* the drink of immortality. I would add Soma’s own name (see IX.92.2, 4 and comm. thereon), or the cows on the basis of IX.87.3 *apīcyāṃ gúhyaṃ nāma gónām*, or the gods, as in the immed. preceding hymn IX.95.2 *devānām gúhyāni nāma*, or Indra on the basis of IX.109.14 *bībharti cārv índrasya nāma*.

IX.96.17–18: These two vss. outfit Soma with the lexicon of poetry, with 17c concentrating on *kaví-* and 18a on *śṣí-*, though with *kaví-* returning in pāda b

IX.96.17: I don’t know what the Maruts are doing here.

In c I have rendered the nom. pres. part. *sán* concessively, in its usual value, but it’s not exactly clear what the concession would be. Perhaps the contrast is between Soma as poet – so emphasized by *kavīḥ ... kāvyena kavīḥ* -- and the less than melodious sound indicated by the root \sqrt{ribh} ‘squawk, rasp’ (see comm. ad VI.3.6, IX.66.9).

IX.96.18: The publ. tr. does not render the rel. *yáḥ* since the rel. cl. is entirely nominal. It is not clear how far it extends – perhaps the first hemistich, perhaps through pāda c, perhaps only the first pāda – since Soma is nominative both in the rel. cl. and in the main cl. The main cl. must constitute at least the last pāda because the finite verb *rājati* is unaccented.

The phrase *padavīḥ kavīnām* is found also in 6a.

What the referent of the “third domain” (*trītyaṃ dhāma*) is is unclear. Lü (273), not surprisingly, has precisely mapped the spatial geography and considers the third domain to be heaven (1 earth, 2 midspace, 3 heaven), with the fourth, in the next vs., the *samudra-*, which is higher than heaven. I think it more likely that these are ritual references, quite possibly to locations on the ritual ground that Soma traverses on his journey (see *dhāmāni āryā* in IX.63.14 and comm. thereon). If “gaining the sun” (*svarṣāḥ*) refers to Soma’s uniting with the milk mixture (assimilated to the sun because of its gleaming whiteness), then the third domain, which comes after, might be the vessels near the ritual fire. If the *dhāman-* are not spatial but temporal, this could be a ref. to the third pressing. Ge (n. 18c) takes it as reference to the forms or phases of soma; Re tr. ‘structure’ without further elaboration.

As generally noted by tr. (Ge, Re, also Scar [72]), pāda d involves a play on the names of the Anuṣṭubh and Virāj meters. The publ. tr. fails to register the pun on *virājam*, well captured by Scar “Soma herrscht nach Art eines Grosskönigs.” I would now

substitute a fuller (if more awk.) tr.: “Soma, as rhythm [/ the Anuṣṭubh meter], rules as wide-ruling one [/regulates the Virāj (meter) according to rule].” This tr. assumes that *virājam* represents not only the acc. sg. of the rt. noun compd. *virāj-*, but also the nom. sg. pres. part. **virājan* to the them. pres. *rājati*. This seems preferable to trying to construe it as an acc. sg. in the sense ‘wide-ruling’, and the interchange of final nasals would be fairly trivial for a pun. Scar. (72 n. 97) notes that the lexeme *ānu* √*rāj* is used in II.43.1 also of regulating meters, there Gāyatrī and Triṣṭubh. The preverb *ānu* also has to be read with *ṣṭúp*, as a compd decomposed and flanking *rājati* (*ānu rājati ṣṭúp*), for the meter name. The technical references to meters here may be the culmination of the *kavī-* / *īṣi-* theme of 17–18.

IX.96.19: I follow Ge in interpr. *vibhītvān-* as ‘spreading (wings)’, an interpr. that Old finds at least possible and that Re accepts. It is noteworthy – though I’m not sure where it gets us – that the Avestan Hom Yašt in Y. 9.14 contains the phrase *vībərəθuuantəm āxtūirīm* supposedly “with pauses and repeated four times,” describing the recitation of the Ahuna Vairiia prayer, with the equivalent of our *vibhītvān-* (*-vant-*) and *turīya-*. But the contexts are so different that it is hard to know what, if anything, to make of it – though if there’s a covert reference to recitational styles here it would continue the technical poetic vocab. of 18d.

The stem *govindú-* ‘cow-finding’ is found only here in the RV and nowhere else in Skt. (though *govinda-* is of course quite common later). As Re notes, it is a play on *indu-* ‘drop’ and is immed. doubled by the synonym *drapsá-*.

The weapons of 16a (and 12d) return here.

I follow Lü (273) and Re in taking *samudrām* in c as part of a double acc. phrase with *vivakti* in d: “declares the sea to be the fourth domain” – rather than as taking it as a 2nd obj. with *sācamānaḥ* as Ge does (“... der Meerflut sich gesellend”). Accepting Lü’s interpr. of the syntax does not, however, require accepting his view that this is the heavenly ocean, higher than heaven. Again, I think it’s a ritual ref. – perhaps to the waters that accompany him in pāda c.

IX.96.20: Soma’s journey from the filter (vs. 17) and across the domains on the ritual ground (vss. 18–19) reaches its end when he enters the two cups, presumably ready for the gods to consume.

IX.96.20–21: Again these two vss. belong to separate mini-hymns, but they are clearly concatenated: *kānikradat* “constantly roaring” in 20d is repeated in the same metrical position in 21b (and cf. *krāndan* in 22d), and 20d *camvòr ā viveśa* “he has entered the two cups” is immediately echoed by 21c *camvòr ā víśa* “enter the two cups” (and cf. 22b *kalásām ā viveśa*).

IX.96.22: Given the play on names of meters in 18d, it’s quite possible that *sāman-* is a technical term here.

Although *eti* has a goal in its pāda (at least in the simile) and should therefore be read as a lexical verb of motion, it may also be functioning as an auxiliary in a periphrasis *krādann eti* “keeps roaring,” which would be an analytic expression functionally equivalent to the “intensive” (that is, iterative-repetitive) *kānikradat* in 20d, 21b.

IX.96.23: The same double reading may apply to *eṣi* in pāda a, which has a goal (again in a simile), but also could be read with the part. *apaghnán* “he keeps smiting rivals.”

śakunó ná pátvā “like a flying bird” seems closely modeled on 19a *śakunó vibhrtvā* “a bird spreading (its wings). In itself the expression is a bit puzzling. If the bird is “flying” it should not already be “sitting” (*sīdan*), and it seems unlikely that *pátvan-* is meant to distinguish it (as ‘flightful’) from a flightless bird like a dodo.

IX.96.24: A last pāda-init. form of $\sqrt{\text{krand}}$, *ácikradat* in d.

IX.97

On the structure of this, the longest hymn in the RV, see publ. intro. It consists of *ṛcas* with varying degrees of cohesion.

IX.97.1–3: No obvious cohesion in this *ṛca*, though it ends with a clan refrain.

IX.97.1: As Re points out, init. *asyá* is reflexive or pseudo-reflexive, referring to Soma.

Gr attributes the instr. *preṣā* to a root noun *preṣ-* (< *pra-ís-*). Scar (59–60) discusses the form extensively, pointing out that a root noun analysis is dispreferred because of the accent on the ending: root nouns generally keeping the accent on the root even in the oblique. An instr. to a putative them. stem *preṣá-* is possible (at least accentually distinct from *preṣa-* I.68.5).

Almost identical to IX.92.6a, pāda d contains one of the few technical references to animal sacrifice (other than the horse sacrifice) in the RV.

IX.97.3: The comparative (*yaśástarah*) with gen. pl. (*yaśásām*) is a mixed construction: we would expect either a *splv.* or an *abl.*

On the disputed etym. of *kṣaita(-vant)*- see comm. ad VI.2.1. As was noted there, both *kṣaita-* here and *kṣaitavant-* there are associated with *yáśas-* ‘glory’.

The final pāda is the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain, and the Anukr. attributes this *ṛca* to Vasiṣṭha himself, rather than one of the Vasiṣṭhids responsible for vss. 4–30.

IX.97.4–6: As Re points out (ad vs. 6), the key to this *ṛca* is the dative of purpose: 4b *dhánāya*, 5b *mádāya*, 5d *mahaté saúbhagāya*, 6b *bhārāya*.

IX.97.5: Ge and Re take *ánu dhāma pūrvam* as referring to an earlier mode of praise (e.g., “nach der früheren Weise”), but *dhāman-* in soma hymns tends, in my view, to refer to the physical domain(s) of the ritual ground, which Soma typically travels across in the course of his ritual preparation. See, e.g., the exx. in the immediately preceding hymn IX.96.18–19 and comm. thereon).

IX.97.6: Like the first *ṛca*, this one ends with the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain. The *ṛca* is attributed not to Vasiṣṭha himself, but to one Indrapramati Vāsiṣṭha, who is not known from elsewhere.

IX.97.7–9: This *ṛca* is attributed to Vṛṣagaṇa Vāsiṣṭha, whose given name was obviously extracted from vs. 8. All three vss. contain wild (or semi-wild) animals: a boar in 7d, geese in 8a, and a “sharp-horned” (*tigmáśṛṅga-*) one in 9c, a descriptor of *vṛṣabhá-*s generally.

IX.97.7: In the expression *kāvyaṃ uśáneva* the first word is the acc. obj. of *bruvāṇāḥ*, but it is also of course a play on the patronymic of Uśanā, the differently accented *kāvya-*.

In d the publ. tr. takes *padā* as neut. pl., based on IX.12.8 *abhí priyā divás padā, ... arṣati* “Soma rushes towards the dear tracks of heaven,” adduced by Re. However, it is also possible and, I now think, desirable to interpr. it as an instr. sg. “along the track.” I would not interpr. the instr., with Ge, as “mit dem Fusse.”

On PREV *eti rébhan*# see IX.96.6=17, IX.97.1 (this hymn) and with *emi* VII.18.22; “snorting” or “grunting” would be a better rendering of *rébhan* in the boar context.

IX.97.8: My interpr. of this vs. differs from the standard because I don’t interpr. anything here as a PN, unlike Ge and to a lesser extent Re. In particular, *ṛpála- manyú-* is taken as PN by Gr, Ge, Re, Mayr (PN); Ge and (waveringly) both Old and Mayr (PN) also so interpr. *vṛṣagaṇa-*. As for the former, *ṛpála-* is also found in the cmpd. *ṛpála-prabharman-* (X.89.5, where it is adjacent to *āpānta-manyu-*, with *-manyu-* as here), both adj. applying to Soma. There is no question of a PN there. It is also likely to be related to *ṛprá-* (VIII.2.5), also of Soma. See comm. ad loc., where I accept Mayr’s (EWA s.v.) suggestion that *ṛprá-* means ‘sharp’. The other part of the dyad, *manyú-*, is of course a well-attested common noun ‘battle fury’. I see no obstacle to interpr. the phrase as “sharp battle fury,” referring to Soma’s martial progress across the ritual ground.

In the standard tr. the geese of *pāda* a are in an unmarked simile, and the real subj. is *vṛṣagaṇāḥ*, which is either a PN (Ge) or a descriptor of officiants (Re: “Les (officiants formant) un groupe mâle”). But again, nothing stands in the way of taking the geese as the subj., modified by *vṛṣagaṇāḥ*; after all, geese come in flocks! In my view the geese are, metaphorically, the singers (so not too far from Re), who attend the ritual in a flock. The point of comparison is the noise they make; cf., e.g., IX.32.3 *ād īm haṃsó yáthā gaṇám, vísvasyāvīvaśan mátim* “just as (the lead) wild goose (sets) its flock (to honking), he has made the thought of everyone bellow.” The last two vss. here (7–8) contrast the harsh noise made by Soma (compared to a boar, 7d) with the equally harsh noise of honking geese, representing the ritual singers. This may be far from the mellifluous singing we imagine, but, as I have long argued, the root \sqrt{ribh} ‘rasp,’ etc. and its deriv. noun *rebhá-* also do not flatter the sound of the singers: they describe the squawking of birds of prey and the creaking of a wagon, inter alia (see comm. ad VI.3.6, IX.66.9). Although the principal image here is of noisily honking geese, the migratory travels of the geese (going from nearby us to their [winter?] home) provide a secondary image. Because in real life the honking of geese is generally perceived as they cross the sky in formation, the two images go together.

Ge and Re take c with ab, with *pávamānam* another goal (beside *Ṛpála Manyu*) of *ayāsuḥ*. I take it rather with d, and I think the 2nd hemistich softens and repairs the uncompromising tunelessness of the noise in ab, by revising the depiction of the singers. They are now “comrades,” and they speak forth (*pra* \sqrt{vad} , with double acc.) to Soma “songful music” (*āṅguṣyām ... vāṇám*). Ge and Re take *āṅguṣyām* as modifying

pávamānam, and in their favor the two words are adjacent. But the only other occurrence of that stem modifies *sāman*- ‘melody’ (I.62.2) and to bleach it to ‘preislichen’ (for which there are already numerous other synonyms) seems unfortunate. I would suggest that the prominent initial position of *ānguṣyām* in c, far from its head noun at the end of d, results from this intention to re-cast the harsh image of ab and do so as soon as possible.

In any case the *vāṇá*- is *durmārṣa*- ‘difficult to forget’ or, perhaps ‘to neglect’; the choice may depend on whether it’s a hauntingly appealing melody or so raucous that one can’t avoid it.

IX.97.9: This vs. presents a number of puzzles, esp. in pāda b.

The verb in pāda a, *raṃhate*, should be intransitive. I construe the acc. *jūtīm* loosely, as indicating the pace or speed at which Soma moves, which is compared to that of Viṣṇu, who is regularly modified by *urugāyá*-, though the adj. is not exclusive to him.

The phrase *vīthā krīlánt*- is also found in IX.21.3. It’s also worth noting that *vīthā* is also found with several instances of *pājas*- ‘face, dimension’ disc. below (IX.76.1=88.5, 109.21).

The problems in pāda b center on the root affiliation of the verb *mimate* and the function of *ná*. The phrase in question is *mimate ná gāvaḥ*. The pāda is incisively and persuasively discussed by Old, with whose analysis my own is in general agreement. To begin with *ná*, both Ge and Re take it as neg., but as Old points out, its position is against that. I think that it is the simile marker, but, unusually, marking the verb that precedes it as to be read in two senses, rather than marking a nominal phrase as the simile, as is its overwhelming use.

This brings us to the verb. Given the presence of cows, our first impulse is to think ‘bellow’; cf., e.g., IX.33.4 *gāvo mimanti dhenávaḥ*. But, though $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘bellow’ does have the requisite redupl. pres. stem *mīmā*-/ *mím*-, it is only active, as Old also points out. I therefore think that *ná* here signals that *mimate* is an imperfect pun: it gestures towards ‘bellow’, but cannot belong to ‘bellow’ because of the middle voice. (Old also thinks the pun is present.) This accounts for my “as they seem to bellow” in the publ. tr. The root to which the verb actually belongs is $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘measure’, which also has a redupl. pres., which, however, is generally middle. The voice of the verb in our passage thus favors $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘measure’, though $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘bellow’, at least initially, seems to fit the context better. What can ‘measure’ contribute? This question was ingeniously answered by Old: the cows, i.e., the milk mixture, “teilen ihm das Mass zu.” They “give him their measure,” that is, provide him further physical substance as he travels through the stages of his ritual preparation.

This image is continued in c, by the VP *parīṇasām kṛṇute*. Although the acc. is generally taken as a substantivized neut. to a them. adj. *parīṇasá*- derived from the noun *pārīṇas*- ‘fullness, profusion’ (so Gr; see AiG II.2.137), I consider it still an adj., with which we should supply *pājas*- ‘face, dimension’. This has good support in IX; cf. IX.76.1 = IX.88.5 *vīthā pājāmsi kṛṇute* “he deploys his full dimensions at will” and with a different medial verb IX.68.3 *pāja ā dade* “he assumed his full dimension” (see also IX.109.21). The added milk allows him to expand and attain ample size or measure. On the association of cows/milk with *parīṇas(a)*- see VIII.45.24 *gó-parīṇasa*-, characterizing soma drinks. In the comm. ad VIII.45.24 I suggest that the 2nd cmpd member is *parīṇasá*- as here (hence a 2nd occurrence of that stem), not *pārīṇas*- (per Gr, etc.).

Acđg. to Ge (n. 9cd), Re, Lü (267), pāda d depicts Soma as sun and moon. This may well be, but I wonder if the source of the contrastive image is not the Overnight (*atirātrā*) soma ritual.

IX.97.10–12: This ṛca is attributed to Manyu Vāsiṣṭha, with the name possibly extracted from the previous ṛca, where *manyú-* in 8a is taken by some as part of a PN (see comm. above).

All three vss. contain a hemistich beginning *ínđuḥ* (10a, 11c, 12c); the verb *pavate* appears in all three (10a, 11b, 12a), though this is hardly unusual. In addition there is the presence of Indra (10b, 11c) or the gods in general (12b), as well as shared vocabulary: hemistich-final *mádāya* (10b, 11d), $\sqrt{pṛc}$ ‘infuse’ (11a, 12b), #*devó devásya* (11d) / #*devó devān* (12d). The net result is an impression of unity, despite the lack of a striking shared theme and the unremarkable nature of the shared material.

IX.97.10: The sense and derivation of *gó-nyoghas-* are disputed. Ge tr. “der die Kühe würdigt” and tentatively connects the 2nd member with what he cites as *ny òhate* in V.52.11. I do not construe *ní* with *ohate* in that passage (see comm. ad loc.), in part because \sqrt{uh} does not otherwise appear with *ní*. The sense he attributes to the cmpd is also rather jarring. He is followed in both sense (“respectant les vaches”) and derivation by Re., who adds to the dossier of parallels I.180.5 *gór óheṇa*, which, however, is too riddled with uncertainties (see comm. ad loc.) to provide good evidence. By contrast Old considers BR’s conjectured emendation **gó-nyokas-* ‘accustomed to cows’ (?—he doesn’t gloss) very likely. He rejects the view that the cmpd as transmitted contains an *s-* stem *oghas-* ‘flood’, related to later Vedic *ogha-*, *aughá-* ‘flood’ (even though he states that if we stick with the transmitted text he would tr. “auf den die Kuh(milch) hernieder flutet”). This dismissal of a potential **oghas-* is shared by Mayr (EWA s.v. *ogha-*): “RV 9,97,10 *gónyoghas-* ist nicht für ein ved. **oghas-* ‘Strömung’ verwertbar.” Mayr instead tentatively follows the Ge/Re interpr. (s.v. *OH*), “vielleicht ‘die Kühe preisend’ od. dgl.” I am puzzled by this blanket rejection, esp. from Mayr, who cites (s.v. *ogha-*) with approbation Narten’s positing (YH 221) of an Indo-Iranian root $\sqrt{*uagʰ}$ ‘fliessen’, found in *ogha-*, *aughá-*. Admittedly, there is no independently attested *s-* stem **oghas-*. But consider the semantically and morphologically parallel *gó-arṇas-* (4x) ‘having a flood of cows’, with the well-attested *s-* stem *arṇas-* ‘flood’. It is easy (at least for me) to imagine that an *s-* stem **oghas-* was coined in analogy to *arṇas-* for just this cmpd.

IX.97.11: The 2nd hemistich contains three pairs of phonological and (partly) etymological figures: #*índur índrasya*, #*devó devásya*, *matsaró mádāya*#, with the 1st two presenting matching nom.+gen. grammatical figures.

IX.97.12: The first pāda is alliterative: ... *priyāṇi pavate punānāḥ*, while opening of the 2nd is an etymological figure that matches the one opening 11d.

The referent of *priyāṇi*, the obj. or goal of *abhí ... pavate*, is uncertain. In the pub. tr. I supply ‘tracks’, on the basis of 7c *padā ... abhy èti*, as well as IX.12.8 *abhí priyā divás padā ... arṣati* “he rushes towards the dear tracks of heaven.” However, as noted above, I no longer think *padā* in vs. 7 is an acc. pl., and I am also more moved by Ge’s cited parallel, IX.75.1 *abhí priyāṇi pavate ... nāmāni* “he purifies himself towards his

own dear names.” But cf. also IX.57.2 *abhī priyāṇi kāvya ... arṣati*. I would now be inclined to supply ‘names’ (“he purifies himself towards his own dear names”), since Soma’s progress across the ritual ground to his names is a trope (see comm. ad IX.75.1). But since there are a number of other referential possibilities for the construction *abhī priyā(ṇi)*, it might be best simply to tr. “towards his own dear (things).”

Pāda c is also puzzling: the phrase “clothing himself in his foundations” (*dhārmāṇi ... vāsānaḥ*) is not immediately interpretable, and there are no illuminating parallels (at least that I have found). The adverbial *ṛtuthā* “according to the ritual order” suggests that the process of “clothing himself” involves following the orderly steps of the sacrifice – which in turn suggests that Soma is making his progress across the ritual ground, encountering first the waters, then the milk, before arriving at his destination. I therefore think that the “foundations” here are the waters and the milk – his supports, the materials of which the soma drink is built. But this cannot be demonstrated.

IX.97.13–15: No particular signs of cohesion in this ṛca, which is a collection of soma tropes. If there is any unifying theme it is movement, with *eti* (13b), *eṣi* (14b, c), *arṣati* (13d), *arṣa* (15d); for other repeated lexical items also *pariṣicyāmānaḥ* (14d), *pāri ... siktāḥ* (15d). Also the final vs. (15) begins with *evā*, the common hymn-ending summary particle – an effect that is muted in the publ. tr.

The poet is supposed to be Upamanyu Vāsiṣṭha, presumably following up on the Manyu to whom the last ṛca was attributed.

IX.97.13: The part. *nadāyan* here (as well as the other 2 forms of this stem) is universally taken as a trans.-caus. ‘causing to resound’ with Heaven and Earth as obj. As I argue in my *-āya*-book (60–61), all 3 passages are better taken as intrans. In this vs. the focus is on the noise that Soma makes; see esp. the parallel part. *abhikānikradat* ‘constantly roaring’. And so intrans. ‘bellowing’ fits this pattern. Note also IX.70.6 *mātārā ... nānadat eti* “he goes bellowing to his two mothers [=Heaven and Earth,” with the same config. of participle to $\sqrt{nad} + eti + H+E$.

IX.97.14: On *saṃtanī-* see comm. ad IX.69.2.

IX.97.15: As was noted just above, the hymn-summary quality of the *evā* opening this vs. is not sufficiently represented. I would now alter the tr. to “Just in this way purify yourself ...”

The etym. figure *madiró mādāya* is reminiscent of *matsaró mādāya* in the previous ṛca (11d), and pāda-final *mādāya* is prominent in the first part of this hymn (5b, 10b, 11d, 15a).

The identity of the ‘water-grabber’ (*uda-grābhā-*) is unclear. The best suggestion, in my view, is Ge’s: Vṛtra. This interpr. entails an implicit identification of Soma with Indra here, but this is not unprecedented: see for ex. the passages in which Soma is called *vṛtra-hán(tama)-* (IX.1.3, 24.6), and note that in the 1st vs. of this ṛca (13c) Soma’s voice is compared to Indra’s. Sāy. suggests ‘cloud’, but why would Soma be fighting a cloud? Old has an ingenious, ritually oriented solution, whereby *udagrābhā-* does not identify the (to-be-)vanquished enemy, but rather the type of weapon Soma is using (the gen. thus depending directly on *vadhasnāḥ*) – namely the ritual ladle (Wasserschöpfer). He uses the

power of water to vanquish an unexpressed enemy, namely “die feindlichen Mächte.” Although Old rejects the possibility that *udagrābhá-* refers to Vṛtra, in part because too much would need to be supplied, in fact by his interpr. the hostile object itself would have to be supplied. His solution also does not mesh with passages like I.165.6 *vísvasya śátror ánamam vadhasnaíḥ* “I bowed with my weapons (those) of every rival,” which has the exact syntactic configuration of our passage.

The expression in pāda c, “encompassing the glistening color,” presumably refers to Soma’s incorporating the gleaming white milk – rendered clearly, if non-literally, by Ge’s “weisse Farbe annehmend.”

IX.97.16–18: This *ṛca* does seem to have a controlling theme and metaphor, esp. in 17–18 -- the passage through the filter, beginning in 16. Navigating among the curly tufts is compared on the one hand to the triumphant progress of the Aryas (vs. 17) and to a sort of moral progress in discriminating between the crooked and the straight (18). Each vs. also contains a form of the impv. *dhanva* ‘run’ (16d, 17c, 18d).

The Anukramaṇī names Vyāghrapād (‘Tigerfoot(ed)’) Vāsiṣṭha as the poet, a colorful name with no precedent in the text.

IX.97.16: The vs. contrasts easy travel (a: *supáthā sugāni*) with difficult travel (c: *duritāni*); the contrast is signaled by *su-/ duṣ-*, while two different roots for ‘go’ serve as 2nd cmpd. member, $\sqrt{gā}$ (or \sqrt{gam} ?) versus \sqrt{i} .

The part. *ḥṛṇvān* in b should be supplied to govern *supáthā sugāni* in a.

Pace Ge and Re, I do not think *naḥ* should be construed with the ger. *juṣṭvī*; it is simply in Wackernagel’s position and goes better with *supáthā sugāni*.

For the loc. *uraú* see III.54.9 *uraú pathí*.

For *ghanéva* see comm. ad I.63.5.

IX.97.17: As Re hints, *śamgáyī-* is a species of univerbation of the common expression *śám + DAT* “weal, luck for X.”

The 2nd hemistich of this vs. is very difficult. Decoding it is made somewhat easier by recognizing the governing image: the progress of the Soma in and around the tufts of wool on the sheepskin filter. The Soma is urged to ‘pull apart’ \sqrt{ci} the *bándhūn* ‘bonds’; *bándhu-* is multivalent here. It refers on the one hand to the physical bonds that exist between the wool tufts, blocking Soma’s progress. It is notable that in VS 23.36 *ví cinvantu* has *lóma* ‘hair’ as object, and refers to the separation of the hair of the sacrificial horse to mark the lines along which the flaying knives are to follow. But *bándhu-* can also refer to bonds of kinship and therefore to kin-groups. Here the 2nd sense of \sqrt{ci} , ‘discriminate’, is probably in play, as Soma as representative of Ārya progress makes strategic alliances among these groups.

Ge follows this 2nd interpr. still further by emending the unclear (*indo*) *vāyūn* to **indav* **āyūn*, tr. “indem du ... diese nächsten Freunde [= *bándhūn* sj], die Āyu’s, aussucht.” In my opinion emending to Āyus doesn’t help much, and I don’t think *vāyūn* is as hopeless as he finds it – though I don’t think the path that Old and Re follow is a convincing one either. They both take it, reasonably enough, as belonging to the extremely well-attested stem *vāyú-* ‘wind’, and Old suggests that these winds might be rain-bringing, thus relating to the *vṛṣṭi-* desired in the first hemistich. But this takes us far

from the fleece filter and the images it produces. I suggest instead that it is a nonce formation to the pseudo-root $\sqrt{vā}$ ‘weave’ (on which see, e.g., EWA s.v. *o*, esp. p. 276), meaning ‘webs’ and again refers to the tangled non-linear paths through the fleece. In this context the ‘weave’ sense would be available to the audience. Re hints at a connection with ‘weave’ in his n., but his tr. doesn’t reflect it.

One of the curious features of this hemistich is that it is the simile that contains the word that is closest to the actual physical object under discussion – namely (*)*stúka*- ‘curl’, very close to ‘tuft’. Before discussing the meaning further, I should comment on the form. The stem of this word is generally given as fem. *stúkā*-, and there are certainly clear fem. forms (acc. *stúkām* AV VII.74.2; also by implication the poss. adj. *stukāvín*- RV VIII.74.13, although the latter could show lengthening at morpheme boundary [cf. *dvayā-vín*- and AiG II.2.917–18]). But nothing forbids us from interpr. *stúkā* here as a neut. pl. to a them. *stúka*- (so already Old), which immensely aids the interpr. of the passage, since a nom. ‘tuft, curl’ compared to the subject Soma and commanded to run is close to senseless. One can interpr. the relationship between fem. *stúkā*- and neut. *stúka*- in one of two ways. Either the neut. stem was so common in bahuvrīhis modifying females – e.g., *viṣita-stukā* ‘with unloosened curls’ of Rodasī in I.167.5 – that the 2nd member was reinterpr. as fem. Or, again because of its presence in bahuvrīhis modifying females, the originally fem. 2nd member was interpr. as *-stuka*-, with the fem. gender appropriate only when a fem. was so characterized by a bahuvrīhi containing it. Either way, I think we can confidently assume a neut. acc. pl. here, parallel to *bāndhūn* and *vāyūn*. Soma is urged to pull apart the *bāndhūn* “like straightened curls/tufts.” That *vītā*- means ‘straight, straightened’ is clear from IV.2.11 cited by Ge: *cīttim ācīttim cinavad vī vidvān, pṛṣṭhēva vītā vṛjinā ca mātān* “Insight and lack of insight will the knowing one [=Agni] distinguish, like backs, straight and crooked, (like) mortals,” where it is contrasted with *vṛjinā*- ‘crooked’, with both acting as object of $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, as Gr suggests, but seems synchronically distinct from the other uses of the ppl. to this root. Gr gives it a separate lemma. Old suggests that *stúkā ... vītā* refers to “Kammwolle” or worsted wool, that is (I learn from the internet), wool yarn that has been combed rather than carded; carded yarn is fuzzier than worsted yarn. Whether this technical interpr. is correct or not, it’s clear that the curls or tufts in question are easier to navigate than those that are not *vītā*-.

IX.97.18: The “straight versus crooked” theme is continued here, and in fact the expression *vītā vṛjinā ca* “straight and crooked” cited from IV.2.11 in the immed. preceding comm. is lexically renewed (*clarified*) by *ṛjūṃ ca ... vṛjinām ca*, with a better attested and unambiguous word for ‘straight’, *ṛjū*-. Again, Soma’s progress across the tufted filter is the topic, made clearer by the use of *gātú*- ‘way’. Both Ge and Re (also Ober II.60) take the verb *vīṣya* only with pāda a and supply a new verb (‘discriminate’ or the like) with b, relying perhaps too heavily on the model of IV.2.11. I think literal unknotting is what’s at stake – finding a way between the entangled wool tufts. Ge further suggests (n. 18a) that the unknotting refers to getting rid of the stalk of the plant in the soma press, but the filter makes far more sense.

The two images in d seem oddly incoherent together: *máryaḥ ... pastiyāvān* “a man in his prime in possession of a dwelling place,” but a passage adduced by Ge (n. 18d) demonstrates that the young man and the house go together: I.91.13 *márya iva svá okyè* “(take pleasure) like a young man in his own home.” Perhaps the point of the house-proud *márya-* is that a man in his prime, perhaps roughly the equivalent of the later *gr̥hastha*, should have achieved the goals of a mature life: a house and household; Soma is implicitly likened to such a man after he has been purified and acquired the water and milk that make him the fully prepared ritual substance, and the *pastyā-* itself is the ritual ground. Ge’s parallel also neatly provides indirect evidence for the semantic equivalence of *pastyā-* and *okyā-* ‘home’ and therefore against the interpr. of *pastyā-* as ‘river’ (often indeed by Ge; see, e.g., IX.65.23, though he tr. it here as Haus). See comm. ad I.40.7.

X.97.19–21: Attributed to Śakti Vāsiṣṭha, who, unlike most of the other Vasiṣṭhids named by the Anukr. for this hymn, has other vss. attributed to him: VII.32.26, IX.108.3, 14-16. The ṛca is more concerned with the gods’ consumption of soma than previous ones; note the “divine conclave” (*devátāte*) in 19a, the invitation to the gods to come to the sacrifice to drink soma in 20d, and the pursuit of the gods (*devāvītim*) in 21a. The final verse of the ṛca (21) also begins with a hymn-summarizing *evā* and the type of plea for benefits that often end a hymn. The first two vss. of the ṛca also contain forms of √*dhanv*: impv. *dhanva* (19b) and *dhanvanti* (20c), thus continuing the repeated impv. *dhanva* of the previous ṛca – with this concatenation suggesting a reason for attaching this ṛca here.

IX.97.19: Pāda b *pári ṣnúnā dhanva sāno ávye* is identical to 16d *ádhi ṣnúnā dhanva sāno ávye* save for the preverb.

IX.97.20: The publ. tr. dispenses with the rel. prn. in pāda a, as tr. the hemistich as a rel. cl. seemed clunky.

Note the alliteration of ab *araśmāno yé arathā áyuktā, átyāso ná sasṛjānāsa ājaú*.

IX.97.22–24: Karṇaśrut Vāsiṣṭha, a name that has no source in the text and is not otherwise found in the Anukr. This ṛca depicts Soma as a king on a royal journey, and associates him with the resonant words *ṛtá-* (23b, 24d) and *dhárman-* (22b) / *dharmán-* (23c) and the traditional roles they imply.

IX.97.22: I read *yádī* in pāda a as *yád ī* ‘when him’. Note the parallel *īm* in pāda c, before a vowel (*īm āyan*), while our *ī* occurs before *m* (*ī mánaso*) and could in principle represent a degeminated **īm mánaso* (though I don’t think this is nec.). As Ge (n. 22ab) implies, the point of this pāda is that the ritual speech of the priest-poet essentially creates the sacral drink soma [/god Soma] from the mere juice of the soma plant.

I do not, however, follow Ge’s interpr. (in the same n.) of b, as meaning that this speech was roused by the prospect of the dakṣiṇā. I am in fact tempted to follow Old’s rather despairing comment, “Der mystischen Verbrämung dieses Gedankens in b weiss ich keine Deutung abzugewinnen.” He finds the other three pādas clear, with the sense that when speech has fashioned soma (or the milk streams, also possible in Old’s opinion), the milk streams stream to the soma. Accepting this as the overall intent of the verse, I think there is some sense – at least structural sense – that can be wrung from b.

To begin with, we must focus on the *vā*. Insofar as I can follow his rendering Ge implicitly interprets the *vā* as loosely contrasting the fashioning from the mind of the seer with that fashioning under the circumstances set out in b, but his tr. seems to me not really German (“So oft ihn die Rede aus dem Geiste des schauenden (Sehers) heraus formte oder bei der Entscheidung angesichts des besten Stückes Vieh”). Klein’s rendering (DGRV II.147), which seems to follow the structure envisioned by Ge though with somewhat different content, does not seem to me to be English either: “When speech (arising) from the mind of the seer fashioned (it., viz. soma) or in the establishment (of the worship) in the presence of the best cow.” Re at least tries to impose some parallelism between a and b, taking *dhármaṇi* in b as an infinitive that is roughly parallel to the finite verb *tákṣat* in a: “Quand la parole (née) de l’esprit du Voyant eut façonné (le soma), ou (quand il s’agissait d’) établir (le sacrifice) en présence du plus puissant bétail.”

None of these basically clausal or pseudo-clausal interpr. seems to me correct (or even parsable). I instead think that the domain of *vā* is only pāda b, and that it is conjoining two locative phrases: *jyéṣṭhasya ... dhármaṇi* and *kṣór áníke*. If I am correct, we are dealing with an example of inverse *vā* (X *vā* Y), rather than the standard X Y *vā* – a pattern that Klein (DGRV II.139) considers rare but existent. In our case *vā* is inserted in the middle of the first, complex member, giving a pattern X *vā* X’ Y Y’. But at least *vā* would be doing its usual job, conjoining parallel nominal expressions, each consisting of a loc. plus dependent gen. Here each would define the conditions or locations under which the fashioning of pāda a occurred. The first of the choices is “on the foundation of the preeminent one”; in the publ. tr. I suggest that the preeminent one could be either Agni or Indra, both of whom are elsewhere characterized as *jyéṣṭha*-. I now think this is incorrect. Instead I would invoke the two other expressions in IX with loc. to *dhárman*- + GEN, both *ṛtásya dhárman* (IX.7.1, 110.4) “on the foundation of truth.” Although *ṛtá*- does not seem to be qualified as *jyéṣṭha*- elsewhere, “preeminent truth” is hardly a jarring expression in RV discourse. Here “on the foundation of preeminent (truth)” would refer physically to the ritual ground and conceptually to the truth that governs the sacrificial enterprise. See also comm. on the next vs.

The other loc. expression is harder to interpr. I will start by saying that I accept the interpr. of *kṣú*- as ‘cattle’ (< **pśu*-), going back to Bloomfield (IF 25 [1909]), rejected here by Old, but reaffirmed by Thieme (ZDMG 95 [1941] 347 = KISch 51), and now generally accepted (see all tr. cited above, as well as EWA s.v.). But what does “face-to-face with the cattle” (publ. tr.) or possibly “at the forefront of cattle” / “in front of cattle” mean in context (or even, indeed, out of context)? I have two suggestions, though neither of them makes a neat disjunctive pair with the first loc. phrase. The stronger suggestion is that this is a temporal expression, referring to dawn. The stem *ánika*- is several times used in this way; cf. VI.47.5 (with loc.) *uśásām áníke* “at the forefront of the dawns,” V.76.1 *uśásām áníkam* “the face of the dawns.” Esp. apposite for our passage is I.124.11 *yuñkté gávām aruṇānām áníkam* “She [=Dawn] yokes the forefront of the ruddy cows,” with the cows a reference to the reddish rays of dawn. Since Dawn and her rays are frequently assimilated to cows and *ánika*- is used to indicate the moment of the appearance of dawn / dawn’s rays, a shorthand expression “at the forefront of the cattle” could, it seems to me, be a way of saying “at dawn.” This would make the two locative phrases conjoined by *vā* conceptually non-parallel (though still syntactically parallel), but

I think this looseness is within acceptable limits, as offering two alternative ways of identifying the circumstances of the fashioning of Soma by speech: “on the foundation of preeminent (truth) or at the forefront of cattle [=dawn].” I would now emend the tr. in that way. Alternatively “in front of cattle” could refer to the place on the ritual ground where Soma encounters the milk mixture – which milk then comes to him. This would more narrowly define the location than the first locative phrase, which gives the whole ritual ground as the locus. The 2nd possibility provides a better set of parallels with *vā* – both locational – but I prefer the 1st because of the use of *ánika*- with dawn elsewhere.

IX.97.23: Since $\sqrt{pū}$ does not appear with *prá*, it’s best to supply a verb of motion with the *prá* opening pāda a and take b (with *pavate*) separately. Note the alliteration in pāda a ... *dānudó divyó dānu(-pinváḥ)*.

This vs. identifies Soma as ‘truth’ (*ṛtám* b) and also contains in c the possessive internal deriv. *dharmán-* to *dhárman-*. If I am correct that *jyéṣṭhasya ... dhármaṇi* in the immed. preceding vs. 22b should be interpr. “on the foundation of preeminent (truth -- *ṛtásya*), both resonant words, *ṛtá-* and *dhárman-/dharmán-*, were already implicitly present in the previous vs. In 23 Soma is then depicted as the embodiment of these words (cf. Ge’s “das (verkörperte) Gesetz” for *ṛtám*), and they define his kingship (*ṛāḥā* in c, also in 24b). Unfortunately it does not seem possible to signal the *dhárman-/dharmán-* connection in English tr., but ‘possessor of the (royal) mandate’ may be too specialized for the latter. Perhaps better ‘founder, foundation-giver, institutor, maintainer’. On Soma as “truth” see also IX.107.15 and IX.108.8.

The ten reins are presumably the fingers of the presser, as is usual for ten anything in IX.

IX.97.23–24: These two vss. each contain the injunc. (/subj.) aor. *bhuvat*, which in both cases I tr. as an immed. past: “he has become.” After considerable disc. with IH, I now think that this particular form can also express a generic or habitual role or behavior of the subject, which IH felicitously renders with the colloquial “he be-s X.” I am therefore now inclined to alter the tr. of both vss. to “he is the king ...” / “he is, now as before, the wealth-lord ...” In the absence of a non-colloquial Engl. habitual/generic, “is” will have to do.

IX.97.24: The two words making up the VP in d, *ṛtám bharat*, appear also in vs. 23, though not together (*ṛtám ṛtāya* b, *bhāri* d). As is pointed out by KH (implicitly: Injunc. 122 and esp. n. 34) and Ober (II.121), this appears to be an Indo-Iranian phrase, and it thus invests Soma with yet more traditional dignity. The pāda thus deserves a more solemn tr. than I gave it in the publ. tr. – perhaps “the drop bears the dear truth that is well worth the bearing.”

Although the morphological means are different, the lexical duplication in both *rayipátī rayīṇām* (c) and *ṛtám bharat súbhṛtam* (d) gives the end of this tr̥ca a stately and archaic air.

IX.97.25–27: Like the tr̥ca 19–21, this one focuses in great part on the gods as drinkers of soma and the desire to bring them to the ritual; the “pursuit” (*vītúm*) of Indra and Vāyu in 25b is reprised in *devā-vī-* ‘pursuing the gods’ in 26a, while the gods are mentioned twice

in 27ab. The final vs. also begins with the typical hymn-summarizing *evā* as three times elsewhere in this hymn (vss. 13–15, 19–21, 34–36). The poet is named as Mṛḍīka Vāsiṣṭha, who is also the poet of X.150. In the latter hymn his name is clearly drawn from the dat. *mṛḍīkāya* found in the refrain of every vs., but there is no such basis here.

IX.97.26: The publ. tr. omits the enclitic *naḥ*; it should be revised to “Pursuing the gods for us while ...”

Ge takes *ksāyam* in b as an Inhaltsakk. (“... sollen ... ein Haus ... herströmen” (sim. but more elaborate, Re). But a dwelling place is a particularly unlikely object to “stream,” and I prefer to see it as goal (as also Scar 398).

The hapax in d, *diviyāj-*, has (at least) two possible meanings: ‘sacrificing at day(break)’ as I take it, and ‘sacrificing (to the gods) in heaven’ (so Ge, Re). See Ge’s n. and Scar (398–99). There is nothing in the context that tips the balance one way or the other; I prefer the temporal reading because the other one requires more material to be understood. The word also appears in a metrically disturbed pāda; as it stands it has 12 syllables and a cadence (– ∪ ∪ ×) that is bad for both Triṣṭubh and Jagatī. Old suggests the possibility of reading the 1st member of *diviyāj-* as a monosyllable, either **divyājah* or **dyuyājah*, which would at least produce an 11-syl. line, and these possibilities are disc. in more detail by Scar without a firm conclusion.

IX.97.27: The summary *evā* might be more emphatically rendered as “in just this way” or sim. The “conclave of the gods” (*devātāte*) returns from 19a. As Ge points out, the whole hemistich is almost identical to IX.96.3, save for *evā* in place of *sā naḥ* and *devapānaḥ* for *indrapānaḥ*.

The ppl. in the periphrasis in d, *smāsi hitāḥ*, could belong either to √*dhā* or to √*hi* (so Sāy.). It is actually not clear to me which one Ge favors from his “denn wir sind in grossem Wettstreit begriffen” (and his n. 27c doesn’t entirely clarify). Re clear chose √*dhā*: “Avec ambition [*mahās cid?*] nous nous sommes en vérité placés dans la compétition.” I favor √*hi*: I think the point is that we are “driven” / “hard-pressed” in the hostile encounter, and we need divine help – which we will only get once they have partaken of our soma. But there are several logical steps missing in every interpr.

IX.97.28–30: Attributed to Vasukra Vāsiṣṭha, who is not otherwise known – though a Vasukra Aindra is supposedly responsible for the devilish trio of hymns X.27–29. The ṛca is marked by the repetition of *ā pavasva* in the 2nd hemistich of each vs. (28d, 29c, 30d) expressing the various good things we want Soma to bring us through his self-purification. The root √*srj* ‘surge’ is also prominent in the 2nd two vss. (29a, 30a).

IX.97.28: The opening of the vs., *ásvo ná kradah*, is very close to 18c *átyo ná kradah*. The first hemistich contains three animals, incl. the fairly rare lion. Ge, fld. by Re, identifies the bulls as the priests.

IX.97.29: I take the hapax *sanitra-* in its full lexical value, as a ‘means of winning’, rather than the bleached Spende, Gabe (Gr), Lohn (Ge), le bénéfice (Re) that prevails. On the accent of the word (and other *-tra-* stems to set roots), see AiG II.2.701–2, which also glosses the word as I do: ‘Mittel des Gewinnens’, flg. Ludwig.

IX.97.30: On *asasṛgram* see comm. ad X.31.3 and Kü 555.

I take *áhnām* as a 2nd, unmarked simile dependent on *sárgāḥ*, rather than supplying a different headnoun, as Ge and Re do. They are surely both right that “the surges of/from heaven” are the rains. As for “the surges of the days,” this could either refer to the passage of time or to an abundance of light; I favor the former.

In b *ná* should be read as both the simile particle and the negation; see Old.

Pādas b–c show a clever chaining of significant vocabulary. In b Soma is compared to a king who doesn’t violate his alliance, with *mítrá-* in its common noun usage. But d contains the part. *yatānā-* ‘taking one’s place, being put in place’, and \sqrt{yat} is an action esp. associated with the god Mitra. Cf., e.g., VII.36.2 *jánaṃ ca mitró yatati* “Mitra puts the people in their place” (sim. III.59.1). Although Mitra is not explicitly present here, the lexical continuity might evoke him. It is indeed possible that it is Mitra’s intentions (or those of the alliance itself) acdg. to which Soma takes his place, rather than “ours” as in the publ. tr.

The vs. ends with yet another term relating to social life, namely *vís-* ‘clan’; as king, Soma would exert himself on behalf of this social unit.

IX.97.31ff.: As noted in the publ. intro., the *ṛca* divisions seem to continue in this 2nd half of the composite hymn, although the Anukr. attributes the remaining vss. to just two poets, Parāśara Śāktya (31-44) and Kutsa Āṅgīrasa (45–58), an apportioning that does not conform to the presumed *ṛca* division (splitting the *ṛca* 43–45 between the two). Both poets are known from elsewhere: Parāśara Śāktya is the poet of I.65-73 and Kutsa Āṅgīrasa of I.94–98 and I.101–15.

IX.97.31–33: The first vs. of the *ṛca* contains a form of \sqrt{srj} , thus concatenating with the previous *ṛca*. Both the first (31) and last (33) vss. contain a reference to the sun, and I see one in the middle vs. as well; see comm. ad 32.

IX.97.31: The skeleton of pāda a, (*prá te dhārā (mádhumatīr) asṛgran*, is identical to 29a (*śatām) dhārā (devájātā) asṛgran*.

The publ. tr. renders *pāvase* as if it were an imperative; correct to “you purify yourself.”

I take “domain of cows” (*dhāma gónām*) in c to indicate that Soma is the substance into which the milk is mixed. Since the milk is sometimes identified as the sun, his swelling of the sun in d may refer to Soma’s providing more body and amplitude to the milk.

As often, *arká-* can be read as a pun.

IX.97.32: The “domain for the cows” is echoed here by the “domain of the immortal one” (*amṛtasya dhāma*). As with the same phrase in IX.94.2 (q.v.), I suggest that the immortal one is the sun, and perhaps specifically milk as representative of the sun. The role of the sun in the surrounding vss. (31d, 33d) supports this interpr. For alternative interpr. of the phrase, see comm. ad IX.94.2. In our passage Re (sim. Lü 467) suggests that it is actually nom. and refers to Soma, but in IX.94.2 it must be an acc. obj. (also acdg. to Re).

The cadence of c is bad as transmitted, but can be easily fixed by reading **matsarā-vān* with the common lengthening of the stem vowel *-a-* before *-vant-* and *-van-*; see Old, in agreement with Arnold. The stem is a hapax, and it is clearly a morphological variant of *matsarín(-tama)-* (4x), with a different possessive suffix. In fact, our pāda is a nonce Triṣṭubh adaptation of the Jagatī line IX.76.5 *sá índrāya pavase matsaríntamaḥ*. For further disc. see comm. ad IX.76.5. The interchangeability of *-vant-* and *-ín-* for metrical purposes speaks against the two possessive suffixes having crucial functional differences.

The initial *sá* in both our pāda and the one on which it is based does not follow my rules for *sá* 2nd-ps. reference. On this aberrancy see comm. ad IX.76.5, where it can be motivated. That pāda was then simply borrowed (and slightly altered) here.

IX.97.33: The form *cakṣi* (also VII.3.6) is in both of its occurrences pretty clearly an impv., but its formation is something of a puzzle. It appears to be a *-si* impv. (so Baum, *Imperative*, 46, 107, with no disc.), but it has none of the standard supports for such a form. Not only does it not have an *s*-aor. subjunctive, but it has no aorist forms at all, and almost all the occurrences of its well-attested root pres. are medial. And of course, assuming it belongs to $\sqrt{cakṣ}$, the form would have to be degeminated from **cakṣ-ṣi* (though that would not be hard). The parallel passage IX.71.9 has a medial injunc. to the marginal thematic stem (see KH 122 n. 33): *divyāḥ suparṇó 'va cakṣata kṣām*. I have no explanation for this aberrant form; it is true that the proper med. impv. to the root pres. *cakṣva* (3x) would not fit this metrical slot, but that doesn't seem reason enough to invent *cakṣi*.

IX.97.34–36: All three vss. concentrate on ritual speech and on the noisy approach of both cows and poets to Soma. This theme takes up 32d, where Soma impels his own speech in concert with the productions of the poets. The final vs., 36, begins with hymn-summarizing *evā*.

IX.97.34: On the “three voices” (*tisró vācaḥ*) see comm. ad IX.33.4, 50.2.

The parallel expressions in c and d -- ... *yanti* ... PTCLE contrast the progress of ritual substance (milk) and ritual speech (thoughts). As elsewhere, *vāvasānāḥ* could belong to both $\sqrt{vās}$ ‘bellow’ and \sqrt{vas} ‘desire, be eager’ (cf. IX.93.4, 95.4). Given the emphasis on noise in this ṛca, the former is probably primary, but both can be meant – hence my tr. “bellowing eagerly.”

IX.97.35: The first two pādas of this vs. are variants of the last two of the previous vs. (34cd), with the repeated *yanti* of 34 gapped, and redistribution of some of the lexicon: the two participles in 34cd, *prchāmānāḥ* and *vāvasānāḥ*, switch positions, with each paired with a more natural subject (cows bellowing 35a, poets asking 35b), and the thoughts of 34d are relegated to the instr. in 35b with their producers, the *viprāḥ*, taking over the subject role in 35b, again a more natural configuration. We can consider 35ab as a complex poetic repair of 34cd.

IX.97.36: The hymn-summary *evā* could once again be rendered more forcefully: “in just this way” vel sim.

IX.97.37–39: I do not see any signs of unity in this ṛca. All three vss. contain a participle of $\sqrt{pū}$ in passive function, *pūnāná-* in 37, 38, *pūyámāna-* in 39, but this is hardly remarkable in the Soma maṇḍala.

IX.97.37: In pāda a *vípraḥ ... matīnām* reprises *víprā matībhiḥ* of 35b in concatenary fashion. For further on this phrase see below.

Gr, Ge, and Re, as well as Lü (439), take *ṛtā* as neut. pl., but this disturbs the syntax, and the tr. all must supply a verb to govern it. I suggest that it is instead the instr. sg. Re explicitly rejects this possibility on the grounds that it would be morphologically isolated. If he means that it would be the only such instr. to this stem, he seems to be correct, but given that the *-ā* instr. to them. stems is in retreat, this isolation would not be surprising. If he means that them. neuters don't have instr. in *-ā*, this is not correct: Lanman (Noun infl., 335) considers them more frequent than to the masc. and counts 77. Whether all his exx. would hold up under closer scrutiny is irrelevant: 77 would be difficult to reduce to 0.

The standard tr. also construe gen. pl. *matīnām* with *ṛtā*, whatever sense they ascribe to *ṛtā*, e.g., Ge “die rechten Wege der Gedanken,” Lü “zu den Wahrheiten der Gedanken.” They may be correct, and I could revise my tr. accordingly: “In accordance with the truth of the thoughts, Soma ...” However, the association of *vípra-* with *matī-* is very strong – I just noted it in 35b in the previous ṛca, and the two words occur in the same pāda numerous times: I.82.2=VIII.25.24 *víprā ... matī*, I.86.2 *víprasya ... matīnām*, II.24.13 *vípraḥ ... matī*, III.5.3 *vípraḥ ... matīnām*, III.30.20=50.4 *matībhiḥ ... víprāḥ*, IV.3.16 *matībhir vípraḥ*, V.80.1 *víprāso matībhiḥ*, VII.78.2 *víprāso matībhiḥ*, IX.63.21 *matī víprāḥ*, IX.85.7 *víprānām matáyah*, IX.107.24 *víprāso matībhiḥ*, X.6.5 *víprāso matībhiḥ*, X.25.10 *matīm víprasya*, X.64.16 *matībhiḥ ... vípraḥ*, X.123.1 *víprā matībhiḥ*; cf. also IX.71.3, X.11.6 *vépatē matī*. I therefore construe *matīnām* with *vípraḥ* in the publ. tr., as a loosely descriptive gen.

In cd the phrase *mithunāsah ... adhvaryávaḥ* is taken by Ge (fld. by Re) as referring to the pair (or presumably multiple pairs, given the pl.) of Adhvaryu and Hotar. Although at least I.83.2, which he adduces for this sense, does seem to refer to that pair of two priests, in the dual, I think the pl. here instead refers to rivalrous priests at competing sacrifices, which must be implicit in Ge's rendering, given the pl. They could be pairs of Adhvaryu and Hotar or (more likely in my opinion) just multiple Adhvarys, each performing in a separate sacrifice.

IX.97.38: The interpr. of this vs. is fairly straightforward, except for the 2nd part of pāda a, *sūre ná dhātā*. I have treated this simile at length in my Fs. Melchert article, “Sūre Duhitár's Brother, the ‘Placer of the Sun’: Another Example of -e <*-as in Rigvedic Phrasal Sandhi,” 2010. I will not repeat the disc. here but will summarize the conclusions. The major problem in this simile is what to do with the apparent loc. *sūre* ‘in the sun’ (to *sūra-*; or possibly, but less likely, dat. to *svâr*); this has led to some outlandish and unpersuasive interpr. of the phrase. I argue that *sūre* is actually the old gen. to *svâr*, from **sūraz* before voiced dental stop, as in the well-known *sūre duhitā* “daughter of the sun” in I.34.5. I start with an archaic formula **sūre dhātā* “placer of the sun,” with the two words separated here by the simile particle *ná* and the true interpr. obscured. The “placer

of the sun” is most likely Indra, and Soma is being compared to him in his cosmogonic role: filling the two worlds and revealing them.

The word order in the 2nd clause of b, *ví śá āvaḥ*, is worth noting. Both preverb in tmesis and *śá* seek 1st position, and *śá* overwhelmingly occupies 1st position, as a glance at Lubotsky shows. Perhaps to maintain *śá*'s 1st position tendency, often when a clause has both a preverb and *śá*, the preverb will remain in position before the verb (e.g., I.105.4 *śá tát dūtó ví vocati*; also pāda d in this vs.: *śá ... prá yamsat*). But it seems from a rapid survey that when a preverb is in tmesis, it regularly wins 1st position over *śá* -- e.g., III.59.2 *prá śá ...*, VIII.20.16 *abhí śá ...* -- with Wackernagel's position material imposed between -- e.g., *prá vaḥ śá ...*, VIII.21.10 *ā tú naḥ śá ...*. Our brief clause shows this PREV *śá* order.

As Old suggests, in c *priyā* is governed either directly or indirectly by the 2nd member of the cmpd. *priya-sāsaḥ* ‘winning dear things’: “those winning dear things (win) dear things.” The effect is rather like the type *gaṇānām gaṇapati-* “troop lord of troops” (II.23.1), though the means are different. As for *priya-sāsaḥ*, its stem is given as them. *priya-sá-* by Gr., and it would have the doubled nom. pl. ending familiar from *devāsaḥ*, etc. However, it seems possible (and in my opinion desirable) to interpr. it as belonging to a root noun *-sā-*. The rt. noun nom. pl. to *-ā-* stems is ordinarily *-āḥ*, which is identical to the nom. sg. Though several cmpds in *-sā-* do have this nom. pl. (*dhanasāḥ* VIII.3.15, X.65.10; *sadāsāḥ* IV.16.21, *sahasrasāḥ* X.64.6), the nom. sg. *-sāḥ* is far more common. In a passage like this, where there are no other nom. pl. forms to support the nom. pl. interpr. (as there are in the *-sāḥ* nom. pl. passages just cited), doubly marking the nom. pl. would make sense. Scar (585) seems to be leaning in that direction, but doesn't actually say so.

Parallel to the dative *kāriṇe ná* “as if to a victor” in the simile, we can assume “to us” vel sim. in the frame. So Ge.

IX.97.39: Pāda a contains another etymological doubling, *vardhitā vārdhanaḥ* “strengthening strengthener,” rather like the doubling of *priyā-* in 38c.

Note the allit. in c: ... *pūrve pitāraḥ padajñāḥ*.

The expression *gā ádrim uṣṇán* “burned the cows out of the rock” is, to say the least, unusual – and on those grounds disputed. A long tradition, going back to Benfey, emends the text to **muṣṇán* ‘stole’, with degemination in the sequence *ádrim (m)uṣṇán*. This emendation is accepted by, inter alia, Ge and Bloomfield (RR ad I.62.2 and Conc.). There is one strong arg. in favor of the change: $\sqrt{muṣ}$ ‘steal’ is formulaically embedded in the Vala myth (see Ge's n. 39d and, e.g., I.93.4 *yád ámuṣṇītam ... paṇím gāḥ* “when you two stole the cows from the niggard”). Other possible args. are inconclusive: both $\sqrt{muṣ}$ and $\sqrt{uṣ}$ have a 9th class pres., though the latter is only represented by one other form, part. *uṣṇán* in II.4.7 – but $\sqrt{uṣ}$ is a poorly attested root. The preverb *abhí* found in our passage does not appear with either root. In the end the clinching arg. seems to me to come from Old, who does not accept the emendation: the meter. The proposed change converts a good cadence into a bad one. Bl. (RR) argues “that the change from *ádrim muṣṇán* to *ádrim uṣṇán* was made by the redactor in deference to the meter.” But why would the poet have produced a bad cadence in the first place? I think it more likely that the poet was *playing* on the rhyming roots $\sqrt{muṣ}$ and $\sqrt{uṣ}$, with full knowledge that the former is the standard one in the Vala myth, and he is forcing us to invent a new and

more difficult image with the latter root. By supplying us with *jyótiṣā* he is providing us with the means to do so. Old adduces X.87.12 *jyótiṣā ... ny òṣa* “with light burn down ...,” comparable to our ... *jyótiṣā / yénā ... uṣṇán* and with a verb form of $\sqrt{uṣ}$. A poet who could deploy the “placer of the sun” formula in the manner he did in the previous vs. is surely capable of such a sly play on words.

IX.97.40–42: No particular unity detectable in the *ṛca*, though the 2nd two vss. do focus on Soma’s role in strengthening and exhilarating the gods.

IX.97.40: The verb *vāvrdhe* in d concatenates with *vardhitā vārdhanaḥ* in 39a.

Ge’s tr. of pāda a, “Der Ocean hat gebrüllt bei seiner ersten Ausbreitung,” seems to imply (though this is not a necessary interpr. of his tr.) that the *samudrá-* is a different entity from Soma himself, and his cited IX.107.23 *tvám samudrám prathamó ví dhārayaḥ* “You were [are] the first to to spread out the sea” (with both *samudrá-* and *ví√dhr̥*) certainly depicts them as separate. However, IX.86.29 *tvám samudró asi ..., távemāḥ pāñca pradīso vídharmaṇi* “You are the sea, ...; yours are these five regions in your [their] expansion” (also with *samudrá-* and the *-n*-stem loc. *vídharman/-ṇi* as here) asserts the identity of Soma and the *samudrá-*. Since forms of \sqrt{krand} ‘roar’ in IX (like *ákrān* here) have Soma as their subject (incl. in vss. 13, 18, 28, 32, 33 in this hymn), the identification of Soma and the sea seems assured here.

IX.97.42: The infinitival dat. *iṣṭáye* is generally taken to mean “to hasten, for hastening” here (Ge “dass er rasch komme”; Re “afin qu’il se hâte”; Klein GDGRV I.68 “for hastening”; and cf. EWA s.v. *Eṣ²* citing Ge’s tr. for just this passage). But I am puzzled as to which root $\sqrt{iṣ}$ the sense ‘hasten’ is supposed to belong to: we have $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’ and $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send, set in motion’. It is to the latter that EWA refers this form (and I assume that the others would also connect the two), but either there has to be a de-valencing of the root (from ‘set in motion’ to ‘be in motion’ – but there are no forms to this root with intrans. value) or the form has to be covertly passive (‘to be set in motion’, hence ‘to move’). I think it belongs rather to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’ and means ‘for seeking, for the quest’. In my view all 20 exx. of *iṣṭáye* can be united under this rubric. See also comm. ad I.112.1 and VII.92.3. In this particular case Vāyu’s quest is for soma, and upon having received it, he benefits us. So the double dative *iṣṭáye rādhase ca* is a bit of a zeugma, in that these beneficial datives are for the benefit of different parties, though the satisfaction of the second depends on the success of the first.

IX.97.43–45: The *ṛca* has a superficial unity from the (over-)abundance of forms of $\sqrt{pū}$, esp. in the middle vs.: *pavasva* 43a, 44a, 44b, 44d; *pāvamānaḥ* 44c; *punānāḥ* 45c (the only form of $\sqrt{pū}$ in this vs., and belonging to a different stem). Otherwise there is little to hold it together. The supposed transition between the poets Parāsara Śaktya and Kutsa Āngirasa happens after vs. 44, but as noted in the publ. intro., this change of poets seems unlikely.

IX.97.43: The first hemistich introduces a note of aggression, but this quickly dissipates. The oppositional pair ‘straight’ (*ṛjū-*) and ‘crooked’ (*vṛjiná-*) recurs from vs. 18, where,

unlike here, it was a morally neutral description of the paths across the sheep’s fleece filter.

I do not understand the doubling of *abhí* in pāda c, esp. since *abhí* seems to add little to this idiom.

IX.97.44: Note the (*s*)*va* repetition: *mádhvaḥ ... pavasva vásva ... pavasva ... svádasva ... pavasva*.

As in IX.96.14 (see comm. ad loc.), I take the acc. with *pavasva* as expressing a transformation of soma into the substance expressed in the acc. This use of *pavasva* with the acc. contrasts with that of *ā pavasvā* in pādas b and d, where *ā* adds the sense ‘bring here by purification’ and the acc. expresses the materials thus obtained.

On *sūda-* see comm. ad VII.36.3. I argue there that, contra most views, it belongs with the ‘sweet’ words, and in fact that in this passage *svádasva ... pávamānaḥ* in c is a virtual gloss (or poetic repair) of *sūdam pavasva* in a.

IX.97.46–48: Again very few signs of cohesion as a whole, though the 1st and last vss. have a few echoes: *rathiráḥ* (46c, 48a) and a *satyá-X bahuvrīhi* (*satyá-śuṣma-* 46c, *satyá-manman-* 48d), as well as *camū-* (46b, 48b). Also, assuming that the “daughter” in 47b is the Daughter of the Sun (as most do), both 46 and 47 have ref. to the sun.

IX.97.47: In pāda b my interpr. differs significantly from that of Ge (fld. by Re) and that favored by Old., though all of us assume that “daughter” is short for “daughter of the Sun.” Ge takes *duhitúḥ* as abl. and assumes an idiom ABL X *tiráḥ √ dhā* “hide X from ...,” an ex. of which he cites from the Kena Up., which seems a distant text from which to harvest a parallel. He takes the *várpāmsi* as Soma’s own forms, but does not suggest why Soma would want to keep them hidden from the Sun’s daughter. I instead take *duhitúḥ* as gen., dependent on *várpāmsi*, which Old considers the more natural construal. Since the acc. with medial *tiráḥ √ dhā* expresses the medium in which the subject hides himself (at least in my view: see comm. ad IX.73.3), in our passage here Soma hides himself “in the forms of the daughter (of the Sun)” – a designation of milk, since the gleaming white milk is often assimilated to the sun. I see the same idiom in IX.72.3, though more disguised: see extensive comm. there. The reference, of course, is to the mixing of soma with milk.

The following pāda provides a different but parallel image of the mixing of soma with water, with the more widespread trope of “clothing himself in.”

The last pāda provides a clever multilevel play, as long as *rēbhan* is properly interpr. As I have often disc. (incl. ad vs. 8 above), *√ ribh* does not mean ‘sing’ as it’s usually glossed, but rather expresses a variety of harsh sounds: rasp, creak, squawk, and crackle. In this pāda Soma is compared to a Hotar priest. But the quintessential Hotar is actually the god Agni, the ritual fire – and fires crackle. So the comparison is to the sound of a lively burning fire, but mediated through the priest.

IX.97.49–51: In contrast to the *ṛcas* with faint or no signs of cohesion, this one is over-determined. The verbal lexeme that dominates is *abhí √ ṛṣ*: the preverb *abhí* opens every one of the 12 pādas, and the impv. *arṣa/ā* is found in the first pāda of every vs. (49a, 50a, 51a). The part. *pūyámānaḥ* ends the first hemistich of each vs. Most of the rest of the

material consists of acc. goals of motion. The goals in the first vs. of the *ṛca* are gods, in the first half of the 2nd vs. the substances with which Soma will be mixed, and in the rest of the *ṛca* those things that we want Soma to provide us. The result is a *ṛca* of utmost banality, enlivened by a small play of words in the last *pāda*.

IX.97.49: Old, Ge, Re identify the acc. goal in c as Pūṣan, because *dhījāvana-* ‘quickening insightful thought’ is used in a simile comparing Soma to Pūṣan in IX.88.3 *pūṣéva dhījāvano* ‘*si soma*, which is, of course, a good arg. But Pūṣan doesn’t cut much of a figure in IX, does not really belong in this exalted company (Vāyu, Mitra+Varuṇa, Indra – though see the list in IX.81.4–5), and is not an appropriate referent for the other words in this *pāda*: *nāram ... ratheṣṭhām*. In the sg. *nī-* is almost always used of Indra, as are *ratheṣṭhā-* and *ratheṣṭhā-*. I am therefore certain that c, like d, refers to Indra.

IX.97.50: Ge adds “zu gewinnen” in *pādas* a and b (also d) with no textual support. And surely these garments and cows are actually references to the milk mixture, as so often in IX.

IX.97.51: Ge again supplies “zu gewinnen” in both hemistichs. I once again see no reason to do so. He also takes the rel. cl. of c (*yéna dráviṇam aśnávāma*) as dependent on *ārṣeyám*: “um ... uns den Namen eines Ṛṣi zu gewinnen, durch den wir zu Reichtum gelangen können.” This ignores the parallel *abhī*’s of cd and also assumes an embedded rel. cl. (though not all *that* embedded). Re takes *ārṣeyám* as a 2nd obj. of *aśnávāma*: “afin que nous obtenions la richesse, afin l’état de Prophète ...” This is somewhat less disruptive than Ge’s, but assumes a purpose function for *yéna* that has no good precedent, as far as I know. My own interpr. – supplying a gapped acc. ‘that’ as antecedent for *yéna* -- seems minimally disruptive and assumes that the insistent structure with *abhī arṣa* ACC continues in this *pāda*. The same interpr. is found in Hettrich (Hypotaxe, 550–51): “(fliesse uns das) zu, wodurch wir Reichtum erlangen werden.”

The interpr. of Ge and Re also minimize or ignore the only clever part of this *ṛca*, which provides a climax of sorts. With the pattern *abhī (...)* *arṣa* “rush towards ...” inescapably established, the poet produces a phonological play on this phrase in the last *pāda*: *abhy ārṣeyám*, where the acc. goal, beginning *ārṣ-*, plays on the impv. *arṣa* (the play also noted by Ge, n. 51d). *ārṣeyá-* is found only here in the RV, though it is extremely common in Vedic prose.

IX.97.52–54: The simplistic repetition of the previous *ṛca* contrasts markedly with the contents of this one, which is mind-bogglingly difficult and opaque. Old pronounces it “grösstenteils hoffnungslos.” Thematically it seems to deal with the distribution of wealth in a ritual/martial context, and it also shows signs of lexical cohesion, esp. the hapaxes *māmścatvá-* (52b) and *māmścatva-* (54b), also *vásūni* (52a, 53c), and of varied formulaic repetition: *ayā pavā pavasvainā* (52a) / *enā pavayā pavaśva* (53a). My interpr. of this *ṛca*, in its many obscure details and in its entirety, is very different from the standard ones. In places it pushes the morphology, syntax, and semantics perhaps further than is warranted, and it may seem at times far-fetched. But it has, I think, a richer semantics than the other accounts, and above all it deliberately avoids the refuge taken by others, to make the difficult words into proper nouns.

IX.97.52: The *ṛca* begins deceptively straightforwardly, with a call to Soma to purify himself and bring goods. The *pāda*-final *vásūni* concatenates with the one ending 51a. Given this acc. with *pávasva* we must assume the idiom *ā pávasva* ‘bring ACC through your purification.’ The preverb *ā* may be concealed in one of the accented final long *ā*-s in the *pāda*, most likely *pavā*, which can be *pavā + ā*, putting the preverb in the standard position right before the verb, or *enā*. Or perhaps, if *enā* is adverbial in the meaning ‘here’ (so Gr, s.v. *enā*, col. 300; AiG III.524–25), it takes the function of *ā* in this lexeme. However, I am inclined, with Sāy. (see Ge’s n. 52a), to take *enā* as an aberrant neut. pl. with *vásūni* – hence ‘these goods’. See AiG III.525, which hesitatingly allows the possibility of its being neut. pl. elsewhere.

The fun begins with the next *pāda* and with the first word in that *pāda*, *māmścatvé*; as was noted above, the word appears, differently accented, in 54b, and these forms are obviously related to *māmścatóḥ* in VII.44.3. In our vss. Ge and Re take it as the loc. of a place name, coreferential with loc. *sárasī*: e.g., “dans le lac Māmścatva.” This is certainly the safest choice here, but a place name is essentially excluded for the occurrence of the related word in VII.44.3 – and of course making difficult words into otherwise unattested proper nouns is an interpretational cop-out. As discussed at length in the comm. to VII.44.3 I return to the old notion that this is a *cmpd* meaning ‘hiding the moon’. In all three passages I take it as a temporal designation, originally ‘at dawn’. This perfectly fits our *ṛca* if it depicts the beginning of the early morning soma pressing.

VII.44.3 also contains the word *bradhná-* ‘copper-colored’, found here in *pāda* c. This word can sometimes refer to soma (VIII.4.13, 14; 69.7), sometimes to Agni/fire (III.7.5, X.20.9), but sometimes, it seems, to the sun: I.6.1 and also the occurrence in VII.44.3. In our passage I think it can be all three: the sun, coppery colored at dawn, is appropriate to the early morning time period identified by *māmścatvé*, and Sūrya in X.170.1 is *vātajūta-* (like our *vāto ná jūtāḥ*). As we have often seen soma is frequently identified with the sun, and it is often urged to speed along the ritual ground (and see IX.64.16 *índavaḥ ... jūtāḥ*). But what is most often described as *vāta-jūta-* is the fire or its flames. The ritual fire, the soma, and the sun would all necessarily be present at the dawn sacrifice. Both Ge and Re take *bradhná-* as referring to a horse, which, in my view, distorts their view of the whole vs. and indeed the *ṛca*.

In d both Ge and Re take the hapax *táku-* as referring to a horse (Renner, coursier), the same one they see as the reference of *bradhná-* in c. Ge seems to think d involves giving this horse a sort of superior groom (“ein tüchtiges Lenker”), with dat. *tákave* the indirect obj. But as was recently noted (ad vs. 49), *ní-* in the sg. is almost always used of Indra, and I think it is here as well. Soma, by virtue of being consumed by Indra at the sacrifice, brings Indra to the sacrifice and in effect bestows him upon the human worshipers, and he does so for a particular purpose. I take *tákave* as an infinitival dative of purpose: ‘to (make the) charge, to rush’ – Indra in his capacity as our supporter in conflict. Old considers, but rejects, such an infinitival interpr., in favor of what he considers the simpler indirect obj. with $\sqrt{dā}$.

IX.97.53: The mystery deepens in this vs.

The first *pāda* is superficially just a variant of 52a, but it poses several problems. On the one hand *pavayā* looks like an instr. sg. to a fem. *pavā*, whose more archaic instr.

pavā is found in 52a. But the accentuation is wrong: it should be **paváyā*. AiG III.117 seems to dismiss the accent problem (sim. AiG II.2.247) and simply accept it as an instr., but Old considers other possibilities, incl. adverbial accent or analogy to *ayā* in 52a. He rejects Lanman's sugg. that it represents **pavāyā* (from **pavā* + *ayā*) on metrical grounds (bad break). I have a similar, but different suggestion that avoids the metrical problem: it represents **paváyā*, namely instr. **paváyā* (with the correct accent) + *ā*, the preverb we were seeking also in 52a, which again would put the preverb directly before the verb. The need for *ā* is less acute here because there's no apparent expressed obj. in the pāda, but *vāsūni* can be assumed on the basis of 52a and the 2nd hemistich of this vs. 53c. Moreover, as in 52a I suggest that *enā* may be neut. pl. and therefore there is an expressed obj.

The other problem is *enā*, which also appeared in 52a in a different position. Here, directly before *pavayā*, it appears to be an instr., filling the role of *ayā* in 52a. But *enā* should be m./n., not fem. Though Ge (n. 53a) convinces himself it is fem. (and AiG III.524 recognizes at least one possible case of a fem. *enā*), I think this is unlikely and, as in 52a, suggest that it is a neut. pl. This means that *pavayā* (*/*paváyā*) lacks an instr. demonstr. parallel to *ayā* in 52a, but this is hardly a problem. Putting all this together, I would thus emend the tr. to “By purifying yourself with purification bring these (goods) here for us.”

The next pāda is syntactically unimpeachable: it consists of a loc. phrase governed by *ādhi* with a gen. dependent on the loc. Moreover, all the words are known and their meanings uncontroversial. The problem is what they refer to when assembled into a phrase. They specify the place (or time) that the self-purification in pāda a is to happen: “at the famous ford GEN.” Given the ritual context, it seems unlikely that a real river ford is meant; instead it must be a metaphorical place or moment in the sacrifice. Most comparable – but unhelpful – is the phrase *āpnānam tīrthām*, which I interpr. as “opulent ford,” found at X.114.7, in a mystical hymn about the sacrifice. I suggest that in our passage it refers to the place/time of the distribution of goods. I further suggest that this refers to the transfer of goods from gods to humans, hence the metaphorical “ford” for crossing the god/mortal divide. In the next hemistich I suggest that it is Indra who is distributing vast numbers of goods. The gen. *śravāyyasya* supports this view, since this adj. generally modifies *vāja-* ‘prize’ or *rayi-* ‘wealth’ (cf., e.g., IX.63.23 *rayīm ... śravāyyam*), as Ge also points out (n. 53b). Ge and Re simply take *śravāyyasya* as a PN, again simply to dodge the interpretational problem. Though the publ. tr. suggests it might be the place for the distribution of dakṣiṇās, I no longer believe that the passage concerns the dakṣiṇā, since I think this is a reference to *Indra*'s distribution of goods.

The 2nd hemistich is entirely clear, except for the nom. sg. subject, the hapax *naigutāḥ*. This vṛddhi deriv. must be interpr. with ref. to its base, *nigūt-*, which occurs in the acc. pl. in the next vs., as the designation of overpowered, indeed annihilated, foes; it is also found in X.128.6 (as nom. pl.), where it refers to enemies of some sort who are repulsed and defeated by Agni. Both Ge and Re tr. as a PN in our two vss. (though Ge ‘Schwätzer(?)’ in X.128.6). EWA (s.v.) suggests an appealing interpr., as a rt noun cmpd to \sqrt{gu} (his *GAV*) ‘call upon’; with the preverb *nī-* ‘*nieder-rufend, schmähend’ in a verbal contest. This interpr. seems to be tacitly accepted by KH (KISch 447), who tr. it in 54c as “Schmäher”; it is also presented by Scar (112–13), though hesitantly – and like Ge and Re he tr. it as a PN. (Mayr in his PN book is dubious that it's a PN.) By contrast, I find the

suggestion quite plausible; I suggest the sense ‘challenger’ for *nigūt-*. In contrast to *nigūt-*, its vṛddhi deriv. in our vs. designates a successful and positively viewed figure, opposed to the *nigūt-s* in the next vs. – hence my tr. ‘challengers’ challenger’ (Scar’s ‘Bezwinger der Niguts’, an interpr. that goes back to Sāy. and Ludwig [see Ge’s n. 53c]). As in 52d, I take the unnamed referent here to be Indra, though Ge (n. 53c) suggests Soma. The extravagance of the gifts and the apparent militant nature of *naigutá-* seems better suited to Indra, though a militant Soma is not out of the question.

IX.97.54: The difficulties do not let up here, esp. in the 1st hemistich. The clearest thing here is the *asya*, which presumably, because of its lack of accent, must refer to the *naigutáh* in 53cd. This same figure is also the subject of the verbs in c.

The first problem is the first word, whose very form is in question. The Pp. separates *máhīmé* into *máhi* and *imé*, with the first then a neut. sg.; Gr takes it rather as a du. *máhī*, with ? This is rejected explicitly by Old on accentual grounds: the standard du. is accented *mahī*. If it is neut. sg., it can modify *nāma*; if neut. du., *vádhatre*. I prefer the latter, despite the formal problems. Old, Ge, and Re take it as a modifier of *nāma*.

Let us now turn to *vīṣanāma*, taken as a cmpd by Pp., despite its two accents. The simple solution here is, as has long been known, to split into two words: *vīṣa nāma*, with *vīṣa* a neut. agreeing with *nāma*. I take this as a naming parenthesis “‘Bull’ his name,” though I recognize that we should probably expect the masc. **vīṣā* in that context (type *nalo nāma*). Perhaps better “‘Bullish’ is his name,” which more easily accommodates a neut. *vīṣa*. (Before continuing I will point out that this is most likely a reference to Indra, whose presence I see also in the preceding two vss. – though Soma is possible as well.) A naming parenthesis is not the standard view, which is that “bullish name” is one member of a nominal sentence equating the dual entities (whatever they may be – see below) with this name (“these two Xs are / make up” [ausmachen] his great bullish name” – so Old, Ge, and more or less Re; Scar [112] also follows this interpr. but assumes a du. ‘great’). As that tr. shows, the standard view also has the merit of providing a head noun to the putative neut. *máhi* that opens the pāda.

Why then do I put myself in morphological difficulties, rejecting neut. sg. *máhi* and struggling with neut. *vīṣa*? Because I don’t think that the two entities are equivalent to his name, but rather belong to him and are deployed by him under specific circumstances, as indicated in pāda b. I therefore assume a du. *máhī*, or perhaps correctly accented **mahī*, which has been redactionally changed after the passage ceased to be understood.

The next question: what are the dual entities. Ge (fld. by Scar) takes *sūṣé ... vádhatre* as a discontinuous dual dvandva: “sein Ungestüm und seine Waffe.” This is clever, but to me unconvincing. Real dual dvandvas with two dual endings that involve material or immaterial entities, rather than gods or at least animate beings, are rare. And this would contain two entities that are not associated with each other textually and do not form a natural semantic class, one of which is an immaterial power, the other a material object. If there is an alternative, we should seek it. And indeed there is: *sūṣé* can simply be the modifier of *vádhatre*. There are “two forceful weapons of death.” Old’s “diese beide *sūṣé vádhatre* implies this solution, and Re adopts it as well, though in his n. he claims that *sūṣá-* is ordinarily a masc. noun. I think rather the reverse: that it is an adj. even though its head noun is often gapped, esp. when it is the obj. of \sqrt{rc} ‘chant’ or

similar verbs and refers to a “fortifying / powerful (praise / thought – *stómam / mánma*, etc.)” The adjectival status of *sūṣá-* is one more reason not to assume it’s one of a pair in a dual dvandva.

The next question after this: what *are* these two weapons. I suggest that it is the two fatal activities described in c, both of which are slangy euphemisms: ‘put to sleep’ (*svāpáya-*) and ‘snow’. The caus. stem *svāpáya-* and assoc. redupl. aor. *síṣvap(a)-* are only used in this euphemistic sense of ‘put to death’, a sense that is familiar of course in the Engl. equivalent. The parallel stem *sneháya-* is found only here. It is clearly related to the IE words for ‘snow’, and, as I discuss in the *-áya-* book (91), the hostile / fatal nuance it projects in context can be derived directly from ‘snow’; the re-semanticization of the IE root to something like ‘stick together’ advocated by a number of scholars (see *-áya-*, p. 91 n. 32) is unnecessary. As I point out there, the verb ‘snow’ is also found in Engl., meaning ‘overwhelm’, though (at least decades ago) in a more or less positive sense. The verb *sneháyat* is accented presumably because it opens a new (sub-)clause.

We must now return to pāda b, which contains a disjunctive *vā ... vā* construction: *māmścatve vā pṛśane vā*. The first term, save for accent, is the same as *māmścatvé* in 52b. I confess I have no explanation of the difference in accent and treat the two as identical, as, it seems, do most interpr. – there’s too much else going on in this ṛca to focus on this! Since most interpr. take the form in 52b as a name, either of a place or a person (person for Scar for the form in this vs.), *pṛśane* receives the same interpr. Since I take *māmścatvé* in 52b as a temporal designation, I want to impose the same analysis on *pṛśane*. The stem *pṛśana-* is a hapax as a masc/neut., but it is at least derivationally related to the fem. *pṛśanī-* (3x: I.71.5, X.61.8, 73.2) with diff. accent (see AiG II.2.184, 197), and the adj. *pṛśanāyú-* (1x: I.84.11) is based upon it. The fem. stem is found in difficult passages, two of which (I.71.5, X.61.8) concern the cosmic incest of Heaven with his daughter, which are perhaps cryptic by design. However, all three forms seem to mean something like ‘caress, caressing’. The *-yú-*adj. is by contrast in a straightforward passage that aids the interpr. of ours: I.84.11 *tā asya pṛśanāyúvah, sómam śrīṇanti pṛśnayah* “These dappled ones, eager for caresses, prepare the soma for him,” with the subject *dhenāvah* ‘milk cows’. The theme is the usual one, of the erotic desire of the cows (= milk) for the bull Soma, a theme of course widely represented in IX. I therefore suggest that the loc. *pṛśane* here as a temporal designation refers to “the time of caressing” – that is, to the ritual moment in which Soma unites with the cows’ milk. Thus, pāda b names two key times in the soma sacrifice: the early morning when the sacrifice begins and the moment that the milk is mixed with the soma.

Even if my interpr. of the locc. is correct, why are these ritual times embedded in a vs. that otherwise occupies itself with deadly weapons and hostile encounters? I don’t have a totally satisfactory answer here, but if the subject is Indra, as I have suggested, he may be eliminating rival sacrificers and rival sacrifices that do not conform to the Ārya compact – or he may be deriving this strength to do battle from the sacrifice, which is simply represented by two of its temporal stages.

Pāda d displays pleasing phonological play: *cāpāmítrāṃ āpácíto acetáh*, where the first two sequences are mirror-images of each other: *c-ā-p-ā* vs. *a-p-ā-c*. (Note that the first *c* is actually borrowed from the end of the last pāda.) It is esp. cleverly designed because of the discontinuous verb *āpa ... aca* – the impv. *aca* needing to be extracted from *acetáh* (= *aca itáh* ‘turn away from here’). This *acetáh* looks superficially as if it

belongs to the stem *acetás-* ‘unperceptive’, but it does not. That sense, and the same privative+ \sqrt{cit} , is found instead in the negated rt noun cmpd. *acít-* in the acc. pl. The pāda provides an exceptionally tricky end to a dazzlingly frustrating ṛca.

IX.97.55–58: The rest of the hymn consists of 4 vss. Old dithers about whether this consists of an odd vs., 55, followed by a final ṛca, 56–58 – or a ṛca 55–57, with a final independent vs. 58. At least to my mind, the latter analysis is clearly superior. Vs. 58 has the “feel” of a hymn-summary vs., with the expression of “our” wish in ab, and its 2nd half consists of the Kutsa refrain. Nonetheless, there are no clear signs of cohesion in vss. 55–57, though one might point to the filters in both 55 and 56. Happily none of the vss. presents us with the desperate difficulties of the preceding ṛca.

IX.97.55: We meet the three filters also in IX.73.8, where their identity is not clear. Needless to say, Lü (703–4) has a cosmic explanation.

IX.97.56: Note the phonological play in d: *ví vāram ávyam samáyāti yāti*. The last bit is reminiscent of 54d, in that the phonological agreement crosscuts the word divisions: we have rhyming *-yāti yāti*, but the first *yāti* is to be segmented (*samā*)*yā āti*.

IX.97.57: The simile in b is one of the best pieces of evidence for my interpr. of \sqrt{ribh} as ‘squawk, creak,’ etc., rather than ‘sing’. The simile “like birds of prey” (*ná gṛdhrāḥ*) only makes sense if the verb that expresses the sounds of the voices of the poets (*kaváyaḥ*) is not a mellifluous one. Both Ge and Re struggle with this. Ge reduces *rebhanti* to ‘become hearable/known’: “... werden die Seher lautbar wie die Geier” (not the first quality one thinks of for a Geier); Re simply recasts the simile: “sur sa trace ils psalmodient, comme des poètes avides (de gain).”

IX.97.58: (*bhāre*) *kṛtām ví \sqrt{ci}* is a dicing phrase found several times in the RV. See disc. ad X.42.9 as well as Falk (Würf. 126–28).

IX.98–101

Hymns predominantly in Anuṣṭubh

IX.98

IX.98.1: On the pattern set in motion by *vāja-sātama-*, see ad vs. 12.

On *sahāśra-bharnas-* see comm. ad IX.60.2.

In the rt. noun cmpd *vibhvā-sāham* Ge, Re, and Scar (609–10) take *vibhvā-* as a PN, that of one of the Rbhū, and also interpr. this PN as having only an indirect relationship to the 2nd member. The cmpd modifies *rayīm* (also in its other occurrence in V.10.7), and they render the phrase “wealth that surpasses that of Vibhvan” – in other words with the actual 1st member implicitly a gen. dependent on a supplied ‘wealth’ that is the implicit 1st member (suggesting a phrase **rayi-sāham rayīm* – a similar cmpd. *rayi-śāh-* does exist). Scar also suggests an alternative analysis: “unter den vorzüglichen [Schätzen] siegreich,” that is, “der beste Schatz,” as well as an even more elaborate analysis by way of the phrase *vibhvataṣṭá-rayi-* in IV.36.5 (based on Ge’s nn. to V.10.7,

IV.36.5), in which they see the Ṛbhu PN as well (but see my comm. ad V.58.4). All of this seems to me a result of over-thinking the cmpd. First of all, I think we would do well to leave the Ṛbhū out of this: they have almost no presence in the IXth Maṇḍala, and taking *vibhvā-* here as a PN seems to complicate rather than simplify the interpr. of the cmpd. The stem *vibhvan-* is attested as an adj. meaning ‘extensive, distinguished’, and I see no reason why that meaning can’t fit this cmpd. in a more direct way than Ge/Re/Scar envision: it can either mean ‘overcoming/prevaling over (even) distinguished (wealth)’ or (more likely in my view) ‘overcoming/vanquishing (even) the distinguished (person/people)’ – that is, we want wealth so overwhelming that we can dominate our rivals.

It is possible that *vibhvā-* does signal a pun on the Ṛbhu PN, but only as a secondary reading. One of the other Ṛbhū is named Vāja, and *vāja-* is the 1st member of a different rt. noun cmpd in this vs., also with a root meaning ‘win’ in the same semantic sphere as *√sah*: *vāja-sātama-* ‘best at winning prizes’. No one to my knowledge suggests that *vāja-* in that cmpd has the primary reading ‘PN, one of the Ṛbhū’, but *vāja-* may have enabled a pun on *vibhvā-*. In fact, it’s worth noting that, as Scar points out (609 n. 875), *vibhvāsāham* gives a bad cadence, and **vibhū-śāham* (as in *vibhū-vasu-* ‘having distinguished goods’) would be better. So perhaps that 1st member **vibhū-* was altered to *vibhvā-* to allow this punning reading.

IX.98.2–3: These two vss. share vocab. and structure. Both begin *pāri syá s(u)vānāḥ*, and both have a pāda-final *akṣāḥ* (2d, 3a), in addition to *ínđuḥ* (2c, 3b), *dhārā(bhiḥ)* (2d, 3c). The meter in both vss. shows some disturbance, esp. in 2d and 3a, and there are several different ways to resolve these disturbances. The HvN solutions as represented by their restorations do not seem to be the most satisfactory ones. As just noted, the initial pādas of both vss. begin in the same way, but though in 2a HvN read the med. part. *svānāḥ* with contracted root syllable, in 3a they read *suvānāḥ*. It seems unlikely that in this patterned repetition in successive vss. the participles would have different metrical realizations; moreover, as Gr points out, that participle, which is quite common, is always elsewhere read *svānāḥ*. A further consideration is that by their reading 3a has a disfavored cadence: *(su)vānó akṣāḥ* (– ∼ – x, with shortening of *o* in hiatus), rather than the more usual iambic cadence of dimeter vs. As for 2d they read med. part. *hiyānāḥ*; this part. appears both with and without contracted root syllable: *hyānāḥ* is found, for ex., in IX.86.3. Given contracted *svānāḥ* in 2a and (contra HvN) 3a, contraction better fits the contextual pattern. And as in 3a their reading also produces a disfavored cadence, (*dhā*)*rābhir akṣāḥ* (again – ∼ – x). The most likely solution is given by Arnold (metrical comm., as well as p. 99 §151 (i)) and Old: distracted *akṣāḥ*, which provides the right no. of syllables even with the contracted participles and also fixes the cadence.

IX.98.2: On the instr. *drūṇā* and the phrase *drūṇā hitá-* see comm. ad IX.1.2. One of the problems with the standard interpr. of this phrase, that it refers to the wooden cup into which the Soma is poured, is that it would be out of sequence, since the vs. otherwise describes the early part of Soma’s journey across the ritual ground.

The pāda-final *avyáyam* (a) and *avyata* (b) echo each other.

The actual target of the simile in b, the nominative equivalent of Soma in the frame, is gapped, being represented only by the adjuncts *rátthe* and *várma*: “like (a man/warrior) on a chariot his armor.” In the publ. tr. “a man” should be in parens.

IX.98.3: The transmitted *akṣā* at the end of pāda a before *i-* should have appeared as *akṣār* in sandhi; the Pp. reads *akṣār íti*. Wackernagel (AiG I.1.334–35) considers it a misunderstanding of original *akṣāḥ* by the redactors.

The simile in d has the same structure as the one in 2b: gapped nominative target whose identity is signalled by an adjunct, in this case *bhrājā* ‘with flame (/flash/light)’ – most likely pointing to Agni (Ge, Re [tr.], Ober [II.56]), though possibly Sūrya, who is also associated with forms of the root $\sqrt{bhrāj}$ (alt. given by Re in his n.).

IX.98.4: The standard tr. take this vs. as a single clause, and it is certainly tempting. However, there are several problems. First, despite the *hí* the main verb *vivāsasi* is unaccented. It is true that this verb comes only at the end of the vs., while *hí* is in 2nd position in the first pāda. Old notes the problem but suggests that it’s the result of sliding into being a main clause, presumably because of distance. But the conditioning of verb accent by *hí* is a robust effect, which does not depend on proximity of the verb to the particle. Another problem is the *sá ... tvám* that opens the vs. As I have demonstrated at length (“sa figé”), *sá (+/- tvám)* with 2nd ps. reference is ordinarily found only with imperatives, and the desid. pres. *vivāsasi* is therefore anomalous.

On these two grounds I therefore divide the vs. into two clauses, ab and cd, with the former an equational nominal cl.: *tvám ... vāsu* “you are good(s).” This may seem an outlandish or tortured expression, perhaps a cure worse than the disease. However, note that the next vs. enables just this identification: in 5b Soma is addressed as “o good one” (voc. *vaso*), of whose goods (*vāsvaḥ*) we want a part. So the line between good thing(s) and a good (one) is presented as permeable, and Soma may well be both.

This interpr. solves the (lack of) verbal accent problem, but what about *sá ... tvám*. I suggest that this is a syntactically conditioned variant of **tad ... tvám ... , vāsu* “you are *that*, namely good(s).” The neut. *tád* has been “attracted” to the (underlying) gender of *tvám* by the well-known syntactic rule of gender attraction of predicated pronouns in nominal equational clauses (see, e.g., Speijer, *Vedisch u. Sanskrit-Syntax*, §95b; other examples and sec. lit. citations collected in Brereton 1986: 99–191 and n. 6). On the supposed exception, which is not (*tat tvam asi* in Ch Up), see Brereton “*tat tvam asi* in Context” (ZDMG 136 [1986]).

śatātman- occurs 3x in the RV (I.149.3, X.33.9, and here); in all cases it seems to mean ‘having 100 forms or embodiments’; in X.33.9 it is almost of the “cats have 9 lives” variety. Here it presumably refers to as many varieties of wealth as we can acquire.

IX.98.5: On *vāso vāsvaḥ* and its relation to vs. 4, see comm. there.

This vs. is supposed to contain the lexeme *ní√as* (#*ní ... , syāma*). Gr glosses this lexeme ‘Theil haben an [G.]’, and Ge and Re both so tr. But *ní* is found nowhere else with \sqrt{as} (in the RV or in the rest of Skt, as far as I can see), and neither the additive semantics of *ní + √as* nor any plausible extension of it would produce ‘have a share in’, at least to my mind. RIVELEX (I. 634, 641 n. 71) agrees with me and instead glosses it ‘jmd ist im Dienst von etw.’ (628), which would yield the not very likely “may we be in

service of your goods ... of your refreshment and favor.” I therefore think it likely that *ní* is not a part of a verbal lexeme as a preverb in tmesis. I suggest, quite tentatively, instead that it is a sort of pseudo-reduplication with the doubly marked splv. *nédiṣṭhatama-* ‘most nearest’, which it immediately precedes (*#ní nédiṣṭhatamāḥ*) or that it provides a further directional specification to that splv.: “down nearest.” I construe the various genitives with this splv. – though I recognize that this does not seem to be a standard usage. They are unlikely to go with *syāma* even in the absence of *ní*, because, as Re points out in his n. (though he tr. flg. Gr and Ge), \sqrt{as} + GEN generally means “être le lot de (qq’un),” which should produce “may we belong to your goods ...”

On *adhriḡo* see comm. ad I.61.1, VIII.22.11.

IX.98.6: This vs. is entirely a rel. cl., which is resumed by vs. 7, where *tyám* (7a) picks up *yám* (6a).

IX.98.8: This vs. presents a number of small interrelated difficulties. We can start with *pāntaḥ*. As was discussed ad I.122.1 (q.v.), forms of the shape *pānt(a)-* belong to two different stems; the better attested is the them. noun *pānta-* ‘drink’, but there are two exx. of the act. root aor. part. to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’, at I.122.4 and in our passage here. Both stems often show distraction of the root syll., and that scansion is required here. The participle is pl.; the question then is what case it’s in. Ge takes it as a voc., coreferential with *vaḥ* in pāda a, with *dakṣasāadhanam* the subj. of both the main cl. in ab and the rel. cl. in cd, or so I read his tr.: “Denn durch seine Gunst wird euch, ihr Trinkenden, ein kraftwirkendes Mittel, der den freigebigen Herren hohen Ruhm verschafft.” However, this is syntactically impossible: if *dakṣasāadhanam* is the subj. of ab, it must be neut., in which case it cannot be the antecedent of masc. *yāḥ* in c. It is also somewhat perverse not to construe *dakṣasāadhanam*, which always refers to soma (IX.25.1, 27.2, 101.15, 104.3), as the obj. of *pāntaḥ*. Re’s tr. suffers from a different syntactic solecism. Like Ge, he takes *pāntaḥ* as coreferential with *vaḥ*, but, it seems, as a modifier of *vaḥ* and therefore an acc. or even dat. pl.: “Pour vous en effet qui buvez (ce soma) réalisateur de la force-agissante ...”

The problems in both interpr. arise from their assumption that *pāntaḥ* must qualify *vaḥ* one way or another. But the most likely referent for the part. is “all the gods” of 7c, around which Soma circled with his *māda-* just previously, as was clearly seen (in his usual way) by Old: “(die Götter, v. 7), den *dakṣasāadhana* trinkend.” If we detach *pāntaḥ* from *vaḥ*, things go more smoothly. I take *pāntaḥ* as a predicated participle with the gods as supplied subj.: “(the gods) are drinking ...”

So then, what to do with *vaḥ*? This has two possible solutions, neither of which is flawless, but both of which are better than the knots Ge and Re tie themselves in to construe it with *pāntaḥ*. In the publ. tr. I take it as referring to the poets/ritualists generally (as so often) and construe it with the rel. cl. in cd, in particular with *sūrīṣu* “among (your) patrons.” Old’s solution is similar, though he actually takes pāda a as part of the rel. cl. beginning in c, which I would prefer not to. So my publ. solution is to take *vaḥ* as being in a sort of extreme Wackernagel’s position, leapfrogging two pādas (and the main cl.) to reach its host. This seems a little extreme, but at least the main cl. is syntactically sketchy – consisting of a predicted aor. participle. A different solution is suggested by the meter of pāda a, which lacks a syllable. Old suggests reading *as’yá*, and

Gr also lists it with this scansion. But this distracted form, if it exists at all, is extremely rare, and I think we should avoid positing it if possible. The lack of a syllable and the problem of *vah* (*vo* in sandhi) may well be connected. I suggest that the pāda hasn't been properly transmitted and *vo* is the remnant of something else entirely, though unfortunately I don't have any suggestions for what might have fallen out. The transmitted *vo* may have been modeled on *vām* in the next vs.

One remaining problem with ab: if *asyá* refers to Soma in the gen. (“with his help”), what about acc. *dakṣasādhanam*, which as I just said is always used of soma. I suggest that the *māda*- ‘exhilarating drink’ of 7d is the referent for this adj., substituting for soma. But in fact there is no real problem even if both the gen. and the acc. refer to Soma/soma.

The 2nd hemistich is considerably more straightforward, though there is one place where I differ from the standard tr. Both Ge and Re take *svár* as nom., with the simile turning on *haryatáh*: “delightful like the sun” (e.g., “wie die Sonne begehrt”). I instead take *haryatáh* as an independent modifier of Soma and *svár* as acc., parallel to *śrávo bṛhát*, as obj. of *dadhé*. This is another instantiation of the formula “place the sun (in heaven),” of which I saw a disguised ex. in the preceding hymn, IX.97.38. See comm. there and my 2010 Fs. Melchert article (this passage and the formula disc. pp. 163–64).

Note that since *svár* may invoke *sūrya*-, there may be indirect phonetic play between *sūrīṣu* ‘in the patrons’ and the ‘sun’ word.

IX.98.9: The referent of the 2nd ps. du. encl. *vām* is clearly the World-halves in the repeated fem. voc. phrase *mānavī ... rodasī / ... devī*. The voccs. are somewhat contradictory, identifying the World-halves as both goddesses and as related to mankind (or Manu). Ge (n. 9ab) ingeniously and persuasively suggests that the dual referent is the soma-press with its two jaws. In IX.75.4 the World-halves are called the mothers of Soma, and our passage depicts his birth as related to them. Ge supplies “son” for *vām* to depend on; Re seems to take *vām* as a dative (or datival gen.): “... est né ... pour vous deux,” which loses the maternal relationship. I take the *vām* as indicating the oblique source with pass. *janīṣṭa* “was born of,” which avoids Ge’s need to supply a head noun. However, there is no serious semantic distinction between my interpr. and Ge’s.

The final pāda lacks a verb, but contains an apparent obj. *tám* most likely referring to Soma. The negated nom. part. *ásredhan* demands a masc. sg. subj.; the adverbial neut.acc. sg. or loc. sg. *tuviṣváni* ‘very noisily / in/at the very noisy one’ (?) suggests a verb of sound or speech: “I praise’ (Ge) / ‘he [priest] praises” (Re) would fit these conditions fine without imposing itself.

IX.98.10: The identity of “the god sitting on the seat” is unclear, though Sāy.’s suggestion (see Ge’s n. 10d) that it is the Yajamāna seems unlikely. I’d suggest rather Agni, on the basis of IX.92.2 *śīdan hótēva sādane camūṣu* “taking his seat in the cups like a Hotar on his seat,” since Agni is the archetypal Hotar and \sqrt{sad} is a regular part of the Agni lexicon. Of course in IX it is Soma who is regularly sitting / seated, but he cannot be the indirect object here.

IX.98.11: There is considerable phonological play, esp. in the 2nd hemistich – *apaprothantah ... prātáh ... ápracetasah*, but anticipated by ab *pratnāśah ... pavitre ...*

The root \sqrt{pruth} uncompounded simply means ‘snort’; it is *ápa* that licenses the acc.

The rt. noun cmpd *huras-cít-* is found once elsewhere, in I.42.3, where the context is more diagnostic than this one. There it is parallel to *paripanthínam muṣṭivāṇam* ‘highwayman (and) robber.’ The 1st member *huras-* belongs to the root $\sqrt{hvṛ}$ ‘go crookedly’ (see, e.g., EWA s.v. *híruk*). As often (and not only in Skt.), ‘crooked’ has moral implications; here the enemies to be banished are those who actively know/perceive the ways to go wrong *as well as* those who simply lack perception (*ápracetasah*). Since both cmpds contain a form of $\sqrt{cít}$, it would have been better to capture this etymological play in the tr. – perhaps “those who discern the crooked ways and those who lack discernment.” Scar (123) in his disc. of this passage somehow convinces himself that the form must modify the soma drinks and is therefore not acc. pl. (as it is usually taken) but nom. pl. I don’t follow his semantic reasoning, but it did, by chance, suggest another possibility to me. Elsewhere in IX forms of $\sqrt{hvṛ}$ can refer to the curly wool on the sheep’s fleece filter and the crooked path the soma must follow across the filter. So here I suggest that the morphologically ambiguous *huras-cítaḥ* can be *both* nom. pl. and acc. pl. As the former, it means ‘knowing/perceiving the crooked ways (of the filter)’ and refer to the clever navigation of the soma drinks. As acc. pl. it refers to those who know morally crooked ways and deserve to be banished. I would represent this, somewhat awkwardly, in a revised tr. “discerning the crooked ways (of the filter), snorting away into the distance those who discern crooked ways and those without discernment.” Of course, since *huras-cítaḥ* can serve for either, the Skt. lacks the clumsiness necessary to spell out the different Engl. readings.

IX.98.12: The hymn ends with two pāda-final cmpds whose first member is *vāja-* (*vāja-gandhīyam* [c], *vāja-pastīyam* [d]), just as its first pāda ends with the same (save for accent): 1a *vāja-sātāmam* – thus producing a satisfying ring encompassing the whole poem.

This rhetorical pattern, the pressure to produce matching 1st member *vāja-* compds, accounts for some disturbance in the cmpd formation in 12c. The cmpd in 1a is a standard rt. noun type (in the splv.). The cmpd in 12d, *vāja-pastīya-* ‘having a house with prizes in it’, is likewise properly formed: it is a bahuvrīhi of the type of *vāja-bāhu-*, *vāja-hasta* ‘having an arm/hand with a mace in it’. With this same 2nd member, see *ásva-pastya-*, *vīrá-pastya-* ‘having a house with horses/heroes in it’. But the hapax *vāja-gandhīya-* in c is a different matter. Here the 2nd member appears to be a gerundive to the root \sqrt{gadh} ‘seize, secure, hold fast’, though the independent gerundive to that root is *gadhīya-* (see below). No other forms of the root have a nasal, and the source of it is unclear, since the etymology is likewise unclear (see EWA s.v. *GADH* and below). It is worth pointing out that without the nasal the cmpd (and the pāda) would end with 4 light syllables (**vājagadhīyam*) due to the distraction of the cluster *-dhy-*, and the influence of a similarly shaped root with similar meaning, $\sqrt{ba(n)dh}$ ‘bind’, might account for a nonce nasal insertion for metrical purposes.

Despite the difference in shape, it is quite clear that independent *gadhīya-* and our *-gandhīya-* are essentially identical, because the former is found primarily as a modifier of *vāja-* in the phrase ‘prize(s) to be seized’ (IV.16.11, 16, VI.10.6, 26.2). Only in IV.38.4 does it appear without *vāja-*, but in the same type of context. So our cmpd. replicates this

phrase, though with an intrusive nasal in the root syllable. Before going further, I should note the interpr. of the word(s) that prevails throughout Ge's tr. and to some extent Re's. For all attestations of the phrase *vāja-gādhyā*- Ge tr. "die deckenhohe Beute [/Gewinn]"; for the attestation of *gādhyā* in IV.38.4 without *vāja*- "bis an die Wagendecke reichende (Beute)"; and for our cmpd "der wagenhohe Lohn bringt." Re in VI.10.6 (EVP XIII ad loc.) "un prix-de-victoire emplissant le chariot" (though just "les butins" in IV.38.4 [EVP XV.162]); our cmpd. "qui a une charge de prix." To my knowledge Ge never explains how he came to this narrowly precise rendering, 'reaching to the top/roof of a cart', but Re (ad VI.10.6; XIII.131) provides us with the source for it, namely the word *gadhā* found in late Vedic (ŚSū) referring to some part of a cart, possibly the roof (see Sparreboom, *Chariots*, p. 123, with lit.). The connection seems to have been suggested in passing by Caland. See in contrast EWA s.v. *gadhā*-, where Mayr. comments "Schwerlich zu *GADH*." Given the large chronological gap in attestation between the supposed derivative (*gādhyā*- RV) and its supposed base noun (*gadhā*- Sū) and the not entirely compelling semantics, I think we can safely drop this interpr., despite its somewhat puzzling hold on Ge, and interpr. the forms as gerundives, as above.

But we must now confront the issue of the cmpd type. By accent *vāja-gandhya*- is a bahuvrīhi. Given the independent phrase "prize(s) to be seized/secured" consisting of the same two elements, we should expect the sense of the bahuvrīhi to be "possessing prizes to be secured," as in the publ. tr. "whose prizes are to be secured." But the order of the elements seems opposite to what we would expect: the 2nd member of a bv should be a noun; if there is an adj., verbal or not, it should be the 1st member. Hence we expect **gādya-vāja*-. Ge seems to ignore the problem (see his tr. above), as does Gr ('dessen Gaben zu ergreifen, festzuhalten sind'). But others try to press the cmpd into a more orthodox bv mode. See Re's "who has a load of prizes," turning *gandhya*- into a makeshift noun; differently, but responding to the same problem, Scar (457) "dessen Beute in Siegespreisen besteht (?)," interpr. *gadhya* as the noun Beute, developed from 'was es festzuhalten, zu ergreifen gilt' (n. 647). This scrupulousness about the cmpd. type is praiseworthy, but in this case I think it is misplaced. The rhetorical pattern I noted above – the ring compositional use of *vāja*- cmpds at the beginning and end of the hymn – has imposed itself, allowing a technically improper nonce bahuvrīhi to be formed with its elements in the wrong order. The cmpd with which it's paired in this final hemistich of the hymn, *vāja-past'yam*, has the same shape: *vāja-X'yam*, and though they are different types of bahuvrīhis and the 2nd member *-pastyā*- is in fact a noun, they appear superficially to be exactly parallel formations.

The formation of the hapax *vāja-gandhya*- may have been aided by the fact that "proper" bahuvrīhis with corresponding elements are rare to non-existent. That is, examples of bahuvrīhis of the shape GRDV + NOUN are surprisingly difficult to find (at least surprising to me), though bahuvrīhis with verbal adjective 1st members are common – when the verbal adj. is a ppl. Cmpds like *sutā-soma*- 'having pressed soma', *vṛktā-barhis*- 'having twisted ritual grass', *vṛddhā-śavas*- 'having increased power' are ubiquitous and easily formed, but a search through Gr for bahuvrīhis with gerundive 1st members came up short. The only such cmpds I found are the hapax *avāryā-kratu*- 'possessing unobstructable resolve' (VIII.92.8), with a negated grdv., and *vāreṇya-kratu*- 'whose resolve is worthy to be chosen' (VIII.43.12) – save for *an-avadyā-rūpa*- 'possessing faultless form' (X.68.3) with the lexicalized negated grdv. *avadyā*- 'fault'.

IX.99

IX.99.1: The stem *mahīyú-* is found also in IX.65.1, also with a fem. pl. subj. There it is quite clearly the fingers of the officiants, and there is no reason why it can't refer to the fingers here as well (as indeed is the standard view). The adj. is generally rendered 'considering themselves great' vel sim., but in both passages 'seeking the great' works just as well and better fits the usual sense of *-yú-*stems (*gavyú-* 'seeking cattle', etc.). I don't see why the fingers would "pleins d'orgueil" as Re has it.

As Ge points out (n. 1c), by "glowing / bright garment" (*śukrām ... nirñījam*) the milk is meant.

"At the forefront of the inspired words" (*vipām āgre*) sets the time as the beginning of the sacrifice.

X.99.2: *kṣapā* 'by night' is somewhat surprising in the context of a soma sacrifice, since the beginning of the sacrifice is supposed to coincide with earliest morning. Sāy. deals with this problem by advancing the time into morning, glossing *ádha kṣapā* with *rātreḥ ... anantaram prātaḥkāle* "immediately following night at the time of early morning." Ober (I.405 with n. 57) suggests that sacrificers fearing the lure to the gods of their rival sacrificers get a jump on them by preparing the soma at night, but given how regulated the ritual day is, at least in middle Vedic śrauta texts but also seemingly in the RV, this premature anticipatory step seems unlikely to be ritually sanctioned. As for the soma sacrifice that does take place at night, the Atirātra, it employs previously prepared soma. I wonder if *kṣapā* should be taken not literally, but metaphorically. In the 2nd hemistich "the insightful thoughts of Vivasvant" (*vivásvato dhíyah*) propel Soma on his ritual journey. Though Vivasvant seems to be the prototype Soma sacrificer (see IX.66.8 and Old on our passage), his name lit. means 'having the shining forth', and he is in some ways the image of the sun. See esp. IX.10.5, where Vivasvant is associated with the Dawns and the sun images produced by the soma poured across the filter. I suggest that here "the thoughts of Vivasvant" that give Soma a push represent the beginning of the verbal portion of the sacrifice as a metaphorical dawn, and therefore anything that happened prior to that in the ritual happened in the metaphorical night. For further on Vivasvant, see publ. intro. to I.139 and comm. ad X.14.5.

In c *yádī* ('if') should be read *yádī* ('when him').

IX.99.3: I am not certain of the referent of *asya* in pāda a. Ge and Re seems to interpr. it as Soma, implicitly dependent on *máda-*, which they take to be the referent of *tám*, on the basis of *mádo yáh* in b. I see the point, and it would solve the *asya* problem. But I have several objections. First, the object of $\sqrt{mṛj}$ 'groom' is unlikely to be exhilaration or the exhilarating drink (*máda-*) conceived of as separate from Soma him/itself. Moreover, in the central part of this hymn, vss. 3–5, each vs. begins with *tám*, and I find it difficult to believe that this *tám* has a different referent from the other two, which refer to Soma. And finally, vss. 6–7 each begin with *sá*, again referring to Soma, and in 7 *sá* is the subj. of *mṛjyate* 'is groomed', the passive version of our *tám ... marjayāmasi* "we groom him." For all these reasons I think *tám* must be Soma, with *mádaḥ* in b equated with him. In this

case *asya* can only refer to Vivasvant, who is the only other singular entity previously mentioned.

The 2nd hemistich contains a striking conceptual reversal: the “cows” suck soma, though ordinarily it is the (conceptual) calf that sucks its mother, the cow. This may accompany another conceptual reversal: in IX “cows” are almost always a reference to the milk mixture added to the soma, but here Ge (n. 3cd) plausibly suggests that here they are the pressing stones, sucking the soma out of the plant stalks.

On the configuration of pāda d see Klein, DGRV I.95–96.

IX.99.4: The idiom *nāma* √ *bhr* ‘bear the name(s)’ generally means “to have that name, to be so called” (cf., e.g., I.103.4). However, I find it unlikely that the thoughts have—that is, are called by—the names of the gods (this thought is called “Indra,” that one “Agni”). Rather, I think there are two possibilities. The thoughts=hymns directed to Soma contain the names of the gods who are to drink the soma (of the type ubiquitous in IX, “O drop, flow for Indra”). A more elaborate suggestion starts from IX.109.14 *bībharti cārv indrasya nāma*, which means, in my view, not “he bears the dear name of Indra” (so, e.g., Ge), but rather “he bears the name dear to Indra,” namely “Soma.” Here, if we supply *cāru*, the passage could mean “the thoughts bear the name (dear) to the gods”; again that name is “Soma.” In this case the thoughts would not be called “Soma,” but would instead contain numerous instances of the name Soma in the hymns directed towards him. I prefer the former solution, as it does not require supplying additional material.

IX.99.5: Ge and Re (flg. Sāy.) take *ukṣāmāna-* to √ *ukṣ* ‘sprinkle’, not √ *vakṣ* / *ukṣ* ‘grow strong’. I prefer the latter, because even medial forms of ‘sprinkle’ are transitive (cf., e.g., V.59.1 *ukṣānte ásvān*) and this one would be passive, but ‘sprinkle’ is not excluded.

The publ. tr. of the 2nd hemistich – “Those of insightful thought hope for him to be like a messenger, (for them) to be first in his thought” – is, at the very least, awkward, but, more to the point, opaque. I now think I interpr. it wrongly. In particular, like Ge and Re (also Lü 208), I 1) take the implicit acc. obj. of *ā śāsate*, corresponding to *dūtām* ‘messenger’ in the simile, to be Soma, and 2) interpr. the verb as meaning ‘hope’. Although both interpr. can be amply justified, what they add up to is not sense. To begin with, though *ā śās* can mean ‘hope’, it can also have the more literal and additive sense ‘direct (towards)’, with a variety of objects. Particularly telling in our case is VIII.24.1 *ā śiṣāmahi bráhméndrāya* “we direct our formulation to Indra,” with a verbal product as object.

This now brings us to the simile. The skeleton of the clause means “They direct (X) like a messenger ...” Let us focus now on *dūtá-*; what can be being compared to it here? This is the only occurrence of this well-attested word or its derivatives in IX. The overwhelmingly standard referent of *dūtá-* is of course Agni; however, there is a subset of passages in which the *dūtá-* is a hymn, praise-song, vel sim. Cf. V.43.8 ... *gír dūtó ná gantv ásvínā huvádhyai* “let the hymn come like a messenger to invoke the Ásvins”; IV.33.1 *dūtám iva vācam* “my speech like a messenger”; VI.63.1 *dūtó ná stómaḥ* “our praise-song like a messenger” (sim. VIII.26.16 *stómo dūtáḥ*). I suggest that in this hymn, so focused on the mental and verbal products of the poets, the object that “those of insightful though” (*manīśinaḥ*) are directing is some variety of thought or hymn. Just

trolling through the previous vss. provides a number of candidates: *vīp-* ‘inspired word’ (1d), *dhī-* ‘insightful thought’ (2c), *gāthā-* ‘song’ (4a), *dhītī-* ‘insightful thought’ (4c), and *manīṣā-* ‘inspired thought’ (extracted from *manīṣín-* in our 5d). Although none of these is masc. to match *dūtā-*, the genders of simile and frame do not have to agree (note fem. *gír-* in V.43.8, *vāc-* in IV.33.1, both cited above).

Finally, what about the purpose dat. *pūrvácittaye*? This form, occurring 8x, only in the dat., in all of its occurrences can mean “for X to be first in (s.o.’s) thoughts.” See comm. ad I.112.1. In two of its occurrences (VIII.3.9, 6.9) it is a formulation (*bráhma*) that we want to be first in Indra’s thought: e.g., VIII.3.9 *tát tvā yāmi suvīryam, tād bráhma pūrvácittaye* “I beg you for a mass of good heroes and for the sacred formulation to be first in your thought.” I suggest that this is the exact configuration we have here, *if* we supply a verbal product as the obj. of *ā sāsate*, as the parallel to *dūtám* in the simile, and as the subject of the infinitival *pūrvácittaye*. A supplied “hymn / thought / formulation” works well with all three of these nested elements and yields sense: “Those of insightful thought direct (a thought/formulation) like a messenger to be first in his thought.” I would now substitute this tr.

IX.99.6: Ge and Re (also Ober II.43) attach c to d as a new sentence, but this makes the already somewhat difficult simile in c all the more puzzling: what does depositing his seed have to do with displaying his eloquence? Whereas b and c work better together: in b “Soma sits in the cups” – that is, the liquid soma is poured into receptacles, expressed in the loc. (*camūsu*). In c this same transfer of liquid is compared to depositing seed/seed (*réta ādādhat*) in an animal, also in the loc. (*paśáu*). So the structural parallelism between simile and frame is exact. The problem is the loc. *paśáu*, for morphologically this should be masc. or at best neut., but the image is of impregnation, and for that we want a fem. My ad hoc solution is to assume that *paśú-* here is used as a collective ‘livestock’, in reference to stock-breeding as a general practice.

IX.99.7: The sense of pāda c is not immediately apparent; its interpr. develops from an appreciation of the idiom inherent in the noun *saṃdadī-*. As discussed esp. ad I.139.1 (but see also IX.10.8, 79.4), the lexeme *sám √ dā* belongs to *√ dā* ‘tie’ and is used in the quite narrow idiom “tie/attach navel [ACC] to navel [LOC],” generally as a metaphor to assert or display a family tie between something human and earthly and something divine and in heaven. In Re’s words (n. to our passage): “partout dit du nombril comme point d’attache entre terre et ciel; on pourra donc ici même suppléer *nābhiḥ*” – though his tr. “quand il se reconnaît dans les (eaux que) voici, s’unissant (à elles)” reflects that interpr. only darkly, at best. The earthly/heavenly connection, in lapidary shorthand, seems to be the intent of our passage, though ‘navel’ is absent. In this particular case I would accept Lü’s constantly asserted conception of the heavenly waters and their connection to Soma. Here because Soma’s umbilical tie to the heavenly waters (represented by the prn. *āsu* fem. loc.) is well known, he plunges into the ritual waters – though Lü (23–39) identifies the two sets of waters exactly oppositely: the *āsu* are the earthly waters, and the “great waters” (*mahīr apāh*) the heavenly ones. The other occurrence of *saṃdadī-* at II.39.7 is more attenuated even than this one.

Note that *vī gāhate* here forms a ring with *prá gāhate* in 2b, which might support my view that the great waters are the ones at the ritual.

IX.100

On the structure of this hymn, or rather two twinned hymns (1–5, 4–9), see publ. intro. The hymn also has an even higher percentage of repeated and partially repeated pādas than usual in the Soma maṇḍala. See Ge’s nn. for some of them.

IX.100.1: *abhī* with lengthened final may conceal the enclitic acc. *ī*, anticipating the accs. in b. In fact, because of its position before nasal (*abhī navante*) it might represent a degeminated **īm*.

The mothers without deceit are, as noted by Ge and Re, the hymns.

IX.100.4: With Ge and Re (who follow Sāy.) I supply ‘horse’ as the headnoun on which *jigyúṣaḥ* (‘of the one having won / of a victor’) depends in the simile marked by *yathā*. This seems reasonable, even though there is little positive evidence for it. The pf. part. *jigivāms-* / *jigyúṣ-* doesn’t enter into a similar construction elsewhere, and the subj. of (*pári*) $\sqrt{dhāv}$ is overwhelmingly Soma. Otherwise we occasionally find cows (VIII.22.4, IX.66.6, X.145.6), but “runs like the cow of a victor” does not impose itself. In IX.87.7 we do find a steed (*árvan-*: ... *pári sómaḥ pavitre ... adadhāvad árvā*), and that parallel will have to do. The simile in the 2nd hemistich, *vājīva sānasīḥ* “like a winner bringing prizes” reinforces this interpr., since *vājīn-* regularly modifies ‘horse’, but of course similes in the same vs. don’t have to have the same content.

IX.100.5: Note the matching *krátve ... kave* beginning and ending the 1st pāda.

IX.100.6–9: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss., constituting a separate hymn, echo and vary the 1st hymn, vss. 1–5.

IX.100.6: The first vs. of the new hymn matches the final vs. (5) of the previous one: 6ab *pávasva ... dhārayā sutáḥ* enlarges on 5b *pávasva soma dhārayā*, with 5c containing *sutáḥ*. The 2nd hemistichs of both vss. consist primarily of datives of the gods who will drink the soma, both beginning with Indra: 5cd *indrāya ... mitráya várunāya ca*; 6cd *indrāya ... viṣṇave, devébhyaḥ ...* There is also a strong echo of vs. 4: 6a *vājasātamaḥ* ‘best winner of prizes’ incorporates in a single word the simile in 4d *vājīva sānasīḥ* “like a winner possessing prizes.”

IX.100.7: This vs. replicates most of vs. 1 in a different order. I will cite here only the repeated elements: 1 ... *adrúhaḥ ... / vatsám ná ... jātám rihanti mātáraḥ*
7 ... *rihanti mātáraḥ ... adrúhaḥ / vatsám jātám ná ...*

On the repeated pāda (d) *pávamāna vídharmaṇi* see comm. ad IX.64.9 and also Ober II.152.

IX.100.8: This vs. has nothing in common with its match, vs. 2, until the end, where the two d pādas are identical: *viśvāni dāsúṣo gṛhé* “all (things) in the house of the pious man.” The two pādas are adapted to two very different themes: in 2 ‘all’ modifies *vásūni* ‘goods’ (c), which Soma will make flourish in the house of the pious, whereas in 7 the

context is darker: ‘all’ modifies *tāmāṃsi* ‘dark shades’, which Soma smashes away in the same location.

IX.100.9: The contents and phraseology of this vs. are furthest from its match, vs. 3, but as noted in the publ. tr., *dyāṃ ca ... pṛthivīm ca* in 9ab recalls 3cd (*vāsūni*) *pārthivā divyā ca* “heavenly and earthly goods.”

IX.101

On the division of this hymn into ṛcas and the structure of the hymn in general see publ. intro. The Anukramaṇī assigns each ṛca to a different poet, in roughly reverse (conceptual) chronological order. The last ṛca plus appended vs., vss. 13–16, is credited to Prajāpati, the Middle Vedic creator god, with no patronymic. The poet of the 2nd to last ṛca, vss. 10–12, is given as Manu Sāṃvaraṇa. This poet is in fact referred to, with the patryonymic Sāṃvaraṇi, in the first Vālakhilya hymn, VIII.51.1 *yāthā mānau sāṃvaraṇau, sōmam indrāpibaḥ sutām* “Just as at Manu Sāṃvaraṇi’s you drank pressed soma, Indra ...” But even if the reference is just to a revered ancient poet, the name Manu, as the ur-man and ur-sacrificer, resonates in the context of Prajāpati. Moreover, there’s a missing step: the Anukr. attributes V.33–34 to one Saṃvaraṇa Prājāpatya, who would be the gapped generational link between Prajāpati and Manu Sāṃvaraṇa (*i*). The names of the next two poets display the proper generational relationship: the third ṛca from the end (vss. 7–9) is by Nahuṣa Mānava, with his patronymic from Manu; the fourth ṛca from the end (vss. 4–6) by Yayāti Nāhuṣa, again taking his patronymic from the next poet in order. The first ṛca (vss. 1–3) does not participate in this generational chain; it is attributed to Andhīgu Śyāvāśvi, a patronymic that links him to the skilled poet of the Marut hymns of V (52–61), Śyāvāśva Ātreya (for further on this attribution see comm. ad vs. 1 below). Leaving Andhīgu aside, it seems that the Anukr. takes the hymn from a presumably contemporary poet Yayāti back through the ages (and 4–5 generations) to the primal god Prajāpati, whose primacy is signaled by his lack of patronymic.

IX.101.1–3: There is no particular unity visible in this ṛca, and vs. 1 in particular stands apart from the rest.

IX.101.1: As noted in the publ. intro. the appearance of the sacrifice-defiling dog in this vs. and vs. 13 sketches a ring. The content of the vs. and its reason for inclusion here are puzzling. Our long-tongued dog (acc. *śvānam ... dīrghajihvyām*) is clearly connected with a story widely attested in Vedic prose of an female demon, an Asurī called “Long-tongued” (*dīrghajihvī*), who licks (and thus defiles) the sacrifice. The story is found in texts belonging to all three ritual Vedas: RV: AB II.22; YV: MS III.10.6, KS XXIX.1; SV: JB I.161–63, PB XIII.6.9–10, though it is most developed in the JB, where it takes a distinctly and entertainingly sexual turn. The story is treated extensively by Oertel in a number of publs. (see reff. in O’Flaherty, JB, pp. 124–25) and tr. by Caland in *JB in Auswahl* and his ed. of PB (incl. an Engl. tr. of the JB version ad PB XIII.6.10); see also W. D. O’Flaherty, *Tales of Sex and Violence: Folklore, Sacrifice, and Danger in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (1985), 100–103. Whether the long-tongued demoness of prose is identical with or was inspired by our long-tongued dog is unclear, but at least the JB connects its account, perhaps secondarily, with our vs. After Indra set a certain Sumitra to

seduce the demoness and get her into his power so that Indra could slay her, Sumitra calls upon Indra with our vs. (quoted in the JB text I.162), which Indra then makes into his vajra, raises as his weapon (*etām anuṣṭubham vajram udyatya*), and smites her. The same vs. then figures in the immediately following story (I.162–63), in which Śyāvāśva, rather nastily tricked by his Sattrā mates, recites the verse (now named the Śyāvāśva sāman), to get himself to heaven. And this story involving Śyāvāśva himself is followed soon after (JB I.165) by one whose main character is Andhīgu (see also PB VIII.5.8–12). So at least serially Andhīgu and Śyāvāśva connect to Dīrghajihvī – remember that the poet of this ṛca is given by the Anukr. as Andhīgu Śyāvāśva.

Unfortunately nothing in the prose narratives provides any help in interpreting our vs., esp. the hapax cmpd. *purójitī*-. Both Ge and Re take the instr. *purójitī* as expressing purpose: “auf dass euer Trank zuvorst siege”; “afin qu’il y ait victoire de votre jus.” I do not understand the case syntax of this (instr. of purpose?), esp. as the standard *dative* of purpose appears in the next pāda (*sutāya mādayitnāve*), and, with the omission of *vaḥ*, a similar dat. **purojitāye* would have fit this vs. line. Old takes the instr. seriously and construes *ándhasaḥ* with *sutāya*, which is certainly possible: “Durch euren vor (in lokalem Sinn) ihm gewonnenen (und ihn so beschützenden) Sieg schlägt dem berausenden Saft des *ándhas* den langzüngigen Hund, ihr Freunde, hinweg.” My own interpr. instead takes *ándhasaḥ* with *purójitī*: the “advance victory over the stalk” is by this interpr. the priests’ initial victory *over* the stalk, by pressing it for its juice, leaving it mangled and spent. This initial victory may provide the model for the violence against the encroaching dog. But I am not at all certain of this interpr.

IX.101.2–3: These two vss. are quoted in JB I.163 just after Indra’s use of our vs. 1 to kill the demoness, and the set of vss. is prescribed for the smiting of haters, rivals, demonic power, and evil. These are the only two Gāyatrī vss. in this Anuṣṭubh hymn.

IX.101.2: Rather than making c a nominal main clause (with Ge and Re), I think it better to take the whole vs. as a rel. cl., dependent on *tām*, which opens the next vs.

IX.101.3: On the impossible word *duróṣa(s)*- see comm. ad VIII.1.13. This is the only one of its three occurrences where it qualifies soma, though in Avestan *dūraoša-* is only used of haoma. Ge refuses to tr. (though he discusses it extensively in n. 3a); Re ‘difficile à mouvoir’ (see his n. for disc.).

The lengthened *ī* of *abhī* may represent *abhī + ī*, the enclitic acc., as I suggest for the same form in the preceding hymn, IX.100.1. In fact, just as in 100.1, it could represent a degeminated *īm* before the nasal of *nāraḥ*.

Both Ge and Re take *yajñám* as the direct obj. of *hinvanti* rather than the goal, as I do (Ge “Soma ... als Opfer”). It is certainly true that *yajñám √hi* is found elsewhere (see Ge’s n. 3c) and that the dat. is more often used for goal or purpose with *√hi*. Still, the sacrifice is so often the goal of motion, the goal of motion is so often in the acc., and soma is so often the obj. of *√hi* that I prefer to keep soma and the sacrifice as separate entities.

IX.101.4–6: No particular unity in this ṛca unless the mention of Indra in each vs. counts. After the difficulties of the 1st ṛca, this one is blessedly simple.

IX.101.5: On the double sense of *makhá-* and its denom. and deriv., see I.18.9, III.31.7.

IX.101.6: The phrase *samudró vācamīṅkhayāḥ* recalls the variant compds in IX.35.2 and 5: *samudramīṅkhaya* (2a) and *vācamīṅkhayām* (5a).

Note that all 4 pādas begin with *s-*.

IX.101.7–9: Again, quite straightforward and not particularly cohesive.

IX.101.7: *bhūman-* generally means ‘earth’ (as opposed to heaven) or ‘world’. Here it seems a little outside its usual patch, as a metrical driven variant of the common phrase *vīśvasya bhūvanasya* ‘of all creation’; see esp. IX.86.5 *pátir vīśvasya bhūvanasya rājasī* matching our *pátir vīśvasya bhūmanah*, but also occurrences in I.164.21, II.27.4, 40.1, III.46.2, V.85.3, IX.86.28, 36, 97.56, X.45.6, 168.2, all but one straddling a late caesura, where the two light init. syllables of *bhuvanasya* fit well; *bhūvanasya* of course fits the cadence of no Vedic meter.

IX.101.9: Both Ge and Re supply ‘wealth’ (*rayím*), found in d, as the referent of all the previous nom. and acc. forms. I think rather of Indra. The splv. *ójiṣṭha-* regularly modifies Indra (and never wealth). Though Ge is correct (n. 9a) that *śravāyya-* is a “beliebtes Beiwort” of wealth, Indra is hardly *unworthy* of fame, and see V.86.2b, where du. *śravāyyā* characterizes Indra and Agni. In the same vs. (V.86.2c) both gods are described as *yā páñca carṣanīr abhí* (though variants of this pāda are usually applied to Agni alone: IV.7.4=V.23.1, VII.15.2), exactly like our c save for the number of the rel. prn. The clinching arg. against *rayí-* as the referent seems to me to be pāda d. Ge and Re clearly take the rel. cl. there as consisting only of *yéna vānāmahai*, with pāda-init. acc. *rayím* part of the main cl.: the referent for *tám* back in pāda a and the antecedent of immed. flg. *yéna* in its own pāda. But this would be an unusual syntactic configuration for several reasons. First, there’s a rel. cl. (in c) intervening between the acc. *tám* and its distant referent in pāda a (and acc. modifier in b). Moreover, in a pāda with the structure #X REL ..., the rel. is usually postposed and the pāda syntactically self-contained – that is, the X is part of the rel. cl. The type of intra-pāda clausal break envisioned by Ge/Re is rare. Moreover, Ge and Re are required to interpr. *vānāmahai* in absolute usage (“... wir Sieger werden”; “nous serons vainqueurs”), but *van* ordinarily takes a direct object, on occasion, in fact, *rayím* (e.g., VI.38.1). For all these reasons I think it’s clear that *rayím* and *yéna* in d cannot be coreferential and we need a different referent for the *tám* and *yá-* forms – with Indra the most obvious one, for the reasons just given.

In c I supply a form of *vas* with *abhí* in the meaning ‘surmount, dominate, prevail over’.

X.101.10–12: Again no particular signs of cohesion, save for the X-*víd-* ‘finding X’ compds in 10b, 10d, and 11d.

X.101.11: This vs. shows a few minor disturbances. To begin with, the employment of the preverb / particle *ví* is unclear. Gr takes it with the pf. part. *suṣvānāśah*, which it immed. follows, but *√su* is not otherwise found with *ví*. Moreover, tmesis of preverbs

with participles is fairly rare, though at least here the two forms are adjacent. Re construes it with the aor. part. *cītānāḥ* in b; here the problem is opposite: *vī√cit* is indeed an idiom, but not only is tmesis in participles rare, but the position of *vī*, if it's a preverb in tmesis, would be anomalous: mid-pāda and not only separated from its participle, but also intrusive in a constituent: *suṣvānāsaḥ ... ādribhiḥ* “having been pressed by stones.” I don't have a real solution, but I wonder if it's meant to evoke the “through/across the sheep's fleece” expression, found, e.g., in nearby IX.100.4 ... *vy àvyāyam* (cf. also IX.13.6, 49.4, 61.17, 67.5, 85.5, 97.56, 109.16). It is also possible that *vī.. cītānāḥ* somehow anticipates *vipaścītaḥ* in the next vs. (12a), but this seems a long shot.

The part. *cītāna-* is another bit of a problem. It is the only form to this part., which seems to belong to a root aor. otherwise found mostly in the well-attested pass. aor. *āceti / cēti*. The semantics works fine, but for a root aor. part. its root accent is anomalous (expect **cītāná-*), and in fact a root-accented zero-grade is peculiar whatever the formation. It could of course have voc. accent – but there's no place for a voc. in this 3rd ps. context. Perhaps it received its root accent redactionally in imitation of *vipaścītaḥ* in 12a.

Both Ge and Re take the verbal idiom in cd as transitive, or at least construe *iṣám* as a species of Inhaltsakk. (e.g., “nous ont en résonnant assemblé de toutes parts la jouissance-rituelle”). But Re's invocation of the idiom *abhí ... sám√svar* as the basis for our *abhītaḥ, sám asvaran* seems quite apposite, and that idiom is intrans. with an acc. of goal. See, e.g., IX.110.8 *īndram abhí ... sám asvaran* “They cried out in unison towards Indra” (sim. IX.106.11, 67.9). The conversion of the preverb *abhí* into the adverbial *abhītaḥ* would not be responsible for transitivizing the idiom. Cf., e.g., X.27.8 *hāvā íd aryó abhītaḥ sám āyan* “The cries of the Stranger came together from all sides.” I agree that *iṣám* is an unexpected goal for this idiom, but I think we have to live with it.

IX.101.13–15: The dog returns from the first ṛca in the first vs. of this one. The ṛca is also more rhetorically ambitious than those in the middle of this hymn, with an abundance of similes (13b, d, 14b, c, d, 15b). Vss. 14 and 15 end identically.

IX.101.13: Ge takes *ná* in b as the neg. (flg. Sāy.) and asserts (n. 13), contra Old, that the presence of the mortal and the dog in this vs. (and the VS vs. Old cites) is an accident. But the position of *ná* in the pāda is that of the simile particle (though at least it would immed. precede the verb), and the wealth of similes in this ṛca supports a simile reading here as well. The point of the hemistich is that, like the human, the dog is attracted to the sound of the soma ritual, particularly the sound of the soma pressing, and invades it.

The 2nd hemistich begins like 1c: *āpa śvānam ...*

The simile in d, “as the Bhṛgus did the Battler” (*makhám ná bhṛgavaḥ*), refers to what Ge calls an otherwise unknown saga. The *makhá-* is found as a defeated enemy of Indra in X.171.2, a hymn attributed to one Iṭa Bhārgava, the patronymic of the victors in our vs.. Note that the denom. verb *makhasyate* occurs in our vs. 5c.

IX.101.14: The d pāda (*varó ná yónim āśadam*) is almost identical to 15d (*vedhā ná yónim āśadam*), both expressing the endpoint of Soma's ritual journey.

IX.101.15: The isolated summary vs. The cow's hide (*gávye ádhi tvací*) closely matches *gór ádhi tvací* in 11b, but the sheep's fleece is found nowhere else in the hymn, unless the *ví* of 11a gestures towards it. See comm. ad loc.

IX.102–6: The following 5 hymns are in Uṣṇih, technically 8 8 / 12 or 8 8 / 8 4 (see Arnold, p. 8). In some hymns, esp. IX.102, the latter variant prevails; that is, there is a word break before the last 4 syllables, which can seem like a syntactic afterthought. In others, the last 4 syllables are not detachable, and we must assume a 12-syl pāda; see, e.g., IX.103.2 ... *kr̥ṇute háriḥ*, with 5-syllable finale.

IX.102

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. As just noted, the 8 8 / 8 4 variant of Uṣṇih is found throughout the hymn.

IX.102.1: On *krāṇā* as instr. see comm. ad IX.86.19. It is echoed by the instr. *krátvā* in the ring-compositional final vs., 8a. As noted ad IX.86.19, with Lü and Re (see also Tichy Kl.Sch 210) but contra Ge, I construe *mahīnām* with *síśuḥ* here.

As noted in the publ. intro., the phrase *hinvánn ṛtásya dīdhitim* in b forms a ring with the same phrase in the final vs. of the hymn, 8c. Both occurrence fill a pāda, but the repetition in 8 is followed by the 4-syl. extension *prādhavaré* (i.e., *prá adhvaré*), which needs to be integrated into the clause.

It is not entirely clear what “all the dear things” are that Soma encompasses in c, but on the basis of vs. 2 they may be Soma's domains (*dhāman-*) or places, i.e., the various stations on the ritual ground that the soma passes through.

The 4-syl. extension in this vs., *ádha dvitā*, has the look of a new syntactic unit, since *ádha* is almost always pāda/clause initial, but it also has to be integrated into what precedes.

IX.102.2–3: Trita figures in these two vss. Although the name Trita has several different referents, or at least several different roles, in the RV, in Maṇḍala IX he is the archetypal soma presser: see esp. comm. ad IX.37.4. In these two vss. there is also a play on the literal sense of *tritá-* ‘third’, which is played off against the dual *pāsyòḥ* in 2a and the numeral *trīṇi* ‘three’ in 3a. The Anukr. ascribes this hymn to Trita Āptya, a mythical figure most prominent in X.8, but this ascription is presumably based on the occurrence of *tritá-* in vss. 2–3. Trita Āptya is credited with several other hymns in the RV, incl., in this maṇḍala, IX.33–34.

IX.102.2: On *pāṣṭ-* see comm. ad I.56.6, the only other occurrence of this stem. In both instances it is dual and seems to refer to a twinned body part. Under this analysis in this passage the body part is metaphorical, referring to the two “jaws” of the soma press, a metaphor also found in the later ritual literature. See Ge (n. 2a) on this interpr., also fld. by Re.

The syntax of the vs. as a whole is very puzzling, and the publ. tr. differs from the way Ge/Re (also Klein DGRV II.128–29) configure its parts – though I recognize the problem inherent in my old interpr. The overarching question that will govern how the details are interpr. is what to do with pāda b. In particular, is *ābhakta* the verb of the main

cl., with immed. flg. *yád gúhā padám* a self-contained nominal rel. cl. dependent on the main cl, or is *ábhakta* part of the *yád* cl., with postposed subordinator *yád*? Either of these is syntactically possible; Ge/Re opt for the former, I for the latter. Cf. for the former Re's "Entre les deux machoires de T., (le soma) a eu part au séjour (qui est) dans la cachette." Ge's tr. simply elides the *yád*: "In des Trita Kinnladen (?) hat er seine geheime Stufe erreicht."

There are several problems with this interpr. First (and perhaps least problematic): *úpa* at the beg. of the vs. then appears to be a preverb in tmesis with *ábhakta*, but *úpa √bhaj* is not found anywhere else, either in the RV or elsewhere in Skt. (to judge from MonWms). For a small set of passages incl. this one, Gr allows for *úpa* with following loc. in the sense "bei, auf," and this is probably the way to go if one accepts the Ge/Re configuration—to take *úpa* as a preposition, rather than positing an otherwise unattested lexeme *úpa √bhaj*. For my interpr. of *úpa* in the publ. tr., see below.

The sense that must be attributed to *ábhakta* (usually 'have a share, share in') under their interpr. is stretched. Ge simply tr. "hat ... erreicht," which is hard to reconcile with the normal usages of the root. In this he follows Gr: "6) me. einen Ort oder Gegenstand [A.] erreichen, hingelangen," but Gr assigns this contextually generated usage to this passage alone. Re's "a eu part au séjour" is attentive to the meaning of the root, but what does the tr. actually mean?

Then there is the question of what to do with the rest of the verse after these 1st two pādas, which in Ge/Re/Klein's various renderings gets loosely attached to what precedes with no logical or syntactic connection. Cf., e.g., Klein's tr. of the whole vs.: "In the two stones of Trita (Soma) has taken for himself a place (of refuge) which is hidden, together (with) the seven orders of the worship, and dear."

My publ. interpr. starts with the other configuration of pāda b sketched above, that the pāda is a syntactic unit, a subord. cl. marked by *yád* with *ábhakta* as its verb. I further take *ábhakta ... padám* to be an instance of the rare idiom PATH + *√bhaj* (med.) 'take to the path', found in VII.39.1 *bhejāte ... pánthām*, VII.18.16 *bhejé pathó vartaním*; see comm. ad VII.18.16. Taking *padá-* as 'track', we arrive at a tr. of b "when he took to the hidden track" – meaning, in my view, when Soma set out on his journey of ritual preparation after being pressed.

As for verse-initial *úpa*, elsewhere in IX it's almost always used with a verb of motion (usually *√yā*) with acc. goal: cf. esp. the repeated phrase GEN *úpa yāti niṣkṛtám* "he goes the rendezvous with X." I therefore supply a verb of motion here, with the goal reached only at the end of the vs. in acc. *priyám* "his own dear (place/domain [perhaps supply *dhāma*])." The intermediate instr. phrase *yajñāsya saptá dhāmabhiḥ* is, by this interpr., an instr. of extent of space and indicates the course of his journey, "through the seven domains of the sacrifice." The 4-syllable extension *ádha priyám*, like *ádha dvitā* in vs. 1, puts some syntactic distance between *priyám* and the rest of the vs. Here it might help indicate the arduous nature of the journey and the achievement of arriving at the goal, as my "now right to his own dear (place)" is meant to convey.

This interpr. seems to me to provide a more satisfactory account of the vs. than the other alternative. However, it has one major drawback: the *yád* clause of b is embedded within the main clause, which occupies pādas a, c (/d). If I follow this interpr., there is no way of avoiding this violation of standard practice, whereas in the Ge/Re/Klein interpr. *yád gúhā padám* is a nominal cl., which is permitted internally.

Weighing the two alternatives, I still find myself inclined to my own, though I don't have an explanation for the problematic embedding. That there appears to be a parenthetical inserted clause in the next vs. may indicate that this hymn is somewhat more lax about the combination of syntactic units than we usually meet with.

IX.102.3: This vs., too, gives the initial impression of a random series of elements strung together, which are difficult to construe with each other. Note, for ex., that ab contains five different nominal forms in four different cases, which cannot easily be connected. I take the vs. as a whole as a restatement of vs. 2, or an extension of it – describing the progress of Soma through his ritual preparation. The vs. is discussed at length by Old, in part responding to a treatment of it by Macdonell in JRAS 1893.

With *trīṇi* I supply 'filters', on the basis of IX.73.8 and IX.97.55 (see comm. ad locc.); see also the three seats (*trī śadhāsthā*) in the next hymn (IX.103.2) in the same verse with sheep's fleece filters. The same interpr. is shared by Old (tentatively) and Re, while Ge construes *trīṇi* with *yójanā* in c, which has the merit of not requiring supplied material, but the referent is fairly distant from its adj. (the basis of Old's objection to this interpr.).

The next question is on what does gen. *tritásya* depend. I take it with *pr̥sthésu* 'on the backs' on the basis of IX.37.4 *tritásyādhi sánavi* "on the back of Trita" (with a different word for 'back'). See comm. ad IX.37.4. So also Old, while Re construes it with both *trīṇi* and *pr̥sthésu* and Ge with *trīṇi*. The displacement of *tritásya* from its headnoun can be easily explained by the desire to juxtapose 'three' and (lit.) 'third': *trīṇi tritásya*.

The real problem in this hemistich, however, is what to do with the impv. *érayā* and the acc. *rayím*. The verb doesn't fit easily into the ritual context nor does the acc. 'wealth'. See Old for various possibilities, none of which he particularly likes. Re makes a valiant attempt to make ab into a single cl., but the semantically and syntactically ill-suited awkwardness is apparent: "Stimule avec (ton) jet les trois (filtres) de Trita, (pour procurer) la richesse sur les (trois) dos (de Trita)." For one thing 'stimulating' or 'rousing' the filters isn't a standard (or even non-standard) action at the soma sacrifice, and his parenthetical "(pour procurer)" glosses over the fact that *rayím* has no syntactic connection to the rest of the clause.

For this reason I reluctantly accept Ge's solution (considered but disfavored by Old), to take the impv. as part of a parenthetical clause, though I restrict that clause more than he does. He takes all of b as parenthetical: "—auf deinem Rücken bringe Reichtum her—" while I would limit it to the impv. + ACC.: "—rouse wealth!—" Although I am loath to solve syntactic problems by a wholesale positing of parentheticals, this seems the least objectionable way to deal with ab. It is not clear to me who the addressee of the impv. is, nor do any of the standard interpr. seem to worry about this question. I very much doubt that it is Soma, who is otherwise referred to only in the 3rd ps. throughout the hymn, until the final vs.; I find it unlikely that this hymn-length consistency and the dramatic contrast created by the switch in persons in the final vs. would be violated by a seemingly irrelevant impv. just here. The most likely addressee is a ritual officiant of some sort. On a possible interpr. of the short impv. phrase see comm. on the next vs.

The 2nd hemistich is, by contrast, relatively straightforward and, like 2cd, sketches the length of the territory Soma traverses, with the verb *ví√mā* 'measure out'

and *yójana-*, a measure of distance. The preverb *vís-* in tmesis and takes its position after the verb at the beginning of the final, short pāda.

IX.102.4: The “seven mothers” (*saptá mātārah*) are presumably the rivers (contra Ge n. 4ab, who prefers *dhītī-* or ‘sisters’), which we also met in vs. 1 as the “great (fem.) ones.” Their appearance here strengthens the likelihood that *mahīnām* in 1a is dependent on *śísuh*; see comm. there.

On *vedhām* instead of expected *vedhásam* see comm. ad IX.26.3.

The other two occurrences of *śriyé* in IX (IX.94.4, 104.1) are associated with birth/child: IX.94.4 *śriyé jātāḥ* and, in the next hymn, IX.104.1 *śísuṃ ná ... śriyé*. I therefore construe *jajñānām ... śriyé* together, despite their polarized positions at the two ends of the hemistich.

As Ge points out (n. 4c), *dhruvá-* can modify *rayí-* (IV.2.7 and, in this maṇḍala, IX.20.4). I therefore think *dhruvó rayīṇām* is abbreviated from *dhruvó *rayír rayīṇām*. Unfortunately in Engl. “enduring wealth of wealths” is too awkward to be parsable, hence my “(treasure) of treasures.” Even more unfortunately the switch in the Engl. obscures the relationship of this vs. to the preceding one. In the context of this vs. the imperative clause “rouse wealth!” (*érayā rayím*) in 3b can be reinterp. as tantamount to “rouse Soma!” since Soma here is identified as *rayí-*, in fact the best *rayí-*.

The 4-syl. addendum pāda is a self-contained subordinate clause, *cikéta yát*, as is the identically structured *juśánta yát* in the next vs. (5d). The poet uses the unusual metrical pattern to his advantage in this hymn. Both Ge and Re think that ‘wealth’ is the understood complement of *cikéta*, and this would find some support in VII.95.2 *rāyás cétantī* “taking note of wealth.” However, as just disc., I consider *rayīṇām* in c as part of a phrase describing Soma. Moreover, as Ge points out (n. 4ab), *ciketa* responds to *asāsata* ‘they instructed’ in b, and I therefore think that the point is that Soma paid attention to his mothers’ instruction.

IX.102.5: My unsignalled addition, “your,” to the nominal cl. of c is unsupported and, I’m now sure, wrong. (It mindlessly follows Ge.) As noted ad vs. 3, Soma is always in the 3rd ps. in this hymn till the final vs. And the initial *asyá* of pāda a reinforces this. I would now change the tr. to “... are his joys.”

As in the previous vs., the 4-syl. last pāda is a self-contained subord. cl., *juśánta yát*, with *vísve devāḥ* of b as its subj. Note that *juśánta* picks up *sajóśasaḥ* in a, which modifies *vísve devāḥ*. The etymological respension might have better conveyed by a more literal tr., such as ‘of joint pleasure, sharing pleasure’.

IX.102.6: This vs. consists of a rel. cl., which is implicitly picked up by the following vs.

The extra four-syllable pāda here consists of a single acc. adj., which is entirely integrated into the rest of the vs., in contrast to the slight syntactic distance the metrical boundary creates in other vss. in this hymn.

IX.102.7: This vs. does not contain an overt referent for the rel. cl. of the previous vs. Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. all supply both this antecedent and a verb: “to him come.” This makes sense, but the only (indirect) support for it is *abhí* ‘towards’. I would be more comfortable if *abhí* were initial.

There are several candidates for the identity of the “two mothers of truth” *ṛtásya mātárā*. The exact phrase *yahvī ṛtásya mātárā* refers both to Night and Dawn (I.142.7, V.5.6) and to the two World Halves (VI.17.6, X.59.8). In IX.33.5 in the plural it refers to sacred formulations configured as cows. On the phrase see Lü (631), who rightly disputes Ge’s “... (Tochter) und Mütter”; Lü thinks the ref. here is to the World Halves, but gives no evidence that I could see. However, this identification is likely to be correct, in that *samīciné* in all three of its other occurrences, incl. 2 in this maṇḍala (IX.74.2, 90.4, X.44.8), is used of the World Halves.

The 2nd hemistich changes subject abruptly without a signal, beyond the change in number/gender from fem. du. (*samīciné ... yahvī ... mātárā*) to masc. pl. in cd. In fact the plural number only becomes clear with the last word, the 3rd pl. verb *añjate*; the part. *tanvānā(h)* that opens the hemistich could be du., given its sandhi position, *tanvānā yajñám* – but it would have to be masc. du. The identity of the masc. pl. is not clear, but the default, esp. given the meaning and usage of both the part. and the finite verb, would be the ritual officiants.

The fourth, short pāda superficially looks like those in vss. 4 and 5, though in opposite order—*yád añjate*—but it is not self-contained like them but belongs to the clause in c. Nonetheless, the positioning of *yád* at the beginning of the little pāda provides the same bit of distance we’ve found in most of the vss. of this hymn.

IX.102.8: As noted several times above, this is the first and only time that Soma is referred to in the 2nd ps. in this hymn, and only in the injunc, verb *ṛnór ápa* ‘you unclosed’. The switch in person is particularly noteworthy because this vs. forms a ring with vs. 1, sharing the pāda 1b, 8c—so the switch in person and the unity implied by the ring are, as it were, at odds with each other.

On *ṛnóti + ápa / ví* see comm. ad I.58.3. In our passage Soma has been made the protagonist of the Vala myth (see Ober II.217).

In the publ. tr. I tr. the verb as a preterite, but I would now be inclined to render it as a general pres. (sim. to KH’s view, Injunc. 122), as a repeated ritual action performed by Soma reenacting the Vala myth.

On the 4-syl. afterthought pāda *prādhvaré*, which is found several times in Uṣṇih or its equivalent, see comm. ad VIII.12.31–33. I argue there that it is a truncated version of the fairly widespread loc. absol. *prayaty àdhvaré* “while the ceremony is pro(ceeding).” I would now change the tr. here to “... spurring the visionary power of truth while the ceremony is pro(ceeding).” Once again the final pāda is a semi-separable unit.

IX.103

On the structure of this hymn and its relationship to the previous hymn IX.102, see publ. intro. Unlike IX.102, the variant of Uṣṇih employed here seems to be 8 8 / 12: in two of the six vss. the configuration of words makes a separable 4-syllable final pāda impossible (2c: ... *kṛṇute háriḥ*#; 3c ... *saptá nūṣata*#), and though the other four vss. end with a 4-syllable word, only in vs. 1 does this show the syntactic distancing found throughout IX.102.

As was noted in the publ. intro., IX.102 and 103 share thematic and lexical material. A list of the most obvious includes

vs. 1: *vedhás-* / 102.4

jújoṣate / *juśánta* 102.5

vs. 2: “three seats” reminiscent of *trīṇi* in 102.3, not to mention the two *trítá*’s in 102.2, 3.

vs. 3: *vāñīr iṣṇā́m saptá* / 102.4 *saptá mātáraḥ*

vs. 4b: *viśvádevo ádābhyah* / 102.5b *viśve devāso adrúhaḥ*

This pattern breaks down in the latter part of the hymn. Moreover, IX.103 is considerably more straightforward than 102, and it also possesses a different, quite salient structuring device, the fronted preverb that opens each vs.: *prá* (1), *pári* (2–6). As was also noted in the publ. intro., *pári* has less and less integral connection to the rest of the vs. as the hymn goes on.

IX.103.1: Ge takes ab as a nominal sentence, separate from c, with *vácaḥ* the nom. subj.: “... wird eine Rede angehoben.” Re takes ab independently as well, but supplies a 1st ps. verb, which introduces needless complications. Although I was tempted by Ge’s interpr., there are two problems: 1) It leaves the opening preverb *prá* orphaned. Though Gr lists a *prá úd √yam* ‘die Stimme erheben’, in fact he registers it only for this passage, which does not inspire confidence in the lexeme, and furthermore having one of two preverbs in tmesis with a ppl. might be unusual. If we do not separate ab from c, *prá* can be construed with the verb *bharā* in c in the common lexeme *prá √bhr.* 2) The *vácaḥ* in b has to be resupplied in c to provide the frame for the simile *bhṛtīm ná*, whereas if there is no break, acc. *vácaḥ* is readily available.

In c the verb *bharā* can be either 1st sg. subjunctive or 2nd sg. impv. There are no implications either way. With Ge/Re/Ober I go for the 1st ps. subj.

As noted above, it is only in this vs. that a separable 4-syl. final pāda seems likely: the 3rd sg. pf. subj. *jújoṣate* forms a single-word clause, with decisive change of subject. As also noted above, this verb echoes *juśánta* in the 4-syl. final pāda *juśánta yát* (5d) in the twinned hymn IX.102. This echo may account for the middle voice of *jújoṣate*; the well-attested pf. subj. *jújoṣa-* is otherwise only active, while the them. aor. *juśá-* is overwhelmingly middle. The unexpected voice of *jújoṣate* is disc. by Old and probably accounts for why Gr (also BR; see Old) interprets it rather as a dat. sg. act. part. to an otherwise unattested pres. stem, even though we should expect a weak stem **jújuṣant-*. Not to mention that such a participle would require that the stem had been reinterpr. as a present. Though this is not a difficult leap, since the subjunctive has accent on the redupl., as opposed to the finite pf., which has standard pf. accent (*jujóṣa*, *jujuśúḥ*), nonetheless, in the absence of unambig. present forms, it seems best to assign the subjunctive to the existing pf. stem. Ge, Re, Lub all take it as a finite verb, not a part.

IX.103.2: See IX.102.3, where it’s suggested that the *trīṇi* in that vs. corresponds to the “three seats” (*trī śadhásthā*) here and refers to the filters.

IX.103.3: As noted above, the “seven voices” (*vāñīḥ ... saptá*) remind us of the seven mothers in IX.102.4. As Re points out, Lü (681–82) identifies the *saptá vāñīḥ* as the heavenly rivers (though not mentioning this passage). If this identification is correct, it is even closer to 102.4, where we identified the seven mothers as rivers. (Gr construes *saptá* with immediately preceding *iṣṇā́m* [“wo weniger gut mit vāñīs verbunden”], which of

course evokes the group of the Seven Seers, much more prominent in later texts than in the RV, where they are mentioned only four times, primarily in late hymns: *saptá řṣayaḥ* [IV.42.8, X.130.7], *saptaṛṣáyah* [X.82.2, 109.4]. However, in that case we might expect overt gen. *saptānām* to modify the gen. pl. *řṣīnām*). Gr’s objection to taking *saptá* with *vāñīḥ* does not seem to have merit, since the phrase *saptá vāñīḥ*, without the seers, is found elsewhere.)

IX.103.4: Starting with this vs., the *pári* has no organic connection to the rest of the vs. Here I supply *arṣatí* on the basis of vss. 2–3. So also Re, KH (133).

On *viśvádevo ádābhyaḥ* as a clever variant on IX.102.5 *viśve devāso ádruhaḥ*, see publ. intro.

Ge takes injunc. *viśat* as model (“... möge sich ... niederlassen”), but with Re and KH (133–34) I take it as a general present referring to Soma’s standard ritual action.

IX.104

As with the immed. preceding hymn, the Uṣṇih here is of the 8 8 / 12 form, with some vss. not allowing a 4-syllable final because the word breaks don’t coincide (1c, 3c, 5c) and the others not showing a syntactic or semantic break.

For the similarities with the flg. hymn, IX.105, see publ. intro. and comm. on 105.

IX.104.3: Pāda b seems to mix two kinds of expressions of purpose: the dative infinitive (*śárdhāya vītáye*) and a clause introduced by *yáthā*, in which we expect a subjunctive. In the absence of such a verb, the *yáthā* appears pleonastic. The next pāda begins the same way, with *yáthā* followed by a dative referring to gods (*mitráya váruṇāya*). The dative gods appear to be exactly parallel to *śárdhāya* in b, and we would expect *vītáye* to follow as there, or at least be supplied. But instead we find the nom. *śámtamaḥ*, which suggests that the *yáthā* in this pāda should be taken seriously and we should supply a subjunctive: “so that he (will be) most wealful for M+V.” (The publ. tr. renders b and c as more parallel than they are and should perhaps be changed.)

IX.104.4: Pāda b, *abhí vāñīr anūṣata* is a variant on the more elaborate *abhí vāñīr řṣīnām saptá anūṣata* in the immed. preceding hymn, IX.103.3c, which occupies the long pāda of Uṣṇih, rather than one of the shorter ones, as here.

IX.104.5: Because of the 2nd ps. reference of vs.-init. *sá*, which is only appropriate with imperatives, I take *devápsarā asi* as a parenthetical insertion, with *sá* to be construed with vs.-final *bhava*. This has the advantage of allowing *naḥ* in pāda a, which would have no function in ab, to be construed with *gātuvíttamaḥ* in c, where it most naturally belongs. See *asmábhyam gātuvíttamaḥ* in two nearby hymns IX.101.10 and IX.106.6. My interpr. of b is supported by the parallel vs. in the twinned hymn, IX.105.5, which has no intermediate clause and has the same configuration #*sá naḥ* ... / *bhava*# with polarized vs.-init. and vs.-final elements as here.

The Anukr. credits this hymn to Parvata Kāṇva and Nārada Kāṇva or, alternatively, to “Kaśyapa’s two Apsaras daughters Śikhaṇḍinī”: *śikhaṇḍinyāv apsarasau kāśyapyau*. It seems likely that this second – unusual – ascription is based on a misparsing of the compd. *devápsarā(ḥ)*.

IX.104.6: On *sánemi* see comm. ad VII.38.7.

I do not understand why *kṛdhí* is accented.

IX.105

As noted ad IX.104, this hymn has a very palpable twinned relationship with 104, though extensive exact repetition is avoided. What follows explicitly traces the parallels and the variations.

IX.105.1: The init. voc. *sákhāyaḥ* in 104.1a is postponed in 105.1a till after *tám vaḥ*. The 2nd pāda begins with the same middle participle, *punāná-*, but in diff. case forms: 104.1b dative, 105.1b acc. The rest of b is identical save for the preverb: 104.1b *prá gāyata*, 105.1b *abhí gāyata*. The final pādas begin identically, *śísuṃ ná*, but go their own ways.

IX.105.2: Pāda a in both hymns has both the calf (acc. in 104, nom. in 105) and its mothers (both instr.), as well as the init. preverb *sám* and a simile particle (*ná* in 104, *iva* in 105). The b pādas are quite different. The c pādas begin with the same two words, *devāvī- máda-*, acc. in 104, nom. in 105. Again the rest of the c pāda diverges.

IX.105.3: The a pāda in 105 decomposes *dakṣa-sādhana-* in 104 to *dákṣāya sādhanah*. The two *yáthā*'s beginning 104.3b and c are replaced by *ayám*'s (also in a). The rest of b consists of the same dative purpose expression as in 104.3b. A superlative plus dative of benefit is found in both c pādas: 104.3c *mitráya váruṇāya sám̐tamah*, 105.3c *devébhyo mádhumattamah*.

IX.105.4: The first two pādas of this vs. in the two hymns diverge from each other. The third pāda contains cows and color (*várṇa-*) in both hymns and refers metaphorically to the same ritual action in both, the mixing of the soma with milk, but the metaphors differ as do the verbs. It is in this vs. that the two hymns are most distant from each other.

IX.105.5: The first pāda in each begins *sá no*, followed by a GEN.PL. + *pate* voc. expression, with deaccented gen. pl. The second pāda begins with voc. *indo*, followed by the compd. *devá-psaras-*, in the splv. in 105, but the simple nom. sg. in 104. See disc. ad 104.4 for the parenthetical nature of 104.4b. The structure of c in both is *sákheva sákhye ... bhava*. In 104.5c in between we get a splv., perhaps a delayed match to the splv. in 105.5b. The filler in 105c is different.

IX.105.6: The two versions redistribute some of the lexical material, while keeping other parts constant. Both begin the verse with *sánemi* and end it with *asmád ā*; only the two syllables in between differ. Both b pādas end *kám cid atrínam*; 105 borrows *ádevam* from the c pāda of 104, while 104.6b begins *rakṣásam*, not found in 105. The *ápa ... dvayúṃ* found at the beginning of 104.6c appears at the end of 105.6c. What precedes has no parallel in 104.6.

The sequence *pári bádhaḥ* was emended to *paribádhaḥ*, here as well as in VIII.45.40 (see comm. there) by BR, fld. by Gr and Old, with Ge skeptical but not entirely opposed (see his n. 6c). I suggest in both passages instead to assume a haplology

of the impv. *bādhasva* in a putative sequence *pári *bādhasva bādhaḥ*, a suggestion made also by Re on our passage here, as it turns out. In our passage we must also assume the gapping of **yuyodhi* with *ápa*, based on 104.6c *ápa ... dvayúm ... yuyodhi*.

IX.106

On the structure of the hymn, see publ. intro. See also Old's assessment of the Uṣṇih variants, by ṛca.

IX.106.1–3: All three vss. in this ṛca contain final 4-syllable sequences that could be syntactically distanced from what precedes, hence a likely 8 8 / 8 4 Uṣṇih type (so also Old). In vs. 1 this piece is *svarvídaḥ*, the signature word that recurs in the same metrical position in 4 (as *svarvídā*) and 9.

Vss. 2 and 3 are also lexically linked: *sānasí-* (2a, 3b), *jaítrasya* (2c) / *-jít* (3d).

IX.106.1: As Re points out, the exact nuance of *śruṣṭí* is hard to pinpoint, but Ge's recessive adverb "willig" does not seem sufficient. Re also adduces II.3.9 *śruṣṭí ... jāyate*, similar to our *śruṣṭí jātāsaḥ*. I interpr. both passages to mean that the right ritual birth happens because of a/the god's attention to the process (Tvaṣṭar in II.3.9, Indra here).

IX.106.2: Both Ge and Re take *jaítrasya* as a noun 'victory', but with Gr I supply Indra as the referent for this vṛddhi adj. This would provide a thematic reciprocity between vss. 1 and 2: in 1 the soma drops are born because of Indra's attentive hearing (in my interpr.), while here Soma repays Indra's attention with his own.

IX.106.3: The etym. figure *grābhám grbhñīta* seems to belong to dicing vocab.; see comm. ad VIII.81.1 and Lü (Würfelspiel, 49–50).

Ge seems to take *grbhñīta* as opt. (which, of course, it can be), but this reading makes it even less compatible with the already loosely connected injunc. *bharat* conjoined by *ca* (see Klein, DGRV I.233). The publ. tr. takes both verbs as preterital injunctives, but I would now be inclined to see them, with KH (Injunk. 124), as general presents describing a regularly recurring situation: Indra's behavior when(ever) he is under the influence of soma. Hence "he grabs ... and he carries ..."

On the phrase *sám apsujít*, which constitutes an independent 4-syl. pāda in all 3 occurrences (here, VIII.13.2, VIII.36.1–6), see comm. ad VIII.13.2 and Scar's views cited there.

IX.106.4–6: Old classifies this ṛca as a third variety of Uṣṇih in which the last four syllables are technically separable but form part of a larger Jagatī pāda with the 8 syllables that precede. Although there is not the same semantic or syntactic distance as with some Uṣṇih vss., I'm not sure that Old's distinction between the two types is nec. As for ṛca unity, all three vss. concern themselves with Soma's ritual journey and the paths he takes. See esp. *pathi-* in 5c and 6c and the deconstruction of the bahuvrīhi *sahásra-yāman-* in 5c into the VP *sahásraṃ yāhi*, with the addition of *pathíbhīḥ* to substitute for the noun *yāman-*. In this figure there's a nice little phonological interchange: *sahásrayāmā* : *sahásramyāhi* The dat. *indrāya* is also found in both 4b and 5a.

IX.106.7–9: Because of the distribution of word boundaries, the first two vss. of this *ṛca* make a separate 4-syllable *pāda* impossible (7 ... *soma naḥ sadaḥ*; 8 ... *amṛtāya kām papuḥ*), though vs. 9 ends with the signature *svarvīdaḥ*. Therefore this must be the 8 8 / 12 Uṣṇih variety. No striking thematic unity.

IX.106.7: On imperatival *sadaḥ*, see comm. ad IX.2.2.

IX.106.9: The pair of cmpds. *vr̥ṣṭí-dyāvo rīty-āpaḥ* is found in the same order in the dual in V.68.5 *vr̥ṣṭídyāvā rītyāpā* of Mitra and Varuṇa. In our passage the 2nd cmpd is unaccented and therefore a voc.; in V.68.5 it is accented and nom. Old suspects that our form should also have the accent, but of course there's no way to tell. (In any case the publ. tr., for simplicity, renders them as if both nom.). The more pressing question is what kind of cmpds they are. There is, of course, a vast lit. on the subject, interpr. these (and others) as verbal governing cmpds with the verbal element as first member. The Paradebeispiel in Vedic is *dāti-vāra-* 'giving choice things', and the type is regularly connected with the Greek βωτι-ἀνειρα 'nourishing men' type. See comm. ad V.58.2. This is not the place to treat this topic at length (see now my forthcoming *dāti-vāra-* paper), but it's worth pointing out that the two cmpds in our passage (and V.68.5), which figure prominently on the very short list of Vedic *dāti-vāra-* cmpds., almost surely don't belong to that type or show its semantics. Although AiG II.1.320 analyzes them as having a verbal 1st member governing the second, and cites parallel transitive VPs *riṇánn apāḥ* 'making the waters flow' (e.g., IX.109.22) and *varśáya-dyām* 'making heaven rain' (V.63.3, 6; IX.96.3) (with, note, quite different transitive verb forms), the two cmpds formulaically belong more closely to intransitive idioms. In particular, the *-tí-*stem first members *rītí-* and *vr̥ṣṭí-* are found with the genitives *apām* and *diváh* twice *in the same passage*: VI.13.1 *divó vr̥ṣṭír ... rītír apām*; IX.108.10 *vr̥ṣṭím diváh ... rītím apām*. In other words, the two cmpds. only appear together (V.68.5, IX.106.9); independent syntagms of the same two elements are also found together. These two pairs are therefore formulaically matched, and this matching strongly suggests that the cmpds should be interpr. in the context of the free phrases and do not have transitive, governing value. Scar (526) provides a plausible first-pass analysis of *vr̥ṣṭí-dyu-* as a *bahuvr̥hi* orig. meaning 'der Himmel mit Regen hat', but I do not follow him in developing it into 'den Himmel regnen lassen'. A similar analysis would produce for the other cmpd. 'having the waters with their streaming'. In other words, a *bv* of more or less the *vájra-bāhu-* type, 'having an arm with a mace' (in the mode of J. Schindler). I would now emend the transl. to "having the heaven with its rain and the waters with their flowing."

IX.106.10–12: In all cases it's possible to detach the last four syllables, but Old considers this *ṛca* to belong with those in which those syllables are integrated into a *Jagatī* line. As for thematic unity, all three vss. concern Soma's journey (but then what vss. do not?), and the 1st two mention the sheep's fleece filter. All three also concern the role of the verbal portion of the ritual and Soma's relation to it: he is "at the forefront of speech" (*ágre vācáḥ*) in 10c and begets speech (*vācam janáyan*) in 12c, while insights (*dhī-*) are used to impel him in 11a and thoughts (*matí-*) sound towards him in 11c.

IX.106.13–14: The last two extra vss. do not allow a detached 4-syllable unit, because the word boundaries don't coincide.

IX.106.13: The well-loved pun *haryatā*- 'delightful' and *hāri*- 'tawny, fallow bay' is found here.

IX.106.14: The fem. instr. *ayā* opening this final vs. seems to fulfill the same role as *evā* in other hymn-summary vss. Both Ge and Re supply a noun with it (Laütering / clarification), but though the use of the fem. seems to invite something more than a semi-adverbial 'in this way', the model of hymn-summary vss. seems to me to outweigh that consideration.

IX.107–8: The next two hymns consist of pragāthas made up of various mixed lyric meters: in 107 mostly Br̥hatī (8 8 / 12 8) alternating with Satobr̥hatī (12 8 / 12 8), in 108 mostly Kakubh (8 12 / 8) alternating with Satobr̥hatī.

IX.107

IX.107.1–3: The first metrical unit in the hymn has a third vs. appended to the pragātha with a 2-pāda configuration of 12 8, identified by the Anukr. as Dvipadā Virāj Bhurij. Arnold (248, E72) analyses vss. 2-3 as simply an extended Satobr̥hatī (12 8 / 12 8 / 12 8). See Old (Proleg. 104–5) on the types of extensions of pragāthas, incl. this one. Since vs. 3 simply hangs off vs. 2 and need not be syntactically independent, the "extension" suggestion is quite plausible.

The vss. are knitted together by lexical repetition and variation. A sample of the lexical evidence: *apsú* is found in 1c, 2c; *uttamám* (1b) is picked up by *úttaram* (2d); the three instr. pl. *ádribhiḥ* (1d), *ávibhiḥ* (2a), *góbhiḥ* (2d) echo each other – the first two phonologically, the 2nd and 3rd semantically.

IX.107.1: The vs. begins with a most unusual sandhi: *pārītó śiñcatā*. Ge (n. 1a; cf. ZDMG 65: 307) suggests that it is Prakritizing. Old and Re, less dramatically, consider it to be based on IX.63.10 *pārīto vāyāve sutám*, where the sandhi of *itás* is correct. (Ge also cites this vs.) Re points out that that vs. ends with *siñcata* and suggests that the unusual sandhi here "résulte de l'assemblage des extrémités du v. 63,10." Although the invocation of 63.10 seems apposite, it doesn't entirely explain the sandhi we find here. The *-o* of *pārītó* can be explained as the adoption of this word sequence from its position before vd. C in 63.10, but the retroflexion in *śiñcatā* does not follow. In fact, in 63.10, though *siñcata* occurs after *-u* (*vāreṣu siñcata*), there is no ruki-induced retroflexion over morpheme boundary (nor do we expect it). Instead I think we must explain the retroflexion as an effect of the preverb *pāri*. By far the greatest number of the retroflexed initials of this root occur immediately after *pāri*, esp. the passive stem (*pari*) *śicyá-* (15 exx.), but also the ppl. *pāriṣikta-* (8x); see also, in the next hymn (IX.108.7), our exact 2nd pl. act. impv. *pāri śiñcata*. There is also retroflexion after the preverb *ní* (5+), and after the particles *tū* (2x) and *hí* (1x). All of these are contact-induced, unlike our example, where the preverb is separated from the verb. Under these circumstances, there is ordinarily no retroflexion (see *pāri ... siñcata* X.32.5, *pāri ... siktāḥ* IX.97.15). However, here I think either the

numerous exx. of *pári* √*ṣic* in IX (15+) imposed distant retroflexion here where it was phonologically unmotivated, or an unretroflexed initial was changed redactionally under the influence of *pári ṣiñcata* in the next hymn.

IX.107.2: The 2nd hemistich of this vs. is intricately interwoven with constituents overlapping; see Old’s sensible treatment at loc. The initial loc. expression consists of *suté cit ... apsú*, with *tvā* interspersed in modified 2nd position. This *tvā* is not construed with the nearby verb *madāma* (*pace* Gr), because *māda-* without preverb is almost never construed with an acc.; here that verb goes with the instr. *āndhasā*. The *tvā* finally finds its governing verb form in the participle *śrīñantaḥ* beginning pāda d; it is so distant from it, with parts of two different constituents in between, because it took Wackernagel’s position in the clause. The adj. *úttaram* at the very end of the vs. modifies it: the soma is “higher” or “better” at this point presumably because the mixing with milk, the last step depicted, improves it.

IX.107.3: Both Ge and Re make this vs. a separate cl., supplying a verb (“fliesst,” “coule”), generated from *pári srava* in 2a, suggested by the init. *pári* in 3a. This is certainly possible, but since this vs. is an afterthought to the pragātha, I take it as dependent on vs. 2, specifically 2ab, simply stringing together more descriptors of soma.

Note *cákṣase ... vicakṣanāḥ*.

IX.107.4–5: Both vss. describing Soma taking his seat (4c, 5b). There is also concatenation between pragāthas: the final word of 5, *vicakṣanāḥ*, matches that of vs. 3, the final word of its metrical grouping. And the first word of vs. 4, *punānāḥ*, is reprised as the beginning of 6 (and echoes the same participle in the 2nd position in 2a).

IX.107.5: Gr, Ge, Re all take *dhūtāḥ* to √*dhū* ‘shake’, but given *apsú dhūtā-* in IX.62.5, X.104.2, I prefer √*dhū*, *dhāv* ‘rinse’.

IX.107.6–7: The c pādas of these two vss. are identically constructed: *tvām vípro* [6] / *kavír* [7] *abhavo* SPLV. Vs. 7 repeats the word *vípra-* along with *ṛśí-* in 7b, so the pragātha seems to have a preoccupation with the varieties of poet.

IX.107.6: The impv. *mimikṣa* probably belongs to √*myakṣ* ‘provide, etc’. See Kü (387–88).

IX.107.7: The two splvs ending the a and c pādas show a nice phonological relationship: (*gātu-*) *vít-tama-* and (*deva-*) *vī-tama*, with interchange between long vowel + single cons. and short vowel + geminate in otherwise identical phonetic sequences, an effect reminiscent of MIA quantitative trade-offs.

IX.107.8–9: The 2nd hemistich of vs. 8 and the first of vs. 9 have a refrain-like structure reminiscent of the echo pādas in Atyaṣṭi, which is unusual for this meter: 8cd ... *harítā yāti dhārayā, mandráyā yāti dhārayā*#; 9ab ... *góbhir akṣāḥ, ... dugdhābhir akṣāḥ*#.

IX.107.8: Since *ásvayā* is fem., the tr. should be emended to “with a golden mare.” See Ge’s disc. (n. 8cd) and dismissal of Roth’s proposed emendation (also rejected by Old), to bring out the comparison of the stream of soma to the urine stream of a horse, which, as Ge points out, is still possible without emendation.

IX.107.9: Both instances of *akṣāḥ* should probably be read with distracted 2nd syllable, to provide the right no. of syllables in b and the right cadence in both pādas. In addition, pāda a is metrically deficient, even with this distracted reading. We expect a 12-syl. pāda in the Satobṛhatī that provides the 2nd vss. of the pragāthas in this hymn; the Anukr. simply identifies the vs. instead as a Bṛhatī, which should have an 8-syl. pāda in this position. Even without distracted *akṣāḥ*, it would have 9 syllables, and with the distraction 10. Best to consider it a deficient Satobṛhatī, which is the vs.-form expected, than an over-abundant Bṛhatī. As for ways to make up the deficiency, see Old. A distracted reading of *anūpé* would provide at least one more syllable as well as a standard 4-syl. opening; however, neither etym. (**anu-Hp-á*; see EWA s.v.) nor the other occurrence of the stem (X.27.23) favors this distraction. Old rather exasperatedly suggests that the metrical disturbances in this vs. (see also the Triṣṭubh cadence of c in a 12-syl. pāda) may result from “mangelhaftes Formgefühl des Vfs.”

IX.107.10–11: Little overt cohesion. The adv. *tiráḥ* ‘across’ referring to the filter is found in both vss. (10b, 11a). And the part. *s(u)vānā-* in 10a echoes the occurrences in vss. 3 and 8.

IX.107.10: With Ge, Re, KH (133), in the publ. tr. I supply a verb in ab. I now think this may be unrec. The impetus was the apparent change of person between the first hemistich and the second: with voc. *soma* in pāda a but a 3rd ps. verb (*viśat*) with Soma as subj. in c. However, as in vs. 12 the 3rd-ps. verb may result from attraction to the simile (*jāno ná purí ... viśat* “as a man enters a fortress”), and the underlying person could be 2nd throughout; see *dadhise* in d. It is hard to convey the change in Engl. but something like “O Soma, while you are being pressed by the stones here across the sheep’s fleeces, as a man enters a fortress, as tawny one (you enter) into the two cups. You have established ...” KH (133) argues that the changes of ps. mark pāda c as parenthetic, allowing it to be interpr. in his “general” sense. This sense should be possible even without branding the pāda as a parenthesis.

IX.107.12–13: No particular signs of cohesion. River(s) appear in both vss., but with different words (*sīndhu-* 12b, *nadī-* 13d). *jāgrviḥ* in 12c echoes the one in 6a.

IX.107.12: The first hemistich of this vs. is structured exactly like the more expansive 10a–c above: with a vocative *soma* in the 1st pāda and a following 3rd ps. verb (*pipye*), which owes its 3rd ps. to attraction to the simile surrounding it, *sīndhur ná ... árṇasā*. Ge (n. 12b) explicitly attributes the 3rd ps. *pipye* to “Attraktion an den Vergleich,” though he keeps the 2nd and 3rd ps. strictly separate in vs. 10. The 2nd ps. in the publ. tr., “you have swollen forth,” should, strictly speaking, be in parens.

Ge and Re make heavier weather of the 2nd hemistich than I think nec. or desirable. Because they strictly break the syntax at the end of b, they need to find

something to do with the instr. phrase that opens c, *aṃśóḥ páyasā*, which then leads them to interpr. *jāgrviḥ* as (unprecedentedly) transitive, which then leads them to supply an obj. for it – way too much machinery for something that can be far more simply interpr. The impetus for all this, the instr. phrase in c, can easily be taken as part of the simile/frame construction starting in b, with *páyasā* corresponding to *árṇasā* in the simile.

Now, as to their transitive *jāgrvi-*. To be fair, it is not only the instr. phrase at the beginning of the pāda but also the apparent ineptness of the simile *madiró ná jāgrviḥ* that lead them to their baroque interpr. The problem with the simile is that it seems to be a straight description of Soma, not a simile: the apparent meaning “wakeful like an exhilarating drink” or “like a wakeful exhilarating drink” is a fine literal (or as literal as we get in the RV) characterization of soma. Both *madirá-* and *jāgrvi-* regularly modify Soma, the latter even in vs. 6 in this same hymn. As Ge says (n. 12c), “*ná* als Vergleichswort macht Schwierigkeit.” And so both scholars search for ways to make this a *real* simile, which requires both words to be given senses they don’t ordinarily have. They take *madirá-* as referring to alcohol or some inebriating drink other than soma – even though it is never so used in the RV. And then, though *jāgrvi-* only means ‘wakeful’ in the RV as far as I can tell, including in vs. 6, they take it as expressing the effect that this other drink has on its drinkers: making wakeful, invigorating. And this all adds up to “Avec le lait de ta tige, toi (qui rends l’homme) vif comme (fait l’alcool) enivrant ...” / “Mit der Milch des Stengels munter (machend) wie der berauschte (Branntwein) ...” Although I realize that the simile is awkwardly comparing soma with a standard description of itself, the cure suggested by Ge/Re seems worse than the disease. I have several, not particularly satisfying suggestions for why we get a simile here. It may be that it is part of a simile chain: soma compared to a river, which in turn is compared to soma. See VII.103.7ab (the frog hymn), where the frogs are compared to brahmins, who are in turn compared to frogs. Or else the animatized Soma the god is compared to soma the drink. But in any case, I prefer to accept the simile at face value, however clumsy, rather than erecting a fantastic superstructure by reinterpreting standard somic descriptors.

IX.107.14–16: Like vss. 1–3, this pragātha has a two-pāda addition (vs. 16), also 12 8. Both 14 and 15 contain the part. *pávamāna-*; all three vss. contain forms of *samudrá-*, *samudríya-*, while 16 repeats the phrase *rājā deváḥ* from 15b. In 16 *haryatáḥ* recalls the same word in 13a, and *vicakṣaṇáḥ* those in 3b, 5d. The voc. of this stem is found in vs. 24.

IX.107.15: On Soma identified as “truth” (*ṛtám*), see IX.97.23, IX.108.8, and Lü 581–82. Although *ṛtám bṛhát* could be an acc. goal here, the parallels, esp. the identical pāda in the next hymn, IX.108.8, support a nom. identification. In IX.97.23–24 Soma is also identified as a king (*rājā* 24b) as here and as ‘possessing *dhárman*’ (*dharmā* 23c), reminiscent of *dhármaṇā* here.

The Pp. analyses *árṣan* opening c as injunc. *árṣat*, while the publ. tr. assumes a nom. sg. pres. part. *árṣan*. Either is of course possible, but the parallelism with vs. initial *tárat* may support the finite verb interpr., as Old points out. So an alt. tr. would be: “he rushes ...” See Hoffmann (117) on this vs.; he is surely right that the two injunctives

should receive the same interpr., rather than Re’s indic. pres. *tárat*, modal *árṣat*, and Hoffmann’s “general” pres. interpr. seems apt here for both.

IX.107.17–18: No particular internal cohesion, but a number of ties with other parts of the hymn. The *Āyus* are found in 17d as the groomers of Soma, while in 14a they were identified with him. The verb *arṣati* (17c) returns from 15c (see also 4b, 5c), and *avyata* (18d) from 13a. The phrase *apó vásānaḥ* (18c) is also found in 4a, and see disc. of the rest of 18c below.

IX.107.17: The enclitic *ī* in d could stand for **īm* in this sandhi position before *mṛjanti* with degemination.

IX.107.18: Soma as *úttara-* is also found in 2d, where it is also associated with cows: *śrīṇanto góbbhir úttaram* “preparing you [*tvā* 2c] with cows as the higher (oblation)”; see comm. there. I supply ‘oblation’ in both instances because of 1b *sómo yá uttamám havīḥ*.

IX.107.19–20: This is the first and only place in the hymn in which the 1st person is found. The speaker’s eagerness for fellowship with Soma, who is addressed directly, and his admission of his troubles give an intimate and almost confessional tone. Both vss. have the 1st sg. prn. *ahám*, a form of *sakhyá-*, a form of *dív-* ‘day’, and the voc. to *babhrú-* ‘brown one’ and are tightly connected, also structurally (see disc. ad 20).

IX.107.19: The indic. pf. of \sqrt{ran} is presential in value; see Kü (413). The form here echoes *raṇyati* in 18b.

The lexeme *ní√car* (or *ní áva√car*) is found nowhere else in the RV or later. The context clearly requires a negative sense; I’ve used the colloquial English idiom “get (s.o.) down,” meaning ‘discourage, demoralize’. There are two ways to interpr. *áva* at the end of the pāda. With Gr (and implicitly Ge and Re), I take it as a 2nd preverb with *caranti*. Since *ní* and *áva* both mean ‘down’, it reinforces by variation, hence my “—way down.” As Ge reports (n. 19c), Ludwig takes *áva* rather as the impv. to \sqrt{av} ‘help’, accented because it starts a new clause. This is perfectly possible and would fit the context, but I prefer the more unusual semantic doubling of the preverbs in this emotional context.

There are various suggestions about what to supply with *purūṇi*: Sāy. *rákṣāmsi*, fld. tentatively by Ge (“böse Geister?”), Re “choses (dangereuses).” Leaving it open seems to me the better solution: the poet is besieged by multiple things he cannot even name.

In the last pāda it is Soma who is urged to “go past the barriers” (*paridhīn*); we might have expected the poet to ask Soma for help in getting past them himself (but see next vs.). For Soma’s journey past the *paridhīn* Ge and Re cite IX.96.11 *paridhīm̐r áporṇu* “open up the barriers.” In both passages the *paridhī-* are presumably obstacles to Soma’s progress on his ritual journey, perhaps the tufts of the fleece filter.

IX.107.20: This vs. is identical in conceptual structure to 19. The first hemistich expresses the 1st-ps. speaker’s constant close relationship to Soma, using the word *sakhyá-* ‘fellowship’ and an “every day” expression (*divé-dive* in 19b, *náktam utá ... divá*

in 20a). The 2nd iteration is more intimate than the first: in 19 the poet simply rejoices in his fellowship, but in 20 he is “at your udder for fellowship” (*sakhyāya ... ūdhani*, suggesting a mother/child suckling relationship).

As for this *ūdhanī*: because this occurrence is followed by the phrase *ghṛṇā tāpantam* “scorching with its heat” and because *ūdhar / ūdhan-* is found in V.34.3 in opposition to *ghraṃsá-* ‘heat’, Re suggests that the two passages need to be interpr. in conjunction with each other. For Re this means rejecting the existence of an independent (*ūdhar / ūdhan-* meaning ‘cold’ (accepted by Ge, EWA, and me), since ‘cold’ does not work in our passage. But I do subscribe to the two *ūdhan-* view—see comm. ad VIII.2.12—with the one here belonging to the dominant ‘udder’ stem. I simply consider the mention of scorching heat in the next hemistich to be coincidence.

The 2nd hemistich matches that of 19. In 19 the poet complains about his afflictions and then invites Soma to pass beyond the barriers. In this vs. the escape presumably effected by Soma in 19 provides the model for the one made by “us.” Just as Soma was to go “beyond the barriers” (*paridhīmr āti*) so did we fly (*paptīma*) “beyond the sun” (*āti sūryam*)—far beyond it (*pārah*). The sun scorching with its heat, described in c, corresponds to the many things that got me down in 19c, and in both d pādas these troubles are overcome, passed beyond. Soma’s presumably successful journey beyond the barriers—barriers that are probably ritually related (see above)—makes it possible for us to overcome our own difficulties with triumphant flight.

IX.107.21–22: Lexical cohesion: *mṛjyāmānaḥ* opening 21a echoed by *mṛjānāḥ* opening 22a; *pāvamāna* 21d, 22a, c; *aṛṣasi* 21d, 22d.

IX.107.21: Both Ge and Re construe *samudré* with *mṛjyāmānaḥ* (e.g., “Im Meer sauber gemacht”), but surely our passage can’t be separated from IX.12.6 *prá vācam índur iṣyati, samudrásyādhi viṣṭāpi* “The drop sends forth his speech upon the surface of the sea,” a passage adduced by Ge (n. 21b) without comment.

IX.107.23–24: Both vss. contain the impv. *pávasva (/ pavasva)*, and the mention of the sea in 23 is balanced by the earthly and heavenly realms in 24. Still, little evidence of cohesion.

IX.107.23: The injunc. *ví dhārayaḥ* in c, in conjunction with *prathamāḥ*, invites a dual reading, both cosmogonic in the past and the ritual present. Hoffmann doesn’t cite this passage.

IX.107.24: Notice the number disharmony in *pārthivaṃ rájo, divyā ca* “the earthly realm and the heavenly (ones).”

IX.107.25–26: No particular signs of cohesion.

IX.107.25: Pāda c is a clever twist on 17ab *índrāya ... marútvate sutáḥ* “pressed for Indra and the Maruts.” In 17 the recipients of the soma are straightforwardly expressed, but in our vs. the expression is oblique. Indra is present not directly, but in the adj. *índriyá-* ‘Indriyan, suitable for/associated with Indra (and Indra’s powers)’, which modifies the

soma drops identified as horses. The adj. *marútvantaḥ* also modifies these drops/horses. On the one hand, I think this is meant to associate the Maruts with Indra, as usual, and identify them as the prototypical recipients of soma; on the other hand, however, the drop-horses are metaphorically associated with the Maruts in full gallop on their regularly described journeys. The double sense would be better conveyed by a transl. “the exhilarating courses, accompanied by the Maruts, fit for Indra along with the Maruts ...”

The fem. stem *medhā-* of course means ‘wisdom’ and is so interpr. here by everyone (incl. me). But its explicit coordination with *práyāṃsi* “pleasing offerings’ (*medhām abhí práyāṃsi ca*) invites, to my mind, a secondary reading associating it with *médha-* ‘ritual offering/meal’. For other possible conflation of *medhā-* and *médha-* see EWA s.v. *médha-*.

IX.107.26: *apó vásānaḥ* returns from 4b, 18c, along with the verb *árṣa-*, ubiquitous in this hymn.

gāḥ ‘cows’ needs to be read with both c and d. In the former it is the referent of the hapax *mandánāḥ* (whose sense is, however, easy to divine) and the obj. of the caus. redupl. aor. ‘causes to bellow’; in the latter it is the obj. of *kṛṇvānāḥ* and the target of the simile: “making the cows as if into his garment” (a simile that of course depends on a metaphor: cows = milk). I consider the *ná* to be displaced – we might expect **nirṇījam ná*. This pāda, in this order, is also found in IX.14.5; for variants on the phrase without simile particle see IX.86.26, 95.1, all adduced by Ge (n. 26d).

IX.108

On the structure of the hymn see publ. intro. It consists of pragāthas alternating Kakubh (8 12 / 8) with Satobṛhatī (12 8 / 12 8). The Anukr. attributes the hymn to seven different poets, but the vss. assigned to them generally violate the pragātha division, which, as the publ. intro. indicates, is often reinforced by syntactic structure. The Anukr. also identifies vs. 13 as Gāyatrī Yavamadyā, but it can be analyzed as a reasonably well-behaved Kakubh.

IX.108.1–2: There is syntactic dependence between the two vss., at least by my reading: 2ab depends on vs. 1, while 2cd consists of a new cl., with a change of person. The Anukr. attributes the two vss. to Gaurivīti Śāktya; there is some support for this, in that V.29 (one of the three other hymns attributed to him [also X.73–74]) has an allusion to the myth involving Etaśa, the sun’s horse (V.29.5), who appears in our 2d.

IX.108.2: This vs. presents us with a syntactic trap of sorts. It appears to consist of a standard REL / COREL construction, with 2a beginning *yásya te* and 2c beg. *sá*. And indeed the rel. and the *sá* are coreferential; however, the grammatical person has changed from 2nd to 3rd. I therefore prefer (contra Ge/Re) to attach 2ab to the previous vs., in which Soma is also 2nd ps. Pāda b acts as a transition from Soma as 2nd ps. to Soma as 3rd ps., with *asyá* referring to him, but the parallelism between the two “drinking” expressions keeps it within the syntactic domain of the rel. clause.

I have silently converted *yásya* into *yád*, since “upon drinking of which – of you -” is unparsable, or at least exceptionally awk., in English.

The gerund *pītvá* in a is echoed by the *i*-stem loc. *pītā* in b.

On the unexpected accent of *suprāketa-*, as opposed to *supraketá-* (4x), see Old, who has no good explanation (nor do I).

IX.108.3–4: Vs. 4 is clearly syntactically dependent on vs. 3, with a series of three rel. cl. introduced by *yéna* referring to Soma, the 2nd ps. subj. of 3.

IX.108.4: Although pāda a treats the mythological past—the opening of the Vala cave (Navagva) and Dadhyañc’s presumably similar exploit (see his connection with cow pens in X.48.2)—the verb is present tense *aporṇuté*, where we might expect an impf., a pres. injunc., or a pf. The two parallel *yéna* clauses have perfects. Hoffmann does not comment on this usage.

The pf. *āpiré* in b takes the partitive gen. *amṛtasya cāruṇaḥ* in c. As in the other occurrences of this phrase (IX.70.2, 4, 110.4) with Ge I take this as a reference to the heavenly soma, with the nominalized neut. *amṛta-* ‘(drink) of immortality’. See comm. ad IX.70.2 and, on supposed masc. *cāruṇaḥ*, VIII.5.14. Re supplies instead ‘principe’: “au beau (principe) immortel.” This is the only finite med. form of the well-attested pf. to $\sqrt{\text{āp}}$, beside two occurrences of the part. Kü. (118) asserts that the medial forms have the “inattent” sense ‘have success’ (implicitly interpr. our form here without the partitive gen. obj.), but he does not cite this passage. Ge (n. 4c) seems to suggest something of the same thing as an alternative, but making *amṛtasya cāruṇaḥ* dependent on *sumné* as he suggests does not seem to me to work. Although it might seem circular for the poets to acquire a share of (heavenly) soma through (earthly) soma, this is exactly the point also of IX.70.2. See comm. ad loc

I cannot detect the semantic nuance between $\sqrt{\text{āp}}$ ‘acquire’ (*āpiré* b) and $\sqrt{\text{(n)as}}$ ‘attain’ (*ānaśúḥ* d). In this passage the first has a more material object, the second an immaterial one, but this distribution does not hold elsewhere.

I take the pl. *śrávaṃsi* as distributive: each one of the pl. subj. acquires his own *śrávaḥ*.

IX.108.5–6: The 1st hemistich of vs. 6 is a relative cl. in the 3rd ps. dependent on vs. 5, also in the 3rd ps. The 2nd hemistich of 6 switches to 2nd ps.

IX.108.6: Ge suggests that pāda a concerns the Vṛtra myth and b the Vala myth, based primarily on *āpya-* ‘watery’ as a descriptor of the cows in the former. This does not seem to me sufficient evidence, esp. because *āpya-* is not elsewhere used in connection with the Vṛtra myth. In his n. (6b) Ge appears amenable to a unitary interpr. of ab, as only depicting the Vala myth, as I also take it, though why the cows are ‘watery’ isn’t clear to me. Ge’s alternative explanation, involving X.67.5, does not seem terribly strong. It suggest it may be connected with the waters used in the ritual preparation of soma; see vs. 7.

On *abhí√tan* see comm. ad VIII.6.25.

IX.108.7–8: Once again the 2nd vs. is syntactically dependent on the 1st in this pragātha: 8ab is couched in the acc., continuing the acc. phrase in 7bc, and 8cd is a rel. cl. whose antecedent is the acc. phrase.

IX.108.7: This vs. contains two sleight-of-hand manoeuvres. The first involves the simile and frame with *pári śiñcata* ‘sprinkle around’. This verb ordinarily takes an acc. of the liquid sprinkled; see for ex. the immed. preceding hymn with the same lexeme: IX.107.1 *pári ... śiñcata sutám* “sprinkle around the pressed (drink).” But the acc. in the simile, *ásvaṃ ná* is the target of the sprinkling, not the liquid. So although the cases agree (implicitly: there is no expressed acc. in the frame), they have different syntactic functions (the opposite of my “case disharmony”). So Ge explicitly (n. 7a). For horses as obj. with \sqrt{sic} , see IV.43.6 *sindhur ha vāṃ rasáyā siñcad ásvān* “The Sindhu River sprinkles your [=Aśvins’] horses with the Rasā.”

The 2nd sleight of hand follows immediately. Both the verb and the string of acc. that follow demand the obj. **sómam*, but instead we find the near rhyme form *stómam* ‘praise’. Rather than emend this to the easier reading (as Old seems inclined to do, along with numerous others; see his comm.), it is better to accept the implicit equation of the two ritual elements: the offered liquid and the offered words. This is not the only place in the RV where this trope is found.

IX.108.8: On Soma as truth see IX.97.23, 107.15.

IX.108.9–10: These two vss. are syntactically independent but linked by the theme of rain.

IX.108.9: The impv. *didīhí* in b is accented because it follows the pāda-init. complex voc. phrase *śas pate*. On the impv. and its twin *dīdihí* with switched quantity, see Old ad loc. The well-attested redupl. formation(s) to $\sqrt{dī}$, a perfect transitioning to a redupl. pres. (see, e.g., my “The Vedic Perfect Imperative” [Fs. Lubotsky, 2018]: 58–59), show a long \bar{i} in the root syllable only in the impv. *didīhí* (1x accented, 11x unacc.); the weak forms otherwise show only *dīdi-*, incl. the competing impv. *dīdihí* (1x accented, 17x unacc.). They are mostly distributed metrically: *dīdihí* is found almost exclusively in final position in a Jagatī or iambic dimeter line; *didīhí* regularly takes final position in a Triṣṭubh line. But a few examples of both forms are found in metrically unfavorable places. E.g., in VIII.60.6 *dīdihí* occurs after a 5-syl. opening; although HEAVY LIGHT is an attested break, LIGHT LIGHT (**didihí*, to an unattested stem form) would be better. Likewise, our form, found after a 4-syl. opening, presents an unusual LHL break, though neither **dīdihí* nor **didihí* would give the most favored break. (Old states that we would expect **dīdihí* here, but does not suggest emending because there are several other exx. of LHL breaks in this hymn.) It is also worth noting that *didīhí* is found several times in the curious phrase ... *sám śo didīhí (naḥ)#* “illuminate our refreshments entirely” (III.3.7, 54.22, V.4.2), and our passage contains the voc. *śas pate* “o lord of refreshment,” so that the presence of *śaḥ* may have triggered the *didīhí* variant here. As for the source of the variation, it’s possible that transposing the Jagatī/iambic-final *dīdihí* into a Triṣṭubh cadence may have led to an almost mechanical balancing of quantities (on the model of alternations like *vavardh- / vāvrdh-*), and then both forms were sometimes used outside of their original places (including *didīhí* in Jagatī/iambic cadences, with the addition of final *naḥ* [III.3.7, V.25.2]), though this seems too convenient an explanation.

The notion that “the middle bucket” (*kósa- madhyamá-*) is the rain cloud goes back to Sāy. and makes good sense, esp. given the explicit rain in the next vs. (10c). It is

possible that the impv. *didīhi* ‘illuminate’ in the first hemistich is meant to evoke lightning in this context, although it is not otherwise found in this usage, as far as I can tell.

IX.108.10: On this usage of $\tilde{a}\sqrt{vañc}$ see comm. ad IX.2.2. This same phrase $\tilde{a}\sqrt{vacyasva}$ (...) *camvòḥ* is found in IX.97.2.

I take *viśām ... viśpātiḥ* to be a syntagm like *gañānām ... gañāpatim* “troop-lord of troops” (II.23.1), with the simile *vāhnir ná* interposed. The expression in II.23.1 also has an interposed word, though just a Wackernagel enclitic *tvā*. Ge takes the *viś-* words as part of the simile, “wie ein zu Wagen fahrender Clanfürst” (and folds the gen. pl. *viśām* into its headnoun). He suggests an alternative (n. 10b) closer to mine, though again with the gen. elided: “wie ein Wagenross, du der Clanfürst.” And, with the aid of parentheses, Re gets three separate NPs out of it: “tel un chef de clan, (maître) des clans, conducteur (du char).”

The syntagms *vṛṣṭim divāḥ ... rītīm apām* exactly replicate the problematic compds *vṛṣṭi-dyāvo rīty-āpaḥ* in nearby IX.106.8. See comm. there. Whether there is any direct functional relationship between the compds and the syntagms, the two sequences must be considered together. As for these two acc. phrases in context here, the publ. tr. considers them to be the self-product of soma’s purification (“purify yourself into ...”), but it’s also possible that the \tilde{a} that opens the vs. should be understood here as well, with the meaning “attract through purification” – hence “attract through purification the rain of heaven and the streaming of waters.”

IX.108.11–12: These two vss. are syntactically independent but both concern Soma as bull (*vṛṣabhā-* 11b, *vīṣan-* 12a).

IX.108.11: The accentuation of *divāḥ* poses problems. *Pace* Ge (n. 11b), who considers *divāḥ* a gen. sg. with unusual accent, I take it as acc. pl. (flg. Old, in turn fld. by Re and Lü 202). Given the correctly accented gen./abl. sg. *divāḥ* in the immediately preceding vs. (10c), it is hard to believe that the poet would get the accent wrong, esp. in this exceptionally common form. As Old suggests, \sqrt{duh} takes a double acc. here. On *divāḥ* as acc. pl., see also AiG III.226–27.

IX.108.12: On the “threefold” (*tridhātu*) nature of Soma’s clothing, see comm. ad IX.70.8.

IX.108.13–14: The main cl. in these two vss. consists of the first two words of 13, *sā sunve* “he is pressed,” followed by a series of rel. cl. that fill the rest of 13 (four *yāḥ* clauses, all nominal, with a single predicate *ānetā* and four dependent genitives) and all of 14 (three *yāsya* clause, one *yéna*, with one finite verb for the *yāsya* cl. and one for the *yéna*).

IX.108.14: The nom., acc., voc., and gen. pl. of *marút-* do not fit any standard RVic cadence. It is not surprising then that though instr. *marúdbhiḥ* and dat./abl. *marúdbhyaḥ* are regularly found in cadences, the other forms are almost entirely absent. Pāda b has a nom. pl. in the cadence (made worse by the fact that the word is preceded by a light

syllable, (*yá*)*sya*. VII.32.10 has the same sequence, also in a double *yásya* construction. Most of the few other cadential forms are found in dimeter vs. (e.g., VIII.3.21, VIII.7.30).

IX.108.15–16: No particular signs of cohesion, but see the ring compositional elements connecting vs. 15 to the 1st vs. of the hymn.

IX.108.15: As pointed out in the publ. intro., the beginning of vs. 1, *pávasva mádhumattama, índrāya soma ...*, recurs here, framing the vs., which begins *índrāya soma* and ends with the pāda *pávasva mádhumattama*.

IX.109–14

These last hymns in the maṇḍala are composed in a variety of meters; the first three are assorted; the last three are in pañkti.

IX.109

IX.109.1–3: No particular signs of cohesion, beyond the mention of Soma’s divine recipients in vss. 1–2. Vs. 3 begins with a possibly summary *evā*.

IX.109.4–6: All three vss. contain the impv. *pavasva*. Vss. 5–6 both contain *śukrá-*, also found in 3. And *pīyūṣaḥ* in 6 reprises the same word at the end of 3.

IX.109.6: On Soma’s expansion (*vídharman(i)*) see comm. ad IX.4.9, 64.9.

IX.109.7–9: Unlike the previous *ṛca* with repeated *pavasva*, each vs. of this *ṛca* has a different form or $\sqrt{pū}$: 7 *pávasva*, 8 *pūtaḥ*, 9 *punānáḥ*. The person switches from the 2nd sg. that has prevailed throughout the hymn to 3rd ps. in vs. 8.

IX.109.7: The morphological identity of *mahām* is uncertain: it could be acc. sg. (m.) (see AiG III.251, etc.) or gen. pl. to *máh-* (so Gr) – or, in my opinion, nom. sg. masc. to *mahānt-*. Most (Old, Ge, Re, Lub) take it as an acc., supplying ‘fleece’ or ‘back’, hence “along the great (fleece) of the sheep.” For detailed disc. see Old ad loc. and ad II.24.11. Although this is certainly possible, the filter is not usually so described. A similar problem arises with a gen. pl. interpr., acdg. to which it would modify *ávīnāmi* “of the great sheep.” Since the most likely entity to be called ‘great’ in this vs. is Soma (cf., e.g., *mahān samudráḥ* in vs. 4, I think it likely that the form is nom. sg. In this sandhi position (before vowel) we would expect *mahām̐* (cf., e.g., IX.66.16 *mahām̐ asi*), but I suggest that the *anunāsika* was redactionally changed to *m* because the form was reinterp. as a gen. pl. modifying immed. following *ávīnām*.

IX.109.8: It is not certain how to construe *vísṽāni* with *kṣarat*, and how this is decided will also determine what to supply with the adj. Forms of $\sqrt{kṣar}$ ‘stream’ without preverb generally do not take an obj. or an Inhaltsakk. (though cf. IX.35.3, 61.3, 86.37 for the latter), though it is found with an acc. of goal or extent of space (e.g., IX.33.2, 63.14). In vss. 16, 17 in this hymn, *akṣāḥ* has intrans. value, though in vs. 16 with accusatives of the space traversed. If we take the verb in that sense, *vísṽāni* could pick up *vísṽā ... dhāma* in

vs. 4, with the sense “stream to/across all (domains).” However, the phrase *vísṽāni drávināni* “all goods” might give us pause, and suggest that *kṣárat* here takes an Inhaltsakk., “stream all (goods).” There is no way to decide, and both may be meant. Ge, Re, and KH (123) all opt for the latter.

IX.109.9: In all clear cases *urāṇá-* is passive, ‘being chosen’ (see comm. ad IV.6.3). Gr, Ge, and Re all take it as trans. with *prajām* as obj., but there is no reason why this acc. can’t be taken as an obj. of *kárat*, parallel to *vísṽāni drávaṇāni*.

kárat opening the 2nd hemistich rhymes with *kṣárat* in the same position in vs. 8. Nonetheless they are morphologically divergent, with *kárat* a subjunctive and *kṣárat* an injunc. Despite their parallelism *kṣárat* is unlikely to have modal value anticipating *kárat*; KH (123 and n. 26) convincingly takes *kṣárat* in “general” sense.

IX.109.10–12: Once again, three different forms of the root $\sqrt{pū}$: 10 *pávasva*, 11 *punánti*, 12 *pavítre*, all hemistich-initial. The washing/grooming of Soma as horse is found in vss. 10 and 12. The phrase *krátve dáksāya* (10) is repeated from vs. 2, though in different metrical position.

IX.109.13–15: The adj. *cāru-* ‘dear’ occurs in 13 and 14. The gods as recipients of soma figure in 14–15.

IX.109.14: This vs. presents a double ambiguity. On the one hand *cāru índrasya nāma* can mean either “the dear name of Indra” (as Ge/Re take it) or “the name dear to Indra”; the question is whether the name Soma bears is “Indra,” as the first alternative implies, or “Soma,” with the second. I prefer the second, since constructing a plausible reason why Soma would be called Indra is difficult: Ge’s (n. 14) “er wirkt in Indra and führt so dessen Namen” doesn’t seem sufficient to me.

The second ambiguity is located in the 2nd hemistich and has two parts: what/who is the referent of *yéna* and who is the subj. of *jaghāna*? The Ge/Re interpr. seems to take the referent of *yéna* to be “the name Indra” and the subj. of the verb to be Soma (though neither is explicit about it). I recognize that this would be a pleasing paradox, since Indra is the default agent in this formula. But I wonder if instead Indra is the subj. of his signature verb, and *yéna* refers to soma, with the name equivalent to the substance.

IX.109.16–18: Vss. 16 and 17 contain the sequence *akṣāḥ sahásra(-dhāraḥ / -retaḥ)* in the same position in the vs. All 3 vss. concern Soma’s journey. The various phrases with agentive instr. in 17 and 18 reprise and reshuffle those in 15: *góbhiḥ śrītásya* (15) is echoed by *góbhiḥ śrīṇānaḥ* (17); *nṛbhiḥ sutásya* (15) gets divided and refitted into two phrases, *nṛbhiḥ yemānāḥ* and *ádribhiḥ sutáḥ* (18).

IX.109.18: On *kukṣí-* ‘cheek’ see comm. ad III.36.8, VIII.92.24.

IX.109.19–21: No particular signs of cohesion, though assembled from the usual assortment of soma clichés.

IX.109.19: This vs. repeats *vājī* from 17, *tiráḥ pavítram* from 16, and *sahásradhārah* from 17.

IX.109.21: for *vṛthā pájase* see comm. ad IX.76.1. The phrase here is a truncated version of what is found in IX.76.1 and IX.88.5.

IX.109.22: An extra vs. in a different meter. Old suggests either 12 8 or 8 4 8, HvN either 12 8 or 8 12. Although the opening of the vs. contains 5 syllables and could therefore be a Dvipada Virāj pāda, the following finite verb *tośate* is unaccented and cannot start a new pāda.

IX.110

On the rare meters and their deployment in the hymn see publ. intro. Likewise for its thematic structure and its connections to the previous hymn, IX.109. It is probably not an accident that the six middle verses, in a meter otherwise not found in the RV (see Old, Proleg. 130), are the conceptually challenging ones, flanked by three vs. at the beginning and three at the end that are fairly straightforward. An omphalos structure signalled by meter.

IX.110.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the opening of this hymn is a variant on the opening of the immediately preceding one, IX.109.1, adjusted to fit the meter: IX.109.1 *pári prá dhanva ...*, IX.110.1 *páry ū sú prá dhanva*

The primary reading of the verb *īyase* is, no doubt, ‘you speed’, with the standard interpr.; however it may also have a secondary reading as the passive to $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘implore, beseech’.

IX.110.2: The b pāda consists of two words ending in *-e*, which are construed together by the standard interpr. (e.g., Ge “im grossen Reiche des Wettstreits”). But since *-rājya-* is thematic and a loc. sg., this requires *mahé* to belong to the rare and secondary them. stem *mahá-*, rather than the primary and very well-attested root stem *máh-*. I prefer to separate the two words and take *mahé* as the dat. to that stem. There are four other occurrences of clear dat. *mahé* in IX.108-110 (including our vs. 7), each with a different head noun: *ávase* (108.14), *kṣáyāya* (109.3), *dyumnāya* (109.11), *vājāya* (110.7). Both because that last phrase appears in our hymn and because of the *vājān* in c of our vs., I supply ‘prize’, though other datives are possible.

IX.110.3: I tr. b as if *vidhāre* has verbal rection, with *páyah* as obj.: “in spreading your milk.” In this I follow Ge (“wenn du mit Kunst deine Milch verbreitest”), but I now think that this is wrong. Although *vidhāre* is a hapax and so its usage elsewhere cannot be compared, I doubt that the loc. of such a stem could be so used (and Bartholomae’s datival infinitive, mentioned by Old, seems morphologically very unlikely). Instead I think it is used in the same sense as loc. *vidharman / -ni*, found 7x in this maṇḍala (3 are identical), incl. the immed. preceding hymn (IX.109.6). In all these passages it refers to the spreading or expansion of the soma liquid as it passes across the filter, and metaphorically to other expansions through space. See comm. ad IX.64.9. If *páyah* is not dependent on *vidhāre* it is most likely a 2nd object to *ájījanat* (as Re takes it, though not

in the same way I will suggest). Ge (n. 3b) adduces IX.34.3 *duhánti śákmanā páyaḥ* ‘They milk out its milk with their skill,’ where *páyaḥ* refers to the soma juice milked from the plant, not to the cows’ milk with which it is mixed. I think *páyaḥ* has the same referent here, and the hemistich means “by your skill you have begotten (your) milk as the sun in your expansion.” What this means is that the soma juice (=milk) takes on the look of the sun as it goes across the filter, golden-colored with rays (=rivulets of juice) spread across the fleece.”

The 2nd member of the hapax *gó-jīra-* is universally (Gr, Ge, Re) interpr. as transitive, governing the 1st: e.g., Gr ‘die Kühen zueilend’. But *jīrá-* both independently and as 1st cmpd member (e.g., *jīráśva-* ‘having lively horses’) is never transitive, but simply means ‘lively, nimble’. One occurrence of the independent adj. is also generally taken as transitive: I.48.3 *jīrá ráthānām* with a supposed objective gen., but see comm. ad loc. Since I do not see attributing an otherwise unattested usage to the word in just this cmpd, however convenient, we must find an alternative path to sense, made more difficult by the fact that there are no other X-*jīra-* cmpds and this one is a hapax. The cmpd modifies the somewhat shadowy goddess Puramdhi, who is associated with plenty and esp. with plentiful gifts. Cf., in this maṇḍala, IX.93.4 *rathirāyātām usatī puramdhiḥ ... dāvāne vásūnām* “Let Plenitude come eagerly on her chariot ... for the giving of goods.” In our cmpd I suggest an instr. relationship between the first member and the second: “lively with cows,” capturing both her quickness (as indicated by her “hastening” here and the eager journey in 93.4) and the presumed accompaniment of a profusion of (living) cows as gift. This type of cmpd — NOUN + INTRANS. ADJ. — seems relatively rare and the relationship between the two members is quite variable. See AiG II.1.233–38. It is also possible, as suggested as a last-ditch alternative by Ge (n. 3c), that the cmpd is an inversion of a straightforward bahuvrīhi **jīrá-go-* ‘having lively cows’ (like *jīráśva-* cited above). Though a fem. instr. sg. **jīrá-gavā* should not have been difficult to build, it is noteworthy that there are no instr. sgs. to the ‘cow’ word in the RV (for V.30.7 see comm. ad loc.).

IX.110.4–6: A very challenging tṛca, esp. the last two vss.

IX.110.4: Though the meter changes here, vss. 3 and 4 are knit together by initial *ájījanaḥ*. Here the obj. is left unspecified and presumably re-supplies the obj. of 3.

Re notes the play between *āṁ ṛtasya* and *amṛtasya*, which might suggest that the *anunāsika* sometimes inserted after final vowels at the end of a pāda to prevent coalescence with the following initial vowel is not merely a redactional addition, as Old (Proleg. 470) asserts.

Ge (n. 4b) identifies *amṛtasya cāruṇaḥ* as a reference to the drink of immortality, namely soma. In this I think he is correct; see comm. ad IX.70.2. However, he also wants it to be a type of partitive genitive (“eine Art von Genit. partit.”) dependent on *ájījanaḥ*; it is difficult to imagine what sort of partitive gen. could be construed with ‘beget’. I see no reason why this gen. cannot depend on *dhárman* as *ṛtasya* does (Sāy.’s solution).

IX.110.5: I don’t quite know what to do with *śrávasā*. Ge and Re bleach it into an adverb (rühmlich, glorieusement), which I am reluctant to do, but it also seems unlikely that it was Soma’s fame that enabled him to do this drilling. Perhaps it is shorthand for a

famous *deed*, referring to this very act of drilling, or it simply characterizes Soma without reference to the action at hand. It may also be a sly allusion to a well-known formula: the adj. *ákṣitam* ends the hemistich, and *śrávas ákṣitam* (in sandhi *śrávo ákṣitam*) is of course the most famous Indo-European verbal formula.

I seem to have misdistributed the elements in pāda b. Because of their proximity I construed *janapānam ákṣitam* together (“inexhaustible drink for men”), but *ákṣitam* most likely goes with *útsam* (as well as notionally with *śrávasā*; see above), because “inexhaustible wellspring” is itself a minor formula: see I.64.6 and VIII.7.16 (both polarized at beginning and end of pāda as here and both obj. of \sqrt{duh} ‘milk’, with Maruts as subj.) as well as III.26.9 *útsam ákṣīyamāṇam* “a wellspring never becoming exhausted.” In the first two quoted passages the phrase must refer to the sky or some feature in it, which the Maruts milk for rain (the third passage characterizes Agni in a somewhat opaque metaphor).

Thus the hemistich seems to compare Soma’s drilling towards the drink for men (which also must be soma) with drilling for (rain)water in the sky. Or so I would take it; Ge, Re, and Lü (384) do not separate pāda b into simile and frame, as I do, but take the whole phrase together with *ná* marking it as some sort of approximative – e.g., Ge: “gleichsam einen unversieglischen Born ..., der von Menschen getrunken wird.” I prefer to distinguish two separate entities being compared, and I suggest that the “drink for men” (*janapānam*) is the earthly ritual soma, while the inexhaustible wellspring contains the heavenly soma. How would Soma be drilling for the ritual soma? what kind of action does this involve? I suggest tentatively that it might refer to the pressing of the juice out of the plant.

But there is another factor to take into consideration: the lexeme *abhí√ṭrd*. In all clear cases (VIII.77.5 is impenetrable) the object of this verb is the Vala cave or the contents thereof, cows or “prizes” (referring to cows). There are a number of such passages: II.24.4 (where in another part of the vs. the Vala cave is referred to as an *útsa*-), III.31.5, VI.17.1–3 (on vs. 1 see comm. ad loc.), VIII.103.5 (metaphorically of Agni), X.74.4. If we plug this stable association into our passage, we need to ask another question: what could stand for the cave full of cows here? And the obvious answer is the container that holds the milk mixture.

What this adds up to is a set of overlapping and partly contradictory images: the ritual soma drink being drilled out of the plant, but also the inexhaustible wellspring standing for not only heaven which contains the heavenly soma, but also the metaphorical Vala cave containing the milk mixture (remember that *útsa*- is used of the Vala cave in II.24.4) – both of which could be drilled out for their respective contents. I would suggest that this welter of images is responsible for the oddly tentative and indefinite presentation of the action, first with the *āmreḍita*-ed preverb *abhy-ābhi*, which I render as “ever closer” (which I now think is not so good) and Ge as “immer wieder” (Re with “toujours” and Lü not at all). I now think it is object-distributive, as it were: there are several targets of the drilling. I do not quite know how to convey this in English. This is reinforced by the indefinitizing *kām cid* characterizing the *útsa*-: “some kind of wellspring, some wellspring or other,” which would be appropriate if *útsa*- in the simile is meant to call to mind both the heavenly holder of the heavenly soma and the Vala cave full of cows.

I would now emend the publ. tr. to “Because you with your reknown have drilled through to the drink for men as if through now to this inexhaustible wellspring [=the

container of heavenly soma], now that one [=the container of milk compared to the Vala cave].” An unfortunately awkward unpacking of a very dense couple of pādas.

And this is only the first hemistich; the final pāda poses its own difficulties, consisting of another condensed simile cum frame.

Both Ge and Re take the whole pāda as the simile, comparing Soma to an archer. Both have to supply a considerable amount of material, including an object for *bhāramāṇaḥ* and a verb and another object to construe with *śāryābhiḥ*; cf., e.g., Re’s “(un guerrier) tenant (l’arc) en ses deux mains (perce la cible) avec les flèches.” His “perce” and, more clearly, Ge’s supplied “das Ziel durchbohrt” pick up *abhī tatārditha* in pāda a, but ‘drill through to’ is an odd action to perform on a target, and as I just said, a lot has to be supplied. (Kü’s interpr. [216] supplies less but also connects less with the rest of the vs.: “wie einer, der mit Pfeilen etwas (=den Bogen) in seinen Händen trägt.”) My interpr. of the pāda depends on a double reading of *bhāramāṇaḥ*, as both passive (in the frame) and self-beneficial transitive (in the simile). I also read *gābhastyoḥ* in both simile and frame. Some material has to be supplied, but less than in the Ge/Re interpr., and it also has the merit of connecting the arrows and the hands: Old points to X.61.3 *śāryābhiḥ ... gābhastau* “with arrows in his hand” as a potential clue to our passage. To deal with the frame first: this participle is found in passive usage, also with soma as subj., in I.135.3, 6 *adhvaryūbhir bhāramāṇā ayaṃsata ... śukrāḥ* “the gleaming (soma drinks), being carried, have been guided by the Adhvaryus” (or “being carried by the Adhvaryus, have been guided ...”). The agents there are the priests, and here I would take the *gābhastyoḥ* in the frame as referring to the priest’s hands that bring the soma forward. In the simile I take med. *bhāramāṇaḥ* as self-beneficial and supply ‘booty’ (or some other desirable material benefit) as the object. Such a usage is found in IX.79.2, containing one of the few medial forms of √*bhṛ* in IX: *vayāṃ dhānāni viśvādā bharemahi* “May we always bear away the stakes.” Here the material borne away was clearly won by the arrows in the winner’s hands. I have recast the simile as passive in English, but more literally the tr. would read “while being carried in the (priest’s) hands, as (someone) with arrows in his hands carries away (booty).” If I am correct, this is an implicit example of my “case disharmony in similes,” though neither the passive subject nor the transitive direct object is actually expressed.

IX.110.6: This vs. seems to follow from vs. 5; it begins *ād* ‘just after that, because of that’, which signals temporal or logical nexus – though what that nexus is remains unclear to me. The indefinite *ke cid* of pāda a also echoes the *kām cid* of 5b, but, again, the reasons why escape me. The vs. isn’t as desperately difficult as 5 but it has more than its share of problems.

The part. in pāda a, *pāśyamānasah*, is one of the few medial forms to this extremely well-attested pres. stem. The same phrase *pāśyamānāsa āpyam* is found in VII.83.1. In both passages it describes the subject(s) as “seeing” (that is, contemplating?) the friendship between themselves and another being or beings, in this case Soma. So much is reasonably clear. Also reasonably clear is what action they took or have taken: they (have) roared to him (*īm ... abhy ānūṣata*).

Who the subjects are is harder to determine and in part depends on the grammatical identification of the rt. noun compd *vasurūcaḥ*. This is ordinarily taken as a nom. pl. and either a qualifier of the other nom. pl. *divyāḥ* or as implicitly conjoined with

divyāḥ as a joint subject. For the former, cf. Re’s “certains (êtres) célestes, brillants (de l’éclat des) Vasu”; for the latter, e.g., Scar’s (457) “gewisse Leute, deren Pracht [für uns] Gut bedeutet [und auch] Himmlische (?)”

As for *vasurúcaḥ*, I prefer to take it as gen. sg., dependent on *āpyam* and referring to Soma (a possibility mentioned by Scar). The next hymn (IX.111) has several forms of \sqrt{ruc} referring to Soma: instr. sg. of the rt. noun *rucā* (IX.111.1a) and the pres. stem forms *rocate* (1d), *rócamānaḥ* (2g), and in IX.111.2a it is said of Soma *vido vāsu* “you found that good (thing).” Moreover, most of the forms of the uncmpd. rt. noun *rūc-*, found here as 2nd member of our hapax cmpd., appear in IX (10 out of 13), again in connection with Soma. In other words, the default association of *-rūc-* would be with Soma, not some indefinite set of beings. (For various interpr. of the sense of this cmpd. see esp. Scar 457–58; my ‘radiant with goods’ is hardly the only one, and many involve a PN in one way or another.)

If we accept my interpr. of the grammatical identity of the cmpd., this leaves us with *ké cid ... divyāḥ* “some heavenly ones, these heavenly ones and those ones,” as the subj. of *abhy ànūṣata*. Because of the close connections between vss. 5 and 6, it would be desirable to interpr. the indefinitizers in both vss. in the same way. In vs. 5, as I argued, *kām cid* signals that there’s more than one referent for *útsam*. I think we should pursue the same interpretive strategy here. In other words, we should expect that *divyāḥ* should have several different referents appropriate to the context. Unfortunately *divyāḥ* and *abhy ànūṣata* point in different directions: the verb is generally used of cows, or entities configured as cows – primarily hymns, priestly voices, and the like. But these would not generally be qualified as ‘heavenly’ – though see IX.86.4, where I supply “hymns” with *divyāḥ*. The adj. also qualifies ‘drops’ on occasion (IX.86.1) and soma itself, so perhaps the heavenly Soma here. And another well-established referent is ‘waters’ (VII.49.2, 103.2; cf. X.98.5), “heavenly waters” being rain. These are all possible, but not particularly compelling, referents here, esp. because they would have to be contemplating friendship with Soma as well as roaring to him. What *divyā-* does not generally seem to qualify is heavenly beings in the form of gods (except possibly in contrast to *pārthivāḥ* - ‘earthly’ [=humans?]), which seems to be the default interpr. of the standard tr. (including mine); my remark in the publ. intro. about “the gods’ yearning for soma” in vs. 6 is therefore probably incorrect. I’ve reached an impasse. Although I think I’m asking the right questions, they don’t produce satisfactory answers.

My interpr. of the final pāda differs from the standard, which takes *devāḥ savitā* as solely constituting the simile: “he uncovers a desirable thing like god Savitar.” But this seems pretty flat. Moreover, the simile particle *ná* is to the left of both parts of the putative simile (... *ná devāḥ savitā*). A better constructed simile would include the portion to the left of *ná*, namely *vāram*. And I think it does: in my view *vāram* is a perfect pun; the word means both fleece (filter) and desirable object. In the frame, the first reading is the filter: Soma uncovers the fleece – that is, the juice passes beyond it; “desirable thing” is the reading in the simile, and in fact a 2nd reading in the frame. The tr. should be slightly emended to “He uncovers the fleece (/desirable thing) as the god Savitar uncovers a desirable thing.”

IX.110.7–9: Considerably clearer than the previous trca.

IX.110.7: Ge and Re take *naḥ* as the obj. of *codaya* in c, but I think rather *dhíyam* from b, with *naḥ* genitive. Cf. III.62.10 *dhíyo yó naḥ pracodáyāt*, VI.47.10 *codáya dhíyam*.

IX.110.8: The phrase *yád ukthyàm* in pāda a appears to be an izafe-like embedded attribute of the preceding accusative phrase, object of the verb *nír adhuḥṣata* in b. See my 2022 “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto Izafe” (Fs. Mark Hale).

IX.110.9: On *niṣṭhā-* see comm. ad III.31.10.

IX.110.10–12: This very straightforward final ṛca concerning the ritual preparation of soma harps on the root $\sqrt{pū}$, with *punānāḥ* 10a, *pāvamānaḥ* 10b, *punānāḥ* 11a, *pavate* 11b, and *pavasva* 12a.

IX.110.11: Note the alliteration in c: *vājasánir varivovíd vayodhāḥ*. The first word *vājasániḥ* forms a ring with *vājasātaye* in vs. 1a.

IX.110.12: The c pāda also shows alliteration: *s^uvāyudhāḥ sāsahvān soma śátrun*.

IX.111

On the characteristics of Atyaṣṭi meter see comm. ad I.127–39, the only series of Atyaṣṭi hymns in the RV, which are attributed to our poet’s father Paruchepa.

IX.111.1: To achieve 8 syllables in pāda c we need to read *sūraḥ* as trisyllabic, as Old points out – a fairly rare scansion for this word.

On “all forms” see comm. ad IX.64.8.

Ge (n. 1fg) suggests that the “versifiers with their seven mouths” refers to the Aṅgirasas, since the same word *saptāsya-* is used of Bṛhaspati with ref. to the Aṅgirasas in IV.50.4 and with direct ref. to Aṅgira in IV.51.4. This is quite plausible, given that the next vs. concerns the Vala myth – but the phrase must simultaneously apply to the current ritualists.

IX.111.2: As indicated in the publ. intro., at least the 1st part of this vs. touches on the Vala myth (as did 1g), but with some twists. In pāda a “that good thing of the Paṇis” (*tyát paṇīnām ... vāsu*) must be the herd of cows concealed in the Vala cave. The only other ref. to the Paṇis in IX is IX.22.7 ... *paṇībhya ā vāsu gavyāni dhārayaḥ* “You secured from the Paṇis the good things of cattle,” which specifies the *vāsu* (there pl.) as bovine.

As indicated in the publ. intro., problems arise in pāda b, with the verb *marjayasi*. The morphology of this form is absolutely clear, as is the normal sense of this well-attested *-āya-*formation: it is transitive and active (save for a fair number of mechanical *-anta* replacements, which are also transitive). The clarity of its form collides with the expected sense: if Soma is the subject (and who else would it be?), Soma is normally the object of \sqrt{mrj} (or subj. of passive forms). We do not expect Soma to be the groomer, not the groomee (as it were). It is somewhat distressing to observe fine RVic scholars override the morphology in order to obtain their desired sense. Re simply renders it as reflexive (“tu te nettoies”) without comment; even the usually severe Old, after some

disc. of previous suggestions, simply declares that here (as, acdg. to him, often) the active “im ungefähren Sinn des Mediums steht.” Ge, however, holds the line (see his n. 2b rejecting Old’s suggestion), and tr. it as an absolute, without obj. (“mit den Müttern machst du im eigenen Haus sauber”), suggesting that it depicts a child cleaning along with its mother -- producing the somewhat comic image of Soma as an especially tidy child. He then takes back his admirably austere approach to the morphology by remarking “Natürlich ist die saubere Herstellung des Soma gemeint ...” I think it must be meant as a real transitive, and the object to supply lies ready to hand: the *vásu* (so also Gr under $\sqrt{mj} + sām$ 4), i.e., the cattle, of the Paṇis, which can also stand for the milk to be mixed with the soma juice. Here Soma acts as agent in the preparation of this milk “in his own house,” that is, the ritual ground. He performs the grooming along with the mothers (b), immediately specified (c) as “the insights of truth” (*ṛtásya dhītíbhīḥ*), the hymns accompanying the ritual.

After this preparation (/grooming) of the milk, the soma is mixed with it and acquires vitality thereby (fg). On the possible sense of *tridhātu-* see comm. ad IX.70.8. It may refer to three ingredients but exactly which ones aren’t clear; in the publ. tr. I suggest that they are identified with the three forms of ritual speech, as casually suggested by Re, although I am not sure I stand behind that view now.

As for pāda d, both Ge and Re take *sāma* as part of the frame, not the simile, which for them consists only of *parāvato ná* (e.g., “Wie aus der Ferne (kommt) dieser Gesang”). Ge (n. 2d) suggests it’s the sound of the trickling soma. By contrast I take *sāma* as part of the simile and suggest that it could refer to the song with which Brhaspati/Indra and the Aṅgirasas opened the Vala cave. The *sāman-* is not a prominent feature of the Soma maṇḍala, occurring only once elsewhere (IX.96.22).

I take *yātra* as standing for *yásmin*, as the loc. regularly found with \sqrt{ran} , so it need not refer to a place or time. Both for the loc. with \sqrt{ran} and for the *sāman-* as locus of pleasure, cf. I.147.1 *ṛtásya sāman raṇáyanta devāḥ* “the gods delight in the melody of truth.”

IX.110.3: There appears to be a pun on *raśmíbhīḥ* in b; the word means both ‘reins’ and (metaphorically) ‘rays’, and in fact the extended meaning is more common in the RV than the original literal one. Here both Ge and Re render only the sun’s rays sense (e.g., “avec les rayons (solaires)”), and this sense is certainly there, prompted by Soma’s eastern journey in pāda a, as well as the comparison to the sun in 1c. Cf., with the same verb, V.37.1 *sám bhānúnā yatate sūryasya* “He aligns himself with the radiance of the sun.” But the repeated phrase *darśató ráthah* (b, c) “chariot lovely to see” suggests that the ‘rein’ sense is also here. But the distinction is somewhat muddled in practice, since the “heavenly chariot” of c is most likely the sun, with which Soma is being identified.

Pāda f contains a non-overt Vāyav Indraś ca construction: *vájraś ca yád bhávathah* “when (you) and the mace become ...” The 2nd du. verb *bhávathah* presupposes a 2nd ps. Soma (expect voc. *soma*), conjoined with the nom. *vájrah* by *ca*.

IX.112–114

On these three pañkti hymns that close the maṇḍala, see Old (Proleg 202): “Diese Pañkti-lieder werden durch das Versagen der Anordnung, durch ihren von den übrigen Pavamānaliedern sich weit entfernenden Inhalt und durch die Characteristica der Sprache

und des Metrums als Zusätze erwiesen.” Among other things, all share the refrain *indrāyendo pári srava* “O drop, flow around for Indra” as the fifth pāda of every verse.

IX.112

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn has no apparent connection with soma except for the refrain.

IX.112.1: The first word of the vs., the hapax *nānānām*, is an adjectival derivative built to the adv. *nānā* ‘various’, used as an adverb (though for simplicity I have tr. as if an adj.). As Thieme suggests (Unters. 54), it’s a rhyme form to *samānā*- ‘same’, and *nānā* and *samānā*- appear together contrastively elsewhere (cf. II.12.8, III.54.6 adduced by Thieme). In our passage it also provides a polarized mirror-image to the word ending the hemistich: #*nānānām* ... *jānānām*# with reversed vowel quantities (*ā ā a* ... *a ā ā*) but matching consonantal structure (save for the initial), though the necessary distraction of the last syllable of *jānānām* disturbs the pattern somewhat.

Pāda c provides a nice example of chiasmus, with the nom. agents at each end and the acc. goals, with similar shape, in the middle: *tākṣā riṣṭām rutām bhiṣák*.

IX.112.2: On the vs. see esp. Old’s comm. It is couched somewhat as a riddle, though the solution is included in the vs.

IX.112.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. contains informal nursery words for father (*tatā*-) and mother (*nanā*-). The latter is not found elsewhere in the RV or indeed elsewhere in Skt. (though similar forms are well established in other IA lgs and in Iranian), while the former is found twice in the Apālā hymn (VIII.91.5–6) and is widespread later (also in the vṛddhi voc. *tāta*). Of course *nanā* plays off the immediately following *nānā(-dhiyah)* beginning pāda c, as well as *nānānām* opening the hymn.

For *upala-prakṣīṇī* I’m afraid in the publ. tr. I gave in to my baser inclination towards an alliterative colloquialism: “pushing a pestle.” In fact, *upala* is of course not a pestle, but the upper millstone of a hand mill, and the standard tr. are more accurate at least for the first member: Ge “... füllt den Mahlstein auf”; Re “... alimente la meule”; Doniger (235) “a miller with grinding stones.” The 2nd member, *prakṣīṇī*, is obscure. The older association with $\sqrt{pṛc}$ ‘mix’ (see Gr, Old’s citation of Pischel, and AiG I Nachtr. 118) seems unlikely on both semantic and morphological grounds. Similarly the connection (see AiG II.2.346, citing but rejecting Re) with *upapraṣṣé* ‘in copulation’ in V.47.6, which appears to be an *s*-enlarged form of $\sqrt{pṛc}$ and again not a good semantic fit. Thieme’s etym. (cited in EWA I.220 [s.v. *ūpara*-] and II.185–86 [s.v. *práṣṭi*-]) connecting it with a PIE **plenk-* ‘dance’, with verb forms only in Balto-Slavic (these forms differently explained in LIV), is too gossamer to consider. I do not have a good alternative, but suggest a possible derivation from $\sqrt{kaṣ}$ ‘scratch, scrape’, a reasonable characterization of the action of manipulating the upper stone on a handmill (see YouTube). Whatever its ultimate source (see EWA s.v.), verb forms to $\sqrt{kaṣ}$ begin to appear in the AV and it is also widespread in MIA and NIA (see Turner nos. 2970–73, 2979), often associated with testing on a touchstone (perhaps requiring motions similar to manipulating a handmill). Though it does not seem to show up with *prá*, this combination would not seem surprising. We probably need to assume a zero-grade thematic noun **kṣ-*

ā- ‘scraping’ (vel sim.) from which the *-īn-* stem was derived. All of this is very tenuous, but at least provides another possible source to evaluate. In any case I would now tr. this pāda as “mama scrapes away with a millstone.”

IX.112.4: In TS (etc.) *úpa mantrayate* means ‘summon, invite near’, but also seems to have the sense of persuading by tricky, hence ‘beguile, seduce’. I base my interpr. of *hasanā-* on the frequent transitive-causative value of the *-ana-* suffix; here something that provokes laughter, that is, a joke. Ge/Re simply laughter, Old specifically the laughter of a woman.

IX.113

On the structure and thematics of the hymn see publ. intro.

IX.113.1: Pāda a lacks a syllable – no obvious fix. Distraction to **śar’yaṇāvati* would produce three light syllables at the beginning of the pāda, which would be highly unusual, and the stem is not otherwise found distracted. On the word see comm. ad VIII.6.39.

IX.113.2: Although in the idiom *ā pavasva* the preverb *ā* generally governs an acc., with the meaning “bring X through your purification,” here it seems identical in usage to the simplex.

On *ārjīkā-* see comm. ad VIII.7.29. The appearance of *śaryaṇāvant-* (vs. 1) and *ārjīkā-* in two successive vss. recalls their appearance in the same vs. in VIII.7.29 (see also *śaryaṇāvant-* in the preceding hymn VIII.6.39).

Note the appearance of both *ṛtá-* and *satyá-* in the phrase *ṛtavākéna satyéna*. Contrary to Ge/Re, who take them as two parallel entities, I construe them as a single NP with *satyá-* as adj. The interpr. of Ge and Re may be supported by vs. 4, where *ṛtá-*, *satyá-*, and *śraddhā-* are treated separately and in series, following the order in which they are found here. I therefore propose an alternative possible tr. here “With speech of truth, with what is real, with trust ...”

IX.113.3: The buffalo (*mahiṣá-*) that is the object of all 4 clauses should be the rain, perhaps configured as the heavenly soma. It is not clear to me what the Gandharvas (c) have to do with the production of rain and its transformation into soma sap.

Pāda b has 9 syllables. Old half-heartedly suggests reading *duhitā* with slurring (Verschließung) of the 1st two syllables, but then remarks that the author of this hymn is “kein exakter metrischer Techniker.” On the other hand, since most MIA forms of ‘daughter’ are disyllabic (Pāli *dhītā- / -tar-*; Gāndhārī *dhida*, Pkt. *dhū(d)ā, dhī(d)ā*, etc.) and disyllabic readings are found in the AV and in several gāthās in the AB (etc.) (see AiG I Nachtr. 37 and EWA s.v. *duhitár-*), a disyllabic reading in this popular hymn seems perfectly likely.

IX.113.4: As noted ad vs. 2, the first three pādas of this vs. pick up the series *ṛta(-vākena) satyéna śraddháyā* and devote a pāda to each – each one as obj. of *vádan* ‘speaking’ and the first two also incorporated into bahuv. vocatives: *ṛta-dyumna, satya-karman*.

IX.113.5: This vs. strikes me as very nearly doggerel. Although RVic poets enjoy indulging in etymological figures – and are skilled at deploying them – those in pādas b and c seem to display neither imagination nor skill: b *sám sravanti saṃsravāḥ* (the pāda missing a syllable, to make it worse), c ... *rasīno rāsāḥ*. Moreover, after the solemn use of *satyá-* ‘reality, what is real’ in vss. 2 and 4, the cmpd *satyámugra-* in pāda a seems to have downgraded the word to an adverb (so AiG II.1.67, 237) in a word with the banal sense ‘really strong’ (AiG II.1.37 ‘wahrhaft kräftig’, 237 ‘wahrhaft gewaltig’; sim. Ge/Re) and that awkwardly uses the neut. adverbial acc. as first member (so AiG II.1.67), to provide a makeshift hiatus-breaker. And there is also an apparent lapse in grammatical agreement, with sg. *punānāḥ* in d modifying the plural subjects of bc, even though pl. *punānā(h)* would have been metrically identical. Ge and Re rescue the poet from this lapse in different ways: Ge construes d with the refrain (as he does in other vss: 2, 4, 6), but given that the refrain serves not only for this hymn but for the previous and following hymns and is generally independent syntactically, this seems unlikely. Re implicitly takes the subj. of d from the genitive phrases of pādas a and c.

In c *rasīnaḥ* could be either gen. sg. or nom. pl., and either would fit. Gr and the standard tr. (including mine) take it as gen. sg., presumably because the other two occurrences of *rasīnaḥ* (VIII.1.26, 3.1) are. A gen. also makes the phrase less pleonastic: “the juices of the juicy one” is marginally better than “the juicy juices.”

IX.113.6–7: On the relationship between these vss. and their function in the hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.113.6: Despite the hemistich boundary and the tr. of Ge/Re, I take *grāvṇā* in c with *vádan*, immediately preceding it in b, because the *grāvan-* regularly “speaks” elsewhere (cf. VIII.34.2, X.36.4 *grāvā vádan*, V.37.2 *grāvāṇaḥ ... vādanti*). Ge and Re need to supply material in order to construe it with pāda c.

IX.113.8–11: In addition to the fifth pāda refrain found throughout the hymn (as well as IX.112 and 114), these four vss. add a refrain in the fourth pāda: *tátra mām amṛtam kṛdhi* “there make me immortal,” each time serving as the main clause for a set of *yátra* clauses.

I.113.8: The standard view of *avaróadhanam* is that it defines a closed or fortified place (Ge “der verschlossene Ort des Himmels”; Re “le rempart du ciel”; Doniger [133] “where heaven is enclosed”) – deriving *ródhana-* from \sqrt{rudh} ‘confine, hem in’. But I take it instead to the other \sqrt{rudh} (*/ruh*) ‘grow’ and interpr. it as ‘means of ascent’, exactly like *róhanaṃ diváḥ* in I.52.9 (q.v.). So my vision of heaven is a more welcoming place, that extends a ladder down for us to make the ascent.

IX.113.10: Re renders *kāmā nikāmās ca* as “les désirs (avoués) et les désirs-secrets”; although *ni-* might suggest something hidden or deposited in secret, but the related bahuvr. *nikāma-* (8x) seems just to mean ‘desirous’ without any special nuance.

The phrase *bradhnāsya viṣṭāpam* is found also in VIII.69.7, where I take it to refer to the surface of the soma (see comm. ad loc.), but *bradhná-* ‘coppery colored’ can also refer to the sun (see comm. ad VII.44.3, IX.97.52) and in fact to both simulataneously,

with soma identified with the sun. What the phrase is trying to convey here is totally unclear to me.

As Old and Ge (n. 10c) point out (see also Doniger (134 and n. 5), *svadhā-* and the root $\sqrt{tṛp}$ ‘satisfy’ are associated with offerings to the Pitars (dead ancestors).

IX.114

IX.114.1: Acdg to Ge, it is Soma’s *mānas* that the poet will satisfy, while Re takes the *mānas* as the poet’s. Re is no doubt correct; cf. VIII.61.9 *avīpró vā yád ávidhad, vípro vendra te vácaḥ* “If without inspiration or if inspired, someone has dedicated his speech to you, Indra ...”

IX.114.2: The Anukr. ascribes this hymn to Kaśyapa Mārica, along with the previous one (IX.113), along with several others in IX and a few in other maṇḍalas.