

Commentary X.30–60

X.30–34

These five hymns are attributed to Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, whose name is, intriguingly, non-Indo-Aryan phonologically (see Mayr. PN s.v.). He figures in the AiB and KauṣB as the son of a dāsī (see Kuiper, Aryans p. 7 and passim), and in the Ten Kings Battle a “famous old” Kavaṣa (*śrutám kavāṣam vṛddhám*) gets drowned (or at least dragged into the water) by Indra (VII.18.12). This does not seem to have kept him (or his supposed namesake) from dedicating a hymns or parts thereof to Indra (X.32; see its publ. intro.; X.33.2–3 per Anukr.). The subjects of the hymns in this collection are heterogeneous, and the last one (X.34) is the famous “Lament of the Gambler.” Much less famous, but very appealing is X.33, which we can call “Lament of a Singer.”

See Ge’s detailed intro. to this hymn group. It should also be noted that Old suggests that the Vasukra hymns (X.27–29) and the Kavaṣa hymns may form not two series but one on the basis of phraseology etc. (see Prol. 234).

X.30 Waters

On the ritual background of this hymn, see publ. intro. and Ge’s and Old’s intros. to the hymn. The hymn treats the ceremonial fetching of the waters for the preparation of soma and their installation on the ritual ground. Re tr. and comm. EVP XV.127ff.

X.30.1: Ge and Re take *devatrā* and *apāḥ* as separate goals of *prá ... etu* (Ge: “Götterwärts soll der Weg ... gehen, hin zu den Gewässern ...”). I have consolidated them (“... the waters that are among the gods”) to avoid the duplication and also because in c the wellspring (*dhāśi-*) belongs to Mitra and Varuṇa.

On *dhāśi-* see the various reff. in Comm. Lexicon. I basically follow Janert. Re quotes Janert’s tr. of this vs., commenting rather acidly “traduction védique <<typique>> des exégètes modernes,” though he doesn’t explain his disdain. With Ge I construe c with ab; both Old and Re take it instead with d, which in turn leads them to consider *dhāśim* in c to be coreferential with *suṁvṛktīm* in d. Re tr. c as “la puissante projection (émanée) de Mitra (et) de Varuṇa.” The *dhāśi-* of Mitra and Varuṇa is also found in IV.55.7, where it is not as clearly tied to water as it is here (at least acdg. to Janert and me: Ge tr. “Schöpfung”), but I take it there as the repository of waters in heaven that produces rain. In any case, whether one takes *devatrā ... apāḥ* in ab separately or together, the conceptual location of the waters to be fetched for this sacrifice appears to be in heaven, not whatever terrestrial water source is actually going to be tapped. This conflation of the earthly element and its heavenly counterpart is of course a standard move of the RVic poet, and in the first vs. of this hymn it frames the action to come as more significant than a little expedition with a bucket down to the river.

The root affiliation of the 1st sg. subjunctive *rīradhā* is disputed. Gr and Lub assign it to \sqrt{randh} ‘be/make subject’, and I follow them; Old, Ge, Re, Janert all prefer $\sqrt{rādth}$ ‘(make) succeed’. At first glance ‘make succeed’ is easier to fit into the passage than ‘make subject’, but there are several arguments in favor of the more difficult interpr. ‘make subject’. First, although a causative system, with pres. *randhāya-* and redupl. aor. *rīradha-*, is very well established in the RV for \sqrt{randh} , the *-āya-*transitive *rādthaya-* to $\sqrt{rādth}$ is first found in the AV, the corresponding redupl. aor. *arīradhat* first in TS (1x). So the default interpr. of *rīradha-* in the RV would be to \sqrt{randh} —although it must be admitted that the other 8 exx. are in *mā* prohibitives: this is the only

occurrence in positive context. Second, the case frame here, ACC *suṽṛktīm* + DAT *pr̥thujr̥áyase*, is exactly that found with the causative forms of \sqrt{randh} , but the dative is foreign to $\sqrt{rādh}$. Those who favor $\sqrt{rādh}$ must therefore resort to makeshifts in rendering the verb (Ge, Janert) or the dat. (Re). In my view “making the hymn subject to DAT” indicates that hymn’s composer recognizes the superior power of the entity denoted by the dative and sends it to do service to that entity.

Who or what then is the referent of *pr̥thu-jr̥áyas-*? In its other occurrence (III.49.2) this *s-* stem bahuvr. modifies Indra, but though Sāy and Re supply Indra here, there is no contextual support for him here (or Janert’s Agni). The uncpmd *jr̥áyas-* refers to space generally, and here the most likely entity to “have broad expanse” is a body of water, whose size would dwarf and humble the hymn approaching it (another argument for *r̥iradha-* ‘make subject’). I do not have a candidate for the underlying noun, which should be masc. or neut. sg. – rather than the fem. pl. of *apáh* (b) and fem. sg. of *dhāsīm* (b), both of which also refer to this water source. Perhaps *samudrám* found in 3a.

X.30.2: In the publ. tr. I take *bhūtá* as an injunc., with the clumsy tr. “since you have become provided with oblations ...” I would now change my grammatical analysis to imperative (with Ge, Re), in the well-known construction in which an impv. in a *hí* clause followed by another clause with an impv. provides the grounds for the 2nd impv. I would therefore emend the tr. to “Become provided with oblations, (and then) go ...” Although on general grounds we might expect the priests’ fetching of the waters to precede their providing themselves with oblations, in fact vs. 3b explains the sequence: the Adhvaryus must sacrifice to Apām Napāt “with an oblation” (*havīṣā*) so that that god will release the waters to them.

In agreement with Ge, Re, Lü (296), contra Sāy. (Soma), I take the ruddy eagle to be the sun. Ge (n. 2c) points out that that phrase is esp. appropriate for the morning and/or evening sun (which often appears red), times prescribed in the later Soma sacrifice for the water-fetching.

Gr, Ge, Re, Lub all assign *āsyadhvam* to the root \sqrt{as} ‘throw’, flg. the Pp analysis \tilde{a} *asyadhvam*. I am persuaded, however, by Old’s connection with $\sqrt{sā}$, *si* ‘bind’. Note first that an undoubted 2nd pl. impv. to this stem is found in vs. 11 of this hymn (*vīsyadhvam*), and that \tilde{a} $\sqrt{sā}$ is found in nearby X.28.10 \tilde{a} *siṣāya* ‘caught’ (in a Vasukra hymn, a collection that Old considers verbally connected with the Kavaṣa hymns [see Prol. 234]). As Old points out, \sqrt{as} has no medial forms in the RV, and he also suggests that \tilde{a} $\sqrt{sā}$ ‘bind on, harness’ would be the opposite to the better attested *áva* / *vī* $\sqrt{sā}$ ‘unbind, loose’.

X.30.3: On the *havīṣ-* see comm. ad 2a.

X.30.3–4: The referent of *tásmai* in d must be Apām Napāt, or at least all discourse signs point to him. It is striking that he receives honeyed soma in 3d, while in 4cd Indra is strengthened for his *vīryà-* by honeyed waters (*mádhumatīr apáh*), even though Indra is of course the usual recipient of soma, esp. in the context of his heroic deeds. The slight paradox is surely meant. (See, however, the passages cited by Ge in n. 4d, which associate the waters with Indra’s strengthening.)

X.30.4: By accent *dīdayat* in pāda a belongs to the redupl. pres. that is emerging in the RV by reinterpr. of the old presential perfect *dīdāya*. The act. pres. part. *dīdyat-* (8x) is unambiguous testimony to this present stem. Besides redupl.-accented *dīdaya-* (2x in addition to this passage), the stems *dīdāya-* with pf. accent (6x) and *dīdaya-* (unaccented, so ambig., 5x) are also found.

All of these should be subjunctives (whether pf. or pres.), and indeed, save perhaps for this one, all of them are at least compatible with and generally best interpr. as subjunctives (see Narten “Vedisch *dīdāya...*” [1987 = KISch 368–79], n. 5, as well as my 2017 “Vedic Perfect Subjunctive,” 316–18)—including the two other redupl.-accented *dīdayat* occurrences (VIII.6.24, X.95.12). However, our form works better as a general present: it is characteristic of Apām Napāt to shine without fuel in the waters; it is not an action that an offering of Soma (3d) will/should bring about. Cf., from the only hymn devoted to Apām Napāt in the RV, II.35.4 *dīdāyānidhmaḥ ... apsú*, with the indicative presential pf. *dīdāya* in identical context. That the parallel rel. cl. in our 4b contains an unambig. indic. pres. *īlate* also supports an indic. interpr. I don’t quite know what to do about this conflict between function and form, but think it at least possible that the shifting nature of the verbal system of $\sqrt{dī}$ allowed a nonce interpr. of *dīdayat* as thematic injunc. On the averbo of this root both in the RV and in later Vedic, see the above cited art. by Narten.

X.30.5: On the ritual act expressed by pāda d, see Ge’s n. 5d.

X.30.6: For a similar use of *sām* + med. pf. of \sqrt{cit} see X.92.4, 10 *sām cikitrire*.

X.30.7–9: These three vss. constitute a direct address to the waters, with the content kept fairly consistent across the vss. In each vs. the waters/streams are urged to “propel” (*prá* \sqrt{hi}) their wave (*ūrmím*) to Indra. Vss. 7–8 share the pres. impv. *prá hiṇota* (7c; note the retroflexion) / *prá ... hiṇota* (8a), the acc. phrase *mádhumantam ūrmím* “honeyed wave” (7c, 8a), and a dative referring to Indra (*tásmā índrāya* 7c; *asmai* 8a). Vs. 9 has streamlined the expression to *ūrmím prá heta* (9b), with aor. impv., no ‘honeyed’ (though there are other descriptors of *ūrmím*), and Indra tucked into a compd. *indrapānam* ‘Indra’s drink’ (9a). I doubt that there is any functional difference between pres. impv. *hiṇota* and rt. aor. impv. *heta*; instead the poet is seeking variety in the third iteration of the command.

X.30.7: Gr (fld. by Lub) assigns *ṛtābhyaḥ* to the fem. noun *ṛtā-*, glossed (by Gr) “Arbeit, Werk oder Bewegung,” found in V.48.2. But it surely is simply the fem. dat. pl. ppl. to $\sqrt{ṛ}$ ‘enclosed, blocked’, as in IV.19.5=42.7 *tvām ṛtām ariṇā índra síndhūn* “you made the blocked rivers flow, o Indra,” referring to the same mythological deed, but with masc. acc. pl. modifying *síndhūn*. The ppl. interpr. is assumed by Old, Ge, and Re.

X.30.8: Pāda b is a full-pāda izafe-type construction, a nominal relative clause containing two appositives, embedded within the acc. phrase of a and c. See my “Proto-proto-izafe” (Fs. Mark Hale).

X.30.9: Pāda b contains a short rel. cl. characterizing the acc. *ūrmím* and embedded within the acc. phrase, begun in pāda a and continuing in cd. The structure of the vs. is thus parallel to vs. 8; however, the rel. cl. in this vs. has a finite verb — *yá ubhé íyarti* — and thus violates the general prohibition against non-nominal embedded clauses. I would explain it here as modeled on the licit izafe-type in 8b, while driven by the poet’s desire to vary the pattern in the last of the three-vs. sequence. See comm. above on X.30.7–9.

The identity of the “both” that the wave rouses is disputed. Both Ge and Re supply “worlds” (that is, Heaven and Earth), and this is certainly a possible pair. Ge (n. 9b) additionally

suggests both races (gods and men), which I follow in the publ. tr., or even the two streams (*dhārā-*) found in the next vs. (10a). The referent of *ubhé* must of course be either fem. or neut. Though the overwhelming number of instances of *ubhé* probably refer to the two worlds (fem. *ródasī*, etc.), there is a subset of passages referring to the two races (neut. *jánmanī*, *jánasī*), and this makes more sense to me in context (though I don't have strong feelings about it).

Pāda c lacks a syllable, and the word in the affected part of the pāda, *ausānām*, is a hapax. The current standard view of this word (Ge, Re, EWA s.v. *usānā-*) is that it's a vṛddhi deriv. of *usānā-*, named as the plant from which soma is derived once (repeated) in the ŚB (III.4.3.13=IV.2.5.15): *vṛtró vai sóma āsīt tasyaitác chārīraṃ yád girāyo yád ásmānas tád eṣósānā nāmaúśadhīr jāyata íti ha smāha śvetáketur áuddālakis tām etád āhṛtyābhīsunvanti* “Soma was really Vṛtra. This is his body, namely the mountains and the rocks. There is born the plant called Uśānā – so says Śvetakeu Auddālaki. Having brought it [=plant] here, they press it.” Although this is certainly suggestive, I am reluctant to hang too much on a single passage in a later brāhmaṇa, with the content attributed to Śvetaketu—esp. since, acdg. to Macdonell/Keith (Vedic Index, s.v. Śvetaketu), “All the references to Śvetaketu belong to the latest period of Vedic literature.” The major exception to the embrace of this etym. is Old, who (like Gr) suggests rather that it belongs to \sqrt{vas} ‘be eager, desire’ and that the transmitted form represents *ā-usānā-*, with the preverb in hiatus providing the missing syllable (sim. Arnold) and showing shortening to *a-* in hiatus. There are several potential drawbacks to his scenario. First, \sqrt{vas} does not otherwise appear with *ā-*; however, other verbs of desiring (e.g., \sqrt{kan}) occur with this preverb, and nonce spread here would not be surprising. Second, the pres. middle part. *usānā-* is quite rare, compared to the very well-attested act. *usánt-*, which in fact is found twice in this hymn in the twinned expression *usánt- usatī-* (“desirous [m.] / desirous [f.]”) in 2b, 6b (as well as the single *usatīh* in 15c). When it occurs, *usānā-* also means ‘eager, desirous’, and that could be the sense here as well—describing the waters’ eager pursuit of Indra. Or, it could show a nonce passive value developed in opposition to the act. *usánt-* pairs, “being desired.” Despite the minor problems with this idea, it seems stronger to me than the other, and I would now emend my transl. from “stemming from the uśāna-plant” to “being eager.”

Ge and Re (and Gr by implication) take *tritántum* as a modifier of the acc. *ūrmīm* that dominates the vs. (see Old for doubts). But this doesn't make a lot of sense—how would a wave have three threads?—and it also leaves *pāri* with nothing to do. In contrast, I take *tritántum* with *pāri*, specifying the location of the action of the participle *vicārantam* referring to the ‘wave’, and I supply *yajñām* as the referent of *tritántum*. Both Ge (n. 9d) and Re cite *saptā-tantu-* as a parallel, and this adj. modifies *yajñā-* in its two occurrences (X.52.4, 124.1). The three threads here are presumably either the three fires or the three soma pressings.

X.30.10: This vs. is paradoxical in content: the waters, feminine in both grammatical gender and personal qualities, are here depicted as powerful, martial, and commanding—no longer the lovely and yielding young women of earlier in the hymn.

The intens. part. *āvārvṛtātīh* in pāda a is glossed by Schaeffer (192) with ‘sich schlängeln’ (meander), but given the rest of the vs., I think a more dynamic movement is envisioned: strenuously whirling, roiling, or the like.

The “two streams” of the bahuvr. *dvidhārāh* are plausibly identified by Ge (n. 10a) as the two varieties of ritual waters, the Vasatīvarī and the Ekadhanā (on which see, e.g., Re Vocab. du rituel s.vv.).

In b the waters are compared to ‘cattle-raiders, (those) fighting when cattle (are at stake)’ (*goṣu-yúdh-*; see Scar 441), a hyper-masculine and violent role, as is seen in its two other occurrences (I.112.22, VI.6.5).

niyavám is a hapax, but despite Ge’s refusal to transl. it, it is plausibly derived from *ní* √*yu* ‘team up, harness’, with well-attested root noun compd *niyút-*, etc. See Gr, Old, Re. The publ. tr. accepts BR’s suggestion (reported by Gr) that it’s an adverbial acc. ‘in teams’; so, apparently, also Scar (441), though with a closer connection to the part. *cárantīḥ*: “in Niyut-Formation wandelnden (Wasser).”

The paradoxical nature of this vs. comes to the fore in pāda c—and presents us with a translational problem created by English. The waters are called the *jānitrīḥ* and the *pātnīḥ* of existence (/ creation / the world), *bhúvanasya*, using the fem. gender equivalents of m. *jānitar-* ‘begetter’ and *pāti-* ‘master, lord’. In Sanskrit the derivational relationship between the masc. and fem. terms is clear, and this relationship establishes the tension between the active power and authority inhering in the usual masc. forms and the counter-expectations created by the feminine derivative. The audience would also be aware of masculine equivalents of these phrases: *bhúvanasya yáḥ pātiḥ* (V.51.12; sim. IX.31.6, 86.5, X.128.7; note also the one other fem. *bhúvanasya pātnī*, of Dawn in VII.75.4), *bhúvanasya pitáram* (VI.49.10; no ex. of *bhúvanasya jānitar-* is found in the RV). In my opinion the poet is covertly asserting that the female waters are equivalent in power to their male counterparts, hence my tr. “begetters and masters of existence.” But this tr. elides the feminine markers in the Skt. Although English does have the corresponding gendered terms, they would distort the sense. For *pātnī-* we have ‘mistress / lady’, but these give the wrong impression: the waters are not the girlfriends / kept women (=mistresses) of existence but the commanders of it, and “ladies of existence” is nonsensical. For *jānitrī-* we could try ‘genetrix’, but this is too lexically specialized, and ‘mother’ has the wrong nuance: the waters are not nurturing existence but creating it. In the end I opted for the masculine terms, but something is lost in translation.

X.30.11: This vs. is a partial reprise of vs. 1. The “yoking of truth” (*ṛtásya yóge*) here echoes the “yoking of mind” (*mánasaḥ ... práyukti*) in 1b. In 1a a way is made for the *bráhman*, while here the waters impel it (b).

Ge, flg. Sāy., interpr. *devayajyā* as a functional dative, parallel to *sanáye* in b, but there’s no reason it can’t work as the instr. it appears to be (see Old, Re), either as a true instrument or as instr. of accompaniment, indicating the time when the waters’ action is to take place.

The loc expression *ṛtásya yóge* “at the yoking of truth” in c also establishes a temporal connection between the loc. and the action of the main verb: the waters are to “unloosen their udder” (i.e., be poured forth) at a particular moment in the ceremony.

X.30.12: Because the verbs of pādas a–c are accented (a: *kṣáyathā*, b: *bibhrthá*, c: *sthá*), they must all be in the domain of *hí* in pāda a, with d the corresponding main cl.

On my tr. of *pātnīḥ* as ‘masters’, not ‘mistresses / ladies’, see above ad 10c.

The waters in general and their powers and characteristics elevate the riverine goddess Sarasvatī in d as their divine representative.

X.30.13: With Ge and Re (contra Old), I take this vs., consisting of a *yád* clause (a) with three following participial adjuncts, each a pāda length, as dependent on the main cl. of 14. Vs. 13 describes the approach of the waters, 14 their arrival and installation.

On 3rd pl. mid. ending *-ram* in *adrśram* see the extensive disc. by Old ad IX.7.1.

Pāda a is metrically disturbed in all its parts—concisely summarized by HvN as “Uncommon opening ... Uncommon break ... Rare cadence” (what’s left?!). Arnold suggest switching the order of the last two words to **āyatīr ādrśram*, which would give a Triṣṭubh cadence but do nothing for the rest of the pāda; Old counsels against this metathesis on formulaic grounds, adducing VII.81.1, VIII.101.11 ... *adarśy āyatīḥ*##

Pāda c *adhvaryúbhīr mānasā saṃvidānāḥ* “(the waters) allying / united in mind with the Adhvaryus” echoes 6cd *sám jānate mānasā sám cikitre, adhvaryávo dhiśánāpas ca devīḥ* “They are agreed in mind and they perceive alike -- the Adhvaryus, the Holy Place, and the divine waters.” In our vs. the *dhiśánā* is absent, but is probably represented by the place where the waters will be deposited. See also *apām nāptrā saṃvidānāsaḥ* in 14d.

Pāda b contains the redupl. pres. part. *bībhratīḥ*, which echoes the finite *bībhr̥tha* of 12b; pāda d has the 1st class pres. part. *bhárantīḥ*. All three have the same referent/subject (waters). Although Re remarks “Distinction nette entre *bībhrat* (aussi 12b) et *bhárant d*,” I don’t see it, and Re’s tr. don’t help – at least don’t help me (“vous portez-en-vous” 12b, “qui (com)portent” 13b, “apportant” 13d). Ge tr. all with “bringen.” It’s worth noting (see Ge’s n. 13d) that d is identical to III.36.7 save for the gender of the participle. It could therefore have just been patched in here, without much attention to the resulting contrast between the present stems of $\sqrt{bhṛ}$.

X.30.14: *revátīḥ* reprises the voc. in 8d, 12a as well as *rāyáh ... pátnīḥ* in 12c.

The voc. *sakhāyāḥ* referring to the Adhvaryus can express relationships in several directions: the Adhvaryus can be comrades of each other, comrades of us, and – given the emphasis on the agreement between the waters and the priests in vss. 6 and 13 – comrades of the waters.

In d the part. *saṃvidānāsaḥ* is most naturally interpr. as nom. pl. masc., modifying the Adhvaryus. But because the same part. (ending in *-ās*) was nom. pl. fem. modifying the waters in the immed. prec. vs. (13c), there is contextual pressure to take it as acc. pl. fem., modifying adjacent *enāḥ*, with the extended ending *-āsaḥ* unusually employed in this paradigmatic slot. See esp. disc. by Old (as well as Ge’s n. 14d, Re’s comment). I think it likely that it is applicable to both (though my publ. tr. only reflects the fem. acc.), esp. given the emphasis on universal harmony in these vss.

X.30.15: *devayajyā* is repeated from 11a, though as nom. rather than instr.

X.31 All Gods

On the structure of the hymn and the obscurity of some of its contents, see publ. intro.

The early vss. of the hymn have a surprising number of perf. optatives (2a *mamanyāt*, 2d *jagr̥bhyaḥ*, 4a *cākanyāt*, 4c *anajyāt*), though the conditions that usually prompt such clusters – women’s or low-register speech – are not found. If Old is correct that the Vasukra (X.27–29) and Kavaṣa (X.30–34) collections are a unity (see ad X.30–34 above), we could invoke X.28.1 with its pf. opt. cluster (see comm. ad loc.) – though there they are in the mouth of a woman. I do not understand the phenomenon in this hymn, though see the pf. subjunctives in X.32.1.

X.31.1: Old and Ge take the gen. *devānām* in the phrase *devānām ... śámsaḥ* as a subjective genitive, but I don’t see why. Although the gods may help us, they don’t ordinarily praise us; the subjects of active transitive forms of the root $\sqrt{śams}$ are humans or their counterparts. In asking

that the laud of the gods seek us out, we are expressing the usual hope that poetic inspiration and its product, the hymn, will come to us at the right moment for producing praise for the gods.

The stem *turá-* ‘strong, overpowering’ is almost always used of gods. Here in the phrase *vísvebhis turáih* it substitutes for *deváih*, which already appeared as gen. *devānām* in the previous pāda, to establish the All Gods as the nominal dedicands of the hymn.

The bahuvr. *suśakhāyah* in c reminds us of the emphasis on comradeship and harmony in the previous hymn, esp. voc. *sakhāyah* in X.30.14.

X.31.2: With most (Gr, Old, Lub, EWA s.v. *MAN*², though not Ge or Kü [364–66, with extensive disc. with lit.]; Re uncertain), I take *mamanyāt* to a separate root \sqrt{man} ‘stay, wait’, whose other two verbal forms are found in this limited group of hymns: X.27.20 (Vasukra), X.32.8 (Kavaṣa). See also comm. ad X.27.20. Among other things it is distinguished from \sqrt{man} ‘think’ by its active voice. Unlike Gr, I do not take the form here as caus. in value (zum Stillstand bringen, festhalten). I think the point rather is that if the poet proceeds along “the path of truth” (*ṛtāsya pathā*) by composing good poetry, he will receive his just reward and should simply wait for it in this location. I do not know what the *pāri* contributes: it goes too easily into English as ‘wait around, hang around’, meaning (originally) ‘in the general vicinity’.

I also don’t know what the *cīd* is doing.

Although *ṛtāsya pathā* is found in the next pāda, adjacent to the instr. *nāmasā*, I take the former phrase with pāda a. The pāda-opening sequence *ṛtāsya pathā nāmasā* is also found in I.128.2 and X.70.2, but in both cases the first phrase is better construed with the preceding pāda and *nāmasā* with what follows.

Note that the redupl. desid. opt. *vivāset* is the moral equiv. of the redupl. opts. elsewhere in the vs., *mamanyāt* and *jagr̥bhyāt*. See above.

Most supply “gods” as the obj. of *ā vivāset*; this is certainly possible, but *dráviṇam* in the preceding pāda presents itself as well. If so, the point is that the poet will win his share by performing his ritual duties properly. How to do that is outlined in the 2nd hemistich.

Note that the partial anagrams *nāmasā* and *mānasā* occupy the same post-caesura metrical position in pādas b and d respectively.

X.31.3: The first pāda of this vs. indicates that the advice in 2cd has been successfully followed. In my opinion the rest of the vs. sustains this ritual theme.

On the plupf. *asasṛgram* (also IX.97.30), manifestly based on the well-attested pass. aor. *asṛgram* with the same passive value, see Kü 555. In our passage the showcasing of unusual pf. forms may have contributed to its appearance, but that situation is not found in IX.97.30.

With Ge (see his n. 3b) I take *tīrthé ná dasmám* as a minor example of case disharmony in similes of the type discussed in my 1982 IJ article “Case Disharmony in RVic Similes.” Both the loc. and the acc. function as goal.

I take *dasmá-* as a reference to Agni, a common but far from exclusive referent of this stem. This identification may be facilitated by a pun: Agni is often called a ‘guest’ (*átithi-*), a stem phonologically similar to *tīrthá-* ‘ford’. Cf. the voc. phrase VIII.74.7 ... *dásamátithe* “o wondrous guest” of Agni.

With Ge I take *ūmāḥ* ‘helpers’ as the gods. The stem is only used of gods, as Gr points out.

Although *sūśá-* is an adjective ‘fortifying, powerful’ (on which see comm. ad IX.97.54), it is often used of praise songs or chants, generally with the headnoun gapped. And that is surely

its use here: the poet has been honing his verbal skill and has now achieved his goal, a powerful hymn. For *abhí√(n)as* with a verbal product as obj., cf. VI.49.8 *abhy ānaḍ arkām* “he has attained the chant,” adduced by Re.

I take gen. *suvitāsaya* as a dative purpose gen.: “the hymn of good faring” is the hymn that will afford us good faring.

On *nāvedas-* as the product of false segmentation of **bhūtana vedasaḥ*, see Schindler Fs. Knobloch, summarized in EWA s.v.

X.31.4: Each of the four pādas in this verse is a self-contained clause, which, each by itself, is reasonably easy to interpret (or, rather, to translate). It is, however, very difficult to figure out how they fit together and what their referents are. This shiftiness is surely deliberate; in fact, I see the poet laughing at us in the last pāda, which begins *só asmai* “he to him,” with two pronouns whose referents are completely opaque even though they should be available from the preceding discourse. The poet does strew clues throughout the vs., but some of these seem to be red herrings, inviting us to identify the wrong referent. And of course, as often in the RV when straightforward reference is evaded, several different referents may be simultaneously meant.

We are on firmest ground—comparatively firm anyway—in the first pāda. Both *nītya-* and *dāmūnas-* point to Agni; the latter is mostly an epithet of Agni, the former regularly modifies him. (On *svāpati-* and *nītya-* in this passage see comm. ad X.44.1.) Moreover, at least by my interpr., Agni is the *dasmá-* on whom the gods have converged in the previous vs. (3b). Old also points to the similarity of our pāda, with *cākanyāt*, and X.29.1a where Agni is the presumed subj. of *cākán*. The question here is what Agni is supposed to take pleasure in, since there is no complement to the verb. Ge supplies the *sūṣá-* (my “fortifying [hymn],” Ge’s “Ansporn” [which he identifies with praise; see his n. 3c as well as n. 3 at the bottom of the pg.]) from the preceding vs. 3c. This makes sense and would emerge from context, but there are other possibilities: Old favors the sacrificer, and the publ. tr. follows him (though I now reject that). The complement of the pf. *cākán-* can be either a thing (like hymns [X.91.12] or wealth [II.11.13]) or a person or persons (e.g., Kutsa [I.33.13], the patrons [X.147.3]), so that either of the just cited suggestions is in principle possible. However, I now favor Ge’s *sūṣá-*.

The rel. clause in b presents us with several puzzles, though the subject and verb, *savitā jajāna*, are straightforward: “Savitar begot / created.” The first puzzle is the referent of the dative rel. prn. *yásmai*, the second the object to be supplied with the verb (if any). The most obvious referent for *yásmai* would be an entity in the preceding pāda, and there is only one (at least overt): Agni. Old again suggests the sacrificer instead, and the publ. tr. follows. Once again I have developed serious doubts and now think the obvious solution—Agni—is probably the right one, or at least the initial reading.

As for the object of *jajāna*, Ge thinks it is the *sūṣá-*: the Ansporn = Loblied. (Klein [DGRV II.15, 184] follows Ge’s interpr. of both pādas.) This would simplify matters by repeating the supplied material of pāda a, but I am (or was) a bit dubious about the sense: did Savitar create the hymn? This is not part of his usual remit; in fact Savitar seems to have very little to do with begetting or creating. The only passage I’ve identified in which Savitar is the subject of a form of *√jan* is IV.53.2 *ājjanat savitā sumnām ukthyam* “Savitar has given birth to praiseworthy benevolence,” which doesn’t seem relevant here. However, I think Ge’s idea can be rescued and indeed considerably enhanced—if we see it as a diabolical pun, or set of puns, on the part of our poet. The word *sūṣá-* is not, of course, derived from *√sū*, the basis of Savitar’s name, but they are phonologically similar, with an initial sibilant followed by long *ū*, and they can

therefore be poetically associated, with Savitar ($\sqrt{sū}$) giving birth to a $sūṣā-$. This would be enabled by another diabolical pun. There are two roots $\sqrt{sū}$: 1) ‘impel’, the source of Savitar’s name and actions; 2) ‘give birth’. They are etymologically distinct, and their verbal systems also don’t overlap. But the agent noun Savitar could in principle be derived from either one. I suggest that the poet is playfully associating him with the 2nd root ‘give birth’, and then lexically substituting the semantically (almost) identical pf. of \sqrt{jan} for the pf. $sasūva$ ‘gave birth’. The proposed underlying VP “gave birth to a $sūṣā$ ” would thus rest on three puns, two phonological ($sūṣā-$: $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘impel’; $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘impel’ : $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘give birth’) and one semantic ($\sqrt{sū}$ ‘give birth’ : \sqrt{jan} ‘beget’). The outcome also has the merit of making Savitar the subject of the gender-appropriate ‘birth’ root: $\sqrt{sū}$ has the mother as subject, while \sqrt{jan} generally has the father or a father-like figure. (Note the occurrence of $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘give birth’ in 10a $sūta$, with female as subj. This root was clearly in the poet’s head.)

I would now retract the publ. tr. and return to Ge’s interpr., though it is, I hope, on a firmer footing: “Our own proper lord and master of the house [=Agni] should find pleasure (in the hymn)—(Agni) for whom the god Savitar gave birth (to it).” (For a full re-tr. of the vs., see below.) (For the substitution of ‘proper’ for ‘constant’, rendering $nītya-$ see comm. ad X.44.1.)

On to the 2nd hemistich. The first issue that confronts us is that pāda c, with $vā$ in 2nd position, seems to be presented as a disjunctive clause. But what is it disjoined from and what are the two opposing choices? Because it is a main clause, it seems unlikely to be directly connected with the preceding rel. clause (b), and because its verb is in the optative it seems likely to be the parallel to pāda a with its optative. This suggests an interpr. of a, c as “Agni should take pleasure (in the hymn), or Bhaga and/or Aryaman should anoint (him/it) with cows.” The pressure of the discourse leads to an interpr. of the obj. $īm$ here as something already known to us from the parallel clause, that is, either Agni or the (supplied) hymn.

These are both possible choices, and we will return to them – but first we should consider the 2nd hemistich on its own. If we do so, we get an interpr. that directly conflicts with the one just offered and that identifies a very different referent for both $īm$ in c and $só$ in d. The phrasology points strongly to Soma. In pāda c the VP “anoint with cows” ($góbhiḥ \sqrt{añj}$) is a fairly common phrase in both active and passive; though a few other entities get so anointed (e.g., Agni V.3.2, Mitra and Varuṇa I.51.8, music VIII.20.8), it is overwhelmingly used of Soma (e.g., IX.10.3, 32.3, 45.3, 50.2, 85.5, 86.47, 96.22, 103.2, 107.22), referring to the mixing of milk with the just-pressed soma juice. Similarly in d $cāru-$ modifies a number of different entities mostly connected with the ritual ($yajñā-$ itself, e.g., VII.84.3, $adhvarā-$ I.19.1, $ghṛtā-$ X.96.1, etc.), but it is extraordinarily common with $sóma-$ (e.g., IV.49.2, X.39.2, etc.) and other words for soma (e.g., $sutā-$ I.137.2, $īndu-$ IX.109.8). If we put this phraseological evidence together, Soma seems the obvious referent: “Bh + A should anoint him [=Soma] with cows; he [=Soma] is pleasing ...” (with the referent of $asmāi$ still unclear). But there’s no real place for Soma, even in this ritual context. Indra does not appear in this hymn; there is no mention of pressing or ritual drinking. Certainly in this verse no rhetorical space has been created for Soma. I therefore think that this is another of the poet’s jokes – a deliberate red herring: everything points to Soma, except that Soma makes no sense when the vs. and hymn as a whole are considered.

Let us now return to the possibilities identified above. I now think that the referent of both $īm$ (c) and $só$ (d) is the hymn, $sūṣā-$, covertly present in each pāda, though overtly absent from all four. The phrase “anoint (the hymn) with cows” is unusual, but interpretable; it means to reward the hymn (or rather its poet) with the gift of livestock. (In one of his shifting interpr., Old suggest something similar: that Bhaga and Aryaman are bestowing Kuhbesitz on the sacrificer

[whom he takes as the referent of *īm*].) This brings us back to 2ab, where the poet awaited his material reward “along the path of truth,” on which see comm. ad loc.

As for the last pāda, though as noted above, *cāru-* is esp. characteristic of Soma, it applies to a variety of referents, incl. verbal products (e.g., *matí-* VI.8.1, *rtá-* IX.97.24.), and so *śūśá-* is certainly possible. As for *asmái*, since it’s unaccented it must be someone already in the discourse, and, though Bhaga and Aryaman are closer, Agni has dominated the vs. and is the god whose delight in the hymn is sought. Pāda d closes the circle with pāda a: the sentiment we wanted to produce in Agni has arisen.

I would now re-translate the verse in this way: “Our own proper lord and master of the house [=Agni] should find pleasure (in the hymn)—(Agni) for whom the god Savitar gave birth (to it). / Or Bhaga (and) Aryaman should anoint it [=hymn] with cows. It [=hymn] seems dear to him [=Agni] and so it should be.”

A few final notes. First I still don’t see why pāda c should be disjunctively related to pāda a, since the two actions (Agni’s delight in the hymn / the anointing of it with cows) do not block each other. Perhaps it’s simply a way to shift our attention to a different way of thinking about the hymn. Kü (95) takes the *vā* as disjoining the two gods: “Bhaga oder Aryaman ...,” but though this would solve the problem, *vā* is wrongly positioned for that. IH has suggested a different, and appealing, explanation for the *vā*, as providing a further enhancement for the hymn if Agni does not find the pleasure in it that we hope for in pāda a; anointing it with cows might make it more appealing. IH’s modified tr. of the relevant parts of the vs.: “Our own proper lord and master of the house [=Agni] should find pleasure (in the hymn ... / Or **[if he doesn’t find pleasure in it as is, then]** Bhaga (and) Aryaman should anoint it [=hymn] with cows. It **[i.e., the cow-anointed hymn]** seems dear to him [=Agni] and so it should be.” The anointment with cows would, on the one hand, refer to the material reward for the poet, as disc. above, but also to the ghee that would be poured into the ritual fire.

As Kü (95–96) points out, the pf. *anajyāt* should have a long initial vowel, like the rest of its stem (*ānájé*, etc.). The superficially peculiar redupl. of this pf. is similar to that in the indic. pf. *ānaśma* ($\sqrt{(n)as}$) in 3c and would be even more like it (and to the pf. opt. in pāda a *cākanyāt*) if it were **ānajyāt*. These phonological similarities may help account for this surprising pf. opt. cluster.

X.31.5–6: On these two responsive vss. as a likely omphalos, see publ. intro. The connections between the two vss. make Ge’s assertion (intro. to hymn) that the first five vss. have no relationship to the rest of the hymn unlikely. The evidence for the interdependence of vss. 5 and 6 includes the three different words for ‘earth’ (*kṣāḥ* 5a, *bhūman-* 6b, and by implication *pṛth(i)vī* via *paprathānā* 6a [the three being reunited in vs. 9]) and the three hemistich-initial *asyá* (5c, 6a, 6c). The theme of the whole world as the ritual ground is what unifies their content.

X.31.5: By my interpr. this vs. depicts the fundamental exchange relationship between mortals and gods, taking place on the ritual ground conceived of as the earth itself. Here meet the gods and the mortal ritualists, esp. the poet. The gods possess livestock (b) and prizes (d) to distribute, and are eager to receive the praise of the singer (c), which will motivate their generosity. In my view the singer is the same poet who was honing his craft in order to receive his material reward already in vs. 2 and whose fortifying hymn was to be anointed with cows (same image as here) in 4c.

In pāda a I read *kṣāḥ* in both simile and frame, in slightly different senses. In the frame it doubles init. *iyám*, which by itself can pregnantly refer to “this (earth)” (a usage very common in Vedic prose, but already developing in the RV); in the simile it has the extended sense of ‘place’, a place proper to someone or other (here the dawns), that is, their particular “world.” (I would now erase the parens around “(the place)” in the publ. tr.) As indicated in the publ. intro., I take pāda a as willing the identification of the sacrificial ground with the earth itself, or, rather, the reverse: the whole earth should become the sacrificial ground. The sacrificial ground is referred to as “the earth/place of the dawns” because the dakṣiṇās are distributed at dawn (as is often emphasized in Uṣas hymns) and this vs. focuses on the rewarding of the singer for his praise. Ge (n. 5ab) also sees this as a reference to the dakṣiṇā. For the rhetorical move to identify the place of sacrifice with the whole world, see the responsive question-and-answer exchange in the riddle hymn, I.164.34–35, in which the vedi is identified with “the farthest end of the earth” and the sacrifice with the navel of the world: I.164.35 *iyám védih páro ántaḥ pṛthivyāḥ, ayám yajñó bhúvanasya nābhiḥ*.

The word order in this pāda is somewhat unusual, with the annunciatory deictic *iyám* immediately followed by the discourse pronoun *sā* in the same case, number, and gender, with the referent *kṣāḥ* postponed till the end of the pāda. Although init. *iyám* is not infrequently separated from its referent in this way (e.g., V.57.1 #*iyám ... matīḥ*), the interposition of the *sā* is found only in I.186.11 *iyám sā vo asmé dīdhitih ...*, as far as I can tell (though it is somewhat more common in the masc. phrase *ayám sá*). In order to reflect this unusual order, in addition to assigning the dynamic ‘become’ sense to the precative *bhūyāḥ*, I would now slightly change the tr. to “This (earth) – she should become like the “earth”/place of the dawns.”

Ge takes bc as dependent on pāda a, whereas I connect them with d. But there is little actual difference in sense between the two.

In b I suggest in the publ. tr. that either gods or patrons could be the referent of *kṣumántaḥ*. Though this is certainly possible in principle, I now think that the gods are the intended referents, both because of the larger context of the hymn and because in c only the gods are likely to partake of the praise. For *kṣumánt-* in a Dawn/dakṣiṇā context, see X.11.3, where Dawn herself is called *kṣumátī* in a vs. concerned with the ritual distribution (*vidátha-*).

In c Ge disjoins *asyá ... jaritúḥ*, taking *asyá* as referring to Agni, an objective gen. with *stutím*. I am sympathetic to his arg. (n. 5c), that it should be coreferential with the two *asyá*'s in vs. 6, but I'm not sure that that's strictly necessary. However, an alt. tr. would be “the singer's praise of this one [=Agni].” Ge also takes *jaritúḥ* as an abl. – again possible, but not necessary.

X.31.6: This vs. is somewhat more opaque than its twin, vs. 5, and returns us to the Agni focus that was missing (or muted, if *asyá* in 5c refers to Agni) in that vs. However, the theme of the sacrificial ground as the whole world and of the dakṣiṇā as manifested there is strongly present in the first half of the vs.

As Ge says (n. 6b), the “foremost cow” is probably the dakṣiṇā herself. She has been produced from / transformed from the *sumatī-* of Agni (assuming that referent for *asyéd*). In this context Agni's “good favor / benevolence” involves his benignly engineering the benign cooperative meeting of gods and mortals for their mutual benefit, symbolized by the gift cow. This *sumatī-* spreads out to encompass the whole world, which is now entirely the place of the sacrifice and, esp., of the distribution of dakṣiṇās.

As noted in the publ. intro. and above ad vss. 5–6, in addition to its participial function I take the mid. part. *paprathānā* as representing the third term for ‘earth’, namely the transparently related *pr̥th(i)vī*. See vs. 9.

I assume that *asyá* in c refers to the same entity as the one in pāda a, and further that that entity is Agni. (These assumptions are not universally shared; for ex., WE Hale [Asuras, p. 73] suggests that *asyá ... ásurasya* refers to Dyaus, though he gives no reasons.) In any case, proceeding from my assumptions, the womb is presumably in the first instance Agni’s hearth or fireplace, as it is so often in Agni hymns, thus again situating us on the ritual ground – but, I would say, further extended to include Agni himself. The two hemistichs contrast the psycho-physical dimensions of Agni: in ab he expands (flatly) to cover the whole world; in cd he concentrates within his enclosure (the fireplace) and indeed within himself the gods – if that is the referent for *sānīlāḥ* ‘those of the same nest’, as seems likely (so Ge, also Sāy.) – though it could refer to his flames (see comm. ad X.99.2). So Agni is both spread wide and contracted into a tight spherical enclosure.

Pāda d contains two morphologically isolated forms, both derived from \sqrt{bhr} ‘carry, bear’, which form an etymological figure. The *-ana*-noun *bháraṇa-* is transparently formed, but not found elsewhere in Vedic (save for the synchronically distinct fem. *bháraṇī-*, the name of a nakṣatra). The middle part. *bībhramāṇa-* is likewise transparently formed, to the redupl. pres. *bībharti*, a form of which is found in 8b, but it is an isolated thematic form; we should expect athem. **bībhrāṇa-*, which is not attested. Our form is in fact doubly isolated, because the redupl. pres. is otherwise only active; it is only the 1st cl. pres. *bhára-* that has a sizable number of middle forms. Gotō (1st Cl. 227), fld. by. Lowe (Part. 253), explains *bībhramāṇa-* as modeled on *paprathānā-* at the end of pāda a. This hypothesis may be possible but it does not seem to me to be strong: although the two participles are isosyllabic, they are otherwise manifestly distinct— with one athem., the other them., one a pf. with redupl. in *-a-*, the other a pres. with redupl. in *-i-*, one with final accent, the other with initial.

By creating these two forms, the poet seems to be signaling a special effect, but for what purpose escapes me. I do wonder if *bībhramāṇa-* is meant to secondarily evoke the root \sqrt{bhram} ‘move unsteadily, flicker’. Although verb forms to this root only begin to be attested in very late Vedic, the noun *bhramá-* ‘flickering’ (of fire) appears three times in the RV. And the theme of the next vss. will be the constant motion of Agni, contrasted with his fundamental stability.

Both *sānīla-* and, even more so, *yóni-* in c define this as a birth context, which carries over into d, so that the ‘bear (offspring)’ sense of \sqrt{bhr} is strongly favored in the two forms in d. The *bháraṇa-* ‘carrier’ is presumably the womb of pāda c, and the point would be that all the gods (assuming they’re the *sānīlāḥ*) are carried and contained in the same womb, namely Agni(‘s). The publ. tr. (“being borne in the same burden”) is maladroit and misleading; I would now tr. “being carried in the same carrier” or even “being contained in the same container.”

X.31.7–10: On my view of the contents of these vss., see publ. intro.

X.31.7: The cosmic question that begins this sequence, pādas ab, is identical to X.81.4ab, in one of the two hymns to Viśvakarman (X.81–82).

On *itáūti-* see comm. ad VIII.99.7.

With Ge, I take *jaranta* as intrans. ‘become old’; Gotō (1st Cl., 152) thinks the stem can have either intrans. or trans. value and here favors the latter: “die vielen Morgenröten machen die Tage (mit sich) alt.” I think this unlikely. Although the trope of the dawns making us (etc.) age is

well established, that doesn't seem to be what's at issue here. For one thing, I don't know what it would mean for the dawns to make the *days* age. More importantly, as indicated in the publ. tr., the contrast here seems to be the unchanging solidity of the cosmic structures Heaven and Earth and the ever-changing nature of time.

X.31.8: As indicated both in the publ. intro./tr. and in comments above, I consider this vs. to refer to Agni, a view I share with Ge (see his intro. to the hymn, though his nn. 8b and 8c seem to retract this), but there is absolutely no direct evidence for it, I fully admit. There are no overt referents, only pronouns (*enā* a, *sá* b, *īm* d), a 3rd sg verb without overt subject (*kṛṇuta* c), and a metaphorical identification (*ukṣā* b). I base my view in great part on the rest of the hymn, which is more clearly Agnaic; although this is an All God hymn, it doesn't have the list structure of some All God hymns, but seems to focus on a single entity.

The vs. seems to follow logically from vss. 5–6, esp. 5a, in which the ritual ground becomes the whole earth, and 6ab, in which the good favor of Agni, spreading out, becomes “the foremost cow throughout the land.” If the place of sacrifice is now coterminous with the entire world, then, as 8a says, nothing else exists beyond it. And of course the most conspicuous entity on the ritual ground is the ritual fire, which is now conceived of as an ox—perhaps the transformation of the *gauḥ* in 6b into something more gender-appropriate for Agni—that bears both Heaven and Earth. That is, the fire flames up to support heaven and, like a pillar, to connect it with earth. Agni is elsewhere unambiguously called an *ukṣán-*; see the passages so identified by Gr (e.g., I.146.2).

Pāda c is, as Ge says (n. 8c), “dunkel,” and we will return to it. In d the entity is in motion, being conveyed, and is compared to the sun on its journey. The identification of Agni with the sun is of course a RVic commonplace. As for the conveying, I suggest that this is a reference to the carrying of Agni eastward on the ritual ground, to establish the new offering fire. Since the ritual ground is now the size of the earth, this would involve a considerable journey.

Pāda c: first note that the adj. *svadhāvan-* is used more often of Agni than any other god, even Indra (again see Gr's lemma). However, both ‘skin’ and ‘purifier, filter’ are initially hard to associate with Agni. The latter (*pavitra-*) is of course a standard piece of Somic vocabulary, attested almost exclusively in Maṇḍala IX. However, Agni's association with the root $\sqrt{pū}$ ‘purify’ is also strong, by way of the epithet *pāvaká-*, which in the sg. masc. is almost limited to him. This may be the link between Agni and the *pavitra-*.

Agni's association with ‘skin’ is much harder to establish. I can only tentatively suggest that his flames, or their visible outline, could be so construed—though I cannot find a passage that indicates that. I will adduce the bahuvr. *pāvaká-śocis-* (10x, all of Agni) ‘having pure/purifying flames’, which might provide the missing semantic link.

Both Ge and Re adduce a number of passages that might bear on our interpr. of this vs. One they didn't mention is the Soma hymn IX.83 (q.v.), which has two striking similarities with this one. 1) The middle vs., an omphalos, is very like our pāda b: IX.83.3b *ukṣā bibharti bhúvanāni vājayúḥ* “The ox, seeking the prize, bears the worlds,” with *ukṣā*, *bibharti*, and a different expression for the cosmos. 2) The controlling mystical metaphor of the hymn is the *pavitra-* ‘filter’. Although I definitely do not think that Soma is the referent in our vs. here, I do suggest that some of the phraseology and conceptual structure of this vs. has been informed by IX.83 or something very like it.

And that's as far as I can get.

X.31.9: As noted above, this vs. reunites the three words for ‘earth’ found in vss. 5–6: *kṣām ... pṛthivīm ... bhūma*.

The vs. opens with the semantically impenetrable *stegāḥ*, whose range of glosses shows the despair with which it has been met by interpr. These include frog, fly, reed, arrow, ploughshare, little worm, and, my choice, snake. See EWA s.v. It is found only here, in the AV (somewhat garbled) repetition of this vs., AVŚ XVIII.1.39, and as both *stegá-* (TS V.7.11.1, etc.) and *tegá-* (VS XXV.1; also KS and MS) in a mantra from the Ásvamedha, (*s*)*tegān dāmṣṭrābhyām*, associating parts of the sacrificed horse with external entities. Oberlies (MSS 53 [1992] 123–24) plausibly derives it from the root \sqrt{tij} ‘be sharp, stick’ < IE $\sqrt{*(s)teig}$, whose *s*-mobile is well established outside of Indic. But he identifies its referent as a ‘reed’ (Schilfrohr), which makes no sense as a subject of our *eti* ‘goes’ (he is concerned with the YV mantra, not our vs.). Oberlies also reports a suggestion of Thieme’s, starting from the same root etymology, that it refers to a snake (presumably as striking with its fangs). The mantra *stegān dāmṣṭrābhyām* “the *stega*-s with its 2 fangs” would fit the snake well, the horse less so: in my sampling of horse dentition on the web I can’t find anything obvious in a horse’s mouth that comes in twos and would be sharp – maybe the canines? (Although note that in RV X.87.3 the word, also in the dual, seems to refer to the upper and lower jaws.) As noted in the art. cit., Agni is elsewhere compared to a snake; cf. I.79.1 *āhir dhúnir vāta iva dhrājimān* “a snake, tumultuous, swooping like the wind.” The point of comparison is presumably the twisting and unpredictable progress of a wild fire across open land, esp. when fanned by wind. Note that both our passage and I.79.1 compare the fire to the wind as well as to a snake.

In b with Re I take *ví ... vāti* as having double sense: in the simile, with *mīham* as obj, it means ‘blow away’; in the frame, without obj. but with acc. of extent, it means ‘blow across / far and wide’.

I do not understand the presence of Mitra and Varuṇa in pāda c. Although Agni is sometimes identified with Mitra and/or Varuṇa (see, e.g., II.1.4 for the two individually), the overlap in functions that enables such identification is not visible here, at least to me.

The part. *ajyámānaḥ* is also found in the next vs. (10a) in the same metrical position; there I take it as double-sensed, both ‘being anointed’ and ‘being driven’, and esp. given the emphasis on Agni’s movement in this vs., the second sense should be present here as well.

In fact I think this double sense interacts with pāda d. Like Ge, the pub. tr. takes *agnīḥ* as part of the simile *agnīr vāne nā* “like a fire in the forest.” But of course the simile marker *nā* is wrongly positioned in that case. I now think that only *vané nā* constitutes the simile proper, and that there are two fires, one in the simile, one in the frame. The one in the frame belongs with Mitra and Varuṇa in c and with the ‘being anointed’ sense of *ajyámānaḥ*: when Agni, the ritual fire, is anointed with ghee in the functions of Mitra and Varuṇa, he lets loose his flame, which is fed by the ghee. The fire in the simile is the forest fire, driven by the wind (see *vāta-codīta-*, *vāta-jūta-* ‘spurred/sped by the wind’), with the 2nd sense of *ajyámānaḥ*. I would therefore now emend the tr. of cd to “where, being anointed as M+V, Agni has let loose his flame, as a fire in the forest, being driven (by the wind), lets loose its flame.”

X.31.10: With Ge (and despite Old’s doubts) I take this vs. as depicting the kindling of the ritual fire, with a focus on the kindling apparatus. In this it resembles vss. 13–14 (esp. the latter) of X.27, showing once again the connection between the Vasukra and Kavaṣa hymns that Old noted. As in X.27.14 the equipment and the process are both sexualized and, paradoxically, desexualized – or, better, de-fecundized. In X.27.14a the rod that connects the two kindling

sticks is described as a tree without leaves or shade, in other words a barren object (see comm. ad loc.). Here in pāda a I think the same entity, the rod, is identified as a barren cow (*starī-*), which nonetheless, paradoxically, gave birth (*sūta*). This identification is surprising because of the rod's phallic shape, and in fact I think the same piece of equipment is depicted as phallic in d—but dizzying layers of paradox should not surprise us in contexts like this. In both X.27.14a and here the rod is barren because it is the mere connector of the two kindling sticks, but it is also productive through its interaction esp. with the lower *araṇi*. Its giving birth in our pāda happens while, and because, it is *ajyāmānā*: “being driven” by the priests rapidly turning it back and forth (see descrip. ad X.27.14) – but also “being anointed,” perhaps with drops of ghee, as Ge (n. 10a) suggests, or with sparks from the friction.

The barren cow / friction stick remains the subject of b. She is described as *svāgopā* ‘having her own herdsmen’, probably the priests who manipulate the stick, per Ge (n. 10b). The opening of this pāda, *vyāthir avyathīḥ* with its X and negated X, surely expresses another paradox, but its contents are not entirely clear, and I am now certain that the publ. tr. “though faltering, did so unflinchingly” did not capture it. I now follow (more or less) Old’s suggestion that *vyāthir avyathīḥ kṛṇuta* contains a double acc. constr., rather like 8c, also with *kṛṇuta*. And I think further that in addition to the paradox expressed by the positive and negated nominal forms of \sqrt{vyath} , there has been a flipping of values. Generally ‘falter, waver’ is a negative notion, evidenced by the number of passages in which it is proudly asserted that *nā* \sqrt{vyath} “he/they do not falter.” However, in terms of the fire kindling, it is desirable to set the inert kindling materials in motion, in the very type of wavering motion that nascent flames and smoke would show. I therefore now take *avyathīḥ* as a fem. acc. pl. to the *i*-stem *avyathī-*, referring to the ‘non-wavering’ (i.e., inert) kindling materials, the referent per haps being f. *samīdh-* (see comm. ad X.27.13), and the *vyāthiḥ* as the second (neut. *-is*-stem) acc. with $\sqrt{kṛ}$. Although *avyathī-* is ordinarily a good quality, here it is not. I would now emend the tr. to “she set the unmoving / unwavering (kindling materials) to wavering / to a wavering course.”

Pāda c expresses the usual beloved paradox of the son being born before his parents. As Ge (n. 10c) says, this must mean that Agni as a god and an elemental substance existed before his particular birth as the ritual fire right now.

Pāda d returns us to the birth scene, with a different and more sexualized image, one that restores the expected gender relations. The cow here (*gauḥ*) is presumably the lower *araṇi*, conceptualized as female, which lies flat on the ground. It has a hole in it, called the *yoni* (see disc. ad X.27.14). This fecund cow contrasts with the barren cow (*starī-*) of pāda a, but may be assimilated to “the foremost cow throughout the land” of 6b.

The interpr. of the pāda turns on the word *samyām*. In this form it can be either the loc. sg. of *samī-* (AV+) ‘samī tree’ or the acc. sg. of a *samyā-*, not found elsewhere but quite likely the same as *samyā-* (III.33.13, AV+) ‘yokepin, peg’. In an item of homely usage, it would not be surprising for the accent to be insecure. If it is the latter, it is the obj. of ‘swallowed’ (*jagāra*); if the former, the obj. of that verb must be supplied. Ge tr. it as the acc. (“so hat die Kuh den Pflöck verschlungen”), though in his extensive n. 10d he seems to favor the loc. Both on syntactic grounds—if there’s an available object, we should take it—and poetic grounds I favor the acc. This expression is then a different sexualized depiction of the kindling of the fire; here the lower *araṇi* “swallows” (that is, takes into its hole, the *yoni*) the friction stick, the rod that is inserted in the lower *araṇi* and set to whirling to produce the friction and the sparks that will set the kindling material afire. The peg is clearly phallic; the image is of sexual intercourse. It’s worth noting that the AV has an occurrence of *samyā-* in a sexual context (VI.138.4). Conceptualizing the rod as a

phallus“repairs” the disharmony of pāda a, where it was seen as female—though, it is true, a failed female, a barren cow.

I am completely baffled by the end of pāda d, the seemingly unconnected dep. cl. *yād dha pṛchān* “if/when they will ask.” This appears to be the effective end of the hymn, since the last vs. (11) is a pseudo-dānastuti. I can float two speculative accounts of this clause, neither of which I find particularly compelling. As I say in the publ. intro., the clause may hark back to the question posed in vs. 7, which began the treatment of the space/time conundrum, which finds its resolution in Agni. “When/if they will ask” sketches what precedes as the answer to such questions and thus provides closure to the hymn. Alternatively, it may provide the transition to the seemingly unconnected vs. 11: when “they” (unidentified) ask, “they” (also unidentified) reply (*āhuḥ* 11a). But since I don’t really understand why vs. 11 has been appended to this hymn, I can’t get any further.

X.31.11: As is frequently noted (Old, Ge, Re, Lü 618), this vs. bears a clear resemblance to I.117.8, in a Kaksīvant Aśvin hymn:

1.117.8 *yuvām śyāvāya rúsatīm adattam mahāḥ kṣṇāsyāśvinā kaṇvāya /
pravācyam tād vṛṣaṇā kṛtām vām yān nāṛṣadāya śrávo adhyádhattam ||*

In the publ. (JPB) tr.:

You two gave a bright (body) to Śyāva Kaṇva [/ Kaṇva, the Dark One] of the great flood (?), Aśvins.

That deed of yours is to be proclaimed, o bulls: that you bestowed fame upon the son of Nṛṣad [=Kaṇva].

Given the coincidence of vocabulary, there can be no doubt that the two passages are deeply interrelated, though they throw less light on each other than we might hope. I think it likely that Kaṇva is not only called Śyāva (‘dusky’) in both passages, but also Kṛṣṇa (‘dark’) in this one, and therefore, rather than seeing a dusky horse (Ge’s “der dunkelbraune Renner”) as the subj. of our pāda b, I take that pāda as depicting Kaṇva’s own triumph. Pāda c then depicts the payoff for the same Kaṇva under another epithet, *kṛṣṇā-*, semantically equivalent to *śyāvā-*: the “gleaming udder” of riches / honors swells for him, with a nice contrast between the bright udder and the dark recipient. Who is this Kaṇva? I can only assume that here he is a poet, indeed the poet of this hymn – perhaps adopting a more Indo-Aryan name than the phonologically aberrant Kavaṣa, but one still phonologically relatable to it – and associating himself with the great mass of Kaṇva poets elsewhere in the RV. If Kaṇva is our poet, then we can make sense of pāda d, a sense already suggested by Re: no one other than himself swelled his *rtā-*, that is, “nul ne l’a aidé dans la composition poétique.” He therefore deserves all the prizes and accolades he has received.

I doubt that the Kaṇva of I.117.8 is the same person; rather our poet has appropriated that “dunkle Sage” to outfit himself with a pedigree and a back-story. The *āhuḥ* “they say” may be a way of distancing this story from factual truth.

I would now slightly emend the tr. to “And they say that Kaṇva is the son of Nṛṣad, and (that) the dusky one, as prizewinner, took the stakes. / The gleaming udder swelled for the black one, (but) no one (else) made the truth swell for him there.”

X.32 Indra

See the publ. intro. for the structure of the hymn, esp. the clear division into two parts (vss. 1–5, 6–9) by meter and subject matter. Ge’s reconstruction of the mise-en-scène of this hymn at the beg. of his intro. to the hymn seems fanciful.

X.32.1: The first hemistich of this vs. is difficult and disputed, the second reasonably straightforward. In the first half it is clear that Indra's two horses are coming or have come to the place of sacrifice. Unclear are the exact sense of the pseudo-part. *dhiyasānā-*, the morphological analysis, root affiliation, and function of *sakṣāṇi*, and the identity and role of the *varā-*.

With regard to the first, see comm. ad V.33.2, which contains the only other occurrences of the stem. In contrast to the standard rendering 'aufmerksam' (etc.), I give the stem more complex semantics, in part encouraged by the larger context of both passages, the rarity of the form, and its unusual morphology, which sets it apart from standard participles to $\sqrt{dh̄}$. In both passages the part. modifies Indra, who in both instances is on his way to the sacrifice. I take the stem as meaning 'being conjured up', that is, 'being brought (to epiphany) by our *dh̄-* [poetic vision]'. In other words, the appearance of Indra at our sacrifice is under our mental control: our visions and the hymns they give rise to can literally "materialize / realize" Indra on our ritual ground. In our passage this conceit may provide the theme for the five "journey" vss. of the first part of the hymn. As disc. in the publ. intro., the standard Indra journey trope is overlaid with a different and almost contradictory journey theme, that of the bridal procession, in which the bride leads the husband rather than the standard vice versa. I now suggest that the "bride" in this scenario is the (fem. gender) *dh̄-* (see also Ge n. 3cd). It is she who leads Indra to us, in a role reversal that gives power not only to the bride-as-*dh̄-*, but also to us, who created her. Although the word *dh̄-* does not appear in this hymn (nor *dh̄t-*, though see X.31.3), I would argue that it is signaled by the very rare pseudo-participle found prominently in the first pāda. See also *dīdhaya* in 4a.

Now *sakṣāṇi*. Although it could be derived from either \sqrt{sah} or \sqrt{sac} , an affiliation with the former is more likely on semantic and lexical (other *sakṣ-* forms to this root) grounds. Flg. Baunack, both Old and Ge (n. 1a) take it as an infinitive in imperatival usage, presumably a loc. inf. to an otherwise unattested *n*-stem **sakṣān-*, and Lub also classifies it as an inf. to \sqrt{sah} . In the publ. tr. I took it as a loc. to such a stem, but not in infinitival usage: "in the power of ..." But I now find neither locative interpr. convincing, esp. because there exists an *i*-stem *sakṣāṇi-* of the appropriate shape, but no **sakṣān-* (though of course an *n*-stem probably underlies both *sakṣāṇi-* [8x, excluding this passage] and *sakṣāna-* [1x]). I return to the view that our *sakṣāṇi* represents an irregular shortening of dual *sakṣāṇī* in pāda-final position, a view that dates back to BR and is also held by Gr, Delb (AiS 416), and Lanman (Noun Infl. 390). The dual *sakṣāṇī* is found in VIII.22.15 modifying the Aśvins, also on a journey, and the very similar *-in*-stem *prasakṣīn-* (like our *prā ... sakṣāṇi*) has a dual *prasakṣīṇā* modifying Indra's *hārī* in VIII.13.10 (followed immediately in the next pāda by *gántārā*, like our *gmántā*). Despite Old's contemptuous dismissal of the dual interpr., I find it less problematic than the loc. infinitive one and would now emend the tr. to "The two overpowering (horses) of the one being conjured up [=Indra] are come." Although the shortening would be irregular, it may have been facilitated by the short *-i* ending pādas c and d.

The first evidence of the bridal motif is found in pāda b, with the 'woosers', both acc. and instr. (*varébhīr varān*). This first evidence is also the first evidence of the role reversals that characterize this motif in the hymn. The wooer is already a defined role in the RVic wedding; see in the wedding hymn, X.85.8–9. As I have discussed elsewhere (Sac Wife 222–23 and passim), the function and behavior of the wooer are most clearly set out in the grhya sūtras. The wooer or woosers are proxies for the bridegroom, who go to the house of the prospective bride and perform the formal wooing of the girl in discussion/negotiation with her family. This always involves

their journey *to* the bride, but here they—or at least some of them— stay put, and Indra, the pseudo-bride, comes to them. I am a bit puzzled by the plethora of wooers, in two different cases, and am not certain of their identities, but I am now inclined towards the solution sketched by Ge in his n. 1b, that they represent two different groups. The acc. *varān* are the priests and ritual personnel, who are wooing Indra with their *dhī-* and sit awaiting his arrival. The instr. *varébbhiḥ* are the wooers who accompany Indra, the gods or specifically the Maruts. I am not sure why wooers would come along with Indra in this scenario, unless (most likely) the image is of the standard model of wooing, with Indra as bridegroom accompanied by his posse of wooers, coming to woo the *dhī-*. The poet thus superimposes the two models one upon the other, leaving his audience off balance. I would now slightly emend this part of the tr. to “... are come, along with the wooers, to the (other) wooers (who are) taking their seats in front.”

The part. *prasīdataḥ* is taken by Gr and Ge as a gen. sg. modifying Indra, but Old points out that word order favors taking it as an acc. pl. with *varān*. I would add that it is not only word order but sense. *prá√sad* in the RV does not have its widespread later sense ‘be/make pleased’. It is quite a rare lexeme and seems specialized in the sense of taking a forward position at the ritual (e.g., IV.1.13, V.60.1). Here the participle locates the acc. *varān* as stationary on the ritual ground, as opposed to the approaching *vará-* in the instr.

In c *ubhāyam* probably refers to both oblations and praise, as Sāy. and Ge suggest (Ge’s n. 1c).

On the pf. subj. *jujoṣati* and *búbhodati* see my 2017 art. on the perfect subjunctive (Fs. García Ramón). As I argue there, there is no reason to assign any anterior value to them (of the ‘will have enjoyed’ type). The pf. subjunctives here may help explain the poet’s penchant for the pf. opt. in X.31 (see above).

X.32.2: This vs. is blessedly straightforward, a rarity in this poet’s oeuvre.

As Ge (n. 2cd) suggests, the pl. subjects of cd are probably not Indra’s horses, despite the verb *vāhanti*, because it is difficult to interpr. d with horses as subject— not to mention that Indra’s two horses figured prominently in vs. 1, so the switch to pl. would be jarring. Instead, as Ge says, the subj. is probably the singers or their praise hymns. This fits nicely with my interpr. of vs. 1 and the situation more generally—that the poets have the power to make Indra appear at their sacrifice, to convey him there, through their poetic vision.

vagvaná- is a hapax, with a very rare suffix (AiG II.2.905), though clearly, if irregularly, derived from *√vac*. Its creation here may owe something to *vagnúnā* in the next vs., 3c. The negative interpr. (‘chattering’) is entirely dependent on context. It is most likely an adj. modifying acc. pl. *arādhāsaḥ*, but as Ge (n. 2d) points out, the latter could instead be a gen. sg. dependent on a substantivized *vagvaná-*: “the chatterings of the ungenerous one.” It hardly matters. It does matter that what the presumed subjects, the poets, are overcoming is something verbal.

X.32.3: This is the omphalos vs., in the exact middle of the first part of the hymn, and, as often, it overtly signals that it contains enigmas—here by the whole 1st pāda. After which follow three “wonders,” one per pāda; I do not consider all three to hang together as a single story, though cd present two views of a single situation. The topsy-turvy quality of each of the *vāpūṃṣi* recalls that of the animal fable vignettes in X.28, another sign of the connection between Vasukra and Kavaṣa.

The verb *adhīyati* (Pp. *adhi-īyati*) is plausibly taken by Old as a nonce thematization of the root pres. to \sqrt{i} , like nonce thematized *bībhramāṇa-* in the previous hymn (X.31.6). For the semantics of *adhī* \sqrt{i} see comm. ad IV.17.12. The wonder in this pāda—the son knowing the birth of his parents—is a variant on the theme found in the last hymn, X.31.10, of the son being born before his parents. I do not think it needs to be interpr. in the context of the 2nd hemistich.

As already noted, these two pādas present two different views of the same thing: (c) a wife conveying her new husband on the wedding journey rather than vice versa; (d) a bridal procession arranged for the bridegroom, not as is usual for the bride. Both of them can be interpr. in light of my suggestion (above ad vs. 1) that our *dhī-* is the bride who will bring Indra to our sacrifice. In c she is the wife and Indra the husband; in d the bridal procession is for Indra. This is also succinctly stated by Ge (n. 3cd): “Der Gemahl ist Indra, die Frau, die ihn heimführt, ist die Dichtung; seine Fahrt zum Opfer ist ein Hochzeitszug.” For \sqrt{vah} in the specialized use of ‘convey (home), marry’ see, e.g., V.37.3 *vadhūr iyám pátim ichánty eti, yá īm vāhāte máhiṣīm iṣirām* “Here she goes, a bride seeking a husband who will take her home as vigorous chief wife” (sim. in a nearby Vasukra passage, X.27.11). In V.37.3 in the following pāda the chariot sounds loudly (*ā ... ghoṣat*); if that pāda is connected to what precedes, this may refer to celebratory noisemaking from bystanders and could be reflected in our *vāgnunā sumát* “amid the uproar.” Numerous passages show *vahatú-* as specifically for the bride, including X.85.14 (wedding hymn) *vahatúm sūryāyāḥ* and, as obj. of \sqrt{kr} , the notorious X.17.1 *tváṣṭā duhitré vahatúm kṛṇoti* “Tvaṣṭar is making a wedding for his daughter.” The *íd* in our *pumśá id* emphasizes the oddness of making a *vahatú-* for a male. Despite the gen. *pumśáḥ* of the Pp., we should probably read dat. *pumśé*, as Old also suggests. As X.17.1 just cited shows, *vahatúm* \sqrt{kr} takes a dat.; see also X.85.20.

X.32.4: In the publ. tr. I render *abhí ... dīdhaya* “I ponder,” on the basis of III.38.1 *abhí ... dīdhayā* (see also IV.33.9), but I now think that it should be interpr. in conjunction with *dhiyasānāsya* in 1a and the underlying *dhī-* that I consider the bride figure in this multi-verse conceit. Ge’s characterization of the action here (n. 4a) is close to my understanding of *dhiyasānāsya* in vs. 1: “Der Dichter *sieht im Geist* [my ital.], wohin die Brautfahrt Indra’s geht, zu der Opferstätte.” I would now change the tr. slightly to “Just this dear seat do I envision ...”

I read *abhí* in pāda with *dīdhaya* but also supply it with *śāsan*, an unorthodox silent repetition in the rel. cl. suggested by the *abhí* in d, introducing the third subject of *śāsan*. For *abhí* $\sqrt{sās}$ meaning ‘direct (to a goal)’, cf. VI.54.2 *yó gṛhām abhiśāsati* “who [=Pūṣan] will direct (us) to the house(s).” In the simile in our passage *vahatúm* ‘bridal procession’ serves as the obj. corresponding to “(us)” in VI.54.2. The goal of both simile and frame is “this seat” (*tád ... sādhasṭham* of pāda a), expressed by *yád* in the rel. cl. The frame lacks an expressed object. Ge supplies “(deine Fahrt),” with the 2nd sg. poss. prn. presumably referring to Indra, who was addressed in the 2nd sg. two vss. before (vs. 2). I supply “(their journey),” referring to the cows, who, in the form of milk to be mixed with soma, are converging on the ritual ground. Ge (n. 4b) also thinks these are Somakühe, but I don’t see how these cows would direct Indra’s journey, as Ge has it.

The identities of the subjects of the other two pādas, also making their way to the seat, are unclear. Ge (n. 4b) suggests “sonstige Opfer (c) und Lied (d).” In particular (n. 4c) he sees “the foremost mother of the flock” (*mātā ... yūthāsya pūrvyā*) as the Iḍā, on the basis of V.41.19 *īlā yūthāsya mātā*, but we should perhaps also bear in mind *pūrvyā bhūmanā gauḥ* “the foremost

cow throughout the land” in the immediately preceding hymn (X.31.6), which we identified as the dakṣiṇā, arisen from Agni’s good favor.

In d *vānāsya saptādhātuḥ ... jānaḥ* “the sevenfold people of the music” is compared by Ge (n. 4d) with IX.103.3 *vāñīr ṛṣiṇām saptā* “the seven voices of the seers” – in both cases presumably referring to the chanters among the ritual personnel, assimilated to the Saptarṣi.

X.32.5: As indicated in the publ. intro., I see this vs. as depicting a two-way, crisscrossed journey: Soma goes to the gods (a); Indra and the gods come here (bc). I am almost alone in identifying the subj. of pāda a as Soma. Ge suggests the poet, Sāy. the Hotar, Baunack Agni, Old Soma or Agni. Although I am not absolutely certain that Soma is the subject – Agni remains a distinct possibility – the sg. of *devayū-* is used more often of Soma than of any other entity.

The lexeme *prá√ric* cannot, in my opinion, have its usual sense ‘project beyond, surpass’ here, since that idiom generally takes an abl. However, Ge and Old both, in different ways, try to wring that sense out of it, with Old supplying “the others” for the missing ablative: Ge “Der Gottverlangende reicht weiter bis zu eurer Stätte”; Old “Hervor (über die Andere) zu eurer ... Stätte hin reicht der Götterverehrer.” Both construe *áchā* with pāda-final *padám*, which they interpr. as ‘place’. By contrast, because *ácha* is often postposed to its complement, I take it rather with preceding *vah* ‘you’, referring to the gods. (For postposed *ácha*, see the common pāda-opening *devāṃ áchā* I.44.4, etc., and for this collocation #PREV ENCL.-PRN *áchā* the identical IV.34.3 *prá vó ‘chā*, etc.) This frees up *padám* to be obj. of *prá√ric*, in a different idiom ‘leave behind’; cf. X.13.4 *priyāṃ yamás tanvām prāṛirecīt* “Yama left behind his own dear body” (and see VI.20.4). Here I think the point is that Soma leaves a trail on his journey to the gods.

Meanwhile in b Indra, who is the single surpassing one (*ékaḥ ... turváñiḥ*), drives to the place of sacrifice along with the Maruts (*rudrébhiḥ* b) or with the gods in general (c). I would now slightly emend the tr., to more or less match Ge’s “oder mit den Unsterblichen,” to “or (with) the immortals among whom ...” with gapped instr. in the main cl. and “immortals” demoted into the rel. cl. as a loc. The position of *vā* is then somewhat anomalous, but (in my opinion) anomalous within reasonable limits.

The rel. cl. seems a bit of a throw-away, without relevance to the topic of the vs. It seems that the immortals have it in their power to “give” old age; indeed, since they’re immortal, the only relevance of old age to them is to inflict it on mortals—or, more positively, to give it to them. If the latter is meant, presumably “old age” here stands for the “complete lifetime” we aim for elsewhere in the RV.

As noted above (comm. ad X.31.3) *ūma-* is only used of the gods, so here it must refer to the immortals of c or perhaps Indra and the Maruts in b. The pl. subj. of the impv. *pári ... siñcata* must be the mortal ritual personnel.

X.32.6–8: These three vss. concern Agni, or rather 6 and 8 do, with 7 a general statement motivated by the previous vs. The final vs. (9) stands apart, though it is in Triṣṭubh like 6–8.

X.32.6: This vs. begins the second, Agni-focused portion of the hymn, though Indra, as the impartor of knowledge about Agni, provides the transition. The last three pādas are identical to V.2.8bcd.

The identity of the *vrata-pā-* ‘protector of commandments’ is left unclear, and the poet may be having a little joke at our expense. Sg. *vrata-pā-* is most often used of Agni (I.31.10, VI.8.2, VIII.11.1, possibly X.61.7); the only other sg. god who serves as referent is Sūrya

(I.83.5). But since the contents of the Vratapā's speech concern Agni, he is unlikely to be the speaker. Since Varuṇa is particularly associated with *vratá-*, he might be expected to be the default referent, but the stem is never directly applied to him, and there is no other sign of him in this hymn. In order to avoid multiplying entities, I suggest that Indra, who is explicitly named at the beginning of the next pāda, is also the referent here. By virtue of his militant actions on behalf of the gods and their clients, he can be considered the protector of their *vratás*.

X.32.7: Just as vs. 3 serves as omphalos in the first Indra-oriented portion of the hymn, this vs., the middle one of the three devoted to Agni, seems to have a similar profile: it is detached from the ritually focused vss. that surround it and expresses a maxim embedded in a general truth: that asking directions leads to a good outcome. As indicated in the publ. intro. the emphasis on the instruction of the ignorant reminds us of X.28. In any case, the *ānuśiṣṭaḥ-* of 6d, modifying the 1st ps. speaker, is picked up by *ānuśiṣṭaḥ* of 7b and *anuśāsanasya* of 7c, both used in general statements.

Although the *-víd-* of *kṣetra-víd-* most likely belongs to \sqrt{vid} 'know' (so Gr etc.; see Scar 482–83) and picks up *vidvān* used of the instructive Indra in 6c, note that \sqrt{vid} 'find' provides the final finite verb in the vs., *vindati* in d, and 'finding the field' is not an impossible interpr. of the cmpd.

X.32.8: This vs. concerns the rekindling of the ritual fire, subsequent to its being re-deposited in 6a *nidhīyāmānam*.

The plupf. (or redupl. impf.?) *āmaman* belongs with \sqrt{mar}^2 'stay, wait', forms of which are confined to the Vasukra / Kavaṣa hymns (see comm. ad X.27.20, 31.2). Agni's waiting may refer to his sojourn in the waters or to his staying quiescent once reinstalled on the ritual ground – or both.

Although 'covered over' (*āpīvṛtaḥ*) could refer either to his time lying within the waters or to his being covered with kindling materials on the hearth, the sucking of his mother's udder (*adhayan mātūr ūdhaḥ* most likely describes the nascent fire's contact with the kindling sticks.

The paradoxical expression "old age has reached the youth" (*āpa jarimā yuvānam*) presumably refers to the gray of ashes, once the fire begins to burn.

Note the enclitic doubling in *īm enam*.

X.32.9: Like immed. preceding X.31, this hymn ends with a twisted dānastuti-like vs. In the vs. here the poet seems to be praising gifts he (and his colleagues) are giving, rather than those they received – hence a sort of reverse dānastuti. The situation is further confused by the fact that the first hemistich contains two vocc., one apparent addressed to a soma vessel (*kalāśa*) and one to a certain Kuruśravaṇa, who, according to the next hymn (also by Kavaṣa), was a king (X.33.4 *kuruśravaṇam ... rājānam*) chosen as patron by Kavaṣa and, by the time of X.33, apparently dead. It is difficult to imagine a semantic or pragmatic class to which both the jug and the king could belong – and I think we would be wise not to try to identify one. Instead, the poet is addressing first the object (the vessel) and then the king, for different purposes. Both Ge and Old suggest that the *kalāśa-* is the referent of *sāḥ* in c—that is, it is the gift (or part of the gift) itself.

As a close parallel to ab Old and Ge aptly adduce V.30.12 *bhadram idām ruśāmā agne akran, gāvāṃ catvāri dādataḥ saḥsrā* "The Ruśamas have done this auspicious thing, o Agni, in giving four thousand cows." In our pāda a the poet may be addressing the soma vessel as an object made auspicious by being part of the gift we are giving. By contrast, in addressing

Kuruśrāvaṇa in b, he may be asking covert permission of the king to perform this giving – or more likely calling attention to the unusual *giving* by the poet (& co.) in order to prompt lavish countergiving by Kuruśrāvaṇa and the patrons, a sort of priming of the pump. Certainly the munificence of Kuruśrāvaṇa to our poet is described in extravagant terms in the next hymn, X.33.4–5.

In c *dānāḥ* is universally taken (incl. by the publ. tr.) as nom. sg. of *dānā-* ‘gift’, but I now wonder if it is not another ex. of the root aor. med. part. (not recognized in the grammars) in passive value. See another possible ex. in V.52.14 (and comm. thereon). Here it would modify the unexpressed nom. *kalásah*: “(the vessel) being given—let it be yours, o bounteous one, and this soma here ...” Though the publ. “let this be a gift for you ...” works fine, the participial interpr. is smoother.

X.33 Lament of a singer

On the situation depicted in this hymn, see Old, Ge, Bl (RR ad I.105.8), Don (64). The meter of the hymn is quite various and reflects the changes of mood and theme in this consistently 1st person discourse. The hymn gives the impression of a remarkably personal testament.

X.33.1: My tr. of *prayúj-* as ‘advance team’ here and in I.186.9, X.96.12 is not a happy one, sounding too close to the operatives of a modern political campaign. Presumably *prayúj-* refers to the horse(s) at the front of the team, and here the point is that the poet is hitched up even in front of those forward horses, in an especially prominent position. Because I doubt that the “teams of the peoples” (*prayújo jánānām*), a phrase also found in X.96.12, actually did their own hitching, I would like to take *prayújah* as an acc. pl. (as it is in I.186.9, in the phrase *prá yuñjate prayújah*). I would then tr. “They hitched me up (even) in front of (before) the teams of the peoples,” though I’m not certain the syntax will work: no other forms of *prá √ yuj* have a double acc. Old dismisses the possibility of an acc.

The use of *sma* with pres. *váhāmi* is unclear. Re (EVP XVI.131) asks “premier ex. de *sma* prétérisant le verbe?” In the publ. tr. I render it as ‘always’, but also “preterize” the verb. This is in part because of the tenses of the other verbs in this narrative: the impfs. *araksan* (c) and *āsīt* (d) should situate the vs. in the narrative past, while *yuyujre* (a) is compatible with that reading. The situation depicted also strongly suggests the non-recent past: in the first three pādas the poet reflects on the privileged position he had under the previous, now dead, king and recalls in d the shout that presaged his abrupt change of fortune. Perhaps the pres. with *sma* here has a past progressive sense “I was always carrying ...”

Pāda b presents two other, related questions: why Pūṣan and what is the sense of *ántareṇa* here? The latter seems to have attracted more attention than it perhaps deserves. See the various suggestions of Old, Ge, and Scar (427 and n. 603). I think it is an adverbial instr. ‘interiorly, intimately’, expressing the close relationship between the poet and Pūṣan. Although Pūṣan is a minor deity, he is invoked for aid in finding the way on journeys, and given the poet’s position as metaphorical lead horse, Pūṣan is an appropriate companion. Old plausibly suggests that Pūṣan here may be connected with the unnamed ‘field-knower’ in the previous hymn, X.32.7, who “finds the straight course” (*srutīm vindati añjasīnām*); see also nearby X.26 (though by a different poet), a hymn to Pūṣan that ends (vs. 9) with a hope for Pūṣan’s aid to our chariot.

See Ge (n. 1d) for two possible interpr. of the hapax *duḥśāsu-*. I take it as referring to the new king, who will replace the poet’s old generous and benevolent patron.

X.33.2: The first hemistich is identical to I.105.8, uttered by a speaker in similar emotional distress. As Ge suggests (n. 2ab), this may be a stereotyped phrase.

ámati- (c) and *matí-* (d) form a contrastive pair. On the sense of *ámati-* see comm. ad X.42.10, where it is argued that it refers to a physical state, which would be supported here by “nakedness and exhaustion.”

X.33.3: The second half of I.105.8 (see immed. above) is found here.

X.33.4: It is striking that the poet “chooses” his royal patron, not vice versa, at least in this telling. Is this a role reversal similar to that of the svayaṃvara?

X.33.5: I take this vs. as the poet’s “choosing” expression at the time of vs. 4, when he chose Kuruśravaṇa. Sim. Ge.

X.33.6: I take the *yásya* cl. as parallel to 5ab, with 5c almost an interlude. The main cl. in this vs. is c, with neut. *kṣetram* a nominative compared to the unexpressed Kuruśravaṇa.

Ge (sim. Don) assumes that the sweet *gírah* of pāda were Kuruśravaṇa’s own (“dessen Worte angenehm waren”; “whose words were sweet”). But *gír-* doesn’t simply mean ‘word’, but refers to the praise songs / hymns produced by poets, and surely these *gírah* were presented to Kuruśravaṇa by our speaker, who in the preceding pāda announced his intention to praise the king (5c *stávai*).

I do not understand the function of *prá-* in *prásvādasah*. No other forms built to *svād-* are compounded with this preverb (anywhere in Skt.), nor does it appear with verb forms built to \sqrt{svad} or $\sqrt{sūd}$. There is an orphaned, functionless *prá* in V.7.6 *prá svādanam pitūnām*, but that doesn’t help much.

For a dwelling, described as *raṇvā-*, compared to an animate being, cf., e.g., I.66.3 *okó ná raṇvāh* “delightful like a home,” of Agni, VI.3.3 *raṇvó vasatīh*, also of Agni.

X.33.9: *śatātman-* ‘having a hundred selves’ verges on “a cat has nine lives” territory, as Don also suggests.

X.34 Gambler

See the publ. intro. for an assessment of the hymn. Like the immediately preceding hymn, X.33, it is a monologue that traverses a landscape of shifting emotions, though the 1st person speakers and their preoccupations are very different. It has been much translated; in addition to the standard ones, Re *Hymnes spéc.*, Macd both *Hymns from the Rigveda* and *Vedic Reader*, Maurer, Thieme *Gedichte*, Don, Falk *Bruderschaft* 181ff.

The Anukr. ascribes the hymn to Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, which is surely correct, or alternatively and fancifully to *Akṣa Maujavant* “The dice (/die) from (Mt.) Mūjavant.”

X.34.1: Note the phonological semi-scrambling in the openings of the first two pādas, #*prāvepā mā* ... #*pravātejā*.

The tr. ‘dangling’ for *prāvepāh* is a bit misleading; it should have a greater sense of movement; perhaps ‘quivering’ or ‘shaking’.

Although *írīṇa-* is literally a salt pocket (see comm. ad VIII.4.3), in this context it refers to a such a pocket, a hollow in the ground, used for gaming, since it can contain the nuts and allow them to whirl freely.

The root \sqrt{chand} can mean both ‘seem’ and ‘please’. I favor the latter sense in d, with most tr., but Ge (fld. by Don) takes in the former sense, with the simile as the predicate: “seemed to me like a *bhakṣá-*.” Since ‘seemed’ is essentially built into the simile, a verb meaning ‘seem’ is superfluous. Moreover, the attraction that the nuts exert on the speaker is better expressed by ‘pleased’. Ge (n. 1d) considers the point of comparison between the nuts and soma to be the wakefulness expressed by *jāgrvi-* in d, but this seems overelaborate. Although, as he points out, *jāgrvi-* is also used of soma elsewhere in the RV, other qualities of soma might make it seem pleasing to the speaker.

X.34.2: The “one die too many” (*akṣásya ... ekaparásya*) refers to the leftover nut once the handful has been divided by four. As indicated in the publ. intro., a single leftover nut is worse than two, which is worse than three.

X.34.2–3: Note the symmetry between 2d *ápa jāyám arodham* and 3a *ápa jāyá ruṇaddhi*.
Note the opening of 3c, *#áśvasya*, matching 2c *#akṣásya*.

X.34.3: The mother-in-law of pāda a is actually the mother-in-law of the wife, that is, the *mother* of the speaker. In the system of patrilocal marriage prevailing at this period, terms for in-laws would only refer to the in-laws of the wife, who would be embedded within them. See disc. ad X.28.1 and Thieme (M+A 14 and n. 5); in M+A (n. 5) and Gedichte (74 n. 5) he suggests that “mother-in-law” is used here because the woman in question no longer considers the gambler her son because of his unacceptable behavior. She has disowned him, and her relationship to him is only through her daughter-in-law.

X.34.4: Init. *anyé* in pāda a, as well as *anyéśām* init. in 10d and 11b, conforms to my rule that indefinite *anyá-* is always init., while def. *anyá-* is generally in 2nd position.

X.34.5: Although some tr. take b as continuing the direct speech of *ná daviśāni ebhiḥ* (a), it seems best (with Ge, Thieme, etc.) to limit the direct quotation to the three words just quoted. In b the gambler then describes the unhappy effect of the virtuous resolve he just announced – abandonment by his *sákhī-*.

There is some discussion about who these *sákhī-* are, the dice themselves or his human gambling pals (see Old, Ge, etc.). I assume it refers to both.

The sense and morphological value of *áva hīye* in b are disputed. I take it as a passive to $\sqrt{hā}$ ‘leave (behind)’, while others (see esp. Kulikov, *ya*-presents, p. 448) as an intrans. ‘stay behind’. The RV gives us no help. This is, in my view, the only RVic form to the stem *hīya-* belonging to the root $\sqrt{hā}$ ‘leave behind’; the other two forms classified there by Gr are cmpd with *ní* and in my interpr. belong to the root $\sqrt{hā}$ ‘change position’ and mean ‘be bent double’ (see VI.52.1 and VII.104.10). Our RVic form is unaccented, and forms in Vedic prose show both accents (*hīya-* and *hīyá-*; for details see Kulikov). Kulikov interpr. it as a non-passive intransitive (anticausative) form, tr. “I fall behind.” Although the formal facts provide no help, I find the passive makes for better drama. Note also the ppl. to this root in passive value in vs. 10, *hīnā* ‘abandoned, left behind’.

As shown by the accent on *ákrata*, *ca* in *c* is a subordinator. See, e.g., Klein DGRV I.243.

X.34.6: On *śúśujāna-*, see comm. ad X.27.2, where, flg. Insler, I take it as a deformation of *śúśuvāna-* ‘swelling up’. As I have often remarked above (flg. Old), there are numerous close connections between the Vasukra hymns (X.27–29) and the Kavaṣa hymns (X.30–34), and the limitation of this supposed root ($\sqrt{śuj}$) in this particular phrase, *tanvā śúśujānaḥ*, to a Vasukra hymn and a Kavaṣa hymn adds to the list.

Among the many tr., opinion is divided about whether *jesyāmi* is a question, “will I win?,” introduced by *prchāmānaḥ* (Macd, Th, Don, Falk [185], Mau) or a confident assertion “I will win” (Ge, Re [Hymnes spéc], Scar [224, 306]). I think the best interpr. is that it’s both, showing the mind of the gambler divided between trepidatious self-doubt and boastful over-confidence, surely a psychologically astute observation. Formally the verb can be either question or statement, and note that it is situated just in between *prchāmānaḥ* and *tanvā śúśujānaḥ*, which express the two emotional poles.

X.34.7: This is the only Jagatī vs. in this Triṣṭubh hymn (though see 5c in the otherwise Triṣṭubh vs. 5); it is also the middle vs., esp. if we take vs. 14 as somewhat aside. Falk (p. 183) cleverly points out that Jagatī with its 12- syllable pādas is divisible by 4 – that is, it is essentially *kṛta*, the winning hand, and further suggests that if there’s a Wahrheitszauber in the hymn (as a number have asserted, with various candidates; see Falk 182–83), this is it. He considers it a *nāmagrāha*: the speaker knows the real names of the dice, or rather the real name, *aṅkuśá-* ‘hook’ (in *aṅkuśín*), which is a phonological scrambling of *akṣá-* (p. 185 n. 534). Although I’m not sure that I’d follow Falk all the way, I am quite taken by his observation that this vs. is the only one that can be divided by 4; he does not make anything of its being the middle vs. (his publication predates my work on the omphalos), but its position fits it to be an omphalos vs., which gives further support to Falk’s suggestion. Rather than considering the various adj.s in the first hemistich, or just *aṅkuśín-*, as the real name(s) of the dice, I wonder if the intent is the reverse, an intent signalled by *íḍ*: an attempt to demystify and disempower the dice by cutting their name down to size, “they are just *akṣáḥ*.” This would make it a kind of reverse omphalos: rather than embodying the enigma of the hymn, it reveals (or tries to) that the apparently irresistible actors, the nuts, are actually just pedestrian objects. But clearly this belittling doesn’t work: the compulsive attraction remains too strong, and the dice are depicted as animate agents in vss. 8–9, 11. For a similar reversion of inanimate actors to mere objects see the end of the pressing stone hymn, X.94.14.

For a somewhat over-the-top interpr. of the adjectives see Th’s tr., beginning (with *aṅkuśín*) “das sind Elefantentrieber, Ochsentreiber ...” This level of specificity seems unnec. and in fact counterproductive.

On *ní√tud* see comm. ad I.58.1, where I argue for rendering the *ní* (‘force down’), rather than the standard ‘spur on, goad’. I opted for the latter here, despite the sequence *nitodíno*, *nikṛtvānaḥ*, because rendering the *ní* produced the awk. “down-thrusting, down-putting.”

X.34.8: The Pp reads the Saṃhitā *nā* as *ná*, and Macd (VR ad loc. [p.191]) cites it as “the only example in the RV. of the metrical lengthening of *ná*,” but better, with Old, to take it as *ná + ā*, which preverb is not uncommon with \sqrt{nam} . Although some forms of $\tilde{a}\sqrt{nam}$ take an acc. (‘bend X’), others seem indistinguishable in usage from the simplex (e.g., VI.50.4 $\tilde{a} naḥ ... namantām$).

X.34.9: Note that *divyá-* ‘heavenly’ evokes the pres. stem *dīvyā-* ‘gamble, play dice’.

X.34.10–11: The “scorching, burning” theme, from 7b *tápanās tāpayiṣṇávaḥ* and 9d *nír dahanti*, is continued by *tapyate* (10a), said of the abandoned wife, and *tatāpa* (11a), said of the gambler—hence my tr. “is scorched / it scorched” rather than the more generic “is pained / it pained.”

X.34.10: Although my assumption (and I think that of most interpreters) is that the “mother” of pāda b is the is the gambler’s mother, who is pained by his wanderings occasioned by his poverty and consequent homelessness, EM suggests that the mother could be identical to the wife, who opens pāda a – that is, the mother of his child(ren). Although I think the standard interpr. is probably the correct one, due to the “wandering child,” there is nothing syntactic to prevent the alternative, and it may add some resonance.

Although “money” as a tr. for *dhānam* in c is anachronistic—the Rigveda does not depict a cash economy—I chose it over the usual renderings of this stem: ‘prize, stakes, wealth’, all of which would be misleading here. The gambler is not seeking riches, but just something to settle his debts.

With most, I consider the gambler’s purpose in d in “approaching the house of others” to be theft. See Re’s (EVP XVI.132) apposite invocation of the debtor turned thief in VI.12.5. However, Ge (n. 10c) suggests as an alternative that he hopes to borrow money, and Maurer in his n. suggests either borrowing or seeking shelter. The benign idiom *úpa √i*, rather than the more aggressive *abhí √i* or the like, might give some support to this view, but I still think theft is much more likely; *úpa √i* might simply indicate a stealthy approach.

X.34.11: Several tr. (Don, Falk 186, Kü 212) take the *strī-* to be the gambler’s own woman, now the wife of others. This seems quite unlikely (see Ge’s n. 11a); among other things, if she’s now the wife of (pl.) others, the sight will pain him in a different way. Furthermore, as far as I can tell, *strī-* never otherwise means ‘wife’. When it’s contrasted with something it’s generic ‘men’, and no passage requires, and most discourage, a ‘wife’ reading. The point here is that when he’s skulking around other people’s houses, nose pressed against the glass as it were, he sees scenes of domestic happiness that remind him of what he gave up.

The sense of the 2nd hemistich, particularly pāda d, is not entirely certain. In c he yokes his “brown horses,” the dice, in early morning and presumably keeps gambling all day. In d the questions are what *agnér ánte* designates and what *vṛṣalá-* (only here until BĀU) means. As for the former, I am inclined to see it as a temporal designation complementing *pūrvāhṇé* in c, and also matching the *náktam* of 10d. The “end of the fire” would be late at night, when the cooking fire would be allowed to subside into coals until the next day. Ge (n. 11d) considers this a possible alternative. But most take it as a location, “near the fire” (Ge “in der Nähe des Feuers”). In his n. Th interpr. the “end of the fire” as its ashes, a comparatively warm place for someone who has no fixed place to sleep – implying that the gambler has kindled a fire for himself outdoors. Others (esp. Maurer) seem to imply that the gambler has taken refuge with the cozy family of pāda b, but was only given a grudging place there. I still favor the phrase as a temporal designation, reminiscent of accounts of people who, in the sensory deprivation of Las Vegas casinos, gamble non-stop with no notion of whether it’s night or day. The time range from early morning to the end of the fire is an indication of how obsessed the gambler is.

As for *vṛṣalá-*, KH (Vedica 87 [MSS 41, 1982] = Aufs. III, 793ff.) considers this passage as well as the much later ones and settles on “Hausgesinde arischer Herkunft.” But this seems

too specific a social role for our period and our hymn. It seems more likely that this derivative of ‘bull’, with its diminutive and deprecatory suffix *-la-* with “popular” *l*, is a familiar and condescending way of referring to a social inferior or someone down on his luck, of the “poor guy” variety. A different species but the same general intent might be “miserable cur” or “mongrel” or “mutt.”

PS points out the mirror-image phonology of the two perfects, *tatāpa* ending pāda a and *papāda* ending d.

X.34.12: The second half of this vs. is taken, almost universally, as the gambler’s admission that he has no more funds to stake and as a gesture of submission to the dice, an interpr. with which I am in agreement. Falk (183–84), by contrast, thinks that “holding nothing back” means that the gambler has won, a victory set in motion by the Wahrheitszauber of vs. 7. Although Falk’s treatment of the other occurrences of *ná dhánam* √ *rudh* is suggestive, I find his interpr. contextually impossible.

X.34.13: *kṛṣím it kṛṣasva* could go nicely into a Voltaire/Candide-style “cultiver notre jardin.”

The verb in d, *ví caṣṭe*, is given the sense(s) ‘explain / reveal / tell’ in all the tr. cited above. However, I am reluctant to ascribe a trans./caus. sense to this middle root pres., which ordinarily means ‘see’—despite Falk’s ingenious attempt (p. 187 n. 546) to make it a two-way street of lightbeams. I prefer ‘watch out for’ (similarly *ví cakṣate* in VIII.45.16): Savitar’s good and bracing advice is his way of exercising benevolent oversight over the (reformed) gambler.

Although *aryáh* is most likely the nom. sg. of the thematic adj. *aryá-*, it could also be the gen. sg. of *arí-* and modify *me* (“me, the stranger”), indicating that by his behavior the gambler has estranged himself from Ārya social bonds (as is amply demonstrated throughout the hymn), but that he is being brought back into the fold.

X.34.13–14: Note the juxtaposition of *aryáh* // *mitrám* across the verse boundary. It almost seems that the gambler is being reintegrated into Ārya society, and the two gods esp. associated with the smooth internal running of that society, Aryaman and Mitra, are indirectly invoked. Savitar seems like a stand-in for Aryaman here.

X.34.14: The particle *khálu*, though extremely common in Vedic prose, is found only here in the RV.

The instr. adj. *ghoréṇa* has been interpr. in a variety of ways: Ge and Th supply “Zauber,” Falk (somewhat anachronistically) “Kali”; Macd. tr. “magic power,” Don “the force of your terrible sorcery,” Maurer “cruelty,” and Re (Hymnes spéc) takes it adverbially “de cette façon cruelle.” I favor supplying either ‘eye’ (on the basis of the cmpds. *ghorá-cakṣas-* and *ághora-cakṣus-*) or ‘mind’ (on the basis of VII.20.6 *mánaḥ ... ghorám*; cf. also the beg. of the Purūravas/Urvaśī dialogue X.95.1 *mánasā tīṣṭha ghore*).

X.35–38: These four hymns are persuasively grouped together by Old (Prol. 229 n. 2, 235), though only the first two, which are a matched pair, are attributed to the same poet. The names of the poets given by the Anukr. for X.37 and X.38 are fanciful and based on the divine dedicand.

X.35–36: The next two hymns, both to the All Gods, are attributed to one Luśa Dhānāka, not otherwise mentioned in the RV. On the structural similarities between the hymns see the publ.

intro. to X.36. Both hymns are top-heavy with 1st pl. middles in (-) *īmahe* and *-īmahi*, both in their refrains and outside of them.

X.35 All Gods

On the matutine character of this hymn and its structure in general, see publ. intro.

The refrain that dominates the middle part of the hymn and the dense repetition found throughout give a slightly claustrophobic feeling to this hymn. Even before the refrain that dominates vss. 3–12 is established in 3d, pronounced chaining links the first three vss.: Heaven and Earth are found in all three vss. (1c, 2a, 3a), in the first as a dual dvandva in the nom., in the 2nd as a gen. du. dvandva (*diváspr̥thivyóh*), in the 3rd again in the nom., but with the two members separated. The stem *uśás-* is likewise found in all three vss., in different case/number (1b, 2c, 3c), and the adverb *adyá-ā* ‘today’ occurs in all three (1c, 2d, 3a). The end of vs. 1 (d *áva ā vṛṇīmahe*) is repeated in 2a, and *anāgāstvám* (2c) reappears in *ánāgasah* in 3a. Note also *mahī* (1c, 3b), *māṭīn* (2b) / *māṭārā* (3b). Lexical and phrasal repetition characterize the hymn throughout. See comm. ad vs. 5, for example. Particularly persistent is the word *adyá* ‘today’, found in vss. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 13, (i.e., half the vss.). It is notable that *adyā* and the VP *ávaḥ ... vṛṇīmahe*, which figure prominently in this hymn, form the post-caesura part of the refrain ... *ávo adyā vṛṇīmahe* that dominates the next hymn (X.36.2–12).

X.35.1: I am not sure why the fires are said to be *īndravant-*; is it because he is a regular at the early morning pressing?

X.35.2: With Old and Gr (contra Ge and Re), I take *śaryañāvataḥ* as acc. pl., not gen. sg.

X.35.3: When the refrain gets established in the final pāda of this vs., its verb *īmahe*, in final position, not only repeats the *īmahe* that ends 2c, but echoes pāda-final *vṛṇīmahe* (1d, 2a).

X.35.4: The form *sudevyaṃ* occurs twice in the RV, here and in I.112.19, both pāda-final. In I.112.19 I take it, with some but not all interpr. (see comm. ad loc.), as an acc. of a PN *sudevī-* with *vṛkī* inflection, rather than assigning it to a them. stem *sudevya-* as Gr (etc.) does. In our passage in the publ. tr. I attempted the same thing, except analyzing it as a nom. phrase **sudevī iyám*, with vowel contraction and shortening (**sudevīyam > sudevīyam*) as well as loss of the accent on *iyám*. I wish I could make this work, but on reflection I see that it rests on too many shaky factors – not only the unprecedented sandhi and loss of accent, but the unlikelihood of starting and ending the pāda with the same deictic *iyám* with the same referent. Not to mention the fact that, like *sudevā-*, *sudevī-* should be a bahuvrīhi, which works for the PN in I.112.19, but would not work here, since it would modify a figure who is already a goddess. I would now detach this form from the identical one in I.112.19, still assigning that one to a *vṛkī* stem *sudevī-*, while accepting the thematic adj. deriv. here (though it occurs nowhere else) and taking it as an adverb. But I would still maintain that it was constructed to evoke *-devī-* and means something like “in the manner of a good goddess.” The emended tr.: “This foremost ruddy one here — in the manner of a good goddess, let her, the rich lady, dawn richly for our gain.” Just as the adv. *revát* matches the fem. nom. sg. *revátī* “the rich lady richly,” so does *sudevyaṃ* match the unexpressed **(su)devī*. Assuming an allusion to the goddess seems preferable to the almost random collection of meanings others have assigned to *sudevya-*: Gr “Schar der guten Götter”; Ge “Glück”; Re (EVP V.50 tr. of this hymn) “la faveur des dieux” (as obj. of *vy ùchatu*, which is otherwise

generally intrans., though see possible exception in 5c), but in the notes on the hymn (EVP IV.112) “fait d’avoir les dieux pour soi” (see also EVP XVI.11 ad I.112.19 “rendant les dieux favorables”).

The stem *durvidātra-*, the negative of the better-attested *savidātra-*, is found three times in the RV: twice in Luśa Dhānaka’s slender oeuvre (here and in the following hymn, X.36.2) and in X.63.12. The adj. is generally given a generic gloss: Gr ‘Schlechtes austheilend, Böses erweisend’, Ge ‘unzugänglich’, AiG II.2.170 ‘Böses erweisend’. The exception is Re, whose rendering ‘funeste à rencontrer’ has real semantics. As disc. with regard to *savidātra-* (comm. ad II.9.6), the question is what root *-vidātra-* belongs to. For reasons detailed ad II.9.6, I connect it with $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘find’, and my assumption is that this root etymology also underlies Re’s ‘... à rencontrer’: ‘to find’, that is, ‘to run across / encounter’. Two of the three examples of *durvidātra-* actively support this derivation by wishing the entity described as *durvidātra-* to be or go far away: here “set the fury in the distance (*āré*)” and in X.63.12, where repeated *āpa* ‘away’ as well as *āré* ‘in the distance’ apply to a series of afflictions we seek to have banished. The point is that the further away all these things are, the less likely we will encounter them.

Re, somewhat bizarrely, takes *dhīmahī* as passive (“Puissions-nous être placés ...”), which requires him to construe the acc. *manyúm* rather loosely. Since *dhīmahī* is almost never passive, I see no advantage in this.

X.35.5: *uśāsaḥ* in b is morphologically ambiguous: it could be the gen. sg. or the (modernized) nom. pl. (as in 6a), agreeing with *yāḥ* in pāda a. Since b is identical to 1b, save for the gender of the nom. pl. pres. part.: m. *bhárantaḥ* 1b, f. *bhárantiḥ* 5b, the gen. sg., construed with *vyùṣṭiṣu* as in 1b, is the more likely choice (so also Re, though he allows for simultaneous readings). However, Ge opts for nom. pl. at least as the primary ident. (tr. *vyùṣṭiṣu* with a pronominal gen. “bei ihrem Aufgang”), and though Old favors the gen. sg. on the grounds of parallelism, he allows for both readings. It is certainly possible that the poet wanted to introduce variation, or at least doubt, in his repeated pāda.

Pāda c introduces another ambiguity: the Samhitā form *bhadrá* can represent either neut. pl. *bhadrá* or fem. pl. *bhadráḥ* (Pp. the latter). The pub. tr. reflects the former, as acc. obj. with *vy ùchata*. I now think this is wrong: not only is $\sqrt{\text{vas}}$ otherwise intrans. (see comm. ad vs. 4), but unambig. *bhadráḥ* modifies pl. ‘dawns’ elsewhere (IV.51.7, VII.41.7). I would now emend the tr. to “as auspicious ones, dawn widely today for our fame.” This adj. picks up *bhadráṃ* in 2d, where it is a neut. substantive, which is perhaps a weak support for taking it as such here. However, the other arguments outweigh that.

The vs. switches from 3rd pl. in the first hemistich (or at least pāda a; b is ambiguous) to 2nd pl. in the second, while maintaining the same subject (dawns) – as is, of course, often the case.

X.35.6: The ambiguous form in this vs. is *āyukṣātām*. The Pp. reads *āyukṣātām*, that is, based on a form with a lengthened augment (which conforms to Prātiśākhya 181), and this preterital interpr. is accepted by the standard interpr. (Gr, Ols, Ge, Re, implicitly Narten [Sig aor. 215]; see esp. Old’s disc. ad V.17.3). But I do not see why in this context we cannot interpr. the Samhitā form as *āyukṣātām*, with an imperative (or imperatival injunctive) plus preverb. The context favors it, with two parallel preceding impvs., *ā carantu* (a) and *úd ... jihatām* (b). There are, admittedly, countervailing factors in addition to the Prātiśākhya. In favor of the lengthened augment interpr. is the unambiguous form *āyunak* in I.163.2, which cannot have the preverb *ā*,

because of the lack of accent; there is also the fact that unambiguous $\bar{a}\check{y}uj$ is fairly uncommon. But cf. $\bar{a}yuyujr\acute{e}$ at V.58.2, X.44.7, where \bar{a} cannot be the augment because it is prefixed to a perfect, and so must be the preverb; also III.35.2 $\acute{a}yunajmi$ with \acute{a} and a pres. indic. It is true that the other occurrence of $\acute{a}yukṣātām$, at I.157.1, is very like our passage ($\acute{a}yukṣātām aśvínā ... rātham$) and is in preterital context with augmented forms (preceded by $\acute{a}bodhi ... \bar{a}vaḥ$, followed by $prāsāvīt$), so “have yoked” is the most likely interpr. But nothing prevents our form from being analyzed $\acute{a}yukṣātām$, versus $\acute{a}ayukṣātām$ in I.157.1. Or, even if the form in I.157.1 has a lengthened augment and no preverb, it is perfectly possible that our poet misunderstood the form as containing the preverb and, potentially, the unaugmented $yukṣātām$. One could construct a scenario to cover the standard interpr. and explain why the first half of our vs. is in the imperative, but the third verb is an augmented aorist: the Ásvins are notoriously early travelers ($prātar-yāvan-$, etc.), and so perhaps they had already yoked their chariot before we urge the dawns and the fires to spring into action. But on the whole an interpr. with three impvs. fits the context better.

X.35.7: The first hemistich of this vs. contains what is surely a deliberate echo of the Gāyatrī mantra (III.62.10), which begins $tāt savitūr várenyam, bhárgaḥ ...$, very similar to our $... savitar várenyam, bhāgām ...$. An expanded, Jagatī version of the Gāyatrī mantra’s 1st pāda is also found at I.159.5 (see comm. ad loc.), which contains the $adyá$ of our pāda: $tád rādhō adyá savitūr várenyam$.

On $dhiṣāṇā$ - see comm. ad IX.59.2.

X.35.8: Although $devānām$ is generally (Ge, Re, Lü [506]) construed with $pravācanam$, I follow Old in taking it with the b pāda, as a genitive indirect object – both because of the pāda boundary and because of the standard god/mortal polarity expressed here by $devānām ... manuṣyāḥ$.

I take pāda c as the content of the $ṛtāsya pravācanam$. Although it seems a somewhat banal satyakriyā, it does express a basic truth about the cosmos. Note that nearby X.37.2 contains a $satyókti$ - ‘statement of reality’ that also asserts that the sun rises every day.

X.35.9: The first word of the vs., $adveṣás-$, a negated s -stem, should by accent be a bahuvrīhi, of the type $cetas-$ ‘insight’: $acetás-$ ‘lacking insight’, $jávas-$ ‘speed’: $ajavás-$ ‘lacking speed’, etc. However, in none of its 4 (or possibly 3 or possibly 2 [see below]) occurrences is a straightforward bahuv. interpr. possible. In all 4 of the passages supposedly containing it, it is pāda-initial in the form $adveṣáh$, i.e., an apparent neut. sg. N/A, but with no neut. sg. referent in context. In our passage the publ. tr. interpr. it as a neut. abstract noun ‘lack of hatred’; Ge’s “Friedfertigkeit” also seems to assume an abstract noun (“Wir bitten heute um Friedfertigkeit”), as also, I think, Re’s elaborate “Nous demandons qu’on ne nous veuille pas de mal,” where the “que” clause seems to be his rendering of $adveṣáh$, though it’s not clear to me how his tr. matches up grammatically with the Skt. An acc. noun as object of \bar{imahe} works well here; the problem is, as indicated above, that it shouldn’t be that kind of compound. But the other three passages are less amenable to an interpr. as a noun. In V.87.8 $adveṣó no maruto gātúm étana$ “Without hatred, come on your way to us here, Maruts,” it seems to be a bahuv. used adverbially, to be more literally rendered as “in a manner without hatred,” apparently so interpr. by both Ge and Re. The same interpr. would in principle be available for I.186.10 $adveṣó víṣṇur vāta ṛbhukṣáh$ in a loose series of individual gods’ names, but here I think it preferable to take it as nom. sg. masc. of the thematic bahuv. adj. $adveṣá-$, marginally but clearly attested as du. $adveṣé$

at IX.68.10=X.45.12. Ge's "Die nie feindselige Viṣṇu" and Re's (EVP V.10) "Viṣṇu qui excludit l'inimitié" seem to reflect the same analysis, though neither comments. The final ex. is in I.24.4. Although the publ. (JPB) tr. of I.24.4 interpr. it as a noun 'freedom from hatred', this does not seem to be the prevailing view – which, however, is a bit hard to figure out. See esp. Old's elaborate disc. of this problematic vs., which does not mention *adveśāḥ*. Ge seems to take it again as a nom. sg. to the them. adj., referring back to *bhāgaḥ* earlier in the vs.; I *think* he tr. *adveśāḥ* as "unangefochten" (unchallenged, undisputed), but this seems so far from the underlying meaning that I matched the tr. and the Skt. only by process of elimination. Re tr. (EVP V.4) "à l'abri de l'envie," claiming his tr. of the vs. follows Thieme's (Oriens 6 [1953]: 399), who renders *adveśāḥ* as "[so, dass er] ohne Feind [ist]." Neither Th nor Re comments on the morphology or syntax, but judging from Th's representation (brackets and all), I assume he's taking it as the them. bahuv. adj. modifying *bhāgaḥ*. To return to our passage, I still weakly favor a noun 'lack of hatred', but given the problematic morphology (expect a bahuv.) and the distance between this hemistich-init. word and the hemistich-final verb that is supposed to govern it, I also consider it possible that we have an adverbial usage as in V.87.8, yielding an emended alternate tr. "In a manner without hostility we beg for the realization of our thought ..."

The next issue in this hemistich is the Saṃhitā form *sādha* in b, analyzed by the Pp. as *sādhe*. The two preceding GEN LOC phrases referring to ritual activities invite us to interpr. *sādhe* as a loc., with dependent gen. *mánmanaḥ*, to a them. stem *sādha-*. It is so classified by Gr and Lub, and Re (somewhat defiantly) also holds to this analysis. But such a them. stem would be found only once in the RV (namely here) and in fact in Skt., acdg. to Wh's Rts and MonWms. Ge suggests rather that *sādhe* is a dat. inf. to the root (an interpr. Re disputes). This is certainly possible. But I am persuaded by Old, who restores *sādhaḥ* for Pp. *sādhe*. This provides *īmahe* with a handy object; if *adveśāḥ* is in fact not a potential obj., *īmahe* will have need of one; if *adveśāḥ* is an obj. of that verb, *sādhaḥ* would be an *s*-stem neut. morphologically parallel to it. The expressed wish for "the realization of our thought" (*mánmanaḥ sādhaḥ*) follows directly on 8b where "we thought up" (*ámanmahi*) a truthful speech.

Finally, in pāda c the question is the identity of the 2nd sg. subj. Acdg. to Ge (fld. by Re), pāda c is a self-address by the singer, but the fire / Agni makes more sense to me. That Agni is referred to in the 3rd ps. in the next pāda is no impediment: that pāda is the refrain, detached from context, and in any case switch of persons is common (see vs. 5 above). The verbal complex *bhur(an)-* relatively frequently has Agni / fire or fires as subj.: e.g., *bhuranyúḥ* I.68.1, *bhuranyávaḥ* X.46.7, *járbhurat* II.2.5, X.92.1, *járbhurāṇaḥ* II.10.5, and the type of movement – quivering, flickering – expressed by this verb is characteristic of fire, less so of the poet (though cf. *vípra-*).

X.35.10: The first hemistich can be syntactically split in several different ways, none of which is entirely satisfactory. The most obvious disposition, made by both Ge and Re, is to take it as containing two clauses, the first ending after *īḷe* in pāda b. Although this provides a neat cut and two clauses each with a finite verb (*īḷe* in the 1st, *sādáyā* in the 2nd), it poses a few problems. For one thing in the first cl. there are two independent accusatives, *barhíḥ* (+/- *brhát*) and *deván*, and only the second one is appropriate with *īḷe*. A related problem is that $\sqrt{\text{īḍ}}$ is never otherwise construed with *ā*. (Ge [n. 10ab] claims that it is also found in IV.3.9, but there the *ā* belongs to the phrase *ā góḥ*, whatever that may mean. See comm. ad loc.) Ge (as he presents it in n. 10ab) and, as far as I can tell, Re construe *ā barhíḥ* together as a rough-and-ready adjunct to the verb: "call (the gods) to the barhis," which would be unprecedented with $\sqrt{\text{īḍ}}$ (admittedly many of our

RVic interpr. are without precedent). Ge also takes *brhát* as a modifier of *barhíh*, which locates the ritual strew in an odd, presumably heavenly, place. (Re takes *brhát* adverbially, which makes more sense.)

Old divides the sequence into two clauses, but with one being discontinuous: *devám̐ īle* is a parenthesis within a larger clause that construes *ā no barhíh* with *sādáyā saptá hótīn*, a more natural conjunction of words and supported by X.36.5 *éndro [= ā índro] barhíh sídatu* in the next hymn. But he does not say what he would do with the rest of pāda a (*sadhamāde brhád diví*), at least the last two words of which might be expected to belong within his parenthesis, which would then begin to get unwieldy.

My own solution is, I think, superior to both the others but is certainly not without flaw. I split the sequence into three, continuous clauses: *ā no barhíh sadhamāde / brhád diví devám̐ īle / sādáyā saptá hótīn*. The first is a nominal clause, with *ā* functioning essentially as the predicate “here is ...” (substituting perhaps for *idám*). Alternatively, and perhaps better, the predicate may be the purpose dative *sadhamāde*: “the barhis here is for the joint revelry” or “the barhis is here for the joint revelry.” (Although Gr takes *sadhamāde* as the loc. to the them. *-māda-*, it can equally be the dat. to the root noun cmpd *sadha-mād-*, as I take it.) I would now, with Re, take *brhát* as an adverb with *īle*; in this usage with a verb of speaking it reminds us of the Gṛtsamāda refrain in Maṇḍala II (II.1.16, etc.) *brhád vadema vidáthe suvīrāh* “May we speak loftily at the ritual distribution, in possession of good heroes.” A slightly revised tr. of the clause here is “Loftily I reverently invoke ...” The sequence *brhád diví* is reminiscent of the cmpds *brháddiva- / brhaddivá-*, and Ge points out that the same phrase, *brhád diví*, is found in V.27.6, separated by the pāda boundary. However, none of these forms is helpful in the interpr. of our pāda.

The verb of the third cl., *sādáyā*, is morphologically ambig.; it can be a 2nd sg. impv. with lengthened ending or a 1st sg. subjunctive. I take it as the latter because of the immed. preceding 1st sg., as do Ge/Re, but the Pp. reads *sādáyā*, as the impv. There is very little riding on the choice.

Pāda c contains a list of divine names in the acc., with another purpose dative. We can supply *īle* from c, as Re does. But since 11c has the same structure (i.e., a list of acc. god names) without a prior verb to govern them, it seems best to import *īmahe* from the refrain for both 10c and 11c, as Ge also does (see n. 10c).

X.35.11: It cannot be determined in pāda b whether it is our sacrifice (so Ge) or ourselves (so Re) that we wish to grow strong. The publ. tr. opts for the latter, but “aid our sacrifice for it to grow strong” or “aid our sacrifice to grow strong” is possible as well. Again nothing much rides on it.

X.35.12: The wished-for *supravācanam chardīh* “shelter good to proclaim” conflates the Ādityas’ shelter in 9c (*śárman-* not *chardís-*) and our *pravācanam* in 8a, which may help account for the slightly odd conjunction of ideas.

X.35.13: The first hemistich seems to contain an extra *vísve* (*vísva ūtī*).

The last occurrence of the refrain is found at the end of the previous vs. (12d). Here the poet steps away from it gradually by means of a transformation: the acc. sg. NP at the end of the refrain *agním̐ samidhānám̐ īmahe* appears in 13b in the nom. pl. *agnáyah̐ sámiddhāh̐*. This pāda could also be tr. “let all the fires be kindled” (so Sāy.; see Ge n. 13b), but the parallel clauses in the rest of the vs. speak against this.

X.35.14: The generalizing (“who(m)ever”) 3rd sg. relative clauses of abc (3rd ps. guaranteed, or at least suggested, by c *yáḥ ... véda*) are picked up by a 1st pl. *syāma* introduced by predicated *té* (“may we be those who(ever) ...”).

X.36 All Gods

On the parallelism with X.35, see publ. intro. X.36, however, seems to have a more miscellaneous character than its twin.

X.36.1: At best this vs. has been carelessly put together: the first hemistich is in the nom., as becomes clear at the end (*váruṇo mitró aryamā*), while the second continues the enumeration of gods’ names in the acc., as objects of *huve*. Even within this hemistich the waters are mentioned twice (c, d), and one du. dvandva referring to Heaven and Earth, *dyāvāḥkṣāmā* in b is replaced by another, *dyāvāpṛthivī* in d. If this were all that was required to compose RVic verse, even *I* could do it!

X.36.2. Heaven and Earth return in the first pāda, this time as overtly coordinated singulars. This emphasis on H+E in these first two vss. matches that of X.35.1–3.

On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

The refrain for this hymn gets established in the 2nd vs. As noted in the intro. to the comm. to X.35, it is a minor variant of X.35.1d *adyā devānām áva ā vṛṇīmahe*, with scrambling of word order and the addition of an initial *tád*.

X.36.3–4: The c pādas of vss. 2 and 3 end with the variant optatives *naśīmahi* and *aśīmahi* respectively. In 4 the inherently heavy final syllable of immed. preceding *marútām* provides the necessary heavy syllable at the beginning of the Jagatī cadence, hence allowing *aśīmahi*—while in 2 *avṛkám *aśīmahi* would have a light syllable there and *naśīmahi* usefully makes position. The other 3 exx. of *aśīmahi* at the end of a Jagatī, all close to each other, also follow heavy syllables, each ending with a nasal, as here: X.37.6 *jaraṇām aśīmahi*, X.40.12 *dúryām aśīmahi*. There are no other instances of *naśīmahi* at the end of a Jagatī line (of 3 total), but see subjunctive *násāmahai* at the end of 11c, where it likewise makes position. (Of course full-grade *naś* is expected in the subjunctive, but not the optative.)

X.36.5: In b note the presence of both *sāman-* and *īc-* (the latter implied by *īkvó arcatu*).

The verb *dhīmahi* is, of course, the medial root aor. opt. to $\sqrt{dhā}$. My tr. “compose,” borrowed from Re, is an attempt at an English pun that recognizes the apparent association between *dhīmahi* and *dhī-* ‘thought, vision’. The same VP *mánma dhīmahi* is found in X.66.2, which, however, also contains a loc., making the ‘place, set’ sense more overt.

X.36.6: Flg. Sāy., Ge takes Agni as the referent of the accusatives in c. Although it is true that Agni is almost always the referent of *āhuta-*, esp. when it is construed with an instr. of *ghṛtá-*, *yajñá-* seems an unimpeachable substitute. Ge’s interpr. requires him to supply a new verb, and it also goes less well with *prācīnaraśmim*, which fits the common sacrifice-as-chariot trope. Cf. also VII.7.3 *prācīno yajñáh*.

X.36.8: On *péru-* see comm. ad IX.74.4; the somewhat fuller rendering here follows the lead of Ge.

I have reinterpr. some instances of *-śrī-*compds with ritual items as first members; see I.44.3 and comm. ad III.26.5, and I now think an alt. tr. of *adhvara-śrī-* here as “perfecting/completing the ceremony” should be considered in this passage.

X.36.9: The first pāda has a triple etymological figure, *sanema ... susanītā sanítvabhiḥ*, which I can only call clunky. The two nominal forms, *susanītā-* and *sanítvan-*, are both hapaxes, which makes it difficult to figure out just what kind of winning and what kind of winners we’re hoping to employ. Ge (n. 9a) suggests that the *sanítvan-* are sons, but the parallel passages he adduces don’t support that notion. The double etym. figure in b, *jīvā jīvāputrāḥ*, is less inelegant, but this hemistich as a whole seems clumsily constructed. The figure *-(d)vīṣo vīsvag* in c is somewhat more pleasing.

X.36.11: Pāda a contains another elementary etymological figure, *mahát ... mahatām*.

X.36.12: The first hemistich redistributes elements from the refrain of the previous hymn, X.35.3–12d *svastí agnīm samidhānām īmahe*, with gen. *agnéḥ samidhānāsya* in pāda a and *svastáye* ending d.

X.36.13: The ostensible dedicands of this hymn appear in a spaced-out nominal relative clause in ab: # *yé ... vīśve, ... devāḥ* #

The relative / correlative structure shows some signs of cleverness (rare enough in this hymn). The first hemistich appears to be a normal 3rd ps. relative clause (“which All Gods ...”), with the second hemistich opening with what appears to be a 3rd ps. resumptive prn. *té* (“they”). But d opens with a 2nd pl. impv. *dádhātana*, which forces the audience to reconfigure the whole vs.: the *té* in c reflects the usage of forms of *sá* with 2nd ps. ref. with impvs. (see my “*sá* figé”), which then requires that the nominal rel. cl. of ab have 2nd ps. ref. too (“[you] who are the All Gods ...”).

X.37 Sūrya

On the relationship between this hymn and the preceding ones, see publ. intro.

As noted above, the supposed poet of the hymn, Abhitapas Saurya (“Scorching Heat, son of the Sun”), is simply based on the divine dedicand.

X.37.1: With Re, I interpr. *mahāḥ* as an adverb; Ge, with Sāy., takes it as an honorary dat., while Scar (231) tentatively has it as a gen. dependent on *devāya* (“... den Gott des grossen [Lichts?]”).

X.37.2: The *satyókti-* ‘expression of reality/truth’ is, in my view, the statement in cd. See the *ṛtāsya pravācanam* “proclamation of truth” in X.35.8 in this same hymn group; in both cases the truth is the fact that the sun rises every day.

The *ca*’s in b conjoin an elliptical dual *dyāvā* ‘Heaven (and Earth)’ and the neut. pl. *āhāni* ‘days’. Although Ge (n. 2b) suggests that *dyāvā* might refer here to day and night, as it sometimes does (though he does not follow this interpr.), I think the poet is making a totalizing statement about both space and time.

In d nom. *āpaḥ* lacks a verb; both Ge and Re supply one. I simply extract *éjati* from the preceding pāda or *eti* (minus preverb) in the same pāda.

X.37.3: The verb that ends the first pāda, *nī vāsate*, is a hapax, and its meaning and root affiliation are disputed. It is discussed sensibly and at length by Old, who rejects affiliation with any of the roots \sqrt{vas} as well as the roots $\sqrt{vā}$, while tentatively favoring \sqrt{van} , by way of the desid. *vīvāsati*, -te (a suggestion that goes back to Ludwig). See also Gotō (1st class, 297), who refuses to endorse any suggestion. I find the Ludwig/Old explanation (fld also by Re) the most likely, though it does have some problems – chief among them: 1) the desid. stem does not appear with *nī* and 2) it is more commonly active than middle. However, forms of *vīvāsa-* of this metrical shape (L H L X) are very common at the end of Jagatī and dimeter pādas, and our *nī vāsate* rhymes nicely with *vīvāsati*, necessitating only haplogy of *nī vi-* or—more likely in my view—the substitution of the preverb *nī* for the reduplicating syllable, which could appear to be the preverb *vī*.

So where does the *nī* come from and what is it doing here? First note the phonological parallelism with metrical shift: 2c ends *nī vīsate yād éjati* #, with the preverb *nī* construed with a verb with the template *v_SIB-ate*, exactly like our pāda. But in our pāda this verbal complex has been shifted to the right, and *yād eta(śébhīḥ)*, which echoes *yād éja(ti)*, pushed into the next pāda (*nī vāsate* # *yād eta(śébhīḥ)*). The *nī* also polarizes with *úd* in 2d, where “the sun goes up” asserts the supreme positive and protective truth. This positive truth is reinforced by a negated negative in 3a: a godless one cannot bring it *down*, however much he wants to. I would prefer that *te* were **tvā*, but I interpr. this as an oblique expression, hence my “seek the upper hand against you.” Re’s “ne pourra gagner contre toi” is similar. The middle voice simply expresses the subject’s desire to bring the object under his control.

My tr. of *pradīvaḥ* in that pāda as “early in the day” is almost surely wrong. No other forms of this adverbial ablative have this sense; it generally instead means “from of old” vel sim. See for this passage Old’s “altersher,” Ge’s “seit alters,” Re’s “du fond des jours.” In fact the standard sense is perfectly compatible with the meaning I assign to the verb here. *pradīvaḥ* regularly appears with a present-tense verb, depicting a state of affairs that has obtained since hoary antiquity – where English would use the English “perfect” tense. See, e.g., III.47.1 *tvām rājāsī pradīvaḥ sutānām* “You are the king of the pressed drinks from olden days” (more idiomatic English “you have been”) (cf., e.g., III.51.4, VI.44.12, X.5.4, etc.). Here the point would be that no matter how often and for how long the godless has sought to keep the sun down, it keeps rising every day. I would therefore alter the tr. to “No godless one has sought the upper hand against you from olden times.”

The “Night Sun” and the “Day Sun” seem to appear in the 2nd hemistich—a pair more often invoked by commentators than I think warranted (see my disc. ad I.115.5). However, here the contrast between the one that “rolls eastward” (*prācīnam ... vartate*) and the other, which is light (*vyótis-*) and goes upward, does suggest a picture of the dark side of the sun making a return journey to the east, whence it will rise again. Ge construes *rājāḥ* with *anyāt* in c, but I think *rājāḥ* is an acc. of extent of space, governed by *ānu*. With the verb *vartate* ‘turns, rolls’, ‘wheel’ seems the likely referent.

X.37.5: Both finite verbs in the first hemistich, *rākṣasi* and *uccāraṣi*, are accented. The default interpr. of the two accents would be that both verbs are in the domain of the *hī* in pāda a (so, e.g., Hettrich, Hypot. 188) and are parallel, and that is perfectly possible. However, semantically I

think the clause in b is dependent on the one in a, explaining in what way Sūrya demonstrates that he is guarding the commandment – namely by rising. I therefore take b as an unsigned “when” clause.

The standard interpr. of cd seems to be as a relative/correlative clause with gender disharmony: *yád ... tām ... krátum*: clearest in Re’s “(Ce dessein) pour lequel aujourd’hui ... nous nous adressons à toi, veuillent les dieux agréer ce dessein de nous” (but so, apparently, Ge; also, sort of, Hettrich 535–36). I do not understand why c is not a straight “when” clause with *yád*. Among other things *úpa √ brū* ordinarily only takes an acc. of the being(s) appealed to, not an accusative of the topic of the appeal. The few exx. given by Gr with supposed double acc. (IV.51.11, VIII.25.21, X.97.4) are equivocal and only contain *tád*, which could be adverbial; in any case they are far outnumbered by those with a single acc.

X.37.6: As is recognized by all comm., the first pāda with the patterned variation *tām* [MASC] *no* X [NOM.] *tán* [NEUT] *no* Y [NOM.] is picked up at the very end of the hemistich with the accusative objects of the appropriate genders, *hávam* [MASC] *vácaḥ* [NEUT]. It’s a clever, if artificial, construction.

śūna- ‘want’ generally takes a genitive; the loc. *saṃdṛṣi* is plausibly attributed to attraction to the loc. *śūne*. The clause could, however, mean “may we not be in want while we still see the sun,” though I consider that unlikely.

X.37.7–8: The d pādas of these two vss. are identical, save for the first word of each, and each takes as obj. a 2nd sg. phrase referring to the sun.

X.37.7: The enclitic *tvā*, found in Wackernagel’s position in pāda a, is pleonastically repeated in the same position in c.

X.37.8: In c I take *brhatáḥ* as a gen. dep. on abl. *pājasah*, supplying ‘heaven’ with that gen.: “from the surface of lofty (heaven).” Both Ge and Re take it as abl., modifying *pājasah*. This is of course quite possible and simplifies the expression somewhat, but I find the geography easier to envision in my tr.

X.37.9: The first hemistich seems more appropriate to Savitar (who is sometimes assimilated to Sūrya), since Savitar gives the signals both to go forth in the morning and to settle down in the evening. But of course the position of Sūrya’s beacon (rising / setting) gives the same type of signal.

The ‘blamelessness’ (*anāgāstvéna*) should be ours: see *ánāgasah* modifying the 1st pl. in 7b. But it is the Sun, as the spy of Mitra and Varuṇa, who testifies to this state – or its absence. See esp. VII.62.2 *prá no mitráya varuṇāya voco, ’nāgasah* ... “You [=Surya] will proclaim us to Mitra and Varuṇa to be without offense.”

X.37.11: Pāda c consists of a series of neut. sg. participles (acdg. to most; other analyses of individual forms are possible), arranged in a logical series—from the consuming of food and drink, to the deriving of nourishment from them, to satiation. The neut. sg. referent isn’t entirely clear; most take it as a global reference to the two- and four-footed of b. This makes sense, though the syntax is a little lax. I suppose the sg. *jánmane* of pāda a accounts for both the singular and the neuter.

The final term of the series, *āśīta-*, is taken, quite plausibly, by Old as the ppl. to a caus. *āśayati* (not attested till the Brāh.). He struggles to account for the initial accent, since \sqrt{as} does not otherwise appear with the preverb *ā* and ppls to causatives ordinarily accent the *-tá-*, like ppls to roots (see Wh, Gr. §1051, Macd. VGS §168f), but Old’s invocation of *árpita-* is apposite.

X.37.12: To harmonize the hapax *práyuti-* with my view of the meaning of the ppl. *práyuta-*as ‘scattered, dispersed’ (see comm. ad V.32.2), I would now tr. *mánasaḥ ... práyutī* “through distraction of mind.” Cf. also VII.100.2 *áprayutam ... mánaḥ* “concentrated thought.”

X.38 Indra

As with X.37, the supposed poet Indra Muṣkavant (“Indra possessing balls”) is extracted from the hymn itself, in this case the final pāda of the hymn. The hymn contains some apparently slangy and irreverent expressions; see vss. 2 and 5.

X.38.1: On *śīmīvant-* see comm. ad X.8.2.

X.38.2: The *-in-*stem *medīn-* is glossed by Gr with the anodyne ‘Genosse, Verbündeter’; sim. Ge “Wir möchten deine Verbündeten sein.” My “share the fat” is a somewhat slangy rendering of the stem, based on its presumed relationship to *médas-* ‘fat’, etc. See EWA s.v. *médas-*, esp. 377, where Mayr. labels the semantic dev. of *medīn-* not entirely comprehensible, with the additional parenthetical remark “(Slang?).” Given the positive associations of fat in Vedic, having or sharing the fat that Indra has means having a share in the good things the god commands.

X.38.3: The adj. *susáha-* takes the dative to express agency; cf., e.g., IX.94.5 *víśvāni hí susáhā tāni túbhyam* “because all these things are easy to conquer for you.” I therefore take the instr. *asmābhiḥ* not as the primary agent, but as an expression of accompaniment.

X.38.4: Despite its position, *adyá* might be better construed with the verb: “today may we make ...,” as Ge does.

X.38.5: The interpr. of the hapax rt. noun cmpd *svavīj-* has gone in two basic directions: Old “wer etwas als seinen Besitz an sich reisst” versus Ge “dein eigener Herr bist.” In other words, Old takes the *sva-* as referring to an object that becomes Indra’s property, Ge as referring to Indra himself. Interestingly Scar presents us with both, in different places, without comment: “einer, der [alles] als sein Eigentum an sich reisst” (flg. Old, p. 200 s.v. **anudā-*) and “über sich selbst verfügend” (flg. Ge, p. 505 s.v. *svavīj-*). My ‘tightly wound’ is a slangy rendition, leaning in Ge’s direction (but far from identical); a more literal version would be ‘wound up in oneself, twisting oneself up’.

On the surprising and impertinent ending of the hymn, see publ. intro.

X.39–41: All three of these hymns are dedicated to the Aśvins. The first two are attributed to a female poet, Ghoṣā Kakṣīvatī, in the family line of the dazzling First-Maṇḍala poet Kakṣīvant (I.116–26), who also focused on the Aśvins. The last very short one (X.41) is ascribed to her son Suhastya Ghauṣeya. There is no way to tell whether a female poet actually composed X.39–40, but at least the name is not a wholly invented one, like the supposed female composer of X.109, Juhū Brahmajyā “Sacrificial Ladle, Wife of (a) Brahman,” with both of the names extracted

from the hymn itself. However, it is the case that a woman identified as Ghoṣā is named in X.40.5, so a fictional woman may have provided the first of the names. For further on these hymns, see the publ. intro. to each hymn and to the series in general.

X.39.1: The voc. *aśvinā* was omitted in tr.; it can be inserted anywhere the English rhythm allows.

In b *uṣāśaḥ* in the temporal expression *doṣām uṣāśaḥ* could be either a gen. sg. or an acc. pl. (with Old and Lanman [Noun Infl. 546] I prefer the latter, *pace* Gr); in either case it must be a species of backformation, with the strong suffixal form *-ās-*, which is in the course of being replaced by weak *-ās-* in the RV even where it is lautgesetzlich, being introduced into a weak case. Old attributes it to the meter, somewhat reluctantly. He also adduces V.5.6 *doṣām uṣāśam* with the acc. sg., which has the historically expected *-ās-*, as possible influence on our passage, which seems plausible. One wonders, however, why the poet didn't just use *uṣāśam* here: being sg., it would be more parallel to *doṣām* and it is metrically identical to *uṣāśaḥ*.

The sequence *hāv(i)yo havīṣmatā* provides a phonological figure with forms built to two different roots. The second hemistich, which follows immediately, opens with nom. pl. *śaśvattamāsaḥ*, with what would ordinarily be a pāda-opening construction *tām u vām ...* seemingly displaced to the right. I wonder if this is to allow final *-matā* of b to have a mirror image echo in *-tamā*. The final pāda ends with a figure both phonological and etymological, *suhāvaṃ havāmahe*, a sort of poetic repair to the discordant root affiliations of pāda b.

X.39.2: Ge provides an appealing tr. of d, different from mine, but one that has a syntactic problem: “machtet uns den Gönnern angenehm wie Soma.” Under this interpr. we are asking to be commended to the patrons, so we can receive abundant rewards. He takes *cārum* ‘dear’ as characterizing ‘us’ (*naḥ*), but of course *cārum* is stubbornly sg. and *naḥ* is pl. It would be possible to finesse this by interpr. sg. *cārum* as attraction to *sómam* in the simile (and this must be Ge’s strategy). But since there’s a sg. noun in the immediate vicinity, *bhāgām* in c, I have gone with the syntactically safer option.

X.39.3: The *bhāgaḥ* of pāda a echoes *bhāgām* in 2c.

X.39.4: Note that the opening of pāda a *yuvám cyávānam* seems to be telescoped into *yúvānam* in b.

On the apparent unredupl. pf. *takṣathuḥ* see Kü 206–7.

X.39.5: The subjunctive *prá bravā* “I shall proclaim” in pāda a semantically doubles the gerundive *pravācyā* “to be proclaimed” that ends vs. 4. The substitution of $\sqrt{brū}$ for \sqrt{vac} in this expression seems to reflect a tricky formulaic play. We would expect the annunciatory 1st ps. to be *prá vocam* as so often (see, of course, the celebrated I.32.1), and this would easily pick up the gerundive to the same lexeme. But *prá $\sqrt{brū}$* is considerably less common than *prá \sqrt{vac}* , and this is the only 1st sg. occurrence in the formula – though I must admit that 1st pl. *prá bravāma* is found several times (e.g., X.112.1) in this type of context. My point is that the poet invites us to expect *prá vocam* on the basis of *pravācyā* and then substitutes a less common variant. (Of course *prá vocam* would also not fit this metrical slot, but the poet could have juggled the word order if he had wanted to.)

The logical connection of pāda b with pāda a is not immediately clear. I think the point is the implicit contrast between the Aśvins' martial activities, expressed by *vīryā* 'heroic deeds' in a, with their healing and comforting described in b.

Pāda c introduces further contrasts. On the one hand, the Aśvins' 'ancient' (*purāṇā*) deeds of pāda a contrast with the Aśvins made 'new' (*nāvyau*) here. But more strikingly what *we* are doing to the Aśvins—making them new—is what they implicitly did for Cyavāna in 4ab. It isn't clear to me how we mortals can make the Aśvins new; we might expect this to be in the power only of the gods. I assume that our renovation involves making new hymns of praise, which, as it were, transfer their youthful luster to the dedicands. Ge avoids the problem by taking *nāvyau* as an adverb or quasi-adverb (“... bewegen wir euch aufs neue zur Gnade”), with the operative syntagm being a kind of periphrastic causative: ACC *āvase* √*kr* “make you (to) help,” like (acdg. to his n. 5c) X.38.4d in the preceding hymn. But there, like here, there is a predicate adj. (*arvāñcam*) with the acc. *īndram*, inviting an interpr. “make X Y” with double acc. I therefore think that we should take “make you two new” seriously, esp. because it plays off the Aśvins' action with regard to Cyavāna.

The meaning of the purpose clause of d and its connection to what precedes are somewhat puzzling. The interpr. depends on who we think the *arí-* is and what we think the near-deictic *ayám* is doing. Both Old and Ge (in somewhat different ways) consider the *arí-* to be the patron of the sacrifice (or so I interpr. Ge's “dieser hohe Herr”). Old, who takes *arí-* to mean “der Geizige,” thinks that getting the *arí-* to trust will unlock his stinginess and cause him to give to us, the priests. If they are correct that the *arí-* is the patron (I think they're not), then the *ayám* would make sense: he would be right there on the scene. But I don't see why our actions with regard to the Aśvins would bring all this about – perhaps we're extraordinarily successful at getting the Aśvins to help us, including the patron? Re comments rather breezily about the *arí-*: “l'Homme (collectif) au nom de qui nous parlons”; I'm not sure what that is meant to mean. Thieme's view (Fremdl. 38–39) is quite different; he interpr. the *arí-* in the context of the dangers of hospitality given and received, which requires trust on both sides (I may be reading a bit more into his brief treatment than is overtly there). This fits my own understanding of the meaning of both *arí-* and *śrād* √*dhā* (which latter I think is often specialized for trust in the hospitality relationship; see pp. 176–84 of my *Sacrificed Wife*). Th tr. “Damit dieser Fremdling Vertrauen fasse.” The question is why the activity in the earlier part of the vs. should cause the stranger to trust. I think the answer is that the Aśvins are the guarantors of the safety of all sorts of beings in distress and that our renewing the Aśvins in order to enable them to dispense this aid is what will cause the *arí-* to trust and take heart: help is on the way. The catalogue of the Aśvins' good deeds that the poet has recited earlier in the hymn gives the *arí-* reason to hope that they will show the same care to him. I might now tr. pāda c as “Now we shall make you new (for you) to help,” without the “us” that I supplied as obj. to *āvase* (it's not in the Sanskrit); the Aśvins' help is more generally distributed than just to us. But why “this stranger” (*ayám ... aríh*)? I am not entirely certain, but I wonder if *ayám* is a way of adducing a salient example – so it functions as rhetorical deixis rather than expressing physical proximity. In any case it also serves to introduce the initial *iyám* of the next pāda (6a) and the dramatic intrusion of the woman in distress, which may be its primary purpose.

X.39.6: As was just discussed, the fem. deictic *iyám* that opens this vs. explicitly contrasts with the masc. *ayám* qualifying *aríh* in 5d. The intrusion of the forceful female voice in this vs.,

demanding the Aśvins' attention, points up the poet's implicit assumption in vs., 5 that he and his colleagues were praising the Aśvins in order to make them inclined to help a *male* in need.

The speaker here is ordinarily identified as Ghoṣā, who is named explicitly in the next hymn (X.40.5) as well as being the putative poet of these hymns, per the Anukr. As I argue in the publ. intro., I find this identification unlikely, because Ghoṣā in X.40 is the daughter of a king, while the female speaker here emphasizes her utter isolation and lack of relatives and protectors.

As was also noted in the publ. intro., her appeal to the Aśvins is in part modeled on (or echoes) the first vs. of this hymn: her *ahve* "I invoked" is built to the same root $\sqrt{hvā}$ that is prominent in vs. 1: *hāvyaḥ* (1b), *suhávam havāmahe* (1d), and the simile involving the father found in *pítúr ná nāma* (1d) is elaborated in her *putrāyeva pítārā* (d).

The series of privative cmpds in pāda c that describe the woman's plight ends with *ámatiḥ*. Although the other three—*ánāpir ājñā asajātyā*—reference her lack of human ties, I render *ámati-* as 'heedless', seemingly a defect of her own making. I now am inclined towards Re's interpr. "sans (personne) qui pense à moi" – 'heedless' in the sense of lacking anyone to heed me. Unfortunately I cannot think of a single word in English that expresses this – the closest perhaps is 'neglected' or, to maintain the privative sequence, 'without attention'. I would slightly alter the tr. to the latter. For further on *ámati-* see comm. ad X.42.10.

In d I would also change 'shame' to 'curse'.

X.39.7–10: As noted in the publ. intro., the catalogue of the Aśvins' deeds, interrupted by the direct speech of the woman in vs. 6, continues thereafter, and in fact it is more formally constructed: 7 consecutive hemistichs (7a–10a) open with the dual pronoun *yuvám* 'you two' (see also 7d and 8d) whereas only one hemistich in the first part of the catalogue, 4a, begins with *yuvám*. This opening is a characteristic feature of Kakṣivant's Aśvin hymns, though not as consistently carried out; cf., e.g., I.117.7a, 8a, 13a, 14a, c, 20c; 118.7a, c, 8a, 9a; 119.4a, 6a, c, 7a, 9c, 10a. (For another such sequence in the Ghoṣā hymns, see disc. ad X.40.) The same deeds are also treated in the Kakṣivant hymns, often with very similar or identical phraseology. E.g., their bringing a wife to Vimada (our 7ab) is found in I.116.1 ... *vimadāya jāyām ... nyūhātū ráthena*, 117.20 *yuvám ... vimadāya jāyām nyūhathuḥ purumitrásya yóṣam*, like our *yuvám ráthena vimadāya ... nyūhathuḥ purumitrásya yóṣañām*. For the parallels to the other stories see Ge's nn.

X.39.7: Ge takes *śundhyū-* as the name of Vimada's wife(-to-be)(so also Mayr, PN s.v.), but since *śundhyū-* is otherwise an adj. meaning 'preening, sleek', I see no reason not to take it as an adjective here. See also Remmer (Frauennamen 39–40), who also takes *śundhyúvam* as an adj. here and thinks Kamadyū is the actual name of Vimada's wife.

X.39.8: Ge makes *cakrathuḥ yuvad váyaḥ* into a double acc. constr. "Ihr machtet das Alter ... wieder jugendlich," but this requires interpr. *váyas-* as "Alter." Re remarks that "*váyas* s'orienté en effet vers <<âge>> au Livre X," but the passages he cites do not, in my view, support this statement. The very similar expression *tákṣan ... yúvad váyaḥ* in I.111.1 (Ṛbhus) is rendered by Ge "... zimmerten ... jugendliches Alter," but "youthful vigor" is a better creation for the Ṛbhus' parents than simply a youthful old age.

X.39.9: On the Atri saga, see my disc. in Hyenas (228–31), but I have emended my tr. of this passage (found on p. 230) in light of Houben's disc. in Fs. Migron, where he argues that *utá* here

connects two separate places where Atri was confined. See also Re's n., suggesting that two separate versions of the tale are conflated here.

X.39.10: This last vs. of the “deeds” sequence is entirely devoted to one story, whereas the first two (vss. 7–8) treated three each, and the following one (vs. 9) two.

I take the dat. *n̄bhyaḥ* as agent with the gerundive *hāvyaṃ*, as often, not as a dat. of benefit as Ge does (“für die Herren”). But there's relatively little difference in effect.

X.39.11: Ge (n. 11a) takes the referents of the voc. *rājānau* to be Mitra and Varuṇa, not the Aśvins—both because the Aśvins are never called kings and because of the presence of the voc. *adīte*. I admit the justice of these two arguments and think it quite possible that the expression was adapted from an Āditya hymn. However, for me it beggars belief that a hymn that never takes its eyes off the Aśvins, in a vs. that caps a sequence of vss. containing the relentlessly repeated 2nd du. pronoun *yuvām* referring to the Aśvins, along with a sequence of 2nd du. verbs with them as subject, would suddenly address a different set of dual entities, who have nothing to do with the hymn otherwise, and then address the Aśvins again (voc. phrase *aśvinā suhavā rudravartanīc*) in the same sentence in the same vs. I think rather that the poet is borrowing M+V's qualities to enhance the Aśvins' prestige, and that this may have been originally suggested by an appeal to Aditi – who as a mother figure may have been addressed because of the females in distress whom the Aśvins helped, as well as the presence of the wife in pāda d. The same infusion of other deities' power and prestige may be seen in the voc. *rudravartanī*, which brings the Maruts into the mix (see comm. ad I.3.3). For another possible use of voc. *rājānā* for the Aśvins see X.61.23 and disc. there.

The 2nd hemistich is oddly and ambiguously phrased. It contains a double acc. construction with a bahuvr. as predicate adj.: *yām ... purorathām kṛṇuthaḥ* lit. “whom you make (to be) one having his chariot in front.” The clause also contains an instr. of accompaniment (clearly so marked): *pātnyā sahā* “along with his wife.” The question is whether the wife is being conjoined more closely with him and or with the chariot – that is, do the Aśvins make the chariot to be in front for him and for his wife, or do they make the chariot and the wife to be in front for him. Although it's a bit more complex, I incline towards the latter interpr. I consider this another allusion to the new ritual model that includes the Sacrificer's Wife as a participant in the sacrifice (a model I have discussed endlessly, both in the SW/SW book and in a number of articles addressing the introduction of the wife in the late RV). This model is sometimes presented through the image of a chariot with a team of equals (husband and wife) pulling it. The most striking exploration of this image is the Mudgala / Mudgalānī hymn (X.102, q.v.), where Mudgalānī acting as charioteer brings ritual and personal success. The wife leading here, alongside the chariot, presents a similar image.

X.39.12: The juxtaposition of instr. *jāvīyasā* and acc. *rātham* across the pāda boundary strikes a discordant note, since they are co-referential. But *rātham* is part of the rel. clause, with ‘chariot’ fronted around the rel. prn. (*rātham yām*). This was surely a deliberate effect by the poet to shake us up. (I have silently promoted ‘chariot’ to the main cl., since “Drive here with the swifter-than-thought one, which chariot ...” does not parse well in English.)

X.39.13: Although Gr interpr. the three occurrences of *jayúṣā* (also I.117.16, VI.62.7) as a dual modifying the Aśvins, I follow Ge in taking it as an instr. sg. modifying a gapped ‘chariot’, on

the basis of the parallels adduced in his n. 13a. See also Pirart (Aśvins I.219 ad I.117.16). The parallels sketch a myth even less filled out than most of the Aśvins' exploits, but the duplication of phraseology strongly suggests that the passages belong together. Note the echoes of our ... *yātam jayúṣā ví párvatam* in the three passages, two of which are from Kakṣivānt's Aśvin hymns:

I.117.16 *ví jayúṣā yayathuḥ sānu ádreḥ* "With your victorious (chariot) you journeyed across the back of the rock."

I.116.20 *vibhindúnā ... ráthena ví párvatān ... ayātam* "With your chariot that splits apart ... you journeyed through (/across?) the mountains."

VI.62.7 *ví jayúṣā rathyā yātam ádrim* "With your victorious (chariot), you charioteers drove through (/across?) the rock."

Ge tr. *yātam* here as an impv. ("Machet eure Umfahrt ..."), and in fact it should be one by rule: the subject-doubling prn. *tā* is proper with 2nd ps. only in the impv. (see my "sa figé"). Nonetheless, the parallels clearly refer to a past deed of the Aśvins, with two (and possibly all three) of them containing a preterital verb: I.116.20 impf. *ayātam*, I.117.16 pf. *yayathuḥ*, VI.62.7 injunc. *yātam* (per Pp.), but note that in the sequence *rathyāyātam* nothing forbids an augmented analysis *ayātam* as in I.116.20 (see comm. ad VI.62.7). Moreover, the rest of the vs. treats previous good deeds of the Aśvins, with two augmented impfs. (*ápinvatam* b, *amuñcatam* d). I have therefore (reluctantly) translated *yātam* as a preterite, against the syntax. Our passage may have been adapted from VIII.87.3 *tā vārtir yātam*, which does contain an impv. Note that it also rhymes with the opening of 12a *ā ... yātam*.

X.39.14: The $\sqrt{takṣ} + rátham$ "fashion a chariot" motif returns from vs. 4, where the rejuvenation of Cyavāna was compared to it. See also 12b, where the Ṛbhus fashion the Aśvins' chariot, while here "we" compare ourselves fashioning a praise-song to the Bṛḡus fashioning a chariot.

The syntax and purport of pāda c are very troubled. The problems are 1) the sense of *ny àmrkṣāma* and 2) the function of loc. *márye*. There is an easy way to solve both, and that is to ascribe a contextual meaning to $ní\sqrt{mrj}$ that will make the case frame (acc. *yóṣāṇām*, loc. *márye*) work. This is the route that Ge takes: rendering $ní\sqrt{mrj}$ as "hingegeben" (give up, surrender), which works well (or well enough) with acc. + loc. This is also what Re's note seems to suggest, though he floats three different and not entirely compatible glosses for the verbal lexeme: "donner," "vouer," and "soumettre (comme en employant la force)." But I think that in this case the easy way is the wrong way. $ní\sqrt{mrj}$ is a striking idiom, and if the poet simply wanted to express 'give' or 'surrender' there are easier ways to do that. For $ní\sqrt{mrj}$ see comm. ad II.38.2, VII.26.3: it means lit. 'wipe / rub down' but metaphorically both 'drag down' and 'clasp to oneself'—sometimes, in sexual contexts, both at the same time. Cf. VII.26.3 *janīr iva pátir ékaḥ samānó ní māmṛje púra índraḥ sú sárvāḥ* "As a single common husband does his wives, Indra has dragged down all the strongholds to submission." This meaning could work in our passage: we clasp our own praise-song to ourselves, as a cherished object; the same sentiment is found in the next pāda, which is part of the same clause, where we hold the song close like a cherished son (*nítayam ná sūnám ... dádhānāḥ*). I think we should take into account the complex semantics of this idiom. But this suggestion runs headlong into the problem of loc. *márye*: the dashing youth should be nominative, parallel in the simile to the 1st ps. subject in the frame: *he* should be clasping the maiden to himself. There is a way out of this – though it is slightly tricky. I suggest we are dealing with a mixed syntactic construction. In X.65.7 and X.66.9 we find a reflexive construction with this idiom: *tanvī* [loc.] $ní\sqrt{mrj}$ "clasp ACC to oneself [LOC]," with the loc. *tanvī*

coreferential with the subject. So, e.g., X.65.7 *yajñām janitvī tanvī ní māmījuh* “They [=heaven-rulers], having created the sacrifice, clasped it to themselves” (sim. X.66.9). I suggest that the construction here is based on this coreferential structure, such that we should have **máryo* [nom.] *márye* [loc.] *yóṣānām *mārṣti* “(as) a dashing youth clasps a maiden to [same] dashing youth.” In this hypothetical sentence the loc. *márye* should be replaced by the reflex. prn. *tanvī*, as in the passages just cited. But instead it’s the nominative **máryaḥ* that has been gapped, leaving the loc. *márye* unreplaced. In the publ. tr. this loc. is tr. as if it were nom., because conveying what I think underlies the passage could not be conveyed in brief. But perhaps it would be a bit clearer if tr. “We have clasped it to ourselves like a maiden *to* a dashing youth.”

Notice that the secondary sig. aor. *amṛkṣāma* (see Narten SigAor. 196–98) rhymes with *átakṣāma*, which opens the preceding pāda (b), though that form is of course not an aorist.

X.40 Aśvins

For my view that Ghoṣā in this hymn is not the same as the woman in distress in X.39 see the publ. introductions, as well as disc. above ad X.39.

The hymn is also tr. by Doniger (pp. 264–66).

This hymn contains another sequence of fronted 2nd du pronouns; see comm. ad X.39.7–10. The concentration here is in vss. 4–8, with such pronouns beginning 4a, c, 5a, 6a, c, 7a, b, c, d, 8a, b, c. Unlike X.39.10, where the only form found is the nom. *yuvám*, this sequence contains varied case forms: nom. *yuvám*, acc. *yuvām*, and gen. *yuvóḥ*, somewhat like the “versified paradigm” of *agní-* in I.1.

X.40.1–4: Note the emphasis on the two poles of the day, dawn and evening, esp. the former. The āmreḍita *vástor-vastoh* is found in 1d and 3b, *doṣā (...)* *vástoh* in 2a and 4b, and *prātár* in 1c and 3a.

X.40.1: With Ge, I take the final instr. phrase *dhiyā śámi* with *práti ... bhūṣati* in b. Doniger seems to construe them as instruments/agents with *váhamānam* (“brought by thought and care”), but though the middle pres. *váhate* is found with instr. of the draught animals, I cannot find a real passive usage of this middle.

X.40.2: The two interrogatives that introduce the question in vs. 1a, *kúha káh*, are here separated and given independent clauses, with *kúha* found 4x in ab and *káh* introducing the implicitly disjunctive question in cd.

Pāda c provides unequivocal evidence for *niyoga* or levirate marriage already in the (late) RV. See Ge’s n. 2c.

The maiden *yóṣan(ā)-* and dashing youth *márya-* of the end of the previous hymn (X.39.14) reappear here. The word *sadhástha-* ordinarily just means a ‘place’ or ‘seat’, but here it must carry the additional of a specific or special place, in this case their trysting spot. Doniger’s “as a young woman takes a young man to a room” seems somewhat anachronistic; I imagine trysts in Vedic times were more likely to occur in the open air.

X.40.3: The sequence *jarethe jaraṇéva* “you awake like two old ones” provides a nice phonological figure built to two different roots. The purport of the simile is unclear, however. Is it alluding to the fact that old people are light sleepers? (And is that a human universal or just a fact of the modern West?) The complete obscurity of the hapax *kāpayā* does not help.

Morphologically this can be an instr. sg. fem. to a *kāpā-* (so, e.g., Gr) or a nom. du. masc. to a *kāpaya-*. In the absence of any etymological help even its morphological identity cannot be determined; the interpr. vary wildly, and rehearsing them all would not be instructive (see Old, Ge [n. 3a], Re, EWA s.v. *kāpayā*, etc.). To add another baseless speculation to the array: if we start with a deriv. of \sqrt{krap} , *kṛp* ‘long for, mourn, lament’ (*kṛpā-* ‘pity’ would be nice, though it isn’t attested until MBh), and run it through the MIA sounds laws, we get (or could get) **kapā-*; cf. to the same root Pāli *kaṇa-* ‘pitiable’ and the RVic pres. *kṛpaṇa-*, *kṛpaṇya-*. From there, a vṛddhi deriv. might yield *kāpaya-*. But this chain of events has no foundation and my “(?)” should probably have at least two ?? As usual, Old pronounces the sensible verdict: “Mir scheint das Rätsel des Worts unlösbar.”

The second hemistich raises the usual anxious question – whose sacrifice will the gods attend, and whose will they pass over? This is usually formulated with regard to Indra, but it is of course an issue with all the gods. The case of the Aśvins’ non-appearance (in c) is nicely phrased: *dhvasrā bhavathaḥ* means ‘become occulted / occluded / obscured (by smoke or the like)’. See disc. of $\sqrt{dhvāms}$ and *dhvas(i)rā-* ad IV.19.7. Because the Aśvins travel early in the morning (see *prātar-yāvan-* in 1c), morning mists can hide their passage over the spurned sacrifices while they make their way to the favored one.

As disc. in the publ. intro., the tatpuruṣa *rājaputrā-* ‘king’s son’ is found only here in the RV. As I say there, I think this simile sets up the marriage to be depicted in the following vss. as a svayamvara. Ghoṣā as daughter of a king (*rājñāḥ ... duhitā* 5b) would, at least in later times, be likely to acquire her husband through Self-choice, and the suitors who would be eligible and would attend should be kings’ sons.

X.40.4: Although elephant-hunters probably didn’t set out to catch two (or only two) elephants, the simile *mṛgēva vāraṇā* has been attracted into the dual to match the Aśvins in the frame. The simile is striking and is only loosely connected to the verb of the frame: presumably elephant-hunting did not involve invocations or oblations. Ge’s “locken” (lure, entice) seems to presuppose a more precise knowledge of hunting techniques than I think we possess and is not supported by the additive semantics of $ní\sqrt{hvā}$ ‘call down’.

The designation *śubhās pātī* occurs 4x in this hymn (as unaccented voc. *śubhas patī* 4d, 12c, 13c, as accented nom. 14b). Ge (also Don.) tr. *pātī* in all four occurrences with “Gatten” (husbands), even though elsewhere, even in the wedding hymn (X.85.15), where it also refers to the Aśvins, he uses “Herren.” Although our hymn is deeply concerned with marriage, I don’t see that this conventional epithet needs to be pulled into the marital orbit – except perhaps in vs. 12.

X.40.5–7: On the unexpected instances of *pāri* in these vss. see publ. intro. All four of the exx. (5a, 6a, 6c, 7c) occur in the same metrical position, in the break after an opening of 5, and the first three are found immediately before the voc. *aśvinā*.

X.40.5: In b *pṛché* can be a 1st sg. mid. or a dat. inf. (see Old, Ge n. 5b); I am strongly in favor of the 1st sg. The middle may be used to emphasize the special circumstance of a woman, esp. an unmarried woman, speaking.

The standard tr. take the 2nd du verbs in cd, *bhūtām ... bhūtām ... śaktam*, as impvs.; I think rather that they’re injunctives, expressing the questions Ghoṣā is asking the Aśvins.

How to take the datives in d is disputed. As Ge (n. 5d) and Old point out, the same general configuration is found in the previous hymn, X.39.6 *māhyam śikṣatam* “do your best for

me,” also in the mouth of a female speaker. Ge takes *áśvāvate rathíne* and *árvate* as two separate beneficiaries of the Aśvins’ help: “tut für den Besitzer von Ross und Wagen (und) für das Rennpferd, was ihr vermöget,” but (n. 5d) sees the whole phrase as a metaphor, referring to Ghoṣā and her desire to win a husband. Old offers two different interpr., the second of which I follow: like Ge, he supplies “me” as the real beneficiary, but suggests that she is compared to the *árvant-* ‘steed’, which should be helped to become possessed of horse and chariot, that is, to win the prize.

X.40.6: This vs. contains two of the sequence of *pari*’s (a, c). The 2nd enables a sort of pun, but the first is problematic. Ge divides pāda a into two clauses, with *sthaḥ* (*/Samhitā śthaḥ*) the verb of the first, and *pári* the preverb to a supplied verb “(fahret).” He does not indicate what Skt. verb he would supply – perhaps \sqrt{vah} , which can take acc. *rátham*. I do not see the necessity, or the utility, of this division. Preverbs can follow their verbs, and esp. in this vs. sequence, where *pári* has a fixed place, the order *sthaḥ pári* poses no problem. What the lexeme *pári* \sqrt{as} means in this context is harder to determine. As Ge points out (n. 6a), it has a different sense (‘encircle [to halt]’) even with *rátham* as obj. in VII.32.10. As I indicated in the publ. intro., I think the intrusive *pári*’s in this sequence are hinting at the marriage theme, by way of the circumambulation of the fire that is part of the wedding ceremony. In 5a Ghoṣā circumambulates the Aśvins; in 6a here the Aśvins seem to circumambulate their chariot—perhaps an allusion to the importance of the Aśvins’ chariot in the RVic svayaṃvara passages. (See my 2001 ‘The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara? [Fs. Parpola], 306–9.) For a possible association of the chariot with the simile of pāda b, see below.

Pāda b is difficult to interpr, primarily because of the uncertainty of the simile. The problem is to determine what belongs to the simile and what to the frame; in particular, the opening of the pāda, *vísó ná*, seems to plant *vísah* firmly in the simile, given the position of *ná*. In the publ. tr. I take it, much against my principles, as part of the frame (“you arrive at the clans of the singer”). This is given some support by the expression in the next (related—see comm. on X.39–41 above) hymn, X.41.2 *vísó yéna gáchathah* “By which you [=Aśvins] come to the clans ...” But the positioning of the simile particle *ná* immediately after at least one part of the simile is almost exceptionless, and I have grown uncomfortable with disregarding that here.

The path to a solution has to begin with Kutsa, who must be a part of the simile, since he is in the nom. sg. and the verb (*naśāyathah*) is 2nd dual, so Kutsa can’t directly be its subject. Although, as Ge says (n. 6b), our knowledge of the Kutsa saga “ist leider zu lückenhaft,” what we do know about Kutsa mostly involves his participation, with Indra, in the killing of Śuṣṇa – which myth involves an intermediate episode, in which Kutsa and Indra make a chariot journey to Uśanā Kāvya (for counsel or weapons or both—not entirely clear); see comm. ad V.31.7–8, 8, X.29.2, etc. I think this is the journey alluded to here, through oblique hints. First, the Aśvins are *kaví* in pāda a. There is nothing about the rest of that pāda that requires (or even invites) them to be identified as poets, and *kaví-* is a rare designation of the Aśvins, found only in I.117.23 (a Kaksīvant hymn, note) and VIII.8.2, 5, 23. In the next vs. (7ab) the Aśvins come to a number of named personages, including Uśanā. That the elements of the name Uśanā Kāvya (including *uśánā-* itself) surround the pāda containing Kutsa suggests to me that the Aśvins’ journey in 6b is being compared to Kutsa’s to Uśanā. The somewhat puzzling mention of the chariot at the end of pāda a (see disc. above) may also be a clue to this mythic complex, since Kutsa is especially associated with the chariot (see comm. ad X.29.2).

The sticking point for me has been how to make *viśaḥ* fit into the Kutsa / Uśanā Kāvya scenario, since “clans” don’t form a part of the mythic fragments available to us. Ge simply tr. “Häuser” (followed by Doniger “houses”), and in V.29.9 and X.22.6 Indra and Kutsa in fact drive to the *grhām* of Uśanā. My slightly sleight-of-hand solution here is to take *viśaḥ* with both frame and simile: “you (Aśvins) arrive at the clans [cf. X.41.2 cited above, also X.43.6 disc. below] of the singer, as Kutsa (arrived) at the “clans” (of Uśanā),” with *viśaḥ* a loose reference to the house or household of Uśanā. (It is also possible that *jaritūḥ* ‘of the singer’ can be read with both simile and frame as well.) I would now substitute that translation for the publ. one. As with a number of other passages involving Uśanā Kāvya, the disiecta membra of the myth have to be assembled from neighboring pādas and arranged into a simulacrum of a story. See disc. in my Rigveda between Two Worlds.

The hapax 2nd du. *nasāyathah* I take as a variant of the already anomalous *aśāya-* (4x); see comm. ad VI.33.2. Note that one of the forms of the latter stem is found nearby in X.43.6, construed, as here, with an acc. of *viś-* (*viśam-viśam ... páry aśāyata*).

As noted above, pāda c contains a second instance of *pāri* in this vs.; it also contains both a simile and a bold image – and, if I’m right, a pun connecting the two, turning on the instr. *āsā* ‘mouth’. The striking image is that of a bee (*mākṣā-*, or fly, though that is contextually less satisfactory) holding enclosed (*pāri ... bharata*) the honey of the Aśvins with her mouth. It is not entirely clear what this is meant to convey: the Aśvins are associated with honey (see, e.g., Macdonell, VedMyth 49–50), both as dispensers and consumers of it. So, the bee may either be carrying bee-produced honey to bestow on the Aśvins or, in a role reversal, holding the honey they produced – either physical honey or, perhaps, the honey of their words.

The simile in the same hemistich seems at first to have little to do with this image: *niṣkṛtām ná yōṣaṇā* “like a young woman a *niṣkṛtā*,” with the young woman compared to the bee and the *niṣkṛtā-* to the honey. A *niṣkṛtā-* is generally a place to which one goes, but often a particular type of secretive place: a trysting place, a rendezvous. Cf., e.g., IX.93.2 *māryo ná yōṣām abhī niṣkṛtām yān* “like a young blood going to a maiden at the trysting place.” Here I think it refers not to the place but to the tryst, the secret meeting itself, and the VP *pāri ... āsā bharata niṣkṛtām* is figurative: the maiden “holds the tryst enclosed by her mouth” – that is, she keeps it secret. (Lü [211, 342] suggests the exact opposite: “mitteilen” [inform, notify], taken up by Re “transmettre par la bouche” → “communiquer.”) The Lü/Re view might seem to find support in I.119.9 (in an Aśvin hymn of Kākṣivānt) *utā syā vām mādhuman mākṣikārapat* “And the little fly [or bee] whispered honeyed (speech) to you [=Aśvins],” since the *mākṣikā* is conveying her *mādhumat* by speech. But I think this only points up the cleverness of the pun in our passage: the phrase *āsā pāri √ bhṛ* can signal not only that the *mākṣā* has something for/or the Aśvins in her mouth (possibly to say to them), *but* by another reading of the *pāri* that the maiden is keeping her secret within. The *arapat* ‘whisper, mutter’ in I.119.9 also emphasizes the secretive nature of the communication.

X.40.7: The first three personages to whom the Aśvins come are known from other Aśvin contexts – esp. Bhujyu, but also Vāsa and, less commonly, Śiñjāra (see Mayr. PN s.vv.); only Uśanā lacks a stable Aśvin association, but the reason for his appearance here was disc. ad 6ab.

Ludwig’s resegmentation of the first two words of c from *yuvó rārāvā* to **yuvór árāvā* has been generally, in my opinion rightly, accepted; *árāvā* belongs to the well-attested stem *árāvan-* ‘hostile, ungenerous’. The Aśvin passage VII.68.7 (adduced by Old), which contains both Bhujyu and a clear *árāvā*, supports this change. Gr lists two occurrences of the supposed

stem *rārāvan-*, this one and *rārāv^añām* in VIII.39.2, which should also be resegmented to **árātīr* *árāv^añām* (see comm. ad loc.).

Pāda c also contains another instance of *pāri*; the sense of the lexeme *pāri* √ *ās* here is unclear—another instance of the “off” nature of the *pāri* occurrences in this section of the hymn. Some (Old, Re) take the verb to be basically positive: (even) a hostile/ungenerous man will “court / pursue” (umwerben, brüger) the Aśvins, while Ge takes it as negative “verpassen.” I am inclined towards the negative approach; my “circumvent” is meant to reflect the *pāri*, though the term itself is somewhat off – but I think the general sense is either “avoid” or “impede.”

X.40.8: Śayu is another regular client of the Aśvins, including in the previous hymn (X.39.13), but Kṛśā is not otherwise associated with them. The stem *kṛśā-* is of course an adj. meaning ‘emaciated, starving’ and is attested in this meaning several times in the RV, including in the previous hymn (X.39.3). Its appearance in the sequence there, *andhāsya cid ... kṛśāsaya cid ... rutāsya cid* “even of the blind man ... even of the starving ... even of the broken,” guarantees that it has the adjectival sense there and is not a personal name, as it appears to be here, at least in part. In our passage it might be possible to take *kṛśām* as an adj. with *śayúm* (“starving Śayu”), but the rhetorical structure of the pāda, with repeated subj. pronoun, makes that unlikely: *yuvám ha kṛśám yuvám aśvinā śayúm*. The two pronouns define two separate subclausal entities, as in the preceding vs., *7ab yuvám ha bhujyúm yuvám aśvinā vāsam, yuvám śiñjāram ...*

In fact, I now think we are dealing with a pun here: *kṛśā-* and *śayú-* are indeed PNs here, in the manner of the catalogues of the Aśvins’ clients. But they also are adjectives: *kṛśā-* has its usual sense just mentioned, ‘starving’, and *śayú-* the sense ‘orphan’, on which see comm. ad IV.18.12. With these interpretations, the pāda conforms nicely to the following one, esp. the mention of the widow. I would now emend the tr. to “You two make wide space for Kṛśā, you for Śayu / for the starving, for the orphan, o Aśvins, you for the worshipper and the widow.”

As for *kṛśā-* as a PN, it is so twice in the Vālahiḷya (VIII.54.2, 59.3). The latter passage is esp. suggestive with regard to our passage. In VIII.59.3 “the seven ‘voices’ of Kṛśā milk out a wave of honey for you two” (... *kṛśāsya vām mádhva ūrmím duhate saptá vāñih*). The “you two” in question are, in context, Indra and Varuṇa, the ostensible dedicands of the hymn. But as I point out in the publ. intro. to VIII.59 (see also comm. ad VIII.59.3), the vocabulary is in many cases more appropriate to the Aśvins (e.g., in that very vs. VIII.59.3c and also vs. 5, the voc. *śubhas patī* “o lords of beauty,” which in its numerous occurrences is otherwise only used of the Aśvins). It seems likely that Aśvin phraseology has been adapted to the Indra-Varuṇa context of VIII.59. I would suggest that in our passage the “thundering seven-mouthed enclosure” (*stanáyantam ... vrajám ... saptásyam*) that the Aśvins open up in our cd can be compared to the “seven voices” of Kṛśā that pour out honey in VIII.59.3 – perhaps the dakṣiṇā, as Ge suggests (n. 8cd), more likely in my view a variant of the Vala cave and its contents, particularly since *saptásya-* is an epithet of Bṛhaspati in that myth (IV.50.4; cf. IX.111.1) – perhaps both.

“The worshiper and the widow” in b do not form a natural semantic pairing, but are probably grouped together because of their phonology: *vidhántam vidhávām*. But the widow and the orphan of the pun in pāda a form a natural class.

X.40.9: On my interpr. of the images of this vs. in a marital context, see publ. intro. As I say there, the coming of age of the maiden in this vs. reminds us of Apālā’s (VIII.91), esp. the plants sprouting in b, which stand for the growth of pubic hair on the newly mature Apālā (VIII.91.5–6). It may not be an accident that Apālā’s fantasy suitor, Indra, is called a *vīraká-* (VIII.91.2)

“dear little hero,” while here, paired with the maiden (*yoṣā*), is a similar *-ka*-form, *kanīnakā* ‘little lad’ – referring either to the new husband or, as I suggest in the publ. intro., possibly to his penis.

The accent on *áruhan* in b indicates that the *ca* there is subordinating (*pace* Old n. 2). See Klein DGRV I.247.

As most comm. point out, *áhne* in d echoes *áhne ... aktáve* “for the day ... for the night” in 5c. As I discuss in the publ. intro., I see a role reversal in our passage: in vs. 5 she asks the Aśvins to “be there for me” (*bhūtám me*) day and night, but here it is she who (in my reading) will “be there for him” (i.e., the bridegroom; *asmaí ... bhavati*). Here the “for night” is not explicit. Perhaps it would be a sly reference to what happens at night, namely sex, but tactfully suppressed, given the innocent state of the new bride.

I take *tát patitvanám* as a separate nominal clause, not the subject of *bhavati* because that interpr. loses the parallelism with vs. 5. Cf., e.g., Old’s “Ihm hilft zu (glücklichem) Tage diese seine Gattenschaft.” By my reading it is a triumphal announcement of the achieved marital state. The heavy suffix *-tvaná-* (on which see AiG II.2.716–17) may add a bit of gravitas to this final statement.

X.40.10: As disc. in the publ. intro., I take this vs. as concerning the public and social aspects of marriage, in particular the inter-family connection that it forges. However, there are a number of uncertainties in the vs., which has been much discussed; Bloomfield (AJP 21 [1900]) and Gonda (Fs. Norman Brown [1962]) each devoted an entire article to this verse alone, and Old’s, Ge’s, and Re’s remarks are relatively full, esp. Old’s. I will not discuss these treatments in detail, but for the most part simply present my own interpr.

The first question concerns the first clause in pāda a “they weep over the living” (*jīvám rudanti*). As Gonda (inter alia) suggests, *jīvám* implicitly invokes its opposite “the dead”; in fact, 3 of the 4 occurrences of *mṛtá-* in the RV are juxtaposed to *jīvá-*. Since the more natural trigger for tears is death, not life, the phrase “they weep over the living” is, on the one hand, a striking reversal of expectations and a paradox. However, on the other, tears are not an uncommon reaction to any emotionally charged situation, including a joyful one, and many people (including me) cry at weddings. This seems to be what’s going on here – whether as the result of universal human psychology (as I think) or a ritual mandate (so, approx. Gonda, who samples a wide range of the anthropological literature). It could also be more specifically related to the separation of the bride from her natal family as she sets out with her new husband to her new home – an esp. fraught part of the marriage ceremony, as I’ve discussed elsewhere (e.g., SW/SW 223–26). Although it is tempting to interpr. the clause in this light, with her family mourning her departure, the fact that *jīvám* is masc. or neut. makes that interpr. difficult (although it would be possible, but probably inadvisable, to emend to the fem. **jīvām*, which would be metrically identical in this context).

The sense of the rest of this pāda, *vī mayante adhvaré*, has also been much disputed. I see in it an expression of the mutual exchange between the bride’s family and the groom’s that lies at the heart of marriage socially conceived. Hence my “they make a mutual exchange at the rite.” The middle voice supports this reciprocal interpr., and the specifying loc. *adhvaré* indicates that the arrangements become legal at the marriage ceremony. Re’s suggested “faire un contrat” also has a legal aspect, though his added parenthesis “(lors du sacrifice: paradoxe!)” is puzzling – why would this be paradoxical? Gonda’s (p. 84) “they (i.e., those concerned, i.e., either the bridal couples or their relatives, the priests, etc.) take turns at the (marriage) sacrifice” doesn’t

make much sense to me; I assume he means that different people perform different ceremonial actions, but he doesn't say, and if so, the statement seems trivial. Gotō's (1st Cl. 241, cited also by Kü 257) "sie wechseln sich bei der [Hochzeits]feier ab" seems to reflect the same general sense as Gonda's, but even less defined.

In pāda b the interpretational debate has centered on the sense of *prāsiti-* and the phrase *dīrghām ānu prāsitim*. On the general sense of *prāsiti-* see comm. ad IV.4.1, where I suggest that the word is a conflation of two etymologically distinct words, one meaning 'onslaught' or, less pointedly, 'trajectory'. Here an attenuated sense referring to a stretch of time seems warranted; see KH Aufs. II.418. In my view this refers to the protracted marriage negotiations between the two families; I find it impossible to follow Gonda's (p. 85) speculation that "this pāda may allude to the men's gaining a visionary insight into the meaning of marriage, the deep secret of procreation, the continuation of family and race."

The second hemistich is less challenging. The two pādas are structurally parallel, with an opening abstract notion (*vāmām* 'a precious thing' c, *māyah* 'joy' d) followed by a dat. of the beneficiaries of this abstract; the two datives refer, in my view, to the parents and close relatives who arranged the match (*pitṛbhyaḥ*) in c, and in d to the actual parties to the match, the husbands (*pātibhyaḥ*) and the wives they embrace. I do *not* think, with some interpr. (e.g., Old), that the *pitars* in c are the dead ancestors who will be benefited by the offspring of the new couple. As for *sameriré*, I take it to mean "set this [=marriage] in motion," "brought it together." The publ. tr. omits the *idām*, and should be slightly changed to one of the tr. just suggested. Although *māyah* in d echoes (*vī*) *mayante* in a, I consider this word play only phonological, not etymological

X.40.11: In contrast to the detailed treatments of vs. 10 just cited, vs. 11 has attracted very little comment, though it is hardly perspicuous – and the first pāda ("we do not know this – proclaim it to us") makes the unclarity explicit. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think it concerns sex, or rather sex and procreation.

The second pāda seems to allude both to the sexual act itself and to the notion (at least later) that the husband is reconceived/reborn in his wife's womb: "that/how a young man dwells peacefully in the womb of a young woman" (see also X.85.45 in the wedding hymn). The plural *yóniṣu*, which I've silently emended to an English singular (like Ge's "im Schosse"), is, on its surface, surprising. The stem is extremely well attested and almost always in the singular, including the very common locatives *yónau* and *yónā*, so it is not a case of a body part that is plurale tantum. The only plural forms are 5 exx. of this very loc. *yóniṣu*. In the other 4 cases the wombs can indeed be multiple, including in a passage where procreation is at issue: X.63.15 *svastí naḥ putrakṛthéṣu yóniṣu* "(let there be) well-being for us in the wombs at the making of sons" (though in that passage plurality isn't necessary). In two of the passages (I.15.4, II.36.4) *yóniṣu* is qualified by *triṣú* 'three' and clearly refers to the three fireplaces where Agni takes his ritual position. (The fifth passage is in the Vena hymn, X.123.5, and like the rest of that hymn is hard to interpret.) Despite the clear conceptual plurality in two of the five passages, in our passage (and quite possibly in X.63.15) I consider the pl. of *yóniṣu* a metrical contrivance: loc. sg. *yónau* is very common pāda-final in Triṣtubh. Both our passage and X.63.15 are in Jagatī, where pāda-final *yónau* won't fit; I therefore consider the pl. an automatic adjustment to the meter. It is only these two passages where *yóniṣu* is pāda-final.

I now think the publ. interpr. of the first hemistich is wrong, or at least incomplete. The question I did not previously consider is the identity of the 1st pl. speakers and 2nd pl. addressees: *ná tásya vidma, tád u ṣu prá vocata*. Given the number, neither can have the Aśvins

as referent. The only previous 1st pl. in the hymn is *ní hvayāmahe* “we call down” (4b) in the early generic ritual portion of the hymn – though the next vs. (12d) contains the opt. *aśīmahi* “might we reach.” There are no 2nd pls. anywhere else in the hymn. Since pāda a of our vs. clearly sets up an interactive speech situation, we need to try to identify the parties to this exchange. I now interpret the vs. as a continuation of vss. 9–10, which concern the marriage itself. I suggest that the first hemistich treats the announcement of the consummation of the marriage. The 2nd pl. addressees are the elders who would announce the consummation, having been shown the evidence – most likely the bride’s bloody garment, as in X.85.28–29. The “we” who await the news are the bride’s relatives (or the relatives of the couple in general); cf. X.85.28, where, after the garment turns bloody, “her relatives are elated” (*édhante asyā jñātāyaḥ*). Note the verb *prá vocata* ‘proclaim’, which suggests a formal and public announcement. The 1st ps. speakers are not asking for private enlightenment about a mystery (as I first thought), but for an authoritative statement made to the assembled group.

On this basis I would now alter the translation from “*how ...*” (which is not supported by the *yád* in the text) to “*that ...*,” and interpret *yúvā* and *yuvatyāḥ* not as generic “a young man ... a young woman,” but as references to the couple in question – yielding an emended tr. “We do not know this – proclaim it to us – that the young man dwells in the womb of the young woman.”

The 2nd half of the vs. expresses the further wish that the marriage just consummated will be procreative and the new husband virile. This is expressed in the familiar bovine terms: the “seed-laden bull” (*vṛṣabhásya retínaḥ*) and his beloved, the ruddy cow (*priyósriyasya*). Less familiar is the trope of the house: “may we go to the house” (of bull and cow), *grhám gamema*, but this image is reinforced in the next vs. (12d), *priyā aryamṇó dúryām̐ aśīmahi* “Dear to Aryaman, might we reach his porticos (/house)” (per publ. tr.) or, perhaps better, “As dear ones, might we reach the porticos (/house) of Aryaman.” On the one hand, “reaching the house” in both vss. is a metaphor for attaining a desired state or situation: 11cd wishes for the new marriage to be generative; in 12d, since Aryaman is the patron of marriage, we are asking for a successful, divinely sanctioned marriage. On the other, we can take “house” more literally as the physical location, the container, of the desired domestic state and representative of it. The motif of the house continues in the final two vss.: 13a *mānuṣo duroṇá ā* and 14d *víprasya vā yájamānasya vā grhám*; in fact *grhám* is the final word of the hymn. In 13 and 14 the “house” shows the more standard RVic usage, as the locus of ritual activity and the goal of the gods, here the Aśvins, coming to the ritual. Nonetheless, the “house” motif resonates throughout this last part of the hymn, even as the focus shifts back to the Aśvins.

X.40.12: As just noted, the Aśvins reappear here, having been absent from the three wedding vss. (9–11).

In b the publ. tr. attributes both the desires (*kāmāḥ*) and the hearts (*hr̥tsú*) to us, but this is not explicit in the text. Ge expresses no ownership of the desires and attributes the hearts to the Aśvins: “die Wünsche sind euch ans Herz gelegt worden.” I was hesitant to assign the hearts to the Aśvins partly because of pl. *hr̥tsú*: although I would not expect the poet to use the dual (the stem has no dual forms, not surprisingly), I thought it likely that for two beings, with only one heart apiece, he would use the sg. *hr̥dí*. However, in at least one passage (I.179.5) pl. *hr̥tsú* seems to belong to a single individual, so this argument doesn’t hold. Also, *hr̥d-* is generally used of humans, but given I.32.14 with *hr̥dí* used of Indra, this argument also falls. I now think that the desires are ours – the desires we just expressed for a successful marriage – but that the hearts are the Aśvins, or the gods in general (see Aryaman in d). Cf. X.64.2d *devéṣu me ádhi kāmā*

ayamsata “My desires have fastened upon the gods,” with *kāmāḥ* + med. *s*-aor. *ayamsata*, as here; only the preverbs, *ní* here, *ádhi* there, differ (though X.64.2 is slightly complicated by having *hr̥tsú* in pāda a clearly referring to our hearts). I would now change the tr. to “(Our) desires have been fastened down in (your) hearts.”

This is the only place in the RV where the Aśvins are identified as a *mithunā* ‘(oppositional) pair’. Though the stem *mithuná-* is by no means limited to a sexual pair – it is used in I.83.3, for example, of the pair of priests, the Adhvaryu and the Hotar – it is often so used, often in sexually charged context, e.g., in I.179.3 of Agastya and Lopāmudrā, VIII.33.18 of the sacrificer and his wife. I therefore think it is used of the Aśvins here to fit the marital context.

On *śubhas patī*, see comm. above ad vs. 4. I think it’s possible that in our vs. this conventional epithet of the Aśvins (found 3x elsewhere in the hymn) has been attracted into the marital context and might be interpr. “husbands of beauty,” as opposed to the standard “lords of beauty,” though its appearance in vss. 13 and 14 might either speak against this or suggest that they all have a marital undertone.

As disc. ad vs. 11, the phrase *dúryāṁś aśīmahī* echoes *gr̥hām gamema* (11d), and both have both a metaphorical and a literal sense. The house here is that of Aryaman (*aryamñāḥ*), who, of course, presides over the institution of marriage, and I attribute his presence here to that function. In the publ. tr. I construe this gen. with *priyāḥ* (“dear to Aryaman”) and supply him with *dúryān* (“his porticos”). I am now not sure that *priyāḥ* should be limited in that way. It is possible that we are dear to the married couple, or the married couple and their family circle, or to the Aśvins, whereas I am tolerably certain that the dwelling is Aryaman’s. I would now slightly emend the tr. to “May we, as dear ones, reach the porticos of Aryaman.”

X.40.13: The phrase *tīrthām suprapāṇām* “a ford that offers good drink” is somewhat jarring, but it cannot be separated from vs. 7 in X.114, a mystical treatment of the sacrifice: *āpnānam tīrthām ... yéna pathā prapībante sutásya* “The Opulent Ford ... the path by which they take the first drink of the soma?” with both *tīrthá-* and *prá√pā*.

On *pathe-ṣthā-* (also V.50.3) see Scar 649. The anomalous loc. sg. *pathe-* is presumably a rhyme form to fairly common and inherited (cf. Aves. *raθaēštā-*) *rathe-ṣthā-* ‘standing on the chariot / chariot-fighter’, with loc. to a thematic 1st member.

X.40.14: As noted in the publ. intro., this final vs. echoes the opening of the hymn, with its anxious questions about the location of the Aśvins.

In *c ní yeme* responds to *ní ... ayamsata* in 12b, though the *s*-aor. in 12b is intransitive and our form is transitive, despite agreement in voice.

X.41 Aśvins

On the place of this hymn in the Ghoṣā Aśvins sequence, see comm. ad X.39–41 above and the publ. intro. to X.39–41 and to X.41. Besides the Anukramaṇī ascription there is little to connect this little hymn to the two preceding ones.

X.41.1: All three hymns in this sequence begin with a vs. dedicated to the Aśvins’ chariot – though since the Aśvins’ chariot often features prominently in Aśvin hymns, this is hardly diagnostic of a shared poetic lineage. This one is esp. close in phraseology to X.39.1 – though there the chariot is in the nom. for most of the vs., while here the first three pādas are couched in the acc., modifying *rātham*, which begins pāda b.

With regard to *samānām* ‘common’, Ge (n. 1a) asks whether the chariot is “common” to the two Aśvins or to all men, offering parallels that could support either. As the 1st word of the hymn, *samānām* seems positioned for significance, but it isn’t possible to determine what its scope is.

X.41.2: The focus on the chariot continues in this vs. The vs. also ends with a mention of the Hotar priest (*yajñām hótṛmantam*), setting the stage for vs. 3.

On *kīrī-* see comm. ad V.52.12.

X.41.3: After the mention of the Hotar in 2d, this vs. presents at least two more ritual functionaries and as many as four: the Adhvaryu and Agnidh are presented as disjunctive goals of the Aśvins’ journey, with double *vā*: #*adhvaryúm vā ... agnídham vā*. But the presence of a third *vā* in c in the off-balance expression *víprasya vā ... sávanāni* “or to the pressings of an inspired poet” suggests that *vípra-* is a third such personage, esp. since the *vā* immediately follows that gen., while *dámūnasam* ‘domestic leader, household master’ can either be in apposition to *agnídham* or refer to yet another distinct person and role.

X.42–44: These three hymns are all attributed to Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa and all dedicated to Indra, with clear verbal connections among them, including sharing their two final vss. (X.42.10–11 = X.43.10–11 = X.44.10–11). To a poet of the same name are ascribed three Aśvin hymns in VIII (VIII.85–87), though there is no clear thematic or verbal connection between the two sets that I can see.

X.42 Indra

The hymn contains a number of striking comparisons, often not overtly marked as similes.

X.42.1: With Ge, I take *lāyam* as an early example of the *-am* gerund (*/absolutive*), rare in the RV/AV, more common in the Brāh. and Sū. (see Whitney, Gr. §995), to *√lī* ‘cling’, etc. Ge’s invocation of *nilāyam* in AVŚ IV.16.2 is apposite, whatever the form means there. Ge’s interpr. here, “geduckt” (crouching), is close to mine (“in ambush”), though mine spells out the scenario I see for the simile in pāda a more clearly—with the poet compared to an archer who, being hidden, can take his time aiming. The ultimate target is, in my view, Indra, who is brought down (like a game bird?) to our ritual in pāda d. The poet must “shoot further” in order to overcome the speech of the *arī-* in pāda c. Old, by contrast, thinks *lāyam* refers to the arrow being shot, flg. Gr (and Ge Gl., inter alia), and that it is compared to the *stómam* in b (which, however, is the object of a different verb).

X.42.1–2: The three even pādas 1d, 2b, 2d all begin with a 2nd sg. act. *-aya* impv. preceded by a preverb (*nī rāmaya / prá bodhaya / ā cyāvaya*), all with Indra as object, taking final position (1d, 2b *índran*#, 2d *sūram*#). In 1d and 2b the impv. is immediately followed by the voc. *jaritar* ‘o singer’.

X.42.2: Old advances good reasons not to accept Roth’s emendation of *dóhena* to *dóhe* **ná*, primarily parallel passages with *úpa síkṣ-* + INSTR. Presumably the objection to the instr. that led to Roth’s emendation to the loc. is that milking would not be an enticement to a cow – but in

reality that is not the case: cows with full udders want to be milked. Ge (n. 2a) toys with the suggested emendation and in the end settles for a haplology **dóhena ná*, which seems like the worst of the options. I see no reason why pāda a can't contain a simile without overt marking, just as pāda b does.

On *úpa śíkṣa-* with acc. complement, see comm. ad I.112.19, 173.10.

As Ge notes (n. 2b), *jaritar jārám* is a word play, with the words belonging to two different roots.

X.42.3: The hapax nominal *śísayá-* is assigned by everyone to the root $\sqrt{sā}$ / *śí*, which furnishes the immediately preceding verb *śísīhí* 'sharpen!'. I therefore don't understand the apparently universal tendency to give it a gloss that separates it from its root (Gr 'stärkend, kräftigend, AiG II.2.85 'stärkend(?)', EWA s.v. *śā* 'stärkend', and most egregiously Ge "dass du ausgiebig bist"), even though it is explicitly recognized (by Ge and EWA at least) that it is a word play with *śísīhí*. The poet has heard that Indra is a consummate practitioner of $\sqrt{sā}$ and asks him to perform this action. I might slightly emend my rendering to "you are the sharpener" or "you are sharpening." As to what "sharpen" means here, I assume the poet is asking Indra to sharpen his (=poet's) mental and verbal skills; the immediately following reference (c) to the poet's *dhī-* 'insight', which he hopes to monetize, supports this interpr.

In d the poet calls upon Indra to "bring to us" (*ā bharā naḥ*##) Bhaga, while in 1b the roles were reversed: the priest is urged to "bring to him [=Indra]" (*prā bharā ... asma*##) the praise – emphasizing the theme of reciprocity that dominates this hymn.

X.42.4: With Old, I accept Ge's (Gl) analysis of *mamasatyá-* as a univerbation of *máma sāt* ("[this] being mine"), with *-ya-* a nominalizing suffix, rather than deriving it from *máma satyá-*.

Pāda b contains the common contrastive juxtaposition of *sám* 'together' and *ví* 'apart, separately'; here the peoples take their stands together (*samṭasthānāḥ*), that is, reciprocally facing each on the battlefield, while each side calls on Indra separately (*ví hvayante*) for his help.

Since there's no acc. prn. in c, the VP could also be tr. "... makes (him=Indra) his yokemate." My supplied "you" looks back to the 2nd ps. ref. to Indra in ab; "him" would look forward to the 3rd ps. *vaṣṭi sūrah* of d. The choice doesn't really matter.

sūra- returns here from 2d, in both cases referring to Indra. That vs. also contains *sákhāyam* 'comrade' referring to Indra (2a), while here *sakhyá-* ('fellowship', perhaps better 'comradeship') is what Indra seeks (or doesn't) with humans.

X.42.5–8: This set of 4 vss. has the formal presentation of a little omphalos. Vss. 5 and 8 define a ring: 5ab *bahulám ... tīvrān sómān* / 8b *tīvrāḥ sómā bahulāntasaḥ* // 5d *ní ... yuváti* / 8c *ní yaṃsan* // 5b *āsunóti* / 8d *sunvaté*. The intermediate vss. 6–7 are responsive (as omphalos vss. tend to be): 6 *ārāc cit ... śátruḥ* / 7 *ārāc chátrum*. But this set of vss. is not in the center of the hymn and the subject is not consequential enough or enigmatic enough to count as a real omphalos.

X.42.5: This vs. is a sort of duplicate and expansion of the 2nd hemistich of the preceding vs. (4cd), depicting the reward Indra provides to one who makes oblation to him. The reciprocal relationship between the two recipients, Indra and the sacrificer, is conveyed by the balanced dative pronouns: *asmai* (pāda a) referring to Indra and *tásmāi* (pāda c) referring to the sacrificer.

The simile that opens the verse (*dhānam ná syandrām bahulām* “like ample streaming wealth” / “ample like streaming wealth”) has a somewhat complex relationship with its target, *tīvrān sómān*), found in pāda b. Ge (n. 5a) suggests that *syandrām bahulām* has been “attracted” by *dhānam*, implying that the phrase really modifies the pl. *sómān*. His suggestion is understandable, because the root \sqrt{syand} means ‘flow’ and generally has either liquids or animate beings as subject. In fact Soma is one of the standard subjects of the verb (see, e.g., the multiple occurrences of aor. *ásiṣyadat* in Maṇḍala IX). The adj. *syandrā-* generally modifies gods (in motion). Therefore applying it to an apparently static substance *dhāna-* ‘wealth’ seems off-balance. But as Ge also suggests, the adj. seems to have a double meaning here. The semantically straightforward application to soma, as a substance that flows, is semi-thwarted by the clash of number and the clear positioning of the adj. in the simile. not the frame. This forces a ‘flowing, moving’ reading on *dhāna-*; Ge: “... beweglich, von dem aus Vieh bestehenden Besitz.” In other words, this is wealth in livestock, wealth on the hoof. The use of *syandrā-* ‘flowing’ may reflect the visual impression of a large herd in movement, which from a distance can look like liquid flowing (google videos of “herds in motion”). Note that the Maruts are compared to “streaming bulls” (V.52.3 *syandrāso nokṣānaḥ*) and that other livestock serve as subjects of, or similes with, \sqrt{syand} (for example, milk cows in IX.68.1).

In the other direction, *bahulā-* is quite at home modifying ‘wealth’ (esp. *rayí-*, e.g., II.1.12, III.1.19), but in our hymn is found in the compd. *bahulānta-* (8b) modifying the same *tīvrā- sōma-* as in our vs. So both adjectives in the opening simile of 5a are implicated, if unequally and in opposite directions, with both simile and frame.

As I indicated above, this vs. is an expanded variant of 4cd – but (if I’m right) with a twist. The first part describes the sacrificer offering soma to Indra in expectation of a reward. In 4c this reward is to form a team with Indra, to become his yokemate – a happy situation; 5cd also involves forming a team, but here the image of the team is negative. It consists of the rivals to the sacrificer, whom Indra makes into a team subject to the sacrificer, to be broken and controlled by him with spurs and goad. For a comparable expression see VII.18.9 *sudāsa índraḥ sutúkām̃ amítrān, árandhayat ...* “Indra made those without alliance (to us) subject to Sudās, (as ones) easy to thrust away / easily goaded,” where the establishment of dominance over the *sutúka-* is more explicit. For the meaning and etymology of *sutúka-* see comm. ad VII.18.9.

I do not entirely understand why this should happen in the early morning, but I assume the temporal expression really applies to the soma pressing of the first hemistich, presumably the Morning Pressing.

The *sátru-* is also a preoccupation in the next two vss., 6–7.

X.42.6: The balanced reciprocity expressed by grammar in the immediately preceding vs. (5a and c) is also found here, in the two relative clauses of the 1st hemistich—with the locative #*yásmín ... índre*# of pāda a corresponding to loc. *asmé*# at the end of b. Both pādas contain a verb of setting that governs the locative, with the subject being the other member of the pair of opposites: “we” in *dadhimā* (a) versus Indra (*maghāvā*) in *śísráya* (b). The use of two different verbal roots keeps the balanced expression from giving too pat an impression.

In b in the publ. tr. I assigned the *kāma-* to Indra (“his desire”), thoughtlessly flg. Ge (“seinen Wunsch”), though there is no overt expression of possession. (Kü [526] neutrally “den Wunsch.”) I now think that the *kāma-* may be ours, the reward for our praise – or, at least, that it is ambiguous or meant to be read in two senses. The same expression, *kāmam* $\sqrt{śri}$ (PF), is found in the next hymn attributed to the same poet, with 1st sg. *śísraya* and Indra in the loc. (*tvé*). There

the desire is mine—that is, it belongs to the subject. This parallel cuts both ways: on the one hand, if the coincidence between the subject of the verb and the owner of the wish is the important thing, interpreting it as Indra’s wish in our passage would be correct. On the other, if the human 1st person’s ownership of the wish is crucial, then it should be our wish in this passage as well. If the ambiguity is deliberate, we can interpret it to mean that Indra sets his desire for further praise in us, while at the same time we set our desire for the reward for our praise in him. I would now slightly alter the tr. to “fixed (his/our) desire in us.”

In d Ge takes *jánya-* as referring to other people (“die Herrlichkeit anderer Leute”), a sense ascribed to the stem already by Gr (meaning 2). This seems reasonable (or at least arguable) in context: the poet first hopes (pāda c) that Indra’s rival will take flight, and then that the *dyumná-* of the poet’s enemies should fall to Indra (who might redistribute them to the poet and his people?). But as discussed ad IV.55.5, all clear cases of *jánya-* refer to *our* people. On the other hand, a certain no. of the occurrences of pl. *dyumná-* are found in passages where “we” wish to wrest away, or otherwise take possession, of *dyumná-* belonging to others. Cf., e.g., IV.4.6, 9 (the latter cited by Ge n. 6d) and IX.61.11 *enā́ víśvāny aryá ā́, dyumnā́ni mānuṣāṇām / síśāsanto vanāmahe* “Seeking to gain all the brilliant things of humans (/sons of Manu) from the stranger, with it [=soma] we shall win them.” Although I don’t think I want to go as far as Ge in rendering *jánya-* here as “other people’s,” I think it may here define the *dyumná-* as belonging in the first instance to humans rather than gods, which latter might be the default interpr., given the etymology of *dyumná-*. This may be conveyed in part by *mānuṣāṇām* of IX.61.11. But *jánya-* may also have a more narrow interpr., referring to the people with whom we might have rivalrous relationships, fighting over the same goods and bragging rights—the larger Ārya community—rather than people beyond the pale, as it were. The same *mānuṣāṇām* of IX.61.11 with this more specific sense “sons of Manu” singles out the Āryas as members of the group that follows the ritual practices stemming from Manu. See also VI.19.6, also with *mānuṣa-*: *víśvā dyumnā́ vṛṣṇyā mānuṣāṇām, asmábhyam dāḥ ...* “All things brilliant and bullish that belong to the sons of Manu -- give them to us,” which may envisage Indra as the redistributor of goods belonging to our rivalrous co-religionists.

X.42.7: The rival, who was already far away in the previous vs. (6c *ārāc cit sán ... śátruḥ*), now needs to be thrust away (7a *ārāc chátrum ápa bādhasva ...*), which seems narratively reversed.

Pāda b is syntactically interesting, as containing an embedded nominal relative cl., resumed by the anaphoric pronoun of the main clause referring to the subject of the rel. cl.: ... *ápa bādhasva ..., ugró yáḥ śámbaḥ ... téna*. Here the *téna* is to be construed with the impv. *ápa bādhasva* “thrust away with that,” and the preceding rel. specifies what *téna* refers to. As I’ve discussed elsewhere (“Proto-proto Izafe,” Fs. Hale), such nominal clauses are exceptions to the ban on (or disfavoring of) relative-clause embedding in Vedic. But this example is esp. striking because it is a reverse izafe: the anaphor follows the relative. In function the relative clause here contains the hapax *śámba-* and seems designed to formally introduce this unfamiliar word. The construction is so unusual that it cannot be rendered both literally and intelligibly (“Thrust the rival far away – what is the mighty śamba-pole of yours, with that”).

Although the noun *śámba-* is found only here, the *-ín-*stem *śambín-* occurs in the AV (AVŚ IX.2.6 = AVP XVI.76.5), in a passage that helpfully limits the sense to a pole or long stick: AVŚ IX.2.6 ... *prá nude sapátnām chambīva nāvam udakéṣu ...* “I thrust forth my rivals as a man with a pole (does) a boat in the waters.” On Pāṇ. *śambā́ √ kr*, see KH (Aufs. 315) and for the word in general EWA s.v.

On *kṛdhí dhíyam ... vâjāratnām* see VI.35.1. *dhíyah karasi vâjāratnāh.*

X.42.8: The postponed referent of the rel. prn. (a: ... *yám* ..., b: ... *índram*##) matches and expands the construction in vs. 6a #*yásmin* ... *índre*##, where the prn and its referent were contained in a single pāda.

For *vṛṣa-savá-* Ge (n. 8a) compares III.42.7, VI.44.20 with *vṛṣabhiḥ sutá-* “pressed by bulls” (probably the pressing stones, in my view). But I see no reason to introduce an agentive reading for the 1st member of the compound here. Instead it seems to me to contain the intensifying *vṛṣa-* ‘bullish’, often found as compd 1st member and often rendered by Gr (etc.) as “stark, männlich.”

Gr considers the *ánta-* ‘end(s)’ of soma to be the dregs or sediment (Bodensatz), but Ge cites VI.43.2, which has not only *tīvrá-* soma, but also its middle and end. He suggests, persuasively, that this refers to the three soma-pressings. The first pressing produces the sharp (*tīvrá-*) juice, which presumably mellows over the day (esp. at the 3rd pressing, where at least in later śrauta ritual it is made of re-pressed stalks). Here presumably *bahulánta-* suggests that the supplies remain ample even at the end of the ritual day, or, if we take *bahulá-* to mean ‘thick’ (as Gr does in some passage), that the soma has thickened over the course of the day. But this seems less likely.

X.42.9: The controlling image in this vs. is the dice game, and the interpr. is therefore hampered by our incomplete understanding of the terminology. A similar vs. is found in the next hymn (X.43.5). The passage is tr. by Falk (Würfelspiel 127, 183 [slightly differently]) and is discussed at length by Scar (698–700, with regard to *prahā-*). On the basis of AVŚ IV.38.3 Scar argues plausibly that *prahām* should be construed with *jayāti*, not with *atidīvyā* (contra Ge, Falk, though with Lü, Wurf. 44 [see Ge n. 9] and Wh [AVŚ VII.50.6]). He provides several different possible interpr. of the root noun, of which I find the most convincing the stakes / pool / kitty “left in front” (*pra √ hā*), which the gamblers play each other to win. See my disc. of *prahāvānt-* ad IV.20.8.

The lexeme *āti √ dīv* in the gerund *atidīvyā* is found only here and in the parallel vs. AVŚ VII.50.6, which has the variant *atidīvā* (Wh “superior player”). (Note that this AV variant without gerund [if it is correctly transmitted] would also support construing *prahām* with *jayāti*; unfortunately there is no AVP parallel.) I take it to mean ‘overplay’ in the sense “go for broke” – that is, play excessively and daringly. (This lexeme might be compared to *ati √ prach* ‘ask beyond / over-ask’ in the famous exchange between Yājñavalkya and Gārgī in BĀUp III.6, where Y. warns G. about the dire consequences [=shattered head] of over-asking.) I take the subj. to be the poet (more or less with Ge, n. 9 “Opferer”), taking bold verbal chances to attract Indra’s attention. In this case the extremity of his action pays off.

The expression in pāda b, *kṛtām ví √ ci*, also belongs to dicing vocabulary and has a number of parallels in the RV (I.132.1, V.60.1, IX.97.58, X.43.5, X.102.2; see Falk 126–27 for this VP). It is clear that its overall sense is ‘win’, but the mechanism of that win is of course obscured by our ignorance of the minutiae of the game. Assuming the general correctness of the current understanding of the play – pulling out handfuls of nuts that are ideally divisible by 4 – I take the verbal lexeme as containing *√ ci* ‘pile’, and with *ví* to mean ‘pile apart’, which is similar but not identical to Falk’s “Abtrennen von Vierereinheiten vom *gláha* [the mass of nuts the player has pulled out],” with the gloss ‘fertig abtrennen, ohne Rest den *gláha* zerlegen’. Acdg. to Falk (pp. 116–17), *kṛtá-* refers to a group of 4 nuts (the best result). In order to avoid the

bewilderment that a more technically accurate tr. would occasion, I render the VP as “pull out [*ví* √*cī*] the perfect [*kr̥tām*] (hand of dice).”

śvaghñín- lit. ‘dog-killer’ (even more lit. ‘having the dog-killing X’) is a slang term for the winner at dice. I tr. “having the best throws,” again in order to provide some interpretable analog in modern discourse. (Falk, 100–101, seems to make heavier weather of the derivation of this term than seems necessary.)

In c *yó devákāmaḥ* must be a nominal relative clause complete in itself, since *ruṇaddhi* is not accented. The lack of resumptive pronoun *sá* is not surprising, and the position of the *ná* is appropriate if the main clause begins there. This clausal division is supported by the two parallels I.102.10 *tvám jigetha ná dhánā rurodhitha* and X.34.12 *tásmai kṛṇomi ná dhánā ruṇadhmi*, in both of which the clause begins after the caesura, preceded by an independent clause (ending in an unaccented finite verb).

In our passage I take the main clause “he does not withhold the stakes” to mean what I take *atidīvya* to mean in pāda a, namely that the poet has gone all out; he has not pulled any punches, has pushed his poetic skills to the limit. The two parallels just cited mean something slightly different and different from each other. In X.34.12 I (with most interpr., but contra Falk; see comm. ad loc.) think that the defeated gambler demonstrates by his empty hands that he has no more funds to stake. It is in this way that he holds nothing back. In I.102.10 after Indra is victorious he does not withhold the prizes won, but redistributes them to his clients – a different sense of “holds nothing back” – but both senses are available to the English expression as well.

In d the audacious chances the poet took are rewarded.

X.42.10: In pāda b the affliction to be overcome, hunger (*kṣúdh-*), is combatted with an appropriate remedy, barley (*yáva-*). The connection between affliction and remedy is not so clear in pāda a: how is *ámati-* (here rendered ‘neglect’) to be helped by cows? Here the solution lies in what kind of neglect is meant. The word *ámati-* lit. means ‘without having thought, without having [=receiving] attention’, for which ‘neglect’ is a reasonable single-word substitute. But it often seems to indicate the *physical* results of neglect or lack of attention. It is paired with *kṣúdh-* ‘hunger’ also in VIII.66.14 as well as in the next hymn X.43.3. It appears to refer to a physical state also in X.33.2, where it is paired with *nagnátā jásuḥ* “nakedness and exhaustion.” In I.53.4 it is checked by cows, as here, and by my interpr. of the difficult vs. III.53.15 a notional cow banishes *ámati-*. Hunger and the physical results of neglect can be countered by cows or rather their nourishing products, and that seems to be the sense here. See also X.39.6.

Although the instr.s in ab (*góbhiḥ ... yávena*) are clearly instruments, the function of those in cd (*rājabhiḥ ... asmākena vṛjānenā* “with our kings and our community”) is not clear: are they instr. of accompaniment “along with ... might we win” (that is, the kings and community share in the good fortune) or true instrument instrumentals (that is, we achieve the win by virtue of them)?

Note that *dhána-* is repeated from vs. 9.

In c *prathamā* is ambiguous. The Pp. reads as *-āḥ*, modifying the subject of *jayema* (so also Old, Ge, and the publ. tr.), but Gr as neut. pl. *-ā* with *dhánāni*. Either is possible and not much rides on it.

X.42.11: I take *bṛhaspátih* in pāda a as an epithet of Indra, and promote *índraḥ* from c to a (against Ge, who gives each a separate clause). HPS (B+I 80–81) also argues that it is an epithet or identification of Indra in this vs. and points out that no other god is mentioned in the hymn.

(His dismissal [p. 81 n. 19] of *bhāgam* in vs. 3 is rather cursory, however.) Although it is not unusual for the final vs. of a hymn to name more gods than featured in the body of the hymn, Schmidt's other arg. (p. 80 and n. 18), that parallels to the protector-from-all-sides trope have a single god as subject, is stronger.

Contra Ge (and HPS) I take c with ab and keep d separate (implicitly also Klein DGRV I.343). Both Ge and HPS seem to take the ablatives in c as the source of the *vāriṣaḥ* made in d – e.g., HPS (80) “Indra soll uns von vorn und von der Mitte ... Weite schaffen.” I know of no parallels for making *vāriṣa-* out of something. Moreover, if the ablatives of c are not construed with ab, the protective shield is incomplete; in particular the crucial direction “in front” is missing.

X.43 Indra

On the different deployment of similar verbal elements between X.42 and X.43, see the publ. intro. to X.43.

X.43.2: On the reciprocal expressions involving LOC *kāmam* √ *śri* in these two hymns, see comm. ad X.42.6.

On *sadaḥ* as having impv. value, see comm. ad IX.2.2.

I take *asmín ... sóme* as a nominal loc. absol., though this is probably not nec.

On *avapāna-* see comm. ad VII.98.1. As disc. there, there is no verbal lexeme *áva* √ *pā*, but the noun *avapāna-* occurs 5x in the RV. In three of these it refers to a drinking hole frequented by wild beasts. In I.136.4 (the only pl.) it can just mean ‘drink(s)’, but I tr. it there as “drinking places”, and I think something like that should be at issue here, given the very limited attestation of the noun and its associated lexeme. Perhaps the idea is that we should provide the equivalent of a watering hole for Indra, perhaps an ample receptacle for soma or a suitable place to drink it; cf. the use of “watering hole” to mean a bar in modern English. I would therefore slightly change the tr. to “let there be a drinking place for you.”

X.43.3: The root noun cmpd. *viṣūvīt-* must belong to the root √ *vr̥* ‘obstruct, ward off’, despite the homonymous stem based on √ *vr̥t* ‘turn’ in II.40.3. See Scar 507 and 511–12 respectively.

The pair *āmati- kṣúdh-* is also found in the previous hymn, X.42.10.

X.43.3–4: As Old notes, there's a pun on *vāyaḥ* in these two vss., with 3d containing the neut. *s-* stem ‘vitality’ and 4a the nom. pl. to *vi-* ‘bird’.

X.43.4–8: Just as X.42.5–8 defines a small internal ring, so too in this hymn we find some evidence of an internal ring, with 4d *vidát svār mánave jyótir āryam* echoed by 8d *ávindaj jyótir mánave havíṣmate*. But the material in between is even more various than in X.42, and I hesitate even to call attention to this possible structure. However, it is the case that the immediately following vs., 9, abruptly shifts focus from Indra to (unnamed) Agni, and vs. 9 is the real final vs. of the hymn, since 10–11 are shared with X.42. So the echo of vs. 4 that is found in 8 may close out the Indra hymn proper, in preparation for the ritual vs. that follows. This suggestion is supported by the fact that “sun-finding” is also found in vs. 1 (pāda a), and so the whole Indra portion would be marked by a ring structure.

X.43.4: The VP *vidát svàr* resonates not only with 8d, as just noted, but also with 1a, where our thoughts are *svàr-vid-*. Here it is the soma drops, so that both the verbal and the physical parts of the sacrifice are sun-finding.

The appearance of *Manu* – and the consequent switch to mythological time – is surprising, since heretofore the focus has been on the ritual here-and-now and *Indra*'s appearance there, a temporal frame to which we return in the next vs. The (aor.) injunc. *vidát* facilitates this balance between ritual present and mythological past. The reprise at the end of the ring, 8d, contains by contrast an augmented imperfect, *ávindat*, which situates the action fully in the past.

Although Gr does not register a lexeme *prá √ dyut* and it is not found elsewhere in Vedic till ŚB, it is difficult to do anything with *prá* in c but construe it with the intens. part. *dávidyutat*. (VB does list this passage as a lexeme, the sole entry under *pra √ dyut* in the Veda vol.) Certainly other verbs of shining / lighting up take *prá* (e.g., *√ruc*). Although *prá* would be in tmesis with a participle, not a finite verb, this is hardly unknown.

X.43.5: The first pāda, with its technical dicing phraseology, is almost exactly X.42.9; see disc. there. Unlike that vs., however, I think *Indra* is the subject of *ví cinotí*, not the poet.

On *saṃvárga-* see comm. ad VIII.75.12, X.61.17.

The VP *sūryam jāyat* “wins the sun” matches semantically, but not lexically, *vidát svàḥ* in the previous vs., 4d. The verb is also an injunctive (though to a present stem this time), and at least in my interpr. has a present-time sense.

X.43.6: On the stem *asāya-* see comm. ad VI.33.2; the stem is found with *pári* as here also in I.34.7. Though in both I.34.7 and VI.33.2 the verb is active, a 3rd sg. mid. *asāyata*, matching the one here, is found in X.92.1. In nearby X.40.6 the related verb *nasāyathaḥ* takes *vísaḥ* as goal/object, as here. See comm. ad loc.

On *dhénā-* see comm. ad I.2.3, 101.10, and V.30.9. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this portion of the hymn has to do with the forward progress of the *Ārya* through desirable territory, under *Indra*'s watchful protection. In pāda a he encircles the clans perhaps to safeguard them (but see below), while in b he watches over the nourishing streams that the *Ārya* are conquering. The sense of geographical space as defined by these streams may be found in the similar passage VIII.32.22 *ihí tísráḥ parāváta, ihí páñca jánāṃ áti / dhénā indrávacākaśat* “Pass through the three distant realms; pass over the five peoples, / keeping watch over the nourishing streams, o *Indra*.” Note the pl. *jána-* there as here. In VIII.32.22 *Indra* is urged to come to our soma sacrifice rather than someone else's, and this involves traveling across a good deal of territory. It is possible in that passage that *áva √ cakṣ* would be better rendered literally, as “looking down upon the streams” from the air, as he passes over a series of them. The *dhénāḥ* could also refer to the inviting streams of soma that *Indra* is keeping an eye out for. And both these interpr. can work here as well. In that case, the *āmreḍita vísaṃ-vísaṃ* in pāda a might refer less to *Indra*'s protective embrace than to his passing over or circling around other clans to reach ours – where *Indra* will rejoice in our pressing (cd). Competitive soma sacrifices are also at issue in VIII.32.22.

śakráḥ in c picks up *śakat* in 5c.

The finale of the verse seems to sketch an infinite loop of beneficial streams. The successful soma presser pleases *Indra* with his streams of soma, which enables this same man to vanquish his foes in battle, allowing him (and his fellows) to conquer more territory containing nourishing rivers, streams of water.

X.43.7: The relationship between streams of soma and streams of water (=rivers) suggested in vs. 6 is reinforced in the first hemistich of this vs. by the similes that bookend the two pādas. The cause-and-effect between water and food is laid out in d, where the rain makes the barley grow. Barley (*yáva-*) returns from X.42.10, where it overcame hunger.

dānu- is ambiguous between ‘gifts’ and ‘drops’, and both fit here; indeed the gift *is* the drop, namely rain.

X.43.8: It is not clear to me why Indra should be “like an *angry* bull,” per the publ. tr., and I now think a tr. of *kruddhá-* as ‘raging’ (as in JPB’s V.15.3 *siṃhám ná kruddhám* “like a raging lion”) better conveys the unbridled behavior of a powerful animal. Note that Indra is a “tempestuous bull” (*vṛṣabhásya śuṣmīṇaḥ*) in vs. 3.

Ge (n. 8b) suggests that the *aryá-* who becomes the husband of the waters (*aryá-patnīḥ ... apāḥ*) is Indra. This is most likely true: Indra leads the people in the conquest of the new land defined by rivers. But I think another sense is also latent: the land is being Aryanized by the conquest of rivers, and so the people (*jána-*) of the Ārya collectively become the husband(s) of the waters – though we might expect **ārya-patnī-*, with the vṛddhi deriv. as 1st member.

In c *jīrá-dānu-* incorporates the same pun as *dānu-* in 7d. Here the “drops” would presumably be soma, thus continuing the identification of soma with the life-giving waters of rivers and rain.

On pāda d see disc. above ad vss. 4–8 and on *āvindat* above ad vs. 4.

X.43.9: On this vs. as being outside the rings formed by 1–8 and 4–8, see above ad vss. 4–8.

As Ge (n. 9) points out (flg. Ludwig), the subject of this vs. must be the ritual fire, often compared to an axe (see, e.g., comm. ad IX.67.30). The hortatory impvs. *új jāyatām* (a), *vī rocatām* (c) mark the kindling of the fire in preparation for the ritual day.

As Ge notes (n. 9b), *ṛtásya sudúghā* recalls VII.43.4 *ṛtásya dhārāḥ sudúghā dúhānāḥ*. However, in VII.43.4 the Saṃhitā reading *sudúghā* represents acc. pl. *sudúghāḥ*, which is the obj. of *dúhānāḥ*, whereas here *sudúghā* is nom. sg. In VII.43.4 I take “the good milkers, the streams of truth” to be the hymns that the gods milk for themselves (from the poets). This is in general agreement with Ge (n. 4b). Here, though he cross-references VII.43.4, Ge identifies the *sudúghā* rather as the Schmalzlöffel. I do not see why. It can easily be, once again, the praise hymn recited as the fire is kindled. Or, perhaps, the stream of ghee that will cause the fire to flare up and shine out.

The second hemistich with its focus on the blazing fire compared to the sun is a culmination of the sun-finding theme found in vss. 1, 4, and (slightly disguised) 8; it turns out that the “sun” is in fact the ritual fire.

This hemistich also contains an echo of Svarbhānu, in the phrase *bhānúnā ... svàr ná*, split between two clauses (in my tr. and Ge’s). Recall that, by my analysis (Hyenas), Svarbhānu is an epithet of Agni.

This hemistich also provides a sustained ex. of sibilant alliteration: ... *śúciḥ, svàr ná śukrám śusúcīta sátpatīḥ*, with three of the words also an etymological figure (*śúciḥ ... śukrám śusúcīta*).

X.43.10–11: For these repeated vss. see comm. ad X.42.10, 11.

X.44 Indra

X.44.1: The stem *svápati-* occurs three times in the RV, all in X (here, and X.27.8, 31.4). Gr glosses ‘sein eigener Herr’, reasonably enough (sim. AiG II.1.264 ‘eigener Herr’). Other *svá-* cmpds. have the sense ‘(having) self/own-X’, and the well-attested stem *sva-rāj-* ‘independent king’ (lit. ‘ruling by oneself’?; see Scar 450 for disc. of the possibilities) is a superficially good parallel. We might then gloss *svá-pati* similarly as ‘independent lord’, via ‘lord of himself’ or ‘lord by his own (power)’? However, it should be noted that all other *svá-* cmpds in the RV are adjectives (generally bahuvr. like *svá-yaśas-* ‘having one’s own glory, self-glorious’), including probably *sva-rāj-* originally, and so there are in fact no direct parallels to the noun *svá-pati-*. And, though Scar also gives *svápati-* as a virtual synonym (“gleichbedeutend”) of *svarāj-*, in context *svá-pati-* is not as clear as we might hope: the referent of *svá-* is not necessarily the *-pati-* himself.

Clearest is X.27.8 (if anything in that devilish hymn is clear), which depicts cows straying and following false / other cowherds (in my interpr.; see comm. ad loc.). In the final pāda the question is asked *kíyad āsu svápatís chandāyate*, in my tr. “For how long will their own lord find pleasure in them [=cows]?” with the referent of *svápati-* being Indra. In this passage the most natural interpr. of *svápati-* is not ‘his own lord, lord of himself’, but rather ‘their own lord’, referring to the cows. Although Ge’s interpr. of the larger context is different from mine, he tr. sim. “ihr Eigentümer.” There are (at least) two plausible ways in which *svá-* could have acquired this unexpected sense in this cmpd, and both may have contributed. On the one hand, *svá-* in this cmpd may not have the adj. sense ‘self/own’ but rather be based on the nominalized neut. *svám* ‘own property’, which is marginally attested in the RV (see VI.28.2 *ná svám muṣāyati* “he [=Indra] does not steal the own property [of the sacrificer]”). An analysis of *svá-* as ‘own property’ in this cmpd seems to underlie Thieme’s (Fremdling, p. 12) “der Herr des Eigentums” (master of the property) in X.27.8. Since the “own property” here is in fact the cows, it is not difficult to reinterpret the referent of *svá-* as the cows themselves: “lord of the property of/in cows” = “lord of the cows” → “the cows’ own lord.” The other contributor may be the fact that differently accented *svapatí-* is a bahuvrīhi, found once in the AV: AVŚ VIII.6.16 *yá imāṃ samvívṛtsaty, ápatiḥ svapatīm stríyam*. “... whoever, not (her) husband, tries to embrace (?) this woman who has her own husband” (=AVP XVI.80.7, with *svapatīm*). Here, once again, the *sva-* is not coreferential with *-pati-*, but refers to the woman. (The use of *-pati-* not *-patnī-* in this fem. bahuvrīhi is noteworthy [see AiG II.1.90 with Nachtr.]; I would attribute it to the desire to match immediately preceding *ápati-* in this polarized expression.) This split reference, with *sva-* not coreferential with *-patí-*, might help enable split ref. in our non-bahuvrīhi.

The other two RVic occurrences of *svápati-* are harder to interpr. or, rather, less contextually defined and more amenable to a variety of interpr. In X.31.4 the referent of the whole cmpd. is Agni (or rather, he is the most likely referent of the pāda; see comm. ad loc.). He is also identified there as *nítyah ... dāmūnāḥ* ‘constant / one’s own ... master of the house / domestic leader’. The default interpr. of *svápati-* as ‘self-lord, lord of himself’ could work here: Agni functions independently; at least once (I.36.7) he is called *svarāj-* and is frequently characterized as *svadhāvānt-* ‘possessing autonomous power’. On the other hand, Ge tr. *nítyah ... svápatiḥ* as “Der ständiger Eigentümer (owner)” without comment; such a tr. might point to an interpr. of *svá-* as ‘(own) goods’, as discussed above. And this is certainly possible: Agni often holds sway over material goods; such goods could be his own or those of the household. And finally Re (EVP XVI.129) remarks that *nítya* reinforces *sva* in *svápati-*. I find this an appealing

suggestion, though it requires a small detour through *nítya-*. This adj. can mean both ‘regular, constant’ and ‘one’s own, own proper’; the former is generally the sense continued in later Sanskrit, but the latter is quite common in the RV, esp. used of relatives and friends. See, e.g., nearby X.39.14 *nítyaṃ ná sūnúṃ tánayam* “our own son who continues our lineage.” Since each household has its own fire, *nítya-* ‘own proper’ is an appropriate modifier of this household fire. If Agni in X.31.4 is “our (own) proper” (*nítya-*), he can also be “the lord of ourselves / our own lord” (*svá-pati-*), and this interpr. is what is reflected in the publ. tr. – though see the revisions to the whole vs. in comm. ad loc.

Finally, the occurrence of *svápati-* in our vs. Here the various alternative possibilities for the interpr. of this cmpd. are unrestrained by context. The referent is Indra. He can be ‘self-lord, lord of himself’ just as he is often *svarāj-* and operates with and possesses *svadhā-*. Certainly his control of all sorts of power is emphasized in the vs. But he could be ‘lord of goods/possessions’, since his power over material goods is constantly on the poets’ minds. And, finally, he can be ‘(our) own lord’, whom we are urging to come to our soma sacrifice. This last alternative underlies the publ. tr., but I would not now rule out either of the other two. Indeed all three may be meant simultaneously.

In bc Indra’s power and energy are expressed by three etymologically independent words beginning *tu/v*: *tūtujānās túviṣmān / pratvakṣāṇāḥ*.

The sense of *dhármaṇā* is, as often, hard to pin down, but it needs to be evaluated in conjunction with the same word in 5d. I tr. it here as “according to his own principle,” which is shorthand for something like “his foundational essence,” the qualities and acts that define Indra. Indra is in a way the quintessence of power, which is his *dhárman-*, his “foundation.” And his actions projecting this power, as described in bcd, are done according to this foundational principle.

The *vísivā sáhāṃsi* over/beyond which Indra projects his vigor are presumably those of others.

X.44.2: The parallelism of the two *su-* cmpds in pāda a (*suṣthāmā ... suyāmā*), echoed by *supáthā* in c, is broken by my tr. “provides a good standing place ... easy to control,” but attempts to produce parallel tr. came out stilted.

X.44.3: This vs. recycles some previous material. Perhaps most obvious is the adj. *prátvakṣasam* beginning c, which matches the part. *pratvakṣāṇāḥ* beginning 1c. Otherwise, *nṛpátim* in a echoes *svápatiḥ* in 1a (though in a slightly different metrical position) and matches *nṛpate* in 2b; *vájrabāhum* recalls the clause in 2b *mimiyákṣa vájraḥ ... gábhastau* “your mace is attached to your fist”; *taviṣāsah*, used of his horses in b, is etymologically related to *túviṣmān* modifying Indra in 1b, and *sadhamādaḥ* (d) echoes *mádāya* (1a); Indra as bull (*vṛṣabhám*) in c recalls his bullishness (*vṛṣnyena*) in 1d. There are also the vs.-internal echoes *indravāhaḥ* (a) ... *vahantu* (d) and *ugrám ugrāsah* (b).

The sole finite verb in the vs., *vahantu*, is postponed till the last word, while its etymological-twin subject *indravāhaḥ* is the first full word; in between is an alternating sequence of nom. pls. and acc. sgs. that further specify the two parts of the cmpd. *-vāh-* and *indra-* respectively. The publ. tr. dampens this poetic effect by inserting two extra copies of the verb “let ... (them) convey,” in pādas a and b. These should, at the least, be put in parens.

X.44.4: The poet plays a few tricks on his audience in this vs., in part arising from the repeated material noted in the comm. to vs. 3. The first is the use of *pátim* in pāda a: since Indra was identified as some variety of *-pāti-* in each of the first three vss., our expectation, on encountering *pátim* as the 2nd word in this vs., would naturally be that its referent is Indra as well. The next two acc. sgs., the hapax *dronasācam* ‘companion of the cup, accompanying the cup’ and *sācetasam* ‘like-minded’ do not rule out this interpr.: the first is liable to various interpr. and the second is used once of Indra (I.61.10). But the beginning of b, *ūrjā skambhām* “the prop of nourishment,” would begin to call our identification into question, and the 2nd sg. verb *ā vṛṣāyase*, which should have Indra as subj., pretty much demolishes this hypothesis and forces us to produce another referent, namely soma.

The verb itself is ambiguous. The denom. stem *vṛṣāyā-* generally means ‘act the bull’; in this sense it is entirely medial, and the voice of our occurrence thus conforms. Indra is often the subject, and he is the likely subject here, and his association with bulls and bullishness is already prominent in the first part of the hymn (1d, 3c). However, several factors complicate this picture: the other occurrences of this stem do not take the acc., but most of the first hemistich here consists of an acc. phrase. And none of the denom. forms appear with the preverb *ā*. There is another, less well-attested stem *vṛṣāya-*, belonging to the root $\sqrt{vṛṣ}$ ‘rain’, attested once in as an act. trans. *vṛṣāya* ‘make rain’ (X.98.1) and quite possibly in the middle in the meaning ‘rain’ in IX.71.3 (so Gr, Lub; I actually consider it a pun, like the similar form here [see below]). Perhaps more to the point, the zero-grade thematic stem *vṛṣa-* (6th cl. pres.? or them. aor.? – see Kü 474–77 [aor.]; Hill, Aor.-Präs 226–29 [pres.]) is also exclusively middle (mostly 2nd sg. impv. *vṛṣasva*) and exclusively found with the preverb *ā*. Although Kü argues that this stem belongs with the dominant *vṛṣāyā-* stem and means ‘sich erheben, sich ermannen’ (see also Baum, Impv. 130, ‘take courage’), Hill points out that it is almost always found in soma-drinking contexts; he assigns it to $\sqrt{varṣ}$ ‘schütten’ (= $\sqrt{vṛṣ}$ ‘rain’). Moreover, it can take an acc. (but only III.60.5) or gen. (regularly, e.g., X.116.1, 4) complement referring to soma, and several times also appears with the loc. *jaṭhāre* ‘in the belly’, as the destination for the soma (I.104.9, X.96.13). Such complements are not compatible with the ‘take courage’ interpr., as far as I can see. The preponderance of evidence thus favors a connection with $\sqrt{vṛṣ}$ ‘rain, pour’, with soma metaphorically standing for rain. Taking account of the middle voice and the *ā*, I tr. ‘drench yourself (in [liquid])’. The *ā vṛṣāyase* in our passage tracks *ā vṛṣasva* closely, with the acc. phrase referring to the soma (see above). The VP also contains the loc. *dharūṇe*, which can be parallel in function to *jaṭhāre* in the *ā vṛṣasva* passages. Ge (n. 4b), flg. Sāy., suggests it means “die Grundlage in Indra, d.h. sein Bauch”; see also Scar (590 and n. 837). I now find this interpr. of *dharūṇe* appealing, against my colorless “upon its support,” and would now slightly emend the tr. to “drench yourself in the lord ..., (pour it) into your ‘support’.” I have argued for a similar usage for the abstract *dhāman-* ‘foundation, fundament’, transferred to a body part, in VIII.92.24 (Vedic Body Parts, 81–83), also in soma-drinking context. See comm. ad loc.

To sum up, I consider *ā vṛṣāyase* here to have a double meaning and a double stem affiliation: on the one hand, it belongs with other forms of *vṛṣāyate* meaning ‘acts the bull’, a sense supported by the other occurrences of bull words in the preceding vss. But more dominant is the sense ‘drench yourself, rain/pour into your self’, parallel to *ā vṛṣasva* belonging to $\sqrt{vṛṣ}$ ‘rain’. To bring out the double sense I would slightly alter the tr. to “you act the bull / drench yourself ...”

Note the phonological echo in (*drona*)*sācam sāce(tasam)*; *drona-* and *dharūṇa* also respond to each other.

The image of Indra’s physical assimilation of soma is continued in pāda c with *ójaḥ kṛṣva*: “make it your might / make its might your own,” with the middle voice emphasizing the internalization of the soma and its power – as well as *sám grbhāya tvé ápi* “take it entirely within you.”

Despite some problems it seems capricious to separate *kenipá-* here from *ākenipá-* in IV.45.6 and the *āke-* in that cmpd from *āké* in II.1.10. For *āké* as ‘in der Nähe’ see Gr s.v. and AiG II.2.519 (contrasting with, e.g., *parāké* ‘in der Ferne’). The unverbated form is found in *ākenipá-* in IV.45.6, and our *kenipá-* appears to be the result of false segmentation of this cmpd. (see, e.g., AiG II.2.744). Although the sandhi context here, *áso yáthākenipānām* in continuous text (analyzed by Pp. as *yáthā kenipānām*), would technically allow an analysis *yáthā *ākenipānām* matching IV.45.6 *ākenipá-*, this is unlikely because of the caesura flg. *yathā*, as Old points out. Nonetheless some such ambiguous context probably set the stage for the false segmentation. Assuming that *nipá-* derives from *ní√pā* ‘protect’ (whatever the contribution of the preverb *nī*), note that that lexeme is found with contrastive locales in X.63.16 *sá no amá só áraṇe ní pātu* “Let it [= ‘well-being’ *svastí-*] keep guard over us at home and in a foreign place.” As to who “those who keep watch nearby” are, I suggest the patrons, although it could be some other group in the relevant Ārya community.

X.44.5: The first hemistich contains a pseudo figura etymologica, which is esp. clever because the figure is displaced: the two words belong to different clauses (separated by the pāda boundary), but the second, the noun, evokes its gapped twin as the object of the preceding verb. The relevant material is ... *ā hí sámśiṣam, svāsīṣam bháram ā yāhi* ... The 1st sg. aor. *ā ... sámśiṣam*, to *√sams*, unusually lacks an overt object. It also unusually appears with the preverb *ā*, which is otherwise rare with this root in the RV. The verb is immediately followed, across the pāda boundary, by the bahuvrīhi *svāsīṣ-* ‘having good prayer(s)’, belonging to the root *√sās* and containing the root noun cmpd *āsīṣ-* ‘prayer’. The bahuvrīhi here modifies *bháram* ‘offering, what is borne (forth)’: this physical offering is accompanied by good prayers. This NP is the goal of the impv. *ā yāhi*. The juxtaposition of the two clauses suggests that *ā ... sámśiṣam* gapped its original object, which can be recovered from the immediately following bahuvrīhi: *ā ... sámśiṣam *āsīṣam / āsīṣaḥ* “I have pronounced my prayer(s).” This would look phonologically like a figura etymologica, but it of course is not, since *√sams* and *√sās* are distinct roots. Their apparent etymological relationship is furthered by the use of the preverb *ā* with the verb, matching the preverb in the root noun. The publ. tr. assumes a more realized figure than the Skt. text presents: it should read “I have expressed (my prayer),” with parens. (Ge’s rendering of *ā ... sámśiṣam* “denn ich rechne darauf” doesn’t seem to fall within the usual semantic range of *√sams* and can, I think, be ignored.)

The odd English “your cups cannot be ventured against” would be better as “your cups are inviolable.”

X.44.6: Ge suggests that pāda a contains the image of a race; this seems reasonable, and the winning of fame that the invocations achieve for themselves (note the middle *ákr̥ṇvata*) fits the picture well. I assume that the separate *deváhūti-* originate from separate sacrificers at distinct sacrifices, though if so, how is it that they all seem to win fame?

In any case the second hemistich provides a contrasting picture of sacrificial failures, memorably expressed in the striking “not able to board the ship of sacrifice.” Interpretation of this hemistich is considerably hampered by the impossible (Old “hoffnungslos”) hapax *képayah*,

which presumably modifies or indeed is the plural subject of the 3rd pl. verbs in the two clauses, *śekúḥ* and *ny àviśanta*—and therefore presumably belongs to a stem *képi*-. I have no solution to this word. Gr’s connection to \sqrt{kamp} ‘tremble’ (see also Whitney’s [Roots], tentatively) with the gloss ‘zitternd, zappelnd’ founders on the phonology, not to mention the fact that the root \sqrt{kamp} is almost exclusively of late attestation (though see Gotō, 1st Cl. 110–12 for Kāṭhaka-Kap. attestations of the present stem); Kü (510) keeps the tr. (“die zappelnden (?)”), though presumably as a placeholder. No other suggestion (see Old ad loc., EWA s.v.) is at all compelling. I do think that, as often with impenetrable hapaxes, it was contextually generated, at least partially. First note that the problematic hapax *kenipānām*, discussed at length above, is only two vss. previous (4d), and our word here, *képayah*, shares with that preceding one an initial *ke* (/ké) and a *p*, which seems to begin what might as well be the root syllable. I find it hard to believe that there’s not some felt connection between *kenipānām* and *képayah*, esp. since they are both isolated. Note also that two verses later (8b) the hemistich-final *kopayat* shares phonology with *képayah* (6d) in the same metrical slot. These observations get us no closer to a meaning, a morphological analysis, or an etymology, but they do situate the problematic word in a context that favors its shape. The publ. tr.’s “*non-protectors (?)” is not a serious attempt at any of the three issues just raised, but a mild suggestion that this word may be meant to be a negative contrastive play off the positive *kenipānām*.

X.44.7: Doubled and doubly accented *evaívá* occurs only here and in IV.54.5 as far as I can tell. In the latter passage it correlates with doubled (but singly accented) *yáthā-yathā*. In IV.54.5 the second accent of *evaívá* is secure, but here, as Old points out, the Saṃhitā text is ambiguous (*evaívāpāg*), and the second accent is dependent on the Pp analysis. The reason for the doubling in this vs. isn’t clear to me; I doubt that it responds to the single *evā* in 4a; as shown below, in the rhetoric of this vs. it corresponds to *itthā*, which begins the 2nd hemistich, but that form isn’t doubled.

Pāda b is 11 syllables and, courtesy of the final *āyuyujré*, has a Triṣṭubh cadence. Gr (also tentatively Arnold) suggests reading **āyuyujríré*, which would fix the problem. However, Old sensibly rejects the emendation, esp. in this hymn of mixed Jagatī and Triṣṭubh vss. See comm. ad IX.70.1.

Ge (n. 7) suggests that this vs. continues the thought of vs. 6, esp. 6ab. This seems correct. The apparent racing motif of 6ab is made more literal by the badly yoked horses in 7b, which cause their owners to fall behind. Beyond this there is no consensus on who is being contrasted with who(m), because there is no consensus on the sense in context of the ambiguous paired words *ápare* and *úpare* or *ápāk* and *prāk*, or whether the first pair are nom. pl. m. or loc. sg. Ge takes the first pair as (near) synonyms (später and künftig). Since this makes it difficult to get a stark contrast between 7ab and 7cd, he decides the contrast is instead between the previous generations, identified as *prathamāḥ* in 6a, and new generations, referred to by *ápare* and *úpare* in 7a and c. While *ápāk* and *prāk* he takes as opposites (zurück- and voraus), referring to different outcomes of ritual invocations. The point, he thinks, is that just as in the past (6) the results of invocations of the gods were variable (successful in 6ab, not in 6cd), so also are they now (unsuccessful in 7ab, successful in 7cd). Old, focusing on *ápāk* and *prāk*, takes these as cardinal directions, west and east respectively; for him the vs. concerns only one group of people, who are currently (7cd) doing well and facing east (the region of light), but who, as evil-doers, should end up facing west (the region of darkness). It is not clear to me what he does with *dāvāne* in c, which should problematize his interpr. of the people in that pāda as malevolent. Kü (407) also

takes *ápāk* as ‘westlich’, but since he does not consider the 2nd half of the vs., it is not clear what contrasts he sees there.

Another problem for the interpr. is the lack of *syntactic* parallelism in the two halves, contrasting with the strict pairing of *lexical* items in pādas a and c. Lexically the two pādas line up exactly:

a:	<i>itthā</i>	<i>ápāk</i>	<i>ápare</i>	<i>santu</i>	<i>dūḍhyàḥ</i>
c:	<i>evaívá (yé)</i>	<i>prāk</i>	<i>úpare</i>	<i>sánti</i>	<i>dāváne</i>

But syntactically the two half-verses are skewed: ab consists of a main clause (a) and a rel. cl. dependent on it (b), but cd is, at least superficially, entirely made of dependent clauses, signaled by *yé* in c and *yátra* in d. We should instead have expected **(té) prāk úpare *santi* to correspond with *ápāg ápare santu*. (Though note that 6c is also a relative clause; however, 6d is its corresponding main clause.) Old is troubled by the skewed syntax and considers several possibilities – including the one that I adopt, which he rejects.

Without sorting further through the various proposed interpr. of this vs., I will set out my choices: 1) I take *ápare* and *úpare* as nom. pl., not loc.; 2) I do not consider them synonyms (as Ge does), though there is overlap in part of their semantic ranges in other contexts; instead, they are here functional opposites: *ápara-* ‘behind’ and *úpara-* ‘nearer, close by’; 3) I do not take a and c as parallel single clauses, despite the superimposable line-up of the parallel words, but split c into two: a nominal relative cl. *yé prāk úpare* “(those) who are nearer and facing forward,” with the main clause beginning with *sánti*, hence its accent: “they are (ready) to give.” There is no generational split (in the Ge mode) between vss. 6 and 7; rather both vss. present us with the same picture, of ritualists (6ab, 7cd) and their unsuccessful rivals (6cd, 7ab). As for d, I think it’s a temporal/circumstantial rel. -- the good guys are ready to give when the ritual patterns etc. are in place -- i.e., at the sacrifice. Ge (n. 7d) takes *yátra* as standing for *yéṣām* and pāda d as concerning the Dakṣiṇā; his interpr. depends on a dubious (to me) interpr. of *váyunāni* as *Rechtwege*.

X.44.8: We now turn to the heroic deeds of Indra, expressed by an interesting series of tenses. The first deed, giving foundation to mountains and plains, is expressed with an augmented imperfect (*adhārayat* 8a). The actions performed by Heaven (b) are in the injunctive (*krandat ... kopayat*), while Indra’s propping apart of Heaven and Earth (c), usually treated as another of Indra’s cosmogonic deeds, is in the present (*vī śkabhāyati*). I do not quite understand the present, unless it is a way to transition to the current ritual moment in d, where Indra himself recites (in the present *śamsati*). Or perhaps the separation of the two spaces is considered to be a daily action, since the disjunction between earth and heaven only becomes visually clear at dawn, every dawn. In any case the injunctives in b mediate between the imperfect of a and the present of c.

The depiction of Indra as performing like a poet/reciter at the sacrifice is striking; see Ge’s n. 8d for some parallels.

X.44.9: The hook or crook (*aṅkuśá-*) that the poet presents to Indra most likely stands for the hymn, as Ge points out (n. 9a), but the exact employment of this metaphorical implement requires discussion. The word appears 3x in the RV. In VIII.17.10 Indra is urged to use a long (*dīrghá-*) *aṅkuśá-* to hold out (*prayáchasi*) goods to the sacrificer. Although it is not clear from the passage how the long crook will enable Indra to hold out goods, the image must be a compressed one, which is illuminated by the use of the related word *aṅkín-* ‘having a

hook/crook’ in III.45.4. There Indra is urged to shake down goods for us as if shaking a tree for its fruit: the hook allows its user to get purchase on the branch: *vṛkṣāṃ pakvām phālam aṅkīva dhūnuhīndra ... vāsu* “As a man with a crook shakes a tree for ripe fruit, o Indra, shake (us) goods ...” In VIII.17.10 the tree and the fruit and their shaking by means of the crook must be understood. A long *aṅkuśā-* and a tree branch (and the root \sqrt{yam}) are also found in X.134.6, which seems to contain the same image, this time with the mediation of a goat: *dīrghām hy aṅkuśām yathā śaktim bībharsī mantumaḥ / pūrveṇa maghavan padājo vayāṃ yāthā yamaḥ* “Because you carry your ability like a long crook, you rich in counsel / as a goat (holds) a branch with its forefoot, you will hold (a branch? fruit? goods?) (with your ability/crook), o bounteous one.” In the 2nd half of the verse the crook must be understood in the instr. parallel to the goat’s forefoot, the instr. *padā*, with which the animal, on its hind legs, pulls the branch down and keeps it steady with its forefoot in order to eat the leaves and bark.

But in our passage, despite the presence of a hoof or hooves (*śaphārūj-*), it seems impossible to extract the tree branch / fruit / goat+forefoot image; instead Indra is aggressively wielding the *aṅkuśā-* against opponents identified as *śaphārūj-* ‘breaking (with) the hoof’(?). Indra uses the (metaphorical) *aṅkuśā-* to break or shatter them in turn, also with the root \sqrt{ruj} . This alternative use for the *aṅkuśā-* allows us to formulate a clearer picture of the tool. Since something like a shepherd’s crook ending in a semicircular hook would be an inefficient tool to use for breaking/shattering, the two uses of the *aṅkuśā-* in the RV suggest that the single tool incorporated two different devices (a sort of rudimentary Swiss Army knife), a hook and something suitable to use for breaking – a combination that exactly fits the Indian elephant goad, not coincidentally called an *aṅkuśa* (modern *aṅkus*, etc.). This stick-shaped device ends in a point, but has a hook protruding backwards from the handle right behind the pointed end. (See numerous images on the internet.) At least according to (quite possibly suspect) discussion in Wikipedia, there is archaeological evidence for these tools in the 2nd half of the 1st millennium BCE, and, judging from the many images on the web, the shape of the elephant goad has remained stable for the ensuing two and a half millennia, which might suggest that even prior to its emergence in the archaeological and visual record, its form was set. (On the *aṅkuśa-* see also Trautmann, *Elephants and Kings*, 65–76.) So here Indra must be goading / ramming / sticking the *śaphārūj-* with the end of the *aṅkuśā-*, while in the other two occurrences he is using the hooked part to grab and shake a tree branch. A nice example of textual confirmation of the visual form of a piece of physical realia. We do not have to suppose the device was specialized for elephants at this period; any goadable animal would do.

Let us now turn to the object of the goading / breaking in this passage. The root-noun compd. *śaphārūj-* is found once elsewhere in the RV, in X.87.12, where it qualifies a sorcerer (*yātudhāna-*) against whom Agni is urged to act. But neither of these passages allows us to narrow down what heinous action these enemies perform. Although the publ. tr. (indeed most tr.) render it as a root noun compd with ACC first member (‘hoof-breaker’), there are in fact a number of possibilities, laid out in some detail by Scar (460–61), who does not choose among them. The uncertainty of the meaning is tied up with a formal problem. The Pp analyzes the compd as *śaphārūjah* (likewise the form in X.87.12)(see also Gr s.v.), with the verbal lexeme \sqrt{ruj} , which is found elsewhere. The Pp also analyzes the opening of the pāda, *yénārūjāsi*, as *yéna ārūjāsi* with the same preverb-verb combination. But root noun compounds with a nominal 1st member, esp. with object function, and a preverb+verb root combination are rare to non-existent – PREVERB + ROOT formations are of course very common; NOUN + ROOT formations likewise—but the two types are not ordinarily combined. See Scar (649 and n. 921) and my 2020 Fs. Lamberterie

article (p. 486), where I argue that a preverb has been gapped by rule in precisely this type of underlying NOUN + PREVERB-ROOT formation. (See also my forthcoming article on the limits of Indo-Iranian compounding.) This fact about root noun cmpds makes the *-ā-* in *śaphārúj-* a problem, one that already exercised Wackernagel (AiG II.1.213) about precisely this form. Obviously in order to avoid positing a preverb between the nominal 1st member and the root, Wackernagel divides the cmpd as *śaphā-rúj-* and hesitates between taking the *-ā-* as an instr. ending (‘breaking with hooves’) or as due to compositional lengthening. Scar considers both those possibilities, as well as that *śaphā* could be a collective or a dual (both as objects of *-rúj-*). He does also consider the Pp. analysis, with the lexeme *ā√rúj-*, but with the proviso that *ārúj-* would have to have been deeply anchored in the poet’s Wortschatz to allow the violation of root noun cmpd norms. Scar does not say anything about the verb that governs the cmpd in our passage, which, as we’ve seen, is taken by the Pp as *ārújāsi*. If this analysis of the verb were secure it would strongly suggest that the preverb is also incorporated in the root noun cmpd contrary to usual practice. However, the sandhi context is ambiguous: *yénārújāsi* could just as well be cut *yénā rújāsi*, with the final lengthening of *yénā* that is far from rare (acdg. to Lub 21x, v. 98 *yéna*, but the numbers of *yénā* could well be higher, since his *yéna* list contains numerous examples in which the rel. is combined with a following vowel in sandhi).

I can claim no more certainty than Wackernagel or Scar, but given the general ban on NOUN-PREVERB-ROOT combinations in root noun cmpds., I think the Pp. analysis of the cmpd as containing *ā√rúj* is unlikely, and we must find another way to account for the long *ā*. I also think that the finite verb in the same pāda lacks the preverb. For the cmpd. I am at least open to the idea that *śaphā-* is an instr. and the cmpd means ‘breaking/shattering with a hoof / hooves’. The use of an animal body part as a weapon could associate the sorcerer with the bestial and the primitive (as in other vss. concerning the *yātudhāna-* in X.87 at any rate)—though I am perhaps too influenced by the Western Christian image of cloven-footed Satan. In our passage, since Indra is urged to use an (elephant) goad against the *śaphā-rúj-*, the enemies might again be considered animal-like (though not elephants obviously, since they don’t have hooves). In any case, as an alternative tr. I would consider and indeed favor “against those who break with their hooves.”

X.44.10–11: For these repeated vss. see comm. ad X.42.10, 11.

X.45–47: The first two hymns (45–46) are dedicated to Agni and attributed to the same poet, Vatsaprī Bhālandana. As Old argued (1888: 236 n. 2), the next one, X.47, dedicated to Indra, belongs here as well on the basis of structural considerations: the three appear between groups identified by the Anukramaṇī as trios and also share Triṣṭubh meter (though on X.46 see below), against the triads on each side with Jagatī. The Anukramaṇī names the poet of X.47 as Saptagu Āṅgīrasa, but this has simply been extracted from vs. 6, where the two halves of the supposed name are qualifiers of the god Bṛhaspati.

The poet of X.45–46, Vatsaprī Bhālananda, is also identified by the Anukramaṇī as the poet of the first of the trimeter hymns in Maṇḍala IX, IX.68. The last hemistich of IX.68 (10cd) is identical to that of X.45 (12cd). Old (1888: 253) explicitly associates IX.68 with the Xth Maṇḍala and, more narrowly, X.45. IX.68 is concerned with the double birth of Soma and hidden versus visible forms of the same god, and these themes are important in X.45 and X.46, esp. the former, which treats the triple births of Agni.

X.45 Agni

X.45.1: The three births of Agni. The ordinals *prathamám* ‘first’, *dvitīyam* ‘second’, and *trīyam* ‘third’, distributed through the first three pādas mark this structure well, but note that there is syntactic variation. The first pāda begins with ABL + POSTPOS. (*divás pári*), with close sandhi; in the second the ordinal intervenes in the same syntactic construction (*asmát ... pári*); whereas in the third the location of the birth (*apsú*) substitutes for the source. In b the form of Agni is identified explicitly as Jātavedas; in c the ‘waters’ point to Apām Napāt. The heavenly source of the first birth, in pāda a, suggests Agni Vaiśvānara, the solar form of fire, and *vaiśvānará-* appears in the last vs. of the hymn (12b), sketching an implied ring.

The second hemistich is structurally ambiguous; see Ge’s (n. 1cd) and Re’s extensive discussions. On the basis of pādas a and b, where Agni is in the nominative, we expect the third birth also to be couched in the nominative, with the verb *jajñe* in pāda a serving for both b and c. This expectation seems to be supported by nom. *ṛṣmanāḥ*, an epithet characteristic of gods (mostly Indra, however). Re in fact renders the pāda this way, ending the cl. before *ájasram* at the end of c: “une troisième fois (il est né) dans les eaux, (le dieu) qui pense en seigneur.” The *ájasram* must be an acc., object of the part. *índhānaḥ* ‘kindling’ that begins d, and so the Agni reference must have shifted to the accusative before the end of c. However, it would be awkward to have a nominative and an accusative, adjacent to each other in the same pāda, both referring to Agni, with a clause break between them. This awkwardness is greatly increased by the near paraphrase of 1cd in 3ab *samudré tvā ṛṣmanā apsv àntáḥ, ... idhe ...* “In the sea, in the waters has the one with a manly mind kindled you,” where *ṛṣmanāḥ* must refer to a priest-figure, not Agni, who is unambiguously the acc. *tvā* – a paraphrase that gives Re pause. (As an aside, *ṛṣmanas-* also refers to a human ritualist in X.92.14, by my interpr.) It therefore seems best to follow Old and Ge in taking cd as a single clause, with an unsignaled switch of Agni to the acc. throughout the hemistich and *ṛṣmanāḥ* qualifying the priestly subject of the participle and finite verb in d.

The verb of d, *jarate*, could belong to either ‘awake’ or ‘sing’; Ge and Re opt for the former, but, with Gr and Gotō (1st cl., 154), I assign it to ‘sing’. Very little rides on this decision.

X.45.2: The four pāda-initial *vidmā* ‘we know’ produce a strong impression of certainty.

Both Ge and Re supply ‘forms’ with *tredhā trayāṇi* “threefold triads.” This seems unduly limiting: the poet is referring to different sets of three that pertain to Agni. Most obvious, given the preceding vs., are his three births, but surely any mention of three and Agni will evoke the three ritual fires. Since *trayāṇi* is pl., we might hope for more than these two triads – three to be exact, but the third is harder to identify: perhaps it’s an oblique reference to the service to the fire at the three soma pressings. Or perhaps to the ritual fire, the household fire, and the cremation fire (or the wildfire), or to the sun, lightning, and the earthly fire. In any case the neatly numbered triads contrast with pāda b *dhāma víbhrtā purutrā* “domains dispersed in many places,” which I think refers to the fire found in every household; the *purutrā* indicates that there is no limit placed on the number. (For an almost identical expression, see X.80.4; see also III.55.4 and comm. thereon.)

The “highest hidden name” in c is implicitly single, thus contrasting with the multiplication of Agnis in pādas a and b. I don’t know if we are meant to identify this name, but it might be Vaiśvānara, as I suggested also for 1a. The appearance of this name in the last vs. (12b) would indicate that we are displaying the knowledge we assert in this vs.

Pāda d, concerning Agni’s source, returns us to vs. 1, particularly the opening phrase *divás pári* “from heaven.”

X.45.3: As noted ad vs. 1, the first hemistich of this vs. is a close paraphrase of 1cd. However, the vs. as a whole seems to reverse the neat progression of births in vs. 1. The first pāda here concerns the kindling in the waters (=1c); in our c the ordinal *tr̥tīya-* opens the pāda, as in 1c, but in the loc., modifying *rājasi* ‘realm’. The other occurrences of *tr̥tīya- rājas-* (IX.74.6, X.123.8; cf. also IX.86.27 *tr̥tīye pṛṣṭhé ádhi rocané diváh*), insofar as they can be interpr., seem to refer to heaven, or the highest part of heaven, and so it seems likely that cd here refers to Agni’s residence and growth in heaven, which would then correspond to 1a. The middle pāda, b, would thus seem to match the birth in between, found in 1b, but the match is not exact if 1b depicts the kindling of the fire on the ritual ground. Ge (n. 3b) identifies the “the udder of heaven” (*diváh ... ūdhan*) as a cloud, though this is disputed by Lü (390–91), who wants to see yet another Himmelsquell. Ge’s cloud would at least place this kindling in the midspace. But as often these riddling locales are hard to penetrate. Re thinks there are only two events in this vs. – Agni, residing in the waters (a), is kindled in b; Agni residing in heaven (c) is raised by buffalo in d. But the parallelism with vs. 1 favors a trio.

Buffalos, Agni, and the lap of the waters are found together in two other passages, neither of which is much help with this one (or vice versa). In VI.8.4 unidentified buffalos “grasped” Agni in the lap of the waters (*apām upasthé mahiṣā agr̥bhñata*); in X.8.1 Agni is himself the buffalo, but the verb is $\sqrt{v}ṛdh$ as in our passage here: *apām upasthe mahiṣo vavardha*. The only possible clue in these passages is that VI.8.4 concerns Agni Vaiśvānara in particular (VI.8.4cd), and if our cd concerns the birth/growth in heaven, this would be (as noted above) Agni as Vaiśvānara. Also relevant may be X.5.1 also treating the birth of Agni in enigmatic terms.

X.45.4: I would now change my tr. of *ákrandat* “has roared” to a simple preterite “roared,” flg. immed. on similarly augmented imperfect *avardhan* ending 3d.

With Old I interpr. *kṣāmā* as an elliptical dual; the two world halves of d (*ródasī*) support this interpr. Ge and Re take it as a sg., referring only to earth, presumably following Gr’s explanation of the final *-ā* as metrical lengthening. Although the earth is the primary locale for the spreading and “licking” of fire, the rising flames can also be seen as licking at heaven.

X.45.5: *udārā-* is found only here in the RV, though it is fairly common later. Ge renders it ‘freigebig’ on the basis of later usage, but the usage of the fairly common verbal lexeme *úd√r* in the RV is surely a better comparandum – as in, for example, nearby X.37.4 *yéna sūrya ... , jágac ca víśvam udiyárṣi bhānúnā* “and with which radiance you rouse up every moving creature, o Sūrya” or, with bounties/gifts as obj. (more or less as here), VI.44.12 *úd abhrāñīva stanáyann iyartíndro rádhāmsy ásvyāni gávyā* “Like the thunderer the rain clouds, Indra raises bounties of horses and cattle.” It’s esp. noteworthy that transitive *iyarti* is found two vss. later in our hymn (7c), with Agni as subject (and smoke as obj.), and the flg. pāda begins with *úd*, though probably to be construed with the participle *ínakṣan*.

Given its accentuation *sóma-gopāh* should be a bahuvrīhi – as I take it (also Old, Re, and Scar [304]), *pace* Gr, Ge. The latter (n. 5b) notes that all commentators take it as a tatpuruṣa, though he reluctantly acknowledges that it could be a bv.

X.45.6: The word order of pāda a favors an interpr. of a pair of GEN – NOUN constructions; so Ge “Das Banner des Alls, das Kind der Welt” (also Gr). This interpr. would also fit well with the chiasitic pair of GEN – NOUN NOUN – GEN that opens the previous vs. (5a). But the very common phrase *vísva- bhúvana-* cuts the other way (so Re as well as the publ. tr.), suggesting that we should take the two genitives together and that this gen. phrase is dependent on *kétuḥ*, with *gárbhaḥ* is to be taken separately. Either interpr. would fit here, and there is little practical difference.

Ge (n. 6cd) identifies the second hemistich as an instantiation of the Paṇi myth. The parallel he cites, I.71.2, certainly concerns the breaking of the Vala cave by the Aṅgirasas, and it is in an Agni hymn. But Agni is not, to my knowledge, elsewhere a principal actor in the Vala affair; he is at best connected by his kinship with the Aṅgirasas and the association of both the Vala myth and Agni with dawn (see, e.g., IV.1, an Agni hymn with an embedded account of the Vala myth). In our vs. I do not know what mythic (or ritual) event is referred to by “he split even the solid rock in leaving it.” The Vala theme recurs in 11cd, where the priests open the cowpen.

X.45.7: I construe *pāvakāḥ* with flg. *aratīḥ* on the basis of the phrase in the paired hymn, X.46.4c *aratīm pāvakām* (a vs. that also contains *usīj-* in its first pāda). Ge/Re/Th (Unters. 35) instead take *pāvakāḥ* with *usík*; there is precedent for this as well: I.60.4 *usík pāvakāḥ*, cited by Ge (n. 7a). However, the parallel in X.46, immediately following and attributed to the same poet, should have more weight. Little rides on the decision, however.

X.45.8: I would now take *dr̥śānó rukmāḥ* as a non-overtly marked simile “appearing (like) a bright ornament,” similar to Ge’s “(Wie) ein Goldschmuck aussehend.” Several parallels adduced by Ge (n. 8a) do have overt similes: IV.10.5 *śriyé rukmó ná rocata upāké* “For beauty it shines like a gold ornament in the nearness” and VII.3.6 *ví yád rukmó ná rócasa upāké* “when, like a jewel, you glow nearby” (jpb), and *dr̥śānāḥ* in our passage acts as a de facto simile marker. Note that both the just-cited passages have a verbal form of \sqrt{ruc} making an etym. figure with *rukmá-*, as does our passage, though postponed till the end of b: *śriyé rucānāḥ*. Dat. *śriyé* is also found in IV.10.5.

The phrase *durmárṣam āyuh* is variously construed. I take it as acc. extent of time; Re supplies a verb to which it serves as obj.: “(en sorte d’atteindre) une durée-de-vie inoubliable.” Gr seems to take it as a sort of Inhaltsakk. (s.v. \sqrt{ruc} meaning 2 [found only here]: “etwas [A] ausstrahlen, herbeistrahlen”). I’m not sure what syntactic role the phrase is meant to be playing in Ge’s “in unvergesslicher Lebenskraft zur Pracht erglänzend.” Sāy. takes *durmárṣam* as an adv., glossed *durabhibhavam*, separate from *āyuh*. Of these choices I favor my extent of time, as requiring less machinery and also belonging to a recognized syntactic class.

Assuming, contra Sāy., that *durmárṣam* is to be construed with *āyuh*, why is this lifetime ‘hard to forget’ (or, less likely, ‘hard to neglect’)? Most likely unforgettable because of its extraordinary length – or its brilliance? The two other occurrences of this stem are not much help. In IX.97.8 (q.v.) it qualifies *vāṇām* ‘music’, but a “music” that may be likened to the raucous honking of geese – hence either ‘difficult to forget’ or ‘... to neglect’ is possible. In VIII.45.18, acdg. to my emended tr. (see comm. ad loc.), *durmárṣa-* also modifies a sonic element, in that case a call (*imām hávam*) and means “difficult to neglect” (i.e., to fail to pay attention to), and a number of the verbal forms to the root $\sqrt{mṛṣ}$ also take speech or the like as obj. (I.145.2 *vācaḥ*, III.33.8 *vācaḥ*, VII.22.5 *gíraḥ ... suṣṭutīm*). However, ‘lifetime’ does not fit this semantic pattern.

X.45.10: The transaction envisaged between Agni and his worshiper is more complex than it first appears. Agni is urged to give him a portion in two different things: *sauśravéṣu* (a) and *ukthá-ukthe ... śasyámāne* (b). The second, “in every solemn speech being proclaimed,” identifies it as a ritual act, which suggests that “in (things) deserving good fame” the otherwise unidentified *sauśravá-* falls in the same semantic domain, that of ritual activity (so Ge: “an ruhmreichen Werken”). This further suggests a two-step process: Agni does not directly give the worshiper in question a share in various desirable things (cows, horses, gold, or, in this case [see d] sons), but in the ritual acts that will indirectly yield such things, by pleasing the gods who bestow them.

Although the root noun cmpd *udbhíd-* is attested a robust 8x in the RV, this is the only instance of a verbal form of this lexeme in our text. On the lexeme see comm. ad VIII.79.1, with lit. The literal sense ‘burst out/up’ leads to the metaphorical use ‘be (dramatically) successful, have a breakthrough, get a lucky break’, esp. in gambling context, and that (minus the gambling) must be meant here. Notice that *√bhid* recurs here from 6c, where Agni is subject.

X.45.11: Ge (n. 11cd) again identifies the 2nd hemistich as the Paṇimythos (that is, the Vala myth); see above ad 6cd.

X.46 Agni

Although the Anukramaṇī gives the meter of this hymn as Triṣṭubh, it is actually a mixture of Triṣṭubhs and Virāj (5 / 5) vss. and those that could be either one (depending on distraction or not) or neither. As an ex., consider vs. 1 with three 10-syl. pādas (caesura after 5) followed by a regular Triṣṭubh (likewise caesura after 5). For further on the meter of the hymn see Old, Prol. 91 and Noten ad loc.

X.46.1: The hymn opens with the preverb *prá*, with no associated verb in the first pāda. Although *prá* does occur marginally with *√sad*, which supplies the verb in b (and Gr so identifies this passage), Ge (see his n. 1ab), Re, and the publ. tr. supply a verb of motion with *prá* rather than construing it with *sīdat* in b. For good reason: in addition to the fact that the expression ‘go forth’, realized by various verbs of motion (esp. *√i*), is extremely common, elliptical *prá* is the structural skeleton of the hymn, opening the middle vs. (5) and the last pāda (10d); see disc. ad locc.

The hapax *nabho-víd-* is generally taken as ‘cloud-*knower*’ (Gr, Ge, Re); Scar’s gloss (484) hedges (“des Gewölks kundig; Wolken findend”), but he tr. “Kenner des Nassen” in the passage. Ge explains (n. 1ab) that Agni is at home in the cloud(s), since one of his births takes place there (see X.45.3b, acdg. to Ge, with comm. ad loc.). But are “knowing” and “being at home in” the clouds the same thing? Without any certainty I have opted for ‘cloud-*finder*’, the image being Agni’s smoke and flames rising to the clouds on their way to heaven.

Pāda c (*dádhir yó dhāyi śá te váyāṃsi*) is oddly constructed: the rel. cl. / main cl. dyad, with *yáḥ* corresponding to *śá* is of course unexceptionable, but the *dádhiḥ* that opens the pāda is taken by all (Ge, Re, publ. tr.) as the referent of *śá* and the verb substitute in the main cl., with *váyāṃsi* as obj. On the one hand, this makes good sense: redupl. nominals of this type regularly show verbal rection; see, for example, the three such phrases in VI.23.4 *babhír vájram papíḥ sómaṃ dadír gāḥ* “bearing his mace, drinking soma, giving cows,” with the well-attested *dadí-* ‘giving’, rhyme form to our hapax *dádhi-* (though with different accent). Moreover, the VP *váyas* *√dhā* is very common, also in the root noun cmpd *vayo-dhā-*. But the interpr. represented by,

e.g., the publ. tr. “He who has been established establishes vital powers for you” would be an egregious example of an embedded relative clause, with *yó dhāyi* inserted between the main cl. subject and the rest of that cl., and, further, a tr. literally reflecting the word order would be awkward. I now think that *dádhih* is a predicate nominative with the rel. cl. verb *dhāyi* and that we must supply a verb form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ in the main clause, with subj. *sá*. I would now alter the tr. to “Who has been established as the establisher, he (establishes / has established) vital powers for you.” Although this creates more machinery, I think it better represents the word order.

The agent noun *yantár-* is found with both nominal and verbal rection, even though the suffix-accented form should only take the genitive. Our form takes the acc. here.

X.46.1–3: Vss. 2 and 3 are partially concerned with the well-known myth of the flight and concealment of the ritual fire and his finding and reinstatement. But the ritual here-and-now exerts its oppositional pull: both vss. begin with the near-deictic *imám* ‘this one here’, pointing to the fire on the ritual ground at the time of recitation. The vss. are also connected by concatenation, which also ties vs. 1 to vs. 2: 1d *vidhaté* / 2a *vidhánto*, along with 1b *apám upásthe* / 2a *apám sadhásthe* // 2d *ichánto ... avindan* / 3a *avindat ichán*. The question is whether vs. 1 also contains a reference to the flight and concealment myth, esp. in 1b where Agni “sits/sat in the lap of the waters” – comparable to the *apám sadhásthe* in 2a. I’m inclined to think not: that *apám upásthe* in 1b is instead alluding to the same event as in the preceding hymn, X.45.3d, which seems to deal with one of Agni’s births. But since I’m rather hazy about what’s going on in that vs., I am far from certain about this one.

X.46.2: The first pāda is identical to II.4.2, which likewise makes reference to the flight and concealment myth. In both I would now emend the tr. “having done honor” to “doing honor,” in part to match the dat. *vidhaté* “to the man who does honor” in 1d, but also because the act of honoring Agni does not have to precede the following / finding him treated in the rest of the vs. In fact, I would be tempted to assign *vidhántaḥ* to the ritual here-and-now represented by *imám* except that \sqrt{vidh} does not take an acc. of the honoree, but a dative, so *imám* cannot be the direct obj. of the participle. Assuming the participle belongs with the rest of the mythic material in the vs., the likeliest sequence is that they do honor to Agni hidden in the water *after* they have pursued and located him.

Our pādas bc are also quite close in wording to I.65.1–2, which also treats this Agni myth. See comm. ad loc.

X.46.3: Like vs. 2 the first half of this vs. concerns the seeking and finding of the vanished Agni, but it is not clear that it refers to the same episode. The finder, Trita Vaibhūsa, is different (from the Bhṛguṣ in 2d), and also, it seems, the find spot: “on the head of an inviolable cow” (*mūrdhāny ághnyāyāḥ*). Ge (n. 3) suggests that this resembles the version of the story in which Agni spends one of his nights on the lam between the horns of a ram (TS VI.2.8.4, ŚB III.5.2.18, etc.), but the two versions seem too divergent. Re cites as parallel I.30.19 *aghnyāsya mūrdhāni* “on the head of the inviolable (bull),” of the place where the Aśvins anchor one wheel of their chariot. This is a good match verbally (save for the gender); I suggest there that this is a mystical expression for the ritual ground, but that is unlikely here. Perhaps it simply refers to the earth. It might be worth noting that Trita destroys a three-headed monster in X.8.8–9 (though the ‘head’ word is *síras-*), and that in that same hymn Agni seizes the head (*mūrdhān-*) of his parents

(X.8.3) and sets his own head (also *mūrdhān-*) in heaven (X.8.6), but I can't make anything of that for our vs, here.

Trita's patronymic (different from Trita Āptya found elsewhere) is *vaibhūvasá-*, found only here – abbreviated from **vaibhū-vasava-* (Mayr, PN s.v.), to the bvr. *vibhū-vasu-* 'possessing conspicuous goods', twice of Soma. Trita (without patronymic) is also found in the nearby hymn X.48.2 (by a different poet) as a recipient of cows, though it is not clear if the two Tritas are connected.

The second hemistich brings us back to the ritual ground and current time.

The sense of *śevṛdha-*, presumably haplogogized from **śéva-vṛdha-*, is hard to pin down; see disc. ad V.87.4. I would here slightly alter the publ. tr. to "with kind attention' for the sake of the English.

X.46.4: The phrase *usíjo námobhiḥ* is repeated in pāda a from 2c, both in the post-caesura position.

Most of the first hemistich consists of accusatives (mostly?) referring to Agni; *akṛṇvan* has to be imported from the second hemistich to govern them, as well as governing the accusatives in cd. There are several ways to interpr. the acc. in ab. One way, fld. by Ge and Old, is to allow the agent noun *netāram* to take both an acc. obj. (*prāñcam yajñám* to its left) and a gen. obj. (*adhvarāñām* to its right), although the suffix-accented *-tár-*stem should only take the gen. (but see *yantár-* above, 1d). Hence Ge's "der das Opfer vorwärts führt, zum Leiter des Gottesdienstes." The other, fld. by Re and the publ. tr., is to take *prāñcam yajñám* and *netāram adhvarāñām* as two separate objects of *akṛṇvan*, both with secondary predication: "made the sacrifice (to) advance and (Agni) the leader of the ceremonies." Old provides a good parallel (VII.19.1) for a suffix-accented *-tár-*stem with acc. and gen. rection simultaneously; Ge adduces several passages (X.66.12, 101.2) where *prāñcam yajñám* is the object of *prá √ nī*. These parallels support the Ge/Old interpr., which is also favored by the fact that construing *yajñám* directly with *√ kṛ* would interrupt the parade of statements about Agni. On the other hand, see I.18.8 *prāñcam kṛṇoty adhvarám* "he makes the ceremony advance" and III.1.2 *prāñcam yajñám cakṛma* "we have made the sacrifice advance," with the construction presupposed by the publ. tr., and see Re's comm. In the end I think either interpr. is possible, and I would allow an alternative "... made him the gladdening Hotar-priest, the one who leads the sacrifice forward, and the leader of the ceremonies."

On *aratím pāvakám* see X.45.7 in the immed. preceding hymn.

Re construes *havyavāham* separately from *dádhatāḥ* ("ils firent (de lui) ... convoyeur d'offrandes, en (le) plaçant chez les humains"), but 10a *dadhírē havyavāham* speaks for the VP.

X.46.5: Note that the 2nd pentad of the first three pādas begins with a disyllabic noun with light first syllable ending in *-ām*: a *mahām*, b *purām*, c *vanām*, the second two of which are gen. pl. to root nouns. The fourth pāda is likewise 10 syllables but, with an apparent opening of 4, is a Virāṣthāna vs. (so Arnold, HvN). Analyzed in this way, the simile particle (which is badly positioned anyway – see below) would follow the caesura, coalesced with the flg. noun. Now it is my impression (though I have not sorted through the 2000+ exx. of *ná*) that simile-marking *ná*, like *iva*, does not immediately follow the caesura. Moreover, Arnold (§122) states that *ná* 'as' is ordinarily found in hiatus with flg. vowel (approx. 60x) and combined only 3x – our passage and I.104.5, X.106.7 "no one of the instances being quite certain." If we distract *nārvāṇam* to *ná árvāṇam*, we would get a regular 11-syllable Triṣṭubh, but with a quite irregular break (_ _) after

a five-syllable opening (if we assign *ná* to the opening to avoid a post-caesura position). But *árvāṇam* may be our problem (or one of them). It's notable that *árvāṇam* is the only acc. sg., indeed the only non-nom. sg., to the putative stem *árvan-*, beside quite frequent nom. sg. *árvā*, which serves as the de facto nom. sg. to *árvant-*. I wonder if we should read **árvām* here, along with distracted *ná*, that is, a pentad vs., *hírīśmaśruṃ ná *árvām dhánarcam*. This would allow the *ná* to avoid both post-caesura position and coalescence and also provide us with another pentad-opening disyllable nominal ending in *-ām*. This proposed form **árvām* would be a nonce, created to the nom. sg. *árvā*, and liable to redactional correction, in this case to match *dharmāṇam*, which ends pāda b.

This vs. presents us with a number of other problems, beginning with the 1st pentad: the sequence as analyzed by the Pp., *prá / bhūḥ / jáyantam*, cannot be easily construed. If *bhūr* (*/bhūḥ*) is taken as a 2nd sg. root aor. injunctive (the only possible verb form, though see Scar below), we are lacking a likely addressee (Sāy., in his first analysis, supplies voc. *stotar*), and the sense of *prá √ bhū* 'overcome, dominate' would not work well with Agni as object. Various solutions have been suggested, which I will not rehearse; see Old, Ge n. 5a and vol. IV.269, Re ad loc., Scar 262 and n. 361. The most appealing and perhaps the oldest is *bhūrjáyantam*, registered already by Sāy. as Udgītha's reading. But Udgītha further analyzes it as *bhūrādīmī lokāñ jáyantam*. Ludwig (cited by Old and Ge) takes the same proposed *bhūrjáyā-* rather as a denom. to the unclear *bhūrjī-* (AV, SV; see EWA s.v.). Whatever its further analysis is, the univerbation to an *-áya*-participle with root syllable *bhūrj*, which requires no alteration to the Saṃhitā text, seems the best of the proposals. In the publ. tr. my "*glittering" reflects an analysis as an intrans. *-áya*-formation built to the zero-grade of *√ bhrāj* 'shimmer, glitter', which is used frequently of Agni, the same zero-grade as is found in *bhūrjā-* 'birch' (see EWA s.v.). Scar's (n. 361) first proposal is close to mine: a denom., to **b^hrHǵ-ó-* (rather than an *-áya*-formation built to the zero-grade root, like me), meaning (acdg. to the tr. in the text) "der hell hervorstrahlt (?)" ; unaccountably he gives the resulting form with short vowel, as **bhurjáy^o*. But the rest of his n. 361 is devoted to an alternative: an attempt to pry a 3rd pl. root aor. out of *bhūr*, which is unlikely. Another alternative analysis has recently been suggested by R. Ginevra (UCLA Conf. Proc. 2016), that *bhūrjáyā-* is the *s*-mobile-free version of *sphūrjáyā-* 'crackle, roar', used of Agni in X.87.11 – both belonging to a putative PIE root **(s)b^hr(h₂)g*. He also derives the name *bhṛgu-* from this root; note the occurrence of the name in 2d. (Ginevra's proposed tr. for our passage, "sizzling," seems inapt, but 'crackling' or 'roaring' would do nicely.) Ginevra's proposal is appealing and certainly possible, but I will stick with the *√ bhrāj* derivation. For further on his proposed root, see comm. ad X.68.1.

With the supposed injunctive *bhūḥ* off the table, the initial *prá* needs a home. As I said above (ad vs. 1), elliptical *prá* serves as the structural skeleton of this hymn. Our vs. has echoes of 1a: cf. 1a *prá ... mahān nabhovíd* 5a *prá ... mahāṃ vipodhām*. As for the construction of *prá* here I would supply (or simply read backwards) *náyantah*, which opens the 2nd hemistich (see also *netāram* in 4b). Given the accent on *prá*, this seems preferable to reading it as in technical tmesis with the immediately following participle (as Scar seems to do).

We have already discussed the metrical and morphological problems with d, but the *ná* there poses another difficulty: the adj. it follows does not appear to be part of the simile, despite the well-nigh unbreakable rule that *ná* does not begin a simile. (It of course usually follows the first word, but can sometimes follow the second – and occasionally there is intervening material between the first word and the simile – but never [as far as I know] does it precede the first word.) Here by all accounts the simile consists only of *árvāṇam* (or **árvām*; see above) or at most

ārvāṇam dhānarcam (see Ge n. 5d). The adj. *hīriśmaśru-* ‘gold-bearded’ is used of Agni also in V.7.7, with the image presumably the flames shooting out of the center of the fire. It is highly unlikely that it is meant to describe the steed in the simile: “like a gold-bearded steed.” I do not have a real solution to the *ná*-flip, but if my proposal for the metrical and morphological situation in d given above is accepted, the rhetorically driven pattern of X-*ām* opening the second pentad of each pāda might have caused the displacement of *ná*, to allow **ārvām* to occupy that slot.

Finally we have the hapax *dhānarcam*, on which see esp. Old, with previous proposals. Perhaps influenced by the SV variant *dhanarcīm*, several interpr. take the 2nd member as ‘shining’ vel sim.: Gr ‘Glanz der Beute, des Reichtums habend, glänzende Beute tragend’, Re ‘qui ... brille sous l’enjeu’. Both Ge and Old by contrast connect the 2nd member to ‘sing’; Old’s interpr. (q.v.) seems over-busy. Ge (n. 5d) points out (correctly) that only the first part of the compd. is strictly applicable to the ‘steed’ in the simile: the steed receives a prize (*dhāna-*) appropriate to the race, whereas the *ṛc-* is only appropriate to Agni. Ge tr. “der sich den Preis aussingen,” with a verbal interpr. of the 2nd member. I prefer my double noun (*dhāna-* + *ṛc-*) interpr.: “for whom a verse is the prize”; in other words, Agni is rewarded with praise poetry after his victory in the equivalent of a race. Very sim. is Scar’s (262) “wobei die ihm zugeeignete (=dessen) Ṛc der {von ihm gewonnene} Kampfpreis ist.”

X.46.6: It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that nom. Trita in pāda a = Agni here; Agni is clearly the nom. referent in c, and Trita apparently performs the same action (sitting: *sīdat*) as Agni did in 1b. But in vs. 3 Trita is emphatically *not* Agni; rather he finds the vanished Agni. Ge (n. 6a) cites Ludwig’s opinion that Agni is called Trita because Trita discovered him, but this seems a bit ad hoc. In any case the first hemistich depicts the fire’s installation (note *nī* in a, in tmesis with *sīdat* in b) on the ritual ground.

On *pastyā-* see comm. ad I.40.7, IX.97.18.

On *pārivīta-* see comm. ad IV.3.2. I think it likely that this refers to the surrounding of the ritual fire by the *paridhī-* ‘enclosing sticks’.

While the 1st hemistich depicts – again! – the installation of the fire on the ritual ground, the second one, in my view, treats Agni’s journey to the gods in heaven conveying the oblations to them. By this interpr. *nīn* ‘superior men’ at the end of the d refers to the gods, as so often. The verbal form *īyā^{te}* is regularly used of this journey of Agni’s; cf., e.g., VII.3.3 *sām dūtō agna īyase hī devān* “For as our messenger, o Agni, you speed to the gods.”

The next puzzle is *saṃgībhya:* what, if anything, is its object? Both Ge and Re take *nīn* at the end of d as the object (both construing it also with *īyate*). Old instead supplies ‘goods’ vel sim.: “von dort zusammenfassend (Güter, Gaben ...),” adducing I.53.3, also beginning *ātaḥ saṃgībhya*, where *vāsu*, which ends the preceding pāda, is to be read as object. Cf. also III.54.15 *saṃgībhya na ā bhara bhūri pasvāḥ* “Having massed it together, bring to us here an abundance of livestock.” The publ. tr. follows Old: “having amassed (goods?),” but I now wonder if, with my current interpr. of the purport of cd, “the oblations” or similar should be supplied instead.

vidharmanā ‘through/with the/his spreading expanse’ can refer either to the expanse of the midspace between earth and heaven through which Agni’s smoke passes or the expansion of the smoke itself. On this stem see comm. ad IX.4.9, 64.9.

On *ayantrā-* Old says firmly “offenbar Bahuvr.” The question is what missing nominal notion it modifies. Old supplies “mit Kräften, Helfern,” while Ge (n. 6d) suggests ‘hands’ or ‘reins’. I think it more likely to be horses : Agni’s reinless horses are the billows of smoke,

which do not make straight and controlled progress towards heaven and are therefore ‘without reins/guiding straps’.

X.46.7: This vs. contains several bold (one might say “jarring”) images describing the fires.

The first is *ajarāsaḥ ... aritrāḥ* the “unaging oars” or “unaging rudders” of the houses (*damām*). Neither ‘oar’ nor ‘rudder’ is easy to understand here, and our lack of knowledge of the technology of boats at this period doesn’t help. If ‘oars’ is the right choice, perhaps the fires are considered to be the things that keep the houses moving; if ‘rudders’, they keep the houses steering on the right course. Ge (n. 7a), Re, and Scar (571 n. 808) all adduce the potentially helpful I.140.12 *rāthāya nāvam utā no grhāya nityāritrām padvātīm rāsi agne / asmākaṃ vīrām utā no maghóno jánāms ca yā pārayāc chārma yā ca* “For our chariot and for our house, o Agni, give us a boat with built-in oars and a foot [=keel? rudder?], / which will carry our heroes and our bounteous (patrons) and our peoples to the further shore and which (will be) our shelter.” In this fuller expression the boat is a metaphor for something that will carry the people out of danger and to the safety of the far shore. The *aritra-* are likely oars, since the ‘foot’ is probably either a rudder or a keel/centerboard. Ge cleverly suggests that “for our chariot and for our house” refers to times of war and peace respectively. The *grhá-* ‘house’ there can correspond to our *dám-* ‘id.’, and the fires as oars here propel the houses (or rather their denizens) to success in a peaceful domestic setting. It would be nice to find a visual analogue to the oars in the ritual fire, but flames don’t look much like oars to me (at least the oars I’m used to); the only other visual candidate I can think of is the sticks of firewood – but the explicit identification in the verse is with “fires” (*agnayah*), not their fuel.

The sense of the first member of the hapax cmpd *arcáddhūma-* is not entirely clear. Gr’s ‘glänzenden Rauch haben’ associates it with ‘shining’ forms like *arcí(s)-* ‘beam’, etc., but the (pseudo-)participial form suggest an affiliation rather with the verbal forms *ārcati*, etc., which always mean ‘sing, chant, recite,’ not ‘shine’. So Ge “rauchsingend,” Re “(feux) dont chante la fumée,” the publ. tr. “with singing smoke.” Scar allows both, though apparently favoring the former: “mit dem glänzenden (/sirrenden?) Rauch.” It is hard to know what this synaesthetic description is meant to convey, but I wonder if it is the hissing sound that accompanies the first appearance of smoke from a newly lit fire. Besides the issue of root affiliation there is the question of what type of cmpd it is. I (and Gr) take it as a bahuvrīhi with adjectival first member, but Ge as a 1st member governing cmpd. (perhaps following Bergaigne; see AiG II.1.319). Although I am generally sympathetic to such interpr., in this case I find it hard to see how “smoke” could provide a meaningful direct obj. to “sing’: acc.s with *ārcati* are either objects of praise (like gods) or the verbal products that provide praise (songs, etc.).

The adjectives of pāda c easily modify fire, but pāda d presents us with a new challenge: what at first glance appears to be a single simile *vāyāvo ná sómāḥ*, with two incompatible terms, “like winds, soma drinks.” This is universally (Old, Ge, Re, Scar) and convincingly interpr. as two distinct similes, each capturing a different facet of the shared quality *vanarśād-* ‘sitting in/on the wood’. Fire of course “sits in the wood” by virtue of its location on the firewood that feeds it. Soma drinks do so by taking their place in the wooden cups after the preparation of the soma, ready for offering (see a number of such passages in IX with *vāneṣu √ sad*). As for “winds,” Ge finds this comparison suspect (verdächtig), a sentiment shared by Scar (571 n. 808). As Scar points out, we might have expected a comparison to birds – and perhaps *vāyāvah* is meant in part to call to mind phonologically similar *vāyah* ‘birds’). To circumvent the problem, Ge tries, not

very hard, to produce an alternative analysis (n. 7d), and already Gr simply declared *vāyávas* an old genitive form). Old sees a sort of secondary comparison: the fires are compared to soma drinks, and since both flames and soma drinks can be driven by the wind (see Old's citations), they are then compared to the wind. This seems too complex to me; I think the wind simile is (somewhat) more straightforward: wind is more perceptible, both visually and aurally, when it blows through trees than in open country. Winds therefore can also be considered *vanarṣád-*, though 'sitting' might be an odd description, perhaps 'situated'. Given the "off" comparisons elsewhere in this vs., this one seems reasonably sensible.

X.46.8–10: The complex imagery and verbal expression of the earlier parts of the hymn are no longer evident in these final vss., and the meter settles down to straight Triṣṭubhs. From the 2nd hemistich of 8 through the first one of 10, Agni is the acc. object of several different verbs describing his birth, fashioning, and establishment by a variety of gods, natural forces, and primordial ritualists. Note also the near-repetitions: 8d *dadhire yájiṣṭhan#* / 10a *dadhiré havývāham#* // 9d *mánave yájatram#* / 10b *mānuṣāso yájatram#*

X.46.8: On *vépas-* see comm. ad I.80.8. Here, as there, the verbal component of Ge's "Wortschwall" seems unrec.: the point is that his flame (=tongue), constantly in motion, shows Agni's state of trembling excitation. The middle voice of *prá ... bharate* is appropriate because the *vépas-* is Agni's own.

In b Ge supplies a new verb "(er kennt)," but the repetition of the preverb *prá*, found initially in tmesis in pāda a, strongly favors a gapped form of $\sqrt{bhṛ}$. If that surmise is correct, what's happening in b is that the bright light of the fire (its "appearance" – *cétas-*) allows the patterns of the earth (*vayúnāni ... pṛthivyāḥ*) to be discerned.

X.46.9: Notice the reappearance of the Bhṛgus from vs. 2.

X.46.10: The ref. to Agni switches from 3rd ps. to 2nd in pāda a, transitioning to the direct appeal to the god for benefits in c.

The very well-attested rt. noun cmpd. *puru-spṛṅh-* generally has the passive sense 'much craved / sought after', but at least in this passage an act. sense 'craving much' works better. So also Scar (670), Ge (n. 10b).

The VP *váyo dhāḥ#* in c responds to 1c *dádhiḥ ... váyāms#* (on the syntax of 1c see disc. ad loc.), forming a ring. It also echoes the middle verse 5a *vípodhām#* and 5c *dhíyaṃ dhuḥ#*.

On elliptical *prá* as a structural element in this hymn, see comm. ad vss. 1, 5. In this vs. the main cl. of d consists only of the preverb and a nom. sg. part.: *prá devayán -- yaśásah* does not belong there, for reasons given below. All the standard tr./comm. (Old, Ge, Re, publ. tr.) take *prá devayán* as an elliptical clause, only differing on what to supply to fill the ellipsis. I think it best to match the initial pāda of the hymn as closely as possible. There I supplied a verb of motion with *prá* ('goes forth'), here the same, though with a diff. English rendering, 'advances', to indicate that the subj. goes forth towards glory.

The phrase *yaśásah sám hí pūrvāḥ* is found also in III.1.11, thus showing that *yaśásah* does not belong directly with what precedes. In III.1.11 JPB tr. "for glory gets the girls." Although not entirely literal, this is far superior to the ploddingly accurate "many (fem.) (assemble) together for a glorious one," and I have adopted it. The phrase has the feel of a gnomic utterance, an old saying (Ge [n. 10d] Sprichwort) – a saying that leaves open the exact

identity of what the glorious man receives. *pūrvīh* is fem. pl., but there are many desirable feminine entities: women/girls, of course, but any fem. noun is fair game: cows, hymns, refreshments, waters, and so on (for other somewhat farfetched possibilities, see Re's comm. ad loc.). In VI.34.1, which contains a similar phrase, the fem. referent is spelled out: *sām ca tvé jagmúr gíra indra pūrvīh* "many songs have converged on you, Indra." But I doubt that hymns are what are meant here. In the words of Re, more tentative than necessary, "Peut-être n'était-il pas dans ses intentions de circonscrire le choix."

X.47 Indra

On the authorship of the hymn, see above ad X.45–47 and also the publ. intro. On the structure of the hymn and the persistent ambiguity of reference between Indra and 'wealth' see publ. intro. Ge (intro. to hymn) thinks all the acc. phrases qualify 'wealth', specifically wealth in sons, but I find this interpr. reductive.

Note that the d pāda throughout is a refrain.

X.47.1–5: As noted in the publ. intro., the non-refrain portions of vss. 2–5 consist entirely of accusative phrases dependent on vs. 1 (though *which* accusative in vs. 1 is the question). Given the syntactic independence of almost all RVic vss. (*muktaka* verses avant la lettre), this run-on sentence is noteworthy – though perfectly easy to interpret. If it were couched in the nominative, it would be an unremarkable example of RVic nominal style.

X.47.1: The syntagm "X-lord of X-es" appears twice in two pādas: b voc. *vasupate vásūnām* and c acc. *gópatim ... gónām*, the latter with the younger gen. pl. *gónām* rather than *gávām*, which wouldn't work metrically here. The presumed older form of this phrase, *gávām* (...) *gópati-*, does occur on several occasions (I.101.4, VII.98.6, X.108.3; also reversed in X.166.1 *gópatim gávām*).

X.47.2: My tr. of pāda b, "supporting four seas worth of riches," is not literal, in that *cātuḥsamudram* is a separate qualifier. On the phrase *dharúna-rayīnām* see comm. ad X.5.1. In that passage the phrase is preceded by NUM. *samudrá-* (*ékaḥ samudráḥ*), rather like our cmpd. *cātuḥsamudra-* but a free phrase. Both seem to depict the sea as a particularly vast trove of riches.

X.47.4: Pāda b is found also in VI.19.8, where it modifies *śúṣma-* 'unbridled force'; see Bloomfield's (RV Repts.) somewhat acid remarks there about our hymn ("rigmarole"). In c *dasyuhánam pūrbhídám* favor Indra as referent, but 'wealth' is not entirely excluded.

X.47.5: The poet seems to have run out of steam here: *vīpravīram* (c) is repeated from 4a and lexically doubled by *vīrávantam* (a). On the other hand, *s^uvarṣām* 'sun-winning' nicely echoes 3c *śrutárṣi-* (to be read *śrutárṣim*).

X.47.6: Save for the initial *prá* this vs. seems to be starting like vss. 2–5, with a continuation of the string of accusatives, but pāda b confounds this expectation: we have a different acc. referent *bṛhaspátim*, a nominative (!) *matíḥ*, and a verb *jigāti*.

X.47.7: The hapax *vānīvānaḥ* clearly belongs to the root \sqrt{van} , or one of the roots \sqrt{van} , but its morphological identity is uncertain. Wh (Roots; fld. by MonWms) takes it as a primary nominal deriv. of an otherwise unattested intens. *vanīvan-*. The disyllabic redupl. ending in long \bar{i} would conform to exx. like *pānīphaṇ-* (\sqrt{phan}), *varīvart-* (\sqrt{vrt}) and thus would not decide for set \sqrt{van} ‘love, long for’ rather than \sqrt{van} ‘win’. Schaeffer calls our *vānīvānas* (wrongly cited as **vanīvanās*) an inten. part. (p. 27 n. 29) and lists *vānīvan-* as an intens. stem (p. 34). The form is not mentioned in AiG. An alternative interpr. takes it as a possessive nominal $-van$ -stem built to the $-i$ -stem *vanī-* ‘wish’ (so Gr), a stem found mostly as 2nd cmpd member (on this stem, see AiG II.2.31–33 etc.); $-i$ -stems generally lengthen the final before $-van-$ (AiG II.2.900–901; e.g., *śruṣṭīvān-*). Although this single occurrence gives us little to go on, I’m inclined towards the intensive interpr., because of the lack of a clear possessive sense – though ‘having desires’ is certainly not out of the question, esp. given *sumatīr iyānāḥ* “begging for favors” at the end of the hemistich. If it belongs to a $-van$ -stem, it is straightforwardly a nom. pl. masc., as the passage requires. But if it belongs rather to an intens. stem, we must reckon with its aberrant inflection. I would like to analyze it as a haplology of a middle part. **vānīvan-āna-*. The haplology itself seems quite plausible, but the form in the passage *vānīvāno* ($-as$) has then to be a singular m. nom. This could be fixed by emending the final syllable to * $\bar{a}s$ (\bar{a} in sandhi), and that is my preference, however unsatisfactory. However, there may have been an intermediate nominal form, or so I interpr. Wh’s listing of *vānīvan* as a primary nominal deriv., rather than as a verbal form to the desid. stem. But what kind of nominal? If it’s a pseudo-root noun, then the nom. pl. should be **vānīvan-as*, with short vowel in the root syllable (cf., e.g., nom. pl. *śatru-hānas*). To get a long vowel in that syllable we have to assume that it belongs to a $-van$ -stem, which rather defeats the purpose of assigning it to a desid. stem *vānīvan-* -- unless he’s also positing a $-van$ -stem built to that desid. stem (**vānīvan-van-*), which then underwent haplology – an unprecedented derivational path. It seems less cumbersome simply to emend the vowel of the final syllable to \bar{a} , as I just suggested. Or, if we want to follow Wh’s path, to assume that a root-noun-like stem *vānīvan-* was reinterpr. as having a $-van$ -stem and given a nom. pl. $-vān-as$. In any case, there is no direct route to the form we have.

The sense of the root $\sqrt{vañc}$ in its various forms has been discussed frequently in this comm. (see lexical list). Since I think the root meant ‘move waveringly’ (sim. already Whitney / Macdonell [VGS 415] ‘move crookedly’; see Kulikov’s [ya-pres. 218] first gloss ‘move (waveringly)’), I find the standard renderings of individual forms as ‘jump’, ‘gallop’, ‘fly’, and the like somewhat puzzling, since these seem like very different kinds of movements. In our passage Ge tr. “mit dem Gedanken fliegend,” Scar (669) “vom Geist in galoppierenden Bewegung versetzen.” The closest passage to ours in content and phraseology is III.39.1 in which ‘thought’ (*matīh*) exits our “heart” (abl. *hṛdāḥ ā*) by a movement described as *vacyāmānāḥ*, which I render as “curling herself out of ...” See comm. ad loc. A similar graceful contortion seems depicted here, esp. in combination with the intimate contact expressed by immediately preceding *hṛdispīś-* ‘touching the heart’. The publ. tr. has “intertwining with the mind,” which I still think is fine, but the root sense might be even better conveyed by “curling up with the mind.”

X.47.8: *yād ... yāmi* “what I beg” in pāda a picks up 7b *sumatīr iyānāḥ* “begging for favors.”

On this trio of hymns see publ. intro. Of especial interest are the first two, Indra's ātmastuti, couched in the 1st ps. sg. On the genre of ātmastuti see esp. George Thompson (1997) "Ahaṅkāra and ātmastuti: Self-Assertion and Impersonation in the Ṛgveda," *History of Religions* 37: 141–71.

X.48 Indra

The 1st person self-assertion in this hymn is forcefully established in the first vss.: every pāda of the 1st vs. begins with a form of the 1st sg. prn.; in the 2nd vs. each hemistich begins thus; the third vs. presents itself as a type of versified paradigm (see comm. ad I.1), with four different oblique forms of the pronoun, each opening its pāda: 3a dat. *máhyam*, 3b loc. *máyi*, 3c gen. *máma*, 3d acc. *mám*. Thereafter the pronominal presence recedes: vss. 4–6 each begin with *ahám*, but there is no other tonic form of the pronoun in any vs.; vs. 7 has no tonic form, though here is an enclitic *mā* in the last pāda, along with two 1st sg. verbs, *asmí* (a), *hanmí* (c). Vs. 8 once again begins with *ahám*, and there is a postpositive *ahám* in d; vs. 9 has only an enclitic *me* (a) but two 1st sg. verbs. Vs. 10 lacks any 1st sg. reference at all and stands aside from the rest of the hymn in content. The final vs. (11) has an enclitic acc. *mā* (c) and a 1st sg. verb (*mināmi* [b]). As noted in the publ. intro., the only forms of the 1st sg. prn. absent from the hymn are the poorly attested instr. *máya* and abl. *mát*.

On the distribution of tenses and moods in this hymn compared with X.49, see intro. to X.49 below.

X.48.1: Each pāda of this vs. has a finite verb; the verbs in bcd are all present indicatives: *sám jayāmi* (b), *havante* (b), *ví bhajāmi* (d), but pāda a contains a 1st sg. aor. injunc. *bhuvam*. In the publ. tr. I render *bhuvam* as a straight preterite: "I was" (sim. Ge. "Ich ward"; Sāy. *abhavam*). Given the present indicatives of the rest of the vs. and its general content, I now think that that rendering is wrong, but I am not certain what the correct one is. I would be inclined to tr. it as a general present ("I am / become") in keeping with the other present verb forms, save for two factors: The next hymn, X.49, which is the ātmastuti companion to this one, contains two forms of *bhuvam* (out of 5 total in the RV): X.49.1c, 4c. Although X.49 is dominated by injunctives and so the temporal values are hard to establish, most of the hymn concerns specific deeds of the speaker (=Indra) in the past, and so *bhuvam* there may have past reference. Moreover in our own vs. the adj. *pūrvyá-* is ambiguous: it can mean 'foremost' with regard to quality or location, with no temporal reference, but it can also mean 'former, earlier' or 'ancient, primordial' or 'foremost' in a temporal sense. If *pūrvyás pátiḥ* here means "earlier / primordial / first lord," then *bhuvam* must have some past reference, but if the adj. only refers to the quality of Indra's lordship, the temporal reference of *bhuvam* is unconstrained. It is probably worth noting that *pūrvya-* is found in the first vs. of the next hymn as well, X.49.1a, though not in the same clause as *bhuvam* in that vs. Although a survey of all the forms of *pūrvyá-* / *pūrvya-* in the RV shows that temporal reference predominates, there is a solid group with the meaning 'foremost' in quality or location, and a very large group where it is difficult or impossible to tell whether temporal or qualify/location reference (or both) is meant. In this case I incline towards the quality interpr. (so also Sāy., who glosses *mukhyah*). Weighing the various factors, I suggest an emended tr. to "I have become the foremost lord of gods," a role Indra has acquired by his regular winning of the stakes, as stated in pāda b. ("I am ..." would also work.) Alternatively IH suggests presential "I become," meaning that he acquires the role on a regular basis; I am not persuaded because I doubt that Indra would ever admit that he *lost* the lordship in between such

episodes. However, if *pūrvyá-* has a temporal sense here, the whole might mean “I am / have (always) been the primordial lord of goods / lord of gods (from) of old.”

Note that the phrase *vásunaḥ ... pátiḥ* reprises *vasupate vásūnām* in the first vs. of the previous hymn (X.47.1), though they are by different poets. The phrase in our hymn has the newer gen. sg. *vásunaḥ*, found also in *vásunaḥ ... pátiḥ* in I.53.2, against *vásoḥ ... vásupatim* in I.9.9. The phrase with gen. pl., *vasupáti- vásūnām* is fairly common.

For *dhánam √ji*, see vs. 5 below.

The morphological identity and usage of *śásvataḥ* in b are disputed. Gr takes it as a gen. sg. dependent on *dhánāni* in the meaning ‘ein jeder, alle’ (his meaning #10; Sāy. also gen.). Ge takes it as acc. pl. masc. to be (irregularly) construed with the neut. acc. *dhánāni*, tr. “alle Schätze.” But *śásvant-* doesn’t mean ‘all’, at least not straightforwardly – rather, it indicates an unbroken, or regularly repeated, sequence: “one by one, one after another, time after time,” shading into “constant, perpetual.” Sometimes the sequence is synchronically distributive: “each and every,” which could be taken as tantamount to “all.” But rather than expressing an undifferentiated “all,” *śásvant-* indicates a succession of individual items considered collectively. Ge (n. 1b) cites III.3.7 as exhibiting another ex. of neut. pl. noun construed with masc. pl. adj., but that passage should be otherwise interpr. He also adduces IX.76.3, where pāda-final *śásvataḥ* (as here) modifies the masc. acc. pl. *vāḥjān* earlier in its pāda: *dhīyā ná vāḥjān̄ úpa māsi śásvataḥ*. Presumably he cites this to show that acc. pl. *śásvataḥ* can modify a synonym for *dhánāni*, in the right gender, and need not be a gen. here. My interpr. of *śásvataḥ* in our passage starts from passages like IX.76.3; I take it as a quasi-adverbial acc. pl. ‘time after time’ that became detached from the NP in which it began because of its location at pāda end at some distance from its noun. In my own tr. of IX.76.3 “As if according to our vision, mete out prizes to us over and over,” *śásvataḥ* is also semi-independent, though it properly matches *vāḥjān* in number, gender, and case. (A less independent Engl. tr. might be “ever-new/continuous prizes.”) I thus avoid the awkwardness of mismatch of gender in our passage, though at the cost of recognizing a new adverbial usage. It would also of course be possible simply to follow the Sāy./Gr interpr. and take it as a gen.: “I win the stakes of each and every one.”

As Ge (n. 1c) points out, *jantávaḥ* has a double sense and should be read with both simile and frame – hence my “creatures ... kinfolk.”

Note the implicit contrast between *sám jayāmi* (b) and *ví bhajāmi* (d). The *dhánāni* gathered in b are redistributed to the deserving in d.

X.48.2: Acdg to Ge (n. 2), the named recipients of Indra’s help in this vs. are among the first Soma-offerers. Unfortunately the mythic incidents mentioned in this vs. are difficult to reconstruct, and the various figures named – Atharvan (if this is a PN, not a title), Trita, Dadhyañc, and Mātariśvan are not clearly connected elsewhere, except that Dadhyañc has the patronymic *ātharvañá-* already in the RV (I.116.12, 117.22; also VI.16.14 *putráḥ ... átharvañah*).

In the nominal clause in pāda a, either Indra or the following common nouns (*ródho vákṣah*) could be the primary predicate(s) of *ahám*. Contra Ge’s “Ich Indra ward ...,” which makes the second choice, I take *índrah* as the principal predicate, on the basis of vs. 5a, which also opens with *ahám índrah*, where the wording of the rest of the pāda suggests the opening two words form a nominal clause. However, the other alternative is certainly possible and changes very little.

Trita is elsewhere associated with cows, but as, himself, a releaser of cows – not the beneficiary of Indra’s action with regard to the cows. See the famous Trita Āptya appendix to the

Agni hymn, X.8.8-9, where Trita first smites the three-headed monster and then ... *nīh sasrje trió gāh* “T. let loose the cows.” Indra is also mentioned in that brief passage, but it seems as if he is there being assimilated to – substituted for – the Indo-Iranian *Trita, who also figures in this myth in Avestan (under the name *Θrita* *Āθβiia*).

What exactly Indra does for Trita in our passage is also unclear, though not because of unclarity of the verbal expression. The pāda is unambiguous: *tritāya gā ajanayam āher ādhi* “I begat the cows from the serpent.” See Ge’s tr. “Für Trita *trieb* ich vom Drachen die Kühe *ab*,” with the somewhat dramatic *abtreiben* ‘abort’. There are two problems here (at least). The first involves which myth we’re actually dealing with. The word *āhi-* ‘serpent’ is a powerful clue that it is the Vṛtra myth, since Vṛtra is constantly identified as an *āhi-* and the encapsulating formula of that myth is *āhann āhim*. But when we can pin down Trita’s activities in the Vedic mythical universe, he is associated instead with the Vala myth. See I.52.5 *índro yád ..., bhinád valásya paridhīm̐r iva tritáh* “When Indra split the barricades of the Vala-cave, as Trita had.” Although the Vala and Vṛtra myths are often assimilated to each other, in our case (i.e., X.48.2) I think Trita has been grafted into the Vṛtra myth signaled by *āhi-*. This seems preferable to interpreting the serpent (*āhi-*) as an image of the Vala cave. (Nor do I, *pace* Ge [n. 2b], think that the serpent is Viśvarūpa, the monster of X.8.8–9.)

So what action does *ajanayam* depict? Presumably a simulacrum of birth: the cows (=waters, probably) are within the serpent and Indra causes them to come out, alive. If what is at issue is the identification cows = waters, the likelihood is that the snake swallowed them, as in X.111.9 (adduced by Ge) *srjáḥ síndhūn̐r āhinā jagrasānān* “You let loose the rivers that had been swallowed by the serpent.” The release of the waters from within the serpent would seem like birth – indeed like the breaking of the waters that precedes birth. The image is a striking one, but I think there is another reason the poet chose *ajanayam*: the beginning of this verb recalls and may have been meant to evoke in the audience several verbs more regularly found with “cows” in the Vala and Vṛtra myths: *√aj* ‘drive’ and *√ji* ‘win’. Cf. phrases like *gā ajati* (I.33.3) and *gā ājayah* (I.32.12).

I don’t know quite what to make of this mash-up of at least three myths in a single pāda: Trita (and Indra) and Viśvarūpa, Trita (Indra) and Vala, Indra and Vṛtra, but I think it is deliberate on the part of the poet. Perhaps he is calling attention to the overreach of Indra’s boasting.

In c the verb *ā dade* could be either a pres. indicative to the redupl. pres. stem or a perfect. Because of the mythological content of the vs., I opt for the pf., as does Kü (241).

As discussed ad I.112.19 etc., simplex forms of the old desid. *síkṣa-* (*√śak*) only take the dat., but here the part. *síkṣan* also has an acc. obj., *gotrā*. The lexeme *ā síkṣa-* does take an acc., in the sense ‘seek to obtain’, with *ā* in the same function as the lexemes *ā√yaj* ‘obtain by sacrifice’, *ā√pū* ‘obtain by purification’. See again I.112.19. I suggest that the *ā* is in fact found in our passage: *gotrā síkṣan* can easily represent *gotrā ā-síkṣan* in sandhi.

In the publ. tr. “their cowpens” refers to the cowpens of the Dasyus.

As far as I know, Dadhyañc and Mātariśvan are never otherwise associated.

X.48.3: On the verb *ārya-* see comm. ad VIII.16.6.

The fronting of the oblique 1st sg. prn. is carried through the whole vs., but it is broken in the publ. tr. in pāda d, since “me they recognize ...” sounded stilted to me.

X.48.4: The first hemistich lacks a verb and definitely needs one, since it has both a nominative and an accusative phrase. It's easy to supply 'win / gain' – perhaps from *sám jayāmi* in 1b, but cf. also the almost identical expression in V.61.5 *sánat sá áśvyam paśúm, utá gávyam ...* "She gains livestock in horses and cows," with a form of synonymous \sqrt{san}

On the slangy idiom *ní√śā* 'grind down' see ad X.28.6. As noted there, the referent of the obj. *purū sahásrā* "many thousands" is likely to be enemies, perhaps the Dasyus of 2c.

X.48.5: Given the position of the *ná* in pāda a, it seems likely that *ahám índraḥ* is a nominal clause. See comm. ad vs. 2 above. So also Kü (189) "Ich bin Indra."

ná párá jigya íd dhánam is the negated opposite to 1b *ahám dhánāni sám jayāmi*, though the image in 5a is specifically from dicing (see Ge n. 5a), while that in 1b seems to be more generalized.

The lexeme *áva√sthā* with dative appears to be unprecedented. Normally it means 'go/step down' with an acc. of goal, incl. in the middle pf. (as here): V.44.9 *samudrām āsām áva tathe agrimā* "The foremost of those (females) has stepped down into the sea." The sense of our passage is fairly clear contextually: 'descend/step down for death' can mean 'give way, concede' or perhaps simply 'come down [from heaven] to approach'; Gr anheimfallen (fall victim to), Ge verfallen (fall for).

In any case the two pronouncements in ab, each couched in the negative, seem odd things for Indra to boast about, esp. the latter, since Indra should not be susceptible to death anyway. Indra's promise in d is also expressed negatively.

Ge tr. the pres. part. *sunvántaḥ* as a functional impv., as if coordinated with *yācatā*: "Presset Soma aus und bittet mich um Gut!" (Sim. Lowe, Part., 263.) I certainly agree that the two are closely connected and temporally / logically ordered, But such an interpr. fails to account for the *íd* (and I also see no reason to erase the morphological identity of the participle). I think the point is – do your begging only when you're pressing soma for me; don't even think about begging for stuff if you're not engaged in pressing soma.

X.48.6: The verb for pāda a must be supplied from *ahanam* in c (with a rel. clause intervening in b).

The intens. part. *śásvasataḥ* echoes *śásvataḥ* in 1b phonologically, though they are of course etymologically and semantically completely distinct.

Pāda b has a functional periphrastic causative in the present middle: *yudháyé 'kṛṇvata* "they caused to fight." It is not at first clear why this periphrasis is used here, since a morphological causative *yodháya-* exists. However, the various formations to the root \sqrt{yudh} show subtle functional and syntactic distinctions (see my *-áya-*, p. 151). The causative means 'set X (and Y) to fighting', where the various parties to the fight are in the acc. and the subject is the instigator, who takes no part in the fight himself. The *-ya-*present *yúdhya-* in the act. also takes an obj., but it means 'attack': the subject fights the object. Its middle equivalent, *yúdhyate* means 'contends (mutually)', the non-causative equivalent of *yodháya-*. The periphrasis in our b has yet another sense: "X (subj.) causes Y (obj.) to fight X" – in other words the subject both instigates the fight and participates in it. The middle voice of *ákṛṇvata* expresses this dual role. (For a different, and to my mind less compelling, interpr. see Zehnder, Periphr. Kaus, 24, 66.)

The publ. tr. renders *ánamasyur namasvínah* as "(I) unbowable ... those to be bowed"; very similar is Ge's "die sich Beugenden ... (selbst) unbeugsam." This is what context suggests it ought to mean—but there are problems. The stem *namasvín-* (8x) otherwise means 'reverent,

offering homage’ The gerundive feature in my tr. (“to be bowed”) is surely wrong, but even without that, it is difficult to square the usual meaning with the context here. If they are already reverent, why does Indra need to smite them – and how can the “challenging” acc. pl. (*āhvāyamānān*) be reconciled with the meek *namasvīnaḥ* in the same case and number? Negated *ānamasyu-* is found only here, but *namasyú-* does occur twice elsewhere (I.55.4, VIII.27.11), again meaning ‘offering homage’, and it belongs to the larger morphological system that includes the denom. *namasyá-*, which means the same. If we take these observations seriously, the violence that dominates the whole vs. up to this last phrase is suddenly absent. Although I would prefer to keep some version of my and Ge’s interpr., I find that hard to justify. I would now take *namasvīnaḥ* as a proleptic descriptor of the challengers, who, once struck down and rendered humble, offer their homage to Indra. As for him, *ānamasyu-* would be a restatement of *ḍṛḥḥā vādan* “talking tough.” Though his opponents have been subdued and offer him *nāmas-*, he does not do so in return. This is not particularly satisfactory, but I can’t otherwise account for the phraseology. I would now emend the tr. to “I struck down with my stroke those who were challenging (me), (I) talking tough, giving no homage to those (now) offering homage.” Note that Gr must have been sufficiently disturbed by *ānamasyuḥ* that he identifies it as a verb form, an imperfect (!) to the denom. *namasyá-* (which, however, doesn’t help matters).

X.48.7: The numerical sequence — “one against one” (*ékam ékaḥ*), acc. “two” (*dvā*), nom. “three” (*trāyaḥ*) — builds on the *āmreḍita dvā-dvā* “by twos” in 6a.

On the shape of the root noun in (*niṣ-*)*ṣāḥ*! see comm. ad IV.88.7. The lexeme *nīḥ √ sah* is found only once as a verb form (I.127.3 *niṣṣāhamānaḥ*) and twice as a root noun, here and in I.181.6. In the other two instances I render the movement implied by the preverb: I.127.3 “going forth to conquer,” I.181.6 “setting out to conquer.” The tr. “utter victor” here does not attempt to do so (nor do Ge’s Sieger, Scar’s “der überlegene Sieger” [603]), though I suppose an alternate “I go forth to conquer, one against one” would be possible.

The verb *karanti* is classified by Wh (Roots) as a root pres., a stem that otherwise doesn’t exist, but it surely is, with Macd (VGS verb list), a root aor. subjunctive. Although grammars give the 3rd pl. act. subj. ending only as sec. *-an*, it does not seem to me that the Sprachgefühl for this part of the paradigm is terribly strong, and it is easy to imagine extending the 3rd *singular* choice between sec. *-at* and prim. *-atí* to the 3rd pl. I would also point out that if it is to be interpr. as a pres. form, it could just as easily belong to a thematic Class I pres. (there being no accent), and have developed from the root aor. subj. A root pres. 3rd pl. should properly have the weak form **krantí*. A modal sense “can/will do” fits the context better than an indicative. For a parallel see *gāmanti* in VII.34.20, which Wh identifies as a Class I pres.

The publ. tr. is somewhat clumsy, since the simile seems to qualify Indra rather than the multitude, who are being compared to threshed ears of grain. The intrusion of a homely agricultural image here is striking, esp. as one would expect a more exalted comparison from Indra’s own mouth. The word *parśá-* is a hapax, but its probable sense ‘sheaf, ears of grain’ is supposedly anchored by the YAv hapax *parša-* (Yt. 13.71), which is likewise the obj. of a form of *√ han* (! Av. *√ jan*) – though it should be noted that the Avestan context is hardly diagnostic and there’s a certain circularity whereby the meaning of the Vedic word is supported by the Avestan one and vice versa. On the other hand, *khála-* ‘threshing floor’ is reasonably well attested in Vedic (esp. AVP, which abounds in agricultural materials) and in Middle and Modern Indo-Aryan (see Turner s.v.), and its presence in this simile certainly helps establish the presumed sense of *parśá-*.

X.48.8: The Guṅgus are otherwise unknown, though they presumably have some connection with the isolated female divine figure Guṅgū in II.32.8. Atithigva is better known. In fact Indra slays the same Parṇaya and Karañja with Atithigva's help in I.53.8, though nothing further is known about these victims. It's also possible that there are multiple Atithigvas (see esp. Macdonell + Keith, Vedic Index, s.v.).

On the lexeme *īṣ* √ *kr̥* see comm. ad VII.76.2. Ge (n. 8b) suggests that the simile *īṣam ná* that begins the next pāda in fact goes with pāda a, as a word play; this seems eminently sensible and is reflected in the publ. tr. (though Scar [190] takes it with b). Ge disavows any etymological connection of the two *īṣ*- here, but as indicated in the comm. ad VII.76.2, it is quite likely that they are etymologically the same, though their meanings and functions have diverged; so also EWA s.v. *īṣ*-.

The compd. *ṛtra-túr-* (5x, always acc. sg. *ṛtra-túram*) occurs three times in positions 4–7 in trimeter vs., as here (*īṣam ná ṛtratúram ...*). In each case HvN comment that a caesura after 3 is rare, but surely the caesura is simply a late caesura in 5th position as usual, coming at the compd seam after *ṛtra-*.

The question is who/what the *ṛtra-túr-* is. Since Indra is the subject, it cannot be him, though he would be the default. Gr suggests Atithigva, and this may be the best solution. Note that in IV.42.8 Trasadasyu is named as a *ṛtra-túr-* “like Indra”: ... *trasádasyum ... índram ná ṛtratúram*, so non-gods qualify. But it is possible that it's Indra's mace: cf. X.99.1 *tákṣad vájram ṛtratúram* “he fashioned the mace that overcomes obstacles.”

The (almost) identically built loc. sg. compds *parṇayaghné* and *karañjahé* in c contain two different thematic derivs. of √ *han*. Scar (696) plausibly suggests that the *-ha-* in the latter is a metrically conditioned nonce form; he might also have noted *ṛtra-hátye* in the flg. pāda, which would have supported the *-ha-* form preceding it.

I consider the mention of the *Ṛtra*-smashing in d to be an implicit comparison: the smiting of the two presumably human enemies in c is likened to Indra's great paradigm deed. I think it less likely that the *Ṛtra*-slaying is simply lumped in, as a third ex., with two lesser such killings.

The redupl. 1st sg. *ásuśravi* is generally taken as a plupf. (Gr, Wh [Rts], Macdonell [VGS 425]), and it may well be. However, it is possible that it belongs instead to the redupl. aor. associated with the caus. *śrāvāya-* ‘make hear(d)’. This seems to be implied by Klein's (DGRV II.170) “after I had caused my fame to be spread.” The redupl. aor. is otherwise represented in the RV by the single form act. 3rd pl. *ásuśravuḥ* (X.20.12). A mid. pluperfect might be expected to have passive value like the single indic. pf. in the middle, *śuśruve* ‘has been famed’, in VIII.66.9. A medial caus. could have the reflexive transitive sense ‘cause oneself to be heard of’, ‘spread one's own fame’, and the engagement of the subject in creating his own celebrity fits the boastful tone of this ātmastuti. No alteration of the publ. tr. is needed, since “I spread my fame” essentially expresses the reflexive nuance (though Klein's tr. is more explicit). The full grade (but light syllable) in both *ásuśravi* and *ásuśravuḥ* may also fit the template of the redupl. aor. better than a plupf., though the weak forms of redupl. formations to such roots are quite variable.

X.48.9: Namī Sāpīya is found also in VI.20.6 and I.53.7, in the latter without the patronymic. But in its place is *sákh'yā* as a play on words. Our passage has the patronymic in c, directly flg. *námī*, though without distraction (probably), but in d *sakh'yā* appears in the same metrical position,

echoing the pun found in I.53.7 (though note that in I.53.7 *sákhyā* is the instr. sg. of *sákhi-* ‘comrade, partner’, while here (differently accented) *sakhyā* is neut. pl. to *sakhā-* ‘partnership’.

The double dat. *īśé bhujé* is also found in VIII.20.8. As Ge suggests (n. 9a), *īśé*, the functional obj. of *bhujé*, has been attracted to it in case. The double-barrelled tr. “restoring refreshment” for *īśé* is meant to capture the word play in 8ab. Tichy (KISch 207) takes *me* with *īśé* (“um meine Stärkung zu genossen”), but as Ge points out (n. 9a), in VI.20.6 it’s Indra who bestows *īś-* on Namī.

In d *éše* plays on *īśé*, though they are grammatically and etymologically distinct.

X.48.10: As noted in the publ. intro. as well as the hymn intro. above, this is the only vs. that lacks a 1st ps. reference. It is also entirely unclear why this vs., which violates the stylistic unity of the hymn, is found here at all – though I will speculate on this below. It is true that the meter changes to Triṣṭubh from Jagatī, also for the immediately flg. final vs. 11, but vs. 7 is also in Triṣṭubh, and both 7 and 11 fit conceptually into the hymn. The puzzling content of the vs. does not help: it has given rise to quite different interpr., esp. because of the hapax *asthā* in b.

The hapax *asthā* is taken by Ge (flg. Ludwig) as the instr. sg. to **asth-* ‘bone’ (Aves. *ast*), which he then interpr. as referring to the myth of Dadhyañc and his revealing the location of the hidden soma. His tr. of the hemistich is “Bei dem Einen ward der Soma im Inneren geschaut; den anderen tut der Wächter durch den Knochen kund.” The contortions that he must engage in (see n. 10 and esp. n. 10ab) to fit the wording to the myth are sufficient evidence for the unlikelihood of the interpr. A more likely, though not entirely trouble-free, approach starts with connecting the word to the root noun $\sqrt{sthā}$, a possibility thoroughly discussed by Old; see also Scar (646–47). Although Gr interpr. it as an adverb ‘sogleich’, Old’s negated root noun “der nicht Stehende” yields a richer semantics. He sees the passage as contrasting the good person, in whom the presence of interior soma can be detected (a), and the evil one, who can be shown to be without it (b). “In Manchem (dem Guten) wird der Soma darinnen (verweilend) erblickt. Manchen (den Bösen, vgl. cd) macht der Wächter (über Gute und Böse) sichtbar (kenntlich) durch den (in ihm) nicht verweilenden (Soma).” By this analysis *asthā* is an instr. sg. to the root noun compd. This analysis is also fld. by AiG II.2.35 and with some hesitation by Scar, and it is registered, though not fully endorsed, by EWA 766 (s.v. *STHĀ*).

The publ. tr. in general follows Old’s interpr., but questions remain. In particular, who is the *gopā-* who reveals the lack of soma in the second party? And is that *gopā-* the unidentified subject of cd or not? Acdg. to Old, the *gopā-* is the one who watches over good and evil; he says nothing specific about the identities in the 2nd hemistich. My current views slightly emend Old’s interpr., in an attempt to explain why the vs. is found in this hymn. Let us begin with the fact that Indra’s signature deed, the slaying of Vṛtra, is barely mentioned in this hymn, found only in vs. 8 and backgrounded there. In that vs. someone/thing besides Indra is touted as a *vṛtratūr-* (8b) and the Vṛtra slaying is compared to Indra’s slaying of two lesser beings (8cd). I suggest that Indra’s signature deed is treated in our vs., which is the climatic one before the summary vs. 11, but it is an indirect treatment of the Vṛtra slaying, expressed in riddling fashion to escape the clichés of that narrative. I therefore think that the contrast in ab is not between good and evil beings (per Old), but between the one powerfully strengthened by soma and the weakling who does not possess it (who in this case is Vṛtra). In pāda a the soma that Indra drinks to prepare himself for battle is discernible (*dadrśe*) in Indra, though the soma is within him. Presumably the signs of battle fury and soma exhilaration are evident in his external demeanor. In b the one who is exposed by his lack of soma is Vṛtra, and I am inclined to think that Indra is the *gopā-* who does

the exposing – by showing up Vṛtra’s inability to fight back. This seems more economical than dragging in a third party, and Indra is at least once called *gopā-* (e.g., V.31.1), though the designation is more often of Agni or Soma, less commonly other gods.

As for the subject of cd, I emphatically don’t think it’s the *gopā-*, *pace* Ge (n. 10c) and Heenen (Desid. 207–8). Rather it is Vṛtra (or if my identification of the soma-less being in b is not accepted, some unspecified enemy of Indra). The same desid. part. *yúyutsant-* ‘desiring/trying to fight’ is used of Vṛtra in V.32.5, where Indra in the exhilaration of soma consigns him to darkness (cf. also I.33.6 of a group of Indra’s enemies, also defeated).

By my interpr. the obj. of *yúyutsan*, the “sharp-horned bull” (*tigmásṛṅga- vṛṣabhá-*), has a double sense. This phrase is several times used of Soma: he is clearly so called in X.86.15, and I argue ad X.28.2 that the same phrase refers to Soma there (contra Ge). See also *tigmásṛṅga-* in IX.97.9, also of Soma. But the same phrase is used once clearly of Indra (VII.19.1). (The other similar phrase, *tigmásṛṅga- vámsaga-* [“sharp-horned buffalo (?)”] in VI.16.39 applies to Agni.) The first reading here is probably Indra, with the two primal opponents, Vṛtra and Indra, serving as subj. and obj. respectively. But in trying to fight Indra, Vṛtra is also battling the soma within Indra that gives the god his invincible power.

With Ge (n. 10d) I supply a word for ‘fetter’ (*pāśa-*) with *bahulé*, on the basis of *baddhá-* ‘bound’ and VII.59.8 with the phrase *druháḥ pāśān* “the fetters of deceit” in VII.59.8. Note also that *bahulá-* directly modifies *drúh-* in III.31.19 *drúhaḥ ... bahulá ádevīḥ*. I have not found a passage that explicitly links Vṛtra with *drúh-*, but as in the just-cited III.31.19 anything Indra is against can be so characterized.

To summarize briefly: if I am correct, this apparently aberrant vs. in the otherwise unbroken ātmastuti, which contains no 1st sg. forms and makes no explicit indentifications, is Indra’s indirect boast about his major achievement, the Vṛtra slaying, made possible by Indra’s access to soma and Vṛtra’s lack of it.

X.48.11: Ge takes *devānām* as parallel to the gen. pls. of pāda a: “das Gesetz der Āditya’s, Vasu’s, Rudriya’s, der Götter.” But its positioning after *deváh* invites us to construe the two words together, and the archaic ring of the phrase (“god of gods”) fits nicely with the whiff of Indo-Iranian antiquity in the previous vs., where the arch-enemy of Indra is linked to the Lie.

The negated past participles, near-synonyms, that fill the last pāda, *áparājitam ástrtam áśālham* “invincible, indestructible, unconquerable” bring the hymn to a powerful close. Note that *áparājitam* harks back to 5a *ná párá jigye* and *áśālham* to 7a *niṣṣāl*.

X.49 Indra

Although X.48 and X.49 are companion pieces—ātmastutis consisting of the same no. of vss.—there are notable differences in the stylistic impression they make, esp. with regard to pronouns and verb forms.

As noted in the publ. intro., the nom. sg. *ahám* is ubiquitous in this hymn: 16 of the 20 hemistichs (excluding the summary vs. 11) begin with *ahám*, as do 4 of the even pādas (1b, 2d, 3b, 5d). This overwhelming presence contrasts with X.48, where the 1st sg. pronouns recede after vs. 3 (see intro. to X.48 above).

X.49 also presents a remarkable collection of injunctives – 19 in all, in the 10 vss. under consideration: 1a *dām*, 1b *kṛṇavam*, 1c *bhuvam*, 1d *sākṣi*, 2a *dhuḥ*, 3a *sísatham*, 3c *yamam*, 4b *randhayam*, 4c *bhuvam*, 4d *bháre*, 5a *randhayam*, 5c *karam*, 6b *rujam*, 6d *karam*, 8c *karam*, 8d *vakṣayam*, 9a *dhārayam*, 9d *vidam*, 10a *dhārayam*. (A few of these require some comment.

Thematic 1st sg. mid. *bhare* in 4d could be either a present or an injunctive, but context favors a past reading and therefore an injunctive identification. In 5c *āyāve 'karam* the Pp. reads *akaram*, but of course *karam* is quite possible in this sandhi situation: Old says the augment is doubtful and points out that even Sāy. reads *karam*. In 6b and d the Saṃhitā *vrtrahārujam* and *rocanākaram* could conceal augments (*a/[ā]rujam*, *a/[ā]karam*), and the Pp. so analyzes, both times with accent, but injunctives are just as possible.) Against this accumulation of injunctives there are 5 securely augmented forms — 3b *āvam*, 5b *ājihīta*, 5d *arandhayam*, 8b *prāśrāvayam*, 10b *ādihārayat* — and a miscellany of other finite forms: 3 perfects: 2d *dade* (or redupl. pres., but see comm. ad X.48.2), 3d *rare*, 7c *āha*; 2 presents: 7a *yāmi*, 9c *tirāmi*, as well as whatever *kṛṣe* in 7d may be. By contrast, consider the distribution of tenses and moods in X.48: 7 injunctives: 1a *bhuvam*, 8a *iškaram*, 8b *dhārayam*, 9a *bhūt* (which, given phonological context, could be augmented (*a*)*bhūt*, but isn't so read by Pp.), 9b *kṛṇuta*, 9c *maṃhāyam*, 9d *karam*; 6 securely augmented forms (by meter): 2b *ajanayam*, 3a *atakṣat*, 3b *avṛjan*, 4d *āmandiṣuḥ*, 6b *ākṛṇvata*, 8d *āśuśravi*, and one likely one (6c *ahanam*, though the Saṃhitā text *hānmanāhanam* would allow an injunc. *hanam* reading); 10 presents: 1b *jayāmi*, 1c *havante*, 1d *bhajāmi*, 3d *āryanti*, 4c *śiśāmi*, 7a *asmi*, 7c *hanmi*, 7d *nindanti*, 10b *kṛṇoti*, 11b *mināmi*; 6 perfects 2c *dade*, 5a *jigye*, 5b *tasthe*, 10a *dadṛṣe*, 10d *tasthau*, 11c *tatakṣuḥ*; 2 subjunctives: 5d *riṣāthana*, 7b *karanti*; 1 imperative: 5c *yācata*.

As noted in the publ. intro., I find it surprising that Hoffmann did not treat this hymn as a testing ground for his interpr. of the injunctive. (He does treat a few vss. piecemeal.) In the publ. tr. I render the injunctives as general preterites, except for *sākṣi* in 1d, which I now would rethink.

On the metrical disturbances in this hymn, see Old's various comments.

X.49.1: As just noted, my tr. of *sākṣi* in d (“I have vanquished”) contrasts with my renderings of the other injunctives in this hymn and I would now change to a general preterite: “I vanquished.” There is no functional difference between the present and aorist injunctives in this hymn that I can detect, and although *sākṣi* is the only *s*-aor. form in this hymn, that should not correlate with a different usage.

X.49.2: Pāda c has no overt verb; I have supplied *ā dade* from d. Ge supplies ‘lenke’, though the parallel he cites, I.63.2, has instead the verb *veh* ‘pursue’. Ge also couches the whole hemistich in the present: “ich (lenke) ... ich ergreife ...” This is grammatically possible: as noted ad X.48.2 *ā dade* is ambiguous between 1st sg. redupl. pres. and 1st sg. pf. And it would also make sense if the half-vs. is describing Indra's usual preparations for his innumerable deeds in the present/future. However, in the context of this vs. a past tense reading works better: the first hemistich seems to depict the original initiation of Indra into his name and role, and the second half then describes his acquisition of his two most characteristic accoutrements, his pair of horses and his mace.

But I also wonder if 2cd should be read in conjunction with vs. 3, with the whole referring to the Uśanā Kāvya, Kutsa, Śuṣṇa myth. Or rather, that both readings are simultaneously possible — the first given above, that Indra is acquiring his horses and weapon for the first time after being given the name Indra, and the second, that the horses and weapon are specifically those for the Śuṣṇa battle, with this reading providing a transition to vs. 3. For the horses and weapon in the UK / Kutsa / Śuṣṇa saga, recall that when Indra takes Kutsa on his chariot to journey to UK, he first yokes the two horses of the Wind; cf., e.g., I.174.5 *rjṛā vātasya*

áśvā “the two silvery horses of the Wind” (cf. I.175.4, IV.16.11, VIII.1.11, X.22.4–5). Then when they arrive at UK’s, the latter produces the weapon for Indra to use against Śuṣṇa. In I.51.10 the weapon is referred to as the abstract ‘might’ (*sáhas*), but UK definitely ‘fashions’ it: *tákṣad yát ta uśánā sáhasā sáhaḥ* “When Uśánā fashions might with might for you.” But in I.121.12 the weapon thus fashioned is a mace: *yám te kāvya uśánā mandínam dād, vṛtraháṇam páryam tatakṣa vájram* “What Uśánā Kāvya gave to you to provide exhilaration, that decisive, Vṛtra-smiting mace had he fashioned.” With more details V.34.2 *yád īm mṛgāya hántave mahāvadhah, sahásrabhṛṣṭim uśánā vadhám yámat* “... when Uśánā, possessing the great weapon, held the thousand-spiked weapon (out to him), to smash the wild beast.”

X.49.3: This vs. names by name two of the participants in the exploit just discussed, Kutsa in b and Śuṣṇa in c. I suggest that Uśánā Kāvya is also present, in the *kaváye* in pāda a; UK is elsewhere referred to by the designation ‘poet’ (*kaví-*), substituting for his patronymic. See, e.g., IV.16.2–3, 26.1, V.34.3 and comm. ad VI.20.4. Note that Sāy. glosses *kavaye* with *uśanase* here. Ge’s identification of the poet with Kutsa (n. 3ab) is a less happy choice and leads him to misinterpret the pāda in my opinion.

But determining the identity of the poet in pāda a is only the beginning of our challenges. On the surface of it, the pāda involves slashing, piercing, or otherwise doing harm to a cloak (*átka-*) for / on behalf of the *kaví-*. This somewhat puzzling action was obviously too much for Ge, who supplies the verb ‘gave’ to govern the cloak, from *raré* in d, and supplies Śuṣṇa from c as obj. of *śísñatham*, thus manufacturing two separate clauses in the pāda, one lacking an overt verb, one lacking an overt object. (This interpr. was followed in all particulars by Elizarenkova [168].) This redistribution of elements seems somewhat perverse, esp. in this hymn and esp. in this verse, whose construction is so four-square, with an *ahám* at each corner (beginning each pāda)—esp. since there’s a perfectly good transitive verb to govern *átkam* in the pāda in question. Old defends interpreting the syntactic deployment of the pāda as given (that is, with *átkam* as obj. of *śísñatham*), even though we can’t restore the plot. He also properly rejects the notion, found already in Sāy., that *átka-* here is a PN.

Clearly the cloak and what was done to it are the key to this pāda. Here we are lucky enough to find a cloak in another treatment of the UK/Kutsa/Śuṣṇa myth, X.99.9cd; unfortunately it doesn’t provide a clear key: *ayám kavím anayac chasyámānam, átkam yó asya sánitotá nṛṇām* “This one here [=Indra] led the poet who was being praised, who won his cloak and was the winner among superior men” (by my tr.; others’ v. diff.). The first hemistich of this vs. contains a compressed account of the victory over Śuṣṇa, with Kutsa the beneficiary. In my view the “poet” in c is once again Uśánā Kāvya. Here (in my view) he carries off a/the cloak as a prize, perhaps a reward for supplying the weapon that did Śuṣṇa in. This suggests that the cloak belonged originally to the enemy, probably Śuṣṇa himself. In our passage then, Indra may be rendering Śuṣṇa’s cloak harmless and up for grabs – in which case perhaps ‘struck down’ or the like might be a better tr. than ‘pierced’ for *śísñatham*. Indra dispatches the cloak (pāda a) before doing the same to Śuṣṇa himself (c). I tentatively suggest that Śuṣṇa’s cloak is a garment of enveloping darkness, consisting of *māyā-* (‘magic art’, etc.). Śuṣṇa’s *māyās* are mentioned several times, as objects of Indra’s attack (I.56.3, V.31.7, VI.20.4, prob. IV.16.9); it is also said that the slaying of Śuṣṇa keeps darkness away (V.31.9), and Śuṣṇa is also said several times to be hidden or in possession of something hidden (X.22.10, 61.13). By contrast Ge suggests (again n. 3ab) that the cloak is Indra’s or Kutsa’s and refers to the apparent switching or blending of the appearances of Indra and Kutsa, glancingly referred to in IV.16.10 and embroidered in

entertaining fashion in the JB. (See comm. ad IV.16.10 and the publ. intro. to that hymn.) I find this unlikely, since the cloak is the object of a hostile act that is identical to what happens to Śuṣṇa. (However, cf. VI.33.3, a passage containing instr. pl. *átkaiḥ* deployed by Indra; I explain these cloaks as a reference to Indra’s shape-shifting; see comm. ad loc.)

There is another possible explanation for the cloak here; though I think it is less likely as the primary reference than what was just presented, it may contribute to the overall interpr. In the UK/Kutsa/Śuṣṇa portion of IV.16 (vss. 9–14) we find (IV.16.13) *átkaṃ ná púro jarimā ví dardaḥ* “You shredded their fortresses, like worn-out age a cloak.” The simile is hard to interpret (see comm., ad loc.), but syntactically the cloak is being compared to the fortresses (*púrah*) that Indra destroyed. Since it is Śuṣṇa’s fortress(es) that are attacked in some passages (I.51.11, IV.30.13, VIII.1.28), the “cloak” here might be a metaphor for these destroyed fortresses.

In b “with this help” conceals the pl. of the Skt. phrase *ābhir ūtibhiḥ*. As so often, I have suppressed the pl. because in Eng. both “with these helps” and “with these forms of help” are awkward.

My tr. of c agrees with Ge’s, in construing *śuṣṇasya* with the agent noun *śnáthitā*. More grammatically punctilious scholars, unwilling to accept that some root-accented agent nouns take genitive complements rather than expected accusatives (and vice versa: suffix-accented *-tār-* stems with genitives), have disordered what seems (to me) the obvious sense of the pāda to accommodate their syntactic scruples, construing gen. *śuṣṇasya* with *vádhaḥ* and supplying an object (from nowhere) for *śnáthitā*. Thus, Tichy (*-tar-* stems, 152; fld. word-by-word by Kü [421]) “Ich habe in meiner Eigenschaft, (jeden Gegner) zu Boden zu strecken, der Waffe des Śuṣṇa Einhalt geboten”; Tichy cites the similar ploy of Re (BSL 39.110) “c’est moi qui, (le) massacrant, ai arrêté l’arme de Ś.” The Tichy-Kü interpr. introduces a generalized enemy (“jeden Gegner”) that is out of place in the tight confines of the UK/Kutsa/Śuṣṇa saga. (Re avoids this by supplying Śuṣṇa as object of *śnáthitā*, which indirectly restores what I think the grammar says.) These interpr. also require that the *vádhar-* belong to Śuṣṇa and that Indra’s act (expressed by the verb *yamam*) involves checking or parrying Ś’s weapon in some way. These assumptions are not impossible: *vádhar-* can be the weapon of the enemy (e.g., I.174.8), and *√yam* can sometimes mean ‘restrain’. However, the more likely interpr. is that Indra is wielding the weapon; cf. the very similar phrase (*vádhar úd √yam*) in V.32.7, where Indra brandishes his *vádhar* against Vṛtra: *úd yád índro mahaté dānavāya, vádhar yāmiṣṭa ...* “When Indra held up to the great Dānava his weapon.” It is also worth noting that in another version of our myth Uśanā Kāvya performs a very similar action, proffering the weapon to Indra: V.34.2 (quoted above) *sahāsrabhrṣṭim uśānā vadhām yāmat* “U. held out the thousand-spiked weapon (to him).” Ge (n. 3c) also adduces V.34.2 and suggests (n. 1 at bottom of page) that Indra is holding the weapon out to Kutsa, producing a kind of chain of transmission. I think it more likely that Indra is holding it out against Śuṣṇa, as in V.32.7 (though we lack the preverb *úd* here).

Pāda d seems to sum up the fortunate result of the destruction of Śuṣṇa, but what that result is also has to be probed. The Dasyu is presumably Śuṣṇa. Acdg. to Tichy (/Kü), Indra did not give away the Ārya Schar (host / troop) to him (“der ich die arische Schar nicht dem Feind preisgegeben habe”), with an unmotivated substitution of “group / troop” for “name.” (Ge. does not make this substitution: “der ich den arischen Namen dem Dasyu nicht preisgab.”) I think we need to take “name” seriously and read this pāda in conjunction with 2a, where the totality of creatures (“of heaven and earth and the waters”) conferred the name “Indra” on him. “Indra” is in some ways the “Ārya name” par excellence, and in 3d he seems to be saying that by his heroic actions he has not ceded or handed over this proud name to a creature with the opposing name

Dasyu. That is, he has not disgraced the name or allowed the Dasyu to lay claim to it. The middle voice of *raré* reinforces this boast; it can be tr. somewhat heavily “I did not give *my own* name ...” (though such self-involvement of the subject is not as strongly perceptible in all middle perfect forms to $\sqrt{rā}$).

X.49.4: The same personnel (more or less) appear in VI.20.8, VI.26.4; see comm. on the former esp. for some decipherment of the story involved. The presence of the same names in all three vss. makes it likely that a single mythic complex is involved in our vs., rather than a set of unconnected anecdotes, one per pāda. In both passages in VI, Indra works on behalf of Vetasu and Tuji and against Tugra. Vetasu and Tuji are found only in those two passages (the latter in disguised form in VI.20.8, q.v.) and this one; Tugra is better attested, esp. as the father of Bhujyu, but it’s not clear to me that these two Tugras are the same. (It is also worth noting that the client Tuji and the enemy Tugra appear to be etymologically related, with a Caland-y configuration; see EWA s.v. *túji*-.)

Vetasu in VI.20.8 and 26.4 is singular, against the pl. here.

In the publ. tr. I take acc. *vetasūn* with *pitéva* (“like a father to the V.s”) in order to avoid supplying a verb. But when *pitár-* has such a complement, it is normally in the dative (typically *sūnáve* ‘to a son’). I therefore now think a verb needs to be supplied to govern *vetasūn* and the dat. inf., perhaps a form of \sqrt{kr} (see *karam* in the next vss., 5c, 6d), as in I.129.1 ... *tám abhíṣṭaye, káraḥ* “you will make it prevail” or $\sqrt{pā}$, as in X.93.11 *sádā pāhy abhíṣṭaye* (also V.17.5). The latter would fit better with “like a father,” but the former makes fewer syntactic waves. I would now emend the tr. to “I, like a father, (made) the Vs prevail.” Ge supplies ‘help’, Old (ZDMG 55.328 n. 1 [=KISch 788 n. 1]) ‘brought’, citing I.129.1 just quoted, with *káraḥ*.

In b *smádibham* is generally taken as the PN of another enemy humbled by Indra, parallel to Tugra. VI.20.8 contains a similar configuration, with acc. *túgram* and *ibham* in the same pāda, subject to Indra’s will. Ge-Pi (Ved. Stud. I: xvi) take *ibha-* there as a short form of our *smádibha-*, both *ibha-* and *smádibha-* being PN. Old (ZDMG 55.329 [=KISch 788]) follows this interpr; see also Mayr (PN s.vv.). I am dubious. The word *ibha-* otherwise means ‘vassal’ or the like, and I suggest that in the phrase *túgram śásvad ibham* in VI.20.8, *śásvad ibham* is an appositive to *túgram*: “Tugra (as) perpetual vassal (to s.o.)” In our passage *smádibham* is phonologically similar to VI.20.8 (*śá*)*śvad ibham*. I suggest that our passage is based on, or rather deformed from, VI.20.8, with *smád-* an apheresized, phonologically adjusted form of (*śá*)*śvad*. Since *smád* can form cmpds (e.g., VIII.28.2 *smád-rātīṣac-* “(Agni), along with the Gift-escorts”), it has captured *ibha-*. Unfortunately I have to assume a serious amount of misunderstanding of VI.20.8 to arrive at our passage. The real problem is *ca*, which, in our phrase *túgram ... smádibham ca*, pretty unequivocally signals that we are dealing with two conjoined entities, rather than the single one I would like to see in VI.20.8. To get to my tentative interpr. of the passage here, we must first assume that a phrase like *túgram śásvad ibham* in VI.20.8 was reinterpreted as consisting of two people, not the original one: “Tugra (and) (his) vassal.” This interpr. could be made clearer in two different ways—either by adding a *ca* (**túgram ibham ca* “T and (his) vassal”) or by cmpding with *smád* (**túgram smádibham* “T along with (his) vassal”)—and our passage represents an irrational blend of the two. This may be far more trouble than it’s worth, and simply accepting a PN Smadibha may be the line of least resistance. But I faintly suggest an alternative tr. “I made Tugra along with his vassal subject to Kutsa.”

The challenges of this vs. continue. Pāda c contains the hapax *rājāni* (≠ differently accented *rājani* loc. sg. ‘king’), over which much ink has been spilled (see, e.g., EWA 445–46,

Keydana [Inf. 190–91, both with lit; most recently Weiss [“King: Remarks on an East-West Archaism,” Fs. B. A. Olsen (2017)]]). The form is surely a loc. sg. and is also fairly surely related to the G and Y Aves. *r/n* stem *rāzar/ rāzan-*, which is variously rendered (Barth. ‘Gebot, Satzung, Anordnung’, Insler ‘directive’, Humbach₁ ‘Verkündigung’, KP ‘adresse’, Humbach₂ ‘prayer’). I will not further pursue the Aves. evidence here, on the assumption that, if the more liturgically limited interpr. are correct, they result from inner-Avestan developments; not will I pursue the prehistory of the formations, for an ingenious account of which see Weiss. I also think it is unlikely to be an infinitive, as, e.g., Ge (n. 4c) suggests. (On this question see Keydana cited above.) But, assuming the stem means something like ‘rule, direction, control’ the question is who is doing the controlling – Indra or the sacrificer (*yájamānasya*), who is in the gen. and presumably dependent on *rājáni*. The categorical difference that even subtle changes in wording can express is clear in the two English phrases “X is in control of Y” and “X is in the control of Y”: in the former X controls Y, in the latter Y controls X. (My sympathies to non-native-speakers of English, who have to confront these two semantically opposite expressions, distinguished only by the presence or absence of the definite article.)

To approach this question it would help to know the identity of the sacrificer. Since this pāda is found within a vs. otherwise devoted to the Tugra, Vetasu, Kutsa, Tuji saga, it is unlikely to be a generic, present-day sacrificer; rather it should be one of the participants in the same story. Sāy. identifies him as Tuji, who appears in the next pāda. Given their proximity, this makes contextual sense, and note that in VI.26.4 Tuji is characterized as singing / a singer (*grnánt-*), that is, as a ritual participant. Or it could be Kutsa, who appears in the preceding pāda (b); Kutsa is called ‘pious’ in VI.26.3 (*kútsāya ... dāsúše*), one of the treatments of this saga. In either case the sacrificer would be, not surprisingly, a devotee and client of Indra, not one of the enemies. This only gets us so far, however, because it is possible to construct opposing scenarios in which Indra is either “in control of” or “in the control of” said person. Although the former is, in some ways, the more likely—Indra is all powerful and can exert control over any mortal—I think the latter, the counterintuitive one, may be the more appealing. In response to a plea, phrased as a directive, from one of his clients confronting a threatening situation, Indra voluntarily puts himself under the direction of the imperiled mortal. This role reversal may account for the unprecedented verbal expression, with *bhuvam* + hapax loc.

We come, at last, to pāda d. As was already noted in the intro. to the hymn above, *bháre* could be either pres. or injunctive, and I take it as injunc. because it belongs to the mythological recital in progress, as the presence of Tuji shows. Before probing what the pāda means, we need to address its syntax: is d a single subordinate clause, dependent on c, or is *prá yád bháre tujáye* the subord. cl. with a flg. nominal main cl, *ná priyádhíše*. Both Ge and I take it as the latter, but Old produces two possible tr. both reflecting the former. The choice makes rather less difference than it might appear.

The next question is what, if anything, is the obj. of *prá ... bháre*. One of Old’s suggested tr. takes *priyá* as obj.: “bring forward the dear things (that are) not to be assailed”; Ge supplies “Wagen.” But I think it more likely that this mid. locution is reflexive / self-involved: “bring oneself to the fore, present oneself.” This action would be the logical follow-up to Indra’s putting himself under the direction of Tuji: he “puts himself out” for T, insuring that the T’s *priyá* were not vulnerable. What these *priyá* were, we don’t know: Ge thinks it’s a pair of horses, but horses don’t figure in the other passage(s) with Tuji, and the form does not have to be a dual. I think it’s more likely to be just general beloved stuff, in the neut. pl.

X.49.5: In contrast to the previous couple of vss., the episodes here are unfamiliar, but the verbal expression is more straightforward (with the major exception of pāda b). Note the bookending (*a*)*randhayam* “I made subject” in pādas a and d (echoing 4b). On likely injunc. *karam* in c, see intro. to hymn above.

Śrutarvan figures in VIII.74, where he is explicitly mentioned in vss. 4 and 13, but is in addition the object of the *dānastuti* in vss. 13–15 (see Anukr.). Vs. 14 of the *dānastuti* contains a comparison to the rescue of (Bhujyu) *tūgryam* ‘son of Tugra’. Although in my comment on the vs. just above (vs. 4) I am skeptical that this Tugra is the same Tugra as in the Tugra / Kutsa tale, it is possible that this sketch of the Śrutarvan / Mṛgaya episode was attached here because of the connection in VIII.74.14.

No opponent of Śrutarvan’s is mentioned in VIII.74 (which is an Agni hymn). The opponent here, *mṛgaya-*, is found as the designation or descriptor of different enemies defeated by Indra in IV.16.13 and VIII.3.19; because of its likely derivation from *mṛgá-* ‘wild beast’ (see EWA s.v. *mṛgá-*), it is quite possible that *mṛgaya-* is not a name, but an adj. ‘wild, bestial,’ or the like.

Pāda b is quite challenging: the only words that present no (or few) problems are the first two, *yád* and *mā*. Let us begin with the third word, the impf. 3rd sg. *ājihīta* (so Pp.). I assume (with Ge, Th [Unters. 25], and hesitantly Old) that Śrutarvan is the subj. of this verb and *mā* (=Indra) is the complement (though see below). To get further, we must first be clear on what the form is out of sandhi. Old points out that it could actually contain the preverb *ā-* *ā-ājihīta*, but I think we can dismiss this suggestion quite easily: *ā-* is not otherwise found with *√hā* ‘move’. But this raises another issue: forms of *√hā* are almost never found without preverb; most of those listed as such in Gr either appear with derivational extensions of preverbs or belong to the other *√hā* ‘leave (behind) / be bereft of’. For an ex. of the former see VIII.20.6 ... *dyaúr, jihīta úttarā bṛhát* “heaven raises itself higher aloft,” with *úttara-* substituting for *úd*, as in X.35.6 *úd agnāyo jihatām jyótiṣā bṛhát* “Let the fires rear up loftily with their light.” In V.32.9d pāda-final *jihāte* does appear without preverb, but it contrasts with the immediately following *ní ... jihīta* in 10a. Only the part. *jihānaḥ* in III.38.1 seems to be a genuine independent ex. without preverb. What then to do with our apparently naked *ājihīta*? I suggest, very tentatively, that the *ānu* underlying *ānuṣák* is to be understood with the verb; the lexeme *ānu √hā* is reasonably well represented (III.31.17, VI.18.15, VII.34.24, X.89.13) in the sense ‘follow, conform to, yield to’, as in the extravagant X.89.13, also with Indra as object: *ānv áha māsā ānv íd vānāny, ānv óṣadhīr ānu párvatāsaḥ / ānv índraṃ ródasī vāvasāné, ānv āpo ajihata jāyamānam* “The months gave way to (him), the trees gave way, the plants gave way, the mountains gave way; the two world-halves eagerly gave way to Indra; the waters gave way to him as he was being born.” In our passage Śrutarvan may have yielded to Indra (per the publ. tr.) or simply followed him; in any case he is a client of Indra for whom Indra accomplished the deed presented in pāda a.

We still have more than half the pāda to go, however. Though the next word is the perennially problematic *vayúnā*, we might first address the value of the following word, *caná*, another perennial problem. This word has fortunately been treated in detail by Klein (DGRV I.285–92), though he does not deal with this passage. As he clearly demonstrates, although *caná* overwhelmingly appears in negative contexts, by itself it does not have negative value; the negative is expressed elsewhere in the context and, as it were, bleeds (not his term) into the *caná*, in part because of the coincidence of *-ná* with the negative *ná*. (See however comm. ad II.24.12, IV.18.8.) He finds only one passage where *caná* has “indisputably negative value” (VIII.1.5), but as I argue ad loc., this counterex. is only apparent, because a trio of negative expressions follow

caná in the same clause. Klein (p. 286) identifies only two examples of his fourth category of *caná*, “in positive clauses, where *caná* does not possess a negative value.” Our passage can be added to this category, as well as V.34.7 (see comm. ad loc.). In V.34.7 I suggest that *caná* is the equivalent of *cid* in that context, and it may serve thus here as well. Note that Old says that *vayúnā* is “hervorgehoben” by *caná*. In any case we need not try to include a negative in our interpr. (as Ge does; see below). On the problematic ex. in X.56.4 see comm. ad loc.

Let us now return to *vayúnā*. The first issue is the grammatical identity of the form, which can be either instr. sg. or nom.-acc. pl. neut. Ge (n. 5b) opts for the former, although allowing the possibility of the latter if a participle is supplied. But Ge’s interpr. of the whole pāda renders *vayúnā* entirely too freely: “als er zu mir nicht einmal gebühlich, wie sich’s gehörte, eilte.” I think his interpr. of *vayúnā* is “gebühlich,” with *caná*, interpr. as a negative, accounting for “nicht einmal” and *ānuṣák* for “wie sich’s gehörte.” In his note he suggests that Śrutarvan was in such a hurry to get to Indra that he in essence forgot his manners; this doesn’t accord with any other usage of *vayúna-* that I know of. By contrast both Th and Old interpr. *vayúnā* as neut. pl. and *caná* as non-negative. I think both choices are correct (inter alia, because neut. pl. *vayúnāni* is found twice nearby, in X.44.7, 46.8), but neither of the resulting interpr. do I find satisfying. If we take *vayúnā* as neut. pl., we then have to figure out how to construe it. Th takes it as an acc. appositive to *mā* in the meaning ‘protection’ (a semantic extension of his preferred interpr. of *vayúna-* ‘Umhüllung’): “als er (Śrutarvan) in stetiger Folge (immer wieder, unablässig [= *ānuṣák* sj]) zu mir (Indra) kam als seinem Schutz.” He notes “[d]er harte Plural der Apposition” (to sg. *mā*) but explains it as expressing Śrutarvan’s repeated seekings of protection. Both the “hard plural” and the lack of other exx. of *vayúna-* as “Schutz” make this interpr. unlikely. It is Old’s interpr. that is closest to mine: “als er zu mir hinstürzte, den Ordnungen richtig folgend.” The syntactically controversial decision here is to construe *vayúnā* with *ānuṣák*; he seems to take *ānuṣák* as an adjective (“richtig folgend”) modifying the subj. of *ājihīta* and governing the acc. *vayúnā*.

Let us now turn our attention to *ānuṣák*, for which see also Scar (588–89). As for adjectival use of *ānuṣák*, Scar (589) finds no certain exx. of it, though a number of passages are suggestive and in his opinion the adverbial usage must have arisen from a predicative use of an original adj. Although Scar doesn’t discuss this, I can find no clear exx. of *ānuṣák* governing an acc., as Old wants it to. What do I do with the combination *vayúnā ... ānuṣák*? As disc. ad II.34.4 and passim, I interpr. *vayúna-* as meaning ‘patterns’, both physical patterns made, e.g., by the alternations of light and shade, and, by extension, ritual patterns, the template of repeated ritual actions, as in VI.52.12 *imāṃ no agne adhvarām, hōtar vayunaśó yaja* “O Agni, Hotar-priest, perform this ceremony as sacrifice for us according to its patterns.” Now, *ānuṣák* is regularly used of the proper ordering of the sacrifice or elements thereof, as in VIII.23.6 *agne yāhi susastibhir, havyā júhvāna ānuṣák / yāthā dūtó babhūtha havyvāhanah* ‘O Agni, drive with our good lauds, pouring oblations in yourself in the proper sequence, as you have become our oblation-carrying messenger.’ Since *vayúna-* often refers to ritual elements, I think we have the same type of expression here: Śrutarvan’s *vayúna-* ‘ritual patterns’ were properly ordered when he yielded to me or followed after me, and I responded positively to this evidence of Śrutarvan’s piety and helped him out. How does this fit syntactically in b? Since I know of no ex. of *ānuṣák* with acc., I take *vayúnā* as neut. nom. pl., with *ānuṣák* as adverbial predicate: “the ritual patterns (were) in due order,” in other words as a nominal clause. In the publ. tr. this is presented as an unsigned 2nd *yád* cl.: “when he yielded to me *when* the ritual patterns were in due order.” This is skirting the edge of acceptability, or has even crossed it, I realize. There are two other ways to

configure this, still keeping *vayúnā* as nominative. It may be that b contains two clauses: dependent *yád ...*, fld by *vayúnā canānuṣák* as the main cl.: “when he yielded to [or followed after] me, his ritual patterns were in due order,” such that the *yád* cl. does not depend on pāda a, as it is universally interpr., but on the flg. nominal clause. Or *vayúnā* could be the neut. pl. subj. of the sg. verb *ájihīta*: “when his ritual patterns followed after me in due order.”

I realize that all of these suggestions for pāda b (which now amount to over 1300 words, commenting on the 6 that constitute the pāda) are super-tricky and suspect because of their trickiness, starting with the manufacture of a preverb *ánu* from *ānuṣák*, which nonetheless gets to keep its own integrity. I’m certain of at least one thing – that *caná* isn’t negative here – and certain that several other interpr. are on the wrong track, notably Ge’s. The rest is much shakier, and I do not think anyone has cracked the code of this pāda.

The beneficiary of Indra’s action in pāda c, *Āyu*, is, as Mayr. points out (PN s.v.), sometimes a client of Indra’s (besides this passage, VIII.15.5), sometimes an opponent (I.53.10, II.14.7, VI.18.13, VIII.53.2 [Vālah., where the preceding hymn, VIII.52, is attributed to *Āyu Kāṇva*]) — in addition to many passages in which it has the adjectival sense (‘lively’ vel sim.) or refers to a different, primordial *Āyu*. Since the passages in which *Āyu* is Indra’s opponent all combine *Āyu*, *Kutsa*, and *Atithigva* into a trio and since *Kutsa* in our hymn is a client of Indra’s we may assume that we’re not dealing with two different *Āyu*-s but with different family takes on the *Indra / Āyu, Kutsa* dynamic.

Ge (n. 5c) interpr. the pāda as a clash between the *Ārya*, represented by *Āyu*, and the non-*Ārya*, identified as *veśá-*, which he takes as the settled (hence presumably indigenous) population subordinated by the conquering *Ārya*. This interpr. depends on what I consider wrong interpr. of *Āyu* and of *veśá-*. Although Ge identifies *Āyu* here as “der arischen Stammeskönig,” as was just noted there seem to be several *Āyus*, and I doubt that the client/opponent of Indra, associated with *Kutsa*, is the same as the primordial *Āyu*. As for *veśá-*, it is not well-attested -- 3x, plus *ásvaveśa-* (1x), *dāsáveśa-* (1x PN?), and *prátiveśa-* (1x) (*niveśá-* (1x) and *svāveśá-* (3x) appear to be independent derivatives of \sqrt{vis} with the sense ‘entry, entrance’; for the latter see comm. ad VII.97.7) – but its other two occurrences call Ge’s interpr. seriously into question. V.85.7 lists a series of associates against whom we might have committed an offense: *aryamyàṃ varuṇa mitryàṃ vā, sákhāyaṃ vā sádāṃ íd bhrātaraṃ vā / vesám vā nityaṃ varuṇāraṇaṃ vā, yát sīm āgaś cakṛmā śísráthas tād*, with *veśá-*s of two different types ending the list. The publ. tr. reads “O Varuṇa, the offense that we have committed against any partner, be he one by alliance or one by custom, or against a brother, / or against a neighbor—whether native or foreign—o Varuṇa, loosen that.” I would be inclined to tr. *nitya-* here rather as ‘one’s own’ (see comm. ad X.44.1) and *āraṇa-* as ‘alien’, but whatever the fine-tuning, it is clear that a *veśá-* can belong to one’s own group, that is the larger *Ārya* community. The difficult vs. IV.3.13 contains a similar, though less elaborated, series of associates of the speaker: *veśá-, āpí-* ‘friend’, *bhrātar-* ‘brother’, *sákhi-* ‘partner’. Given that the other terms define a relationship of some intimacy with the speaker, it seems unlikely that *veśá-* would refer to an unrelated non-*Ārya*. Again ‘neighbor’ seems a reasonable interpr.; I suggest that this sense for the simplex was extracted from the cmpd *prátiveśa-* (RV 1x, X.66.13, but common starting in the AV, esp. in *Samhitā* and Br. prose), with the literal meaning given by AiG II.1.284 as “die Wohnung gegenüber habend.” Such an interpr. starts with a *veśa-* *‘house’ (quite possibly accented **veśa-* and the equivalent of Grk. φοῖκος, etc.), but given that all three RVic occurrences of *veśá-* denote people, synchronically *veśá-* must have the personal sense backformed from *prátiveśa-*. I realize that this interpr. is more complex (or complex in a different way) than the one set forth by Mayr (EWA s.v.), whereby *veśá-* is

from the *IE* nom. ag. **uoi̯k-ó-* (*√uei̯k* ‘sich niederlassen’) and not directly derived from Ved. *√viś*, but the occurrences of *veśá-* in V.85.7 and IV.3.13 require a relational meaning like ‘neighbor’, not simply ‘settler, inhabitant’. *dāsáveśa-* in II.13.8 is the PN of an opponent of Indra’s, but should mean ‘having Dāsas (/a Dāsa) as neighbor(s)’, so also seems to contain the back-formed personal sense. As for *ásvaveśa-* in the difficult vs. VII.37.7, see comm. ad loc.; it may contain the old ‘house’ sense. For other disc. of *veśá-* see Macd-Keith Vedic Index, s.v., Thieme ZDMG 91 (1937): 107, Renou EVP IV.100 (ad VII.37.7), and EWA s.v., with further lit.: the word has attracted considerable attention. In any case in this passage I would now substitute “his neighbor” for “the vassal.” This change does not of course get us any closer to knowing what actually happened, but it does eliminate the misleading ‘vassal’ sense. Taking *veśá-* as a PN in this passage (Gr; explicitly rejected by Mayr, PN s.v.) does not advance us any further either.

Pāda d is quite straightforward, with another occurrence of the verb *randhaya-* and two likely PNs, one of Indra’s opponent (*pádgr̥bhi-*) and one of his client (*sávya-*). Both are almost speaking names. *Sávya-* must be related to the adj. *savyá-* ‘left’ with accent retraction; despite the usual negative associations of the left, he is Indra’s beneficiary here. Note that one Śavya Āṅgīrasa is the poet of I.51–57, acdg. to the Anukr. As for *pádgr̥bhi-* its transparent literal sense is ‘grabbing the foot’, and it is of course possible that this is not a name, but a description of the enemy. For the retroflex *d*, cf. *pádbīśa-* and the instr. pl. of *pád-* ‘foot’ (*paḍbhīh*); see Old (ZDMG 63.300–302 = Kl Sch. 316–18), EWA s.v. *pádbīśa-*. For the phonology see AiG I.172, etc.

X.49.6: As noted in the intro. to the hymn above, I interpret the hemistich-final verbs as injunc. *rujam* and *karam* respectively, because of the dominance of injunctives in this hymn. However, this comes at some cost: if we follow the Pp. in reading accented *árujam* and *ákaram*, we can have finite verbs for the subordinate clauses introduced by *yáh* (pāda a) and *yád* (c). By my interpr. both those clauses need to be otherwise configured, and it may not be worth the necessary contortions to keep the unaccented injunctives. However, even taking them as accented imperfects does not produce a smooth interpr. of either hemistich, as Ge’s tr. demonstrates.

To begin with, even if we read *árujam* and make it the verb of the relative clause beginning with *yáh*, it cannot govern the accs. in pāda a, *návavāstvam br̥hád̥ratham*, because this phrasal name (or names) is used of a client (or clients) of Agni in I.36.18 and *návavāst^uvam* alone of someone under the protection of Indra in VI.20.11 (see Ge n. 6a). Therefore he (or they) is/are unlikely to have been shattered by Indra in our vs. To deal with this problem Ge supplies a participle (“schützend”) to govern this acc phrase. If we don’t take a and b together (as I don’t), we simply need to supply a finite verb with a positive sense in pāda a. I see very little difference between Ge’s participle and my finite verb: both need to be manufactured and the accs. in pāda a construed differently from those in b. I tentatively supplied ‘aided’ in the publ. tr.; ‘led’ would be possible on the basis of I.36.18 *agnīr nayan nāvavāstvam br̥hád̥ratham*, or some other verb with positive sense.

As for whether we’re dealing with one client or two, Sāy. takes them as two, and Ge follows. I prefer one (though not very strongly), with *br̥hád̥ratha-* an epithet or descriptor, “N. possessing lofty chariots.” Note that the full phrase *br̥hánt- rátha-* is found in I.35.4, the hymn immed. preceding the other attestation of *návavāstvam br̥hád̥ratham*, suggesting that it is a descriptor in I.36.18 too.

The interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is even trickier. See Old’s thoughtful, somewhat discouraging, and ultimately indecisive disc. of the possibilities. Besides the question of *ākaram* v. *karam* and one clause or two, there are the issues of 1) who/what the referent of the acc. caus. participles in c is, 2) what the object of these participles might be (*rocanā* or to be supplied?), 3) what (*ā*)*karam* governs and how it interacts with the participles, 4) what to do with *ānuśák*. Let us first examine what Ge does with a single-clause interpr. of cd – and how it fails – before attempting one with two clauses. Acdg. to Ge. (nn. 6cd, 6c), the referent of *vardháyantam pratháyantam* is Vṛtra and as object to these two causatives we should supply *tanvàm*, rendering the participles reflexive: “... den sich auswachsenden, gehörig [his tr. of *ānuśák* sj] sich ausbreitenden (Vṛtra).” But these interpr. would better fit a medial simplex participle, like *várdhamāna-* in III.30.8, which he cites as semantic parallel. (Note that Sāy. simply glosses the two participles with their medial simplex equivalents: *vardhamānam ... prathamānam*, making no attempt to account for the morphological differences.) The numerous act. forms of *vardháya-* (and fewer but not negligible ones of *pratháya-*) are never so used: there is always an external object. And although one of the two medial forms of *vardháya-* does take *tanvàm* as object, it is not a mere reflexive but a transitive-causative with internal object: X.59.5: *ghṛténa tvám tanvàm vardhayasva* “strengthen your own body with ghee.” Ge then construes *ākaram* with two accs., the participial phrase (X) and *rocanā* (Y), in the sense “make X into Y”: “als ich den ... (Vṛtra) ... in Himmelslichter verwandelte.” But this is a notion that is foreign to the RV: in all the seemingly myriad treatments of Indra’s slaying of Vṛtra in this text, Indra’s turning him into heavenly lights, or realms of light, is never the final (or any) act, as far as I know. Ge (n. 6c) cites one RV passage (X.138.6), which should be otherwise interpr. (q.v.), and a few equivocal passages in Vedic prose. Given that his interpr. of the participial acc. phrase is already deeply problematic, Ge’s solution of desperation can be properly set aside.

There is another potential comparandum, adduced and discussed by Old, which I think is another red herring: II.11.8, which has *vardháya-*, a transitive form of $\sqrt{\text{prath}}$, and *dūré pāré*, but the two verbs are construed separately, with two different objects that have no counterparts in our passage, and the whole is quite obscure in any case.

In my view the passage that gives us the best clue is X.94.9, which contains parallel intrans. forms of $\sqrt{\text{vṛdh}}$ and $\sqrt{\text{prath}}$, with Indra as subject: *tébhīr dugdhám papivān somyám mādhu, índro vardhate práthate vṛṣāyate* “Having drunk the somyan honey milked by them [=pressing stones], Indra grows strong, spreads out, plays the bull.” On this basis I suggest that Indra [I “me”] should be the supplied obj. of *vardháyantam pratháyantam* in our passage, with the whole phrase the transitive equivalent of X.94.9. But who/what is the referent of the participles, their subject? Judging by X.94.9 alone, it should be soma – but soma is not found in our passage, and introducing yet another entity is not a good idea. Looking to the larger context, the subject could be the one who provided the soma, in other words the organizer of the soma sacrifice, the sacrificer. I suggest that this is Navavāstva, who receives Indra’s aid in pāda a. He is the one who in c performs the strengthening and spreading out of Indra “in due ritual order” (*ānuśák*), in other words, during the proper performance of a soma sacrifice. Recall that in the immediately preceding vs. (5ab), by my interpr., Śrutarvan was the beneficiary of Indra’s action because *his* ritual patterns were *ānuśák*; here Nāvastva organizes his sacrifice in the same proper way. In both vss. Indra does something for somebody (5a, 6ab), who does the right thing by him ritually (5b / 6c).

But how would this fit together syntactically? Here we come to the realm of dangerous speculation, which may bring my whole house of cards crashing down. As I just said, I take the

acc. sg. participial phrase in c to be coreferential with *nāvāstvam* in a, which is also acc. sg. In order to construe them together I suggest (very tremulously) that *yád* in c is functioning as a rough izafe connecting the two acc. phrases. Unfortunately this would be the only such ex. in early Vedic, to my knowledge. Although in Old Iranian (both OP and Aves) non-nom. forms of the rel. pronoun can connect non-nom. NPs and in YAves the neut. *yať* substitutes for various oblique forms of the rel. prn. in this type of construction, giving rise to the later Iranian izafe, insofar as Vedic has a similar construction, it shows different parameters. In the RV there exist nominal relative clauses with izafe-like characteristics, but they are always in the nominative, whatever case the antecedent is, and the rel. prn. agrees with the antecedent in number and gender. In early Vedic prose *yád* is in general use, instead of a number- and gender-matching rel. prn., but the clause is also always in the nominative. (For detailed treatment see my “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto-izafe,” to appear in a forthcoming Festschrift.) Here we would have two features that conflict with the other Vedic exx. of the phenomenon – 1) default neut. *yád* rather than matching rel. prn., 2) a (pseudo-)clause in the same case as the antecedent, not the default nominative. Even though both find matches in some of the Iranian materials, I certainly do not want to claim that the construction here is inherited – rather that it was a maladroit nonce attempt at a fix to a particular contextual problem. The presumed underlying phrase would have been a simple acc. NP *nāvavāstvam brhádhratham vardháyantam pratháyantam*, which, however, was too long to fit in a single pāda. For whatever reason the poet inserted the parenthetical main cl. b (... *rujam*) between the name+epithet and the modifying participles, but the latter needed some resumptive device. The poet could have made it all into a rel. cl., **yó vardháyati pratháyati* – but this would have caused confusion with the opening construction of the vs., *ahám sá yáh* “I am he who ...,” where *yáh* is of course Indra. A 2nd *yáh* clause would have invited the Indra interpr. Wanting to make it clear that Navavāstva remained the referent, the poet kept the phrase in the acc. with an inert introducer. (Too bad this strategy sowed confusion rather than reducing it.)

Pāda d is again an independent cl., expressing one of Indra’s cosmogonic actions. Elsewhere he is said to have ‘upheld’ ($\sqrt{dṛh}$) the *rocaná*– VIII.14.9 *índreṇa rocanā divó, dṛḥhāni dṛṃhitāni ca / sthirāni ná parāṇúde* “Through Indra the luminous realms of heaven are firm and made firm, / stable and not to be shoved aside.” (Cf. also II.27.9=V.29.1 of other divinities.) Here he either created the realms or placed them (/ “made them be”) on the far shore of space. This pāda transitions us away from the specifics of the N. story and into the more general situation found in the next vs.

To summarize the structure I see for this vs.: a and c are a single clause, in which we have to supply a verb like “aided” to govern the long acc. phrase that bleeds from a to c. Their connection is signaled by the pseudo-izafe *yád* opening c. Pāda b is a parenthetical main cl., specifying the aid Indra gave N. – we might supply a dative: “(for him) I shattered the Dāsa ...” The final pāda is another independent main cl.; it is not strictly tied to the Navavāstva story, but falls more into the category of Indra’s cosmogonic deeds. I have no faith that my interpr. of the vs. is correct either in general or in detail, but I do think it is an advance on Ge’s and Old’s attempts.

X.49.7: Another discouragingly obscure vs. The first thing to note about it is that it is set in the present, after all the injunctives with past/mythological reference in previous vss. The first hemistich contains the finite present *yāmi* (a); the second the perfect *āha* (c), which always has present value (see Kü 115–17), and whatever *kṛṣe* (d) is, it’s unlikely to have preterital value, a

point made also by Kü (116 n. 47, *pace* Ge’s tr. of *āha* and *kṛṣe* as “riet” and “beseitigte” respectively), but see disc. below.

The first hemistich is fairly straightforward: Indra drives around with the Sun’s steeds (a), further specified as pl. *étaśa*-s in b. Since in the sg. *étaśa*- can be the name of Sūrya’s horse and since *étaśa* is regularly mentioned in the context of the dim story of Indra’s conflict with Sūrya over the latter’s wheel, our vs. seems to depict a post-conflict phase, in which Indra has prevailed and has acquired the Sun’s steeds for his own use. This surmise is supported by the fact that the other two occurrences of pl. *étaśa*- are in conjunction with the Sun (VII.62.2, X.37.3).

The 2nd hemistich is a different story. Its difficulties begin with the 3rd word *sāvāḥ*. As a simplex, it is a hapax, but (assuming it’s the same word) it appears in the cmpds. *prātaḥ-sāvā-* (3x) and *sahasra-sāvā-* (2x). The stem is almost universally (incl. by Sāy.) derived from \sqrt{su} ‘press’, a derivation supported by the cmpds. (presumably ‘early-morning pressing and ‘pressing of thousand(s)’ respectively), but the influential voice of Ge takes it instead to $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘impel’ (see n. 7c), tr. it as “Anweisung” (instruction), a rendering that actually seems relatively far from the root meaning ‘impel’ to me. Ge’s deviating opinion can be discounted here (though Kü [116] allows the possibility of both, with “der Antreib / die Pressung”), even though it makes for a smoother tr.: that is, it is easier to imagine “instruction” as the subj. of a verb “says” than a soma-pressing. Nonetheless, RVic discourse contains far stranger pairings.

The next question is whose *sāvā-* is at issue. There is a dependent genitive, *mānuṣaḥ*, which Sāy., Ge, and Kü (116) take as referring to an unidentified man (see esp. Ge’s n. 7; he thinks it might be Uśanas Kāvya). In contrast, with Old and Scar. (285) I take it as referring to Manu(s), the first sacrificer: “the pressing of Manu(s)” is both the primal offering of soma and every re-creation of it since. By associating it with Manu, the poet gives it the charter to make authoritative statements (*āha*).

And what is that statement? It is embodied in a single word, the dat. *nirṇīje* (in sandhi it could also be abl./gen. *nirṇījah*, but this is less likely; Pp. goes for dative). This dat. is found three times closely packed in IX (IX.69.5, 70.1, 71.1), as a purpose abstract / (quasi-)infinitive: “for / to be (s.o.’s) raiment” (see Scar 284–85). Here I think Soma is announcing himself as Indra’s raiment – that is, that Indra’s ritual drinking of soma, starting with the very first soma pressing, provides him with a protective garment or shield in preparation for battle. Alternatively Soma could just be telling Indra to suit up (which is what Old’s “... sagt mich sauber zu machen” and Scar’s “mich zum Ausschücken anhielt” more or less add up to), but the point of hearing this from Soma would be lost if Soma is not the garment itself.

The result of Indra’s arraying himself is given in the main cl. in d. It is quite clear that Indra seriously damages the/a Dāsa with his *hātha-* (‘blows, thrusts’ vel sim.), but the verb in the clause, *kṛṣe*, is extremely problematic. It is presumably to be construed with the adv. *īdhak* ‘apart, aside’, but the morphological analysis and even the root affiliation are hard to determine. On the one hand, it looks like the accented *kṛṣé* found in VIII.3.20=32.3, but there are serious divergences. If *kṛṣé* is a finite verb, it is a 2nd sg.; the other possibility is a predicated dat. infin. (see disc. ad VIII.3.20). In either case, this allows a root affiliation with $\sqrt{kṛ}$, which fits the context. But here the default interpr. is 1st sg. (Gr simply invents an aor. stem *kṛṣa*, to which this is the 1st sg.). Though it would be possible to recast d as the words of Soma addressed to Indra: “you (will) do ...” (on this poss., see Ge’s n. 7d) and preserve the 2nd sg. interpr., this doesn’t fit the rhetoric of the rest of the hymn, where Indra is always the speaker, and it introduces another layer of complication. And we cannot interpret it as a -ṣe 1st sg. (of the *stuṣé* type), because those forms belong to a tight semantic class, that of praising. There is another factor to keep in

mind: two more exx. of *kṛṣe* are found in the next hymn, X.50.5 \cong 6, attributed to the same poet. These three forms must obviously be considered together, but finding a common denominator isn't easy. Among other things, the usual interpr. of the forms in X.50.5–6 is as 2nd sgs. (like *kṛṣé* in VIII), as opposed to the 1st sg. here – though see disc. ad loc. for my rejection of that interpr. Moreover if the repeated *kṛṣé* in VIII is a finite form, it is probably preterital, but that value doesn't fit here. Note Kü's explicit insistence (116 n. 47) that *kṛṣe* cannot be a preterite in our passage.

Taking it by itself (that is, in conjunction neither with *kṛṣé* in VIII nor *kṛṣe* in the next hymn), I see two possibilities, both of which have their problems as well as their advantages. 1) It belongs to $\sqrt{kṛ}$. The advantages are obvious: $\sqrt{kṛ}$ is an overwhelmingly well-attested root; moreover, *ṛdhak* $\sqrt{kṛ}$ is found elsewhere, in an appropriate meaning: 'put aside, set aside, separate'. Cf. VIII.18.11 *ṛdhag dvéṣaḥ kṛṇuta ...* "Set hostility aside" (also IV.18.4 and prob. IV.34.9). The publ. tr. "sideline" is a slightly idiomatic version of this. But the drawback of this interpr. is serious and indeed insurmountable in my opinion: we need a source for the *-ṣ-*, and I have been unable to find any way to get the *-ṣ-* that is not breathtakingly arbitrary. There is a marginally attested zero-grade medial *s*-aor. (*akṛṣi*, *akṛṣata*), found in JB and BŚS (see Narten, *s*-aor. 96), presumably based on the old medial root aor. (so Narten). Our form could belong to such a stem – but 1) the stem is very late, 2) we would still have to assume that it had been reinterpr. as a pres. stem, to explain the *-e* ending – or else that it shows an archaic *-e* subjunctive ending (rather than *-ai*) built to an anomalously zero-grade stem. Just to set this down in writing shows how desperate a confection it is. If we want to preserve the root affiliation with $\sqrt{kṛ}$, I'm afraid we have to renounce any attempt to account for the *-ṣ-*. 2) But there is another avenue: the root $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ 'plough; drag, draw'. Here the morphology is (relatively) unproblematic. The root has both a 1st class pres. *kārṣati* and a 6th class pres. *kṛṣāti*. Although both presents are generally active, both have medial forms in Vedic (e.g., to the 6th cl., *kṛṣasva* RV X.34.13). On the presents, see Gotō (1st. cl. 112–13) and Hill (Aor.-pres. 115–21); on injunc. *karṣat* see comm. ad X.28.10. Our form can straightforwardly be the 1st sg. med. pres. to *kṛṣá-*. Assuming a meaning 'drag, draw', there is no problem with the semantics of our passage: 'draw/drag aside/apart' can produce the same 'sideline' sense for *ṛdhak* $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ as for the same idiom with $\sqrt{kṛ}$. There are a few problems: the root is not otherwise found with *ṛdhak* and in fact forms of the root are relatively poorly attested in general, esp. compared to $\sqrt{kṛ}$. Moreover, the 'plough' sense is dominant; in fact Gotō (112) claims that the 6th cl. pres. is only used in this technical meaning, whereas *kārṣa-* has a wider semantic range (sim. Hill). But given the (Rig)Vedic propensity for metaphorical extension, I find it difficult to believe that *kṛṣá-* could not widen in the same way as *kārṣa-*. On balance I favor interpr. *kṛṣe* here as a med. 6th cl. pres. 1st sg. to $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$. Or, that *kṛṣe* is a blend, a form originally of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ that has borrowed the *-ṣ-* from $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ on the basis of passages like this, where the semantics were neutralized ('put aside' = 'drag aside'). But the blend idea seems more trouble than it's worth.

The rest of the pāda is unproblematic.

X.49.8–10: These three vss. show concatenation, though their contents are otherwise divergent: 8a *sapta(hā)* matches 9a *saptá* in the same metrical position; 9a *dhārayam* matches 10a *dhārayam*, though in a diff. position. Note also 9b *sīrā(h)* and 10d *āsīram*.

X.49.8: This vs. comes as a relief after the many knots that precede it. It also returns us to the mythological past, with two injunctives (*karam* [c], *vakṣayam* [d]) in addition to the augmented *prāśrāvayam* in b.

On the seven whom Indra smites (*saptahā*) see Ge's n. 8a; of the parallels he cites, X.120.6, with its *saptā dānūn* shattered by Indra, is the most apposite. See also his remarks on Nahus in the same n.

The c and d pādas are implicitly contrastive: the definite *anyām* 'the one' in c evokes an unexpressed **anyān* 'the others' as complement, modifying the acc.s of d (so also Ge).

Since *sāhaḥ* is neut. and *anyām* is masc., they must be two parallel objects: the individual enemy (*anyām*) and the abstract power he represents (*sāhaḥ*); for a similar passage (also adduced by Ge n. 8c) where the *sāhaḥ* is Vṛtra's, which is defeated by Indra's corresponding *sāhasā*, see I.80.10 *īndro vṛtrāsya tāviṣīm, nīr ahan sāhasā sāhaḥ* "Indra has smashed forth the power of Vṛtra, has smashed forth the might of Vṛtra with his might."

The apparent act. participle *vrādhant-* is essentially isolated; the sole finite form to the supposed root $\sqrt{vrādh}$ (V.6.7) is plausibly explained by Hoffmann (Inj. 122 n. 32; see also Gotō [1st cl. 302]) as a backformation to *vrādhant-*. Lowe (Part. 291) considers the poss. that it is a Caland adj. In any case it lacks synchronic participial function, serving as a plain adj., but one with shifting value: 'arrogant, overweening' of enemies, 'proud' of clients. For the former, cf., e.g., X.69.11 *āva vrādhantam abhinad vṛdhas cit* "as strengthener you [=fire] cut down even the greatly arrogant one." For the latter I.122.10, where Nahus, found also in our vs., is so described: *vrādhato nāhuṣaḥ ... śārdhastaraḥ* "more forceful than proud Nahus"; see also I.150.3. Since the ninety-nine here are the object of Indra's strengthening, a positive interpr. is called for. See Ge's n. 8d.

X.49.9: On Indra's holding the waters fast, see comm. ad I.51.4, also I.61.11 (adduced by Ge n. 9a). KH (Inj. 192) takes *dhārayam* as having the same presential-general sense as the identical form in 10 and tr. "ich erhalte die sieben Ströme", but, despite the pres. tense verb in c, I think the rest of the verse is couched in the mythological past.

I do not know why c has a pres. tense verb *vī tirāmi*, while d has the injunctive *vidam* (which could in fact be augmented *avidam* in its sandhi context: *yudhā[avidam]*, though this seems unlikely), esp. since, as Ge asserts (n. 9cd), the actions in the two pādas are elsewhere associated (see esp. X.104.9).

X.49.10: KH tr. and disc. this vs. (Inj. 192). He takes *dhārayam* as "generell" in function (= "allgemeine Eigenschaft bzw. Fähigkeit") and tr. "Ich halte ... fest," while the augmented *ādihārayat* in b he renders as a semi-modal "festhalten konnte." As he points out, the vs. seems to concern one of the beloved Vedic paradoxes about cows and milk: that "cooked" milk comes from "raw" cows, or that white milk comes from red cows. But in fact the particulars of the vs. point to neither of these (save possibly for the *rúṣat* 'gleaming' in 10b); the content more resembles another standard paradox, that the fetus doesn't fall out of the womb or the sun out of the sky. It is also not clear why/how Tvaṣṭar failed while Indra succeeded, that is, what episode this refers to. Ge (n. 10ab) says that Tvaṣṭar is the creator of animals, but this only makes his failure in this endeavor the more mysterious. Because of the contrast between Indra's and Tvaṣṭar's actions here, I think it must refer to a mythological incident in the past, not a general situation holding now, contra KH.

Pāda b is metrically problematic; for various possible solutions see Old – while Arnold (metrical comm.) suggests reading *tváṣṭa ádhārayat* with the contraction of *tváṣṭādhārayat* unloosed and shortening of *tváṣṭā* in hiatus. What no one seems to have suggested is to read *ná* not as the last word of pāda a, but as the first word of b. This would yield a well-formed Triṣṭubh in pāda a (and the following and final vs. 11 is in Triṣṭubh) and a Jagatī in b, without the need to dissolve the contraction of *tváṣṭādhārayat*. The break of b would be irregular (two heavies), but it is also under the current pāda division, hence the makeshifts of Old, Arnold, and HvN. My suggested division also eliminates pāda-final *ná*, which is vanishingly rare and places the *ná* in a standard pāda-initial position. (There are numerous examples of # *ná ... caná*; see Lub s.v. *caná*.) For disc. of supposed exx. of pāda-final *ná* see comm. ad X.111.7.

The loc. pl. *ūdhasu* (or *ūdhaḥsu*) in c would be better read as degeminated **ūdhasu* to avoid a rare break (– – ∪).

The phrase *sómam āśíram* has been variously interpr. The problem is that although the acc.s throughout this vs. have so far referred exclusively to milk, we suddenly have soma, followed by *āśír-*, the technical term for the milk mixed with soma. Ge (n. 10d) suggests that *āśíram* here is an infinitive, with *sómam* as its complement: “to milk-mix into soma” in an awkward English rendering. (His is smoother: “um den ... Soma zu mischen.”) Alternatively he allows for the possibility of a loose cmpd “die Soma-Mischmilch.” The publ. tr. follows Old’s interpr. (given Noten I.411 n. 1), whereby the milk is *identified* with soma, presumably as a particularly exalted liquid, as well as with the milk to be mixed with it. After all it has just been called “the honey of honey,” another valued substance that is not chemically identical with it. (KH’s [192 and n. 162] “den Zusatz zum ... Soma” seems to follow Ge, though he cites Old.)

X.49.11: Unlike its companion hymn X.48, in this ātmastuti Indra does not remain in character through the whole hymn. The final vs. of X.48, vs. 11, continues the 1st sg. reference with *mināmi* in b and *mā* in c. By contrast, the final vs. of our hymn is a 3rd ps. summary, beginning with the formulaic summary-verse particle *evā* “just in this way,” with Indra the 3rd ps. subject of ab, followed by 2nd sg. reference to him (*te* + heavy voc. *harivaḥ śacīvaḥ ... svayaśaḥ*) in cd.

There are two problems associated with ab and esp. its verb. 1) The pf. *vivīye* is the only medial form not only to the pf. to $\sqrt{vī}$, but to any stem belonging to the root. (Wh’s and Gr’s root pres. part. *vyānā-* X.85.12 is universally interpr. instead as ‘breath’; see comm. ad loc.) 2) Moreover, the lexeme *prá* $\sqrt{vī}$ is relatively rare in the RV; see comm. ad I.34.4 as well as Scar (501). (Ge’s suggestion [n. 11a] that *prá* “excuses” (entschuldigen) the middle voice is belied by the fact that all other finite forms of *prá* $\sqrt{vī}$ are active.) I propose to deal with one of these issues by the simple expedient of separating a and b into separate clauses. Taking them as a single clause results in an unusual verbal configuration: not only would *prá* be separated from *vivīye* by tmesis, but it would follow it at some distance, introducing the next pāda. Although preverbs in tmesis sometimes follow their verbs, they generally follow them immediately and remain in the same metrical unit; I do not offhand know of another example of this type (which is not to say they don’t exist).

With the *prá* eliminated, we are free to interpr. pāda a with a simplex *vivīye*, which allows us to tap into a common formula. The VPs *devān* $\sqrt{vī}$ and *nīn* $\sqrt{vī}$ are occasionally found as free syntagms (e.g., VI.50.2 and VI.2.11 respectively) and the cmpds *devā-vī-* and *devā-vīti-* are quite common, all in the meaning ‘pursue / seek to attract the gods (/men)’, i.e., seek to attract their attention and their presence. As a summary of the intent of his self-praise (*ātmastuti*), “Indra pursued / sought to attract the gods” seems accurate and would immediately evoke the

stereotyped VP. His string of boasts is meant to impress the audience with his powers and previous deeds and excite their admiration. The unusual middle voice would reflect Indra’s intense self-involvement in the action; the verb is otherwise syntactically identical to the active, as Kü remarks (454) with some puzzlement.

In the publ. tr. I take *devān ... nṛṇ* as a conjoined phrase without overt conjunction: “gods and men.” I now think it at least equally likely that *nṛṇ* refers to the gods, as so often, and the whole should be tr. “the gods, the superior men.” Cf. VI.2.11 *vīhī ... divó nṛṇ* “pursue the men of heaven,” clearly referring to the gods.

This leaves us with pāda b, independent by my interpr. but lacking a finite verb. This can be easily remedied by attending to the first two words: *prá cyautnéna*. The latter of course is derived from \sqrt{cyu} ‘stir, rouse’; *prá* is the most common preverb with \sqrt{cyu} . I generate a verb form for b from this combination, *prācyāvayat* vel sim., supplying as obj. *devān ... nṛṇ* from pāda a.

It is also possible that the second hemistich should be divided into two clauses, rather than being a single cl, as in the publ. tr. The first (c) would be a nominal clause: “all these (deeds) are just yours,” with a displaced *íd*, or “all these (deeds) are yours.” Pāda d would then simply supply *tā* as obj. from its nominative in c: “The powerful ones applaud (them).” This separation might allow more of a role for the *íd* in c, though both interpr. are possible and pretty much amount to the same thing.

Since *abhī√gṛ* means rather ‘greet, welcome, applaud’ rather than ‘sing’, the tr. should be adjusted accordingly.

X.50 Indra

The hymn has an intriguing structural omphalos, although it does not seem to correlate with specially emphasized content. In vss. 3, 4, and 5 each hemistich in the vs. has a more or less matching opening: 3a *ké té*, 3c *ké te* (note the accentual and therefore morpho-lexical difference in the 2nd word); 4a *bhúvaḥ*, 4c *bhúvaḥ*; 5a *ávā nú kam*, 5c *áso nú kam*. Vss. 3 and 4 also have echoes of the opening further along: 3a and the beginning of 3b continue the pronominal pattern: *ké té nára indra yé ta iṣé, yé te ...*, with 3d opening with *ké* again; 4b starts with the same *bhúvaḥ* as 4a and c.

There are a few other patterns worth noting: the word *nṛ-* and derivatives dominate the first four vss. of the hymn: 1b (*viśvā*)*narāya*, 1d *nṛmṇám*, 2a *nárya*, 2b *naré*, 3a *náraḥ*, 4c *nṛṇ*. And note contrastive *paúmsye* in 3d. Pāda 5d and 6a are identical save for a minor variation (#*viśvéd etā* v. #*etā viśvā*). And the first (1a) and last (7d) pādas of the hymn end with *ándhasaḥ*, construed, not surprisingly, with a form of $\sqrt{ma(n)d}$.

X.50.1: The verb *prá ... árcā* can be either 2nd sg impv. or 1st sg. subj. I have followed the Pp. (etc.) in taking it as the former, despite the presence of 2nd pl. *vaḥ*. As I discuss in “Poetic Self-Reference” (Fs. Skjaervø, 2005: 69 and n. 10), a poet sometimes urges himself, in the 2nd sg., to praise, while referring to his priestly colleagues on behalf of whom he is acting in the 2nd pl. (regularly *vaḥ*). It is awkward to render the enclitic in English, and so I left it out of the publ. tr.; Ge. takes it as a possessive with *ándhasaḥ* (“an eurem Tranke”), but this seems just like a place to park the pronoun.

With Gr, Old, Scar (360), but contra Pp., I analyze *viśvābhū-* as *viśva-ābhū-* ‘present / available to all’, which distracted reading salvages the meter. The argument against this analysis might be that rt. noun cmpds generally don’t contain both a nominal 1st member and a preverb

(see my *iṣudhyá-* [Fs. Lamberterie, 2020] 486 and my forthcoming “Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian”; Scar 649 and n. 921). However, this restriction seems to be limited to nominals with object function; *viśva-* is more loosely construed with the rest of the cmpd. here.

As disc. ad I.18.9, III.31.7, *makhá-* and its derivatives and cmpds can have both martial and bountiful sense. Here since *súmakha-* modifies *sáhaḥ* ‘strength, power’, it is more likely to be the former, hence my “good-battling strength” versus Ge’s somewhat discordant “des freigebigen ... Siegeskraft.”

I take *máhi* with *śrávaḥ* despite the pāda boundary between them, because *máhi śrávaḥ* is a fairly common phrase (I.43.7, 79.4, etc.), but there is no harm in taking it with *sáhaḥ* as Ge does.

X.50.2: The *sákhi-*, Indra’s “comrade,” doing the praising in pāda a is by implication the “man like me” who is supposed to celebrate Indra in b — which neatly identifies me as having such a privileged relationship with the god.

The various locatives in cd sketch a range of situations in which Indra is hard pressed and needs – and receives (*abhí ... mandase*) – the exhilaration of soma. The English might be more parsable if the locatives had been rendered more uniformly. I now would take the list as a series of unmarked locative absolutes, tr. “Whether it’s a question of ...” The standard interpr. (incl. in the publ. tr.) is that four different circumstances are enumerated: *viśvāsu dhūrṣú*, *vājakṛtyeṣu*, *vṛtré*, and *apsú*, with *vā* preceding the last member of the series in a construction “X₁ ... X_{n-1} (*utá*) *vā* X_n” (see JSK, DGRV II.172–73). I now wonder if there are only two items on the list, each with a characterizing loc.: the two items would be *vājakṛtyeṣu ... vṛtré vā* (with conventionally placed *vā*), with each further characterized by a circumstantial locative, the initial *viśvāsu dhūrṣú* and the final *apsú* – thus producing a chiasmic construction. On this basis I now suggest an alternative tr. “whether it’s a question of seeking prizes among all the chariot poles or of Vṛtra among the waters.” The reason for my change of heart (beyond a better placement of *vā*) is that an independent situation “among the waters” that would require Indra to rev himself up with soma is a bit difficult to conjure up, and “amidst all the chariot poles” is also somewhat hard to construe independently – witness the varying interpr. given by Sāy., Ge (n. 2c), and Klein. My second proposed item, “Vṛtra among the waters,” would refer to Vṛtra’s confinement of the waters, and Indra’s need to smite Vṛtra in order to free the waters.

As for the first item, we must first take a brief detour through *vājakṛtya-*. The 2nd member of this cmpd, *-kṛtya-* is presumably a neut. abstract ‘doing’ (so AiG II.2.828), found also in AV *karma-kṛtya-* ‘doing of deeds’. But what does ‘doing (or ‘making’) of *vāja-*’ mean? The syntagm *vājam / vājān √kr* is very rare: I have been able to find only one example, the throw-away final pāda of VIII.26, vs. 25 *kṛdhí vājān apó dhíyaḥ* “(O Vāyu,) make prizes, waters, and insights for us.” I suggest that *√kr* in our *vāja-kṛtya-* is, as it sometimes is, a dummy verb, that is, it serves as the abstract of the denom. to *vāja-*, *vājayá-* ‘seek prizes’; with its associated adj. *vājayú-* ‘seeking prizes’. With this array, we might expect a long-*ā* abstract **vājayā-* ‘the seeking of prizes’ – cf., e.g., *śravas-yá-* ‘seeks fame’, *śravas-yú-* ‘seeking fame’, and *śravas-yā-* ‘the seeking of fame’. I suggest that *vāja-kṛtya-* is substituting for **vāja-yā-*, perhaps to avoid a pile-up of fem. loc. pl. Alternatively *√kr* in this cmpd might be used in the same way as in VIII.26.25: ‘make’, that is, ‘supply’ prizes to someone else.

In either case the “seeking / making of prizes” happens “amidst all the chariot poles.” This must refer to the disordered scrum of chariots and the horses yoked to those chariots found

either on the battlefield or in a contest or chariot race. So acdg. to my two-item interpr., Indra receives an infusion of soma at his (mythological) battle with Vṛtra and in the confusion of (present-day) battles and contests in which he gives aid to mortals.

So I now suggest an alternative rendering of the 2nd hemistich “Whether it’s a question of seeking/making prizes amidst all the chariot poles or of Vṛtra amidst the waters, you find exhilaration.” I have not entirely rejected the four- (or an alternative three-) item interpr., however, because the independently construed *apsú* in the next vs., 3d, may respond directly to *apsú* here.

X.50.3: As Ge says (n. 3), the answer to “who are these men (*nárah*)?” is probably a resounding “we are!” This answer has been prepared by the explicit “a man like me” (*māvate naré* 2b). However, since *nī-* can also be used of gods and in the pl. is especially common with the Maruts, the poet may be setting up a sneaky identification between the human adherents to Indra and the gods who have the same type of relationship to him. In any case the concentration of *nī-* forms early in the hymn gives weight to the question “who are these men?”

Judging from the various tr., it almost seems that the dative pred. *iṣé* could belong to any number of stems *iṣ-* (several of which don’t exist). I take it to *iṣ-* ‘refreshment’ (so also Scar 291 and Sāy., who glosses *annāya*), the point being that the men in question provide Indra with *iṣ-* (in this case, probably soma). Ge “nach Wunsch” (wouldn’t this be an instr.?) or better (n. 3) “zu deiner Freude” (presumably to the same *iṣ-* as mine); Heenen (Desid. 80–81) “à ta force” (what stem?). Note that VI.68.1, adduced by Ge (n. 3), contains both *iṣé* and *sumnāya*, like the *sumnám* in our pāda b. See comm. ad loc. Our passage makes the reciprocity between the two terms clear: we provide Indra with *iṣ-* and in turn receive *sumnā-* from him.

On *sadhanyām* see comm. ad IV.1.9, VI.51.3, where I accept Scar’s re-analysis of this stem as ultimately based on *sa-dhana-* ‘common wealth’, with the developed meaning of *sadhanī-* ‘companion’, contra the usual deriv. from a rt noun cmpd with $\sqrt{nī}$. In Scar’s rendering of this passage he takes the companion to be Indra’s: “dein Wohlwollen, das dein [ständiger] Begleiter ist (?)” I think it more likely that the men are seeking to make Indra’s favor into *their* companion. I would now slightly emend the tr. to “as their companion,” eliminating “travelling,” which is a ghostly trace of the old interpr. with $\sqrt{nī}$. Curiously Ge tr. *sadhanyām* here as “deine Mitanteil an der Beute gewährende (Huld)” (fld. by Tichy [1983 = KISch 207 n. 22], W. E. Hale [Asuras (1986) 93, “booty-apportioning”], Heenen [“qui procure des butins”]) though Ge’s renderings of the stem elsewhere are in the “companionship” range.

In c the “lordly prize” (*vājāyāsuryāya*) for which the men strive matches the prize in *vājakṛtya-* in 2c. Likewise, the loc. phrase *apsú svāśūrvārāsu paúmsye* seems to have a function similar to the locatives in 2cd, except here they express what is at stake for the men, rather than for Indra as in 2cd. The presence of the reflexive adj. *svāsu* ‘their own’ emphasizes the men’s self-interest. Note that *apsú* is found in both 2d and here; in 2d it referred (probably) to the waters associated with Vṛtra, but here it must be the waters that the men are battling for. I therefore think that *svāsu* not only modifies flg. *urvārāsu* (“their own fields”) but, more importantly, preceding and likewise fem. *apsú* (“their own waters”), in order to contrast with the waters in 2d, which are in Indra’s domain. Gr, Ge, and, flg. Ge, Hale take *svāsu* only with *urvārāsu*. I would now slightly emend the tr. to “when their own waters (and) fields (or) their masculine power is at stake.”

The last loc., *paúmsye* ‘masculine power’, implicitly contrasts with the many forms of *nṛ-* so far encountered, esp. the subj. of this vs., pl. *náraḥ*. For a similar contrast see comm. ad X.29.7.

X.50.4: The three insistent pāda-initial forms *bhúvaḥ* are of course troublingly ambiguous, because formally they can be either injunctive or subjunctive (see disc. ad IV.16.18, X.8.5–6) and because the influential disc. of KH (Injunk., esp. 214ff.; see also just cited comm.) imposes what to me is an overly narrow interpr. of these forms. In the publ. tr. I take the three *bhúvaḥ* here as subjunctive “you will become” (so also JSK DGRV I.99); this may be supported by the undoubted subjunctives in the next vs. (*ásah ... vārdhāḥ* 5c). However, I now think it possible, though not necessary, to take them instead as injunctives “you become” — meaning that Indra periodically takes on these roles (see comm. ad X.8.5–6). If we maintain the subjunctive interpr., the first hemistich is a promise to Indra from the poet and ritualists, while the second portrays the aid Indra will provide in return. I think it less likely that the forms are injunctives in preterital sense “you became” (*pace* Ge’s “Du ... wardst ...”) although this is not excluded.

The stem *cyautná-* is otherwise neut. in the RV (pl. *cyautná(ni)*); as the numerous occurrences in Aves. (both O and Y) of the exact cognate *šīaoθ(a)na-* are also neut., this seems like an inherited trait. The masc. nom. sg. *cyautnáḥ* here is a grammatical nonce, with the stem pressed into service as a rough-and-ready agent noun. I suggest that it was generated from the last vs. of the previous hymn (X.49.11) where I suggested that *prá cyautnéna* is a compressed expression of * *prācyāvayat cyautnéna* “With his stirring action he be(stirred) (them),” where in fact *nṛn* forms part of the object. Here, with Old, I take *nṛn* again as an acc. to be construed with the nonce nom. agentis *cyautná-*. The tr. would better reflect this as “you will become the rouser of men” (cf. Ge. Aufrüttler, sim. KH, JSK ‘mover’).

In d identifying Indra as a mantra, a solemn utterance, or if we take its suffix literally, “an instrument for thinking,” is a surprising turn; in fact it is rather like identifying him as a (hastily masculinized) *cyautná-* in the previous pāda. Since the ordinarily word *mántra-* is already masculine, it does not need to be masculinized here, but perhaps our form is the equivalent of masculinized *cyautnáḥ*, a nonce agent noun from a nom. act. (Gr glosses this usage as Berather.) Note also that the pair *cyautná- / mántra-* shows the deeply embedded IIr. opposition between deeds and words/thoughts.

Three of the pādas in this vs. contain *visva-* ‘all’: b *visveṣu sávaneṣu*, c *visvasmin bháre*, d *visvacarṣane* – thus universalizing Indra’s roles. This *visva-* concentration resonates with *visvānarāya visvābhúve* in 1b, with *visvacarṣane* ‘common to all domains’ being esp. similar to *visvānarāya* ‘common to all men’ in sense.

X.50.5: *jyāyān* in pāda a picks up *jyēṣtha-* in 4d.

The hapax *ómatrām* is very problematic; see esp. Old’s detailed disc. He favors a combination of *óman-* (m.) ‘aid’ and *trā-* ‘protect(ion)’ because the two roots regularly appear together. But the morphological details are very difficult. I have rendered it as an unholy (or at least unorthodox) dvandva “succor and protection” without any faith in its correctness.

The conjoined subjunctives in c, *ásah ... vārdhāś ca*, seem functionally untethered, which is why I interpr. them as belonging to an unsignalled purpose clause dependent on (my interpr. of) d. This is not necessary, however – the pāda can simply mean “you will be unaging and will make (us) strong.”

As for *vārdhāh*, Gr, Ge, and JSK (DGRV I.80, 83) take it as intransitive (JSK: “grow (even) stronger”), but the active 1st class pres. *vārdhati* is overwhelmingly transitive. Gotō (1st Cl. 290) hesitantly registers only 3 possible intrans. forms of the act. simplex, incl. this one. It seems a simple matter to interpr. it in its usual function and supply ‘us’ (vel sim.) as object, esp. given that the first half of the vs. depicts the help Indra gives to mortals.

The last pāda (essentially repeated as 6a) has two problematic forms, which are run together in the Saṃhitā text: *tūtumākṛṣe*. The Pp. divides as *tūtumā kṛṣe*, an analysis followed by all subsequent tr. (but the publ. tr.) and interpr. (as far as I know), starting with Sāy. Flg from this word division, *tūtumā* is a hapax neut. pl. adj. modifying *sāvanā*, perhaps meaning ‘strong’ (Gr ‘kräftig’) or ‘abundant’ (‘ausgiebig’ BR) to $\sqrt{tū}$ ‘be strong’ and somehow derived from *tumrā-* (so Gr, AiG II.2.85 etc.). *kṛṣe* is a 2nd sg. verb to $\sqrt{kṛ}$, identical to the problematic accented *kṛṣé* found in a repeated passage in VIII.3.20=32.3 (see comm. ad VIII.3.20). The whole assemblage means “you made all these pressings strong / abundant.” There are several glaring problems with this interpr.: 1) The supposed adj. *tūtumā-* is oddly formed; 2) Although it is possible to interpr. *kṛṣe* in the same way as *kṛṣé* in the repeated pāda in VIII, this requires separating it from the identical *kṛṣe* in the immediately preceding hymn (X.49.7) attributed to the same poet as this one. The standard interpr. of that form is as a 1st sg., which would rest on a very different set of morphological processes. Ignoring the nearby form in favor of the distant one is not good philological method; 3) In terms of the content of the pāda, it isn’t really *Indra*’s job to make the pressings strong/abundant; that should fall to the mortal worshipers.

I have a radically different interpr., which depends on a different analysis of the Saṃhitā text: *tūtuma ākṛṣe*. (This requires no emendation of the Saṃhitā text, only a deviation from the Pp.) Note the lack of accent on *tūtuma* and the accented *ā* attached to *-kṛṣe*; both are crucial for the analysis to follow. With this word division we have, first, a 1st plural verb to the reduplicated stem *tūto-* (3x: *tūtos* VI.26.4, *tūtot* II.20.5, 7). All three other occurrences are transitive, and the two in II.20 take ritual objects: *brāhmā* ‘sacred formulations’ and *sāmsam* ‘laud’, so *sāvanā* ‘pressings’ would be an appropriate obj. for my *tūtuma*. Contra Wh and Macd (VGS), *tūto-* probably does not belong to the perfect system but is a redupl. aor., as identified already by Gr and argued for by Kü (220-21), flg. KH etc. (see Kü’s n. 298); see comm. ad VI.26.4. Assignment to a redupl. aor. seems reasonable, since the single clear pf. form, *tūtāva* (I.94.2), is intrans. and so the *tūto-* forms are functionally distinct. I am somewhat disturbed that there is no *-āya-*pres. attested (**tāvāyati* ‘makes strong’), since in my view trans./caus. redupl. aorists are all secondarily dependent on such present stems. However, since verbal forms to this root in Sanskrit are confined to the RV and are quite rare, the absence of **tāvāyati* may result from the accidents of attestation – esp. since Old Persian has the corresponding stem *tāvaya-* (see EWA s.v. *TAV*¹; Cheung, Etym. Dic of Iran. Verb 386; Schmidt, Altpers. Wö. 252, etc.), and Vedic could well have inherited the same. That the redupl. aor. is athematic suggests that it belongs to an early layer of such formations. The redupl. aor. analysis also explains the short root vowel – since $\sqrt{tū}$ is set, we might have expected **tūtū(-ma)* in weak forms – since the metrical template of redupl. aors. is heavy redupl. + light root syl. (not achievable in the *tūtos*, *-ot* forms however).

Having exchanged an oddly formed adj. *tūtumā-* for a well-formed finite verb, we now must confront my suggested *ākṛṣe*, and this requires revisiting *kṛṣe* in the previous hymn X.49.7. As argued in the comm. ad loc., I take *kṛṣe* there not as a form of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ (the universal view), but of $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ ‘drag, draw’ – in that case the 1st sg. mid. of the 6th cl. pres. *kṛṣá-*. I assume the same root affiliation here, but take it not as a form of the 6th cl. pres. but rather as a dative inf. *ākṛṣe* with purpose sense: “to draw (you) here.” This makes for a satisfyingly conventional sense for the

pāda: we make our soma particular powerful / abundant in order to attract the god. There are a few loose ends to be cleaned up, however. First, \acute{a} is not otherwise attested with $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ in Vedic. However, it would be exceptionally easy to create on the model of the numerous lexemes with \acute{a} like $\acute{a}\sqrt{kr}$ ‘make (to be) here’, $\acute{a}\sqrt{bhr}$ ‘bring here’, etc., and in fact $\acute{a}\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ ‘draw to oneself’, etc., is quite common in epic and Cl. Skt. A more serious problem is the accent: in a rt. noun cmpd like this we should expect $\bar{a}-kṛṣe$, rather than having the accent on the preverb. I have no good answer for this; I can only suggest that the accentuation was adjusted (with retraction onto the preverb) redactionally on the basis of ($\acute{r}dhak$) $kṛṣe$ in the preceding hymn (X.49.7) after the correct analysis of the form, and the configuration of the pāda, had been forgotten.

X.50.6: The rel. cl. in pāda b, depicting Indra’s assimilation of the pressings, seems to support my interpr. of 5d/6a.

The mantra takes its more accustomed place with other elements of the sacrifice, after its unusual identification with Indra in vs. 4.

X.50.7: On a slight ring with vs. 1, see comm. at the beginning of the hymn.

Ge construes *sumnāsya* with *pathā* “auf dem Pfade (deiner) Gunst,” while I take it with adjacent *mānasā*. There seems no principled way to decide.

X.51–53

These three hymns concern the well-known myth of Agni’s flight and concealment in the waters to avoid his ritual role as conveyor of the oblations, his discovery by the gods, and his return to his role. The first two hymns are in dialogue form. All three are attributed to Agni Saucīka, a name presumably generated from the subject matter of the hymns. On the patronymic *saucīka* see Ge’s intro. to the three hymns.

X.51 Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., the responson in vss. 4 and 6 define vs. 5 as an omphalos, and it is in this vs. that the gods emphasize Agni’s responsibilities to Manu as first sacrificer. The responson is esp. pronounced in 4a ABL ... *varuṇa bībhyad āyam* and 6c ABL *bhiyā varuṇa ... āyam*, but note also “this business” (4d *etām ārtham* / 6a *ārtham etām*).

The first four vss. are also characterized by the repetition of the adv. *bahudhā*.

In addition to the usual treatments, see Schnaus, Dialoglieder 233–52.

X.51.1: That Agni was covered with a caul on his entering the waters suggests that the episode is configured in part as a pregnancy and re-birth. On the caul, see below ad X.53.6.

Note the phonetic echo in ... (-) *viṣṭitaḥ* ... (-) *vivésītha*, though the two forms belong to diff. roots ($\sqrt{viṣṭ}$ and $\sqrt{viś}$). Note also (-) *viṣṭam* in 4b.

Final *ékaḥ* contrasts with hemistich-init. *viśvā* as well as *bahudhā*.

X.51.2: The use of $\sqrt{kṣi}$, which ordinarily means ‘dwell’, is somewhat surprising for Agni’s kindling sticks; its usual meaning is found in 5b.

Ge (n. 2cd) suggests that what lies behind Agni’s question about the location of his kindling sticks is his assumption that he could not be visually located in the waters by his pursuers because the kindling wood is not making him bright. That the kindling sticks are said to

“lead to the gods” (*devayānīh*) seems a little off; perhaps Agni is suggesting what Ge did: that the brightness of the kindling sticks would lead the gods to him. See also comm. ad vs. 5.

X.51.3: The root \sqrt{vis} from 1a returns, but as a ppl. *-viṣṭa-*, morphologically matching the ppl. to the root $\sqrt{viṣṭ}$ also in 1a.

On *dasāntaruṣyā-* and *antār* \sqrt{vas} , see Old and AiG II.2.831.

X.51.3–4: The plupf. *aciket* in 3c has clear preterital function, parallel to the impf. *aíchāma*. It contrasts with the presential pf. *ciketa* in 4d (on the presential value of this pf. see Kü 169). The two forms also have different semantic values: ‘perceived’ versus the extended meaning ‘attend to’ ‘think about / consider’.

The opening of 3c *tām tvā* is echoed by the opening of 4c *tāsya me*, both reinforcing an enclitic personal prn. with a form of *sāl tām*.

X.51.5: On the gods’ somewhat disingenuous use of Manu as argument for Agni’s return, see publ. intro.

Opinions differ about the deployment of the gerund *aramkṛtyā* in b. With Ge, I take it with pāda a with Manu as agent, despite the pāda boundary. Like Ge (n. 5b), I supply **yajñām* as obj., extracted from *yajñā-kāma-*. Cf. with similar obj. X.63.6 *kó vo ’dhvarám tuvijātā áram karat* “Who will properly prepare the ceremony for you, o powerfully born (gods)?” But most interpr. take it with pāda b with Agni as agent: Old, Don., Schmaus (Dialog, 238–40 with disc.). Sāy. considers both possibilities and gives an alternative interpr. for each; Schmaus cites Tikkanen (Gerund, 352) as favoring the Ge solution. The problem with respecting the pāda boundary is that the result doesn’t make a lot of sense (at least to me). If Manu is the subject, the point is clear: the sacrificer has everything in readiness, but lacks the means (i.e., sacrificial fire) to offer it and convey it to the gods. But if Agni is the subject, what has he previously prepared? Sāy. supplies *ātmānam*, seeming to suggest that Agni has arranged himself so that he can’t be seen. Old thinks the object is the sacrifice: Agni previously prepared (/used to prepare) it (as a general rule?), but now he rests quietly out of the fray. Don implicitly takes *kṣeṣi* as a modal, suggesting (n. 9) that the gods are promising that if Agni will (return to) perform the sacrifice for them “you may rest after serving us.” Schmaus accepts Sāy.’s *ātmānam* and discusses possible semantic nuances, not to much purpose. The range of interpr. if the gerund belongs with the rest of b shows how ill it fits there. Taking it with pāda a fits the urgency of the gods’ address to Agni, with the three 2nd sg. impvs. (*éhi ... kṛṇuhi ... váha*): Manu is prepared and waiting impatiently for your (=Agni’s) action.

Note *tāmasi*: since Agni is a perpetual source of light, his dwelling “in darkness” is surprising, almost paradoxical. This paradox is also found in the 1st vs. of the famous hymn X.124 (on which see my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas”), where Indra tempts Agni to join his sacrifice, with the argument *jyóg evá dīrghám táma āśayīṣṭhāh* “For a long time indeed you have lain in long darkness.”

On *kṛṇuhi* see comm. ad vs. 7 below.

devayānīh in 2d is reprised by *devayānān* in c. As with the two forms of $\sqrt{kṣi}$ (see comm. ad vs. 2), the second occurrence is more easily interpretable than the first, and we may consider both pairs as showing a species of poetic repair.

X.51.6: On the responsions with vs. 4 see publ. intro. and the above intro. to the hymn.

The Pp. divides *rathívādhvānam* as *rathí iva ádhvānam*; under this analysis *rathí* would be the nom. sg. of the *-ín*-stem *rathín-* ‘having a chariot’. Old (see also Gr s.v. *rathín-*) prefers to restore *rathír va*, with the *vrkī*-stem *rathí-*.

Old remarks that *ánv ā ...* is not an exception to the accentual rule regarding two preverbs the second of which is *ā*, whereby the first preverb loses its accent. Here *ánu* is to be construed with preceding *ádhvānam*.

As is generally agreed (explicitly Gr, Old [with copious earlier lit.], Re [EVP XIV.79–80], Schaefer. [Intens. 192–93], Schnaus [241], though contra Sāy., who favors \sqrt{vr}), on the basis of formulaic context the verb *āvarīvuḥ* must belong to the intens. of \sqrt{vrt} ‘turn, roll’ (*varīvart(t)i*, etc.). But the morphology is wrong, with a mostly missing root syllable: we should expect a 3rd pl. **avarīvrtur*. Old plausibly suggests that the 3rd sg. pres. *varīvart(t)i* with simplified underlying geminate *-tt-* and the *t*-less 3rd sg. impf. *avarīvar* gave rise to our *t*-less form, by haplology. Old does not, however, provide an intermediate preform. We should expect either **avarīvrur* with zero-grade root syllable or perhaps (on the model of the imperfects of redupl. pres.) **avarīvarur*, with full grade. The latter would be a candidate for Old’s haplology, the former for liquid dissimilation. Either process would work, but it’s too bad Old wasn’t more explicit. Re suggests that the impetus was “de conserver le quadrisyllabisme, typique dans cette classe d’intensifs” – but the zero-grade form would have done just that.

There is some difference of opinion about the structure of the phrase found in the simile (*gauró nā*) *kṣepnóḥ ... jyāyāḥ*. Both forms are abl.-gen.; one of them should be an ablative construable with *avije* ‘I flinched (from)’, with the other a genitive dependent on it. The uncertainty is located in the hapax *kṣepnú-*. This is a clear deriv. of $\sqrt{kṣip}$ ‘throw, hurl’, but the question is whether it refers to an agent who performs such an action (‘hurler, shooter’) or to an action or abstract. Most tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take it as the former, i.e., ‘hunter, archer’ vel sim., in which case it is a gen. dependent on the abl. ‘bowstring’ (so my “from the bowstring of an archer”). But AiG II.2.742 takes *kṣepnú-* rather as an abstract ‘quickness, swiftness’ (das Schnellen), presumably connecting it semantically with another deriv. of the root *kṣiprā-* ‘quick’. This interpr. flips the case relations, imposing an interpr. “from the swiftness [abl.] of the bowstring [gen.],” as reflected in Schnaus’s “vor dem Schnellen der Bogensehne” (p. 241; see also her explicit case idents. on the same page). Without certainty about the meaning of *kṣepnú-* it is not possible to be certain; however, I still favor the first interpr. “Swiftness” is not the first quality one thinks of in a bowstring, and when an animal is afraid of being shot, its fear would not, I think, be concentrated on how fast the string would go from behind the shooter’s ear to its normal position a few inches in front, but on whether the shooter was going to use the bowstring to propel an arrow its way.

X.51.7: It is worth noting that this hymn contains one of only three forms in the RV of the developing irregular 8th class pres. to $\sqrt{kṛ}$ (*karóti*, *kuruté*), viz. 1st pl. act. pres. *kurmáḥ* here – the other two being the 2nd sg. impv. *kuru* (X.19.2, 145.2). The form here is esp. surprising because the standard 5th class pres. impv. *kṛṇuhi* is found two vss. earlier, also in the speech of the god(s). There is more to be said about *kurmáḥ*, some of it puzzling. The first thing to note is that the expected 1st pl. act. of the 5th class present, *kṛṇmās(i)*, is not found in the RV, though its medial counterpart *kṛṇmahe* occurs twice (VII.16.4, X.84.4). The 5th cl. form *kṛṇmās(i)* is, however, very common in the AV (approx. 15 occurrences in Ś, most with P parallels), but the AV entirely lacks the 1st pl. found here, *kurmás(i)*, even though the 8th class present is otherwise far better developed in the AV than the RV. (*kurmáḥ* predominates in the other early Vedic texts,

though KS also has *kṛṇmah* in addition to *kurmah*.) That *kṛṇuhi* and *kurmah* not only appear in the same hymn, but within two vss. of each other in the speech of the same individuals (and gods at that!) suggests that, at least for the composer of this hymn, the two forms didn't belong to different paradigms or signal different registers, but that *kurmah* was the de facto 1st pl. act. present to the "normal" pres. stem to $\sqrt{kṛ}$. I don't quite know what to make of this, esp. given the strong representation of *kṛṇmās(i)* in the AV.

In context the form also strains to be a modal: the gods seem to be promising that they will do something for Agni (hence my "will make") rather than that they are doing so at present. A subjunctive would have done nicely; both pres. subj. *kṛṇāvāma* and aor. subj. *karāma* are attested in the RV and would have been available (though not metrically apt).

The rest of pāda a contains an apparent nominal izafe-type clause: *āyur ajāram yād* "a lifetime that is free from old age." On such constructions, see my article in the Mark Hale Fs. This phrase is so interpr. by all the standard tr. (Sāy, Ge, Re, Don). However, Schnaus takes it differently, and it is worth considering her divergent interpr.: she takes *yād* as subordinator ("wenn") of the whole pāda. Even though it is quite late in the clause, this seems syntactically possible, since what precedes it is in some sense a single constituent, the VP. So, by her interpr., the first hemistich is subordinated to the main clause found in the second. Like me, she takes cd as a non-overtly-marked question: "Wenn wir dein Leben alterlos machen ... wirst du dann ...?" This could be a solution to the non-modal form of *kurmah* just disc., since in a "when" clause the pres. indic. would be at home. I therefore consider that an acceptable alternative tr. would be "When (/if) we make your life free from old age ..., will you ...?" flg. Schnaus.

The standard tr. take cd as a flat statement: "then you will convey ...," not a question. This would seem somewhat presumptuous on the part of the gods and also not to square with the hard-ball negotiations Agni undertakes in the next vs. I prefer to take it as a question.

Pāda c reprises 5d, with the 6-syllable pres. part. *sumanasyāmānaḥ* occupying the whole of each pāda after the opening and the subjunctive *vahāsi* matching the impv. *vāha* in 5.

X.51.8: Agni bargains for considerably more than the life without old age that the gods were offering in 7a. The numerous examples of *ca* in this vs. nicely express the pile-up of perks that Agni is demanding, as Schnaus points out (245): "Agni will nicht nur die Voropfer, sondern auch noch die Nachopfer, und die Schmelzbutter und und und." The "long life" of the original offer is relegated to the final pāda.

The referents of the expressions in c, "the ghee of the waters and the man of the plants," are disputed, particularly the second. Ghee is of course a prized ritual substance and a main contributor to the blazing up of the offering fire. As to its relationship with the waters, it can be conceived of as the essence of liquids, the distillate of the class of substances whose cover term is waters, or as the final and best product of the process that begins when cows drink water. Both possibilities have been suggested; I favor the former.

On the model of the first expression we should expect "the man of the plants" to be 1) another ritual substance offered into the fire, and 2) the essence of the class of substances whose cover term is plants, or the product of a process that begins by the ingestion (vel sim.) of plants. It is very difficult to identify anything that meets both criteria. If "man" is taken literally, then we must use the second alternative of criterion 2: "product of process," since a literal man can't be the essence of a different class of substances (unless, with JSK I.141, we silently replace "plants" with "animate things," a superordinate class I doubt if Vedic India had). In the "process" interpr., we must assume that men eat plants and therefore count as the product of plants (the linkage here

being rather fragile). Even if we accept this reasoning, what ritual substance would man represent? Old (in his long and thoughtful disc. of the pāda), fld by Klein, suggests it's the dead body that is given to the fire to devour. I think this is unlikely: the "flesh-eating" (*kravyād-*) fire of cremation is carefully distinguished and forcefully separated from the ritual fire that conveys oblations to the gods (see esp. X.16.9–10), and it's the latter that's in question here. I very much doubt that the oblation-conveying Agni who is speaking here would associate himself with the cremation fire or remind the gods that one form of fire has this inauspicious job. Though see the anxiety expressed in the next hymn, X.52.3, and also bear in mind that Yama is the one who found him in our vs. 3. Alternatively Schnaus (245) suggest that the man here is the sacrificer, who makes offering to and nourishes Agni – and that plants are the principal nourishment of men.

If we do not take "man" literally but as an entity embodying the essence / best of plants, other interpretational possibilities open up. Perhaps the best is that the "man" is Soma (see Ge n. 8c, Re), an idea that goes back to Hillebrandt. The plants are elsewhere said to have Soma as king (*óṣadhīḥ sómarājñīḥ* X.97.18–19, sim. 22); certainly in the RVic universe Soma would be considered the pinnacle of the plant world. And Soma is a ritual substance. The problem, however, is that soma is not offered into the fire – for obvious practical reasons: unlike ghee, which makes the fire blaze, a liquid like soma would put it out or at least put a damper on it. I therefore doubt that Agni would be requesting soma. Ge (n. 8c) suggests rather offhandedly that "the 'man' of plants" might be the tree, which, in the form of firewood, is crucial to the ritual fire's continued existence. Trees can have a vaguely anthropomorphic shape (trunk and limbs), and "firewood" makes sense as a ritual substance Agni would want— but "soma" has more conceptual oomph. Perhaps this is just a riddle we (and the bewildered gods, who ignore or reconfigure this request in their response) are meant to ponder. But in the end, I favor the tree / firewood interpr.: ghee and firewood together provide the food, the fuel, for the fire.

Schnaus (245) points out that Agni entered into the waters and plants (*apsv óṣadhīṣu*) in 3b, so their return here has been prepared.

X.51.9: The gods echo (and accede to) Agni's requests from the first hemistich almost word-for-word; the metrical disturbance in 9a (extra syllable) may be meant to call attention to the respension, as elsewhere: see, e.g., comm. ad Yama/Yamī hymn, X.10.11–12.

If (like us) the gods had trouble figuring out what Agni was demanding in 8c, their corresponding offer of "the whole sacrifice" (*yajñāḥ ... sárvaḥ*) in 9c may be meant to cover all possible bases. (Note *sárva-* for *vísva-*, which prevails in the older RV and is found [in the pl.] in vss. 1 and 2.)

X.52 Agni

Ge asserts that the entire hymn is in Agni's mouth (save for the final summary vs. 6); as noted in the publ. intro., I consider vs. 3 to be an intrusion from a human ritualist. Re tentatively considers 3 and 4cd not to be Agni's speech.

In addition to the usual treatments, see Schnaus, Dialoglieder 253–65.

X.52.1: The two hemistichs are constructed in parallel: a 2nd pl. impv. of speaking addressed to the gods (*śāstánā a, prá ... brūta c*), followed by a *yáthā* clause, with the *yáthā* reinforced / doubled by a second subordinating *yá-* form (*yád b, yéna d*). But this 2nd subordinator makes some trouble for interpr. in the first construction. The construction in cd is fairly straightforward: in *yáthā ... yéna pathā*, the phrase *yéna pathā* more nearly specifies *yáthā* "how, by what path"

(at least in my interpr.; see below) and *yéna* is clearly a modifier in a noun phrase. But the function of *yád* in b is more open to interpr. For one thing, it is not adjacent or near-adjacent to *yáthā*. For another, though it could be a neut. sg. NA and function as a modifier like *yéna*, there is no surface noun it can attach itself to, and of course it could instead be a subordinating conjunction, introducing a new clause, or doubling *yáthā* to introduce the old one. Old cf.s *kathā kád* in IV.23.5a, c, but there the two are adjacent and there is a noun *sakhyám* associated with *kád*. Ge (n. 1ab) cites III.32.14 with *yátra ... yáthā*, on which see comm. ad loc. Re compares *yád ... yáthā* in the immed. preceding hymn (X.51.7), but those two forms are quite unconnected contextually.

On first glance it appears that *yád* is pleonastically marking the gerund as a clausette, but gerunds don't require such marking. (See Hettrich, Hyp. 231 n. 41 on this point with regard to this passage.) Re supplies a noun referring to speech for the *yád*, though in a somewhat twisted construction: "... je pourrai concevoir (un thème poétique et) lequel." Although this solution is in part supported by an expression in the next hymn (X.53.4 *vācāḥ prathamám masīya* "might I devise the foremost of speech," also with a modal form of \sqrt{man}), the context here does not seem to me to be about Agni's poetic development but about his figuring out how to perform the role assigned, that of Hotar. On the basis of the similar construction in cd, I think *yáthā ... yád* are parallel subordinators, but this goes awkwardly into English ("how, what (task) I shall conceive ..."); in the publ. tr. the *yád* is therefore represented by "it." Ge's rendering (253) is more faithful without losing too much parsability: "wie ich and woran ich ... denken soll" (sim. Schnaus 253), but I would prefer not to use a simple "think (about)" for *manávai*.

This verb may be responsible for much of the trouble, and its presence here is, I think, part of a buried verbal play. Recall that in X.51.5 the gods argued that Agni owed it to Manu, who was all prepared to perform sacrifice, to return and take over the role of his oblation-conveyor. The verb *manávai* looks very like the dat. *mánave* "for Manu," save for accent (and ending), a dative that regularly occupies just this metrical position (e.g., IV.26.4 *havyám bháran mánave ...*). I take this as the poet's subtle reminder of Manu's part in this scenario.

In contrast to my interpr. of *yáthā ... yéna pathā* as doubled subordinators of a single clause, both Ge and Re both take them as introducing separate clauses, the first being a nominal cl. consisting only of *bhāgadhéyam yáthā vaḥ*, the second spanning pāda d with the finite verb – though Re in his n. considers the possibility of a unified cl. The best evidence I can see for a two-cl. interpr. is the doubled enclitic *vaḥ*, but as seen in the publ. tr., I take the two *vaḥ* as having different functions: as genitive with the nouns referring to the gods' share and as dative indicating them as recipients/goals with *ā (...)* *vāhāni*. Schnaus has yet another way of configuring cd, with *bhāgadhéyam* as the obj. of *prá ... brūta*, and what follows as a single cl. with double subordinators: "Sagt mir die Anteilsverschaffung, wie ich euch, auf welchem Weg ich euch die Opfergabe hinfahren soll." None of these interpr. takes proper account of the parallel structures of ab and cd.

X.52.2: The first hemistich reprises the first hemistich of vs. 1: pāda a *ahám hótā ny àsīdam ...* \cong 1b *hótā ... niśádyā*, while b opens like 1a with the *vísve devāḥ*, though in nom. not voc. But other elements have been added. Agni claims to be "the better sacrificing" (*yájīyān*) Hotar; as Ge suggests (n. 2a), he may be comparing himself to his older brothers or to the human Hotar or both. And in b all the gods are joined by the Maruts, for reasons that are not clear to me (though see the passages cited in Ge's n. 2b for the Maruts' presence at Agni's kindling).

I render the impf. *ny āsīdam* as an immed. past “I have sat down,” though this is not a standard use of this tense (see IH’s work). However, the context certainly favors this interpr.

The publ. tr. of the first part of d is quite different from the standard, which take *brahmā* and *samīd* as two independent subjects of *bhavati*: “the Formulator is (there, and) the kindling stick”; Re “le *brahmān* (est présent), la bûche-flambante est (là).” I take *bhavati* as expressing an equational transformation, “X becomes Y” – “The kindling stick becomes the Formulator.” Although this may not make immediate sense, I think it in fact gives richer semantics. It may be that the crackling of the just-kindled fire is compared to the verbal part of the sacrifice, or that the recitation of the formulation coincides with, and appears to cause, the kindling of the fire. However, as an alternative I would consider the tr. given above.

X.52–3: Both 2c and 3c begin with the āmreḍita *āhar-ahar*, which draws especial attention because in the first instance this produces a very rare opening of four light syllables (as Schnaus points out, 255), slightly ameliorated to three lights in 3c.

X.52.3: As indicated in the publ. intro. and the hymn intro. above, I think that this middle vs. is not spoken by Agni. Besides the third-person reff. in the vs., note that vs. 3 is distinguished structurally from the two flanking vss., 2 and 4. Vs. 2 opens *ahām hótā* rhyming and contrasting with 3a *ayām yó hótā*, while vs. 4 firmly reestablishes the 1st ps. reference by beginning *mām*. Nonetheless, Ge (flg. Sāy.) considers Agni to be the speaker of vs. 3; acdg. to Ge, Agni poses the questions in ab to himself, and answers them in cd. This seems overly complex. Most other comm. (Lanman [Reader, 387], Old, Re, Schnaus) agree that the speaker is “Andrer als Agni” (Old), but there is no consensus on who the speaker is. The most likely, in my view, is a human ritual participant (Re’s tentative “Le récitant?”; Schnaus “Sänger”). On seeing the newly (re-)installed Hotar, the speaker expresses some anxiety about the Hotar’s identity – and esp. his possible connection with Yama. Recall that it was Yama who discovered Agni in hiding in the previous hymn (X.51.3), and Yama’s role as king of the dead raises the unappealing possibility that the fire now installed as Hotar is actually the cremation fire or one closely related to it. Hence “who is he to Yama?” On the need and desire to keep the ritual fire of divine worship and the cremation fire strictly separated, see comm. above ad X.51.8 and passages in the funeral hymns, esp. X.16.9–10.

On *āpy ūhe* see comm. ad VII.104.14, where I uphold the old root affiliation with $\sqrt{ūh}$ ‘solemnly proclaim, laud’, rather than accepting Kü’s (489–90) assignment to a putative $\sqrt{vāh}$ ‘anerkennen’. I take *āpi* $\sqrt{ūh}$ to mean ‘(solemnly) address / call upon’, with the *āpi* contributing the sense of closeness, directness: in both passages the obj. of the verb is a god or gods in a ritual situation, and here especially the speaker is in intimate proximity to the ritual fire, addressing it with the words of the liturgy. With this second question I think the ritual officiant is asking which actual fire he is addressing in the current ritual, which is a sacrifice to the gods, not the dead.

Pāda c contains two āmreḍitas, *āhar-ahar* and *māsī-māsī* “every day / day after day” and “every month / month after month.” It is not clear if they are meant to be contrastive or sequential. In the publ. intro. I tentatively accepted Lanman’s suggestion (Reader, 388) that the birth every day is that of the ritual fire (for the Agnihotra, destined for the gods) and the birth every month is that of the fire for the Śrāddha celebration, destined for the ancestors (Pitars). I now consider this doubtful, because 1) I am not aware of any RVic evidence for the monthly Śrāddha, and 2) if this is actually the sense, it would mean that there is no distinction between the

fire(s) for these two purposes, even though I have just argued that this issue drives the anxious questions in the first half of this vs. I now think it more likely that the fire born every month is for the RVic equivalent of the Darśapūrṇamāsa, with the daily and monthly sacrifices marking the most temporally significant ritual observances.

It is for these sacrifices that the gods established Agni as their oblation-carrier. Note the middle *dadhire*, signaling the gods' stake in the action. Note also that *havyavāham* reprises 1d *havyám ... vāhāni*.

However, with regard to the Śrāddha, I have to admit that it does seem referred to in the *Atharva Veda*; see AVŚ XVIII.4.63 *pārā yāta pitarah ... / ádhā māsí púnar ā yāta no grhān havír áttum* “O forefathers, go away; then in a month come again to our houses to eat the oblation.”

X.52.4: Save for the emphatic reestablishment of the 1st ps. via vs.-initial *mām*, in pāda a Agni repeats 3d verbatim. Although many recommend reading disyllabic *mām* here (Gr, Lanman, Arnold, Schnaus [oddly Old doesn't comment]), I think this may be another instance in which metrical irregularity calls attention to patterned repetition; see in this hymn sequence X.51.8–9 as well as X.10.11–12 and comm. thereon.

Note the “popular” *I* in *ápamluktam* to the rare root \sqrt{mruc} , *mluc*, found only here in the RV.

With Ge (n. 4cd) I take cd as the gods' words – in my view, quoted by Agni as the verbal accompaniment of their formal installation of Agni in his role. Note that pāda c consists of 8 straight heavy syllables, with the first (and only – the final being anceps) light syllable found in the cadence at position 9. This metrical structure may express the solemn and ponderous nature of the gods' instructions.

Pāda d is identical to X.124.1d; interestingly that passage also depicts an attempt to coax Agni into becoming the oblation-carrier of the gods, though this time in the context of the “divine revolution” – on which see my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas” (Ged. Frits Staal). I will not speculate on the numerology in this characterization of the sacrifice; there is quite enough such speculation out there already.

X.52.5: The standard tr., incl. the publ. tr., take the 1st sg. med. aor. *ā ... yakṣi* in modal/desid. value; KH (Injunk. 253) includes this passage among the 1st sg. injunctives he considers to have immediate future value. Given that Agni doesn't seem to have embarked on his duties yet, some version of these views is probably correct. I do now suggest, however, that pāda b need not be as closely linked to pāda a as all tr. (incl. mine) assume, which would take the pressure off the modality of *yakṣi*. It does not make a lot of sense that Agni would win immortality for the gods *so that* he can make wide space for them: these two actions aren't causally linked. I now think that b may rather be a prelude to c: in order to win wide space, Agni wishes to put the mace in Indra's arms, so that Indra can perform his usual martial feats. Winning battles is generally the necessary prelude to gaining wide space elsewhere in the RV. Cf., e.g., VII.98.3 *yudhā devébhyo vārivaś cakartha* “Through combat you [=Indra] made wide space for the gods” (= I.59.5, with Agni as subj.); sim. III.34.7 (Indra). I therefore suggest an alt. tr. for bc: “So that I may make wide space for you, o gods, might I place the mace in Indra's arms. Then ...”

X.52.6: This is a 3rd ps. summary vs. I do not think the speaker is the same as the ritualist in 3, who appears to be on the scene.

In c *aúkṣan ghr̥taiḥ* “they sprinkled (him) with ghee” seems to further specify *samañjānti devāḥ* “the gods anoint (him)” in 3b.

The final words of the hymn *hótāraṃ ny àsādayanta* echo 1b *hótā ... niśádyā* as well as 2a *hótā ny àsīdam*. This ring composition is hardly surprising, since the installation of Agni as Hotar was the aim of the dialogue and the hymn.

X.53 Agni

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. and the introductory remarks of Old and Ge. See also Schnaus, *Dialoglieder* 267–89 and Köhler, *Kaví*, 114–17 and 326–28.

One of the verbal tics of this hymn is the use of a rel. cl. beginning with *yéna* identifying the means by which something is accomplished: 4b the speech with which the gods defeat the Asuras, 7d the chariot by which the gods lead (something), 9d the hatchet with which Brahmanaspati hews his formulation, 10d the track or word with which the gods achieve immortality. See also 10b *vāśtbhir yábhiḥ* with the instr. rel. in 2nd position and a different gender and number, but functioning in the same way.

X.53.1: Note the annunciatory here-and-now quality of *sò 'yám*, which is difficult to render in English in conjunction with a relative cl.

In c it might have been better to render *yájīyān* as ‘better sacrificer’, given its use as a true comparative in X.52.2.

X.53.2: For a construction similar to pāda a see I.70.8 *árādhi hótā ... niśattaḥ*, adduced by Ge. My rendering there is “he has been brought to success, installed as Hotar-priest”; I use “realized” here to distinguish *árādhi* from the form of $\sqrt{sādh}$ in the next vs.

On *yájīyān* see comm. ad vs. 1.

Pāda b is essentially identical to VI.15.15; see comm. there. On the position of *hí* and on the peculiar behavior of forms of $\sqrt{khyā}$ with preverbs and *hí*, see comm. ad III.31.12.

I interpr. the function of the injunc. *abhí ... khyát* as presential/general. Ge as modal “so möge er ... sich ansehen”; Re and Schnaus as preterital “il a pris en considération” and “er hat ... beschaut” respectively. I connect b with cd and assume that b indicates that Agni has made the conditions favorable for the sacrifice that we wish to perform. The other tr. take b with pāda a. This is possible but, to my mind, less likely because his success / realization in pāda a is not the result of his watching over the oblations, as the *hí* would suggest.

The second hemistich is notable for the interjection *hánta* and for the two syntactically parallel fig. etym.: *yájāmahai yajñīyān* and *īḍāmahā īḍīyān*. Note also that *yajñīyān* echoes the two previous occurrences of *yájīyān* (1a, 2a)

X.53.3: The opening of pāda a, *sá āyur āgāt*, echoes the end of 1a *sò 'yám āgāt*. Pādas a and d are also entirely parallel in structure: ADJ (FEM. ACC) *akar deva-Xtīm no adyá* “he has made our X-of-the-gods Y today.”

Ge remarks on pāda b (n. 3b) that the hidden tongue is sacred speech (“die sakrale Rede”). This is one possible reading, but surely the primary referent is Agni, who is often called the tongue of the sacrifice (e.g., II.1.13). Although strictly speaking it wasn’t the human ritualists but the gods who found Agni in hiding, they can be pardoned for taking some of the credit. Re in his comm. recognizes both possibilities.

The publ. tr. agrees with Ge and Re in construing *āyuh* with *vāsānaḥ*, as in X.16.5. Schnaus (269–70) takes it instead with *āgāt*, which would certainly be possible, but this leaves *vāsānaḥ* without an object. She takes it as reflexive with a pred. adj.: “sich wohlreichend kleidend,” but I know of no reflexive uses of this present without an expressed obj. In X.16.5 I render the phrase more fully as “clothing himself in (new) life,” of the dead man’s embarking on the afterlife (see comm. ad loc.). The phrase here can be interpr. similarly. As noted ad X.51.1, the prominent mention of the caul in the first vs. of this hymn sequence suggests that Agni’s entry into his hiding place in the waters is configured as a pregnancy, and so his emergence to take up his duties as Hotar is a type of (second) birth.

Schnaus tr. *devahūtí-* as ‘Göttertrank’, a minor lapse, I assume

X.53.4: Pāda b contains one of the rare representations of the Deva/Asura conflict that so dominates the later Vedic mythological scene, but that is essentially absent from the RV, as W. E. Hale has definitively shown. Only in this late hymn and in X.157.4 do we find pretty clear evidence of the Asuras as a group in structural and hostile opposition to the gods. Hale in fact (p. 85) suggests that the Asuras here could instead be human enemies, but this seems unlikely. It’s noteworthy that Agni seems to think that a particularly well-devised speech is what will defeat the Asuras.

On the formation of *ūrjād-* and its problems see Old and Scar (34).

The 2nd hemistich is addressed to both gods and men, the former clearly identified as *yajñiyāsaḥ* and the latter as *pāñca janāḥ* (though see Ge’s n. 4d for some very flimsy evidence that the five peoples may have been deified). Who the *ūrjādaḥ* are is a little less clear, in part because the compd is a hapax. Acdg. to Re, they are gods, but since *ūrjādaḥ* is explicitly (*utá*) conjoined with *yajñiyāsaḥ*, we might expect it to have a different referent. Moreover, we regularly ask the gods to provide *us* with *ūrj-*; cf., e.g., VIII.35.10–12 *ūrjam no dhattam aśvinā* “provide nourishment to us, o Aśvins,” and as far as I know, the only instantiation of the VP *ūrjam √ ad* in the RV has cows as subj.: X.100.10 *ūrjam gāvo yāvase pīvo attana* “Cows, eat nourishment in the pasture, eat fat” (though these cows in fact stand for the milk to be mixed with soma). The question cannot be settled without considering the telling variant on the conjoined phrase in the next vs., 5b *gójāta utá yé yajñiyāsaḥ* “the cow-born and those who are worthy of the sacrifice.” Who are the “cow-born”? The word is found twice elsewhere (VI.50.11, VII.35.14); in the former it appears in a list with “earthly, heavenly, and watery,” in the latter, in a pāda identical to ours, with “earthly and heavenly” immed. preceding. Note that in our vs. the second hemistich contains references to both heaven and earth (as well as the midspace), though not to beings identified as earthly and heavenly. In both the other passages there is a presumption that all of these groups are divine in some way, though it is not explicitly stated. Ad VI.50.11 I tentatively accept a suggestion of Re’s, that the cow-born are the Maruts, and that is possible here. But I would not rule out a reference to livestock. To summarize, the referent of *ūrjādaḥ* in vs. 4 is not certain, and the parallel *gójātāḥ* in 5 isn’t as much help as it might be. In balance, I think humans are the more likely referent or *ūrjādaḥ*, but neither gods (or a set of gods) nor even livestock are excluded.

X.53.5: On *gójāta-* see disc. of immediately preceding vs. 4.

X.53.6: This vs. is addressed, presumably by the human ritualist(s), to Agni (ab) and the speaker(s)’ fellow priests (cd), who are urged jointly to proceed with the sacrifice. In particular,

Agni is to go towards heaven along paths readied by ritual speech. These paths are probably the “work” that the humans are urged to “weave,” in a different metaphor. Cloth-making metaphors in fact unify the vs.: Agni “stretches the thread” of the sacrifice (a), while the priests “weave” (c).

The word *anulbaṇā-* occurs twice in the RV, here and in VIII.25.9. Despite superficial similarity, it is generally held that it is unrelated to *úlba-* ‘caul’; see the curt rejection by KH (MSS 8 [1958]: 18 = Aufs. 398), followed by EWA s.v. I think this is worth revisiting. To begin with, the only occurrence of *úlba-* in the RV is found in the first pāda of this hymn sequence (X.51.1a); that one of the two RVic occurrences of *anulbaṇā-* is found two hymns later, in the same hymn group, seems unlikely to be a coincidence, esp. given their aberrant phonology – though it could, I suppose, be just a deliberate phonological echo. The negated *anulbaṇā-* is usually glossed ‘without bulges / knots’ (Gr “ohne Wulst oder Knoten”), for no particular good reason that I can see. It is then considerably widened to ‘faultless’ (Gr “ohne Fehl”). Let us first consider the example in VIII.25.9, where it modifies *cákṣas-* ‘(eye)sight, vision’. Since sight generally has neither knots nor bulges, the semantically widened version has to be used – e.g., Ge’s “mit fehlerlosem Gesicht” (or, as in the publ. tr., with a reasonable facsimile of knots, there ‘motes’). However, if we start with ‘caul’, an obvious interpretation imposes itself: the blurry vision and semi-opacity of the eye’s lens resulting from cataracts were surely known in ancient India (it’s a condition that afflicts most people as they age), and a “caul” over the eye is an appropriate metaphor for both the appearance and the experience of this condition. (For a [close-to] current day analogue, note that David Knipe in his *Vedic Voices* [p. 198] records how the smoke from the daily Agnihotra damaged the eyes of some of the Āhitāgnis he studied in late 20th c. Andhra, rendering them blind or close to it – though the fact that these Agnihotras were performed indoors may have exacerbated the eye condition.) The sense of the word in our passage is more difficult to determine, since as far as I know, there is no weaving failure that could be conceived of as a caul. Here I think it must be metaphorical for veiling, unpellucidity, or cloudiness of the poetic product, esp. since in the preceding pāda Agni is supposed to be associated with “paths of light made by insightful thought.” I would emend the tr. to “a work without a veil [=clear].” Note that Schnaus (276–77) discusses *anulbaṇā-* at length and comes to similar conclusions.

On the hapax *jógū-*, derived from the intens. of $\sqrt{gū}$ ‘sing’, see Schaefer (114). It is presumably a subjective genitive (so Schnaus, 275) with *ápas-*; that is, the singers are to perform the work that has been woven, not to receive it. Both Schaefer and Köhler (*Kaví-*, 327) assert that the stem no longer has intensive semantics, but I do not see on what grounds: my “ever-singing” or a more “intensive-like” “laut singend” (Gr) are perfectly compatible with the context.

The last pāda is syntactically and lexically straightforward, but has somewhat surprising content. Agni is urged to “become Manu” and “generate the divine race,” on first glance a cosmogonic act not within the capability of a human, even the first human. Ge (n. 6c) is surely correct, that Manu as first sacrificer *makes them appear* at the ritual (“zum Vorschein, zur Stelle bringen”) by his ritual activity; he thus “begets” them metaphorically at a particular place and time. The relationship between Agni and Manu first highlighted in this hymn sequence in X.51.5 comes to its climax here, with Agni actually transforming into Manu.

X.53.7: On *ís* $\sqrt{kṛ}$, see comm. ad VII.76.2.

Gr, Ge, Schnaus all supply *raśanāḥ* ‘reins’ as obj. of *ā ... piṃśata*. I follow Re (also JSK DGRV I.436), who supplies ‘chariot’, on the basis of the focus on the chariot in cd and the NP in I.49.2 *supéśasam ... rátham*.

Klein (l.c.) points out the unusual position of the second *utá* in this hemistich “following a preverb within a conjoined set of verbal lexemes,” where he would expect *ca*. (The set consists of ... *nahyata-utá ... íṣkṛnudhvam ... ā-utá piṃśata*.) Acdg. to him, this is the only such ex. in the RV, but he defines the context rather narrowly. For another ex. of *utá* between preverb and verb, see V.59.5.

There’s a surprising lack of comment on what the eight seats on the chariot represent in the ritual. I’d don’t mind admitting that I have no idea.

In d it is impossible to know if *priyám* is the object of *ánayan*, as in the publ. tr. (also Gr, Ge, Schnaus) or the goal, with the object “us” to be supplied or none at all: “led to something dear” / “led (us) to something dear” (so Re and Ge alt. in n. 7d). Since *priyám* isn’t further specified, we have no info. with which to make a decision. In any case, the pāda seems to reverse the direction and director(s) of the chariot. In abc it seems that the ritualists are being exhorted to prepare the chariot of sacrifice and drive it (presumably towards heaven and the gods), but in d the gods seems to have taken the reins. This may (as Schnaus seems to suggest, 278) reflect the two-way street of ritual reciprocity: “die Opfertgaben werden damit ebenso zu den Göttern gefahren wie die Gaben der Götter zu dem Menschen.”

X.53.8: On the vs. see Old’s comments in his intro. to the hymn. On pāda a see Ge’s long n. 8. As he points out, this vs. is often used in later ritual for a real or symbolic river-crossing. Unfortunately, of course, the word ‘river’ is missing from our text; we must triangulate from the fem. gender of the nom. *ásmanvatī* (most words for river and most river names being fem.) and the meaning of the verb *rīyate* ‘flows’ (cf. X.40.9 *rīyante ... síndhavaḥ* “the rivers flow”). The interpr. of the phrase is greatly aided by the variant verse in AVŚ XII.2.27 *úttiṣṭhatā prá taratā sakhāyó, ’śmanvatī nadī syandata iyám*, with an explicit ‘river’ modified by *ásmanvatī* and a verb, *syandate*, synonymous with our *rīyate*. This vs. immed. follows one that quotes our pāda directly (AV XII.2.26a *ásmanvatī rīyate ...*) and seems to be meant as a gloss or explanatory expansion – let us hope they got it right.

Ge suggests that the stones are stepping stones (or rather a bridge of them) in a powerfully flowing stream; I am dubious, because I think even a lot of closely bunched stones would provide precarious footing for horses pulling a chariot (if the chariot of 7 is still in question), or oxen pulling a cart, or even for a group of men walking. I think more of a river or stream with a stony bottom that would provide better footing than a soft one, but admittedly I know nothing about the bottoms of the rivers in NW India. (On the potential problems for vehicles crossing a river, see III.33, esp. 9–13, and III.53.17.) In any case the crossing here is metaphorical, but presumably involves the metaphorical chariot from vs. 7.

The medial idiom *sám √rabh* is generally construed with an instr. and means ‘be clasped / embraced by’ metaphorically (e.g., I.53.4–5). Here, however, it appears without instr. and must mean something like ‘clasp each other’. See X.72.6 where JPB tr. *súsaṃrabdhā átiṣṭhata* as “well clasped to one another, you stood ...” (of the gods). The point in that passage and ours must be that by embracing each other, a group creates a united and formidable front and can proceed to action. My tr. here, “pull yourselves together,” is not literal, but I think it conveys the intent better than “embrace each other” – but perhaps “pull together” or “stick together” might be closer to the literal.

In c the publ. tr. wrongly renders the subj. *ásan* as if it were an imperfect. The tr. should be changed to “those who will be unfriendly.”

In d the question is whether *śívān* modifies *vājān* or is an independent and parallel goal. Although Ge and Re choose the former solution (e.g., “zu günstigem Gewinn”), with Schnaus I think the latter is more likely. *śívān* is obviously meant to contrast with *áśevāḥ* in the previous pāda, as their juxtaposition across the pāda boundary shows. And the *áśevāḥ* in c are definitely beings (probably human enemies), not things. The point being that we want to find ourselves a more agreeable set of companions, as well as acquiring prizes.

X.53.9–11: As disc. in the publ. intro., these three vss., in Jagatī stand somewhat apart from the rest of the hymn, though they also continue its themes—the most important of which is the crafting of effective ritual formulations, as seen esp. in vs. 6 and also 4.

Vss. 9 and 10 are esp. parallel; note the repetition of *nūnám* and forms of the pres. *śísā-* / *śísī-*. More important is the fact that 9cd and 10ab depict the same actions (though with partly varying lexicon) performed by gods (Tvaṣṭar and Brahmaṇaspati in 9) and human poets (*kavayaḥ* in 10): the production by carving with axes/hatchets of the verbal portion of the ritual. Strikingly neither in 9b nor in 10b is there an overt object for the verb of hewing (*vṛścāt*) / carving (*tákṣatha*), despite the clear assumption that it is a verbal product.

X.53.9: See Ge’s note on this vs.

In the publ. tr. the pf. injunctive *vet* is rendered as the preterite “knew,” but, given the context (pres. part. *bíbhṛat* b, pres. *śísīte* c, subj. *vṛścāt* d), I now would follow the other tr. in taking it as a general present ‘knows’. KH (Injunc. 169) pronounces it “generell.” In the sandhi context (*māyāvet*) it could be an augmented plupf. *avet*, but this is unlikely.

Calling Tvaṣṭar “the best worker of workers” (*apásām apástamaḥ*) links his activity to that of the human ritualists in 6c, urged to “weave a work (*ápaḥ*).” Tvaṣṭar provides the drinking cups for the soma (pāda b), thus contributing to the oblation/physical portion of the ritual. But more important, in the second hemistich, he sharpens the tool that the “lord of the formulation”—“das göttliche Vorbild des Dichter,” in HPS’s felicitious phrase (B+I 126)—will use to produce the formulation, the verbal portion of the ritual.

Parts of this vs. are reminiscent of the enigmatic X.28.8, which I argue depicts the original instantiation of the sacrifice by the gods (see comm. ad loc.). The first hemistich of that vs. reads *devāsa āyan paraśúm̐r abibhran, vānā vṛścānto abhí viḍbhír āyan* “The gods came; they carried axes; hewing the trees, they advanced with their clans towards (the ritual ground),” with the redupl. pres. *abibhran* matching our part. *bíbhṛat*, the axes (*paraśú-*), and the verb ‘hew’ (pres. *vṛścá-*) present in both. I don’t quite know what to do with these similarities.

The most puzzling part of the second hemistich is *étaśaḥ*, which must be a qualifier of Brahmaṇaspati. This stem usually names, or refers to, the sun’s horse or horses, but it is unlikely that Brahmaṇaspati is being identified with that animal. The stem is generally derived from *éta-* ‘mottled, dappled’, and most tr. render it as a color term here (buntpfarbig / bigarré). But why would Brahmaṇaspati be multicolored? Th (Stud. z. idg. Wortkunde, 68), adopted by HPS (and see EWA s.v.), interpr. it as ‘bunte Tiere (Kleinvieh) gewinnend,’ but with an unfortunately typical Thieme overreach (*-śa- < *-pśva-*). My “(chariot-)steed” is a placeholder, as if the image in this pāda were a sort of transition figure from the chariot image in vs. 7. But this may be worse than useless. However, I do think a whiff of the chariot image recurs in vs. 11 (q.v.).

X.53.10: The poets are now exhorted to follow the the model of Brahmaṇaspati.

The identity and function of *satáh*, which opens the vs., are much disputed. It is generally taken as an adverb (‘equally’ vel sim.: Ge, Re, Schnaus [281 and n. 302], Köhler [327]), but I follow Old’s preferred interpr. as an acc. pl. masc. of the pres. part. of \sqrt{as} , meaning ‘being (t)here’. As for its referent, flg. a suggestion of Re’s I think it picks up the *paraśúm* in 9c, which is the obj. of *śísīte* ‘sharpens’, with Tvaṣṭar as subj. Here the pl. Kavis are the subj. of pl. *śísīta* and we might expect pl. **paraśún*. Instead we get, in the rel. cl., the fem. pl. *vāśibhiḥ*, a virtual synonym of *paraśú-*, and *satáh* referring to the *paraśú-* serves as transition to this synonym, which we might have expected as an acc. pl. **vāśīḥ* in the main cl. For disc. (and rejection) of other poss. exx. of *satáh* as adv., see X.27.4, VII.104.21, IX.21.7.

The connection between pādas c and d is loose at best. On the one hand, the *yéna* with which d opens has no clear referent. Given the structure of the hymn so far, with its *yéna* clauses (see hymn intro. above), we would expect its referent to be the pl. *padā gúhyāni* “hidden tracks/words” of c, but the numbers don’t match. On the other, there is also a mismatch of tenses: c contains an imperative *kartana*, but d a perfect *ānaśuḥ*. I think the clue to understanding the connection is the existence of both these anomalies. To take the second first, we cannot order the poets to create (impv. *kartana*) something that has already produced its effect (“they achieved” *ānaśuḥ*). So I think d presents the already successful model for the type of things the poets are now urged to create. It worked for the gods, so make more of them now. There is thus a disconnect between the two clauses, even though the same type of causal relation is gestured to as in 3cd, 7cd, and, with plurals, 10ab. Because that pattern was strongly set earlier, the audience is invited, in fact more or less compelled, to interpret 10cd in the same vein and to use its ingenuity to deal with the number and tense-mood mismatches. I do not see the advantage of taking *yéna* as a conjunction, despite Köhler’s detailed disc. (327 and n. 1008), and I actually don’t see how his “wodurch” differs from the usual instr. rendering of *yéna*.

Almost all tr. and interpr. take *padā* as ‘words’, and I am in agreement that this is the underlying intent. However, with Schnaus (“Fussspuren,” 291), I think the surface, literal meaning is ‘tracks’. This allows the vs. to be connected with 6b *jyōtiṣmataḥ pathāḥ ... dhiyā kṛtān* “the paths of light made by insightful thought.” The radiant paths to heaven are created by the poets’ insights and the words they are formed into, and so in 10cd the poets are exhorted to create these paths, these tracks, which are in fact words.

X.53.11: Unfortunately, if this final vs. is an example of the *padā gúhyāni* of 10c, as I think it is, the tracks remain hidden indeed. The first question is who the subj. of *ādadhuh* is. With Ge and Re (Old, Schnaus, and Köhler do not specify, though Kö seems likely to favor poets as well), I take it to be the poets addressed in 10 (*kavayaḥ*). They perform their work “with cryptic mind and tongue” (b *apīcyèna mānasotā jīhvāyā*), a phrase that resonates with *gúhyāni* of 10c and whose accuracy we can certainly endorse. Old sensibly says about the vs. “die vieldeutigen Rätsel zu lösen versuche ich nicht,” and though I will make a stab at solving them, I acknowledge the wisdom of Old’s forbearance.

Pāda a contains two chiasitic NP paradoxes—*gārbhe* (LOC) *yōśām* (ACC) ... *vatsām* (ACC) *āsāni* (LOC) “in embryo young woman ... calf in mouth.” Between them is the verb *ādadhuh* “they placed,” which must owe its accent to its contrastive use with both NPs.

The first phrase is the clearer paradox: in real life the embryo would be placed in the young woman—that is, she would become pregnant—not the reverse (so also Ge n. 11). (My tr. “maiden” is somewhat misleading, since a *yōśā* can give birth; cf., e.g., III.48.2 ... *te mātā* ...

yóṣā jānitri “Your mother, the young woman who gave you birth”). The paradoxical content of the second phrase is more obscure, but it may be that, since mother cows ordinarily lick their calves (e.g., III.33.3, III.55.13=X.27.14, IV.18.10) and this involves putting their mouth, or at least their tongue, on the calf, putting the calf in/on the mouth reverses this image. This is Ge’s interpr. (also n. 11), but I am a bit dubious. The words for ‘mouth’, *ās-* and *āsán-*, aren’t found in expressions of the calf-licking image, as far as I can find, nor even ‘tongue’. However, I don’t have a better solution. (For a reversed image that does involve both cows and mouths, see IX.99.3 and comm. thereon; unfortunately it won’t work here.)

Such are the possible conceptual paradoxes behind these two phrases, but for them to work in the hymn they must have a real-world (that is, ritual) reference, and ideally this reference should connect with the content and themes of the rest of the hymn, the recovery of Agni as oblation-conveyor and the successful progress of the ensuing sacrifice. I think that Agni is present in both NPs in pāda a, but in different cases – loc. *gárbhe* and acc. *vatsám*. Both words, esp. *gárbha-*, are regularly used of Agni; for a passage containing both, see X.8.2 *mumóda gárbhaḥ ... vatsáḥ ... arāvīt* “he rejoices as an embryo ... the calf has bellowed” (as well as X.27.14). If my identifications are correct, we must determine the referent of the other word in each expression: acc. *yóṣām* and loc. *āsáni*. For the first, I think the most likely referent is (one of) the (paired) kindling sticks, who is/are regularly referred to as Agni’s mother(s), particularly the lower kindling stick. See, e.g., III.55.4 and esp. X.27.14bc (and comm. ad loc.) *tasthaú mātā víṣito atti gárbhaḥ / anyásyā vatsám rihatī mimāya* “The mother [=kindling stick] stands still; unloosened the embryo [=Agni] eats. Licking the calf [=Agni] of another [=kindling stick], she [=oblation] lows,” also containing both *gárbha-* and *vatsá-* referring to Agni. Placing the kindling stick in the embryonic fire may simply mean that the sticks are positioned where the fire will begin to catch. Alternatively the young woman might be some piece of ritual equipment with fem. gender (like the *ukhā-* ‘pot’) or even be a reference to Dawn, sometimes called a *yóṣā* (e.g., VII.75.5, 77.1), and be a metaphor for putting light into the newly kindled fire. But I strongly favor the kindling stick.

As for putting the calf into the mouth, what is the “mouth” here? The question is complicated by the fact that Agni himself is often called the mouth of the gods and oblations are poured into his mouth. Such an interpr. would produce the awkwardness of two references to Agni in this two-word phrase, and I do not think it means “they played Agni in Agni.” Instead I suggest very tentatively that in this case the mouth is the hearth or fireplace, rather than the fire itself. Although I cannot find a parallel usage, it seems conceptually possible – the place, roughly mouth-shaped, on the ground in which the kindling materials are set.

(For a quite different interpr. of this hemistich, see Schnaus 283. Though thoughtful, it is not convincing, at least to me.)

As for the 2nd hemistich, again I think we have to think about it in the context of the whole hymn and indeed the three-hymn sequence – the reinstallation of Agni and the successful reinstatement of the sacrifice. After Agni as embryo and then calf has been re-kindled in ab (by my interpr.), he proceeds to glorious victory in cd (again, by my interpr.). I do not think that the subject of this hemistich is either Indra (tentatively floated by Old) or a man (supplied by Re), but Agni himself. Given the focus in this three-hymn sequence on the return of Agni for the sake of the sacrifice, the supreme victor in the final vs. can hardly be anyone but him. Certainly the vocabulary doesn’t impede this identification. The adj. *sumānas-* can modify a variety of referents, but is particularly common with Agni; note esp. that in the first hymn of this sequence, X.51.7, the gods hopefully suggest that Agni should return, *sumanasyámānaḥ* “showing your

benevolence.” The recurrence of *sumānas*- here implicitly announces that this has happened. Agni is also one of the most common subjects of the verb stem *vāna*- (e.g., I.140.11, III.19.1, V.3.10, 4.3, etc.). And although the strongly martial tone of the hemistich might at first point in another direction (Old’s Indra?), Agni is hardly lacking in martial aspects.

With most of the standard interpr. I take the Saṃhitā *kārā* as loc. *kāré*, against Pp. *kārāḥ*.

The problematic part of the hemistich is *yogyā abhí* in c. By most interpr. *yogyā* is taken as an acc. pl. fem (*yogyāḥ* out of sandhi). with postposition *abhí*, loosely construed either with *sumānāḥ* (Ge, Re, sort of Schnaus, 282) or with *siśāsaniḥ* (Köhler, 328 and n. 1009). The stem *yogyā*- lit. means ‘harness/yoking cords’, a sense clearly found in III.6.6. In our passage (and supposedly in VII.70.4) it is taken metaphorically to mean something like ‘obligation, task’ (lit. ‘what is to be yoked [to oneself]’?). This is not impossible, and a tr. “well-disposed towards his tasks” is not excluded. But *sumānas*- doesn’t otherwise take such a complement, and the desid. *siśāsa*- takes as object material things we want to gain (prizes and the like), not duties or tasks, so that Köhler’s “der die Werke zu gewinnen sucht” seems off. I am also dubious about postpositional *abhí*, though I confess that I haven’t checked all 739 examples (per Lub) of the form. For all these reasons I make bold to suggest an unorthodox reading of the two words, as a mangled instr. pl. In III.6.6 (one of the two other occurrences of the stem *yogyā*-) we find a pāda-final instr. pl. *yog’yābhiḥ* in a Triṣṭubh cadence. Here, in a Jagatī cadence, we have *yog’yā abhí*, which I suggest is a species of distraction and misinterpretation of **yog’yābhiḥ*. I take it in its literal (or literal-metaphorical value): Agni wins with his yoking strings, that is, with his horses yoked to his chariot. This would continue the chariot metaphor, with its technical terms, of vs. 7 (and possibly vss. 8 and 9d; see above). It’s a long shot, I realize, and the tr. floated above (“well-disposed towards his tasks”) is a possible alt. Still I favor the emendation. The publ. tr. should have an asterisk before “with the yoking strings.”

X.54–56

The next three hymns are attributed to Bṛhaduktha Vāmadevya, the first two dedicated to Indra, the last to the All Gods, per the Anukr. The Indra hymns have 6 and 8 vss. respectively, violating the usual principle of ordering – a fact that causes Old (Prol. 238–39) some distress. He rejects Bergaigne’s suggestion to assign the second hymn to the All Gods, which would restore order since the final, All Gods, hymn has 7 vss. and would follow one with 8. Old’s rejection is based on the supposed difference in content between 55 and 56, but, as disc. in the publ. intro. to X.55, I am inclined to follow Bergaigne, for reasons stated there: although 55 and 56 are indeed quite different, X.56 is a kind of one-off, while X.55 has a number of hallmarks of enigmatic All God hymns. Both fall well within the loose parameters of All God hymns. Although X.55 begins and ends with Indra (never named), it is hardly a conventional Indra hymn and its mysterious center (esp. vss. 4–6) strays far from Indra, while sharing themes, particularly “light,” with X.56. It does not help Old’s case that his only suggested explanation for the violation of ordering in the two supposed Indra hymns is that it reflects “eine alte, traditionelle Reihenfolge” based on grounds “die sich unsrer Kenntniss entziehen,” if not in fact on chance – hardly a compelling alternative hypothesis, esp. given the rigidity of the ordering in other (and older) parts of the RV.

X.54 Indra

X.54.1: The hymn begins with a syntactically incomplete pāda, with the acc. *tām ... kīrtīm* governed by no verb. Ge supplies “(will ich) ... (verkünden),” which is certainly possible, but I

think something trickier is going on. First of all, the structure of 1ab is very like that of the 1st hemistich of the following hymn, X.55.1ab. The b pādas are almost identical: 54.1b *yát tvā bhīté ródasī áhvyayetām* / 55.1b *yát tvā bhīté áhvyayetām vayodhaí*. And the first pāda of 55.1 also lacks a verb and its principal noun, *nāma* ‘name’, is semantically similar to *kīrti-* ‘reputation, fame’ here. The difference of course is that *nāma* is neut. and can therefore be the subject of a nominal clause (Ge: “Weit ... ist jener ... Name”), whereas the undeniably acc. *kīrtim* cannot be. On the one hand, I think this is the poet’s little joke.

But on the other it needs to be interpr. in the context of the overall sense of the hymn, at least as I understand it. As disc. in the publ. intro. to X.54, I think that in this poem the poet is implying “that Indra’s great deeds and the words that express them are essentially the same,” in fact that the words generate the deeds. The very first hemistich announces this, by equating Indra’s *kīrti-* with himself (*tvā*): the frightened world halves are actually calling on his reputation when they call out to him. (It might be noted that *kīrti-* is found only here in the RV, though it’s fairly common in the AV.)

In the c pāda the two verbs, *prāvah* and *átirah*, can technically be either main-clause verbs with accented preverbs (*prá=āvah*, *ā=atirah*) or still under the domain of the *yád* of b with accented verb (*pra=āvah*, *ā=átirah*). The Pp. opts for the former, as do Ge and I, although I was tempted by the alternative. But the parallelism with X.55.1 supports the Pp. solution, since X.55.1c *úd astabhñāh* with unequivocally accented preverb has to be a main-clause verb.

The referent of *prajāyai tvasyai* of d is not made clear – again, I think, deliberately. Ge (n. 1d) thinks this already reflects the later notion of the double descent of Prajāpati (gods and demons), but the implicitly contrastive *tva-* form seems to me to set up a dichotomy with both terms in c: the gods whom Indra helped (*prāvo devān*) suggest their antonymic opposite, humans, and the *dāsas* he overcame suggest the other half of that pair, the Ārya. Putting those together, we get the ideal human – namely us, the Ārya.

X.54.2: If I am correct about vs. 1, that it expresses the identity between the verbal reputation of Indra and his actual actions, this same sentiment is expressed considerably less politely in this vs. The first hemistich has Indra going about *proclaiming* (*prabruvāñāh*) his own powers—that is, representing them in words, rather than performing them as deeds—and this boasting is dismissed curtly in the next pāda (c) as just *māyā*, which in this context comes very close to the later meaning ‘illusion’. Indeed, “what they call battles” are simply Indra’s *māyā*. (Note that Ge’s tr. “da war nur Blendwerk, was sie von *deinen* Kämpfen sagen” [my ital.] is slightly wrong: *te* cannot qualify *yuddhāni*, because this would require an enclitic to begin the clause [... **te yāni yuddhāny āhúh*]; the *te* must go with the main clause and qualify *māyā*.) In this context pāda d has a cynical and deflating tone. It plays on, and against, the triumphal statement found in I.32.4, the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn, which states *tādītnā sátruṃ ná kílā vivitse* “you surely never found a rival since” – meaning that after Indra’s decisive victory over Vṛtra, no one could rival him. But here, despite the near identity of wording, *nādyá sátruṃ nanú purá vivitse* “neither today nor before have you discovered a rival” seems rather to mean that Indra has done none of his vaunted fighting, has never confronted an enemy – it’s all words and *māyā*. As both Old and Ge point out, this hemistich is quoted in the ŚB (XI.1.6.9–10), where it forms part of a denial of the truth of the tales of the Deva / Asura conflict. I think that it has been partly repurposed there, rather than that our passage already reflects the whole ŚB situation, which in fact primarily concerns Prajāpati’s acts of creation. It’s worth noting that the ŚB paraphrases our pāda d in less

ambiguous terms: *ná tvám yuyutse katamác canāhar ná te 'mítro maghavan kás canāsti* “Not for a single day hast thou fought, nor hast thou any enemy, O Maghavan” (Eggeling).

X.54.3: In this vs. the poet seems to retreat a bit from his extreme Indra-denigration of 2cd, but I think this is more a matter of ambiguous wording than a change of attitude: the intent of the vs. is hard to read. (I now depart in part from my assessment of this vs. in the publ. intro.) The initial impression of the first hemistich is that Indra’s greatness is such that it is impossible even for poets (previous poets) to have entirely grasped it, “reached its end.” This is a fairly common expression emphasizing the unlimited power of Indra. Cf., e.g., I.100.15 *ná yásya devā devātā ná mártā, āpaś caná śávaso ántam āpuḥ* “The limit of whose [=Indra’s] vast power no gods in their divinity, nor mortals, nor even the waters have reached.” However, I think in our passage the apparent exaltation of Indra’s *mahimán-* is undercut by the adj. *sama-* in the genitive phrase and, quite possibly, by the deed that exemplifies it in the 2nd hemistich.

To begin with *sama-*: as disc. ad X.29.4, this indefinite stem is always used in pejorative contexts, even when it appears to be neutral or positive. Particularly pertinent here is VI.27.3, which is very like our passage: *nahí nú te mahimánaḥ samasya, ná maghavan maghavattvásyā vidmá / ná rádhaso-rádhaso nūtanasyéndra nákir dadṛṣa indriyám te*. Ge’s rendering, more or less followed by the publ. tr., puts a positive spin on the phrase containing *samasya*: “But yet we do not know your whole greatness, nor generosity, o generous one”—implying that although we know some of his greatness, we have not yet experienced the full amount. But Ge’s “ganz”/ my “whole” for *sama-* is not a legitimate rendering of *sama-*, and the final pāda “your Indrian strength has not shown itself” (my “your (whole) Indrian strength” is even less justified than the earlier “whole”) indicates that Indra has simply not been there for us at all. Hence my emendation of VI.27.3 to “But yet we do not know any (*samasya*) of your greatness ...” I now would interpr. our passage in a similar way. Once again “whole” (Ge’s “ganz” again) for *samasya* is a contextual invention; once again I think the idea is not that Indra’s greatness is so vast that its limit cannot be reached, but rather that it’s a question whether *any* greatness has been deployed on our behalf. I would now emend the tr. to “what seers before us reached the limit of any greatness of yours?” – with a somewhat scornful emphasis on “any.” They didn’t reach the limit, because there was no limit to reach.

However we interpr. 3ab, the 2nd hemistich sits oddly in relation to it, though since it is introduced by *yád*, it should be dependent on what precedes. On first glance this is just another of the endless expressions of Indra’s cosmogonic powers, while also displaying the RVic partiality for paradoxes of birth, whereby the child gives birth to its own parents. Flg. Sāy.’s plausible suggestion that the mother and father here are Earth and Heaven, the statement at first does not seem *very* different from passages where Indra begets, for example, “the sun, heaven, and dawn” (e.g., I.32.4 *āt sūryam janāyan dyām uṣāsam*). But there are notable distinctions. For one thing, although Indra is often credited with begetting things / beings (generally in the active of the stem *janāya-*, as above), they are not identified as his family members. I do not know of any other passages in which Indra is credited with begetting his own parents. The closest is I.159.3, in which their sons, that is, the gods (presumably including Indra), are said to have begotten (act. pf. *jajñuh*) their “two mothers” (*mātārā*), Heaven and Earth. But our passage depicts the birthing as much more intimate: it is expressed in the middle, one of the only “real” middle forms (*ájanayathāḥ*) to the extremely common trans./caus. stem *janāya-*, whose middle forms are otherwise almost entirely confined to 3rd pl. *-anta* replacements (see my 1979 “Voice fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial 3rd plural *-anta* in active paradigms,” *III* 21: 146–69) and

forms based on them, with active sense. Here, though the form is transitive, the medial self-involvement of the subject is underlined by the reflexive abl. expression *tanvāḥ svāyāḥ* “from your own body.” The middle verb and the reflexive (one might almost say “double reflexive,” since *tanū-* has quasi-reflexive value in addition to its lexical meaning ‘body’) expression of source highlight the physical aspects of this birth – and in fact depict Indra as a mother, a female from whose body the child emerges. This is, needless to say, uncharacteristic of Indra, at least in the RV—in my 1991 *Hyenas* (pp. 76–81 and passim) I argue that Indra is depicted as a mother hyena in a complex of Brāhmaṇa stories, but even there he is not shown giving birth to them (and, moreover, female hyenas are formidable, Indra-like animals).

But why is this episode here? Is it meant to be a culminating example of Indra’s greatness touted in the first hemistich – or, if I’m correct about the sly derogatory tone of ab, as an example of just how paltry his greatness is? Is his begetting of Heaven and Earth, his own parents, meant to awe us – or should his role as mother diminish him in our eyes? This feat, if feat it is, merits no further mention in this hymn, or elsewhere. What relationship there might be between the invocation of Indra by the frightened world halves in 1ab (also X.55.1) is not clear either. I confess myself baffled. It might be noted that 3cd is essentially the middle of the hymn, so bafflement is to be expected.

X.54.4: This vs. firmly returns us to the equivalence of words and deeds. It is in fact *through / by means of* his names that Indra performs his deeds (see pāda d). The names are presumably epithets like *vṛtra-hán-* (so also Ge n. 4ab) that encapsulate the deeds in question. They are *ádābhya-* — here tr. ‘unfalsifiable’ rather than the usual ‘undeceivable’ — because the very existence of the names testifies to the reality of the deeds. As Ge points out, the adj. implicitly contrasts with the *māyā* of 2c. What exactly the four names are I have no idea and won’t speculate, but see VIII.80, esp. vs. 9, for a similar connection between names and deeds, also with four as the number of names.

X.54.5: As the poet gets closer to the end of the hymn and the implicit “ask,” he softens his tone towards Indra. The last pāda of the vs. contains two agent nouns applied to Indra, *ājñātā* ‘heeder’ and *dātā* ‘giver’, which might be interpr. as among the names referred to in the previous vs.: the reality (or not) of “giver” would be esp. pertinent to the poet. By giving Indra the name “giver,” he is affirming the reality of the (expected and hoped for) act of giving, just as in vs. 4 a name like “Vṛtrahan” makes the act of killing Vṛtra “unfalsifiable,” undeniable. See X.55.6 for another pair of agent nouns.

The tr. of d would be more faithful to the rhetoric as “you are the one who takes heed; you the one who gives, Indra.”

X.54.6: By my interpr. (in part flg. JSK DGRV II.96–97), the first hemistich hangs off 5d, as another characterization of Indra, this time dynamic rather than the static expression via agent nouns. The last hemistich is a meta- hymn-ending summary. On the structure of the last pāda and the play on the poet’s name, see publ. intro.

X.55 Indra (per Anukr.; better, All Gods)

On the disputed dedicand of this hymn, see pub. intro. as well as the intro. to X.54–56 above.

In the publ. intro. of this hymn there is an error in the 3rd para.: “... in the next hymn

(X.55.1)” should read X.56.1.

X.55.1: As disc. ad X.54.1, these two initial vss. are very similar, esp. in their 1st hemistichs, with our pāda a syntactically better formed than that in X.54. The emphasis on the name as embodiment of power and of the potential for action is prominent here.

As Ge points out (n. 1b), the verb “prop up” is strictly only applicable to heaven, not to earth.

The identity of the *bhrātuḥ putrān* “brother’s sons” is quite unclear. First, whose brother? Although both Ge and I assume it is Indra’s brother (“die Söhne deines Bruders” / “... of your brother”), it could of course be someone else’s brother (Heaven and Earth’s?), although context favors Indra. The problem is to identify who it might be, since generally Indra appears to be an only child with a traumatic birth and a fraught homelife (see esp. IV.18). Ge starts with the sons and worries about the brother secondarily; he suggests (n. 1d) that the sons are the Maruts, the sons of Rudra, which latter would here count as Indra’s brother, since gods seem to use “brother” among themselves as a kind of courtesy title (see his citations). This is, as Old says, possible, but I do not find it compelling (nor does Old). The highlighting of the double kinship relationship, “sons of the brother,” seems too prominent for “brother” to be just a courtesy title, and although the Maruts seem to appear, unnamed, in vss. 7–8, that context is quite different from this one: the Maruts don’t generally participate in the propping up of Heaven and Earth (though see VIII.94.11). An even less likely possibility: in VI.55.3 Pūṣan is called the brother of Indra in a series of statements about Pūṣan’s kin, but this seems a deadend: if Pūṣan has sons they don’t figure anywhere, as far as I know.

I will now venture a very fragile alternative suggestion. Although the dominant account of Indra’s birth in the RV is the dramatic one found in IV.18 and alluded to glancingly elsewhere, he is also once named (in the MS) among the Ādityas, the eight sons of Aditi, born two by two. Although the RV vss. treating the pair-wise birth of the Ādityas (X.72.8–9) do not name the sons, nor do most of the Vedic prose versions, the MS passage (I.6.2 [104.10ff.]) gives the names in pairs: Dhātar and Aryaman, Mitra and Varuṇa, Aṃśa and Bhaga, and finally Indra and the aborted fetus, Mārtāṇḍa. (For the story and relevant Vedic passages, see KH, Aufs. 422ff.; my Hyenas 404–8; Brereton Ādityas 244–45.) By this account Indra is an Āditya, albeit a minor one barely mentioned among them, and his closest brother, with whom he shared Aditi’s womb, is the aborted fetus, “stemming from a dead egg,” who – notably – is the ancestor of mankind. So I tentatively suggest here that “the sons of your brother” are actually humans, and his “sparking” (*tītvīṣānāḥ*) them, energizing or even vivifying them, establishes the all-important relationship between Indra and his human devotees. Our RVic passage seems late enough to share mythological content with that early prose text the MS. I would now tentatively withdraw the statement in the publ. intro. that Indra has no brother.

X.55.2–3: The numerology in these two vss. is characteristic of All God hymns; the references of these numbers are not clear, as often in such passages.

X.55.2: The notion that it is by means of his name(s) that Indra performs his deeds, as expressed in ab, is also found in the previous hymn in vs. 4, with the same instr. rel. construction (X.54.4 *nāmā* [or -a?] ... *yébhiḥ* ..., 55.2 *nāma* ... *yéna* ...).

Note that the injunc. *janáyah* is multivalent enough to express both the previous begetting and that to come. Contrast this with the impf. *ájanayah* in a similar construction in 4b, which

refers only to the past.

Pāda c lacks two syllables; Ge (n. 2cd) suggests supplying another *priyám*, presumably at the end of the pāda, which would have been lost by haplogy: *... *priyám, priyám priyāḥ*. This seems unlikely to me, esp. as it would produce a bad Triṣṭubh cadence. Old suggests various distractions, which are likewise unconvincing; Arnold (§227 iii c) suggests two “rests,” before and after the caesura, with a Triṣṭubh cadence. I think rather than trying to fix the meter, we should accept it as a truncated pāda, whose brevity is in harmony with its syntactic configuration as a kind of topicalized nominal clause, either marked as dependent by *yád* deep in the clause (“which light ...,”) or with *yád asya* as a nominal izafe (“the light that is his ...”), for which see my forthcoming “Proto-proto izafe.” The publ. tr. reflects the latter, but the former would also be syntactically possible.

The lexeme *sám √ víś* is barely attested in the RV (here and in the flg. hymn, X.56.1, as well as X.18.7; cf. also *saṃvéśana-* also in the next hymn, X.56.1). Here and in the AV, where it is somewhat better attested, it seems to be partly specialized for funerary contexts, for the merging into or joining with light. If “merging into the light” here refers to death, then the vs. contains the endpoints, birth and death, both associated here with Indra, the begetter in b, the owner of the light after death in c.

The identity of the “five dear ones” cannot be determined. Ge (n. 2d) follows Sāy. in supplying *jānāḥ*. Although the phrase “five peoples” accounts for many of the occurrences of RVic *pañca*, I do not think that is the referent here. Given the rarity of *sám √ víś* in the RV and its use in the next, related hymn (X.56.1) for the merging of the dead body with light, I find it hard to believe that the occurrence here, which also involves light, simply depicts a sociopolitical fact. Although it seems way too early for this idea to be circulating, could it refer to the later doctrine of the five elements that the dead dissolve into, in expressions like *pañcatām √ gam* (etc.) ‘go to fivehood’, i.e., ‘die’?

X.55.3: The vs. begins as a conventional Indra vs., with his filling of the world-halves and the space in between (pāda a), but the numerology that follows and the multiplicity of Indra’s lights, picking up the light of 2c, soon take it in a new and baffling direction. Ge makes trouble for himself (in my opinion) by construing the acc. in b with the verb in a, *ā ... aprṇāt*. Since the phrase *ā √ prā* WORLDS “fill worlds” is stereotyped in the RV as one of Indra’s deeds, trying to join a very dissimilar direct object, “gods,” to this expression puts both off balance. The presence of the “fill worlds” expression is probably owing to the emphasis on light: what Indra ordinarily fills the space with is light. Contrary to Ge I construe b with cd; besides avoiding the ill-assorted expression resulting from grafting b onto a (see above), this has the advantage of providing the verb in c, *vī caṣṭe*, with an object. Although *vī √ cakṣ* can occur without an object, it frequently has one.

The numerological material in b and c has been amply chewed over by both Old and Ge (nn. 3b, 3c), though there is no fixed consensus on the referents of the numbers – nor do I intend to add to the discussion. Based on my grouping of the pādas, the general outline of what’s going on seems to be that Indra surveys the ranks of the gods arranged by some numerical principle (perhaps, five groups of seven)(pāda b), by means of the light from thirty-four sources (pāda c), probably a collection of heavenly lights (stars, etc.), which are, however, really underlyingly only one light (pāda d), though with different functions. This single light is presumably the same as Indra’s “light born of old” (*pratnām jātām jyótiḥ*) of 2c, into which the mysterious five merged in 2d. We can also recall Indra’s deed in the previous hymn, X.54.6, whereby he “placed

light within light” (*ádadhāj jyótiṣi jyótir antáh*).

X.55.4–6: As disc. in the publ. intro., these vss. do not appear to be Indra vss., esp. 4–5, but rather seem to allude to cosmic mysteries or paradoxes. Since vss. 4–5 are the exact center of the hymn, they fit the omphalos template. In my opinion all three center on astronomical phenomena and form a sequence that sketches the end of night and the beginning of the day, though not quite in sequence. Vs. 4 announces the dawn, while vs. 5 describes the moon amid the stars and its disappearance in the gray of dawn; vs. 6 presents us with the ruddy sun at daybreak. For details see the comm. on the individual vss. below.

X.55.4: This vs. is addressed to Uṣas; her appearance here has probably been motivated by the emphasis on light(s) in the previous vss., esp. cosmic light, as well as by the theme of unity and diversity (see below). As noted in the publ. intro., the final pāda of the vs. seems a deliberate echo of the notable refrain in III.55 (1–22) *mahád devānām asuratvám ékam* “great is the one and only lordship of the gods.” It is remarkable that this solemn general pronouncement has been adapted for one of the less majestic (or at any rate non-male) gods.

Each of the first three pādas is a dependent clause under the domain of a *yá*-form: *yád* a, c, *yéna* b. In the publ. tr. I take the three clauses to be sequential and parallel and the *yá*-forms to be functionally similar, expressing cause (“in that ..., because ..., in that”), but I now think that the *yéna* clause in b should be taken separately from the surrounding *yád* clauses and that it is dependent on pāda a. I base this on the other instr. rel. clauses in this hymn sequence that express the means whereby a god (=Indra) accomplishes a deed—namely X.54.4 *yébhīḥ kármāni ... cakártha* and esp., earlier in this hymn, X.55.2 *yéna bhūtám janáyo yéna bhávyam* “by which you begat what has been and by which (you will beget) what is to be.” Our pāda contains the same verb (though augmented), *ájanayaḥ* in addition to the *yéna*, and I doubt that this match is accidental. But what is the antecedent of *yéna* here? In both the Indra exx. just cited, the antecedent is “name(s),” and the point is that it is by the name(s) alone that the god performs his action(s). But there is no obvious antecedent in our main clause. Dawn is herself the subj. of *ájanayaḥ* and should not be the referent of *yéna*, not to mention that she’s feminine and *yéna* is not. It might be that a singular could be extracted from the gen. pl. *vibhānām* “of the radiant ones” in pāda a, but this hapax stem *vibhā-* is most likely (though not entirely certainly) fem. as well (see Scar’s disc. [350]). I think the referent has to be ‘light’ (*jyótiṣ-*) plucked from the larger context: 2c, 3d; note esp. instr. *jyótiṣā* in 3d. The main clause in 4a is suffused with light, even though *jyótiṣ-* is not found there. I would now emend the tr. of ab(c) to “In that, o Dawn, you dawned as the foremost of the radiant ones, by which (light) you begat the thriving of the thriving, / in that ...”

It is not clear to me what *puṣtásya puṣtám* refers to, but we should begin with the fact that though *puṣtá-* is formally a past participle to $\sqrt{puṣ}$, it never shows clear adjectival use in the RV but is always nominalized as ‘(a/the) thriving, flourishing’ vel sim. (see already Gr’s definitions 6 and 7, of neut. *puṣtá-*), essentially doubling the fem. abstract *puṣtí-*. Because all clear cases of *puṣtá-* are nominal, I doubt that the gen. here is implicitly adjectival referring to a person/being who thrives, with the sense of the phrase “the thriving of the thriving (one)” (implied by Gr’s interpr. of the gen.); rather I think it’s an implicit superlative: “the thriving of thriving” = “the thriving of (all) thriving(s),” “the best thriving.”

Exactly how to construe and interpret c is unclear, muddled by the often-paired relational terms *ávāra-* and *pára-*, as well as by the question of whether *te* and *párasyaḥ* are coreferential or

to be construed separately. Let us begin with the paired terms *ávāra-/ pára-*, which can show several different spatial or temporal polarized values: “lower/higher” // “nearer/further” // “later/earlier.” As it happens, this pairing is found in the next, related hymn, X.56.7, where the temporal sense is found, referring to earlier and later generations. I think our passage also has a temporal sense, though displayed in a spatial metaphor. I assume it is expressing the familiar trope of the kinship, indeed identity, of all dawns, from time immemorial till the dawn of the current day and on to future dawns.

The trick is to figure out exactly what form this trope takes here. To solve this, we now turn to the second question: is *te* corefential with *párasyāḥ*? Although Sāy. interprets it that way and Gr so indicates (see also W.E. Hale, *Asura* 97), I think this unlikely, because it requires that the Dawn addressed in pāda a is the Dawn of the distant past, but if she is the past Dawn, how can she be on the scene to be addressed? True, she is called *prathamā* ‘foremost, first’ in pāda a, but in other Uṣas hymns (cf. esp. I.113.8, 15) *prathamā* is used of today’s Dawn, the first of those who are to come, as the passages in I.113 make explicit. I therefore think that *párasyāḥ* is to be construed independently of *te* and it refers to a Dawn long in the past. The enclitic *te*, which here could be either gen. or dat., depends on the *jāmitvām ávaram* and is explicitly contrasted with the previous (*pára-*) Dawn; note that Ge also takes them separately. The whole phrase then indicates that “you,” the current Dawn, have a close kinship (*jāmitvām ávaram*) even with the/a Dawn of the far distant past (*párasyāḥ*), with *ávāra-/ pára-* expressing a temporal relationship through a spatial metaphor. The theme of unity in multiplicity found in vs. 3, with the many lights counting as a single light (3cd) is reprised here, with a more familiar example, that of the fundamental identity of the infinite number of dawns in the past and to come. The unity is emphasized by the adaptation of the “one and only lordship” refrain to Dawn.

X.55.5: This is the most challenging vs. in the hymn and the middle verse of the three astronomical ones (4–6). Each of the pādas presents its own problems. The standard interpr. of this vs. runs counter to the usual: there is general agreement about the *referent* of the principal entity—the moon—but none about the meaning or etymology of its first epithet, *vidhú-*, though it is also generally agreed that it is a riddling designation in a riddling vs.

In my view, the first pāda continues the theme of unity and multiplicity found previously, and this polarity helps in interpreting the much discussed word *vidhú-*. The scholarly back-and-forth about this word has been conveniently summarized by Carmen Spiers in her recent (2020) EPHE diss., “Magie et poésie dans l’Inde ancienne,” 308–10, and I will not repeat this disc. in detail, nor will I engage much with the much disputed question of its etymology and word formation. Instead I will first focus on the rhetorical organization of the pāda in which it’s found: *vidhúṃ dadrāṇām sámāne bahūnām*, with its final loc.-gen. phrase “in a gathering/crowd of many.” Given the balanced contrast between one and many / unity and multiplicity that we have noted in the previous two vss., the “many” at the end of pāda a invites a “one / alone” interpr. of *vidhú-* at the beginning. And in fact much of the older lit. so interpr. it: Gr (flg. BR) ‘vereinsamt, einsam’, MonWms ‘lonely, solitary’, sim., though tentatively, Old. There are several, not entirely incompatible, ways to get to this sense, one of which involves a connection with *vidhāvā-* ‘widow’ as ‘the solitary one’ (see Old, again tentatively) and/or derivation from the root $\sqrt{\text{vidh}}$ ‘divide’ (which, however, is a secondary root with somewhat different semantics). The connection with ‘widow’ was maintained by Tichy in her treatment of *vidhú-* (HS 106 [1993]: 15–17 = KISch 365–67), but she proposes a very different root etymology, to $\sqrt{\text{vyadh}}$ ‘pierce, wound’ or, in her gloss, ‘jdn. verletzen, mit dem Pfeil treffen’, besonders ‘tödlich treffen’. She

considers the interpr. “tödlich getroffen” for *vidhú-* justified by the fact that later in the vs. the referent dies (*mamāra*). But there is a certain rhetorical tone-deafness to this interpr.: it seems to me that the local context of pāda a, which favors ‘alone’ versus ‘many’, should outweigh the dying at the end of the vs., esp. because *mamāra* enters into its own rhetorical pairing with immediately following *sām āna* ‘he breathed’. Moreover, neither the phases of the moon nor the setting of the moon at daybreak (which are both possible real-world analogues for ab) conceptually involve wounding. Nonetheless, Tichy’s interpr. has mostly carried the day, having been adopted by Mayr. in EWA s.v. *vidhú-* (in a fascicle publ. in 1995, soon after Tichy’s art.) and by Kü (254). But note that Lubotsky (“RV *ávidhat* [1994: IXth Fachtagung IGG, 205]) asserts the connection with *vidhávā-* and with $\sqrt{\text{vidh}}$, though with a different and somewhat dubious etymology of the root and a different sense for *vidhú-* ‘divided in two parts, a crescent’. (Since this publication arose from a 1992 conference, the original paper predated Tichy’s article, which is not mentioned.) To summarize my own view briefly, I find Tichy’s etymology and interpr. of the word quite unsatisfactory, despite their current dominance; I am more sympathetic to Lub’s view, but I still find it dubious. (Inter alia, surely ‘divided in two parts’ with reference to the moon would identify a half moon.) To my mind, the ‘alone’ sense is rhetorically the best supported, and a connection with ‘widow’, whatever the further details of root and word formation, can underlie this sense. Thus the first pāda can depict the solitary (moon) running in a crowd of many (stars), as it crosses the sky from moonrise to moonset.

The next question is – what happens to this moon in pāda b? As I have indicated above, I think the image is that of the moon setting into the gray clouds/haze at the horizon at dawn, (or alternatively, as I also suggest in the publ. intro., the gray could be the smoke from the ritual fire kindled at dawn). A possibly similar image, of sunrise through gray clouds, may be found in the Pūṣan hymn VI.56.3 (q.v.), with a different word for ‘gray’ (*paraśá-*), but that passage is even more obscure than this one. I am puzzled by Old’s suggestion that the gray one is the “old sun” (“der alten Sonne”) – I cannot think of a naturalistic situation in which the sun could appear to swallow the moon, and furthermore the sun is hardly gray, esp. at sunrise. Ge’s suggestion (n. 5b) that the *palitá-* is “das personifizierte Greisenalter” is worth more consideration, but I think we are dealing with a semantic association of gray with old age, rather than a personification. The pāda set us a semantic polarization between the young and the old, via the association of gray (hair) with old age, with the young moon, presumably the new moon, being swallowed up by the gray cloudbank.

One issue that no one dealing with the passage seems to have confronted: despite the universal assumption that the referent of the accusatives in this half-vs. is the moon, the gender is masc. – and the standard word for moon is feminine. (However, other words used for the moon, most notably *sóma-* (already so used in the wedding hymn, X.85.1–5) can be masc.) I don’t know what to do about this, but given the other strong evidence for the identification of this entity as the moon, I do not think the gender mismatch invalidates it. Perhaps this is part of the riddle.

Although pāda c is morphologically and syntactically unproblematic and the words are all familiar, its sense and its relevance to the rest of the verse are not. To begin with, what is the referent of *devásya*? Is this the moon from ab, once again unusually masc., or is a god external to the rest of the vs., perhaps Indra, who is the subject of the first and last vss. of the hymn? I am inclined towards the former, since it seems to point to the subject of pāda d, who seems to be identical to the accs. in ab.

Then, what does *kāvya-* mean here? I usually tr. it as ‘poetic skill/art’ or, in the pl.,

‘products of poetic skill, poems’. In passages with any sort of diagnostic context, the word is found in association with other words for speech and verbal products (e.g., IV.3.16, 11.3, V.39.5, VIII.79.1, IX.97.7). Others render it as “sagacity, understanding, wisdom”. But neither tack works very well here. In particular, if pāda d is meant as an illustration of the god’s *kāvya-* (as the colon after c in Ge’s, Tichy’s, and Kü’s (370) tr. suggests), dying does not seem a great example of his wisdom. But even less is d an example of poetic art. In the publ. intro. I suggest that *kāvya-* here refers to the *previous* hemistich, which is identified as a piece of *kāvya-*, a hyper-“poetic” description of the moon’s journey, which then, in pāda d, is expressed in stark and simple terms. In the absence of anything more convincing, I still think this is the best available interpr. But I remain disturbed by the *devāsya:* by this interpr. the *kāvya-* is not a product of the god [=moon], but *about* the god, which is a somewhat odd use of the genitive. I am also disturbed that d does not seem to describe quite the same situation as ab. The first hemistich, by my interpr., describes the moon’s traversal of the sky and its setting at dawn; d is most easily taken as a depiction of the moon’s phases, with “he died” referring to the dark period between the waning crescent and the new moon. But if “yesterday” can refer to the night before the dawn, perhaps the two pictures can be reconciled.

In d *mamāra* presumably owes its accent to the short contrasting clauses in this pāda, or else we should assume unsigned subordination: “(Although) today he died, yesterday ...”

X.55.6: As noted above and in the publ. intro., I think this vs. refers to the sun at daybreak. Ge (n. 6), similarly but not identically, to Indra as Sonnen-*hamṣa*. In favor of the sun as referent is the fact that the phrase *aruṇāḥ suparṇāḥ* is used of the sun in X.30.2 (so Ge’s n. 6a), V.47.3 (see comm. ad loc.), and *suparṇā-* by itself is frequently used of the sun (see Gr’s def. 6, even if the referent in not all these passages is correctly identified). I do not know why the sun is called ‘nestless’ (*ānīḷa-*)—perhaps because the sun is constantly on the move, even at night when most birds settle down in their nests, while he must make his invisible return journey to the east, to be ready for sunrise.

The first hemistich lacks a verb, and in addition the morphological identity and the syntax of *mahāḥ* is unclear. Ge takes *mahā-* as nom. sg. and supplies a verb of motion with *ā* in b: “der als der grosse ... herbei(kommt).” This may be the easiest solution, though not the most inspired. The publ. tr. reflects an assumed ellipsis of a verb form of $\sqrt{\text{śak}}$ (a type of haplogy after *śākmanā śākāḥ* opening the vs.), with *ā*, governing *mahāḥ* (prob. an acc. pl., so Old). Note that finite forms of (*ā*) $\sqrt{\text{śak}}$ are sometimes used as essentially etymological glosses of *śakrá-*, e.g., VIII.32.12 *sá naḥ śakrás cid ā śakat* “He as ‘able one’ will be able for us” (also I.10.6, VII.20.9).

Pāda c expresses the common trope that the Sun, traversing the sky, sees everything and everyone and spies out the truth for Mitra and Varuṇa (see, e.g., VII.60.1–4).

The last pāda of the vs. effects a transition to the final two Indra vss., though it can also be applied to the Sun.

As Ge notes (n. 6d), the paired agent nouns *utá jétotá dātāḥ* recall the somewhat less tightly knit pair in the previous hymn, X.54.5 *ājñātā ... dātāḥ*, though interestingly with different accent. The suffixed-accented pair in X.54.5 function as names of Indra, whereas these root-accented forms describe deeds and govern an acc.

X.55.7–8: These two vss. return to Indra, who, however, is not named. But his epithet *vajrín-* and association with the Vṛtra-slaying in 7b make his presence undeniable, and his drinking of the soma in 8c is hardly less diagnostic. Much else remains unclear, esp. in vs. 7.

X.55.7: As was just noted, the unnamed Indra is the subject of this vs., but we must also identify the unspecified “gods” (*devāḥ*, the last word of the vs.) by virtue of whom Indra acquires his manly powers (pāda a) and becomes strong for the Vṛtra-slaying. Here I think Ge is correct (and Sāy. well before him) that these are the Maruts, who are regularly mentioned as Indra’s supporters in the Vṛtra battle. I do not think this necessarily means that Ge’s identification of “the sons of the brother” in 1d as the Maruts is also correct. It’s worth noting that though Sāy. names the Maruts as the referents here, in vs. 1 he has an entirely different (if unlikely) interpr.: the brother is Parjanya, and the sons are “a collection of water(s)” (*udakasamstyāyān*).

With the Maruts plugged in as the referents of *ebhiḥ* (a) and *yébhīr* (b), the interpr. of the first hemistich is fairly straightforward. Not so the second. Here the gods, who must be the Maruts, “were born / came into being / arose” under some unclear circumstances. The immediate cause or concomitant circumstance is “the greatness of the deed/action being done/performed” (*kármaṇaḥ kriyámānasya mahná*). Given the context, it is difficult not to identify this deed as the Vṛtra-slaying of the previous pāda, which is depicted as happening concurrently, with the present passive participle. But did the Maruts come into being or arise because of the Vṛtra-slaying? Not in the standard accounts – and it is hard to see how they could have supported Indra at the time if they weren’t in existence yet. How to reconcile pādas c and d is made considerably more difficult by the word opening d, *ṛtekarmám*.

There has been curiously little discussion of the hapax *ṛtekarmám* despite the fact that its meaning is unclear (it’s been given two quite distinct senses in the literature), its second member seems to show a very early thematization of the old *n*-stem *kárman*-, and the accent may be anomalous. The only mention in the lit. that I can find is in EWA, s.v. *ṛté*, with a gloss ‘ohne (eigenes) Zutun’, but with no disc. of its formation. It is entirely absent, as far as I can tell, from AiG and from other standard grammars. In the older lit. the first member is taken as the loc. sg. of *ṛtá*-; see Gr’s ‘dem beim Gottesdienste vollbrachten Werke gemäss’ and the large (earlier) BR ‘handelnd nach der Ordnung, nach der Jedermann angewiesenen Bestimmung’ (though with ?). This analysis is also reflected in Sāy.’s gloss and paraphrase *ṛtakarma vṛstipradānakarma*. But in the short (later) BR (/br) the word has been given a radically new meaning: the full entry there is “Adv. ohne Werk,” which is reflected in MonWms “without work” (attributed to “BRD,” presumably the short br). I have found no disc. or justification of this abrupt about-face. Ge’s “ohne eigenes Zutun” follows this new view. (Old fails to comment on anything in this strange verse.) This later interpr. obviously takes the first member as the adposition *ṛté* ‘without’, found sparingly in the RV, always with the ablative. This would be the only such cmpd. in the RV (*ṛte-jā*- ‘born in truth’ belongs with *ṛtá*-), but a few exx. begin to appear in Vedic prose, already MS and KS. See AiG II.1.314–15 and its Nachtr., p. 86. The MS contains two accented forms (with unaccented parallels in KS), whose accents clash with each other: *ṛté-mūlam* ‘without roots’ (MS I.10.17; cf. KS XXXVI.12) with 1st member accentuation and *ṛte-yajñám* ‘without a sacrifice’ (MS I.11.5; cf. KS XIV.5) with 2nd member accentuation, both to thematic stems. The only other accented form is *ṛté-gu*- ‘without cow(s)’ in ŚBK I.2.4.10, corresponding to the phrase *ṛté góḥ* in ŚBM II.2.4.13. With so little data it is hard to draw any conclusions about the accent, but, for what it’s worth, the two forms with first-member accent appear to be adjectives, whereas our *ṛte-karmám* and, probably, MS *ṛte-yajñám* are adverbs and so may show adverbial accent shift. As for the apparent thematic ending *-ám*, I am puzzled. Perhaps it is an effort to distinguish the adverb from the case forms to the neut. *n*-stem *kárman*- found in these two vss.: gen. sg. *kármaṇaḥ* (7c), clearly to an *n*-stem, and acc. pl. *kármāni* (8a), the usual *-n*-stem form, though it

could of course belong to a putative *a*-stem **kárma*-. We can also note that the word precedes a vowel-initial word *udájāyanta* and so the *m* could have originated as a hiatus-filler.

Let us now focus on the meaning. The fact is that neither the older interpr. nor the younger one fits easily in the passage. To start with the later one and with Ge's tr. of the hemistich: "die [=Götter] durch die Grösse (seines) getanen Werkes auch ohne eigenes Zutun emporkamen" – the tr. implies that because of Indra's ("seines") activity the gods arose / came into being / got born without any action on their part. But does this follow? What does Indra's deed have to do with the birth of gods – esp. if this act is indeed the Vṛtra-slaying, as I suggested above? And does the birth of gods involve their own activity under other circumstances? The Maruts' birth is generally depicted as complex and problematic (see esp. VI.66.1–6, where they do seem to take an active role in their own birth). Or must we reckon with a very bleached sense of *úd√jan* 'come to prominence' or the like? This lexeme is rare (6x in the RV), and it generally refers to real birth or at least to physical (a)rising. In short, Ge's interpr. is not impossible, but it does not conform to any mythological situation I'm aware of, and the formation envisioned, a compd with *rté* 'without', seems a little early. The older interpr. does not fare much better; here again we'd need an adverb, in this case meaning something like "in the manner of (an) action in (accord with) truth." Such an adverb could qualify the immediately preceding phrase *kármaṇaḥ kriyámānasya mahná* "by the greatness of the action being performed" and indicate that the action was not only great but in harmony with the truth – perhaps a nervous preemption of the blood guilt associated with killing. Once again the word formation is anomalous, but that's a problem with both interpr. Although the publ. tr. follows the later interpr., I am now inclined towards the earlier one: "... which gods arose/came into being by/because of the greatness of the action being done, in a manner of (an) action in accord with truth." This still doesn't solve the problem of what the Vṛtra-slaying (or other deed of Indra's) has to do with the birth/arising of the Maruts, but I think I've gotten as far as I can.

X.55.8: This vs. is blessedly straightforward. Assuming that it follows more or less directly on vs. 7, we can supply "with them/the Maruts" to flesh out *yujā*. The *kárman*- prominent in vs. 7 returns here, obj. of the root *√jan*, which, as we saw, complicated 7d. As was likely there, we have to deal with an attenuated sense of 'beget' -- 'give rise to', vel sim. -- rather than a literal one.

The hymn limps to the end with a 10-syllable pāda (d).

X.56 All Gods

On the aim of the hymn, see publ. intro. As was disc. there, there are two competing views: that the hymn is the poet's memorial for his dead son Vājīn (Sāy.) or that it concerns a dead horse, either sacrificed (Old) or deified (Ge). The horse interpr. is strongly defended also by Doniger, but Re (EVP XVI.133) questions it: "peut-être l'allusion au cheval est-elle à rejeter?" As was also noted in the publ. intro., I reject both interpr.; there is simply no evidence for a horse save for the word *vājīn* 'prizewinner', which need not apply to a horse (see the numerous passages under Gr's definitions 3–8), nor is there any evidence for a father-son connection between the poet and the dead entity. Instead the hymn seems to be a general treatment of what happens after death, picking up and developing some themes found in the previous hymn, X.55, particular that of light.

X.56.1: The fact that this vs. is found in the AV (AVŚ XVIII.7≅ AVP XVIII.69.5) and

elsewhere in a normal funeral hymn is another piece of evidence that the dead in question is a person, not a horse.

The three lights are probably more or less as Ge indicates (n. 1a): this one here (*idám*) is the light of earth, quite possibly the fire; the distant one (*paráh*) is that in heaven, probably the sun; the third one is in the furthest distant heaven beyond the sun.

As noted above ad X.55.2, the lexeme *sám* √ *vis* is very rare, and its attestation twice in this vs. and once in a vs. in the preceding hymn is strong evidence for the continuity of thought between the two hymns. Both passages concern the “merging” of being(s) with or into light.

As elsewhere (I.163.4, VII.34.2, 56.2) I take the instrument suffix *-tra-* serious in *janitra-* and tr. it ‘means of begetting’, not ‘birthplace’ with most. Here the point would be that merging with the third light is the best kind of birth.

X.56.2: It must be admitted that this vs. is found in AVŚ in a short hymn to a horse (VI.92.3; the AVP IX.34.13 equivalent is in a longer and more miscellaneous collection).

Sāy., fld by Ge and Don, interpr. *tanūḥ ... tanvām náyantī* as meaning that the body of the horse is carrying the body of its rider, but this seems like a forcing of the horse theme on a phrase that resists it. For ex., Don tr. “carrying a body,” but √ *nī* doesn’t mean ‘carry’, but ‘lead’. For Don’s suggested meaning we would expect a form of √ *bhr* instead. Re appositely cites the compd. *ásu-nīti-* ‘leading to the (other) life’, found in the funeral hymns (incl. nearby X.59.5–6), referring to the one who guides the dead person to the beyond and reunites him with his faculties, a sort of psychopomp. In fact I now think that the nom. *tanūḥ* does not refer to the body of the dead man in question, which is rather the acc. *tanvām*; 2nd-position *te* can as easily qualify this following form, separated only by a voc. *vājín*, as the preceding *tanūḥ*. (I do not think that the close sandhi *tanūṣ te* requires a syntactic connection to the preceding: a preceding rukifiable *-s* generally seems to ruki before *te* regardless of the syntax. See, e.g., *vidúṣ te* [I.11.6, 7], *nákis te* [I.48.6, 69.7].) I would therefore change the tr. to “Let the body, leading your body, establish ...” Who the nom. body belongs to I’m not sure – perhaps it refers to a generic body, the psychopomp, that leads the other dead along the way.

The accent on *dhātu* is motivated by its participation in two clauses, between which it stands.

In d *jyótiḥ* can be read with both simile (to the left: *divīva*) and frame (to the right: *svám*). I take “own light” as referring to the *idám ... ékam* in 1a, “one light here [on earth]” – in other words, to the light that the person had while alive, which he will exchange for another light, the third one mentioned in 1b. Why the exchange partner is expressed in a simile “as if for the light in heaven” has to do with the three lights of 1ab. The dead is merging with the third light, beyond the one in heaven, i.e., the second light – but since that second one, the sun, is the only one we can see and therefore imagine, the poet compares the merging with the distant invisible third light with the less (but still) distant and visible second one. Ge’s interpr. is different: he supplies the sun in the simile, with the comparison between the sun’s exchanging its light (alternating between day and night?) and the dead man’s exchanging his. But I don’t understand the point of comparison: the dead person’s exchange is permanent – he’s giving up his own light for a higher one—whereas the sun’s exchange happens daily. Still less do I understand Don’s “change your own light as one does in heaven.”

X.56.3: The them. deriv. *vājina-* is poorly attested and poorly defined; here it seems to be used as a pleonastic etymological qualification of the nom. *vājī* “you are a *vājín* by your qualify of

vājina-.”

The rest of the vs. is structured by five occurrences of *suvitāḥ* ‘well gone’ (*su* √ *i*), which forms a non-etym. semantic figure with the single finite verb *gāḥ* ‘you have gone’ (to √ *gā*). This use of *suvitā-* is highly unusual. It is the only occurrence of this quite well-attested stem with an animate being; it is ordinarily neut. and a noun ‘good going, easy passage’.

The real problem in this vs. is the hapax *suvenīḥ* (see AiG II.380 “ganz unklar”), starting with its morphological identification. Sāy., Old, and Re take it as a nom. sg. (in different ways), while Ge, Don., and I take it as acc. pl. fem. Ge and Don think it refers to the heavenly mares (Ge n. 3a), the ‘well-loved’ (“zu den schönen Geliebten”) or ‘well-loving’ (Don: “who long for you”) ones, with an outmoded sense of √ *ven*. I associate it with the fem. pl. *venīḥ* ‘(female) trackers’ in VIII.41.3, which I now think refers to the dawns. (See comm. ad loc.) Here the same referent is quite possible; remember that the addressee is on a journey to merge with the distant light, and the dawns, sources of heavenly light, therefore fit the larger context. Recall that in the “light” section of the previous, thematically related hymn, X.55.4, Dawn featured prominently. As a goal in our vs., “dawns” fits well with heaven (*divām* b) and the gods (*devān* d). I would, however, slightly alter the tr., since *suvitāḥ* does not seem to be construed with *suvenīḥ*, as the publ. tr. implies. The new version would be “You have gone to the (dawns?), the good trackers, well gone to the praise, well gone to heaven ...”

X.56.4: On my general interpr. of the vs., see the publ. intro., where I suggest that the vs. describes the step-by-step mechanism whereby the recently dead regain their bodies. The last pāda is the clearest expression of this thought, with the dead entering (*ā ... nī* √ *viś*) their own bodies again. The use of √ *viś* recalls the lexeme *sām* √ *viś* ‘merge into’ (of the dead) almost confined to these two hymns (X.55.2, 56.1); see comm. above. It is used of the dead merging with light; in this pāda they (re-)merge with their own bodies.

The rest of the vs. is beset with difficulties, though the outlines of the process seem fairly clear – even though I’ve now changed my mind about some of it (see below). It involves uniting the previous mental force of the dead (*krātu-*, b) with their vibrant energy (*yāny ātviṣuḥ*, c; see below), and, with this package, entering into their own bodies again (d). What exactly is going on in pāda a is less clear.

The interpr. of pāda a depends on that of *caná*, in particular whether it is positive or negative. There is some difference of opinion here, but weighted towards a negative interpr. So, though Sāy. takes it as positive and both Old and Re consider this as a possibility, in the end Old prefers a neg. interpr. (Re does not decide), and Ge, Don, and the publ. tr. all follow the negative one, without disc. Certainly the apparent contrast between the Pitars in pāda a and the gods in b favors the negative, as Old points out. However, this interpr. collides with the usage facts of *caná* elsewhere. As disc. esp. ad X.49.5, flg. Klein (DGRV I.285–92), although *caná* overwhelmingly appears in negative contexts, the actual negative is always expressed by (an)other explicitly negative word(s) in those contexts. There are almost no clear examples of *caná* as the sole expression of the negative (though see comm. ad II.24.12); unfortunately Klein does not discuss our passage, which seems like a strong candidate – or at least it is often so interpr. On the one hand, we could assume that the negative sense had “rubbed off” on *caná* in this late passage, and it means “even ... not” as in the publ. tr. in contrast to its standard usage. As I explain in the publ. intro., this could mean that the immediate predecessors of the dead, their Pitars, do not control the “greatness” of those dead, which is in the hands of the gods and powers further above. However, given the overwhelming no. of *caná* passages that conform to the usage facts

just set out – there are nearly 100 exx. of *caná-* in the RV – I am now more reluctant to follow this path than when I made the transl. without full consideration of *caná*. But, if *caná* is positive, what then would this pāda mean? That interpr. must in turn depend on what we think *mahimán-* expresses. This well-attested word is of course an abstract meaning ‘greatness’, but that doesn’t get us very far. I would suggest, very tentatively, that the use of pl. *mahimānaḥ* in the famous cosmogonic hymn X.129.5 may help illuminate our passage. Late in the creation depicted therein, the creation becomes sexualized, with polarized male and female features: *retodhā āsan mahimāna āsan* “There existed placers of semen and there existed greatnesses,” with the “greatnesses” likely referring to pregnancies. If *mahimán-* (sg., I grant) in our passage can refer to the pregnant belly and, by extension, to sexuality, reproduction, and all the messy parts of physicality, this could be in the control of the Pitars, who are in fact vitally interested in the reproductive capacity of their descendants, while the mental power and vital energy belong to the gods. Although this suggestion is fairly fragile, given how many exx. of *mahimán-* lack this sense, it fits the context quite well, since the Pitars return in the vs. 6 to establish the continuity of generations. I would therefore now change the tr. to “Even though the forefathers are masters of their “greatness” (=procreative powers), the gods ...”

The next pāda is, by the standards of this hymn, pretty straightforward. By my interpr. the gods have control over the *krātu-* ‘mental force’ of the dead and deposit it among themselves. The mental *krātu-* contrasts with the physical procreative power (if my interpr. of *mahimán-* in a is accepted).

Pāda c presents several challenges: 1) what is *utá* doing in the middle of the pāda? 2) how should we interpr. *yāny átvīṣuḥ*? In particular, is *yāni* nom. or acc. and, related, is *átvīṣuḥ* intransitive or transitive? 3) What is the subj. of *sám avivyacuḥ*?

The question about *utá* has, I think, not previously been raised: it has simply been taken as connecting c with b, despite its mid-pāda position. See Ge’s tr., whose rendering of c begins with “Und.” Klein (DGRV I.380) is explicit that it connects the clauses across a distich boundary, despite its pāda-internal position. The publ. tr. reflects this shared view (notice my “and” beginning c). But I now think it is wrong. Instead I think it connects the unexpressed first obj. of *sám avivyacuḥ* ‘they enveloped / encompassed’ with the second, which is the relative clause that follows *utá*. In other words, it is the *utá* version of an “X and which Y” construction, usually expressed with *ca* (X *yá-* ca Y). The use of the preverb *sám* ‘together’ supports this view that two things are being united. The first object is, in my view, *krátum*, to be supplied from b. In other words they bring together the mental force of b and the vibrant energy expressed by *yāny átvīṣuḥ*. Once these have been combined, the crucial parts of the dead person have been reunited and are ready to be (re-)placed in the bodily envelope.

Let us now turn to the rel. cl. and specifically to its verb *átvīṣuḥ*. The first thing to note is that a different form of this root was found in the previous hymn, X.55.1 *títvīṣānāḥ* tr. there ‘sparking’, that is, energizing or vivifying. That form is a middle pf. part. and transitive, but opinions differ on the value of our act. form. For intransitive value: Sāy. (*yāni tejāṃsy atvīṣuḥ dīpyante*), Don (“all things that shine”), and apparently Ge (“Glanzleistungen”), as well as the publ. tr. (“those things that were in vibrant motion”). For transitive: Gr (“anregen ACC”), Kü (“welche sie erregten,” p. 500), and Old (“was sie aufgestürmt haben”). It is true that this is the only act. form to this root, and so an oppositional transitive might be expected (most of the middle forms, though not X.55.1, are intrans.). A trans. sense would certainly work within my scenario: “they encompassed the *krātu-* and the parts that they ‘sparked’.” But, despite the morphology, I weakly favor the intrans. version because it is more harmonious with the simple

obj. *krátum*. Putting the whole pāda together, I would now tr. “They enveloped / encompassed (the mental force) and those things that were in vibrant motion” – in other words intellect and life force. One final question about this pāda: who is the subj. of *sám avivyacuḥ*? Ge (/Don) thinks it’s the divine racehorses, which we can dismiss. It could be the gods of b, but I think it is more likely the dead themselves, who have reclaimed the various parts of themselves from the various places they ended up after death.

X.56.5: As indicated in the publ. intro., I think the first hemistich of this vs. depicts the newly reassembled dead moving about in the other, upper realm. I’m not sure exactly what their “powers” (*sáhobhiḥ*) are, but I assume that this refers generally to the powers that come from the (re-)combination of mental force, life force, and body.

As also indicated in the publ. intro., in my view the 2nd hemistich refers to a different type of life-after-death. Though each separate being is limited to and held within a single body – even if that body is in heaven, as in the last pāda of the previous vs., 4d — by producing offspring, a single being can extend himself in many different beings. This is of course a standard Vedic sentiment. On the medial reflexive form *prásārayanta* see my *-aya*-book, p. 170.

X.56.6: As Ge (n. 6) says, “Schwierige Str.” The first thing to note is that the configuration of two plus a third matches vs. 1, though the referents of the numbers cannot be the same. Since the final vs. of this hymn (7) seems to be a summary vs. applicable to the poet, the matching of 1 and 6 is ring compositional. In vs. 1 we have *ékam ... ékam ... tṛtīyena*, whereas here we have *dvidhā ... tṛtīyena*. In 1 the third entity is light (*jyótiṣā*), here a deed (*kármaṇā*). Light is represented in this vs., however – by *svar(-víd)*- ‘sun(-finding)’.

The vs. concerns the same subject as vs. 5: the ways in which the dead (or to-be-dead) can assure some kind of continued existence for themselves. This is also generally Ge’s take on the vs. (see n. 6ab), though we differ sharply on details, esp. the referents of the crucial terms. The topic of continued existence is also approached from two points of view, that of the sons of the dead (ab) and that of the already dead forefathers (cd).

With Ge, I take *dvidhā* ‘in two ways’ as referring to two different locales: yonder (i.e., heaven, or whatever we want to call it) and here on earth. My important differences from Ge are that I don’t think the “sons” are the Aṅgirasas, an idea of Sāy.’s that seems a distraction in this hymn, and I think the *ásura*- is the sons’ actual father, not heaven (so Ge) nor the sun (Sāy., Don). The sons have established their father, their “lord,” as a sun-finder—that is, they have made it possible for him to merge with the light, as in 1b. Yonder in heaven this is effectuated by the sons’ performance of the proper funeral rites; on earth by their extending themselves through offspring, thus producing grandsons for their fathers, the standard three-generation model in later Hinduism. This extension is produced by “a third action” (*tṛtīyena kármaṇā*), which, with Sāy., Ge, and Don, I interpr as procreation. Although we might think that procreation was already covered by the second category, “extending themselves through offspring,” I think the offspring and the sexual intercourse that produces them are considered separately. Sexual intercourse is definitely an “action,” requiring another person, the ambivalently viewed female, and therefore involving some danger and risk of impurity. The hoped-for result, the offspring continuing the line of the grandfather, is not a given.

This is the extension of the line from the son’s point of view. Their fathers’ is given in the second hemistich. These (now dead) Pitars established their own offspring (*svām prajām*), that is, the sons whose actions we observed in ab, as their “paternal power” (*pítṛyaṃ sáhaḥ*). In this

context “paternal power” seems to identify the offspring as the tool, the secret weapon, that the Pitars wield to ensure their continuity into the next generation(s). The sons will have sons (and so on), and they will stretch like a thread across the generations.

X.56.7: The first hemistich of the vs. is essentially unrelated to the rest of the hymn, simply expressing metaphorically all the difficulties Bṛhaduktha has overcome – though for a possible relationship between the boat in pāda a and the journey to the next world, see comm. ad X.135.4. The real meat is in the second hemistich. There the general statement in the previous vs. (6) is applied specifically to the poet Bṛhaduktha. This application is emphasized by the exact echoes in the two second hemistichs:

6cd #*svām prajām ... , āvareṣv adadhuḥ ...*

7cd #*svām prajām ... , āvareṣv adadhāt ...*

Just as the Forefathers establish their own progeny to provide continuity to later generations, so has Bṛhaduktha. This would seem simply to say that Bṛhaduktha, too, has produced sons. But what about the final phrase, *ā páreṣu* “among previous (generations),” found only in the Bṛhaduktha vs.? This is the finale of the hymn (and of the hymn sequence, X.54–56), and, when given some thought, it seems like a radical statement. The Pitars can only produce forward, as it were: their offspring connect them with generations to come. But how can one’s own offspring connect to the past? I venture to suggest, quite tentatively, that this is a statement about poetry. Bṛhaduktha’s “own offspring” are also his hymns, and by producing them he has not only set about ensuring the continuity of the poetic tradition to generations in the future, but he has also provided a continued existence to previous generations by celebrating them in his poetry. He has generated backwards, as it were, and given a new life to the Pitars who preceded him. Bṛhaduktha’s special ability to connect with both past and future is enabled by *mahitvā*, his ‘greatness’.

X.57–60

On these four hymns (and their possible resolution into three) see publ. intro. to the four hymns as well as the introductions to the individual hymns.

X.57 All Gods

X.57.1: Technically speaking, *somínaḥ* could be gen. sg., as I take it (also Ge), abl. sg. with *yajñāt*, or nom. pl. agreeing with the 1st pl. subj.

X.57.2: The “thread stretched” (*tántuḥ ... ātataḥ*) to the gods is Agni: the ppl *āhuta-* is overwhelmingly used of him. The phrase exactly matches (save for case) *tántum ātatam* in the immediately preceding hymn (X.56.6), and, though the referents and contexts are completely different, this agreement may account for the placement of this set of hymns.

X.57.3: The mention of the Pitars also connects this hymn with the end of the last: see X.56.4, 6.

X.57.5: The tr. of *pitaraḥ* here should have been harmonized with that of *pitṛṇām* in 3, hence “o forefathers.”

X.57.6: *vraté* in this vs. echoes *vrātam* in 5c, despite their different senses. Both vss. end with

sacemahi.

X.58 “Return of Mind” (*manaāvartanam*)

On the relationship between this hymn and the previous one, see publ. intro.

X.58.1 (–12): The locational adv. *dūrakám* seems almost contradictory: the base *dūrā-* means ‘distant, far away’, but the suffix *-ka-*, diminutive or deprecatory, seems to undercut its base – with an implication “a little far away, sort of far away.” This may give us some reassurance that we can succeed in calling back the *mānas-* that has gone to those not-quite-so-distant parts.

X.58.6: As was noted in the publ. intro., the “sloping paths” (*pravātaḥ*) lead to Yama in the funeral hymn X.14.1. It is not clear to me whether the preceding *mārīcīḥ* ‘light-beams’ is meant to be identical to the sloping paths or a different destination. Distinct parallel accusatives seem less likely because we might otherwise expect a double *yád* as in vss. 2 (*yád ... dívam yát pṛthivīm*), 7, and 8. But I’m not sure whether the sloping paths are really conceived of as beams of light. The word *mārīci-* is found only once elsewhere in the RV, in very late X.177.1; it is more common in the AV, esp. AVP (see Griffiths 2009, ad AVP VI.7.1), but it does not seem to have a technical or particularly well-defined meaning there.

X.59 Various divinities

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. In Old’s view (Noten, ad 57–60), vss. 1–7 belong together, but 8–10 belong with X.60.

X.59.1: The interpr. of b is disputed; I find both Ge’s and Old’s unsatisfactory because they miss connections between b and pādas a and c. To begin with the subjects of b, the dual *sthātārā*. With Old (also Re, but not Ge) I take the referents to be the two Aśvins; Ge (n. 1b, though see n. 1c) finds a reference to the Aśvins unnecessary (nicht notwendig), but the mention of one of the Aśvins’ clients, Cyavāna, in c, not to mention the fact that the form is dual, makes the Aśvins the prohibitive favorite. The Aśvins are addressed as *sthātārā* in I.181.3. I construe gen. *rāthasya* with the agent noun, *pace* Ge and Re, who take it with *krátumatā*. Cf. for this same phrase III.45.2 *sthātā rāthasya*.

The next question is the referent (and analysis) of *krátumatā*. Although Gr (and tentatively Lanman, Noun Infl. 516) take it as a nominative dual, such disregard for standard morphology should be avoided. Both Old and Ge (and I) take it as an instr. sg.; for them it refers to another person: Ge to another unidentified charioteer, Old to Cyavāna. But we really need no other personnel. Although a word meaning ‘possessing *krātu*’ might be expected to refer to a living being, in fact this is not necessary. In IV.41.1 *krátumān* modifies a praise song (*stómaḥ*) that is spoken by us (*asmád uktāḥ*). I therefore supply a verbal product here as well: the Aśvins did X “with their resolute (speech).”

And what is it that the Aśvins did? Here the well-known saga of Cyavāna comes into play: the Aśvins are famous for making him young again. This is where pāda a becomes relevant. There we have a passive syntagm “his lifetime has become extended” *prá tāry āyuh*, expressed with the passive aor. of the lexeme *prá √ tī*. The owner of this lifetime is the unnamed subject of this part of the hymn. But this extension of his lifetime is comparable to what the Aśvins did for Cyavāna, and in fact the same verbal lexeme is once used of this very deed: I.116.10 *prātiratam jahitāsyāyur dasrā* “You extended the lifetime of him who was left behind [=Cyavāna, mentioned

in the preceding pāda], wondrous ones.” I suggest that the syntactic relationship between pāda a (the frame) and pāda b (the simile) belongs to the phenomenon I’ve discussed under the rubric of “case disharmony in similes” (IJ 24 [1982]). Here pāda a is passive and the neut. *āyuh* is nominative; in b I supply a transitive form of the verbal lexeme (*prātiratam* as in I.116.10 just cited will do), with neut. *āyuh* available to serve as accusative obj. This tight and poetically ingenious connection between a and b, pivoting on a shared neut. noun but changing the voice of the shared verbal idiom, seems preferable to Ge’s invention of an obj. in the simile in b: “wie die beiden Wagenfahrer (ihre Fahrt fortsetzen),” which still requires the verb of the simile to be transitive and to be a variant of *prā√tī*, at least as I understand him.

What task or goal (*ārtham*) the unnamed subject, (like) Cyavāna, sets his force to is not clear to me. Cyavāna set out to marry young women (see I.116.10d). Perhaps in the context of this revivifying hymn, the same end is in view.

Note that the adverb beginning the refrain of d, *parātarām* ‘further away’, phonetically echoes the opening of the verse, *prā tārī*.

X.59.2: As was hinted in the publ. intro., the relevance of this vs. to the life-restoring first vs. is not entirely clear. Given the presence of the *sāman* (pāda a) and of a singer (*jaritā c*), the vs. seems to concern the sacrifice and the material and non-material goods to be gained from it. Note also that there is a switch to 1st pl. reference in this and the following two vss. belonging to this section, from the unnamed 3rd sg. whose life was extended in vs. 1. Both these changes seem abrupt, despite the presence of the refrain in all the d pādas.

With Ge I take loc. *sāman* as in essence a truncated loc. absolute: “when the *sāman* (is sung),” “at the *sāman*.” A similar minimalist usage is found in VIII.89.7. With Ge, I reject Old’s ascription to a different stem built to *√san* ‘win, gain’, represented by Gr’s “2. *sāman*” and fld. also by Re.

I do not understand the doubled *nū* in this pāda. The two other exx. of this phenomenon make rhetorical sense: in VIII.51.7 repeated *in nū* connects two parallel adverbials (*ūpōpēn nū ... bhūya in nū* “over and over ... more (and more) ...”); in X.27.7 they connect two contrastive chiasmic clauses: *dārṣan nv pūrvo āparo nū darṣat*. But here there is no grammatical or thematic parallelism between the items adjacent to the two *nū*s, and the second *nū* does not signal a new clause.

The phrase *nidhimāt ... ānnam* is somewhat puzzling. A *nidhī-* is ‘a deposit, a treasure or treasury’; it is several times used with *mādhu-* ‘honey’: VII.69.3 *nidhīm mādhumantam* “honeyed treasure,” I.183.4=III.58.5 *nidhāyo mādhūnām* “deposits of honey.” All three passages are in Aśvin hymns; if we assume that in this food context *nidhimānt-* has the pregnant sense “possessing treasures/deposits (of honey),” this might provide the link between this vs. and the first one, where the Aśvins are prominent though unnamed, but beyond this I can’t go.

The mid. subj. *kārāmahe* takes both *ānnam* and *śrāvāmsi* as parallel and contrastive objects, with the self-beneficial sense “make one’s own” (so also Ge: “... wollen wir ... gewinnen”).

The c pādas of vss. 2 and 3 are almost identical:

2c *tā no vīśvāni jaritā mamattu*

3c *tā no vīśvāni jaritā ciketa*

In the first the speaker asks the “singer” to rejoice in all these things of ours (presumably the food and the fame); in the second the singer is to take note of them (there presumably our manly powers). In both cases I think the singer is not merely a human ritual participant, but must be a god – very likely Agni, who is sometimes called a *jaritār-* (e.g., III.15.5, VIII.60.19, X.100.6). In

this I differ from Ge (n. 3c), who identifies the singer as Subandhu, “der Wortführer der Gaupāyana’s.” But as disc. in the publ. intro., Subandhu is only found in the last metrically distinct part of this hymn (vs. 8), which does not seem to be a unified composition.

X.59.3: Gr and Ge take *aryáḥ* as acc. pl.; I follow Th (Fremdling, 54) in interpr. it as gen. sg., supplying a haplogized acc. pl. **paúṃsyā(ni)*. However, the Gr/Ge interpr. is certainly possible, producing an alt. “May we surmount the strangers with our manly powers.” The purport is the same.

On pāda c see disc. ad 2c immed. above.

X.59.4: Ge (fld. by Ober [Relig. II.59]) construes *dyúbhir hitáḥ* together and interpr. *dyúbhiḥ* as an agentive ‘heavenly ones’: “das von den Himmilischen bestimmte Alter.” See his n. 4c. But in all clear cases *dyúbhiḥ* has a temporal sense ‘through the days’; see esp. Old’s excursus ad IX.112.2. Re also favors ‘through the days’. Moreover, the form belongs to the noun *div/dyu* and should not have a derived adjectival sense.

X.59.5: On *ásu-* (in *ásu-nīti-*) as ‘(other) life’ see comm. ad X.12.1. The other three occurrences of the cmpd., all in the funeral hymns (X.12.4, 15.14, 16.2), refer to an object, a way or path leading to the other life. But the two vocc. here (vss. 5, 6) address a being capable of agency, perhaps just the animatized path.

Pāda c would make somewhat better sense if *rārandhī* were transitive/causative: “make us take pleasure in seeing the sun.” As it is currently tr., we must assume a certain selfless benevolence on the part of the Leader, who gets joy from the joy of others. It is hard to avoid this tr. because the other two occurrences of *rārandhī* (I.91.13 and III.41.4) unequivocally have the sense given to the form here in the publ. tr. There is, perhaps, a way around this, however. Though *rāran-* must belong to the pf. system originally (Kü 413–14), given that there is a fairly well-attested *-áya-* formation (*raṇáya-*) and given that *rāran-* has a heavy redupl., it is possible that it was reinterpr. as a redupl. aor. associated with *raṇáya-*. And *raṇáya-* has an interesting syntactic profile: most of its occurrences are intrans. (or I/T in my *-áya-* book terminology), with a complement in the loc. “take pleasure in,” but two are transitive (double I/T), with the sense “cause X to take pleasure in” (see my *-áya-* formations, pp. 75, 143). In fact one of these two shows the change in process, with the simile and the frame having different case frames: VIII.92.12 *vayám u tvā ..., gāvo ná yāvaseṣu á/ ukthéṣu raṇayāmasi* “We will make you take pleasure in our hymns, o you of a hundred resolves, as cows do in their pastures,” with the simile a simple intransitive (I/T), the frame transitive (double I/T). (For further disc. see my 1982 “Case disharmony in RVic similes.”) If *rāran-dhī* has become associated with *raṇáya-*, the latter’s transitive potential may have been transferred to it, allowing the alt. tr. given above. See comm. ad V.54.13 for a more complex possible ex. of this same switch.

On med. caus. *vardhayasva* see comm. ad X.49.6.

X.59.6: Contra Ge I do not take *bhógam* as a parallel object to *cákṣuḥ* and *prāṇam*, partly because ‘use, enjoyment’ is a different type of entity from the first two, partly because only they are marked with *púnar*. I take *bhógam* adverbially, flg. Janert (Dhāsi, 22 n. 5).

X.59.7: The occurrence of *ásu-* here does not have the sense ‘(other) life’ that it does in the cmpd. disc. above ad vs. 5.

The three worlds, Earth, Heaven, and the Midspace, each serves as subj. to *dadātu*, each marked by its own *púnaḥ*. Given their distribution across the hemistich, Heaven (*dyaúḥ*) seems to be qualified as fem. *devī*, hence my tr. “goddess Heaven.” As is well known, *dyaúḥ*, though overwhelmingly masc., is occasionally modified by fem. adjs. and pronominal adjs. (see comm. ad I.57.5 and VIII.40.4). What is surprising about this passage is that Heaven is also called a god(dess), for Heaven is never otherwise called a *devá-*. And indeed he is not a god, but the father of gods, as the morphological derivational relationship implies. See my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of X.124,” p. 298 with n. 16. However, Heaven and Earth together, esp. under the designation *ródasī* ‘two worlds’ are sometimes modified by the dual *devī*, and that must be the source of the (apparently) sg. *devī* here. Note that dual *ródasī* is found in the next vs. (8a) and Heaven and Earth in the refrain (d pādas) of the next three vss.

X.59.8–10: The last three vss. of the hymn are unified by their meters (varieties of Pañkti) and their three-pāda refrain. Note also that vs. 8 begins with *sám*, which is echoed by the initial word of vs. 10, *sám*.

X.59.8: As Re notes, this is the first occurrence of the word *subándhu-* in this hymn cycle – and the only one in this hymn. Though by the standard accounts a man named Subandhu is the focus of the desires for mental and physical restoration in these hymns, in fact the word need not be a personal name (though the occurrences in the next hymn, X.60.7, 10 make this more likely): it could mean ‘possessing good lineage/family’ as it can elsewhere.

Pāda b is identical to I.142.7c, where it refers to Night and Dawn. Its use in that context is responsible for Ge’s tr. “youngest daughters and mothers ...”; see comm. ad loc. I see no reason to see two distinct kinship relations in this phrase; in either passage, since there is no generational difference between the members of either pair. They would be esp. inappropriate here given the underlying gender difference between Heaven and Earth. Note that the dual fem. qualifying *ródasī* puts the apparently singular *devī* modifying *dyaúḥ* in 7b into a wider grammatical context.

X.59.9: Note the *-ká*-suffixed numbers, *dvaké*, *trikā*, and *ekakám*, each agreeing, in the appropriate number, with neut. *bheṣajā-*. Because these suffixed numbers are isolated, it’s difficult to know what semantic or stylistic sense the suffix may contribute. Edgerton (*The k-Suffixes of Indo-Iranian*, 1911: 26) suggests that the suffix forms “adjectives with a sort of distributive force” (rendering them “singly ... by twos ... by threes”). This is certainly possible, even attractive, but the addition of the suffix might just be a way to produce a morphologically parallel and phonologically unified series “two ... three ... one,” since the sequence made from the numerals directly would be more disparate: *dvé ... tríṇi ... ékam*. (And *l*) or the *-ka-* could convey a “popular” flavor on this popular hymn.

X.59.10: The first hemistich (that is, the non-refrain part of the vs.) is completely baffling with regard to its possible relevance to the rest of the hymn. The fem. name *Uśīnarāṇī* occurs only here. It is transparently related to the name of a people, *Uśīnara*, mentioned in the Aitareya Br and later, but that isn’t much help. Sāy. considers *uśīnarāṇī-* the name of a plant, and Old has a similar view (“Wagen der Kräuterfrau,” bringing healing plants). By contrast, Ge (n. 10b, flg. Ludwig) suggests that *Uśīnarāṇī* is the wife of Subandhu, whose name is really the ethnonym *Uśīnara*, and Indra is restoring his wife to him. This requires a longer chain of assumptions than

I'm willing to accept. But I do think that he is correct that a wedding context is implied, since *ánas-* can be for the wedding vehicle for the bride. I have nothing helpful to add, but the vs., with its hope that the ox and the cart should be whole and in good working order, reminds me of the tacked-on section of the composite hymn to Indra (etc.), III.53.17–20, which I describe (in the publ. intro. to the hymn) as “prayers to deflect various possible catastrophes that might befall a team of oxen and the vehicle they pull on a journey, and wish for safe return.” Given the outside RVic interest in chariots and vehicles of all types, it would not be totally surprising that a hymn for the restoration of the health of a man might attract a vs. hoping for the restoration of the health of a draught animal. We can also recall that the journey of a new bride to her husband's household is considered to be fraught with perils (see, e.g., Sac Wife 222–26).

X.60 Asamāti, etc.

For the various divisions of this hymn, which probably consists of several hymns combined, see the publ. intro.

X.60.1–4: As noted in the publ. intro., these four vss. form a single sentence, the full skeleton of which is contained in vs. 1 — with the other vss. merely expanding on the recipient of the praise and his stellar qualities, by means of accusatives modifying the object of vs. 1 (vs. 2) and relative clauses dependent on that object (*yáḥ* vs. 3, *yásya* vs. 4).

X.60.1: I have followed the line of least resistance, encouraged by Ge and Old (see also Mayr, PN), and taken *māhīna-* as the name of a people. However it might be better, with Re, to take it as a variant of *māhina-* ‘great, might’ and tr. “of the great ones.” Re further suggests that the referent is the gods, but this is not necessary and is in fact unlikely.

X.60.2: On a literal reading, pāda b identifies, or at least implicitly compares, Asamāti to a chariot. This seems perfectly reasonable to me — the man as a juggernaut bearing down on his opponents — but the unmediated image seems to have caused consternation to some interpr. Ge alters it from chariot to chariot fighter by a strategic parenthetical addition: “dem ... Wagen(helden),” while Re considers *tveṣám ... rátham* a decomposed bahuvrīhi in tmesis, for *tveṣá-ratha-* ‘having a glittering chariot’, which does exist (V.61.13). Neither trick seems necessary to me.

Ge suggests reading *bhajā *ráthasya* “um zu gewinnen den Herrn des Wagens,” with a dat. inf. **bhajā*. See Old's disc. Since this would require emendation, and it's hard to understand why **ráthasya* would have lost its accent redactionally, I think it best, with most, to see here an otherwise unknown name of a person or place. So Ge, Mayr (PN).

X.60.4: On *marāyín-* see EWA s.v., citing Ingrid Eichner-Kühn 1976.

X.60.5: On *rátha-proṣtha* see KH (StII 13/14 [1987]: 129–34 = Aufs. III.855–63, esp. 862), who analyzes the second member as *pra-úṣ-tha-* from the lexeme *prá√vas* ‘spend the night away from home’, with the developed meaning ‘camp bed’. Here ‘whose chariots are their camp beds’. In KH's view this identifies the Asamātis as “ein ‘reisiger’ Kreigerstamm,” and he further suggests that since the meaning of *proṣtha-* was not previously understood, this led to the analysis of *rátha-proṣtha-* as a PN. This seems plausible, and we might emend the tr. to “in the Asamātis, whose chariots are their camp beds” — though the density of PNs in this hymn might suggest that

we keep the tr. as given.

X.60.6: Ge (n. 6) calls this “eine kleine Dānastuti,” presumably because of the yoking of the *sāptī*. But that assumes that the subj. of *yunakṣi* is the patron, even though the most likely 2nd sg. referent is Indra, who was addressed in vs. 5. The victories attributed to the 2nd sg. referent in the 2nd half of vs. 6 also fit Indra far better than a putative patron.

X.60.7: Although this vs. is universally taken as meant to heal Subandhu and recall him to life, it presents this healing as a (second?) birth. The lexeme *nīr√i* is specialized for birth (see comm. ad I.37.9), and the presence of mother and father in pāda a reinforces this theme, with the movement expressed by *prasārpana*- ‘slithering forth’ also evoking birth.

Note the masc. *ayám* with *mātā*, this mismatch is doubtless due to the fact that the *ayám* is annunciatory: “here is ...,” though the genders match in c *idám ... prasārpaṇam*, which by my interpr. is also annunciatory.

X.60.9: Since the demonstrative is attributive, the genders match in the phrase *iyám pṛthivī*.