

## Maṇḍala X

### X.1-7

The first seven hymns of X are dedicated to Agni and attributed to Trita Āptya, a mythological figure regularly mentioned in the RV (on whom see, e.g., Macd., Ved.Myth. 67–69), with an Avestan counterpart Ōrita, who is closely associated with Āθβiia, a variant of our Āptya. For further disc. see publ. intro. to X.8, which really belongs to this series, despite being assigned to a different poet. All seven hymns are in Triṣṭubh and contain seven vss.

### X.1 Agni

X.1.1: The well-attested 3<sup>rd</sup> (also 2<sup>nd</sup>) sg. *aprāḥ* is generally taken (correctly in my view) as belonging to an *s*-aor. (so, e.g., Wh Root, and see disc. by Narten 173). Re, however, suggests that it might be a root aor. form with the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. *-s* borrowed from the precativē – an explanation that seems too contorted for whatever advantage the analysis might bring.

The referent of the “seats” (*sādmāni*) is disputed; see Ge’s n. 1d. It seems likely to have multiple referents: the dwelling places of gods and men (so Ge) in a cosmic sense, but the ritual hearths in a more localized sense.

X.1.2: As noted in the publ. intro., nom. sg. *jātāḥ* is the signature word of this hymn, occurring in the 1st 3 vss. and in vs. 6. In all but vs. 2 Ge and Re render it as a adjunct qualifier of Agni, not as a clause predicate, but here they both predicate it (“Du bist ... geboren”; “Tu es né ...”). I prefer to interpr. the four occurrences identically: as a temporal designation “just born / at his/your birth.”

Ge (n. 2d) takes the “mothers” of d to be the kindling sticks, but these should ordinarily be dual (though not always: see Re’s collection of exceptions). Re’s plants is probably correct: dispersed among the plants (2b) he emerges from them (2d).

The phrase ... *pāri tāmāmsy aktūn#* reminds us teasingly of VI.4.6 ... *pāri tāmāmsy aktāḥ* “anointed (he leads us) around the dark shades” (adduced by Ge [n. 2c]), with phonologically similar but etymologically and semantically separate final terms. In the latter passage there is a verb (*nayat*), but here I think we need to supply a minimal verb of motion.

X.1.3: Agni is here identified with Viṣṇu—the point of comparison being Viṣṇu’s three strides that take him to highest heaven. In a Viṣṇu context *pādam* ‘step’ is the obvious word to supply with *pāramam*: cf. I.22.20, 21 *viṣṇoḥ (...)* *paramām pādam* (also I.154.6), though *pāthaḥ* ‘pen, fold’ is also possible (III.55.10 *viṣṇuḥ ... paramām pāti pāthaḥ*). There is no such stable lexical association with *trītya-*, though it must refer to Viṣṇu’s third step or the place where that step reached in heaven. With Re I supply ‘seat’, which can be adapted from *sādmāni* in 1d. In any case I suggest that the three strides of Viṣṇu are implicitly compared here to the three fire-hearths of Agni; his furthest is the place of the offering fire (later Āhavanīya), which is the furthest point of the ritual journey of Agni.

Although in an Agni context, instr. *āsā* would lead us to expect a statement about Agni’s eating the oblations with his mouth – or the gods eating the oblations by Agni’s mouth (see, e.g., II.1.14 *āsā devā havír adanty āhutam*), the poet has tricked us, at least acdg. to my interpr. of the passage. Instead this is the (collective) mouth of the poets, who make their poetry into milk for the infant Agni.

X.1.4: The two actions of ab and c are deliberately framed as reciprocal: ... *tvā ... prāti caranti* “they proceed towards you” and *tā īm práty eṣi* “you go towards them.” This suggests that they are happening at the same time, and I therefore am not convinced by Ge’s explicit (n. 4c) and Re’s implicit interpr. that “having other forms” (*anyárūpāḥ*) refers to the vegetation that feeds him in ab growing up again fresh and green and affording Agni a new home. Rather I think that these “other forms” are those that the kindling wood acquires as it burns. See *anyád várpaḥ* in I.140.7 and comm. thereon.

Note that *caranti* in 4b is a scrambling of *arcanti* in 3d in the same metrical position.

In c *īm* doubles *tāḥ*—probably to identify *tāḥ* as acc. pl., since the fem. pl. in the 1st hemistich to which it refers was nom. and the form is ambiguous.

X.1.5: The *āmreḍitas yajñásya-yajñasya* (b) and *devásya-devasya* (c) make it impossible to construct a pāda with a properly situated caesura; see Old.

This vs. is couched entirely in the acc. Any verb of praising or reverent approach could be supplied; the *abhy ārcanti* of 3d is a good candidate. Note that there was no expressed object to that verb there, so that this vs. can serve as deferred obj.

The 2nd hemistich contrasts Agni’s role among the gods (c) and humans (d) by virtue of contrasting qualities he possesses; the *tú* connecting the two phrases therefore seems adversative (see Ge’s “aber”), as discussed in detail by Klein (RVic *tú* and *sú*, 1982: 6).

X.1.6: Klein (DGRV II.112) takes *ádha* as connecting vss. 5 and 6, as “a weak discourse continuative ‘(and) so’,” introducing the imperative clause in 6. This seems unlikely because of the odd mid-pāda position of *ádha*—and because Klein has to *supply* the impv. for 6ab: “(let) that one, Agni, (come hither).” I don’t actually know what to do with *ádha*, but an interpr. like Re’s “de vêtements (qui sont autant de) parures” that takes account of the position seems preferable. I might suggest “donning (now) garments, now ornaments.”

The standard tr. (Ge, Re, Klein cited above) take ab as a separate clause in the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps., each tr. supplying a different verb. Then in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich they switch to the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. impv. This is not necessary, and in fact I think the poet is tricking us again: the initial *sá* invites the audience to expect a 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. clause, but of course it is also regularly found with 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. impvs., as I demonstrated at length long ago. Only when we get to the final pāda and the *si*-impv. *yakṣi* do we realize that the latter syntactic situation obtains. Ge (n. 6ab) argues that the Kasuswechsel between nom. *agníḥ* (b) and voc. *rājan* (d) requires assuming an elliptical clause in ab, but I don’t consider this a valid argument: clauses with 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. reference regularly have nominatives referring to the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. subject, even, I think, their own names (though I don’t have a parallel ready to hand).

X.1.7: Ge (n. 7ab) argues persuasively that *ā ... tatántha* has a double sense here: in the frame it has the intrans. sense ‘stretch through/across’ with an acc. extent-of-space (*dyāvāpṛthivī*), while in the simile it is transitive, referring to the propagation of the parents (*mātárā*) through their offspring.

## X.2 Agni

X.2.1: The phrase *devāṃ usatāḥ* in pāda a reprises *usatāḥ ... devān* in the last hemistich of the previous hymn, X.1.7.

On *vidvān* with acc., see Re’s n.; as he points out, this pf. part. is generally used absolutely (as it is in 3c, 4c), but does occur with the acc., less often with the gen., in contrast to the finite forms of the pf.

Re separates c from d and supplies the impv. phrase “sacrifie aux dieux” (from *devān ... yaja* in ab) with *tébhiḥ*. Although the instr. fits a bit awkwardly with the d pāda, I don’t see the necessity for Re’s solution.

X.2.2: In three of its four occurrences *mandhātār-* is the name of a (legendary) poet or other ritualist (I.112.13, VIII.39.8, 40.12), but here it seems to have full lexical value as the designation of a ritual function. As disc. in the publ. intro., the elements from which this agent-noun cmpd is made, *mán(a)s + √ dhā* are the same as those in the name of the supreme god in Avestan, Ahura *Mazdā* “Lord *Wisdom*,” with its exact Vedic cognate *medhā* ‘wisdom’ (see here also Scar 257). What priest and/or god this figure might represent has elicited various suggestions; see Old, Ge (n. 2b), Re. It is also possible that it simply qualifies *draviṇodāḥ*; see Old, Ge (n. 2b). I will not add to the speculations.

The “wealth giver” (*draviṇodās*) has a prominent, if vaguely defined, role in the Ṛtugrāhas, where he is the recipient of 4 of the 12 cups (cups 7–10), associated with the priests Hotar, Potar, Neṣtar, and, later, Achāvāka respectively. See pub. intro. to I.15 and I.15.7–10, II.37.1–4. As indicated in the publ. intro. to I.15, he seems to have been added to the rota in order to bring the number of cups to 12.

I take *svāhā* as adverbial, rather than as a 2nd obj. to *kṛṇāvāmā* as Re does. A similar usage is found in the first vs. of the Ṛtugraha hymn II.36.1; see also I.13.12.

The verb in c, *kṛṇāvāmā* is accented because the cl. in pāda c is implicitly subordinated to d.

X.2.3: The publ. tr. renders the acc. inf. *právoḍhum* as a purpose inf. with pāda a, with *yác chaknāvāma* a rel. cl. dependent on the *tád* that follows it (for reference, the pāda reads *yác chaknāvāma tád ánu právoḍhum*). Sim. Ge and Re. But this is syntactically problematic for two reasons: 1) purpose infinitives are generally in the dat.; in fact *vólhave* is found 9x in that usage (while *právoḍhum* is found only here); 2) by this reading *yác chaknāvāma* is embedded in the matrix clause. These two issues disappear if we construe the inf. with *śaknāvāma*: *√ śak* regularly takes an acc. infinitive. I therefore would emend the tr. to “we have come along the paths of the gods, so that we will be able to convey (the oblation) along it.” I supply ‘oblation’ because *havyá-* is several times the obj. of the dat. inf. *vólhave* (I.45.6 = III.29.4, IV.9.6, V.14.3); in our passage *hávīṃṣi* in 2c is available to serve as obj. Thus *yád* and *tád* are not coreferential pronouns but have different functions, with *yád* a subordinating conjunction introducing a purpose cl. (for *yád* introducing purpose clauses with subjunctive, see Hettrich, Hypotaxe 386–93). A couple of minor issues to clear up. First, despite my emended tr. “along it,” *tád* cannot pick up *pánthām* directly, because of difference of gender. I take it, rather loosely, as a reversion to the neut. referring to the course of the journey. As for *ánu*, which I take as a postposition, Gr takes it as a 2nd preverb with the infinitive; Macd (VGS 464) asserts that if an infinitive has two preverbs, both are accented (citing as one ex. our *ánu právoḍhum*). However, the lexeme *ánu prá √ vah* would occur only here, and it makes more sense to construe *ánu* independently, in the same manner as *pánthām ánu* “along the path” in the last vs. of the hymn (7c). Of more interest is

Macd’s claim (VGS 336–37) that the *-tum* infinitive “expresses the purpose with verbs of motion ...” (though he allows it also with  $\sqrt{arh}$  ‘be able’ and  $\sqrt{ci}$  ‘intend’), while it is the *-am* inf. that is found with  $\sqrt{śak}$  (inter alia). So under this description our infinitive could be construed with pāda a, because it contains a verb of motion. However, his lack of other exx. of  $\sqrt{śak}$  + *-tum* is likely only the result of the extreme rarity of *-tum* infinitives in the RV (on which see VGS 195). Though we do have a verb of motion in pāda a (*ā ... aganma*), it is different from Macd’s “go ... to do X” example because the verb of motion here has a different complement, “go along the path.”

X.2.4: I’m not entirely sure what *ā pṛṇāti* means here; ordinarily it has the literal sense ‘fill’. Both Ge and Re push it further in this passage than I think can be justified: “wieder gutmachen” and “compense” respectively. My ‘fulfill’ is meant to convey that Agni will fulfill the conditions of the *vratāni* and make up for our lapses.

X.2.4–5: These two vss. have the same structure: in the first hemistich we mortals, because of our general stupidity (*āviduṣṭarāsaḥ* 4b, *pākatrā mānasā dīnādakṣāḥ* 5a), mess up our obligations to the gods, particularly the sacrifice. The c pādas begin *agnīṣ tād* and end with a participle of knowing (*vidvān* 4c, *viḥānān* 5c) and an assurance that Agni will put everything to rights. Ge breaks the parallelism by taking *yād* in 5a as a neut. rel. prn., picked up by *tād* in c, as obj. of *viḥānān*, whereas in 4a he renders *yād* as a subordinating conj. I think the parallelism should be respected, which requires “when/if” for both *yād*s and objectless participles in c.

X.2.7: The b pāda naming Tvaṣṭar as the begetter of Agni solves the riddle implicitly posed in 6b, which contained the generic etymological figure *jānitā tvā jajāna* “the begetter begot you.” The rather pedestrian repetition in our pāda, *tvāṣṭā ... tvā ... jajāna*, does not put this in the category of the best of RVic riddles.

The part. *pravidvān* here takes an acc. obj., as *vidvān* does in vs. 1, contra vss. 3 and 4.

### X.3 Agni

The hymn seems to have an omphalos structure, which I had not recognized at the time of the publ. tr. The middle vs., 4, is more than sufficiently contorted and baffling to count as a central enigma. The structure is marked (though not excessively marked) by lexical rings: most importantly, *arati-* is found in the 1st two and the last two vss. (1a, 2c; 6d, 7b); the verb *vī bhāti* (1c, 2d) is matched by *vī ... bhāti* in 6d; *bhānū-* in 2c returns in 5d; *rúśadbhiḥ* in 3d = the same in 6c.

X.3.1: Just as the first vs. of X.2 echoed the last vs. of X.1, there is concatenation with the preceding hymn here as well: *vī bhāhi* in c repeats the last words of X.2.7.

The voc. *rājan* is jarring in this 3rd ps. description of Agni, but it can hardly be addressed to anyone else (though Old flirts with the possibility of another entity), esp. given that the same voc. is definitely addressed to Agni in X.1.6 and (the next hymn) X.4.1. It is always possible in Agni contexts to imagine a bifurcation between the physical fire and the god Fire, here with the former described and the latter addressed.

In c *brhatā* produces a bad cadence, with no possible fix.

The final pāda is chiasmatically structured, with initial *āsiknīm* ‘black’ the obj. of the final participle *apājan* and the middle two words *eti rúśatīm* to be construed together. This

configuration confounds word-order expectations: we would normally construe the elements in order, yielding “he goes to the black (*ásiknīm eti*), driving away the luminous (*rúsatīm apājan*). It is only the audience’s awareness of the standard trope about the banishment of female night by female dawn and of the usual dawn context of Agni hymns that allows them to redistribute the elements to produce a more semantically and pragmatically satisfactory result – a nice ex. of the tension between syntax and sense and of how poets learn to exploit it. Note also that the discontinuous phrase “driving away the black one” is iconic of its action, driving away or apart.

X.3.2: The first hemistich of this vs. “repairs” the last pāda of vs. 1, by depicting Agni’s adversarial relation with Night and his benevolent paternal one with Dawn, though neither of the females is named and the hemistich introduces new themes. This contrasts with the rather pedestrian repair strategy in X.2.6–7, which involves exact repetition of the riddle that needs solution, with the solution slotted in.

Pāda b is superficially self-contradictory or at least sketches a tangled parentage, in that Agni “begets” (*janāyan*) someone who is the child of a different father (*pitúr jā́m*). But of course the two fathers can be reconciled: Heaven may be the stable father of Dawn, who is regularly called *divó duhitā́*, but Agni at his daily kindling gives birth to her every day.

As Ge (n. 2cd) points out, Agni is identified with the Sun; the “spoked wheel of Heaven” (*diváḥ ... aratíḥ*) in fact is the sun; cf., e.g., II.2.2. The gen. *diváḥ* in d can also be seen as a sly way to resolve the identity of the “lofty father” (*bṛhatáḥ pitúḥ*) of Dawn in b, sneaking in the word Heaven (in the gen. as the father phrase is in b) in a different context.

X.3.3: The masking of identities continues in this vs. The Sun and Dawn appear only as m. *bhadrá-* and f. *bhadrá-* in pāda a and with roles suggesting incestuous relations in b (*svásar-* ‘sister’, *jā́rá-* ‘lover’). But finally in c we get an actual name: the first occurrence of *agní-* in this hymn.

From the publ. tr. it would appear that another name, or at least unmasked identity, is found in d, where I tr. “prevailed over the night.” But in fact the word I tr. as ‘night’, *rāmá-*, merely means ‘dark’ and is quite rare (though fem. *rāmī-*, *rāmyā-* are better attested, and also clearly refer to night). So *rāmám* here is like *ásiknīm* in 1d and *kṛṣṇām* in 2a in referring to night by a color term. (I would now emend the tr. to “prevailed over the dark.”) This pāda is a recasting of 2a (as Ge, n. 3d, also indicates), with lexical substitution: *abhí ... asthāt* for *abhí ... bhūt*, *rāmám* for *kṛṣṇām ... énīm*, *rúśadbhir várṇaiḥ* for *várpasā*. But the ‘night’ term has become more masked, by being masc., not fem. as in 1d, 2a.

X.3.4: A difficult vs. (Ge n. 4: “Dunkle, offenbar gekünstelte Strophe”). As noted above, it is properly situated to be the omphalos vs. in a hymn that is organized by that structure. Ge thinks the vs. has to do with the day-sun and the night-sun, for which he refers us to I.115.5. For my rejection of the concept of the night-sun see comm. ad I.115.4–5.

Decoding the vs. works best by considering the constituents one by one; the syntactic structure is relatively straightforward (at least as I see it – see Ge’s comm., however, and the different deployment of elements by Ge and Re). The vs. is dominated by two long gen. phrases, both referring to Agni: ab *asyá ... agnéḥ sákhyuḥ síváśya* “of this one ... Agni, our kindly companion” (I do not take *bṛhatáḥ* in this phrase; see below) and c *īḍyasya vṛṣṇo bṛhatáḥ* “of the lofty bull worthy to be invoked” (I did not take *svásah* in this phrase, though I’m more open to it now; see below). The first depends on the nom. *yāmāsaḥ* ‘journeys’ (again, as I take it). As for

the predicate of ab, I take it to be a predicated pres. part. *índhānāḥ* ‘kindling’. This participle, so accented (as opposed to *idhānā-*), is ordinarily, though not invariably, transitive, and is so interpr. by Ge, Re, and me. The expression “his journeys kindling X” is what I meant (rather loosely) by synesthesia in the publ. intro.: in the ordinary way of things journeys can’t “kindle” anything, though metaphorically it is possible even in earthbound English (e.g., “his European travels kindled his interest in architecture”). Agni’s journeys can refer to the ascent of his smoke towards heaven (this possibility supported by vs. 5 and see my interpr. below of 4cd), or perhaps the spreading of the fire over the firewood outward from its place of kindling, or the movement of the ritual fire to the east and the place of the offering fire.

What object do these journeys kindle? The only acc. in the vicinity is *vagnūn* ‘calls’, though it appears to be part of a simile. In the absence of a corresponding acc. in the frame, I originally thought (see below for revision) that the *nā* here doesn’t mark a standard simile but contributes an “as it were” sense (sim. Ge gleichsam, Re pour ainsi dire). Before trying to determine what the *vagnūn* are, we must tackle *brhatāḥ* in the simile complex *brható nā vagnūn* (assuming it’s part of the simile: neither Re nor Ge does, but how do they account for the position of *nā*?). It can be either acc. pl. masc., modifying *vagnūn*, or (abl./)gen. sg. dependent on it. There are arguments for both: *brhánt-* sometimes qualifies sound (*rāva-* VII.33.4, IX.97.36; *gīr* V.43.8, *gīras* III.51.1; cf. also *brhád-uktha-* (3x) and the Gṛsamada refrain *brhád vadema*). But in order to make the comparison work we need to know who the *vagnūn* belong to / emanate from, and that suggests a gen. sg. The stem *brhánt-* is common in this hymn, with a number of different referents: 1c ‘beam’, 2b ‘father’ (=Heaven), 4c (also in our vs.) Agni as bull, 5b Sun=Agni. In the publ. tr. I suggest that it here refers to the pressing stone, and the *vagnūn* are the sounds of pressing. Pressing stones are regularly said to be noisy and to have voices (cf., e.g., X.76.6 and esp. X.94), and *vagnú-* is associated with the pressing stone in I.84.3; it is said to speak ‘loftily’ (*brhát*) in V.25.8, X.64.15=100.8, 70.7. And see its association with the kindled fire in X.70.7: *ūrdhvó grāvā brhád agnīḥ sámiddhaḥ*. In our passage the point would be that the kindling of the fire “kindles” (that is, signals the start of) the soma pressing and thus the noise of the pressing stone. (For the record, Ge thinks the *vagnūn* are the sounds of the burning fire, Re the voices of the human chanters. Both are also possible, but I think the pressing stone suggestion has better textual support.)

I now also see that there is a way to rescue a “real” simile interpr., by means of a double reading of the part. *índhānāḥ*. As I said above, this part. is generally transitive, but sometimes passive. For the former, cf., e.g., II.25.1 *índhāno agnīm vanavad vanuṣyatāḥ* “Kindling the fire, he will win against those who seek to win”; for the latter I.143.7 *índhānaḥ ... vidátheṣu dīdyat* “... while being kindled, shining at the rites.” If we take it as passive in the frame, the journeys themselves are being kindled (that is, set in motion), while in the simile they kindle the voices. So I suggest an alt. tr. “his journeys, being kindled, are as if kindling the voices of the lofty one [=pressing stone].” The Engl. “as it were” cannot be avoided, but the frame / simile relationship in the Skt. is better structured. This would be an extreme ex. of my “case disharmony in similes.”

So much for the first hemistich. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> one let us first turn to the gen. phrase in c. The last word of that pāda, *svāsaḥ*, is generally interpr. (Gr, Ge, Re) as a gen. sg. to a cmpd *svās-* ‘having a good mouth’, which does appear in IV.6.8 of Agni. However, I think it more likely to be the nom. pl. m. of *svá-* ‘own’, referring to the *bhāmāsaḥ* that immediately follows in the next pāda (though ‘having a good mouth’ is also possible, and I would now accept a tr. “of the lofty bull worthy to be invoked, having a good mouth”). I take the remaining gen. phrase with cd, while Ge/Re take it with the gen. phrase in ab. The journeys (*yāma-*) of ab reappear in the loc.

sg. *yāman* to a different stem, and just as the gen. phrase of ab depended on *yāmāsaḥ*, I here attach it to *yāman*.

Beyond this I am pretty baffled. The focus of this bafflement is *aktú-*. This is a well-attested word for ‘night’, though it does have or acquire a (probably secondary) association with  $\sqrt{añj}$  ‘anoint’. In our passage Re takes it as “ornaments-brilliant”, which makes the interpr. easier, though he admits this sense is, at best, rare. Moreover, I would add, in a hymn that has used three other words referring to ‘night’, one each in the previous three vs., it seems perverse to assume that a more common word for ‘night’ doesn’t mean that in this context (it’s also found in nearby X.1.2 in the clear meaning ‘night’). The problem posed by *aktávaḥ* is acute enough to cause Old to make what seems to me an uncharacteristic lapse in grammatical judgment: he suggests that it stands for gen. *aktóḥ*. Now it is true that the phrase *yāman aktóḥ* is found pāda-final in III.30.13 and VI.38.4 (though in neither case do I construe *aktóḥ* directly with the loc.), but making *aktávaḥ* a makeshift gen. seems a really bad idea to me, and Old doesn’t try to justify it. Ge suggests instead a word haplology of *yāman \*aktór aktávaḥ*, which is slightly better but still leaves us with *aktávaḥ* to deal with. As noted above, he does so via the “night-sun”: “seine Strahlen sind bei Ankunft (der Nacht) als Dunkel erscheinen.” My publ. tr. makes little (actually, no) sense; I have no idea what I thought it meant at the time: “the nights appear as his own beams.” I would now suggest a new one, with the terms reversed, rather like Ge’s though with a different image in mind.: “his own beams appear (like) the nights.” The somewhat counterintuitive image is of the smoke arising from the fire, which, though it comes from the beaming brightness of a burning fire, turns dark as it rises. For similar passages describing the mingled brightness of the flames and darkness of smoke see II.4.5 and VI.6.4 and comm. on both.

X.3.5: This vs. consists entirely of two rel. cl.; it can easily be attached to the following vs. (or the preceding one).

The ‘beams’ (*bhāmāsaḥ*) of the previous vs. return here, but once again in unexpected form. In vs. 4 they appear like nights, that is, presumably, dark – which is not what we expect of lights (the word is after all a transparent deriv. of  $\sqrt{bhā}$  ‘shine’). Here they “purify themselves” (*pavante*), while being compared to sounds (*svanā nā*). The verb is of course the signature verb of soma preparation: the medial participle *pāvamāna-* gives the functional title to the Soma of the IXth Maṇḍala (Soma Pāvamāna “self-purifying Soma”). It would be impossible to use this verb in a RVic context without calling soma immediately to mind. The subj./verb combination thus already conjures up a discordant image: beams of light purifying themselves like soma liquid. But the simile adds another layer of complexity and dissonance, for the subject is being compared not to soma but to sound. So we have two incompatible entities (light and sound) identified with each other and each performing an action – purification -- that is uncharacteristic of either. Ge simply translates the phrase word-for-word (“Dessen Strahlen rein werden wie die Töne”) without comment; Re makes the connection with soma, which I think is unavoidable. The cleverness of the poet is to put the image further off-balance, comparing the beams to the sounds of soma when it is being purified. Cf. IX.41.3 *śṛṇvé vṛṣṭer iva svanāḥ, pāvamānasya śuṣmīṇaḥ* “A roar like that of rain is heard -- the roar of the self-purifying tempestuous one,” where the more natural genitival relationship between the roar and the self-purifier is found. So that accounts for the simile, but what is “the beams purify themselves” meant to convey in the frame. I think it must be read in the context of the previous vs.: there the beams were dark as the nights, because surrounded with smoke; here the purification would involve getting free of the smoke

and rising up brightly, amidst the roar of the blazing fire (hence the term of comparison). This compressed expression seems to me a prime example of synesthesia, as noted in the publ. intro.

The gen. phrase that constitutes b, *rócamānasya brhatáḥ sudívaḥ* “the lofty one, shining, bringing the good day,” technically belongs with the rel. *yásya* in pāda a and therefore refers to Agni. But I think it is also a reference to the sun, or Agni identified with the sun, and that it functions almost like a gen. absol.; see Ge’s tr. as a “wenn” cl. (though without comment) as well as the “when” cl. in the publ. tr. This would be another reference to the dawn sacrifice, the overall setting of this hymn.

In cd Agni’s radiant beams, *bhānū-* (a different derivative to the same root  $\sqrt{bhā}$ ), reach heaven and implicitly join the sun’s *bhānū-* there; cf. 2c where Agni “props up the radiance of the sun” (*bhānūṃ sūryasya*). On the connection between Agni as Svarbhānu and the sun, see my extensive treatment of the Svarbhānu myth in my 1991 book, *The Ravenous Hyenas and the Wounded Sun*.

X.3.6: The first half of this vs. continues and indeed amplifies the “sound” theme, but restores a more natural subject/verb relationship: Agni’s “snortings resound” (*śúṣmāsaḥ ... svanayan*). Note that the verb here and the noun *svanāḥ* in 5a are transparently related. We can think of this as an ex. of poetic repair. It is also worthy of note that the subj. *śúṣma-* is represented in IX.41.3 cited above concerning the roar of the self-purifying soma: *svanāḥ ... śuṣmīṇaḥ*.

The vs. also exploits the literal sense of *aratī-* (‘spoked wheel’, hence fireplace, hence ritual fire) to elaborate the journey theme found already in vs. 4, with wheel rims (*-pavi-*) and teams (*niyúdbhiḥ*). On this vs. see Thieme, *Unters.* 31–32, 34.

The bahuv. *dadr̥ṣānā-pavi-* has a medial pf. part. as 1st member. On this rare type see AiG II.1.43–44 and on its accent AiG II.1.292.

In the publ. tr. I follow Ge in supplying ‘flames’ with the instrumentals of cd. I now think it should rather be ‘beams’ (*bhāma-*, 4d, 5a) or ‘radiant beams’ *bhānū-* (5d) because the somewhat incompatible adjectives *rúśadbhiḥ ... rébhadbhiḥ* “luminous and crackling” continue the synesthetic effect associated with ‘beams’ earlier, in vss. 4 and 5. The presence of the verb *ví ... bhāti* also supports supplying a nominal derivative from the same root. Perhaps best *bhānúbhiḥ*, echoing the same instr. pl. in 5d. Cf. also X.1.1 *bhānúnā rúśatā*.

IX.3.7: The poet then turns the journey theme to his own advantage in this final vs., but asking Agni to bring us something good when he comes.

#### IX.4 Agni

On the imagery in this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.4.2: The warmth of the pen in the simile is presumably an indirect reflection of the warmth of the fire in the frame.

On *rocanéna* expressing extent of space, see comm. on identical pāda, III.55.9.

X.4.3: All the images in this vs. seem to depict natural fire in a landscape rather than the ritual fire. The ‘mother’ of ab is probably, as Re takes it, Mother Earth. In both c and d the fire ranges freely in the natural world, consuming whatever fuel it finds.

On *jénya-* see comm. ad I.128.7. Even though Agni is called *jénya-* elsewhere, here the word surely belongs to the simile, with *tvā* intervening in modified 2nd position. Cf. IX.86.36 ...



*śísuṃ, nāvam jajñānām jényam ...* “the new-born child of worthy birth.” Although the *śísu-* here could be a human child, the appearance of other domestic animals in the similes of 2–3 suggest that it too is an animal.

The hapax denom. *sacanasyāmāna-* receives rather bleached renderings: Gr ‘huldreich, hülfreich sein’, Ge ‘getreulich’, or Re’s somewhat richer ‘se sentent heureuse’. But its base should mean ‘having joint delight’, and I think the point here is that the mother desires delight for both of them.

As Narten (YH, 121) persuasively argues, in both Vedic and Avestan the desid. of  $\sqrt{ji}$  ‘win, conquer’ does not have an aggressive or battle-oriented sense, but simply means ‘seek (food, livelihood)’. She tr. this passage “du wünschst (Nahrung) zu gewinnen wie losgelassenes Vieh.”

X.4.4: This vs., the middle one of the hymn, functions as a notional omphalos vs. It begins by suggesting a mystery beyond our knowledge (ab) and continues with a paradox (c), signaled by the oppositional *śáye* ‘lies still’ / *cáratí* ‘moves’. But the paradox is easily understood, and the vs. just signals where an enigma would be inserted, rather than actually presenting a challenging one.

The pres. part. to  $\sqrt{as}$  in the nominative usually functions concessively (“although being ...”), but I do not see that meaning here. “Although being the clanlord, he licks the young woman” would suggest that Agni is doing something beneath his dignity or even shameful—which would be appropriate to our contemporary attitudes (sexual politics, abuse of power, “me too”), but I doubt its application to Vedic mores. The *sán* may owe its existence here to a more mundane reason: meter. The stem *vispáti-*, in nom., voc., and acc., regularly comes at the end of 8 or 12 syllable pādas, providing a good iambic cadence, but it does not fit a Triṣṭubh cadence. I suggest that a pleonastic *sán* was added to provide a proper finale.

X.4.5: The fem. ‘old ones’ (*sánayāsu*) are of course the plants, which, old and dessicated, easily catch fire.

The problematic pāda is c, *asnātāpo vṛṣabhó ná prá veti*. The simile / frame structure is both formally and semantically / pragmatically flawed. The standard view (i.e., Ge/Re and the publ. tr.) is that the meaning of the pāda is more or less what is found in the publ. tr.: “(Although) not a swimmer, he pursues the waters like a bull.” As Ge points out (n. 5c), the thirsty bull or buffalo is a well-known image in the RV. But this assumes that ‘waters’ is part of the simile as the shared term; yet the simile particle follows ‘bull’ (*vṛṣabhó ná*), with ‘waters’ preceding – which is not the placement we expect. Moreover the form of ‘waters’ is wrong: it should be acc. (*apáh*) but the accent tells us it must be nom. *āpah* when extracted from sandhi. There are a few occurrences of nom.-for-acc. forms to this stem, but the vast majority are properly distributed. Such are the formal problems. The semantic-pragmatic one may be worse: there is no ritual, mythological, or natural-world scenario in which Agni/fire “pursues” water. The closest we come is the myth of Agni running away from his ritual duties and hiding in the waters, but I find it hard to wring this out of this expression. Likewise Agni as Apām Napāt (vaguely suggested by Tichy, Agent nouns, 146); that figure doesn’t behave as he would need to here. There is a very minor rite of aspersion of the hearth, which Ge sees in a couple of RVic passages (VIII.39.10, 102.14), but again this does not seem a compelling explanation here. Ge in his n. suggests an alternative structure: that the waters belong only to the simile, and another object should be supplied for the frame: Agni pursues (firewood), as a bull does waters. This

solves the pragmatic problem, but makes the formal structure of the simile even worse, since the *āpaḥ* is not part of the frame at all: we really should then have *āpo \*nā vṛṣabhāḥ*. Moreover, what then is the point of *asnātā* ‘no swimmer’?

I will suggest a much trickier solution, which depends on a pun made possible by the sandhi coalescence in *asnātāpaḥ*. The accepted analysis of this sequence is *asnātā āpaḥ*, going back to the Pp. But the second element could, of course, be *āpaḥ* as well – and *āpaḥ* is a perfectly good word: neut. sg. *s*-stem ‘work, task’. I suggest that in the frame we read *āpaḥ* -- “(Agni) pursues his work” – and, secondarily, in the simile *āpaḥ* -- “as a bull pursues waters.” This pun would help account for the “wrong,” nominative, form of ‘waters’, which needs the initial accent to enable the pun. Rigvedic poets are willing to tamper with morphology if it is in the service of word play. It would also put the acc. in its first reading as ‘work’ firmly in the frame, not the simile, thus accounting for the position of *nā*. The ‘no swimmer’ is a little joke: since Agni has nothing to do with the waters in the simile, he is of course no swimmer; only the bull would qualify. I would also point out that there is a fairly well-established expression *viver āpāmsi* (I.69.8, VI.31.3, etc.; see comm. ad locc.) “you toil(ed) at your labors.” Although the two verbs belong to different roots,  $\sqrt{viṣ}$  ‘toil’ and  $\sqrt{vī}$  ‘pursue’, *prā veti* in our passage is close enough in meaning and form to  $\sqrt{viṣ}$  in that expression that they could be assimilated to each other. I realize that this interpr. is quite intricate, but it solves both formal and semantic problems. I therefore propose to emend the tr. to “No swimmer, he pursues his task, as a bull does waters.”

As Ge (n. 5d) points out, *prā vī* seems to refer to conveying the ritual fire to its new hearth in the east.

X.4.6: For the striking image in pāda a, see publ. intro.

## X.5 Agni

On the structure and contents of this mystical hymn see publ. intro.

X.5.1: My interpr. of the first hemistich differs crucially from the standard (Ge, Re, Lü [*passim*], Doniger [117], Köhler [*Kavī* in *Ṛgveda*, 121, 319–20]) in taking pāda a as a nominal clause and assuming a change of subject in b. All the others, save for Ge, assume an identification between Agni and the sea; Ge like me considers the sea to be the sea in the heart and “der Urquell der dichterischen Erkenntnis” (n. 1a). My major reason for separating the pādas is that the sea is sometimes identified with the heart, and therefore the abl. *hṛdāḥ* in b should be, in my opinion, coreferential with nom. *samudrāḥ* in pāda a. For the identification see IV.58.5 *hṛdyāt samudrāt*, 58.11 *antāḥ samudré hṛdy āntar āyusi*; cf. also VIII.102.4–6 *agnīm samudrāvāsasam* “Agni whose garment is the sea” and X.45.3, which relates Agni’s birth/kindling in the sea. I therefore think that Agni is within the sea but distinct from it. We also see separation between the sea (of poetic inspiration) and an agent who performs  $\sqrt{cakṣ}$  in X.177.1 *samudré antāḥ kavāyo ví cakṣate* “The sage poets espy it within the sea.” I do have to admit, however, that the 2nd phrase in pāda a, *dharūṇo rayīṇām* “foundation of riches” is used of Agni in I.73.4, X.45.5; on the other hand this phrase is not limited to Agni, modifying Indra in X.47.2; see also VII.34.24. Interestingly, X.47.2 resembles our passage phrasally, in that it is preceded by a numeral qualifying *samudra* — there as a compd., here as a free phrase: X.47.2 *cātuḥsamudraṃ dharūṇaṃ rayīṇām* / X.5.1 *ékaḥ samudró dharūṇo rayīṇām*. I don’t quite know what to make of this, beyond the apparent use of the sea or seas as an extreme measure of wealth.

In b the two hidden ones (*ninyóh*) who serve as his mothers could be the two kindling sticks, Night and Dawn, or Heaven and Earth. On this as an enigma, see Ge's n. 1c. The naming of the two world halves (*ródasī*) in nurturing roles in 4c may determine the matter, at least by the middle of the hymn.

If the gen./loc. du. *niṅ'yóh* belongs to the stem *niṅ(i)yá-*, we should expect *\*niṅyayoh* (AiG III.99); our form would simply show haplology, with the distracted syllable maintaining the syllable count. (The stem shows distraction in some other forms, not simply the gen.-loc. du., so this can't be the only reason.) Lanman (Noun infl. 392) suggests rather a stem *\*niṅ-* (see also Old), but there seems no reason to multiply entities here and the formation would be distinctly odd.

As Ge (n. 1d) also thinks, the wellspring (*útsa-*) in d must be the sea of pāda a; presumably the "hidden track of the bird" (*níhitam padám véh*, a phrase found elsewhere [I.164.7, III.5.5–6, 7.7; IV.5.8]) here is the trace of the mystical fire—though Lü (614), Re favor the sun. Again the intent is to locate the enigma of Agni in the sea of poetic inspiration within the poet. X.45.2–3, which treats Agni's birth (see above), also has the wellspring (2c), the sea (3a), and the udder (3b) together in a similar context.

X.5.2: As indicated in the publ. intro., the first half-vs. describes the mating of the flames of the nascent fire, configured as both male and female. So also Ge and Re.

The med. root part. *vāsānāh* properly must belong to the root pres. to  $\sqrt{vas}$  'wear', and *vāvasāné* in 4c supports this association. However, in sense it seems closer to  $\sqrt{vas}$  'dwell'. A similar conundrum is posed by *saṃvāsāna-* in IV.6.8, which is assigned by Gr (and others, e.g., Ge) to 'dwell', even though that root is otherwise active and has no root forms. There the preverb *sám* could have triggered a middle form or at least a nonce reinterpret. of a form belong to 'wear', and I take it as a pun. (See comm. ad loc.) Although the participle in our passage is not compounded with *sám*, *samānám* 'same' with which it's construed, as well as the immediately following *sám* (*jagmire*), could exert the same influence. I therefore take it as a pun here as well.

The 2nd hemistich seems an elaboration on and restating of 1d.

X.5.3: This vs. revisits the birth of Agni alluded to briefly in 1c. Here again we have dual parents, here clearly identified as feminine – though this does not narrow down the possible sets of referents already noted above.

The two fem. *-ín-*stems that open the vs., *ṛtāyínī māyínī* seem designed to be contrastive. Although *māyā-* has not acquired the generally negative sense of 'illusion' that it often has later, it does refer to power derived from supernatural manipulation or tricks or some variety of artifice, the opposite of *ṛtá-*, the truth that encapsulates the real and enduring structures of the cosmos. These combined skills of Agni's mothers would endow him with an extraordinary range of powers. The twinning of these two words is clear from the fact that the hapax *ṛtāyín-* is clearly modeled on the well-attested *māyín-*; see AiG II.2.343, 842.

There is much disagreement about the meaning and the grammatical and lexical identity of the part. *vīyantah* in d. Gr assigns it to  $\sqrt{vi}$  with the sense 'durchwandern'; Ge to the same lexeme but with the somewhat bizarre gloss 'abschneidend' (cutting off, snipping). (He also thinks it's anacoluthon for du. fem. *vīyatī*; on the pl. see below.) Köhler (320) agrees with the assignment of Gr/Ge but with the sense "einzeln zum Nabel ... gehen," connecting pāda c with d, rather than with ab as most do. Re calls it a "forme baroque" of *vāyantah* 'weaving'. The most persuasive suggestion is Old's, though he falls short of endorsing it— that it belongs to the root

pres. of  $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$  ‘pursue’. Although the weak pre-V forms of this pres. are transmitted with initial cluster *vy-*, they are almost all to be read with distracted  $v'y-$ ; cf. for this exact nom. pl. part. IV.5.5, VI.1.4, VII.27.5, all pāda-final as here (only the form in I.127.5 is not distracted). Old is reluctant to ignore the “transmitted spelling” (“überlieferte Schreibung”), but since the original oral version would have had distracted *v'iy-*, it is only the later redaction that imposed that form, and it can easily be the result of misunderstanding of the sense of the passage (not difficult, as the various versions demonstrate). The assignment to  $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$  is supported by the fact that this root is part of the characteristic lexicon of Trita Āptya; note X.2.2, 4.5, 6.2, 3, 8.5, 7.

Assuming that the form is indeed a nom. pl. m. pres. part. (*pace* Gr), it must be predicated, since the previous subjects were fem. dual. The most likely subject to supply here is the *kavāyaḥ* of 2c, as Old (tentatively), Re, and Köh do. They, the human poets, “pursue the thread of the poet”; this sg. *kavī-* must be Agni, and the human poets are following his lead and model in their own work. Threads and weaving are of course standard images for the materials and activity of a poet; see the famous passage VI.9.2–3, in which the apprentice poet confesses his ignorance of thread and weaving, that is, of his own craft, but he learns this craft from Agni.

X.5.4–5: Note the phonological echoes in 4c *vāvasāné*, 4d *vāvṛdhāte*, 5a *vāvasānó*. The two med. participles in 4c and 5a are in the same metrical position and (besides the ending) differ only in the identity of the sibilant.

X.5.4: The ‘over-cloak’ is interpr. by Sāy. (fld. by Ge) as plants, stars, etc.—an appealing interpr. In one of the other two occurrences of *adhīvāsá-* (I.140.9; the other in the Aśvamedha hymn, I.162.16, is irrelevant), it refers to the ‘over-cloak’ of the Earth, which Agni consumes – so vegetation there as well. However, I think it possible that it refers here (also?) to the smoke that envelops the two world-halves as the fire flares up.

My interpr. of d is entirely different from the standard; Gr, Ge, Re, Lü (469) all take *vāvṛdhāte* as intrans./reflex. – e.g., Ge “... stärkten sich.” (Doniger’s tr. [117] is like mine.) And certainly the preponderance of occurrences of the med. pf. have this sense. However, some forms of the med. pf. are transitive. Cf. esp. VII.7.5 *dyaús ca yám pṛthivī vāvṛdhāte* “whom [=Agni] Heaven and Earth have made strong,” which is exactly parallel to our passage, with the same subjects and the same object. The form is medial because of the self-involvement of the subject: they act as parents of the child in question. In our passage the point is that, whether H+E are the original parents of Agni (see 1c, 3b), they nurture him as he grows in the space between them. If the verb is taken as intrans./reflex. the connection between Agni’s birth and the self-strengthening of H+E is unclear. Ge (n. 4cd) says “Agni’s Geburt gereicht Himmel und Erde zum Segen”; Lü considers the actions of ab and cd reciprocal: H+E bring Agni hymns and refreshments (though in fact their involvement is not overt in ab), and he gives them rain in return, with honey and ghee a poetic expression of rain. But Ge’s explan. is vague and generic, and Lü’s forces an interpr. on ab that is not supported by the text.

Ge (fld. by Lü) takes the two instr. *ghṛtaír ánnaiḥ* and the gen. *mádhūnām* as parallel, while I (along with Re) construe the gen. with *ánnaiḥ*.

X.5.5: The part. *vāvasānāḥ* could belong either to  $\sqrt{vas}$  ‘desire, be eager’ or  $\sqrt{vās}$  ‘bellow’, and either would work in the passage. The former is favored by most (Gr, Ge, Re, Lub), but Kü (479–80) assigns most forms of the stem to ‘bellow’.

The “seven ruddy sisters” (*saptá svásīr áruṣīḥ*) are generally and plausibly taken as Agni’s flames, though why seven? I doubt if it has anything to do with the seven boundaries (*saptá maryādāḥ*) of the next vs. (6).

The honey from which Agni carries them up is, acdg. to Ge (n. 5ab), again plausibly, the ghee that fuels the fire. (Re’s “soma” is less plausible, even though *mádhu* is more often used of that substance.) If “honey” is what fuels Agni’s flames and that “honey” is actually ghee, this provides support for my transitive interpr. of 4d, where H+E strengthen Agni “with ghee” *ghṛtaiḥ* as well as with *ánnaiḥ ... mádhūnām* “with foods of honey(s).”

In the publ. tr. the placement of *drśé kām* makes it sound as if it’s to be construed with the abl. *mádhvaḥ* (“... from the honey to be seen”), but I meant it to go with the sisters. An emended tr. “... from the honey, to be seen” (with comma) or perhaps more explicitly “from the honey, (for them) to be seen” will disambiguate.

The 2nd hemistich is difficult, and I will emend my publ. tr. in several ways. In c the question centers on the value of the med. pf. *yeme*, but also involves the grammatical identity of *purājāḥ*. In the publ. tr. I take the latter as a fem. acc. pl. referring to the flame-sisters, which is therefore the object of a transitively used *yeme*. However, *purājāḥ* can also be a nom. sg. m., as Gr, Ge, and Re take it. Re (in a n. erroneously located in the nn. to vs. 4) points out undoubted nom. sg. *prathamajāḥ* in 7c also referring to Agni, and this seems to me good evidence for a nom. sg. here as well. The flame-sisters can still be understood as obj. of *yeme*, but need not be—and, I now think, should not be. I would now take *yeme* as intrans./reflex. ‘hold oneself in check, hold still’ and with the presential value Kü (396–97) attributes to most of the forms of this pf. (though not this one). I think the point is that, once the fire has flared up, it becomes fairly stable in that position. I would now tr. “he holds himself there within the midspace.”

Pāda d is considerably complicated by the presence of the hapax thematic gen. *pūṣanāsya*, which differs from the divine name *pūṣān-* not only in stem but also in accent. It is hard not to associate this form with the divine name, but whether it is a secondary thematization based on ambig. forms like acc. sg. *pūṣānam* (with unexplained accent shift) or a thematic *-á-* derivative of the name cannot be determined. (See Old’s sensible disc.) And context is of no help.

The word *vavri-* ‘cover’ appears in the preceding hymn, X.4.4, where Agni’s ‘cover’ lies still as he moves about eating it. In that passage the cover seems to be the firewood that fuels him. That interpr. does not work here, because Agni is already positioned in the midspace and so the covering he seeks should be located in that vicinity. What sort of covering could that be? I think the most likely identification is a cloud of smoke rising through the sky, assimilated to the clouds naturally found in the midspace. In V.19.1 Agni emerges from one *vavri-* (probably the wood) only for another to appear, quite likely smoke, and *vavri-* seems also to be used of actual clouds (e.g., I.164.7, 29).

So far so good. But what, if anything, is the connection to Pūṣan? Here I have only a very tentative suggestion to make, linking this enigmatic passage to an equally baffling one. In VI.56.3 Pūṣan is said to have set the golden wheel of the sun down “in(to) the gray cow” (*paruṣé gávi*). In the publ. intro. to that hymn I suggest that this may be a “a naturalistic reference to a cloudy dawn twilight, with the sun rising through it.” If Pūṣan is associated with a gray phenomenon that masks light and brightness and is found in the midspace, the same association may be alluded to here.

X.5.6: On the general purport of the vs., see publ. intro.: in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich Agni, who was born in the first vss. and rose through the midspace in the subsequent ones, now reaches heaven, at least as I interpret it. However, the first hemistich is puzzling. I have no idea what the seven boundaries are, but it is of course in keeping with the theme of the hymn that they were created by the Kavis. Ge has what seems to me an overly schematic interpr. (n. 6); see Köh's disc. (322) of some of the possibilities.

I take Agni to be the referent of both the hapax *amhurá-* 'narrow (one)' and *skambhá-* 'pillar'. Although Ge's notion (n. 6c) that it refers to the Weltpfeiler is surely in the background, the image, I think, is of fire rising vertically as a narrow flame, to join heaven and earth.

X.5.7: See publ. intro. for the cosmogonic aspects of this vs., which contains the only occurrences of the name Agni in the hymn.

With JSK (DGRV I.171) I take the *ca* in d as an inverse *ca*.

## X.6 Agni

X.6.1–3: As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn begins with annunciatory *ayám sá* "Here he is," presumably gesturing towards the offering fire on the ritual ground, and the rest of the first 3 vss. consists of rel. clauses, one per hemistich, dependent on *sá*. The meter of the hymn is unusual, in that it contains a large number of Pentad (and other 10-syllable) vss. amid the Triṣṭubhs. See Arnold 239, 318 and Old ZDMG 60 (1906): 751–52 (review of Arnold) = KISch 226–27. Because of the fluctuating meter, it is not always clear which forms we should distract – e.g., in 2d *átyo* is read distracted (*at'yo*) by Gr, Old (hesitatingly), HvN, but Arnold prefers the disyllabic reading. The first gives a Triṣṭubh, the 2nd a Pentad line. The stem *átya-* is more often disyllabic than trisyllabic, but there are undoubted exx. of the latter. In any case it is well to be wary of the distracted readings enshrined in HvN.

X.6.1: Ge (n. 1cd) considers *paryéti* 'circles around' a representation of the *paryagnikaraṇa*, the circular tour around the fire or an offering (the sacrificial beast) with a firebrand; Re rather a circuit of heaven.

A nice figure involving adjacent verbal forms combined with *pári*, *paryéti párivītaḥ*, with the first describing Agni's action of encircling, the 2nd his being encircled.

X.6.1–2: Note the concatenation: *yó bhānúbhiḥ* (1c, 2a), *vibhāvā* (1d, 2a, with the latter etymologically doubled by the immediately cognate verb *bhāti*). Perhaps to draw attention to the shifting meter, the concatenated items are in different metrical positions.

X.6.2: Ge takes *sakhyā* as a dat. on the basis of I.156.5 *ā yó vivāya sacáthāya daívyah*, without explaining how the morphology would work. Despite superficial similarity the two passages have very different structures; see comm. ad I.156.5. There *ā ... vivāya* takes a dat. inf. as complement; here it is construed as usual with a goal/obj. in the acc., the pl. *sakhyā*.

Another type of concatenation: *áparihvṛtaḥ* recalls *paryéti párivītaḥ*.

On the reading of *átyah* see above.

X.6.3: This vs. locates Agni as the controller of both the ritual and the natural world, which meet on the ritual ground at the dawn sacrifice: on the one hand, Agni controls "the pursuit of the

gods” (*devá-vīti-*, a compd that picks up the verb *ā ... vivāya* from the previous vs.); on the other, the kindling of the ritual fire is thought to cause Dawn to dawn. The somewhat awk. tr. “every effort to pursue the gods” for *devá-vīti-* was meant to avoid the more literal “every pursuit of the gods,” which makes it sound like the gods are pursuing their hobbies or playing cribbage or crocheting.

As indicated in the publ. tr. I take the chariot as a symbol of the sacrifice, as so often.

The root  $\sqrt{ska(m)bh}$  ‘prop’ seems an odd choice in the context, and the oddness is conveyed by the publ. tr.; ‘fixes’ or ‘piles’ might be less jarring.

X.6.4: Another concatenation between vss.: *sūṣaiḥ* ending vs. 3 and *sūṣébhiḥ* opening vs. 4. In this case they are not only in different metrical positions but also exhibit different forms of the same case (instr. pl.), which is emphasized by their cross-verse-boundary juxtaposition.

Note *jigāti* (b), *jigharti* (d) – again the echoing forms are located in different metrical positions.

Both Ge and Re, in different ways, try to split *ā jigharti* from other occurrences of this verb meaning ‘sprinkle’ that have Agni as obj. Cf. esp. II.10.4 *jigharmy agnīm havīṣā ghr̥tēna*, which could hardly be clearer. Ge suggests that  $\sqrt{ghr}$  in our passage is an older form of  $\sqrt{hr}$  ‘take’; Re gives the lexeme *ā√ghr* the sense ‘attirer à soi’, with the sense of the preverb *ā* dominant. But he doesn’t say what happens to the “recessive” ‘sprinkle’ portion, which shouldn’t be entirely lost: for example, the common lexemes *ā√yaj* ‘attract here through sacrifice’, *ā√pū* ‘attract here through purification’ still maintain the sense of the base verb. Nor does he attempt to account for the two straightforward examples of *ā√ghr* with Agni as object: II.10.5, X.87.1, where ‘attirer à soi’ does not seem to be in question. (In II.10.4, 5 he tr. both verbs [+/- preverb] as ‘j’arrose’, but in X.87.1 he argues for ‘attirer à soi’ for no compelling reason.) I see no reason to decouple our *ā jigharti* here, or the other two passages that are superficially difficult to interpret with the ‘sprinkle’ meaning: IV.17.14 and V.48.3, from the standard literal usage. And in fact keeping all the passages together leads to richer semantics and produces the kind of paradoxical reversal so beloved of RVic poets. In all three of the anomalous passages, Agni is subject (undeniably here, by my interpr. in the other two passages). If in the standard usage of the verb, Agni is the object, being sprinkled with ghee by the priests, in the anomalous passages Agni switches roles: he sprinkles rather than being sprinkled. In two of the passages he is also identified as the Hotar (here) or being like the Hotar (IV.17.14), so that part of the standard model is maintained (priest sprinkles ...) even as it’s being disrupted by the promotion of the usual object to subject. But what would it mean in real-world terms for Agni to ‘sprinkle’? I suggest that he releases a stream of sparks, which could appear to be bright droplets of ghee. Notice that here he sprinkles the gods with his tongue, that is, his flame, from which the sparks would pour out. For further disc. see comm. ad IV.17.14 and V.48.3.

X.6.5: On the analogic hyper-feminization in the loc. sg. *usrām* see comm. ad VI.3.6 and AiG III.213.

The verbal configuration and pāda boundary in the sequence *īndraṃ ná réjamānam, agnīm* seem to favor an interpr. of the simile “... Agni, trembling like Indra.” But this is unlikely pragmatically: Indra is not a trembler! So with the other standard interpr. (going back to Sāy.) I take the participle only with Agni, even though it appears before the pāda boundary. The simile is off-kilter for another reason: it is not a poetic comparison but the equation of two real-world

actions: “bring Agni *as you do* Indra,” referring to Indra’s usual appearance at the dawn sacrifice. RVic similes don’t ordinarily have this function.

X.6.7: Gr reads distracted trisyllabic *mah nā* here as in IV.2.1. Given the fluctuation between 10- and 11-syllable lines in this hymn, that distraction is not necessary, though it is possible. For discussion of the trisyllabic form see comm. ad I.123.4.

## X.7 Agni

X.7.1: Ge takes the *urú- śámsa-* as Agni’s, but it makes more sense, with Re, to interpr. them as ours—reciprocally exchanged for the wide space given us by Agni. (This is supported by 2a.) I take the instr. as an instr. of price. The phrase corresponds to the (presumably) *bahuvr. uruśámsa-* ‘of wide/broad praise/pronouncement’, ‘widely praised/praising’ used of both gods and, less commonly, of singers. The phrase presumably refers to a laud that is widely disseminated.

X.7.2: In b *góbhir ásvaiḥ* is an instr. of specification with *rádhaḥ*.

The lexeme *ánu √(n)as* is fairly rare. In most of its occurrences it has the idiomatic sense ‘be equal to’ (II.16.3, VII.99.1, VIII.69.18, 70.5), but in some, like here (=I.163.7), I.52.13, and IX.22.6, it does not seem to differ appreciably from the simplex.

Despite my tr. “from you,” *te* is of course not an abl., but I wanted to make clear that it was a subjective, not objective genitive.

Ge interpr. *dádhānaḥ* in d as passive, modifying Agni. This requires a change of subject in the middle of the hemistich and a predicated participle, predicated of a 2nd ps. subj. None of these interpretive moves is impossible, but the combination is unnecessarily complex, esp. since the part. *dádhāna-* is frequently transitive and since a nom. sg. subject is readily available in the *mártaḥ* of c. Re agrees with my syntactic assessment, but supplies ‘you’ as the obj. of *dádhānaḥ*. But *√dhā* in the middle frequently means ‘appropriate, make one’s own, acquire’, and here it can take *bhógam* as obj.

The stem *matí-* and the ppl. (-)*jātá-* are found in the 1st and last pādas of the vs., emphasizing the closed loop of reciprocity depicted in these first two vss.

X.7.4: Despite its 1st member accent, the hapax *nítya-hotar-* must be a karmadhāraya; see Old and AiG II.1.189, 266, who do not explain the accent but simply stipulate it. As Ge points out (n. 4b), the free syntagm *hótā nítyaḥ* is found in nearby X.12.2, which further supports a karmadhāraya interpr. I tr. the phrase there “constant Hotar,” rather than “own Hotar” as here. The stem *nítya-* can mean both, and here the emphasis on Agni’s actions in the house of a particular man seems paramount—though “as his constant Hotar” would also work here.

Pāda c seems designed to mislead the audience. On the one hand, the *yám* (b) ... *sá* (c) construction is the standard relative / correlative one, and *sá* should therefore be coreferential with *yám*, namely the mortal worshiper. But the adjectives qualifying the subject of c are better suited to Agni than to the mortal: *rtāvan-* is far more often used of gods, esp. Agni, than of mortals, including in the immediately previous hymn (X.6.2); *rohíd-aśva-* occurs 5x in the RV, 4 of them clearly of Agni; *puru-kṣú-* is used several times of gods, including Agni (e.g., III.25.2), but usually modifies ‘wealth’ (*rayí-*), never humans. I think the poet is tricking us by playing syntactic expectations off against lexical ones, in the service of the reciprocal exchange of



identities between god and mortal that was the theme earlier in the hymn. The pāda *could* simply modify the subject of pāda b, namely Agni, yielding an alternate tr. “Whomever you, as his own Hotar-priest, safeguard in his house, (you) the truthful one, possessed of reddish horses [=flames] and much livestock, for him ...” But the *sá* in c would nag at the audience (I hope), since *sá* with 2nd ps. ref. only occurs with imperatives. So the listener would ultimately have to conclude that the referent is the worshiper, but now endowed with many of Agni’s qualities. With the reading of c with the mortal as subj., in the publ. tr. I supplied the impv. *astu* from d. However, it could be simply mean “whomever you safeguard, that truthful one is/becomes possessed of ...,” without requiring a modal verb to be supplied.

The instr. phrase in d, *dyúbhiḥ ... áhabhiḥ*, also confounds expectations. The standard temporal opposition is of course “days and nights,” with various lexical realizations, but here we have two different words for day. On *áhar-* versus *div-* for ‘day’ see comm. ad IX.86.19.

X.7.5: *prayógam* in pāda a is a much discussed hapax (see esp. Old); *pace* Gr it surely belongs to *pra √ yuj* ‘hitch up, harness’, referring to the initiation of the sacrifice. I’m taking it quite loosely as an adverbial acc. of purpose.

Although the Pp. reads augmented *ajananta* in c, the form could easily be the injunc. *jananta*, despite the parallel augmented *asādayanta* at the end of the next pāda. Both verbs are -*anta* replacements in otherwise act. paradigms.

The somewhat odd expression “gave birth to him with their arms” of course refers to the Āyus’ priestly activity in producing the fire.

X.7.6: This vs. urges a reflexive loop on Agni: to sacrifice to himself by himself. This is almost iconically represented by the hermetic circular repetitions and doublings: the extremely alliterative and etymological figure *diví deva devān* in pāda a repeated by *deva devān* in c; the three 2nd ps. verb forms to *√ yaj*, two identical: *yajasva* (a), *áyajah* (c), *yajasva* (d); and the semantically similar pair *svayám* ‘(by) oneself’ (a), *tanvām* ‘self, (own) body’.

## X.8–9

These two hymns are attributed to Triśiras Tvāṣṭra (the second with the alternative attribution Sindhuvīpa Āmbarīṣa). The poet’s name is a transparent adoption from the mythological material in X.8.7–9, and this hymn, and by default the next, belong with the Trita Āptya hymns X.1–7. See Old (Proleg. 233–34) and publ. intro. to X.8.

## X.8 Agni

As was just noted, this hymn belongs with the Trita Āptya Agni cycle, X.1–7. The Agni portion of the hymn ends with vs. 6, so it would fit the sequence by showing a smaller number of vss. than the first seven hymns, all with seven vss., as Old points out. There are also lexical reminiscences between this hymn and the previous seven: *ketú-* (1a, also X.1.5, 2.6); *vibhāvan-* (4b, also X.6.1-2 and a number of *ví √ bhā* forms in X.3); *veṣi* (5b), *veti* (7d)—cf. forms of *√ vī* in X.2.2, 4.5, 5.4, 6.2, 3; *sácse* (6b), *sacasyámānaḥ* (7c)—cf. X.3.3, 5.1, 4, 7.1.

X.8.1: Although the act. pf. *vavárdha* (etc.) is usually transitive, there are undoubted intrans. occurrences (see Kü 470), and it is hard to interpr. this pāda in any other way.

For the buffalo, Agni, and the lap of the waters see also X.45.3 and VI.8.1, neither of which is much help.

X.8.2: The single form of the pf. to  $\sqrt{mud}$  in the RV, *mumóda*, is taken, convincingly, by Kü (384) as presential and stative.

On the various forms of the root  $\sqrt{srev}$  ‘abort’ see EWA s.v. and comm. ad III.29.13.

The stem *śīmī-* and the adj. deriv. *śīmīvant-* (sometimes to be read *\*śīmivant-* as here) is generally taken as an irregular derivative of  $\sqrt{śam}$  ‘labor’. EWA (s.v. *śīmī-*) suggests a process of “laryngeal umlaut.” I wonder if instead it comes from the semantically similar root  $\sqrt{śram}$  ‘labor, become weary’, via a Middle Indic form built to a zero-grade *\*śrm*, with development of syllabic *\*r* to *i* (though we might expect *u* because of the labial).

In c I supply ‘oblations’ with *údyatāni* (so more or less Ge and Re), but rather than interpr. *kṛṇvān* as describing an action separate from *úd*  $\sqrt{yam}$  (e.g., Re “préparant ... (les mets) offerts”) I see *údyatāni*  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  as the equivalent of a periphrastic causative ‘make (to be) raised/lifted’; the morphological caus. to  $\sqrt{yam}$ , *yāmayati*, is rare and specialized in its usage (see my *-āya-*, 164–65). For a very close parallel to our passage, see VIII.74.3 ... *devātāti údyatā / havyāni aīrayat divī* “who raised to heaven the oblations lifted up among the conclave of the gods,” with the oblations overt.

X.8.3: The sense and the referents in this vs. are much disputed; see Ge’s extensive and somewhat dogmatic notes, Re’s comments, and Lü (594–96) discussion, in part a refutation of some of Ge’s views. I think it is useful to consider the vs. in the context of nearby X.5, which depicts the birth and growth of Agni, esp. in vss. 1, 3–5.

In the 1st pāda in the expression “the head of his two parents” (*mūrdhānam pitróḥ*), the two parents are generally agreed (esp. Ge, Re) to be Heaven and Earth. But see disc. of X.5, where not only cosmic parents (H+E, Night and Day) were considered, but also the two kindling sticks. Sāy. suggest these last as possible referents here, in addition to H+E – a suggestion dismissed by Ge (n. 3a), but one that I think is well worth considering. The fire “seizes” their head, which can be a metaphor for the fire “catching” (note the similar English metaphor). At the same time it can refer to H+E, and his seizing their head can refer to the fire’s ascent up towards the sky.

The main cl. in b (note the unaccented verb *dadhire*) has no coreferential pronoun to pick up the rel. *yāh* of pāda a; we must simply supply *tām*. As the gramm. number (pl.) of the verb makes clear, the subject is not the two parents, but must be unidentified priests. No plural beings have been previously mentioned in the hymn. The phrase *sūro árṇaḥ* (“the sun’s undulating flood”) both asserts the identification of Agni with the sun, a cosmic connection that pervades the hymn, and depicts the fire on the ground as both bright like the sun and in constant wave-like motion.

In c there is a lively debate among the aforementioned commentators about the referent of the fem. pl. *áruṣīḥ* ‘ruddy ones’—dawns, flames, or flames standing for the cows of the Dakṣiṇā (for the last, see Ge’s n. 3cd). Given that the same *áruṣīḥ* are found in X.5.5, where they are generally agreed to refer to flames, this same identification seems likely here. As in X.5, the flames rise higher as the fire goes stronger. The lively debate continues with regard to the bahuvr. *ásva-budhna-* ‘having horses as ground’, a hapax but in clear relationship with *ásva-budhya-* (3x). Since the latter always qualifies some kind of wealth (see comm. ad I.92.7–8), Ge believes that the adj. here must refer metaphorically to the Dakṣiṇā, but making this work requires mental contortions that do not seem worthwhile. Here I think the ‘horse’ is actually

Agni: the flames have the fire as their base or foundation, even as they and the rest of the fire rises. Agni is regularly compared to a horse (e.g., IV.2.8, VI.3.4, VII.3.2).

In d these flames “find pleasure in their own bodies” (*tanvò juṣanta*), a description of the seemingly rapturous movements of flames.

X.8.4: The two hemistichs of this vs. seem thematically disjunct. The first has to do with Agni’s timebound daily appearance, the second with his role as a creator of alliances. I do not see any connection between them. These distinct themes are reunited in vs. 6; see comm. there.

The āmreḍita *uṣá-uṣaḥ* of course preserves the archaic gen. sg. of *uṣás-*, representing *\*uṣ-ṣ-as*.

Both the referents and the grammatical identity of the dual gen.-loc. *yamáyoḥ* are disputed. Among the suggestions are Day and Night, the Aśvins, and even Yama and Yamī, whose famous dialogue is found two hymns later (X.10). It is also unclear whether the form is a gen. dependent on *vibhāvā* (Ge), gen. dependent on a supplied noun (Re: le maître), or loc. and dependent on nothing. As for the first, favored by Ge, *vibhāvan-* doesn’t take the gen. (I.69.9, cited in his n. 4b, is not an ex.); since supplying a headnoun (with Re) is arbitrary, a loc. reading seems the best choice. I opt for that, with the loc. as a temporal marker: by day and by night.

The apparent causal relationship between pādas a and b, signaled by the *hī* in pāda a, is rather difficult to interpr., and I would now somewhat change my tr. and the interpr. that lies behind it. In b the publ. tr. renders *abhavaḥ* as “have become,” but (per IH) augmented imperfects should not have this “perfect”-type sense, but rather mean “you became.” I now think this pāda means that (in the primordial past) Agni assumed the role of (/became) the far-radiant one at the two twilights, namely dawn and the onset of night (“at [the time of] the twins”), a role he continues to have. He did so *on the grounds (hī)* that he always—every dawn—goes at the forefront of the dawn. The contrast between the pres. *éṣi* in the *hī*cl. and the augmented imperf. *abhavaḥ* in the main cl. is not problematic: the *hī* clause describes a regular recurring action, still happening in present time but repeated from time immemorial, whereas the main cl. asserts the result of this recurrent action, a distinct event in the past (“you became”), though Agni maintains this role in the pres.

The *hī*cl. says nothing about night, just dawn, whereas I claim that Agni is *vibhāvan-* at night as well as at dawn. The two twilights are regularly assimilated to each other in Vedic, including in ritual time: the daily Agnihotra is to be performed at the rising and setting of the sun. And of course the illumination of the fire is even more evident at night than in daylight.

As was said above, the 2nd hemistich of this vs. embarks on an entirely new theme. It also strikingly introduces the ritual enactment of the formation of an alliance (*mitrá-*), a ritual that persists to the present day in Hindu wedding ceremonies: the seven steps taken by the parties to the alliance towards the northeast from beside the ritual fire. (See reff. in publ. intro.) This general description of the formation of alliances seems to introduce the next vss. (5–6), in which Agni becomes, or becomes identified with, other divinities or divine roles. If this is the intent, I find it somewhat puzzling, because the insistent *bhuvah* ‘you become’ of 6–7 implies a transformation of Agni into the various entities, not an alliance with them. But perhaps the point is that Agni keeps his own identity even when fulfilling the various roles, which is more like an alliance than straight transformation, but still doesn’t seem to me to be the same thing at all.

X.8.5–6: As just noted, these last two vss. in the Agni portion of the hymn introduce a series of roles that Agni fulfills. All four pādas of vs. 5 and the first one of 6 begin with the injunc.

*bhúvah* ‘you become’. Listing a set of roles Agni performs and/or a set of divinities with which he is identified is fairly common practice; see, e.g., the lengthy list in II.1; what is novel is that these might be considered alliances—see comm. *immed.* above. Note that the repeated *bhúvah* has an entirely different function from *abhavaḥ* in vs. 4. Here *bhúvah* refers to the regular assumption of a role in the present; *abhavaḥ* referred to a single event in the past. In this interpr. of *bhúvah* I part ways with Hoffmann (214–15), who takes such usages of the (secondary) injunctives *bhuvās*, *-at* as expressing “resultative Konstatierung”: as a result of an action in the past, the situation holds now and in the future (that is, “became and now is,” with emphasis on the “is”). Here, therefore, he tr. *bhuvah* as “bist,” not “wirst”: “Du (Agni) bist das Auge ...” In our passage, at any rate, I think the point is not that Agni became each of these entities and remains so, but that he takes up these roles from time to time and then moves on.

X.8.5: Verbal forms of the root  $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$  are not construed directly with the dative, but have a direct obj. in the acc. In pāda b I have supplied “your tasks” as a generic object, though I do not have particular parallels in mind. A common object of  $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$  is ‘gods’, enshrined also in the cmpds *deva-vī-* and *devā-vīti-*, and supplying “gods” as object would also be possible here.

X.8.6: This vs. reunites the separate strains of the Agni portion of the hymn: the birth and growth of Agni up through the cosmos (vss. 1–4ab) and the various roles he assumes (vss. 4cd–5). This may account for some ill-assorted phraseology. In particular the two terms in the overtly conjoined phrase *yajñāsya rájasas ca* “of the sacrifice and of airy space” do not form a natural class, to say the least, and the fact that the gen. depends on *netā* ‘leader’ makes it somewhat worse. “Leader of the sacrifice” makes perfect sense and is in fact found elsewhere (I.196.2, III.15.4, both of Agni, as well as fem. *yajñāsya netrī* IV.56.2). But what does it mean to be “the leader of *rájas-*”? Several different solutions have been proposed, none particularly satisfactory. Sāy. interpr. *rájas-* as a reference to waters, which would improve the sense but has no support and doesn’t fit the context. Ge takes the 2nd term as if expressing extent of space (“der Führer des Opfers und durch das Dunkel”), whose awkwardness speaks for itself (less awk. but no better supported in KH’s [215 n. 204] “der Führer des Opfers und der Führer durch die Finsternis”). Re in his n., calling the phrase a sort of zeugma, supplies “mesureur” as the headnoun with *rájasah* (without argument); similarly Klein (DGRV I.68), also calling it a zeugma, supplies instead “pervader.” Tichy (-tar-stems 352) decouples the two terms, taking *ca* as ‘auch’: “Du wirst zum Führer des Opfers, auch im Luftraum.”

My own, very tentative, suggestion rests on the return of the theme of the birth and growth of Agni. In the first vss. of the hymn (esp. vs. 1; see also nearby X.5 and comm. there) Agni is kindled and goes forth and up (1a), with his first location on leaving the earth being the space between the two world halves (1b), until he reaches heaven (1c). Here again, I would say, the sacrifice of our pāda a locates his origin on the earth, but the *rájas-*, the realm between earth and heaven, is also found in pāda a and the whole of the *yátrā* clause of b, which qualifies *rájasah*. Pāda b makes it quite clear that Agni has reached that location. He then arrives at heaven in pāda c. The twist in my interpr. is to take *rájasah* not as genitive, but as ablative: “he is leader of the sacrifice and from the airy realm.” I realize that this is a trick, possibly a cheap one: *rájasah* looks as if it’s entirely parallel to *yajñāsya* and in the same case, but my reading gives it an alternative case interpr., which is morphologically entirely legitimate but pushes the syntactic envelope. The point would be that the *rájas-* is only a waystation on Agni’s journey towards heaven and he leads the sacrifice from the *rájas-* to heaven.

My interpr. of c is also different from most, though not as radically. I take *sácase* as intrans./pass. ‘you are accompanied’, while most take it as an underlying transitive in absolute usage (e.g., Ge “du ... das Geleit gibst”; sim. KH, Tichy). It is certainly true that *sácate* regularly takes an acc. (“accompany X”), and here we might even (re-)supply *yajñám* (“accompany [the sacrifice]”) from pāda a. However, in nearby X.7.1 *sacemahi* is used in the same pass./intrans. I suggest here. I would also point to the *nīyúts* that accompany him or help him accompany others: *nīyút-* is used especially of Vāyu’s teams; they are literally wind-horses, and I see these breezes wafting Agni upwards towards heaven.

X.8.7–9: On this appended account of the Trita-Viśvarūpa myth and possible reasons for its attachment to the end of the preceding Agni hymn, see publ. intro.

X.8.7: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. may be subject to two simultaneous readings, as an account of the beginning of the Trita-Viśvarūpa conflict and as a description of the establishment of the third (=Āhavanīya) ritual fire on the ritual ground. To assemble the evidence for the latter reading first, note first the appropriateness of *tritá-* as a designation for this fire; on *tritá-* for the third fire, see X.46.6. This entity is located *vavré antár* “within a/his covering.” Although this phrase can be used for the Vala cave in that myth (see below), it could also refer to the kindling wood or the plants within which Agni is concealed. Note that the related stem *vavrí-* is found in this sequence of Agni hymns in similar usage (X.4.4 of the wood, X.5.5 of his smoke; cf. also, e.g., V.19.1). “Seeking a visionary thought” (*ichán dhītím*) can refer to the ritual fire’s response to the hymns chanted at its kindling, and under this reading the father can be Heaven. In pāda c the real tipoff to the Agni reading is *pitrór upásthe* “in the lap of his parents”; not only does this phrase recall *mūrdhānam pitróḥ* in 3a, but, more importantly, *pitrór upásthe* (also *upásthe mātūḥ*) is regularly used of the ritual Agni’s location (cf., e.g., I.31.9, 146.1, III.5.8, 26.9, VI.7.5, etc.). The audience would be primed to perceive an Agni reference here. As for the hapax *sacasyámāna-*, although Ge and Re both take it to mean ‘seeking help’, surely its derivation from the root  $\sqrt{sac}$  ‘accompany’, via a putative *\*sacas-* ‘accompaniment, companionship’, suggests rather a sense ‘seeking companionship’, and it echoes *sácase* ‘you are accompanied’ in the immediately preceding vs. 6b (see disc. there). The verb *vetí* in d also echoes *véṣi* in 5b. All of this suggests that a reading that continues the Agni focus of the first 6 vss. is eminently possible.

However, equally possible and supported by the vss. that follow is a reading that feeds into the Viśvarūpa myth. As I noted in the publ. intro., the Indo-Iranian myth of the slaying of the three-headed serpent-dragon has been assimilated into the Vala myth, and we see the telltale Vala signs beginning in the first pāda with the phrase *vavré antár*: in 2 of its 3 other occurrences (IV.1.13, V.31.3; not VII.104.3) this refers to the confinement of the cows within the Vala cave. The b and d pādas specify the means with which Trita (in this vs. the hero of the myth) effects the cows’ release. In the standard versions of the Vala myth, Indra-Bṛhaspati opens the cave not by brute force but by verbal means, singing or reciting an open-sesame. In b Trita seeks the visionary thought (*dhīti-*) derived from his poetic ancestry that will provide this open-sesame; in d he “speaks his own familial weapons” (*jāmí bruvāṇá áyudhāni*). In other words the weapon he uses to release the cows is speech—poetry—which he has inherited from his forefathers, a point made more explicit by *pítryāny áyudhāni* in the next pāda (8a). The same phrase, in the sg., is found in VIII.6.3, again describing the deployment of words as weapons. Pāda c is a bit harder to interpr. in a Vala context: perhaps Trita is seeking the companionship of the cows, or the association (=herd) of cows; “in the lap of the two parents” could in this context mean “in the

space between heaven and earth.” Ge (n. 7c) suggests, rather loosely, that it refers to the whole world. (In general, the reconstructions of the story behind these vss. by both Ge and Old are fanciful and not very helpful.)

One loose end is the referent of *asyá* opening the vs. I take it as inherently reflexive and explicitly contrastive with *pitúḥ ... párasya* at the end of the hemistich. Trita—whether referring to Agni or to the slayer of Viśvarūpa—employs his own resolve while also seeking to conform to the ancestral ways.

X.8.8: The transition from the Agni hymn to the Viśvarūpa saga is complete here, and without the double Agni/Trita reading that complicated the transition verse, 7, this vs. presents straightforward narrative. However, another conceptual disjunction is introduced: as the Indo-Iranian myth requires, the monster is actually attacked, struck, and slain, using the quintessential verb of violence,  $\sqrt{han}$  (*jaghanván* [c]). But the plot of the Vedic Vala myth unfolds differently, and the Vala myth, with the release of the cows, is what we encounter in d.

As noted above, the “familial weapons” (*jāmí ... áyudhāni*) of 7d are reprised here with the semantically almost identical *pítryāny áyudhāni* (pāda a), reinforced by (*abhy*) *áyudhat* in b. Indra is also introduced as the setter-in-motion of Trita Āptya’s action, preparatory to making him the agent himself in the next vs. The replacement of the old Indo-Iranian hero by the new Power God of Vedic is deftly managed in this set of three vss.: Indra absent in vs. 7, Indra obliquely responsible for the action in vs. 8; Indra himself the actor in vs. 9.

On the phrase “three-headed, seven-reined” used of Agni in I.146.1 and on the lexical substitution of *-śíras-* for *-mūrdhán-* in the “three-headed” compound, see publ. intro.

X.8.9: The desid. stem *ínakṣa-* to  $\sqrt{nas}$  ‘reach, attain’ is a secondary replacement of the old desid. to the root, *íyakṣa-* (on which see comm. ad VI.21.3), presumably because the older form lacked transparency and was being attracted into the orbit of  $\sqrt{yaj}$  ‘sacrifice’. See Heenen (Desid., 78–79) on the late distribution of *ínakṣa-* and on its formation. As he points out, the lack of initial *n-* in the redupl. (not *\*nínakṣa-*) shows that it is a secondary adjustment of *íyakṣa-* via the introduction of the initial consonant of the full-grade root.

The publ. tr. has a complex interpr. of *ávābhinat* with a double acc. “split (the heads [acc.]) off the victim (acc.),” with “the heads” to be supplied. I now think this is unnecessary: *áva*  $\sqrt{bhid}$  simply takes an acc. of the victim (I.54.4, II.11.2, 18, etc.). Although I would prefer to sneak the sense ‘split’ into the rendering, I’m afraid ‘cut down’ has to suffice, and I would emend the tr. to “... cut down the one ...” Ge does “decapitate” (enthauptete), while Re’s interpr. is truly baroque: “l’abattit-en-le-transperçant.” Here the *áva* ‘down’ contrasts with the *úd* in *udínakṣantam* ‘trying to reach up’, of the vaunting ambition of Viśvarūpa.

The mid. part. *mānyamāna-* ‘thinking himself’ is used in a pregnant sense. This participle is generally used with a complement that indicates a false view the subject holds about himself, e.g., VI.25.5 *yodhó mānyamānaḥ* “thinking himself a fighter.” Here I think the false view is that he has the qualities of his opponent, Indra.

Gen. pl. *gónām* must be a partitive-type gen. with *ācakrānāḥ* (so Ge and Old, *pace* Re), but, as often, without partitive sense: surely the point is that Indra got *all* the cows.

## X.9 Waters

This hymn is an Anhang on the Agni collection that opens the maṇḍala. Along with X.8 it is attributed to Triśiras Tvāṣṭra (with an alternative poet Sindhudvīpa Āmbarīṣa also named for

this one), but as discussed above, X.8 clearly belongs with the earlier Agni hymns X.1–7. This hymn, however, has no clear points of contact with the ones that precede, and it has a different divine dedicand and a different meter: Gāyatrī (1–7) and Anuṣṭubh (8–9) rather than Triṣṭubh. (The Anukr. analyses vs. 5 as Vardhamāna [6 7 / 8] and 7 as Pratiṣṭhā [8 7 / 6], but both are resolvable into perfectly fine Gāyatrīs.) Ge’s textual presentation assumes that it is in ṛcas; Old dithers. That vss. 6–9 are identical to I.23.20–23 but the ṛca boundary should fall between vss. 6 and 7 makes a strict ṛca division unlikely, but vss. 1–3 do seem to stand apart from the rest. See publ. intro.

X.9.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is very compressed for what it seems to be expressing. It opens with a lexeme that is found a number of times elsewhere: *āram* √*gam* DAT. Cf. I.187.7, VI.63.2, VII.68.2, VIII.92.27, as well as the cmpd. *aram-gamā-* (2x). The idiom seems to mean “go/come (to a place), ready/fit for DAT., with the dative expressing one of several functions: “fit to benefit someone, serve as something, or derive benefit from something” (sim. Re). The shifting relationship of benefit expressed by *āram* in general is discussed in the comm. ad VIII.92.24–27. For the first sense of this particular idiom, “fit to benefit someone,” see VIII.92.27 *āram gamāma te vayām* “let us go (to be) fit for you.” The second, “serve as something, lit. be fit to be something,” is found in I.187.7 *āram bhakṣāya gamyāḥ* “you should come, fit (to be) (our) portion,” in a vs. and a hymn addressed to Food. For an example of the opposite relationship, with the dative providing the benefit to the subject rather than receiving it, see VI.63.2 *āram me gantam hāvayāyāsmāi* “Come fit for this summons of mine,” where the Aśvins benefit from the singer’s call by arriving in order to drink the soma promised in the next pāda. A similar situation is depicted in VII.68.2, also addressed to the Aśvins: *āram gantam haviṣo vītāye me*. Here I would alter JPB’s tr. to “Come fit for the pursuit of my oblation.” Because the cmpd *aramgamā-* lacks the full syntagm, it is not possible to be certain which of the senses it has. Both occurrences modify Indra, both times in the collocation *aramgamāya jāgmaye*, which I tr. “who comes fittingly, who comes regularly.” But Indra could be coming to benefit us (by giving, e.g.) or to be benefited by us (by soma or praises, e.g.) – or, indeed, both. As for the sense expressed in the full syntagm in our passage, *tāsmā āram gamāma*, it must be the first, “fit to benefit someone.”

The next problem in the vs. is what to do with *vah*. Re pronounces it “explétif” and does not tr. it; Ge’s rendering seems to reflect a view like Re’s: “Dem möchten wir euch recht kommen ...,” in which tr. I don’t really understand the use of *euch*. As noted in the publ. intro., on the basis of the motherly image in vs. 2, I assume that the poet is claiming “you,” that is, the waters, as our mothers, and as their sons (or under their auspices) we wish to be beneficial to the person referred to by *tāsmāi*. The further twist is that it is for the house of that very person that the waters (re)vivify “us.” As noted in the publ. intro., the general view that this is the house of the sacrificer seems reasonable, but it is hard to extract from the abbreviated phrasing. What the waters are doing when they “animate and beget us” is not clear.

X.9.6–9: As indicated in the publ. intro. and also in the above intro. to the hymn, these vss. are identical to I.23.20–23, verses to the waters appended to a hymn otherwise following the sequence of the Praūgaśastra. The only departure is the omission of I.23.20d *āpas ca viśvābhesajīḥ* “and the waters are healing for all” (lit. “possess all healing remedies”) in its equivalent vs. X.9.6 (which has only 3 pādas), but this is somewhat made up for by the last pāda

of our vs. 5, *apó yacāmi bheṣajám* “I beseech the waters for a healing remedy.” For comm. on the individual vss. see the comm. to the equivalent vss. in I.23.20ff.

## X.10–19

On these hymns loosely organized into a Yama cycle, see publ. intro. Although the Anukr. assigns them to a number of different poets, they all touch on some aspect of Yama, the realm of the dead over which he presides, or the funeral that precedes mortals’ entry into that realm. See esp. Old (Prol. 232–33) on the close phraseological connections among X.10–13 and in favor of their further connection to X.14–18 [19].

## X.10 Yama and Yamī

This remarkable dialogue is one of the most famous hymns in the RV (in the rather limited circles in which *any* hymn in the RV might gain fame), and it has been tr. and discussed by numerous scholars. Recent treatments include that of Susanne Schnaus in her *Die Dialoglieder im altindischen Rigveda* (2008: 163–201) and Bodewitz’s generally negative response to it (IJ 52 [2009]), as well as parts of W. Knobl’s 2009 Leiden diss., notably parts of the chapter “Mind-reading the Poet,” reprinted from StII 24 (2007). The comm. here will make no attempt to discuss / refute / concur with the various points of view found in the many treatments, but primarily set forth my own, esp. when it differs from the standard versions of Ge and the like. (Schnaus cites previous views quite fully, so her disc. can be usefully consulted, and Bodewitz adds additional reff.) Although Re’s treatment in EVP (XVI.122–23 [1967]) is scanty, he gives a complete tr. with nn. in *Hymnes spéculatifs* (1956: 55–57 + 238). The hymn is also found in the AV, at the beginning of the collection of funeral vss. in XVIII (AVŚ XVIII.1.1–16) and so is available in Whitney’s rather antiquated tr.

The hymn, esp. Yamī’s speech, contains a large proportion of perfect optatives (*vavṛtyām* 1a, *dadhīta* 1c [probably; see Ged. Elizarenkova p. 160 and n. 12], *viviśyāḥ* 3d, *riricyām* 7c, *mimīyāt* 9b [probably]; cf. also *bibhryāt* 9d [to a redupl. pres., but similar in Gestalt]; Yama’s speech: *papṛcyām* 12a). On the pf. opt. as characteristic of women’s speech, see my 2008 Ged. Elizarenkova article “Women’s Language in the Rig Veda?” On the usage of the pf. opt., see my 2009 “Where Are All the Optatives?” There are attempts to interpret the pf. opt. with a special nuance added by the pf.—e.g., Knobl’s claim (n. 10 p. 110 of “Mind-Reading” = p. 50 of diss.) that it refers to “unreal possibility,” though he tr. more as a past potential “I would have liked to make the companion turn” for *vavṛtyām* 1a, “I would have yielded ...” for *riricyām* 7a—but as I demonstrated in my 2009 article, these attempts are misguided. Given the distribution of optatives across paradigms, the perfect optative is ordinarily the only optative attested to its root and simply expresses general optative value.

It is also remarkable how many kinship and quasi-kinship terms are deployed in this hymn (3 in the first vs. alone), but “sister” and “brother,” the two terms that name the relationship between the protagonists, are postponed until vs. 11. As noted in the publ. intro., it is also eminently worth paying attention to the grammatical categories of voice and number, esp. the almost studied avoidance of the 1<sup>st</sup> du (“we two”), which, again, is the operative paradigmatic slot that describes the two participants in the dialogue.

There is a considerable amount of concatenation between vss., esp. where one of the speakers twists the words of the other.



X.10.1: The vs. is Yamī’s, and she speaks of herself in the 1st ps. (*ā ... vavṛtyām*), but the rest of the vs., including the apparent references to Yama, are in the 3rd ps.

The grammatical identity of *sakhyā* is debated. Ge pronounces it a dative, which would work well contextually but is morphologically excluded. Old (and most others) take it as an acc. pl. neut, an interpr. reflected in the publ. tr. But I now am more inclined to see it as an instr. sg., also an old view (so already Wh’s tr. of the AV vs., flg. Lanman *Noun Infl.* 336), recently upheld by Schnaus. It would be an instr. of cause, and I now emend the tr. to “on the grounds of partnership.”

The 2nd pāda poses a number of separate problems. The first is that the nom. sg. pf. part. *jaganvān* is masc., though the speaker of vs. 1 must be Yamī. The part. can therefore not modify the subject of pāda a, but must have the same referent as acc. *sākhāyam* in the first pāda, namely Yama. Technically speaking it could modify the likely masc. subj. of c (masc. reference confirmed by *dīdhyānaḥ* in d), but it seems best to take b as a separate clause with a predicated pf. participle (so most interpr.; see esp. Old) and *cīd* marking a concessive clause(tte).

The adj. *purū* and the noun *aṇavām* disagree in number. With most, I supply a neut. pl. noun with *purū*, viz. *rājāṃsi* ‘realms’; cf. III.58.5 *tiráḥ purū cid ... rājāṃsi*, and the reasonably numerous passages in which *tiráḥ* is construed with *rājas-*.

The larger question that this pāda raises is where did Yama go, and is he now separated from Yamī or did she come along? On the one hand, *ā √ vṛt* ‘turn here’ in pāda a implies that he is somewhere else and she wants to bring him back; on the other, it is hard to believe that the dialogue that follows in the rest of the hymn was conducted at long distance; it has too intimate and claustrophobic a feel. So he must have made a quick return. Some have suggested that he crossed from immortality to mortality, but there is no other evidence for that. Perhaps it’s simply a matter of a mental journey: many a wife has said to many a husband, “are you even listening to me? you seem like you’re a million miles away.”

In the 2nd hemistich Yamī presents her strongest juridical argument for their incest, though it is a bit anachronistic. Her phrasing is also remarkable for its distancing effects. The argument is the one familiar from later Hindu dharma and religious practice, that a son should beget a son, so that his own father will receive ancestral offerings from his grandson: the three-generational paternal lineage. (It is anachronistic here because, in the absence of other humans, no such religious expectations and societal structures can yet exist.) In her formulation only the grandfather (*pitūh*, that is, the father of the unidentified subject) and his grandson (*nápātam*) appear overtly; the central actor, the male of the middle generation, who is by implication Yama, is merely the understood subject of the 3rd sg. verb *ā dadhīta*. The only identity he is given is the archaic ritual title *vedhāḥ*, which adds to the solemnity of the quasi-legal prescription she is asserting. It is also worth noting that though the verb here seems to have the primary sense ‘provide, establish’, *ā √ dhā* in the active can also mean ‘impregnate’ and in the middle (of a female) ‘conceive’, so the procreative sense of the lexeme is lurking.

In d *pratarām* is generally rendered as ‘future’ or the like (Ge: Zukunft), but I think it’s a little more pointed: it’s not merely a temporal designation but refers to the extension of Yama’s own line.

X.10.2: On Yama’s first appearance, he picks up—and rejects—the overture Yamī made in her first pāda, by echoing her etymological figure *sākhāyam sakhyā* with *sākhā sakhyám*, while emphatically expressing the rejection (*nā ... vaṣṭi*). Although he speaks of himself in the 3rd ps.,

*sákhā ... vaṣṭi*, he does implicitly accept Yamī’s designation of him as ‘partner, companion’, by using the same noun stem. He also introduces the first overt 2nd person, in the enclitic *te*.

The second pāda of this vs. is difficult and disputed—as well as being crucial, since it gives Yama’s first and strongest argument against the proposed incest and the one that depends not on fear of detection by the gods (cd) but on some sort of apparently universal principle. The argument is structured (in part) by the opposition between *sá-* ‘like’ and *vīsu-* ‘different’. The standard interpr. is that *sálakṣmā* refers to someone of the same kinship lineage (in this case a sister) and *vīsurūpā* to a woman of a different lineage, so that she is available for marriage. The idea is that though Yamī belongs to the former class, she will behave like one of the latter. See Old’s clear paraphrase “dass ... die Schwester ... werde wie eine Frau aus anderm Geschlecht.” This interpr. is favored by the subj. *bhāvāti* ‘will become’, which implies a transformation or pseudo-transformation. However, I am bothered by the other part of the opposition between the two bahuvrīhis, *sálakṣmā ... vīsurūpā*. Yama is contrasting not only ‘like’ and ‘different’ but also ‘mark(s)’ and ‘form’, but the standard interpr. assumes that the 2nd part is held constant: same family / different family. The stem *vīsurūpa-* is used several times in the fem. dual of Night and Dawn (I.123.7, I.186.4, VI.58.1), who are in fact sisters but have different bodies, different physical form. I therefore suggest that here the contrast is not between kin / non-kin, but rather between someone who is kin to him, but has a different—viz., female—shape. Yama is rejecting a *sakhyām* ‘partnership’ that involves such a pairing because its outcome in sex is inevitable. The subjunctive *bhāvāti* fits my interpr. less well than the standard one, I admit; it must be a sort of deliberative subjunctive rather than depicting a transformation, But it recognizes that both parts of the two crucial cmpds contrast, not just the first members.

There are two factors that complicate things. The first is that, though on the surface *sálakṣmā* looks like a straightforward fem. like *vīsurūpā*, its stem must be *sálakṣman-*, and our form can’t be simply taken as fem. without question. Ge makes much of this (n. 2b) and suggest that it’s a neut. pl. with a singular verb. His insistence on this point is connected with the fact that similar expressions in neut. and masc. are used in the animal sacrifice, already in the early YV mantra collections (see details in the n.), and he wishes to see the adjectives here used of Yamī as applications of the words in technical usage in animal husbandry. Bodewitz also makes an enthusiastic detour through the animal sacrifice to produce yet a different interpr. of this pāda. However, Old sensibly argues that the phraseology was borrowed *into* the animal sacrifice ritual from the RV and not vice versa, and since he is content to take *sálakṣmā* as a fem., so am I.

In c the two genitives, *mahāḥ* and *ásurasya* can be construed together (“the sons of the great Lord, the heroes”), as Ge and Re take them. It doesn’t seem to me to make a good deal of difference. The Lord (or great Lord) may well be Dyaus. As to the group identity of his sons, I agree with Old in choosing not to try to narrow it down. Ge’s (n. 2c) assertion that they must be the Aṅgirasas seems unduly restrictive; surely the point is that *all* the gods potentially perform surveillance.

X.10.3: As is generally noted, Yamī picks up Yama’s words, specifically his verb *vaṣṭi*, which he used in his rejection of her proposal in 2a. She begins her vs. with emphatically fronted *uśānti ghā*, which we might render in idiomatic Engl. as “They *do too* want it.” She not only takes his verb, but she provides it with a more powerful subject: the immortals (a generalizing of the group he referred to in 2cd). She keeps his *etád* at the end of the pāda. We might also note that because of the fronting of the verb the subj. (*té amítāsaḥ*), incl. the demonstrative *té*, is displaced to the middle of the pāda, with the *té* taking somewhat unusual non-initial position. Here it

teasingly echoes the enclitic *te* in 2a, which, as was just noted, is the first overt 2nd ps. in the hymn.

In b *tyajás-* is a hapax, though clearly (*pace* Bodewitz, who takes it as a thematized adj.) a possessive secondary derivation of the well-established *s*-stem neut. *tyajás-* to  $\sqrt{tyaj}$  ‘leave (behind), abandon’. Ge thinks *tyajás-* is the personified fault, that is, the living result of the blameworthy act of incest. But surely Yamī is not going to pitch it in that negative way. Re’s suggestion (EVP XVI.122) that it is analogous to *rēknas-* ‘legacy’ to  $\sqrt{ric}$  ‘leave behind’ is more illuminating. (In the earlier Hymnes spéc, he instead tr. as ‘un survivant’.) I take *tyajás-* as the personified ‘legacy’, who embodies what the father left behind. This personification finds a bizarre analogue in modern-day American English academic terminology: in the (controversial) practice of elite colleges and universities offering preferential admission to children of alumni, a practice called “legacy admissions,” the students so admitted are known as “legacies.”

The gen. *ékasya cit ... mártasya* is the clearest indication we have that Yama is, or will become, mortal. It of course contrasts with *amṛtāsaḥ* in pāda a.

Pāda c is the first time in the hymn in which the 2nd ps. and the 1st ps. appear together. The 2nd sg. enclitic *te* returns from 2a (with shifted reference: in vs. 2 it refers to Yamī, here to Yama), in a similar phonological context: 2a *ná te*, 3c *ní te*. But the 1st ps., used of herself by Yamī, is—oddly—plural: *asmé*. She is still practicing the distancing characteristic of the speech of both of them in the opening of the hymn, but creeping closer to intimacy, at least pronominal intimacy.

The injunc. *ní ... dhāyi* is almost universally taken as modal; e.g., Ge: “Dein Sinn soll sich unserem Sinne fügen,” but this is far from necessary. (KH doesn’t treat this vs.) I think rather that Yamī is asserting that Yama’s mind is *already* fixed on—or indeed in—her, whether he acknowledges it or not; two vss. later (5a) she claims that their sexual relationship was determined long ago, and here she seems to say that he is mentally prepared for, perhaps already eager for it, and now he should take the next step to the bodily relationship. If the sense is “your mind is fixed *in* me,” the entering of the body she demands in the next pāda has already been accomplished mentally.

The last pāda is the most direct expression of what she’s been hinting at so far encountered. It also contains the first 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. verb (probably; see below), the pf. opt.  $\tilde{a}$  *vivisyāḥ* ‘you should enter’. But until we come to the verb at the end of the pāda, her statement seems entirely parallel to her first juridical argument for incest given in 1c. Like that one, this contains two (quasi-) kinship terms, *jāni-* ‘wife’ and *pāti-* ‘husband’, and the optative should give it the same legally prescriptive force as 3rd ps.  $\tilde{a}$  *dadhīta* in 1c. We expect 3rd ps. “a husband should enter the body of his wife,” and so the “as husband, *you* should enter ...” comes as a shock. She may also be splitting the difference, as it were: I wonder if *vivisyāḥ* can also be read as a nonce perfect *precatīve*, in the 3rd sg. Precatives are of course only built to aorist stems, but the athematic *-yāḥ* in the aor. entirely substitutes for the ordinary opt. 3rd sg., expected *\*-yāt* (see my “Where Are All the Optatives?”), and so I think this 3rd sg. prescriptive force could carry over to the pf. here. In this way Yamī can both maintain her tone of legalistic authority and make a direct personal appeal. Her statement here is reminiscent of Lopāmudrā’s (less explicit) ones in I.179.1–2: 1d *ápy ū nú pātnīr vṛṣaṇo jagamyuḥ* “Bullish (men) should now come to their wives”; 2d *sám ū nú pātnīr vṛṣabhir jagamyuḥ* “Wives should now unite with their bullish (husbands).”

On the gen. ending *-ur* in *jányuḥ* (found only here) borrowed from the kinship terms, see Old inter alia.

X.10.4: Yama simply ignores Yamī’s arguments in the previous vs. and changes the subject. This change is signaled by the lack of concatenation: for the first time in the hymn no words from the previous vs. are carried over into the next. He also shows himself to be as adept at distancing as his sister, until the very end of the vs. In the 1<sup>st</sup> hemistich, as he poses rhetorical questions about what they should or should not do, he uses the 1<sup>st</sup> person, but the 1<sup>st</sup> person *plural*: *cakṛmā* “should we (pl.) do?”; *rapema* “should we (pl.) murmur?” So for the first time they are both subjects of the same verbs, but the expression is grammatically skewed.

His first argument, in pāda a, is the “no precedent” one. Interestingly he doesn’t actually make the argument, leaving the main cl. verb-less and in the air. We expect “\*(should we do it) now?” – and this verb is supplied by almost all tr. and comm. (The exception is Bodewitz, who think the *kād* clause includes b, but his tr. is so contorted that it demonstrates by itself that that is a bad idea.) The verb we would expect, corresponding to the pf. *cakṛmā* in the dependent clause and parallel to the opt. *rapema* in b, would be the pf. opt. \**cakriyāma*. I would suggest that since at this point in the hymn Yamī “owns” the pf. opt., he would avoid using that form; it’s only towards the end, when he’s essentially won the argument, that he uses a pf. opt. (12a).

His second argument has to do with public versus hidden. Just as their behavior should stand up to the public visual scrutiny of the gods (2cd, also 8ab), so should their words be truths not only when spoken out loud (*vādantaḥ*), but also in the quiet intimate register ( $\sqrt{rap}$ ) that (he seems to imply) the gods might not overhear. Like most, I think that b is a rhetorical question like the incomplete one in b introduced by *kād*.

His clinching argument is found in cd, though in a sense it’s just a restatement of what they both know—that they are siblings by virtue of their parents, the Gandharva and the Apsaras (“watery maiden” *āpyā ... yōṣā*).

In d *sā no nābhiḥ* is a fine ex. of the “attraction” of a demonstrative in an equational clause to the gender and number of the predicate, a phenomenon quite familiar in Vedic prose (on which see, e.g., Brereton “*tat tvam asi* in Context”). Here the referent of *sā* is the gender-mixed dual pair of Gandharva and maiden; we might expect \**tā no nābhiḥ* if this syntactic rule hadn’t been applied. For another ex. see X.11.8 and comm.; for an equational rel. cl. that does not show this attraction see VI.41.3 and comm.

The standard tr. take *sā no nābhiḥ* and *paramām jāmī tán nau* as parallel phrases, expressing essentially the same thing; e.g. Ge: “die sind unser Ursprung, das ist unsere höchste Blutsverwandtschaft.” By contrast, in the publ. tr. I adopt a clever suggestion of Bodewitz’s (p. 265), that *tād* in the second phrase means ‘therefore’, and the second phrase thus draws conclusions based on the first. This conclusion is that their kinship is of the highest, that is, in this case the closest (full siblings), and that precludes any other relationship they might have, esp. a sexual one.

The final word of the vs. is *nau*, the 1st dual enclitic. This is the first time in the hymn that we meet a 1st dual, perhaps not accidentally in unaccented, hence syntactically recessive form. But its appearance here is striking; even in this same pāda the 1st ps. was first represented by the pl. enclitic *naḥ*. Yama has finally acknowledged, however indirectly, that this is between the two of them alone.

X.10.5: Yamī immediately counters Yama’s triumphant assertion that their highest relationship is blood kinship, by substituting what is (for her) implicitly an even higher relationship. Since they shared a womb (thus acknowledging their full siblinghood), they were created from the first as a married couple, a household pair (*dāmpatī*), lit. ‘two lords [/lord and lady] of the house’. As

in 1d with her deployment of the inherited ritual title *vedhāḥ*, she utilizes an archaic, inherited, and resonant word for the married pair, which gives dignity and prestige to her claim. (On the use of *dāmpatī* and its lexical replacements, see my 2019 “The Term *gr̥hastha* and the (Pre)history of the Householder,” in *Gr̥hastha: The Householder in Ancient Indian Religious Culture*, ed. Patrick Olivelle. Pp. 3–19.)

She is also quick to pick up his newly introduced *nau*, placing it in pādas a and b.

The sequence of nom. sgs., *janitā ... tvāṣṭā savitā viśvárūpaḥ*, raises the question of how many agents were involved, and, in particular, is the god Savitar separately named here beside Tvaṣṭar or is the stem *savitár-* used here as a descriptor (‘the impeller’)? With most interpr. I opt for the latter. Among other things *asyá* in c presupposes a singular referent. Tvaṣṭar is, of course, most closely associated with the procreation and the shaping of embryos; see, e.g., X.184.1 *tvāṣṭā rūpāṇi pīmśatu* “let Tvaṣṭar carve the forms,” in a pregnancy charm. In nearby X.2.6–7 there is an implicit riddle that posits the generic “begetter” as the one who “begot you” (X.2.6b *jānitā tvā jajāna*), immediately solved in the next vs. by Tvaṣṭar (X.2.7b *tvāṣṭā ... tvā ... jajāna*) in the same words. See comm. ad X.2.7.

Note that *viśvárūpaḥ* in b echoes *viśurūpā* in 2b, though there doesn’t seem to be a close thematic relationship. In light of nearby X.8.7–9 (q.v.), the brief treatment of the Trita-Viśvarūpa myth, it is striking that Tvaṣṭar is credited here with ‘possessing all forms’. In that myth Tvaṣṭar is the father of the three-headed monster Viśvarūpa; cf. X.8.9 *tvāṣṭrāsya ... viśvárūpasya*, with the patronymic. See also comm. ad V.42.13.

As Re (Hymnes spéc., 237) points out, Yamī’s invocation of Heaven and Earth as witnesses is a clever ploy, since they are a famously incestuous pair and thus provide a divine charter for the action she wants to take (see further 9c). Her phraseology, *vēda nāv asyá pṛthivī utá dyaúḥ*, is strongly reminiscent of the refrain in the famous hymn I.105, *vittám me asyá rodasī* “Take heed of this (speech) of mine, you two world halves” (see comm. ad I.105.1). Both her adaptation of that refrain (or some formula that lies behind both) and her statement in c, *nákir asya prá minanti vratāni* “no one transgresses his commands,” which echoes similar expressions in, e.g., I.69.7, II.38.7, set a verbal imprimatur of formulaic authority on her speech, which is of course all the more important because, as a woman, she does not have that authority by nature.

Note that in our phrase even an explicitly conjoined subject (with *utá*) consisting of two (non-neuter) singular nouns can take a singular verb.

X.10.6: Yama’s answer is somewhat confusing, I think because he pretends to respond to her claim in 5a but really does not. What does he mean by “this first day” (*asyá ... prathamásyāḥnaḥ*)? He *seems* to be asking about their time in the womb, about which she spoke in 5a; so Ge (n. 6a): “Der erste Tag ist der ihrer Zeugung.” But the implication of his question “who knows about this first day?” is that no one does: it belongs to the time before time, at the first creation (as presented, e.g., in X.129). He has substituted one (unknowable) time for a knowable one. This twisting of temporal reference makes it seem as if her claim about their birth is unsubstantiated, in fact unsubstantiatable—whereas, in fact, Tvaṣṭar their creator at least should know, along with the other gods. Surely the birth of Yama and Yamī does not go back to the primordial past.

I would change the rendering of the verbs in b to “who saw it; who proclaims it here.” The first again calls into question the possibility of a witness of primal events; the second raises suspicions about anyone who claims to know or have seen the first day—in this case, Yamī by implication, since she made apparently authoritative statements about the action of the god

Tvaṣṭar in 5a.

To her invocation of the *vratā-* of Tvaṣṭar in 5c he counters with the *dhāman-* of Mitra and Varuṇa and thereby mobilizes the ethical rigor of those two gods at the center of the RVic moral universe and the ceaseless scrutiny they are known to exercise over humans. He will return to this in 8ab.

Pāda d presents some difficulties. On the one hand, the analysis of *vīcyā* is disputed; on the other,  $\sqrt{brū}$  can take the acc. of the addressee or the acc. of the subject spoken about: which semantic role does *nīn* fill and who does the acc. pl. refer to? To answer the second set of questions first, I take *nīn* as the topic of discourse (“speak about superior men”), and I take its referent not to be mortal men (of which, remember, there are none at the time), but rather, as so very often with this stem, of gods. Here Yama raises the very issue discussed above ad vs. 5: how does she, a woman, have the right to speak about superior males, in fact the most superior of all: gods? And she is not just a woman, but one characterized as *āhanās-*. Whatever the exact meaning and etymology of this word (on which see comm. ad V.42.13), it is associated with rampant sexuality. In this context that characteristic would make Yamī even less qualified to engage in discourse about the gods, esp. the divine upholders of ethical principles. Yama’s insulting address to her—this is the first voc. of the hymn—is meant to delegitimize her participation in the dialogue. He further emphasizes this with the instr. *vīcyā*. Here I follow the old interpr. (see Ge n. 6d) as a fem. instr. to an otherwise unattested *-āñc* stem, \**vyāñc-* ‘going apart, aside’; supplying the instr. \**vācā* we get “with (speech) going aside, with deviant (speech).”

It is worth noting that *āhanās-* is found in V.42.13, modifying Tvaṣṭar, in a snippet of text that implies incest between Tvaṣṭar and his daughter – the same Tvaṣṭar who was responsible for making Yama and Yamī a married couple, according to her (5ab).

X.10.7: If I am correct that Yama’s intent in vs. 6 was to disqualify Yamī from participation in the dialogue on the grounds of her gender and sexual avidity, he was successful. Her measured unemotional legalistic arguments for their coupling give way in this vs. to an expression of naked desire. For the first time in the hymn their names appear, and they are nearly juxtaposed (*yamāsya mā yamyām*). And she speaks of ‘desire, lust’ (*kāma-*), not duty, divine preference, or personal history. As W. Knobl points out (p. 119 n. 42), the first pāda consists of a wonderful repetitive phonetic figure, which, I would add, seems iconic of the wave of desire that overcomes her: *yamasya mā yamīya(m) kāma* ... (My presentation of the figure is somewhat different from Knobl’s: he omits the final vowels and also doesn’t include the 2nd syllable of *kāma*.)

Pāda b contains a nice play: Yamī expresses her desire “to lie together in the same *yóni*,” here a ‘place’ or ‘nest’, but of course, since *yóni-* can refer to the womb (see esp. in the miscarriage and birth charms X.162.1, 2, 4, 184.1), they did lie in a *yóni* before their birth. In vs. 5 she refers to the same place with *gárbha-*, but the latter word more often means ‘embryo’ than ‘womb’.

Pāda c reprises the wife/husband pairing found in her vs. 3d, though with a different word for ‘wife’ (*jāyā-* rather than *jāni-*), along with the contested place, the wife’s body (*tanvām*) as object in both. But the agency has switched: in 3d the husband was urged to enter the body of his wife, while here the wife is the subject, yielding her own body to her husband (*jāyā ... pátye*). I do not know why she expresses it as a simile here.

The word for ‘yield’, another pf. opt. *riricyām*, belongs to the root  $\sqrt{ric}$  ‘leave (behind)’ and may be meant to evoke *tyajásam*, the personified ‘legacy’ built to  $\sqrt{tyaj}$  ‘abandon, leave’. See my

invocation of *réknas*- ‘legacy, heritage’ ad vs. 3 above.

The problematic pāda is d (with its near repetition 8d). There are almost as many interpr. as there have been readers of this hymn, and I cannot rehearse them here. Most interpr. start from the assumption (voiced or taken for granted), which I share, that this is a piece of erotic slang. Unfortunately of course such expressions are almost impossible to interpret in the absence of a sufficient body of texts containing such material – which the RV does not provide us. My interpr. starts with the observation that *ví√vr̥h* is a violent verb, with the literal sense ‘tear off, tear apart’. The lexeme is reasonably well attested in the RV; cf., e.g., VI.45.9 *ví dṛ̥h̥h̥ni cid ... vr̥há* “Tear apart even the strongholds.” But in this context a purely violent interpr. is unlikely, esp. since it’s an activity that Yamī herself suggests that she and Yama could do together: this is the first, and indeed the only, 1st dual verb in the hymn, *ví vr̥theva*. But of course as a general rule the erotic incorporates much of the violent, and so the most sensible way to approach this expression is to assume that the violence of *ví√vr̥h* has been repurposed for an erotic charge. Riffing around in modern English provides us with several useful parallels. On the one hand there’s a specifically erotic expression “tear up the sheets,” referring to energetic or violent sex. There’s also the expression used in the publ. tr., “let ’er rip,” with the dummy object ’er (for her, but without gender implications). Like “tear up the sheets,” the verb in this expression has the same literal meaning (‘tear, rip’) found in *√vr̥h*, but it also has a wider sense, which may allow us to understand the curious simile in our pāda concerning chariot wheels. One of the reasons that there are so many, and so many implausible, interpr. of this pāda is that it’s hard to figure out what chariot wheels have to do with sex—with many fanciful notions concocted to connect them. I would actually suggest that they don’t; what the simile is capitalizing on is a secondary meaning that seems to be shared by verbs of this nature (at least Engl. ‘rip’, ‘tear’; Skt. *√vr̥h*), namely reference to extreme speed. In English in addition to “let ’er rip” we have “tearing hurry,” “tear off to,” “on a tear.” These verbs seem to inhabit the intersection between violence and speed, here mediated by sex. So, while Yamī’s *ví vr̥theva* is proposing, on the one hand, that the two of them engage in passionate vigorous sex (type “tear up the sheets”), her simile compares this sex act to the speed of a rushing tearing chariot. The Free Online Dictionary defines “let her/something rip” in part as “to do something without inhibition or restraint, typically with great enthusiasm or force” and specifically as “allow an engine to go as fast as possible. An American colloquialism dating from the first half of the nineteenth century, this term presumably was first applied to locomotive or steamship engines.” Note the connection with the speediest vehicles of their respective days. So Yamī’s verb is already a metaphor and her simile adds another level of figurative distance.

The pāda is not only conceptually challenging, but also grammatically. The noun *cakrá-* is of course neut.; its dual should be, and several times is (X.85.11, 12, 16), *cakré*, and so our form *cakrā* should be neut. pl. In the first part of the simile, *ráthyeva*, the sandhi should be dissolved into *ráthyā iva*, again a neut. pl., rather than expected du. \**ráthye*. A neut. pl. reading is not impossible here, but it seems pretty clunky. The human pair was surely envisioned in the simile as a matched set of wheels belonging to this light two-wheeled vehicle (on the construction of the chariot, see Sparreboom pp. 10–11), turning rapidly in perfect synch as the chariot tore (/dashed) along the way. Assuming more than two wheels gives us a very different and more plodding picture. Fortunately VIII.5.29 contains the phrase *ubhā cakrā* “both wheels,” which is emphatically dual in sense, and I think we must reckon with the same pseudo-masc. form here. As for *ráthyeva* it is possible that it should be resolved into *ráthye ’va*, with the truncated simile particle to be read occasionally in the RV and generally in MIA. For *va* for *iva*, see Gr’s list p.

221 and for a similar du interpr. of *-eva* as *-e 'va* see Macd., VG p. 259.

There is some difference of opinion about whether the wheels are in the nom. or the acc. Without reproducing the terms of the debate, I will simply opt for the nom.: the speeding, whirling wheels are compared to the two energetic lovers.

X.10.8: Yama does not respond directly to Yamī's erotic break, but simply repeats, more strongly, his warning from 2cd about the ever-vigilant divine witnesses.

His pāda a shows a nice syncopation in *ná tiṣṭhanti ná ní miṣanti*, where *ná Cí* is answered by *ná Cí*, but the rhyming *miṣanti* is postponed a syllable.

The fronted *anyá-* in c and later in the hymn (10d, 12c, 13c, 14a) provides prime evidence for the indefinite value ('another', not definite 'the other') of this stem in initial position. On which see my "Vedic anyá- 'another, the other': syntactic disambiguation," Fs. Beekes (ed. A. Lubotsky), 1997, pp. 111–18. It is a particularly cruel usage because there *are* no other males available for Yamī to pick from.

In c Yama picks up the 2<sup>nd</sup> level of metaphor in her 8d—the chariot wheels—by urging her to “drive off straightaway” (*yāhi tūyam*). He rejects her 1st dual opt. *vṛheva* in favor of a 2nd sg. impv. *vṛha* + instr., with the instr. referring to her hypothetical other partner, removing himself from the situation entirely. He also repeats his insulting voc. *āhanaḥ*.

X.10.9: With her approach to intimacy (reaching its high point in the 1st du verb of 7d) so decisively rebuffed, Yamī abruptly returns to distanced discourse: this vs. is entirely couched in the 3rd ps., though both their names appear, juxtaposed, in d. She is the 3rd ps. subject of all three verbs, all optatives: a *daśasyet*, b *ún mimīyāt*, d *bibhryāt*. The optatives in this case are not prescriptive, as in some of her earlier uses (1c, 3d) but, like her 1st ps. opt. in 1a and 7c, express desire or potentiality.

The redupl. form *mimīyāt* in b could technically belong to the redupl. pres. of  $\sqrt{mā}$  or the pf. of  $\sqrt{mī}$ , but most (incl. Kü 369) assign it to the latter, as do I. For one thing it fits into Yamī's pattern of perfect optatives. Unfortunately the lexeme *úd  $\sqrt{mī}$*  is not otherwise attested, which has opened the possibility of all manner of contextual translations, which abound in the lit. I think it should be interpr. in light of the conventional formula Yamī pronounced in 5c, using the same root: *nákir asya prá minanti vratāṇi* “No one transgresses his commandments.” Old adduces a striking parallel containing *prá minanti* and the eye of the sun that illuminates the sense of our passage: V.59.5 *sūryasya cákṣuḥ prá minanti vṛṣṭibhiḥ* “They [=Maruts] confound the eye of the sun with their rains,” depicting the sun's loss of vision behind a veil of rain. Here Yamī is asserting that at least for a moment (*múhur*) she too could transgress / confound one of the iron laws of nature, the inescapable sight of the sun, which misses nothing as it transits the sky. Here she is implicitly countering Yama's statement *ná ní miṣanti eté* “they never blink” (8a) about the “spies of the gods” (*devānām spásah* 8b): the sun is the quintessential spy (cf. X.35.8 *spáḥ úd eti sūryah*). I tr. “trip up” to capture the *úd* and also register the fact that this idiom is out of the ordinary.

In c she makes clear why she invoked Heaven and Earth as witnesses in 5d. The “couple” (*mithunā*) is a 3rd ps. reference to themselves, Yama and Yamī, and she asserts that they have the same kinship relationship (*sábandhū*) as H+E—the point being that H+E are both siblings and an incestuous couple.

In d *bibhryāt* is not a pf. opt., but it is the next best thing, a redupl. athem. opt. that matches *mimiyāt* in b (and perhaps, as JL suggests, to avoid the anomalous redupl. of the pf. *jabhṛ-*). The



pāda has very rich semantics with a number of overlapping readings available to the VP *bibhryād ajāmi*. First, note that she has reached back to 4d, where Yama used their *jāmi* ‘kinship’ as an argument against her. (In our vs. I tr. *ajāmi* as ‘unbrotherly’, not ‘non-kindred’ vel sim., because the latter lacks punch in English.) I see at least three readings for her statement here: 1) she would happily bear (=endure physically) the “unbrotherly” sexual act; 2) she would happily bear (=assume the burden, mentally) the guilt associated with this act; 3) she would happily bear (=give birth to) the living result of this act (though ironically any child from this union would be super-related to both parties!).

X.10.10: Once again Yama fails to answer her, but goes off on a tangent of his own; in fact it’s not entirely clear to me what he’s trying to say, esp. in b. His speech begins portentously: the first 6 syllables of pāda a are heavy, and the repeated long *ā*s, punctuated by *g(h)*s, draws attention to the ponderous pace: *ā ghā tā gachān út(ar)ā (yu)gā(ni) ...* He prophesies that latter generations (*yugā-*, another word sketching a kinship connection) will come when kin will do the unkindred/unbrotherly act (*jāmāyaḥ kṛṇāvann ajāmi*), using both his *jāmi-* (4d) and her *ajāmi* from the previous vs. But what is his point here? It almost sounds as if he’s predicting the debased behavior of the Kali Yuga (and *yugā-* might support this view), behavior that he refuses to have anything to do with. But the notions of cyclical time and the four ages of progressively worse actions and circumstances are foreign to the RVic conceptual universe, as far as I know. Perhaps they, or something like them (minus the cycle), were circulating in some form at the time – after all, a sequence of ages showing progressive decline is also found in Greek mythology as early as Hesiod and, more to the point, the Avestan Yima, Yama’s counterpart, presided over an age of peace and prosperity (see Videvdāt 2), which was also followed by decline (see Skjaervo’s art. on the myth of Jamšid, Encycl. Iran. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/jamsid-i>, inter alia).

His suggestion to Yamī in c, to make her arm a pillow for her lover, may strike us as bizarre, but it has a parallel in V.61.5 *dór vīrāyopabārbrhat* with a different word for ‘arm’ (*dós-* rather than *bāhú-*) and a different word for the male, but the same very rare intensive stem (*úpa bārbrh-* (on which see Schaef. 157–59). Note the phonetic play with labials and *h* in the pāda: *upa barbṛhi vṛṣabhāya bāhúm*. I would also suggest that Yama is twisting Yamī’s *bibhryāt* from the previous vs. (9d); Re, flg. Pisani, in fact assigns the form to  $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ , an idea that has little to recommend it. As for the shape of the impv. *barbṛhi*, a properly formed impv. to this stem should be *\*barbṛdhi*; Old suggests reading *\*barbṛhi* in part for metrical reasons. Whether we want to follow Old’s suggestion, the somewhat simplified form shows how derivationally shallow the intensive is.

X.10.11: As noted in the publ. intro., this is the first time in the hymn that the words “brother” and “sister” appear, tellingly in a context that questions the meaning and worth of the very terms. We can interpret the first pāda in two ways simultaneously. On the one hand, a brother is supposed to provide a refuge for his sister; if he does not, he’s not a proper brother. On the other hand, she seems to be saying, “why get hung up on our sibling relationship, when I have a more important relationship to worry about?– I need a husband!” In this connection it’s worth remembering that in later Sanskrit *nātha-* can mean simply ‘husband’. So she’s saying both “you’re not behaving like a good brother” and “who cares about ‘brother’? It’s not the most important relationship we have to each other.” The 2nd pāda continues this line of thought. Acdg. to most interpr. (with which I concur), “if Dissolution will come down” (*yán nírtir*

*nigáchāt*) refers to the non-continuance of the human race after the twins if they don't do something about it. In the face of this potential catastrophe why is he worrying about the word and relationship “sister”?

Her brief return to logical argument in the first hemistich is followed by an emotional pitch resembling her first erotic break in 7a, picking up *kāma-* from there and reusing his  $\sqrt{rap}$  from 4b. Her final appeal to him is made in the impv., *pipṛgdhi*, rather than the opt. she has previously favored, and an impv. to a redupl. pres. stem. Note also that for the first time both bodies (*tanū-*) are in question, whereas in 3d and 7c it was only the body of the wife.

The destabilization of the dialogue is also signaled by the switch of grammatical categories: for the first time in the hymn Yamī uses the subjunctive (a: *asat ... bhāvāti*, b: *nigáchāt*) and the imperative (d: *pipṛgdhi*) – categories that had been exclusively Yama's (subj.: 2a *bhāvāti*, 6d *bravaḥ*, 10a *gachān*, 10b *kṛṇāvar*; impv. 8c *yāhi*, 8d *ví vṛha*, 10c *úpa barbr̥hi*, 10d *ichasva*). Her legalistic logical optatives give way to longings and demands.

X.10.12: And Yama in return steals *her* grammatical category! He answers her pres. impv. with a *perfect optative* built to the same root  $\sqrt{pṛc}$ , *papṛcyām*, his first use of this category (though see below). Moreover, as has often been remarked, the first pāda of his reply is hypermetric by three syllables (assuming, as we should, distraction of the two forms of *tanū-*, on which see Knobl n. 80 p. 131 [Mind-Reading] = p. 71 diss.). Although various scholars have suggested emendations to render the vs. an ordinary Triṣṭubh, we should surely resist that urge, as argued persuasively and at length by Knobl (Mind-Reading, pp. 130–35 = diss. 70–75) and already by Old. To begin with, the pāda almost exactly repeats her 11d; the crucial deviations are emphasized by the awkwardness of the meter, which signals the climactic emotional force of his response. What Yamī wants is a simple repetition of her appeal, with person shift. That is, responding to her words

*tanū vā me tanū vaṃ sām pipṛgdhi*  
 “Mingle your body with my body.”

she wants

\**tanū vā te tanū vaṃ sām papṛcyām*  
 “I would mingle my body with your body.”

This desired echo would follow her wording and her metrical form exactly, but of course he refuses. His negation would necessarily add another syllable, the *nā*, but I suggest that just one additional syllable would not sufficiently demonstrate how far his reply fails to mirror her appeal—hence the addition of three, *nā vā u*, to introduce the echo (note also that the enclitic *te* flips its position to modified 2nd). The rare (in the RV) and solemn particle *vai* (‘verily’ or the like) also draws attention to his deliberate, rather pompous style and the finality of his rejection. And the too-many-syllables here is in keeping with the too-heavy-syllables in 10a discussed above. Moreover, the additional syllables at the beginning of the pāda have a complex relationship with what follows: *nā vā u te* is a scrambling of *tanū vā*, which opens 11d: the *t* from *te*, *na* flipped to *an*, *vā u* likewise flipped – the result is *t-an-u-vā*. This point is made also by Knobl, pp. 133–34 = 73–74. He also suggests that *nā vā u* could also stand for \**nā vā u*, with the nom. sg. of *nī-* ‘man’: “As a man [and not as your brother] could I have commingled with you” (pp. 134–35 = 74–75), though the absence of the indep. nom. sg. *nā* in the RV (and indeed until quite late) makes this suggestion less compelling. Moreover, it seems psychologically out of character: throughout their dialogue Yama has shown no desire for, or even human/brotherly sympathy towards, Yamī.

A brief word on the redupl. pres. versus perfect to  $\sqrt{pṛc}$ . I wonder if these two supposedly

different tense/aspect stems don't belong to the same paradigm, distributed phonologically, with forms with root-final velars taking *i*-redupl. and those with root-final palatals *a*-redupl. The former include only *pipṛgdhi* (1x, here) and *pipṛkta* (1x), the latter *papṛcāsi*, *papṛcyām* (here), *papṛcyāt*, each with one occurrence, plus two occurrences of the mid. part. *papṛcānā-*. The system would be reminiscent of *sīṣakti*, *sāścati* and would belong to a redupl. pres. If *pipṛgdhi* / *papṛcyām* do belong to one paradigm, Yama's repetition and deviation from repetition would be more pointed, but if *papṛcyām* belongs to a redupl. pres., he then would not have appropriated her grammatical category – though it's the moral equivalent thereof.

In b Yama takes her verb *nigāchāt* from 11b and puts a nasty spin on it. Although the VP here, *svāsāraṃ nigāchāt*, is usually rendered rather staidly (e.g., Ge “... der zur Schwester geht”), it is hard not to see this idiom as a sexual one, as Re comments (in EVP, despite his restrained “qui a commerce avec sa soeur” in Hymnes spéc.) – even if a specific sex act, as in the same English idiom ‘go down on’, is not meant.

In c Yama urges her for the third time (8c, 10d) to find some other undefined sexual partner.

And in d he brings the discussion to a firm end. His *nā te (bhrātā subhage) vaṣṭi etāt* almost exactly repeats his first words, in 2a *nā te (sākhā sakhyam) vaṣṭi etāt*. The repetition is ring compositional, but a striking use of this device. It not only defines the compositional unit by the poet for the audience (us), but Yama uses this boundary-setting repetition to close off the dialogue, to shut down the communication between him and his conversation partner. In other words, ring composition is deployed by a fictional character to limit a fictional debate, as well as by the poet to delimit a self-contained poetic unit—it functions both within the fictional space and outside of it, at the same time.

X.10.13: After he has so decisively shut her off with his defining ring, it is no wonder she produces the sputtering outburst in 13a. Her first pāda is also considerably too short, 7 syllables rather than 11, so with 4 syllables lacking, almost balancing the 3 he added in 12a. In this case as well, Knobl (110–15 = 50–55) argues strenuously and persuasively for letting this pāda stand in its truncated form, rather than pursuing various emendation strategies proposed by previous scholars to fill the pāda out, and once again he is following the lead of Old (Noten, though in the Proleg. Old had himself considered emendation). Her initial reaction is all the more powerful for its brevity, a pure eruption of frustration, exasperation, and anger.

It also contains the striking doublet *bató bata*, found only here in the RV. The latter word *bata* is found as an interjection later (Br+, also Pāli *vata*), the accented stem *batá-* nowhere else but here. There are two exactly opposite schools of thought on these words: 1) *bata* is the voc. of *batá-* and later pressed into service as an interjection; 2) *batá-* represents the nonce substantivization of that interjection. Despite the eminence of the scholars who hold the latter view (incl. Wackernagel, Old, Knobl, and Bodewitz [p. 279]; see the reff. in Knobl pp. 111–12 = 51–52 + nn), I am strongly inclined towards the former. I find it hard to believe that Yamī gave violent vent to her emotions by saying “INTERJECTION, you are (an) INTERJECTION.” Knobl's artificially constructed and barely parsable “A LAS, alas, you are, Yama!” (111=51) demonstrates the difficulty better than I could, but consider also some hypothetical exx. “Argh! you are an argh, Yama!” or “Yikes, you are a yike, Yama!” I think instead that we're dealing with a pejorative slangy designation, and I see no reason why the voc. of such a designation couldn't get turned into a swear word or an emphatic particle. Most exclamations are downgraded content words, often verbs (damn! blast!), but not limited to verbs (hell! shit!), in a

process akin to the well-known and widespread process of grammaticalization of content words and morphemes. I find it hard to imagine the opposite process, as the argh and yikes examples show. For noun as exclamation one of the best parallels I can think of in contemporary English is the exclamation of frustrated disappointment “rats!” popularized by Charlie Brown in the comic strip Peanuts; synchronically this is surely perceived (via folk etymology) as derived from the rodent, though its history complicates the picture: it is probably from “drat” or its predecessor “(G)od rot.” Consider also how “God” or “Christ” gets used in modern-day English as mere interjection without any blasphemous intent or the use of “the devil” “to make a statement stronger” (funkyenglish.com: <https://funkyenglish.com/idiom-speak-devil>); see also <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/What+the+devil%3F> and <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/what-where-how-why-the-devil>. Some website examples: “what the devil are you talking about” “where the devil have you been?” Cf. also expressions like “the devil he did,” an example of which from Jane Eyre I unearthed on the internet. In any case the initial *b-* of *bata* marks it as belonging to a different stratum of discourse from that usual in the RV. We have no way to know what the word actually meant, but English “jerk” inhabits the right register.

Note that, flg. a suggestion of Georges Pinault, Carmen Spiers in her 2020 EPHE diss. (“Magie et poésie dans l’Inde ancienne: Édition, traduction et commentaire de la Paippalādasamhitā de l’Atharvaveda, livre 3”), pp. 571-72, apropos AVP III.39.1 (a hymn “après une fausse couche”) suggests that *patam* in that vs. is a *p*-form of *batá-*. She translates the line *dhruveṇāśvinā patam bharāmi* “[Même] avec un cavalier solide, je porte un raté” / “[Even] with a solid rider, I bear a runt.” The vs. is confined to the Paippalāda and is beset with problems; given the uncertainties of the text, this can only be a suggestion.

Yamī’s 2nd pāda is, by contrast, hypermetric, though only by one syllable: it has a good Triṣṭubh cadence, but 12 syllables. It would have been easy for her to make a standard Triṣṭubh, just as it would be easy for us to fix it now: either *evá* or *te* could be eliminated with no detriment to the sense. But once again metrical disturbance calls attention to the message; I suggest that her *naívá te* ... is meant to match his 12a opening *ná vaí u te* ... [note that *ná vaí* and *naívá* are anagrams], though on a slightly lower discourse level—*evá* being a much much more ordinary RV particle than the elevated *vaí*. After her disordered outburst in pāda a, she demonstrates that she can speak as formally and collectedly as he can. This is also conveyed by the 1st pl. *avidāma*. Knobl (116=56) thinks that this plural contains “a multitude of divine peers” along with herself, but I think rather that she is speaking for herself alone but deploying the plural majestatis, as it were – giving herself a detached and authoritative persona, which coolly passes judgment on Yama’s failings. (Queen Victoria’s supposed statement “we are not amused” captures the right note.)

Her last move in her effort to reposition herself in the dialogue is to appropriate one of his ploys: the indefinite *anyá-*, here in the feminine of *his* as-yet-unidentified new lover. She has washed her hands of him. The creeper / tree pairing for a delicate and clinging woman and a sturdy man is of course a trope that persists through the rest of Sanskrit high literature; this is the first example of it, to my knowledge.

X.10.14: Yama gets the last word, at least technically, but it seems anticlimactic, not the clincher he may have envisioned. In the first hemistich he simply repeats and elaborates her 13cd with gender switch, and in c he seems to promise that there’s another man out there who has the *mānas* that he, Yama, does not. I’m again not sure what he’s trying to say: is he condescendingly

recommending something outside of her power (find another man) and then reassuring the little lady by saying it'll all be fine? Is he not the least embarrassed to admit that he lacks *mānas*?

In any case, I find his rhetorical form more appealing than his message: his a and c pādas contain parallel reciprocal structures:

*anyām ... tvām / anyāḥ ... tvām*

*tāsya ... tvām / sā ... tāva*

In both structures the case forms are arranged chiasmically, ACC ... NOM / NOM ... ACC // GEN ... NOM / NOM ... GEN, while the stems have A ... B / A ... B order. Each of these structures has paired particles, *ū/u* in pāda a, *vā* in pāda b. Pāda c is once again metrically disturbed, with 12 syllables and this time the Jagatī cadence appropriate to that number of syllables. Arnold suggests emending the final *tāva* to *te*, which would give a Triṣṭubh. Once again Old resists – properly. The accented disyllabic *tāva* is needed to balance its disyllabic partner *tāsya* at the beginning of the line; moreover, the final *sā vā tāva* makes a nice little figure. Note also that *tvām* is not to be read distracted in either pāda – this unusual scansion is perhaps deployed in the first pāda to make it more equivalent to acc. *tvām* and in the second to match *sā*.

Both of his neatly packaged structures have conceptual problems, however. Pāda b, which he repeats verbatim from Yamī's 13d, is appropriate only for the first part of pāda a, *anyām ū sū tvām*, with the female “you” (Yamī) compared to the creeper; in Sanskrit art poetry the man (the masc. nom. *anyāḥ* of the 2nd part of a) would never be compared to a creeper wrapping himself around a stalwart female.

In c, rather like his 4a, Yama starts a thought that should require a 2nd verb, which he omits, leaving the thought incomplete. Once again this may be because the required verb is problematic. Here he addresses Yamī with the impv. “seek” (*ichā*); the paired clause beginning *sā vā* “or he ...” should have a 3rd sg. impv. (*ichatu* vel sim.: “or let him seek ...”), but since the subject, the *sā*, has only a hypothetical and at best future existence, it is hard for Yama to give him orders. Hence his final pāda (“it will all be fine”) is undercut by his inability to construct credible reassurances. The hymn ends at an impasse.

I have always been puzzled by the anodyne *ādha kṛṇṣva saṁvīdam sūbhadrām* “Then make yourself a very happy compact” that ends the hymn and Yama's speech—which I took as his condescending advice to find a new lover and arrange things with him. But I now see that it should be read in conjunction with Yama's own *sām √ vid* in X.14.4, where he comes to an agreement / makes a compact with two distinct groups of beings, the Aṅgirasas and the Pitars, with whom he will share the new realm of the ancestors. In our passage Yama seems to be foreseeing a time when Yamī will have to negotiate such an agreement with someone quite distinct from herself (as Yama is not) and indeed quite possibly someone belonging to an entirely alien breed, namely a mortal. The root noun *saṁvīd-* is also found in a Vākh. fragment, VIII.58.1 (q.v.), where a sacrificial *saṁvīd-* is made between the Sacrificer and the officiating priests.

## X.11 Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., it's long been recognized that this hymn shares some phraseology with X.10, even though they have nothing in common thematically. See esp. vs. 2c *rāpat gandharvīr āpyā ca yōṣaṇā* with X.10.4c *gandharvó apsv āpyā ca yōṣā*, and for *rāpat*, X.10.4b *rapema*, 11c *rapāmi*. The hymn is also characterized by alliteration and etymological and morphological figures.

X.11.1: All 4 pādas of this vs. show alliteration, some mixed with etymological figures or use of identical stems in different case forms:

- a: *vṛsā vṛsne duduhe dóhasā diváh*
- b: ... *áditer ádābhyah*
- c: *vṛsvaṃ sá veda váruṇo ...*
- d: ... *yajñíyo yajatu yajñíyān ...*

With Ge and Re, I take the subject of the first hemistich to be Soma, of the second Agni. Old instead sees Agni as subj. of the whole. The focus on milking in ab makes Soma more likely than Agni; as Ge points out, the pressing of soma is elsewhere likened to milking. The paradox of a bull, a male, giving milk is of the type much loved by RVic poets.

There is a certain amount of disagreement about where to assign the genitives *diváh* and *áditeḥ*. Ge takes *diváh* with *páyāmsi*, Re with *vṛsā*, with Old I attach it to *dóhasā*, on the basis of word order and pāda boundary, though Ge’s solution is also possible (and not terribly different in sense). Old takes *áditeḥ* with *páyāmsi*, while I follow Ge and Re in supplying ‘son’ for the gen. to depend on. Again word order favors this interpr. Cf. also VII.60.5 ... *putrá áditer ádabdhāḥ* (sim. II.28.3). The problem is that neither Soma nor Agni is generally classified as an Āditya (though for Agni see Brereton, Ādityas, 221–31); Ge’s n. 1b attempts to argue that Soma is the youngest son of Aditi, but his arguments aren’t particularly strong. But perhaps being “undeceivable” (*ádābhya-*) is sufficient to make a divinity an honorary Āditya.

In d most interpr. take *yajñíyām̐ ṛtūn* as the obj. of *yajatu* (“let him sacrifice to the sacrificial *ṛtu*’s”); I take it as an acc. of extent of time (a possibility Ge mentions in n. 1d). In favor of the former interpr., Re argues that *yajñíya-* is almost always used of divinities. Acknowledging this, I might suggest an alternative tr., taking the two acc. pls. separately: “Let the one worthy of the sacrifice sacrifice to those worthy of sacrifice [=gods] throughout the ritual sequences.” On the sequential offerings see comm. ad I.15 and the publ. intros. to I.15 and II.36.

X.11.2: Note the sequence of paired alliterative words in b: *nadásya nādé pári pātu me mánaḥ*, the first pair also being an etym. figure.

As in vs. 1, the first hemistich seems to concern Soma, the 2nd Agni.

As noted above, pāda a *rāpad gandharvīr ápyā ca yóṣaṇā* is a variant of X.10.4c *gandharvó apsv ápyā ca yóṣā* “the Gandharva in the waters and the watery maiden” and must be interpr. in that context. The version in X.10 is surely the original—it provides one of Yama’s most important arguments against incest—with ours a playful adaptation. The most crucial deviation is the substitution of fem. *gandharvī-*, found only here in Vedic, for masc. *gandharvá-*. (The replacement of *yóṣā* by *yóṣaṇā* is a more or less automatic adjustment from a Triṣṭubh to a Jagatī cadence.) So the question is whether the two feminine designations refer to one female or two; another way to phrase this is what is the function of the *ca*?s In X.10.4, of course, it conjoins the “watery maiden” with the Gandharva and is properly positioned to do so. If the Gandharvī and the watery maiden here are two separate individuals, *ca* can be doing the same thing. This is Old’s view. The presence of a singular verb (*pātu*) in b, to which they should be the subject, is not actually an obstacle: see the conjoined subject in X.10.5 with singular verb (see comm. ad loc.). However, it’s trouble enough to figure out what to do with *one* female here; there’s no obvious role for two. Ge and Re both take the two feminines as referring to one individual, but deal with the *ca* in different ways. Ge takes *ca* as subordinating, with domain over the whole pāda despite its position, and tr. “Wenn die Gandharvin, die Wasserfrau, flüstert.” This is rightly rejected by Klein (DGRV I.262), in favor of Re’s solution, that when the original pāda

was adapted here, the *ca* came along for the ride, losing its function (“*ca* irrationnel”). While also taking the two feminines as referring to one individual, I suggest a slightly different solution. In borrowing the pāda, the poet has repurposed the *ca*, no longer needed to conjoin the two nouns, into a sentential coordinator, introducing the 2nd clause.

The sense of this opaque hemistich is cleverly illuminated by Ge (n. 2ab). The Gandharvī watery maiden is a designation of an Apsaras; in IX.78.3 the waters mixed with the just-pressed soma are called Apsarases. In b the “bellow of the bellowing (bull)” is the sound of the pressed soma; noise is often a prominent part of the description of the soma pressing. The idea here is that the gentle murmuring of the (female) waters moderates the clamor of the (male) bullish soma and insulates the mind of the poet against it.

Aditi returns in pāda c (from 1b), but it is not clear what her relevance is in either vs. (Brereton [Ādityas, 224] considers *āditi-* here to be personified Innocence used as a designation for Agni himself; I am not convinced, esp. as Aditi in 1b was in relation to Soma.) For further spec. on the reason for Aditi’s presence here, see below.

In this pāda *naḥ* is universally taken as the obj. of *nī dhātu* “let her set us down” and *iṣṭāsya* as the ppl. to *√iṣ* ‘desire’: Aditi is to establish us in the midst of everything we want. This interpr. is reflected in the publ. tr., and it may well be correct at least in part. But it seems a trivial and frivolous use of Aditi, and I wonder if there’s not another possible, perhaps dominant reading. The lexeme *nī√dhā* is regularly used of the establishing of Agni as Hotar (e.g., I.45.7, V.4.3), and *agnīm hótāram* is the catchphrase of the omphalos in this hymn, in the next two vss., 3d and 4d. Moreover, the referent of “eldest brother” (*bhrātā ... jyeṣṭhāḥ*) in the next pāda (2d) is taken by most to be Agni. Therefore I suggest that Agni could be supplied as the obj. of *nī dhātu* with *naḥ* a dative of benefit: “Let Aditi set (Agni) down [/install (Agni)] for us.” In this case *iṣṭā-* could belong to *√yaj*, and the phrase would mean “in the midst of what has been / is sacrificed,” that is, in the middle of the ritual ground. For somewhat similar passages of Agni, see I.69.4 *mādhye niṣattaḥ ... duroṇé* “set down in the middle in the dwelling,” VI.12.1 *mādhye hótā duroṇé* “in the middle in the dwelling,” as well as nearby in the mystical X.5.1 *útsasya mādhye níhitam padām veḥ* “the track of the bird has been set down in the middle of the wellspring,” also, despite superficial appearances, of Agni. If this suggestion is correct, then the point may be that Aditi is involved in the establishment of both primal ritual divinities, Soma (1b) and Agni (2c).

Ge (n. 2d) convincingly explains the use of *bhrātā* for Agni in d: “Der älteste (Amts)bruder des Priesters, insbes. des Hotar, ist Agni.” But I wonder if there’s a more pointed reason for the word ‘brother’ here. When our poet borrowed X.10.4c for his pāda a in this vs., he erased the male Gandharva, father of the twins, by making him into a female Gandharvī; he may be indirectly restoring the brother here.

But what is Agni doing to or for us? Ge (n. 2d) thinks that he is deciding what reward we should receive, Re that he is stating our desire (from c) explicitly. I think it is both more general and more pointed. The lexeme *vi√vac*, in verbal forms entirely limited to the aor. stem *vōca-*, almost always has the sense ‘provide a decisive answer to a question’; see I.105.4, IV.5.12, VI.18.3, 22.4, X.28.5, 88.17. Sometimes it’s a question with two alternative answers.; e.g., VI.18.3 *ásti svin nú vīryam tát ta indra, ná svid asti tát ṛtuthā ví vocaḥ* “Does that heroic power now exist for you, Indra, or does it not? You will declare [=decisively answer] that at the proper season”; sometimes the questions are about impenetrable enigmas, on which a mortal seeks enlightenment, as in I.105.4 *yajñām pṛchāmi avamām, sá tát dūtó ví vocati / kvārtām pūrvyām gatām, kás tát bibharti ṇūtanah* “I ask the nearest one [=Agni] about my sacrifice. Will the

messenger [=Agni] declare [=decisively answer] this: ‘Where has my earlier “truth” gone? Who bears it now?’” Although in our passage no questions are explicitly posed, this is the last pāda before the omphalos vss., the ordinary locus of enigmas, and I would suggest that now that Agni has been installed (2c; see above), he will provide us with decisive instruction about the mysteries that concern us—esp. because “He knows everything, as Varuṇa does, through his insight” (1c *vísvaṃ sá veda váruṇo yáthā dhiyā*). Perhaps Aditi is the installer in c in order to connect Agni with her most eminent son, Varuṇa, distinguished by both knowledge and ethical stature. I would therefore emend my tr. of d to “Our eldest brother (Agni) will be the first to instruct us.”

X.11.3–4: As indicated in the publ. intro., these two vss. form the omphalos of the six-vs. Jagatī portion of this composite hymn. Their 2nd hemistichs match each other: #*yád ī(m) ... , agnīm hótāram ...*, and both vss. end with a form of *jan* (3d *jījanan*, 4d *ajāyata*). Both also play the ritual present against the mythic past: in vs. 3 the *cid nú* points to the ritual present, but Manu belongs to the mythic past; in vs. 4 the fetching of the drop by the falcon in ab is mythic past, but the verb in c (*vṛṇāte*) is present. As noted in the publ. intro., the 1<sup>st</sup> hemistichs of the vss. treat the introduction of the ritual substances fire (3ab) and soma (4ab) respectively. This toggling between present and past leads to a strange collection of verbal stems and tenses.

X.11.3: The first of the omphalos vss. It also contains the alliterative and etymological figures *uṣā uvāsa* (b) and its echo *uśántam uśatām* in c (though of course the phrases belong to two different roots,  $\sqrt{vas}$  and  $\sqrt{vaś}$  respectively).

The publ. tr. omitted *bhadrá* in pāda: correct to “... auspicious Dawn ...”

X.11.4: Some alliteration that crosses the pāda boundary in ab: *vibhvām vicakṣaṇám, vír*.

Based on the parallelism with 3c and on the sense, *yádī* in 4c should be read *yád ī*, not as a lengthened form of *yádi* ‘if’. The *īm* in 3c precedes a vowel, *ī* in 4c a consonant.

The verb *ābharat* in b is read by the Pp. as augmented *ā abharat*, but in fact it could just as well be an injunctive. An injunc. would give more flexibility in putting together the temporal relations of the rest of the vs. I am now tempted to read it with presential value “does the bird ... bring,” to conform with the pres. in c. The injunctive would also allow both the mythic past and the ritual present meanings simultaneously. On taking c with ab, rather than d, see immed. flg. remark.

In the publ. tr., contrary to the standard interpr. I take the *yád* clause of cd with ab and take *ádha dhīr ajāyata* as a new independent sentence. This disposition of clauses was made in great part in response to the awkwardness of having a pres. *vṛṇāte* in the subordinate cl. and an augmented impf. in the main cl.—which, strictly speaking, should yield the unharmonious “when the Aryan clans choose ..., a thought was born.” Most interpr. take c with d and tr. *ajāyata* as an aoristic-type recent past: e.g., Klein, DGRV II.105 “When the Aryan clans choose the wondrous Agni as Hotar, then a (poetic) thought has been born.” But (per IH) augmented impfs. should not express such a value. I therefore stick to the publ. tr. (save for substituting a presential reading for *ā bharat*). Note that the *yád īm* clause in 3cd is also subordinate to a main cl. in ab, so that my interpr. here reinforces the parallelism of the two vss.

The *dhī-* that was born in d harks back to 1c, where Agni knows everything “with his insight” (*dhiyā*). Thus the very end of the omphalos sees the creation of the quality that allows Agni to instruct us authoritatively.



X.11.5: The opening of b, *hótrābhir agne*, is a scrambling of the repeated phrase of the omphalos vss., *agním hótāram*, which likewise opens the even pāda. Another partial repetition from the omphalos vss. is *mānuṣaḥ*, echoing *mānave* of 3b and connecting the current ritual to Manu's first establishment of it.

It is not immediately clear what *vā* in c is conjoining, but I am persuaded by Klein's suggestion (DGRV II.184–85) that the nominal expression in b, *hótrābhiḥ ... mānuṣaḥ svadhvarāḥ* is equivalent to a temporal cl., with the bahuvr. *svadhvarāḥ*, lit. 'having good ceremonies', functioning as the predicate "(when) you have/conduct ..."

X.11.6: Pāda b has chiasmic alliteration: *īyakṣati haryatō hṛttā iṣyati*. The 2nd two terms (*hṛttāḥ* and *iṣyati*) appear to be abbreviated versions of the 1st two (*haryatāḥ* and *īyakṣati*).

As noted in the publ. intro., this last vs. of the Jagatī hymn is esp. crammed with matter and subject to simultaneous and overlapping readings. As Re points out, the vs. contains 7 finite verbs, of which 6 are pres. indic. (only the first is exceptional, the impv. *īraya*). For none of them is the subject identified (save for epithets or descriptors). Suggestions for the identities of the subjects vary widely; I will not list them all, but give what I consider the primary referents in each case – but as indicated in the publ. intro., the studied vagueness as to identity is surely meant to invite the audience to interpr. each statement as applicable to both Agni and Soma (or vice versa).

I take the/a priest as the subj. of the impv. in pāda, prompting a fellow officiant. I also favor the kindling sticks as the referents of *pitārā* among the usual pairs (Heaven and Earth, Day and Night) suggested. The vs. seems to be the climax of the ritual activity prepared for in the earlier parts of the hymn, and kindling the ritual fire would be the first critical event.

Ge follows Yāska in interpr. *ā* as a simile particle; I am quite skeptical, even though I think *jārā ā bhāgam* is an implicit comparison. The most helpful parallel is I.134.3 *prā bodhayā pūraṃdhim, jārā ā sasatīm iva* "Awaken Plenitude as a lover (awakens) her who sleeps," with the same sequence *jārā ā* followed by an object referring to the female of the pair. (Cf. also X.39.2 *ūt pūraṃdhīr īrayatam*, which contains our verb and *pūraṃdhi-* as in I.134.3.) Although *bhāgam* is obviously not feminine, I wonder if it's not erotic slang, something like "piece of luck" for a girl he "got lucky" with.

In b I take the subj. to be Soma, primarily because, although *haryatā-* can be used of Agni, it more often modifies Soma. The desid. *īyakṣa-* has Soma as subject a number of times. As complement to *īyakṣati* I perhaps over-hastily supplied 'cows', on the basis of a passage like IX.78.1 *apā vāsāno abhī gā īyakṣati*, of Soma. I now would be inclined to leave it in absolute usage ("the gladdening one is yearning ..."). As for *iṣyati*, this verb regularly takes 'speech' as obj. with Soma regularly as subj. (IX.12.6, 30.1, 64.9, 25, 95.5), and this seems a fairly safe obj. to supply, esp. since it is followed immediately by *vīvakti*.

In c *vāhni-* 'draught-horse' is used of both Agni and Soma; here I would favor Agni as the primary referent on the basis of *vīvakti*. Although this verb obviously belongs to the redupl. pres. and therefore does not contain the preverb *vī*, it cannot help but recall to the audience *vī vocati* (2d), the verb that introduced the omphalos verses and means something like "provide decisive instruction." Agni was the subject of that verb, and I think his role as instructor is reprised here.

On *makhā-* see comm. ad I.18.9. The stem is not particularly associated with either Agni or Soma, and the verb doesn't help. I tentatively assign the phrase to Agni partly because the

identities seem to switch pāda-by-pāda rather than clause-by-clause, and partly because Agni does more actual labor at the sacrifice.

As to d, the denomn. *taviṣyá-* occurs 3x in the RV; the other two occurrences have Soma as subj. The cl. *vépate matí* is used of Soma in IX.71.3. So Soma seems the likely primary referent of this pāda.

X.11.7: Although the isolated form *ákṣat* is identified an aor. subjunctive to  $\sqrt{(n)as}$  by Gr, see Narten's disc. (sig-aor. 160). She interpr. it as a nonce present injunctive analogically created beside the (likewise isolated) *-ís-*aor. Whether her model is correct (I am dubious because the *-ís-*aor. is a hapax), I concur with her grammatical analysis: a subjunctive in the generalizing *yáḥ* cl. does not fit well with pres. *śṛṇve* in the main cl. I would now emend the tr. to “whatever mortal attains ...” Note that *ákṣat* echoes *íyaksati* in 6b and they belong to the same root; although they belong to two different hymnlets, I think it's possible that well-attested *íyaksati* influenced the form of nonce *ákṣat*.

In b I supply “all” on the basis of VIII.2.34 *vísṣvā yó 'ti śṛṇve* “who is famed beyond all things.”

In d the lexeme *ā ... bhūṣati* has elicited a range of contextual translations all assuming that *dyūn* is the object: Gr “eine Zeit hinbringen, verleben” [spend time], Ge “sieht er den (kommenden) Tagen entgegen” [look forward to, await], Re “il fortifie ses jours”—none of which resembles the usual employment of  $\sqrt{bhūṣ}$ . This idiom normally takes a loc. and means ‘attend upon / to’. Cf., e.g., VIII.99.2 *tvé ā bhūṣanti vedhásah* “The ritual adepts attend to you.” I take *dyūn* as an acc. of extent of time, as often, and supply ‘you’ with *ā... bhūṣanti*, like the explicit *tvé* in just-quoted VIII.99.2 or the implicit one in I.43.9; alternatively we might supply loc. \**sumataú*, picking up the *sumatím* in pāda a, similar to X.160.5 *ābhūṣantas te sumataú nāvāyām*—yielding for our passage “he tends to (your favor) through the days.”

X.11.8: Much of the 1st hemistich resembles I.95.8 *sā devātātā sāmītir babhūva*: see our ... *eṣā sāmītir bhāvāti devī devéṣu* ... In I.95.8 I take *sāmīti-* as a reference to Agni: “he has become the meeting point with the assemblage of gods” (so also, e.g., Ge), an allusion to Agni's role as ritual intermediary between gods and men. I now think our passage has the same sense and reference and would emend the tr. to “When (you)/he will become the divine meeting point among the gods, the one worthy of the sacrifice.” There is a problem with this interpr. that does not confront I.95.8, namely that Agni, supposedly the referent of *sāmītiḥ*, is addressed in the voc. in the 1st hemistich (*agne ... yajatra*) and is the 2nd ps. subj. of the parallel *yád* cl. in c (*yád vibhájāsi*). I suggest that this is an extreme example of the well-known “attraction” of grammatical categories in nominal sentences with pronominal subject; see disc. above at X.10.4. In that ex., *sā no nābhiḥ* “that is our umbilical tie,” the referent of fem. sg. *sā* is actually the mixed gender dual pair of the Gandharva and the watery maiden,” so a dual masc. (representing a masc.+fem. pair) has been “attracted” into the fem. sg. to match the gender and number of the predicate *nābhiḥ*. In I.95.8 just quoted, the fem. sg. *sā* matches *sāmītiḥ* in gender, though the referent is Agni. In our passage we would have not only that gender attraction but also, I suggest, “person attraction,” from 2nd to 3rd. On the other hand, a less radical revision of the publ. tr. might follow the Ge/Re path to something like “when this divine assembly [=the sacrifice probably] will take place / take its place [*bhavāti*] among the gods ...,” but this loses the parallelism with I.95.8 and also removes the focus from Agni. In addition *yajatá-* ordinarily modifies gods, not inanimate entities.

X.11.9: The use of *mākiḥ* with a 2nd sg. subj. with clear referent (you=Agni) would be unusual. In fact, Re takes the first clause as 3rd ps., only the second as 2nd: “Que nul des dieux ne soit à l’écart, sois (toi-même) ici!” Although the publ. tr. reflects the 2nd ... 2nd interpr. of Ge, I am now inclined towards Re’s 3rd ... 2nd, at least as an alternative: “Let no one of the gods be absent; you should be here!” The reason is that I now think that *mākis* only has 3rd ps. ref. (for possible counterexx., which I explain otherwise, see I.147.5 and X.100.7). In this behavior it is like *nākis*, which likewise has only 3rd ps. reference (for potential counterex., see VI.67.10 and comm. thereon). The gen. pl. *devānām* here also is easier to construe with “no one” than as an independent constituent. The big stumbling block is, of course, *bhūh*, which looks like an undeniable 2nd sg. Re suggests it might have been attracted by the flg. *syāh*, which is possible. I think it might be a nonce (pseudo-)precative, like *dhāyīh* in I.147.5.

## X.12 Agni

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

X.12.1: The first hemistich cannot be interpr. without ref. to I.185.10, which contains the other occurrence of them. *abhiśrāvā-*, there in the dat.: *ṛtām divé tād avocam pṛthivyā, abhiśrāvāya prathamām sumedhāh* “I of good wisdom have spoken this truth to Heaven and to Earth to hear first.” Like our passage that one contains a form of *prathamā-* and one of *ṛtā-*. In I.185.10 the dative is (quasi-)infinitival; I agree with Ge (n. 1ab) that our *abhiśrāvé bhavataḥ* is a periphrastic construction, even though, as Re points out, the loc. *abhiśrāvé* is not technically an infinitive.

Note the polarized and contrastive vocabulary: H+E both “speak” and “hear” and the two resonant and contrasting words *ṛtā-* and *satyā-* both appear in the hemistich. I think the point here is that H+E are the major physical cosmic entities; as such, they both embody and oversee the natural laws that control observable reality (*satyā-*); hence they “speak what is real” (*satya-vāc-*). This quality of theirs gives them title to be the first to hear *ṛténa*, that is, to hear what is in accordance with the deeper conceptual truths that govern the relations among things, beyond this observable reality. This *ṛtā-* is conveyed at the sacrifice, which is initiated in the 2nd hemistich.

In c *mártān yajáthāya kṛṇvān* “setting / causing mortals to sacrifice” can be considered a periphrastic causative (see Zehnder, Periphras. Kaus. 18 and passim; Keydana, Inf. 262–63). The morphological caus. to *√yaj*, *yājayati*, is not attested until Vedic prose and should not exist in the RVic period because it would be a double transitive, a type that is blocked for *-āya-* transitive/causatives at this time (see my *-āya-*, esp. 186–89).

In d the standard tr. construe *pratyāñ* with *svām ásum*; in fact, Ge and Re seem to take it as part of a phrase with the part. *yān* in the meaning ‘returning’ (e.g., Ge “wieder in sein Leben zurückkehrend”). Ge (n. 1d) claims, without giving evidence, that *pratyāñ* is “verstärktes *prāti*.” But *pratyāñc-* means ‘facing towards’, ‘face-to-face’; I see no passages with a semantic component ‘again’. In the publ. tr. I re-supply *mártān* from c; cf. the passages in which Agni is *pratyāñ víśvā bhúvanāni* “facing towards all beings” (II.3.1, X.88.16). Alternatively Agni is regularly described as *víśvátaḥ pratyāñc-* “facing in all directions” (I.144.7, II.10.5, VII.12.1, X.79.5), and that might be the expression underlying this one.

This leaves *svām ásum yān* as the phrase to be interpr. The stem *ásu-* is fairly common in this set of hymns: *ásum* 14.12, 15.1, *asutíp-* 14.12, *ásunīti-* 12.4 (this hymn), 15.14, 16.2. Interestingly, at least in usage, in these funeral hymn passages the word implicitly refers to a new/other life, at least to a change of state, as in X.14.12 ... *asmábhyam ... púnar dātām ásum adyéhá bhadram* “Let these two here today grant a fortunate life again to us”; X.15.1 *ásum yá*

*īyúḥ* “(the forefathers) who went to (their next) life ...” In our passage, with Agni as subject, “going to his own (next/other) life” must surely refer to the rekindling of the ritual fire at every dawn sacrifice (this is also Ge’s view, n. 1d), with this kindling referred to in the next vs., 2c.

X.12.2: Agni having initiated the mortals’ sacrifice in 1cd now turns to his sacrificial role with regard to the gods. The opening of the two segments, 1c *devó yán mártān* and 2a *devó devān*, emphasize the parallelism. Our pāda a lacks a syllable; Arnold and HvN supply a rest at syllable 5. I suggest that omitting a syllable in the opening draws attention to the parallelism, since the subord. conj. *yád* isn’t nec. in 2a.

For *devān paribhūḥ* see V.13.6 *ágne nemír arāṃ́ iva, devā́ms tvám paribhūr asi*.

Ge takes *prathamáḥ* in b with *cikitvān* (“als erster Kundiger”), but *cikitvān* is ordinarily a syntactically inert final qualifier like *vidvān*. I take *prathamáḥ* instead as part of the verbal complex (“(as) first convey”), parallel to *prathamé* in 1a, also of ritual activity (so also Re).

For *hótā nityaḥ* see *nitya-hotā* in nearby X.7.4.

X.12.3: A difficult vs. Note also that three of the four pādas (a, c, d) end in monosyllables, *gór*, *gur*, and *vāḥ* [underlying *vār*] respectively, a striking stylistic effect.

The difficulties begin at the beginning, with *svāvṛj-*. The old interpr. (Gr, AiG II.1.220, Wh AV XVIII.1.32, etc.) is that it is a cmpd of *su-ā-vṛj-*, but Old gives good arguments against this (first *v* is consonantal, unexpected accent). Old’s candidate for first member, *sva-*, is now the standard (e.g., Ge n. 3a, Scar 502); he takes it as a bahuv. “wobei bz. wovon eigene (d.h. eignen Besitz schaffende) Aneignung stattfindet.” This interpr. was adopted in AiG II.2.29 and is one of the alternatives given by Scar in his analysis, which begins with *sva* + fem. rt. noun cmpd \**āvṛj-* (so accented). The problem is that though such a bahuvr. might account for the accent we have, in the interpr. of the passage, even by those who offer a bahuvr. interpr. of the form, it generally comes out as a determ. cmpd (Old “angeeigneter Besitz,” Scar “eigener Besitz”), which, as far as I can tell, should be accented \**svāvṛj-* (and cf. *svavṛj-*). If it is interpr. as a bahuvr., a neut. modifying *amṛtam*, it seems as if the meaning should be opposite to what we expect: “the immortal drink having the own possession of the god” rather than what the sense should be: “... being the own possession of the god.” In other words, as far as I can see, grammatically speaking the drink should *possess* the god, not be his possession. Ge, Re, and Scar (2nd alt.) all produce a bahuvrīhi-type interpr., but in all cases with the backwards interpr. I just constructed (e.g., Ge “... in der eigenen Gewalt des Gottes steht”). The phrase could, I suppose, be twisted to make *devásya* a subjective gen., but getting to this interpr. involves too many steps, to my mind. There is also the problem that root noun cmpds. generally only have two members, and even in PREVERB + ROOT idioms often gap the preverb if cmpded with a further 1st member. (See my 2020 “Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūidiia-*; Fs. Lamberterie.) I wonder if, rather than a cmpd, we originally had a syntagm \**svā āvṛk* “own possession/acquisition,” with fem. root noun cmpd., which underwent expected vowel contraction to \**svāvṛk*, with the double accent then simplified to *svāvṛk* when it became interpr. as a cmpd. This does not in fact change the interpr. or tr. of the clause.

We are not yet finished with the problems of this pāda. All standard interpr. take the *yádī* towards the end of the pāda as subordinating the whole pāda to the main cl. in b. This clause lacks a verb, but *svāvṛk* can serve as the predicate: so, more or less, “If/when the immortal (drink) from the cow becomes the possession of the god, ...” This is, in fact, syntactically (barely) possible. However, there is an alternative, which I think works better in the passage: to

take *yādī* (or rather *yād ī*) as an izafe-like marker qualifying *amṛtam*: “the immortal (drink) which is from the cow.” As often, I read *ī* as the enclitic prn., variant of *īm*, though I’m not exactly sure what it is doing here, perhaps doubling *amṛtam*. I would point out, however, that it fills a rhetorical role: pāda a ends *yād ī gōr#*, pāda c ends *yájur gur#*; without the *ī* the match would be less exact.

What substance are we dealing with? *amṛtam* suggests soma, but the addition of the cow as source makes this unlikely. I think it is ghee, the ordinary ritual offering to Agni. Ge thinks it is the rain and therefore identical to the *divyám ghṛtám vā* “the heavenly ghee, the water” in pāda d, but this seems rather reductive to me: it is more interesting to have two substances, earthly and heavenly, assimilated to each other rather than simply being the same. (See publ. intro.) And it’s also hard for me to understand how Agni would possess the rain.

In any case the beings born from this substance (*áto jātāsah*) uphold the two worlds. Who these beings are is debated. I think it is likely the gods, who make their appearance at the beginning of c. They are “born” from the ghee because the ritual oblations feed and sustain the gods. Med. pres. *dhārayante* is based on the *-anta* replacement *dhārāyanta* and need not be credited with a medial sense. The identical form (with accent) appears in vs. 7.

In the publ. tr. pāda b is set in quotation marks, to indicate that I thought that it constituted the *yájus*, the sacrificial formula, that is mentioned in pāda c. This interpr. was inspired by Re’s idea that d is the actual *yájus*. I am now not at all sure that this interpr. works, though I would like to identify an internal formula here.

On my interpr. of d as an early ex. of the water cycle, see the publ. intro. Unlike Ge, who identifies the *gauś* ‘cow’ of pāda a with the *énī* ‘speckled cow’ of d, I think they are quite distinct and the sources of earthly and heavenly ghee respectively. Since heavenly ghee is water (*vā*), namely rain, the speckled cow may be a raincloud.

X.12.4: As noted in the publ. intro., Heaven and Earth, called to witness in vs. 1, receive the same call in this vs., which ends the 1st portion of this hymn: *dyāvābhūmī śṛṇutam* in b responds to 1ab *dyāvā ... kṣāmā ... abhiśrāvé bhavataḥ*.

In pāda a the standard interpr. of the sequence *vārdhāyāpaḥ* is as *vārdhāya + āpaḥ*, with the latter belonging to the *s*-stem neut. *āpas-* ‘work’, and this is undoubtedly correct. However, I see a potential pun here, with *āpaḥ* ‘waters’ also to be read in *vārdhāyāpaḥ*. This *āpaḥ* would be nom. for acc. *apāḥ*, as sometimes elsewhere. For exactly the same pun see nearby X.4.5 and comm. thereon. By my interpr. both ‘work’ and ‘waters’ are the obj. of the infinitival *vārdhāya*. The “work” of H+E is the creation of rain (see Ge’s n. 4a), that is, “waters.” This was made quite clear in the immed. preceding pāda, 3d, which ends with *vāḥ* ‘water’, and is probably also represented by the ‘honey’ (*mādhvā*) in 4d (so also Ge).

Pāda c seems to be an elaborate way of describing the passage of time (so Ge), appropriate to the use of the cmpd in the funeral hymns to come (X.15.4, 16.2). Re’s more convoluted interpr., which seems to conceive of the days as a sort of psychopomp, seems unrec. On *āsu-* see comm. on vs. 1. On the conjunction of *āhar-* and *dív-/dyú-*, both in the meaning ‘day(time)’, see nearby X.7.4 *dyúbhiḥ... āhabhiḥ*.

X.12.5–8: On the possible thematic connection of these apparently disordered vss., see publ. intro.

X.12.5: The pf. *jagr̥he* is quite likely a pun. The form is ordinarily assigned to  $\sqrt{gra(b)h}$  ‘grasp’, for good reason. Grasping is a standard action of Varuṇa’s and fits the worried atmosphere of this vs. However, it could also belong to  $\sqrt{grh}$  ‘complain’ (Aves. *garəz*) and is so taken by Re and Insler (1968: 223).

My interpr. of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is completely different from the standard tr. See, in addition to Ge and Re, Old’s extensive disc. and Schmidt (*Vrata*, p. 88). I will not detail my divergences from these interpr. As noted in the publ. intro., I suggest that Varuṇa’s enigmatic and inexplicable hostility to us (ab) is contrasted with Mitra’s more reliable support for us: even when angry, or being shiftily, he still presents himself loud and clear (like a signal call) and provides good things (like a prize). The contrast between Mitra, our helper and advocate, and the easily annoyed Varuṇa is found more clearly in 8cd.

My disagreements with other tr. begin with the standard interpr. of *juhurānāḥ*, which is generally taken as transitive with *devān* as obj. (e.g., Ge “indem er die Götter verführt”). Because the other three exx. of this med. part. are intrans./pass., I find this interpr. unlikely on syntactic grounds, and it also then requires the construction of a complex and not very plausible backstory as to how and why Mitra would lead the gods astray (see Old, Ge’s n. 5, HPS’s n. 88). I take the form as intrans. and as a pun involving  $\sqrt{hṛ}$  ‘be angry’ (on *juhur-* forms to this root see Insler 1968, EWA s.v.  $\sqrt{HAR}$ ) and  $\sqrt{hvar}$  ‘go crookedly’. The point is that even when Mitra is angry (like Varuṇa) and/or following a not entirely straight course, unlike Varuṇa he can be understood and he remains favorable to us.

What then to do with *devān* if it’s not the obj. of *juhurānāḥ*? I construe it loosely with *ślōkaḥ* just across the pāda boundary. Such enjambment is found in this same vs. between pādas a and b: ... *kād asya, āti vratām cakṛma* ... A *ślōka-* is a signal call that goes up and/or out: cf., in the next hymn, X.13.1 *vī ślōka etu pathyā*. For its place among the gods see III.54.11, for its journey to heaven I.190.4. Although the verb of motion is lacking here, it is easily supplied and could perhaps be extracted from the gen. pl. *yātām*.

The function of *āpi* in this pāda is disputed. I take it as ‘also’, introducing a 2<sup>nd</sup> simile, that of Mitra as *vāja-* ‘victory prize’.

X.12.6: On the sense and placement of this vs., see again publ. intro. Again my interpr. of the vs. is quite different from the standard. As I say in the publ. intro., I think that Yama’s name was “difficult to contemplate” (*durmāntu*) while he was still an immortal, because of the taint of incest, spelled out in pāda b. But after Yama chose offspring over immortality (see X.13.4 in the next hymn), which choice involved committing incest (never directly mentioned in the text), instituted the sacrificial compact between men and gods, and established the kingdom of the dead, his name became *sumāntu*. In other words, Yama’s history is a sort of Felix Culpa: his offense was indeed a sin and cost him his immortality, but the results, esp. for us humans, were happy.

Pāda b is a direct quote from X.10.2, where Yama describes what the offense, the “partnership” that Yamī is urging on him, would consist of. See comm. ad loc. for my interpr., very different from the standard. It is quoted here to indicate what offense is associated with his name, such that the name should not be thought of.

In c the name “Yama” is overtly mentioned, since that name can now be brought to mind without ill effect because of the good consequences of Yama’s actions, here esp. tied to the sacrifice. The name is absent from pāda a.

X.12.7–8: These two vss. belong together, but their connection is somewhat obscured by an accumulation of clauses. Both begin with a *yásmín* rel. cl. (each with a different loc. referent); in vs. 7 this rel. cl. extends over the whole hemistich, as the accent on *dhāráyante* in b shows. The main cl. to which both rel. cl.s correspond is postponed till 8b, where the correlative of the two *yásmíns* is the unemphatic *asya*. In the meantime, the 2nd hemistich of vs. 7 interposes two parenthetical clauses. The point of the larger structure (7ab / 8ab) is that where the gods do what they do and what they want is completely unknown to us. Ge's nn. are esp. illuminating on the structure and what it conveys.

X.12.7: Though formally a med. present, *dhāráyante* is clearly based on the *-anta* replacement *dhāráyanta*, like the identical form in 3b, and need have no middle semantic nuance. Unlike the form in 3b, there is no expressed obj. here, however, and Gr, for ex., takes it as reflex./intrans. (See also Wh, AV XVIII.1.35 “maintain themselves.”) Since, however, all other forms of *dhāráya-* have an object, expressed or unexpressed, this seems unlikely. In the publ. tr. I supply *urvī* on the basis of 3b; similar objects with *dhāráya-* are found elsewhere (e.g., *prthivīm utá dyām* V.62.3, *ródasī* VI.17.7). However,  $\sqrt{dhṛ}$  takes a wide variety of objects, and in this sacrificial context it might instead be something more tied to the ritual. But, since the parenthetical insertion in c has to do with the gods' arrangements for the sun and moon, a cosmic object seems likely.

As noted above, cd is a parenthetical interjection; c presents the gods' primal act of establishing the qualities of sun and moon, while d describes the current behavior of sun and moon after that original act. The verb in c, *ádadhuh*, is accented because it's positioned between its two contrastive predicates: *sūrye jyótiḥ ... māsy àktūn*.

In d I interpr. *dyotaním* as a reference to Agni, in accordance with Sāy's comm. ad AV XVIII.1.35 (see Ge's n. 7d). The point is that the ritual fire remains at the center of the alternating brightness and darkness as the sun and moon, day and night, perform their regular daily round, a comment appropriate to the ritual context of the first hemistich.

X.12.8: Another ex. of enjambment in this hymn: *apīcyè*, which begins pāda b, belongs with pāda a, modifying *mánmani*. The poet is playing games with us: *ná* immediately follows this first word of b and is thus in standard simile-marking position, but here it opens its clause and must be the negative.

On the thematic ring that cd forms with vs. 5, see publ. intro.

X.12.9: This vs. repeats X.11.9, likewise the final vs. See comm. there.

### X.13 Soma Carts

On the structure and contents of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.13.1: In the publ. tr. I take *pathyā* as a nom. sg., with most (see Old explicitly), but I now think the instr. (rejected by Old) is an alternative possibility: “as if along a path.”

X.13.3: On my interpr. of this vs., see publ. tr. As noted there it contains the obscure root noun *rūp-* also found in an impenetrable context in IV.5.7; see comm. there. In both passages it is associated with a form of the root  $\sqrt{ruh}$ .

X.13.4: This is the vs. that I take as the charter for Yama’s choice, his Felix Culpa. See publ. intro. The puzzling part is pāda c. Assuming that the gods are the subj. of c, as most do, their action of making Bṛhaspati into their sacrifice must be meant to contrast with Yama’s own actions with regard to the sacrifice, but figuring out how takes some reflection. Pāda c seems to depict a closed loop: the gods make one of their own the sacrifice, a phrase somewhat reminiscent of the famous statement in the Puruṣasūkta X.90.16 *yajñēna yajñām ayajanta devāḥ* and even more reminiscent of the less famous statement in X.124.6 *haviṣṣ tvā sántam haviṣā yajāma*. Thinking about those passages may help us with this one. In both X.124.6 and X.90.16 I take the VP ACC *√yaj* as meaning “sacrifice to ACC”: “with an oblation let us sacrifice to you [=Soma], though you yourself are an oblation” and “the gods sacrificed to the sacrifice with a sacrifice.” (For X.90.16 the standard interpr. is probably “the gods sacrificed the sacrifice ...,” i.e., “... performed the sacrifice” – but X.124.6 supports the former reading.) I wonder now if the same blurring of identity between the recipient of the sacrifice and the sacrificial substance is not found in our passage, with Bṛhaspati filling both roles: “They made sacrifice to the seer Bṛhaspati as the sacrifice.” My discussion of the other two passages in my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124” (Gs. Staal) sees them as depicting the original establishment of the sacrifice. As I said there (p. 297):

These two statements express a kind of endless loop, an inescapable reflexivity: the object of worship and the means of worship are identical (sacrifice and sacrifice, soma and soma). This tight internal and grammatical circularity is situated within a larger, though not explicitly expressed, circularity: in X.90 it is the gods—the ordinary object of worship—who are performing the sacrifice. In X.124 ... in vs. 6, when Indra tells Soma “we will sacrifice to you,” clearly Indra and unspecified others, again presumably gods, are performing the sacrifice, but Soma is a god and Indra is thus promising that the gods will sacrifice to one of themselves. What I am groping towards saying here is that X.124 is “about” the primal instituting of the sacrifice, which in its first instantiation was a closed circle—created by the gods to worship themselves.

The relevance of these passage to our vs. is, in my view, that Yama *breaks the circle*. By choosing death he ceases to be one of the immortals who sacrifice to themselves. The agent and object of sacrifice are no longer identical, nor are the object of worship and the means of worship. The stasis of the reflexive loop gives way to the dynamic interchange between two separate entities, gods and men, with reciprocal roles and complementary duties – the ideal model for Rigvedic people.

Pāda c thus expresses the previous situation, when the gods sacrificed (to) one of their own. The next question is – why Bṛhaspati? I don’t have an entirely satisfactory answer, but since Bṛhaspati is associated with the sacred formulation (*bráhma-*) and is in fact called the formulator (cf. X.141.3 *brahmāṇam ca bṛhaspátim*), he represents the crucial verbal portion of the sacrifice, which was especially the topic of vs. 3. Note that in the next hymn he is associated with the *ṛkṣans*, lit. those ‘possessing the *ṛc-*, the versifiers’.

Pāda d needs to be read in the context of X.10, the Yama/Yamī dialogue. In that hymn much is made of bodies (*tanū-*): Yamī urges Yama to enter her body (X.10.3d *tanvām ā vivisyāḥ*); she wishes to yield (*√ric*) her body to him (X.10.7c *tanvām riricyām*); and finally she orders him to mingle his body with hers (X.10.11d *tanvā me tanvām sám pipṛgdhi*), a command he refuses (X.10.12a *ná vā u te tanvā tanvām sám papṛcyām*). Yamī also asserts that the gods



want what he will leave behind as the one and only mortal, his (personified) legacy (X.10.3b *ékasya cit tyajásam mártasya*). Thus in our passage it is telling that once Yama has chosen death and unchosen immortality (that is, has become a mortal), he leaves behind his own body, using the same word *tanū-*, in the form of offspring. This VP also telling uses the same root  $\sqrt{ric}$  (and the same stem, the perfect) as Yamī did in her expressed desire to yield her body to Yama, in the phrase in our pāda d, *tanvām prāīrecīt*. The semantic nuances of the two occurrences of the  $\sqrt{ric}$  differ, but the echo must be deliberate.

X.13.5: On this vs., too, see the publ. intro.

#### X.14 Yama

The hymn has been much tr.: Macdonell, VRS and Hymns from the RV; Re, Hymnes spec; Doniger; Maurer; it is also excerpted in Lanman’s Reader and much of it, scrambled, is found in the funeral vss. of AVŚ XVIII.

X.14.1: Note the phonetic figure in cd ... *-am saṃgāmanam jānānām, yamām rājānam ...*

X.14.3: The first hemistich consists of three (apparently) parallel NPs, with a nom. sg. PN associated with an instr. pl. The 2<sup>nd</sup> two names are of course familiar, Yama and Bṛhaspati, implicitly paired also in X.13.4, but *mātalī* occurs only here in the RV. This word is also formally anomalous: a presumable masc. in *-ī* (devī, not vṛkī, type; though Sāy. takes it to an *-in-* stem, the accent is wrong). The name is found twice more in the AV (VIII.9.5, XI.6.23, in addition to the vs. parallel to this one, XVIII.1.47). The AV passages provide no help in determining who Mātālī is or what group of beings he belongs to. The more interesting of the AV passages, XI.6.23, simply adds to the mystery: there he “knows a chariot-bought immortal remedy” (*yān mātalī rathakrītām amṛtam véda bheṣajām*), which Indra causes to enter the waters. In the Mahābhārata Mātali, with short *i*, is the name of Indra’s charioteer, but this semi-agreement from a much later text is also unhelpful. Charpentier suggested that *mātalī* is a short form of *mātariśvan-* (endorsed in KEWA [s.v. *Mātariśvā*], viewed more skeptically in EWA [s.v. *mātalī-*]). Although Mātariśvan is associated with Bṛhaspati (see HPS, B+I 72–77), identifying Mātālī here with Mātariśvan does not seem to get us anywhere.

It is more useful to approach the problem by way of the associated instr. pls. Here we first confront two issues: 1) are they instr. of accompaniment or agents with the pf. part. *vāvṛdhānāḥ* ‘having been strengthened’, or indeed a mixture of the two; 2) are the instr. proper names or descriptors. As for 1), both Ge and Re (Hymnes spec.) tr. as a mixture: the first two as accompaniment, the last as agent (e.g., Re “Mātālī avec les Kavya, Yama avec les Angiras, Bṛhaspati que les chantres ont invigoré”). They must assume that since *vāvṛdhānāḥ* is sg., it can only modify one of the nominatives, but this is of course not the case: a series of singulars can take a singular verb. Most of the rest of the numerous tr. of this hymn take all three in only one way or only the other: Macd (VRS), HPS (B+I 56), Maurer (249) as accompaniment, Doniger (43) as agent. The publ. tr. takes all as accompaniment, but I now think this is incorrect: the mutual strengthening (using the same root  $\sqrt{vrdh}$ ) that is depicted in pāda c supports an agentive reading. Moreover, the Aṅgirasas are famous for their use in the Vala myth of their verbal power to effect change, and both *kavyá-* and *ḥkvan-* suggest similar deployment of words. I might therefore consider emending the tr. to “Mātālī having been strengthened by the poets ...,” etc. I

am only given (slight) pause by the fact that the next two vss. (4–5) contain instr. pls. of accompaniment.

As for the question of proper names versus modifiers, although *āṅgīras-* is without doubt a PN, I see no advantage in interpr. the other two in that way (*pace* the standard inter.: Ge and Re [only for *kavyāñh*], Macd, HPS, Doniger, Maurer), since both are transparently associated with words for poetry and appear elsewhere in non-naming function (*ṛkvan-* is esp. well attested). Because the role of the Aṅgīrases in verbal activity was well known, they can take their place in this company of wordsmiths without further specification.

None of this gets us closer to identifying Mātālī, and this task is initially made more difficult by the three-into-two problem. As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn in part concerns the *pitryāṅa-* ‘way of the forefathers’, which leads to the realm of the dead; this way is contrasted with the *devayāna-* ‘way of the gods’. The gods and a group of others, presumably mortals or perhaps specifically the forefathers, are contrasted in pāda c, and this two-way contrast is continued by the *anyé ... anyé* “the ones ... the others” construction in d. But the first half of the vs. presents us with a division into *threes*. How are we to reconcile this discrepancy? I don’t entirely know, but I suggest that we focus now on the middle of the trio: Yama and the Aṅgīrases. Bṛhaspati is of course a god, but Yama is a boundary-crossing figure: he started as an immortal, but chose death and became a mortal, as we were explicitly told in the preceding hymn X.13.4. The Aṅgīrases also have a somewhat equivocal status: Gr describes them (s.v. *āṅgīras*) as “Wesen zwischen Göttern und Menschen, die also Vermittler zwischen beiden ... erscheinen”; cf. also Macd (Vedic Myth. 143) “it seems probable that the Aṅgīrases were originally conceived of as a race of higher beings intermediate between gods and men.” If both Yama and the Aṅgīrases inhabit an in-between realm, with one pole, Bṛhaspati, being a god, this defines the other pole, Mātālī, as a mortal and representative of the Pitars, the forefathers. This structural argument is the best way I can see to try to get at the identity of Mātālī; the conclusion may be supported by the fact that the *kavyās* are associated (/identified) with the Pitars in the next hymn, X.15.9. As for the *ṛkvan-* who strengthen (or accompany) Bṛhaspati, this stem is sometimes (though by no means always) used of the Maruts (e.g., I.87.5, V.52.1, 60.8), who are of course gods. Acdg. to this distribution, each pair of nom. + instr. would consist of a different set of beings: mortals/Pitars at one end and gods at the other, with the pair in the middle starting from the divine but transitioning to the human. This intermediate set will then “caucus” with the mortals, and the three-into-two problem is solved. But, as the next vss. show, Yama is tasked with integrating this diverse population.

My observation (if it is correct) that the antithesis of the gods is a heterogeneous group consisting of mortals/Pitars and former (/semi-) gods may account for the fact that only the gods are named in the following pāda; the others are represented only by the rel. prn. *yān ... yé*. There are two moieties, but only one is a unity with a single designation.

I follow Re (Hymnes spec. and EVP) in taking *svadhā* in the funeral hymns as the ritual exclamation preferred by the Pitars, a minor phonological modification of the gods’ *svāhā*. Although it is homonymous with the rt. noun cmpd. *svadhā-* ‘autonomous power’ and must be derived from it, it is synchronically distinct (though, e.g., Scar, 264–65, does not separate them). I do not see the necessity for a 2nd lemma *svadhā* “Opfertrank,” as given by Gr.

X.14.4: The non-god group, defined in the last vs., is assembled here: Yama with the Aṅgīrases, the Pitars, and, indirectly, the *kavyās*. Although the publ. tr. identifies the Aṅgīrases with the Pitars—most other tr. leave it unclear—I now think two different groups are meant, both

appearing in vs. 3, with *pitṛbhiḥ* designating the *kavyaṅh* of 3a, which is then reprised in the cmpd. *kaviśastāḥ* ‘pronounced by kavis’ in c. I also think that *saṃvidānāḥ* has the technical meaning ‘come to/make an agreement’, here depicting the fusion of the two groups of non-gods. See the use of *saṃvid-* in the final pāda of the Yama/Yamī dialogue, X.10.14 and comm. there. I would therefore emend the tr. to “coming to an agreement with the Aṅgirasas and the forefathers.”

I did not know how to handle the *hī* in pāda a (and so I essentially ignored it, in tacit agreement with most every other interpr.). Ordinarily when *hī* appears in an imperative clause, it provides the grounds for a following imperative, but here the action of the immediately following impv. clause logically precedes the action of the first: “sit here; let the mantras bring you here.” However, I now see that the next impv., addressed to Yama as is the first, can fit the pattern: “sit here ... and (then) become exhilarated,” with the middle impv., in the 3rd ps., a parenthetical intrusion.

X.14.5: The standard tr., incl. the publ. tr., take *vairūpā-*, the only occurrence of this stem in the RV, as the name of another group of beings. I now think this is wrong; rather I think it’s a vṛddhi deriv. of the poss. cmpd. *vīrūpa-* ‘having different form(s)’ and it continues the theme of the heterogeneous composition of the denizens of Yama’s realm. Here it may refer to the Pitars, who are, as I argue above, originally distinct from the Aṅgirasas, or perhaps to the whole group, containing both Aṅgirasas and Pitars. I would emend the tr. to “become exhilarated here along with those of different form [or better perhaps, to capture the vṛddhi: with the descendants of those of different form].” Although Gr (and others; see Mayr PN s.v. *vīrūpa*) identifies several occurrences of *vīrūpa-* as names of singers related to the Aṅgirasas, only in the deriv. *vīrūpavāt* in a list of seers in the uninspired and seemingly late hymn I.45.3 do we need to interpr. it as a PN. In that passage it is adjacent to *aṅgirasvāt* and may result from misinterpr. of earlier passages. The *vairūpā-* here should be considered in conjunction with Yama’s use of *vīśurūpa-* in X.10.2 to describe Yamī in arguing against their having incestuous sex. See comm. there.

In the Avesta, *vīuuantv<sup>u</sup>ant-* is also the father of *yima-*; in Y.9.4 he is identified as a mortal. Where on the human-divine spectrum Vedic Vivasvant lies isn’t entirely clear. Ge, on the basis of X.17.2 (q.v. with Ge’s n. 2a) claims that he is a mortal, though that vs. is quite opaque; Mayr (PN s.v. *vīvasvant-*) suggests rather that he is, like Yama, “dem Mittelbereich göttlicher und sterblicher Wesen zugehörig,” which seems more plausible. See also Gr’s “Name eines Gottes oder Halbgottes.” As for the accent fluctuation between *vīvasvant-* (here and elsewhere) and the more common *vīvasvant-*, the preverb-accented form is found three times in this group of hymns (here, X.17.1–2) as well as twice elsewhere, while the root-accented form is much better attested and more widely distributed; nonetheless, the two accentual forms do not seem to require semantic separation. Thieme (MSS 44 [1985 Fs. Hoffmann] 243; see EWA s.v. *vīvasvant-*) attributes the *vīvasvant-* forms to spread from vocative accentuation.

With Ge (explicitly, n. 5c), Re (Hymnes spec.), Gonda (Ved. Lit. 238), as well as Whit (AV XVIII.1.59), I take pāda c as a parenthesis, with Yama as the subj. of the gerund *niśādya* in d, because the structure of vs. 5 is a mirror-image of vs. 4. In 4 Yama is first urged to sit on the grass strew (a: ... *yama prastarām ā ... sīda*) and then to become exhilarated (d: *mādayasva*); in 5 he is urged to become exhilarated (b: *mādayasva*) after having sat down on the barhis (d: *barhiṣy ā niśādya*). This pattern would be disturbed by making Vivasvant subj. of the gerund in d, as Macd (VRS), Doniger, and Maurer do. Old considers both possible and the uncertainty perhaps

intended. The position of the rel. expression *yáḥ pitā te* would not tell against an interpr. with Vivasvant as subj. of d, since it is of the izafe type.

X.14.6: This last vs. of the first portion of the hymn opens out to further populations with equivocal status on the human-divine spectrum; in addition to the already familiar Aṅgirasas and Pitars, there are the Navagvas, the Atharvans, and the Bhr̥gus. In this it resembles the final vss. of hymns that mention a wider range of divinities than the rest of the hymn treated.

The publ. tr. has the erroneous Atharvaṇas, which should be corrected to Atharvans.

X.14.4–6: As noted in the publ. intro. it is well worth remarking that Yama and his companions can come *back* to our sacrifice; they are not permanently confined to the realm of the dead. Moreover, beyond the difference in the ritual call for gods and forefathers, the crucial parts of the sacrifice seem identical or at least parallel: it is called a *yajñá-* (5d) and the recipients are called *yajñíya-* (5a, 6c); there is a grass strew, identified as *barhís*, for the visitors to sit on (4a, 5d); it has both mantras (4c) and oblations (*havís-* 4d); the appropriate response of the consumer of the oblation is exhilaration ( $\sqrt{mad}$ , 4d, 5b) as in the soma sacrifice, and this oblation indeed appears to be soma, since its recipients are *somyá-* (6b). The tight association of Yama with the sacrifice is also emphasized in vss. 13–15.

X.14.7: The remarkable alliteration of *p* and *r* in the first hemistich has been noted, inter alia, by Macd (VRS ad loc.), Watkins (Dragon, 291): *préhi préhi pathíbhiḥ pūrvyébhir ... pūrve pitārah pareyúḥ*.

It is of course striking that Varuṇa the god is mentioned in connection with Yama and the rites of the dead.

X.14.9: The vs. opens with repeated 2nd ps. impv. of  $\sqrt{i}$  with different preverbs, followed by a 3rd impv. to a different verb but with repeated preverb: *ápeta víta ví ca sarpata*. This pattern plays off *préhi préhi*, which opens vs. 7, likewise with a 2nd ps. impv. to  $\sqrt{i}$  (sg. instead of pl.) and repeated preverb *prá*. The difference in pattern is iconic: the sequence in vs. 9 uses divergence to depict diverse directions of movement, while that in 7 is focused on a single forward movement.

The rest of the verse is framed by the dat. demon. *asmaí* (opening b) ... *asmai* (closing d), referring to the dead man.

My interpr. of the instr. in c differs from all the standard renderings, which take the three as parallel; cf., e.g., Macd “distinguished by days and waters and nights.” But, using the more lit. sense of the ppl. *vyákta-*, I not understand what it would mean for a place to be “anointed/decorated with days and nights,” whereas “anointed with waters” is straightforward and makes the place sound quite appealing. I take *áhobhiḥ ... aktúbhiḥ* as the usual instr. of extent of time “though the days and nights”; cf. nearby *rātrībhiḥ ... áhabhiḥ* (X.10.9) with different lexical realization of ‘night’. The two temporal terms flank the instr. that is actually construed with *vyáktam*, namely *adbhíḥ* ‘with waters’. This positioning is likely to allow *áktubhiḥ* to adjoin (*vy*)*áktam* because of their (folk-)etymological connection.

X.14.10: The publ. tr. should probably be changed to “run beyond,” since the dogs seem to be guarding the entrance, not attacking.

On *suvídātra-* see comm. ad II.9.6, as well as comm. on *durvidātra-* ad X.35.4.

X.14.11: The first hemistich displays tricky and ever-changing phonetic play, which partly crosses and partly conforms to morphological boundaries: *rakṣitārau, catur(-)akṣaú pathi-rákṣi nṛ-(c)ákṣasau*.

X.14.12: *udumbalá-* occurs only here in the RV (and later only in dependent passages); Ge, Re (Hymnes spec., but see n. in EVP), and Macd refuse to tr., but the view that it is a color term derived from the udumbara tree (*udumbára-*, already Saṃhitā prose), already given by Gr, seems a solid hypothesis.

X.14.13–15: See comm. ad vss. 4–6.

X.14.14: The standard tr. take *prá tiṣṭhata* as an intrans. verb of motion, “go forth”; however, although this stem is indeed usually intrans., *prá √sthā* in the ppl. *prásthitam* refers to an oblation that has been ‘set forth’. Cf., e.g., II.36.24, 37 *prásthitaṃ somyám mádhu*, and this is simply the transitivized version of that idiom. Cf. also I.15.9.

The subj. *yamat* (*√yam*) of course echoes the name of its subject Yama, as Old, Ge, Macd, etc. point out.

X.14.16: On this vs. see the publ. intro. As noted there, it is only loosely connected to the rest of the hymn (by the name Yama), and its meaning and referents are completely obscure, though the syntax is not. Various interpr. have been advanced by the various tr. Ge (nn. 16a, 16b) thinks the *trikadrukebhiḥ* refers to three days in the Soma sacrifice and here is used to indicate extent of time; the six broad ones are the regions through which the dead man’s soul flies and the lofty one is his goal. In the absence of anything else compelling, this interpr. is thinkable – though once we get to the meters, all bets are off.

The “six broad (fem.)” are found elsewhere, without providing illumination for our passage. VI.47.3 *ayám ṣaḷ urvīr amimīta dhīro, ná yābhyo bhúvanam kác canāre* “This wise one [=Soma] measured out the six broad (realms), from which no world is at a distance.” There ‘worlds, realms’ seems a reasonable guess for the referent, though what feminine underlies it is unclear (perhaps pluralized *pṛthivī-*? for further spec. see comm. ad X.128.5). In that passage the six feminine entities are followed by a single neut. (*bhúvanam*) as here (*ékam ... bṛhát*), but there’s no evidence that the world in VI.47.3 is lofty. X.128.5 contains a voc. phrase *dévīḥ ṣaḷ urvīḥ*, with the six broad goddesses asked to provide broad(ness) for us; there is no hint of who these six goddesses are. However, in all these cases I now bow to the majority opinion (already Gr, def. 14 s.v. *urū-*) that the six broad females are the three heavens and the three earths (or some other sixfold division of the cosmos) and would alter the tr. to “the six (world-spaces) are broad ...”

## X.15 Pitars

A repetitive and somewhat tedious hymn, which, however, makes it perfectly clear that the Pitars receive the same type of ritual treatment as the gods. See also comm. ad X.14.4–6. Despite (/because of?) its monotony, it is found in Macdonell, VRS, and is tr. by Maurer.

X.15.3: Note the etymological figure of *suvidátrām avitsi* “I have found those good/easy to find,” assuming that *suvidátra-* is derived from *√vid* ‘find’ as I do.

On *nápāt-* and the various speculations on its referent, see publ. intro. I find plausible Old's suggestion that it refers, at least in part, to the grandson of each of the Pitars, whose duty would be to perform ritual for his grandfather, a duty found throughout the history of Hinduism but already well embedded in the RV. Re (EVP 16.125) cites Yamī's words in X.10.1, where she argues that Yama should have sex with her because his duty was to provide a grandson for his father: *pitúr nápātam ā dadhīta*; the juxtaposition of the two kinship terms there is strikingly reminiscent of the situation in our passage.

X.15.4: Ge, fld. by Macd and Maur, supplies a verb in pāda, the impv. "come." I don't see the need for it, since the pāda can be interpr. easily as a nom. sentence.

X.15.6: *viśve* in b has 2nd ps. ref., to the subject of the impv. *abhī gṛṇīta*; we might expect it to be a voc. and therefore unaccented. However, as it turns out there are no unaccented forms of *viśva-*; even in the rare voc. phrase "o All Gods," *viśve* is positioned at the beginning of the pāda and therefore accented. Cf. I.3.7=II.41.13, VI.52.7 *viśve devāsaḥ*; also in I.23.8=II.41.15 *viśve māma śrutā hāvam* "all of you, hear my call" (preceded by pāda-init. voc. *dévāsaḥ*). I therefore think that *viśve* is a functional voc. here, despite its position, which would invite a deaccented \**viśve*. This saves us from an awk. "As all, greet this ..."

X.15.7: The referent of the fem. gen. pl. *aruṇīnām* is disputed; see, e.g., Ge's n. 7a. Most opt sensibly for 'dawns' (Old+), though Ge chooses 'wool' (! – and he has the nerve to call 'dawns' "forced" [gezwungen]).

The 2nd pl. act. impv. to  $\sqrt{dhā}$  is represented here by both *dhatta* and *dadhāta*. Both probably belong to the redupl. pres., though *dadhāta* could also perhaps belong to the pf. (It has an anomalous strong stem, whichever it belongs to.) See also *dadhāta* in 4d and *dadhātana* in 11d. Although the distribution is far from perfectly complementary, the two forms seem to have positional preferences: *dadhāta(na)* is mostly pāda-final, while *dhatta(na)* is mostly medial, a distribution displayed in this hymn – but there are a number of counterexamples.

X.15.8: On the med. pf. to  $\sqrt{vah}$  see Kü (485), who considers it generally "affektive oder possessiv," but here "inattigent und subjektsresultativ," tr. "die nachgefahren sind ihrem Somatrunk."

The med. part. *saṃrarāṇāḥ* is universally assigned to  $\sqrt{rā}$  'give', either with the sense 'sharing' (Macd, Maur) or bleached to 'together with'. For the latter see Kü (421), who considers the orig. sense of *sām*  $\sqrt{rā}$  to be 'gegenseitig spendierfreudig', but developed to 'vereint, gemeinsam (mit)', and in practice a synonym for *saṃvidānā-*. As noted in the comm. ad X.14.4, I think *saṃvidānā-* there has richer semantics than 'vereint', maintaining the sense of 'coming to an agreement', so it is hardly a model for such bleaching. For the part. here I have a different interpr. entirely: I consider it a haplology of a putative \**saṃrarāṇānā-* to  $\sqrt{ran}$  'enjoy', hence 'jointly enjoying with'. There are several possible objections to this interpr.: 1) the perfect to  $\sqrt{ran}$  is rare and does not have medial forms; in answer to this, I would point out that *sām* triggers medial inflection in numerous roots; 2)  $\sqrt{ran}$  is not otherwise found with *sām*, but again such nonce lexemes with *sām* are easily formed; 3) there are several med. participles *saṃrarāṇā-* (VI.70.6, VIII.32.8) that undoubtedly belong to  $\sqrt{rā}$  and mean 'jointly bestowing' vel sim. However, in the latter ex. (VIII.32.8) there is verbal play with a redupl. form of  $\sqrt{ran}$  that opens the ṛca (*rārāṇaḥ* VIII.32.6); see comm. ad loc. Although I recognize the cumulative strength of

these objections, our passage seems to call for the “joint enjoyment” sense I give it; cf. the parallel semantics and syntax of the type *sajūṣ-*, *sajóṣas-* + INSTR similarly formed to a verb of enjoyment. Moreover, as just noted  $\sqrt{rā}$  and  $\sqrt{ran}$  can be played off each other.

X.15.9: I take *hotrāvid-* (also V.8.3) as ‘knowing the priestly functions’, rather than Macd’s ‘knowing oblations’ (and sim. for other interpr.). Though either would fit the context reasonably well, I prefer the former: the Pitars, who in life were surely ritualists, knew their jobs and have returned to the ritual to see them carried out. For a similar use of *hótrā-* see nearby X.17.11 in this same set of hymns.

The cmpd. *stóma-taṣṭa-* is found 3x in the RV, twice modifying *matí-* in nearby passages, III.39.1, 43.2. In form it is of course of the common type *devá-kṛta-* ‘made/done by the gods’, with a passive ppl. and, generally, the agent or instr. of the action as 1st member (see two exx later in the hymn: 11a voc. *ágniṣvāttāḥ*, 14a *agnidagdhá-/ánagnidagdha-*)—though alternative functions of the 1st member are also possible. In the two passages in III, modifying ‘thought’, an agentive/instrumental ‘fashioned by praise’ is contextually odd, and so I render it with a datival 1st member, ‘fashioned for praise’ (so already Gr). Here, since the cmpd modifies the Pitars, interpr. the cmpd is tricky. The standard view (see, hesitatingly, Old; more confidently Ge n. 9b, Re, Macd) is that it is an inversion of \**taṣṭa-stoma-*, a bahuv. that would mean ‘having praises fashioned (for them)’, with the instr. *arkaīḥ* an instrument/agent ‘by songs’ (Macd, Maur) or a kind of secondary predicate to *stoma-* (Ge “die ihre Loblieder zu Preisgesängen formten”). But this type of inverted cmpd, of the type *putra-hata* = *hata-putra*, does not exist at this period, as Old and Macd admit. I think we must interpr. the cmpd here within the formal parameters of this well-established type in the RV, esp. since, as Re says, “le même composé sous 3.39.1; 43.2 a sa valeur normale.” I suggest that the Pitars are “fashioned by praise” because they would not keep existing (in the next world) if they weren’t continually remembered on earth. This is simply a variant on the standard notion that the paternal line must be continued, in order for male descendants, embodied in the grandson, to perform rituals in honor of their forefathers (see disc. ad vs. 3 above, inter alia), rituals later including the Pitṛyajña and the various Śrāddha rites, inter alia. Here we can envision the Pitars’ bodies literally being fashioned by praise, in a way reminiscent of the famous story in the MBh (I.41ff.) in which the ascetic Jaratkāru comes across his ancestors (*pitaraḥ*) hanging upside down in a cave, emaciated and with the single blade of grass from which they are suspended about to be gnawed through by a rat. When he tries to save them by offering him a portion of his austerities, they berate him for his celibacy and their consequent lack of descendants and order him to find a wife and beget children. The thirsting and panting of the Pitars in our pāda reminds us of the emaciation and deep hunger of Jaratkāru’s unfortunate ancestors in the MBh story. The continued existence of the Pitars in Yama’s realm depends on continual praise and oblations offered to them in this world. (I might add here that, as often, interpretational attempts to ignore clear morphological or syntactic evidence because it doesn’t fit easily into the context may yield a superficially “easier” interpr., but can conceal more interesting conceptual connections.)

I interpr. *satyaīḥ* in d in this same general conceptual sphere: the Pitars are ‘real’ – really here (on the ritual ground) or really (still) existent because of our ritual activity.

On *kavyá-* as a designation of the Pitars, see disc. ad X.14.3, 4.

X.15.10: On *satyāśaḥ* see disc. of *satyá-* in the previous vs. By my interpr. their “eating and drinking the oblations” is what keeps them *satyá-*.

X.15.11: Since *ágni-ṣvāttāḥ* is a voc. (by accent), the publ. tr. should rather read “O forefathers, sweetened by Agni.”

X.15.14: In d the meter would be improved by reading *suvarāḍ* (so, tentatively, Old) or even *suva(r)rāḍ*. But Old rejects a proposed *suvārāḍ* for \**suvar-rāḍ*, and “Sun-king” does not fit the context very well, unlike the same transmitted form in VIII.46.28. See Scar 450.

## X.16 Agni

Re treats this Agni hymn out of order in EVP XIV (pp. 37ff.). It is found in Lanman’s Reader and tr. by Doniger and by Maurer.

X.16.1: On *cikṣipah* as the redupl. aor. to  $\sqrt{kṣā}$  ‘burn’, see Ge (n. 1b) and my *-áya-* (140 n. 71).

X.16.1–2: The pādas 1c and 2a are as close as they can be, save for the contrastive subjunctives, pres. *kṛṇavāḥ* in 1c and aor. *kárasī* in 2a. Their main clauses (1d and 2b) are likewise strictly parallel and both contain a “future” impv. in *-tāt*, both built to the pres. stem:

1c *yadā śṛtām kṛṇavó jātavedo, áthem enam prá hiṇutāt pitṛbhyah*

2a *śṛtām yadā kárasī jātavedo, áthem enam pári dattāt pitṛbhyah*

Although the publ. tr. makes a distinction between the pres. and aor. subjunctives here (“when you will make him” versus “when you will have made him”), I am not at all sure this is correct, as modal forms to tense-aspect forms generally don’t reflect the putative functions of the indicative of the same T/A stem, as I have discussed at length in various publications. The composer may simply have been aiming to vary the expression; note that in the opening of the two pādas the two words are flipped, with no metrical or syntactic effects. As for the metrical difference between the pres. and aor. subjunctives, the L L H break produced by *kṛṇavó* is more common than the three L’s of *kárasī*, but the latter is certainly not unusual.

Note the doubling of enclitic acc. *īm enam* in 1d and 2b, on which see my 2002 “Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*” (Fs. Cardona), p. 302 and n. 18.

X.16.2: The hapax rt. noun cmpd *vaśa-nī-* is another ex. of conflict between form and context. Rt. nouns in such cmpds generally have active/transitive value, and in particular *-nī-* cmpds all mean ‘leading X’ (e.g., *senā-nī-* ‘leading an/the army’). However, such an interpr. here of the phrase *devānām vaśanīḥ* would produce “leading the will of the gods,” which most interpr. obviously judge unacceptable and therefore for this *-nī-* cmpd alone give it passive value – e.g., Old “in der Götter Willen gegeben” (sim. Ge, Re, Maur). Scar (290) at first hesitates between act. and pass., but reaches an acceptable active sense “den Willen (der Götter) ausführend’ (carry out, execute). My interpr. also maintains the active sense of the root noun, taking *vaśa-* adverbially, as I do in the same syntagm in X.84.3 *vaśī vaśam nayase* “Exerting your will, you lead at will.”

X.16.5: With the standard interpr. I take *svadhābhiḥ* in the usual RVic meaning of *svadhā-* ‘own / independent power’, rather than the specialized usage of this stem in the funeral hymns for the ritual cry appropriate to the Pitars, corresponding to *svāha* for the gods; see comm. ad X.14.3. But I do wonder if there is a low-level word play here: the dead man proceeds motivated by the *svadhā* cry.



There is much discussion about the sense of pāda c, esp. what *śéṣaḥ* is referring to. (For disc. see, e.g., Ge’s n. 5c, Maur’s n., Ober I.501.) This *s*-stem neut. means literally ‘what is left (behind)’ but in all its other RVic occurrences it refers specifically to one’s posterity, that is, descendants. So, e.g., Re “Que ... il accède à (sa) descendance.” Although the preoccupation with continuing one’s lineage is of course ubiquitous and quite prominent in this Yama cycle (cf., e.g., X.10.1, 3; 15.3, 9) in particular, I do not see that meaning here. Rather pāda c seems to depict the preliminaries to the action in d: the dead man (re-)uniting with his own body in the realm of the Pitars. In c he acquires his new life (“clothing himself in (new) life”; *āyur vāsānaḥ*), which I take to be a new spiritual/non-material life, and this incorporeal being sets out, presumably on the Pitryāṇa, the *ásunīti*- “(the way) leading to (the other) life” (cf. vs. 2), to follow his *śéṣaḥ*, his ‘remains’, which (somewhat like this Engl. word) refers to the physical remains after the cremation, which have already gone to the realm of the Pitars. Once he finds them, he can reunite with them. In somewhat similar fashion, Ober (I.501), flg. Sāy (see Ge’s n. 5c), takes *śéṣaḥ* as a reference to the bones, but he also takes it as the subj. of *úpa vetu*, so that what’s left of the physical body follows the dead man to the afterlife (rather than vice versa): “Im Lebenskraft sich kleidend soll das Übriggebliebene (= die Gebeine) sich hinwenden [zu dem, was ins Jenseits gegangen ist].” But this is grammatically impossible: *śéṣaḥ* is neut., but the nom. part. *vāsānaḥ* is masc., so *śéṣaḥ* must be acc. and the object / goal of *úpa vetu*.

X.16.6: *agadā*- here may mean ‘free of disease, healed’, as per most interpr. and as in the other RVic occurrence of the stem (X.97.2). However, it may preserve the “speech” aspect of the root  $\sqrt{gad}$ . See disc. ad X.97.2; also *vigadā*- X.116.5.

X.16.7: On the various potential meanings (‘anger’, ‘flame’, ‘grasp’) and associated etyma of *háras-*, see EWA s.v. Here I prefer ‘flame’ (so also Ge) because of Agni’s actions, but ‘anger’, or indeed ‘grasp, grip’ would also work in context; see Mau “in his grip,” or Re’s more elaborate “(dans son élan) d’emportement.” There is obviously also a phonological and folk-etymological association with the immed. flg. intens. part. *járhṛṣāna-* ‘bristling’. Most of the other occurrences of *háras-* are found in X.87, a hymn to Agni Rakṣohan: vss. 5, 10=14, 16, 25, in all of which ‘flame, blaze’ is appropriate. In VIII.48.2 ‘anger’ seems more likely; in IX.10.6 opinion is divided, but I opt for ‘rage; in X.158.2 opinion is also divided, but I take it as ‘flare, flame’. In II.23.6 JPB tr. *hárasvant-* as ‘grasping’ (sim. HPS B+I 106 ‘packend’), which is plausible, though Ge produces the portmanteau ‘wutentbrannt’.

X.16.12: In addition to the four forms of *uśánt-*, this vs. contains a nice rhyming figure: a ... (*n*)*i dhīmahi* #, b ... *idhīmahi*, as Re points out.

X.16.14: The verb of c, *sám gama* (Samhitā), is somewhat peculiar; restoring *sám gamaḥ* with Pp. we get an active rt. aor. subjunctive, even though *sám*  $\sqrt{gam}$  is ordinarily middle (though not entirely: cf., e.g., X.6.2 *sám ... jagmúḥ*, though there the subjects are joining together in something else). The subjunctive is also unexpected, esp. as it’s correlated with impv. *harṣaya* in d. The standard tr. (incl. mine) simply tr. *sám gama(h)* as an impv., but properly speaking it should be tr. “you will join together” vel sim.

## X.17 Various divinities

On the ragtag structure of this hymn, see publ. intro., which also needs a slight correction: the Pūṣan vss. are 3–6. The first 6 vss. are found in Lanman’s Reader

X.17.1–2: On the obscure mythology sketched in these two vss. see publ. intro. I will not further speculate here on what lies behind them. The Sanskrit itself is relatively straightforward.

X.17.2: Since *mithuná-* often refers to a complementary gender pairing, *mithunā* here may provide more, if slight, evidence for Yama and Yamī as the referents.

X.17.3: The preverb *prá*, in tmesis with *cyāvayatu* (the lexeme *prá√cyu* is quite well established), follows its verb, somewhat unusually. I suggest that this is to allow it a secondary perceptual connection with the immediately following pf. part. *vidvān*: *prá√vid* is also a well-established lexeme, and although the part. is most often found without preverb, it does occasionally occur with *prá*; cf., e.g., X.2.7 *pánthām ánu pravidvān pitryāṅnam* “knowing the way along the path leading to the forefathers,” concerning exactly this journey to the other world. The configuration *prá* + PART with the same sense and the same subject and in the same pāda-final position is found in both 5d and 6d *prajānán*. The presence of this same structure, with lexical replacement (*√jñā* for *√vid*), in the first (3c) and last (5d, 6d) pādas of the Pūṣan section creates a defining ring.

The adj. *suvidātra-* ‘easy/good to find’ is used of the Pitars three times nearby in this cycle, X.14.10, X.15.3, 9, but here it seems used exclusively of the gods.

X.17.4: There is a technical gender clash in pāda a: *āyus-* is a neut. *s*-stem (distinct from the stem *āyú-*, with masc. nom. sg. *āyúḥ*), but *viśvāyuh* is a masc. nom. sg. to the stem *viśvāyu-*. We should properly expect *āyur \*viśvāyu* with neut. adj., but either *āyuh* reflects a nonce masculinization, or a surface matching of *-uh* endings led to the phrase we have.

Note the alliteration in *pāri pāsati ... pūṣā ... pātu prāpathe purástāt*, also pointed out by Re.

X.17.5–6: The *p* and *r* alliteration noted in 4ab continues here: 5d *áprayuchan purā ... prajānán*, 6ab *prāpathe pathām ... puṣā, prāpathe ... prāpathe pṛthivyāḥ*, 6cd *... priyátame ... párá ... prajānán*.

On *prajānán* of 5d, 6d forming a ring with *prá vidvān* see comm. ad vs. 3.

X.17.7–9: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss. to Sarasvatī show a connection to the Pitars in vss. 8–9. I wonder if the insertion of this sequence of vss. into this ill-assorted hymn was also facilitated by the concatenation of *sukṛtaḥ* ‘those of good ritual action’ in 7c with the same word in 4c and also perhaps because the insistently repeated pāda-init. *sárasvati-* (7a, b, c, d, 8a, 9a) echoes *s<sup>u</sup>vastidā-* beginning 5c.

X.17.7: The injunc. *dāt* at the end of d is multiply ambiguous. I take it as a functional subjunctive, but it could also be presential ‘gives’ or past ‘gave, has given’. I do not see a way to decide, esp. since the other two verbs in the vs. are pres. (a: *havante*) and augmented impf. (c: *ahvayanta*).

X.17.11–13: Expiation for spilled soma; see Ge n. 11–13.

X.17.11: The phrase *ánu saptá hótrāḥ* is rendered in the publ. tr. “according to the seven priestly functions,” in agreement with Ge and Ober (II.73), though Kü (572) has instead “nach den sieben Opfertgüssen,” flg. Gr. The phrase “seven priestly functions/offices” is also found in III.4.5 *saptá hotrāṇi*; the problem of course is that the stem there is the neut. *hotrá-*, while here we have the fem. acc. pl. to *hótrā-*, which ordinarily means either ‘oblation’ or ‘invocation’ (see comm. ad IV.48.1). However, *hótrā-* does display the sense ‘priestly function’ in later Vedic.

### X.18 Funeral hymn

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. It has been much translated: Re, Hymnes spec.; Macdonell, Hymns from the Rigveda; Doniger; and it is found in Lanman’s Reader.

X.18.2: Assuming that this vs. is addressed to the living relatives of the dead (as described in vs. 3, which repeats 2b as 3d), the voc. *yajñiyāsaḥ* at the end is somewhat surprising, since this stem is used almost exclusively of gods in the RV. However, in the AV the word is used of humans after they have “wiped off” defilement onto something else or otherwise physically removed it, thus becoming *yajñiyāḥ súddhāḥ* (e.g., AVŚ XII.2.13, 20, in the same hymn that contains many of our vss. [XII.2.21–25 ≅ X.18.1, 3–4, 6, 5]). Wh tr. ‘fit for sacrifice’, that is, presumably cleansed of taint and pure enough to take part in sacrifice to the gods. The phrase *súddhāḥ pūtāḥ ... yajñiyāḥ* is also found several times in the AV, as Old points out: in AV VI.1.27 = XI.1.27 of waters; also of waters in XI.1.17 and, in an expanded phrase, of soma shoots in XI.1.18; the waters would be used to effect the purification.

X.18.3: The successful “invocation of the gods” *deváhūtiḥ* also signals their turn towards the *yajñá-*.

X.18.6: Old makes a good case for construing *āyuh* with *ā rohata*, esp. as in the later funeral rites a hide is spread out to step on (see Ge n. 6 as well as Old). Others (Re, Wh AV XII.2.24) take *āyuh* with *vṛṇānāḥ*.

Contra all the standard interpr., I supply an instr. (“with the wives of the gods”) on the basis of II.31.4 *tváṣṭā gnābhiḥ sajósāḥ*, VI.50.13 *tváṣṭā ... jānibhiḥ sajósāḥ*. In our context, which depicts Tvaṣṭar as providing good birth(s) (*sujānimā*), the presence of females would make good sense; see also the auspicious women in the next vs. It is also the case that there are almost no exx. of sg. *sajósas-* without an instr. (in the pl. the subjects are “in concert” with each other), so the “absolute” reading of most tr. is unlikely.

X.18.7: What the referent of *yóni-* lit. ‘womb’ is is not clear: the renderings range from “place of mourning” (Macd) to “marriage bed” (Doniger; cf. Re’s “la couche (conjugale)”). Given the auspicious character and appearance of these women, the latter might seem more likely. Recall also Yamī’s expressed desire *samāné yónau sahaséyyāya* “to lie together in the same womb” with Yama, for incestuous sex, in the dialogue that opens this Yama cycle (X.10.7). However, since this vs. immediately precedes the one in which the widow is recalled to life, it seems quite possible that these auspicious wives have come to adorn her for her second marriage. They may serve the same function as the non-widowed women (sometimes further specified as possessing living sons) who play various parts in the marriage ceremony as outlined in the Gṛhya Sūtras (e.g., ŚāṅkhGS I.11.5, 12.1; ĀśvGS I.7.21; GGS II.4.6, JGS I.22).

X.18.8: This is of course the famous vs. that hints at a momentary, pseudo-suttee, with the widow lying briefly beside her dead husband, before being called back to life and a new marriage. It has, not surprisingly, been much discussed; see esp. Thieme, “Jungfrauengatte” (1963, in the section on “Wiederheirat der Frau,” esp. 187–92 = KISch 452–57), who sees the ceremony as a symbolic rebirth of the widow, thus rendered ritually free to marry again. The vs. is addressed to the widow and presumably spoken by a priest or other religious functionary – or perhaps by the new husband-to-be, who would most likely be the dead man’s brother. The first hemistich is dramatically phrased, esp. with the abrupt impvs. that begin and end it: *úd īṛṣva nāri* “Arise, woman!” and *éhi* “come here!” But the second half, esp. the last pāda, sounds like stilted legalese: *pátyur janitvám abhí sám babhūtha*, lit. “you have come into being towards the wifeness of a husband ...,” while pāda c seems to contain technical terms from marriage ritual: *hástam* √ *gra(b)h* ‘grasp(ing of) the hand’ and *didhiṣú-*, the desid. (pseudo-)participle sometimes meaning ‘wooer’. I think we should take this stilted phrasing serious and perhaps see here an actual citation of legal language from this early period. For further on *didhiṣú-* see my forthcoming “What Would a Vedic Law Code Look Like? “Overslaughting” in Vedic and Dharma Literature: Ritual, Mythological, and Legal Continuities and Disjunctions” (Bühler lecture, Univ. of Vienna, May 2022).

MLW suggests that *janitvám* could also be a pun: *\*jánī tvám* “you are a wife,” a clever idea that might help account for the awkwardness of the phrasing.

As Thieme points out (188–89=453–54 and 188/453 n. 3), tr. (including the publ. tr.) that render *hasta-grābhá-* as if it were a participial bahuvrīhi (the equivalent of *\*grbhī́tá-hasta-*) ‘having grasped (your) hand’ < ‘possessing your grasped hand’ cannot be correct, on the grounds of both accent and order of elements. It must be a tatpuruṣa: ‘grasper of the hand’ / ‘grasping the hand’ –Thieme’s “Handergreifer” –as a technical designation of a legitimate bridegroom (cf. later *pāṇi-grāha-*, etc.; also, e.g., AV V.17.8 for the connection of *hastam* √ *gra(b)h* with the legitimate *pāti-*). I would therefore now alter my tr. to “... as wife of one who grasps your hand [=bridegroom], who intends to have you, of a/your (new) husband.” On the technical meaning of *didhiṣú-* see Thieme, 189–90=454–55 as well as my forthcoming art. cit.

X.18.9: There is some dissent about who the subject of *ādadānāḥ* is in pāda a, who the referent of *tvám* is in pāda c, and whether they are the same. See esp. Old’s disc.: Caland thinks that the two are the same and the referent is the dead man’s son (or some lineal descendant). The son seems the likely subj. of the participle, but I am convinced by Old’s arg. that the *átra* locating “you” (*tvám*) “there,” as opposed to “we here” (*ihá vayám*), is powerful evidence for a disjunction between the dead man and the living, and “you” must therefore be the dead man. (See *átra* in 12 and esp. 13d, where it is associated with Yama.) The second hemistich is thus probably direct speech uttered by the son as he takes the bow, reassuring his father that, even though dead, he will share in the victories of the living, achieved by his bow. This would be better signaled in the publ. tr. by emending to “Taking the bow from the hand of the dead man, (his son says), ‘you there and we here—may we win ...’”

X.18.10: Two words for ‘earth’ occur here, *bhūmi-* and *pṛthivī-*; likewise in the next vs., *bhūman-* and *pṛthivī-*.

The earth to which the dead man (or more likely his bones) is consigned is depicted as two benevolent female figures, mother and young girl (though probably already of marriageable

age). In this gentle and enfolding context it's a bit of a surprise to encounter the priestly pitch: the soothing embrace of the earth is only for the man who gave sufficient Dakṣiṇās (priestly gifts) (*dákṣiṇāvanta-*) during his ritual lifetime.

X.18.11: Note the phonetic play between the initial and final words of the first hemistich: #*ucchvāñcasva ... sūpavañcanā*#—noted already by Re. The 2<sup>nd</sup> word of course also echoes the one that begins its pāda, *sūpāyanā*.

X.18.12: *ucchvāñcamānā ... tiṣṭhatu* appears to be a periphrasis: “stay/keep arching up.”

As has been noted frequently in this comm., an imperative clause with *hí* followed by another impv. clause gives the grounds on which the 2nd impv. cl. can take place. Here the clauses are reversed: pāda a logically follows b, which contains *hí*: once the houseposts are erected, the earth can stay arched up.

Even in the pl., *grhá-* can refer to a single house(hold), presumably because it can consist of a number of individual structures.

Note the phonetic figure *grháso grṛtaścúto*.

X.18.13: I do not understand the function of *te* in pāda a. It could be a (vague) beneficial dative: “For you I prop up the earth from you.” Or perhaps it's an anticipatory doubling of the full 2nd ps. prn., abl. *tvát*. In that case we would need to allow occasional ablatival value for the enclitic, and though that's not out of the question since enclitic pronouns don't always seem to be tied to strict case functions, I prefer the former. The tr. should then be slightly emended to that given above.

On the ring created by *mā ... riṣam* with 1d *mā ... rīriṣaḥ*, see publ. intro.

X.18.14: On the status of this vs. in the architecture of the hymn and on its disputed meaning, see publ. intro. As noted there, my interpr. of the vs. is quite different from the standard (see esp. Old's disc. of various previous suggestions). Unlike most, I do not see this as the poet predicting his own death and burial and therefore restraining his speech in anticipation of that event. For one thing, this attitude doesn't ring true for a Rigvedic poet. Moreover, as noted in the publ. intro., the vs. is defined as extra-hymnic by the ring created between vss. 1 and 13 as well as by its different meter and its absence from the commentarial tradition. It also can easily be interpr. within the genre of hymn-final meta-reflections on the hymn that precedes. So rather than seeing it as the poet's elegiac and sombre reflection on his own eventual death, I interpr. it as the usual proud, indeed boastful assertion of the poet about his own verbal skill.

The principal syntactic shift that enables my interpr. is a different construal of *mām*: this acc. is well nigh universally taken as the obj. of *ā dadhuḥ*, but I see it rather as bound to *pratīcīne* ‘facing’. The stem *pratyāñc-* (with its derivatives) frequently takes an acc., ‘facing X’, and *mām* is well positioned, in the middle of the NP *pratīcīne ... āhani*, to fulfill this role (though it could be interpr. as occupying Wackernagel's Position, but with tonic *mām* rather than enclitic *mā* because it precedes a vowel-initial word). As for the obj. of *ā dadhuḥ*, I supply the remains of the dead man who is the subject of the rest of the hymn; what's likely to be as light as a feather but the ashes and leftover bones of someone cremated? I would also add here a note on the sense of *pratyāñc-*, etc.: the standard tr. must take it as qualifying a day in the vague, but hopefully distant, future, but in fact *pratyāñc-* (& co.) is very much “in your face”—generally referring to

something in the immediate vicinity, locationally or temporally (see, e.g., the exx. in X.28.4, 9). So by the usual interpr. the poet would be anticipating his death in the very near future.

In the 2nd hemistich by my interpr. the poet asserts his mastery over the speech appropriate to the occasion, the speech that occurred to him (/ faced him) when confronted with a commission for funeral vss. Although the standard interpr. take *vācam* √ *grabh* to mean ‘restrain speech’ (that is, go silent), in fact on what little evidence we have for similar idioms it is more likely to mean ‘speak, pronounce’ – the French idiom “prendre parole” might be cited here. Cf., e.g., X.145.4 *nahy àsyā nāma ḡrbhnāmi* (in a co-wife hymn) “I do not grasp [=mention] her name”; sim. I.191.13 *sārvāsām agrabhaṃ nāma* “I have grasped [=spoken] the names of all.” In VIII.6.10 *ahām íd dhí pitúṣ pári, medhām ṛtásya jagrabha* “Because it is just I who have acquired the wisdom of truth from my father,” the poet grasps and uses the “wisdom of truth” acquired from his father—he certainly doesn’t restrain it. In our passage the poet seems to see speech as a spirited horse that needs to be grasped and controlled by his own power, as a horse needs to be controlled by its halter. Of the various interpr. out there, mine is closest to that of Lanman (Skt. Reader, p. 386) flg. Whitney. Lanman remarks, “The stanza seems to express the poet’s satisfaction at having made a good hymn at the right time and place and with as good skill as a skilful horseman has” and cites Whitney’s tr. “I’ve caught and used the fitting word, / As one a steed tames with the rein” (I cite only the tr. of cd).

### X.19 Cows

As discussed in the publ. intro., it is not clear why this hymn is attached to the end of the Yama cycle, but Old convincingly demonstrates (Prol. 231ff.) that it cannot belong to the following group of Vimada hymns (X.20–26), which is clearly demarcated. On p. 238 with n. 1 he considers the possibility that X.19 is an interpolation, but such an assumption is too uncertain to pursue. See also his remarks in the Noten.

MLW suggests an intriguing reason for attaching this hymn at the end of the funeral hymns: “I wonder if the return of the cow is connected with the end of the day and so metaphorically with death. It reminds me of Thomas Grey, Elegy written in a country churchyard

The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,  
The lowing herd wind slowly o’er the lea,  
The plowman homeward plods his weary way,  
And leaves the world to darkness and to me.”

The “meaning” of the hymn is carried by its phonology—the jingle-like repetition of forms of *ní* √ *vṛt* ‘turn back’ and riffs based on this lexeme and the series of rhyming words built with the same suffix that dominate the middle vss. It gives us a glimpse of a different type of deployment of verbal means: intensive patterned repetition as spell.

X.19.1: Ge renders *revatīh* as “die ihr unseren Reichtum bildet.” This is surely the right implication: the cows aren’t so much rich in themselves as the foundations of our wealth. But such a tr. is awfully heavy for a single-word voc.

X.19.2: Note the impv. *kuru*, one of three forms of this 8<sup>th</sup> class pres. in the RV; see disc. ad X.51.7.

X.19.4: The accumulation of *-ana-* nominals in pādas a–c is impressive. Besides the incantatory repetition of *-anam*, there are further phonological echoes in pādas a *yán niyānaṃ nīyāyanaṃ* and c *āvārtanaṃ nivārtanaṃ*.

X.19.5: The *-ana-* pile up continues (with c = 4c), but in pādas a and b the near rhyme form (*ud*)*ānaḍ* is in fact a verb.

## X.20–26

As was noted just above ad X.19, Old (Prol. 231–32) demonstrated quite clearly on internal grounds that these hymns belong together, thus supporting the single authorship assigned to them by the Anukramaṇī. The hymns are characterized by unusual meters and puns on the poet's name Vimada; the poet is identified as Vimada in X.20.10, 23.7 and the family of Vimadas in X.23.6. Moreover, three of these hymns (X.21, 24, 25) show the signature lines *vī vo mādē* and *vivakṣase*. The seven hymns are dedicated to five different divinities, starting, as usual, with Agni followed by Indra.

## X.20 Agni

On the opening vss. of this hymn, see publ. intro. The hymn is in a variety of meters, and these meters are metrically ragged. For details, see, e.g., the metrical comm. of HvN.

X.20.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs., consisting of a single pāda, is adapted from X.25.1 to provide an auspicious beginning to the Vimada series. The sequence from which it's adapted contains two 8-syl. pādas *bhadraṃ no āpi vātaya, māno dākṣam utā krātum*; the 2nd and 3rd terms of the tripartite NP in b have simply been lopped off here, producing an awkward 10-syllable line that reads as prose.

X.20.2: As also noted in the publ. intro., the first two words of this vs. are identical to the opening of RV I.1. Although *agnīm īle* is found elsewhere as a pāda-opener (I.44.4d, III.27.12c, VIII.43.24c=44.6c), nowhere else does it open a hymn (or even a vs.) except here (leaving aside the mangled auspicious motto of our vs. 1) and I.1.1. It is therefore hard not to see this as a conscious echo of I.1, which in turn might suggest that a RV collection already existed in some form when Vimada composed this hymn and that I.1 inaugurated it. The metrical disturbance—pāda a has 9 syllables—may call attention to *agnīm īle* as a quotation.

Ge and Re (also Sāy., Gr.) take gen. pl. *bhujām* as referring to the gods as 'enjoyers' of the sacrifice and construe it with *yaviṣṭham* (e.g., Ge "den Jüngsten der (Opfer)geniesser"). But of the fairly numerous occurrences of the root noun *bhuj-* (incl. the infinitival dat. *bhujé*) this would be the only agentive one, as opposed to the standard sense in the non-infinitival occurrences 'enjoyment, delight'. I therefore follow Schindler (Rt. nouns s.v.) in seeing the same sense here, construing the gen. as a secondary complement to *īle*. Gr allows acc., gen., or dat. with *√iḍ*, and although the gen. is quite rare, we must reckon with it at least in VII.24.5 (q.v.). Moreover, note that acc. pl. *bhújah* is found in nearby X.22.13 with the undoubted sense 'benefits, delights'.

In b the question is whose *śās-* is at issue. I take it as Agni's: he is difficult to restrain because he holds the command, but at least by implication Ge and Re take it as belonging to those who would try (and fail) to restrain the fire (e.g., Re "difficile à tenir sous un

commandement”). This is certainly possible, though I favor my interpr. because it would associate the *śās-* with the authority of Mitra.

Ge points out the etymological figure *durdhárītum* (b) / *dhárman* (c), which is difficult to render in Engl.

As usual, *dhárman-* is problematically ambiguous. I take it as referring to the physical foundation, the fireplace, where the flames are found; see my interpr. of *dharmāṇah* in the next hymn, X.21.3. By contrast both Ge and Re take it as immaterial: “Befehl” and “l’ordre-corrélatif” (whatever that means) respectively. Such senses cannot be excluded, but I don’t see what they would contribute here.

The fem. pl. *énīḥ* is much discussed: see Old for various older interpr., as well as Lü (391). I follow Ge and Re as seeing it as a description of the mottled or dappled flames. They “honor the sun” by reaching towards heaven, where the sun is the heavenly counterpart of Agni. As for “the udder of their mother” (*mātúr ūdhaḥ*), I take it to refer to the fireplace itself, or perhaps, with Ge (n. 2cd), the kindling sticks.

X.20.3 As with the rhyming *śāsā* in 2b, there is some dispute about whose mouth is referred to by *āsā* in pāda a. Re takes it as Agni’s, and it is of course true that Agni is considered the mouth of the gods. But in conjunction with *vardhāyanti* ‘they make increase’, it makes more sense, with Ge (n. 3a), to think of the priests, who increase Agni by blowing on him and/or by reciting praise hymns to him.

The identity of the 1st member of the bahuvr. *kṛpānīla-* is also disputed. EWA (s.v.) throws up its hands. Ge renders it “Nestbereiter,” suggesting (n. 3a) that it is a *trasá-dasyu*-type cmpd, but this assumes the existence of a root *\*√kṛp* ‘prepare, arrange’, an *r*-form parallel to *√kṛp*. But as I have shown (-*āya*-form. 124–25; see also my 2009 “Indo-Iranian Priestly Title” [Fs. Salomon] 112–13), *√kṛp* is a secondary root, backformed from the *p*-causative to an *l*-form of *√kṛ* ‘do, make’ and barely exists in the RV outside of the causative system. Better is the prevailing assoc. of the 1st member with *kṛp-* ‘body’; the apparently thematic *kṛpá-* can be accounted for as Re does, by pointing out that the athematic form would produce the “impossible” *\*kṛbnīla-* (actually surely the even worse *\*kṛmnīla-*). But most who identify the first member as *kṛp-* bleach the meaning to ‘beauty’—so, Gr “in Schönheit oder Glanz wohnend,” Re “le nid de la beauté-formelle.” I take *kṛp(a)-* in its standard sense of ‘body’, in agreement with its Iranian cognates; no RVic passages require or even invite ‘beauty’, and all but one are used of Agni. Here I think the sense of the cmpd is ‘whose nest is his body’: that is, in my view, the physical concentration of the fire is the lower part at and around the firewood, which can be considered the nest out of which the leaping flames and beams of light fly upward, as expressed by *bhāsāketu-*, the parallel cmpd in the next pāda.

The teeth in a row would be the regularly spaced flames. Note the figure *-nīlam* (*l - nīdam*) (a) / (*śre*)*ṇi-dan* (c), with the flipping of retroflexes.

X.20.4: The phrase *gātúr eti* recurs in 6b. I take it as a non-literal idiom somewhat similar to French “ça marche”—that is, because of Agni, things “go well” for both the *arí-* and the *vís-*, specifically because “Agni has reached the ends of heaven,” that is, his light and his smoke have opened the way for the oblations and praises offered by both *arí* and *vís-* to reach the gods and set in motion favorable reciprocal action. In this context it is tempting to interpr. *arí-* as Ge’s “hohen Herr” or Re’s “l’homme privilégié” rather than Thieme’s Fremdling; Thieme (Fremdling



37–38) sees the pairing as a contrast between the wandering stranger and the settled peoples, but it might rather be meant to include the leader and the common people alike.

By my interpr. pāda c further spells out the benefits Agni’s arrival in heaven will provide for the people of pāda a: as “bright-shining poet” (*kavīḥ ... dīdyānaḥ*), Agni, in the form of flame and light, conveys the praise-hymns suggested by ‘poet’); as cloud (*abhrām*), Agni, in the form of smoke, conveys the oblations. I take neut. *ābhram* as nom., though Ge/Re take it as acc. – Ē as goal parallel to *divó ántān* in b, Re as obj. of *dīdyānaḥ*, though he admits that this part. is ordinarily intrans. I see no obstacle to taking it as nom.

X.20.5: This vs. seems in a way to explain or comment on vs. 4.

The injunc. *juṣat* seems to be one of the sporadic act. forms built to this predominately mid. stem. I do not see a need to take it, with Lub. (Conc. 569), as a *t*-less medial \**juṣa* remarked with secondary *t* (of the *aduhat* type).

X.20.6: I consider pāda b a reprise of vs. 4, prompted by the same idiom *gātúr eti*. Because (in my opinion) Agni is identified with peace, oblation, and sacrifice, men should obey his injunctions and sacrifice accordingly, for things to go well for them.

In d I would now tr. “the gods (come) to Agni,” depicting the reciprocal journey to the sacrifice. So Ge.

X.20.7: As Ge remarks (n. 7), “Dunkle Str.” Its sense turns on the interpr. of the verb *iṣe*. Opinion is split on the root affiliation and morphology of this form. Ge (n. 7a) discusses possibilities but ultimately opts for a *-se* form to  $\sqrt{i}$  ‘go’; Re’s “j’aborde” seems to reflect the same analysis, though in his n. he cites Old’s ‘send’ with some approval. Old and Scar (607) assign it to  $\sqrt{iṣ}$  ‘send’. The form must be considered in conjunction with the two other forms of the same shape in IV.23.6 and VI.22.5; see comm. ad locc. In all three passages a long-vowel form \**iṣe* fits the meter better; in all three cases I analyze it as a 3rd sg. pf. to  $\sqrt{iṣ}$  ‘seek’ (Sāy. also interprets it as ‘seek’). The verb then takes two parallel objects, *agnīm* and *dúvaḥ*. For the latter, cf. III.2.6 *agne dúva ichámānāsaḥ*. The tricky part is that Agni is represented in the object phrase twice, first as an object himself and second as the gen. dependent on *dúvaḥ*, namely *pūrvasya sévasya* “of the kindly ancient,” with both acc. objects discontinuous, spread over two pādas, and interwoven (*yajñāsāham ... agnīm* and *dúvaḥ ... pūrvasya sévasya*). This may reflect the twisty sensibilities of the poet Vimada; see comm. ad X.21.1 in the next hymn.

The hapax rt noun cmpd *yajñā-sāh-* is taken by Old, Ge, and Scar (607) as having an obj. relationship—e.g., Scar “der über das Opfer herrscht.” But the long final vowel of the first member is puzzling; Scar suggests it’s due to metrical lengthening, but in a cmpd whose 1st and 3rd syllables are already heavy and whose fourth syllable is also heavy in context (*yajñāsāham dúvaḥ*), metrical lengthening hardly seems necessary. Scar also toys with the possibility that *yajñā* is an instr. and even cites a semantic parallel: V.3.5 *sá yajñéna vanavad deva mártān* “he [=client of Agni’s] will vanquish mortals by sacrifice, o god (Agni).” This seems the better interpr. (though not the one Scar chooses) and is also represented by Re’s “qui domine par le sacrifice.”

On Agni as stone-born, see I.70.4 and the parallels adduced by Ge ad loc. (n. 4a).

X.20.8: *vísvét* in b (*vísvét té vāmá ā syuh*) is troublesome, since it shouldn’t properly represent the masc. nom. pl. *vísve* that seems to be called for here. Taking the sandhi seriously, as *vísvā* +

*íd* with a neut. pl., complicates the interpr., leading to Re’s implausible “Les seigneurs quels qu’ils soient ... (et) toutes choses (leur appartenant) ...” Roth (see Old and Ge n. 8b) simply interpr. it as irregular sandhi of the nom. pl., and I agree; I think it may have been influenced by I.40.6 *vísvéd vāmā vo aśnavat* and VI.1.9 *vísvét sá vāmā dadhate tvótaḥ* (passages also adduced by Old, who notes the frequent association of *vísṽā* with *vāmā(ni)*). In both the just-cited passages *vísṽā* is a neut. pl. modifying likewise neut. pl. *vāmā*. Here the form of *vāmā* (Saṃhitā; *vāmé* Pp.) is of course not neut. pl., but the association may have led to the irregularity.

The phrase *vāmā ā√as* has the ring of a fixed, slightly slangy expression; it contains the only loc. of the stem *vāmá-*, which may signal that it doesn’t belong to the high discourse register of the RV. Ge’s “im Glück sein” strikes the right note; my “be in the money” is meant to capture the register difference—I didn’t quite have the courage for “be in clover.”

Note that *várdhantaḥ* echoes *vardháyanti* in 3a, also with ritualists as subj.

X.20.10: The vs. is presented as a typical meta-summary final vs., opening with *evā*, with the poet, naming himself, as subject. However, the verb in this summary is *ā vakṣat*, which clearly belongs to the *s*-aor. subjunctive of *√vah*, though we ordinarily expect an aor. in this context. Both Ge and Re in fact tr. it as preterite: “hat ... dargebracht” and “il a convoyé” respectively. Without directly addressing this issue, Old suggests that *vimadáḥ ... ā vakṣat* may be an echo of the characteristic refrain *ví vo máde ... vívakṣase* found in X.21, 24, and 25, though of course *vakṣat* and *vívakṣase* are etymologically and semantically entirely distinct.

The Pp. analyses *ābhāḥ* as containing an augmented *abhāḥ*, but it could just as easily be *ā bhāḥ* with an injunctive

## X.21 Agni

On the meter and the metrically defined split refrain, see publ. intro. and immed. below.

X.21.1–8 (etc.): The first pāda of the refrain, *ví vo máde*, is of course the poet’s name *vimadá-* split by a Wackernagel’s enclitic (*vaḥ*) into preverb *ví* and loc. *máde*, with the preverb to be construed with the verb that forms the 2nd pāda of the refrain, *vívakṣase*.

This verb, *vívakṣase*, has been variously interpr., with root affiliations suggested to *√vah*, *√vakṣ*, and *√vac* and various morphological analyses; see, e.g., Old, Ge (n. 1cd), and recently Heenen (Desid. 219). Most likely is the interpr. as desid. to *√vac* with the *-se* 1st sg. ending generally specialized for verbs of praising (*stuṣé*, etc.).

In the publ. tr. I take *vaḥ* as the object of praise; I now realize that *vaḥ* should be dat., with the gapped object of praise being Agni. I would alter the tr. to “I wish to proclaim (him) to you (all)” or, since Agni is addressed in the 2nd ps. through most of the hymn, the awkward “I wish to proclaim (you=Agni) to you (all).” The referent of *vaḥ* may also be the priests rather than an audience of gods.

X.21.1: The hapax *svávr̥ktibhiḥ* has elicited elaborate, and to me not terribly convincing, rather legalistic interpretations; cf., e.g., Ge’s “aus eigner Berechtigung.” I do not think the word can be interpr. without considering its near twin, *sv̥r̥ktibhiḥ*, which instr. pl. occurs 18x (in addition to other case and no. forms), almost always pāda-final as here. *sv̥r̥ktí-* means ‘well-twisted (hymn)’ and refers to particularly fine products of poetic skill deployed at the sacrifice. See comm. ad I.61.2. Here I think ‘hymns’ must be the underlying referent as well, but here the hymns “have their own twists.” I do not think it is fanciful to interpr. this as a reference to the

twisted construction of all the vss. of this hymn, with the split refrain twining around a pāda (=e) isolated from the rest of the content of the vs. For the phrase “choose ( $\sqrt{vṛ}$ ) Agni X-*vṛktibhiḥ*” here, cf. V.25.3 *svvṛktibhiḥ vareṇya* “you [=Agni] worthy to be chosen with well-twisted (hymns).”

The simile particle *ná* seems, at first, both misplaced and functionless, since it seems to target *agním* as the simile—and we are not choosing (someone/something) *like* Agni, but choosing Agni himself. However, the real target of *ná* is *svávṛktibhiḥ*, and the order of the two words has been flipped because, as far as I can tell, simile-marking *ná* is blocked from pāda-final position (though *iva* is not; see, e.g., 3b). See disc. ad VIII.76.1 and X.111.7 and for other exx., III.10.5, IV.1.19, and X.127.8; the only counterexamples I have found (in the vast numbers of simile-marking *ná*) is *apó ná* in VII.68.8 and the syntactically complex ex. in X.95.3, spoken by the manic Purūravas. This phenomenon was already noted by Ge; see his n. 4a to IV.27.4. Even construed with *svávṛktibhiḥ*, *ná* doesn’t mark a conventional simile, but rather, in my opinion, draws attention to the implicit word play with *svvṛktibhiḥ* and the joke about the way this twisty hymn is constructed.

X.21.2: Because *svābhū-* is used of patrons (*sūrī-*) in VII.30.4, this referent seems to be assumed here (e.g., by Ge), leading to the further interpr. of *ásva-rādhās-* as ‘bestowing horses’ (e.g., Ge “die Rosseschenker”). But *śumbhānti* ‘they beautify’ invites an officiant, an active participant in the ritual, as subj.; I therefore tr. “who receive bounty in horses.”

X.21.3: I take the suffix-accented *dharmāṇaḥ*, lit. ‘possessing *dhárman-*’, as I did its root-accented base *dhárman* in the last hymn (X.20.2), namely as referring to something physical and material, viz. the foundation out of which the flames leap up. Both Ge and Re give *dharmán-* here an immaterial and conceptual sense: “den Satzungen getreu” and “(... représentant) la loi (incarnée)” respectively. They then both assume that the referents are the priests, sitting beside the ritual fire. This is certainly possible and would follow from *śumbhānti* in the previous vs. However, as in X.20.2 I prefer to see the subjects here as the flames, which have the fireplace and the lower part of the fire as their foundation and sit upon it.

My interpr. simplifies the interpr. of the simile in b. Since by the Ge/Re interpr. the subjects are masc., the fem. part. *siñcatīḥ* requires them to conjure up water-pouring women who have no other function but to justify the fem. pl.; moreover the instr. pl. *juhūbhiḥ* is underutilized. By my analysis the flames are fem.: see *éñīḥ* in X.20.2, which both Ge and Re also take as a reference to flames, and therefore the fem. *siñcatīḥ* is fully justified. (Note that the adj. *dharmāṇaḥ* in pāda a can be fem. as well as masc.; see, e.g., Macd VGS p. 67 n. 5; AiG III.263.) And the simile is also semantically richer: as elsewhere, *juhū-* can be ‘tongue’ as well as ‘ladle’, and “tongues of flame” is a RVic metaphor as well as an English one; further the flames dipping and rising can look as if they themselves are pouring, like women pouring with ladles. Although like Ge and Re, I do invoke a group of women with ladles, they are suggested by the inherent feminine of the frame.

As Ge (n. 3c) points out, pādas c, e recall vs. 9ab of the previous hymn, X.20.

X.21.4: The preverb *ā* is doubled, appearing in both c and e, perhaps because of the disruption created by the interspersed refrain in d.

X.21.5: Ge takes instr. *átharvaṇā* as the agent with *jātáḥ* (“von Atharvan erzeugt”). This saves him from trying to construe the instr. independently (as Re and I do), and passages like VI.16.13 *tvám ... átharvā nír amanthata* “You, Agni, did the Atharvan churn forth ...” support this interpr. However, *jātá-* is an extremely common ppl. and I know of no other passages with an agent. Moreover, the Atharvan is associated with poetic vision at least in I.80.16 (*dhî-* in that case).

KH (215) takes *bhúvat* here as “resultative Konstatierung,” tr. as a pres. “(Agni) ist der Bote Vivasvants,” but the mention of Vivasvant and Yama seems to put the action in the mythic past.

X.21.7: Both Ge and Re take *mánuṣaḥ* as nom. pl. and subj. of *ní śedire*. I now see that the publ. tr. “blazing for Manu” is unlikely and would now agree with Ge/Re and change my tr. to “They—the sons of Manu—installed you ... ghee-faced, blazing, most observant with your eyes.”

X.21.8: On the plants as Agni’s wives, see reff. in Ge’s n. 89d.

## X.22 Indra

On the meter of this hymn, which is unique to it, see publ. intro. and Old, Prol. 117. For the structure and contents see publ. intro.

X.22.1–2: As noted in the publ. intro., these two vss. are responsive—the first posing a question and the second replying to it. Note the point-by-point respension esp. in the first pāda of each:

*kúha śrutá índraḥ kásmin adyá*  
*ihá śrutá índro asmé adyá*

Note that the pāda break (after *adyá*) does not coincide with the syntactic break (which should come after *índraḥ*) but does coincide with the end of word-for-word respension.

X.22.1: In b I read *jáne* twice; on the one hand it belongs with the interrog. loc. *kásmin*, “among what people?” further specifying the first interrog. *kúha* “where?” But it also belongs with the following simile *mitró ná*, because “an ally among the people” *mitrá- jáne* is a fixed phrase, found also in the next vs., 2c, as well as II.4.1, VIII.23.8, X.27.12, 68.2; see my 2001 disc. in “The Rigvedic Svayamvara” (Fs. Parpola), 311–13. The phrase often is a reference to Agni, and though in n. 16 in the op. cit. I assert that there is no reference to Agni in our two vss., I now think it’s possible that Agni is covertly present here. Among other things, Agni is both likely to be in a dwelling place of seers (1c) and famously goes into hiding (1d). In addition to this possible ref. to Agni via formula, an identification with Mitra is also overtly suggested.

The intens. form *cárkṛṣe* to the root  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  ‘celebrate’ belongs to the reasonably well established intens. stem (*carkar-* / *carkir-*), which is ordinarily act. and tr. (with gen. obj.) and which serves as the only pres. stem to the root. Medial *cárkṛṣe* is found 3x, once as a 1st sg. with the same sense as the act. (X.74.1), twice as a 3rd sg. in passive value (here and X.105.4). The 1st sg. clearly belongs with the 1st sg. *-se* forms to verbs of praising and the like, such as *stuṣé*, as well as the verb of the Vimada refrain *vívakṣase* disc. above ad X.21.1. But the 3rd sg. passives are harder to account for. Note however that *stuṣé*, which is overwhelmingly 1st sg. and transitive “I praise,” is used as a 3rd sg. pass. in I.122.7, 8. It is possible that, since accented *-sé* forms can be interpr. as dative infinitives, the functional voice neutralization in infinitives (“to praise / to be praised”) allowed a reinterpr. of the form, which subsequently could be used as a 3rd sg. mid. with a value more appropriate to the middle. On *cárkṛṣe* see Schaeffer 108–9,

though I would not endorse the Rasmussen source for the forms or the Oettinger stative that are both presented as explanations there. The 3rd sg. passive interpr. is reinforced by the responsive verb in 2b, *stáve*, a *t*-less 3rd sg. in passive sense. See also disc. of *stoṣi* in vs. 4 below.

X.22.2: In addition to the exact match of 2a with 1a (see above), there are other signs of responson: c repeats the “ally among the people” phrase, slightly rearranged, from 1b; the verb of b, *stáve* ‘is praised’, is semantically a match with both *śrūyate* of 1b and *cárkṛṣe* of 1d; while the verb of d, *cakré*, echoes *cárkṛṣe* phonologically.

As Ge points out (n. 2cd with reff.), *yásas-jáne(ṣu)* is another fixed expression, and I therefore read *jáneṣu* here twice, with *mitró ná* and *yásas cakre*.

On *ḥcīsama-* see comm. ad I.61.1.

X.22.3: A vs. without a finite verb (or even a predicated part.). It most likely consists of a single rel. cl., introduced by *yáḥ* in pāda a, with four separate NPs as predicates, but in the absence of a finite verb, the structure cannot be determined for certain: it could, for ex., have an unsignaled rel. cl. (ab) / main cl. (cd) structure, “who (is) the lord ..., (he is) the bearer ...”

The fluidity of structure is also on display in the first hemistich: are the two genitive expressions #*maháḥ ... śávasaḥ* (a) and #*mahó nṛmṇásya* both dependent on *pátih*, as I take them (so also Tichy), or does the latter depend on *tūtujih*, as Ge has it? (Not much depends on this.)

In pāda a *śávaso ásāmi* reminds us of the hapax bahuvr. *ásāmi-śavas-* (V.52.5). *ásāmy* ḥ# also concatenates with the same phrase ending the previous pāda, 2d.

The 2nd hemistich is a classic case of case disharmony between frame and simile: the agent noun *bhartā* takes gen. *vájrasya* in the frame (c), but acc. *putráṃ* in the simile (d). See Ge’s n. 3cd and Tichy (-*tar*-stems, 366, 369–70). Of course, because of its suffix accent, the gen. is the “correct” case complement for *bhartár-*, but as is well known, the distribution of gen. and acc. compliments with agent nouns (suffix-accented versus root-accented) is far from perfect.

X.22.4: A difficult vs. that begins the transition to the Kutsa / Śuṣṇa myth, starting with the two horses of the Wind, which figure in that story (cf., e.g., I.174.5-7, I.175.4, VIII.1.11). Ge considers it the speech of Uśanā, though I do not. For most of the vs. the action is carried nominally, by the aor. part. *yujānāḥ* (a), agent noun *syántā* (c), and aor. part. *śrjāmāḥ* (d), all referring to Indra, to whom the voc. *vajrivaḥ* in b is also addressed. As it unfolds, it therefore resembles vs. 3, though with some participles to provide dynamic action and a 2nd ps. reference.

But pāda d also has a finite verb, *stoṣi*, which considerably gums up the works. Wh (Roots) and Macd (VGS) assign this form to the root pres. of  $\sqrt{stu}$ , so presumably consider it a 2nd sg. indic. pres., but neither of course tr. it. The current consensus (Ge, Tichy [*tar*-stems, 116–17], Baum [Impv. 58]) seems to be that it is a 2nd sg. imperative with the horses of pāda a as obj.: e.g., Ge “so lobe (die Rosse).” Baum further identifies it as a -*si* impv., and it is certainly the case that  $\sqrt{stu}$  has an *s*-aor. that builds the characteristic subjunctive (*stoṣat*, etc.) that regularly patterns with -*si* imperatives. The problem is the meaning this analysis requires: is it likely that the poet is urging the great god Indra to *praise* some other god’s *horses*?! much less the roads (*ádhvanaḥ* immed. flg. *stoṣi*) that would provide a nearer acc. object (see Old). As Old, who surveys the various previous suggestions, sensibly says, “Das Natürlichste ist doch, dass I. gepriesen wird.” This is the insistent theme of the first two vss., with *cárkṛṣe* ‘is celebrated’ and *stáve* ‘is praised’ in addition to the three forms of  $\sqrt{śru}$  ‘be famed’, and vs. 3 contains a good sample of what this praise would consist of. And of course this hymn is dedicated to Indra. With

Old (“Liegt vielleicht *-i* als Endung der 3. Sg. med. vor ...?”), I consider this yet another morphological manipulation of the root  $\sqrt{stu}$ , in this case a pseudo-passive aor. built to a sigmatic stem, a variant on *stáve* in 2b and confected much like *cárkṛṣe* in 1d. Recall that that form is 3rd sg. and passive (“is celebrated”) but was created beside the identical 1st sg. *-se* form with transitive value (“I celebrate”). The root  $\sqrt{stu}$  has a well-attested 1st sg. *s*-aor. *ástoṣi* with transitive value “I have praised”; the identical (save for augment) *stoṣi* here could show the same switch to 3rd sg. and passive value.

There is, however, a further complication: as noted above, Indra is addressed in the voc. in pāda b, so he should be in the 2nd ps., not 3rd. Given the serious semantic problems created by taking *stoṣi* as 2nd sg. act. impv., as outlined above, I do not consider this a serious objection, for several reasons. First, switching between persons is quite common in the RV, even in a single vs. Moreover, since four vss. in this hymn contain the same pāda-final voc. *vajrivah* (10b, 11b, 12d, 13d), it is quite possible that *vajrivah* here is a redactional replacement for something else (nom. \**vájrivān*? though the fact that this stem is only attested in the voc. makes this less likely). In any case, apart from this voc., the rest of the vs. is perfectly compatible with 3rd ps. ref., just like the previous vs.

The voc. *vajrivah* brings up another issue: what is this formation? We should of course expect a *-vant*-stem to be \**vájra-vant-*. AiG II.2.892 considers it analogical to *adrivant-* ‘possessor of the stone’, another epithet of Indra, very common (49x) and likewise attested only in the voc. *adrivah*, almost always at the end of 8/12-syllable pādas. And certainly some influence from this stem is quite likely (though it’s worth noting that there are no exx. of *adrivah* in Maṇḍala X). However, I think that the very common possessive stem *vajrín-*, meaning the same thing as *vajrivah*, must have been the driving factor. Adding a pleonastic *-vant-* (or rather the voc. *-vah*) would convert the voc. *vájrín* (41x) into a form friendly to the cadence of 8/12-syllable pādas, where the trisyllabic case forms of this stem (*vajrínam*, etc.) are regularly found (though here I have to admit that *vajrín* is fairly rare in Triṣṭubh cadences). Note that nom. *vajrī* is found in 2b.

Since acc. pl. *ádhvanaḥ* is unlikely to be the obj. of a putative transitive “praise” (see above) and since *srjāná-* is overwhelmingly passive, it must express an acc. of extent of space (so also Ge “die Wege entlang”).

X.22.5: On the possible metrical restorations in pāda a see Old.

I’d now be inclined to tr. “you came,” not “you have come,” given the mythological content of the vs. However, if Ge is right (I’m dubious) that this is the speech of Vāta, “you have come” would be better.

The phrase *devó ná mártyaḥ* “(neither) god nor mortal” seems to lack one of its negatives; however, *nákiḥ* has simply been postponed till the next pāda. See IV.17.19 *nákir devāḥ ... ná mártāḥ* with the expected underlying order.

X.22.6: On the unusual morphology of the name Uśanā, see my 2007 “Vedic Uśanā Kāvya and Avestan Kauui Usan” (Fs. Jasanoff).

The unexpected initial *g-* of abl.-gen. *gmáḥ* to the ‘earth’ word is plausibly explained by Wack (AiG III.243) as dissimilation from *jmáḥ* because of the surrounding *ca*’s in the repeated phrase to which it is confined: *divás ca gmás ca*.

On the isolated *prkṣase*, whose root affiliation and grammatical identity have been disputed, see esp. Narten’s extensive disc. (SigAor. 175–76), where she affirms Ge’s assignment

to  $\sqrt{pras}$  ‘ask’ and identifies it as an *s*-aor. subjunctive, whose root vocalism she interprets with ref. to that of similarly non-conforming *ḍṛkṣase* (Sig.Aor. 146), on which see comm. ad I.6.7.

X.22.8: The privative cmpds. applied to Śuṣṇa are all presumably culture terms: *akarmān-* meaning that he doesn’t perform rituals, *amantū-* that he follows the wrong counsels, *anyā-vrata-* that he follows the commandments of other gods than ours, *āmānuṣa-* that he doesn’t belong to the descendants of Manu. In other words, he is non-Ārya. But the stark renderings in the publ. tr. are, I think, rhetorically more effective.

X.22.9: The 2nd hemistich contains the standard theme of competing sacrifices, vying to attract Indra to them—a theme established by vss. 1–2. The usual lexeme  $\sqrt{hvā}$  ‘invoke in competition’ is replaced by the more vivid  $\sqrt{nū}$  ‘bellow in competition’. For the former idiom, with *purutrā* as here, see, e.g., II.18.7 *purutrā hí vihāvyo babhūtha* “for you have become the one to be competitively summoned in many places.” Note the figure #*purutrā ... pūrtāyaḥ*.

X.22.10: I dealt with this vs. in detail in my 2009 “An Indo-Iranian Priestly Title Lurking in the Rig Veda? An Indic Equivalent to Avestan *karapan*” (Fs. Salomon). I will not reproduce the disc. here. The gist involves the reinterpr. of the hapax *kārpāṇé* here (and X.99.9 *kṛpāṇé*) as a garbled reflex of the priestly title found in Avestan *karapan-* (always to be read as a disyllable). In the Avesta the *karapans* are associated with *kauuis* and with *xšaθra-* ‘lordly power’, and these same associations are found here and in X.99.9—here *kavīnām* in c, which I take as a proto gen. absol., and *kṣatrā-* in the cmpd \**kṣatrā-śavas-* (accepting Ludwig’s emendation of *nákṣatraśavasām* to \**ná kṣatrā...*), as Old and Ge (n. 10d) do.

My interpr. also involves taking *kārpāṇé* as the dat. to an athem. stem, rather than as a thematic loc. to a word referring to a sword or sword fight (as most take it), and in reading *yád ī* rather than *yádī*, with *ī* referring to the enemy Śuṣṇa.

The vs. depicts (however darkly) Indra’s pursuit and discovery of Śuṣṇa along with his entourage of warriors whom he urges on in the battle, in company with the priestly figures who benefit from Śuṣṇa’s killing.

Although my interpr. is hardly secure, the others available make even less sense. For the details of my interpr. and args. against previous one, esp. *kārpāṇé* as ‘sword fight’, consult the art. cit.

X.22.11: This vs., or the first hemistich, is scarcely less obscure than the immediately preceding one, because of the hapaxes *dānāpnas-* and *ākṣāṇé*.

Before tackling these words, we should get some handle on the syntax; fortunately there is a model near at hand: 13a *asmé tā ta indra santu satyā* “for us let these of yours be(come) real, o Indra” is very similar to our pāda a *makṣū tā ta indra ...*, hence my tr. “right away these things (became) yours,” though it diverges from 13a in some particulars. See below.

As for the problematic words, let us begin with the 2nd. Old gives a rather despairing survey of possibilities, displaying enthusiasm for none of them; AiG II.2.272 calls it “ganz dunkel,” though (p. 119) Ge’s interpr. (see below) is noted. Gr assigns it to a dubious root  $\sqrt{akṣ}$  ‘erreichen’ as a pf. part.; sim. Wh Rts. (with “?”). But the currently prevailing view, if we can qualify it as such since it’s basically the only one around, is that of Ge, set forth in ZDMG 71 (1917) 25 and reprised in his n. 11b—that it is a thematic vṛddhi deriv. of a dvandva of *ākṣa-* ‘axle’ and *anī-* ‘axle pin’, meaning “im Kampf um Achse und Achsnagel”; see also Spareboom

(Chariots, p. 19) and the measured recognition given in AiG II.2.119 and EWA p. 41. Although I have to admit that an axle pin figures as a point of contention in a Śuṣṇa context in I.63.3, I am not convinced by this interpr., which loses a good deal of its cogency if the near-rhyme *kārpāṇé* in vs. 10 does not mean “im Schwertkampf” but refers to a priestly officiant. My own rendering “on gaining control” is based on deriving it from the root  $\sqrt{kṣā}$  ‘rule over, possess’, which underlies the secondary IIr. root  $\sqrt{*kṣāj}$  (extracted from the pres. *\*kṣH-ājati*; see, e.g., EWA s.v. *KṢAY<sup>1</sup>*), found in Vedic  $\sqrt{kṣī}$ , pres. *kṣáyati*. Relics of the root  $\sqrt{kṣā}$  are found in cmpds like *ṛbhukṣā-* ‘master of the Ṛbhus’ (an occurrence of which is found in the next hymn, X.23.2), possibly *divákṣā(s)-* ‘heaven-ruling’ (*pace* MM op. cit.). I suggest that we also find it here in what I analyze as an *-ana-* nominal *kṣā-ana-*, cmpded with the preverb *ā*. Although *ā* doesn’t otherwise appear with  $\sqrt{kṣī}$  (just  $\sqrt{kṣī}^2$ ), here it may perform something of the same function it does with  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  ‘attract here’ and  $\sqrt{pū}$  ‘attract here by purification’, locating the action in the immediate place and time—hence, with the context fleshed out, *ākṣāṇá-* “on bringing (his possessions) under your immediate control.” The accent is also not what we might expect: most *-ana-* nominals have root accent; however, there are a certain no. of exx. with final accent, and we might also invoke the accentuation of *kārpāṇé* in the previous vs. (explaining *obscurum per obscurius*, I realize). The presence of etymologically related *kṣatrá-* in *\*kṣatrá-śavas-* in the previous vs. might lend some support to my analysis here, which, I recognize, hangs by a thread.

As for *dānāpnas-*, I have slightly changed my analysis from the one reflected in the publ. tr. There the implicit analysis is that it’s a genitive of a tatpuruṣa (‘property for giving’) dependent on *ākṣāṇé*: “on gaining control (?) over his property for giving.” I now think it must be a bahuvr., as both Gr and Ge take it – but both of their renderings are vague and gloss over what the literal meaning and the intent of the cmpd must be (Gr “Fülle [*āpnas*] von Gaben [*dānā*] habend,” Ge “der du freigebig lohnest”). I now reject my tatp. analysis for three reasons: 1) tatp.s with ordinary noun as 2nd member are quite rare at this period, and in particular I have been unable to find any certain tatp.s in the RV with an *-as-* stem as 2nd member; though compds with *-as-* stems abound, they are overwhelmingly bv.s. 2) acdg. to the standard rules of tatp. accent, we should expect final-syllable accent (*\*dānāpnás-*) whatever the underlying accent of the 2nd member (see, e.g., Wh Gr. §1267, Macd VG §91). I therefore now take the form as gen. *dānāpnasah* modifying *te* (or, contra Pp, as dat. *danāpnase*, likewise modifying *te*: either constr. can express possession). As for the literal sense of the cmpd., I have no idea how Ge analyzed the cmpd, since his tr. bears only a hazy relation to either of the members. But Gr’s assumption that the first member is *dānā-* and means ‘gift(s)’ needs to be challenged: *dānā-*, so accented, means ‘giving’, not ‘gift’, which is *dāna-*. I therefore interpr. the cmpd. *dānāpnas-* as ‘possessing (Śuṣṇa’s) property for giving’; in other words, Indra takes possession of Śuṣṇa’s belongings in order to redistribute them to us. I would now alter the tr. to “Right away, on gaining control (of it), these things [that is, Śuṣṇa’s possessions] (became) yours, Indra, who had (/acquired) his property for giving (to us).” The *tā* is a neut. collective referring to the *āpnas-* of Śuṣṇa. The same sense is echoed in 13a.

In c *dambháyaḥ* echoes *dambhaya* in 8d.

X.22.12: Note that the voc. phrase *śūra vajrivah* (of 10b, 11b) has been broken apart and redistributed to 12a / 12d.

The hapax *akudhryàk* is plausibly explained by Old as a cross between *akútra* and *sadhryàk*. KH (56 with n. 43, further disc. 54 n. 32) reads *mā kudhryàk* (also *mā kútra*, not *mākútra* in I.120.8), flg. Pischel, but contra Old, who argues against Pischel, Ge, etc. I do not



understand the Pischel/Hoffmann objection to the privative, and *akudhryàk* fits the striking privative pattern in vs. 8: *akarmā ... amantúh ... ámānuṣaḥ ... amitrahan* (and 13 *apādī ... ahastāh*). Certainly the expressed wish “let them not go nowhere (/to a non-place)” (i.e., end in futility) seems to me stronger than “let them not go somewhere else” (KH’s “Nicht sollen ... die guten für uns (bestimmten) Hilfen irgendwohin geraten”). On the other hand, I also don’t see any reason to follow Ge’s separation of a and b into two clauses (fld. by Scar 23); *asmé* as dat. of benefit (/non-benefit) can easily be construed with the *mā* cl. of pāda a.

X.22.13: As noted ad vs. 11, 11a and 13a follow the same pattern. Both have an unidentified neut. pl. *tā*, which is attributed to or of Indra (*te indra*); in 13a the attribution is overt, with 3rd pl. impv. *santu* and neut. pl. *satyā*, in the expression “be real(ized) / come true.” The question is what is the referent of *tā*; it can’t be anything in the immed. neighborhood because both *abhīṣṭayaḥ* in 12b and the *upaspīśaḥ* of 13b are fem. Ge takes it as a dummy “that,” referring to the wishes about to be expressed (“... soll sich das von dir ... bewahrheiten: ...”), conveniently ignoring the plural; Scar (667) follows suit but nods to the pl. with “Bei uns soll dies [alles] sich bewahrheiten.” Both ignore the strong parallelism between 11 and 13; taking it into account, I think the *tā* here, as in 11a, refers to the belongings of Śuṣṇa that Indra will distribute to us. Indra’s welcome affectionate gestures (*upaspīś-* ‘caress’) that bring benefits / enjoyments (*bhūjah*) are part of the package.

X.22.14: This vs. provides a tricky end to the Śuṣṇa saga in this hymn. The vs. opens with two adj. *ahastā ... apādī* “handless (and) footless.” Both adj. are characteristically used of Vṛtra, most notably in the famous Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32.7 *apād ahastāh*, also III.30.8, just *apād-* in V.32.8. In this monster-killing story we are primed to apply these adj. to the enemy, but neither of them is exclusively used of monsters and, more to the point, they are fem. here. The fem. referent quickly appears: it is the earth (*kṣāḥ* [on this form, see, e.g., AiG III.242]), who grows strong (*vārdhata*) when Indra is dispatching Śuṣṇa. The switch is easily made, since *apād-* is not confined to demonic referents: indeed Heaven and Earth are *apādī* in I.185.2 (also Dawn [I.152.3, VI.59.6]). Nonetheless, as Ge (n. 14) points out, the plotline is something of a reversal: it is usually Indra who stretches out the earth after having killed various demons. I don’t have any explanation for this little act of independence on the part of the earth.

The adv. *pradakṣiṇit* can elsewhere be used in the context of the animal sacrifice (see IV.6.3) and here seems to invest Indra’s killing of Śuṣṇa with ritual overtones. On the formation of the word, see comm. ad V.36.4.

Note the phonetic echo #*śúṣṇam ... śíśnathaḥ*#

X.22.15: On *vasavāna-* see comm. ad V.33.6.

The pres. part. *sán* is definitely non-concessive here, unlike its usual usage.

### X.23 Indra

The publ. intro. states that Indra’s beard is mentioned in vss. 1 and 3, which latter should be corrected to 4.

X.23.1: *vájradaṣṇam* ‘having the mace in his right (hand)’ recalls the adv. *pradakṣiṇíd* referring to Indra’s circumambulation of Śuṣṇa before killing him at the end of the last hymn (X.22.14).

The preverb *prá* is in tmesis with (/from?) the part. *dódhuvat*, not the finite injunc. *bhūt*, cf. nearby X.26.7 (same poet) *prá śmáśru ... dūdhot* and II.11.17 *pradódhuvac chmáśruṣu*.

In d the part. *ví ... dáyamānaḥ* (likewise in tmesis) appears without obj., but since *vásu* is frequently the obj. of this verb (e.g., I.10.6, VIII.103.5) and it is found in the next pāda (2a), it seems reasonable to supply it here (or, otherwise, tr. the part. as absolute). The two instr. *sénābhiḥ* and *rādhasā* I take as expressing the qualities that allow and encourage Indra to distribute largesse: on the one hand, his weapons (*sénābhiḥ*), the martial prowess that allows him to capture goods, and, on the other, his generosity (*rādhasā*), the cultural practice and habit of mind that cause warrior chieftans to redistribute the goods thus won to their underlings.

X.23.2: Old pronounces the first pāda “sehr dunkel,” and I am certainly in agreement. See his typically incisive presentation of the difficulties. My publ. tr. essentially follows Ge’s, analyzing it as an “X and which Y” construction without the “and.” Both the X (*hárī*) and the Y are asserted to be Indra’s (*asya*). By this analysis, the nominal rel. cl. expressing Y consists of a neut. pl. rel. *yā* modifying *vásu*, which, though ambig. as to number, would be pl. here. The verbal element is a predicated dat. inf. *vidé* ‘to be found’, and the loc. *váne* refers, as often at least in Maṇḍala IX, to the wooden cup that contains soma. Hence Y, “the goods to be found in the wooden (cup),” is a complex and oblique way of referring to soma. All of these interpr. can be questioned, and in fact on returning to the pāda, I now find myself tempted by a suggestion of Old’s, that we should read \**yāvane* for *yā váne*, a datival *-van*-stem to  $\sqrt{yā}$  ‘drive’. Old’s rendering of this possibility is “seine *hárī* (sind dazu da) zu fahren, Güter zu erlangen.” My Engl. tr.: “Now are his two fallow bays to drive (/be driven), to find/acquire goods.” The advantages of this interpr. are 1) the anomalous “X and which Y” without overt conjunction is eliminated; 2) so is the very indirect way of referring to soma; in particular, I know of no other instance in which *vásu* is used of soma. The disadvantages are pretty serious, however: in addition to requiring emendation (though only the zapping of a single accent; see the emendation in the previous hymn, X.22.10d, involving the addition of a single accent), *yāvan-* is not found in the RV as a deriv. of  $\sqrt{yā}$ , whose ordinary datival infin. is *yātave*. Nonetheless, since the proposed interpr. produces a more satisfactory account of the pāda in context, I would now change the tr. to the one suggested above.

KH (215) interpr. *bhuvat* as an injunc. expressing “resultative Konstatierung.” But surely the poet meant it to contrast with the undoubted injunc. *bhūt* in the previous vs., also pāda final (1c). I therefore take it as subjunctive, which will harmonize nicely with the new interpr. of pāda a above: Indra’s horses are to be driven to find or acquire goods; once the goods are acquired, Indra will distribute them. Pāda b expresses the same complementary characteristics as 1d: Indra is martial (here *vṛtrahā*), and he is, consequently, generous (*maghaír maghāvā*) (see also Ober II.169).

In c Indra is identified with the three Ṛbhus; these craftsmen and demi-gods-come-lately seem to have little in common with the martial Indra on display in the rest of the hymn so far (and to come), but Ge (n. 2d) plausibly suggests that the deed Indra boasts of in d (in what is taken, rightly in my opinion, as Indra’s own words), “I whet down” (*áva kṣṇaumi*) is an action typical of the Ṛbhus “als Werkleuten.” This pāda is compared by Ge (n. 2d) with V.33.4, but see comm. ad loc., where I assert that the two passages have less in common than is generally thought.

X.23.3: An oddly disjointed vs., despite its apparently straightforward content, which, as in vs. 1, associates Indra with his *vájra*-, his fallow bays, his chariot, and his generosity. The problems are the following, in order of appearance (not magnitude): 1) the acc. *vájram* is governed by nothing, though we expect a verb like ‘took’ (e.g., V.29.2 *ādatta vájram*); 2) *híraṇya*- is generally a noun ‘gold’, not the adj. ‘golden’, which is *híraṇyáya*-, elsewhere used of *vájra*- (e.g., I.85.9); 3) the *íd* seems functionless; 4) the main clause begins with *áthā rátham* at the end of pāda a, with the main cl. verb coming at the beg. of c, *ā tiṣṭhati*, but most of b is a rel. cl. qualifying *rátham*, which is, therefore, clearly embedded in the main cl., although this type of embedding is almost entirely absent from the RV; 5) *ví sūribhiḥ* at the end of b has no obvious connection either with the preceding rel. cl. nor the main cl., and in fact the two words have no obvious connection with each other. Fortunately the 2nd hemistich, after the main verb, is troublefree.

The one that troubles me most is 4), but I see no way around the embedding. I do not have solutions for the other problems either. For 1) and also 3), with a bit of creative fiddling, we could find a verb concealed or hinted at in pāda a to govern *vájram*: interpr *yadā* as *yadā* + *ā* and in *íd áthā* see a gesture towards *\*dattá* or *\*ādatta* or *\*ādatthā(s)* (which would fit the phonological traces best, but a 2nd sg. would be out of place in the 3rd ps. context) – but a pres. or at best an injunc. is called for, not an impf., and in any case the phonological overlap is too slight. So I abandon attempts to pull a verb out of a hat, so to speak. As for 2) I’m afraid we just have to accept *híraṇya*- as a nonce adjective or as a separate specifier of the mace; perhaps the *íd* is signaling this: “the mace, that very piece of gold”?

As for *ví sūribhiḥ*, Ge supplies ppl. *hūtáḥ* with *ví*, hence “competitively invoked by the patrons,” as an adjunct to the rel. cl. He is followed by Klein (DGRV II.78–79). However, Ge’s parallels (n. 3b) are not strong; moreover *sūri*-s in the pl. seem always to be a happily harmonious group attached to our side, not rivals nor patronizing rival ritualists. Hence I think Ge’s “von den Opferherren um die Wette (gerufen)” is pure invention (and his interpr. of *ví√hū* different from standard). Instead I suggest, quite tentatively, that *ví* is in tmesis with (/from) the verb of the rel. cl. *váhataḥ*, which it immediately follows, and ends the rel. cl. As for the semantics, remember that Indra’s fallow bays are *vívrata*- in 1b; moreover, due to the echo of the poet’s name Vimada, *ví* is a Lieblingswort in this hymn: cf., in addition to the ex. here, 1b *vívratānām*, 1d *ví ... dāyamāno ví*, 5a *vívācaḥ* and the *vi*-sequences in 2a *vidé*, 6c, 7c *vidmā*, and the poet’s name in 6a and 7b. Although *ví√vah* is (later) specialized for marriage, I don’t think we should try to find that sense here: the *ví* is simply there to echo the poet’s name. If *ví* ends the rel. cl. of 3b, then *sūribhiḥ* belongs to the main cl.: Indra mounts his chariot along with them. The position of this instr. is somewhat anomalous, but so is everything else in this vs.

X.23.4: Another disjointed and puzzling vs., with the problems concentrated in pāda a and its relations (or lack of relations) with b. The major questions are what case and number *yūthyā* is and whether pāda a is an independent cl. or parallel to b. Ge takes *yūthyā* as fem. nom. sg., modifying *vṛṣṭiḥ*, and the pāda as an independent nominal cl.: “Auch dieser Regen ist als sein unzertrennlicher Genosse dabei.” My publ. tr. instead begins with a neut. acc. pl. *yūthyā*, favored by Old (who, however, doesn’t tr. or discuss further), and takes pāda a as a shadow version of b, with *vṛṣṭiḥ* equivalent to *índraḥ* and *yūthyā svā* to *śmáśrūṇi*, as obj. of *pruṣṇute*: “as rain he (sprinkles) all things belonging to his herd.” Both Ge and I have to explain what the apparently intrusive “rain” is doing here. Ge (n. 4a) suggests that it’s not really rain, but soma (often called rain in IX), which drops or is sprinkled on Indra’s beard. Under my interpr. it’s Indra who’s identified with rain, via his association with *vṛṣan*- ‘bull’ (as [semen-]sprinkler). Since *yūthá*-

‘herd’ seems generally specified for the female members of the herd, pāda a would be an oblique way of referring to Indra’s powers of insemination (cf. for the insemination of the *yūthā-* III.55.17 ... *vṛṣabhāḥ* ... *yūthé ní dadhāti rétaḥ*). In favor of this interpr. is the strong association of *yūthā-* / *yūthyā-* with the various hyper-male animals derived from √ *vṛṣ*: *vṛṣṇí-* ‘ram’, a rhyme with *vṛṣṭí-* (I.10.2 *yūthéna vṛṣṇíḥ*), *vṛṣan-* (e.g., IX.15.4 *yūthyò vṛṣā*; cf. I.7.8, IX.76.5, 77.5, 96.20), and *vṛṣabhā-* (III.55.17, IX.110.9). In other words, the “rain” here is, by etymological and phonological association, homologized to semen and to Indra as semen. Nonetheless, I am not entirely convinced by my own arguments, primarily because I don’t know what to do with *sácā*. This adv. can be a pleonastic marker of a loc. absol. (esp. *suté sácā* / *sácā suté*; see comm. ad IV.31.5, VI.26.4), but there’s no loc. absol. to be pleonastic to in this pāda; Ge’s tr. seems to do a somewhat better job of accounting for the *sácā*, and I would therefore consider an alt. tr. of the type “The rain [=soma] is, in association, his [=Indra’s] own flock-mate” (with apologies for “flock-mate”). Then in the next pāda he sprinkles this “rain” on his beard.

There is another possible way of accounting for *sácā*. As I just said *sácā* is very common with *suté* when the latter is a loc. absol.: “when (the soma) is pressed.” Pāda c contains an occurrence of *suté*, which is generally (incl. by the publ. tr.) construed with *sukṣáyam*, as “having a lovely dwelling in the pressed (soma).” But this phrase modifies *mádhu* ‘honey’, which in such contexts is ordinarily *identified* with soma, not situated within soma (though cf. *sómam ... mádhumantam ... sutám* in the next hymn, X.24.1). So it is possible that *suté* is a loc. absol., and the pāda means “he pursues his track down to the well-situated honey when (the soma) is pressed.” And in this case, given the somewhat lax constraints on word order elsewhere in the hymn, *sácā* in pāda a might anticipate the loc. absol. in c. (Note that *suté* can be taken as a loc. absol. whether or not we take this further riskier interpretational step with *sácā*.)

The preverbs that open c and d and the actions thus defined are complementary: *áva* ‘down’ and *úd* ‘up’. As far as I can tell, this is the only instance of *áva* √ *vī* in the RV (or indeed elsewhere), and it seems to have been contextually created. Gr’s elaborate gloss “Speise [A.] in sich aufnehmen, verzehren” is thus unrec. and misleadingly specific.

X.23.5: It is possible that the bad meter of pāda a is iconic of the enemies with bad speech.

Note the *vī* in *vívāc-*.

*śávaḥ* returns from 2c.

X.23.6: As disc. in the publ. intro., *vidmā* (also in 7c) is a near-anagram of *vimadá-*.

As Old points out, in the 2nd hemistich *yád* belongs at the end of the c pāda.

### X.24 Indra (1–3) and the Aśvins (4–6)

As noted in the publ. intro., this “hymn” actually consists of two separate, three-vs. hymns, with different dedicands and different meters. The first three vss., to Indra, are in Āstārapañkti, like X.21 and X.25, and like them contains the Vimada split refrain (on which see comm. ad X.21.1–8). Vss. 4–6, to the Aśvins, are in Anuṣṭubh. Renou (minimally) treats this hymn in EVP XVI.76.

X.24.1: On the loc. *camū* see AiG III.188.

X.24.2: The etym. figure *sácīpate sácīnām* should be tr. “o power-lord of powers,” with a pl.

X.24.4–5: On the obscure myth alluded to in these vss., see publ. intro., Old, and Ge’s n. 4–5. I have nothing to add. The fem. dual *samīcī* to the stem *samyāñc-* is found reasonably commonly elsewhere in the RV, of Night and Dawn (I.96.5, II.3.6, III.55.12) and of Heaven and Earth / the two world-halves (I.69.1, II.27.15, III.30.11, 55.20, VIII.6.17, X.88.16). Neither of these pairs makes sense as a referent in this context. The dual *samīcī* may refer to the fire-churning sticks in III.1.7, though not to magical ones. As Ge points out, the Aśvins churn out golden fire-churning sticks as embryo (or churn the embryo out of them) in a birth charm, X.184.3 *hiranyāyī arāṇī, yām nirmānthato aśvīnā / tāṃ te gárgham havāmahe, daśamé māśī sūtave* “The one that the Aśvins churned out of the two golden kindling sticks, that embryo of yours we call, to be born in the tenth month.” Although this passage makes it likely that *samīcī* refers to *arāṇī* here as well, it doesn’t help as much as it might, particularly because the double acc. in X.184.3ab is hard to interpr.

X.24.4: Although this vs. begins the new hymn(let), the du. voc. *śakrā* encountered at the beginning may be a link to the preceding one, since *śakrá-* is overwhelming sg. and an epithet of Indra, the dedicand of the 1st 3 vss.; it is used of the Aśvins only once elsewhere (II.39.3), once of the Maruts, and once in the fem. modifying *várūtī*. In the 1st part of this hymn, Indra is called *śacīpate śacīnām* with a different deriv. of the root  $\sqrt{\text{śak}}$ .

The possessive stem *māyāvīn-* occurs only 3x in the RV, beside very well-attested *māyīn-*. I wonder if it is used here in order to evoke the name *aśvīn-*, which is not found in this hymn, where the dedicands are only called Nāsatyā (4c, 5c).

The exact repetition of the verb in main cl. (*nír amanthatam*) and dep. cl. (*nirámanthatam*) seems clumsy—a view shared by Re (“phraséologie faible”).

X.24.5: Since  $\sqrt{\text{krap}}$  usually (insofar as there is a “usual” for this rarely attested root) takes the acc., *samīcyór niṣpātantyoh* may be a loc. absol.: “All the gods mourned when the two joined (churning sticks) flew forth.”

The preverb *nīs* is found with  $\sqrt{\text{pat}}$  only here in the RV (though it does appear marginally in the AV), and it seems likely that it’s used here to match the two occurrences of *nīs*  $\sqrt{\text{math}}$  in the previous vs. It may therefore refer to the same action—the churning out / birth of the two *samīcī*—though they must have gone somewhere, since the gods ask the Aśvins to bring them back.

X.24.6: The obscure myth of the last two vss. is abruptly dropped here, though the Aśvins remain the addressees. The theme of going away and coming back again is the semantic connection to what precedes; note esp. *púnar* in 5d and 6b.

## X.25 Soma

The Āstārapankti meter and the Vimada refrain go together, as in X.21 and 24.1–3.

X.25.1–3: The c pādas of these three vss. begin with *ádhā*.

X.25.2: There is a difference of opinion as to whether *hr̥dispīśaḥ* is gen. sg. modifying *te* [=Soma] (Gr) or, more likely, nom. pl. qualifying the unexpressed subj. (Sāy., Ge, Scar [669, uncertainly]; Old likewise waffles). The next question is the referent of the subj.: Sāy., endorsed by Ge (n. 2a), thinks priests; Old suggests several possibilities, but seems to favor *kāmāḥ* of pāda

c, as I do. As Old points out, it makes sense for the desires first to “sit” on the ritual ground and then “spread out” in search of goods.

Finally, there is the referent of *dhāmasu*: Ge: Soma’s forms, Re: Soma’s structures, Scar: his seats. The last seems the most likely – or, to be more precise, the various places where soma is purified, including heaven; cf. IX.86.22, 66.3, etc., as well as IX.28.2 cited by Ge.

X.25.3: The sense of the two clauses in this vs. (ab and c, e) cries out for the first to be a conditional clause to the second: “if I transgress ..., be merciful.” Re yields to this temptation, if only with a parenthetical “(si).” For a parallel passage with such subordination, cf. VIII.48.9 (likewise to Soma), containing the same VPs in both subord. and main cl. as here: *yát te vayám pramināma vratāni, sá no mṛṣa* “If we will confound your commandments, be merciful to us.” In our passage it seems uncharacteristically bald for the poet to trumpet forth his transgression, rather than wrapping it into a conditional. At best we might reconfigure it as a question: “Do I ...?” though there is no overt sign of a question. I suggest we’re dealing with a different phenomenon. As is well known, in a subset of passages the coordinate conjunction *ca* actually marks a subordinate, conditional (“if”) clause (see, e.g., Gr *ca* IV., coll. 428–29; Klein DGRV I.238–56); this usage is also found in a few instances of RVic *céd*, continued into the later language. In these *ca*/*céd* clauses the verb is accented. Now *utá* ‘and’ is similar to *ca* in many of its usages (see, e.g., Klein DGRV I.293). I think we have here a nonce use of *utá*, which opens the first clause, in the function of subordinating *ca*, though without inducing accent on the verb. I would therefore change the tr. to “And if I transgress ...”

On *pākyā* see comm. ad vs. 5 below.

In pāda e *abhí cid vadhāt* seems untethered to the rest of its pāda. Gr registers a special usage of  $\sqrt{mṛṣ}$ : “**abhí** jemand [A.] gnädig wovor [Ab.] bewahren.” But this would be the only occurrence of  $\sqrt{mṛṣ}$  with *abhí* in the RV, and in fact  $\sqrt{mṛṣ}$  never otherwise appears with a preverb or with an abl. Ge also construes the phrase with *mṛṣā*, though not in the exact same sense as Gr: “doch verzeih uns wie ein Vater seinem Sohne auch ohne Strafe.” I think it better to supply a separate verb, with appropriate semantics, that can be construed both with *abhí* and with an abl. Verbs meaning ‘protect’ come immediately to mind: both  $\sqrt{pā}$  and  $\sqrt{rakṣ}$  fulfill both conditions, and forms of both appear in this hymn: *pāhi* with abl. in 8e, *rakṣasi* in 6a. Re obviously responded to the situation as I do, supplying a parenthetical ‘protect’ with the phrase: “(nous gardant) même de la mort-violente,” though he makes no comment.

X.25.4: The *dhīti*- ‘insights’ and *krātu*- ‘resolve’ here may reprise the *mānas*- ‘thought’ and *krātu*- of vs. 1b, though there is no equivalent to the *dākṣa*- ‘skill’ of the trio in 1b—unless *śakti*- ‘powers’ in 5a counts.

The simile in c, e is a little off kilter, but presumably the idea is that one has to hold beakers steady to keep the liquid inside from spilling—esp. important if it’s precious soma.

X.25.5: If *śakti*- is the third member of the trio of vs. 1, as just suggested ad vs. 4, it might be best, with Re, to ascribe those powers to the insightful humans, rather than to Soma: “Grâce à leurs capacités ... les-célèbres (hommes) ... ont ouvert ...” This interpr. requires finding another way to construe the gen. phrase referring to Soma (*táva ... gṛtsasya ... távasaḥ*). Re seems to take it with *nīkāmāsaḥ*: “dévoués (à toi) ...” This is tempting, but no other forms of *nīkāma*- are construed with a gen. (or any other case). So, although I’d entertain an alt. tr. “Through their

powers these insightful ones, devoted to you who are clever and strong, open ...,” I think it runs into syntactic difficulties.

The rare word *gr̥tsa-* opening pāda c may participate in two different verbal plays. On the one hand, *gr̥tsa-* is elsewhere the opposite of *pāka-* ‘naïve, simple’; cf. IV.5.2 *pākāya gr̥tsaḥ* and in particular nearby X.28.5 *gr̥tsasya pākāḥ tavāsaḥ ...*, almost identical to our pāda c *gr̥tsasya dh̥rās tavāsaḥ*. Although *pāka-* is not found in our vs., see *pākyā* in 3a. In addition Gr̥tsamada (*gr̥tsamadā-*) is the name of poetic family of Maṇḍala II; note here in cd the polarized #*gr̥tsa(sya) ... māde#*. Since the poet expressly associates himself with the great poet Kakṣivant in vs. 10, a concealed mention of another bardic family would not be surprising.

Ge (n. 5) suggests that the vs. is a description of the dakṣiṇā, playing off the Vala myth.

X.25.6: The two forms of *sām* (*samākṛṇoṣi, sampāśyan*), neither of which is strictly necessary, may be meant to contrast with the persistent *vī* of the Vimada refrain.

X.25.7: On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

X.25.8–9: These two vss. both begin *vām*; vs. 8 contains a comparative to a root noun cmpd (*kṣetra-vīttara-*) and 9 a superlative to a root noun cmpd (*vṛtra-hantama-*).

X.25.8: The ‘resolve’ (*krātu-*) of vss. 1 and 4 returns here, but belonging to Soma, not us.

Ge and Re construe *mānuṣaḥ* quite differently. Ge takes it as an abl. with the comparative *-vīttara-* (“Ortskundiger als der Mensch”), and Scar (482–83) and the publ. tr. follow; Re. as a gen. with the first member *kṣetra-* (“Toi qui connais le territoire de l’homme mieux (que tout autre)”). Since Re ends up having to supply an abl. with the comparative, Ge’s interpr. seems more economical.

X.25.9: The “us” of pāda a are identical to the referents of the 3rd pls in c, e, or rather the 3rd pls are a subset of us (namely, the warriors).

X.25.10–11: The last two vss. of the hymn each contain two annunciatory *ayām-*s, opening the a and c pādas. This repetition is not well signaled in the publ. tr., which should probably have made use of “this one” or “this one here” despite the heaviness of that effect.

X.25.10: Note the complementary injunctives, med. intrans. *vardhata ...* act. trans. *vardhayat*.

On the presence of Kakṣivant here see publ. intro. and also comm. on vs. 5 above.

X.25.11: In the publ. tr. I take *saptābhyaḥ* as a dat. of benefit with the VP of pāda e, more or less parallel to *vīprāya dāsūṣe* in pāda a, with *ā vāram* an independent adverbial. This interpr. is quite different from those of Ge, Old, and Re, all of whom construe the phrase of c together, with *saptābhyaḥ* an abl. with *vāram*, as in I.4.4=IX.45.2 ... *sākhibhya ā vāram* “the choice from among the companions” (on IX.45.2 see comm. ad loc., which rescinds the publ. tr.). Pāda e is then a separate cl. I now see that they are right and I am not: besides the striking parallels adduced there is also the fact that e begins with the preverb *prā*, which suggests (though it doesn’t require) that a new cl. begins there. I would now emend the tr. (starting with pāda c) to “this one is the choice of the seven; he will advance ...” I still don’t know who or what “the seven” are.

## X.26 Pūṣan

Tr. and comm. by Re in EVP XV.152–54. As Old points out, the meter is very ragged.

X.26.1: The first hemistich of this vs. plays on the frequent ambiguity of the stem *niyút-*, which can refer both to Vāyu’s teams, with which he drives to the sacrifice, and to our “teams” of poetic thoughts, which drive to Vāyu and the other gods. See disc. in comm. ad VII.90.1. In this passage I think both senses are found simultaneously, with *mānīṣāḥ* both nom. and acc., in the first case coreferential with *niyútaḥ* and in the second expressing the goal. Ge opts for the first, Re the second.

The du. *dasrā* refers to Vāyu, under the epithet *niyúdratha-*, and Pūṣan. Pace Gr (and Old’s qualified endorsement), there seems no reason to emend to sg. *dasró*. The impv. *aviṣtu* is sg. because a series of sg. subjects can take a singular verb. For Vāyu and Pūṣan together and with similar phraseology, cf. VII.39.2 *vāyúḥ pūṣā svastāye niyútvān*, where *niyútvān* modifies Vāyu.

The bahuvr. *niyúdratha-* ‘having a chariot with teams’ is a hapax, and despite the additional semantics was probably formed beside the standard *niyútvant-* ‘having teams’ to provide an iambic cadence; the *-vant-* stem in the nom. *niyútvān* is fairly common in the cadence of Triṣṭubh lines (III.49.4, VI.40.5, 60.2, VII.39.2, IX.89.6). For the syntagm underlying the compd see I.135.4 *rātho niyútvān* (cf. III.49.4).

X.26.2: Both Ge and Re manage to wring a good deal of sense out of this puzzling vs.; unfortunately they do so by construing the unaccented verb in c (*ā vamaṣat*) in the rel. cl. that begins with *yásya*; cf., e.g., “Dessen Grösse ... unsereins, der Sänger, durch seine Gedichte gewinnen möchte ...” (Re sim.). Even Old, who usually holds the line on such things, speculates that *vamaṣat* might be a Nebensatzverb despite its lack of accent, citing his disc. (ZDMG 60 [1906]: 737–38) of a handful of cases (not incl. this one) that he so analyzes. It is a tempting solution to a sticky little problem, but when we ignore such a dominant syntactic practice for interpretational convenience, I fear we risk returning to the early emendation-happy days of Western RVic exegesis. And in almost all of Oldenberg’s cases that I’ve checked, another solution is possible; cf., e.g., disc. in the comm. ad I.141.5, IV.17.19, though also cf. VI.17.10. As often in the RV, I think the poets deliberately push us to go beyond an obvious, but grammatically problematic interpr. to another, more complex one that conforms to the rules. In this case, too, a different interpr. is possible, though I have to admit that it is somewhat inelegant: the relative cl. occupies only the first hemistich and is an expression of possession. Pūṣan has greatness, the friendship of the wind (here Vāta, but reflecting the partnership with Vāyu in vs. 1), and this people here – presumably the Ārya or the subset engaged in the ritual, but possibly referring to the speaker himself, as Re suggests (“cet homme que voici [moi-même]”). By this interpr. pāda c is the corresponding main cl., and we can supply “him” as obj. of *ā vamaṣat*, the antecedent of *yásya* in ab.

On the interpr. and metrical shape of *vātāpya-* and their interaction see detailed disc. ad IX.93.5. In origin it appears to be a bahuvr., and in its other three occurrences (I.121.8, IX.93.5, X.105.1) I take it as adjectival. But here in the publ. tr. I take it as nominal: “the friendship with the wind [/sought-after friendship].” So also Re (“l’amitié digne d’être gagnée”), with expressed reluctance similar to mine. It might be an adj. modifying *mahítvām*, as Ge takes it (“Dessen Grösse, die mit dem Vāta befreundet(?) ist”), but the tr. is hard enough to parse as it is.



In d I would change the tr. of *cīketa* to presential “takes cognizance.” On the anomalous accent on the redupl., see Kü (174).

X.26.3: The interpr. of this vs. is hampered by the hapax *psúrah* in c. As Schindler succinctly and despairingly notes (Rt Nouns s.v.), its stem, meaning, and etymology are all unknown. To begin with the first, it can either be an acc. pl. (or abl./gen sg., though this is unlikely syntactically) to a root noun *psúr-* or acc. sg. to an *s*-stem *psúras-*. It hardly matters, but since its root syllable doesn’t really fit the profile of an *s*-stem, I opt (as most do) for the root noun. As for the meaning, its syntax helps narrow that down: assuming it is an acc., it’s the obj. or goal of *pruṣāyati*, which also appears in the next pāda, with an acc. goal *vrajám* ‘enclosure’. Therefore *psúrah* should either be something that gets sprinkled on (as in d), or a liquid that gets sprinkled:  $\sqrt{pruṣ}$  and *pruṣāyá-* admit both types of acc., though the goal is more common (however, consider the rt. noun cmpd. *ghṛta-prúṣ-* 6x ‘ghee-sprinkling’). Re suggests the meaning ‘nourriture(s)’ on not very strong grounds, but the semantic field of object or goal of sprinkling remains fairly wide open. As for etym., a connection has been suggested with *psáras-* ‘delight’, which is itself not entirely clear (see Old, Ge n. 3c, AiG II.2.58) and therefore helps little. But save for an offhand remark by Old (“das Wort vielleicht gewählt wegen Anklang an *pruṣāyati*”), the most obvious explanatory factor has been ignored: the phonological context. I suggest that *psúrah* was not “chosen” because of its “Anklang an *pruṣāyati*”; rather it was *generated* from *pruṣāyati* as a deliberate phonological deformation, a distant metathesis: *pruṣ-* → *psur-*. And this phonological manipulation was inspired by the subject of the vs. and the hymn, namely Pūṣan. That the fairly rare verb *pruṣ(āyá)-* is found twice in this vs., prominently repeated at the end of pādas c and d, is probably owing to its near rhyme with the god’s name: *pruṣ* : *pūṣ*. The metathesized *psur(aḥ)* shows a different phonological relationship with the name, with Pūṣan’s first two consonants adjacent in the initial cluster *ps-* with the vowel (*ū*) between them flipped. In other words, we need not seek an independent etymology for *prúṣ-*; its etymology is contained in its context and is skin-deep.

X.26.4: For ease of parsing I tr. cd as a new cl.: “(you are) the means to ...,” but since *sādhana-*, at least, is masc., they are more properly rendered as acc. predicates to *tvā* in pāda a (as Ge/Re do it). Best to tr. “We would contemplate you, o Pūṣan, / as both the means to realize our thoughts ...” The construction is resumed by the nom.s in vs. 5.

X.26.5: On *prátyardhir yajñānām* see VI.50.5 *abhyardha-yájvan-*, also of Pūṣan, and comm. ad loc.

The gen. *ráthānām* may limit the first member (*aśva-*) of the preceding cmpd. *aśvahayá-*, so, less literally, “driving the horses of chariots / driving the chariot horses,” as in Ge’s “der die Wagenrosse antreibt.” Alternatively – and perhaps better – the independent gen. *ráthānām* may independently limit the 2nd member of the cmpd. *-hayá-* (cf., e.g., VI.45.14 *hinuhi rátham*), and be functionally parallel to the 1st cmpd member *aśva-*, another way of avoiding a three-member cmpd. I would now propose an alternative tr. “driver of horses and chariots,” though this unfortunately does not capture the syntactic mismatch. On Pūṣan as charioteer, see VI.55.1, 2 and, if I’m right (see comm. ad loc.), VI.56.2–3.

Both of these phrases show the RVic avoidance of over-complex compounds, with what would in later times be the 1<sup>st</sup> member instead a genitive in a syntagm. In the first, even the presence of the preverb *práti* seems to have interfered with cmpding, as in the root-noun cmpds

with direct object first members. See comm. ad I.124.7, as well as the immed. following remarks on pāda d.

The cmpd *yāvayat-sakhá-* differs by accent and therefore by sense from the fairly common adjectival X-*ayát*-Y type with 2nd member object—particularly relevant exx. here being, on the one hand, *yāvayád-dveṣas-* (2x) ‘keeping away hatred’ and, on the other, *drāvayát-sakha-* ‘setting its comrades to running’ (X.39.10) and *mandayát-sakha-* ‘exhilarating its companion’ (I.4.7). As a karmadhāraya, our form should mean ‘the warding-off companion, the companion who wards [smtg] off’, and the gen. *víprasya* expresses who he is companion to, hence literally “the warding-off companion of the inspired poet” (Ge “der abwehrende Freund des Beredsamen”). But the other cmpd with this caus. stem as first member, namely *yāvayád-dveṣas-*, probably gives the hint as to what Pūṣan wards off: “hatred” (*dvēṣas-*). On Pūṣan’s partnership with mortals see I.138.2, 3, 4, VI.48.18, 57.1.

X.26.6: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. is extremely obscure, beginning with the hapax *ādhīṣamānā-* that opens it. My current interpr. differs considerably from the publ. tr. and attempts to find a coherent theme in the four disparate pādas.

Before tackling the sense of this 1st hemistich, it will be useful to pay attention to its structure. The first hemistich of the next vs., 7ab, consists of two nom.+gen. phrases, with the first ending GEN *pátih#* and the 2nd GEN *sákhā#*; the last pāda of the preceding vs., 5d, ends GEN ...-*sakháh*. On the basis of this parallelism I supply *sákhā* as the head noun of pāda b.

As for *ādhīṣamānāyāh*, its morphological analysis is, at least in part, quite clear: it’s the fem. gen. sg. of a them. middle participle, implying a verb \**ādhīṣate* (or *-ta*), which, however, is not attested elsewhere. It is also generally (and at least superficially plausibly) assigned to the root  $\sqrt{dhī}$  ‘think’ with preverb *ā*. Wh (Rts) tentatively classifies it as a desid. to  $\sqrt{dhī}$ , but in the Gr (§897) as a participle to “an a-form of an s-aor. of  $\sqrt{dhī}$ ”; the latter is also the analysis of Macd (VG §527) and of Gr (“zu Aor. *dhīsa-*,” which does not exist). See also Scar (274), who tr. “sich sehnd” but does not venture a morphological analysis beyond associating it with the lexeme *ā*  $\sqrt{dhī}$ . Re invokes the rt noun cmpd *ādhī-* ‘care, worry’ (see Scar 274–75) and tr. (in good Re baroque fashion) “qui songe-avec-nostalgie.” I can’t get any further than this, at least by conventional means.

But in a perhaps pardonable indulgence of fancy, perhaps also in keeping with the imaginative phraseology of the hymn, I can confect an alternative. The desiderative stems to  $\sqrt{dhā}$  ‘place (etc. etc.)’ are *dīdhiṣa-* and *dhīṣa-*, the former confined to the RV (except for adj. deriv.), the latter late RV+. I suggest that our *dhīṣa-* is a third, if nonce, desid. to  $\sqrt{dhā}$ , perhaps built on the model of  $\sqrt{āp}$ : *īpsa-* (AV+) ::  $\sqrt{dhā}$ :  $\rightarrow$  *dhīṣa-*, which is a good match both phonologically (roots with *ā*) and semantically (both [sometimes] meaning ‘acquire’). In particular, the lexeme *ā*  $\sqrt{dhā}$  in the middle can mean ‘acquire’, hence here ‘desiring to acquire’. There’s a very telling specialization of the desid. of  $\sqrt{dhā}$ , found in the *u*-adj. participial substitute *dīdhiṣú-* to the first desid. stem listed above. Besides the literal ‘desiring to acquire’ sense, it can be specialized in a marriage context to mean ‘desiring to acquire (a wife)’ = ‘suitor, wooer’. This is famously found in the funeral hymn X.18.8, where the man ready to remarry the widow is so designated. It is also used of our own dedicand, Pūṣan, in the striking (and somewhat mysterious) statement VI.55.5 *mātúr dīdhiṣúm abravam* “The wooer of his mother [=Pūṣan] I have spoken to.” Despite Old’s dismissal of the relevance of that passage: “... hilf nicht weiter,” I think it brings us closer to a solution. Recall that at least once Sūryā, daughter of the Sun, has Pūṣan given to her, presumably in marriage: VI.58.4 *yám devāso ádaduḥ sūryāyai*,

*kāmena kṛtām* “whom [=Pūṣan] the gods gave to Sūryā, (him) prompted by desire.” Note the astonishing reversal of the usual marriage procedure: ordinarily the maiden is given to her new husband (the institution known as *kanyādāna*- in later Skt. legal texts), but here the *husband* is given to the *wife*. This is presumably because of Sūryā’s participation in Self-choice marriage. She is the protagonist of a widespread if fragmentary myth of Svayaṃvara marriage in the RV; see esp. my 2001 “The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara? Formulaic Evidence” (Fs. Asko Parpola).” Putting all this together, I suggest that in our passage Pūṣan is presented as the husband (*pātiḥ*) of Sūryā, as in VI.58.4, and she is described as “... her seeking to acquire [a husband],” that is, as a female wooer, complementary to the masc. *didhiṣū*- just discussed, in allusion to her active role in the Svayaṃvara. I would now change the tr. of the first pāda of this vs. to “the husband of her who wooed (him).”

So much for the first pāda of this maddening vs. Let us move to the second. Here the issue is the meaning and reference(s) of the them. nominal *śucā*-, found only here in Vedic. Though Gr glosses the stem as ‘rein, hell’, both Ge and Re interpr. the two forms in light of the well-known later use of forms of the root  $\sqrt{\text{śuc}}$  in the semantic realm of pain or grief: Ge: “(der Tröster [consoler]) der Trauernden und des Trauernden (?),” with the explanation (n. 6ab) that Pūṣan is the benefactor of widow and widower; Re: “Epoux ... de celle qui souffre et (ami) de celui qui souffre.” But this sense is unknown to the RV (except possibly in I.125.7, q.v.), as Re admits, further conceding “La traduction proposée est donc fort douteuse.” The role of consoler of the emotionally bereft also doesn’t seem to me to lie in Pūṣan’s ambit as presented elsewhere in the RV. We should therefore try to interpr. *śucāyās ca śucāsya ca* in terms of the RVic meanings of  $\sqrt{\text{śuc}}$ , namely ‘blaze, gleam, etc.’, and with regard to Pūṣan’s usual activities and associations.

In order to do this, first recall that structural considerations lead me to supply *sākhā* in pāda b (see above): Pūṣan is then the comrade / companion of the male and female here referred to. Let us also remember Pūṣan’s standing epithet *āghṛṇi*- ‘glowing, fiery’, on which see comm. ad VI.53.3, putting him in the realm of the bright and blazing. Pūṣan’s marriage to Sūryā obviously associates him with the sun, and in VI.58.3 he has “golden ships” (*nāvah ... hiranyāyīḥ*) that wander in the midspace and “with which you travel on a mission of the Sun” (*tābhīr yāsi dūtyāṃ sūryasya*). (The next vs. concerns his marriage to Sūryā.) But perhaps most telling is the 1st vs. of that hymn, VI.58.1, which ascribes possession of the two day-halves (*āhanī*) to Pūṣan, “one of which is gleaming, the other belongs to the sacrifice” (*śukrām te anyād yajatām te anyād*). Although this passage is difficult and its meaning disputed (see comm. ad loc.), it is clear that Pūṣan is associated with something *śukrā*- (to the same root as our problematic words), with the daily round of time, and with the sacrifice. I therefore think that the *śucā*- forms here should be interpr. in that context. For the fem. *śucāyāḥ* I suggest that the most likely referent is Dawn, who is regularly described by forms of  $\sqrt{\text{śuc}}$  elsewhere: e.g., *śukrā*- I.123.9, IV.51.9; *śucī*- I.134.4, IV.51.2, 9, and various cmpds like *śukrā-vāsas*-. As for the masc. *śucāsya*-, although Pūṣan’s association with the sun (see above) might suggest Sūrya as the referent, the overwhelming connection between both verbal and nominal forms of  $\sqrt{\text{śuc}}$  and Agni is, in my opinion, the deciding factor—a mere glance at the various stems in Gr, with his identifications of the referents, should suffice to show this. Our pāda b then depicts Pūṣan in association with two glowing, blazing entities connected to the early morning sacrifice: Dawn and Agni, the ritual fire. Or such is my more sober assessment of the meaning and reference of pāda b.

However, I will suggest an alternative, which is far less grounded but which may allow us to interpr. the vs. as a unity. As will be set out immed. below, I now wonder if the garments in pāda c and d are the wedding garments of Sūryā the bride in pāda a. In the wedding hymn (X.85), where Pūṣan figures in several roles, a number of vss. are devoted to the wedding journey of Sūryā, mustering a variety of cosmic and ritual elements to correspond to parts of the vehicle and its equipage. Twice, derivatives of √*śuc* are found in the dual in this role: X.85.10 *śukrāv anaḍvāhāv āstām, yād āyāt sūryā gṛhām* “The two gleaming/blazing ones were the two draft-oxen when Sūryā went to her home” and X.85.12 *śucī te cakre yātyāḥ* “The two gleaming/blazing ones were your two wheels as you [=Sūryā] drove.” Who these two are and whether they are the same pair in both vss. is unclear; they owe their genders (masc. and neut. respectively) to the gender of the entities they’re identified with (m. ox and n. wheel respectively). I now suggest that in our passage the phrase *śucāyās ca śucāsya ca* refer to the same paired entities that we meet in the wedding hymn. As for their identities, they could still be Dawn and Agni, or Heaven and Earth, or some other gendered pair. The point is that they fill the role of attendants on Sūryā’s wedding procession, a procession that Pūṣan leads (X.85.26).

Penetrating the sense of the second hemistich is even more challenging than the first, if that is possible. Old, Ge, and Re have essentially nothing to say about it, and I’m afraid I have nothing to add, at least in my levelheaded mode. I don’t know why garments suddenly intrude here, both being woven (c *vāsovāyāḥ*) and being washed (d: *ā vāsāmsi mārṃjat*). Are the sheep in the gen. pl. in c the beneficiaries / recipients of the garments, as Ge and Re seem to think (e.g., “tissant le vêtement pour les brebis”) or, as I think, the material (wool) from which the garments are made. Among other things, why would sheep be wearing clothes? or, rather, what flights of metaphor are required to produce the image of “sheep” wearing “clothes”? Given that elsewhere in the hymn a gen. can depend on a first cmpd member (5b *aśvahayó ráthānām*; see above), limiting *vāso-* by *āvīnām* here seems perfectly possible, hence my “... garments of sheeps’ (wool).” But if the garments aren’t for the sheep, who are they for (if anyone/-thing)? Here is where my level head loses its equilibrium again. If, as I’ve argued for pāda a (fairly convincingly) and for b (rather less so), this vs. concerns the marriage of Sūryā, then the *vāsas-* can be her wedding garments. Her auspicious *vāsas-* comes up early in the wedding hymn: X.85.6 *sūryāyā bhadrām íd vāso, gāthayaiti páriṣṛtam* “Sūryā’s auspicious garment goes adorned with a song.” I suggest that in our pāda c Pūṣan is the weaver of this lovely bridal dress (*vāsovāyāḥ*). Much later in the wedding hymn there a few stark vss. (28–30) again devoted to the wedding garment, now stained with blood from the deflowering of the bride. This is both a cause for rejoicing and a menacing transformation, and it needs to be purified and set right. I suggest that this is what happens in our pāda d, where Pūṣan keeps rubbing the garments to clean them. In X.85.35 the purification is expressed by a different verb, *śudh* (and covers not only the garment but also the wedding feast with its slaughtered cow; see comm. ad loc.): *sūryāyāḥ paśya rūpāṇi, tāni brahmā tú śundhati* “Behold the forms of Sūryā! But the brahman makes them clean.” But I suggest the same purification is expressed here in d by *ā mārṃjat*.

This is the only occurrence of the preverb *ā* with the very well-attested root √*mṛj*, but this is hardly the worst of our problems.

X.26.7: As Ge (n. 7c) points out, the shaking-the-beard motif is found in the same poet’s hymn X.23.1, 4 of Indra, whom it better befits. Perhaps the repeated *ināḥ* (a, b) evoked the Indra trope.

X.26.9: Pāda b is identical to 1d, a not very inspired form of ring composition.

## X.27–29

These three hymns are attributed to Vasukra Aindra and contain some of the most challenging poetry in the RV. All three hymns are dedicated to Indra.

### X.27 Indra

On the structure and the challenges of this hymn, see publ. intro. See also Ge's extensive intro. In the publ. intro. (2nd para. p. 1413) the statement "Here verse 10 contrasts the suitor of a blind girl ..." should be corrected to "verse 11."

X.27.1–2: On the functional equivalence of subjunctive and 1st sg. injunctive in these two passages (esp. *pacāni ... ní śiñcam*), see KH 247, 249.

X.27.1: The hymn begins with a form of  $\sqrt{as}$  (subj. *ásat*), and  $\sqrt{as}$  is rather overrepresented in the early parts of the hymn: *asmí* in c, *satya-* in d, plus *ásam*, *āsan*, *satáh*, and *sántam* in 4. In particular, *ahám asmí* in c is a strong, basically unnecessary statement (i.e., either *ahám* or *asmí* would have done), so it may be asserting the epiphany of Indra, or in addition the real existence of Indra (which, as we know, can be doubted), or be a strong form of *aham-kāra*.

The lexeme *abhí√vij* is found only here (in the noun *abhivegá-*) and in the med. aor. *abhí vikta* in I.162.15, a verse often repeated in the mantras of the Aśvamedha. The root  $\sqrt{vij}$  expresses various forms of physical agitation; I.162.15 expresses the hope that a blazing hot cauldron not *abhí vikta*. I tr. 'topple over' there, but I am now more sympathetic to Ge's 'boil over'. Here the noun *abhivegá-* seems to express a tremendous burst of physical and mental energy on Indra's part, for which Ge's "Bestreben" seems a too pallid rendering—hence my figurative "boil over" in quotes (as in the Engl. phrase "boil over with rage"). Its expression is oddly oblique, however, with Indra relegated to an enclitic *me*, in what is literally "There will be boiling over of me," which I have adjusted to a more direct phrasing. I don't know why Indra's agency is displaced.

The lexeme *prá√han* barely exists in the RV; besides this agent noun it is found only in the negated *áprahan-* (VI.44.4) and *praghnánt* (IX.69.2), as well as *abhipraghnánti* (VI.46.10). *prá* is fairly common with verbs of violence; see *prá ... kṣiñām* in 4d.

X.27.2: In this vs. the singer promises Indra a lavish sacrifice in the 2nd hemistich, to follow his great victory in the first. But curiously, though we expect the great victory to be achieved by the help of Indra, there is no mention of Indra's involvement; the battle is presented as the act of the singer alone.

The opening verbal complex should be read *yád+ṙ+íd* rather than *yádṙ+íd*. Note that 3c begins *yadā* and 4a with *yád*.

The supposed root  $\sqrt{śuj}$  appears only here and in nearby X.34.6, both times in the pāda-final phrase *tanvā śūśujāna-*. Given its isolation, it seems best to consider it a nonce confection, quite possibly a deformation of *śūsuvāna-* 'puffing (oneself) up' to  $\sqrt{śvā}/\sqrt{sū}$  'swell' (so Insler, p. c.). A form of this part. is found in the next hymn, also by Vasukra, in the same metrical position in X.28.9 (and the other two nom. sg.s of this part. are also pāda-final: IV.27.2, VII.20.2). Accounting for the *-j* is difficult; perhaps there's some contribution from *tūtujāna-* ( $\sqrt{tuj}$  'thrust'), whose part. is reasonably well attested, but there is no clear textual connection between them. As for the phrase, there is a template of pāda-final *tanvā* MED. INTENS./PF PART, all with heavy

redupl., which could have contributed to its creation; cf. *tanvā śāsādāna-* I.123.10, 124.6, *tanvā jārbhurāṇa* II.10.5, *tanvā vāvṛdhānā* X.54.2. Also, in opposite order, #*śuśruṣamāṇas tanvā* IV.38.7=VII.19.2.

X.27.3: This vs. seems to be the Vedic version of “there are no atheists in foxholes.”

As Old and Ge both point out, pāda c is very similar to IV.24.8a *yadā samaryām vyāced řghāvā* “When the ballsy one [=Indra] surveyed the clash,” but with masc. nom. *řghāvā* rather than neut. acc. *řghāvat*. Indeed both scholars suggest emending the occurrence in IV.24.8 to *řghāvat* to match this one (see comm. ad loc., where I reject the emendation). I think rather that this is a nice ex. of the conscious manipulation of formulaic language.

There is mismatch between the singulars of abc and the plural of d, but I think this simply reflects a universal tendency to neutralize number in phrases with indefinite reference, of the English type “anyone ... they.”

X.27.4: As noted ad vs. 1, this vs. is heavily laden with forms of  $\sqrt{as}$ : 1st sg. impf. *āsam* (a), gen. sg. part. *satāḥ* (by my interpr.; see below) and 3rd pl. impf. *āsan* (b), acc. sg. part. (*ā*) *sántam* (c). This emphasis on  $\sqrt{as}$  may indirectly reflect the common anxiety about the actual existence of Indra and about the likelihood of his showing up at our sacrifice (epiphany). All but *satāḥ* have heavy first syllables in *ā* (if we count the preverb in c); I suggest that this is meant to contrast with *ābhúm* ‘nullity’ in c (also 1d), built to the other verb of existence ( $\sqrt{bhū}$ ), with its anomalously lengthened privative.

As in vss. 1 and 3, in this speech of Indra’s half the vs. describes people’s proper positive reactions to him (ab), while the other (cd) depicts the punishments he inflicts in the reverse situation—though each half is somewhat complicated.

In the first hemistich the question is the relationship between the peoples in pāda a and those in b. In pāda a Indra talks about his sojourn in foreign parts among unknown peoples; in b some people are said to have been bounteous to Indra under these circumstances. Are the generous folk in b the same as the unknown ones in a, or different? Ge suggests that they are different; it is only when Indra is away (“wenn er fern sei”) that people (by implication us) recognize his value and sacrifice to him (“seien die Menschen mit Opfer freigebig”) – the “absence makes the heart grow fonder” argument. This seems perfectly possible – or would be, save for the participle *satāḥ*, at least acdg. to my analysis. Ge obviously takes it as the adverb *satāḥ*, found as the first member of the hapax cmpds *sató-mahant-* (‘entirely great’ VIII.30.1) and *sató-vīra-* (‘entirely heroic’ VI.75.9) and supposedly sometimes independently; here he renders it as “gleich” (sim. Klein, DGRV II.202 “equally”). However, with Gr and Lub I take it as a gen. sg. of the pres. part. and in general doubt the existence of an independent adverb *satāḥ*; see comm. ad VII.104.21, IX.21.7. Here, by my analysis, it modifies *me* and means ‘really present’, as often; that is, Indra was recognized by the people in the distant communities as really being there, and *they* were generous to him, in comparison with the folks around here – so the communities in pāda a and the subjects of *āsan* in b are the same. For the gen. with *maghāvan-* see nearby X.33.8 *maghāvā máma*. It is rather a nice twist that *maghāvan-*, a standing epithet of Indra, is here used of people who play the role of *maghāvan-* towards Indra.

It should be noted that Old suggests an entirely different interpr. of b, though taking *satāḥ* as Ge does: “Sagt Indra: damals waren alle “*maghāvan*” mir gleich, d.h. sie waren mir alle nichts wert, und ich vernichtete sie alle (cd)?” This requires us to assume that Indra would put

“bounteous” in scare quotes and mean the reverse, which type of antiphrastic irony seems foreign to Indra’s straightforward personality.

If I am correct about who the liberal benefactors are in b, Indra is comparing us, the people here, unfavorably with unnamed and unknown strangers who know Indra’s true worth. I think that this is conveyed in part by the preverb *ā* next to *sántam* in c, referring to the unsatisfactory *ābhú-* who is here. The pres. part. *sántam* is doing several jobs in this pāda by my interpr.: as just noted, when combined with *ā* locates the *ābhú-* as “being here” (not in distant parts), but like many forms of *sánt-* (though not *satáh* in b) it is also concessive and in that function is construed with *kṣéme* ‘at peace’ (“although being at peace”). This is in some sense a pregnant expression: the other 4 occurrences of loc. *kṣéme* are found in the phrase *kṣéme (...)* *yóge* “at peace and at war” (V.37.5, VII.54.3, 86.8, X.89.10; *yóge* lit. ‘at the hitching up [for war]’). The point here is that Indra ambushes the *ābhú-* not only when he is at war, as we’d expect, but even when he is not.

The publ. tr. renders *vét* as ‘truly’ because I was at the time persuaded by Klein’s (DGRV II.201–2) view that *vā* here is the equivalent of *vaí* (see *vā u*) in the next vs., 5a. I am now less persuaded. As Klein points out (see also Ge n. 4c), the pāda begins like V.34.5 *jināti véd amuyā hánti vā dhúniḥ*, with a real *vā ... vā* construction, and Klein does suggest that ours is “partially borrowed” from there. I now think a “partial borrowing” of a *vā* passage precludes a *vaí* interpr., and I also suggest that the contrast between the happy outcome of ab and the dire fate meted out in cd is worth an “or” or its equivalent – here “but.” I would therefore now omit “truly” in the tr.

Note the phonological echo of the two verbs *jināmi ... kṣiṇām*.

The contents of pāda d are unclear, though the grammar and lexicon are unproblematic. Ge implies that the victim in d is the same as the one in c, but this ignores the potential mythological resonances the phrasing of d evokes. The only other occurrence of the striking gerund *pādagṛhya* in the RV is in IV.18.12, which also contains the same main verb: *yát prākṣināḥ pitáram pādagṛhya* “... when you destroyed your father, having grasped him by the foot.” IV.18 is the famous account of Indra’s fraught birth, ending with his sudden killing of his unnamed father. It is hard to believe that our poet did not have this passage (or a similar account) in mind. The location “on the mountain” (*párvate*) also connects with another, more famous piece of Indra mythology, the killing of Vṛtra, who was confining the waters inside the mountain; cf. I.32.2 *áhann áhim párvate śísriyāṇám* “He smashed the serpent resting on the mountain.” Although I am not claiming here that pāda d refers to the slaying of Vṛtra (who, after all, didn’t have a foot to be grasped: cf. I.32.7 *apād ahastáh ...* “footless, handless”) or of Indra’s father, I do think that Indra is reaching into his own lore to suggest, formulaically, what happens to those he targets.

X.27.5: Both *vṛjána-* and *párvata-* return from the previous vs., but in somewhat different usage. I do not agree with Ge (/Sāy.) that *vṛjána-* here refers to battle. Rather, Indra is asserting that he is not geographically or socially limited: he will go where he wants to (*yád ahám manasyé*), and one single community can’t own him no matter how good their sacrifices are (see 4ab).

The bahuvr. *kṛdhu-kárṇa-* ‘of stunted ear’ is found only here in the RV, but twice as fem. *kṛdhu-karṇī-* in the AV (XI.9.7, 10.7). On the accent see AiG II.1.297, 300. It is tempting to compare the mysterious Old Avestan hapax *kərədušā* (Y 29.3 in the famous Lament of the Soul of the Cow), which has received almost as many interpretations as there have been interpreters (which I will not canvass here). That (the first part of) the word may be the equivalent of Vedic *kṛdhú-* was suggested by Narten (*Die Aməša Spəntas* 88 n. 8) and adopted by Kellens-Pirart

(though Narten and K-P differ on the morphological analysis); Insler has a different explanation of *kārād-* but suggests that *-uṣ-* is the (daevic) word for ‘ear’, which is well attested in YA (though since the stem is *uṣ-*, it would have to be a byform). As far as I know, it was Martin West who, putting these two interpr. together, suggested that it is actually a compound of *kārādu-* + *uṣ-* ‘small-eared’ (which he reconfigures into an *n*-stem with the suffix *-an-*) [acdg. to my notes this is found in his “The Querulous Cow” in *Iran* 45 (2007), but I don’t currently have access to that article]. I find the compound interpr. appealing – that it is not represented as a compd in the text is not surprising, since it would have lost its transparency quite early – though I don’t think the *n*-stem addition is necessary: it can be simply an instr. sg. to the root noun byform “with stunted ear.”

As for the dust stirring in d, both Old and Ge appositely adduce I.63.1, where just after Indra was born the turbulence he created made everything, even the mountains (*girāyaś cid*), stir in fear like dust-motes (*bhijā ... kirānā naijan*). Here Indra boasts first that his roar will strike fear even in the nearly deaf, and then that his actions will make everything as unstable as dust-motes.

X.27.6: The person changes from 1st to 3rd but the boasting about Indra’s ability to punish non-sacrificers (as in 1cd) continues, at least by my interpr. The speaker may be Indra himself, affecting the 3rd ps., or the singer depicting Indra. The time remains the here-and-now, as indicated by *nv ātra* of pāda a and *ū nū* of d. The meaning and construction of the vs. are much disputed, beginning with the first word, the subjunctive *dārśan*, so read by the Pp (hence a 3rd pl.), a reading followed by Ge, Klein (DGRV II.185), and Kü (290), while Gr takes it as 3rd sg. *dārśat* out of sandhi, as does Scar (89, 314) with an indef. subj. (“man”) and as do I, though with Indra as implicit subj. (Old hesitates.)

The next question is the relationship between the various acc. pl. phrases in ab, *śṛtapāṃ anindrān bāhukṣādaḥ śārave pātyamānān*, and the relationship of those to the ... *vā yé* clause of c. In my opinion *śṛtapāṃ anindrān bāhukṣādaḥ* go together, despite the pāda break after *anindrān*, so that *anindrān* modifies both the other acc. pls. The phrase describes people who eat and drink without offering a portion of the comestibles to Indra; all the other cited interpr. take *anindrān* only with *śṛtapān*, which leaves *bāhukṣādaḥ* hard to account for.

The next two words, *śārave pātyamānān*, clearly belong together because the same expression is found also in VI.27.6. The question is what does it mean, and in particular what does the participle mean and what root does it belong to? The standard view (Ge, Klein, Scar) is that it belongs to  $\sqrt{pat}$  ‘fly’, though in the meaning ‘fall’ (e.g., Ge “die ... meinem Geschoss verfallen sind”), but there are two problems with this: 1) that root does not have a stem *pātya-*, which instead is the well-attested semi-denom. pres. stem to *pāti-* ‘lord’; 2) in the RV  $\sqrt{pat}$  ‘fly’ has not yet developed the ‘fall’ sense, which is still limited to  $\sqrt{pad}$ . So the form must belong to *pātyate* ‘is lord’, where Gr puts it. Kü clearly accepts this analysis and tr. the phrase “die dem Geschoss gehören,” but this must rest on a passive interpr. of the stem ‘be ‘belorded’ to, belong to’, which is not otherwise found. An indirect clue to its sense is provided by the preceding context when compared to a parallel passage: VII.18.16 contains *śṛtapām anindrām* (as in our pāda a), followed by *śārdhantam* ‘vaunting himself’—so the man who defiantly consumes without offering to Indra is also boastful (and he is duly defeated in that vs.). I think *śārave pātyamāna-* expresses something similar to *śārdhant-*: the men “act (like) the lord, play the lord” – that is, they pretend to power—but they do so “for an arrow,” which is, perhaps, a paltry weapon to boast about.



As for the rel. cl. in c, I consider it part of an “X and which Y” construction, except, of course, that it is “X *or* which Y” and, because of the fronting of *ghīṣum*, the *vā* precedes the rel. prn. In any case, the clause describes yet another set of unsatisfactory people engaged in insulting behavior. With Ge (n. 6c) and Kü, I take the “ardent comrade” to be Indra.

All of these groups are to be run down by the wheel rims in d, with the pf. opt. *vavṛtyuḥ*. As I demonstrated at length (“Where Are All the Optatives? Modal Patterns in Vedic,” Kyoto conf. 2007, publ. 2009), the pf. optative does not have a specifically “perfect” nuance. And this passage, with its *nú*, is a good demonstration of this, since a perfect-type interpr. “should *have* now rolled over them” doesn’t work very well.

X.27.7: The singer now addresses Indra directly, with the first pāda containing three 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. verbs (*ābhūḥ*, *aúkṣīḥ*, *ānaṭ*), but the glorification of Indra and the celebration of his destruction of his enemies continues.

The 2nd sg. root aor. *ābhūḥ* plays off *ābhúm* ‘nullity’ in 1d and 4c; *ābhūr u* is also picked up by mirror-image *u āyur* later in the pāda. Likewise, the polarized verbs in pāda b #*dárśan nú ... nú darṣat*# echo 6a *dárśan nú* to a distinct root. (Note that only the final form makes it clear that the verbs are 3rd sgs. not pls.) The pāda is completely symmetrical: *dárśan nú pūrvo áparo nú darṣat*.

The phonetic and grammatical figures and resonances with forms in earlier vss. may mark this vs. as a finale; the topic changes in the next vs. by my interpr. (see publ. intro.).

As is universally pointed out (Old, Ge n. 7b, KH 164 with n. 112, Kü [by implication] 502, 230), pāda b is reminiscent of VI.27.4–5, esp. 5cd *vṛcīvato yád dhariyūpiyāyām, hán pūrve árdhe bhīyásāparo dárt* “when he [=Indra] smashed the Vṛcīvants in the front division, and the rear division shattered from fear,” which anchors *pūrva*- and *ápara*- in our passage as spatial, not temporal, designations. (Note that the next vs. [6] in VI.27 contains the other occurrence of *śárove pátyamāna*- [found in our vs. 6], where it is the doomed Vṛcīvants who “play the lord for an arrow”; the two passages obviously have a close connection.)

The du. *paváste*, found also in AVŚ IV.7.6 (=AVP II.1.5), in context clearly means something like cover (Gr Zeltdecke, EWA s.v. Decke, Hülle, Wh AV covers; see Ge’s n. 7c). EWA compares OP *pavastā*- ‘the thin clay envelope used to protect unbacked clay tablets’, as well as MP and NP *pōst* ‘Haut, Fell’. Obviously if the OP comparison is correct, the OP form had to have undergone semantic development after the introduction of writing (which is certainly possible). I wonder, though, if an etymon closer to home might be more likely—such as a lexeme *pra* √ *vas*, to √ *vas* ‘clothe’, which has been through MIA sound laws (\**pavattha*) and then incompletely re-Sanskritized. Unfortunately √ *vas* is not found with *prá* elsewhere in Sanskrit or, as far as I can tell, in MIA, but the combination would not be hard to create, with the sense of stretching fabric “forth” over something.

I assume that Indra is the subj. of d, though the verb is not 2nd ps.

X.27.8–10: On the theme of these vss., see publ. intro.

X.27.8: Several different scenarios provide possible models for interpr. this vs.; see the various ones sketched by Old, as well as the one presented in detail by Thieme (Fremd. 12–14). (Ge makes no real attempt at interpr.) Mine differs from all of these and turns on a potentially controversial interpr. of *sahágopāḥ* in b. As I say in the publ. intro., the cows (here standing, in my view, for the erstwhile followers of Indra) are grazing in the pasture of the stranger (pāda a),

“roaming with their cowherd” (b *sahágopās cárantīh*). This tr. might better be “with their cowherds”: I think the point is that the cows have found other leaders to follow, leaders summed up in the word *arí-* ‘stranger’. The appeal – or appeals – of these alternative leaders are found in pāda c, where (in my view) their inviting messages come at the cows from all sides, trying to attract the cows to a new herd. (Thieme thinks these are the cries of the owner of the grain of pāda a, trying to shoo away the trespassing cows; Ge, who construes *aryáh* in pāda a with the cows, not the grain, probably thinks the *arí-* is calling them back, but he doesn’t discuss.) In d their *real* own lord (*svápati-*), that is, Indra, is, in my opinion, losing patience with his wayward herd; the pāda is a veiled threat: if the cows continue to follow others and “eat their grain,” Indra will stop finding pleasure in them and treat them as he has the other apostates and non-sacrificers who figured earlier in the hymn (1cd, 6, 7b).

On the *svá-* as referring to the cows, not the lord, in the cmpd *svápati-* see disc. ad X.44.1.

X.27.9: No doubt the speech of Indra, his patience exhausted. (Old suggests that it is all “zornige Ironie.”) He announces his plans (ab) to “round up” (*sám ... váyam*) the straggling herds in one broad pasture, all those who had been eating the grass and grain of (other) people. The phrase *yavasādo jánānām ... yavādah* responds thematically to 8a *yávam ... aryó akṣan*, and in my opinion the *jána-* here are the equivalent of the *arí-* in 8a. Ge (n. 9a) suggests that the grass-eaters are livestock and the grain-eaters are men, corresponding to the four-footed and two-footed in 10b, but admits that it’s the cattle that eat grain in 8a.

Note the mirror-image figure *váyam yava-*.

The 1st sg. *váyam* in the subord. clause corresponds to subjunctives in the main cl. (*ichāt ... yunajat*). Although it ought technically to be an injunctive, it seems to belong to a small class of 1st sgs. ending in *-am* that function as subjunctives (see KH, Injunk. 247–48; Lub also identifies it as a subj.). See also the clear 3rd sg. subj. *váyat* to the same stem in the next hymn, X.28.9.

It is difficult to see how cd fits with the rest of the vs. (and the sequence in general). Ge (n. 9cd) sees it in terms of a division into the defeated and the victorious in war: in the former case, a yoked horse, having lost its charioteer in the battle, seeks to be released from its yoke, while the victorious forces have their pick of the captured horses of the other side, which they can then yoke for their own use. This seems too elaborate and fanciful a scenario, esp. since (in my view) there’s no hint of a battle scene in these vss. until 10cd. This scenario is favored, however, by an interpr. of the pf. part. *vavanvān* in d as ‘victor’, belonging to  $\sqrt{van}$  ‘win’ (so Gr, Ge, Klein DGRV II.88, Tichy 1995: 10, Kü 450), but I take it rather to  $\sqrt{vaní}$  ‘desire, love’. This root forms a pf., mostly with long redupl. (*vāvān-*), but to sequester the forms with short redupl. (as here) and assign them all to  $\sqrt{van}$  ‘win’, as Kü does (447–51), seems unjustified, since variation in the quantity of the redupl. vowel is found in unified stems (type *vāvṛdh-* / *vavárdh-*, etc.). I interpr. it as a participle used absolutely (“the one who desires to”). In this sense it nicely balances *ichāt* in c: the subject of each clause desires the opposite of his current state. But what is this all about? I tentatively suggest that the big round-up of the scattered and confused animals that Indra performs in ab is physically and mentally chaotic. The herd animals (standing, as I suggested above, for Indra’s straying erstwhile followers) want what they don’t have: those who have followed a false doctrine now wish to be released from it; those who became detached from all doctrine need to be brought back (“yoked”) to proper belief.

X.27.10: As noted in the intro., the elaborate phraseology of pāda a, *átréd u me mamsase satyám uktám* “And just then you will consider this truly spoken by me,” sounds like a truth formulation – or perhaps Indra is simply saying, “now you’ll finally believe me!” But I am again not entirely sure what the content, presumably found in pāda b, is telling us and why it should be esp. important. So far the talk has only been of cows, though as I’ve argued “cows” standing for humans. But I do not see what Indra’s vow to bring together, to mingle, humans and animals is about.

We should first consider the lexeme *sám √srj*. Pace Klein (DGRV I.171) it certainly doesn’t mean ‘release’, and also pace Ge I doubt if it here means “durcheinander bringen” (muddle, confuse). The lexeme is fairly common, and generally means ‘bring smtg [ACC] together with smtg [INSTR]’: wife with husband (X.85.22), me with splendour, offspring, etc. (I.23.23, 24), a mother cow with her calf (I.110.8), etc. The process is orderly and seems designed to match entities that belong together. The only places where there is a nuance of muddle and confusion is in the nominals *sámśraṣṭar-* and *sámśraṣṭa-jít-*, both found in the same vs., X.103.3, where Indra sends forces pell-mell into battle and then conquers them. It is possible here that we have traces of both senses, the orderly matching and the chaotic collision. On the one hand, the last hemistich of the previous vs. (9cd) depicts a set of complementary matches: the yoked animal finds its unyoker; the man who wishes to find an unyoked animal to yoke. In this way Indra brings together (*sám √srj*) in orderly fashion the human agents and the animal objects to effect the desired pairing. The statement may also be a more general claim about Indra’s ability to mete out just deserts, as it were, to match reward / punishment to behavior – his favorable treatment of people who sacrifice to him and his vengeance on those who don’t.

And there may be a faint nod to the other, sending-into-battle sense of *sám √srj*, since the 2nd hemistich of the vs. threatens a chaotic battle scene with bad matches. The man who “does battle with women (as weapons/comrades)” (*strībhīh ... pṛtanyāt*), and against a bull (*vīṣaṇam*) at that, is not producing appropriate pairings; he is disastrously over-matched and he will be defeated and his possessions distributed to those on the winning side. Women as weapons are found in V.30.9 (and less clearly in I.104.3); whether in either passage the women are actual women or “girly men” (or something else entirely, quite possibly rivers in V.30.9 and I.104.3), the outcome is clear. The “women” are inappropriate in a battle context, and anyone who employs them will fail. V.30.9 is very clear: *strīyo hí dāsá āyudhāni cakré, kím mā karann abalā asya sēnāh* “Because the Dāsa made women his weapons, what can they do to me? His armies lack strength.”

X.27.11–12: The last two vss. of the first half of the hymn change topic once again, to a stark contrast between an improperly, indeed fraudulently, arranged marriage, and one where the marital arrangements conform to social and legal norms and lead to a happy outcome. I have discussed these vss. at some length in my 1996 “Vedic *mení*, Avestan *maēni*, and the Power of Thwarted Exchange,” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 20 [Fs. P. Thieme]: 187–203, esp. 197–200; for vs. 12 see also my 2001 article on the RVic svayaṃvara cited below.

X.27.11: As I discuss in the first art. cited just above, I think this vs. describes a legal situation treated in some detail in the later dharma texts (see, e.g., MDŚ IX.72–73, VIII.205, 224)—namely, the “flawed girl given in marriage.” Acdg. to the dharmic materials, if a man contracts marriage with a girl who is flawed in some way, physically or morally, and the girl’s father, who arranged the marriage, knew about the flaws but did not inform the potential bridegroom, he (the

groom) can annul the agreement and abandon the girl. But if the father made the flaws known before the marriage was arranged, the groom has no recourse. I see this legal provision reflected here—uncannily similar (if obscured by the obscurity of RVic style)—one of the pieces of evidence that some of what we find in later dharma materials already existed, as formulated law, in the Vedic period, in striking detail, and such legal anticipations often concern marriage and family law.

By my interpr., the first hemistich concerns the second situation, the “full disclosure” scenario, whereby the girl’s flaw, in this case blindness, has been declared to the bridegroom in advance. In b we have a rhetorical question concerning the groom: if he knows her to be blind (*tām vidvān ... andhām*), will he still want her and/or does he have any right to be angry at the father? This double question is enabled by the fact that *abhí√man* has two, almost opposite, senses: ‘desire’ and ‘be hostile’ (both from ‘set one’s mind on X’, which action can have several different purposes). For the first see X.86.9, the Vṛṣākapi hymn, where Indrāñī says about the monkey’s sexual advances *avīram iva māṁ ayām, śarārur abhí manyate* “This noxious creature has designs on me, as if I lacked a man.” (There’s probably an admixture of the second sense here as well: the monkey is disrespecting her.) Cf. also IV.20.5 *máryo ná yóṣām abhí mányamānaḥ* “setting my mind on him [=Indra] like a dashing youth on a maiden,” which is less equivocal. Verbal forms of *abhí√man* in the meaning ‘despise, be hostile’ are first found in the AV—e.g., AVŚ VI.6.1 *yó ‘smān bráhmaṇaspaté, ’devo abhimányate | sárvaṁ tām randhayāsi me, yájamānāya sunvaté* “which(ever) godless one is hostile to us, every one (of them) shall you make subject to me, the sacrificer and presser.” But the noun *abhímāti-* ‘hostility’ and derivatives are already well embedded in the RV. (On the unetymological length of the root syllable in *abhímāti-* [versus *matí-*], see AiG II.2.630 [with lit.] and EWA s.v. *matí-*.) The implicit answers to these rhetorical questions are 1) the suitor will probably no longer be interested once he knows she’s blind, but 2) because the father was upfront about the problem, the suitor has no cause to be angry at him.

The second hemistich, by contrast (and in my interpr.), concerns the opposite situation, when the father has not been candid about his daughter’s defects. I supply a notional \**ávidvān* ‘not knowing’, referring to the person indicated by *kataráh*. I also take the *kataráh* ‘which (of two)’ seriously. The “two” are identified in pāda d *yá īṁ vāhāte yá īṁ vā vareyāt*: “(the man) who will marry (lit. ‘convey’) her or (the man) who will woo her.” Here “woo” refers to a technical stage in the arrangement of a marriage, when a friend or relative of the groom comes to the maiden’s house to formally ask her father (or appropriate male relative) for her to be given in marriage, on which see, e.g., my 1996 *Sacrificed Wife*, pp. 221–22.

I discussed the problematic word *mení-* in the first article cited above. As the title already suggests, I derive it from the root *√mi* ‘exchange’ and consider it the embodiment of thwarted exchange, which can be mobilized to punish those who don’t abide by the rules of this most Indo-European and Indo-Aryan institution, reciprocal exchange. Here the girl’s father has flouted the conventions governing marriage exchange, and the injured party has the right to employ *mení-* against him. The only question is whether the wielder of *mení-* should be the bridegroom himself or his proxy, who, in coming to the household for the wooing, would have become aware of the problem first. In the cited 1996 article and in the publ. tr. I tr. the verb governing *mením, práti ... mucāte*, as ‘unleash’ (*√muc* ‘release’). A recent art. by Maté Itzés, “The Interpretation of *práti ... mucāte* in Ṛgveda X.27.11c” (IJ 58 [2015]: 203–15), takes up this very question. He convincingly shows that this lexeme in early Vedic means “put on, take on, assume”; although he essentially accepts my general interpr. of the vs. and of the sense of *mení-*, he suggests that the

verb in pāda c means not ‘unleash’, but ‘take on’—that is, assume the responsibility for punishing the violator of exchange relations, namely the girl’s father. I think this must be correct, given the strength of his case for the meaning of the lexeme elsewhere, and am happy to alter the translation to “which of the two will assume the (responsibility for punishing) violated exchange”; I am glad that this improved understanding of the verb does not materially affect the meaning of the passage. While altering that tr. significantly, I’d also change “who marries” to “who would marry” and “who woos” to “who would woo.”

X.27.12: A sunny contrast to the previous vs. The bride has no flaws, hidden or disclosed; she was obviously much besought (*maryatāḥ* ‘from among the young bloods’) and has made a good marriage; the wedding is celebrated publicly in front of the people (*jāne cit*), and she is surrounded by the gifts and adornments that in later texts constitute much of *strīdhana*- (‘women’s property’: e.g., “what is given at the [wedding] fire [and] on the wedding [journey]” MDŚ IX.194 *adhyagnyadhyāvāhanikaṃ dattaṃ*, describing two of the six types of *strīdhana*). Flg. Ge (n. 12cd) I have argued elsewhere (“The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara: Formulaic Evidence,” Fs. Parpola [2001]: 303–15; relevant pp. 309–13) that this vs. depicts a self-choice or Svayaṃvara marriage, with the phraseology in d *svayāṃ sá ... vanute* (standing for *vṛṇīte*) the major piece of evidence, though there are other lexical clues. See the art. cit. for details.

Ge (n. 12cd) takes *vanute* as the verb of the subord. cl. beginning *yád* “... wenn sie schön geschmückt ... ihre Gefährten ... gewinnt.” He attributes the lack of accent on *vanute* to the fact that the verb is in a different pāda from the subordinator. But in my view *yát supésāḥ* is a brief nominal cl., and pāda d is an independent main cl.

X.27.13–24: As discussed in the publ. intro., the second half of this hymn is essentially independent of the first, though the two halves are thematically connected by the notion of the proper reciprocal relations between man and god and man and man. The focus in the second half is on the sacrifice. As was also noted in the publ. intro., this part of the hymn, esp. the last 6 vss., can be close to impenetrable. The first 6 vss. are essentially riddles, esp. the first 2 (13–14). This half of X.27 is lexically and formulaically similar in many respects to the following hymn, X.28, also a Vasukra product.

X.27.13: As Ge states (n. 13), this vs. almost certainly describes the fire and the wood that feeds him/it, esp. the kindling stick. Each pāda sets out a different image, each of which is compatible with the behavior of physical fire. That pāda d is nearly identical to X.142.5d (with *ānv eti* in our passage corresponding to *anvēṣi* in the latter) in an Agni hymn provides clinching evidence for the referent as fire.

In b I take *śīrṣṇā śīraḥ* as a sort of false *āmreḍita* ‘head upon head’, rather than construing them separately as Ge does: “mit seinem Kopf hat er (ihm) einen Kopf angesetzt.” The *āmreḍita*-type reading would be facilitated by the existence of a plethora of real *āmreḍitas* to this stem: *śīrṣṇā-śīrṣṇā*, *śīrṣṇé-śīrṣne*, *śīrṣṇāḥ-śīrṣṇaḥ*, all pāda-initial as our phrase is. The image is that of multiple flames, each looking like a head, one on top of the other, which collectively look and act like a shield. As Old points out, *śīrṣṇā śīraḥ* is found in AVŚ VI.49.2 immed. fld. by another such figure *āpsasāpsaḥ* “breast with/upon breast,” also of fire. Both phrases are construed with the participle *ardāyan* ‘causing to shake (violently)’ (on this stem, see my *-āya-* book, p. 107). Here also the reference is probably to flames and an interpr. “violently shaking head upon head,

breast upon breast” works at last as well as Whitney’s “exciting head with head, breast with breast,” with real instr.

Note the body-part polarization of *pattáh* ‘from the foot’ with the ‘head’ phrase, as well as the repetition *pratyáñcam ... práti*.

The fem. entity that the seated fire destroys when it is “erect in his lap” (*ūrdhvām upási*) is most likely a piece of kindling wood; *samídh-* is feminine. The image is sexualized, as is the one in pāda d, where the fem. element is represented by the earth instead.

X.27.14: This vs. also concerns the ritual fire, but it is somewhat more challenging than the previous one; see the publ. tr. Part of the difficulty is that the two hemistichs seem to apply to two different phases and aspects of the ritual fire: ab to its creation, cd to the offering of an oblation into it. The second hemistich is identical to III.55.13ab, which gives some help in interpr. it.

The first hemistich contains separate descriptions of the two crucial pieces of paraphernalia used to kindle the fire. Both the shapes of the pieces of wood and the process of kindling are sexualized. The lower *araṇi*, the “mother” of pāda b, lies flat and motionless on the ground; it has a hole in it called, tellingly, the *yoni*. The upper *araṇi* is not directly in contact with the lower one: rather they are connected by an upright rod known as the *mantha* or *cāt(t)ra*, which serves as a spindle. The bottom end is inserted into the *yoni* and the rod is rapidly turned back and forth (by hands or by cords) to create the friction that produces the fire. See Re’s *Vocabulaire du rituel védique* and Sen’s (derivative) *A Dictionary of the Vedic Rituals*, s.v. *araṇi* and *araṇī* respectively, esp. Re’s description of the *cātra*: “tige à forme de pénis dont une extrémité ... vient s’assujettir sur la yoni ...” Various YouTube videos are also quite instructive.

In our passage pāda a is devoted to the *cātra* (not a RVic term), the rod or churning stick, which is homologized to a tree, but a peculiar one: it is lofty (*bṛhán*) but does not provide shade (*achāyáḥ*), the rendering I now prefer over “without a shadow,” and lacks foliage (*apalāsáḥ*). In other words, it is wooden like a tree, and upright like a tree, but otherwise lacks tree-like characteristics. It is also, in a different image, called a ‘steed’ (*árvā*); this might be because of its rapid movements, but I think it more likely reflects the cords bound around it by which the turning is effected. This is clear from I.28.4 in the playful hymn comparing Soma preparation to domestic cookery; that vs. contains the only form of the noun *mánthā-* in the RV, clearly naming the churning stick: *yátra mánthāṃ vibadhnáte, raśmín yámitavá iva* “When they bind the churning stick on both sides like reins to control it,” with a slight slippage between the one bound (the stick) and the bindings (the reins) in frame and simile (see comm. ad I.28.4). Like a horse by reins, the churning stick is directed and controlled by the cords bound around it.

As for the lower *aráṇi-*, this is clearly the mother who stays still in b (*tasthaú mātā*), while the embryo that eats when set loose (*vísito atti gárbhaḥ*, also in b) is obviously the nascent fire already consuming firewood.

As was noted above, the 2nd hemistich is identical to III.55.13ab; see comm. there for additional remarks. The subj. of both verbs (*mimāya* in c, *ní dadhe* in d) must be the *dhenú-* in d. It is she who “licks the calf of another” (*anyásyā vatsám rihatī*), which indefinite (note initial position) “other” is surely the mother of pāda b, namely the lower *aráṇi-*. It is a rather nice reversal that the ritual fire, which is often identified with tongue(s) and which sometimes is the agent of the verb  $\sqrt{rih}$ , is here the one being licked. The *dhenú-* is in turn the oblation being poured into the just kindled fire or rather the producer of that oblation, most likely the *ídā* on the basis of III.55.13c. While her “udder” (*ūdhah*) refers to the contents of her udder, the oblation

itself. On the phrase *káyā bhuvā* see comm. ad III.55.13, where I reject Ge’s interpr. “in which world?” in favor of “with which form?” referring, in my view, to the precise form that the oblation takes: in III.55.14c *Iḍā* “swelled with the milk of truth” (*ṛtāsya ... páyasāpinvata*), and milk (of truth, or just milk) may be what is meant here as well.

X.27.15: As often in the RV, numerology sows confusion. However, by focusing on the place of this vs. in the hymn and also on the action depicted within it, I think we can achieve a certain level of understanding, without necessarily being able to identify the groups presented in order as consisting of seven (a), eight (b), nine (c), and ten (d). If, as I argue in the publ. intro., this part of the hymn concerns the mystery of the sacrifice and the creation of its central focus, the ritual fire, this vs. seems to depict the coming together of four distinct groups from the four cardinal directions for cooperation; I suggest this cooperative enterprise was the primal institution of the sacrifice. Just as the classical śrauta sacrifice requires the mutual but complementary endeavors of different groups of priests drawn from the three ritual Vedas and thus belonging to different śākhās, here we seem to have the joining of distinct groups of beings, each perhaps with its own function. That they come from south, north, west, and east marks the action as universal or at least as involving the entire Ārya community. *Pace* Ge (intro. to hymn) I do not think this depicts “den Aufstieg der Götter und Erzväter zum Himmel.”

Various identifications have been suggested for the four groups. Although I think their identities are less important than the regularly increasing sequence of numbers and their representation of all points of the compass, it is of course tempting to try to name them. The hardest to identify is the eight. Old’s suggestions are perhaps the least risky: the seven seers, the Navagvas, and the Daśagvas, with the parenthetical question “(wer die acht?).” It is more interesting to try to match the groups with their directional sources. The “seven heroes” (*saptā vīrāsah*) come from the south; if these are indeed the Saptarṣi and if the Saptarṣi were originally human seers who got divinized (both big if-s), this might make sense ritually, since the Southern Fire (*dakṣināgnī*- [not yet so called in the RV, but already AV]) is used for offerings to the Pitars (see, e.g., Keith, *Relig. & Philos.* 288–89). The problematic eight might be the Ādityas; although the number of these gods fluctuates (see *Macd. Ved. Myth* 43–44), it is once clearly stated in the RV that Aditi had eight sons (X.72.8 *aṣṭaú putrāso āditeḥ*). The eight come from the north, which is the quarter of the gods, which would be appropriate for the Ādityas.

The identification of the nine and their function is complicated by the fact that the identity of their only attribute (*sthivimánt*- ‘possessing *sthivī*’) is unclear. Nonetheless, Ge’s “sacks,” or some object that can contain grain, seems pretty safe. In the only occurrence of the independent noun (X.68.3) Bṛhaspati strews cows from the Vala cave “like grain from *sthivī*” (*yávam iva sthivibhyaḥ*), which seems diagnostic. The nine come from the west, which is the place of the Gārhapatya fire (also not yet named in the RV, but clearly already part of RVic ritual) and the place where the offerings are prepared. Hence the grain sacks make sense. As for the ten in the east, traversing, or perhaps better “coming through,” the back of the rock (*sānu vī tiranti āśnaḥ*) sounds like a depiction of the Vala myth. Note that the same lexeme *vī√tṛ* is found in the Vala passage just cited, X.68.3 (a point made by Ge n. 15c). Since, inter alia, the Vala myth involves the release of the *dawn* cows, the east is the appropriate direction.

X.27.16: This vs. returns to the creation of the ritual fire and seems to follow directly from 14b, after the interruption of vs. 15 (and 14cd). The placement of 16 may result from a trivial concatenation: the group of ten in 15d is picked up the first word of 16, *daśānām* ‘of the ten’,

though the ten here must be the fingers of the ritual officiant, which is not a possible referent for *dāśa* in 15d in my opinion. Ge (n. 16a and hymn intro.), by contrast, considers the ten to be the same in 15d and 16a and identifies *kapilā-* as the name of the Ur-Ṛṣi, whose birth is depicted here. This seems to take us too far afield, away from the focus on the primal sacrifice. The word *kapilā-* appears only here in the RV; although in the Śvet. Up. (etc.) it is likely the name of a seer (see, e.g., Macd/Keith Vedic Index s.v.), there is no reason not to see our occurrence as a color term (supposedly ‘ape-colored’ ← *kapī-*; see EWA s.v.). It also appears as a color term later. Here I assume it’s a reference to the just-kindled fire, or perhaps better, to the kindling stick being manipulated by the fingers of the priest to produce fire (see vs. 13 above).

Both the mother and the embryo in 16c (*gārbham mātā*) are identical to the same figures in 14b, in my opinion, though the scene in 16cd is logically prior to that in 14b: the embryo has not yet been released to eat, that is, the fire has not yet been kindled. It is still held in the belly of the mother (the lower *arāṇi-*). The two participles in b, *ávenantam tuṣáyantī*, depict this stasis: the fire seeks after nothing, while the mother is still and content (very like *tasthaú* ‘she stayed still’ in 14b). The ten fingers are just starting the process of kindling (16ab).

Ge renders *vakṣāṇāsu* as “an ihren Brüsten,” which implies that the *gārbha-* has already been born. But III.29.2 (which he adduces), with strikingly similar phraseology, strongly suggests that the babe is still in the womb: *arāṇyor níhito jātávedā, gārbha iva súdhito garbhínīṣu* “Jātavedas, placed within the two fire-churning sticks, like an embryo well placed within a pregnant (belly).” Despite the pl. *garbhínīṣu* in that passage (and the publ. tr. [JPB] “within women with child”) I now think *garbhínīṣu* there presupposes a gapped *vakṣāṇāsu*, like here, and since pl. *vakṣāṇā-* can be a pl. tantum, it refers here to a single belly. Some plural forms of *vakṣāṇā-* do refer to multiple bellies (see, e.g., I.162.5, X.49.10), but most do not (e.g., V.42.13).

The standard interpr. of *tuṣáyantī* is transitive (e.g., Ge ‘es stillend’; see also Old), but the zero-grade vocalism favors an intransitive interpr., which is just as possible in context and in fact, as was just noted, echoes *tasthaú mātā* in 14b. See my *-áya-*formations, pp. 50–51.

X.27.17: This vs. follows from 16 (note the *vīrās(ah)* in both) and probably depicts the primal sacrifice (sim. Ge., intro. “das Tier- und Somaopfer”). The very similar I.164.43, adduced by both Old and Ge, supports this view: *ukṣāṇam pīśnim apacanta vīrās, tāni dhārmāṇi prathamāny āsan* “Heroes cooked a dappled bullock. These were the first foundations (of the rite).”

The dice of pāda b must serve a ritual purpose. Although the more famous instance of dicing in śrauta ritual is in the Rājasūya, where the newly installed king plays dice with representatives of the four varṇas (see, e.g., MŚS IX.1.4.21–25), there is also dicing in the Agnyādheya, the initial installation of the ritual fire for a new Ahitāgni (=śrauta sacrificer), where the sacrificer dices (with his sons in some versions) with a cow for the stakes. See, e.g., Keith, *Relig. & Philos.* 317; Hillebrandt, *Rit. Lit.* 108; and in detail Falk, *Würfelspiel* 136–63; from the śrauta sūtras, e.g., MŚS I.5.5.6–16. Such a ritual context makes sense here, at the first establishment of the institution of sacrifice and the creation of the sacred fire, and the players would, most likely, be the representatives of the four quarters who assembled in vs. 15. Just as the four varṇas in the Rājasūya dicing match represent the totality of Ārya society, here involving the groups coming from the four cardinal directions would create the same type of universality. In the Agnyādheya the cow, once won, is killed and divided among the brahmins after offering portions to the Pitars. It is possible that the “fat ram” (*pīvānam meṣām*) serves the same purpose here.



The second hemistich must depict the establishment of the soma sacrifice in particular, given the telltale terms *pavítravantā ... punántā* “provided with filters ... purifying.” But the passage is difficult to interpret because the identity of “the two” (*dvā*) who are the referents of these words is entirely unclear. Ge does not hazard a guess (and in fact does not raise the question). None of the usual dual suspects—Heaven and Earth, Night and Dawn, Sun and Moon, the Aśvins, Mitra and Varuṇa—makes any sense here, or at least any sense I can grasp. Since these two must be parties to the creation of the sacrifice, they should be part of the groups we first encountered in vs. 15. Since in the next vs. (18) the harmonious cooperation of this amalgamated assemblage breaks down and they split into two halves, I wonder if 17cd anticipates the break-up, even though the two halves are still working together here: they agree on soma but will split on cooking.

Ge (flg. Gr) takes *dhánum bṛhatīm* as the obj. of *punántā* (“... den hohen Quell ... zu läutern”), which he further qualifies (n. 17c) as “Den Quell des Soma, d. h. die Somapflanze oder den Somasaft.” But *dhánu-* does not, in my opinion, ever mean ‘source’ or the like, but refers to a type of place, a plain or steppe, and is related to *dhánvan-* ‘wasteland’; see EWA s.v. *dhánu-*, despite his hesitations. In particular the stem is found in I.33.4 in the “schism” passage that we will discuss below at our vs. 18, where it most likely refers to a similar location. I construe *dhánum* with *carataḥ* “the two roam the steppe” (thereby interpr. the latter as a full lexical verb, not an aux. with the part. *punántā*). The “lofty steppe” may refer to the high elevations where the soma plant grows. Although my interpr. leaves the participle without an overt object, it is child’s play to supply “soma.”

X.27.18: By my reading, in this vs. the groups that had come together so harmoniously in order to establish a common sacrifice clash disastrously over the way the sacrifice should be performed. Note the polarized verbs *sám jagmíran té* “they came together” (15b) and *ví āyan* “they went apart” (18a). This vs., esp. the first hemistich, is strongly reminiscent of the “schism” passage I.33.4–10, which depicts a split, quite possibly in the Ārya community, dividing into sacrificers and non-sacrificers, with the sides going off in different directions and Indra intervening on the side of the sacrificially orthopractic. In our vs. they “went apart in opposite directions” (*ví ... víṣvañca āyan*); in I.33.4 in almost the same words *viṣuṇák te vy āyan*. Moreover, in I.33.4 they depart *dhánor ádhi* “from the (high) steppe,” the place where our people were roaming in 17c. In addition, our people depart “shrieking” (*krośanáśaḥ*), while in I.33.7 the two groups are polarized as (acc.) *etān rudató jákṣatas ca* “those wailing and those laughing”; though the two roots for the negative sound effect,  $\sqrt{kruś}$  and  $\sqrt{rud}$ , are different, they seem to amount to the same thing. In I.33 the divisive issue seems more serious than here: it pits the *āyajvan-* ‘non-sacrificer’ (4d, 5b) against the *yājvan-* ‘sacrificer’ (5b), who is also a presser and a praiser (7d). Here the doctrinal issue is cooking versus non-cooking (shades of Lévi-Strauss!) – in ritual terms, perhaps the cooking of a sacrificed animal (as in 17a *meśám apacanta*) and therefore the question of whether to perform animal sacrifice itself (so Ge, intro.), or perhaps simply the issue of offering any type of oblation into the ritual fire, which “cooks” it. The latter is perhaps supported by the second hemistich, where Savitar pronounces the sole victor to be the fire, which consumes wood and ghee (*drvānnaḥ ... sarpíraṇnaḥ*), the latter of course as an oblation.

The doctrinal dispute is expressed by two subjunctives to the same root but different stems, them. pres. versus *s*-aor.: *pácāti ... nahí pákṣat*. Narten (Sig.Aor. 167) ingeniously attributes this difference to aspect: those who will cook (*pácāti*) will occupy themselves with it

over time (imperfective), while those who will not cook (*nahí pákṣat*) won't even begin to do so and therefore reject the activity envisioned as a whole (perfective). As an account of this passage alone, the analysis would be convincing, but since, in general, modal forms to tense/aspect stems fail to display whatever aspectual value such stems have (as I have discussed in a number of publications), I am dubious. And it can be noted that a pres. subj. *pácāt(i)* would not easily fit any metrical slots in the second part of this pāda, whereas *pákṣat* allows a neat cadence. The publ. tr. should be emended to reflect the 2nd subjunctive, however: “for the other half will not cook.”

I do not understand why Savitar is the bearer of the message, but the content of the message is clear: only Agni will win, and Agni will win only if we make regular correct offerings into him. This section of the hymn (vss. 13-18) concerned with the establishment of the original ritual fire and the sacrifices associated with it thus concludes with a strong and satisfying assertion of the centrality of the sacrifice.

X.27.19–24: On the difficulties of this last section of the hymn and possible interpr. thereof, see publ. intro.

X.27.19: Ge (intro.) convincingly identifies the vision depicted here as the year, or possibly old age. The image of the wheel-less cycle favors the former. In the famous riddle hymn (I.164) the year is configured as a wheel (generally the wheel of the sun), with the various temporal divisions marked on that wheel; see, e.g., vss. 2cd, 11–13, 48. Here the wheel-less (*acakráyā*) self-powered (*svadháyā*) turning seems a further, deliberately innovative development of the year=wheel trope. The phrase *acakráyā ... svadháyā* is also found in IV.26.4 (see Ge's n. 19b), used of the flight of the falcon that stole the soma from heaven, but that passage seems to have nothing to do with this one.

The horde (*grāma-*) here may be the constituents of the year, i.e., the seasons, months, and days. W. Rau (“Earliest Literary Evidence for Permanent Vedic Settlements,” *Inside the Texts*, ed. M. Witzel, 1997, 203–6 [proceedings of 1989 conf.]) argued that *grāma-* means in the first instance “a train of herdsmen roaming about with cattle” and secondly “a temporary camp of such a train,” and that the later standard sense ‘village’ is not found in Vedic. Certainly here the first meaning, a roving band, fits the context well (as also, e.g., in I.100.10, II.12.7, III.33.11), but I would dispute the strong form of his claim, or rather assert that the word (and its deriv. *grāmyá-* RV 1x) can contrast the domestic with the wild—e.g., the beasts *āraṇyān grāmyāś ca yé* in the Puruṣasūkta X.90.11; the safety and security of the settlement as opposed to the wilderness in the Araṇyānī hymn (X.146). Whether these settlements were “temporary” or not, they project all the associations of “village” in context. (Interestingly only one of the many passages Rau cites is from the RV [III.33.11 just cited].)

In c *yugā* (lit. ‘yokes’) surely refers, as often, to generations; the question is how to construe the gen. pl. *jānānām* and the likely gen. sg. *aryāḥ*. Ge and Th (1941: 109 = KISch. 34) take them as parallel and implicitly conjoined (though in slightly different senses), e.g., Ge “die Geschlechter des hohen Herrn (und) der anderen Leute.” However, I think it likely that *yugā jānānām* is a variant of the common expression *mānuṣā(ni) [manuṣyā] yugā(ni)* “human generations [lifespan],” and I take *aryāḥ* as dependent on that whole phrase. The “peoples of the stranger (*arī-*)” I would take here to refer to the Ārya as a whole.

The lexeme *prá √ sac* seems to occur only here in the RV (since *sákṣvā ... prá* in I.42.1 belongs to *√ sah*; see comm. ad loc.). Th takes it in hostile sense (“sucht heim” [afflicts]), but

(with Gr and Ge) I think it has a neutral and essentially additive value, with the negative sense confined to *praminānāḥ* in d.

That participle (*praminānāḥ*) by my interpr. participates in a complex set of relationships with the rest of the hemistich. To begin with, although the *yugā* phrase of c is properly construed with *sīśakti ... prá*, it should not be forgotten that a similar phrase serves as obj. to *prá √ mī* in what seems to be a fixed formula, used of Dawn: I.92.11 [=I.124.2] *praminatī manuṣyā yugāni* “diminishing the generations of men.” If that is a formula (or something close to it), it would come to the audience’s mind here, even if the actual syntax separates the verb and its usual object.

But there is plenty more for *praminānāḥ* to do in its own pāda, where I think it is used in two different senses in two different constructions, one with *sīśnā*, one with *nāvīyān*. (Note that the participle is strategically located between them, adjacent to each.) This view seems to be essentially Ge’s: though he makes no comment on the construction, he tr. pāda d with two different participial phrases (“die männlichen Glieder alsbald schwächend, (selbst) sich verjüngend”). Let us now note that our *praminānāḥ* is one of the few middle forms to this root; that voice is confined to a few forms of the participle, including one in the vs. (10) immediately prior to just-cited I.92.11 in a similar context concerning the effect of time on human lifetimes. One of the senses of the middle part. is to ‘exchange’ or ‘transform’ forms; see esp. V.42.13 *rūpā minānāḥ* of Tvaṣṭar’s transformations in the belly of his daughter and Th op.cit. 108–9=33–34. Th interpr. our form here in that way: “... sich verwandelnd in einen neuen.” I think this is fundamentally correct, though I do not follow Th’s view that the referent is the sun—rather it is the year that constantly renews itself. I also think that it is correct only for part of the passage: there is a third use of *praminānāḥ* packed into this tiny verbal space. By Th’s interpr. *sīśnā* is an instr. sg.: “mit Hilfe des Schwanzes,” a curious expression he makes no effort to explain. For others, however, it is the neut. acc. pl. (see Ge’s tr. above), and so I take it, as the obj. of *praminānāḥ* in its other usage. Here *√ mī* ‘diminish’, rather than *√ mī* ‘exchange’, is again at issue. The question is what sense of *sīśnā-* is found here: ‘tail’ (as in I.105.8, where mice chew on their own tails) or (slang for) ‘penis’, as Ge takes it, found also presumably in *sīśnā-deva-* ‘having the phallus as divinity, phallus-worshiper’ (2x). Ge (n. 19d) thinks the sense is “die Zeugungskraft vermindernd,” and this is certainly possible. But I wonder if real, though metaphorical, tails are involved: diminishing—docking—their tails is an image of shortening their lives. The history of the English word ‘curtail’ is instructive here since ‘tail’ figures twice in its formation: first as a loan word from French for an animal with a docked tail (curtal), then folk-etymologically adjusted to align it with ‘tail’. And from the physical docking of tails the word expanded to cover all sorts of shortenings and restrictions.

I take *sadyāḥ* usually ‘in a single day, immediately’ to mean ‘at the same time’, referring to the two different actions expressed by *praminānāḥ*. Although I do not know of other occurrences of this word in this sense, it seems a reasonable semantic extension.

X.27.20: This vs. is essentially impenetrable, though the grammar is straightforward. It seems to continue the gloomy reflections in the previous vs., but beyond that it is difficult to say. (Though as will be clear from what follows, I say a great deal about it.)

Interpreted in the context of vs. 19, the two yoked oxen (*etaú ... gāvau ... yuktaú*) ready to drive off could be a reference to a different temporal phenomenon inflicting its unavoidable harm on the vulnerable human. In great part the interpr. depends on the interpr. of *pramará-*, the being to whom the oxen belong. The word occurs only here; Gr, Ge, Debrunner (AiG II.2.65, 88,

though in latter loc. with ?), and Kü (365: “Fortsterben”) take it to mean ‘death’, but I am skeptical. *prá√mṛ* is not found in the RV; indeed the root ‘die’ does not occur with any preverb there. There are some nominal forms later, but the closest in time, *pramārá-* in AVŚ XI.8.33, is in such an obscure context that ‘death’ is not only not assured, but doesn’t make sense there. I suggest instead a connection with *√mṛ* ‘crush’, which is characteristically construed with *prá;* for the conspectus of passages see Scar (390–91). Assigning it to a *seṭ* root might account for the *guṇa* rather than *vṛddhi* in the root syllable if to an old \**o*-grade, inter alia. Although interpr. the form as “the Pulverizer” or “the Crusher” doesn’t get us any closer to a referent, some constraints on the meaning of the passage are removed if the referent is *not* Death. It could be another way of referring to the year, which was the subject of the previous vs., or an anticipation of “old age” in the next one (21d). The two oxen belonging to it could be day and night, the regular recurrent time periods that draw us through the year and that the poet wishes to delay for a moment. I favor this general interpr., though see below for more detail.

On *prá sedhīh* see Narten (Sig. Aor. 267).

With most I assign *mamandhi* to *√man<sup>2</sup>* ‘stay, wait’, distinct from *√man<sup>1</sup>* ‘think’, pace Kü’s efforts to revive the notion that it’s a specialized form of the latter (364–66; abandoned in LIV<sup>2</sup>) and his tr. “bedenke.” See also Old’s comments on this vs.

The second hemistich is considerably harder than the first. For Ge (intro.) the point is that the waters and the sun also stay by the poet in his race with old age. But it is hard for me to see that in the actual wording, and there is no evidence that I can see for a race (Wettlauf). Ge (n. 20b) bases himself on passages in the JB (III.183) and PB (XIV.3.13) where a wager is made between Viśvāmitra and some others about driving a pair of oxen pulling a laden cart up a steep bank (not a race either, as far as I can see), and he suggests that Old Age and Death are here running a race with the living human. Acdg. to him (n. 20c), in pāda c Death and the waters have the same goal, but the waters win. I see no connection between the JB/PB passage and this one, save for the presence of two oxen (though *anaḍvāhau* in JB; no word for oxen in PB)—hardly a major piece of evidence, since draught-oxen come in pairs. Old Age and Death do not make an appearance in the Brāhmaṇa passages, and we have no wager, no laden cart, and no steep bank here. Much less any race.

Although I don’t have a solution to the meaning of the hemistich, I can point to certain structural considerations that weigh against the usual construction of the two pādas and may open the way to a more satisfactory interpr. To begin with, most tr. (Ge, Klein [DGRV I.227–28], Kü [365]) take the two pādas as two separate clauses; e.g., Ge “Auch die Gewässer erreichen sein Ziel, auch hinter der Sonne ist die Vernichtung zurückgeblieben.” But the two supposed clauses would be conjoined by *ca*, which is usually a subclausal conjunction (Klein [327] describes it here as showing a “looser degree of nexus”), and the verb in the 2<sup>nd</sup> clause would be a predicated pf. part. *babhūvān* parallel to a finite form in c. Neither of these is impossible, but the combination of the two factors suggests we might take a second look at structure. In fact, the *ca* can be read in its usual subclausal value if it is conjoining an NP in pāda d with one in c – most likely a nom. connected with *āpaḥ*. We have two choices for this nom. phrase: either *sūras ca markāḥ* “and the harmer of the sun” (with gen. *sūraḥ* to *svār-*) or just *sūras ca* “and the sun” (with nom. *sūraḥ* to *sūra-*). I opt for the latter (note that the same poet uses nom. sg. *sūraḥ* in X.29.5), with *markā úparaḥ* then a pred. nom. with *babhūvān*. By this interpr. this pf. part. is not the predicate of a clause, but an adjunct descriptor of one of the conjoined subjects (*sūraḥ*) of the main clause, whose verb is *vī naśanti*.

This reinterpr. of the syntax provides a more satisfying structure than the standard interpr., but it doesn't get us considerably further towards sense. We must now turn to the referent of *asya* in c, the meaning of the VP *ví naśanty ártham*, and the sense of the hapax *marká-*, of the multivalent *úpara-*, and of the two together. The first question is perhaps the easiest: for unaccented *asya* we need a referent already in the discourse, and the most likely is *pramarásya* in pāda a. This is in fact the apparent view of all the interpr. However, I suggest that the 1st ps. speaker might be an additional referent.

Now the VP. The lexeme *ví√naś* takes a variety of object types with slightly different meanings of the verb: 'penetrate', 'reach through to', 'reach', 'achieve'. Here of course "reach his goal" works perfectly fine. But before trying to decide what his (= *pramara*'s) goal is, let us consider another very common idiom involving *ví√naś*, which regularly takes *āyus-* 'lifetime' as its object – including an instance in this very hymn, X.27.7 *vy ù āyur ānaṭ* "you have traversed your lifetime." Normally this is a positive idiom: someone who has done this has achieved a full lifespan and escaped having his life cut short. But considered in the context of old age there is a definite downside: if you have achieved your full lifespan, then it's over; you're dead (or about to be). I suggest that this idiom is implicated in the phrase *ví naśanty ártham*. A full lifespan is a goal, one of many. The speaker of ab may have achieved this goal; this is why the Pulverizer's oxen are yoked and ready to convey him. He begs for just a moment of delay.

Now what would be the Pulverizer's goal? If he is the Year, then presumably the year's end – and its beginning – the moment when cyclic time resets. If he is Old Age, then presumably just the end, i.e., the end of life.

The next question (and a harder one): why is it that the waters and the sun reach this goal? I find the waters difficult to fit into this context, the sun less so. Like the other signals of recurrent time that I see in this passage—the year, day and night—the sun marks the passage of the days. In X.37.2, adduced by Ge (though not for quite the same reason), the daily unstoppable activity of the sun is described: *viśvāhód eti sūryaḥ* "always the sun rises." In fact, our own poet Vasukra describes the sun as sending everyone to their *ártha-* (X.29.5). And in its own journey between the solstices it too reaches the turn of the year. The waters, though – they are not usually temporal markers. It may simply be because they, like the sun, are in constant motion; the full pāda from X.37.2 just quoted reads *viśvāhāpo viśvāhód eti sūryaḥ* "Always the waters (are in motion); always the sun rises," with the same association of waters and sun as here, as Ge (n. 20cd) points out. But perhaps this is a reference to a regular yearly cycle of water: the monsoon rains or the spring snow melt from the high mountains. The *cid* 'even' may indicate that the waters are a somewhat surprising addition to the statement, which fits the sun better.

Before leaving pāda c, we should consider the form of the verb *naśanti*. Though it used to be classified as a 1st class. them. pres., *náśa-* is now universally analyzed as a root aor. subjunctive, and I think our act. 3rd pl. should also be taken as a subj., even though the standard view of the grammars (Wh, VGS) is that the 3rd pl. act. subj. ending is only secondary *-an*.

The last issue we need to take up is the phrase *marká úparaḥ*. *marká-* is a hapax, found nowhere in Skt. but here, but the differently accented *márka-* is reasonably well represented after the RV, as a purohita of the Asuras (see, e.g., Macd&Keith, Ved. Index s.v. 2. Marka). For him and his co-purohita Śaṇḍa offerings are drawn at the First Pressing of the soma sacrifice, and then the two are immediately driven away; see, e.g., TS VI.4.10, ŚB IV.2.1, and mantras in VS VII.16–17 (with extensive parallels in other texts; cf. Vedic Concordance). Although I am certain that our *marká-* does not represent the mythico-ritual figure of later Vedic, as Old remarks, "*marká* trennt man ungern von *márka*, der später als Purohita des Asuras begegnet." And both

must be derived from the root  $\sqrt{mrc}$  ‘harm’. (For the corresponding Old Avestan *maraka-* and YA *mahraka* see EWA s.v. *MARC.*) As Ge points out (n. 20d), the sun is sometimes associated with the root  $\sqrt{mrc}$  (see AB IV.10, AVŚ XIII.1.40 [Rohita hymn]), though I would not say the association is strong.

The adj. *úpara-* has several values: temporal (‘later’ versus *pūrva-* ‘earlier’), locational, both horizontal (‘behind’ versus *puráh* [*sánt-*] / *pūrva-* ‘in front’) and vertical (‘lower, hence nearer=earthly’ versus *pára-* ‘further’). Here the temporal value seems excluded since ‘later/future’ is incompatible with *babhūvān* ‘having become’. The horizontal dimension doesn’t make sense either, but, given the sun’s heavenly locus, the vertical dimension does. Some light is shed on this by a snatch of V.44.2 describing Agni’s flames as *úparasya yāḥ svāḥ* “which are the suns of the lower (realm).” I suggest that here too we have the common identification of (heavenly) sun with (earthly) fire, and here the fire as destructive force. Though it is also possible that the sun itself is seen as destructive to humans in its role as marker of time.

After nearly 2000 words of discussion of this vs., containing barely 20 words, I feel I have a somewhat better handle on its meaning and its place in the hymn, but hardly a solution. I would emend the translation of cd to “Even the waters will reach this one’s goal – and the sun, having become the Harmer below.”

X.27.21: This vs. is not appreciably more intelligible than the last, but it does seem to mark some kind of turning point, with the introduction of “fame” (*śrávah*) at the beginning of the 2nd hemistich beginning to dispel the gloom.

In order to identify the referent of the *vájra-* in pāda a it is important to determine what happened to it—that is, what action *vívr̥tta-* depicts. Ge thinks it means ‘divided, split into pieces’, tr. the phrase as “der vielmals zersplittet wird,” and compares a RVic passage with a different verb and plural *vájra-* and a Brāhmaṇa story about Indra’s *vájra* splitting into three pieces. But the lexeme *vívr̥t*, which is quite common in the RV, never means ‘split, divide’. It either means ‘turn aside’ (e.g., V.53.7) or simply ‘roll along, roll through’ (e.g., VI.9.1), often of wheels or entities so configured (e.g., I.185.1). When transitive, it means ‘unroll’ in opposition to *sámvr̥t* ‘roll up’ (e.g., V.48.2). It is surely a mistake to ascribe a unique meaning to a lexeme in a passage where one of the only clues we might have is the use of that lexeme elsewhere. Whatever the *vájra-* refers to, it has been rolled out or turned aside, not split. The adv. *purudhā* does not have to mean ‘in many pieces’ or the like, but ‘in many ways, in many places’.

The opening of the vs. with its annunciatory *ayám só vājraḥ* “Here/this is the mace that ...” is striking and should give us some clue about the referent. Either the *ayám* is pointing to something in the immediate vicinity, in place and time, of the poet, or it is making a particularly strong connection between the *vájra-* and something else in the discourse. I think the former, the hic-et-nunc usage we often find in a ritual situation, is unlikely, because there is no other indication of immediacy in the context. I therefore think it refers to something in the preceding vs. – quite possibly the Pulverizer in 20a. Indeed *vájra-* is the subject of a form of *pra√mṛ* in III.30.6 *prá te vājraḥ pramṛṇānn etu śátrūn* “let your mace come forth, pulverizing the rivals,” which seems to me as close to clinching evidence as we’re likely to get in this maddening passage.

Thus the mace, the Pulverizer, has been deployed (rolled out, *vívr̥tta-*) in many ways or places; where this deployment has taken place is indicated in the next pāda, which seems to me a variant on and expansion of 20d “the sun, which has become the Harmer below.” Here the action unfolds “below [the X] of the lofty sun,” in which the sun maintains its usual heavenly position,

but the theatre of action is underneath it, again the realm of human activity. To get any further in interpr., we must identify the “X.” The fairly rare word *púriṣa-* (7x, plus *purīśín-* 5x and *purīṣyà-* 1x) is found twice in this hymn, close together: the 2nd occurrence is *púriṣam* two vss. later (X.27.23d), also pāda final. And it is worth noting that the intervening vs. contains a phonologically similar form in the same location, *pūruṣādaḥ* (22b), seemingly to tie the three vss. together. On the general semantics of *púriṣa-* see comm. ad I.163.1. Unfortunately the presence of two forms of the word in proximity here doesn’t help in the interpr. of either. The acc. in 23d must be either the object or the goal of a form of  $\sqrt{vah}$  ‘convey’, probably a goal, since *púriṣa-* appears sometimes to be a place. See, e.g., the other two passages with abl. *púriṣāt*, where it is conjoined with *samudrāt* (I.163.1, IV.21.3). The usage of the occurrence in vs. 23 does not appear to be closely connected with the one here, as discouraging (and counterintuitive) as that may be. Here the association is with the sun in heaven. Now in the riddle hymn in I.164.12 the possessive deriv. *purīśín-* is used of a heavenly body (vel sim.) “in the further half of heaven” (*divāḥ ... páre árdhe*), which is *purīśín-* ‘possessing overflowing fullness’. Most interpr. take this as a ref. to the sun (or to the year)(see, e.g., Ge ad loc.), though the publ. tr. (JPB) identifies it as the moon. If it is the sun, our phrase would be the syntagm underlying *purīśín-*, with gen. *sūryasya* dependent on the noun *púriṣa-*: “the overflowing fullness of the sun.” I suggest that this “overflowing fullness” is a reference to its rays, the overwhelming torrent of heat and light coming from the sun, which in some situations, like this one, can be dangerous and harmful.

Meanwhile the pulverizing *vájra-* is inflicting its destruction.

As for the second hemistich, we should first note two things: 1) pāda c *śráva íd enā paró anyád asti* is very similar to nearby (though attributed to a different poet) X.31.8 *naítávad enā paró anyád asti* “There does not exist another of such kind beyond that”; 2) *ávaḥ* ‘below’ (as in pāda b) and *paráḥ* ‘beyond, above’ are paired elsewhere: I.164.17, VI.9.3, X.17.13, 67.4; cf. also *avástāt ... parástāt* X.88.14, 129.5 and pairings of *ávava-* ‘lower’ and *páraḥ* I.164.17–18, 43, VI.9.2. Our passage seems to be contrasting the mayhem and devastation happening below the sun (b) and something else that is found beyond or above it (c). And that something else is fame (*śrávaḥ*). I now think that we have here a little whiff of the inherited Indo-European trope of inevitable death and “imperishable fame.” In the sublunary (or in Vedic terms sub-solar) world, the Pulverizer – Time as a *vájra* – keeps pulverizing, but beyond it we can look forward to *śrávaḥ*. I would now significantly emend my tr. of c to “But there exists something else beyond this – just fame.”

The last pāda develops this thought, but it presents difficulties of its own. The principal curiosity is that it contains the only *plural* of the abstract noun *jarimán-* ‘old age’, namely nom. pl. *jarimāṇaḥ*. It is difficult to imagine what a plural of such an abstract would imply, and both Ge and the publ. tr. don’t try: we render it as a singular, “das Alter,” “old age.” But I now think it should be taken seriously, and not by transforming it into a covert possessive adj., “aged (ones),” however tempting. But I am stumped – does it refer to the old age(s) belonging to generation after generation / cohort after cohort of humans? I think this the most likely of several not very good possibilities. From time immemorial the old age characterizing the current population has crossed to the other world, where fame awaits, but there is always more old age in this world because there are always more people growing old. I am not entirely convinced by this interpr., but I don’t now see a better one. And I do not see how to render it into English effectively, so I reluctantly stick to the singular of the publ. tr. One curiosity: if pādas c and d are closely connected, as seems likely and if imperishable fame is at issue, there is a significant departure

from the standard IE ideology, which generally connects *early* death and eternal fame, not old age.

With Gr I interpr. *avyathī* as an instr. sg., here used as an adverb – in the publ. tr. “unwaveringly.” In keeping with my new interpr. of the pl. *jarimāṇaḥ* I wonder if it is meant *not* to express a resolute unhesitating progress (as implied in the publ. tr.), but rather to indicate that there is no gap between the various old ages as they cross.

X.27.22: As indicated in the publ. intro., I think that this vs. concerns the fire, esp. the ritual fire. As I say there, the unpredictability of fire’s appearance from the places where it lies latent seems to negate the inexorable progress of time as depicted in vss. 20–21, and though fire can be frightening and destructive, it also makes possible the sacrifice, which is the bridge between the human and the divine and between this sub-solar realm and the desirable one beyond. In this way it makes the sacrifice the implicit solution to the despair induced by the destruction wrecked by time. This is, of course, only one possible interpr. of the vs., and not all of the vs. fits it well. Ge (intro.) has an entirely different take: that the singer needs Indra’s protection, because the arrows of death are threatening everywhere. I find this hard to detect. In his n. 22 he suggests the following associations: the tree is the bow, the cow the bowstring, and the birds the arrows. This is not impossible, I suppose, but I’d expect at least some clue that archery was the suppressed theme and that there are two levels of extreme metaphors. For me, “held in check in every tree” (*vṛkṣé-vṛkṣe nīyatā*) refers to fire’s immanence in all wood; “the cow will bellow” (*mīmayad gauḥ*) to the roar of a kindled fire, and the “man-eating birds” (*vāyaḥ ... pūruṣādaḥ*) to the flames, which are capable of destruction. On the role of the cmpd *pūruṣādaḥ* in knitting together vss. 21–23 phonologically, see comm. ad vs. 21.

The second hemistich expresses the common contrast between the fear that destructive fire (forest fire and the like) inspires and the ritual activity that takes focus on it, esp. the soma sacrifice to Indra. I would be inclined to replace my “though” with “while.”

X.27.23: Old limits his comment on this vs. to noting its “absolute Dunkelheit,” a disheartening description for anyone who takes it up. However, on the whole it seems somewhat more penetrable than the vss. that precede it. Ge (intro.) suggests that it picks up from vs. 15, which I think is essentially correct. Since in my view vs. 15 concerns the primal institution of the sacrifice, I take that to be the topic here as well, with, as in vs. 15, cooperation between groups depicted as essential to establishing this institution. Ge by contrast takes it as depicting the creation of the world. He gives extensive notes on this vs., but I do not find them persuasive and will not for the most part engage with them.

By my interpr. *māna-* and *kṛntātra-* are two successive stages of the laying out of the ritual ground. First the ground must be measured ( $\sqrt{mā}$ : *māne*), and then the boundaries of the ground must be defined. I consider this to be expressed by *kṛntātra-*. Now this fairly rare stem, presumably derived from  $\sqrt{kṛt}$  ‘cut’, is found once elsewhere in the RV, describing a landscape feature, in the Vṛṣākapi hymn, X.86.20, where it is conjoined with *dhānva* ‘wasteland’ and I tr. ‘chasm’ (perhaps better ‘cleft’). But the word has an abstract sense in AB V.16 *yad rathamtarāṃ syāt kṛntatram syāt* “if it were to be the Rathamtara, there would be cleavage (of the Stomas)” (tr. Keith), with regard to the choice of *sāmans* in a particular ritual sequence. I see such an abstract sense here: the “cleaving” involves the tracing of the boundaries. Recall that in classical śrauta ritual this is done with a *sphya*, a wooden sword (see, e.g., Re, Vocab. du rit. véd., s.v.), presumably making a shallow trench. Why the subjects “come up” (*úd āyan*) from this activity is



unclear to me, unless it is a sort of pun: since the *krntátra-* can also be a cleft or chasm in the earth, the shallow trench can be conceived of as a deep space from which its makers must climb out.

Pāda c presents a paradox: three entities ‘along the water / adjacent to water’ (vel sim.; *anūpá*) heat the earth (*tráyas tapanti pṛthivīm anūpāḥ*), with the heating and the water apparently incompatible. Ge renders *anūpāḥ* as “Büffel,” commenting (n. 23c) that the certain attested meanings of *anūpá-* are “am Wasser wohnend, Marschland, Küstenland; Büffel.” But he gives no ref. for the last (or indeed for the others), and I can find no Vedic exx. for Büffel. Instead the only other ex. in the RV, *anūpé* at IX.107.9, must be a place, not an animal (I tr. “at water’s edge”), and the deriv. *anūpyà-* in the AV (I.6.4 ≅ XIX.2.2) is found in a list of waters from different sources, including “waters from marshy places.” See also ŚBK III.1.1.7 ... *yó vā asyāḥ pṛthivyā ápy anūpè ‘nyátrānyatra khānen naívāpò ‘bhivindét* “... who, even though he would dig in place after place in marshy (land) of this earth, should not find water.” (Cf. EWA s.v., esp. with ref. to the Pkt. *aṇūva-* ‘marshy place’.) On this basis I think we can assume that the three *anūpāḥ* in our passages are locales, not animals, and that they are places that can be configured as marshy or damp in some way. Leaving this last qualification aside for the moment, the best candidates within the context of my interpr. are the three fires or fire places on the ritual ground, which certainly “heat the earth.” But why “marshy” or “damp” or “adjacent to water”? This is harder: all I can suggest is that they are so called because liquid oblations are poured into them or perhaps (though I think less likely) that the hearths are adjacent to where these oblations are kept before they are poured.

The final pāda contains not only the difficult *púrīṣa-* (see comm. ad vs. 21) but also a hapax with non-IA phonology, *bṛbūka-*. Several clues—and several questions—emerge from the pāda: the subject / verb structure is clear: *dvā vahataḥ* “two convey,” though the identity of the “two” is not. The rest of the pāda consists of two apparently acc. sg. masc or neuts: *bṛbūkam* and *púrīṣam*. Are the two to be construed together, in which case *bṛbūkam* is an adj. (so Gr’s tentative ‘dicht, dick’)? are they parallel but separate objects of *vahataḥ* (so Ge: “zwei führen das Wasser(?), den Wasserquell her”)? or is one the object and one the goal of *vahataḥ*. I tentatively opt for the last.

As for *bṛbūka-*, although it is a hapax, it patterns phonologically with a few other words: 1) a PN in a dānastuti (VI.45.31, 33), the sacrificial patron named *bṛbū-*, presumably from a non-Ārya family but assimilated into Ārya society; 2) *bṛbād-uktha-*, a bahuvr. modifying Indra in VIII.32.10, q.v. I adopt in my tr. there a suggestion of Weber’s that it means ‘of stammering speech’, which might be a little joke at Indra’s expense (strong but tongue-tied). I suggest that Indra is also the referent here, and that he is being conveyed to the sacrifice—the default expectation, since this is an Indra hymn and Indra hymns hope for and anticipate the epiphany of Indra at the sacrifice (see next vs.). The “two” that convey him would then be his usual pair of fallow bays, who are regularly the subj. of dual forms of  $\sqrt{vah}$  (see, e.g., nearby X.23.3, as well as I.84.2, 165.4, X.96.6).

The other acc., *púrīṣam*, is then the goal to which Indra is being conveyed. For the basic semantics of this word see comm. ad I.163.1, where I tr. ‘fertile ground’ to reflect the range of “fruitful, loose rich earth, bottom land, as well as overflowing fullness.” I take it here to refer to the sacrifice and would now alter the translation to “to the fertile ground (of the sacrifice).” It thus continues the metaphorical semantics of *anūpāḥ* ‘marshy places’ as a designation of the ritual fires. Both *anūpāḥ* and *púrīṣam* express the luxuriant richness and overflowing fertility of well-watered places—esp. piquant since the ritual ground is dominated by fires.

X.27.24: As the hymn limps to the end, there comes no blinding moment of clarity – even though, as pointed out in the publ. intro., this final vs. appears to be propounding an instructive truth. The first half of the vs. addresses someone in the 2nd sg., and so the first question to arise is – who? Ge clearly thinks it is Indra, the nominal dedicand of the hymn, and I am inclined to agree, though I think it is possible (no more than that) that it is the singer or another mortal. If Ge is correct (intro.), the poet is urging Indra to come out of hiding, as the sun does. This would follow appropriately on the last pāda of vs. 23, where, by my interpr., Indra is being conveyed to the sacrifice, and would express the usual hope for an epiphany of that god on the ritual ground.

My current interpr. of the vs. differs in certain respects from the publ. tr., beginning with the first phrase: *sā te jīvātuḥ*, which I would now render “This is living for you.” By this I think the singer means not only that Indra’s epiphany on the ritual ground is the way he conducts his life (/ is his job), but also that in some sense it provides him with life and refutes the doubts about Indra’s existence that are expressed from time to time in the RV and the wavering devotion to him complained about in vss. 1–4 of this hymn.

The gender of *jīvātu-* is somewhat at issue. Here it seems to agree with fem. *sā*, but in X.60.7 we find *ayám jīvātuḥ* “here/this is life,” as if masc. However, AiG II.2.668 points out that the same vs. contains the phrase *ayám mātā* “here/this is the mother,” so in that context *ayám* is not diagnostic of a masculine. Gr and Old also explicitly identify *jīvātu-* as fem.

This means that the following *tásya* cannot be coreferential with *jīvātuḥ*. With Old I take it as referring to the content of the knowledge Indra is supposed to have, which is stated in what follows. I take the actual content of the knowledge to be the model given in cd, that of the (rising?) sun freeing itself from concealment, while pāda b is the advice itself: don’t keep yourself hidden. This pāda is very similar to VII.100.6 *mā várpo asmád ápa gūha étád, yád anyárūpaḥ samithé babhūtha* “Do not hide away this shape from us, when you have appeared in another form in the clash,” though the addressee is Viṣṇu, not Indra and the word for ‘clash’ is different (*samithé* rather than our *samaranyé*, which recalls *samāraṇa-* twice in vs. 3). In our case I don’t think that “another form” (*anyárūpa-*) is at issue, just that Indra should not conceal himself at all—though of course Indra’s notorious shape-shifting might also be referred to.

As for the model in cd, we should first address the phonologically problematic word *busa-*, a Vedic hapax, which, like *bṛbūka-* in vs. 23, shows non-IA phonology. The word is possibly related to a later, identical word for ‘chaff’, also found in MIA and NIA, as well as some NIA words for fog and drizzle (see EWA s.v.). In our context ‘mist, fog’ makes good sense, since the sun is often concealed by such while it is rising, but often breaks through it with beams of light.

In d *pādú-* is another word isolated in Vedic. Contra Old, I very much doubt it means ‘shoe’ (despite later *pādukā-* ‘shoe’). Bad enough for the sun to have a foot—a shoe seems an image too far! As indicated in the publ. intro., I think the idea is that, as the sun rises out of the mist, a sunbeam shoots down towards the earth, as if shaking itself free of a garment of mist or fog. On this as a possibly optimistic final note, see publ. intro.

## X.28 Indra

In addition to Ge, there are tr. by Doniger (146–48) and Schnaus (Dialoglieder, 203–32). Both Old and Ge provide lengthy introductions and assessments of the general sense and tone of the hymn. None of these treatments convinces me (esp. the true and false Indras of Old and Ge), and I will not engage with them in detail.

This hymn is half the length of the preceding one, and serves as a sort of complementary companion piece, with Indra ostensibly offering simple instruction appropriate to the intellectual level of the artless and naïve, rather than framing it in the deep obscurity of most RVic revelations, incl. those in X.27. However, of course, this “simple instruction” is not so simple after all, though it is couched in the form of abbreviated animal fables, like those used in the Pañcatantra and such texts for the instruction of the callow young. The hymn is also tightly structured as an omphalos hymn. I have discussed the hymn in detail in a number of publications, in addition to the publ. intro. See, for a brief characterization, the Brereton–Jamison Rigveda Guide (2020), esp. pp. 152–53. For the structure, see my 2004 “Poetry and Purpose in the R̥gveda: Structuring Enigmas,” in *The Vedas: Texts, Language, and R̥itual* (ed. A. Griffith and J. Houben), 237–49, and pp. 80–83 in my 2007 *The Rig Veda between Two Worlds*; for the animal fables, my 2009 “The Function of Animals in the Rig Veda, RV X.28, and the Origins of Story Literature in India,” in *Penser, dire et représenter l’animal dans le monde indien* (ed. Nalini Balbir and Georges-Jean Pinault), 197–218. I will not reproduce all of these discussions in what follows.

Like the early vss. of X.27, the hymn is a dialogue, mostly between Indra and the poet-sacrificer, but introduced by the Sacrificer’s Wife, a controversial role in the late RV, as I have discussed at length elsewhere. As disc. below, esp. ad vs. 1, I think the brief presence of the Sacrificer’s Wife here places this hymn in the group that obliquely addresses the introduction of this ritual role in the late RV. As in other such hymn Indra seems to favor this innovation. I do not entirely understand why this complex hymn is introduced by this fleetingly present female, but as I suggested above it may be to call attention to the new ritual model that involves a Sacrificer’s Wife and perhaps to set the stage for the animal stories, simple instruction adapted perhaps for the limited intellect of the woman.

X.28.1: This vs. is clearly spoken by a woman, because the kinship term *śvāsura-* ‘father-in-law’ in the phrase *māma ... śvāsuraḥ* only refers to the father-in-law of the wife, given the patrilocal bias of in-law terminology. There is no symmetrical usage for in-laws of the husband. See Macd/Keith Vedic Index s.v. *śvāsura*, where they assert that “not till the Sūtra period does it include the ‘father-in-law’ of the husband.” (Schnaus, 207–8, suggests that the singer, as son-in-law of Indra, speaks this vs. and that a daughter-in-law does not appear in the hymn, but she fails to understand the asymmetry of the kinship terminology.) The speaker should be the wife of the sacrificer/singer, the male who assumes the role of dialogue partner with Indra in the rest of the hymn. And her father-in-law is presumably Indra: after she marks the surprising absence of her father-in-law, Indra appears, and this is unlikely to be a coincidence. But we should keep in mind that the identification Indra=*śvāsura-* is only implied, not stated. (See also the disc. below ad pāda c of the roasted grains [*dhānāḥ*].) The female speaker vanishes after the first vs. and is not referred to again. The vs. is also, in my view, typed as women’s speech by the concentration of perfect optatives: *jakṣ(ī)yāt ... papīyāt ... jagāyāt*. On the pf. opt. as such a marker, see my 2003 “Women’s Language in the Rig Veda?” (Ged Elizarenkova), pp. 160–64, esp. 161.

The phrase *vīśvaḥ ... anyó arīḥ* is variously interpr., the different readings being driven in great part by likewise variable interpr. of the controversial word *arī-*. For a summary of the various suggestions for this phrase see Schnaus, *Dialoglieder*, 204. The most natural interpr. of the three words is as a single unit, “every other *arī-*,” and this is completely compatible with both the context and the view of the meaning of *arī-* that I follow (see comm. ad IX.79.3), namely that of a stranger who is nonetheless a member of the larger Ārya society. In context, if all *other arīś*

have come, we must conclude that her father-in-law is also an *arí*. Further, if her father-in-law is Indra (see immed. above), then Indra also must be part of the *Ārya* community – and in one sense who embodies the *Ārya* better than Indra?! Why then is he a ‘stranger’? Given Indra’s busy and peripatetic life as the most active god of the Vedic pantheon, I think we can assume that the standard model of the patrilocal joint family, with the father-in-law living with and presiding over his sons and their wives and families (as exemplified, e.g., in the Purūravas and Urvaśī hymn, X.95.4), did not hold in this case, and Indra was at best an occasional (and not always reliable) visitor.

This first clause contains a *hí*, which is quite unlikely to have its usual causal value: \*‘‘Because every other stranger has come, my father-in-law has not come.’’ One doubts that Indra is avoiding the sacrifice because he doesn’t like the guest list. Hettrich (Hypotaxe, 177) ascribes an ‘‘adversative’’ value to *hí* here, which is plausible, though I am not entirely certain how it would develop from the usual sense of *hí*. Perhaps because of the otherwise universal attendance of *arís* depicted in pāda a, the absence of the father-in-law is all the more noteworthy.

In b the poss. 1st ps. prn. *māma* is triply emphasized: by being a first-position tonic pronoun followed by two emphatic particles *íd áha*. It is not clear to me why ‘‘just my father-in-law’’ has this emphasis: if this soma sacrifice follows the standard later śrauta model, implicit also in the RV, of having a single sacrificer (and so a single Sacrificer’s Wife), the absence of other fathers-in-law would need no remark, since no other daughters-in-law should be participating in the sacrifice. It is all the more striking because our 1st-ps. female speaker disappears from the hymn after this 1st vs.

The three pf. opts. in the 2nd hemistich are ordinarily interpr. as expressing past irrealis ‘‘he should have Xed.’’ I have argued at length against this interpr. of the pf. opt. in general; see esp. my 2009 ‘‘Where Are All the Optatives? Modal Patterns in Vedic,’’ in *East and West: Papers in Indo-European Studies*, ed. Kazuhiko Yoshida and Brent Vine, 27-45. I will not repeat the arguments here in detail; suffice it to say that the attested pf. opts. are almost always the only optative stems to their root system and therefore presumably simply express pure optative value, since they are not contrastive with pres. or aor. optative stems. Although in context here, past irrealis could work (‘‘he should have eaten,’’ e.g.), in fact a straight opt. sense ‘‘he should eat / be eating’’ fits better: the sacrifice is in progress, and her father-in-law, not yet arrived, should be eating and drinking *now*.

As Old points out, *jakṣīyāt* is problematic for two reasons: the form should be \**jakṣyāt* and the transmitted form produces an over-length pāda. Both problems can be solved by reading \**jakṣyāt* and explaining the transmitted form as a redactional change induced by pāda-final *papīyāt*. This is no doubt the correct solution. I do wonder, however, if this form could be another, indirect piece of evidence of women’s speech, with the pseudo-distraction of the cluster -*kṣy*- to -*kṣīy*- reflecting the svarabhakti vowel sometimes found in Pāli optatives like *jāniyā*- beside *jaññā*- (see, e.g., v. Hinüber, Überblick, §440; Geiger/Norman, Pali Gr., §129A (1), etc.). A MIA-type form would reflect women’s lower speech register, and the overlength of the pāda would call attention to it.

The roasted grains (*dhānāḥ*) that provide the food portion of the sacrificial meal may provide more indirect evidence that Indra is the father-in-law in question, because *dhānāḥ* are a fairly rare part of the ritual menu and are (almost?) always associated with Indra and, esp., his two fallow bays, which are given *dhānāḥ* to eat in III.35.7, with *dhānāḥ* offered to Indra generally in conjunction with his horses (I.16.2, III.35.3, 43.4, III.52.7). They are also associated with the Third Pressing (see, e.g., III.52.6), which is in large part the domain of the Sacrificer’s

Wife, as I have discussed at length elsewhere (SW/SW, esp. 132–46). This may be the explanation for the question I raised above: why does the Sacrificer’s Wife speak the first vs. of the hymn? She would be esp. active in the Third Pressing, when *dhānāḥ* are employed in an offering to Indra, and this establishes an association between women and *dhānāḥ*, found also in the Apālā hymn (VIII.91.2), on which see my Ravenous Hyenas 161–65. The most prodigious use of *dhānāḥ* in the Third Pressing is in the Hāriyojana graha, the cup for “yoking the bay horses,” in which the roasted grains are liberally mixed with the soma (see, e.g., Hillebrandt, Rit Lit. 133 and MŚS II.5.4.2–7). Note that our vs. ends ... *púnar ástaṃ jagāyāt* “he should go home again”: Indra’s departure for home is the action that would immediately follow the yoking of his horses. On the Hāriyojana in the RV, see I.61.16, 62.13. Thus the female speaker is talking specifically about the behavior Indra should exhibit at the Third Pressing, where she plays an important role.

The third of the three pf. opts. we have been discussing is *jagāyāt*, a puzzling form (see Kü 161-62). It is the only pf. form to the root  $\sqrt{gā}$  in Vedic (save for a single, unconnected med. form in JB; Kü 162), which builds a very well-attested redupl. pres. *jīgāti* and an also well-attested root aor. *ágāt*. Moreover, as Kü also points out, the full-grade root syllable is morphologically aberrant; we should expect *\*jagīyāt*, which would match *papīyāt* to parallel root  $\sqrt{pā}$ , which ends the preceding pāda. The form is all the more surprising because it follows two pf. indic. forms to the synonymous root  $\sqrt{gam}$  in the same vs., likewise pāda final: *ājagāma* (a), *āj jagāma* (b). The 3rd sg. pf. opt. to  $\sqrt{gam}$ , *jagamyāt*, is metrically identical to *jagāyāt* and would therefore fit the cadence, and that form is well established in the RV, with 4 independent occurrences, one in a repeated pāda with 8 occurrences. Moreover, another form of that opt. paradigm, the 1st sg., occurs in the phrase “go home,” like here: I.116.25 #*ástam ... jagamyām*#. Since all circumstances conspire to place *\*jagamyāt* at the end of our vs., the fact that it is avoided in favor of a form to a non-existent pf. stem with the “wrong” grade of the root demands an explanation. The poet must be calling special, even frenzied, attention to the form – but why? I suggest that he is forcing us to recognize the speech in vs. 1 as *woman’s speech*, and doing so by this concentration of pf. opts., the first two legitimate (more or less, though see remarks on *jakṣīyāt* above) and the last a bit of a monstrosity. He seems to be conveying that his female speaker *had* to use a pf. opt. and, lacking one, she made it up, rather incompetently, on the fly, producing something that no *man* would say. Had he used the innocuous and well-formed *jagamyāt* the sociolinguistic point would have been lost, since men in fact use this opt. all the time. Now how did our hapless female produce the form? Probably starting with the redupl. pres. *jīgā-(ti)*, which only requires vowel-substitution in the redupl. to get a perfect stem. (For another woman using the opt. to a redupl. pres. as the moral equivalent of a pf. opt., see Yamī’s *bibhīyāt* in X.10.9 and comm. there.) There are no modal forms to this pres. stem (nor would we expect an opt., at least by my rules) and also no (pre-C) zero-grade forms to the root at all (only pre-V part. *jīg-at-* 1x, 3rd pl. root aor. *ag-uḥ*), so our female speaker would have been on her own for ablaut and would have chosen just to reproduce the full-grade stem *jīgā-* → *jagā-* before the optative suffix.

I realize this is a small point, which is entirely elided in translation and which even the most punctilious philologists focus their lenses on only in order to comment on the morphological disruptions of the form. But if we evaluate the form in context—in the context not only of linguistic form but of “content,” I think it tells us a great deal about how the poet is setting up his hymn and what he wants us to take away from it.

X.28.2: Indra now makes his appearance at the sacrifice and takes the speech. His first hemistich is in high-register Rigvedic rhetorical style, in sharp contrast to the first speaker. As often in such discourse, the subject is not identified. Old (fld. by Schnaus 205–6) suggests that the pf. *tasthau* is 1st sg., which would match 1st ps. *pāmi* in c and constitute an *ātmastuti*. However, the *sá* that opens the pāda makes that interpr. impossible. In my treatment of “*sá* figé” (HS 105 [1992] 213–39) I show that Rigvedic forms of the *sá/ tām* pronoun with 1st ps. reference are vanishingly rare (see esp. pp. 217, 230–31), and in particular there is only one ex. in the whole RV with sg. *sá* and a 1st ps. verb. The standard view (Gr, Ge, etc.) that *tasthau* here is 3rd ps. must be correct. Who then is the referent? Although those who take it as 3rd ps. (Ge, Doniger, etc.) are not explicit, I infer that they think it’s Indra praising himself in the 3rd ps. However, parallel passage with the same rhetoric point in a different direction: to Soma. For pāda a cf. the almost identical X.86.15 (also cited by Ge n. 2a) *vṛṣabhó ná tigmásṛṅgo ’ntár yūthésu róruvat* “Like a sharp-horned bull constantly roaring within the herd,” whose referent is Soma (see also *tigmásṛṅga-* by itself in IX.97.9) —in addition to numerous occurrences of the intens. part. *róruvat-* in IX (e.g., IX.86.7, 91.3, in both of which the part. modifies *vṛṣā* ‘bull’), also characterizing Soma. As for b, passages like IV.54.4 ... *pr̥thivyā váriman ... várṣman diváh* (cf. also III.5.9) suggest that we should supply *diváh* with *várṣman* here (contra Ge, though he partially concedes in n. 2b). For Soma as referent in this type of phrase see VI.47.4 *ayám sá yó varimāṇam pr̥thivyā varṣmāṇam divó ákr̥mod ayám sáh* “This is the one [=Soma] who created the expanse of the earth; who created the height of heaven is this one here.” There is one major piece of counterevidence to my claim that ab refers to Soma: a similar phrase in the next hymn, also by Vasukra: X.29.7 *sá vāvṛdhe várimann ā pr̥thivyāḥ* “He has grown strong on the expanse of the earth.” The subject here is presumably Indra, though it is not excluded that it could be, or could be in addition, Soma. Weighing all the evidence, I find the strong association of pāda a with Soma and the association of the phraseology of pāda b with Soma elsewhere stronger on balance than X.29.7c, though I acknowledge that it is somewhat awkward.

Although this is not strictly relevant to the interpr. of this passage, both of the *-man*-stems in this passage show a curious distribution. Here we have the endingless locatives *várṣman* and *váriman*, both root accented. Both are identified as neuters by grammars and lexica, but in fact both stems are found in the RV only in the loc. (*váriman* 5x, *várṣman* 5x) and so their gender is not assured – though of course root-accented *-man*-stems *should* be neut. They both have suffix-accented stems attested beside them, *varimán-* and *varṣmán-*, identified as masc. and both having clear masc. forms (e.g., acc. *varimāṇam*, *varṣmāṇam*). But these suffix-accented forms do not have the expected poss. adj. sense of, e.g., the Paradebeispiel *brahmán-* to n. *bráhma-*, but seem identical in meaning to the root-accented forms. I have no explanation (beyond positing a cyclic ‘height’ >> ‘having height’ → ‘height’, which may be correct but is not very satisfactory).

From this showy high-style evocation of cosmic Soma, in the 2nd hemistich Indra switches to a balder and more idiomatic presentation of the expected tit-for-tat: my protection for your soma. The first hemistich has no further purpose, I’d say, than to establish Indra’s rhetorical superiority and to cloak the soma he is demanding in exalted language.

In c Ge takes *vṛjāṇeṣu* as referring to troubles in battle: “(Kriegs)bedrängnissen,” but *vṛjāṇa-*, a deriv. of √ *vṛj* ‘twist’, means in the first instance ‘enclosure’ and, by metaphorical development, a group of affiliated people (the same development seen in Engl. expressions like “circle of friends”), and then simply community. It is so used in the previous hymn, X.27.4–5, also spoken by Indra.

On *kukṣí-* as ‘cheek’, not ‘belly’, see my 1987 “Linguistic and Philological Remarks on Some Vedic Body Parts” (Ged. Cowgill), pt. II “*kukṣí* (and *āsyā*),” pp. 71–81, where I argue for the sense ‘cheek’ on the basis of the consistent dual number of this word and its association with the head and its parts in both RVic passages and YV body part litanies, as well as a telling ŚB passage.

X.28.3: It is generally assumed, correctly in my view, that the sacrificer/singer now enters into dialogue with Indra; Indra’s voc. *jaritar* in the next vs. (4a) essentially guarantees this. He briskly and perhaps a bit testily answers Indra’s possible implication that the sacrificial arrangements for the god have been inadequate. In 2d, in exchange for his protection (2c), Indra demanded a *sutásoma-* ‘one who has soma pressed / has pressed soma’, in the form of a bahuvrīhi, and 3ab responds to that, with a full VP utilizing the same words decomposed: *sunvānti sómān*. The speaker makes sure to note that not only has the soma been pressed, but Indra drinks it (*píbasí*)—implicitly linking this statement to his wife’s phrase in the opt. *sómam papīyāt* “he should drink the soma” in 1c. His wife’s words about food, *jakṣīyād dhānāḥ* “he should eat roast grains” (1c), are also echoed, though not lexically, by 3c *pácanti te vṛṣabhāṃ átsi teṣām* “They cook bulls for you. You eat them.” As noted above ad 1c, the roasted grains are associated with the Third Pressing and the Wife and are appropriate in her speech; the cooked bulls are perhaps more masculine. (See the cooked bulls in the preceding hymn, X.27.2, 3.)

Although adjectival *tūya-* appears only here, against 21 occurrences of the adv. *tūyam*, there seems no reason either to emend it or (as Ge does) to render it as an adv. despite its clear acc. pl. form.

The identity and function of *yán* (in sandhi before *m*) in d is disputed. Does it represent the subordinating *yád* (so Pp, Schnaus p. 207, implicitly Doniger), or the masc. nom. sg. pres. part. *yán* to *√i* (so Old, flg. Keith), or both (Ge n. 3cd). I find Ge’s interpr. the most appealing and it is reflected in the publ. tr. “coming when you are summoned.”

The instr. *prkṣéṇa* is construed by Ge with his pres. part. *yán*: “mit Ungestüm kommend,” but this would be an unusual sense for *prkṣá-*, which generally means ‘strengthening, nourishing; strengthening nourishment’; see comm. ad II.34.3. Gr takes it as a PN; but, although it seems definitely to be a name in II.13.8, there seems no reason to interpr. it as such here. (See Mayr PN, s.v., where he accepts it for II.13.8, but hesitates about this passage.) Schnaus (206–7) takes it as an adj. qualifying the (non-overt) personal agent of *hūyámānaḥ* (“von einem Kraftvollen herbeigerufen”). I see it rather as the nominalized ‘nourishment, food’ and a real instrument instrumental, with *√hū*. Cf. IV.34.6 ... *námasā hūyámānāḥ* “being summoned with reverence.”

X.28.4: Indra’s instruction proper begins here. He introduces it with an injunction to his interlocutor to pay close attention to it, using the fronted near-deictic *idám*. To convey its force, the pāda might be better tr. “This (speech) of mine – mark it well.” There follow three tiny vignettes of counter-intuitive events, one per pāda, the second two (c, d) hinting at animal stories, each barely summarized by its climactic act. The first (b) describes in unequivocal fashion a physical impossibility: flotsam floating upstream. This provides the framework within which to interpr. the more ambiguous animal scenes not only in this vs. but in the vss. to come. The overall lesson of all these condensed episodes appears to be that, using the tools and skills appropriate to its species, the weak can best the strong. This may seem like a strange message for Indra to be conveying, since his strength is so overwhelming that he doesn’t need stealth or cunning to prevail. But perhaps it is his hint to the mortal singer/sacrificer that though he is far

weaker than the god, his device—the sacrifice—can be appropriately wielded to exert some control over the god, just like the fox over the lion.

In c Ge (fld. by Doniger) tr. the sense we expect: “Der Fuchs hat von hinten den Löwen beschlichen.” Unfortunately this is not what the Skt. says: Ge’s “von hinten” renders *pratyāñcam*, which does not mean “from behind” but quite the opposite: “facing towards.” Moreover, the adj. qualifies the lion and is neither an adverb nor a modifier of the fox. Schnaus (209–10) faces the problem more squarely, tr. “Der Fuch hat den gegen ihn gewandten Lösen beschlichen” and suggesting that instead of using its usual craftiness and slyness, the fox is engaging in direct confrontation with the lion. Although this admirably reflects the meaning and morphology of *pratyāñcam*, to my mind it doesn’t quite capture what’s likely to be going on: direct confrontation is not what the verb *atsār* ‘crept up on’ implies, and direct confrontation is also unlikely to end well for the fox. My own tr., “the lion, his opponent,” is, I admit, a cop-out. I now think it’s possible that the mismatch between *pratyāñcam* and *atsār* may be the point of the passage: though the lion is directly facing the fox, the latter still manages to creep up on him by stealth and take him by surprise by attacking him frontally. The most widespread fox in India, the Bengal fox, preferentially inhabits open grassland or scrub forest and is nocturnal, both of which could mask its stalking. I would now tr. the pāda “The fox crept up on the lion, (though) he was facing him.”

Note that *atsāḥ* (underlying *atsār*) echoes *átsi* in 3c, to two entirely different roots. (Noted also by Schnaus, 210.)

Pāda d also depicts a weaker, smaller animal (the jackal) taking on a stronger one (the boar), though here the method of hunting seems to be one standard for the jackal— judging from the Wikipedia description of the way golden jackals, which are widely distributed in India, hunt: “Once prey is located, the jackal conceals itself, quickly approaches its prey and then pounces on it. ... They hunt rodents in grass by locating them with their hearing before leaping into the air and pouncing on them.” The root  $\sqrt{tak}$  seems to be esp. used for the swooping of birds, and our verb *nír atakta* here may express precisely an airborne pounce. Google “jackal pouncing” for impressive images of a jackal in midflight.

Another phonetic figure, *atakta kákṣāt*, also noted by Schnaus, 210.

X.28.5: Once again the singer/sacrificer echoes Indra’s words, this time picking up Indra’s pf. impv. *cikiddhi* with a 1<sup>st</sup> ps. form to the same stem, *ciketam*, while substituting *etád* for *idám* to refer to Indra’s speech. He, perhaps disingenuously, emphasizes the intellectual gap between himself, a simple man (*pāka-*), and Indra, the clever one (*gṛtsa-*) who knows (*vidvān*). As disc. in my 2009 “Function of Animals” (pp. 216–17), the *pāka-* regularly seeks instruction or enlightenment from someone who is *gṛtsa-* or more knowledgeable (*vidúṣṭara-*) or discriminating (*vícetas-*)(see, e.g., I.31.4, IV.5.5). As I also argue there, the animal fables with which Indra has already begun are the appropriate vehicle for the instruction of such a man – and, quite possibly, for his wife, as I suggested above.

The other quality the singer attributes to Indra, strength (*tavás-* ‘strong’), seems unconnected with Indra’s intellectual attainments, but it’s worth noting that *gṛtsa-* and *tavás-* are paired elsewhere (see III.1.2 and nearby X.25.5 two vss. after an occurrence of *pākyā*, X.25.3; see comm. ad X.25.5). Perhaps the idea is that the two qualities together define an ideal, someone with both brains and brawn (in the Engl. phrase).



The verb *ciketam* is most likely a pf. injunc in modal usage; so KH (246), Kü (175), though in n. 186 Kü allows the possibility that it is a subjunctive with 2ndary ending, and Lub identifies it as a subj.

On the lexeme  $\sqrt{v}vac$  see comm. ad X.11.2, where I argue that it means ‘provide a decisive answer to a question’, a sense that certainly fits our context. For our particular phrase see VI.18.3 ... *tád ṛtuthā ví vocaḥ* “you will announce that at the proper season,” also of Indra. The injunc. here seems to have modal or future sense. *Pace* KH (263) I do not think it is a “hortative injunctive,” the functional equivalent of an impv. Rather the singer expects Indra to instruct him, but to do so at the time the god deems appropriate.

The timing is, in my view, expressed by the adv. *ṛtuthā* ‘seasonably, at the proper time’—contra the standard view (Gr, Ge, Doniger, Etter [Fragesätze, 204], Schnaus) that it means ‘truly’ / ‘richtig’ in this context. The base *ṛtú-* is of course synchronically completely distinct from *ṛtá-* ‘truth’ and means ‘right time, season’ (see EWA s.v.) both in terms of the regulation of time and, in ritual context, of the proper order of ritual acts, the ritual sequence. The adverb derived from this stem, *ṛtuthā*, should not switch its semantic allegiance to *ṛtá-*, and even in conjunction with the roots  $\sqrt{vid}$ ,  $\sqrt{vad}$ , and  $\sqrt{vac}$  (despite Gr’s meaning 5) “in rechter Weise, der Wahrheit gemäss”) it refers to timely knowledge or timely speech.

What the singer expects Indra to expound to him, expressed in pāda d, is quite obscure, since it both lacks a verb and is couched in metaphor, indeed several metaphors. The subject is Indra’s chariot pole (*dhúr-*), “that part of the yoke which is placed on the shoulders of the animals drawing the chariot or cart” (Macd/Keith Ved Index s.v.), “Anschirrwerk, Gestänge; means of harnessing a horse to the car, pole, forecarriage” (Sparreboom, Chariots 132, citing KEWA s.v. *dhūḥ*). Because the two draught animals are attached to either end of the *dhúr-* with the chariot’s shaft between them, the two sides can be imagined as “halves” (*ārdha-*). Moreover, with a perfectly matched team, the *dhúr-* would be exactly parallel to the ground, but its actual angle is determined by the comparative heights of the two animals whose shoulders it’s attached to. Therefore, one side of the pole may be higher or lower than the other. See *uttarā dhūḥ* in the next vs. as well as VIII.33.18 and a similar phrase in X.102.10. In the latter two passages, esp. VIII.33.18, the chariot pole and the two yoked animals are a metaphor for marriage, with the higher end of the pole (just a little bit higher) ideally representing the husband. Although I do not think this is the primary sense here or in the next vs., it may be lurking, given the presence of the Sacrificer’s Wife in vs. 1.

Here instead I think the question has to do with who or what Indra plans to team up with. The word “half” invites us to consider a number of standard oppositional pairs: heaven/earth, gods/men, Ārya/non-Ārya, men/women, humans/animals, but I think in this case the answer is narrower: which sacrificer will fill the other side of the yoke? It is the usual worry that Indra will attend someone else’s sacrifice.

The adj. *kṣemyā* is the closest we come to a verb or verb substitute in the rel. cl. It is found only here in the RV, though it appears in other early Vedic texts: once in an impenetrable passage in AVŚ XII.2.49, more helpfully in passages in MS (III.2.2) and TS (V.2.1.7) concerning the Agnicayana, in which wanderers (*yāyāvarā-*) are contrasted with *kṣemyā-* ‘stay-at-homes, those at rest’. In my view, the singer is asking which sacrificer or group of sacrificers the (other end of) Indra’s chariot pole will rest upon. Ge (fld. by Doniger) takes *kṣemyā-* rather as ‘peaceful’, an interpr. he explains (n. 5d) as indicating that his pole is looking not for battle, but for peace. This seems to me misconceived: though the base noun *kṣéma-* can mean ‘peace’ as well as ‘repose, rest’, the war/peace dichotomy does not fit the context. Moreover, interpr. it as

‘resting upon’ gives the acc. *árdham* something to (quasi-)govern it, whereas a “peaceful chariot pole” leaves *árdham* entirely up in the air (Ge supplies “geht”).

X.28.6–7: With vs. 6 we arrive at the paired responsive vss. that form the omphalos of this tightly structured hymn in its exact center. Both vss. are spoken by Indra in my opinion, though most (e.g., Ge and Doniger, flg. Sāy.) divide them between Indra (6) and the sacrificer (7). The vss. begin identically: *evā hí mām tavasám* and continue with Indra’s extravagant self-praise, his *ātmastuti*. I disc. these vss. and their place in the hymn in my Animals art. (pp. 241–43), where I suggest that the vss. constitute the technical epiphany of Indra that was hoped for in vs. 1.

X.28.6: I take the subj. of *vardháyanti* to be the mortal sacrificers, harking back to the pl. subjects of *sunvánti* ‘they press’ and *pácanti* ‘they cook’ in vs. 3, where the singer affirmed that ritual offerings were being made to Indra. Cf., e.g., VIII.16.9 *índraṃ vardhanti kṣitáyah* “Indra do the separate peoples make strong”; alternatively it could be the soma drinks or the hymns or some other ritual offering, as in IX.46.3 *eté sómāsa índavaḥ ... índraṃ vardhanti* “these soma drops strengthen Indra.” In any case the subject belongs to the human realm, in my opinion. The *evā* ‘in this way’ may be a blanket reference to these ritual activities as well as a ref. to those activities in vs. 3. I also take *tavásam* as a proleptic adj., the result of the action expressed by *vardháyanti*.

Indra’s response to the singer’s question about the chariot pole is given in pāda b in his typical hyperbole: his chariot pole is higher than lofty heaven. This would, in fact, not be a good arrangement for a yoked team. As disc. immed. above, the ideal position for a *dhúr-* is parallel to the ground or at most a bit asymmetrical (favoring the husband in the marriage metaphor). But here Indra’s end of the pole would be so high that it would be closer to perpendicular, which would make hitching up the other draught animal and driving the chariot quite challenging. But Indra of course does not aim to be a team player, but to assert his overwhelming superiority, and he may even have found the singer’s question about the location of his *dhúr-* somewhat insulting.

The *úd-* ‘up’ (in *úttara-*) in b is complemented by *ní* in the hostile verb *ní śísāmi* “I ‘grind down,’” an idiom found elsewhere (cf. VI.18.13, X.48.4 adduced by Ge n. 6c). In all three cases the obj. is neut. *purū sahásrā* “many thousands,” which phrase is also found in other contexts (I.62.10, IV.28.3, V.37.3, X.23.5). Interestingly, only in X.23.5 is a referent directly supplied: neut. pl. *ásívā* ‘the hostile’, but in IV.28.3 it is likely the Dasyus mentioned in the first hemistich, who are the referents of the gen. pl. part. *yātām* ‘of those going’ that depends on *purū sahásrā*. In any case in all three cases the object to be supplied to ‘grind down’ is enemies.

X.28.7: As noted just above, this vs. is generally assigned to the singer. I find this unlikely: I do not believe that the singer would— or could—claim for himself, in cd, the two signature actions of Indra, the killing of Vṛtra and the opening of the Vala cave, esp. with Indra on the scene. Even less likely is Old’s take, based on his belief that the hymn contains both a true and a false Indra; by his interpr. the false Indra praises himself in vs. 6, while the true one does so in vs. 7, though addressing the false Indra as “Indra” ironically.

There is one very good reason for the standard view: the vocative *indra* in pāda b. I recognize this as a stumbling block – but not as major a one as putting cd in the mouth of anyone other than Indra. I suggest that in b Indra is ventriloquizing the gods calling on him for help “in every action” (*kárman-karman*; that is, in every battle), that is, saying “o Indra” again and again. Although it is not strongly parallel, cf. a passage like V.40.3 *vīṣā tvā vīṣaṇaṃ huve, vājriñ*

*citrābhir ūtibhiḥ / vṛṣann indra vṛṣabhir vṛtrahantama* “Bullish I call upon you, the bullish, possessor of the mace, with your bright help. / Bullish Indra, with your bulls, best smasher of Vṛtra.” I think it also possible that in ātmastutis the self-praiser can address himself, rather in the manner of the poets’ self-address discussed in my 2005 “Poetic Self-Reference” (Fs. Skjærvø), though I have not yet found parallels. I realize that my solution is ad hoc and not strongly supported, but it saves us from worse.

The pf. *jajñūḥ* in pāda a echoes *jajāna* in the immed. preceding pāda, 6d. The 3rd pl. in our pāda is of course ambiguous, however, as it can belong to either  $\sqrt{jan}$  or  $\sqrt{jñā}$  ‘know’. (Though the 3rd pl. to  $\sqrt{jan}$  is *jajanur* in VIII.97.10 (q.v.), the weak forms of the pf. to that root generally have *jajñ-*, including 3rd pl. act. *jajñuḥ* I.159.3, *jajñūḥ* VII.62.4.) Flg. Sāy., Ge and Don. take the form to  $\sqrt{jñā}$ , while Gr (in Nachtr. col. 1761; it’s missing in the orig. lexicon) assigns it to  $\sqrt{jan}$ , and this interpr. is fld. by Lub and Schnaus (p. 214). (Curiously Kü does not cite or disc. this passage.) Because it immed. follows *jajāna*, the initial audience interpr. would surely be as a form of  $\sqrt{jan}$ , and it is only as the hemistich unfolds that  $\sqrt{jñā}$  might seem like a more appropriate contextual reading, since the gods are more likely to *know* Indra as something than to *beget* him. However,  $\sqrt{jan}$  does not have to refer just to physical birth but can also refer to the metaphorical creation of someone in a new role or behavior; see VIII.97.10 with the unambiguous *jajanuḥ* just discussed, where Indra is fashioned and begotten for ruling: ... *tataksur indram jajanuś ca rājāse*. The agents in VIII.97.10 are unexpressed but are probably the singers (so Sāy.) or other officiants (see Ge’s n. 10b); obviously Indra already existed, but their actions fit him for ruling. The gods in our passage also have the capacity to shape Indra’s behavior to their own ends, and I therefore think  $\sqrt{jan}$  is a possible root affiliation and *jajñuḥ* here is a pun.

The 2nd hemistich is strongly alliterative, esp. pāda c: *vádhīm vṛtrám vājreṇa ... vrajám ... vam*. The VP *vádhīm vṛtrám* reproduces the alliteration of the more common formulaic variant *áhann áhim* by other means, with lexical substitution in both terms. The 1st sg. *vádhīm* is of course grammatically “wrong” – we expect \**vádhām*, but it has been mechanically generated to the extremely common *iṣ*-aor. (*á*)*vadhīs*, -*īt*. The 1st sg. is only found once elsewhere, in I.165.8 in the same phrase #*vádhīm vṛtrám*, Our pāda is identical to IV.17.3 except for the 3rd sg. *vádhīt* found there and has simply been transposed here, with the minimal substitution of the final of the 1st sg. ending -*m* for 3rd sg. -*t*. Note that the expected form \**vádhām* (which, however, is not actually attested) is metrically identical to *vádhīm* and could easily have been used.

An even greater grammatical solecism is found in the next pāda, *ápa ... vam*. Just like pāda c, this one contains an unmistakable formula, here the one for the opening of the Vala cave: *ápa*  $\sqrt{vr}$ , which otherwise never shows up in the 1st sg. If it did, we should expect the injunctive to the root aor. to be \**varam*. The formulaic content of the pāda (for *vrajám* in this context, see I.92.4 *vrajám ... ví ... āvar ...*; for the injunc. in the formula, e.g., II.14.3 ... *ápa hí valám vaḥ*) allows the audience easily to interpr. the fairly monstrous form *vam* as a nonce 1st sg. root aor. to  $\sqrt{vr}$ . The 2nd/3rd sg. instantiations of the formula involve monosyllabic *vár*, which is always (5x) pāda final and therefore realized as *vaḥ* in pausal sandhi. Based on this pausal form, where the -*r* of the root is not found on the surface, a monosyllabic 1st sg. has been confected, marked only by substitution of the 1st sg. -*m* for -*h*. Unlike *vádhīm*  $\infty$  \**vádhām*, *vam*  $\infty$  \**varam* differ in metrical shape and the expected form would not fit here. I wonder if the easily interpretable—and unnecessary—*vádhīm* in c was used to set the stage for the less transparent *vam* in d.

X.28.8: This may be the most peculiar vs. in this peculiar hymn. It is a one-off, belonging neither with the responsive ātmastuti vss. 6–7 nor with the dialogue or animal fable vss. that surround them. It is universally (beginning with the Anukr.) and I think rightly assumed to be the speech of Indra. It presents itself as a de-contextualized narrative of some actions of the gods in the past. Ge (fld. by Doniger) thinks the point is that the gods can distinguish the good from the bad—supposedly exemplified by cd esp., where they collect the good wood for making their vehicles (“zu ihre Wagenbau”) and burn up the bad. I see no trace of that scenario in the vs. itself.

Instead I generally follow the interpr. of Pischel (Ved. St. I.179ff.), that this vs. depicts the primal institution of the sacrifice. As he says (179–80), “Die Götter werden hier dargestellt als das Holz zum Opfer schlagend und es dann auf die *vakṣānās* d.h. den *yoni* legend, wo Agni entflammt wird.” The same original establishment of the sacrifice was treated in the previous, related hymn, by my interpr. See esp. X.27.15, in which various groups come together in this enterprise; the first pāda of that vs., *saptá vīrāsaḥ ... úd āyan* “seven heroes came up” (and cf. c *nāva ... āyan* “nine came”) is similar to our *devāsa āyan* “the gods came,” with *abhí ... āyan* in the next pāda. In X.27 the emphasis in the sacrifice-instituting vss. is on the creation of the ritual fire (13–14, 16), and our vs. here depicts the gods cutting the firewood with their axes and placing it in the “belly” – here, in my opinion, the hearth where the fire will be kindled. The same loc. pl. *vakṣānāsu* is found in X.27.16, also concerning the first kindling of the fire, though with slightly different referent: there it refers to the belly of the lower kindling stick (see comm. there).

The instr. pl. *vidbhīḥ* is found only here. It is universally, and I think correctly, assigned to *vīś-* ‘clan’, though it could in principle belong to the very marginal *vīś-* ‘work’. On the stages of the phonological development of *vīś+bhīs* to *vidbhīs*, see the disc. in my 1991 (MSS 52) “An Ox, a Cart, and the Perfect Participle,” pp. 83–84. But who are these accompanying clans? Acdg. to Sāy., the Maruts, and Pischel follows him. Ge rather “mit ihrer Dienstmännern,” fld. by Don. (“servants”), but this seems a reductive interpr. of *vīś-* particularly in its RVic attestations. Oberlies (I.336), who interpr. the vs. as a depiction of the clearing and settling of new land, takes *vidbhīḥ* as referring not to beings (human or divine) but to places where such beings settle (“mit den Niederlassungen”), which seems to be reflected also in Schnaus’s (215–16) “durch die Siedlungen,” with her identification of the form as “Instrumental der Raumerstreckung.” Again I think a comparison with the similar material in X.27 is illuminating: in X.27.15 the original institution of the sacrifice and the establishment of the ritual fire were accomplished by the cooperative labor of different groups. We seem to have the same picture here: the (various) gods, each with his own *vīś-*, that is, his kin-group and followers, come together in this enterprise.

In contrast to simple *āyan* in pāda a, pāda b contains *abhí ... āyan*. I supply “ritual ground” as the goal of *abhí*.

The interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is hampered by (at least) two uncertainties: 1) the referent of *sudrvām* ‘having / made of good wood’ and 2) the meaning and referent of *kīpīta-*. With regard to the first, despite my publ. tr. ‘good wood’, *sudrú-* must be a bahuvr.; see its other occurrence, VII.32.20, where it modifies fem. *nemí-* ‘felly’, which is ‘made of good wood’. Ge here (n. 8c) supplies *vṛkṣá-* (m.) as referent, ‘(tree) having good wood’, and develops a scenario in which the gods load these good logs into their wagon (“in dem (Wagen)inneren niederlegten”), leaving behind the stuff that’s only fit for burning. I do not find the fact that *sudrú-* is a bahuvr. fatal to Pischel’s (and my) interpr., as Old and Ge seem to; we just need to find a suitable referent, either masc. or fem. The *vána-* ‘wood’ of pāda b won’t work, because it’s neut., but something like *samídh-* (fem.) ‘kindling (stick), firewood’ or *idhmá-* (masc.) ‘id.’

certainly would, and in fact the latter might be suggested by the bahuv. *svidhmā-*, with the same structure as *sudrú-*, in the phrase *svidhmā ... vanádhitih* “wood pile provided with good kindling” (I.121.7, by my interpr.). I would therefore slightly adjust my tr. to “depositing the (kindling) consisting of good wood ...”

Ge’s interpr. of *c* requires that *vaksánā-* refer to some part of a wagon, the wagon-belly/innards, that is, presumably, the cargo bed. This is a leap, since there is no sign of a vehicle in this vs. and the stem *vaksánā-* is not otherwise so used. Admittedly the stem isn’t used elsewhere directly for ‘hearth’ either, but see X.27.16 just cited, where it appears in the same context of the kindling of the ritual fire. Moreover, the apparent root noun cmpd *vaksane-sthā-* in V.19.5 has the ritual fire as referent and should mean “(Agni,) standing in the belly [=on the hearth]” (though see the formal issues raised by Scar 654–55).

Another piece of evidence in favor of interpr. this pāda as the primal establishment of the ritual fire is the verbal lexeme, *ní√dhā* lit. ‘set down’, which is often used of the installation of the ritual fire; see I.45.7, III.27.10, VIII.19.17, etc. etc. A particularly succinct version is found in V.21.1 *manuṣvát tvā ní dhīmahi, manuṣvát sám idhīmahi* “Like Manu, we would install you. Like Manu, we would kindle you,” where the kindling immediately follows the installation, as I think it does in our cd. See also *ní√dhā* in the preceding hymn, X.27.14, and *súdhita-* in the same hymn, X.27.16, both of the ritual fire.

*kṛpīṭa-* is a hapax. Given the context, the standard renderings ‘Buschwerk, Gestrüpp’ (EWA s.v. < Neisser), ‘Dürrholz’ (Ge), ‘thicket or firewood’ (Kuiper, Aryans 14), ‘scrub wood’ (Don.) are perfectly reasonable, but all of them assume a sharp contrast between whatever this word refers to and the “good wood” of pāda *c*, hence the deprecatory nuance of the glosses. But there is no evidence for a contrast in the context; it’s simply been read into the passage by the interpr. In fact, *kṛpīṭam* could in principle refer to the same thing as *sudrvām* in the previous pāda – not the same underlying word, because of the difference in gender: *sudrvām* must be masc. or fem., *kṛpīṭam* must be neut. if it is the subject of a nominal clause consisting only of *yātrā kṛpīṭam* – but the same real-world referent. Interpr. it is severely hampered not only by its isolation but also by the fact that it has no etymology and no derivational web. I do not have a solution, but I would point to one clue that has not been utilized heretofore: the parallelism with Vasukra’s preceding hymn X.27, esp. the vss. concerning the installation of the ritual fire and the establishment of the sacrifice (X.27.13–18), which we have already invoked in the disc. of this vs. With regard to *kṛpīṭa-* I would point to X.27.16 with *kapilā-*, meaning (in my interpr.) ‘the brownish one’ and referring (in my interpr.) to the nascent fire or to the kindling stick; our *kṛpīṭa-* could be a hyper-Sanskritization of that stem – or conversely, *kapilā-* could be a MIA development from *kṛpīṭa-*. I would be more comfortable with this hypothesis if the accents weren’t different (and if the quantities of the medial *i*-vowel matched), but it is perhaps not an accident that these two phonologically similar RVic hapaxes are found in adjacent hymns in similar contexts. If they are connected (and actually even if they’re not), the *kṛpīṭa-* can refer to the just-kindled fire or the kindling stick that produced it, with the subj. of *dahanti* the god-priests.

X.28.9: We here return to the précis of animal fables last encountered in vs. 4, one per pāda. Most (Anukr., Ge, Don.) assign the vs. to Vasukra, though Old (intro.) agrees with me that Indra is the speaker. He is continuing his instruction in the medium appropriate to his simple (*pāka-*) audience. Like the stories summed up in vs. 4, these depict the surprising success of a weakling confronting (or pursuing) a stronger opponent. For possible parallels/sources of these stories,

esp. the first about the hare and the razor, see esp. Old, Ge n. 9a, and my 2009 “Function of Animals,” pp. 216–17.

In the first story “the hare swallowed the razor coming towards [/facing] it.” Note first that *pratyāñcam* recurs from 4c, a verbal sign of ring composition, marking out the intermediate vss. (5–8) as an extended omphalos. It is not clear from the bare summary how the hare fared: did the swallowed razor tear him apart internally (as real-world knowledge would lead us to predict), or by the clever ploy of swallowing it did he eliminate its threat? It is only in the larger context of the following stories that the latter, the favorable outcome, seems the likelier (if unrealistic) one. It is a story I certainly wish we had the whole of—the elements so ill assorted and the climactic action so dramatic. Although I will not speculate about the plot behind the summary, I do wonder if it’s not a disguised cosmological reference. As I say in my 2009 article (p. 216 n. 34) “it is tempting to see in the hare/razor story an astronomical allusion to the well-known later conceit of the hare in the moon, already found in Vedic (SB X1.1.5.3 and JB 1.28). If the razor is curved, it could represent the new moon, which the hare of the full moon absorbs (‘swallows’).” If this lunar image lies behind it, the lack of injury inflicted by the razor would make sense.

The middle two pādas (b, c) are distinguished from the rest by the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. speaker (b: *vy ābhedaṃ*, c: *randhayāni*, with the verbs in the impf. and subj. respectively). Although all-powerful Indra is the putative subject and agent of both, the theme of the victory of the weak over the strong is maintained: in b Indra uses an inferior instrument (a clod of earth) to split what should have been impregnable, a rock; is this an early variant on the children’s game rock–paper–scissors? In c, in a more standard Indraic act, he uses his power to render the strong subject to the weak. In b the breaking into the Vala cave seems indirectly referred to;  $\sqrt{bhid}$  is regularly used for this action (see e.g., II.24.3, VIII.14.7, X.62.2). And though in the standard story Indra does not use an earth clod, his instrument is another seemingly ineffectual one, namely a song, a formulation. In c the root  $\sqrt{ra(n)dh}$  plus acc. and dat. (as here) is a stereotyped construction regularly used of Indra’s subjecting an enemy (acc.) to a client-beneficiary (dat.) (see I.51.6, II.11.19, etc. etc.). The use of 1st ps. expressions employing typical Indra phraseology in these two pādas reinforces my view that Indra is the speaker of this vs.

Note the phonological figures in c and d: *brhántam cid rhaté randhayāni, vayad vatsó vṛṣabham ...*

The dat. *rhaté* is a hapax, clearly employed here to function in opposition to *brhántam*. Its general meaning is easy to extract from context, since it must be a semantic opposite to *brhánt-* ‘lofty’—hence, ‘weak’, ‘low(ly)’, or the like. Its etymology is unclear (see EWA s.v.), and since it is situated between *brh-* and *radh-* its phonological shape may have been manipulated to fit the context, esp. given the possibility that the medial *-h-* might represent MIA loss of occlusion. Old suggests a connection with  $\sqrt{arh}$  ‘be worthy, deserve’ (with “small, low” assumed [“sei er noch so klein”] but not overt: a twist on “the deserving poor”). Though the phonology works, I am less convinced by the semantics. The old connection with  $\sqrt{ramh}$ , *raghú-* ‘quick’ (Gr; see EWA) is even more problematic semantically; more attractive is Mayr’s suggestion of  $\sqrt{ra(n)dh}$  in intransitive usage, ‘subject to, subordinate’, so that *rhaté randhayāni* would be a disguised etymological figure. I would myself suggest a connection with *ārbha-* ‘small’ (or even *ardhá-* ‘half’), which would work well semantically. But there is no way to go further here. As for its morphology, Lowe (Participles in RV, 285 and n. 108), flg. Rau (2009: ... *Caland System*, 90), takes it as a Caland adjective, like, in fact, *brhánt-*. But given its isolation, nothing prevents it

from belonging to an athematic root formation or a Vith class pres. or thematic aorist, which is otherwise unattested.

The verb of d, *váyat*, is one of the rare subjunctives to  $\sqrt{vī}$  ‘pursue’; cf. the 1st sg. injunc. *váyam* in the preceding hymn, X.27.9, and comm. there.

X.28.10: In this vs. the strong are depicted as getting into trouble by themselves, without any direct intervention of the weak. In the first three pādas three different powerful animals, an eagle (or other large bird of prey: *suparṇá-*), a lion, and a buffalo, all get trapped; the implication is that in the arrogance of their power they weren’t paying attention. The traps and snares were, however, surely set by comparatively weak humans, and so the overall theme persists.

With most (Old, Ge, Lü [KISch 515], Don 147, Kü 548, Scar 297) I see the *suparṇá-* in pāda a as another trapped victim. Schmaus (pp. 218–19) suggests rather that the bird has his talon firmly fixed in a prey animal, indeed in the lion of the next pāda—reviving, unaware, the view of Pischel rejected by Old. She sees the mismatch of predator (bird) and prey (lion) in ab as a continuation of the weak-versus-strong theme of the previous vs., and parallel to the pairing of buffalo (c: strong / victim) and lizard (d: weak / predator) in the 2nd hemistich.

The two middle pāda, b and c, once again resemble each other—this time by having a large mammal trapped, using the same ppl. of the same root  $\sqrt{rudh}$  (*ávaruddhaḥ* b, *niruddháḥ* c) compounded with the semantically equivalent preverbs *áva* and *ní*, both ‘down’. I have no idea why the 2nd form, *niruddhá-*, is accented on the suffix, not the preverb, contrary to the usual rule (see, e.g., Macd. VGS p. 462) embodied by *ávaruddha-* in the preceding pāda – esp. since the other occurrence of this form is accented on the preverb, *niruddha-* in I.32.11. For another suffix-accented form in this hymn, see *avasṛṣṭá-* in 11c.

The acc. *paripádam* in b is somewhat surprising: a loc. “entrapped *in* a snare” would be more comfortable. See disc. of the stem and of the case syntax by Scar 297–98. The simplest solution seems to be that reflected in Ge’s “wie ein in die Fusseschlinge (geratener) Löwe,” with a dynamic reading of the ppl. *ávaruddhaḥ*—hence my “into.”

On the sandhi of *godhá* in vss. 10 and 11, see Old, Scar 271, and disc. below ad 11a. The word is discussed at length by Lü (ZDMG 96 [1942] 23–50 = KISch. 490–517, treating this passage pp. 48–49 = 515–16) and Scar (269–72). Lü’s identification of the animal as a monitor lizard, a large lizard widely distributed in the subcontinent and, though terrestrial, also at home in the water, is quite convincing, and his treatment covers vast textual and linguistic ground.

My interpr. of d differs radically from the standard, but is close to Old’s and Scar’s (270). The standard (Ge, Lü [KISch 515], Don 147, Kü 548, Schnaus 218–19) sees the *godhá* as seizing the foot/leg of the buffalo and dragging the hapless animal away: e.g., Ge “Ein Krokodil wird ihm dann das Bein wegschleppen.” This interpr. founders, in my opinion, on three points: 1) the rendering of *ayátha-* as ‘foot, leg’; 2) the interpr. of dat. *tásmāi* as a possessive; 3) the necessity of reconciling this interpr. with the almost identical repetition of this pāda in the immediately following one, 11a, with the substitution of pl. dat. *tébhyaḥ* for sg. *tásmāi*. To start with 1): *ayátha-* is found only in these two almost identical pādas 10d, 11a. Although ‘foot’ is the standard interpr., the *-átha-* suffix normally forms abstracts shading into nomina actionis (see AiG II.2.171–73), such as *vakṣátha-* ‘growth’. The best comparandum for our form is *carátha-*, also built to a verb of motion. It is found 5x in the dat. *caráthāya* in (pseudo-)infinitival usage “for moving, to move’. (The 8 [or 9] non-dative forms are morphologically and metrically somewhat troubled [see comm. ad I.66.9, etc.] and are best left out of account here.) If *carátha-* means ‘movement, moving’, then the most likely sense of *ayátha-* is similarly abstract ‘going’, or

concretized to ‘a going, a way’, as Old suggests (‘Gang’), in rejecting the ‘foot’ interpr. Scar (270) also brings up the usual abstract function of *-átha-* as a problem for ‘foot’ and accepts Old’s re-interpr. Scar also points out that this reinterpr. makes it easier to accommodate the dative, since with ‘foot’ we would expect a genitive or perhaps “in partitiver Apposition” an accusative. Although the dat. can be used for possession in Vedic, this use is restricted to existential predication “(there is) a foot to him / he has a foot,” in my experience. Rendering *ayátha-* as ‘foot’ also complicates the interpr. of 11a, for there it would not be the buffalo’s foot that was grabbed, but that of the stingy people who taunt brahmans. Although interpreting 11a requires a certain metaphorical latitude, eliminating the “foot” at least removes an extra layer of metaphor.

If the lizard is not dragging the buffalo by the foot, what is it doing? Let us now focus on the verb *karṣat*, which belongs to the root  $\sqrt{krṣ}$  (though see other spec. by Scar 270, which he ultimately rejects), an item of agricultural vocabulary whose primary sense is ‘plough’, not ‘drag’. The form itself is synchronically an injunctive to the 1st class pres. *kárṣati* (see, e.g., Gotō, 1st Kl. 112–13; no RVic forms are accented, but see AV XV.13.7 *kárṣet* [though the passage is obscure]), whatever its history may be: the existence of both 1st and 6th cl. presents hint at a root formation in its past. In my opinion the fact that the form is injunctive is crucial to the interpr. of these two vss., because the transition from vs. 10 to vs. 11 takes us from Indra’s narrative animal fables to the current situation pitting non- (or bad) sacrificers against good ones. The injunctive in 10d, found in a narrative verse couched in the past, is to be read as a preterite, but the one in 11a has modal/future value: it is a warning that what happened to the buffalo can happen to you! The functional ambiguity of the injunctive provides an ideal pivot.

And what did happen to the buffalo? Here I think Old is essentially correct: the lizard ploughed a way for the trapped buffalo, ostensibly to free it, but “in Wirklichkeit wohl, wie v. 11 zu ergeben scheint, zu seinem Unglück” – presumably by opening a way for the buffalo that led to a place where the lizard could more easily gain control over it (perhaps a body of water? the buffalo was already “thirsty” *tarṣyāvān*). The root  $\sqrt{krṣ}$  ‘plough’ is quite apposite: because the monitor lizard has a long, heavy, dragging trail, its tracks show a distinct furrow-like ridge between its footprints (google ‘monitor lizard tracks’). The characteristic tracks of this large lizard would presumably be familiar to any human who lived in proximity to it.

(As an aside, a google search for monitor lizard hunting turns up the title “Giant lizard versus buffalo.” There are a number of videos on YouTube of komodo dragons attacking and killing water buffalo. Unfortunately the lizard in question is the Indonesian komodo dragon, the largest monitor lizard species and not of course found in the subcontinent – but still ...)

X.28.11: With this vs. we return to the outer ring, with its concern for proper modes of sacrifice matching that of the first 3 vss. of the hymn. As was just noted, this return is effected by pivoting on the almost identical pādas 10d / 11a, using the ambiguity of the injunctive *karṣat* to transition from the narrative past to the ritual present. The fate of the thirsty buffalo in 10cd serves as a cautionary example for the greedy men depicted in 11ab. Although an actual monitor lizard is not bringing them to ruin, the point seems to be the one cited from Old above: although it appears that an easy path has been created for these heedless people, as there was for the thirsty buffalo, it leads to disaster. They think that they can satisfy themselves directly, by eating luxury food (oxen) that others would offer in sacrifice to the gods and, thereby, to the brahmans who perform the sacrifice. But this gluttony and disrespect for gods and brahmans destroy their strength and their bodies.



As I said just above, the first pāda needs to be interpr. metaphorically: the greedy men are not being led astray by a real lizard. However, Scar (270–71) makes the attractive suggestion that *godhā-* in this pāda (though not 10d) is a pun on *go-dā-* ‘cow-giver’ (5x), primarily an epithet of Indra (III.30.21, IV.22.10, VIII.45.19). If Indra is lurking in the background of this word—and identified as the one who provides the bovines in the first place—the expression in pāda a would not be metaphorical and the warning would be more acute: Indra has the power to prepare a path to perdition for those who offend him and wrongly eat the oxen he gives (some of which in turn should be sacrificed to him). I would now slightly emend my tr. to “The monitor-lizard (/the cow-giver [=Indra]) will plough ...”

If Scar’s suggestion is accepted, it may also provide a solution to the problematic sandhi variation in the two occurrences of *godhā-*. In 11a the word appears in hiatus followed by a vowel-initial word: *godhā ayátham*, suggesting an underlying nom. sg. form *godhās* with final *-s*. But in 10d it appears before *tásmai*; if the nom. sg. ended in *-s*, we should find *godhās tásmai*. So the form in 10d must lack the ending *-s*, as it does also in its other occurrence (in a different meaning) in VIII.69.9; such is the Pp analysis too. The apparent *-s* of the form in 11a (so also Pp) needs an explanation: if it is a pun on *godā-* it may owe its *-s* to the influence of that word. In its four nom. sg. attestations the form is always underlying *godās*. Curiously, though the pun is Scar’s idea, he only mentions the possibility of morphological influence of *godā-* on the form of *godhā-* glancingly in a footnote (271 n. 380) as an alternative to his favored explanation, which is both more complex and less plausible.

The offending action that leads to the downfall of the subjects is “mocking the brahmans with food” *brahmāṇaḥ pratipīyanty ānnaiḥ*. Exactly what that means is unclear; Ge (n. 11b) points out that it must be the opposite of *pratiśikṣanty ānnaiḥ* in the next hymn (X.29.5), also by Vasukra. Unfortunately that phrase is at least as obscure as this one, so it does little to illuminate our passage. I think they “mock” either by words (“we’ve got food and you don’t – nyah nyah nyah”) or, more likely, by actions—in the latter case by ostentatiously consuming food that was meant for sacrifice, some of which would have been distributed to the officiating priests, had it been sacrificed. Their eating is expressed by the same root  $\sqrt{ad}$  used for Indra’s (proper) eating of the sacrificial animals in 3c: *pácanti te vṛṣabhāṃ átsi téṣāṃ* “they cook bulls for you. You eat of them,” here echoed by *ukṣṇāḥ ... adanti* “they eat oxen.” See also X.27.6, where the non-sacrificers “drink the cooked milk oblation and serve the foreleg without offering to Indra.” The specific mention of the brahmans here is reminiscent of the two fierce AV hymns against interfering with “the Brahman’s cow” (in Whitney’s title), AVŚ V.18–19 / AVP IX.17–18, promising dire penalties to those who do so. The first hymn begins (AVŚ V.18.1 = AVP IX.17.1 [the latter wo/ accents]) *naítām te devā adadus, túbhyam nṛpate áttave / mā brāhmanásya rājanya, gām jighatso anādyām* “The gods did not give her to you to eat, o king; do not seek to eat the cow of the brahman, which is not to be eaten, o Rājanya.” The overt hostility between varṇas in the AV hymns, which is especially characteristic of the AV, is absent from our passage, but similar disaster is in store for our unidentified subjects.

The extent of their mockery, indeed their blasphemy, is expressed by the ppl. *avasṛṣtān* ‘released’ in c. Although the lexeme *áva*  $\sqrt{srj}$  has a number of applications, a particular ritual use is in play here. The sacrificial animal is “released” (*áva*  $\sqrt{srj}$ ) from the post to which it was tied immediately before it is sacrificed. See the stereotyped usage of this lexeme in the Āpṛī hymns, where the *vānaspāti-* ‘lord of the forest’, that is, the post, “releases” the animal, generally referred to as “the oblation” for taboo reasons, for sacrifice to the gods. Cf., e.g., I.13.11 *áva srjā vanaspate, déva devébhyo havīḥ* “Release, o Lord of the Forest, the oblation to the gods, o god”

(very sim. also 142.11, II.3.10, III.4.10=VII.2.10, X.110.10). The very next action in the Āprī hymn template is the sacrifice itself. An even clearer instance of the usage of this lexeme is found in a non-Āprī hymn, X.91.14, where a list of sacrificial animals, including *ukṣāṇaḥ* ‘oxen’, are *avasṛṣṭāsa āhutāḥ* “released (and) offered.” Although the qualifier ‘released’ might suggest that the animals have been let loose and are roaming free, in fact they are on a narrow path to ritual death. In other words the offenders in our vs. have snatched and themselves consumed the sacrificial animals on the point of being offered to the gods – they have invaded and hijacked the sacrifice. (Ge [n. 11c] also recognizes that *avasṛṣṭā-* describes specifically Opfertieren, but, referring only to a gṛhya sūtra passage, seems to think it refers to animals that had been bound for sacrifice but were then actually released without being sacrificed.)

On *simá-* see esp. Old ad I.95.7, where he considers all the relevant passages incl. this one—which he renders “sie (und keine Andern).” The Pp interpr. the Samh. *simá* as sg. *simáh*, but *simé* with pronominal nom. pl. ending is the better reading. See Old’s disc. ad I.95.7.

Pāda d depicts the comeuppance that the arrogant eaters bring on themselves—their role in their own downfall emphasized by both *svayám* and *tanvāḥ*, as well as by the middle voice of the part. *śṛṇānāḥ*, the only middle form to this stem. Most take *tanvāḥ* as gen. sg. dependent on *bālāni* (“breaking the powers of (their) body”). This is possible, but because of the number disharmony (one body / plural subjects) and the acc. pl. *tanvāḥ* in the matching contrastive vs. 12b, I take it as an acc. pl. parallel to *bālāni*. However, as to my first argument, the sg. instr. *tanvā* in clear pl. context in the companion hymn X.27.2 *tanvā sūśujānāḥ* “puffing themselves up in body / with their body/-ies” renders that consideration less cogent.

X.28.12: The arrogant, impious, but ultimately self-defeating behavior of the actors in vs. 11 is contrasted here in the first hemistich with the good sacrificers, who bring themselves success. The hymn ends with an address to Indra, asking for bounty for “us” – presumably those who perform sacrifice in ab.

The standard interpr. of pāda a involves two etymologically near-identical instr.: *śámībhiḥ susámī* “by ritual labors, by good ritual labor.” For a poet of the skill of Vasukra this seems an exceedingly flatfooted way to end this tour-de-force hymn. It also leaves the verb *abhūvan* with surprisingly little to do. Ge (n. 12a) suggests that the verb has the pregnant sense common for  $\sqrt{bhū}$  in the Brāhmaṇas, namely ‘thrive’ – a sense he also claims for *ābhūḥ* in the preceding hymn, X.27.7—where, however, the straightforward “came into being” fits the context better. I suggest in contrast that *susámī abhūvan* is a pseudo-/proto-*cvi* construction, a type found in the RV only in *akhkhalī-kṛtyā* in the Frog hymn, VII.103.3. Here the base noun would be the well-attested indeclinable *śám* ‘weal, luck’. This form in fact is regularly compounded with  $\sqrt{bhū}$ , in the adjectives *sambhú/-bhū-*, *viśvá-sambhū-*, with the splv. *sambhaviṣṭha-*. There are also a number of examples with finite forms of  $\sqrt{bhū}$ : e.g., I.90.9 *śám no bhavatv aryamā* “Let Aryaman be weal for us” (see also I.189.2, II.3.8.11, III.17.3, etc.). But, as the tr. shows, this VP does not mean “become lucky,” but “be luck for” – that is, the subject transfers the luck to the dative recipient. In order to indicate that it’s the subject that possess or acquires the luck, in this late RVic hymn it would not be surprising to improvise with the  $\sqrt{bhū}$  version of transitive  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  in the nascent *cvi* construction. Though I do not know of other examples with a root noun (or whatever we want to call *śám*) as base in the *cvi* type, it is not unlikely that various experiments were tried as the construction was emerging. That the resulting *śám-ī* coincides with the stem of the noun *śámī-* ‘labor’ is, for Vasukra, a happy rhetorical result. By my interpr., then, *śámībhiḥ susámī* is a punning expression, since the two *śám*-s are unrelated. Rather than the pedestrian

doubling assumed by other interpr., we see here yet another example of Vasukra’s poetic artfulness.

On *hinviré tanvāḥ* see comm. ad X.65.2.

The *ukthaiḥ* that ends b contrasts with identically placed *ánnaiḥ* in 11b, characterizing the tools of the bad sacrificers.

The last hemistich is addressed to Indra. Note the framing: #*nṛvát* ... *vīráḥ*#, two words that can be applied to both humans and to gods, but here applicable to Indra. The poet may be underlining the relationship between superior humans and Indra, the qualities they share.

“Speaking like a man” (*nṛvát vādan*) may also refer to the verbal instruction Indra has given in the middle of the hymn, which were composed in the human style.

The nom. *vīráḥ* may simply double the subject, in which case the pāda should be rendered “(As) hero, in heaven you have established your fame and name.” But far more likely is that standard interpr. (incl. the publ. tr.) that *vīráḥ* is the actual name, which reverts to the nom. in quoted speech, though *nāma* is in the acc. See a similar ex. in I.103.4.

## X.29 Indra

This last hymn attributed to Vasukra does not let up on the enigmas or the splashy poetic displays. In fact, vs. 1 is a leading contender for the most complex and trickiest single verse I have encountered in the RV. Unfortunately the tight control of structure exhibited in the preceding two hymns, esp. X.28, is not encountered here, so that we cannot use structural clues to help untangle the mysteries of the hymn.

X.29.1: As I have treated this vs. at extraordinary (perhaps wearisome) detail in my 2015 Fs. Gerow article (“Śleṣa in the Ṛgveda? Poetic Effects in RV X.29.1,” *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 19: 157–70), I will simply insert most of the text of that article here. In it I argue that the verse anticipates techniques well known from Classical Sanskrit poetry, such as bitextuality, ambiguity of reference, and other types of punning, while serving to sketch a larger ritual situation than the verse appears to depict on the surface.

Although the various poetic effects operate simultaneously, I will first treat them separately under some of the following rubrics: phonological patterning, syntactic reversal, syntactic ambiguity, lexical ambiguity, dual reference, bitextuality, and thematic allusion. I will be as explicit as possible about the mechanisms, to the point, I fear, of tedium.

The hymn begins with a striking phonological and morphological sequence. The first four syllables, ending with the caesura -- *vāne ná vā* – are a near phonological chiasmus, with initial *vā* matching final *vā*, and *ne ná* echoing each other internally. This pattern is rendered particularly salient by the unusual sequence of four monosyllables following the initial disyllable: *vāne ná vā yó ní*. Or apparent monosyllables: we will see below that there are several ways to construe this sequence besides the monosyllabic interpretation of the Padapāṭha. The opening calls attention to itself also by the unbalanced *vā* ‘or’ syntactic construction, where *vāne* ‘in the wood’ and *ná* ‘not’ are the apparent non-parallel disjunctive possibilities set up by ‘or’.

The rest of the pāda sets up a syntactic puzzle. The last two words are both finite verbs, *adhāyī cākān* (or better *nī adhāyī*), but their order is the opposite of what Ṛgvedic syntax would dictate. In the first verbal lexeme *nī adhāyī*, the finite verb is unaccented but immediately follows the relative pronoun *yāḥ*, which should trigger verbal accentuation (that is, \**nī ádhāyī*) if that verb belongs in the relative clause, while the second finite verb *cākān* is accented, though it appears to be a main clause verb. (The accentuation of a main-clause *cākān* is less problematic

than the non-accentuation of a subordinate clause *adhāyi*, because *cākān* in this interpretation would resume the main clause and so possibly count as syntactically initial.)

One solution (going back to Baunack 1886: 377; see Oldenberg, *Noten* ad loc.) has been, as in Geldner's translation, to switch the functions of the two verbs, i.e., to interpret *ní adhāyi* as the main verb and *cākān* as the verb of the subordinate clause. Thus, "[he] has been deposited who takes pleasure ..." For Geldner and other interpreters of earlier eras, a period that subscribed, explicitly or implicitly, to the notion of free word order in Vedic, the order of the verbs assumed here would be unusual but not really problematic. But in the more regulated RVic syntax of our time we expect neither embedded relative clauses nor—worse—embedded main clauses. But the Baunack/Geldner interpretation, which construes the initial locative *vāne* with the final *cākān* ("[he/it] has been deposited who takes pleasure in the wood or not"), requires that the main clause verb *ny ādhāyi* be embedded in the discontinuous relative clause *vāne ná vā yāḥ ... cākān*. (Even English, which embeds relative clauses with abandon, would have serious trouble with an embedded *main* clause, as here; note that a literal English translation of the proposed interpretation of the pāda is unparseable: "Who in wood or not -- he is deposited -- takes pleasure.")

As it happens, I think the embedded-clause interpretation is the correct one. But not because I believe that embedded clauses were generally licit in Ṛgvedic discourse, but because I believe that they were not. This is a deliberate syntactic violation, and it is also a syntactic-semantic pun. The clause "(he) has been set down/deposited" is literally "set down" (that is, embedded) in the middle of the relative clause; its *meaning* replicates its *syntactic position*. The grammatical embedding is, as it were, iconic of the "setting down" of the referent in the main clause. I do not know if there is a technical term, either in Sanskrit or in the larger literary world, for this type of rhetorical figure, but even if it does not fit into a particular named category in literary theory, in my opinion it displays a remarkably sophisticated consciousness of how grammatical form can be made to follow and mirror semantic function.

There is a way to avoid the verbal accent problem while retaining the relative clause: by interpreting it as a nominal relative clause: *vāne ná vā yāḥ* "who is in the wood [=Agni] or not." What follows this putative nominal relative clause, the two verbs *ny ādhāyi cākān*, would then be taken as two parallel verbs in the main clause: *ny ādhāyi cākān* "he has been installed (and) takes pleasure." The accent of *cākān* would then be explicable according to the resumptive verb condition alluded to above. This seems to be Ludwig's solution, cited by Oldenberg (*Noten*, ad loc): "Der im Holze oder auch nicht im Holze (weilt), wird niedergelegt, er wars zufrieden." This is possible but not particularly elegant.

This pāda has not yet yielded all its secrets, however. Let us return to the string of monosyllables discussed above: *ná vā yó ní*. In the Geldner interpretation (which I generally follow, as the primary reading), which is based on the Pp. analysis, this sequence is, in translation, "not / or / who / down," each with its separate function in the syntactic complex. But different interpretations are made possible by unverbating adjacent syllables in different combinations, and even if these were not meant by the poet as the *dominant* reading these alternatives add an elusive (but I would claim, deliberate) resonance and thematic nuance to the overall "meaning" of the verse.

Let us begin at the very beginning of the line, with *vāne ná*, where we could read the two ostensible words as one, the instr. sg. *vānena* (with erasure of the second accent). As this reading doesn't seem to buy us anything thematically, I will not discuss it at length. Nonetheless, it opens the poem with a possible ambiguity and sets the stage for the following multiple readings.

Proceeding then from left to right, the first two apparent monosyllables *ná vā* could be combined and read as a form of *náva-* ‘new’. What would this contribute to the verse? Note that the first actual nominative in this verse is *stómaḥ* ‘praise-song’ in pāda b; the two verbs in pāda a lack overt subjects. Given that ‘praise-song’ is the subject of pāda b, it would not be surprising if a semantically related noun, such as ‘hymn’, ‘song’, ‘praise hymn’, were the underlying subject of the verbs in pāda a, and ‘new(er)’ is a regular qualification of hymns and songs in the RV, expressing the crucial goal of the RVic bard: to attract the gods to the sacrifice by producing a strikingly novel verbal composition generated from traditional materials. True, if *návā* is to modify it, the noun should be feminine, as opposed to masculine *stóma-*, but such feminine nouns are easy to find (e.g., *gír-*, *dhī-*, *dhītí-*, *matí-*, *stutí-*, etc.); fem. *návā-* in fact modifies *gír-* in II.24.1 (*ayā ... návayā mahā girā* “with this great new song”). Although I do not believe that “new (hymn)” is the primary intended subject of pāda a (*pace* Lanman, Noun inflection 505, flg. Roth), given the lack of overt subject in that line the audience would be pardoned for falling into such a trap, especially as “has been set down/deposited” is certainly a possible predicate for such a subject. See nearby X.31.3 *ádhāyī dhītīḥ* “The insightful thought has been set in place,” also in ritual context (additionally, e.g., I.162.7, 183.6). And I venture to say that the poet consciously laid this trap.

Combining the next two words, *vā yó*, gives us several possibilities, one of which has a long interpretational pedigree. Yāska (VI.28) follows this unverbated reading *vāyó*, interpreting it as a patronymic, ‘son of a bird’ (*veḥ putrah*), i.e., presumably a vṛddhi derivative of the root noun *ví-* ‘bird’. Yāska is followed by Sāyaṇa and by Oldenberg. Sāyaṇa’s gloss of *vāya-* spells out the implications of the vṛddhi at some length (couched in the accusative because he rewrites the aorist passive as a transitive present): *śakuniḥ sve nīḍe vāyam ātmīyaṃ putraṃ nyadhāyī nidadhāti śísukam ajātapakṣam* “a bird places in its own nest the *vāya*, (viz.) the son of its own self, its little chick whose feathers haven’t grown.” Here is Oldenberg’s translation of the first pāda with the vṛddhi interpr.: “Wie im Wald ein Vogel (weilt), ward er (im Wald = Holz) niedergelegt, fand (daran) Befriedigung,” interpreting *ná* as the simile marker, not the negative, and also doing away with the somewhat awkward *vā* ‘or’. See also the explicit vṛddhi reading in Klein’s (DGRV II.208-9) preliminary translation “As the son of a bird (dwells) in the wood, he (i.e., Agni) has been set down (in the wood).” But this is just Klein’s pūrvaśa; he rejects the “bird” reading and accepts the Śākalya / Geldner interpretation with *vā yó*.

Not surprisingly the proposed simile is a fairly common image, as in IX.96.23 *sīdan vāneṣu śakunó ná pátvā* “sitting in the woods like a flying bird.” The entity compared to the bird must be Agni, a comparison often made in the Ṛgveda. Although this interpretation is tempting and, by eliminating the supposed relative pronoun *yó*, would also eliminate the problem of verb (non-)accentuation in a subordinate clause discussed above, there are some problems with it in turn. The primary one is the fact there is no independently attested stem *vāyá-* ‘bird’ to which *vāyó* would be the nom. sg. in sandhi -- only the archaic paradigm *ví-* (nom. sg. *vés* as well as synchronically regular *vís*) and a marginally attested collective neuter *s*-stem *vāyas-* with short vowel, generally assumed (see AiG II.2: 227) to have been reinterpreted from the identical root noun nominative plural. The only ‘bird’ word with long vowel in the initial syllable is the transparent vṛddhi derivative with thematic suffix *vāyasá-* (I.164.52 and later), built to the *s*-stem. Although a putative thematic vṛddhi derivative to *ví-*, namely \**vāyá-*, would probably be theoretically possible (see AiG II.2: 127-28 on vṛddhi derivatives to *i*-stems, but there are no examples given of root nouns in *-i*), it seems preferable not to invent an otherwise unattested stem for just this passage. Moreover, at least in Oldenberg’s rendering (see also Klein’s

pūrvapakṣa), the simile is supplied with a different verb (weilt / dwells) from the frame (ward ... niedergelegt / has been set down), a serious violation of Ṛgvedic simile structure (see Jamison 1982). Nonetheless, I do not reject the possibility that a “bird” reading is one of the several recessive alternatives hidden in this syllabic sequence.

But a reading *vāyó* suggests another possibility, though it requires the elimination of the accent -- namely the vocative of the god Wind, Vāyu. As with *nāvā* I am not suggesting that this is the primary reading, but a secondary possibility that actualizes some underlying themes. Why a fugitive reference to Vāyu might be appropriate here will be discussed below.

Let us finally turn to the last two monosyllables, *yó ní*. Read together, with elimination of the second accent, they produce the word *yóni* ‘womb’ in both literal and extended senses. The fireplace at the sacrifice is often called a *yóni* and the ritual fire / god Agni is established therein (generally with the lexeme *ní√sad* ‘sit down’, sharing the preverb *ní* with our *ní√dhā*; e.g., VI.16.41 *ā své yónau ní śīdatu* “let him [=Agni] sit down in his own womb”). Since one of the few things that is clear about this verse is that it at least partially concerns the establishment of the ritual fire in its fireplace, a subsurface reference to *yóni* is entirely apt.

We can map these various possible readings as follows. (Asterisks mark forms where one accent has been erased. Combinations of the listed variants are also possible, e.g., *váne nāvā \*yóni*.)

*váne ná vā yó ní* (per Padapāṭha)  
 \* *vánena vā yó ní*  
*váne nāvā yó ní*  
*váne ná vāyó ní* (per Yāska, etc.)  
*váne ná \*vāyo ní*  
*váne ná vā \*yóni*

I find it hard not to see embryonic śleṣa or bitextuality in the six superimposable possibilities of this six-syllable sequence, most of which subtly underline the thematics of the verses as a whole.

Such are the verbal intricacies of the first pāda, but several larger questions about it remain not only unsolved but as yet unposed. Chief among them is the identity of the unexpressed subject of the two verbs, and this will lead us to the larger question of reference in this verse, which is generally quite coy about the identities of the entities contained therein. For the first pāda the verb *ny ādhāyi* is the major clue, for the lexeme *ní√dhā* is a standard technical expression for the installation of the god Agni as ritual priest (see Geldner, n. 1a, with numerous parallels cited). Combined with the initial word *vāna-* ‘wood’, a substance not surprisingly associated with fire and the deified Fire, circumstantial evidence strongly points to Agni as subject. This surmise finds some support in the priestly title Hotar found at the end of pāda c, since Agni is regularly identified as a Hotar and identified with the human Hotar.

But pāda c also raises problems with this identification, because the nom. sg. *hótā* at the end of the pāda is matched in case, number, and gender by *índraḥ* earlier in the line. There is nothing explicit in the pāda to disjoin the two nominatives, though an audience’s general knowledge of the Vedic context should produce strong opposition to equating Indra and the Hotar. Nonetheless, Scarlatta (302 n. 430) tentatively suggests the possibility, among many others floated, that Indra is being referred to as Hotar here. (I find this very unlikely.) Sāyaṇa also takes *hótā* as a qualifier of Indra, but interprets it not as the priestly title, but as a transparent *-tar*-agent noun to *√hū / hvā* ‘call’, glossing it *āhvātā*. This contrasts with his gloss of *hótar-* when he is comfortable with a priestly reading – e.g., referring to Agni in I.1.1 *hotāram ṛtvijam / devānām yajñeṣu hotṛnāmaka ṛtvig agnir eva*.

The identification of Indra and Hotar can be blocked, but this produces a different conceptual disharmony. It would be technically possible to divide the pāda into a nominal relative clause (*yásyéd índraḥ*) and a nominal main clause (*purudīneṣu hótā*), with *hótā* [=Agni] as the referent of *yásya*. This seems to be Scarlatta's (302) preferred solution: "... er, dem Indra ja zugehört, an vielen Tagen der Hotar ..." But, the implication, that Indra belongs to Agni, is at least as hard to accommodate within the R̥gvedic conceptual universe as that Indra is the Hotar. We will return to the syntax of this pāda below.

So, we have implicit reference to Agni in pādas a and c and explicit reference to Indra, who is also the dedicand of the hymn, in pāda c. What is the relationship of the two gods here? This question is further muddled by pāda d in the phrasal etymological figure *nṛṇām nāryo nṛtamaḥ* "the manly one, best man among men." Although the phrase is in the singular, it is actually applicable to either Indra or Agni -- or both. The adjective *nārya-* is generally typed for Indra when it modifies a god, but (*nṛṇām ...*) *nṛtamaḥ* is used of both gods (though somewhat more often of Indra). Out of ca. 50 occurrences of *nārya-*, about 8 apply directly to Indra, including one in verse 7 of this same hymn; it is also used of a few other gods, also of legendary heroes and of humans, as well as of inanimate objects and forces. Indra and Agni are almost the only referents of the approximately thirty independent occurrences of *nṛtama-* (with or without *nṛṇām*), though a few characterize human heroes or the Maruts. The absolute numbers are skewed towards Indra, however, because the word is found in a common Viśvāmitra refrain (14x: III.30.22, etc.). For Agni, cf., e.g., ... *nṛtamo yahvó agniḥ* (III.1.12, IV.5.2); for Indra, e.g., X.89.1 *índram stavā nṛtamam yásya mahná*. Of course the splv. phrase (undistracted: *nṛtamasya nṛṇām*) occurs in the next vs. (2b) clearly referring to Indra, but I don't think this requires the phrase here to apply exclusively to Indra. Thus, the final pāda seems designed *not* to resolve the puzzle set up by the juxtaposition of Indra and (Agni) Hotar, but to allow both gods to be evoked by the descriptive phrase in the singular. Note that this phrase shows an embedding reminiscent of the embedding in pāda a, with the two halves of the superlative phrase (*nṛṇām ... nṛtamaḥ*) surrounding the adjective *nāryaḥ*. If the superlative is more likely to refer to Agni and the adjective to Indra, interspersing the words in this fashion further blurs the separate identities of the two gods. What makes this double application especially nice is that the various derivatives of *nṛ-* 'man, superior man' select different manly qualities in the two gods: Indra's superior manly heroism, but Agni's closeness to men, as the god who lives in their dwellings and mediates between them and the gods. (Recall also that in the final vs. of the previous hymn, X.28.12, Indra speaks *nṛvát* 'like a man'.)

The final word of the verse, *kṣapāvān*, does little to resolve the duality. In modern times the standard reading of this adjective is 'protector of the earth' bleached to simple 'protector' (*kṣa-pāvant-*, with the first element a zero-grade from of the archaic noun *kṣám-* 'earth'). Although this word (thus accented also in I.70.5; with initial accent, *kṣá-pāvant-* 3x) is clearly used of Agni in three of the four other occurrences (I.70.5, VII.10.5, and VIII.71.2; in III.55.17 the referent is ambiguous, but the most likely candidates are Agni and Soma), there seems no reason that an adjective with such a meaning could not equally describe Indra. But the word displays what we might term morphological śleṣa, as it can also be analyzed *kṣapā-vant-*, with the first element containing the word *kṣáp-* 'night'. Such an analysis has ancient roots, as Sāyaṇa's gloss shows (though with unjustified additions to its semantics): *rātriparyāyeṣu somabhāgaḥ* "having a share of soma in the rounds of the (Ati)rātra [=Overnight] ritual." With a suggestion of Scarlatta (303), we could analyze *kṣapāvant-* as based on a syntagm with original predicative instrumental (*kṣapā* "[he is] with night"), which was then provided with a *-vant-*

possessive suffix. Scarlatta (303) also suggests other ways to incorporate *kṣáp-* ‘night’, e.g., by haplology from \**kṣápā + pā-* ‘protecting by night’ (his reconstructed initial accent reflects a posited adverbial accent shift from inst. *kṣapā́*; see p. 303 and n. 452). The exact details matter less than the fact that the Vedic audience could likely see a pun in this word, between *kṣa-* as a combining form of *kṣám-* ‘earth’ and *kṣap-* ‘night’ (for another poss. ex. see I.70.5, 7 and comm. thereon). An analysis involving ‘night’ would favor Agni as referent, since fire is depicted in the RV as man’s defense against encroaching night and, in particular, the kindling of the ritual fire is associated with the return of daylight and the defeat of night.

If pādas c and d can both be read as applicable simultaneously to Indra and Agni, we might reconsider pāda a, where we identified only Agni as the subject of the verbs in that line. Could Indra also be lurking in that pāda as well? I think it possible, on the basis of the odd phrase *vāne nā vā yāḥ ... cākān* “who takes pleasure in the wood or not.” Agni as fire certainly does “take pleasure in the wood” throughout the RV, burning his way through both ritual and profane versions of that substance. But Indra is not likely to get any satisfaction from wood. If Indra is a potential subject of the verbs in pāda a, he may be “set down” at the ritual ground as the recipient of the dawn sacrifice whose epiphany is much desired. In this case, he could be the subject associated with the disjunctive negative “or not.”

Ambiguity of reference also clouds pāda b, which we have yet to deal with. Unlike the other pādas, the general message of this one is fairly straightforward: *śúcir vām stómo bhuraṇāv ajīgaḥ* “The gleaming praise-song has awakened you two, o bustling ones.” The problem is posed by the vocative *bhuraṇau*. First, so far there has been at most one being referred to in the hymn, namely the unnamed subject of the verbs in pāda a, so where do we get a dual 2<sup>nd</sup> person? The general context allows us to surmise who the dual might be. On the one hand, as we saw above, the verb *ny ādhāyi* is likely to have Agni as its subject on the basis of multiple parallel passages and the technical ritual sense of the verb; on the other, the hymn is dedicated to Indra, as the audience would of course be aware. Thus the enclitic *vām* ‘you two’ and the vocative *bhuraṇau* ‘o bustling ones’ could easily identify the pair Indra and Agni. Such an identification is supported by the second hemistich discussed above: the presence of both Indra and (Agni) Hotar in pāda c and the epithets applicable to both those gods in pāda d, as well as by the possible lurking presence of Indra in pāda a, as was just suggested. But the adjective *bhuraṇa-* is only found in the dual (3x total; only voc. so unaccented), and the other two duals are addressed to the Aśvins. Moreover, the phraseology of pāda b has reminiscences in explicitly Aśvin contexts. Those gods are twice objects of the verb *ajīgaḥ* (III.58.1, VIII.67.1); III.58.1 is an especially close parallel: *uśāsa stómo aśvínāv ajīgaḥ* “The praise-song of Dawn has awakened the Aśvins.” So, although the pragmatics of our hymn suggest that Indra and Agni should be the referents of the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. dual in pāda b, the larger formulaic system suggests the Aśvins instead. Indeed, this is Sāyaṇa’s view – one that causes him some distress (*tad asādhu*), given that the first ṛc of a sūkta dedicated to Indra should not be in praise of the Aśvins.

Can these competing referents be reconciled? I would argue that they can, or rather that throughout this verse we are meant to hold distinct referents in our minds simultaneously and superimpose them upon each other: Indra upon Agni, and Indra and Agni upon the Aśvins. Simultaneous reference is quite common in the R̥gveda. This practice is not quite equivalent, at least in scale, with composing a poem that narrates the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa simultaneously, but it arises from the same impulse – to encourage multiple readings, rather than forcing the audience to choose one. I would further argue that in our verse these multiple readings are in service of a larger project: evoking the dawn sacrifice and its attendant divinities



in a verse that makes almost no overt reference to this ritual complex. The gods associated with the dawn ritual are Agni, whose kindling initiates the sacrifice, the Aśvins, Indra and Vāyu, the pair who receive the first offering, and of course Dawn herself. And, although only Indra is mentioned by name in the verse, (almost) all the others are indirectly present here: Agni, because of his characteristic vocabulary (pādas a, cd), the Aśvins, because of their formulaic evocation in pāda b, and Vāyu, in the śleṣa identified in pāda a discussed above. Note that it is the vocative of his name, *vāyo*, that floats to the surface in the reanalysis of pāda a. This is probably no accident, as it evokes the well-known conjoined address to Indra and Vāyu, *vāyav* [voc.] *īndras* [nom.] *ca*, an archaic construction found in dawn-ritual hymns inviting the two divinities to soma drinking (e.g., I.2.5, 6).

But where is Dawn? She may be evoked by the parallel to pāda b just cited: *uṣāsa stómaḥ ... ajīgaḥ* “The praise-song of Dawn has awakened...” The *súciḥ* ‘gleaming’ modifying *stómaḥ* in our verse can also be a stand-in for Dawn’s light; see I.134.4 .. *uṣāsaḥ súcayaḥ...*, etc. But more importantly she appears overtly at the beginning of verse 2: *prá ... asyā uṣāsaḥ* “At the forefront of this dawn here...” Thus, the poet skillfully sets the stage for the dawn sacrifice in verse 1 using none of the standard tropes, but rather by śleṣa and lexical and formulaic evocation. Only then, in verse 2, does he straightforwardly introduce the dawn and proceed to the sacrificial performance that is to draw Indra to our ritual ground. If it is poetic cleverness and linguistic indirection that lure Indra, the poet will certainly succeed.

There remain a few loose ends, concentrated in pāda c. The pāda lacks a verb and, as we saw above, the referent of the rel. *yāsya* is unclear. Here I follow Ge in supplying *cākān* from pāda a as the verb and the *stómaḥ* of b as the referent of the relative. I diverge from Ge in taking *īndraḥ* and *hótā* (=Agni) as separate subjects of the supplied *cākān*; Ge nudges pāda-final *hótā* into the next pāda. Ge makes the nice point (n. 1a) that *cākān* can take both loc. and gen. complements, with the first in pāda a and the other in pāda c – though in the midst of all the other poetic complications this effect is hardly noticed.

Pāda c also contains the hapax *purudína-*, with the ‘day’ element (*-dína-*) found otherwise only in *madhyāmdína-* ‘midday’ and *sudína-* ‘day-bright’ (?), on which see EWA s.v. *madhyāmdína-*. Since *sudína-* is an adj., *purudína-*, with the same accent, probably is too; so Gr “vielleicht ein *vieltägiges Fest*,” EWA ‘viele Tage enthaltend’. It is thus likely that this is the temporal designation of some ritual (a sattrā? or just a soma sacrifice, but reckoning in the days of preparation?), but the exact ritual reference escapes me. Nonetheless the tr. should probably be altered to “at (rituals) of many days.”

In the publ. tr. I limited the number of alternatives presented for the sake of (semi-)intelligibility.

X.29.2: This vs. lacks the verbal tricks of vs. 1 but is discouragingly enigmatic nonetheless.

The multiple days of the sacrifice indicated by *purudíneṣu* in 1c may also be reflected in the expression *asyā uṣāsaḥ ... áparasyāḥ* “of this dawn and a/the later one.” With Old and Ge I take this gen. phrase as a temporal expression; I construe the genitives loosely with the repeated *prá*, which seems associated with the two temporal alternatives (*prá ... asyā uṣāsaḥ práparasyāḥ*). The *prá* is otherwise difficult to account for; it should not be a preverb with *syāma* in b because *prá√as* means ‘be preeminent, surpass’, which does not fit the context—*pace* Ge’s “bei deinem ... Antanzen ... den Vorrang haben,” which suggests that we’re hoping for front-row seats. On the temporal genitive see Delbrück, AIS §113, which mentions *uṣāsaḥ* specifically. Gr construes *uṣāsaḥ* with *nṛtaú* (see s.v. *nṛtí*), and Ge (n. 2b) suggests this as an additional syntactic

connection on the basis of I.92.4, where Dawn is compared to a dancer. However, Indra most definitely dances elsewhere (cf. V.33.6, where Indra's *nṛmṇāni* appear in the same pāda, with the same word play as here), and I think his "dance" here is his much-desired epiphany.

Like 1d, pāda b contains a sequence of three *nṛ* forms, including the repetition of the splv. phrase *nṛṇām nṛtama-*, though in a different order and a different case. But the third word *nṛtaú* 'at the dance' is not etymologically bound to this phrase, as *nárya-* in 1d is (though it surely is by folk etymology).

As Ge says (n. 2c), the 2nd hemistich presents a "dunkler Sagenzug." The problem (or one of them) is *triśóka-*. This word is always a PN, seemingly of a human ṛṣi/poet. In I.112.12 he is one of the many clients aided by the Aśvins, in a series of vss. that name men of similar ilk, like the far better known poets Kaksīvant (vs. 11) and Bhāradvāja (vs. 13); in VIII.45.30 he is aided by Indra. In both cases the aid he receives allows him to drive cattle up or out (of a mountain in VIII.45.30), in a Vala-like denouement. VIII.30 is also attributed to Triśoka Kāṇva by the Anukr, probably on the basis of his appearance in vs. 30. And in AV IV.29.6 he appears in an overstuffed list (vss. 3–6) of clients of Mitra and Varuṇa that includes many of the best-known RVic poets. (In vs. 6 he finds himself between Medhātithi and Uṣanā Kāvya.) What is this rather recessive poet/hero doing here? As indicated in the publ. tr., I think there is a pun here, and that in addition to the man's name, *triśóka-* is a reference to Agni, who, of course, is represented at the ritual by three fires, hence 'having three flames' as an epithet. (Three of the five occurrences of *śóka-* are connected with Agni.) A reference to Agni could continue the theme of vs. 1, the establishment of the ritual fire. But it doesn't get us much further with the Sagenzug, and in fact I now think that the Agni identification is a red herring planted by the poet.

For the Sagenzug we should start further along, with a name we know better: Kutsa. Kutsa is famous for his association with Indra in the battle against Śuṣṇa, in which exploit Uṣanā Kāvya also figures. Kutsa regularly rides on Indra's chariot. See, e.g., IV.16.11 *yāsi kútsena sarátham* "you [=Indra] drive on the same chariot with Kutsa" (sim. V.29.9, also with *sarártham ... kútsena*). It is this phrase that I think underlies the puzzling relationship between the main clause and the relative clause, with the latter having as subject *rátho yáh* "which chariot" (nom.), which has no apparent antecedent in the main cl. If *kútsena* belongs to the main clause and allows us to supply the phrase *\*sarátham kútsena*, then the antecedent is covertly there, though locked in an adverb, which, moreover, is unexpressed in the text. (Construing differently, though with more or less the same sense, Ge: he takes *kútsena* with the rel. cl. and supplies *\*ráthena* in the main cl.: "... auf dem Wagen, der durch Kutsa der Gewinnende werden sollte." On the difference see below.) But Indra not only travels on the same chariot with Kutsa, he sometimes "conveys" (*√ vah*) him: V.31.8 ... *ávaho ha kútsam* "you conveyed Kutsa" or they are "conveyed" together: V.31.9 (next vs., same hymn) *indrākutsā váhamānā ráthena*. Now *√ vah* provides the verb of the main clause in this hemistich: *ánu ... ávahat*. The subject of this verb is Triśoka, who may or may not also stand for Agni, as noted above – but the subject I would really like to see here is Indra – and I do not see any way to make *triśóka-* an epithet of Indra beyond arbitrary fiat.

There is also the problem of the verbal lexeme: *ánu-á√ vah*, which occurs only here in all of Skt. as far as I can see. Ge also feels (n. 2c) that decoding the hemistich depends on understanding the sense of that lexeme.

And a further problem is the 100 men whom Triśoka conveyed, for which I know no mythological precedent.

I can make some further headway but am far from understanding the whole. Looking at the Trisoka passages elsewhere we can situate him in a web of associations that point to the episode of Indra's slaying of Śuṣṇa with the help of Kutsa and the counsel of Uśanā Kāvya. Trisoka is linked to Kutsa at least marginally, since I.112, which contains one of the few attestations of *trisoḱa-*, is attributed to Kutsa; Trisoka is directly linked to Indra because Indra aids him in VIII.45.30. On the basis of AV IV.29.6 we can also connect him to Uśanā Kāvya. The phraseology of our passage also points to this same episode, as outlined above. It is almost as if Trisoka is a kind of Zelig figure (from the movie of the same name), a nearly anonymous minor figure absorbed into a well-known plot. Perhaps the 100 men he conveys are reinforcements or auxiliaries for the combat, and the *ānu* of *ānu-ā√vah* means 'convey in addition'. But if this is an variant of and expansion on the more familiar Śuṣṇa slaying tale, this is its only occurrence, as far as I know, and we will never know more about it.

Even if this is all true (and in fact it doesn't fit together very well), what does this contribute to this vs. and this hymn? I remain mostly baffled. One clue to the contribution it makes is the switch from mythological past to potential future: the verb of the main cl. is (most likely) an augmented impf. (so Pp.), though technically it could also be an injunc., *ā vahat*. The verb of the following rel. clause is subjunctive, made even clearer by being periphrastic (*āsat sasavān*). So the mytho-historical snippet in the main clause must be serving as model for the present: the chariot journey in the main clause led to success and victory (the killing of Śuṣṇa, if I've identified the myth right), and so the chariot with which we're currently concerned will be victorious too. I would suggest that current chariot is the one on which Indra is traveling to our sacrifice – for the epiphany that seems to be the topic and goal of this hymn. (Note that if I am correct about the division between mythological past and ritual present, this provides more support for my view that *kūtsena* belongs to the main cl., despite the preceding pāda boundary [*pace* Ge], since Kutsa belongs to the myth, not our current ritual.)

Here and in two other occurrences (VII.87.2, IX.74.8), the nom. sg. of the pf. part. to *√san* should be read with a heavy root syllable, reflecting, one way or the other, the set root. On this issue see KH (Aufs. 544–46), who weighs the merits of *\*sasāvān* and *\*sasanvān*; I would favor the former.

X.29.3–5: These three vss. present themselves technically like an omphalos structure, with the two outer vss. (3, 5) responsive, with their vs.-final *ānnaiḥ* and forms of *√śak*. This would define vs. 4 as the omphalos, and, rather cutely, it also has a form of *ānna-*, but the recessive *ānne* beginning 4d. However, in terms of content this doesn't work: vss. 3 and 4 pattern together, and vs. 5 change the subject, so, although the structure of the three vss. is promising and they are found in the middle of the hymn, I don't think that's what's going on. Instead it's better to concentrate on the similarities of the first two of these vss. (3–4), where the poet peppers Indra with questions about when and how Indra will come to our sacrifice and what will induce him to choose our sacrifice (over those of competing sacrificers).

X.29.3: In pāda a the publ. tr. renders *rāntyo bhūt* as if it were a gerundive periphrasis ("is to be enjoyed by you"), but since *rāntya-* is built to the *-ti-* stem *rānti-*, the tr. oversells its verbal nature. I'd now emend to "... is / will be enjoyable to you." The injunctive *bhūt* is functionally ambiguous.

In b the verbal lexeme (*abhí ... ví dhāva*) is construed with a double acc. *dúraḥ gírah*. I think it likely that *dhāva* selects a different preverb for each acc.: *abhí* for the goal *gírah* 'hymns',

*vī* for the doors, through which Indra is to run. *vī* is regularly associated with ‘doors’ elsewhere, esp., but not only, with the lexeme *vī√vṛ* ‘open’.

But the doors of what? I think it likely that they are the same as the enigmatic “divine doors” (*dvāro devīh*) found in the Āprī litanies, generally in vs. 5 (I.188.5, VII.2.5, etc.) or 6 (I.13.6, 142.6). In the Āprī context the doors open up for sacrifice (e.g., I.13.6 *yāṣṭave*) or for the gods to come through (e.g., I.142.6 *prayaī devébhyaḥ*). See esp. III.4.5 *abhīmāṃ yajñām vī caranta pūrvīh* “They [=gods] proceed through the many (doors) towards this sacrifice,” with *vī* and a verb of motion, as here. The doors are discussed in detail by van den Bosch in his comprehensive treatment of the Āprī hymns (IJ 28 [1985] 95-122, 169–89), with the doors disc. pp. 104–6, incl. a survey of previous lit. Though the disc. is useful, I cannot follow the au in taking them as real doors, “special gates ... erected for this sacrificial performance” (p. 105) of, in his view, an archaic domestic animal sacrifice. Instead I think they must be the conceptual doors that give the gods access to our ritual ground, that open up for them when we perform sacrifice, and that, when conceptually shut, keep the divine and mortal spheres safely separate.

Note the phonological play *dūro gīro ... ugró*, with parts of the 1st two words combined in the third.

Pāda c poses some questions, beginning with the first word, *kād*. Is it a lexicalized ‘when?’ (per publ. tr.) or the neut. nom./acc. sg. of the interrogative prn/adj. ‘what/which?’ (per Ge, Old [ZDMG 50 (1896) 430 = KISch 8])? I now favor the latter against my previous tr. The final word of the pāda is also problematic: *manīṣā* in the Saṃhitā text. Since *d* begins with a vowel (*ā*), the underlying form should be *manīṣāh*, and this is the interpr. in the publ. tr. The presence of an indisputable *manīṣāh* at the end of the next vs. (4d) might support this reading. However, the Pp. reads *manīṣā* despite the resulting hiatus; on this reading see Old’s various reff. starting with the Prātiśākhya, which favor the form in hiatus. I now see that I should accept this sg. form, though in fact it will not make much difference in my interpr. (which will change considerably for other reasons). In the publ. tr. I took it as nom. pl.; I now interpr. it as nom. sg., though it could also be an instr. sg. (so Gr).

To understand the pāda we need to consider the meaning and use of the keyword *vāhas-*. (As for its form, I have no opinion on the lengthened grade in this word and some other derivatives of the root *√vah*.) Gr glosses it ‘Darbringung’, which is adopted in EWA (s.v. *VAH*, p. 536); Ge renders it “Anziehungskraft” (force of attraction), I’m not sure on what grounds. (In fact Ge makes no comment on this vs. whatsoever.) The word is discussed at length by Old in the art. cit. above (“Vahni und Verwandtes,” ZDMG 50 [1896] 423–33 = KI Sch 1–11) with his customary acuity: he situates it within the well-known RVic conceptual equation of the sacrifice with a chariot. He notes the fact that *vāhas-* is primarily – and widely – found as a 2nd cmpd member in bahuvrīhis whose first member is a word for ritual speech: *ukthā-vāhas-*, *gīr-vāhas-*, *stóma-vāhas-*, etc. Old’s interpr. (429=7) of such cmpds is “dass das Loblied als mystischer Wagen oder als Gespann den Priester zu Erfolg und Gewinn hinführt, oder dass der Priester es dem Gott als Gespann ausrüstet, der Gott mit diesem Gespann zum Opfer fährt.” His 2nd suggestion seems to me the one most generally in play: the poet’s hymn serves as the vehicle that brings Indra to the sacrifice. Two (III.30.20, 53.3) of the uncmpded occurrences of *vāhas-* involve poets making a *vāhas-* for Indra. Cf., e.g., III.30.20 ... *matībhis túbhyam vípra, índrāya vāhaḥ ... akran* “The inspired poets have made a vehicle for you, for Indra, with their thoughts.” Although *vāhas-* is not cmpded here, it does appear in the same pāda, and probably the same case, as *manīṣā-*, a word for ritual speech, though not one cmpded with *-vāhas-* elsewhere.

The syntax of the pāda is compressed; there is no verb and no Indra, but the phrase *arvāg úpa mā* “near by, to me” suggests that “me” is the goal, and we need a verb of motion (cf., e.g., VII.72.2 *ā naḥ ... úpa yātam arvāk* “drive here near to us”) or perhaps better a form of  $\sqrt{vah}$  with *índram* as supplied object and *mā* as goal. I also now think that initial *kád* should, with appropriate (if silent) adjustment in gender be construed with *manīṣā* as well as *vāhaḥ*, thus equating the two words, as if in a cmpd \**manīṣā-vāhas-* ‘having inspired thought as vehicle’. Putting all this together I would now emend the tr. to one of the following: “What vehicle, (what inspired thought (will come) nearby to me?” or “What vehicle, (what) inspired thought (will convey you) nearby to me?” I favor the latter, even though it requires supplying more, because the poet is deliberating about how best to craft his *manīṣā* to bring Indra to him.

The lexeme  $\acute{a}\sqrt{śak}$  is uncommon in the RV and does not seem to have a settled sense or even a settled case frame. I would now change my “would compel” to “would empower”; in other words the poet by the offering of both praise and food would give Indra the power (as well as the inclination) to reward the poet. This rendering also conforms better to the one for the desid. *pratiśīkṣanti* in 5d.

X.29.4: The poet’s questions continue in this vs., and indeed, like 3c, it begins with *kád*. As in that pāda *kád* here can be either ‘when?’ or ‘what/which?’. Either would be grammatical, since *dyumnám* is neut., but despite the apparent parallelism with 3c I prefer ‘when?’ here (contra Ge, Old), since we’re not choosing between various *dyumná-*s that Indra has to offer, but hoping that he will arrive with *dyumná-* to bestow. Moreover, *kád* in b cannot be ‘which?’ but should be ‘when?’ or at the very least a question particle as Ge takes it, so intra-vs. parallelism supports the ‘when?’ interpr.

My interpr. of pāda a differs from those of Ge and Old because of divergent interpr. of the final phrase *tvāvato nīn* and divergent morphological analyses of the final word *nīn*. The same phrase is found in II.20.1; see esp. Old ad loc. Both Old and Ge (and indeed a number of scholars; see in general AiG III.211–12) see a morphological multivalence in *nīn* to which I am highly resistant (see comm. ad I.146.4, IV.2.15, 21.2): I think it can almost always be interpr. as the acc. pl. it appears to be, while Ge allows gen. pl. as well (e.g., here and in II.20.1) and Old takes it in those two passages as gen. sg. (and elsewhere even as nom. pl.). There is, in my view, strong pressure to take it as acc. pl. here. On the one hand the same form is a clear acc. pl. in 2c, and there are also two perfectly formed gen. pl. (1d, 2b, as often, better read \**nīnām* to repair the cadence; see Old) and a nom. pl. *nārah* in 5d, so the poet must have had the conventional paradigm in his head. Against a gen. singular reading is the nom. pl. *nārah* in 5d, who appear to be the same people as our *nīn*. Moreover, 3c, our pāda 4a, and 4b all have the same conceptual structure in my view: all three contain an acc. goal referring to us or our side: 3c *mā*, 4a *nīn*, 4b *naḥ*, and all three are questions about when or how Indra will come to us—though only the last has an overt verb of motion, *āgan*.

In b we return first to the question of *whose* hymn, *what kind* of hymn will attract Indra (as in 3c): *káyā dhiyā karase*. But the next question, which continues into the next hemistich, is about the timing of Indra’s advent.

In c I take *satyā-* as ‘actually present’, with reference to Indra’s epiphany, rather than the standard ‘true ally’ construed with *mitrah* in the simile.

The dat. *bhṛtyaí* is ambiguous: it can either refer to our bearing offerings for Indra (as I take it) or to his support for us (or, indeed, both). There are no other dat. occurrences to this

stem, but the two acc. sg. *bhṛtīm* (VIII.66.11, IX.103.1) both refer to our offerings to the gods, and since the next pāda refers to such offerings I favor that interpr.

Ge's interpr. of *d* is entirely different from mine: "da eines jeden Sinnen auf Speise gerichtet sein wird." He thus takes *manīṣāḥ* in an entirely different sense from *manīṣā* in 3c (a vs. that also contains *ánna*-), which speaks against his interpr. In my view, the poet is returning to the issue of competing sacrifices, which is implicit in the urgent questions he's been raising. Now he makes it explicit: admitting that the sacrifice of someone else (*samasya*) will also feature both food (*ánne*) and *manīṣā*-, the two items he promised Indra in 3cd. This admission seems a bit like a strategic blunder – though surely Indra knows it already – but (again implicitly) the poet is asserting the superiority of his own offerings. My interpr. requires loc. *ánne* to refer to the ceremony of food offering, not just to the food itself, but this doesn't seem like too much of an expansion.

The unaccented pronominal stem *sama-* (13x, excluding reps.) is generally taken as a straight indefinite 'someone, anyone', but it's worth noting that it's almost always found in clear pejorative context, of unspecified opponents. English 'some' can develop the same sort of negative sense – e.g., "some guy" in contexts like "Some guy was Xing ..." generally refers to someone doing something disapproved of ("some guy was making trouble" rather than "some guy was helping an old lady"). For the RV cf. passages like I.176.4 *ásunvantam samam jāhi* "Smite anyone who doesn't press (soma)." For the three passages that appear to have neutral sense (VI.27.3, VIII.21.8, and X.54.3), see comm. ad locc.; all three are best interpr. negatively.

X.29.5: Another vs. studded with puzzles. The first pāda seems to consist of several interlocked similes anchored by *préraya* 'send forth', with Indra the unnamed addressee of this impv. in my view (versus Ge [n. 5ab]: self-address of the poet). The first simile consists of nom. *sūrah* (*pace* Gr, who takes it as gen. to *svār*-, but in agreement with Ge, KH [139], Scar [252]) and acc. of goal *ártham* "send forth (as) the sun (sends forth X) to the task/business," with the direct object – who or what is being sent there – unexpressed. But it is not difficult to supply the object, since this is the common trope of the dawn / sun / Savitar dispersing humans to their tasks in the morning (cf., e.g., I.113.6, VII.63.4). In the 2nd simile, by my interpr., the only expressed element is the goal, *pārám* 'far shore'. I supply "boat" as the direct object being sent there, in keeping with the literal meaning of *pārám*, though the others cited above simply take it as the goal in the frame (e.g., Klein DGRV I.122 "Impel forth over to the other side ..."). In his n. 5ab Ge does introduce the possibility of a boat and cites the telling passages II.42.1. *íyarti ... iva nāvam*, X.116.9 *síndhāv iva prérayam nāvam* "I send forth (speech) like a boat on a river." Although the position of *ná* might seem to speak against my interpr., as has been discussed elsewhere (VIII.76.1, X.21.1), *ná* 'like' is blocked from pāda-final position and flips with the simile word in those circumstances. In any case the direct object of the frame is, by general agreement, the gapped masc. pl. prn. \**tān*, which would serve as antecedent of the rel. *yé* in pādas b and cd.

These two clauses (b and cd), conjoined by *ca*, presumably define the groups of humans who will benefit from Indra's nudge and who have in some way earned his helpful push. The 2nd rel. cl. (cd) works very well in this scenario, depicting the humans' ritual activity. But b is a different matter.

The interpr. of b is considerably complicated by the hapax root noun cmpd *janidhā(h)* 'wife providers' (?). By form this can be either nom. or acc. pl., but neither choice contributes helpfully to the interpr. Before tackling the wife problem, it's useful to determine the referent of

*asya*. This is generally taken to be Indra (Ge, Old, Klein, Scar, but not KH), but Indra must be referred to in the 2nd ps. in cd, given the enclitic *te* and the voc. phrase *tuvijāta ... indra*. As indicated above, I also think that Indra is the addressee of the 2nd sg. impv. in pāda a. Although switch between persons is not unusual even within a single vs. in the RV, it would, I think, be unusual to have a 3rd ps. sandwiched between two 2nd ps. in the same vs. The case for the Indra ref. of *asya* is based on the larger context: if men are trying to fulfill Indra's wish (*asya kāmam*), they deserve his aid, just like the ritualists in cd. But I find the reference sandwich too problematic and think that b is actually less parallel to cd than it appears (or indeed should be). Instead it seems to be a recasting of one of the similes in pāda a: just as the sun sends people to their task(s), so (in b) do people pursue each his own desire. The sg. *asya* would be individuating the various different *kāma*- the plural subjects have.

So what do the *jani dhā*- have to do with this, and are they being compared with the subjects, the *yé* who go to the *kāmam*, or with the object, the *kāmam*? Most opt for the former, while the publ. tr. reflects the latter. Before attempting to adjudicate the case identity, we should make a stab at figuring out what the cmpd might mean. I will start with an outlier suggestion, that of KH, which I wish I could adopt but which seems an impossible interpr. His tr. of b (139) is “der einem (*asya*) auf den Wunsch eingehen wie ein zum Eheweib bestimmtes Mädchen (?)” Unlike the standard interpr. noted above, he does not take *asya* as a reference to Indra (as far as I can see), but as a sort of indefinite. But it is his interpr. of *jani dhā*- as a nom. sg. fem. “zum Eheweib bestimmtes Mädchen” that is more radical, since it assumes a passive sense of the root noun *-dhā*-, which would be unprecedented for *-dhā*- cmpds (and in fact questionable for most root noun cmpds). But it would yield some sense in the pāda: those fulfilling the wish of the unidentified *asya* would be likened to a new bride fulfilling the wish of her husband. However, I think this interpr. has to be rejected because of the twisting of the root noun cmpd, which is esp. unlikely given the existence of the parallel cmpd *jani-dā*- ‘giving wives’ (IV.17.16, of Indra). Conforming to the standard model of root noun cmpds, the first member should be the obj. of the root noun – as in cmpds like *dhiyaṃ-dhā*- ‘creating thought’, *ratna-dhā*- ‘creating / establishing / providing treasure’, etc., as well as the just-cited *jani-dā*-. What would a bride-creator/establisher/provider be? Ge suggests “Ehestifter” (matchmaker), which makes literal sense, but I do not know of any evidence for such a role in Rigvedic society (not that we would necessarily have it). Nonetheless, the publ. tr. adopts a version of this, “providers of wives,” with the further assumption that men go to such people to fulfill their wish (for a wife). I now think this was an ill-thought-out translation of desperation, though I don't have much better to replace it with. I now think Gr's ‘Brautführer’ / Scar's ‘Brautwerber’ are closer to the mark and have some connection to what we know about the mechanics of ancient Indian marriage. As I have discussed elsewhere (see esp. SacWife 221–23 and passim), a prospective bridegroom does not seek the hand of a maiden himself, but sends “woosers” (*varā[ka]-*) to the prospective bride's family to arrange the match. These woosers are already found in the RVic wedding hymn X.85.14, and the institution is treated more straightforwardly in the gr̥hya sūtras. The woosers can reasonably be considered ‘arrangers/providers of the bride’, and they would perform this task “at the desire” (*kāmam*) of the bridegroom. I now therefore would tr. the pāda “(those) who pursue each his own desire, like bride-providers (=woosers) at his (=bridegroom's) wish,” with *asya kāmam* used in two different senses and syntactic functions (the one in the simile being adverbial) and *jani dhā* nom. rather than the acc. of my publ. tr.

After this, the interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is comparatively uncomplicated. As noted above, this clause must express the ritual actions directed at Indra that attract his aid. As in the

previous two vss., which treat the same matter, food is a crucial element: pāda-final *ánnaiḥ* matches that of 3d, with loc. *ánne* in 4d somewhat recessive, since it describes the ritual of the rival sacrificer. The previous two vss. also showcase the verbal portion of the ritual, with *manīṣāḥ* (3c, 4d). In our vs. *gírah* is substituted. The use of a form of  $\sqrt{sak}$  ‘be able’, here the semi-lexicalized desid. *síks* with *práti*, a combination found only here, also recalls vs. 3 *ā ... śakyām* – though the two uses of *sak* are slightly different. In 3d the object is Indra, who is empowered by the ritual offerings to (display) generosity; here it is the hymns that are empowered, to be offered to Indra.

X.29.6: The worst is now over, and the hymn drifts to its conclusion with no more than normal difficulties.

My interpr. of the first hemistich differs considerably from Ge’s, and there are arguments in favor of each—though ultimately I favor my own. The points of difference are 1) what is predicated of what, 2) how *mātra-* ‘measure’ is used and what it refers to, 3) what root *súmīta-* belongs to:  $\sqrt{mā}$  ‘measure’ or  $\sqrt{mi}$  ‘fix’, 4) what the instrumentals in b are doing and who do these qualities belong to.

Ge’s tr. is “Die beiden sind für dich reichliche, gutbemessene Massstäbe: der Himmel an Grösse, die Erde an Weisheit.” He thus takes *mātre* as predicated of Heaven and Earth, with *te* a dative enclitic. That is, “the two (=H+E) are a measure (/measuring rods / standards) for you.” For him *súmīte* also belongs to  $\sqrt{mā}$  and forms an etymological figure with *mātre*: “the two well-measured measures.” As he indicates in his n. 6ab, only Heaven and Earth are vast enough to serve as measuring standards for Indra. By contrast I take *mātra-* as a measure, that is, a unit of mass (like “a measure of grain”) and, further, the container that would hold that mass (in a phrase like “quart measure,” the “measure” may be the amount of liquid in a quart or the cup that holds it). So H+E are conceived of as very large, hollow containers.

I take *súmīte* to  $\sqrt{mi}$  ‘fix’. Syntactically *mātre* is the subject and *súmīte* ‘well fixed’ is its predicate, referring to the standard cosmogonic deed of Indra’s, propping apart Heaven and Earth. Cf., e.g., III.30.4 *táva dyāvāprthivī párvatāso, ánu vratāya nímīteva tasthuḥ* “It is following your [=Indra’s] commandment that heaven and earth and the mountains stand (/stay) like (pillars) implanted. By my interpr. *te* goes with the instr.s in b, but occupies standard Wackernagel’s position.

And the instrumentals name Indra’s powers, which he used to fix the two world halves. For Ge, by contrast. they are the measuring standard for Heaven and Earth respectively (“Heaven in greatness, Earth in wisdom”). There is something to be said for both interpr., though *majmánā* works better for him than *kāvya-* does. The former, *majmán-*, is generally associated with Indra, and it is often the instrument he uses to effect his deeds (e.g., I.55.5, I.130.4), thus supporting my position, but it can also be the standard by which Indra is judged (III.32.7, 46.3 [both cited by Ge]), supporting Ge’s. That “greatness” would be an appropriate standard for evaluating both Indra and Heaven is easy to accept; it is harder to see how *kāvya-* ‘poetic skill, sagacity’ could be a shared standard for Indra and Earth, since I’m not aware of passages in which Earth is credited with mental capacity of this sort. But *kāvya-* can be used as an instrument, even in cosmogonic contexts. Cf. the following passage, which describes the separation of Heaven and Earth; though the deed is attributed to Soma, the action is one of Indra’s standard ones: IX.70.2 *ubhé dyāvā kāvvyenā ví sísrathe* “through his poetic skill he [=Soma] has loosened both, Heaven (and Earth), from each other.” Although *kāvya-* is more generally associated with Soma (as here) or Agni, recall that Indra in the Vala myth opens the cave through his verbal skill, not his physical power.



In balance, therefore, though I find Ge’s interpr. appealing in many ways, I think the evidence points rather in the direction of my own. And in particular, despite the suggestive interlacing of NOM. INSTR. NOM. INSTR. in b, the two instrumentals are Indra’s means – the complementary physical power and verbal skill displayed in the Vṛtra and Vala myths respectively – and are used to fix both entities, Heaven and Earth, with no association of one of the instr. with one nom., and the other with the other.

The two pādas of the 2nd hemistich are constructed as parallels, each hoping that one of the substances offered to Indra will be acceptable to him. Given the parallelism, initial dat. *vārāya* “for your liking” should correspond to loc. *svādman*; cf. Ge’s “nach deinem Wunsche ... nach deinem Geschmack.” Although this is surely the intent, the use of the loc. is somewhat odd.

X.29.7: *ámatra*- in pāda a appears to be playing off *mātra*- in 6a, and since *ámatra*- is a large liquid measure, this may make it more likely that my interpr. *mātra*- in 6 is also one.

Note that *satyá*- from 4c and *rādhas*- from 3d, both used in reference to Indra, are reprised here in one cmpd.

Flg. Ge’s cited parallel, VII.21.6 *abhí krátvendra bhūr ádha jmán* “Become preeminent through your will, Indra, on the earth,” I supply a participial form of ‘be/become’ with *abhí* in d.

The *nr* theme of vss. 1–2 returns here with *náryah*, doubled by and contrasting with adjacent *paúmsyaiḥ*.

X.29.8: The first pāda here is almost identical to VII.20.3 *vy āsa índraḥ pṛtanāḥ svóajā(h)*; see comm. ad loc. Bloomfield (RReps ad VII.20.3) works himself into a state of near apoplexy because of differing translations of the two pādas, esp. different renderings of *pṛtanā*-, which he declares always means ‘battle’. Although the two pādas are too similar to be chance resemblances and although I agree with Bl that *pṛtanā*- should be interpr. in the same way in both, I differ from him on two points. 1) I do not think that *pṛtanā*- in general only means ‘battle’; rarely, as here (in my view, contra Ge), it seems to refer to the battlers themselves. (For the contribution of the root noun cmpd *pṛtanā-śāh*- to such a reinterpr. see comm. ad III.24.1.) 2) I think the choice of two different but phonologically similar verbs, *ví√as* (VII.20.3) and *ví√(n)as* (here), shows that the poet of the derivative pāda (probably our Vasukra) meant to vary the sense, not reproduce it. In VII.20.3 Bl takes *vy āse* as lit. ‘threw himself through’, but pregnantly ‘pervaded’, with our *vy ānaṭ* also meaning ‘pervaded’. For the verb in VII.20.3 I prefer ‘dispersed’, for the one here ‘penetrated’. The point here is that Indra has taken position in the middle between the armies, which marshal themselves (pāda b) competing to secure his patronage and help in battle for their side.

Pāda c is somewhat unclear. Ge, who interpr. both instances of *pṛtanā*- in this vs. as ‘battle’, tr. *ā ... rátham ná pṛtanāsu tiṣṭha* as “Besteige den Wagen wie in den Schlachten,” with the simile consisting only of *pṛtanāsu*. But the position of *ná* speaks against that (and this is not a situation like that in 5a where *ná* is flipped because it’s barred from pāda-final position [see comm. there and ad X.21.1], though I admit that \**pṛtanāsu ná* would not work metrically). My interpr. takes *pṛtanāsu* as the frame and *rátham* as the simile, both construed with *ā ... tiṣṭha*. Since *ā√sthā* can take either acc. or loc., this is an example of case disharmony between simile and frame, of the type discussed in my 1982 IJ article “Case disharmony in RVic similes.” The point is that Indra shows himself superior to both sides in the battle – he mounts (perhaps ‘surmount’ would be better here) them like a chariot. So in fact he does not tip his favor to any

side (despite the competition implied between the hosts in pāda b), but takes control of them all. The metaphorical chariot made up of the *pṛtanā*-s he will then drive (pāda d) to his own advantage (and perhaps ours, given his benevolent *sumatī*). The middle voice of *codāyāse* expresses the same self-involved action as the same form in VI.46.13, where Indra spur on his own steeds.

For *sumatyā* and suggested substitute reading *sumatī* see Old ad I.31.18.