

Commentary X.95–191

X.95 Purūravas and Urvaśī

On this famous hymn and the later Sanskrit versions of this story, see publ. intro. The general approach to the RVic hymn has been to retroject the narrative found in the Śatapatha Brāh. version onto the RVic hymn, interpreting all enigmatic details in the light of that later version. As I said in the publ. intro., I think the ŚB version misunderstood or deliberately reconfigured the RV one. Similes and other images were taken literally – e.g., the lambs tied to the bedpost in the ŚB were invented out of a simile in vs. 3; there are no real lambs in the RVic hymn. If we approach the RVic version directly, without invoking the ŚB, a very different picture emerges. To readers used to the standard take on this hymn, my interpr. may seem radical and disconcerting. This way of reading the hymn dates back, for me, to an intense exploration of it with Stanley Insler and Joel Brereton sometime in the early 1970s (1973 or 1974?), perhaps the first time that I saw the exhilarating possibilities of close reading of the RV. Some of the ideas in the current tr. and comm. date back to those sessions of 50 years ago and emerged from our joint discussions then.

Needless to say, numerous others have tr. and commented on the hymn, and I cannot consider them all in detail. A recent one is found in Susanne Schnaus’s 2008 *Die Dialoglieder im altindischen Rigveda*, 355–404, and Elizabeth Thornton provides a detailed formal and rhetorical analysis in her 2015 (unpublished) UCLA dissertation “The Double-Voiced Rig Veda: Poetics and Power Dynamics of Formal Structuring Devices.”

The pattern of this dialogue is that P speaks and U responds, generally taking up and, indeed, upending his words. Most of the verses are paired, and it is illuminating to read them against each other, but this pattern does not establish itself until vs. 4. In vss. 1–3 P speaks 1 and U responds with 2, but then P completes her vs. with 3. Following this we get

P:	4	U:	5
	6		7
	8		9
	10		11
	12		13
	14		15

The last three vss. break this pattern: the speakers have changed places -- U speaks 16, P 17 -- and the two vss. are not responsive. The final vs., 18, seems to be in the mouth of a narrator speaking for the gods.

X.95.1: The first two words of this hymn provide one of the most striking openings of any RVic hymn: *hayé jāye* “Woe, wife!” with its in-your-face jingly rhyme (rhyme in general being rare in the RV). On a technical note, it’s somewhat surprising that voc. *jāye* is accented here in apparent 2nd position. The other RVic occurrence of *hayé* is also followed by a voc. but an unaccented one: II.29.4 *hayé devāḥ*. The disorganized, staccato-like nature of Purūravas’s speech, esp. initially (note the parenthetic command inserted after the next word in this pāda), may account for the accent, with voc. “wife!” effectively starting a new detached utterance.

The function of *mānasā* and its syntactic status are disputed. Some (e.g., Re, Hymnes spéc.) take it as an independent clause, but most construe it with the clause in pāda b, with *tīṣṭha ghore* an interjection. This latter view is more satisfyingly dramatic: having got her attention with *hayé jāye*, P starts his plea – but after the first word has to try to arrest her in her flight, with

an imperative and another voc. Moreover, I don't see how *mānasā* can be an independent utterance; Re's "sois sage!" is a very loose rendering of the instr. Assuming that *mānasā* belongs with pāda b, what is its function there? With most (Ge, etc.) I take it as a semi-adverb, "with thought, thoughtfully," but Hoffmann (in his complete tr. of and comm. on this hymn, *Injunk.* 198–208) provides parallels for construing it with *mīśrā* (199 n. 179). Again for me the drama is enhanced by having *mānasā* a separate constituent rather than subordinate to a flg. NP (*mānasā ... vācāmsi ... mīśrā*).

Note the phonetic figure over the hemistich boundary: ... *nú / ná nau*.

Note the pres. subj./impv. *kṛṇavāvahai* (b) contrasting with the aor. subj. *karan* (d) to the same root.

As noted by many, P's use of two deriv. of \sqrt{man} 'think', *mānas-* and *māntra-*, situates (or attempts to situate) his approach in the rational, perhaps even coolly logical, realm – an attempt that fails before it even begins.

X.95.2: Urvaśī ignores his gesture towards the rational, but picks up his *vācāmsi* \sqrt{kr} (1b), though with an idiom (INSTR. + \sqrt{kr}) entirely different from his (even though her subj. *kṛṇavā* matches his *kṛṇavāvahai*): *vācā* \sqrt{kr} 'do with speech'. Her emphasis is on action—an emphasis reinforced by the next pāda, where she announces her (already accomplished) departure.

By comparing herself to "the foremost of dawns" (*uśāsām agriyā*), she makes her departure inevitable and irrevocable, since nothing can stop the foreordained journey of each day's dawn. I don't know why the simile particle *iva* is placed after the 2nd word in the simile -- perhaps because the NP *uśāsām agriyā* is felt to be a unit.

It is worthy of note that she twice uses the (syntactically unnec.) nom. prn. *ahām* with a 1st sg. verb (a: *kṛṇavā ... ahām*, d: *ahām asmi*), presumably emphatically and contrastively, to distinguish and separate herself from P.

X.95.3: By most accounts, this vs. is spoken by P, though Old suggests rather U. In the vs. P nostalgically reminisces about U's untameable and tumultuous beauty. The vs. certainly bears the hallmarks of P's disordered speech, being both metrically and syntactically jagged, and this has given rise to uncertainty of interpretation. In fact, the difficulties of the 2nd hemistich are responsible for the implausible Gandharvas-sheep-and-bedposts of the ŚB version.

There is some disagreement about the position of the pāda break in the first hemistich: either after *īśudhēr*, producing an 8-syl. pāda a and a conventional Triṣṭubh in b; or after *asanā*, with pāda a 11 syllables, though without a Triṣṭubh cadence, and b 8 syllables. I strongly favor the former: the hemistich trails off U's statement in the preceding vs., 2d, with P adding other similes describing U's fleet beauty. A truncated first pāda calls attention to the fact that it is just finishing a thought already articulated. Moreover, the shared quality of all the similes is U's word (*dur*)*āpanā* '(difficult) to attain', the unspoken beginning of P's speech, and it would rhyme with *asanā* beginning pāda b. Most interpr. construe *asanā* with pāda a, however (e.g. Ge "Pfeilschuss" somehow combining the two nominatives *īśuḥ ... asanā*, KH "ein Geschoss aus dem Köcher," with *īśudhēr asanā* a separate NP), which would favor a pāda break after *asanā*. I instead take *asanā* with the flg. *goṣāḥ*, parallel to the next, overt, simile *śatasā ná rāṃhiḥ*, supporting the pāda break after *īśudhēr*.

On the phraseology in b, cf. X.178.3 *sahasrasāḥ śatasā asya rāṃhiḥ* "his charge that wins thousands, that wins hundreds" of the mythical racehorse Tārksya. See also *rāṃhi-* in the next hymn, X.96.4.

Against the Pp. and essentially all other tr./comm., I take *śriyā* in sandhi as standing for gen. sg. *śriyās* (a paradigmatic form not certainly found in the RV to this stem, but cf. *dhiyās* to *dhī-*, as well as possible abl. *śriyās* in IX.94.4 [see comm. ad loc.]). The “quiver of beauty” adds a metaphor to the simile.

I will not engage with the numerous variant interpretations of cd, all heavily influenced (not to say misled) by the ŚB version, but simply attempt to justify my own. In pāda c there are two grammatical issues on which one must take a stand before attempting to interpret the pāda further: 1) does the sandhi form *davidyutan* represent a 3rd sg. in *-at* (so Pp.) before *n-* or a real 3rd pl. in *-an*? 2) is *ná* the negative or the simile particle? I opt for 3rd sg. and simile particle respectively. I take U as the subject of *davidyutat* and interpr. the verb as an irregular subjunctive (for **davidyotat*); cf. the injunc. in 10 *dávidyot*. In fact the occurrence in 10 provides the clue for the interpr. of our pāda here. In 10 P compares U to lightning, with an overt simile: *vidyún ná yā ... dávidyot* “She who kept flashing like lightning ...” I think the same simile is covert here, conveyed by the preverb+verb *ví davidyutat*; the noun “lightning,” which should be the grammatical focus of the simile, does not have to be expressed because it is embedded in the verb, and so the simile particle dangles rather uselessly right after the verb and at the end of the pāda. Though I have elsewhere (see comm. ad X.21.1) argued that simile-marking *ná* is blocked from pāda-final position, I take its position here, as well as the absence of an overt nominal simile, to be another symptom of P’s emotionally distorted speech. The explicit simile in 10b, also applied to U, seems designed to repair the truncated one here.

As to what the pāda is conveying -- P is saying that she is dazzling and that she cannot be mastered (“under no man’s will”), with the suggestion that even in her sexual transports she is not subject to male control.

Given the use of *vīra* in 5d, where I tr. ‘hero’, *avīre* here might be alternatively tr. ‘no hero’s’.

Pāda d is also tricky syntactically, with the verb *citayanta* furnishing the trick. As I long ago argued (“Case Disharmony in R̥gvedic Similes,” IJ 24 [1982] 258–59 with n. 25), *citayanta* here shows two different constructions, one with the simile, one with the frame, both supported by independent occurrences of this stem elsewhere. In the simile the verb is transitive “manifest/display X” (lamb its bleating) with overt acc. obj., while in the frame it is intransitive “be manifest/displayed” ([her] noisy [cries] / tumultuous [tempests]). This image is the third in a series depicting U. as a thunderstorm: the wind (2b), the lightning (3c), and the thunder (3d).

Though this interpr. of vs. 3 is radically at odds with all the standard ones, I think it is rhetorically truer to the rest of the hymn and more powerful emotionally than those that introduce the Gandharvas (unnamed anywhere in this hymn) and pet lambs (extracted from an overt simile).

X.95.4–5: Here P and U present wildly incompatible visions of their previous married life.

X.95.4: In my opinion, in this vs. P. continues his nostalgic reverie, here focusing on U’s seamless fit into family life -- until his crude depiction of their sex life in the final pāda. But there are multiple interpr. of all parts of the vs., starting with the identity of the speaker. Both Ge and Re assign the vs. to a narrator, perhaps because U. is described in the 3rd person, even though P. is supposedly conversing with her directly. But his dreamy reversion to a happier time, narrated as if she weren’t there in front of him, makes psychological sense. And her sarcastic

citation of his final phrase in this vs. (4d) in her response to him in the next (5a) makes it clear that she was the audience for this speech.

The meter of the first three pādas is disturbed and cannot easily be fixed -- nor, given P's disordered state, should it be. With KH, I read *vāya(h)* at the end of pāda a, rather than initial in b, because it should be read with the participle *dādhatī*. Moreover, the position of *yādi* in b is better if only one item precedes it in its pāda/clause.

How to construe pāda b and what relation, if any, it has to cd are matters of dispute. The first question involves the word *úṣaḥ*, interpr. by Gr and Ge (apparently also Re, Hymnes spec., Don) as a nom. sg. m. to a hapax thematic stem *úṣa-* 'lover' (see Ge's n. 4b). By this interpr., U, having been kind to her father-in-law in pāda a, is at the beck and call of her lover, namely P, whenever he wants her (*yādi váṣṭi*) for sex. Even leaving aside the precarious status of the supposed hapax noun *úṣa-*, I find that pāda b works better as a continuation of U's attention to her father-in-law, because of the word *ántigrha-* 'house opposite' (vel sim.). Although we know nothing about the housing arrangements of the RVic joint family and *ántigrha-* is a hapax, it still seems more likely that her in-laws would inhabit a separate but nearby dwelling than that she and her husband lived in separate houses and she had to go to his whenever he wanted sex. Instead, I take the subject of *váṣṭi* to be the father-in-law (so also KH, as I read his tr.), whom she dutifully served (not sexually) whenever he asked her to. (Schnaus takes U to be the subject, on the assumption that U was in fact not a dutiful woman, but did what she pleased. I take the point, but P's musings here focus on his [false] memory of her agreeable subservience.)

What then is *úṣaḥ*? With Old (also KH, Schnaus), an acc. pl. to *uṣás-* 'dawn'. Old himself takes it as a third object to *dādhatī*, "dawns"; that is, U bestows three boons on her father-in-law – goods, energy, and "dawns," standing for day upon day added to his lifespan. But it's better as a temporal adv.: "mornings, (all) mornings" (so KH, also Schnaus). See AiG III.282 and for the accent III.26.

The subordinator *yādi* should be read *yād *ī* 'when it' rather than 'if'.

The next pāda (c), again in my opinion, contrasts the home (*ástam*) that was U's own with the one opposite (*ántigrha-*) that belonged to her in-laws. She obtained it and took pleasure in this dwelling of hers, or thus do I interpr. the reference of *yásmiṇ*. Others (Ge, Re, Don) take the referent of the relative to be rather P (e.g., Ge "(zu ihm), an den sie Gefallen hatte"; Don "and took her pleasure in him"). I find it easier to believe that U was house-proud than that even P could delude himself that she was madly eager for his sexual assaults -- esp. given his *avīre krátau* "under no man's will" in the preceding vs. (3c).

X.95.5: Note the typo in the publ. tr., "used to pierced" → "used to pierce."

As noted above, in pāda a U picks up the final words of the previous vs. (4d), good evidence that P spoke vs. 4 and U was there listening. She now expresses her distaste for his relentless sexual demands in the first hemistich, while, in the second, indicating that she behaved as a dutiful and submissive wife at that time.

The words *kétam* (c) and *vīra* (d) implicitly contrast with the phrase *avīre krátau* in 3c. Though I tr. both *krātu-* and *kéta-* as 'will' in these two vss., I am playing on the ambiguity of the English word 'will'. In 3c 'will' refers to the power to control: U was under the control of no man. Whereas in this vs. 'will' refers to P's desire, which U went along with – until she didn't. I think she is using the voc. *vīra* ironically; see vs. 11 with vs. 7 below. It would in fact be possible in this sandhi context to read (*me*)'vīra 'o non-hero', but I think the ironic insult is truer to U's rhetoric. Moreover, in pāda b of this same vs. the transmitted *mé 'vyatyai* has to be read with

restored initial *á-*; it seems unlikely (though not impossible) that a putative **me* *vīra* would be treated differently.

X.95.6–7: Here P reminisces about the sensuous beauty of U’s companions, the Apsarases, while U points out that the Apsarases were not there to delight P’s senses but to assist her when she gave birth.

X.95.6: Once again P conjures images from his memory’s eye – here of alluring but elusive Apsarases, who, as we learn in the next vs., were attending on the birth of U’s child. (I do not follow the view that the Apsarases are currently running away.)

Many tr. (e.g., Ge, Re [Hspec], Don) take the first hemistich as a list of personal names, but interpreting the words as descriptors of the Apsarases provides a richer semantics.

The vs. is structured by a clever grammatical mismatch: it begins with a rel. prn. *yā*, which is fem. *singular*, with the collective sg. noun *śréṇih* ‘rank, row’; *yā* is picked up by matching *tā*, which opens pāda c – but this is *tā(h)* in sandhi and a fem. *plural*: the implicit plurality of the collective sg. here takes grammatical form. The difference in number is subtly emphasized by rhyming final *caranyúh* (singular adj.) in b with final *sasruḥ* (pf. plural.) in c.

For *sumnāāpi*- see VIII.13.3 *sumné ... sákḥā*. Our form is of course a bahuvrīhi, but I have suppressed the possessive aspect, since ‘consisting of friends in good favor’ is too clunky.

Most tr. take *añjāyah* as an adjective characterizing the subject, with just *aruṇāyah* in the simile, evoking the dawns – e.g., KH “diese schmucken (?) (Frauen) ... wie die rötlichen (Morgenröten).” This is not impossible, and I admit that the placement of *ná* favors taking *aruṇāyah* as the first (and only) word in the simile. (However, recall the misplaced *iva* in 2b.) But *añjī-* is otherwise only a noun ‘salve, ointment’ and turning it into an adjective is not trivial. I think (the motion of) the Apsarases is here compared to the fluidity of such semi-liquid substances, which are also appropriate in this context since they could serve as cosmetics for the Apsarases.

The verb *sasruḥ* phonologically evokes *apsarás-*, a word not found in this hymn, though U is an Apsaras and these center vss. (6–9) concern a troop of them.

X.95.7: The depiction of the Apsarases and the rivers assisting at the birth of U’s son reminds us of the waters at Indra’s birth (IV.18.6–8), though their role there is somewhat equivocal.

Schnaus points out a syntactic problem with this vs.: *asmin* in pāda a, presumably referring to the child of U+P, is unaccented, but the referent is not yet in the discourse, though such an unaccented form should have a prior referent. I don’t have an answer for this – but making P. the referent (as the only masc. sg. in the discourse) is too radical, giving grammar more power over sense than even I would favor. The lack of accent may in part signal U’s lack of interest in her son (see esp. vs. 13) – making a truly unidentified and unemphatic ‘him’. Moreover, in this vs. U seems to adopt some of the careless speech habits of P: her pāda a has an opening of 3; there’s the just mentioned problem with accentless *asmin*; and the segue between pādas b and c is a non sequitur.

With regard to this last, U jumps from the birth of her child and the motherly nurturing of the rivers (*avardhan*, b) to the gods’ strengthening of P (*ávardhayan*, d) and their purpose in doing so: for great battle and Dasyu-smiting. Though the same (or almost the same) transitive verb is used for both actions, they otherwise have little in common. Instead, U is preparing to make her case for P.’s generally unheroic behavior and his evasion of his god-destined role, and

so she slips this remark in here, pendant to the description of the birth of her son. The use of the son's birth as contrast to P's is found also in vss. 10–11. As for the construction, Ge (n. 7cd) suggests that *yád* is short for **yáthā yád* "just as when ..."

X.95.8–9: In this pair of vss., spoken by P. and U. respectively, she turns his whole vs. against him (see below). Again, he sees the Apsarases as females susceptible to his seductive advances, while she tartly declares their indifference to him. The vs. pairing is signalled by slightly slant repetition: 8a X *yád āsu* ... / 9a *yád āsu*.

X.95.8: On *sácā* as a pleonastic marker of an abl. absolute, see comm. ad IV.31.5. Here as sometimes elsewhere it seems to signal that the action of the loc. absol. is temporally the same as that of the main verb.

The pres. part. *tarásantī* and the impf. *atrasan* belong to the same pres. stem *trásati* to the root \sqrt{tras} ; the distraction of the initial cluster in the participle is unprecedented. KH (Injunk. 203 n. 185) cleverly – if, in my view, implausibly – suggests that it's the reflex of Sievers-Edgerton Law after a heavy syllable, from underlying *mát* **trásantī*, while the cluster remains after the light syllable in *atrasan*. Even if we were inclined still to believe in the Edgerton portion of S-E Law (distraction of initial clusters after heavy syllable), it seems unlikely to have been preserved only here, in this very late hymn. I suggest instead that it's another symptom of P's lack of control over his speech, here manifesting as stuttering. (That the first simile [the one in c] has a singular, but the frame a plural may be another symptom.)

X.95.9: U uses P's vs. 8 against him, matching him point by point. His *āsu* ... *ámānuṣīṣu mānuṣaḥ* is taken up by her *āsu mārto amṛtāsu* with a synonym pair; his *ratha-spṛś-* by her *nispṛś-*; his double similes about animals in the 2nd hemistich matching hers in the same place, with the 2nd simile in both involving horses. In the course of this she turns his point upside down. In vs. 8 he depicts the Apsarases as timid (cd) but potentially eager for his advances (shown by their removing their garments [a]). Her depiction is quite different: her Apsarases may participate in sex with him, even demonstratively ("with their cries" *kṣonībhiḥ*), but it is on their own terms. The male is fooling himself if he thinks it was "by his intentions" (*krátubhir nā*); see *avīre krátau* in 3c indicating the U's sexual life is "under no man's will." The two animal similes in cd show the Apsarases, indifferent to the male, absorbed in preening themselves and playing among themselves – a far cry from the bashful creatures of P's 8cd. Note the reflexive expression *tanvāḥ śumbhata svāḥ* (on *śumbhata* see below) and the middle part. *dāndaśānāḥ*, both suggesting the Apsarases' focus on themselves and exclusion of the male.

Though belonging to different roots ($\sqrt{spṛś}$ and $\sqrt{pṛc}$), *nispṛk* at the end of pāda a and *pṛkté* at the end of b echo each other, rather like *tarásantī* and *atrasan* in 8ab, even as *nispṛś-* also picks up *ratha-spṛś-* in 8d. For the sensual nuance of *ní* $\sqrt{spṛś}$, see the same root noun compd. in nearby X.91.13, where it refers to a wife caressing her husband.

Gr and Ge (fld. by Re [Hspec], Don) take *śumbhata* as 2nd pl. impv. act. to the common thematized pres. *śumbhāti*. However, Old clearly sets out the arguments for taking it as a medial 3rd pl. nasal-infix pres., an analysis supported by the existence of the athem. mid. part. *śumbhāná-* (/ *śumbhāna-*). The early thematization of such a 7th cl. pres. isn't surprising when one contemplates putative forms like 3rd sg. mid. **śu-m-bdhé*, but the 3rd pl. keeps the root form reasonably intact. Flg. Old's analysis are KH, Schnaus, and the publ. tr.

X.95.10–11: Like vss. 8–9, these two vss. are paired, with P’s speech (10) taken up and twisted by U (11). Here the lexical pivot is \sqrt{jan} ‘be born’.

X.95.10: Another of P’s rosy recollections of U’s beauty and sexual compliance. His speech is also marked by metrical disturbance (pāda a) and syntactic disjunction: a relative clause describing U (ab) trails off, to be followed by an unconnected clause about the birth of the child (c) and ending with another clause with U as subject.

As discussed above, pāda a “repairs” the ill-formed simile in 3c, with both passages comparing U to flashing lightning. But it requires some repair of its own: the missing syllable in pāda a could be repaired by the preverb *vī* in tmesis, that is, **vī vidyút ... dávidyot*; cf. 3c *vī davidyutat*. The repeated **vī vi(dyút)* would have undergone haplology – or, perhaps better expressed, the missing syllable gestures towards a preverb that ought to be there but isn’t.

In b the adj. *ápyā* is grammatically ambiguous: it can be nom. sg. fem. referring to U or acc. pl. neut. modifying *kámyāni*. With most (but not Schnaus), I take it as the former. The phrases *ápyā yóṣā* (X.10.4) and *ápyā yóṣanā* (X.11.2) support this interpr., as Old points out.

By most interpr., in b P is reminiscing about the joys of love that U brought to him. KH suggests instead that she is taking them away, depriving him of them, as she leaves, but this doesn’t fit his nostalgic tone.

The son is born in pāda c. KH notes the etymological figure *jániṣṭaḥ ... sújātaḥ*. The form *apáh* is one of the few exx. of a singular form, in this case ablative, of *áp-* ‘water’. This source of his birth identifies him with his mother, who was just called *ápyā* in b, as well as with the birth as depicted in 7ab, with the participation of the rivers. In my view *náryaḥ* ‘belonging to men’ connects him with his father, the human P – though this argument is weakened by the fact that *nárya-* can be applied to gods as well as humans.

The standard interpr. of d is that it is U’s life that is lengthened (e.g., Ge “Urvaśī soll langes Leben haben”), with the only disagreement being about the modality of the injunctive (*prā*) ... *tirata*. But as an Apsaras, U is surely immortal – note they are called *amṛta-* in 9 a -- and so it makes little sense that she would lengthen her own lifetime. Instead I think the life in question is the son’s and that this is a pun. The name of U’s (and P’s) son is Āyu; see, e.g., IV.2.18, V.41.19, and Macd. Ved. Myth 135 n. 9. The obj. phrase *dirghám āyuh* “long lifetime” in d therefore plays off his name. Since the son has a mortal father, he is limited to a mortal lifespan, but his mother does what she can to make it a long one. (Of the comm. and tr. I’ve consulted, only Don interprets it this way: “Let Urvaśī lengthen the span of his life.”)

It is striking that this is the first occurrence of the name Urvaśī in this hymn, found also in vs. 17. By contrast, U addresses P in the vocative in vss. 2, 5, 7, 11, 15, that is, in most of the vss. she speaks (but not 9, 13, or 16).

X.95.11: U matches P’s *jániṣṭa* (10c) with *jajñiṣé* (11a), both pāda-initial, but she’s pivoting to P’s own birth: the purpose for which he was born and his failure to fulfill that purpose – a more explicit follow-up to 7cd. Though as king and warrior he was born to provide protection to his kingdom and subjects, instead he has exerted his force (*ójas-*) only on her.

I do not entirely understand the function or position of *hí* in 11a, but I assume that it is meant to mark the preceding purpose dative *gopṭhyāya* as a separate small clause, much like purpose datives in Brāhmaṇa prose.

It is not made clear in c on what precise day (*sásmin áhan*) she issued her warning, but the general view (e.g., Ge n. 11c) that it was the day they first came together seems reasonable.

X.95.12–13: Another pair of vss., this time devoted to the fate of the child. P (12) tries to play the family harmony card, but U (13) shows herself quite willing to abandon the child to his father.

X.95.12: As just noted, P tries to persuade her to return on the basis of family ties, three generations of them: the sorrow of a single-parent child (ab), the indissoluble bond between the joint ‘masters of the house’ (*dāmpatī*) (c), and the parents-in-law (d). The in-law relation thus returns from 4ab. Although *śvāśureṣu* is plural here, it presumably only names the parents of the husband, with the plural appropriate to a general statement about the relationships in a joint family.

In b the identity of *cakrān* has long been disputed (see Old, Ge n. 12b), though has generally been assigned to \sqrt{krand} ‘roar, cry out’. However, KH’s ingenious interpr. of *cakrān ná* as *cakrām ná* “like a wheel” (already MSS 8, 1956, but repeated in Injunk. 205 n. 190 and repr. in Aufs. II) has won general acceptance (e.g., Re HSpec, Schnaus, publ. tr.).]

Most interpr. assume the child is crying because he (now) knows he’s separated from his father, but why would this recognition (*vijānān*) come to the child only now. I think it’s instead possible that these are tears of joy at seeing his father (again). Although I recognize that this doesn’t seem to work well with 13a, I think P is imagining a sentimental little scenario of tender reconciliation, which U then cruelly twists in the next vs.

X.95.13: U’s curt dismissal of the child and his feelings (or the feelings invented for him by P) is shockingly harsh.

The sequence *vartáyate áśru, cakrān ná* almost replicates, in mirror image, 12b *cakrān ná áśru vartayat*, though split across the pāda boundary. But, though it thus begs to be interpr. as a unit, this is not possible because of the unaccented *krandat* that immediately follows: *cakrān ná* must be part of the *krandat* clause, while it is very difficult to fit *vartáyate áśru* into the same clause. KH’s solution seems the correct one. The wheel is no longer the comparandum for the tear (sharing roundness), but for the child, who screeches like an unoiled wheel – as in the English saying “the squeaky wheel gets the grease.” U has transferred the simile from one target to another, and the picture is distinctly less attractive: a noisy crybaby, not a sad child silently releasing a single tear.

Her distaste for her child comes through even more strongly in c, where she refers to him with neuter pronouns (*tát ... yát*). Although Ge (n. 13c) suggests that the neuter refers to everything U still has from P, including the child, such an interpr. dilutes the power of her statement – and seems a modern version of the later Indian attempts to soften U into a more conventional female.

In d she tries to wrap up their conversation ring-compositionally, echoing phrases from the vs. containing her first speech: *párehi ástam* repeats 2c (*púnar*) *ástam párehi* and *nahí ... mápah* “you will not attain me” is more or less equivalent to 2d *durāpanā ... ahám asmi* “I am hard to attain.” But P ignores the closure generated by the rhetorical structure. For a similar attempt to close a dialogue ring-compositionally, see Yama’s words in X.10.2 and 12; as with U, his efforts are unavailing.

X.95.14–15: The last pair of responsive vss.: P’s over-the-top self-dramatizing (14) is met by U’s weary pacifying.

X.95.14: P responds with maudlin, self-pitying threats to do himself in. All three verbs in this vs., *prapátet*, *śáyīta*, and *adyúh*, all in the optative, are accented, though there's no overt mark of subordination. Old (ZDMG 60: 735 = KISch 210; fld by KH and Schnaus) suggests the accent is emphatic, but this is not terribly satisfactory. (Everything P says is emphatic.) I suggest they are unsignaled “what if” clauses. The publ. tr. represents this for *prapátet*, but in the 2nd hemistich the verbs should rather be tr. “(Of) if he should lie ... or if the wolves should eat ...” This interpr. essentially follows Re’s tr. (HSpec, fld. also by Don), though he doesn’t discuss the accent. The implied main clause in all instances is “wouldn’t you be sorry?!”

X.95.15: U’s first hemistich echoes P’s three clauses, but in *mā* prohibitives with expected adjustment of aspect stem and/or root: her redupl. aor. *prá paptah* picks up his pres. *prapátet*; her aor. *akṣan* (\sqrt{ghas}) his pres. *adyuh* (\sqrt{ad} , which lacks an aor.). Her *mṛthāh* “(don’t) die” paraphrases his more elaborate *śáyīta níṛteḥ upásthē* “should lie in the lap of Dissolution” – and of course an aor. to $\sqrt{sí}$ barely exists at this period.

Her deprecatory remark about women in the 2nd hemistich seems to me not the result of self-hating misogyny on her part but rather an attempt to deflect him into the general: all women are bad — stop ranting at me.

X.95.16: This remark of U’s seems like a non sequitur (see Old’s similar puzzlement). It is also difficult for those with even a passing familiarity with Greek mythology to avoid interference from the Persephone story. But it *should* be avoided: this verse is surely not indicating that U, having consumed some mortal food, is now stuck living at least part of the time with mortals, but the reverse – that she’s tasted quite enough mortal food, however tiny her portions, and she’s taking off. As KH says, the verse provides the reason “warum Urvaśī persönlich vom irdischen Leben ‘genug hat’.” Unfortunately the reason is expressed obliquely. Don suggests that butter (i.e., ghee) may stand in for semen, and U is saying that she’s had more than enough sex with P. A clever suggestion, but somehow it doesn’t ring true to me.

Pādas a and b can form one subordinate clause, or b can be a main clause, since the accented verb *ávasam* opens the pāda. With most others, I favor the first option.

I take the 1st ps. sg. forms *acaram* (a) and *carāmi* (d) as functionally contrastive: *acaram* has full lexical sense (“I roam”) and *carāmi* is an auxiliary with *tātrpāñā* “I continue to be sated.” Most interpr. treat the two thus (see, e.g., Ge n. 16d), but not Kü (216–17: “... wandle ich hier befriedigt”) or probably Schnaus (“... lebe ich hier als Gesättigte”).

X.95.12: P makes one last-ditch effort to persuade her, but she has already departed – as the impv. *ní vartasva* “turn back” (d) shows. The high-style descriptors of U in pāda a, “she who fills the midspace, who is the measurer of the dusky realm,” may suggest that she is literally, before his eyes, traversing the midspace on her way to heaven (so approx. Ge n. 17). In V.41.19 U is described as *bṛhaddivā* ‘of lofty heaven’, so her ordinary dwelling may be there.

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

P’s characterization of himself as *vásiṣṭhaḥ* is puzzling, esp. since the generic superlative sense is vanishingly rare, as against the PN of the poet of Maṇḍala VII; once again Old is similarly puzzled. In VII.33.11 it is said that Vasiṣṭha Maitrāvaruṇa was “born from Urvaśī” or “born from the mind of U” (*urvásyāḥ ... mānasó ’dhi jātāḥ* (cf. also VII.33.13 *apsarásah pári jajñē vásiṣṭhaḥ*). But P is hardly representing himself as U’s son, and the possibility (which Old

entertains) that we are now dealing with that Vasiṣṭha rather than P as speaker is strongly countered by P's usual tone of desperate longing (esp. pāda d). I have no answer.

The verb in c, (*úpa ...*) *tīṣṭhāt*, is accented, with no sign of subordination. As in vs. 14 I think the accent indicates that this is an unmarked subordinate clause, in this case giving the grounds for the action he hopes she will perform: doing a good deed — that is, returning to him — will bring her a reward.

X.95.18: The dialogue is at an end, and the last vs. seems to be spoken by the poet or by a disembodied heavenly voice – at least acdg. to most interpr: KH puts it in the mouth of U (as she flies up through the midspace?). In any case, whoever the speaker is, there is another layer of quotation, since the speaker ventriloquizes what the gods said to P.

The syntax and sense of b are unclear. The most straightforward way to take it is with *bhāvasi* as the verb in the *yáthā* clause (so Old, Ge, Re, Don). But the sense is not entirely satisfactory, since it takes P's bond with death as a given, not the result of some (recent) action – as the change-of-state verb *bhāvasi* implies. I therefore follow KH's more complex split into two clauses, with *bhāvasi* starting the main clause and owing its accent to its position. (Acg. to Old, this is the interpr. in Ge's Komm., which he abandoned in the tr.) The point is that though P has a divine (/semidivine?) mother, Iḍā (hence the voc. in pāda a, *aīḷa*), he remains bound to mortality because U did not snatch him up and make him immortal (unlike Tithonus, made immortal by Eos in Greek mythology). Nor did she make their child immortal, so he will sacrifice to the gods (c), rather than himself receiving sacrifice.

But it seems that, nonetheless, P may receive special treatment after death, in heaven (*svargé*, d). It is difficult to interpr. this last statement, however. For one thing, this is the only occurrence of the word *svargá-* in the RV. For another, the root \sqrt{mad} is used of the exhilaration enjoyed by the Pitars (/forefathers) after death in the funeral hymn X.14 (see esp. vs. 10, where it is clear that the subject of *mādanti* is the Pitars) – and so the verb in d, *mādayāse*, which declares to P that he will reach exhilaration in heaven, may not be promising more than the usual postmortem joys that all humans receive.

X.96 Indra's horses

On the extended puns in this hymn, see publ. intro. Almost every pāda contains a form of *hári-/hárita-* or *haryana-*, sometimes more than one. Outside of vs. 13, the final summary vs., only 6a and 12c lack such forms.

X.96.1: The lexeme *prá ... śamsiṣam* here substitutes $\sqrt{śams}$ in the more standard formula *prá vocam*.

Although *prá* is rare with \sqrt{van} , I do not think, *pace* Re, that it is found here only to match the *prá* beginning pāda a. Cf. the inf. *právantave* in I.131.5.

The tr. of the subject of pāda c should be emended to “the delightful (drink) ...” As for the verb, Wh (Rts) registers one occurrence of a 1st class pres. *sécate*, namely this one. It should probably be interpr. instead as the subjunctive to the root aor. marginally found in the Br and tr. “will drip” here. However, note that Gotō (327) argues for its identity as a 1st class indic. present.

X.96.2: The syntax of this vs. is surprisingly clotted, and there are several possible ways to interpr. the overall structure. I take the two hemistichs as syntactically separate; in the first

hemistich, pāda a is a preposed rel. cl. and pāda b is the main cl., with the pres. part. *hinvántaḥ* functioning as main verb, whose subject is the same as the *yé* of a. This rel. cl. / main cl. structure begins with an acc. phrase *hárim ... yónim* “the golden womb,” presumably referring to the soma cup (vel sim.). It functions as the goal for both verbs in this complex: *abhí ... samásvaran* “they have cried out together towards” and *hinvántaḥ* “spurring [horses]” towards” and should be taken as fronted around the whole structure, not merely from the rel. cl. The acc. simile ending b, *divyám yáthā sádaḥ* “like a heavenly seat,” is to be matched with the golden womb opening the hemistich; it can be read with both a and b or only with b. The polarization of these two heavy acc. phrases accounts for much of the apparent awkwardness of the phrasing.

The subjects are presumably the priestly officiants.

The second hemistich also consists of a rel. cl. followed by a main cl., whose structure is more pellucid than ab. Indra is the referent of the rel. *yám* in c and is named in the main cl. of d. In the simile in c, *háribhir ná dhenávaḥ, háribhiḥ* is the shared property: the priests fill Indra with golden soma as the cows do with golden ghee. The only slight syntactic problem in the hemistich is that the verb of the rel. cl. is 3rd pl. *prṇánti* while that in the main cl. is 2nd pl. *arcata*. We can either assume that the impv. *arcata* is addressed to a different set of officiants than those in abc, or that a switch to direct address has happened in midsentence, which would not be unusual.

The use of the adj. *hárivantam* in d to modify the fortifying hymn (*sūśám*) is cute: this stem, usually in voc. *harivas*, is of course almost entirely used of Indra “accompanied by his fallow bays.” Here, though Indra is explicitly present in the pāda, it does not modify him but rather than hymn, and it refers not to his horses but to the soma. See vs. 8 below for another ex.

X.96.3: It is quite possible that the *vájra* is the only referent of the two forms of *háriḥ* in b. The mace is described as *níkāma-* in VI.17.10, and the location of the *vájra* in Indra’s two fists is widespread (I.130.4, VI.45.18, VIII.12.7; cf. with sg. fist VI.20.9, X.44.2). However, there is no reason why soma should not be eager for Indra, and the fists are associated with the pressing and purification of soma (e.g., IX.71.3 and a number of repetitions of *mṛjyámāna- gábhastyoḥ* (IX.20.6, etc.).

hári-manyu-sāyaka- is one of the very few multimember compounds in the RV. (I count no more than 15 exx.) It has received a surprising number of alternative translations. Gr takes it as ‘dessen Zorneswaffe [= *manyusāyaka*] (Blitz) goldfarben ist’, with Zorneswaffe standing for *vájra*. Ge, flg. Sāy. (n. 3c), sees the 2nd and 3rd members as a dvandva, with both equated with *hári-*, standing for soma: “sein Ingrimme [= *manyu*] und sein Geschoss [= *sāyaka*] ist der goldgelbe (Soma).” Re appositely cites the voc. phrase in the Battle Fury hymn X.83.1 *manyo ... vájra sāyaka* and on this basis seems to consider the middle member *manyu* to be predicated of both the 1st and the 3rd members: “qui a pour arme-de-jet la Fureur, pour (foudre [*vájra*]) doré (la Fureur).” But this would be an oddly constructed compound indeed. My interpr. differs from all three, though is perhaps closest to Gr’s: I consider *manyu-sāyaka-* a determinative compd with *manyu-* in genitival relationship with *sāyaka-*; this compd in turn is equated with *hári-*, which stands for both *vájra-* and soma, which are, of course, both necessary for Indra’s successful fighting.

X.96.4: The mace undergoes a series of metaphorical transformations in this vs. – from the static sun (a), to a racehorse (b), to Indra himself (c), before becoming a weapon again (d). The first three pādas also trace the trajectory of the mace’s use in the Vṛtra battle. It is first put in Indra’s hand; Indra then swings it energetically and (likely) in a wide arc; it then hits the serpent.

As Ge points out, the beacon placed in heaven must be the sun; this is a disguised instantiation of the formula “place the sun” that I discussed in the Melchert Fs. (“Sūre Duhitār’s Brother, the ‘Placer of the Sun’,” 2010). The location where the mace has been set in place is not specified, but it is either Indra’s fist (as in 3b) or, less likely, Indra himself (3d).

In b the mace seems to be compared to a racehorse “with its charge” (*rāmhyā*); see the “charge” in the preceding hymn X.95.3 as well as that of the mythical racehorse Tārksya in X.178.3 *sahasrasāḥ śatasā asya rāmhiḥ* “his charge that wins thousands, that wins hundreds.” As noted just above, I think this pāda depicts Indra’s energetic swinging of the *vájra*. This movement would be the *vájra*’s “charge.” The verb in the pāda, *vivyácat*, is ambig. in both form and function. The publ. tr. follows Kü’s (505) interpr. as a perfect subjunctive, but given the injunctives in the neighboring pādas (*dhāyī a*, *tudát c*), I might be inclined towards Old’s interpr. as thematic pluperfect (injunctive). As for meaning, *vyac* ordinarily means ‘contain, envelop, encompass’, with object. But given *vyacas-* ‘expanse’, the nuance seems to be that the space that is encompassed is extensive. Here without object the idea seems to be that the racehorse gobbles up the distance of the course it runs on, and so encompasses it. In the same way the *vájra* encompasses the space that it swings through.

The poet plays tricks with reference in pāda c, which harks back to two different phrases in the preceding vs., which point to two different referents. The first we encounter is *hārisīpraḥ* ‘golden-lipped’, which echoes *susīpraḥ* in 3c, referring to Indra. But the next phrase, *yá āyasāḥ* “which is made of metal,” found in 3a, seems to swing the interpr. definitively to the mace (but see 8a below). Why/how is the mace golden-lipped? It may simply mean that it is golden, as has been repeatedly emphasized. Or perhaps it is now closely identified with Indra, whose lips are dripping with soma. In any case the *vájra* has agency here, as the one who thrusts/pushes the serpent, in effect *vṛtra-hán-*.

In d *harimbhará-* must be Indra, so that the *vájra* (identified as *hari-*) has been demoted to a material object again. I do not understand why Indra becomes ‘thousand-flamed’ under these circumstances.

X.96.4–5: Note that initial *tudád* is echoed by *tuvam(-tuvam)* opening 5a and c.

X.96.6: The stem *mandín-* ordinarily modifies soma and means ‘exhilarating’, and I have followed that path here, though a passive ‘exhilarated’ of course fits Indra better.

X.96.7: As in vs. 2, *hārivant-* modifies not its usual referent, Indra, but, here, *kāma-* ‘desire’.

X.96.8: The poet returns to the conundrum of vss. 3–4. In 4c we were whiplashed by the incompatible phraseology, which first suggested that Indra as the referent, but then seemed to decisively identify the *vájra* because of the izafe-type rel. *yá āyasāḥ* “which is made of metal.” But here the referent can hardly be anyone but Indra: all the rest of the phraseology in the vs. points to him. But he is called *āyasāḥ*. Is this simply a metaphorical application of this adj. to mean especially strong and invulnerable, like the superhero Iron Man? or is Indra now identified with his mace, as his mace is transformed into him? If so, it’s a mace that can drink (see b).

X.96.9: As Ge suggests (n. 9b) *vājāya* is probably an abbreviation for *vājapéryāya-* ‘drink of victory’ vel sim. Although the compd is not attested until the AV and already there is the name of a particular ritual (parallel to the Rājāsūya, Aśvamedha, etc. [e.g., AVŚ XI.7.7]) not a drink, the

ritual must have been named after a ritual drink, and in our passage *turaspéya-* ‘drink of overcoming’ (?) in the preceding vs. (8b) would have conjured it up. I offer an alternative tr. “sets his two lips to twitching for (the drink) of victory.” The vs. is stuffed with reff. to drinking.

With Ge (also Kü 294) I take *dávidhvataḥ* as the gen. sg. of the intens. part. agreeing with *yásya* in pāda a, *pace* Sāy., Gr, who take it as 3rd du. Schaf. identifies it as a 3rd du., but then says *śípre* is its object, which sounds like the Ge interpr., since there are no other duals that could serve as subj.

X.96.10: “Both dwelling places” are presumably Heaven and Earth; see *ródasī* in 11a.

The epithet *hárivant-* now finally has its proper referent, Indra (see above vss. 2 and 7).

X.96.11: With Ge, I supply ‘fill(ed)’ with *ā* in pāda a, on the basis of the stereotyped expression “fill the two worlds with greatness.” Cf., e.g., III.54.15 *ubhé ā paprau ródasī mahitvā* (repeated twice elsewhere).

X.96.12: On *prayúj-* see comm. ad X.33.1. I would now change the awkward “advance teams of the peoples” just to “teams of the peoples.”

Contra Pp (and Lub), the sandhi form *pībā* must be an underlying subjunctive *pībās* in the *yáthā* purpose clause, not an impv. *pība*. So Old.

On the problematic *dásoni-* see comm. ad VI.20.4. Here it is supposed to refer to the “10-armed sacrifice,” i.e., one conducted by 5 priests.

X.96.13: The second hemistich of this summary vs. is found elsewhere (cd = X.116.4; d also = I.104.9). As pointed out above, the key words of this hymn are almost lacking in this vs. (save for *harivaḥ* in pāda a), a sign that it is extra-hymnic.

X.97 Plants

As Ge points out, the hymn is entirely Atharvan in character. It corresponds roughly to AVŚ VIII.7 and AVP XVI.12–14, with very different orders and selections of vss., as well as various YV versions. The variety and lack of overlap gives a free and somewhat improvisational feel to the healing herbs verses.

X.97.1–2: In 2ab *dhāmāni* contrasts with *rúhaḥ*, which I render ‘shoots’, and it is therefore tempting to tr. it as ‘roots’ – the emplaced part of the plant, the foundation – or the body or stem of the plant, but that works less well in 1d. In 2ab Ge (n. 2b) suggests rather than the *rúhaḥ* are the individual plants and the *dhāmāni* their types (/species) (Arten); the difference in numbers (100 versus 1000) could support his view.

X.97.2: The adj. *agadá-* appears twice in the RV (here and X.16.6); it is probably also related to *vigadá-* in X.116.5 (q.v.). It is usually etymologically connected with *√gad* ‘say’, whose verb forms are first attested considerably later. (Note also that the root violates IE root-structure constraints, beginning and ending with a plain voiced stop.) The chronological gap in attestation is not as troubling as it might be, given that the RVic occurrences of *-gadā-* are in the Xth Maṇḍala in non-hieratic contexts. The sense ascribed to it here – ‘without disease’ – (as well as Cl Skt. *gada-* ‘disease’) is explained by Th as a dev. from *‘curse, spell’. See EWA s.v. *GAD* for

disc. The speech component of the underlying root may be found in the other occurrence of *agadá-* as well as *vigadá-*.

X.97.4: This vs. is structurally complex, in that its first hemistich contains fem. pl. vocatives (*mātarah ... devīh*) and a 2nd pl. enclitic prn. (*vaḥ*) and its second a masc. sg. voc. *pūruṣa* and a 2nd sg. prn. (*táva*). The second half must be the direct speech of the poet-healer, signaled by pāda b *tád ... úpa bruve* “I say this to you / I implore you in this way” and probably also by the *ítí* in pāda a, though that also marks *óṣadhīh* as a quoted name. The speech in cd seems to be addressed by the poet-healer to his sick client. As Ge cleverly suggests (n. 4c) the three acc. in c *ásvaṃ gāṃ vāsaḥ* indicate what the healer hopes to get for his fee, while *ātmānaṃ táva* refers to the self of the person being healed. (That d is repeated in 8d in a different context supports the notion that it can be separately interpreted here.) The sense might be clearer if it were rendered “Might I gain a horse, a cow, a garment – and for you your very self, o man.”

X.97.5: One might ask what earthly good getting a cow would do the plants, but (more or less with Old) the idea must be that the plants are the poet-healer’s helpers and will technically have a share in the cow he hopes to get for himself (4c).

X.97.6: Again the aid of the plants makes the poet successful at healing: poet + plants → healer.

X.97.7: I take the acc. sg.s in ab to be plant names (see Ge n. 7ab), an interpr. supported by 9ab.

X.97.8: As in 5c, in pāda c here the poet uses the conceit that the plants desire a material fee for healing the client. Again as in 5, the difference between the two objects of \sqrt{san} would be clearer with the tr. “... as they seek to gain the stake -- and for you your very self, o man.”

X.97.9: The stem *sīrā-* in most of its RVic occurrences (I.174.9, etc.; see EWA s.v.) appears with a form of \sqrt{sru} ‘flow’ and seems to mean ‘stream’, a sense acknowledged by Mayr (EWA), though he finds the word “problematisch.” Ge (n. 9c) thinks that meaning is excluded here, but he does not sufficiently explore the metaphorical possibilities. The phrase *sīrāḥ patatrīṇīh*, lit. “winged stream(s)” describes plants; the wings can be leaves, while the stream(s) can be the stem/stalk, a hollow tubelike shape with liquid running through it like a streambed

The primary 2nd pl. ending *-tha* of (*nīs*) *kṛtha* is surprising, since the verb must belong to the root aorist stem. KH (Injunk. 111) plausibly explains this (and similar formations) as an attempt to make clear that the form is being used as an injunctive, not an imperative, as the imperative use of morphologically ambiguous forms like *kṛta* is the prevailing one.

X.97.10: I don’t understand the image of ab: what are the plants actually doing? Are they growing riotously over the fence (in their garden, as it were), or are they breaching the body’s envelope to heal from within? I favor the latter; I find it hard to imagine Rigvedic settlements as having fenced-in gardens.

X.97.11: Ge takes *vājáyan* as the denom. “nach dem Siegerpreis (Gewinn) verlangend,” but it’s best to take it to the other stem *vājáyā-*, inherited transitive ‘invigorate, incite’; see my *-áya-* book (89); so Re as well as Forssman 1987.

The real puzzle in the vs. is pāda d, esp. the rt.noun cmpd *jīva-gṛbh-*. Scar (113–14) discusses the phrase at length, following Forssman’s 1987 (Fs. Rau) treatment. Forssman interpr. *purā* as “temporal-präventive” (“zum Schutze vor, zur Vermeidung von”) and the cmpd as an abstract (since only abstracts are construed with *purā* in that sense). The point here seems to be that the mere act of the healer’s picking up the healing plants causes the sickness to die, so as to avoid being “captured alive” – that is, having the remedy directly applied to it. I would now alter the tr. to “as if against [=to prevent] being captured alive.” I think we can safely dismiss Macdonell-Keith’s (Vedic Index, s.v.) reproduction of Roth’s view that it refers to a police officer in the RV.

X.97.12: The voc. *oṣadhīh* was omitted from the tr. Alter to “O plants, him ...”

A different rt. noun cmpd. causes trouble here, *madhyama-śī-*, lit. ‘lying in the middle’. Given the context, it refers to someone who is powerful (*ugrāh*) and successful drives away enemies like illnesses. The word is discussed at some length by Ge, Old, and Scar (535), as well as Macdonell-Keith (Vedic Index, s.v.) Whitney (ad AVŚ IV.9.4), and Jeong-Su Kim (2014, ad AVP IX.8.9 [p. 276]). It seems to refer to a king, or similar figure, whose position in the center gives him particular power or authority – perhaps the positional version of “primus inter pares.” It seems quite unlikely to be, *pace* Old, a person in the middle of a bed, who pushes his companions to the right and the left edges of the bed. The sense might be clearer as “situated in the middle,” rather than “lying ...”

X.97.13: *nihākā-* is another puzzling word. Re (Fs. Turner, cited EWA s.v.) interpr. it as ‘blizzard’, hence a derivative of $\sqrt{\text{snih}}$, the IE ‘snow’ word.

X.97.14: The unidentified fem. pl. referents are of course the plants, again as helpers of the poet-healer.

X.97.18: Although the publ. tr. does not make this clear, the “you” of c is sg. and fem. It presumably refers to the particular medical plant singled out in 19d and 21d.

X.97.22: The *pārayāmasi* in d should be considered beside *pārayiṣṇvāh* in 3d. In both cases the verb means “deliver (to the far shore) / deliver (from evil/illness).”

X.98 Rain

On the structure and backstory of this hymn, see publ. intro., as well as the extensive intros of Old and Ge, and HPS’s extensive treatment (B+I 89–92). The hymn provides a basis for an elaborate itihāsa (Nir. 2.10, BṛhDev. 7.155ff.), which, however, does not seem to be reflected in the RVic hymn.

X.98.1: This vs. has received a wide variety of interpr., depending in great part on the interpr’s notion of the nature of Bṛhaspati. Ge (n. 1a), for ex., takes Bṛhaspati as a protean god, able to take form as any of the gods mentioned. However, as HPS points out, there is no parallel for this. Moreover, in the RV *prāti* \sqrt{i} does not mean ‘take form as’ (vel sim.), but ‘go up against, confront’. (For other interpr. of the vs., see esp. HPS’s disc. pp. 90–91.) My interpr. rests on an alternative suggested by Ge (also n. 1a), that bcd are the direct speech of Bṛhaspati to the gods in question, seeking one who can exert influence on Parjanya.

The impv. *vr̥ṣāya* is somewhat problematic. It must be trans./caus. ‘make rain’; see Sāy.’s gloss *varṣaya* – in which case, why not just use that causative stem (*varṣāya*-)? The obvious answer is meter: *varṣaya* would not fit the cadence – though meter is never an entirely satisfactory answer. Two homonymous verb stems are joined in *vr̥ṣāyā*:- the more common us the denom. ‘act the bull’, always middle; the less common one found twice in the middle (IX.71.3, X.44.4), with the intrans. meaning ‘rain’. In both these passages there is also a likely pun on ‘act the bull’ (for disc. see comm. ad locc). The sole act. form is here, and it has developed a contractive trans./caus. value. It is possible that there’s a buried pun on the ‘bull’ sense, but I don’t see any positive evidence for this.

X.98.2: The god Agni, one of the only prominent gods not mentioned in vs. 1, appears here— having apparently taken Devāpi’s message in vs. 1 (delivered in front of the ritual fire?) to Bṛhaspati. Rather than serving as Devāpi’s intermediary with the other gods, Bṛhaspati offers to place effective speech in Devāpi’s mouth, presumably so he can approach the gods directly.

Note the insistent *praticīnāḥ prāti* (... *vavṛtsva*) in c, picking up *prāti* (... *ihi*) in 1a.

X.98.3: Devāpi happily accepts Bṛhaspati’s offer, as is seen in his near word-for-word repetition in pāda a of B’s speech in 2d.

On metrically bad *iṣirām* see comm. ad X.68.3.

Pāda d plays on multiple senses of *drapsá*- ‘drop’. Ge and HPS think the primary referent here is ‘soma’; however, although both *drapsá*- and *mādhumant*- are commonly used of soma in Maṇḍala IX, I think this referent is a distant third here. Since Bṛhaspati has just offered to put speech in Devāpi’s mouth and Devāpi has accepted, I think it likely that the honeyed *drapsá*- is this very speech, which Devāpi is consuming by mouth. And it is hard not to see a reference to rain in a word ‘drop’ (as pointed out by many).

X.98.4: There is disagreement about the speaker of this vs.: Ge opts for Bṛhaspati, while Old (hymn intro.) prefers Śaṃtanu. Although Bṛhaspati would make the four-vs. sequence more symmetrical, and 4a answers 3d, as 3a did 2d, I find it unlikely that Bṛhaspati would have to say “*let the drops enter...*,” since, as a god, he presumably has some control. Moreover, the orders given to Devāpi to sacrifice in cd seem likely to have been issued by his patron, not the god.

The drops in pāda a are (in my view) most likely the rain for which Śaṃtanu was eager (see esp. 1d, 3c).

As Old and HPS suggest, the thousand cows and a chariot in b sound like a Dakṣiṇā, but (*pace* both), I don’t think this means that Śaṃtanu has to be identified with Indra – rather Indra has to give these items first, before they can be redistributed to Devāpi.

The middle voice of *yajasva* in c does not conform to its canonical later usage, since it here seems to be addressed to Devāpi, the officiating priest (who should be the subject of active forms of \sqrt{yaj}): *yajasva* would properly be addressed to the patron, i.e., Śaṃtanu.

X.98.5–6: The second half of 5 and all of 6 provide a textbook example of Lüders’s heavenly ocean – which all too frequently otherwise seems to rest on flimsy evidence.

X.98.6: The waters confined in the higher sea sound very much like the waters confined by Vṛtra. Cf. I.32.11 ... *atiṣṭhan, níruddhā āpaḥ* “The waters stood still, hemmed in” and our pāda b *āpo devébhīr nírṛtā atiṣṭhan* “The waters stood still, confined by the gods.”

The hapax *mṛkṣīnī-* is of unclear sense and etymology. I opt for a connection with $\sqrt{mṛj}$ ‘wipe, groom, curry’ and, more narrowly, with *mṛkṣá-* in VIII.66.3 meaning (in my view) ‘currycomb’ (see comm. ad loc.). The tracks left by the rains gushing over the land in rivulets would resemble the tracks of a currycomb.

X.98.9: The bahuvrīhi *rohídaśva-* is otherwise only used of Agni, so the reference to Agni must persist in this vs., though he is unnamed.

X.98.11: The vṛddhi form *aulāná-* in d is utterly opaque; it is even unclear whether it is a personal name (most likely) or, as Gr would have it, the designation of an offering.

X.99 Indra

The Anukr. attributes this hymn to Vamra “Ant,” and in a playful spirit in the final summary vs. (12) the poet names himself as *vamraká-* ‘little ant’. There is no clear connection between this humorous self-deprecatory nickname and the often puzzling contents of the hymn, though an “ant couple” (*vamrásya ... mithunā* appears in vs. 5).

On the pronominal skeleton that structures the hymn, see publ. intro. The lack of divine names in the hymn, noted in the publ. intro., invites the audience to try out multiple referents, and in fact a number of the vss., esp. in the early parts of the hymn, are ambiguous. In my view previous interpr. have been too quick to assume that Indra is the exclusive referent throughout the hymn.

The hymn has some striking similarities to I.51, an Indra hymn attributed to Savya Āṅgīrasa. These include the “hundred-doored” vs. 3 : I.51.3 / ants vss. 5/12 : I.51.9 / Pipru vs. 11 : I.51.5 / Rjīśvan vs. 11 : I.51.5 / Kutsa+Śuṣṇa vs. 9 : I.51.6, 11 / Dasyus vss. 7–8 : I.51.6, 8.

X.99.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn begins with maximal referential uncertainty: the first vs. contains two questions about identity, with the two interrogatives *kám* and *kád*, opening the two hemistichs. Moreover, there is 2nd sg. address, via the verb *iṣanyasi*, with the 2nd sg. subject unidentified. And the pronominal gen. *tásya*, assuming (as most do) that it has personal reference (“of his/its”), is also unspecified. In fact, the only semantic anchor is the *vájra-* in d, further identified as *vṛtra-túr-* ‘obstacle/Vṛtra-overcoming’, which situates the verse in the larger Indra narrative.

In addition to the referential problems, there are a number of uncertainties in the syntax. These include – 1) do *citrám* and *vāśrám* belong together, as obj. of *iṣanyasi*, or is *vāśrám* separate and the obj. of *vāvṛdhádhyai*? 2) is *pr̥thugmānam* a bahuvrīhi or a karmadhāraya? 3) is *śávasah* (+/- *tásya*) to be construed with *dātu* or *vyùṣtau*? 4) Is cd one clause or two? With regard to all these questions the publ. tr. takes a different stand from most other tr., views that I will in part now defend. I will also try to impose a bit more interpretive sense than the often vague publ. tr. did – though the hymn remains maddeningly opaque.

Let us begin with the 2nd ps. subject to the verb *iṣanyasi* in pāda a. The only thing we know about him is that he’s capable of setting in motion something bright (*citrám*) and he’s *cikitvān* (cognizant, observant, attentive). This pf. part. may be the clue: it is esp. common as a modifier of Agni, and since at the beginning of any RVic hymn a reference to the ritual fire would not be amiss, Agni is a reasonable suggestion. Here Agni could be sending out his bright beam (vel sim.). On the other hand, if we follow Ge (n. 1a) in supplying ‘song, praise’ with *citrám*, the addressee could be the poet, urged by his fellow officiants to send out his hymn on

our behalf. I think either of these (or a combination of both – e.g., Agni acting in lieu of the poet) is plausible here.

As for *vāśrā-*, the evidence goes in several directions. The distance between the two words *citrām* and *vāśrām* (in separate pādas) and their proximity to two different verbal forms (*iṣanyasi* and *vāvṛdhādhyai*) disfavor construing them together. However, *vāśrā-* is often used of cows and the stem *iṣanya-* several times takes cows as obj. (III.50.3, IX.96.8); moreover, *vāśrā-* also modifies *gīrah* ‘songs’ in VIII.44.25 and so would still work if we think ‘song, praise’ is the object of *iṣanyasi*. The publ. tr. “bright bellower” does construe the two together, with the object of *vāvṛdhādhyai* left unspecified. However, I would entertain the alternative, “Which bright (hymn?) did you send ... to strengthen the bellower” – the interpr. of Ge (also Scar 190). In that case the referent of *vāśrām* is in question; Ge (n. 1b) suggests Indra. This is also plausible, though it should be noted that *vāśrā-* is never used of him.

As for *pr̥thu-gmānam*, it is generally taken as a bahuvrīhi (so, e.g., Gr ‘breite Bahn habend’, Gr ‘breitspurigen’), modifying *vāśrām*. Its second-member accent would be paralleled by some (though not all) bahuvrīhis with 1st-member *pr̥thu-* (e.g., *pr̥thu-pājas-* ‘of broad dimension’). However, the b.-v. interpr. goes back to the period in which the 2nd-member -*gmán-* was taken as a form of \sqrt{gam} ‘go’ (see the glosses given above and Gr s.v. “(*gmán*)”). It is now clear that it belongs to the ‘earth’ word (*kṣám-*), with a zero-grade *ghm-* parallel to *jm-*. The apparent -*n-*stem we have here was backformed to the loc. **gm-án* (cf. loc. *jmán* and EWA s.v. *kṣám*). With 2nd-member -*gmán-* meaning ‘earth’, a b.-v. interpr., i.e., ‘having the broad earth’, no longer fits the context; see Scar’s awkward and semantically stretched “den auf der weiten Erde {bekanntesten} Brüller.” Instead, it must simply be a karmadhāraya meaning ‘broad earth’, here as an acc. extent of space with *iṣanyasi*. Old appositely compares voc. *pr̥thu-jman* in AVŚ V.1.5, also showing a backformed -*an-* stem extracted from the loc.; again it must mean ‘o broad earth’, not *‘o (one) having (a) broad earth’. Note also that in our vs. 2b the phrase *pr̥thúm yónim* ‘broad womb’ is found in the same metrical position and refers to the same space, in my opinion.

The second hemistich brings a new set of problems. First, Ge takes cd as a single clause through *vājram* in d, with *vṛtratúram ápinvat* an unsigned dependent clause [“(wenn)”], making *kát ... dātu* the subj. of *tákṣat* (“Welche Gabe wird ... die Keule zimmern”), an expression that seems strange even in the context of the general strangeness of RVic discourse. It seems more natural to take c as an independent nominal cl. (so also Scar). See below.

The next question is whether *dātu* belongs to $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘give’ or $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘divide’ (EWA’s *DĀ⁴*): Ge opts for the former, Gr, Old, publ. tr. the latter, Scar either one. The decision rests in part on what *sávasaḥ* is construed with. Save for the publ. tr., it is universally taken with *vyùṣtau* (e.g., Ge “im Erwachen seiner Kraft”; Scar “beim Aufflammen seiner ... Kraft”). But *vyùṣti-* is never construed with a genitive of anything but Uṣas -- except X.76.1 with *ūrjām* “at the first dawn flushes of nourishment,” a passage that Ge. (n. 1c) adduces. But I take the expression there as referring to “the milk of the dawn cows”; see comm. ad loc. I prefer to take *sávasaḥ* here with *kát ... dātu* “what is his share/portion of strength?” This question would follow naturally upon the *vāvṛdhādhyai* that ends the preceding pāda: if either Indra or the hymn is what is to be strengthened in ab, then it makes sense to inquire how much strength he/it has received. I tr. *tásya* as “his,” but if the question is about the hymn (as Scar tentatively suggests), “its” could be substituted. (Since Ge and Scar both take *tásya* as an independent genitive, as do I, there is no point in exploring the possibility of its modifying *sávasaḥ*.)

This brings us to pāda d. Here the problem is that it's too easy to fill in the blanks. There are two good possibilities for the subject of *takṣat*. As Ge points out (1d), Tvaṣṭar is quite frequently the subject of *tákṣad vájram* and related expressions (esp., in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn, I.32.2 *tváṣṭā ... vájram ... tatakṣa*). It is difficult to believe that the audience wouldn't immediately think of Tvaṣṭar when confronted with *tákṣad vájram*, esp. with that noun qualified as *vṛtra-tuṣam*. Although Tvaṣṭar might be thought of as the default here, I actually favor Uśanā Kāvya, who also several times fashions the mace: see, e.g., I.121.12 ... *kāvya usānā ... vṛtrahānam ... tatakṣa vájram* and comm. ad X.49.2. In my view is also found in this hymn in vs. 9, and so introducing him here would provide some continuity, whereas Tvaṣṭar has no further role here. Ge rejects Tvaṣṭar in favor of Soma, the referent (in his view) of *dātu* in c. I see his point: Tvaṣṭar seems like a red herring – too obvious in the otherwise hazy rhetoric of the hymn. But it may be that the poet wants to throw his audience a belated lifeline: nothing so far in the hymn gives any indication that Indra is the dedicand, so in the last pāda of the 1st vs. he sets up a situation that refers uniquely to Indra: the *vájra* and its unnamed, but easily supplied fashioner, and Indra's standard target *vṛtrá* (whether the personal Vṛtra or the generic 'obstacle') – without having to mention Indra's name or any of his epithets. In other words, pāda d is the semi-riddling answer to a riddle that hasn't been directly posed.

The last word *ápinvat* provides a last difficulty. It is accented; if it belongs with the apparent main clause introduced by *tákṣat*, it must begin a new asyndetic clause. This is how the publ. tr. takes it. One problem is that that interpr. assumes that the obj. is the *vájra* and the subj. the unnamed Tvaṣṭar. Each of these assumptions is less than ideal: the *vájra* doesn't "swell," at least literally, and Tvaṣṭar is not the most likely agent of such an action. We could supply "waters" as the obj. of *ápinvat*, which is a more natural VP, but Tvaṣṭar remains a less likely agent. By contrast, if we take *ápinvat* as part of an unmarked dependent cl., owing its accent to this subordination, it doesn't need to be initial in its cl. Its obj. can then be *vṛtratúram*, which need not be coreferential with *vájram* but instead refer to Indra (as in IV.42.8). This little clause could then depict Tvaṣṭar's supplying soma to Indra to swell him up. The drawbacks: 1) soma-supplying is not usually Tvaṣṭar's role either; 2) the (pseudo-)root \sqrt{pinv} is not used elsewhere of Indra's reaction to soma-drinking. Nonetheless, *pinv* and soma both inhabit the realm of the liquid, which is more than the *vájra* does, and so I propose an alternative tr. "(Tvaṣṭar) fashioned the mace, (when) he made swell the Vṛtra/obstacle-overcomer."

X.99.2: The long portion of the hymn with anaphoric *sá* as subject of every vs. (2–9) begins here, but this pronominal expression of the subject doesn't help as much as it might. We still lack explicit referent(s).

At least in the first hemistich the referent is, in my view, open. Although Indra is for most interpr. the default, Agni seems to me a distinct, indeed the likely, possibility for various reasons. To begin with, the other occurrence of instr. *dyutā* in VI.2.6 is in a comparison of Agni's flashing with that of the sun, and it is overwhelmingly Agni who takes a seat on the ritual ground, here characterized as "the broad womb" (*prthúṃ yónim*) – though Ge (n. 2b) conjures up a few passages with Indra as subj. In favor of Agni see esp. VIII.29.2 with similar phraseology (*yóni-*, \sqrt{sad} , and *dyut-/dyot-*): *yónim éka ā sasāda dyótanaḥ*.

The second hemistich, with its own initial *sá* (therefore opening the [to me unlikely] possibility of different referents for ab and cd), likewise seems applicable to Agni or Indra (or neither). The unidentified subject has both nestmates (*sániḷebhiḥ*) and a brother as helpers in his action. Ge (n. 2cd), who takes the subj. as Indra, identifies the nestmates as the Maruts,

reasonably enough, and the brother as Viṣṇu, with less justification. The only passage I know of that names a brother of Indra is VII.55.5, where the brother is (oddly) Pūṣan. If the referent is Agni, the nestmates can be his flames; for this possibility see (admittedly obscure) X.31.6 *asyá sánílā ásurasya yónau* “in the womb of this lord are those of the same nest,” where “this lord” is most likely Agni (so also Ge). The lexical similarity to our passage (*ásura-*, *yóni-*, and *sáníla-*) is striking. Moreover, Agni’s brothers are well known (cf. I.164.1, maybe X.11.2, and the story of the flight of Agni, with his brothers mentioned in X.51.6), and in IV.1.2 Varuṇa is named as his brother. The curiously indirect expression “not without his brother” (*bhrátur ná ṛté*) could reflect the story of Agni’s failed attempt to escape his ritual role and the fate of his brothers. Contra most interpr., Old considers the *ná* here to be the simile particle; he suggests it means “as if without a brother,” and indicates that the subject used the help of the *sáníḍa-* because he lacked a brother or his brother was somehow absent. This is an alternative worth considering, whoever the subject is meant to be.

The VP *prasahānāḥ ... māyāḥ* “overcoming *māyās* is equally applicable to Agni and Indra. In V.2.9 Agni *prādevīr māyāḥ sahate* “overcomes ungodly *māyāḥ*, while in VII.98.5 it is Indra: *yadéd ádevīr ásaḥiṣṭa māyāḥ* in almost identical words.

The identity of “the seventh” (*saptáthasya*) is unclear. Ge (n. 2cd) considers it to be one, or the first, of a group of seven well-known demons, possibly Vṛtra. (The passages Ge cites for the existence of this group are suggestive but not utterly convincing.) Old instead weakly endorses Bergaigne’s view that it’s Varuṇa, on the basis of vs. 10, but gives no reason why he’d be “seventh.” With Ge (n. 2cd) I tentatively adduce X.49.8, where Indra claims to be *saptahán* ‘the smasher of the seven’; that same vs. is connected with our vs. 7, and our vs. 9 has thematic and verbal parallels in X.49.3.

Note the predicated participle *prasahānāḥ*, the only verbal form in this hemistich; the opening *sá* makes it likely that cd is a clause independent of ab. Ge also takes it as separate.

X.99.3: Another obscure verse with obscure referents. Once again both Agni and Indra seem to me reasonable possibilities, though different pieces of the vs. fit one or the other better. Indeed at this point in the hymn Indra begins to outweigh Agni, who seems to me the more plausible referent of the first two vss., but who is being increasingly elbowed out as the hymn proceeds.

As for this vs., Indra is more generally associated with the winning of the sun, the topic of pāda b, than Agni. See, e.g., VI.17.8 *svarṣātā vṛnata índram átra* “They choose Indra here at the winning of the sun,” though Agni also participates in this activity. For example, in X.8.6 Agni’s head is *svarṣā-* ‘sun-winning’. Indra’s signature verb \sqrt{han} is found in the pres. part. *ghnán* (d), and in general the aggressiveness of the vs. and even the drive to the prize in pāda a seem more characteristic of Indra. However, the phrase *abhí várpasā bhūt* “prevailed with his form” exactly matches the phrase in X.3.2 *kṛṣṇám yád énīm abhí várpasā bhūt* “when with his form he has prevailed over black, mottled (Night)” of Agni, and *várpas-*, a term that seems to refer to an often indistinctly defined form or shape laid on top of another, is esp. associated with Agni (e.g., I.140.5, 7, 141.3; VI.3.4) and with the smoke that envelops him. (The same phrase *abhí várpasā bhūt* also of course occurs near the end of this hymn in 11d.)

Ge interpr. the hapax instr. *ápa-duṣpādā* as ‘not lame’ (“mit einem Nichtlahmen”), with *ápa* functioning as a sort of privative to *duṣpād-* ‘lame’, lit. ‘having a bad foot’ (I.53.9). But *ápa-* isn’t a privative prefix in the RV; the closest would be *ápa-vrata-* ‘(one) contrary to commandment’, which is, however, distinct from *a-vratá-* ‘without commandment’ (see disc. ad I.51.9). Moreover, the context here favors a negative notion: the idea seems to be that the subject

succeeds despite having bad equipment, not because his equipment is good (as “not lame” would indicate). See the next vs., 4c, with *apādaḥ ... arathāḥ* “(they, though) lacking feet and chariots ...” The interpr. of the compd by (Gr /) Old, “auf einem Weg, dem Schlimmfüssiges fern ist,” better accounts for the *āpa*, but still errs by inserting a positive value in a context that invites a negative one. Old seems to mean that the subject is following a path that a lame person couldn’t, and so it is a good one. This actually doesn’t follow logically, but see Gr’s paraphrase as “sichern Ganges.” In contrast, I suggest that *āpa*- here has the same sense as archaic English “off” as in “off ox,” the one further from the driver. So here the horse (if that’s what the referent is) is lame, but since it’s the off foot that’s lame the driver (*yātar*-) may not have noticed this defect.

I have no idea what the “hundred-doored” (*śatādura*-) refers to; the same descriptor is found in I.51.3, associated with Atri, but otherwise unclear.

X.99.3–4: The negated nom. sg. *anarvā* begins 3c, while 4a ends with *ārvā*. The propinquity of these two forms highlights their semantic divergence: *ārvan(t)*- refers to a horse, specifically a ‘charger, steed’, while the adj. *an-arvān*- (etc.) means something like ‘without assault / unassailing / unassailable’. Most of the philological energy has been expended upon accounting for the protean stem of the negated form (see the reff. in the lexical comm., inter alia), but I know of no real attempt (incl. by me) to reconcile the meanings. In RV the unnegated form refers only to a horse (real or metaphorical), but since *auruuā(ṅt)*- is found as an adj. in Aves., incl. in the bahuvr. *auruuāṣpa*- ‘having *auruuant* horses’, a meaning like ‘headlong, breakneck, precipitous’ could underlie the semantic development of RVic *anarvān*-.

X.99.4: The vs. begins promisingly with an apparent Indraic theme: the youthfully exuberant streams (*yahvyò ’vānīḥ*) that the subject pours out (*ā juhōti*) could be the waters released by Indra after smashing Vṛtra. Both these fem. plurals are used in such a context (e.g., *avānīḥ* I.61.10, *yahvīḥ* V.29.2). However, the verb *ā√hu* introduces at least the metaphor of ritual oblation, and a different metaphor, that of a horse racing for the prize, is represented by *gōṣu ārvā ... pradhanyāsu saśrīḥ* “as a charger running for the cows that are at stake.” By sheer number of words, this last image, of the racehorse, dominates the first hemistich. However, that image feeds back into the ritual one, since soma is regularly compared to a horse (e.g., IX.10.1=66.10 *ārvanto nā śravasyāvah / sōmāso rāyē akramuḥ*) running towards the cows, that is, the milk with which the soma will be mixed.

It is this ritual image that takes over the second hemistich – until the end. As Ge points out (n. 4cd), in IX.97.20 the soma-drinks are described as running, though “without reins, without chariots (*arathāḥ*, as here), unyoked,” while the subjects of cd are “without feet ... without chariots.” (Though the subjects here *are* yoked [*yūjyāsaḥ*], this hardly matters: the drops are moving like teams of horses despite lacking horse tackle.) The bahuv. in d, *droṇy-āśva*- ‘having wooden (cups) as horses’, clinches the soma context, since *drōṇa*- is used only of the wooden cups into which soma is poured (see comm. ad VI.2.8). However, although *droṇī*- confirms the soma-ritual context, it creates an awkward image. Soma cups aren’t mobile, much less swift like horses; they are instead the stationary goal towards which the soma-horses are racing. And ‘having wooden cups as horses’ conjures up the comic image of the soma drinks clumping around in cartoon versions of Dutch wooden shoes. The ineptness of the image makes me wonder if we’re once again changing imagery in midstream, as it were – though I don’t have a good suggestion for what it might be. Gr paraphrases *droṇy-āśva*- as “Regenwolken als Rosse

habend,” and the apparent goal of the verb *īrate*, *ghṛtām vāḥ* “ghee (and?) water,” does not fit in a soma context. This phrase is also found in X.12.3 *duhé yád énī divyām ghṛtām vāḥ* “when the speckled (cow) gives as her milk the heavenly ghee, the water” – an apparent reference to rain (see publ. intro.). I there suggest that the speckled cow might be a rain cloud, but, *pace* Gr, I do not see how *droṇy-āśva-* could refer to the same. I confess myself baffled.

Ge takes *īrate* as transitive “strömen lassen,” but med. forms of *īrte* are always intrans. and furthermore ‘stream’ is not one of the meanings of this stem. He recognizes the intrans. possibility in n. 4d.

X.99.5: For a change, the referent, at least of the first hemistich, is tolerably clear. The stem *ībhvan-* ‘craftsman(?)’ is used primarily of Indra, though, it must be admitted, several times of Agni. The association of the subject with the Rudra – in the plural almost always a designation of the Maruts – tips the balance towards Indra. See esp. the almost identical phrase adduced by Ge (n. 5a) describing Indra in I.100.5 *rudrébhir ībhvā*. The puzzle here comes from how the subject is described – as one “whose wish is unpraiseworthy” (*āśasta-vāra-*) but “who keeps disrepute at a distance” (*ārē-avadya-*). It is striking that, in his first undoubted appearance in this hymn, Indra should enter under an ethical cloud, as it were. Now Indra in his long career does many disreputable things, but which one this is, and why it’s brought up here, are questions to which I don’t have answers. I seem to be alone in this uncertainty. Other interpr. (notably Ge, but also Old), try to connect the first hemistich with the second, in which the ant couple (*vamrásya ... mithunā*) figures. This impulse is understandable but I don’t think successful. It requires Indra, as supposed subj. of the verbs in d, to steal the food (of the ant couple or of unspecified other(s)) and make them cry. Indra’s “unpraiseworthy wish” is, acdg. to Ge (n. 5a), to steal – in this case, to steal food. For Ge (n. 5c) this further entails (though I don’t see the logical connection) that Indra turned into an ant in order to commit the theft, and his taking the ant-form from the ants that used to possess it left them uncovered (*vīvavṛī*). For Indra as thieving ant does Ge have in mind ants at a picnic (vel sim. – it’s rather nice to imagine Ge picnicking in the German countryside)? I frankly find this ludicrous – I don’t see the great god Indra having the ambition to become an ant and steal a crumb, nor do I imagine the victim of the theft of a crumb weeping over it.

I instead think that cd is a separate incident. In fact I take it as an animal fable in embryo, like those I identify in X.28 (q.v). The *manye* in c, “I think of,” “this puts me in mind of,” seems like a casual introduction to such a tale. And in fact a similar tale, though with a different ending, is familiar to all of us – the Ant(s) and the Grasshopper, attributed to Aesop. There the ants diligently store up food for the winter during the delightful summer, while the grasshopper mocks their toil while taking his pleasure. When winter comes and he is unprepared, he begs food from the ants, who refuse, and he starves. Here we might be confronting an alternative version, in which the ants’ stockpiled food is plundered while they are out of their lair. Not surprisingly this theft makes them cry when they discover it. My interpr. leaves the subject of *arodayat* and *muṣāyán* unspecified (certainly *not* Indra, in my view), but if the story was well known, the identity of the thief would be too.

What then would be the connection between ab and cd. In my opinion, it’s not the unpraiseworthy wish and the evaded disrepute, but rather leaving one’s home. Indra came here *hitvī gáyam* “having left behind / abandoned his home”; the ant couple are *vīvavṛī* ‘without/outside their covering/lair.’ Notably *vavṛím* serves as object to $\sqrt{hā}$ ‘leave’ twice: IX.69.9 *hitvī vavṛím ...* / IX.71.2 *jāhāti vavṛím*. Although my interpr. of the vs. leaves several

loose ends – why did Indra abandon his home? (a question not addressed by Ge either), what was his unpraiseworthy wish? who stole the food? – the answers previously provided to these questions seem unsatisfactory to me.

X.99.6: The referential whiplash continues here. Having just learned in the last vs. that Indra left his home behind, the subject of this vs. is identified with the archaic phrase *pátir dán* ‘lord of the house’ – a phrase more appropriate for Agni, so often identified as *gṛhāpati-*, *dāmūnas-*, and similar designations, than Indra and used of Agni in I.149.1, probably I.153.4, and in a variant (*śísūr dán*) in X.61.20; it is applied to Indra (somewhat oddly) only in X.105.2. But the actions recounted in our vs. belong to Indra, or to his older alloform Trita Āptya. As Ge (n. 6) points out, this vs. concerns the same deed(s) as are found in X.8.7–8. There, curiously, a muddling of the identities of Agni and Indra, not to mention Trita, is also found. As discussed in the publ. intro. as well as in the comm. to X.8, the three vss. concerning the slaying of Viśvarūpa (X.8.7–9) are appended to an Agni hymn (X.8) at the end of an Agni cycle (X.1–8). This myth goes back to Indo-Iranian times, with an Avestan version where figures corresponding to Trita Āptya, namely Ōrita and Āθβiia, are found. In RV X.8.7–9 the hero who slays Viśvarūpa morphs before our eyes. In vs. 7 the subject is *tritá-*, which can be read simultaneously as Trita and as “the third (fire),” namely Agni. In the next vs. (8) Trita Āptya is named as the slayer of “the three-headed, seven-reined” (*triśīrṣāṇam saptárāsmim*) enemy, like the “six-eyed, three-headed” (*ṣaḷakṣām triśīrṣāṇam*) Dāsa here, but he was urged on by Indra (*índresita-*). But in the final vs. (9) Indra has supplanted Trita Āptya as the slayer of the three-headed Viśvarūpa; he is not just an enthusiastic bystander. The same blurring of identities seems to be found in this vs.: as just noted, the phrase *pátir dán* suggests Agni; the default referent is Indra; and Trita (otherwise unknown in this hymn) is explicitly named as the slayer in c. The phrase *asyá ... ójasā vṛdhānāḥ* “grown strong through his might” is in fact ambiguous as to the referent of *asyá*. Although we might expect *asyá* to refer to Trita, the subject, it is possible that *asyá* is Indra, referring to the same invigoration of Trita by Indra that is found in X.8.8 *índresita-*.

The last pāda tosses in further confusion. Here the victim is specified as a boar (*varāhá-*), a rare word and one that doesn’t occur in this myth elsewhere. And the weapon is “metal-tipped poetic inspiration” (*vipā ... áyoagrayā*), a curious and clashing phrase, both internally and externally. (I suppose we might paraphrase it as “weaponized rhetoric.”) But this discordant element can also be interpr. in the context of the version in X.8.7–9. As I argue there (see comm. ad loc.), the weapons that Trita uses there are words, and the myth is assimilated to the Vala myth, in which the cave is opened by verbal means. The same explanation can account for the much abbreviated expression here as well.

Note the rhyming pāda-final monosyllables *dán* (a) and *han* (d) of the first and last pādas. There is also internal near-rhyme in pāda d: (*var*)*āhām* immediately precedes the caesura, while (*áyoagray*)*ā han* ends the pāda, with *-āhaN* positioned before the two metrical breaks. Verse-final *han* is also picked up by the verse finals of 7 and 8; see below.

With *áyo-agra-* here compare *áyo-apāṣṭi-* ‘having metal claws’ in 8d.

X.99.7–8: The last word of 7, *dasyuhátye*, is expanded into the last phrase of 8, *hanti dásyūn*. This word order is somewhat anticipated by the full phrase following the caesura in 7d, (*ar*)*han dasyuhátye*. And recall the *han* that ends vs. 6.

X.99.7: At least we can be tolerably certain that Indra is the referent of this vs. The stem *arśasānā-* (on which see further below) in b is elsewhere used of an enemy of Indra's; Indra is associated elsewhere with Nahus (e.g., X.49.8)(c); and he is of course a master splitter of fortresses and smasher of Dasyus (d).

The stem *arśasānā-* is generally taken as a PN for a demonic enemy of Indra's – throughout the publ. tr. and in the standard tr., as well as Mayr PN. It may indeed be a PN, but I now consider its formation to be contextually driven. The form appears three times independently in the RV (I.130.8=VIII.12.9, II.20.6, and here). In two of these three occurrences it is found in conjunction with a participle or pseudo-participle in *-(a)sāna-*. The clearest ex. is I.130.8fg in Atyaṣṭi meter, where it is part of the rhyme pāda: ... *tatrsānām oṣati, nī arśasānām oṣati* “... scorches the thirsty, scorches the *arśasānā-*,” where the two forms are near phonological matches. (VIII.12.9 repeats the g pāda but lacks the f pāda.) The occurrence in our vs. immediately follows one ending in *ūrdhvasānā-*, a patently artificial *-(a)sānā-* form. Note that one of the best established of these forms is found in vs. 9, *śavasānā-*. (Both parallels pointed out already by Old.) On the type see comm. ad IV.3.6 and AiG II.2.236–37. The only independent occurrence of *arśasānā-* that lacks an *-(a)sānā-* form in its context is II.20.6, but this passage in fact is verbally connected with this one (as Old and Ge [n. 7a] point out): the pāda preceding the form of *arśasānā-* contains the phrase *ūrdhvó bhuvan mānuṣe*, a paraphrase (or at least equivalent) of our *mānuṣa ūrdhvasānāḥ*. I'm therefore inclined to take *arśasānā-* as belonging to the shadowy root $\sqrt{rś}$ ‘harm’ (so Wh. Roots), built to the *s*-stem *árśas-* ‘harm’ (supposedly VS+), as suggested in EWA s.v. *arśasānā-* (and adumbrated by Gr s.v. *arś*); many of the *-asānā-* formations of course sit next to *s*-stems (like *śavasānā-* : *śavas-*). The form may still be a PN, but perhaps it would be better to tr. “Harmer.”

In c Ge takes the superlative *nītama-* as standing for a comparative and the phrase *nītamo náhuṣaḥ* as equivalent to Indra's boast in X.49.8 *náhuṣo náhuṣtarah* “(I am) more Nahus than Nahus.” (For another passage with *náhuṣaḥ* + COMP, see I.122.10 *náhuṣaḥ ... śárdhastarah* “more forceful than N.,” there of a human patron.) In the publ. tr. I rejected this interpr. and instead construed *náhuṣaḥ* with what follows: *náhuṣo 'smát sújātaḥ* on the basis of X.80.6 *mānuṣo náhuṣo ví jātāḥ* “those born variously from Manu and from Nahus” and IX.88.2 *vísṣvā nahuṣyāñi jātā* “all creatures stemming from Nahus,” with *-jāta-* as here — tr. “well born from Nahus and from us.” I now think this was wrong, because Nahus is the progenitor of humans, of Ārya (see comm. ad VI.26.7, etc.), and Indra decidedly does not fit this category. I would now emend the tr. to something closer to Ge's: “He, more manly than Nahus, because of us split the fortresses ...” I'm following Ge in taking *asmát* as an abl. of cause, though an alt. might be to take it parallel to or dependent on *náhuṣaḥ* “more manly than Nahus, than us” or “more manly than Nahus from among us.”

X.99.8: In b the Pp reads *vidát*, a 3rd sg. injunc., and the publ. tr. accepts this analysis. However, there is no good reason for the accent; although Old endorses the Pp reading, he lumps this passage with others for which he can find no explanation (ZDMG 60: 736 [=KISch p. 211]), and in fact in n. 5 on that page he considers the masc. pres. part. *vidán* to be a possible alternative. Against the part. interpr. are two facts: the part. stem *vidánt-* is otherwise unattested (though there is no obstacle to such a form existing), and the main clause of the first hemistich would lack a finite verb. Still, I now prefer to take it as a predicated pres. part. rather than a finite verb with unmotivated accent and would change the tr. to “He ... is the one finding a way ...” For another pred. tense-stem part. in this hymn, see vs. 2.

Note the pronominal doubling in b: *no asmé*. It's possible that the two are not doubled but are meant to be construed separately: "finding for us a way to peaceful dwelling for us" or even "... for us to dwell peacefully." Ge (n. 8b) adduces the identical pronominal sequence, but split over the pāda boundary, in VI.50.3 ... *no, asmé kṣáyāya*, a phrase that also includes the same dative goal. The publ. tr. of that passage interpr. the sequence as doubling, but it's possible there too that the pronouns should be construed separately. See comm. ad loc.

The publ. tr. renders pl. *śárīraiḥ* as "with his limbs," but this sounds awkward, to say the least. I would now, with Ge, substitute "with his body."

áyo-apaṣṭi- 'metal-clawed' of d echoes *áyo-agra-* 'metal-tipped' in 6d.

X.99.9: The pronominal structure that dominates the hymn changes mid-verse: the first hemistich begins with *sá*, the second with *ayám*. This may signal Indra's approaching epiphany. Because of the prominence of the pronominal skeleton, I would slightly alter the tr. of the first pāda to "He, along with ...," rather than having the subject pronoun parenthetical and deep in the clause.

With Ge I supply a verb in pāda a, rather than construing *vrádhataḥ* with *párādat* at the end of b. It is easy to borrow \sqrt{han} from 8d. Cf. IV.32.3 *hámsi vrádhantam ójasā* with the same VP.

I dealt with this vs. extensively in my 2009 "An Indo-Iranian Priestly Title Lurking in the Rig Veda?" (Fs. Salomon), esp. 114–16, apropos of the hapax *kṛpāne* (and the similar hapax *kārpāné* in X.22.10 (see comm. ad loc.)). I argue there that these two words are deformations of an Indo-Iranian priestly title, found in Avestan as *karapan* (always disyllabic, i.e., **karpan-*). Part of my argument rests on the association in this passage of the equivalents of the Aves. priestly trio, *kauui-*, *usij-*, and *karapan-*, namely *kaví-* (pāda c) and *ausíjā-* (11a), the vṛddhi deriv. of *usíj-*. For further disc. of this apparent mythic complex, incl. its association in various parts of the RV with the Śuṣṇa / Kutsa myth, see the art. cit., esp. pp. 112–16 and nn. 12–13.

As indicated in that art., I consider the Kavi in c to be a reference to Uśanā Kāvya, who figures prominently in the Śuṣṇa / Kutsa story (see n. 12 in art. cit.). The mysterious cloak in pāda d is also found in a Śuṣṇa / Kutsa / (Uśanā) Kavi passage in X.49.3; see the extensive disc. there. In that passage Indra does some sort of harm to a cloak "for the poet" (i.e., for Uśanā Kāvya in my opinion); in our passage it is unclear what happens to the cloak. Ge thinks the poet wore / put on the cloak (cf. also JSK DGRV I.367 "who (put on) his (i.e. Indra's) cloak," supplying *avasta*). This is not impossible, but a more economical solution is to construe *átkam* with the only verbal form in the rel. cl., the agent noun *sánitā* (so, actually, Gr). Besides avoiding the need to supply a verb out of nowhere, this can also explain the position of *utá*, which causes JSK some distress because, if the syntagm is *sánitotá nṛṇām*, *utá* is in "enclitic" position. If, however, we read *sánitā* with what proceeds as well as what follows, *utá* can connect the constructions that share *sánitā*. In my view, the cloak originally belonged to Śuṣṇa (contra Ge n. 3a [though he considers this as an alternative in n. 3a] and JSK) and was awarded to Uśanā Kāvya, probably because of the help he provided Indra in the Śuṣṇa fight, as I suggest ad X.49.3. I also suggest there that Śuṣṇa's cloak may have consisted of *māyāḥ*; note *māyī* in the next vs. (10b), as well as in 2d.

For another connection between our hymn and X.49, see vs. 7 and X.49.8.

X.99.10: In pāda a *náryebhir asya* echoes *śavasānébhir asya* in 9a, and the *nárya-* picks up the *nṛṇām* that ends vs. 9. It is not clear whether *náryebhiḥ* should be construed with *devébhiḥ* in b

as a single constituent (so Ge) or the two instr. refer to different groups (so, implicitly, the publ. tr.).

In c *avedi* could belong either to $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘know’ or $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘find’. The publ. tr. takes it to the latter, Ge (and Scar 310) to the former. I am now inclined to change my allegiance to ‘know’, with some slight rearrangements of the rest of the pāda. Flg. Scar, I would supply ‘already’ with *kanīnaḥ*, referring to Indra’s early forays into soma-drinking. The qualifier *ṛtupāḥ* ‘drinking acdg. to ritual sequence’ may be euphemistically polite here, if the reference is to Indra’s commandeering Tvaṣṭar’s soma right after his birth (e.g., IV.18.3). My revised tr.: “This one here, (even) as a lad, became known as drinking according to the ritual sequence.”

The verb of d, *āmimīta*, is taken to mean “changed into” (verwandelte) by Ge, who suggests that the form is an “entgleiste” form of **aminīta* (to $\sqrt{\text{mī}}$ ‘(ex)change’). This root affiliation is also held by Sāy., Gr, Thieme (see Kü 370), Kü 369–70, and Lub, but I see no reason not to assign it to $\sqrt{\text{mā}}$ ‘measure’, where it would be the correct 3rd sg. mid. impf. There is no evidence that Indra was transformed into Araru – though Indra’s shape-shifting seems to be a bit of an *idée fixe* of Ge’s for this hymn: see his peculiar view that Indra turned into an ant in 5c. Rather, the default scenario would be that Araru is yet another enemy that Indra handily dispatched. I take *āmimīta* to mean ‘measured himself against, gave his (full) measure against,’ an abbreviated form of a phrase like V.31.7 *ōjaḥ...āmimīthāḥ* “you measured out your strength against ...”

X.99.11: Verse-init. *asyá* is the last of the initial deictics in this part of the hymn; it would be better to give it a more prominent position in the tr.: “Through praises to him, AṚ ...”

On *ausījá-* see comm. above ad vs. 9.

In c Ge (n. 11c) emends *yajataḥ* to **yájataḥ* gen. sg. of the pres. act. part., construing it with *gīḥ* (“die Lobrede des Opfernden”), while Old takes *gīḥ* as a masc. ‘singer’ (see Noten ad I.37.10 n. 1, with several other such occurrences suggested, none of them convincing). Neither of these makeshifts seems necessary. The publ. tr. instead takes c as containing two parallel subord. clauses: the nominal *sútvā yád yajataḥ* “when the one worthy of the sacrifice possesses the soma-pressing” and (*yád*) *dīdayad gīḥ* “(and when) the song will shine.” For the synaesthesia of the latter, see VI.16.36 *bráhma ... yád dīdayat*.

X.99.12: This summary vs. contains a pun on the poet’s name (or at least the poet as identified by the Anukramaṇī), Vamra ‘Ant’. Here he identifies himself as ‘Little Ant’ (*vamraká*); the presence of the pl. *paḍbhír* ‘with feet’ indicates that the subject is not conceived of as a two-footed human. The ant of course also occurs in vs. 5.

X.100 All Gods

On the structure of the hymn and on the refrain, see publ. intro.

X.100.1: Old considers *tvāvat* adverbial, leading to a convoluted rendering “Indra, sei fest, Gabenreicher, in der dir eignen Weise, damit man (dich) geniesse” (with a slightly less convoluted, but still unconvincing paraphrase offered immed. after). The interpr. as a neut., the subj. of *bhujé*, is snappier and conforms better to the sense of pāda b.

A nice rhyming figure in b: *stutáḥ suta(pāḥ)*, which is echoed by *śrutám* in c.

With Ge I supply ‘speech, word’ vel sim. with *śrutám*, but take the latter as proleptic: “help (the speech) (such that it is) heard,” rather than attributive like Ge’s “dem gehörten (Worte).” I do not, with Old, consider it an early ex. of *śrutá-* meaning ‘learning’.

X.100.2: The publ. tr.’s “bring forward for the taking” loses the etymological figure in *bhárāya ... bharata*, but something like “bring forward for bearing away,” which better captures it, is less idiomatic.

As Ge points out, *bhāgám ṛtvíyam* is found also in I.135.3 (in the nom.), also of Vāyu.

There is no agreement on the meaning or structure of the hapax *krandád-iṣṭi-*, with both the cmpd type and the root affiliation of the 2nd member variably interpr.: Gr “mit Brausen dahineilend,” Ge “der den brausenden (Soma) wünscht” (sim. Re “qui aime (le *soma*) hurlant”), Old (ZDMG 61: 474) “unter Gebrüll sein Suchen betreibend,” Burrow (see Lowe, Part. 272 n. 75) “conquering riches,” Scar (314) “wenn er brausend daherkommt.” It surely should be interpr. in conjunction with the rhyming cmpd *bhandád-iṣṭi-*, likewise a hapax (V.87.1). In both cases I take *-iṣṭi-* to \sqrt{is} ‘desire, seek’ and the cmpd. as a bahuvrīhi with an intrans. (pseudo-)participial 1st member. Here ‘having a roaring quest’ (vel sim.), whose English has been somewhat adjusted for parsability. My interpr. is closest to Old’s quoted above. On these two *-ad-iṣṭaye* cmpds, see comm. ad V.87.1 and Lowe (Part., 270–72, esp. 272 with n. 75). Curiously Lowe does not treat *bhandád-iṣṭi-* and *krandád-iṣṭi-* as parallel and does not commit to a semantic or functional interpr. of either, though his diachronic account of the dev. of non-governing pseudo-participial cmpds is persuasive.

This is the only occurrence of *gaurá-* in the RV that Gr identifies as meaning ‘white’ (as opposed to ‘buffalo’), and his assessment appears to be correct. Although it’s tempting to unify all the RVic occurrences and therefore translate “of the buffalo milk” vel sim. here, EWA (s.v.) indicates that the color term is well represented across both Middle Indic and Middle Iranian languages.

X.100.3: The publ. tr. renders the subjunctive *sāvīṣat* with modal “may he impel”; I would now change to “he will impel.” The point is that we can count on Savitar to provide us with the requisite energy to do our ritual duty.

Note the etym. figure *savitā sāvīṣat*, Savitar often participates in such figures.

The adverbial *pā kavát* ‘guilelessly’ connects semantically with the refrain for the first time.

X.100.4: As in vs. 3, pāda c begins with *yáthā* (actually the āmreḍita *yáthā-yathā*), but the *yáthā*’s have different functions in the two vss. In vs. 3 it introduces a purpose clause, while here it provides a clausal comparison.

The sense and syntactic configuration of c are not agreed upon. Brereton (Ādityas 35, fld. more or less by Klein, Āmreḍitas; see also Ober. Relig. II.183) takes the gods of ab as the subject of *saṃdadhúḥ*: “according to the terms of the alliance they agreed to” (Klein: “precisely as (if) they had made friendship-pacts with us”). However, these interpr. can’t work because the verb is not dual, but the first hemistich only mentions Indra and Soma. Both Ge and Re supply dummy subjects (“man,” “les hommes”) for *saṃdadhúḥ*, with *mitrádhitāni* as obj. I think they are closer to the correct interpr., but I prefer to take *mitrádhitāni* as the subject. From this cmpd I pull *mitrá-* out to serve both as the noun modified by *mitrádhitāni* and as the object, but using different senses of *mitrá-*. As the subj. it means ‘pact, alliance’, as the object ‘ally’ (as it does as

the 1st cmpd member, in my view), yielding “(alliances) concluded by allies bind (them [=allies]) together.” This may seem overly tricky, but it allows the crucial word *mitrá-* to dominate. As for the connection of c to the first hemistich, the idea seems to be that we’re trying to forge the same kind of relationship with the gods as we do with each other.

X.100.5: I take *párus-* as referring to the articulations or joints of the sacrifice, on the basis of X.53.1 *yajñásya vidvān páruṣas cikitvān* “knowing the sacrifice, attentive to its articulation.” On *párus-* in general see comm. ad IX.15.6. For similar phraseology, but with ‘sacrifice’ as obj., see I.3.11 *yajñam dadhe sárasvatī* “Sarasvatī has received our sacrifice.” That the sacrifice is at issue is suggested by pāda c. Alternatively *párus-* could refer to the joint of the soma plant and thence to soma itself (so Gr); for a parallel see III.22.1 *sutām dadhé*. (I favor the first suggestion.) Others (Old, Ge, Re, HPS [119]) take *párus-* as referring to an actual limb or joint, which produces a grotesque image—Indra (or us) with a super-bendable arm or with three arms?!—leading in turn to a watered-down interpr.: that Indra grows strong (Ge n. 5a) or (Old) acquires or grants “Fähigkeit gelenkiger Bewegung.”

X.100.6: Both Ge and Re take *súḁrtam* as the predicate: “Indra’s divine might is well made.” This is of course possible, but the pāda-initial position of *índrasya* and its parallelism with *agnīḥ* in the same position in b support my interpr.

My interpr.—that the sacrifice is *our* dear intimate—may seem somewhat strange, but it should be judged in conjunction with 5c, where the sacrifice is our father. Moreover, *ántama-* overwhelmingly refers to intimacy or nearness to *us*. Both Ge and Re take the more conventional route, assuming that the sacrifice should be dear to the gods (Re: “aux dieux” supplied) or (Ge) “der Kennerschaft genehm,” with an unsupported interpr. of *vidátha-* (found also in his tr. of VII.84.3, adduced as parallel, n. 6c). Both also render the injunc. *bhūt* as a modal, though that is certainly not necessary, and I prefer a preterital interpr.

X.100.7: *duṣḁrtám* plays against *súḁrtam* of 6a, though the accent difference distinguishes the adj. *súḁrta-* (versus *sukṛtá-* ‘good work’) from the nominal *duṣḁrtá-* ‘ill-doing’. As indicated in the publ. intro., in this vs. the refrain becomes an integral part of the vs. as we disavow bad behavior and untruth and lay claim to wholeness and innocence. Tge vs. serves as a rough omphalos, though it is not in the exact center of the hymn. However, the *duṣḁrtám* (6a) : *súḁrtam* (7a) contrast may link vss. 6 and 7, and the two vss. could form an omphalos in the exact center.

Both Ge and Re take the pāda boundary between a and b more seriously than I do: in their interpr. the ill-doing would have been committed in secret, and the god-angering in the open. This seems peculiar to me, as if doing ill in the open would have been ok. Surely what is meant is a categorical denial of ill-doing under any circumstances, in a standard disjunctive merism of the type “neither by day nor by night.”

My rendering of pāda c differs significantly from the standard. Most (Old, Ge, Re, KH [102: reproducing Ge’s tr.]) take the gods, present as voc. *devāḥ*, as 2nd ps. subj. and supply a verb like ‘punish’ (e.g., Ge “Nicht (sollt ihr) Götter uns ... (bestrafen)”). Although this makes reasonable sense after the first hemistich, it still requires supplying a verb out of thin air. It also requires *mākis* to have 2nd ps. reference (lit. “let no one (of you gods) ...”) or to function simply as a prohibitive negative. (That KH cites it in a set of passages with unadorned *mā* would indicate that he takes no account of the *-kis*.) But *mākis* (and *nākis*) have only 3rd ps. reference

and are overwhelmingly nominative (for potential counterexx. and their explanations, see comm. ad X.11.9 and I.147.5). The phrase *ánrtasya vápasah* also does not fit easily into such an interpr.: *vápas-* must be taken as ‘mere/false appearance’, which might lead the gods to punish us wrongly. But though *vápas-* may be an indistinct shape (see comm. ad X.99.3 above), it does not seem to be a false one. My tr. avoids supplying a verb and ascribing 2nd ps. value to *mākis*; we (or rather “no one of us”) remain the subject, and *ánrtasya vápasah* is a genitive of quality.

X.100.8: The phrase *savitā sāviṣat* repeats the same phrase in vs. 3 – a responson that might support the omphalos-structure interpr. (see immed. above). In vs. 3 Savitar impels good things towards the sacrifice and sacrificer; here by contrast he impels bad things away from it.

Both Ge and Re take *ádrayaḥ* as “mountains” (die Berge, les montagnes), an interpr. I find puzzling. The stem *ádri-* is extremely common as a designation for the pressing stones (see, e.g., X.76.2 cited for other reasons below); the alternate term *grāvan-* is found in the next pāda (and in 9a); and the context is entirely a ritual one.

On the unusual usage of the explicit passive *ucyāte* see comm. ad X.64.15, which contains the identical pāda.

X.100.9: The form *sotári* has caused no end of problems, though it seems uncomplicated to me. I take it as the loc. sg. of the well-attested *-tár-*stem *sotár-* ‘presser’, with standard agent-noun value. Here I think it’s a single-word loc. absol.: “when the presser (is there)” / “the presser being (present).” But I seem to be alone in this: see comm. ad X.76.2, which contains the identical form. Here Ge takes it as a nom. sg. modifying *grāvan-*, Re sim., both flg. Old (ZDMG 55), who endorses the Ludwig/Neisser theory that there are nom. sg.’s in *-tari*, which I find implausible; Tichy (*-tar-* p. 60) considers forms in *-tári* to be locatives to verbal abstracts, here “beim Somapressen.” I do not see the need for these evasions of a morphologically straightforward form to a stem whose other 12 occurrences all mean ‘presser’.

X.100.10: As Ge points out (n. 10b), the cows stand for the milk to be mixed with soma.

Ge (n. 10c) flg. Sāy. suggests that the cows’ milk is “medicine” for the soma, presumably because without the milk mixture the soma is intolerably sharp to drink. But the failure to identify which bodies are referred to seems deliberate, and I wonder if the soma+milk is (also?) medicine for our bodies.

X.100.11: The “singer” (*jaritā*) in pāda a is almost surely Agni, not an indefinite mortal ritual officiant (“ein Sänger”: Ge, Scar [332]). Agni was so identified in 6b: *agnír gr̥hé jaritā médhiraḥ kavíḥ*, and in that hemistich Indra was his foil (6a), as he is here (11b).

The referent of *yásya* in c is unclear: *whose* heavenly udder is full for pouring? The only referent in the vicinity is Indra in b, but this doesn’t make much sense. I think it must refer to soma, even though soma is only obliquely referred to, as *suta-* in the gen. pl. *sutávatām* in b.

X.100.12: The final vs. lacks the refrain pāda and is in Triṣṭubh, not the Jagatī of the rest of the hymn. Nonetheless its connection with the preceding vs. is affirmed by the root-noun cmpd *kratu-prā-*, which picks up *kratu-prāvan-* in 11a – and contrasts with *jaraṇi-prā-* in the next pāda, 12b. As the publ. intro. points out, neither the internal structure of the vs. nor its conceptual connection with the rest of the hymn is clear. The first pāda happily celebrates an unidentified

referent, but the second introduces rivals who seem to pose a threat. The second hemistich could be a fragment of a dānastuti -- or not.

Although the referent of *te* in pāda a is not specified, it must be Agni. The bahuvrīhi *citrā-bhānu-*, matched here in the syntagm *citrās te bhānūḥ*, almost always modifies Agni. Moreover *kratuprāḥ* is a variant of *kratuprāvān* in 11a, which, as we just saw, refers to Agni.

The sense of pāda b turns on the meaning of the hapax *jaraṇi-prā-*, obviously coined in opposition to *kratu-prā-*. The pāda sets up a set of rivals (*spṛdhah*), who may (or may not) be menacing (to you, Agni, or to us). The adj. *ádhr̥ṣṭa-* ‘unassailable’ might indicate that they do pose a threat, but *jaraṇi-prā-* has been taken in two opposing senses—though there is general agreement that *jaraṇi-* belongs with *jaraṇā-* ‘old’, *jaraṇā-* ‘old age’, etc. For some (notably Gr, Re, and Scar [332 and 333]), the force of the compound is essentially negative: those qualified by it suffer from the frailty and decrepitude of old age (e.g., Re “qui parachèvent (leur propre) décrépitude”) and therefore are no longer a threat. The problem with this interpr. is that it has to be squared with *ádhr̥ṣṭa-*, and it takes all of Re’s characteristic parenthetical sleight of hand to do so – via the parenthetical “(tout en passant à tort pour) inexpugnables,” an addition for which there is no textual support. With Old and Ge (in somewhat different ways), I think that the cmpd is essentially positive: they “fulfill their old age,” that is, they live a successful life, to full term (escaping early death at our hands or Indra’s) (see Ge’s n. 12b). For the desire to secure old age, see V.41.15, 17 and X.59.4, as well as VII.61.2 (cited by Scar [333]). What is positive for the rivals is of course negative for us. On this interpr., pāda b is a reminder that threats remain, despite the generally sunny outlook of the last few vss.

As for the second hemistich, we can start with the fact that the last word, *duvasyúḥ*, is also, acdg. to the Anukr., the name of the poet (Duvasyu Vāndana). However, this supposed poet is found nowhere else, and it seems best to take the word in the usual sense of its stem (and its variant *duvoyú-*) and related denom. *duvasyá-* ‘offers friendship / friendly service [to a god or gods]’. On this stem, see comm. ad IX.65.3.

Acdg. to Ge (n. 12cd), the subject of the clause is the poet, who is seeking a dakṣinā, in an image drawn from racing for the prize of cows or tracking cows. This seems reasonable, though some of the details are hazy.

The verb *tūtūrsati* is the only attestation of this desid. stem (on which see Heenen [Desid. 154–55], with a fanciful explan. of the long reduplication). It could belong to $\sqrt{tṛ}$ or \sqrt{tvar} , though it is usually ascribed to the former (or a development thereof). Morphologically it seems akin to the perfect optative stem *tuturyā-* (4x), though there is no special connection between their usages. In the publ. tr. I render it “seeks to rush,” though this is not altogether satisfactory. The problem is compounded by immed. flg. *pári*, which does not appear as a preverb with either $\sqrt{tṛ}$ or \sqrt{tvar} . I now think that *pári* has to be considered in conjunction with the heavy opening phrase *rájiṣṭhayā rájyā* “with/in the straightest line”: *pári* ‘around’ provides a strong semantic contrast. My “to round up” attempts to express the contrast, and I think it is fundamentally correct, though I wish there were a better way to integrate the verb and the preverb in Engl. I have no view on the long redupl.

I take the obj. of the round up to be *paśvá ā góḥ ... ágram* “the foremost of bovine stock,” but the supposed gen. phrase is problematic both because of *paśváḥ* and of *ā*. To take the latter first, the pāda-final phrase *ā góḥ* occurs three times elsewhere, all in Maṇḍala IV (IV.3.9, 22.4, 23.6). In none of these passages is its function or even the case form of *góḥ* clear (see comm. ad locc.); at least twice it may be an abl., which would make better sense of *ā*. However, here I think the phrase should be gen. with *ágram*. As for *paśváḥ*, is it being used to generalize the *góḥ*, as in

my tr. “bovine *stock*” (cf. Ge “der Rinderherde”; Re “bétail (consistant en) vache(s)”) – or does it refer to a distinct animal, as in Watkins’ (1979 Folk Taxonomy of Wealth,” 278 = 1994 Sel.Wr. II, 653) “sheep (and) cow,” metonymically “flock (and) herd” (for disc. see Sojkova, 2022, *Animals in Vedic Prose*, DPhil. diss. Oxford Univ., pp. 31–32)?

The noun *ráji-* ‘line’ is found only here, with differently accented *rají-* occurring in X.105.2 (see comm. ad loc.). On the accentuation see Lub. (Nominal Acc. 30), who considers the form here the accentually innovating one, perhaps because of its occurrence in a phrase containing *rájiṣṭha-*.

X.101 All Gods or Priest(s)

X.101.1–2: The first two vss. contain seven straight 2nd pl. mid. impvs in *-dhvam*, five of them in vs. 2. Of those in vs. 2, four are identical (or almost): *kṛṇudhvam* (a, b, c) ~ *íṣkṛṇudhvam* (c). The repetition of this heavy clump of morphology makes a marked impression, quite distinct from the usual fleet and quicksilver RVic style. It may be meant to imitate the rhythmic predictability of a work song. In any case it gives a more demotic impression.

The last pāda of vs. 2 breaks the string of middle impvs. with an active 2nd pl. impv., *prā nayatā*, followed by one opening vs. 3, *yunákta*. But there’s a last gasp of *-dhvam* in (*vī*) ... *tanudhvam* closing 3a, replicating (*ā*) *tanudhvam* at the end of 2a. Another clutch of *kṛṇudhvam-*s is found in vss. 7–8 and some more *-dhvam-*s in vss. 10–11.

X.101.1: The first verb of the hymn *úd budhyadhvam* may be responsible for the name of the poet in the Anukramaṇī, Budha. On the name see Ge’s n. 2 (bottom of page).

Agni and Uṣas are of course associated with Dawn and the early morning sacrifice. The presence of Dadhikrā, the deified racehorse, is somewhat puzzling. Re (Hymnes spéc.) says he is the/a “symbole du lever du jour,” though without specifying on what basis he claims this. It’s true that Dadhikrā is compared to the sun at the end of the first hymn dedicated to him, IV.38.10, but that’s not quite the same thing. Our pāda is also found in III.20.5, but as part of a longer list of divinities. For one possible reason for the inclusion of Dadhikrā here, see below ad vs. 11.

X.101.2: This vs. produces a plethora of images drawn from ordinary life as comparanda for the priests’ work. This skipping from image to image is anchored by the repetition of *-dhvam* noted above.

Ge (fld. by Re, HySpéc [but not EVP XVI], Don.) takes *dhíyaḥ* with the first verb: “Machet die Gedanken wohlgefällig.” But this is grammatically impossible: *dhíyaḥ* is fem. acc. pl., and so neut. acc. pl. *mandrá* cannot modify it (would need to be *mandráḥ* in sandhi). I gather from his n. 2a that he takes *mandrá kṛ* as a phrasal verb, but positing such a construction requires more argumentation. Old points out that *mandrá-* and *dhī-* are associated in IX.86.17, but I don’t see that as a sufficient reason to contravene the syntax.

X.101.3–6: These four vss. fall into two pairs, with 4 essentially repeating 3(ab) and 6 repeating 5.

X.101.3: There’s a common metaphorical connection in Vedic (and later) between sowing seed for crops and semen to impregnate a woman, but the metaphor usually goes the other way: the

furrow is the metaphor for the vagina. Here it's the vagina that's a metaphor for the furrow in an agricultural context. (Of course the whole thing is metaphorical for the priests' work.)

The second hemistich indirectly expresses the reciprocity that underlies the RVic ritual system: that the response to a praise hymn should be equal to it, though in material form.

The accent on *ásat* suggests that *ca* is subordinating; so the standard tr.

X.101.5: Note the rhyming heavy 2nd pl. active impvs. ending the first two pādas: *kṛṇotana ... dadhātana*.

As Ge (n. 5b) points out, these must be the cords attached to the buckets.

X.101.6: As was noted above, 6 is a version of 5, with the same lexical materials, scrambled and recombined.

X.101.7: The reason for the stress on the well in vss. 5–6 becomes clear here in the 2nd hemistich, where the features of the well are identified with parts of the soma apparatus in equational bahuvrīhis.

X.101.8: I don't quite understand why we should make a "pen" (*vrajám*) for soma: perhaps because if it provides drink, it must be like a cow and need a pen.

In d *vaḥ* was omitted from the tr. Correct to "your beaker."

X.101.9: The standard tr. (Ge, Re, Don, though see Ge n. 9 for possible alternative) are agreed that *dhíyam* here refers to the gods' thought. I think it must rather refer to *our* thought. The position of *vaḥ* immediately before *dhíyam* is of course not probative, since *vaḥ* is in standard Wackernagel's Position and can be construed with anything in the clause (including *ūtáye*, as Ge suggests in n. 9). The plural *dhíyah* in 2a clearly referred to our thoughts. The image of the *dhī-* as a milk-yielding cow does not require her to be a creature from the gods. Instead she represents the usual reciprocity relationship (as seen also in 3cd): if our thought=cow pleases you gods, she will yield milk in the shape of material rewards from you.

On *duhīyāt* see comm. ad IV.41.5.

X.101.10: These images of the soma pressing need decoding. The "lap of wood" in pāda a is presumably the wooden cup. In b the publ. tr. takes the object also as the wooden cup, in part flg. an unpubl. paper by HPS. However, I now think (with Old) that the "axes of stone" (*vásībhiḥ ... aśmanváyībhiḥ*) are the pressing stones, based esp. on 7c *ásma-cakra-* 'whose wheel is the (pressing) stone'. Soma is then the object, and I would emend the tr. to "Fashion (it [=soma]) with axes made of stone."

The 10 girthbands are the fingers (so Old, Ge, Re [HSpéc]); cf. X.94.7 *dásakakṣyebhyaḥ*, modifying the pressing stones. The object here should therefore also be the stones and not soma. So I would emend to "Embrace (them [=stones]) with ten girthbands." The two chariot poles in pāda are the hands and the draught horse the soma (so Old, Ge, Don for both identifications). I think this is probably right, but if *váhni-* is soma, it must be the soma *plant*, not the pressed juice, for the image to work, since juice can't be yoked to the implements that pressed it – even though the pressed juice is already referred to in pāda a. It is also possible that the two are the pressing stones.

X.101.11: As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn takes a surprisingly erotic turn at this point. Pāda a essentially repeats 10d, with *ubhé dhúrau váhniḥ* “the two chariot poles ... the draught horse”; again, I think the horse must be the soma plant and the chariot poles may be either the hands or the pressing stones. But an erotic simile is applied to this trio: a man, comparable to the draught horse, with two wives, comparable to the two chariot poles.

On *pībd-* see comm. ad VI.46.6 and EWA s.v. *PAD*: ‘sich hin und her [auf den einen und anderen Fuss] fallen lassend, stampfend’ citing Strunk and Gotō for this interpr. as an iterative. A stronger iterative sense would fit this sexual passage well, esp. give the two wives.

The *vānāspati-* is presumably soma, placed in the cup, but given the simile of b probably also the penis in the *yóni*.

The final pāda has two competing syntactic interpr. One, which is essentially universal in the standard tr., is that *útsam* is the obj. both of *ní ... dadhidhvam* and of the negated pres. part. *ákhānantaḥ* -- e.g., Don “sink the well deep without digging.” The other, found in the publ. tr., is that the obj. of pāda c, *vānāspátim*, is the obj. of the main verb, with *útsam* obj. only of the participle. The reason for my interpr. is that *ní ... dadhidhvam* seems the logically next action after *ásthāpayadhvam* and should take the same object (see the next vs. for syntactic continuity), and the deeper foundation of the soma / deeper penetration of the penis is what is demanded. This can be effected without digging a well/spring. But since I don’t really understand the image of the spring/well (and none of the tr. attempts to explain it), the standard view is not excluded.

Note that *dadhidhvam* is a near-rhyme with *dadhikráṁ* in the first vs. (1c), providing a sort of phonological ring composition, which might help account for the presence of that racehorse in this hymn.

X.101.12: Since the penis is the overt object of a set of 2nd pl. movement verbs, my interpr. of it as the object of *ní ... dadhidhvam* in 11d seems to gain some support.

It is hard not to be reminded here of the Sappho fragment “raise high the roofbeam, carpenters” (here filtered through the J. D. Salinger) in a wedding context.

The feminine name (or nickname) *niṣṭigrī-* is found only here. In context it is a designation of Indra’s mother. The word is treated by Scar (112) and, at greater length, Remmer (*Frauennamen* 63–64), but the disc. doesn’t get us very far.

X.102 Mudgala and Mudgalānī

For my general interpr. of this famous hymn, see the publ. intro. As I say there, I consider the hymn to be part of the under-the-surface debate in the late RV about the introduction of the ritual Patnī – in this case, very much in favor of this introduction, as she leads to victory and fertility. For disc. of this hymn in that context, see my 2018 “‘Sacrificer’s Wife’ in the *Rgveda*: Ritual Innovation?” (*Creating the Veda, Living the Veda*, papers from 13th World Skt. Conf., ed. Brereton and Proferes, 19–30, esp. 23–25), also “The Secret Lives of Texts” (JAOS Pres. Address, JAOS 131 [2011], esp. 5–6) and, in earlier form, *SW/SW*(1996): 108–10.

It is striking that this hymn immediately follows the final, explicitly sexual vs. of the preceding hymn, X.101.12. In addition the “chariot pole” that figures in X.101.10, 11 is found here in vs. 10.

X.102.1: The speaker of the first vs. is taken by Ge (fld. by Don) as Mudgala; this seems reasonable. But this identification has further implications, given the enclitic pronouns *te* (a) and *naḥ* (d). Since Indra is in the 3rd ps. in this vs. (b *índro avatu*), the *te* can only refer to Mudgalānī,

and it must identify the chariot as “yours” (namely, hers). The *nah* (Samhitā *no*) would then refer to the two of them or, perhaps, to their general household. If the former, the number is wrong – unless the form should really be dual **nau*, i.e., *nāv* in sandhi. As HvN point out in their metrical comm., “Exceptionally, -o in no should be scanned as long before a following vowel to avoid the uncommon cadence ~~~~.” If the original enclitic was dual *nau*, however, this metrical license isn’t necessary, since it would scan as *nāv* before vowel – and the sense is better as well. The tr. could be changed to “help *us two.”

Most tr. render *mīthūkṛtam* as ‘wrongly made’ vel sim.: e.g., Brereton 2002: 227 ‘wrongly used’, Scarlatta (78) ‘auf falsche Weise gefertigt, unbrauchbar’, Ge ‘vertauschten’ (the lexeme *mīthū kṛ* further glossed in n. 1ab as ‘verwechseln, vertauschen, falsch, verkehrt machen’), Don ‘perversely transformed’ (resting, I think, on Ge). But the second member is not ppl. *kṛtā-* but the root noun *kṛt-*, and X-*kṛt-* compounds are always transitive or, at least, active in sense – not passive, as most tr. assume for this one. Scar indeed asserts that *-kṛt-* is passive here, and Ge clearly favors the passive interpr., though in the n. he allows for an active sense “Fehler machend, umschmeissend.” In the publ. tr. I go with the passive interp. ‘wrongly made’ as one reading, but I would now substitute an active ‘wrongly functioning’. In addition, and more important, I think this word is a pun, with *mīthū* referencing *mīthunā-* ‘(sexual) pair’: “forming a sexual pair” looks forward to the successful sexual pairing effected by the chariot race.

Vs. 3 of the Agastya–Lopāmudrā hymn, which also treats fraught gender relations, also contains both *mīthunā-* and *ājī-*.

X.102.2: In her first appearance in the hymn (save for, probably, the ungendered *te* in 1a), Mudgalānī appears both as a victorious charioteer and as a highly sexualized female. The wind whipping up her dress in pāda a reminds us of the many Apsarases in the epic who seduce ascetics through the judicious application of a breeze to their filmy garments.

At least in this hymn *sma* + present seems to have the function of a past iterative/durative; see also 4b *sma ... eti* and 6d *ṛchānti sma*.

On the dicing idiom *kṛtām ví√ci*, see comm. ad X.42.9.

X.102.3: This vs. is in Bṛhatī, like the first and final (12) vss. of the hymn, unlike the Triṣṭubh of the rest. It also has nothing to do with the specifics of the hymn, being a conventional plea to Indra for help in combat. (Vss. 1 and 12 are also somewhat distant from the hymn in sense, but closer than this one.) I do not know why this intrusive vs. is found here; it actually disrupts the depiction of the race and introduces an incongruous scene of general warfare.

On *abhi√dās*, see Narten (Sig. Aor. 140; also KZ 78: 56ff.). She considers it a secondary root, based on an *s*-aor. subjunctive.

It is worth noting (but probably not pursuing) that Indra is asked to parry his own signature weapon, the *vajra*, presumably in the hands of another; the *vadhá-* in d that he is asked to keep away is also often his. (This issue is also raised by Don, n. 6.)

X.102.4: The bull that is one of the yoked team that Mudgalānī controls makes its appearance.

The stem *kūṭa-* is rare to non-existent in Skt. outside of this passage (see Ge n. 4b, EWA s.v.; the interpr. owing to Neisser), but is found in Pāli as a word for ‘hammer’ (*kūṭa*³ in Cone, Dict. of Pāli; see also *aya-kūṭa-*). It seems likely (to me) to be a specialization of *kūṭa*¹ ‘a prominence or projection; a horn; a summit, a peak’. Here it seems to be used as a nickname for the bull, characterizing its assaultive intensity and persistence. For a similar nickname, cf. Matt

“the Hammer” Hamill, a “mixed marital artist and wrestler,” whose profile is available on the web.

Ge suggests (n. 4b) that *ṭṛṃhát ... eti* is almost a periphrastic. Although I am generally sympathetic to periphrastic analyses, in this case I think *eti* should be interpr. as a full lexical verb, with *sma* (on which see comm. ad vs. 2), meaning “kept going” – that is, nothing kept him from running the full race.

ṭṛṃhát is the only form of the nasal infix pres. in RV, but it is robustly attested in the AV (both Ś and P). *Pace* Gr, the expected form here is not **ṭṛṃhán*, since neut. *kūṭam* is the subject.

X.102.5: The first hemistich describes how the efforts of the opponents/competitors to check the progress of the bull – against which, as we saw in 4b, he “kept going.” As Ge (n. 5ab) and Don (n. 8) point out, the animal would be forced to stop either to roar or to piss.

X.102.6: The form *kakárdave* is a hapax and has received a variety of interpr. Gr takes it as dat. to a *-u*-stem meaning “der Knurren in den Eingeweiden” (rumbling in the guts), Ge as loc. to an *-a*-stem, an onomatopoeic word for the cart or its shaft. Old dithers around these various possibilities, but suggests that it is best to leave the word unerklärt, an opinion apparently shared by EWA (s.v.). (Don tr. it as a verb [“rumbled”], with Gr’s semantics, but no indication of how she sees the morphology.) I am strongly drawn to, and in fact persuaded by, a suggestion of Dumézil’s (*Nouvelle Clio*, 1953: 261–62; repeated and rediscussed in *Mariages indo-européens* 1979: 282ff., esp. 288–89), reported by Re (ÉVP XVI ad loc.). Dumézil suggests that the word contains the cross-linguistically common nursery word *kaka* for excrement. As for the rest of the form, he half-heartedly suggests that roots or enlargements containing the phonological sequence *-ard* are “fréquents dans cette zone sémantique” (1953: 262 = 1979: 289 n. 1), a rather hazy explanation. I suggest rather that it contains a form of the root \sqrt{rd} ‘shake (out), scatter, spray’. As Dumézil points out, this interpr. of a dat. *kakárdave* as “ut stercus faceret” fits well not only with the companion verb *ameháyan* ‘made piss’ in 5b but also with the droppings that hit Mudgalānī in 6d. I construe this dative with *yuktáḥ* ‘yoked’ in the sense of ‘employed, set to the task’, since I see this startling image – of the bull droppings hitting Mudgalānī as she drives – in this middle vs. of the hymn as establishing a perverse type of sexual contact between bull and woman, which sets up her gaining of fertility at the end of the hymn.

The apparent intensive *ávāvacīt* is found only here, and is ordinarily assigned to the root \sqrt{vac} ‘speak’, but I think it makes much more sense to assign it to $\sqrt{vañc}$ ‘move crookedly’. Ge (n. 6b) explicitly rejects Roth’s suggestion to this effect, as does Schaeffer (Intens. 176–77; she tr. “redete unaufhörlich,” which at least fits the context better than Ge’s simple “schrie”). Schaeffer asserts that roots of the shape *KeRK* always have the R represented in intensive redupl., and we should therefore expect ***vaṃvañc-*, which could later be replaced by the grammarians’ *vanīvañc-*. I don’t consider intensive redupl. to be as well regulated as she claims, and in particular the ambiguity of long-redupl. perfects like *rārandh-* (with impv. *rārandhī* VI.25.9), interpr. by many as an intens., would allow the nonce creation of an intens. stem *vāvac-* to $\sqrt{vañc}$ here. Such a root assignment fits the context much better: Mudgalānī keeps dodging the bull’s turds, but unsuccessfully. Rendering it as crying out or speaking incessantly adds nothing to the passage.

The nom. phrase *sāraṭhiḥ ... keśī* “long-haired charioteer” should be masc. In its other occurrences *sāraṭhi-* has masc. reference, and feminines to *-īn-* stems are in *īn-ī* (see, in fact, fem. pl. *keśīnīḥ* 2x), not *-ī*. However, the gender-ambiguous *vṛkī-* form *rathīḥ* in 2c, used of

Mudgalānī, has prepared the way for a fem. interpr. of *sāraṭhiḥ* here, and of course the nom. sg. *keśī* looks like a nom. sg. to a *devī*-type fem. Ge (n. 6b) and Don (n. 10) claim that the long hair identifies the subject as a woman, but since masc. *keśīn-* is used a number of times of male munis (ascetics) in X.136, this claim is not straightforward.

In c “bull” should be in parens, since it doesn’t appear in the Skt.

The adjacency of *niṣpādo mudgalānīm* “the droppings Mudgalānī” is nicely iconic, since the droppings do in fact touch the woman.

X.102.7–8: These vss. depict the yoking of the ill-assorted pair, the bull (vs. 7) and the piece of wood (vs. 8), as the team for the race. It is not initially clear if this yoking actually precedes the headlong race described in vss. 4–5 or whether this represents a new stage in the proceedings. My surmise is the former – that is, as in other RVic narratives the events have been scrambled and some episodes are duplicated. The first description of the race in vss. 4–5 simply omits mention of the piece of wood, while in vss. 7–10 the full measure of the accomplishment – a victory despite a faulty team – is emphasized. One of my reasons for thinking this is that Mudgala’s win is described in almost identical terms in 5cd and 9cd:

5cd *tēna ... śatāvataḥ saḥāśraṃ, gāvāṃ mūdgalah ... jigāya*

9cd *yēna jigāya śatāvataḥ saḥāśraṃ, gāvāṃ mūdgalah ...*

This near-identity suggests that the two statements are summarizing the same event.

X.102.7: The word *pradhī-* seems to refer to a part of a wheel that can come in segments (see I.164.48, IV.30.5 for explicitly numbered *pradhī-* and II.39.4 for dual *pradhī*). Scar (267) lists it with other *-dhī-* compounds but makes no further remarks. Ge (n. 7a) thinks it refers the wheel-rim (Radkranz, like “later” *nemī-* [though *nemī-* is well attested already in the core RV]), constructed of boards/planks (Brettern). This doesn’t seem like it would produce a smoothly running and swift chariot, but I don’t know enough about archaic wheel construction to judge. Nonetheless, I would think it referred to some part of the wheel that didn’t have contact with the ground.

The publ. tr. contains an awkward doubling of the word ‘bull’ – representing both *vāṃsaga-* in b and *kakúdmant-* in d. The rendering of the latter should be corrected to “humpbacked (bull),” with bull in parens. The full phrase is found in X.8.2 *vṛṣabhāḥ kakúdmān*. The prior term *vāṃsaga-* is more problematic. Don tr. ‘steer’ and (n. 13) identifies it as “the castrated bull” as a metaphor for the wooden club yoked and contrasted with the virile bull, the “husband of the cows” in pāda c. I think she may have been hastily misled by German “Stier” (Gr’s gloss and Ge’s tr. of *vāṃsaga-*), which is not the direct semantic equivalent of English steer, but refers more generally to bulls. And certainly elsewhere *vāṃsaga-* is compared to a *vṛṣan-* (I.7.8). Moreover, Indra himself is compared to a *vāṃsaga-* (e.g., I.55.1, 130.2, VIII.33.2), and it seems unlikely that the super-virile Indra would regularly be compared to a castrated animal. The virility of the animal is suggested by, e.g., X.144.3, where it is found “among his own females” (*āsú svāsu*). I tr. the word as ‘buffalo’ sometimes elsewhere, in part following EWA’s gloss ‘Stier, Büffelbulle’ and in part because some of the behavior of the *vāṃsaga* seems like that of a wild animal: sharpening its horns (I.55.1, VI.16.39) and thirstily approaching to drink (I.130.2, V.36.1, VIII.33.2). Esp. telling are V.36.1, where the thirsty animal is *dhanvacará-* ‘roaming the wastelands’, and VIII.33.2, where the thirsty animal is ‘following its own track’ (*svabdīn-*, on which see comm. ad loc.). In any case in our vs. I think there is only one male bovine at issue – the virile bull, yoked by Indra.

X.102.8: To harmonize with the other occurrences of *áṣṭrā-* (IV.57.4, VI.53.9, 57.2), I would change the tr. of *aṣṭrāvín-* to ‘goad in hand’. The subject is probably Mudgala, though the goad and the *kaparda-* hairstyle are also characteristic of Pūṣan, as Old points out (see also Ge n. 8ab and Don n. 14).

The goad and strap also appear in the agricultural hymn IV.57.4 in conjunction with *śunám*: *śunám varatrā badhyantām, śunám áṣṭrām úd ingaya* “For prosperity let the straps be bound; for prosperity brandish the goad.” In that vs. I take *śunám* as an adverbial acc.; here I construe it with *acarat* “achieved prosperity,” more lit. “practiced / proceeded to.” It would be possible to take *acarat* as a (quasi-)aux. with *ānāhyamānaḥ* “continued to / kept binding,” but I think the point here is that the binding needs to be done quickly and efficiently.

As for *varatrā-* ‘strap’, see X.60.8, where a yoke is tied with a *varatrā-*.

In IV.22.9 I tr. *kṛṇuhi ... nṛmṇāni* as “activate your manly powers,” arguing (comm. ad loc.) that *nṛmṇā-* does not refer to manly deeds but the abstract powers that allow these deeds to be performed. Such an interpr. works better here as well, since the yoking just performed makes it possible for the chariot victory to be achieved. This is directly expressed by the end of d *táviṣṭr adhatta* “he assumed his powers.” I would therefore emend the tr. to “activating his manly abilities.”

I am not sure who the “many folk” (*bahú-jána-*) are or why they are the beneficiaries of this action. Quite possibly the spectators, who will speak the next vss. (9–10).

I am in agreement with Ge (n. 8cd) and Don that the subject in the 2nd hemistich changes to the bull.

X.102.9–10: These two vss. are the direct speech of the spectators watching the unexpected victory. So also, e.g., Ge and Don. They in fact include vs. 11 in this direct speech section, but I consider it a summary vs. and the “moral” of the hymn.

X.102.9: On the root noun *yúj-* and the “strong” forms *yúnjam* (here) and du. *yúnjā* (I.162.21) see Schindler (Rt noun s.v.), who takes these forms as secondarily strengthened on the model of paradigms like *sánt-/sát-*, with the weak pres. stem *yuñj-* as the basis. Our form occurs at the end of a Triṣṭubh line, where the ordinary acc. sg. *yújam* wouldn’t fit; *yújam* is fairly common in the iambic cadence of dimeter lines. As for dual *yúnjam*, its metrical position also favors a heavy syllable; see comm. ad loc.

The position of the wooden club is expressed in phraseology very similar to that of Vṛtra after his smiting in the famous Indra-Vṛtra hymn, I.32.10: *kāṣṭhānām mādhye níhitam śárīram* “his body sunk down in the middle of the race courses” versus our *kāṣṭhāyā mādhye drughaṇām śáyānam*. Although that particular pāda in I.32 does not have a form of $\sqrt{śi}$ ‘lie’, it is the signature verb of that section of the hymn and our *śáyānam* may be meant to recall the larger context. I find it hard not to interpret the expression here as a direct echo of that well-known hymn.

On the second hemistich, see comm. ad 7–8 above.

X.102.10: With others, I consider this vs. to concern the wooden club, which was also the focus of attention in vs. 9. However, I think the club is assimilated to Mudgala, who (in my view) has been impotent and inert like a piece of wood. But just as the club has pulled off an improbable victory in the race, so Mudgala has (re)gained his potency. The key to this interpr. is pāda b, with

the verb *āsthāpayanti* “they make mount.” On the one hand, as Ge (n. 10) suggests, after the race the bystanders just pick up the club and put it on the cart – as opposed to its yokemate, the bull, who will be fed, watered, and possibly allowed access to the waiting cows. On the other hand, ‘mount’ can be meant sexually (see the use of *āsthāpayadhvam* in the immed. preceding hymn, X.101.11), and so we can infer that Mudgala has recovered his sexual powers and can mount his wife. The negatively viewed excreta of vss. 5–6 have been, in some sense, transformed into positive sexuality, as is even clearer in vs. 11.

The apparent nonsequitur of the last pāda, with “the higher end of the chariot pole” (*úttaro dhurāḥ*), is, again in my view, a reference to the new ritual model with the Sacrificer’s Patnī. As disc. in my 2018 art. cited above (22–25), the chariot pole, with one side slightly higher, is a metaphor for the new ritual pairing, with husband and wife both yoked to the same pole, but his side somewhat higher. In our vs. the husband’s (/wooden club’s) side is given a slight edge, but an almost equal yoking is necessary for the chariot to go forward.

X.102.11: As noted above, although Ge (/Don) consider this vs. part of the spectators’ reactive direct speech, I take it instead as a summary of the successful outcome of the race: the recovery of the fertility of both Mudgala and Mudgalānī (and, by extension, the success of the new ritual model). It is in essence the last vs. of the hymn narrative, since vs. 12 is in a different meter and celebrates Indra. The 1st person speakers of the second hemistich of vs. 11 are not the narrative-internal spectators but the ritual officiants who have recited the hymn and express their hope for similar success from their ritual performance. The “charioteer” (*rathī-*) in c is a metaphorical reference to the ritual Patnī, identified with Mudgalānī the charioteer(ess) in the narrative just recounted.

On the “Avoided Wife” (*parivṛktā*) esp. in the later ritual lit. (there usually *parivṛktī*), see my *SW/SW* 99–110. One likely reason she is “avoided” is that she has failed to have children (/sons), and here she recovers her husband by “swelling” – that is, lactating as a consequence of birth -- itself a consequence of his “dripping” with semen, as a sign of the recovery of his potency. The dripping is in turn a sort of transformation of the bull’s pissing in vs. 4. Ge (n. 11b, with his tr. fld. by Don) considers masculine *siñcān* as a substitute for fem. *siñcāntī* at pāda-end, so that she would be both swelling and dripping. But the image of both members of the married couple exuding fertile fluid is surely stronger than assigning it only to her, and a poet capable of composing this complex hymn could surely have found a way to incorporate the fem. part. *siñcāntī* had he intended that form.

The “poor (water) wheel” is presumably a little deprecatory joke.

The hapax *eṣaiṣī-* has been variously analyzed; see some of the possibilities laid out by Old. I follow Old and Ge (n. 11c) in taking it as built to an adj. **eṣā-* ‘swift’, which has been doubled to produce a colloquial emphatic: ‘super-swift, swifter than swift’. A very similar formation is found in the next hymn, X.103.1 *ghanāghanā-* ‘smiting again and again’. The *-ī-* fem. is due to matching that of *rathī-* (so Old).

On *sīna-* see comm. ad II.30.2, where I suggest ‘gear’ as a gloss. In *sīnavant-* here I think it refers to material winnings, in contrast to non-material *sumāṅgāla-* ‘bringing good luck’.

X.102.12: As noted previously, this vs. is in Bṛhatī, like the 1st vs. and vs. 3. It celebrates Indra, who engineered the victory of Mudgala and Mudgalānī. The first hemistich is generic – and somewhat off-kilter -- praise of the god: why is Indra called “the eye of the world”? The second half briskly summarizes the point of the hymn narrative – particularly the yoking of a virile bull

with a impotent castrate – though without the telling details. Although Ge (fld. by Don) takes Mudgala to be the speaker, I see no reason for this assignment.

I follow Old and Ge (12cd) in taking *vṛṣṇā* as an irregularly distracted instr. sg. (beside *vṛṣṇā* 2x), not a dual. One of the two occurrences of *vṛṣṇā* is in fact in the next hymn, X.103.2, and (faulty) distraction is possible there too. Though most of X.103 is in Triṣṭubh and the form is in a good Triṣṭubhs cadence (... *-hastena vṛṣṇā*), two of the three other pāda in this vs. are actually Jagatīs with the cadences *jīṣṇúnā* (a) and *dhrṣṇúnā* (b), so **vṛṣṇā* (d) would be possible (though producing a light penult); a similar faulty distraction would also be possible in c: *sahadh^uvam*.

X.103 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., there is considerable lexical chaining in the hymn.

This hymn has several features reminiscent of the previous one; see comments esp. to vss. 1 and 2.

X.103.1: The passages collected by Ge (n. 1a) make it clear that “horns” should be supplied in the simile. Ge also supplies “weapons” as object in the frame, while I take the participle simply as reflexive. Ge’s addition is certainly possible.

As noted ad X.102.11, the hapax double cmpd here *ghanāghaná-* ‘smiting and smiting, smiting again and again’ is constructed like *eṣaiṣṭ-* in X.102.11, if the latter’s analysis as *eṣa-eṣá-* / *-ṭ* is correct. Note also that the base *ghaná-* is found in the unique cmpd *dru-ghaná-* ‘wooden club’, which in X.102.9 is yoked with the bull for Mudgalānī’s chariot race.

Although *saṃkrāndana-* is glossed as intrans. (Gr ‘brüllend’; Ge’s “Heerrufer” is ambig.), *-ana-* nominals ordinarily pattern with *-āya-* verbs and have transitive value; see in fact *kṣóbhana-* in the preceding pāda. Here I supply as its obj. the *carṣaṇí-* that is construed with *kṣóbhana-* in b.

X.103.2: The already heavy phrase *saṃkrāndano ’nimīṣāḥ* of 1b becomes even more so in its instr. transformation *saṃkrāndanenānimīṣéṇa* in 2a. The lexical chaining is initiated with a bang! Note that this transformation eliminates the caesura in this pāda (as HvN point out), a lack that would focus even more attention on the heavy phrase.

Note the rhyming and morphologically parallel finals of the first two pādas: ... *jīṣṇúnā* # (a), ... *dhrṣṇúnā* # (b). This figure would draw attention to the fact that these two pādas are Jagatīs in an otherwise Triṣṭubh hymn (save for the final vs. 13: Anuṣṭubh). As noted ad X.102.12, one of the two occurrences of instr. sg. *vṛṣṇā* is found at the end of our d, in contrast to distracted *vṛṣṇā* in X.102.12. I suggest there that the *vṛṣṇā* here could possibly be read distracted, given the Jagatī cadences of the first two pādas of the vs. Of course, this would produce a bad cadence, with light penult, but I think it’s possible that the distraction possibility was lurking in the background – esp. since the final of c, *sahadhvam*, could also be read *sahadh^uvam*, with the same light penult, but a match to the Jagatī cadence of a and b.

The string of *-ana-* forms continues with *duś-cyavana-*. The transitive value of *cyávana-* is maintained, but with the modified nominal as obj. not subj.

X.103.3: The most salient ex. of lexical chaining is *īṣuhastaiḥ* picking up *īṣuhastena* in 2d, but *yúdhaḥ* in b matches *yúdhaḥ* in 2d (and *yut-* in *yutkārēṇa* in 2b). There is internal chaining between the forms of *sám* √ *srj* in b and c: agent noun *sámsraṣṭā* and ppl. *sámsrṣṭa-jít-*.

The tr. of *vas̥t* as ‘willful’ is misleading; I’d now substitute ‘exerting his will / who exerts his will’.

X.103.4: No chaining between 3 and 4, save for *yudhā* in c picking up the various *yudh*- forms in 2 and 3. The intrusion of Bṛhaspati is surprising; even as an alloform of Indra, he is not usually excessively martial, but he certainly is here. HPS (B+I 100) suggests that Bṛhaspati is here Indra’s Hauptpriester and his charioteer, reciting Zaubersprüche. But the vs. shows him in a more physically active role than that of priest; vs. 8 ties him more directly to ritual activity.

The phrase in pāda a *pāri dīyā ráthena* is addressed to Parjanya in V.83.7, where it makes more sense. As Ge (n. 4d) points out, pāda d is almost identical to VII.32.11c, addressed to Indra. This Bṛhaspati vs. seems to have been assembled from spare parts.

X.103.5: This vs. returns to Indra and modulates through a series of phonological and etymological figures: *sthávirah pravīrah ... / abhívīrah → abhívīro abhísatvā, sáhasvān ... sáhamāna(h) ... / ... sahojá.*

právirā-, abhívīra-, abhísatvan- are found only here in the RV and so their preverbal prefixes must meaningfully contrast.

X.103.6: After a few vss. without chaining, this vs. has numerous echoes in what precedes: *gotrabhídam govídam* opening pāda a pick up the *go-* of *govít*, which ends 5d: in fact, of course, *govit* and *govídam* belong to the same stem, and *gotrabhídam govídam* also rhyme. Still in a, *vájrabāhum* picks up *bāhuśardhī* in 3c; *jáyantam* in b *jáyan* in 4c; *pramṛṇántam* in b *pramṛṇáh* in 4c; and in c *vīrayadhvam* echoes *právirah ... abhívīrah* in 5a, c.

In d “Indra” should be substituted for “him,” an oversight in the publ. tr.

X.103.7: This vs. is a veritable “greatest hits” of the hymns so far: *gotrá-* (see *gotra-bhíd-* 6a); *sáhasā* and (*prtānā-*)*śāt* (see *√sah* forms in 5, also 2c); *vīrah* (see 5 and 6); *duścyavaná-* (2b); *ayudhyáh* and *yutsú* (various *yudh* forms: 2b, 2d, 3b, 4c, *sénā-* (1d, 4c), *avatu* (4d).

X.103.8: As noted above ad vs. 4, Bṛhaspati is here in a priestly (as well as martial) context.

In c *√bhañj* (*abhibhañjatīnām*), *sénā-* (*devasenānām*), and *√ji* (*jáyantīnām*) recur from 4c *prabhañján sénāh ... jáyan*, but in vs. 4 the *sénāh* were objects of *√bhañj* and *√ji*, whereas here it is the armies themselves that do the shattering and conquering. This is typical of the shifting use of the repeated lexical items in this hymn.

The Maruts make their first appearance here.

X.103.9: The Maruts recur here, and Varuṇa and the Ādityas are introduced. The pres. part. *jáyant-* is found again (see vss. 4 and 8).

The compd. *bhuvana-cyavānām* echoes *duś-cyavaná-* (2b, 7c), but the echo *-ānām / -aná-* is morphologically misleading, since *-cyavānām* is the gen. pl. of *-cyavá-*.

X.103.10: The vs. is structured by the *úd* opening all four pādas. The first is construed with the 2nd sg. impv. (*(d)harṣaya* (*√hr̥ṣ*) in pāda a, the last with the 3rd pl. impv. *yantu*. Since the nouns in b and c are neut. pl., they can either be objects of the verb in pāda a or subjects of the verb in d. I chose the former (as did Ge), but the latter is not impossible.

More repetitions: *sátvan-* (5c *abhí-satvan-*), *mánas-* (9c *mahā-manasām*, which partly overlaps with *māmakānām* preceding *mānāṃsi* here); *rátha-* (4a, 4d, 5d), *jáyant-* (4b, 8d, 9d), *ghóṣa-* (9d).

The peculiar deriv. *māmakā-* of the gen. sg. 1st ps. pronoun *māma* is striking. It is curious to find this diminutive/deprecatory type of formation in this highly martial context. Perhaps the tone is one of proprietary affection.

X.103.11: Like vs. 10, this vs. has identical openings to all four pādas, the emphatic 1st pl. pronoun, with a slight variation in the final pāda: acc. *asmān* instead of gen. *asmākam*.

With Gr (and implicitly Ge) I take *úttare* as a nom. pl. with pronominal inflection (as elsewhere).

The *úttara-* chains with the pāda-opening *ud-*s of vs. 10, while the pāda-openings ‘(of) us’ can be seen as chaining semantically with *māmakānām* of 10b.

X.103.12: On *apvā-* see EWA s.v. and esp. KH (Aufs. 52–57). It is found also in AVŚ IX.8.9, as well as AVŚ III.2.5 = AVP III.5.5, which are variants of our vs.

X.104 Indra

As indicated in the publ. intro., this hymn, attributed to a Vaiśvāmitra, ends with the Vaiśvāmitra refrain common in Maṇḍala III, and it has an almost self-consciously old-fashioned well-made air. Like the preceding hymn (X.103) there is a fair amount of chaining between vss.

X.104.1: The dat. prn. *túbhyam* both ends pāda a and begins pāda c; in between pāda b ends with the rhyme form *tūyam*. Pāda-final *túbhyam* recurs in 2c and 3b.

On the curious bahuv. *vīpra-vīra-* see comm. ad IX.44.5. The sense presumably is that the creators of ritual speech are just as heroic as more martial men.

X.104.2: Ge construes gen. *sutásya* with *jatháram pṛṇasva* “fill your belly with the pressed (soma),” and it is conceivable that *√pr* ‘fill’ could take a partitive genitive. However it ordinarily takes the instr., and it seems better here to take *nṛbhiḥ sutásya* in b as parallel with *apsú dhūtásya* in pāda a. That in IX.62.5 (cited by Ge n. 2ab) *apsú dhūtó nṛbhiḥ sutáḥ* is a single phrase supports this analysis. Another passage containing *jatháram √pr* with a potential gen. is found in VI.69.7 *sómasya ... jatháram pṛṇethām*, where Gr and Ge both construe the gen. with *pṛṇethām*. However there as well the gen. is better taken with the preceding verb: *píbatam mádhvo asyá, sómasya ...*, like our *píba*. The fact that the preceding vs. in this hymn ends with the short exhortative clause *píbā sutásya* provides addition support for a syntagm *píba ... sutasya* here.

I take *jatháram pṛṇasva* as a brief parenthetic clause, rather like the *píbā sutásya* that ends the previous vs. (1d). The rel. clause in c then hangs off the genitive complements of *píba* in pāda a.

The root affiliation of the verb *mimikṣúḥ* in c is unclear. Gr takes it as the pf. to the desid. of *√mih* ‘ausgiessen, pissen’, with the developed sense ‘reichlich zuströmen’. Ge tr. “schmackhaft gemacht haben” (root affiliation?). Kü (387) takes it to *√myakṣ* ‘attach, be attached’ but in an unusual constr., tr. “Den bei sich halten die Presssteine, Indra für dich ...,” which satisfies neither syntactically nor semantically, though it accounts for the *-ṣ*. Somewhat daringly, I take it as belonging semantically to *√mih* ‘piss’, but after the roots *mih*, *myakṣ*, and **mís* (‘mix’) had become hopelessly confused. My ‘trickle’ is a semantic development of ‘piss’.

The pl. *tébbhiḥ* in d has no clear referent, but it probably refers to plural soma drinks; as Old points out, the soma described in pādas a, b, and c could almost be taken as three different somas.

X.104.3: On *prayaí*, see Keydana (Inf. 201–2), who denies that it’s, technically, a real infinitive. Nonetheless, it might as well be. Moreover, he bases his decision on the fact that the subject of the putative inf. would fill the recipient role in the matrix clause, but I think it’s possible, and so tr., that the expression of the recipient is limited to *vīṣṇe* in pāda a, with *túbhyam* in b reserved as subj. of *prayaí*.

On *dhénā-* as ‘nourishing stream’, see comm. ad I.2.3. Ge’s “an den Reden” relies on an out-of-date interpr. of the word. Instead, cd indicates that Indra is receiving both soma and verbal praise.

The tr. of *śácyā* as ‘ably’ in d was conditioned by its chaining with *śacīvaḥ* in the next pāda, 4b. Another ex. of chaining: *suásya* in b repeats the same in 2b (and 1d).

X.104.4: The phrase “in the house/dwelling of Manu” (*mánuṣo duroṇé*) is found four times elsewhere (VII.70.2, VIII.87.2=X.40.13, X.110.1), three times in Aśvin hymns, once in an Āprī hymn in a Jātavedas vs. (X.110.1), and here in an Indra hymn. It is always in a ritual context and presumably refers to the ritual ground.

Act. *grṇántaḥ* contrasts with passive *grṇānāḥ* in the previous vs., 3d; as just noted *śacīvaḥ* (a) chains with *śácyā* in 3d.

X.104.5: This vs. is essentially a continuation of vs. 4, with Indra’s praisers as subject, achieving their goals through Indra’s aid. The vs. lacks a finite verb; I take the participle *dádhānāḥ* as predicated.

The participial phrase *ūtím ... dádhānāḥ* echoes *váyo dádhānāḥ* in 4b. Another echo is furnished by the vs. opening *práñītibhiḥ te haryaśva* (5a), which matches 4a *ūtī śacīvas táva* in structure: INSTR *te* VOC (5a) : INSTR VOC *táva* (4a). Here the *te* is expanded with a series of genitives, *suṣṭóḥ ... suṣumnásya pururúcaḥ*. The opening instr. is matched by *sūnṛtābhiḥ* at the end of the vs. And *ūtī* of 4a is repeated as *ūtím* in c.

The form *suṣṭóḥ* has caused much consternation, summarized in brief by Scar (637). Since a root noun cmpd *suṣṭú-* would be ill-formed, lacking the stem-final *-t* expected for roots in short resonants (like *-stú-t-* itself), another analysis is required. Re’s 1937 suggestion (reported by Scar) that it belongs to a stem **su-ṣṭótu-* ‘praiseworthy’, whose gen. **suṣṭotoḥ* underwent haplology, is appealing, if not definitive.

X.104.6: The banal first hemistich packs in a lot of echoes from earlier in the hymn: *harivo háribhyām* picks up *háribhyām* (1b) and *harivaḥ* (2a), not to mention *haryaśva* (3b, 5a); *sutásya* is also found in 1d, 2b, 3b; *úpa ... yāhi = úpa yāhi* (1b) as well as *prayaí* (3b); *pītáye* recalls *pītím* (3a); *sómasya = sómaḥ* (1). Only *bráhmāṇi* is new.

The second hemistich shakes things up a bit. In pāda c it is striking that the sacrifice goes to Indra, not vice versa (as in 1a *yajñám úpa yāhi*), and that (at least in my interpr.) Indra has been patiently waiting for it (*kṣámamāṇam*) – not a characteristic Indraic trait! (Ge’s der Nachsichtigen [“indulgent, forgiving”] is hardly more Indraic.)

Then in d Indra is called both “pious” (*dāśvān*) and “the visible sign of the rite” (*adhvarásya praketaḥ*). To treat the second anomaly first: this description is far better suited to

Agni, and is in fact applied to him in a pāda almost identical to this one: VII.11.1 *mahām asy adhvarāsya praketaḥ* (cf. also III.8.8 ... *adhvarāsya ketúm* also of Agni, and other similar expressions). It is of course possible to construct a rationale for using this phrase of Indra: his presence at the sacrifice is the sign that it is actually proceeding. But the change of referent is jarring nonetheless.

As for *dāśvāms-*, this very well-attested stem is used overwhelmingly of mortal worshipers, but here it must modify Indra. Gr gives a handful of passages where it modifies divinities: gods I.3.7, Savitar I.110.5, and esp. Varuṇa X.65.5, 6, X.113.5 in the pāda-final formula *vāruṇāya dāśúṣe*. Given Varuṇa’s ethical proclivities, “pious” fits him rather better than the freewheeling Indra, and in X.65.5–6, as I say there (comm. ad loc.), the hymn has a tendency to attribute human ritual roles to gods. For I.3.7 and I.110.5 see comm. ad locc. Ge simply ignores the usual sense of *dāśvāms-* and tr. “der Freigebigē.” There is no note on the passage, so I don’t know if he thought that this sense was possible for *dāśvāms-* or if he misread the word as *dāśvān* ‘rich in gifts’ (or thought a pun on that form was intended).

The cluster of un-Indra-like characteristics in this hemistich seems intended to jar the audience out of the complacency fostered by the standard tropes that have dominated the hymn so far (and will return).

X.104.7: As in a few other places, *svṛktī-* is a secondary bahuvr. referring to the recipient of “well-twisted” hymns, not the hymns themselves. See comm. ad II.4.1. It is used of Indra in X.74.5. For an exactly similar usage, see *suśastī-* in 10a.

In the face of near-universal agreement that *namasyā* is underlyingly *namasyāḥ* and a nom. pl. (Pp., Gr, Ge), Old points out that desid. substantives in *-yā* do not form plurals and are normally adverbial frozen instr. sg. -- though he allows as how the instr. sg. would produce a less natural (“minder natürliche”) construction here. Nonetheless, I find an instr. perfectly acceptable semantically and much more likely morphologically: the singer produces the songs with a desire to do homage.

X.104.8–10: After seven relatively banal vss. about Indra’s journey to the sacrifice and the predictable delights that await him there, the last three vss. (before the Viśvāmitra clan refrain, vs. 11) concern Indra’s exploits, esp. the Vṛtra battle.

X.104.8: An unobtrusive chaining connects this narrative vs. with the ritual one(s) preceding: 7b *suté-raṇam* : 8a *su-rāṇā(h)*.

I am puzzled by the instr. *yābhiḥ* in b, referring to the seven divine waters of pāda a. In Ge’s tr. and in the publ. tr., it seems to portray the seven divine waters as the instruments by which Indra crossed the *sīndhu*, but this makes no sense. Lü (132–34) shares my puzzlement, but I do not find his solution any more satisfactory than Ge’s: he (re-)interpr. *sīndhu-* as ‘Meere’ and $\sqrt{tṛ}$ as ‘durchdringen’, with the seven waters of pāda a the waters freed in the Vṛtra battle. (Pāda c then gets construed with d, with the 99 streams constituting the *gātú-* that Indra produced for the gods and Manu.) There is a simpler solution: to take *yābhiḥ* as an instr. of accompaniment, to be construed with *sīndhum*. In other words, Indra crossed the *sīndhu* along with / in addition to the seven divine waters (presumably, indeed, the *saptá sīndhavaḥ*). This goes somewhat awkwardly into English, but is perfectly compatible with the Sanskrit. I would now emend the tr. to “Seven are the divine waters ... along with / in addition to them you ... crossed the boundary river ...” The 99 streams in c are then additional riverine barriers to cross.

X.104.9: Ge takes *cakārtha* in c as a gaming term and tr. “Die du ... gewonnen hast.” But though terms like *kr̥tá* and *kārā* (see his n. 9c) do have such senses, I do not know of other exx. of the bare finite verb being so used. I take the verb in its standard sense, and think it probably means that in freeing the waters he actualized them, as it were – made them really exist. It’s also possible that \sqrt{kr} is a dummy verb or with a gapped infinitive, in the sense ‘made/let flow’, but in the absence of anything in the context that encourages this interpr. and of any parallel expressions elsewhere, this seems less likely.

X.104.10: The first word of the vs., *vīrénya-*, has attracted more disc. than I think it deserves; see Old’s and Ge’s (n.10a) treatments, both referring to Bloomfield, who thinks that the phrase *vīrényaḥ krātuḥ* stands for the cmpd *vāreṇya-krātuḥ* (RV 2x). Although the influence of this cmpd, not to mention the much better attested simplex *vāreṇya-*, on the hapax *vīrénya-* is likely, I see no reason to emend the text. Moreover, I find overfastidious the concern expressed by all that *vīrá-* is not a verb and does not deserve a gerundive suffix, producing a “monstrous” (Old) form. On the one hand, as Ge points out, there is a denom. *vīraya-*; however, Ge also argues that the denom. is intrans. and for *that* reason doesn’t deserve a gerundive. So he constructs a possible transitive sense “desire to have X as hero/master,” which – finally – deserves a gerundive. His tr. of the relevant bits is “Indra muss man also seinem Meister wünschen” (fld. by JSK, DGRV II.212 “Indra, the one to be desired as a hero (by men)”). All of this seems to demand too much machinery for what appears to be a playful riff on *vāreṇya-*, hence my “proper to [/worthy of] a hero.”

In any case, unless one emends to a bahuvr. *vāreṇya-krātuḥ* “whose resolve is worthy to be chosen,” it’s still necessary to take *krātuḥ* as identified with Indra, as Ge/JSK in fact do (e.g., JSK “(is) determination (incarnate),” as does the publ. tr.

I take *suśastīḥ* as a secondary bahuvr., like *suvr̥ktīm* in vs. 7 (see comm. there), though it’s possible that it’s an identification like *krātuḥ* earlier in the pāda: “Indra is resolve (and) good praise.”

On *dhénā* see comm. ad vs. 3. In context Ge’s “Reden” fits better here (with the verb *īṭte*), but if good contextual fit were our highest interpretational criterion, the RV would look very different. As in vs. 3 the point here is that Indra receives both praise and soma. I consider this to be signaled by *utāpi* opening b. In my opinion there’s a tricky shift of function in *suśastīḥ* at the end of the preceding pāda. In pāda a it is a secondary bahuvr̥hi ‘receiving good praise’ modifying Indra, but it reverts to a karmadhārayā ‘good praise’ in order to serve as conjoined subject of *īṭte* in b, where *dhénā* is either a conjoined nominative – a series of singular subjects can take a singular verb – or an instr. “along with the (soma-)stream.”

Pāda d contains another identification of Indra with an abstract entity – here “superiority” (*abhiṣṭīḥ*).

This last vs. before the clan refrain exhibits some ring-like behavior with the beginning of the hymn: *puruhūtá-* (1a, 10b), (*vípra-*)*vīrāḥ* (1c): *vīrénya-* (10a), *dhénā-* (3a, 10b).

X.105 Indra

On the extreme metrical and textual problems in this hymn, see publ. intro. (in addition to detailed discussions below). I will not engage further with the meter.

The hymn also acts like a dress rehearsal for the impossible X.106 that follows immediately – still within the realm of possible decoding, if barely, but pushing the envelope.

X.105.1: The meter of this 1st vs. is esp. aberrant. See Old.

The publ. tr. follows Old's alternative word division *áva śmasāru dhad vāḥ*, which requires no change to the Saṃhitā text and has the merit of providing a full form of the 'beard' word: *-śmasāru-* is found also in the cmpd *hāri-śmasāru* in X.96.8. (It is likely not an accident that *hāryate* is found shortly before the 'beard word' here.) Ge (n. 1b) suggests rather a haplology **śmasā(ru) rudhad*, which is also possible. But I find his suggested meaning less likely than the one associated with the Old reading. Ge thinks Indra's beard will dam up the water=soma and keep Indra from drinking; Old that the beard (which surrounds Indra's mouth after all) will descend into the water=soma to drink. Since I prefer Old's reading, the publ. tr. should have an asterisk before "descend."

On *vātāpya-* see comm. ad IX.93.5.

X.105.1–2: Note that 1b, 2a, and 2c all end with monosyllables (*vāḥ*, *véḥ*, and *dán*) respectively

X.105.2: As Old points out, *yāsya* stands in effect for **yó asya* – or perhaps better **yó yāsya*.

There is some disagreement over the grammatical identity of *véḥ*. Gr takes it as the gen. sg. of *vī-* 'bird'; he is followed by Lub (who does not, however, discriminate between nom. and gen. *véḥ*). By contrast Ge considers it the 2nd sg. to the root pres. of \sqrt{vi} 'pursue', and I concur: the parallel I.63.2 *ā yád dhārī indra vívratā véḥ* seems to me decisive.

In b *árvantānu* (i.e., Pp. *árvantā ánu śépā*) Old suggests a haplology from *árvantā *tānu-śépā*, a reading that also requires erasure of the accent on *śépā*. Given the difficulties in construing *ánu śépā*, I have accepted his haplology.

Flg. Lub (Nominal Acc., 30), I take *rajī-* here as equivalent to *rájī-* 'line' (X.100.12) (*rajī-* in VI.26.6 is a PN.) Lub considers our form accentually older. See comm. ad X.100.12.

As noted ad X.99.6, *pátir dán* "lord of the household" is a somewhat incongruous designation for Indra, and it hardly fits the context here, with its emphasis on the speed of Indra's horses: he's unlikely to be sitting at home.

X.105.2–4: At least acdg. to my interpr. the two relative clause of 2 (*yāsya*) and 3ab (*yóḥ*), with two different referents, are never resolved. Instead 3cd begins a new subord. cl. (*yád*), whose main cl. is (sort of) found in 4. The syntax thus adds to the general shiftiness of the hymn.

X.105.3: The apparent mockery of Indra begins here.

Another monosyllable, *yóḥ*, though not in final position. Assuming that the standard identification of this form as gen.-loc. du. of the rel. prn. is correct, it is the only instance of this in the RV; the ordinary form is disyllabic *yáyoḥ*. The pāda-opening sequence *ápa yóḥ* plays off *sácāyóḥ* opening 4a.

The verb *pāpaja* is the only verb form attested to a putative root $\sqrt{pāj}$ in Sanskrit (though it has abundant cognates across IE). On the grounds of accent and heavy redupl., Sch (Intens. 151–52) takes it as an intensive (so already Old, contra Wh), though with *t*-less perfect-like 3rd sg. ending. Kü tacitly accepts this non-perfect interpr., since he does not discuss the form; his tr. of the passage (336, 525) follow Sch's. As an intens., the verb matches *cárkṛṣe* in the same position in 4a. Note the distant phonetic figure with the preverb in tmesis: *ápa ... pāpaja*.

On the position of *ná* in Lub's pāda division, see comm. ad X.111.7: *pace* Lub, *ná* is not pāda-final, but internal in the next cl.

Note rhyming *bibhīvān* # / *tāvisīvān* # at the ends of pādas b and c, anticipating *śiprīṇīvān* at the end of 5c.

Although Ge takes c with ab, and of course the verse boundary favors this, the *yād* clause of pāda c does not belong logically with ab: if Indra is apart from his horses, he hasn't yoked them. Pāda c makes more sense with the contrastive 4a.

X.105.4: The sequence *sácāyóḥ* (also in 9c) can be resolved in several different ways. The Pp. takes the second word to be *āyóḥ*, presumably gen./abl. of *āyú-* 'lively', while Gr (fld. by Lub) prefers *ayóḥ* (gen./loc. du. of *ayám*) and Old and Ge *yóḥ* (gen./loc. du. of rel., as in 3a; so apparently also Sch [Intens. 108]). The first is unlikely; the other two have complementary merits and demerits. The rel. prn. would account for the accent on *cárkṛṣe*, but would leave us without a main cl.; the demonstr. has the exact opposite qualities. I weakly favor the demonstr. *ayóḥ*, despite the verb accent. The identical sequence in 9c appears to have the demonstr., as do those in I.174.6, III.54.2, and I also feel that a main cl. works better in context. I do not have an explanation for the accent; we could ascribe it to the supposed corruption of this particular hymn, which seems facile, or to the parallelism of the intens. *pāpaja* in 3a (though the forms are not phonologically or morphologically similar), but I do not find that satisfactory either. Perhaps because it implicitly contrasts with the same verb to be supplied in c, it has contrastive accent.

The form *upānasáḥ* has been much discussed: see esp. Old and Ge. I follow Ge's suggestion (n. 4b) that it is a Beiwagen, an auxiliary vehicle of some sort – as a metaphorical measure of Indra's relative unimportance in comparison to his horses (in the teasing vein found in this hymn).

The opening of the vs. *sácāyóḥ* is paralleled by the opening of the hemistich *nadáyor vívratayoḥ*. Note that *vívrata-* was also found in 2a; the term associated with it there, *suyújā*, has already been actualized in 3c *yád yuyujé* "when he has yoked (the two)."

X.105.5: The ref. of the dual *vyácasvantā* in the simile is unclear. Ge takes it as modifying the horses and meaning "die gleichsam Platz haben," which is unsatisfying on several counts; it's not really a simile and *vyácas-* doesn't mean simply 'place' but 'expanse'. The identical form *vyácasvantā* is found in VI.25.6, referring to the two opposing martial forces, which is no help here. The fem. pl. *vyácasvatīḥ* is used twice of the Divine Doors, again no help. I think the most likely referent is Heaven and Earth, which individually or jointly serve as both subj. and obj. of \sqrt{vyac} (in different passages), e.g., X.112.4 *yásya tyát te mahimānam ..., imé mahī ródasī nāvīviktām* "you whose greatness these two great world-halves did not encompass." The point of such expressions is to indicate that even very expansive entities, like H+E, cannot contain Indra; they are themselves therefore implicitly *vyácas-vant*. The problem is that H+E / world-halves expressions are generally feminine. Here, I would attribute the non-fem. -*vantā* form to agreement with the simile frame *késasvantā* immediately preceding it across the pāda boundary. The use of *ádhi* $\sqrt{sthā}$ for 'mounting' heaven is found in IX.83.2, 85.9, 86.8.

The adj. *śiprīṇīvān* is way overdetermined, with both an *-in-* suffix and a *-vant-* suffix. The latter appears to be attached to a fem. *śiprīṇī-*. This reminds us of the unexpected fem. for masc. gen. pl. *śiprīṇīnām* in I.30.11 (see comm. ad loc.). However, here I think the impetus to create this nonce form came from the desire to rhyme with *babhīvān* (3b) and esp. *tāvisīvān* (3c).

X.105.6: With Ge, I take *ṛṣvébhiḥ* as a ref. to the Maruts.

Also with Ge, I would supply *vájram* as the obj. of *tatákṣa* in b, even though it seems somewhat odd for Indra to fashion his own mace, rather than Tvaṣṭar (though see I.121.3 adduced by Ge [n. 6b], not to mention the next vs., 7a, where the middle voice of *cakré* supports the interpr.). (The designation *sūrah* seems to guarantee that the subj. is Indra: see 4c *sūra índrah*.)

I have no idea what to do with Mātariśvan here, nor does anyone else. See comm. on the next vs., however.

X.105.7: Vss. 6 and 7 seem intertwined. As was just noted, 7a supplements or indeed repairs 6b, and I will now suggest that Mātariśvan at the end of 6 should be construed with the orphaned simile at the end of 7.

The two words that form pāda b, *hirīmaśó hirīmān*, most likely display a playful riff on *hári-* ‘golden’ (see EWA II.806). In particular, *hirīmaśáh* echoes the likewise phonologically deformed (*háryate...*) *śmaśá (ru-)* in 1b, itself built on *hári-śmaśāru* in X.96.8, as well as *híri-śmaśru-* ‘having a golden beard’, an epithet of Agni (V.7.7, X.46.5) with the same *hírī-* as here. The word ‘beard’ seems to attract word play. Given this web of verbal associations, I’d now emend the tr. to “gold*bearded, golden,” in an attempt to capture the phonological manipulation in *hirīmaśó*. See Old on this word, though he rejects the association with ‘beard’.

The word play continues in c: *-hanu-* ‘jaw’ plays on *-hánāya* ‘to smash’. Ge (n. 7c) is somewhat puzzled about why Indra is described as ‘having an unbroken jaw’. As he points out, there is a surprising amount of attention paid, here and there, to Indra smashing Vṛtra’s jaws, so perhaps the description here of Indra’s intact jaw is a counterweight to Vṛtra’s jaw injury – but the pun it allows with *-hánāya* also has to be taken into account, and that pun becomes cuter when a different word for ‘break, smash’ is used in *áruta-* ‘unbroken’.

The simile *ádbhutam ná rájah* poses yet another puzzle, and the publ. tr.’s “(Indra) is like the infallible airy realm (?)” is worse than useless. (Ge [n. 7c] at least tries to make sense of it.) I don’t have a simple solution, but I can at least now offer something potentially better than what I produced in the publ. tr. We can start with the fact that *rájas-* is regularly a vast expanse to be crossed or measured out, mostly located in or around the midspace, since birds are among its traversers. It could then be used here as a measure of Indra’s own vastness – hence a simile in the nom., as both Ge and the publ. tr. take it. However, I will tentatively suggest a bold alternative – desperate situations call for desperate measures. As noted just above, Mātariśvan hangs at the end of vs. 6 with nothing to do, unintegrated into the rest of the vs.; *ádbhutam ná rájah* is similarly positioned and similarly unintegrated in this vs. It might be possible to read them together, as a disjunctive simile, with an indirect connection to the Vṛtra myth. Recall that in the archetypal Indra–Vṛtra hymn I.32, after killing Vṛtra, Indra, like a frightened falcon, flees across the *rājāmsi* (I.32.14 *śyenó ná bhītó átaro rājāmsi*). Recall also that Mātariśvan is the fire-stealer, who brings fire from heaven (*diváh* I.93.6), from afar / a great distance (*parāvatáh* I.128.2, III.9.5, VI.8.4). I suggest that in 6c/7c Indra’s flight across the *rájas-* is compared to Mātariśvan’s, if we construct the simile from the undigested pieces that end those two vss. – however hard this is to convey in translation. I’d suggest something like the following as revision for both vss.

6. He of lofty might has struck up the praise song with the lofty ones. The champion fashioned it with his swelling strength,
like an artisan (R̥bhu) in accord with his intentions. (Like) Mātariśvan ...

7. Who made his own mace, to smash the barbarian easily -- he, golden-colored, golden, with unbroken jaw -- (fleeing) like (Mātariśvan) across the *ādbhutam* realm.”

This leaves us with the always difficult *ādbhutam*: the standard ‘unerring, infallible’ does not fit well here (nor does it always elsewhere; see, e.g., comm. ad V.87.7). Perhaps, with semantic bleaching in this late hymn, ‘ineffable’.

X.105.8: I take *yajñā ṛdhak* as referring to a sacrifice undertaken by a particular, individual sacrificer -- a sense that seems to be supported by X.93.8. It could also be a sacrifice destined for an individual god (here Indra), an interpr. that is supported by VI.49.10.

The problem in c is *joṣati*. Ge takes it as the 3rd sg. finite verb it appears to be, but this comes at a high cost: he must assign it a meaning ‘please, give pleasure’ (“dass es dir gefalle”) contrary to the sense of the overwhelming number of attestations of this very common root, which consistently mean ‘enjoy, take pleasure’. (Ge [n. 8c] cites only two parallels, which can both be interpr. otherwise.) One could attribute this unexpected meaning to the act. voice, as opposed to med. *juṣáte*, etc., but other active forms have the ‘enjoy’ sense (e.g., *joṣat* in X.81.7). I prefer Old’s suggestion (explicitly rejected by Ge) that *joṣati* is a loc. of a pres. act. part., forming a loc. absol. with *tvé*. Unfortunately this is not morphologically unproblematic: no such part. is attested, and the status of the thematic *joṣa-* stem with full-grade accented root isn’t clear to me. It’s possible that this restrained set of forms are subjunctives built somehow to *juṣá-*, or to a root aor. distinct from that stem (so Wh. Roots and Macd. VGS; see now comm. ad X.158.2) and then misinterpr. -- though both the voice and the accent would have to shift. Nonetheless, the loc. absol. interpr. causes fewer problems than Ge’s finite form.

X.105.9: Verse-final *sácāyóḥ* matches the same form opening vs. 4 (q.v.); I take then both as containing the loc. du. demonstr. *ayóḥ*. Although one might hypothesize that these two identical forms demarcate a section of the hymn ring-compositionally, the contents of these vss. seems too various to admit this explanation. I do think the dual referent should be the same as in vs. 4, namely Indra’s two horses – though the boat makes difficulties.

With Gr and Ge, I take *tretīnī* as referring to the totality of the three ritual fires, but the feminine is puzzling. For this reason Old suggests that it might instead refer to fem. entities that might be ‘aloft, upright’ (*ūrdhvā*), like Dawns or prayers, but neither of those comes in a standard triad. The sequence *-īnī bhūt* may anticipate *upasécanī bhūt* in the next vs. (10a), which might account for the unusual fem. I would make a small alteration in the publ. tr., from “threefold one” to “triad.”

The acc. phrase *nāvam svāyaśasam* “boat having its own glory” is left hanging in c, with nothing to govern it; a verb needs to be supplied. Ge goes with “board” reasonably enough, on the basis of *ā√ruh / sthā* passages (e.g., VII.88.3); “make” would be possible on the basis of nearby X.101.2 *nāvam ... kṛṇudhvam*, and “launch/send forth” is also possible (e.g., X.116.9 *prérayam nāvam*). In any case the boat is metaphorical; the question is what it stands for – the sacrifice or a hymn/sacred formulation are the most likely candidates. Cf., e.g., II.42.1=IX.95.2 *īyarti vācam aritéva nāvam*.

X.105.10: Ge (n. 10a and tr.) interpr. *pṛśnir upasécanī* somewhat oddly as a dappled cow that pours (“die bunte Kuh, die zugiesst”), but the same fem. *upasécanī* in X.21.2 he takes as a ladle

(appropriately). I think it must be a ritual instr. here as well, qualified as ‘dappled’ because the substance it contains (melted butter?) has that appearance.

It seems a little odd that Indra should be pouring his own drink, but perhaps it’s of a piece with his making his own mace in vss. 6 and 7.

X.105.11: The first pāda is puzzling. Ge supplies both another measuring unit, to account for the *vā*, and a verb, producing “Wenn dich auch Hundert oder (mehr) dagegen (preisen).” This yields sense: even if 100 or more other poets praise you, Sumitra [the poet of the hymn] has praised you -- presumably better or more effectively. Unfortunately it also requires supplying a lot of material, and it also does not account well for the *prāti* (his “dagegen”): \sqrt{stu} does not occur with *prāti*. Old toys with this interpr. among others, incl. the possibility that *prāti* expresses equivalence, as in II.1.8 *tvám sahásrāṇi śatā dáśa prāti* “you are the counter(-part) to thousands, hundreds, tens” (cf. also II.1.15). The publ. tr. adopts this interpr., as it requires supplying no additional material. I now realize that at least as it appears in the publ. tr. it also doesn’t make a lot of sense. The point as I see it is that even if there were a hundred Indras, or heroes like Indra, Sumitra’s praise would be sufficient to include them all. It might be a little clearer if the tr. were altered to “Even if a hundred are counter(part) to you, Sumitra has praised (you) to just such an extent.”

The echo clause with Durmitra is obviously some sort of joke, but of what sort escapes me. These two oppositional clauses with Su/Dur-mitra are matched by the last two clauses of the hymn. The second one, with lower-register *kutsa-vatsám* “Kutsa’s kid [lit. calf]” substituting for the more formal *kutsa-putrám* “Kutsa’s son,” has something of the same jokey feel as the Durmitra clause.

X.106 Aśvins

As discussed in the publ. intro., this hymn has an impenetrable center, and verses 5–8 therefore remain untranslated and will be furnished with minimal commentary here. For the simile as structural principle, the omphalos shape, and the parallelism with the Aśvin hymn II.39 see the publ. intro.

X.106.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the opening of this vs. (and hymn) ... *tád íd arthayete* “you two have just this as your aim” is reminiscent of II.39.1 ... *tád íd ártham jarethe* “you two awaken to just this aim,” with the denom. *arthaya-* substituting for the acc. *ártham* in II.39.1. The finite verb ‘awaken’ in that vs. is postponed to our pāda c: transitive *ajīgaḥ* corresponding to intrans. *jarethe* in II.39.1.

Various suggestions have been made for the (unexpressed) subject of *ajīgaḥ* (see Ge n. 1c, Old) – perhaps most likely is the hymn (or its singer) or Dawn. Properly speaking “you” should be in parens., since the dual obj. is expressed only by *sadhrīcīnā*.

As goal of *yātave*, Re suggests supplying *ártham*, extracted from the verb in pāda a, and cf. X.143.1 (also an Aśvin hymn) *ártham ... yātave*.

What to supply with *sudínā* is the next question; as Old points out, *sudínā* can be either masc. du. or neut. pl. He favors the former, and since most of the similes in this hymn refer to the Aśvins, this might seem the better choice. But Ge’s clumsy tr. as a dual (in n. 1d he claims it can only be a dual) characterizing the Aśvins, “die guter Wetter haben,” shows the drawback to this morphological analysis. Moreover, the stem *sudína-* is generally a neut. pl. and modifies ‘days’

(*áhāni*, etc.). Such an interpr. fits the context better: the point of the simile is that the Aśvins, who are early-morning visitors to the sacrifice, “bring” the days.

The VP *pṛkṣa ā tamsayethe* is a more vivid version of, e.g., I.47.6 *pṛkṣo vahatam aśvinā* “convey nourishments [/provisions], o Aśvins.” As disc. in my *-āya-* book (p. 93), the sense of \sqrt{tams} is difficult to circumscribe, given its rarity and (contrariwise) the variety of preverbs found with it, but ‘tug, yank’ and similar abrupt movements fit the contexts. The preverb *ā* ‘here’ makes the action goal-directed, and ‘haul’ may capture a certain arduous quality. As Re points out, the verb is also playing off (*vī*) *tanvāthe* to \sqrt{tan} in b.

X.106.2: This vs. is full of uncertain words, several of which appear to concern agriculture. I will not pursue the desperate and dubious etymologies and meanings suggested for them – here consult Old, Ge, Re (EVP XVI.74), and EWA s.vv.

Needless to say, I make no claims of certainty about the translation – save for pāda c, which seems surprisingly straightforward. It is probably not an accident that c also has a semi-parallel in II.39.1 *dūtēva hávyā jānyā purutrā* “like messengers serving the people, you are to be called upon in many places” (cf. our *dūtēva ... jāneṣu*). As with vs. 1 and its parallel in II.39.1, one word is postponed: *purutrā* appears in 3c.

X.106.3: Lacking opaque words, this vs. is clearer than the last.

In b we should expect dual **paśū*, as in the YAves. dual dvandva *pasu. vīra*. We can’t put too much faith in the morphology of this hymn anyway, and I would suggest that the *paśvā* that underlies *paśvéva* simply shows an assimilation to the numerous duals in *-ā* characterizing the Aśvins in this hymn, particularly *pakṣā*, which immediately precedes it across the pāda break — as well as matching the *-ā-iva* → *-eva* pāda-opening similes that abound in the hymn (1d, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3d, 4b, 4c [2x], 4d, etc.).

For ‘bright’ (*citrā-*) livestock, see the passages cited by Ge (n. 3b).

The goal *yájuh* in b may play off (*sākaṃ*) *yújā* in pāda a.

As Re points out, the Aśvins are earth-circlers themselves (*párijman-* I.46.14), so it’s somewhat pleonastic to compare them to the same.

X.106.4: The publ. tr. follows Ge, Re (and implicitly Old) in supplying a verb of address (“I call upon you ...”), with the Aśvins and their trailing similes now in the acc. This is partly because of the apparent enclitic *vah*, which needs some structure to attach to, and partly because of the father/son configuration: one of the things sons do to fathers is call on them (e.g., VII.32.3 *putró ná pitāraṃ huve*). But with regard to the latter, it is puzzling why both fathers and sons are in the dual (see Ge’s equally puzzled n. 4a). And the *vah* is even more troubling: it’s plural, and if there’s anything the poet of this hymn knows how to do it’s produce duals! Despite Old’s ultimate rejection of this idea (after toying with it for quite awhile), I accept Henry’s suggestion that the sequence *āpī vo asmé* conceals the simile particle *iva*; Old (in his toying phase) suggests the reading **āpīva asmé*; since *vo* would have been read *va* in this sandhi situation, the real underlying *-va* was wrongly restored to *vo* once *āpī* was separated from *iva*. This eliminates the problematic plural and its need for structure. Since the Aśvins are relentlessly nominative throughout this hymn (even apparently in the untranslatable parts) as well as in the similar II.39, and since “I call upon” is made up out of whole cloth (the *hávam* in d, adduced by Re, is irrelevant: *hávam ā gamiṣtam* there is just a variant on *yájur ā gamiṣtam* in 3b), I would simply eliminate “(I call upon you,) who are” and tr. the first three pādas as a string of nominal similes:

“like friends to us, like fathers, (like) sons, like ...” Although *putrā* lacks a simile marker and it might seem slightly strange to compare the Aśvins to our sons, this first pāda proposes a series of close relationships we might share with those gods.

In the simile *ugrēva rucā* I supply Heaven and Earth as the referents of *ugrā*. They are called *ugrā* in X.121.5 and appear with *rucā* in IV.56.1.

On *ūrya*- see comm. ad V.58.4. Since it twice appears with *gopā*- ‘herdsman’ (VII.13.3, VIII.41.4), both times in similes, I have supplied ‘herdsmen’ here as well, esp. since there is an agriculture strain in this hymn.

On the likely meaning of du. *kirāṇā* (presumably separate from *kirāṇa*- ‘dust’) as labia (or at least something “obscene,” so Old), see Old, Ge n. 4c, Re; EWA does not treat it separately as far as I can tell.

X.106.5–8: Although these vss. contain a number of (apparently) interpretable words and phrases (e.g., 5b *mitrēva rṭā*, 7d *kṣayad rayīṇām*), they glitter like fool’s gold in the mass of material that seems frustratingly always just on the other side of intelligibility. What is most salient about the passage – as others have also remarked – is the phonological and morphological patterning. For example, forms with intensive-type reduplication or near reduplication: 6ab ... *jarbhārī turphārītū* ... *turphārī parphārīkā*, 7a *cārcaram*, 7b *tartarītha(h)*, 7d *parpharat*, 8c *turphārī phārivāram*; adjacent deformations like 7c *kharamajrā kharājgur*; runs of slightly variant syllables like 7a *cārcaram jāram marāyu*, 6c (*udanya*)*jéva jémanā maderū*, 6d *jarāyv ajāram marāyu*. The rare-ish phonemes *ph* and *kh* are especially highlighted (starting actually with *phārvareṣu* in 2a).

X.106.9: As noted in the publ. intro., the exit from the gibberish of the middle omphalos vss. to the relative intelligibility of the outer ones is teasingly accompanied by a promise of “firm standing in the depths.”

In pāda a I again supply “Heaven and Earth” as referents for *bṛhāntā* ‘lofty’. The fem. dual *bṛhatī* regularly modifies *ródasī* the ‘two world halves’, as well as *dyāvāpṛthivī* (IV.56.1, VII.53.1), and a reference to H+E here in the first of the post-omphalos vss. would form a ring with the reference in 4b, the last of the pre-omphalos vss.

śāsuh in c matches the same word in 2b, helping to provide the ring around the omphalos (though not situated in the directly corresponding vs.).

In d, flg. Ludwig (see Old), I take *āmśā* as an elliptical dual referring to two minor Ādityas, *Amśa* ‘share’ and *Bhaga* ‘portion, fortune’ (on the close association between *Amśa* and *Bhaga* see Brereton, *Ādityas*, 307–8). *Bhaga* is indirectly present in the verb *bhajatam* of this pāda, as well as (perhaps) in *bhāgevitā* in the preceding vs., 8b. Note in passing that the poet of this hymn is named *Bhūtāmśa* (named in 11d and assigned the hymn by the Anukr.).

X.106.10: The agricultural cast of the second vs. of this hymn returns in this, the penultimate vs.

Gr and Re suggest that the hapax *āraṅgarā*- is a word for bee, but this seems unlikely; instead it seems a phonological play on the actual word for bee, *sāraghā*-, that begins the next pāda. Best, with Ge, to leave it untr.; in context it ought to refer to a husbandman or someone/thing responsible for producing milk in cows (assuming *gāvi* refers to an actual cow).

In the publ. tr. I supply parenthetical “(milk)” as the obj. of *érayethe* in the frame, with *mādhu* the corresponding object in the simile. I now think it is more likely that *mādhu* is used metaphorically for milk as well as literally to (bees’) honey and is shared by simile and frame. For the structure of the frame, cf. VIII.89.7 *āmśasu pakvām aīraya(h)* “you raised/produced the

cooked (milk) in the raw (cows).” Note also the final vs. of this hymn, 11c *pakvám mádhu góṣv antáh* “the cooked ‘honey’ within the cows.” I would now slightly emend the tr. to “... you produce the ‘honey’ in the cow ... as bees produce honey.”

On *-bāra-* in *nicīna-bāra-* see comm. ad VIII.40.5. The explanation of this form (also in *jihmā-bāra-* ‘with sloping banks’) as showing a Middle-Indic-type intervocalic voicing of *pārā-* ‘opposite shore, edge’ is very plausible and would fit the register of this hymn.

I attach pāda c to ab, because like them it concerns the production of a liquid substance.

On the hapax *kīnāra-* and its relation to *kīnāśa-* (RV 1x, but common later), both of obscure etymology, see EWA s.vv. It is very likely that our hapax owes its *-āra-* to the phonological deformation that characterizes this hymn.

Ge renders *kṣāmeva* as “wie zwei magere (Tiere),” flg. Sāy. *kṣāmā = kṣīnā gauḥ* (see also, tentatively, Scar p. 38 and n. 47); I’m not sure what etymon he is thinking of. But it surely belongs to *kṣām-* ‘earth’, with Old and Re. It should be an elliptical dual, (Heaven and) Earth, as it is in II.39.7. But here the analysis is complicated by the fact that the associated adjective *sūyavasāt* ‘feeding on good pasture’ (*sūyavasa-ad-*) is sg. (and the Pp reads *kṣāma*). I think that the poet created a nonce singular (aided by the vowel-quantity-obliterating sandhi in *kṣāmeva*) and that only the earth, conceived of as a cow (as often), is at issue.

Note that *sacethe* is also found in II.39, vs. 2, though in a slightly different usage.

X.106.11: As noted in the publ. intro., the last vs. of this hymn resembles the last one of II.39 (vs. 8). The praises for the Aśvins are proffered -- *bráhma stómam* in II.39.9, *stómam ... mántam* here – and the poet urges the Aśvins to drive near: *úpa yātam* in both. In both the poet or poets proclaim their achievement with their own name: II.39.8b *bráhma stómam gr̥tsamadāso akran* “The Gr̥tsamādas have made the formulation and praise song”; X.106.11d *ā bhūtāṃśo aśvinóh kāmam aprāḥ* “Bhūtāṃśa has fulfilled the desire of the Aśvins.”

X.107 Dakṣiṇā

This hymn has certain points of contact with the second section of Kakṣīvant’s Prātaritvan hymn, I.125, vss. 4–7, which describe the cosmic rewards for the generous sacrificer.

X.107.1: As Ge points out, dakṣiṇās were distributed at the dawn sacrifice in RVic times, in contrast to the midday distribution in classical śrauta ritual. The emphasis on the coming of light in this vs. fits this ritual fact.

X.107.2: See I.125.5–6, esp. for our second hemistich.

X.107.3: It is quite possible that *kavārībhyah* in b is abl., not dat., as it is usually taken: “It is not *from* the stingy” (so Maurer, p. 299). I think it is likely meant to be both: the dakṣiṇā doesn’t come *from* the stingy, and the great rewards of giving it don’t come *to* the stingy. I would now allow the alt. tr.

X.107.4: Similar cosmic fertility is described in I.124.4–7, though there is little or no overlap in phraseology.

X.107.6: As Ge points out (n. 6ab), the five figures named are the poet and the four principal priests (Brahman, Adhvaryu, Udgātar, and Hotar) of the classical śrauta ritual.

I do not follow Ge (n. 6c, fld by Maurer, p. 299) in seeing the “three bodies of the blazing one” (*śukrāsya tanvāḥ ... tisráḥ*) as the three Vedas, but rather as the three ritual fires.

X.107.7: Note the “X and which Y” construction in b.

As Ge points out (n. 7c), there is gender attraction in the nominal pseudo-izafe clause *yó na ātmā*, which qualifies neut. *ánnam*.

X.107.8: Although it is tempting (a temptation that Ge and Maurer gave in to) to tr. the pf. *mamruḥ* as presential, “they do not die,” the parallel pf. *īyuh* has preterital value, and as Kü demonstrates (370–71), in older Vedic the pf. of \sqrt{mr} had past-related usage.

Note the appearance of both *vísva-* and *sárva-*, overlapping here in the late RV. Here the older form *vísva-* appears in the very common fixed phrase (*idám*) *vísvam bhúvanam* “(this) whole world (here)” (I.73.8, 102.8, etc. etc.), while its replacement *sárva-* is found in freer usage.

X.107.9: Another izafe-type construction, ... *vadhvām yā suvāsāḥ*. There are a surprising number of such nominal relatives in this hymn.

The exact sense of *antaḥpéyaṃ sūrāyāḥ* “the right to the inner drinking of liquor” is unclear to me (and others); it seems odd to grant to the pious and generous sacrificer access to the generally forbidden, or at least disdained, *surā*. For speculations see Old, Ge, Re.

In d the obj. **tān*, referent of the rel. *yé*, has been gapped (so already Sāy.; see Ge n. 9d). The defeated uninvited (*áhūtāḥ*) contrast with the invited (*hūtāḥ*) dakṣinā-bestower in 5a.

X.107.11: The first hemistich contains two elementary etymological figures: *-vāho vahanti* (a) and *-vṛt ... vartate* (b), both involving root noun cmpds.

[X.108 Saramā JPB]

X.109 All Gods [Brahman’s Wife]

On my interpr. of the hymn see not only the publ. intro. but the detailed treatment of it in my 2016 article “Ṛgveda X.109: The ‘Brahman’s Wife’ and the Ritual Patnī,” in *The Vedas in Indian Culture and History: Proceedings of the Fourth International Vedic Conference (Austin, Texas 2007)* (ed. Joel P. Brereton), pp. 207–20, which also discusses the tangled history of its interpr. To sketch my views briefly, the hymn is one of several in the late RV that concern the fraught introduction of the ritual Patnī into solemn sacrifice. The hymn both proclaims the great benefits that the Patnī brings to the sacrifice and also discounts the possible risk of placing her on the ritual ground in contact with the gods. The implausible interpr. that held sway previously, that this is a very early version of a tale in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa about King Soma’s abduction and return of Bṛhaspati’s wife, can now fortunately be discarded.

My treatment of the hymn assumes an omphalos structure: the initial and final vss. (1, 7) present the “offense” (*kilbiṣā-*) and its expiation; the outer ring (2, 6) the giving back of the wife; the inner, omphalos vss. (3–5) the wife’s activities on the ritual ground.

As noted in the cited article, there are two not-entirely-parallel versions of the hymn in the AV: Ś V.17, P IX.15, whose interrelations I discuss in n. 54 of the article. Jeong-Soo Kim’s edition and tr. of AVP VIII and IX (2014) appeared long after I wrote the article and while it was still languishing in press, but the Kim treatment does not add much relevant.

The hymn is too short for its position in the text; we should expect 11 vss. I discuss this question in connection with the two AV versions in n. 54 of the art. cit.

I would now add a few things to the interpr. found in the article, inspired by the difficult vs. 5 (for more on which see below), which I did not treat in that article. Although I still believe that the hymn primarily concerns the ritual Patnī, I think it also has connections to the Brahmācārīn, the Vedic student, whose designation appears in vs. 5 for the only time in the RV. Like the Patnī the Brahmācārīn is an innovation in the religious structure: he is well established in the AV – the word *brahmācārīn-* appears dozens of times, along with a fair representation of the abstract *brahmācārya-* – but neither the word (save for our vs. 5) nor the concept is Rigvedic. The pioneering reformers responsible for the introduction of the ritual Patnī were no doubt also implicated in the development of celibate studentship, and they must have been aware of the conceptual polarization that the Patnī and the Brahmācārīn represented – one embodying sexuality and fertility, the other chastity and fervent austerity. Our hymn has some phraseological and conceptual connections with the AV hymn “extolling the Vedic student (brahmācārīn)” (Whitney’s title): AVŚ XI.5 ≅ AVP XVI.153–55. In addition to the word *brahmācārīn-* itself, also *tāpas-* (vss. 1, 4), a word that appears in practically every vs. of the AV Brahmācārīn hymn. Other connections will be noted ad the individual vss.

X.109.1: As noted in the art. cit., the speakers in this vs. are mostly natural forces, esp. the waters both in their own form and as the boundless ocean (*ākūpāraḥ salilāḥ*). I suggest there that since in later Vedic waters are prescribed for the removal of a *kilbiṣā-*, esp. at the final bath (*avabhṛtha*) of the Sacrificer and his Wife in śrauta ritual, the waters may owe their prominence in this vs. to that function. I cannot so readily account for the other players. However, note that Mātariśvan is found in the AV Brahmācārīn hymn along with the waters (*mātariśvan ... apsū: Ś XI.5.13≅P XVI.154.4*) and *salilā-* in the same hymn (*Ś vs. 26 = P XVI.155.6*).

Both *salilā-* and *tāpas-* are ordinarily neut., but appear to be masc. in this vs. (so Old), perhaps as animatized forces? Re (EVP XVI.162) suggests that *vīlūharās tāpa(h)* is the “resolution” of an avoided three-member compd **vīlūharastapas* (no accent given), an explanation I am somewhat sympathetic to, though it would help if he had indicated what he thought it meant and what its structure would be. Perhaps a 2nd member dvandva *-haras-tapas-* in a bahuvrīhi: **“possessing staunch rage and fervor”*? But we must deal with the ill-assorted elements we have in the text.

As also disc. in the art., the *brahma-kilbiṣā-* could be either an offense committed against a brahman or by him. I opt for the former (as do most interpr.). The precise offense, in my view, is the separation of the Wife from her husband when she performs her duties on the ritual ground and interacts with the gods there, in what could be interpr. as sexual contact. Even though the brahman probably initiated the ritual, the separation could technically be considered a *kilbiṣā-* committed against him.

X.109.2: This is the first mention of the “giving back” of the Brahman’s wife. The list of gods involved in her return remind us of the gods who serve as husbands to the bride before she is married to her human spouse in the wedding hymn (X.85.40–41) – as I am not the first to notice. The first and last gods there are Soma and Agni, matching the endpoints of our list here. However, the middle figure in the wedding hymn is a Gandharva – not a good functional match for Varuṇa, or Varuṇa and Mitra, here. As I suggest in the art. cit., the Third Pressing, in which the Wife has a major role, with simulated sexual contact with the gods, is dedicated to the

Ādityas, whose two principal gods are Varuṇa and Mitra – this ritual episode may be alluded to here, but see also below.

There is much discussion about the derivation of the agent noun *anvartitā*: to *ānu* √*ṛ*(*t*) (the Pp. interpr.) or *ānu* √*vṛt* with simplification of **anuvart-* (see Old, Ge n. 2c, etc.)? Old favors √*ṛ*(*t*) and is fld. by Ge, Tichy (Nom. ag. 126, flg. I. Eichner-Kühn), with the sense ‘demand-er back’ (Zurückforderer). But since the few passages adduced for this lexeme are late and seem divergent in sense, I favor the connection with √*vṛt* (as does Re, but he thinks it means “consentant”). The lexeme *ānu* √*vṛt* is reasonably well attested in both RV and AV and means ‘follow after, escort’, which fits the context well. The AV has a future *ānvartisyē* in a wedding context (Ś XIV.1.56=P XVIII.6.4). The form is phonologically ambiguous in the same way as ours, but Wh (AV ad loc.) and Kim (Index verborum s.v. *vart*) both interpret as **ānu vartisyē*. AVŚ XIV.1.56 *idāṃ tād rūpāṃ yād āvasta yōṣā, jāyāṃ jijñāse mānasā cārantīm / tām ānvartisyē sākhibhir nāvagvaiḥ, kā imān vidvān ví cacarta pāsān* Wh “This [is] that form in which the young woman dressed herself; I desire to know with [my] mind the wife moving about; I will go after her [/escort her? swj] with nine-fold comrades: who, knowing, unloosened these fetters?” The “fetters” in d are “the fetters of Varuṇa” (mentioned explicitly in the two flg. vss., XIV.1.57–58), with which the bride is briefly bound at the beginning of the wedding ceremony, before being released to marriage. That Varuṇa is the *anvartitā* in our vs. seems significant.

I render *mitrāḥ* here as ‘ally’, an appositive to *vāruṇaḥ*, rather than as the god Mitra (contra the standard tr.), primarily for this reason: i.e., that the idiom *ānu* √(*v*)*ṛt* is also found in a passage that links Varuṇa (alone) with the wife (*jāyā*). It is also the case that there’s a singular verb and agent noun, though that is not so strong an argument, since singular nouns in series can take singular verbs.

X.109.3: This vs. has received a number of (over-)elaborate interpr., bending it to fit the purāṇic story (or whatever scenario the interpr. favors). I cannot engage with these in detail; see the extensive disc. of, e.g., Old, Ge, and Doniger (275–77). Suffice it to say that the supposed plot the interpr. see does some violence to what is actually in the text.

In my interpr. the vs. concerns the Patnī’s activity on the ritual ground. Her presence there is announced in b. In pāda a the standard interpr. assume that the hand belongs to someone else, but I take it to be hers (see pāda-final *asyā(h)*). Only she can touch and transfer the ritual substance from the earthly to the divine realm. Her exclusive role in this transfer is further treated in pāda c: she does not allow a proxy or messenger to be sent; she must do it herself. As I say in the art. cit., the mid. perfect *tasthe* with dat. inf. may go too easily into idiomatic Engl. (“stand for” = “allow, permit”), though Ge’s “gestattete” is sim. (Kü doesn’t treat this passage.) Note the double dative infinitival phrase *dūtāya prahyè*.

I do not have a particularly good explanation for pāda d. I do not think it has to do with tension and hostility between the two varṇas, brahmins and kṣatriyas, although I think this vs. probably contributed to the reorientation of this expanded hymn in the AV to just this issue. (See n. 54 in my 2016 art. for disc.) Varṇa-consciousness barely exists in the RV, though it does begin to surface in the later parts of the text. But even there the relation between king and priest is generally one of cooperation and complementarity. I think such a situation may be depicted here: she is the wife of the Brahman, quite possibly a/the priestly sacrificer, but the correct performance of the sacrifice ensures the continued successful function of the overarching social and political structures – the kingdom and its ruler. Note also that the AV Brahmacārin hymn contains a very similar statement: AVŚ XI.5.17=AVP XVI.54.7 *brahmacāryeṇa tāpasā rājā*

rāṣṭrām ví rakṣati “By brahmacarya and by fervor the king protects his kingdom.” In both cases kingship is supported by the characteristic activity of priestly personnel.

X.109.4: This vs. continues the celebration of the Patnī’s critical role in the sacrifice. It is a canny move on the part of the ritual innovators who recently introduced the Wife into the sacrifice to ascribe these praises of the Wife to “the ancient gods and Seven Seers” (*devāḥ ... pūrve, saptarśayah*), thus providing this innovation with a supposedly primordial pedigree.

My interpr. of what they say is quite different from the standard, turning on a different understanding of the hapax *durdhā-* (besides the standard tr. and comm., see also Scar 252). It is generally taken to mean ‘disorder’; by contrast I interpr. it as ‘difficult to place’. It is not that she causes trouble in heaven, but that she performs difficult and dangerous tasks in the sacrifice – particularly the preparation of the sacrificial animal – and transfers the perilous material to the divine world.

The standard interpr. also must take *úpanītā* as ‘led away’ (Wh [AVŚ V.17.6] ‘led away’, Don ‘taken away’), referring to her supposed abduction. But *úpa* doesn’t mean ‘away’, but its opposite ‘up to, near’; moreover *úpa √nī* has a technical idiomatic meaning: ‘initiate’. Given the presence of *brahmacārīn-* in the next vs. (5a), it is difficult to believe that this technical meaning wasn’t in the poet’s and audience’s minds, since already in the AV the Brahmacārīn undergoes Upanayana; see, e.g., AVŚ XI.5.3. Here I think both the additive meaning ‘led near’ and the technical ‘initiated’ are meant: the Wife is led into intimate association with the personnel and activities of the sacrifice, and she is also initiated as a performer in her own right. (In śrauta ritual the Patnī undergoes Dīkṣā along with her husband.)

X.109.5: For another take on this vs., which I find no more plausible than the others, see HPS (B+I 120–22).

This vs. contains the only occurrence of *brahmacārīn-* (or *brahmacārya-*) in the RV. As noted above, I think the poet who lobbies so effectively for the new ritual Patnī in this hymn also infuses the hymn with hints of the Brahmacārīn. I also think the poet was well aware of the literal sense of the compound ‘practicing *brāhman*’, in addition to its newly developed technical sense. This is immediately evident in the double etymological figure that opens the vs.: *brahmacārī carati véviṣad víṣah*. Here I think that *carati* functions as an auxiliary, reinforcing the iterative value of the participle *véviṣat* (“keeps constantly laboring”). If *brahmacārī* is interpr. in its literal sense, this would mean that the priest/poet, who produces formulations, just keeps doing what he’s always been doing in the ritual, while the newly introduced Patnī, the “wife of the formulation” (*brahmajāyā-*), a possible interpr. of that compd. (see 2016 art.), brings novelty to the ritual. If *brahmacārī* is interpr. in its new idiomatic sense, the student keeps accomplishing the many types of cosmic deeds attributed to him in the AV Brahmacārīn hymn.

The second pāda is difficult, in part because *ékam* can be interpr. in diametrically opposed ways: does he become *one* limb of the gods, of which there are potentially more, or the *single* limb of the gods, of which there are no more? As is often my technique, I think it can be interpreted as both. On the one hand, if *brahmacārī* refers here to the standard ritual formulator, the priest-poet, pāda b may be pointing out that he is now (just) one limb of the gods; the new Patnī is another, and together they will form a more effective team. This could also be true if *brahmacārī* refers to the student (forming a polarized pair with the Patnī), but I think “the single/only limb” interpr. fits the student better – if we’re allowed a more expansive interpr. of *āṅga-* ‘limb’. In the wedding hymn X.85.30 sg. *āṅgam* clearly refers to the bridegroom’s penis;

the designation “one/single limb” would make that referent even clearer here. Of course, it’s a shocking paradox to call the chaste student “the penis of the gods” – but the kind of shock a RVic audience would enjoy. Moreover, the Brahmacārin is credited with an astounding and unambiguous sexual act in the AV Brahmacārin hymn: Ś XI.5.12 = P XVI.154.2 *brhác chépo ’nu bhūmau jabhāra / brahmacārī siñcati sānau rétaḥ pṛthivyām* “He “bore down” his lofty penis on the earth; the Brahmacārin pours semen on the back, on the earth.” (On the sexual idiom *ānu √ bhr̥* see my 1981 ‘A Vedic sexual pun: *ástobhayat, anubhartrī,* and RV I.88.6” [*Acta Orientalia* 42 (1981[82]) 55-63].) It seems that the very fervor of his chastity makes him prodigiously sexual.

I don’t quite know what to do with pāda c, which has provided (weak) support for the abduction narrative – though I now have a few new ideas.

The first problem is *tēna*: this is ordinarily (incl. in the publ. tr.) taken as an instrument instrumental: “by/with him,” referring to the Brahmacārin; it could alternatively be an instr. of accompaniment: “... discovered the wife along with him” or “along with him, Bṛhaspati discovered ...” Or it could be an adverbial “in this way ...” None of these possibilities is particularly compelling, though I now weakly favor the last.

The subject *bṛhaspātīḥ* is, not surprisingly, generally taken as the god, but I now wonder. I think it is a multifaceted pun: in the RV this well-attested compound is doubled by the less common, but more transparent *bráhmaṇas-pāti-*, and the genitive 1st members of these compounds could easily be replaced by the stem form *brahma-*, which we find in *brahma-jāyā-*. In other words *bṛhaspāti-* here can count as the husband of the pair, a putative **brahma-pāti-* – and he also can be taken as a different realization of *brahma-cārīn-* ‘practicing formulations’, which begins the vs. In other words, I now think that *bṛhaspātīḥ* here designates not a god, but the husband of the *brahmajāyā-*, from whom he has been separated during her activity on the ritual ground. He now finds her: this is the beginning of the “return” of the Brahman’s wife, which will occupy the next vs. And just as Soma was the first to give her back in 2a, here she is led to her husband by Soma.

The simile in d is interpretable if *juhū-* ‘ladle / tongue’ is taken as standing for Agni (see VI.66.10 for “tongues of fire”). It is a glancing allusion to the myth of Agni’s flight from his ritual role and rediscovery by the gods.

X.109.6: The vs. corresponding to vs. 2 in the outer ring of this omphalos hymn; see publ. intro. and art. cit.

As disc. in the cited article, “kings” in the plural is almost never used of mortal kings in the RV, but only of the Ādityas. As the deities of the Third Pressing, their particular participation here is understandable. Once again, the scenario of the supposed hostility between the kṣatriya and brāhmaṇa varnas is subverted by closer attention to the actual text.

On *adaduḥ* (a), *daduḥ* (d), and the gapped verb of b, see the art. cit. There is no justification for the modal interpr. of b and d in the standard tr., and I take them all as preterital. Everyone involved in the ritual, gods and mortals alike, have restored the wife to her husband after her ritual activities.

X.109.7: This vs. forms a ring with the first, particularly in their shared *-kilbiṣā-* – an esp. nice example of a ring, because the second example cancels out the first: the offense has been expiated. On the possible ref. to the avabhṛtha or “final bath,” taken by the Sacrificer and his Wife in śrauta ritual, see art. cit.

The standard tr. have some trouble with the instr. *devāih*; they must assume that the mortals make expiation with the help of the gods. But in my interpr. the gods are equally guilty of the offense of separating the wife from her husband and participate in the expiation.

The last hemistich of the hymn seems only loosely connected to it, expressing the good results that the participants in the sacrifice, both gods and men, share (c). I see no reason to bring Viṣṇu into d (like Ge, e.g.). Although *urugāyá-* does elsewhere modify Viṣṇu, he is not the only typical referent. Instead the form often refers to the wide space so prized by Vedic people – see VI.28.4, where cows wander *urugāyám ábhayam* “(space) that is wide-ranging and free of fear,” and the repeated passage VII.35.15=X.65–66.15, where the gods are asked to grant *urugāyám* to us. In neither case is Viṣṇu appropriate.

Note the non-standard gerund suffixes on *kṛtvī* and *bhaktváya*.

X.110 Āprī

A fairly unremarkable Āprī hymn: an 11-verse version with Tanūnapāt in vs. 2 (like I.188, III.4, VII.2, IX.5) instead of Narāśaṃsa (like II.3, V.5, X.70). I.13 and I.142 have both, with Tanūnapāt in vs. 2 and Narāśaṃsa in vs. 3.

X.110.1: On the phrase *mānuṣo duroṇé*, see comm. ad X.104.4, also (for *duroṇé* X.11.2).

On the accent on *váha* in *ā ca váha*, see comm. ad I.74.6. At least functionally we do not seem to be dealing with subordinating *ca*, *pace* JSK (DGRV I.243–44) and others.

X.110.2: On the phrase *pathá ṛtásya yānān*, see Re’s extensive disc. (EVP XIV.119). To my mind we are dealing with the crossing of two expressions: on the one hand, *ṛtásya pánthā-* “path(s) of truth” is a common expression (I.46.11, 136.2, etc. etc.); on the other, the phrase *ṛtām yaté* “to the one going to / following the truth” (though with the part. of \sqrt{i} , not $\sqrt{yā}$) is a fairly common pāda-ending, incl. in the Tanūnapāt vs. in the Āprī hymn I.188.2. I think they’re combined here, with “truth” as goal supplanted by the genitive. This seems easier than assuming a decomposed **ṛta-yāna-* [no accent given] as Re does.

Pāda d contains a *ca* whose coordinating role is not immed. clear. JSK (DGRV I.223) plausibly explains it as connecting the *kṛṇuhi* clause of cd with the *svadayā* clause of ab, but preceded by the heavy participial phrase that occupies all of c. That phrase itself contains an *utá* conjoining the acc. objs. *mānmāni* and *yajñām*.

X.110.5: Pāda c consists of a single voc. phrase, with a single accent, on the initial syllable of *dévīh*.

X.110.6: On *susváyantīh* see comm. ad the other RVic occurrence of this stem in VII.36.6, as well as my *-áya-* book (pp. 52–53), where I argue that our form is based directly on VII.36.6.

X.110.7: I take *yájadhyai* as a purpose inf. with *mímānā*, with the two Hotars as subjects of both (so also Re). Ge (fld. by Keydana, Inf. 61) instead construes it as a predicated inf. with “I” as supplied subj. (“... will ich verehren”). But in other Divine Hotar vss. in Āprī hymns, it’s the Hotars who sacrifice; they aren’t sacrificed to. Cf. I.13.8=I.142.8=I.188.7 *yajñām no yakṣatām imám* and II.3.7 *yakṣataḥ ... / devān yájantau*. Acdg. to his n. 7b, he bases his tr. on VII.2.7 *mánye vām ... yájadhyai*, but that is better interpr. as “I think you are to perform the sacrifice, rather than his “... euch gedenke ich zu verehren.” In neither interpr. is there a finite verb in this

vs. In this type of “mentioning” context a finite verb does not seem necessary, but the vs. does contain three pres. participles that could be taken as predicated: *mímānā* (b), *pracodáyantā* (c), and *diśántā* (d).

The “dwelling of Manu” (1a) has now been further specified as the “sacrifice of Manu.”

A more significant piece of chaining is *prācīnam ... pradísā* (d), which picks up the same phrase in 4a. In 4 the “east-facing” substance was the barhis; here it is the light (*jyótiḥ*), which is presumably the ritual fire (so Ge n. 7d, referring to “all commentaries”). The root noun cmpd *pradís-* occurs three times in this hymn, twice as instr. (4a, 7d), once as loc. (11c). This stem also has several different senses, rather like its English counterpart ‘direction’ – either as a geographical term, leading ultimately to its use for quarters or regions, or as an instruction, order, or command (see Scar 222–23). In our 4a it is clearly the former, in our 11c clearly the latter. In my opinion the one in our vs. is a modulation from one to the other and can be interpr. in both senses. Ge seems to ignore the strong phraseological agreement between 4a and 7d and interpr. *pradísā* only in the ‘instruction’ sense (“mit ihrer Weisung,” versus 4a “in der Richtung der Erde”). My tr. is meant to capture both: the Hotars direct the fire towards the earth’s eastern direction, just as the barhis was arranged in 4a, but they also do so at their own direction.

X.110.8: On Iḍā’s instruction of Manu, see I.31.11 *īlām akṛṇvan mānuṣasya śāsanīm* “They made I. the instructor of M.”

Barhis as *syonā-* for gods to sit on returns from 4a, d.

X.110.9: The verb *āpimśat* picks up *sukra-pís-* in 6d.

The 2nd hemistich echoes and scrambles 3cd: *hótā ... yakṣi iṣitó yájīyān* matched by our ... *hotar iṣitó yájīyān ... yakṣi*.

X.110.10: I take the Lord of the Forest, the Butcher, and Agni as three different entities because of the pl. verb *svadantu*. In II.3.10 the three figures appear in different pādas and have different associated verbs. Ge merges the Butcher and Agni, but doesn’t mention the number of the verb.

The phrase in 2b *mādhvā samañján svadayā* is picked up and parceled out here: *samañján* (a) ... *svádantu mádhunā* (d). In b *pāthaḥ* echoes *patháḥ* of 2a, though they are entirely different words.

X.110.11: More echoes: *vy àmimīta yajñám* recalls 7b *mímānā yajñám*. On *pradísī* see comm. ad vs. 7. And *adantu* (d) plays on *svádantu* 10d.

X.111 Indra

On the hymn’s reflections on the connection between poetry and deeds, esp. in vss. 1–4, see the publ. intro.

The hymn is overstuffed with *hi*’s, esp. at the beginning, often without clear function: 1d, 2a. 3b, also 6a. The publ. tr.’s attempt to render them all as causal may be misguided.

X.111.1: The interpr. of pāda b is somewhat open-ended: does *yáthā-yathā* mean “exactly as ...” (so, e.g., JSK, “Āmreḍitas ... [JAOS 123 (2003): 785]) or, its opposite, “in whatever way” (which Klein also allows as possible for this passage)? I favor the latter, in part because it seems a loose paraphrase of the poet’s patronymic Vairūpa ‘having many/different forms’, in part because the beginning of the hymn seems to celebrate the range of poetic possibilities.

There are several different ways to take *satyañ ... kṛtébhiḥ*; Ge’s anodyne “durch seine wahrhaften Taten” is perhaps the most obvious, with *satyá-* modifying nominalized *kṛtá-*; Lü (508–9) flips the grammatical values, with *kṛtá-* modifying nominalized *satyá-*: “gemachten Wahrheiten,” which he further specifies as Satyakriyas (truth-formulations). This seems to me to go too far, esp. as it’s *ṛtá-* that participates in RVic truth-formulations. My interpr. reads *kṛtá-* twice, both as nominalized ‘deed’ and as an adj. predicating *satyá-* (“made real”). As indic. in the publ. intro., I think the point is that poets by celebrating Indra’s deeds give them reality – this is a minor variant on the IE “imperishable fame” theme that pervades archaic IE poetry: it is not enough to *do* something heroic; it needs to be enshrined in words, words artful enough to last. That Indra, the hero (*vīráḥ*), realizes this is shown by pāda d.

X.111.2: HPS (B+I 229–30) takes this vs. as a depiction of the Vala myth, with the “cows” (*góbhiḥ*) being the cows trapped in the cave, not (with Ge n. 2b) hymns. Interpr. the vs. in this way helps account for its place in the hymn and esp. the first pāda (with *hī*). Since in the Vala myth Indra functions as poet, opening the cave by his true and well-formulated speech, he understands the power of the ritual speech produced by human poets. I now take pāda a as further explaining 1d. In 1cd it is said that the poets make Indra’s deeds real (in poetry) *because* (*hī*) “he is known to long for song.” Pāda 2a explains Indra’s particular penchant for songs: *because* (*hī*) his own hymnic vision (*dhītīḥ*) “flashed out” effectively when he was positioned at the Vala cave, just as the same type vision flashes out from the human poets on the ritual ground with the same efficacy.

In pāda b I would now replace “the cows [=Dawns/hymns]” with “the cows (from the Vala cave).”

Indra’s mother is identified as a *gr̥ṣṭī-* in IV.18.10, the only occurrence of this word in the RV, just as the metronymic *gr̥ṣṭeyá-* only appears here. The tr. “heifer” is a bit misleading, since the usual def. of the English word is “a young cow, esp. one that has not given birth to a calf.” But “young cow” is flat, and “heifer” conveys the tone better, I think.

Pāda c is a clearer version of pāda a; that is, it depicts Indra’s action at the Vala cave. The presence of *rāveṇa* is a tipoff, because this word is almost always used in a Vala context for the roar that breaks open the cave (e.g., *valám ruroja ... ráveṇa*).

I interpr. *mahānti cid ...* as a concessive nominal clause, in great part because *purūṇi cid* in 4c invites the same treatment; both modify *rājāmsi*. See also *mahīm cid* in 5c.

Ac dg. to Kü (503), the indic. pf. of *√vyac* is only stative presential, and he so tr. this passage. But in this mythological context a presential interp. seems strained; see HPS’s preterital “... hat er ganz umspannt.”

X.111.3: My interpr. of the first pāda differs considerably from the standard. In my view (see publ. intro.) it asserts the crucial role of poetry in Indra’s self-fashioning: he knows about his deeds and powers from hearing about them in praise poetry. Contra the Pp (and all standard interpr.) I take the Saṃhitā form *śrútyā* as standing for abl. *śrútyās*, not dat. *śrútyai*. (For abl.-gen. in *-yās* to fem. short *i*-stem, see, e.g., *yuvatyās* to *yuvatí-*).

The referent of *asyá* ‘of this’ is, broadly, the Indra mythology related in the first vss. as well as what is to come.

It’s a good thing that *he* knows it, because the rest of the vs. is deeply puzzling to the rest of us. HPS (229 n. 106) claims that it also concerns the Vala myth. Although this would be both convenient and make sense, since 2 and 4ab are Vala vss., I see no points of contact – although

there's a cow, it's singular, and the Vala cows are plural. As Old and Ge (n. 3c) point out, pāda c, with *mēnā-* and a cow, is reminiscent of the likewise deeply puzzling I.121.2, and I have interpr. our passage in light of my own interpr. of that vs. (see comm. ad loc.). Here I think the context is (the time of) dawn, and the *mēnā* and the cow are both Dawn, who becomes Indra's consort. The dawn context is set in pāda b, where Indra becomes the "path-maker" for the sun, implying a time before the sun rises and begins its journey across heaven.

The second hemistich must continue pāda b, both thematically and syntactically, because the accent on *bhúvat* in c can best be explained if it's still under the domain of *hí* in b -- so Old, implicitly contra Ge; alternatively Scar (147) makes the first part of c an unmarked subord. cl ("Wenn ..."). In this hemistich I read both *góḥ* and *pátih* twice. I first take *góḥ* as abl., in the phrase "making a wife from a cow," and then as gen. with *pátih*: "husband of the cow." In both cases the cow is Dawn. *pátih* is positioned between two adjacent genitives and can also be read with flg. *diváh* as "lord of heaven" (for Indra as "lord of heaven" see VIII.13.8, 98.4–6). This is a bit tricky, but the overall interpr. makes at least a bit more sense than the others.

X.111.4: The first hemistich returns to the Vala myth, signaled most clearly by the presence of the Aṅgirasas. Although there are no other unambiguous exx. of *aṛṇavá-* 'flood' referring to Vala (*pace* Ge n. 4a and HPS [Vedisch *Vrata* 47 n. 84], the occurrence in VIII.40.5 is not at all clear), but several occurrences of *udadhí-* 'water-holder, reservoir' probably do refer to Vala (X.67.5, possibly VII.94.12), and it is not difficult to think of Vala as a reservoir of cows/dawns/waters, and by some semantic fiddling as a flood: "flood" – i.e., the contained (cows/dawns/waters) -- can be used to name their container, the Vala cave.

The statement "Indra by his greatness confounded the commandments of the great Flood [=Vala]" (*índro mahnā mahatō aṛṇavásya vratāmināt*) is quite extraordinary in a RVic context. *vratás* are otherwise almost the exclusive province of gods, esp Varuṇa. (On *vratá-* in general see HPS, Vedisch *Vrata*, and for important adjustments to HPS's views, Brereton, Ādityas, 69–81.) When construed with $\sqrt{mī}$ (+/- *ā* or *prā*), the syntagm is almost always negated: "he/they [generally mortals] do/did *not* confound the *vratā(s)*"; in the few positive occurrences the subjects who do confound the *vratas* [again mortals] are inviting divine punishment, though often hoping for mercy. Acdg to HPS, who discusses this vs. at length (Vedisch *Vrata* 46–47), this is the only place in which a "widergöttlich" being has *vratas*. He reasonably asks what Vala's *vratas* might be and concludes, also reasonably, that it is the lie (*drúh-*), untruth (*ánṛta-*). The ascription of *vratas* to Vala is a remarkable index of his power, almost an indication that his power is equivalent to that of the gods, a sense encouraged by assigning greatness to both Indra and Vala in this vs. (*mahnā mahatáh*). If this power is linked to Untruth as the gods' is to Truth, the picture is almost like that of the uneasy Avestan balance between those two forces – a hint of Zoroastrian dualism that does not get further developed in Vedic. Here, happily, Indra's own greatness is sufficient to overcome great Vala's *vratas*, but the fact that the verb is *amināt* (per Pp, or possibly *ā-amināt*), whose subjects in this formula are otherwise disobedient mortals, is unsettling; it casts Indra in the role of a less powerful being challenging the implicitly legitimate commandments of an implicitly legitimate and powerful authority.

The lexeme $ní\sqrt{tan}$ does not otherwise occur in the RV, but in the AV and early Saṃhitās there are various plant names based on it, presumably meaning 'stretch(ing) down' of roots. See Griffiths's disc. ad AVP VII.5.6. I take c to concern the fixation of the earthly realms. On *purūṇi cid* see comm. ad 2d, also 5c.

The final word of d, *satyátātā*, may form a ring with *satyañ* in 1c, bringing to a close the section of the hymn concerned with the intertwining of divine deeds and poetry. The form is universally taken (incl. by the publ. tr.) as an instr. to *satyátāt-*. Acdg. to the publ. tr., Indra performed these deeds by means of the realization provided by their poetic encapsulation, by the Aṅgirasas (as in the publ. tr.) or in general. An alternative analysis could start with the stem **satyátāti-* (attested 1x in the RV, but as an unaccented voc.), which would then be in the loc. (as often with *-tāti-* stems; e.g., *devátātā*, *sarvátātā*). In this case it would mean “buttressed their buttress in reality / in poetic realization.” The two are equally likely (or unlikely). We should also consider *satyátātā* in conjunction with the unexpressed, but implied, linkage of Vala and his *vratas* to Untruth, discussed immed. above. Under this interpr. Indra did his various deeds *by means of truth/reality* or rooted the realms and buttressed their buttress *in truth/reality* (depending on whether the *-tāt-* or *-tāti-* stem is selected).

X.111.5: This vs. is a bit of a mythological grabbag; one of its points, esp. in the first pāda, may be to reestablish the superior power of Indra after the destabilization in the previous vs., 4ab. The first hemistich echoes III.31.8. Bl (RV Repts, ad III.31.8) dismisses our vs. with characteristic acidity: “[III.31.8] has furnished material for a hackneyed, commonplace stanza, in which the repeated pāda is varied insipidly, to wit X.111.5. ... the overshrewd thought of an epigonal poet ...” It is always bracing to read Bl at his most censorious, but his judgments need not be accepted.

Pāda d is marked by the heavy etym. figure *cāskambha ... kāmphanena skābhīyān*, where, cleverly, each word begins with a different consonant.

X.111.6: Another etym. fig.: *vṛtrahā vṛtrām*.

The verb *ástar* can be either 2nd or 3rd sg.; Ge opts for the latter, while I do the former. It doesn’t really matter: it’s a modulation form between the 3rd sgs. of vs. 5 (ending with *cāskambha*) and the 2nd sgs. of 6cd (*jagantha .. abhavaḥ*).

Pāda b lacks a verb and can be construed either with pāda a (so publ. tr.) or c (Ge). Again it doesn’t really matter.

X.111.7: The first hemistich is relatively straightforward, the second bristling with difficulties.

The only real question in ab is whose *ketús* are at issue – the sun’s or the dawns’? Though Ge (see also JS, Root nouns 41) takes the beacons to be the sun’s (with *asya* dependent on *ketávaḥ*), I think they are actually the dawns’. Although *ketú-* can be associated with both the sun (e.g., X.37.1 ... *ketáve ... sūryāya* ...) and the dawns (e.g., VIII.43.5, X.78.7, 91.5 *uśásām iva / ná ketávaḥ*), it is my impression that the connection with dawns is more common. I therefore take *asya* as limiting *citrām ... rām* “glittering gift,” referring to the sun’s light or even to the sun itself.

My real departure from the Ge and Old interpr. comes with c. They take c and d as antithetical clauses concerning the not-yet-risen sun (c) and the unknowable goal of the sun once set (d). Flg. Ludwig, they both take *yát* in c as a neut. pres. part. to *√i* (construed with *ā* “coming here”), complementary to (*púnar*) *yatāḥ* “going away again.” The *yát* in c is therefore not (or not primarily) the subordinating conj.; eliminating an overt subordinator requires the accent on *dadrśé* to be explained: Old suggests antithetical accent; Ge (n. 7cd) adds the possibility of haplogy **yád yád*. All of this seems plausible and I am almost convinced. The resulting tr. would be “(When) the heavenly body coming here from heaven [or, “the day’s heavenly body,”

with Ge’s “Tagesgestirn,” construing *diváh* with *nákṣatram* in the meaning ‘day’] is not (yet) seen, no one knows about its going (away) again.” I now consider this a possible alt., though I don’t see how pāda c furnishes the logical basis for d, and the position of *ná* creates difficulties (see below).

The publ. tr. reflects a different construal of pāda c – as a rel. cl. appositive to the “glittering gift” of b, with the rel. prn. attracted to the neut. gender of the internal referent *nákṣatram* (from the fem. of *citrām ... rām* in b). Pāda d is then a separate clause. By this interpr. *dadṛśé* has its accent because it is in a subord. cl. I would now, however, tr. the verb as “appears,” rather than preterital “appeared,” given the usual presential use of the middle pf. of $\sqrt{dṛś}$ (Kü 233).

This interpr. leaves pāda-final *ná* out of the rest of c and is the most problematic part of my interpr.: I take it as an emphatic expletive, anticipating the next pāda with its own neg. (*nákiḥ*) and its own emphatic (*addhā*). I recognize the ad hoc nature of this interpr., but pāda-final *ná* is problematic for everyone. Ge (7cd) weighs both “wie” and “nicht” (both to be construed within pāda c) and decides for the latter – on apparently reasonable grounds, because simile-marking *ná* seems essentially excluded from final position (see comm. ad VIII.76.1, X.21.1), as he himself noted elsewhere. But as it turns out, pāda-final negative *ná* is also on shaky ground; see immed. flg. disc.

To aid our interpr. we need to make a detour to a general consideration of pāda-final *ná* in the RV. I have made a complete (so I hope) collection of pāda-final *ná*, which is extremely rare, especially if *caná* passages are excluded. For reference I patch in the repertoire of *caná* passages: pāda-final *caná* (12x): II.23.5 *ná ... ná ... kútaś caná*; V.34.5 *ná ... caná*; VI.54.9 *ná ... kádā caná*; VII.82.7 *...ná ... kútaś caná*; VIII.19.6 *ná ... kútaś caná*; VIII.23.15 *ná ... caná*; IX.69.6 *ná ... kím caná*; X.39.11 *ná ... kútaś caná*; X.48.5 *ná ... kádā caná*; X.62.9 *ná ... kás caná*; X.85.3 *ná ... kás caná*; X.152.1 *ná ... kádā caná*.

We can now consider possible examples of simile-marking *ná* and negative *ná* in that position. There is one, seemingly secure, ex. of pāda-final *ná* in a conventional simile (VII.68.8). X.95.3 also has a pāda-final ‘like’, but it occurs in a truncated simile and, more importantly, in Purūravas’s disordered speech and can serve as an index of how his mania has affected his syntax (see comm. ad loc.). The pāda formatting in Lub in the metrically complex hymn X.105.3 appears to provide another ex.: *ápa yór índraḥ pápaja ā márto ná*, but the hemistich continues *śásramāno bibhívān*, and the correct pāda configuration is clearly *ápa yór índraḥ pápaja, ā márto ná śásramāno bibhívān*, with 8 12 (so HvN), with *ná* safely inside the pāda.

There are even fewer secure pāda-final *nás* in negative than in simile-marking usage, and they all have, as it were, extenuating circumstances. In IV.13.5 [=14.5] *ánāyato ánibaddhaḥ katháyāṃ nyànn uttāno ’va padyate ná* “Not held firm, not tied down -- how does this one not fall down, head over heels?” the *ná* echoes the two negated adjectives that open the hemistich, creating a chiasmic *#án ... án ... ná*, and it also poses a negative question, which may have affected its position. In X.49.10 *ahám tád āsu dhārayaṃ yád āsu ná, devás caná tváṣṭādhārayad rúṣat* “I held fast in them that which the god Tvaṣṭar never held fast in them: the gleaming ...,” the pāda-final *ná* (if so it is) is clause-internal in a rel. cl. that straddles the pāda break, with *caná* doubling it in the following pāda. Moreover, pāda b is metrically problematic (see comm. ad loc.), and it highly probable that *ná* opens that pāda (*#ná devás caná ...*) rather than ending pāda a, and so this ex. can be scrapped. X.129.7 contains the famous final phrase *yádi vā dadhé yádi vā ná*, which is both syntactically and metrically incomplete: the unusual final *ná* draws attention to this principled lack of closure.

In short, save for IV.13.5 there are no examples of a pāda-final negative *ná* that *ends* a complete clause and is construed within it – the function that the Ge interpr. of our pāda c requires. Since there is no body of such usage to set against my (admittedly unique) interpr. of *ná* here as an emphatic anticipation of the next, negative clause, I cautiously favor my interpr. in the publ. tr.

With Ge and Old, however, I do consider pāda d to concern the unknowable whereabouts of the sun after setting.

X.111.8: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. serves as a sort of semantic pivot, with the unidentified females of most of the first hemistich (gen. pl. *āsām* [a], *yāḥ* [b]) seeming to continue the subject of the Dawns in vs. 7, but identified instead as waters by the last word of the hemistich (*āpaḥ*), an identity hinted at by the immed. preceding verb *sasrúḥ* ‘flowed’. This transitions us to the Vṛtra myth, which is overt in vs. 9. Since the action in pāda a is characteristic of Dawns – the daily passage of one after the other – the introduction of waters in b is even more unexpected.

The first pāda of this vs. also responds indirectly to the end of the preceding vs.: we do not know about the sun’s going away, but the subjects of 8a “have gone into the distance” (*dūrām ... jagmuḥ*). The certainty of our knowledge of their trajectory seems signaled by *kīla* (see the same particle in 2a), in contrast to the radical *uncertainty* of 7d (*nákir addhā nú veda*). Uncertainty returns in the second hemistich of this vs., however.

A slight adjustment to the tr. to “the first ones ...” would avoid the apparent number mismatch of “the first ... have gone.”

The second hemistich shows a different transition, from 3rd ps. (fem. gen. pl. *āsām*, like 8a) in c to 2nd ps. in d (*vaḥ*), by way of *āpaḥ*, which must be voc. here, but was nom. in 8b.

X.111.10: With Ge I take *āritáḥ* with *jārāḥ* (“acknowledged as their lover”). Although it is tempting on the basis VIII.33.5 *yāḥ pūrbhíd āritáḥ* “who is acknowledged as the stronghold-splitter” to construe *āritáḥ* with flg. *pūrbhíd*, the context favors the first alternative.

X.112 Indra

The poet’s name in the heading to the publ. tr. contains a typo: his name is **Prabhedana**, not **Prebhedana**. The hymn is fairly elementary and trouble-free.

X.112.1: *vīryā prá bravāma* echoes the famous opening of I.32; for an even closer echo see vs. 8 below.

X.112.3: Ge (n. 3ab) suggests that ab really refers to soma, under the guise of the sun. Possible but not necessary.

X.112.5: This vs. is formally a riddle, though hardly a challenging one. The referent of both the relative (*yásya* [a]) and the two *sá*-s (c, d) is withheld till the final word: *sómah*.

śátrūn is the problem here, since there is nothing that clearly governs this acc. Ge simply supplies a plausible verb (erschlugest); making use of a trick of English, I’ve given *cakártha* two different senses – “do in” and “do” – for the two different accs., *śátrūn* and *anānukṛtyā rányā*. But I doubt that $\sqrt{kṛ}$ has the “do in” sense, and I should probably simply follow the Ge path by supplying ‘conquered’, ‘smote’, vel sim. There is another, trickier, possibility, which I think is

unlikely in a hymn on this rudimentary rhetorical level, though I would certainly consider it in a more sophisticated hymn. It would be possible to read *anānukṛtyā* with both the following acc. *rāṇyā* (as is already done) and the preceding one, *śātrūn*, in two different senses. The whole phrase would mean “made your rivals not to be emulated and did inimitable martial (deeds).” Of course, *anānukṛtyā* is not acc. pl. masc. like *śātrūn*, but since the two objects differ in gender, it can agree with only one. I would not hesitate to suggest this interpr. in another type of hymn, but its trickiness is out of place in the plain-vanilla context of this one. For *anānukṛtyām* + *√kṛ*, see X.68.10, where it has the “inimitable (deed)” sense.

The primary sense of *rāṇyā-* is ‘joyous’, but it also shares the martial sense of its base noun *rāṇa-* ‘joy’ / ‘battle’; the noun is found in 10c, probably in both senses as well.

X.112.8: Like vs. 1, this vs. echoes I.32.1 *īndrasya nū vīryāṇi prā vocam, yāni cakāra prathamāni vajrī*. Our vs. has a counterpart for everything but *vajrī* and the rel. prn., and indeed elaborates on some elements. The enclitic + voc. *te indra* matches *īndrasya*; *nūnām* matches *nū*, which occurs in an expanded phrase *pūrvyāni ... nūnām; vīryā ... prathamā* as a single NP matches *vīryāṇi* in the main cl. of I.32.1 and *prathamā* in the rel. cl.; *prā ... prā ... vocam* with tmesis and doubled preverb corresponds to simple *prā vocam*; *kṛtāni* takes the place of the finite *cakāra* in the rel. cl. in I.32.1. It is hard not to conclude that our poet modeled this hemistich on I.32.1, or at least that both poets were working from the same template, given the various other versions, like V.29.13, 31.6.

Interestingly, given the fairly slavish imitation of I.32.1, what follows is not the Vṛtra myth, but Vala. (Perhaps I’m underestimating the skill of this poet – or at least his awareness of the poetic tradition.)

X.112.9: Indra now takes on his role as Bṛhaspati, singing open the Vala cave. See esp. pādas b and d.

Note that the superlative + genitive phrase *vīpratamaṃ kavīnām* “the best *vīpra* of *kavis*” shows the virtual synonymy of the two terms, or at least their fungibility.

X.112.10: In b the impv. *bodhī* can belong either to *√bhū* or *√budh*. Gr, Old, and I opt for the former, with *sākhe* a predicative voc.; Ge and Scar (99) for the latter (though Ge [n. 10b] offers the former as an alternative).

I take the double etym. figure *rāṇaṃ kṛdhi raṇakṛt* as a pun, with *rāṇa-* meaning both ‘joy’ and ‘battle’; see *rāṇyā-* in 5b and disc. there. Certainly the bahuvr. *satya-śuṣma* ‘whose impetuous powers are real’ suggests a martial context, since *śuṣma-* and its deriv. are common in them (e.g., VI.68.7 *yéṣāṃ śuṣmaḥ pṛtanāsu sāhvān* “whose impetuous force, victorious in battles ...”). Note that *satya-śuṣma* is a variant on *satīnā-manyu-* ‘whose battle fury is real’ (8c).

On first glance *ābhakte ... rāyē* appear to belong together morphologically as they do semantically. But of course they don’t, despite the surface agreement in endings (-e): *rāyē* is a dat., *ābhakte* a loc. The lexeme *ā√bhaj* ordinarily takes a loc.; it is difficult to find a function for dat. *rāyē* in this cl. If we take the dat. seriously, we might tr. it as a purpose dat.: “Give us a share even in unapportioned (goods/wealth/booty), for wealth.” But it may be better to follow Ge’s suggestion (n. 10d) that dat. *rāyē* can substitute for the unattested loc. to this stem, here encouraged by the superficial agreement of the endings.

X.113 Indra

X.113.1: In the publ. tr. I construe *sācetasā* with the instr. *viśvebhir devaiḥ* “of one mind with all the gods,” but since *sācetas-* doesn’t otherwise appear with the instr., it might be better to take the instr. as an independent instr. of accompaniment: “H+E, of one mind, along with all the gods ...” The difference in sense is fairly minor, though it emphasizes the agreement between H+E.

The preverb *ānu* is fairly rare with \sqrt{av} (though see VIII.7.24, with the same obj. *śuśmam*). My “assist” is meant to convey that they gave auxiliary aid, since Indra’s *śuśma-* is not likely to need a lot of help. As noted in the publ. intro., the model of auxiliary help continues through the hymn.

It’s possible that *ait* is a sort of aux. with *kṛṇvānāḥ* “as he went on creating ...,” though I prefer the publ. tr.

X.113.2: A verb needs to be supplied in pāda a; since this pāda has the same general structure as 1ab: *tām asya* GOD(S) INSTR. ACC [POWER], I supply “assisted” (*ānu ... *āvāt*) based on 1b *ānu ... āvatām*. Ge (n. 2ab; sim. Kü 255–56) instead supplies **avardhat*, anticipating *āvardhan* in 3d (and [not noted by Ge] serving as the corresponding transitive to *avardhata* in 1d). Either will work, but anticipating a verb almost two vss. in the future seems less likely than basing the passage on a preceding one with the same structure.

In b *dadhanvān* is universally interpr. as transitive (e.g., Ge “der den (Soma)stengel fliessen liess”; sim. Kü 255–56). But as disc. ad VIII.19.1, the secondary root \sqrt{dhanv} as well as the pf. part. *dadhanvān* (which can belong to \sqrt{dhan} [so Kü], but has been assimilated to \sqrt{dhanv}) is otherwise intrans., and the two other occurrences of *dadhanvān* (IX.67.2, 107.1) are definitely intrans., with soma as subject. Clearly the trans. interpr. of our passage assumes a flip of soma from subj. to obj., but I find such syntactic malleability implausible. I think it more likely that Viṣṇu runs to the plant, to prepare it for Indra. On Viṣṇu’s participation in soma preparation, see, e.g., I.85.7, II.22.1, VI.17.11.

Acdg. to Ge (n. 2b), the subj. of *vī rapśate* is Indra, but since the same expression in IV.45.1 *mādhuno vī rapśate* has as its subj. a leather bag (*ḍṛtiḥ*), the plant, as a container of soma like the bag, seems more likely.

X.113.3: The infinitival phrase *śāmsam āvīde* “to acquire a laud” may be a semi-technical expressing for earning a *prāsasti*, the formal praise that a king would receive for a heroic deed.

The obj. in d, *mahimānam indriyām*, is repeated from 1c, and *mahimānam* is also found in the same metrical position in 2a.

X.113.4: In contrast to the first 3 vss., in this catalogue of deeds Indra apparently operates alone.

X.113.5: Likewise in this vs.; Mitra and Varuṇa do appear in the vs., but not as helpers but as beneficiaries of Indra’s actions.

In c (*d*)*hṛṣitāḥ* is a pun facilitated by the sandhi: the form can belong either to $\sqrt{dhrṣ}$ ‘dare’ or $\sqrt{hrṣ}$ ‘be excited’. Old tots up passages that favor the one or the other, but surely the point is that it represents both. (The Pp. reads *dhrṣitāḥ*, and this analysis is followed by Gr and Ge.)

In d Ge tentatively takes *dāsūṣe* as a third party, the mortal worshiper, in addition to M+V. Although it is true that the stem *dāśvāms-* is overwhelming used of mortal worshipers, there are a limited no. of passages where it modifies a god; see disc. ad X.104.6. Since our exact

phrase, *vāruṇāya dāśūṣe*, is found in X.65.5, 6, separating these two datives is not indicated here. See comm. ad X.65.5.

X.113.6: My interpr. of the first hemistich diverges significantly from the standard, starting with the subject. Sāy. and Ge supply the waters, for which I see no evidence; in fact at the time the vs. takes place they are held captive by Vṛtra (pāda d) and in no position to be hastening anywhere. I favor the Maruts (as does Gr [s.v. *ramh*]). Their presence here is signaled by *virapsīnaḥ* ‘teeming’. Gr and Ge take this adj. as gen. sg. modifying Indra, and admittedly the stem regularly modifies him (which must be why Ge takes Indra as subj. of *vī rapśate* in 2b). However it is also used 3x in the plural of the Maruts, each time adjacent to a form of *tāvas-* vel sim.: I.64.10 *tāviṣībhīr virapsīnaḥ* #, I.87.1 *prātavaśo virapsīnaḥ* #, I.166.8 *tavaśo virapsīnaḥ* # -- just like our *tāviṣībhyo virapsīnaḥ* #. By my interpr. the Maruts hasten to the site of the Vṛtra battle to give their support to Indra and his powers and battle fury, hence the datives. It is well known that in some versions of the Vṛtra myth the Maruts provide such support to Indra. It is appropriate that they are characterized as “teeming,” given their identity as the thunderstorm.

In c *vy āvṛscat* echoes *āvṛscat* in 4c; nicely, the use of this verb connects the Vala myth of 4a with the Vṛtra myth here. Another echo: the redupl. pres. participle acc. *bībhratam* modifying Vṛtra and the same stem in the nom. *bībhrat* modifying Indra in 3a.

X.113.7: As Ge points out (n. 7), this vs. presents the Indra–Vṛtra battle as a dual between two, nearly equally matched, rivals, rather than the usual one-sided slaughter of Vṛtra by all-powerful Indra. See the duals *yātamānau samīyātuḥ*, and esp. the preverb *sām*. This balanced account is reminiscent of the depiction of the same battle in the later part of the most famous account of it, in I.32, esp. vss. 12–13 (see comm. ad I.32.12).

The vs. begins ambiguously, and indeed misleadingly: since the initial rel. prn. *yā* immediately precedes a neut. pl. expression, *vīryāṇi prathamāni kártvā*, it is natural to read it as a neut. pl. “which heroic deeds ...” But this leads to a deadend, as there is no correspondent in the main cl. in cd. Only when we reach the second part of b do we encounter the duals that are the real referents of *yā*, which can also be du. masc. “which two ...” The main cl. of cd does not have a resumptive pronoun (*tā* vel sim.), but does have an implicit “the one ... the other” construction, with c devoted to Vṛtra and d to Indra. The interpr. of *yā* as dual is Ge’s (n. 7a), though he in fact suggests reading *yā* twice, as dual masc. and neut. pl.; Old rejects Ge’s dual interpr., but this leaves us with an unresolved rel. cl.

Note that *vīryāṇi prathamāni kártvā* is quite similar to *vīryā ... prathamā kṛtāṇi* in the previous hymn (112.8), attributed to same or related poet. See comm. there.

Note also the return of *patyate* (cf. 5a). Ge interpr. d as referring to Indra’s right to the first drink of soma: “ein Anrecht auf die erste Einladung (zum Soma).” I think that this is correct and my tr. is somewhat opaque. I’d now slightly alter to “over the Early Call (to soma).”

X.113.8: The “causative” *āvardhayan* opening b is in the same position as semantically and functionally identical *āvardhan* opening 3d, and the two verbs have nearly identical subjects: 3a *vísve ... marútaḥ*, 8a *vísve devāsaḥ*.

The content of the 2nd hemistich is startling and syntactically skewed – these two features are probably connected. It is stated that someone/something *ate* (*āvayat*) Vṛtra, with the subject unexpressed. Indra is in an oblique case, the gen. dependent on *hánmanā*, which might almost seem to exclude him as subject of “ate.” But what other candidate is there? Certainly Ge

(n. 8d) thinks Indra is the subject and cites the epithet *vṛtra-khādā-* ‘gnawer of Vṛtra’ used of Indra in III.45.2, 51.9 and of Indra’s alter ego Bṛhaspati in X.65.10. However, this semi-cannibalism is not a standard part of the Indra–Vṛtra myth and seems rather shocking – though eating a snake isn’t as bad as eating a being more human in form. I suggest that Indra is not specified as subj., but shunted into an oblique case, to lessen the shock. On the verb *āvayat* see my *-aya-*book, p. 71. The other occurrence of the verb in the RV, in VIII.45.38, is in a slangy context (see comm. ad loc.).

X.113.9: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. spells out the reciprocal partnership agreement between Indra and his mortal worshipers (ab) and then provides an example of it from the semi-mythic past (cd). The mutual aid between Indra and various gods (esp. the Maruts) earlier in the hymn provides the model for the agreement in ab. As I say in the publ. intro., the language is “labored,” esp. in ab, presumably to approach legalese as closely as possible. Esp. important are the balanced forms of *sakhyā-* ‘(act of) comradeship / partnership’.

As for the illustrative example in cd, elsewhere in the RV it is clear that Indra eliminated Dhuni and Cumuri for Dabhīti because Dabhīti performed ritual service for Indra. See esp. VI.20.13 “Dabhīti who presses for you with the soma juices, who brings the firewood and the cooked food, along with the chants” (... *túbhyaṃ sómebhiḥ sunvān, dabhītīr idhmābhṛtiḥ pakthy ārkāḥ*); in a nearby hymn (VI.26.6) these actions of Dabhīti’s are summarized as *śraddhā-* (pl.) ‘hospitality offerings’. For detailed disc. of *śraddhā-* as ‘trust in hospitality relations’, with hospitality often embodied in the ritual, see my *Sacrificed Wife*, 176–84. Here *śraddhā-manasyā-* refers to Dabhīti’s ‘mind/thought on/of hospitality’; it is rather like the epithet of Manu in the Manu’s Cups story (see SW/SW disc. just referred to), *śraddhā-deva-* ‘whose deity is hospitality’. In the cases of both Manu and Dabhīti, the hospitality is specifically that of the ritual.

X.113.10: In this, the final vs. of the hymn, the poet turns his attention to a different reciprocal relation: not between god and gods, nor god and humans, but human and human – viz., that between the poet and his patron, who is, however, not overtly referred to. The poet asks Indra for material goods (horses in this case) in exchange for the poet’s praise – but the goods are not for the poet himself. Instead, they should make the poet considered to be an effective wordsmith (*māṃsai nivācanāni śāṃsan*). In other words, the unmentioned patron will receive an abundance of horses and conclude that his poet has effectively praised Indra, which roused Indra’s generosity.

X.114 All Gods

On the manifold difficulties of this hymn, see publ. intro.; I have little to contribute to understanding the content, though I can tinker with phraseology and form. Re treats it (insofar as he does) in EVP XVI, not in the Viśve Devās fascicles. Old’s treatment is scanty. (I have the feeling he had the same unenthusiastic reaction I have to the numerological extravagances of the hymn.) Köhler translates and discusses the whole hymn at length in his 2011 Kavi *im Ṛgveda* (110ff.). For attempts to decode the referents and especially the numerological referents, consult these standard treatments.

X.114.1: The lexeme *vī√āp* is found only here in the RV, but is already tolerably well attested in the AV, including in the strikingly similar passage AVŚ VIII.9.20 *kathāṃ gāyatrī trivṛtaṃ vyāpa*

“How did *gāyatrī* permeate the triple [*stóma*]?” (Wh)(no AVP corr.), which, however, is just as obscure.

The root affiliation of *aveṣan* is disputed. Gr assigns it to a root $\sqrt{viṣ}$ ‘sich ergiessen’, separate from $\sqrt{viṣ}$ ‘toil’, and he is followed by Narten (Sig. Aor. 245) and Gotō (1st Kl. 249). On this supposed root, see comm. ad I.178.2; I see no need for it. Ge instead takes it to $\sqrt{vī}$ and tr. “sie für sich beanspruchend” (whose relationship to the standard meanings of $\sqrt{vī}$ is opaque to me). Köhler (110–11) also takes it to $\sqrt{vī}$ but with a sense in line with the usage of that root: “haben ... aufgespürt”; unlike other tr. he takes *divás páyaḥ* as the obj. of *aveṣan*, not *dīdhiṣānāḥ*. But the existence of an *s*-aor. to $\sqrt{vī}$ is questionable, and I see nothing against assigning this form to $\sqrt{viṣ}$ ‘toil’ – at least without a clearer sense of what this vs. is about.

Assuming that *aveṣan* is an impf., it should not have the recent past sense “have toiled.” I am inclined to recast the tenses of the first three pādas to “pervaded ... came ... toiled.”

X.114.2: I have no idea what *nīṛtīḥ* refers to. The only other pl. to this stem in the RV (VIII.24.24) is no help.

Although I would prefer the root-noun cmpd *dīrgha-śrūt-* to have active meaning, ‘hearing long / afar / for a long time’, in all clear cases it has the passive sense ‘heard of / famed for a long time’ (either from the distant past or for the foreseeable future or both), as Scar (555) interpr. it, flg. the standard view. It is therefore essentially equivalent to the bahuvr. *dīrghá-śravas-*. In this passage (far from clear!) in the publ. tr. I rendered it with my preferred tr. “who hear afar,” which makes sense in context: the conveyers recognize the *nīṛtīḥ* because of their keen hearing. But I doubt that the cmpd has active sense in just this passage, and so I might emend to “the conveyers of far fame ...” Alternatively (and now, to me, preferably), *dīrghaśrútaḥ* could be nom. pl. fem. and modify *nīṛtīḥ* in the previous pāda: “Three (Goddesses of?) Dissolution, of long fame ...” The logical connection between the clauses would then be stronger: the conveyers recognize the *nīṛtīḥ* because they are famous. Taking the adj. with what precedes also makes sense of the displaced *vī hí* in b, which should begin a clause. I would now substitute “Three (Goddesses of?) Dissolution of long fame reverently approach to be pointed out, for the conveyers (of songs?) recognize them.”

Although this doesn’t help much, it’s worth noting that the same conjunction of lexical items – *nīdāna-*, *vāhni-*, and multiple occurrences of *kavī-* -- is found in VI.32.2–3. For *nī cikyuḥ kaváyah*, see the identical phrase in X.124.9.

X.114.3: The referent(s) in this vs. and its general purport are completely opaque to me, and I have nothing to contribute to the multiple identifications suggested by others (see esp. Ge, Re, and Th. Unters. 16, 60–63). Th favors the night sky as the overall referent and downplays (or denies) any ritual associations, but as in the rest of the hymn, it is likely that both types of referents are in play. The general view (Ge, Ober [RdR II.133]; see also the reff. in Th, p. 61 n. 3) that in the ritual realm the female referred to is the *vedī* seems hard to dismiss, though Th tries mightily.

X.114.4–5: As indicated in the publ. intro., I take these two vss. as contrastive treatments of the poetic enterprise. In 4 the 1st ps. speaker, with his simple mind (*pākena mānasā*), saw a single eagle as a unity, while the inspired kavis (*vīprāḥ kaváyah*) in 5 configure this single eagle in many ways (*bahudhā*) with their words (*vācobhiḥ*). The power of poetry to create and represent the multiple manifestations of the world could hardly be more clearly expressed.

As for the identity of the eagle (*suparṇā-*), it is generally taken as the sun or the sun identified with the ritual fire (Ge, Lü 299f., Köhler 112), though Th (62) opts for the moon, and other referents have been suggested (see Köhler’s detailed disc.). In my opinion, the emphasis on identifying the referents (and defending the identification against others) has distracted interpr. from the more interesting depiction of how poets operate and what they provide.

X.114.6: The consideration of the poets’ contribution, esp. in creating the sacrifice and making it effective, continues in this vs. The role of meter, mentioned in 5c, is elaborated on in 6b, and the focus narrows to the specifically ritual. Again, there is much disc. of what exactly is going on, with a deep dive into the numerology. Although obviously to a contemporary audience the referents of the exact numbers were interpretable, I still think that too much attention has been lavished on decoding the numbers and too little on the celebration of the role of poets.

X.114.7: By my rules, *anyé* should be definite in this position: “the others ...,” not with most interpr. indefinite “others ...” If Ge (n. 7a) is correct that this is a reference to the variants of the model ritual, a definite reference makes sense: the first, unnumbered one would be the model itself.

On a *tīrthā* associated with drink, see *tīrthām suprapāṇām* in X.40.13 and comm. thereon; see also the “famous *tīrthā*” in IX.97.53. In the comm. there I suggest that it may refer to the place or time in the sacrifice when the dakṣiṇās are distributed. If the hapax *āpnāna-* is related (however sketchily) to *āpnas-* ‘property, wealth’ (see AiG II.2.275–76), as is reflected in my tr. ‘opulent’, the same situation may be referred to here.

X.114.8: The lexeme *prāti* √*pad* occurs in the RV only here. The standard tr. are contextual (e.g., Ge “hat ... erkannt”). Re points out that the later ritual sense of the idiom is “entamer le répons,” which he hesitates to employ here, but I don’t know why ‘undertake, begin’ would be excluded.

X.114.9: Pādas a and b seem to me contrastive, with the unidentified some / ones making an extended journey to the end of the earth, despite being stably yoked to the chariot poles. With Köhler (114) I’m inclined to see the subject as the poets, or particularly skillful poets. As for the rest, it’s just as baffling as the rest of the hymn.

X.115 Agni

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

X.115.1: The “two mothers” in b are of course the kindling sticks.

In c I take *yādi* as standing for **yād ī*, even though it does not precede a cons. cluster that would have encouraged redactional shortening. The form occurs right before the caesura in an opening of 5, and it seems unlikely that both syllables would be light in that position.

In the standard renderings (incl. the publ. tr.), we find a non-conjoining *ca* in c, apparently marking the beginning of the main cl. of cd after the subord. cl. that begins c. (See JSK, DGRV I.211–13, II.106 for attempts to account for its use here.) However, it is possible to assign it its usual conjoining function if we take the *ādhā ca nū* clause as parallel to what precedes, with both under the domain of *yādi*: “when the udderless one has begotten him and then he has waxed strong ...” This double *yādi* cl. would depend on the main cl. in ab. The

vavákṣa would be accented in either reading – either as a subordinated verb or one first in its *pāda*.

Note the distant etymological figure: *vakṣáthaḥ* (a), *vavákṣa* (d).

X.115.2: The vs. has a number of teasing word plays, initiated by the sequence *nāma dhāyi*, which appears to contain the idiom *nāma √ dhā* ‘give a name’ (*nāma-dhā*- 1x, *nāma-dhéya*- 1x), but in fact the two words should be separately construed.

In context *dán* can hardly be anything but an endingless loc. to *dám*- ‘house’: as Ge (n. 2a) points out, ‘establish the ritual fire in the house’ is a widespread locution. The question is how we arrive at this form. A gen. sg. *dán* to this stem is widely accepted (e.g., AiG III.243–44, EWA s.v. *dám*-), but this is from a preform **dám*-s, with the nasal assimilating to the dental ending. It is possible that in ambiguous passages (like I.120.6) gen. *dán* was misinterpreted as a loc. and spread to unambiguous loc. contexts. (In fact JPB tr. as a loc. there, though I would substitute the gen. “you two house-masters of beauty,” flg. Ge.) (That *dán* here is on the model of gen. *dán* elsewhere is essentially Old’s view – though he also considers the possibility that it’s really a gen. here. I’m not sure how that would work contextually. And he also floats the possibility that *dán* is a redactional change for **dám*.) Given the instr. *datā* ‘with his tooth’ in b, one should factor in a word play with *dánt*- ‘tooth’ (so also Re). In any case the form is not directly comparable to the Old Aves. vṛddhied endingless loc. *dqm*.

On *abhipramūrā* see Scar 390–91.

X.115.2–3: The mid. part. *próthamāna*- in d is the only mid. form attested to this (not very well attested) root; it is followed immed. by the act. *próthantam* in the next vs. (3b), whose voice is confirmed by other occurrences of this stem. The middle form here also occupies metrical positions 4–7, making a caesura after 4 or 5 impossible. Given that the opening of 2d *inó ná* is somewhat echoed by 3b *índum* and that immed. following act. *próthantam* allows a caesura after 5, 3b seems to repair 2d, where the irregularities call attention to the form. I have no explan. for the contrastive voice of *próthamāna*-; I very much doubt that semantics is involved.

X.115.3: This vs. is couched entirely in the acc. and has no syntactic connection with either the preceding or the flg. vs. With Ge and Re I supply a harmless 1st ps. verb of calling/praising to govern both the acc.s and the *vah*.

As Ge (n. 3ab) points out, the vs. is dense with imagery, and as I point out in the publ. intro., the words can do double or even triple duty: *dru-śád*- is appropriate for the frame (the fire sitting on the firewood) and for two associated similes (the latter unmarked as a simile): a bird sitting in a tree and the soma drop sitting in the wooden cup. (The applicability to the drop is not noted by Ge/Re, but is by Scar [566–67]; also more or less by Old.)

Agni is several times directly identified as *váhnir āsā* “conveyor by mouth” (I.76.4, 129.5 [in opposite order], VI.11.2, 16.9=VII.16.9), not in a simile – so *ná* here seems at first pleonastic. However, I think it contributes to the density of imagery noted above: *váhniḥ* should be read twice, with Agni explicitly compared to a draught-horse.

virapsín- and its associated forms are not usually construed with the instr., but see IV.20.5, cited by Ge.

The hapax pres. part. *sarājantam* is anomalously formed (apparent disyllabic root syl *saráj*). It must be construed with *ádhvanah* (prob. acc. pl., but possibly gen.-abl. sg.). The form has been ascribed to numerous different roots: \sqrt{sr} , \sqrt{srj} , \sqrt{raj} ; for details consult KEWA s.v.

(EWA simply refers to the earlier work). As far as I know, no one has tried *srāj-* ‘garland’ or *sará(g)h-* ‘bee’ (though I was sorely tempted by the latter: “buzzing along the ways”?). I see no grounds for decision, but I think it’s possible that it’s a portmanteau (*l*mash-up) of \sqrt{sr} ‘flow, run’ and \sqrt{srj} ‘(be) released’, both of which appear with *ádhvānaḥ*: X.22.4 *srjānāḥ ... ádhvānaḥ* [acc.] and VIII.59.2 *sísratū rájasah pāré ádhvānaḥ* [gen.]. Such a tricky form would be at home in this tricky hymns.

X.115.4: As disc. in the publ. intro., this and vs. 6 are the two most complex vss. in the hymn, and in each vs. I think the topic is Agni (sg.) and his flames (pl.). My interpr. differs in many details from Old, Ge, and Re, though is closer to Old. In particular, with Old but contra Ge/Re, I take *ná* in b as simile-marking rather than negative (though unfortunately it precedes the simile proper). I will not otherwise register agreements and disagreements.

In my interpr. the trick in the first hemistich is that the two nom. pl. masc. forms *vātāḥ* and *ácyutāḥ*, which, cutely, iconically encircle the verb *pári sánti* ‘encircle’, are *not* to be construed together in an inherently self-contradictory phrase “immovable winds.” Rather they belong to two different similes, the second unmarked (as in 3b). Thus Agni’s flames are compared to two conceptually opposite natural elements, the ever-volatile winds and the never-moving mountains. For the encircling of winds, see IV.24.4 *párijman ... vātāḥ*. For *ácyuta-* with mountain / rock, see I52.2 *párvataḥ ... ácyutāḥ*, VI.17.5 *ádrim ... ácyutam*. In the latter passage, the rock surrounds (*pári ... sántam*) the cows (see also IV.1.15 and [with pl. *ádrayaḥ*] III.32.16).

On *jrayasāná-* and its type see comm. ad IV.3.6.

In the 2nd hemistich I take Trita as identical to Agni, though he could also (with Ge, etc.) be the one sent to search for Agni. See comm. ad X.46.6, 3.

X.115.5: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. has the feel of a final vs. – the first of several. It has some associations with vs. 7. The cadences of a and c are disturbed.

For the connection with the Kaṇvas, see Ge (n. 5a).

X.115.6: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. appears to belong with vs. 4, with vs. 5, the pseudo-final vs., an intrusion. As in vs. 4, I think the vs. concerns Agni and his flames. In vs. 4 the flames surround him and urge him on to battle; in this vs. they concede to his superior power. In vs. 4 they are in the pl., in this vs. the sg. That Agni is the referent of the dative phrase that dominates all 4 pādas is clear, but Ge/Re identify the sg. nom. as the wind, against my ‘flame’.

The hapax voc. *supítṛya* is taken by most as ‘good for the Pitaras’ – possible, but at least in my opinion the base adj. *pítṛya-* generally means ‘ancestral’. In any case, the voc. does not seem to have much connection with the rest of the vs. thematically.

In b the phrase *tṛṣú cyāvānaḥ* reminds us of the cmpds *tṛṣu-cyāvas-* (VI.66.10) and *tṛṣy-cyút-* (I.140.3). The latter qualifies Agni, but the former is used of Agni’s tongues, i.e., his flames – and this is the exact usage I see here. Note that *cyāvānaḥ* picks up *ácyutāḥ* in 4b.

There is no finite verb in this vs., but as Ge (n. 6b, fld. by Re) suggests, *ánu* in b invites a verb to be supplied; the best choice is *ánu* $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘concede’, which regularly takes a dative.

The dat. phrase of ab is continued by ... *saté* in c and *mahíntamāya ... avíṣyate* in d. The syntax of c is otherwise problematic, however: the problem is the rel. prn. *yáḥ*, which interrupts the dative phrase as (if?) an embedded rel. cl., but what the rest of that rel. cl. might be is unclear. Re essentially ignores the *yáḥ*; Ge (n. 6cd) says that a verb needs to be supplied with *yáḥ*, similar to what was supplied in ab, but I don’t quite see how he puts the pāda together and

in particular what he does with dat. *saté*. I now think that the phrase consists of *yó* + adverbial instr. *dhṛṣatā* and that it is a nominal izafe, embedded in the dative phrase. As argued in my 2022 Fs. Hale paper, nominal rel. clauses (i.e., izafe-like structures) can be embedded in the RV, contrary to be-verb-ed rel. clauses. Our cl. would mean, literally, “who [is] with daring.” It is very similar to VIII.21.2 *ugrás cakrāma yó dhṛṣát* with the adverbial neut. NA *dhṛṣát* to the same stem. I now think that supplying a verb (“acts”) in the publ. tr. was wrong, and I would emend the tr. to “to him in his daring when ...”

As for the rest of the pāda, with Gr I construe *anudré cíd* with *saté* despite their distance. Note that *anudré* echoes *ānu* in b, and the *d* might even hint at the $\sqrt{dā}$ to be supplied in b. Moreover *anudré cíd* corresponds to *dhānvanéd* “even through a wasteland” in d (so also Ge n. 6cd), both indicating the unpromising locations in which fire seeks its food.

Now as for *vāram* – in adverbial usage, this form is usually construed with *ā*, and in fact this is easily extracted from immed. preceding *dhṛṣatā* (i.e., as *dhṛṣatā-ā*). But I don’t quite understand what “by choice / acdg. to wish” adds semantically to this pāda.

Pace Gr, *dhānvanā* must belong to ‘wasteland’, not ‘bow’.

X.115.7–9: As indicated in the publ. tr., each of the last three vss. of the hymn presents itself as a final summary vs., each in a different meter. Vs. 7 is the last Jagatī vs. of this otherwise Jagatī hymn and may have been the original final vs.; vs. 8 is in Triṣṭubh, 8 Śakvarī. These last two vss. explicitly name the poet – or at least provide a name for the Anukramaṇī to affix to the hymn: Upastuta (8b), the sons of Vṛṣṭihavya, the Upastutas (9ab).

X.115.7: This vs. seems to pick up vs. 5, with its mention of *sūrī*-s (5c, 7a). These patrons (in the instr.) receive praise along with Agni, while the instr. in b (*nṛbhiḥ*) must, in my view, refer to the poet/singers (contra Ge, who thinks they’re still the patrons). The plural subjects of cd are unidentified, but I think they are likely the patrons again.

In b *sāhasaḥ sūnāraḥ* “the spirited (son) of strength” obviously plays on *sāhasaḥ sūnū-* ‘son of strength’, defeating expectations in the second syllable of the second word. Note also that (*sū*)*nāro* plays on immed. following *nṛbhiḥ*. I don’t think we’re dealing with haplogy (per Ge n, 7b) but with deliberate misdirection. As Re points out *sūnāra-* and its relatives are never elsewhere used of Agni.

Pāda d is almost identical to IV.16.19, as Ge (n. 7d) points out.

X.115.8: This vs. responds in a way to vs. 2, where Agni’s name was at issue (*agnír ha nāma*). Here he is explicitly given another name or epithet: “child of nourishment” (voc. *ūrjo napāt*). This name can also be seen as a substitute for the name “son of strength” gestured to, but avoided, in the preceding vs., 7b – and note that *sahasāvan* in this address picks up the *sāhasaḥ* in the name in 7b. Unfortunately this connection cannot be seen in the publ. tr., because I translate *sāhasaḥ* and *sahasāvan* differently. I would now alter the publ. tr. in 8a to ‘possessing strength’ from ‘mighty one’.

X.115.9: Pāda c *tāms ca pāhī grṇatás ca sūrīn* is a reprise of 5c *agnīḥ pātu grṇató agnīḥ sūrīn*, which may account both for the metrical lapse (10-syl. pāda for 11) and the wrong placement of the 2nd *ca* (on which see JSK DGRV I.135). As for the meter, Old suggests distracting *tān*, but the parallel in 5c speaks against this: the 4-syllable openings match (*agnīḥ pātu* and *tāms ca*

pāhī), and what follows the caesura should match too – but *ca* does not match the syllable count of *agnīḥ*.

X.116 Indra

For the structure of paired vss. see publ. intro.

X.116.1–2: Each of the four pādas of vs. 1 begins *pībā*; non-initial unaccented *pība* in 2a provides continuity.

X.116.3: As in vs. 1, each pāda of this vs. begins with a repeated impv., *mamātu*. In the bcd pādas everything after that impv. is in a rel. cl. whose antecedent is the unexpressed subj. of *mamātu*. To bring out the parallelism, b might be better tr. “let that exhilarate (you) which is pressed among earth-dwellers.” In any case the “you” of b should be parenthetical.

X.116.4: This is the only really challenging vs. in the hymn, the challenge lying in the second hemistich, esp. d, and what to do with *khédām*. Scar (683) takes it as a unit of measure, used adverbially, on no clear grounds. Ge (and implicitly Old) take it as obj. to *ā vṛṣasva*, but this doesn’t work either syntactically or semantically. The lexeme *ā vṛṣ* takes gen. objects almost exclusively (the only exception is III.60.5 *sutám sómam ā vṛṣasva*). Moreover, the obj. of the lexeme is always soma. This pattern is found in the 1st vs. of the hymn, 1b *pībā mádhvas tṛpád indrá vṛṣasva* and matched in our vs. by *sutásya ... mádhvah ... ā vṛṣasva*. As for the semantics: *khédā-* in its two other appearances (VIII.72.8, 77.3) is a concrete object capable of being threefold or triply turned (*trivít-* VIII.72.8); I take it as ‘hammer’ in VIII.77.3, where it is used to fix spokes into a wheelrim. On both counts it seems best to detach *khédām* from the verb *ā vṛṣasva*, which should be construed with the long gen. phrase that occupies all of pāda c.

What then to do with *khédām*? I start with the observation that forms of *√khid* (verbal and nominal) are regularly found in conjunction with *√han* forms (IV.25.7 *khidāti hānti*, VIII.77.3 *sám ... vṛtrahákhidat, khé ... khédayā*, VI.22.4 *khidvah ... asuraghnáḥ*). Here it immed. precedes *aruśahā*. I suggest taking it as a detached 1st cmpd member, assuming **khédā-hán-* “smashing the hammer,” parallel to *aruśahán-* -- or else as an external argument to *aruśa-hán-* “smashing the hammer on the *aruśa-*.”

As for *aruśa-*, Old and Scar (683–84) take it as a PN, but the interpr. of Gr and Ge (seemingly accepted by EWA s.v. *rúśant-*) as a negation of *rúśant-* ‘shining, white’ is appealing, given Indra’s penchant for slaying dark beings. Scar, who discusses the proposal at length, is understandably concerned about the formation. We might expect *ruśat-* as 1st cmpd member (as in *rúśad-vatsa-*) -- though this would produce a difficult-to-parse **ruśad-dhán-*. But I think it likely that *aruśa-hán-* was produced and perceived as a near-anagram of *asura-hán-* (RV 3x).

X.116.5: On *ní* reversing the fundamental meaning of the verb *bhrāsáya-*, see Ge (n. 5ab) and my *áya-*Formations (p. 86).

The hapax *vigadá-* is most likely derived from the much-later-attested root *√gad* ‘speak’. See comm. ad X.97.2 on *agadá-*. Although Ge tr. “im Streit,” in his n. 5d he specifies this as “Wortstreit”; cf. Old’s tentative “unter verwirrten Reden (der Feinde).”

X.116.6: This vs. takes the verbal lexemes used in vs. 5 with concrete objects and applies them to abstract qualities and to an animate being (Indra). In 5b *áva v tan* ‘loosen’ was used of

bowstrings; in 6ab *ví√tan* takes as object ‘fame’ (pl. *śrāvāmsi*, so lit. ‘fames, reports of fame’ – unfortunately not an English idiom), ‘might’ (*ójah*), and ‘hostilities’ (*abhímātiḥ*) – with the bowstrings kept, but in a simile. The switch from *áva* to *ví* is potentially problematic, because *ví√tan* ordinarily means ‘stretch out, stretch through’, not ‘loosen’, so it should have essentially positive value here and mean the opposite of *áva√tan*. This is argued at length by Old, similarly by Th (Fremd. 72–73). Although I see their point, the attempt to impose a positive value on the verbal lexeme requires Th to produce a highly unnatural interpr. of the hemistich. I think in just this passage we must reckon with the essential equivalence of *áva√tan* and *ví√tan*, in line with Ge’s interpr. This is not hard to motivate: *ví* has a number of different senses: ‘apart, widely’, ‘through’, and – crucial here -- ‘without’ (generally in nominal forms, admittedly). The negating value of this last usage can be transferred to this nonce verbal form.

In 5a *ní√bhṛś* was used of arrow points made blunt; in 6d Indra himself is ‘unblunted’ (*ánibhṛṣṭah*).

X.116.7: The past participles in c, *sutáḥ ... pakváḥ*, are in a chiasmic relationship with the impvs. in d: *addhí ... píba*. That is, Indra is urged to eat what is cooked and drink what is pressed.

The impvs. in d, *addhí ... píba ca*, are both accented; *addhí* owes its accent to its pāda-initial position, *píba* owes its perhaps to the fact that it’s explicitly conjoined with *addhí* but more likely because it’s perceived as opening a new clause, even though *prásthitasya* must be construed with both verbs, as 8a *addhí ... prásthitemā havīṃṣi* shows.

The final phrase, *píba ... prásthitasya*, picks up the same in 2a, forming a weak ring.

X.116.8: Pāda b provides yet another pairing of food and drinking (see 7cd), here with concrete nominals, *pacatā ... sómam*.

X.116.9: This final vs. opens out first to Agni in addition to Indra (in a dual dvandva) and then to the gods in general. As indicated in the publ. intro., the final image of the gods as dice whirling around, giving and withholding luck, is a surprising one. On *udbhíd-* see comm. ad VIII.79.1.

X.117 Generosity

On the unusual nature of this hymn in a RVic context, see publ. intro. Although the hymn is made up of bromides, it makes some artful use of word order.

X.117.1: I would now prefer to tr. *vadhá-* here and in vs. 6 as ‘bane’ or ‘deadly bane’.

As Ge (n. 1b) points out, the AV reckons the “forms of death” to be 100.

X.117.2: This vs. alternates nominatives referring to the miserly rich man and datives referring to his hungry (ex-)friend, as if to intertwine them even as the subj. refuses the importuning beggar.

The hapax *raphitá-* has no obvious etymology (see EWA s.v. *rāpas-*) or meaning, though it obviously refers to some sort of miserable state. I have interpr. it as semantically adjacent to *rāpas-* ‘defect, malady’, rather than *√rap* ‘jammern’ (per Th., Ged. 78), though neither of these works phonologically.

X.117.3: On *grhú-* see EWA s.v.

I take *yāma-* in the cmpd *yāma-hūti-* to *√yā* ‘beg’, rather than with the usual *yāma(n)-* ‘journey’; see comm. ad X.64.1.

X.117.4: The play on the root \sqrt{sac} in ab can hardly go unnoticed: *sákhā ... sákhye, sacābhúve śacamānāya*. The isolation of nom. *sákhā* (the stingy non-companion) from the rest of the \sqrt{sac} forms and the distance between the verb *dádāti* and its (partitive) obj. *pitváh* seem to be iconic for the separation between the non-companion and his would-be companion and between a potential act of charity and the actual gift. This separation contrasts with the intertwining of the same two figures in vs. 2.

In d *anyám* should, by my rules, be definite since it is non-initial, but I can see no way to interpret it as anything but indefinite “another”; the āmreḍita *anyám-anyam* in the next vs. (5d) is properly positioned for an indefinite. For another anomalous positioning of *anyá-* (though in the opposite direction) see nearby X.119.7. This syntactic rule may be eroding in the late RV.

X.117.5: I’m not sure what to do with *íd* – it’s perhaps displaced, and the pāda should be interpr. “it’s just the stronger man who should give ...”

I take the phrase in b to be the equivalent of English “take the long view.”

X.117.6: As noted ad vs. 1, I’d now change the tr. of *vádha-* to ‘bane’ or ‘deadly bane’ for fluency.

X.117.7: In later Skt., forms of *apa* \sqrt{vrj} , lit. ‘twist away’, mean ‘complete, finish’. This appears to develop from an idiom specialized for weaving. See AVŚ X.7.42 *nāpa vrñjāte ná gamāto ántam* concerning two weavers: “They wrest not off; they go not to an end” (Wh). The the first verb, *ápa vrñjāte*, must express the somewhat delicate manoeuvre (see YouTube videos on this procedure) of removing the woof (=vertical) threads from the loom when the cloth is finished. I use the less specific English idiom “wrap up,” which also signifies closure. I’m not sure what idiom English uses for the removal from the loom (if there is one), but the equivalent in knitting is to “bind off.”

X.117.8: The solution of this numerical riddle provided by Ge (n. 8) seems quite convincing and bears some resemblance to the Greek riddle of the sphinx, as Don points out. It is somewhat curious that herd animals come in groups of five (*pañktīḥ*), but see Old and Ge (n. 8d). The use of *pañktī-* here is surely in part because ‘five’ is the next number in the series of riddles, but the fivefold classification of *paśu-*s found across Vedic prose is probably also at issue. On this classification see B. Sojkova, *Animals in Vedic Prose* (DPhil. diss., Oxford Univ., 2022). The larger question is what is the riddle meant to be conveying here: it doesn’t seem entirely on message. Presumably that having more feet doesn’t make you better off, but instead worse. If there’s relevance to this hymn it may be that giving away what you have (and thereby having less) will be a good move for you.

X.117.9: The examples given in this vs. seem even less relevant to the generosity theme than vs. 8, since they are concerned with the differential performance of two apparently identical items. Pāda d forces the topic back to “giving” but not very convincingly. It almost seems as if, in vss. 8–9, the poet went off on a riddle track, started by vs. 7, and lost sight of his main theme. I suppose the whole vs. could be interpr. as counseling generosity to the less fortunate because of the inherent inequality in the world – but this seems somewhat counter to the standard Vedic worldview.

On the non-**o*-grade in kinship terms as 2nd compound members (apropos *sammātārā* here), see J. Lundquist, “Does *tvátpitārah* = εὐπτόρω?” *IEL* 9 (2021), esp. 133–36.

X.118 Agni Rakṣohan

This hymn is banal in the extreme; its salient feature is the inter-verse chaining.

X.118.1: As noted in the publ. intro., despite the Anukramaṇī ascription, “demon-smiting” Agni is barely visible in this hymn, though the first pāda of this initial vs. does establish such a theme.

X.118.1–2: There is no explicit chaining between these two vss., but *út* opening 2a may respond to *ní* in 1a.

X.118.2–3: (*s^uv*)*āhutaḥ* (2a): (*sá*) *āhutaḥ* 3a.

X.118.4: This vs. consists of almost nothing but links to preceding vss. In pāda a *ajyate* responds to the same form in 3c; both are construed with instr., though with slightly different functions: *srucā* in 3c identifying the instrument performing the anointing and *ghrténa* the substance. The latter also picks up *ghrtāni* in 2b. In b (*mádhu-*)*pratīka(h)* echoes *prátīkam* in 3c, and *āhutaḥ* the same forms in 2a and 3a. In c *rócamānaḥ* matches *ví rocate* in 3a; the preverb *ví* there is teasingly replicated in the sequence *rócamāno vi(bhāvasuḥ)*, though the *ví* in 4c is not construed with the preceding participle.

X.118.5: After the frenzy of linkage in vs. 4, this one marks a new start: the only link is the preverb *sám*, with *sám idhyase* (a) echoing *sám ajyate* (4a).

The pāda *devébhyo havyavāhana* occurs in this form 3x (III.9.6, X.150.1, as well as here) and once as the minimally different *devébhyo havyavāhanaḥ* in the next hymn, X.119.13. The formula presupposes that nominative, rather than the voc. found here and in the other two occurrences, since *devébhyaḥ* must belong to the phrase and an initially accented **dévebhyaḥ* would be expected in a voc. phrase (even though *devébhyaḥ* is of course not a voc. itself).

X.118.6: Despite the transmitted *martā(h)*, it seems best, with Old, to restore **mart'yā(h)*, both for the meter and for the chaining with *márt'yāḥ* in 5c.

X.118.7: *ádābh'ya-* is the link between 6 and 7. This is also the first vs. since 1 with a *rakṣohan* theme, and it also has echoes of that vs.: the voc. *ágne, sóciśā* picking up *śuci(-vrata)* (1c), *dīdīhi* picking up *dīd'yat* (1b).

X.118.8: The immediate link between 7 and 8 is *dīd'yat* (c) with *dīdīhi* (7c), but this of course also matches *dīd'yat* in 1b. Another link to vs. 1 is (*uru-*)*kṣāyeṣu* with (*s^uvé*) *kṣāye* (1c), and note also *prátīkena* (a) echoing *prátīkam* (3c) and (*mádhu-*)*pratīka* (4b).

Ge and Re (see also Mayr., PN s.v.) take *urukṣāya-* (also in 9a) as the PN of a poet or his family, which seems unnec. to me. Although the Anukramaṇī ascribes this hymn to one Urukṣaya, this can have been plucked from the hymn, as elsewhere, esp. in X. In I.2.9 the stem modifies Mitra and Varuṇa and means ‘having wide dwelling’, and the *ti*-stem abstract *urukṣití-* also means simply ‘wide dwelling’ (VII.100.4, IX.84.1). The fact that *urukṣāya-* here seems to respond to *kṣāya-* in 1c seems to me an argument against a PN.

X.118.9: On *uruṣāya-* see ad vs. 8.

The first two pādas are made entirely of recycled materials: *tām tvā* (also 5c), *gīrbhīḥ* (*girā* 3b), *uruṣāyāḥ* (*uruṣāyeṣu* 8c), *havyavāham* (*havyavāhana* 5b), *sām īdhire* (*sām idhyase* 5a). The last pāda breaks new, if similarly hackneyed, ground.

X.119 Labasūkta

A number of pairs of vss. pattern together: 2–3 share a pāda (2b=3a); 4–5 concern the *matí-*; 6–7 have the identical phrase #*nahí me ... caná* and both concern the insignificance to the poet in his current state of major components of the world; 9–10 both have *pṛthivīm* as obj. and share the phrase *ihá vehá vā* at the end of the b pāda.

X.119.1: The opening of the hymn, with *ítí vā íti*, is unusual, to say the least. The repeated *ítí* cannot be taken as a standard use of the quotative particle – nor can the *ítí* that marks the end of the refrain. The various tr. render it as “such” or “thus,” which to my mind dampens the rhetorical exuberance of the 1st-person assertions. (A particularly stilted version is Maurer’s “My inclination is thus.”) I therefore render it as a strong affirmation, flg. Thompson 2003 (*EJVS* 9).

X.119.2: The standard tr. (Ge, Re, Mau) supply “trees” as obj. in the simile in pāda a, either modified by an acc. pl. *dódhataḥ* (Ge, Mau) or not, interpr. *dódhataḥ* as nom. pl. Like Don and Thompson I consider the added trees unnec.

X.119.2–3: I now think that *pītā(h)* should be tr. more literally; I’d substitute “(the soma-drinks) when drunk” in both vss. (2b, 3a).

X.119.4: The use of *putrá-* for a calf, a bovine “son,” seems a bit unusual to me, but I have not checked all the RVic exx. of this stem.

X.119.5: The chariot-fashioning imagery applied to a “thought” (*matí-*) is a strong indication that the speaker is the poet, since this is a common trope.

X.119.6–7: I take both these vss. as implicitly subordinated (by *nahí*) to vs. 8. Having established the insignificance of the principal features of the cosmos in comparison to himself, the speaker asserts his complete dominance in 8.

X.119.6: The point here seems to be that the poet in his soaring flight looks down on the earth and the whole Ārya population is visually reduced to a tiny speck.

X.119.7: In the companion vs. to 6, the two world halves are reduced to the size of just one wing of the speaker (poet=bird). The predicate of this vs. is *práti* ‘(be) the counterpart (to)’.

Pāda-initial *anyám* should be indefinite, but it is difficult to make the expression mean “not equal to *another* wing of mine.” The phrase “the one wing ... the other (wing)” is found in 11ab, where the two definite forms of *anyá-* are correctly positioned in non-initial position. For another wrongly positioned form of *anyá-* in the vicinity, see X.117.4 and comm. thereon.

X.119.10: On the hapax *oṣám* see EWA s.v., where it is plausibly derived from $\sqrt{uṣ}$ ‘burn’. I have rendered it slangily as “to blazes.”

X.119.11: The *anyá-pakṣá-* phrase picks up 7b.

X.119.12: As Re points out, *mahāmahá-* is otherwise used of Indra.

X.119.13: For my take on this final, disconcerting vs., which has complicated (and I think skewed) other interpr. of the hymn as a whole, see publ. intro. As I say there, vs. 12 seems to me the climax of the hymn with Indra’s assertion of supreme power. Vs. 13 I take as Agni’s rather weak counterassertion; the vs. certainly should not impose Agni as the speaker of the entire hymn, contra Re, etc.

Pāda b is identical to 5b in the immed. preceding hymn (X.118.5), except that it’s in the nom., not the voc.

X.120 Indra

This is mostly AVŚ V.2, AVP VI.1, which latter is treated at length in Griffiths’s (2009) edition of AVP VI and VII, pp. 3–18, which is well worth consulting. Griffiths (henceforth AG) also draws attention to the comm. on vss. 1–3 in JBr II.144, cited in his disc. (pp. 3–4). On my interpr. of the knotty problem of the identity of Bṛhaddiva, see publ. intro. Unlike AG, who follows Bergaigne in identifying him as Indra, I think he is actually Bṛhaspati, the alloform of Indra.

X.120.1: The identity of the neut. “foremost among beings/existences” (*bhúvaneṣu jyéṣṭham*) from which/whom Indra was born is unclear to me. Given this uncertainty, I would at least delete “living” from the tr. “living beings” – better: substitute “among beings / existing things.” At this late stage of the RV we may be dealing with an undefined principle. AG tr. “the chief in the worlds.”

On the ambiguous (and likely multiple) identities of the helpers (*ūmāḥ*), see publ. intro.

X.120.2: This vs. is a loose paraphrase of vs. 1, with ab corresponding roughly to 1bc and d to 1d; c lacks a parallel.

The preverb *ví* is found with \sqrt{an} only here in the RV, though it becomes quite common later, starting in the AV.

The neut. sg. *sásni* is problematic. Gr and Old (partially) want to emend to masc. nom. **sásnis*, and the following *s* (*sám*) might help (though for real degemination we should have a cluster *-s sC-*). Old also considers the transmitted form possible, but he wants to make it part of a neut. NP in c serving as another obj. to *dadhāti* in b: “Indra stellt Atmendes und Nichtatmendes als *sásni* hin,” which seems an anacoluthon too far. It is probably better to take it as an “adverbial” or “infinitival” usage of this transitive redupl. stem. AG takes c as a nominal sentence, flg. the JBr interpr.: “Both the one which does not breathe, and the one which does breathe, is winning.” This works syntactically, but what would be its relevance to this vs.?

As subj. in d, best to supply *ūmāḥ* from 1d, flg. Ge (n. 2d); that it recurs in 3b supports this.

X.120.3: On *ápi* \sqrt{vij} see comm. ad VI.36.2.

The point of b must be that the *ūmāḥ* subordinate their wills to Indra's, even though there are many more of helpers than of Indra. I do not understand Ge's n. 3b, where he contrasts the number of helpers with the number of gods. AG takes the numerical expressions in b quite differently.

I take cd as the direct speech of the helpers, addressed to Indra; the *īti* that opens the next vs. suggests this interpr., though Ge does not follow it.

Note the insistent alliteration in c, not to mention the etymological figure binding the first three words.

Ge's suggestion (n. 3d) that "yonder honey" (*adāḥ ... mādhu*) is the rain seems reasonable.

X.120.4: On *īti* see comm. on 3cd. The direct speech of the *vīprāḥ* may continue in 4cd, merging with the speech of the poet of this hymn. For the presumed identity of that poet, see publ. intro.

Pāda b is a variant on 1d *ānu ... vīśve mādanti ūmāḥ*: 4b ... *anumādanti vīprāḥ*. This near repetition suggests that the *ūmāḥ* and the *vīprāḥ* are the same, *pace* Ge, and also sketches a small ring.

X.120.5: On the meaning and etym. of $\sqrt{śad}$ see EWA s.v. *śAD²* and Schaef., Intens. 30–32. The use of this verb of young women and their bodies (I.123.10, 124.6) favors the sense 'exult, flaunt' (so already Gr), against 'sich stark fühlen' favored by Th and Re and fld. by Kü and AG, on which see Kü 512–14 and n. 1032, AG (AVP VI+VII: 11), who also cites Pinault on this root.

X.120.6: The acc. phrase of ab characterizing Indra requires a verb to govern it; I supply "I praise," picking up the 1st ps. poet's discourse in 5cd. Alternatively – but this is a long shot – the hapax "Doppelstamm" gerundive *stuṣé'yam* that opens the pāda may conceal a 1st ps. verb. This is a tempting possibility (though a similar suggestion by Roth is dismissively rejected by Old). Among other things the supposed gerundive begins *stuṣé-*, with its first two syllables coinciding with the well-attested 1st sg. *-sé* form *stuṣé* "I (shall) praise," which occurs 13x at the beginning of a pāda. I am now inclined to assume that that's what we started with here – but what about the rest (*-y'yam*)? Is it a separate acc. that has been mangled in some way, or, more likely (insofar as "likely" enters into it), has *stuṣé* been extended as a nonce 1st sg. optative? (This sugg. is similar to Roth's ill-fated idea.) Such a form would be tantalizingly similar, but unfortunately not similar enough, to the *dheyām* opt. type, over which so much ink has been spilled (also by me: see my 1999 Ged Schindler article). Although I do not see a way to work out the details, I would now favor an alt. tr. "*I would praise the craftsman possessing many forms ..." AG (citing Kü 1996) assumes a hapology **stuṣé stuṣéyyam*.

X.120.7: The referent of *ávaram páram ca* is unclear, though it might be neut., given the *tád* (though that could be adverbial). Ge, flg. Sāy., supplies *dhānam* 'prize, stake, wealth' (Ge "Schatz"). This seems harmless enough, though nothing particularly favors it, save for *dhānā* in 4a. Moreover, *dhāna-* is not usually simply 'treasure', but is rather a prize (vel sim.) to be won (as in fact in 4a). It *is* frequently construed with $\sqrt{dhā}$, as it would be here, but in the sense "set a prize," esp. in the common loc. absol. *dhāne hité* "when a/the prize is set." If *dhāna-* is the correct referent here (which I very much doubt), the clause should mean "you set (the prize), both the lower and the higher" – with no role for *ní* and no obvious contextual sense. AG (p. 14)

suggests rather *rátanam*, in the same semantic sphere, which is also construed elsewhere with $\sqrt{dhā}$, but again there is no compelling reason to supply this word.

The oppositional pair *ávāra- pára-* is fairly common, with a variety of meanings (see comm. ad X.55.4) and no fixed pair of referents. Probably the closest parallel to our passage is I.155.3 *dádhāti putró 'varam páram pitúr, nāma tṛtīyam ádhi rocané diváh* “The son sets in place the lower and the higher names of the father and the third name in the luminous realm of heaven,” with “name” as the immediate referent, although the contextual referent is the three strides of Viṣṇu. But this is of no help here. If I were to speculate, I would suggest that Agni is the referent (and *tád* an adverbial red herring) because of the appearance of *ní√dhā*, a lexeme often used of the establishment of the ritual fire, and of *duroṇé*, which is almost always used of the house in which the ritual fire is kindled. If this is correct, the “nearer/lower” would be the ritual fire and the “further/higher” would be the sun. This would fit with the cosmic reference in c as well as Indra’s (or Bṛhaddivi’s) winning of the sun in 8b. However, it has nothing to do with either the Vala or the Vṛtra myth. I tentatively suggest an alt. tr. “Then you established the nearer (fire) and the further one, in the house ...,” with no confidence in its correctness.

X.120.8: I take the praise of Indra as beginning in the middle of b, contra Ge and HPS (B+I 208). Among other things, *svaṛṣā-* is never used of human, but does modify Indra in III.34.4 and his vajra in I.110.13. On the other hand, if (as I suggest in the publ. intro.) Bṛhaddiva is actually Bṛhaspati, or a proxy for him, *svaṛṣā-* would be appropriate, since the adj. modifies him in VII.97.7. An alt. tr. would be “Bṛhaddiva, the first to win the sun, speaks these sacred formulations fortissimo to Indra: ‘he has dominion ...’ ”

With HPS I take *svaṛāj-* as referring to Indra, despite the slight awkwardness of the apparent double ref. to Indra in the clause (both subj. and gen.). Ge’s identification of the the sovereign king as Vala is unlikely on conceptual grounds; see HPS’s remarks. AG (p. 16) takes Bṛhaddiva as subj. here, with Indra the referent of *svaṛāj-*.

The referent of *svāḥ* ‘own’ is not clear – are these Indra’s own doors or the own doors of the cowpen (*gotrá-*)? This pāda is identical to III.31.21, where it is harder to find any referent but Indra. The adj. may be applied proleptically: the cowpen is about to be his and so are the doors. The prominent position of *svāḥ* as the final word of the vs. is probably the result of phonological play with the finals of b and c: *s^uvaṛṣāḥ* and *svaṛājāḥ*.

X.120.9: On my assumption that Bṛhaddiva is really Bṛhaspati and is therefore addressing his alloform Indra, see the publ. intro. It is pretty much impossible to escape the interpr. that he is addressing “his own self (*svām tanvām*), namely Indra (*índram evá*). RVic discourse is seldom so straightforward. See, however, Ge’s attempt to evade this interp. (n. 9b).

On the hapax *mātarībhvarīḥ* (to a putative stem *mātarībhvan-*), see Old ad loc. and AiG II.2.177 (neither v. satisfactory). If it does mean ‘staying by their mother’, this would correlate semantically with *ariprá-* ‘flawless, stainless’: both would refer to virginal girls (so Ge n. 9cd). The further referent is probably to hymns. As is regularly noted, *mātarībhvan-* recalls *mātaríśvan-*, incl. the anomalous accent on *mātarí*. But Old is surely correct that the form should not be emended to a form of *mātaríśvan-*. AG (in collab. with W. Knobl) suggests a novel interpr. of this hapax (pp. 17–18), which I am afraid I find farfetched: that it is a haplogized form of **mātarí-ribhvarīḥ* “singing on Mother (Earth).” Among other problems, as I have discussed at length (see reff. in Comm. lexicon), \sqrt{ribh} does not mean ‘sing’, but ‘rasp, croak’;

moreover, the meaning suggested seems reverse-engineered from the constructed pre-haplologized form and doesn't, to me, ring true.

[X.121 JPB]

X.122 Agni

As indicated in the publ. intro., the hymn is attributed to a Vasiṣṭhid and ends with the Vasiṣṭha refrain (8d). The given name of the poet acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, Citramahas, has been extracted from the first pāda of the hymn, where Agni is called *citrāmahas-* 'having brilliant might'.

The meter of the hymn vacillates between the dominant Jagatī and occasional Triṣṭubhs. Although acdg. to the Anukr. vss. 1 and 5 are Triṣṭubh, vs. 1 has only one unambig. Triṣṭubh pāda (a); c is clearly Jagatī and b and d end with *-Cyam* sequences that are almost surely to be distracted: *advīṣeṇīyām* and *suvīryam*. As for 5, pāda a ends with another word that invites distraction, *vāreṇīyah*. The pāda then has only 11 syllables, but a Jagatī cadence. Pāda b is Triṣṭubh, but c and d are Jagatī. On the other hand, 3d is a clear Triṣṭubh (and 3b has a Triṣṭubh cadence but 12 syllables), and the Vasiṣṭha refrain (8d) is a Triṣṭubh pāda and limited to the Triṣṭubh hymns of VII. In this late hymn the fungibility of the two trimeter types is manifesting itself.

X.122.1: Note the caesura at the compd seam of a non-dvandva: *citrā-/mahasam*.

On *śurūdh-* see comm. ad IX.71.5.

X.122.2: Pāda d requires an object to be supplied; there are two candidates: *bráhma* (from c), so Ge, Re, and the publ. tr.; *vrátam* (from d), so Th (Unters. 21 and n. 1), HPS (Vrata 66). Both are paralleled: VII.22.9 *bráhmāni janáyanta* (cf. also VII.31.11); VII.75.3 *janáyanto daívyāni vrátāni*. Although I think either is possible, I am now somewhat inclined towards the Th/HPS suggestion, since I think it would be unusual for gods to create *bráhman-*; in the two passages just cited, the subjects are poets. I would therefore now suggest an alt. tr. "Following your commandment, the gods begot (their commandment(s))."

X.122.3: As Ge and Re point out, the "seven domains" are the domains of the sacrifice (cf. IX.102.2, IV.75, as well as nearby X.124.3 *ṛtásya dhāma ví mime purūṇi* with vs. 1 *yajñám ... saptátantum*).

Unlike Ge/Re but with Kü (354), I take dat. *sukṛte* with *māmahasva*, not as parallel to *dāsúṣe* with *dāśat*. There are no implications, but it's attractive to supply *māmahasva* with a compliment. (For dat. with $\sqrt{maṃh}$ see, e.g., VIII.1.32.)

Note *suvīra-* here, between *suvīrya-* in 1d and 4d.

X.122.4: Ge (n. 4b) appositely adduces the seven Hotars in VIII.60.16, etc.; the "seven domains" of 3a is of course also relevant.

X.122.5: The referent of *amítāya* is unclear. Ge considers it a reference to "die Götterwelt"; Re tr. "pour le (principe) immortel." Because of the associated impv. *matsva* 'become exhilarated', I take it as a refernce to soma (so also Gr), though I realize that Agni is not a standard drinker of soma.

I don't know what the Maruts are doing here, though see Ge (n. 5c).

In d *rurucuḥ* would be better read **rūrucuḥ*, as also in the almost identical IV.7.1. For this possibility see comm. ad IV.7.1, 16.4.

X.122.6: I interpr. *duhán* as taking a double acc. construction, “milk the cow (for) milk,” with Ge (tr., though he considers alt. in n. 6a), contra Re, who thinks all the acc. refer to the milk substitute. The pāda-final adj. *viśvādihāyasam*, repeated from 1c, could in principle modify either the refreshment or the cow. I take it with the former, since in 1c it modifies “riches,” a desirable product, not a producer.

Although Gr, Ge, and Re agree in interpr. the hapax *yajña-prī-* as ‘loving the sacrifice’, transitive forms of $\sqrt{prī}$ don't mean ‘love’ but ‘please’. The rendering ‘pleasing to the sacrifice’ in the publ. tr. uses this sense, but I now think it should be refined. In the similar cmpd *brahma-prī-* (2x) I take *prī-* with this transitive sense, but the first member *brahma-* as instr. in function: “pleasing [X] with the formulation” (see comm. ad I.83.2). A parallel sense “pleasing [X] with the sacrifice” works well here, conforming to the other descriptions of the ritually active sacrificer in this hymn (3b *dāśúśe sukṛtāya*, 4b *yás ta ānaṣ samídhā*, 4d *prṇaté*). I would now emend the tr. to “... for the sacrificer who pleases with the sacrifice” – the object of “please” presumably being the gods.

In b the voc. *sukrato* returns from 2b, and in d this nominal stem is made into a denom.: *sukratūyase*.

In c *ghṛtasnú-* recalls 2c *ghṛtanirṇik*.

The distribution of elements in cd is uncertain. Both Ge and Re (in his tr.) take *ṛtāni* as obj. of *dīdyat* (e.g., Re “en éclairant trois fois les (domaines de) l'Ordre”). But as Re points out in his n., “*dī-* n'est factitif qu'avec des régimes internes” – or, better, $\sqrt{dī}$, esp. in the participle, is almost always in absolute usage: “shining,” not “shining on X” or “making X shine.” I therefore take this pāda-final participle in purely adjectival usage, interrupting the acc. phrase that continues in d. As Ge (n. 6cd) points out, *trīḥ* in c should be construed with *vartīḥ ... pariyán*, referring to the triple fire-circuit. I take *ṛtāni* as parallel to *yajñām*. This is essentially identical to Re's emended tr. in his n.: “toi qui, en brillant, parcourt le circuit autour des *ṛtā*, (autour du) sacrifice,” though he leaves out the *trīḥ* (probably by mistake).

pariyán returns from 3a.

X.122.7: The idiom *ní√mrj* is rare and fairly idiosyncratic in its usage, usually meaning ‘drag down, clasp to oneself’ sometimes with loc. *tanvī* (hence my “(on your body)” here; see, e.g., comm. ad II.38.2, VII.26.3, X.39.14). Even without the preverb, \sqrt{mrj} does not take as object the substance to be wiped (here *ājya-* ‘melted butter’) but the animal figure to be wiped upon. I wonder if *ājyam* is meant to evoke *átyam* ‘steed’, which is an occasional obj. of \sqrt{mrj} (e.g., VII.3.5 *agním átyam ná marjayanta*). In any case the usage here seems at best a mixed construction, and it is possible that the *ní* simply anticipates the *ní* that opens the following vs. Both Ge and Re render this pāda rather vaguely.

X.123 Vena

On the difficulties of this hymn and its connections with other hymns, see publ. intro. As I say there, I consider the *vená-* ‘seeker’ to be both Soma and the Sun. The treatments of this hymn are too manifold and often too fanciful to engage with in detail. I will just set out my barebones interpr. Ge's notes are useful to consult and stay sensible.

X.123.1: Note that the first word of the hymn, *ayám*, situates the subject in the ritual here and now, which positioning is reinforced by *imám* beginning the 2nd hemistich.

Whatever the exact referents, this vs. depicts a conceptual birth, with the two RVic hapaxes *pr̥śni-garbha-* (fem. pl., ‘whose embryo is dappled/the dappled one’) and *jyótirjarāyu-* (masc. nom. sg., ‘whose afterbirth is light’) (sim., for both, Ge nn. 1ab and 1b) as well as the licking of the infant in d, an action performed by a mother cow just after a calf is born (also Ge n. 1d). The females in question can be both the waters, whose embryo is soma, and the dawns, whose embryo is the sun. The afterbirth of light could be, for Vena=soma, the spreading of the golden liquid across the filter; for Vena=sun the radiance after sunrise. Pāda d treats the importance of poets and their hymns in the production of both soma and sunrise.

X.123.2: On this vs., see comm. ad VIII.100.5, which is similar in phraseology. As disc. there, the Vena is regularly associated with heights (also in IX.85.9–12). Here the first three pādas seem to depict the first sighting of the soma emerging from the pressed plant on the top of the filter and the first sighting of the sun rising through the clouds.

Against Ge’s attempt (n. 2b) to make *nabhojāḥ* modify *pr̥ṣṭhám*, it seems better to take the two as independent nom. sg. So, more or less, Scar (140), though he tries to accommodate Ge’s views.

On *vr̥ā-*, see comm. ad VIII.2.6 and my treatment of this word in the 2003 HPS Fs. Here it probably refers to the hymns eagerly seeking the Seeker; thus, like 1d and 3d it keeps the theme of the importance of the praise hymns in the forefront.

X.123.3: This vs. recycles vocab.: *samānám* (a =2d); *ṛtasya s̥nāv ādhi* (c =2c); *rihānti* (d = *rihanti* 1d). In pāda a I supply *yónim* with *samānám* on the basis of the immediately preceding pāda, 2d *samānám yónim*; all standard treatments supply instead “child” (Ge: “Kind,” Don) or “calf” (Gr, Lü 605). This is certainly possible, and the phrase *samānám vatsám* is found elsewhere (I.146.3), but in the absence of any compelling reason to switch referents I weakly prefer my solution, esp. since *samānám yónim* is also found in III.33.3 and X.17.11.

The part. *vāvasānāḥ* in pāda a is most likely a pun, belonging to both \sqrt{vas} ‘bellow’ and \sqrt{vas} ‘desire’.

With Ge (n. 3d) I take *mádhvo amṛtasya* as the gen. obj. of *rihānti*, though not very happily: I don’t really think that ‘lick’ should take a partitive genitive. Gr (s.v. *rih*) seems to suggest that *vāñih* is the object, but identifies the same form as a nom. pl. s.v. 2. *vāñī*.

X.123.4: On the possible connection of this vs. with “name-and-form” see publ. intro.

Ge connects b with a, while I connect it with c because there movement is depicted in both b and c.

X.123.5: The introduction of the Apsaras responds to the mention of the Gandharva in 4d. Beyond that I make no effort to interpr. this vs., though see Ge’s nn. for more or less plausible possibilities.

X.123.5–6: Because I consider vs. 6 to be dependent on 5cd, I take the injunctives *cárat* (5c) and *s̥dat* (5d) as preterital, because of augmented *abhy ácakṣata* in 6b. Ge (and Don) keep vs. 6 independent – it’s not clear to me how Ge deals with the subordination of 6: he tr. *yád* as “als”

but the attachment to 7 is vague. If vs. 6 is independent, then presential “wanders” and “sits” would be appropriate for 5cd, but thematically 6 seems to fit better with 5, with the wing (5d, 6c) – though the presence of *nāke* in both 6a and 7b does give me pause.

X.123.8: On the downplayed “climax” in this vs., embodying name-and-form, see publ. intro.

This vs. forms a slight ring with vss. 1–2: *rājasi* (d): 1b *rājasaḥ*; *vidharman* (b) recalls *vimāne* (1d); *samudrām* (a): *samudrāt* (2a).

Ge (fld. by Don) construes the instr. *śukrēṇa śociśa* with the pf. part. *cakānāḥ* (“mit ihre hellen Glut begehrt”), but the Vena vs. IX.85.12 *bhānūḥ śukrēṇa śociśā* without part. makes this unlikely. Kü (142 n. 132) is in agreement with me.

X.124 Various divinities

On this famous and much discussed hymn, see publ. intro. and, especially, my detailed treatment of it in my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas” (Ged. F. Staal: *On Meaning and Mantras: Essays in Honor of Frits Staal*, ed. George Thompson and Richard Payne, 289–306), which challenges the entrenched view of the hymn as depicting the conflict between the Devas and the Asuras so ubiquitous in Middle Vedic literature. I will not here repeat the arguments found in that article in detail, but make global reference to it.

The sec. lit. on this hymn is immense; I will just note two fairly recent treatments: Theodore Proferes (2007), *Vedic Ideals of Sovereignty and the Poetics of Power* (New Haven: American Oriental Society), 106–13, and Joel Brereton (2016), “Reconstructing Ṛgvedic Religion: *Devas*, *Asuras*, and Rites of Kingship” in *Vedic Investigations* (Proceedings of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference, Helsinki, Finland, July 2003), ed. Asko Parpola and Petteri Koskikallio, 35–58 – neither of which I am in complete agreement with, though it is important to note that both scholars free themselves from the dominant Asura/Deva model. Again I will not engage with the multiple other interpr. of the hymn.

The hymn is in dialogue for the first 6 vss., though there is no agreement on who all the speakers are. 1st and 2nd person references abound. The last three vss. (7–9) are in the 3rd ps. and spoken, presumably, by the poet.

X.124.1: As Ge points out (n. 1b) there are a number of ways to “solve” the numerological references here. The exact referents matter less than the fact that Indra is offering Agni participation in an elaborate, already worked-out ritual system; he’s not just improvising, even though, as I argue in the art. cit., we are watching the primal instantiation of the sacrifice.

The “long darkness” in which Agni has been trapped in d is, by my interpr., the pre-yajña stage in which the ritual fire was not kindled.

X.124.2: In my interpr. the being that Agni is leaving behind is Father Heaven (Dyaus Pitar). Although identifying him as a “non-god” (*ádeva-*) might seem paradoxical, I argue at length in the art. cit. that though Heaven is the *father* of the gods, he is not a god himself.

Both words in the phrase describing Agni’s goal, “an alien lineage” (*áranīm nābhim*), need unpacking. With regard to *áranī-*, I argue in my 2016 art. that the word “seems generally to refer to ‘foreign’ or ‘alien’ places and people primarily in terms of physical distance and separation from familiar surroundings, not kinship or natural affinity.” I also suggest that it participates in word play here: the differently accented *arānī-* is the word for the kindling sticks

used to produce the ritual fire. As for *nābhi-*, lit. ‘navel’, it is used both for kinship affiliation and, more often, to refer to the ritual ground, indeed the ritual fire itself, as the conceptual navel or center of the universe. So, under the ritual interpr. of those two words, Agni is going from a pre-sacrificial to a sacrificial state.

X.124.3: Against many interpr., I take the speaker of this vs. not as Agni (e.g., Ge, Re), but Varuṇa (so also Don, Proferes). The “guest of the other branch” (*anyāsya átithim vayāyāḥ*) is Agni, whose journey (in vs. 2) Varuṇa has just witnessed. Recall that Agni is frequently called the guest (of men, etc.), since he is a god, whose original domain should have been heaven, installed in a mortal setting.

Varuṇa’s claim to “measure out the many domains of truth” refers, in my view, to his measuring out the ritual ground for the instituting of the sacrifice. See the parallels adduced in the Staal Ged.

“Father Asura,” again in my view, is Dyaus Pitar. See the art. cit. for instances where he is called an asura. “Father” is of course part of his title.

X.124.4: Again, rather than Agni, I think Soma is the speaker here (with Don, Proferes). His defection means that the crucial ritual materials – fire and soma – are now available for yajña. The assemblage of the four principal gods, Indra, Agni, Varuṇa, and Soma, signals that the conceptual revolution is complete.

The speaker’s curious expression “I have ‘done’ many years within him” refers to Soma’s confinement and inactivity, deprived of any ritual role.

X.124.5: On this vs. as expressing the twin kingship of Indra and Varuṇa with their complementary functions, see the art. cit.

Pāda b contains subordinating *ca*, as shown by the accent on *kāmáyāse*.

X.124.6: I argue in the art. cit. that the first hemistich depicts the passing of the old heaven/sun-centered religion to one based in the midspace, closer to the mortal world.

“Come forth” (*niréhi*) in c, addressed to Soma, implicitly responds to Soma’s statement about doing many years “within” the father (4a), while pāda d expresses his desired transformation into a ritual substance, an oblation. On the purport of this pāda see disc. in art. cit.

X.124.7–9: These three final vss. contrast sharply with the first six, esp. in leaving dialogue behind in favor of strict 3rd person. For my view that these vss. effect the transition from the closed loop of gods sacrificing to themselves to the divine–human partnership that prevails now, see art. cit. As I argue there, vss. 7–9 are delimited by a ring, and it is through the shifting referents of that ring that the movement from divine to human sacrificers comes about, what I call there “an indirect transfer of sacrificial responsibility.” Vs. 7 begins *kavíh kavivā* “the poet with his poetic craft”; the referent is Indra. Vs. 9 (and the hymn) ends *kaváyo manīṣā* “the poets with their inspired thought”; the poets are human, with Indra (acc. *índram*) their object.

To sum up these verses I say in the art. cit.

Without calling attention to it, the composer of X.124 has modulated from the gods-worshipping-gods model, with Indra as a kavi, to one in which other, presumably human, kavis offer praise and sacrifice *to* the

god(s). The closed circle is broken and the human/divine dynamic established, but the verbal identification of Indra and the human kavis implies that the current model of sacrifice derives from the older one depicted earlier in the hymn and that the human officiants are occupying formerly divine roles.

X.124.7: Although there is a sharp stylistic break between vss. 6 and 7 and although, as I just argued, vss. 7–9 form a unit, there is, nonetheless, conceptual continuity between 6 and 7. In 6c Indra and Soma prepare to smite Vṛtra; throughout the RV it is the killing of Vṛtra that allows the waters to flow, starting in 7b.

The poet-agent (*kavīḥ*) in pāda a is not identified, though the agent of pāda b is: Varuṇa. It would be possible to take Varuṇa as the referent in pāda a as well. In fact, though Indra is sometimes called a *kavī-* (e.g., I.11.4, VI.32.3), Varuṇa is a more poet-like figure than Indra. See, e.g., from a hymn dedicated to Varuṇa, VIII.41.5 *sá kavīḥ kāvya purú, rūpám dyaúr iva puṣyati* “he is a poet who fosters the many poetic arts, as heaven does its (concrete) form [=sun],” which also contains the *rūpá-* in heaven found here. Nonetheless I think Ge (n. 7a) and Re are correct that Indra is the subject. He is the focus of these three vss., and, moreover, it is the peaceful royal partnership that Indra invited Varuṇa to join (see vs. 5) that is celebrated in the rest of the hymn.

Placing the sun in heaven is one of Indra’s standard cosmogonic actions (e.g., I.7.3 *ā sūryam rohayad diví* “he made the sun mount in heaven,” etc. etc.); I therefore take *rūpám* here as a reference to the sun (so also Re: “la forme (solaire)”), rather than “his [=Indra’s?] form” (Don, Proferes) or “die Farbe” (Ge). See VIII.41.5 cited immed. above, where *rūpám* also appears to be a ref. to the sun.

The releasing of the waters in b is also prototypically Indra’s deed – here presumably credited to Varuṇa because of the power-sharing arrangements of the two gods, aided by Varuṇa’s growing association with water.

Note the phonological and morphological similarity of the two parallel, pāda-final verbs: *sajat* and *sjat*.

As I point out in the Staal art., co-wives are notoriously *unpeaceful* towards each other (see RV X.145, 159); the peace achieved here is thus esp. noteworthy – or else the pāda slyly hints that the rivers are not all that peaceful. This pāda is variously interpr. – see, e.g., Re’s over-elaborate “Les rivières ... ont fait (d’elles-mêmes) une possession-pacifique (à l’usage d’Indra)” – but my interpr. seems to conform best to the Skt. phrase.

I do not know what “bear his color” refers to. First, what is the referent of *asya*? Ge (n. 7d) opts for Varuṇa, but his parallels are not strong – though the echo *váruṇo* (b) / *várṇam* (d) is suggestive. Indra seems more likely, esp. since he is surely the referent of *asya* in 8a. But I am uncertain about what exactly his *várṇa-* is. I am toying with the possibility that it is the physical manifestation of Indra’s impurity, the blood guilt, incurred by slaying Vṛtra: Indra distributes the impurity arising from killing to various natural elements in Vedic prose accounts (e.g., TS II.5.1). Since waters are well known as removers of impurity (see, e.g., I.23.22), this could make sense.

X.124.8: The phrase *svadháyā mādantīḥ* is also used of waters in VII.47.3. In both cases I think the *svadhā-* belongs to the waters, even though in this case the previous pāda states that they follow Indra’s power. But in the next pāda they exert their *svadhā-* by choosing him as king.

The depiction in c of the choosing of a king by the the clans (*viśāh*) is striking and has been much discussed (e.g., Proferes 94, 110–11, Ober. Relig. I.352, Jamison art. cit.).

X.124.9: I forebear from speculating myself on the mystical image of the roving goose, but see Proferes’s discussion (110–13, 127–28) of the goose as royal symbol and symbol of the sun, associated with unction waters.

X.125 Speech

On this famous hymn and the carelessness its fame has induced in its many translators, see publ. intro. Re (HymSpec) points out that the word *vāc*- does not occur in the hymn, which is, therefore, an extended riddle. I am not at all certain that I would have solved it, but we don’t need to: *Vāc* is identified by the Anukramaṇī as both the poet and the dedicand of the hymn. The hymn also belongs to the genre of *ātmastuti* “self-praise,” with forms of *ahám* extremely prominent, esp. at the beginning: the first 7 pādas all begin with *ahám*, with an extra one in 1d.

X.125.1–2: The speaker’s association with divinities progresses from groups of undifferentiated gods (1ab), to dual divinities (1cd), to single gods (2ab).

The pres. *bibharmi* (1c, 2a) is a good candidate for a habitual reading of the redupl. pres.

X.125.1: In all clear cases (uncertain: VI.51.7, VII.25.11), the cmpd *viśvādeva*- is a bahuvrīhi meaning ‘possessing / belonging to all the gods / the All Gods’, as its accent indicates. In this passage it is universally interpr. (incl. in the publ. tr.) as a nominal designation ‘All Gods / all the gods’. However, it could in fact be a bahuvrīhi and modify the three previous instr.: “with the Rs, Vs, and Ās, comprising all the gods.” In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the Rudras, Vasua, and Ādityas are sometimes mentioned together, implicitly as the totality of the divinities (see, e.g., nearby X.128.9 and Macd., Vedic Myth., 130). However, the position of *utá* speaks against this interpr. — which, however, I consider a strong alternative.

The three paired entities in cd are progressively less differentiated: the dual dvandva *mitrāvāruṇā* has two accents and two inflectional endings and is split across the caesura; the dual dvandva *indrāgnī* has a single accent, a single inflectional ending, is not read distracted (as it sometimes is), and precedes the caesura (though it occupies the same metrical slot as *mitrāvāruṇā*, immediately after pāda-initial *ahám*); *aśvínā* is not a compound of two divine names but refers to a pair without individual names.

X.125.2: The Anukr. identifies this vs. as Jagatī, but the first pāda is a Triṣṭubh.

On the difficult word *āhanás*- see comm. ad V.42.13.

Bhaga is universally taken as a separate god here, though it would be possible to take *bhágam* as an epithet of *pūśanam*, “Pūśan the distributor,” an interpr. weakly favored by the position of *utá* (though JSK [DGRV I.340] considers this an X *uta* Y Z construction).

After the divinities in the first verse and a half, we arrive at the human ritualist in cd.

X.125.3: It is only in this vs. that the gender – feminine – of the 1st ps. speaker is established – by a flood of fem. nouns and adjectives in ab and d, *rāṣṭrī saṃgámanī ... cikitúṣī prathamā ... bhūriṣṭhātrām ... āvesáyantīm*, and by the demonstrative *tām* reinforcing the (genderless) 1st ps. enclitic prn. *mā*. The gender is of course an important clue for the solution of the riddle, esp. since female divinities are scarce. The content of this vs. also provides a few clues to further

narrow the already narrow field of female gods. The fem. agent noun *rāṣṭrī* ‘ruler’ (a) is found once elsewhere (VIII.100.10), where it clearly refers to Vāc. (On the single form of anomalous masc. *rāṣṭrī* see comm. ad VI.4.5.) In c the statement that the gods distributed her in many places would remind any Vedic hearer of the divisions of speech that are a staple topic of Vedic enigmas (see, e.g., my Hyenas, 251–60).

The two characterizations of Vāc in d *bhūriṣṭhātrām* and *bhūry āveśāyantīm* are clearly meant to complement each other. The morphology of the second term is also very clear, namely a transitive-causative participle to *ā√viś* ‘enter’, which should have the sense ‘cause to enter’; cf. I.176.2 *tāsminn āveśaya girah* “cause the hymns to enter into him.” The poet must have meant the causative morphology to be taken seriously, because in the corresponding vs. 6 (forming the ring around the omphalos vss. 4–5) we encounter the non-causative pf. *āviveśa* (6d). Despite all this clear signaling, translators have tended to ignore the morphology and make the phrase mean what they think it ought to: e.g., Re “j’entre en beaucoup (de formes)” (HymSpec, but see EVP XVI.166, where he is more sensitive to the morphology); Don “I ... enter into many forms”; Mau “entering upon many a form”; Ge slightly better “viele (Formen) annehme” (though this still doesn’t accurately represent the morphology). If we take the morphology seriously – and I think we must – the phrase has to mean “causing many things to enter (me).” This provides a striking contrast to *bhūriṣṭhātrām* “having many stations.” On the one hand, she has been infinitely subdivided and is found in many different places, but on the other she encompasses everything – the multiplicity of things enters into the single entity that is Speech, which can express them all. As often, if we hold ourselves to taking the grammar literally, it leads to a more interesting result than just going by what we think it ought to mean: by the standard interpr. *bhūry āveśāyantīm* is simply a paraphrase of *bhūriṣṭhātrām*, but taking the causative seriously produces a sharp contrast and sketches a totalizing project.

X.125.4–5: On these vss. as the omphalos, see publ. intro. Note, inter alia, the repetition of *vadāmi* (4d, 5a).

X.125.4: On the interpr. of this vs., see publ. intro. The first hemistich provides another clue to the identity of the speaker, but once again it is oblique. She asserts her power over a bodily function – but, surprisingly, it is not speaking, but rather eating. This at first appears to be a nonsensical statement: how does Speech enable eating? The connection is the location: the mouth is the locus of both speaking and eating, and so, by a bit of slippery logic, Speech claims control over eating. She also makes another assertion, which is subtly conveyed by the syntactic structure: the primacy of eating over any other sensory activity – seeing, hearing, breathing. These last three are conveyed in relative clauses (“who sees ...,” etc.), which are dependent on the main cl “he eats.” Since food is essential to life, sensory activity is dependent on eating. (The hierarchy between eating and the other senses is elided by tr. like Don’s “the one who eats food, who truly sees ... (etc.),” which ignore the *sá ... yāḥ* structure.) See the publ. intro. for a second possible message, directly relevant to the poet, in this same passage.

The final pāda of the vs. is justly famous for its phonological and etymological patterns: *śrudhī śruta śraddhivām te vadāmi*. Watkins (Dragon 111) argues that it contains “an exhaustive classification of the speech sounds of the Vedic language, with one example of each class: the vowels *a*, *i*, *u* and a single icon each of the oppositions of quantity (*a* : *ā*) and nasalization (*a* : *aṃ*); a single sibilant *ś*; a single liquid *r*; a single semi-vowel (glide) *v*; a single nasal *m*; and a

single order of stops, *t d dh* as tokens of the oppositions of voicing (*t: d*) and aspiration or murmur (*d: dh*).”

The pāda is also at almost the exact center of the hymn, where the “message” is often located. It contains the only imperative in the hymn, which must be addressed to the poet, and the only 2nd ps. prn. (*te*). Once again, the familiarity of the pāda has led to some lack of focus in tr. The tendency has been to take *śruta* in its common usage as ‘famed, famous’; see Ge “Höre, du Berühmter”; Watkins (Dragon 111) “Listen, o famous one.” Even further afield, Re (HSpec) “Écoute, toi qui sais,” which is either a major extension of ‘hear’ to ‘know’ or a lapse on his part. The trick to (which I think) is the correct interpr. is to take *śruta* as ‘heard’ → ‘listened to’, not ‘heard of’ → ‘famous’. Speech is addressing the poet as the conduit of her message; others listen to him, and he can therefore convey what she says to a wider audience as long as he himself listens to her.

X.125.5: The first hemistich seems to echo the content of *bhūry āveśāyantīm* in 3c in other terms. Although she acts on her own (*ahām evā svayām* “just I myself ...”), what she says is applicable to and favorably received by both the divine and the human realms – that is, to all beings.

The anomalously accented old past participle to *√juṣ* ‘enjoy’, *júṣta-*, ordinarily takes a dat. complement (presumably conditioned by its accent retraction). This is the only place in the RV where it is found with the instr. expected with a ppl. It is probably no accident that this involves the phrase “by gods and men” (*devébhīr utá mānuṣebhiḥ*); cf. the three instantiations in Old Avestan of the similar phrase *daēuuaiścā (...)* *mašiiāiścā* (Y. 29.4, 34.5, 48.1), though with the Avestan semantic shift of *daēuua-* to the negative side.

The second hemistich concerns the choosing and creating of a poet by Speech. It is reminiscent of Vasiṣṭha’s happy memory of the day when the god Varuṇa made him a poet: VII.88.4 *ṛṣīm cakāra svāpā mähobhiḥ, stotāraṃ vípraḥ ...*” He [=Varuṇa], himself skillful in his work, made him [=Vasiṣṭha] a seer through his great powers. / The inspired one [=Varuṇa] (made him [=Vasiṣṭha]) a praise singer.”

X.125.6: I do not know why this vs. is so aggressive in tone. Perhaps the mention of the “formulator” (*brahmán-*) in 5d brings to mind the enemy of the formulation (*brahma-dviṣ-*) and reminds Speech that true speech must always be defended.

dyāvā-prthivī brings us back to the dual dvandvas of 1cd; like *mitrā-vāruṇā* there the dvandva here is split by the caesura and also has all the furbelows of a true dual dvandva: double accent and double inflectional ending.

Re (HSpec.) suggests that *samādam* is a verbal contest (p. 253 n. 11 “la joute oratoire”), an idea taken up by both Don and Mau. This is not impossible, esp. given the identity of the speaker (Speech). However, it is far from necessary: well-attested *samād-* isn’t otherwise specialized for verbal contests, and Speech can be implicated in regular battles (“fighting words”). On *samād-* see Scar 381–83.

The pf. *ā viveśa* contrasts with *āveśāyantīm* in 3c, as discussed there. In vs. 3 many things enter her; here she herself enters.

Her entering Heaven and Earth here picks up the gods and men of 5b: both phrases are merisms of a sort, referring to the totality of beings / realms by their two most conspicuous and contrastive members. She will further develop this in the next vs.

X.125.7: This vs. expresses Speech’s total pervasion of Heaven and Earth, announced in 6d. It does so by using two deep-structure formulas, with gapped members – a demonstration of her own virtuosity. I do not think this vs. has been understood correctly by previous interpr. We start with the apparent paradox, “I give birth to the father on his head.” In my view, the father (*pitár-*) is Father Heaven, Dyaus Pitar (of whom we heard so much in the immed. preceding hymn, X.124). The paradox of his place of birth, “on his [own] head” (*ahám suve pitáram asya mūrdhán-*), can be resolved by reference to a different formulaic phrase, “the head of Heaven” (*mūrdhán- diváh-*): this phrase is regularly used of Agni (e.g. I.59.2, III.2.14, VI.7.1, VIII.44.16 -- cf. also X.8.6 *diví mūrdhānam dadhiṣe* also of Agni). To expand this: “I give birth to Father Heaven on the head of Heaven [(i.e., Agni). In other words, we are dealing with two formulae: *dyaus pitā* and *mūrdhán- diváh-*. They intersect in this pāda, and in both formulae one of the words in the formula is gapped – but the *same* word, namely “Heaven.” What this means is that by being present and officiating on the ritual ground, beside the ritual fire, Speech creates and sustains the cosmos – from the restricted space on earth to the very top of heaven. From this space she spreads through all realms and across all beings and touches heaven.

As sometimes elsewhere (see comm. ad I.57.5, VIII.40.4), ‘heaven’ is modified by a fem., in this case the pronominal adj. *amūm* ‘yonder’, which may seem esp. disturbing because (at least in my interpr.) Heaven is the father in pāda a. But this can be interpr. as part of Speech’s totalizing project: she has contact with both aspects of a putatively androgynous Heaven. (At least *amūm* has the right deixis; sometimes the fem. demonstr. with heaven is *iyám* ‘this here’; see comm. cit.)

varṣmán- (and apparently synonymous *várṣman-*) is regularly construed with *diváh-* (VI.47.4, X.63.4), so, *pace* Re (HSpec), Don, and Mau, Speech does not touch heaven with *her varṣmán-*.

X.125.8: In the final vs. Speech claims a larger territory than even heaven and earth – in c she asserts that she goes beyond them both. She also manifests as the wind, which is of course suitable for speech, which is carried by breath.

Strictly speaking, *enā* cannot modify *prthivyā*, despite the standard tr., because *prthivī-* is fem., and instr. *enā* in masc.-neut. Unlike ‘heaven’ (see ad 7d above), ‘earth’ does not switch genders. Hence my “this earth here” is misleading, but I can’t come up with a suitable adverbial rendering.

X.126 All Gods

On the elementary structure of this hymn and on its meter, see publ. intro.

X.126.1: As often, a pattern in a hymn takes a while to settle down: although in vss. 2–7 pāda b is occupied entirely by the same trio of gods in the same order, Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman (in nom., except voc. 2b), in this initial vs. the three are scattered across cd.

X.126.2: The lexeme *nīh √pā* is found only here and seems to have been confectioned in order to find some way to repeat *ámhas-* from 1a.

X.126.3: The construction *té ... (a)yám*, with pl. nom. *té* seemingly doubled by sg. nom. *ayám*, in pāda a gives Old fits and he spins increasingly complex scenarios to explain it. Re (EVP XVI.167) claims that ‘*yám*’ was borrowed from 1c, which seems quite dubious to me. I think that,

given the individual listing of gods in b, it's conveying that each one is both separately and jointly here.

On the dependence of splv. *pārṣiṣṭha-* on *parṣāni* see Re ad loc.

X.126.5: A verb needs to be supplied in ab; “lead” seems the obvious choice, given its prominence in the rest of the hymn (1c, 2d, 3c, 4d, 6a) (so also Ge).

A surprising intrusion of other divinities in cd.

X.126.7: Ge and Re take *śunām* as adverbial or (Re) “semi-interjectif.” I don't see why it can't be another object to *yachantu* in c. The word order in this vs. is tortured enough.

X.126.8: This vs. is identical to IV.12.8 in an Agni hymn. Why it has been added here, in a metrically variant hymn that contains only one glancing mention of Agni (5d), is unclear to me. Perhaps because of the *āṃhas-* in c, recalling the occurrences in 1a and 2c. Bloomfield makes no comment (and in fact doesn't register the repetition ad IV.12.8). The alternative poet's name given by the Anukr., Amhomuc Vāmadevya, bases the first name on *muñcata vy āṃhaḥ* in 8c and the patronymic on the original site of this vs. in the Vāmadeva maṇḍala. The full name is found only here in the Anukr., though there are several other poets with the Vāmadevya patronymic in X.

X.127 Night

X.127.1–3: Nom. *devī* appears in the same place in all three vss.: in pāda b in the 4th and 5th syllables. My attempt to render this parallelism was impossibly stilted, so I abandoned it.

X.127.1: Night's “eyes” are presumably the stars. For stars see also vs. 7.

X.127.2: The actions ascribed to Night here are otherwise associated with Dawn and the sun. See, for ab, e.g., IV.52.5 *ōṣā aprā urú jrāyaḥ* “Dawn has filled the broad expanse,” and for c X.37.4 *yéna sūrya jyótiṣā bādhasa támaḥ* “by which, o Sūrya, you repel the darkness with (your) light.” With *urú* I supply *antárikṣam*, since this phrase is extremely common. See, e.g., nearby X.124.6 *urv àntárikṣam*. However, *jrāyaḥ*, as in IV.52.5 just quoted, would also do.

X.127.3: The part. *āyatī* returns from 1a.

The root aor. *askṛta* is the only such form in the RV. In fact the Pp. reads *akṛta*, which, however, would produce a bad cadence. The preservation (if that's what it is) of *s*-mobile here must have been fostered by real or imagined degemination of the idiom *niṣ-(s)kṛ*; ; cf. I.92.1 *niṣkṛṇvānā* — though of course here the preverb is in tmesis and the augment would have intervened in any case.

X.127.4: The initial *sā* must be coreferential with the 2nd ps. relative expression *yáśyāḥ ... te*. As I demonstrated in my 1992 “Vedic 'sá figé': An Inherited Sentence Connective,” 2nd ps. reference for nom. forms of the *sá/ tām* pronoun is only found in impv. clauses, and so I supply an impv. in the *sā no adyá* main clause – a form of (*ā*) *√bhū* or (*ā*) *√as* (with the *ā* possibly concealed in *sā*). As Ge (n. 4ab) points out, the same pāda opening *sā no adyá* is found in the Dawn hymn, V.79.3; there it occurs with an overt 2nd ps. impv. *vy ùchā*. I am not alone in

supplying an impv here: it goes back to Sāy., though he takes the reference as 3rd ps. (*prasīdatu*), and as far as I can see simply ignores the *te*. Ge’s imperativ “(Steh) du” more accurately captures the usage of 2nd ps. *sā*. Re supplies a pres. indic. (“tu es”); other tr. -- Macdonell (VRS), Don, Mau – also recognize the 2nd ps. ref. but supply a past-tense verb (e.g., Macd. “So to us to-day thou [hast approached]”) – though in *Hymns from the Rigveda* Macd tr. “So, goddess, come to-day to us,” with an impv. but an invented voc.

X.27.5: This passage provides good evidence for Rau’s contention that *grāma-* means ‘roving band, horde’ in the RV, not ‘village’; though see comm. ad X.27.19 for a more nuanced assessment.

The parallel forms *padvánt-* and *pakṣín-* ‘footed’ and ‘winged’ respectively are a good argument against the view that there’s a consistent functional difference between the *-vant-* and *-in-* possessive suffixes.

There is a range of possible tr. for *arthín-* lit. ‘having a goal’, e.g., ‘busy’ (as in the publ. tr.; cf. Ge’s “geschäftigen”), but I think ‘hungry’ (Macd. *Hymns*), ‘greedy’ (Macd., VRS; Mau) go too far. However, a rendering more focused on the goal might be better; AR suggests “intent (on their prey).”

X.27.6: The transmitted Saṃhitā contrast between the two pāda-initial impvs. *yāváyā* (a) and *yaváya* (b) is surprising. (The Pp. reads them both with short root syllable, *yaváya*.) As was established in my *-áya-* monograph (174–75), both stems are almost equally well attested in the RV, but their distributions don’t overlap except in X: *yāváyā-* is well established in the Family Books, from which *yaváya-* is missing. The short-vowel form is clearly a replacement for the the long-vowel stem. For further on the distribution see the disc. just cited. Why the poet chose to use both here in identical metrical and syntactic situations I have no idea.

X.127.7: The act. intens. part. *pépiśat*, the only intens. form in the RV (though see comm. ad V.57.6), appears to be intrans., despite its diathesis. C. Melchert has point out, however, that there are no transitive neuter participles in the RV (save for *várdhat* V.62.5). On this intens. and its problematic intransitivity, see Schaefer. (152–53); after the RV the stem appears as middle *pépiśāna-*, whose middle form better fits its usage. The ornaments in question are clearly stars; cf. I.68.10 *pipésa nākam stṛbhiḥ* and VI.49.3 *stṛbhiḥ anyā* [=night] *pipísé*.

The simile in c is curiously hybrid. Although as Ge (n. 7c) points out, *ṛṇám √yat* is a later expression for ‘settle a debt’, in the RV the idiom is *ṛṇa-yā-* (on which see the thorough disc. of Scar. 407–9). This *√yā* does not have any verbal forms (see tentative disc. in EWA s.v. the bracketed *YĀ³*); if it did, we should expect **yāpaya* here. The poet seems to be frustrating expectations with the odd, but phonologically similar expression *ṛṇā √yat*, which may also have been encouraged by *yāváyā ... yaváya* in the previous vs. The obj. in the frame must be darkness, with the point being that Dawn on her arrival should put it down or aside.

X.127.8: The poet is once again playing games with us. The voc. in the previous vs. was *úśaḥ* ‘o Dawn’, and the first voc. in this vs. *duhitar divaḥ* (b) “o Daughter of Heaven” is regularly addressed to Dawn (or to Sūryā). But it is immed. followed (c) with the voc. *rātri* ‘o Night’. Are both females present in this vs. or are we to assume that Night is also the daughter of heaven (as she rightly should be)? Note also that the middle impv. *vṛṇīṣva* ‘choose’ is the svayavara verb,

esp. appropriate to Sūryā (see my 2001 Fs. Parpola “The Rigvedic svayamvara? Formulaic evidence”).

On the complex simile and the verb therein see Ge (n. 8b). The full expression, as he points out, is “make [=drive] cows homeward.” Cf. X.169.4 *śivāḥ satīr ūpa no goṣṭhām ākaḥ* “(Prajāpati) has sent (the cows) here, being well-disposed, to our stable.” This simile participates in the uneasy ambiguity between Night and Dawn just noted. In real-life terms cows are driven home at the beginning of the night, not (as apparently here) at its end with the advent of dawn.

Perhaps the most obvious problem with the simile is that it seems to have no object in the frame, but two in the simile: *gā iva* (a) and *stómam ná* (c). Moreover, *stómam* is exactly the object we would want in the frame (hence my supplied parenthetical “hymn”). The various tr. attempt to have it both ways, understandably. I now think that the simile marker *ná* is displaced, and the simile in c consists only of *jigyúṣe *ná*. As disc. elsewhere (see comm. ad VIII.76.1, X.21.1), simile-marking *ná* cannot appear pāda-final and is flipped with its target under those circumstances. I would now therefore slightly emend the tr. to “Like cows (to their pen) I have driven a praise song up to you, as if to a victor.” Unfortunately pāda b has to be parenthetically inserted, which makes the parsing all the harder.

Note the faint sign of ring composition: *rātri* opens the hymn and opens its final pāda.

X.128 All Gods

On the theme of competing sacrifices, see publ. intro. The hymn is also (more or less) AVŚ V.3 and AVP V.4 (ed. and tr. Lubotsky).

X.128.1–4: These first vss. are dominated by (usually) fronted 1st sg. pronouns: *māma* (1a), *māhyam* (1c), *māma* (2a), *māma* (2c.), *māhyam* (3d), *māyi* (3a, 3b [2x]), *māhyam* (4a), *māma* (4a), *me* (4b). But these pronouns abruptly cease at this point – though one might consider the regular repetition of *mā* ‘don’t’ (4c, 5c [2x], 5d, 8d [2x]) a continuation by other means.

X.128.1: In addition to the forms of the 1st sg. pronoun, note 1st pl. *vayām* (1b) and 2nd sg. *tvā* (2b) and *tvāyā* (1d).

In b I take acc. *tanvām* as referring to both the subject (“we”) and the obj. of the part. *īndhānāḥ* (“you” = Agni). Forms of \sqrt{pus} ‘thrive’ regularly take the acc. Scholarly opinion is divided on the referent – Agni: Ge; us: Proferes (*Sovereignty*, 44), Wh (AVŚ), Lub (AVP); Re (EVP XVI) sits on the fence. I see no reason why it can’t be both. In favor of “us” are 3d, 5c.

X.128.2: Note *devāḥ ... sārve* versus *vísve devāsaḥ* in 4d, 5b.

The hapax *urú-loka-* must be a bahuvrīhi, as it is standardly taken – even though bahuvrīhis with *urú-* often have 2nd member accent (e.g., *uru-cakrá-*). There are, however, exceptions – e.g., *urú-yuga-*. The corresponding nominal expression is the truncated *u lóka-*. It’s also worth noting that the noun this cmpd modifies and which it immediately follows is *antárikṣam*, which is regularly modified by *urú*, as was noted above ad X.127.2 – usually, but not invariably, in the order *urv antárikṣam* (I.91.22, etc.; but III.22.2, IV.52.7 *antárikṣam urú*).

The publ. tr. does not render *asmín*; it could be modified to “for me, at this (my) desire,” but it hardly seems worth it.

X.128.3: Ge renders *vanuṣanta* as a modal, “sollen Partei nehmen.” On the one hand, the modals that surround this form – impvs. *ā yajantām* (a), *astu* (b), opt *syāma* (d) – might support a modal

reading. On the other, *pūrve* ‘ancient, previous, earlier’ suggests that the divine Hotars in question performed an action in the past that can serve as a model. Since the verb stem *vanuṣ(a)-* is only attested here (though cf. *vanuṣyá-*), the morphology is not clear: is it an injunctive or a subjunctive? The AV versions (AVŚ V.3.5, AVP V.4.5) substitute *saniṣan*, an *-iṣ*-aor. subj., but this substitution for the morphologically isolated RVic form is of little evidential value for the interpr. of the RVic form, since the AV often replaces forms it clearly finds puzzling.

X.128.4: The construction of pāda a is unclear. Ge simply takes the two parts *máhyaṃ yajantu* and *máma yāni havyā* as separate parallel clauses: “Für mich sollen sie opfern, mein sind alle Opferspenden,” ignoring the rel. prn. Wh (AVŚ V.3.4, which has *yānīṣṭā* [i.e., *yāni iṣṭā*]) ingeniously takes the nom. rel. as subj. of *yajantu*: “Let what sacrifices I make make sacrifice for me,” but I doubt that either *iṣṭá-* or *havyá-* can be subj. of act. \sqrt{yaj} ; I certainly know of no such passages. (Lub’s tr. of AVP V.4.4 seems to follow Wh’s, though it is not unambig.: “For me let them sacrifice, whichever sacrifices are mine.”) Like Wh and Lub, I want to take account of the rel. prn., but I also think the construction should follow a more conventional model. When the means of sacrifice, the oblation, is construed with \sqrt{yaj} , it is in the instr.; cf., e.g., V.3.8 *tvām ... ayajanta havyaiḥ* “They sacrificed to you [Agni] with oblations.” I therefore assume a gapped instr. in the first part of the pāda, which is coreferential with the nominal izafe-like expression that follows.

X.128.5: On *dévīḥ saḥ urvīḥ* see comm. ad X.14.16. I now see that the standard view, found already in Gr (def. 14 s.v. *urū*), that this is a ref. to the three heavens and the three earths (or some other sixfold division of the cosmos) is most likely correct – or at least provides a plausible solution. Why fem.? perhaps as a pluralization of sg. *urvī* modifying *bhūmi-* / *prthivī-* ‘earth’ or of du. *urvī* modifying *ródasī* ‘two world-halves’ (common) or *dyāvā-prthivī*. I would now alter the tr. to “you six divine broad (world-spaces),” however awkward the English.

On the passive value of the *s*-aor. injunc. *hāsmahi* see Narten, Sig. Aor. 285.

X.128.6: On *nigút-* see comm. ad IX.97.53.

On *neśat* see comm. ad IV.1.17.

X.128.8: Old, flg. Ludwig, suggests that *uruvyácā(h)* can be a neut. modifying *śárma*, but there seems no need to take it as anything but the masc. nom. sg. it appears to be. This adj. regularly modifies Indra (e.g., VII.31.11).

X.128.9: A touch of ring composition: *adhirājám* (d) recalls *ádhyakṣa-* in 1d.

[X.129–130 JPB]

X.131 Indra

On the contents and later use of the hymn see publ. intro.

X.131.1: The pattern of the repeated preverb in tmesis *ápa* followed by acc. pl. directional adj. creates a nice phonological effect, esp. in the first two pādas: #*ápa prácaḥ* ... #*ápāpācaḥ*.

X.131.2: On the interpr. of the inagery in this vs., see publ. intro. As I say there, the most obvious initial interpr. has to be set aside as the vs. continues.

X.131.3: For the interpr. of this vs., see publ. intro. I have rendered pāda a rather loosely, to capture its slightly slangy tone. As I indicate in the publ. intro., a more literal tr. would be “there is nothing which, when drawn by a single animal, has travelled in the right way” or, per JSK DGRV I.375, “For it is not driven in the proper manner by means of a single horse.” The periphrasis *yātām āsti* is somewhat puzzling: I don’t see the need for an overt copula. Since the overt 3rd sg. pres. of \sqrt{as} is usually existential, not copular, I have so tr. it in my literal rendering just given. But wonder if it’s there instead to make it clear that *yātām* is not the common dual impv. to $\sqrt{yā}$ so frequently used of the Aśvins. Moreover, as I disc. in my 1990 “Tense of the Past Part.” article, surface copulas are more likely to be found in subord. clauses, as here. See comm. ad VII.22.2.

On *sthūri* see Bl’s comments (RReps ad IV.17.16); he also favors “one-horse” as an Eng. rendering.

Note that though *utā* suggests that pādas a and b are conjoined, *vivide* (b) is not accented, unlike *āsti* (a), and so cannot be in the domain of *hī* in a. JSK (loc. cit.) does not note the differential verb accentuation and seems to think that *utā* is conjoining clauses that are at least loosely parallel. I assume that *utā* in this somewhat vernacular style is simply introducing a new clause.

Ge supplies a subj. “ein solcher” for *vivide*, but I follow Gr in taking it as passive with *śrávaḥ* as subj.; this would match the passive expression in pāda a. For other pass. usages of this med. pf., see Kü 493.

The 2nd hemistich is identical to IV.17.16ab, but the sentence continues there in cd. In both places Ge supplies a main verb “call on.” This is possible, but in the pub. tr. I supply “seek” semantically extracted from the *-yā-* denominatives. In IV.17.16, by contrast, I read *vājáyantaḥ* as a pun: not only ‘seeking prizes’, but also (as often) ‘rousing’. See comm. ad loc. This is possible here as well; I now suggest an alt. tr. “inspired ones, seeking cows, seeking horses, seeking prizes / [are] rousing the bull Indra for partnership.” In this case, *vājáyantaḥ* would also be a predicated pres. part.

X.131.4–5: As discussed in the publ. intro., these two vss. make brief mention of the Aśvins’ healing of Indra, who got sick from drinking the liquor *surā*. This myth is treated extensively in Vedic prose, esp. in connection with the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, which seems already alluded to here, and there is abundant sec. lit. on it (see reff. in the publ. intro., also Ge’s n. 4a).

The word *surāma-* is found only in these two vss., and its meaning and formation are much disputed (see Gr, Ge n. 4a, Old, EWA s.v. *sūrā-*, etc.). I favor the suggestion of Brune (cited by Old) that it is a blend, or portmanteau, of *sūrā-* and *sóma-* (of the “brunch” type). It is, after all, the obj. of $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘separate in drinking’ in 4c. The word also, obviously, plays off *sutrāman-*, the epithet of Indra in vss. 6 and 7 and the base for the name of the Sautrāmaṇī ritual.

On $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘separate in drinking’ see esp. comm. ad VII.22.4, I.191.10.

X.131.5: The publ. tr. conceals a grammatical problem in the first hemistich, though not a very interesting one. The Aśvins are nom. (or acc.) in pāda a, with suffixal accent *aśvínā*. But the du. verb in b is 2nd ps. *āváthuḥ*. Moreover, there is a voc. *índra*, so an extra 2nd ps. ref. The simplest

solution, reflected in the tr., is Old's: read 3rd du *āvātuḥ* for *āváthuḥ*; he suggests 2nd ps. form was influenced by *āvatam* in 5d.

X.131.6–7: These vss. are identical to VI.47.12–13, where they do not seem to have any connection to the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, unlike here.. As noted above, both vss. contain the epithet *sutrāman-*.

X.132 Mitra and Varuṇa

On the problematic nature of this hymn, see publ. intro. I will not engage deeply with the various other interpr. and in fact will not spend much time trying to justify my own -- taking as my guide Old's introductory remark: "Nur teilweise verständlich." On the hymn and esp. vs. 4, see Ingrid Eichner-Kühn, "Ein Eidbrück im Ṛgveda," MSS 41 (1982) 23–31. Her solution for the problematic hapax in 4d is brilliant and puts a very different complexion on the interpretation of the difficult vss. 4–5, but I cannot follow her in her interpr. of the whole hymn (27) as an oath-breaker's attempt, through an expiatory sacrifice to Agni, to avert Varuṇa's retribution for this offense – however ingenious this interpr. is.

X.132.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the repeated pf. mid. part. *ījāná-* seems to be identifying the role later called the "Sacrificer" (Yajamāna).

The first hemistich lacks a finite verb; something needs to be supplied to govern the loc. inf. *prabhūṣāṇi*. Pace Gr, Wh (Rts), AiG II.2.624, it seems better to take *prabhūṣāṇi* to $\sqrt{bhūṣ}$ 'attend on', than to $\sqrt{bhū}$, since *prá* $\sqrt{bhū}$ ordinarily means 'project, dominate', not 'help' vel sim. Old is uncertain which root to choose.

X.132.2: As noted in the publ. intro., act. *yajāmasi* seems a deliberate contrast to the three exx. of the mid. part. *ījāná-* I vs. 1 and may identify the 1st pl. subjects here as the working priests. This vs. reprises some of vs. 1: in addition to the contrastive forms of \sqrt{yaj} we have *suṣumnā* echoing *sumnaiḥ* (1d), mid. *krānāya*, which I take as synonymous with *ījāná-*, and *abhí* \sqrt{as} in d may pick up *abhí prabhūṣāṇi* in 1b (though I confess I'm not sure how).

īṣitatvātā is a remarkable piece of morphology: a double abstract (*-tva+tā-*) built to a ppl. (Somewhat similar, though built to a noun, is *puruṣatvātā-* RV 2x.) I think *īṣita-* refers to the ritual prompt to sacrifice; see, e.g., X.110.3 *sá enān yakṣīṣitāḥ* (i.e., *yakṣi īṣitāḥ*) "sacrifice to them when prompted" (cf. X.110.9, III.4.3, VI.11.1, VII.39.1).

For c, cf. VI.19.13.

X.132.3: On the interpr. of this vs., see publ. intro., where I claim that the vs. continues the opposition between the sacrificing priests and the Sacrificer. The publ. tr. would be easier to understand if parenthetical identifications were inserted: "And even now, when we [=priests] seek to establish you two [M+V] here, while coming into possession of our own dear legacy, / or when the giver [=Sacrificer/Patron] prospers with regard to his legacy, no one shall bring his [=Sac./Patron] bounties (for us) into collision [=destroy them]."

As I say in the publ. intro. (see also comm. on X.61.11), the word *réknas-*, used twice here (b, c), is several times (I.121.5 [=X.61.11], VI.20.7, VII.40.2, possibly I.31.14 [note typo in publ. intro.], VI.16.26) used of what the gods "leave behind" (\sqrt{ric}) for the mortals at the sacrifice. Here both the sacrificing priests ("we" ab) and the Sacrificer/Patron (c) should receive

part of this “legacy.” In addition the Sacrificer/Patron should be distributing “bounties” (*māghāni*) to the priests (d).

On the pf. part. *dadvāms-* see Kü (238), who claims that it never takes an obj. in the RV. I think he is correct in this case, and although it is tempting to construe *réknaḥ* with *dadvān* (like VIII.46.15 *dadī réknaḥ*, which must mean ‘giving a legacy’; cf. also VI.20.7), it is better to take *réknaḥ* as an acc. of respect with *púsyati* (sim. Kü: “oder wenn ein Spender das Erbteil mehrt”).

The verb in d poses two problems. On the one hand, its sandhi is ambiguous: it may represent 3rd pl. *āran* (so Pp., fld. by Lub, Re, implicitly Kü) or sg. *ārat* (Gr, Ge [n. 3d], Heenen [163], publ. tr.). (Old is uncertain.) By the former analysis *maghāni* is the subject, by the latter *nākih*. Then there is the question of the morphological identity of either form. Whether *ārat* or *āran*, it is generally taken as an augmented thematic aorist, which would require a preterital interpr. Since I consider d to be the main clause for the parallel *yád* clauses in ab and c, which are presential (marked even further as such by the opening *ádhā cin nú* “and even now”), a preterital interpr. poses problems (see Re’s attempt to wriggle out of this by emending to *āran* with preverb *ā*, allowing him an underlying injunctive *aran*; EVP VII.64). However, nothing prevents us from taking it as a pf. subjunctive (indic. *āra* etc.), and that is the analysis I strongly favor on the basis of the structure of the vs.

I am less certain about what the pāda means, and the numerous other renderings do not help. The publ. tr. starts from the fact that in the middle *sám √ṛ* means ‘clash together’; in the act. it could therefore mean ‘cause to clash together, bring into collision’ – hence destroy. I do not see a better route to interpr., but I confess I find my own solution weak.

X.132.4–5: As noted in the publ. intro., the interpr. of these two vss. is highly uncertain. (Please also note another typo in the intro.: “The first half of vs. 5 ...” should read “vs. 4.”)

X.132.4: The first half of this vs. is structured by a twist on the classic *anyá- ... anyá-* “the one ... the other” construction: the second *anyá-* is replaced by a 2nd ps. Although the apparent assignment of kingship to both Heaven (pāda a) and Varuṇa (b) is at first puzzling, in fact it can easily be interpr. within the context of the famous hymn X.124 (in my interpr.), on which see the comm. ad loc. and my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of R̥gveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas” (Ged. Staal), as well as the publ. tr. of that hymn. I argue that the “divine revolution” in X.124 involves the peaceful passing of the kingship from Father Heaven (Dyaus Pitar) to a complementary duo, Indra and Varuṇa (see esp. X.124.5). Our hemistich here can be interpr. within the same framework, with a chronological gap between the two pādas: *previously* Heaven was consecrated (*sūyata*) as king, but *now* Varuṇa is king. Esp. telling is the placement of the voc. *asura*: it is found in pāda a between *asaú* and *dyaúḥ*, which add up to the standard designation “yonder heaven,” but it must be construed with the voc. *varuṇa* in b. But Heaven is called “Father Asura” in X.124.3 and elsewhere, while Varuṇa also frequently is so called. It is as if our poet wants to associate the word with both figures: Heaven by word order and Varuṇa by grammar.

The second hemistich is harder. In pāda c both the referent of the nom. *mūrdhā* and the morphological identity of the verb *cākan* are up for grabs. I take *mūrdhā* as continuing the reference to Varuṇa, from the previous pāda. This suggests that *cākan* is 2nd sg., rather than 3rd (per Gr, etc.). For both identifications, see Re’s tr. (EVP V). What chariot does he take pleasure in? Obvious answers are the chariot of sacrifice or the war chariot (both have been suggested – e.g., sacrifice Scar 245, war chariot Re) – or both. If it is the latter (or partly the latter), this might

help in interpr. the baffling pāda d. In the power-sharing arrangement between Indra and Varuṇa, Indra is the Kriegskönig, while Varuṇa presides over peacetime. Suggesting that he gets pleasure from war might suggest that he is violating his nature and perhaps committing a transgression (*énaś-*).

As noted above, Eichner-Kühn provides an inspired solution to the problematic hapax in pāda d. The second word of the sandhified sequence *énaśāntakadrūk* is read as *antakadrūk* by the Pp, and all subsequent treatments of the word have started with that reading. But E-K suggest reading instead *āntakadrūk* (which requires no emendation to the Saṃhitā text), with *ānta(ka)-* the expected ppl. to the set root \sqrt{am} ‘swear’. The cmpd then means ‘deceiving (/breaking) an oath, a sworn agreement’, and it is essentially synonymous with *mitra-drūh-*, a cmpd not found in the RV (though see *drógha-mitra-*) but attested in the MS and later and the direct correspondent to well-attested YAVestian *miθrō.drug-*. That *āntaka-drūh-* here is meant as a substitute for the resonant and inherited Indo-Iranian technical term *mitradrūh-* is shown by the presence of *hité mitré* “when an alliance is/was concluded” in the complementary contrastive passage in the next vs, 5b.

E-K thinks this pāda means that the oath-breaker is (no longer) burdened with sin because he has performed his sacrifice to Agni, who, acdg. to her, is the subject of the preceding pāda c. But I think this requires too much backstory to be supplied – though I admit my own interpr. is pretty shaky. As hinted at above, I suggest that Varuṇa’s penchant for the war chariot might have been – but is not – considered a transgression worthy of the description ‘oath-breaking’ – in this case breaking his power-sharing agreement with Indra. What really counts as oath-breaking is described in the first hemistich of the next vs.

X.132.5: One thing all interpreters can agree on is that 5ab must be read with 4cd, with contrastive treatments of *énaś-* ‘transgression’, which is lodged in someone called, or described as, *śákapūta-* lit. ‘shit-purified’ or ‘durch Mist gereinigt’. E-K (28) thinks that this personage is really Agni, and the *énaś-* of the oath-breaker has been deposited (harmlessly) in this god to whom the original offender made expiatory sacrifice – i.e., it has been offered into the fire. Agni is then the subject of b, punishing others who have committed the same offense. With others I take *śákapūta* as a derogatory personal name, the negative sense of which identifies him as an enemy or someone who operates outside Ārya norms. He is the one who deserves the appellation “oath-breaker,” and pāda b describes what his offense consists of: killing men who have already fallen (or have surrendered by prostrating themselves) after a peace agreement has been reached.

Note that the sandhi form *cháka(pūta)* echoes *cākan* in 4c.

As I indicate in the publ. intro., I think the 2nd half of vs. 5 belongs with vs. 6 and concerns the current ritual, where Mitra and Varuṇa are present. The description of this ritual unfolds in a series of disjointed clauses.

For *avór vā yád* I read (with Gr, Old AiG III.350, and JSK [DGRV II.209]) **vām*. Both of the other occurrences of *avóḥ* are fld. by *vām* (VI.67.11, VII.67.4), and *vām* could have been redactionally changed to *vā* here to match 3c #*dadvām vā yád*. The specification with *vām* would help clarify the unusual pron. form *avóḥ*, which is, per Lub (121), probably an assimilation from *ayóḥ*. For a similar doubling see 2a *tā vām*. (This emendation is explicitly rejected by E-K [n. 13] and is ignored by Ge and Re, who both tr. the *vā*.)

With most (Old, Ge, Re, E-K), I take *arvā* as a ref. to Agni as ritual fire.

X.132.5–6: Note the play: 5c #*avór* ..., 5d #*ávaḥ* ... *árvā*#, 6a #*yuvór* ..., 6c *áva* ...

X.132.6: The first hemistich is highly reminiscent of 1ab, which provides at least limited help in interpr. this obscure mess (as both Old and Re point out). Both passages contain *dyaúh ... bhūmih* + LOC. INF. The first help vs. 1 provides is in interpr. 6b *dyaúh ná bhūmih*. Although Ge takes *bhūmih* as the frame corresponding to *dyaúh* in the simile (“die Erde ... wie der Himmel”), vs. 1 suggests that they should be read as parallel and essentially conjoined “Heaven (and) Earth,” with both in the simile (so also Old and Re). Placing *ná* between the two nom.s is rather like breaking up a dual dvandva with a particle.

On the loc. inf. *pupūtáni* see also Keydana (Inf. 182). Exactly who or what is being purified is unclear to me – or even whether the inf. is to be interpr. as act. or pass. In the publ. tr. I opt for an act. interpr., which would parallel *prabhūśāni* in vs. 1, and assume that Aditi as a maternal figure is purifying with mother’s milk, as H+E purify with rain. But I am by no means certain of any of this. Re suggests that soma is the obj. of Aditi’s purification – this seems reasonable, insofar as “reasonable” is applicable to this hymn.

The identify of the 2nd pl. subjects of the verbs in cd (*áva ... didiṣṭana, ninikta*) is again unclear. I assume M+V plus Aditi – and whatever other gods are hanging around the sacrifice. We have finally come to the point of making our demands.

What it means to “wash with the sun’s rays” is unclear to me, but it seems to be parallel to “purify with milk” in b.

X.132.7: I have nothing to contribute to the interpr. of this vs. See publ. intro.

On *apna-rāj-* and the discrepancy between the 1st member *apna-* and putative base *ápnas-*, see Scar 446; on *dhūr-śád-* and *vanar-śád-*, Scar 567. See also Kü (223), who tr. the whole vs.

X.133 Indra

On the hymn and its connections to others in the RV, see publ. intro. It is also quite similar to the next hymn, X.134, although the Anukr. attributes them to different poets.

X.133.1: The bahuvrīhi *purorátha-* occurs once elsewhere (X.39.11), where it refers, semi-metaphorically, to a man “whose chariot is in front”—that is, who is dominant and/or victorious. Here the metaphor has been extend to describe a hymn that will prevail over the hymns of our competitors (so Ge, plausibly). My “leading chariot (of a hymn)” is meant to avoid the awkward and barely intelligible “(a hymn) whose chariot is in front.”

On *sūśá-* see esp. comm. ad X.31.3.

As noted in the publ. intro., the refrain is an elaboration on the Nābhāka Kāṇva refrain of VIII.39–42, with further use of the deprecatory low-register *-ka*-suffix.

X.133.2: Despite the pāda boundary, *adharācaḥ* must be construed with the previous pāda, as shown by the accent on immed. flg. *áhan*, which must begin a new cl. in the middle of b.

X.133.3: The first two pādas of this vs. are illuminated by the more expansive parallel in IX.79.1 (on which see comm. ad loc.) *vī ca náśan na iśó árātayo, aryó naśanta sániṣanta no dhíyaḥ* “If hostilities will reach our refreshments, those of the stranger will go to destruction. Our insightful thoughts will prevail.” Acdg. to the clever interpr. of Old (who also discusses our passage ad IX.79.1), in IX.79.1 the two verbs *náśan* and *naśanta* can belong to different $\sqrt{naś}$ roots – ‘reach, attain’ and ‘disappear, go to destruction’. I adopt – but modify in details – this insight both for

IX.79.1 and here. The same double sense can be seen here, but embodied in the single verb form *naśanta*, which should be interpr. as ‘go to destruction’ in pāda a and ‘reach beyond’ in b. The gen. *aryáḥ* that opens b can be read with both pādas. This interpr. is also reflected in Ge’s tr.

X.133.5: The phrase *mahīva dyaúḥ* appears to mean “like great Heaven” and, due to fem. *mahī*, shows a fem. *dyaúḥ*, a gender assignment that is rare but not non-existent for this stem. This interpr. is reflected in the publ. tr. However, there are other possibilities. *mahī* might by itself mean ‘great (Earth)’, since *mahī* regularly refers to the earth. In this case we would have a simile exactly like that in the immed. preceding hymn X.132.6 *dyaúḥ ná bhūmih* “like Heaven (and) Earth” (see comm. ad loc.), but in reversed order: “like great (Earth) (and) Heaven.” Or *mahī* might be an elliptical dual, modifying gapped *ródasī* ‘the two world-halves’, and specified here only by *dyaúḥ*: “the two great ones, Heaven (and Earth).” Although this might seem like a long shot, see I.22.13 *mahī dyaúḥ pṛthivī ca* with (possibly) the full expression: “the two great ones, Heaven and Earth.” See comm. ad loc. I don’t have a particularly strong feeling about any of the three possibilities, but given that the final vs. of this hymn (7) wishes “a great cow” to swell and give us milk, and this great cow might be the earth (though she is more likely an insightful thought [*dhī-*]), perhaps the alt. taking *mahī* as standing for the earth should be adopted.

X.133.5: See above ad vs. 5 on the identity of the “great cow.” It is possible that this is a metaphor for the earth, but in IV.41.5cd=X.101.9cd, whose pāda d is identical to our d, the reference appears to be to a *dhī-* ‘insightful thought’; see comm. ad X.74.4.

X.134 Indra

As noted above, these two hymns, X.133 and X.134, both dedicated to Indra, are quite similar, though attributed to two different poets by the Anukr. For their similarities, see the publ. intro. to each.

X.134.1: The first 6 vss. have the same refrain, but only in this vs. is it clearly syntactically integrated into the rest of the vs.: pādas cd serve as the obj. of *ajjjanat* in the refrain. (In the other vss. the obj. of the verb in the refrain must be supplied, and abcd are independent -- though see comm. on vs. 4 below.)

X.134.2–5: All four of these vss. begin with *áva*, each in tmesis with a different verb; vss. 3–4 both contain a form of *dhūnu-* ‘shake down’ (though in different tense/mood and voice), while 2 and 5 have verbs belonging to other roots.

X.134.2: This vs. shows esp. close connections to X.133.4 *yó naḥ ... ādideśati / adhaspadám tám im kṛdhi*, which, slightly abbreviated, is our *adhaspadám tám im kṛdhi, yó asmāñ ādideśati*. The generalizing rel. cl. (“who(ever) will ...”) appears before the main cl. in 133.4 and after it in 134.2, which speaks against a fixed position for this type of clause, as some Vedic syntacticians have argued.

X.134.3–4: Given the close similarity between these two vss., act. *áva ... dhūnuhi* and med. *áva ... dhūnuśé* seem functionally identical, and in fact the act. and mid. forms of this stem in general (as well as the other, less well-attested stems to this root) are both transitive and show no obvious functional differentiation. The essential identity of the two vss. is shown also by the near

repetitions *viśvá(ścandrāḥ)* (3b) / *viśvāni* (4b) and *viśvābhir ūtibhiḥ* (3d) / *sahasrīnībhir ūtibhiḥ* (4d).

X.134.4: Note that *viśvāni* can't directly refer to the obj. in 3 because of the change of gender, though the neut. pl. "all (things)" can be a generalized reference to it.

The obvious way to read the simile in cd is as a comparison to *viśvāni* in b – that is, as the material that Indra shakes down (all things being compared to wealth). So Ge. However, it would be possible to take it as a comparison with the implicit *tvām*=Indra that serves as obj. of *ajījanat* in the refrain, with Indra being compared to wealth. In this case the structure of vs. 4 would be like that of vs. 1, with cd serving as obj. to the verb in the refrain. I weakly favor this interpr., because a simile "all (things) like wealth" seems weak. The publ. tr. deliberately allows both interpr., though tipping towards the latter.

X.134.5: It is not clear whether pāda c goes with d (so Ge) or ab (publ. tr.). Ge gives no explan. for why he thinks the blades of *dūrva* grass would be compared to 'malevolence' (*durmatīḥ*); perhaps the near coincidence of their initial syllables (*dūr-* / *dur-*) is sufficient. I connect b with what precedes, because the multiple blades of grass could be compared (at least in number) to beads of sweat and missiles. Macdonell and Keith (s.v. *Dūrva*) make the baffling comment about our passage: "A simile occurring in the Rigveda seems to indicate that the ears lay horizontal with the stem," which deduction seems to suit neither ab nor d.

X.134.6: On the *aṅkuṣā-* in general and this image in particular, see the extensive disc. ad X.44.9. Anyone familiar with goats will recognize this scene: the goat, standing on its hind legs, uses its forefeet to pull down a branch so it can graze on the leaves (see images on internet). The question is what is the obj. in the frame that would correspond to the branch (*vayām*) in the simile? I think that the branch should be read in both simile and frame, since, as Ge points out, this vs. picks up the "shake down" imagery of vss. 3–4. Indra is obviously using the hook on the *aṅkuṣā-* (see X.44.9) to shake a fruit-laden branch. See Ge's n. 6ab, though he doesn't seem to recognize the relationship of the goat to the branch.

It is quite possible that *śakti-* is a pun, meaning both 'ability' and 'spear'; Ge (n. 6ab) suggests this as an alternate. Although the 'spear' meaning is generally confined to later texts (though see II.39.7), this kind of passage with its homely pastoral image is a context in which words in use in a lower register are likely to show up. I would now slightly alter the tr. to "Because you carry your ability/spear ..."

Note also that *śaktim* (b) picks up *śacībhiḥ śakra* in 3c.

X.134.7: This final vs. is in a different meter and lacks the refrain of the rest of the hymn. It also expands from Indra to the gods in general.

The obj(s). to *minīmasi* and *ā yopayāmasi* must be supplied. The former verb takes a wide variety of objects, but esp. *vratāni* 'commandments'. *√yup* is of course far less common; of the objects with which it is found, *dhārma* (VII.89.5) 'foundations, ordinances' is closest to *vratā-* and the apparent purport of our passage. With Gr, therefore, it makes sense to extract *māntra-* from *mantra-śrūtyam*, which serves as the obj. of the third 1st pl. verb *carāmasi* and supply *māntrān* 'solemn utterances' as the obj. of the 1st two verbs.

The 2nd member of *mantra-śrūtyam* found only here seems to be independent of the fairly well-attested, formally identical gerundival *śrūtya-* 'worthy to be heard, worthy of fame'.

AiG II.2.284, 288 points to a number of pairs of root noun and associated *-ya-* form, and that seems the best way to account for this compound, which must then mean ‘the hearing of (→ obedience to) mantras’.

The final verb of the hymn *abhí sám rabhāmahe* recalls *ā rabhāmahe* in the previous hymn (X.133.6) and is another index of their connection. Ge (n. 7cd) thinks that the reference here is to horseback riding, with the subject grabbing onto the horse (=Indra by his interpr.) with his thighs. The introduction of the horse and rider seems abrupt and unnecessary to me; I merely thought that we were grabbing the gods (pāda a; note that Indra is absent from the vs.) by *their* sides and shoulders. On *apikakṣá-* as ‘region of the armpit, shoulderblade’ (against Ge’s “Gurt”), see my 1987 Vedic Body Parts (Ged. Cowgill), p. 84.

X.135 Yama

Another famous hymn with a plethora of competing interpr. Since I have treated the hymn at length myself (“The Earliest Evidence for the Inborn Debts of the Brahmin: A New Interpretation of R̥gveda X.135” – *Journal asiatique* 302 [2014]: 245–57), I will not discuss the hymn in detail here but refer interested readers to the art. cit.

X.135.1–2: In my view, these two vss. are spoken by a boy whose dead father has made the journey to Yama’s world, where he now lives pleasantly, drinking with the gods in the shade of a tree. The boy, missing his father and longing to see him again, decides to follow the same path – but he is also apprehensive and reluctant to undertake the journey – a plausible psychological portrait of a bereft child.

The pairing of the vss. is underscored by the near repetition in the first pāda of 2 of the last pāda of 1: 1d *purāṇāṃ ānu venati* / 2a *purāṇāṃ anuvénantam*.

X.135.2: I take the intens. *acākaśam* in the same way as *vicākaśat* in VIII.91.2 (Apāla), as a frequentative ‘keep looking’.

X.135.3–4: These vss. concerning the (metaphorical) chariot are likely to be spoken by the father, since the speaker addresses the previous speaker familiarly with the voc. ‘lad’ (*kumāra* 3a, 4a).

Again the pairing is signalled verbally: 3a #*yám kumāra ... rátham* / 4a #*yám kumāra ... rátham*.

X.135.4: In the last pāda of these paired vss., a boat makes a sudden surprising appearance: the chariot is set on it (*nāvy āhitam*), as if on a car ferry. Although the RVic funeral hymns (X.14–18) give no sign that there’s a River Styx-like barrier between this world and the next, there’s at least a hint of this in X.56, a hymn focusing on the afterlife. The last vs. (X.56.7) begins *nāvā ná kṣódaḥ pradísah pṛthivyāḥ, svastíbhīr áti durgāni vísvā* “As if with a boat across the swell through all the earth’s directions, (having gone) beyond the difficult places with blessings,” apparently describing the journey to the next world -- though the boat there is in a simile.

X.135.5–6: These vss. are paired both by the difficult and much discussed word *anudéyī* and by the crucial structural fact that vs. 5 poses questions and vs. 6 begins by answering one in almost the same words (though see below for a crucial interpretational shift): 5d *anudéyī yáthābhavat*, 6a *yáthābhavat anudéyī*.

As I have disc. *anudéyī* at length in the 2014 art. (esp. 247–50), I will not repeat the details here. The gist is that I interpr. the word in the context of an AV passage (and its Vedic prose parallels), which contains an idiom *ṛṇám ánu √ dā* ‘forgive a debt’ in the context of Yama’s world. The gerundive here is part of an underlying phrase “(debt) to be forgiven”; its fem. gender (versus the neut. of *ṛnám*) is due to the metaphor found in the AV (etc.) passages: the “rope (of debt)” (with fem. *rájju-* ‘rope’). The debt in our passage is in reference to what later become the trio of debts a brahmin owes on birth, one of which is to produce a son. In the RV, I suggest, there was only a two-debt system: beget a son and perform sacrifice, since the system of studentship was only just developing in this period. In our vs. Yama asks the father, who has arrived at Yama’s world, about the two debts and whether they have been discharged. The father answers affirmatively.

X.135.6: The result of this positive answer is that the father is reborn in Yama’s world, a birth depicted, with technical terminology, in 6bcd. The trick to interpr. the two vss. is to see that although 5d *anudéyī yáthābhavat* and 6a *yáthābhavat anudéyī* are identical except for word order, *yáthā* is being used in two different senses: “how” in 5d, “as” in 6a.

X.135.7: This final vs. pairs with vs. 1, describing the delights of Yama’s world, into which the father has been reborn.

X.136 Muni

On the subject of this hymn and its similarity to the Laba-sūkta (X.119), see publ. intro. As with the next hymn (X.137), the Anukr. assigns each of its vss. to a different poet – in this case the seven (unsung) sons of the muni Vātaraśana, a name plucked from the bahuvrīhi ‘wind-girt’ (lit. ‘whose halter is the wind’) in vs. 2.

X.136.1: Pāda c lacks a verb. The most obvious way to construe the pāda is to supply ‘bears’ from pāda b, though there’s a wide variety of other interpr.

X.136.2: The expression “when the gods have entered (them)” is striking. In this context it presumably means they have been en-theos-ed – possessed -- as it were.

X.136.5: All consulted tr. interpr. the first member of *devéṣita-* as pl. (“impelled by the gods”). But given the focus on the wind in pāda a (also 2a, c), I take it as a sg. ref. to Vāyu.

Pāda d contains a novel twist on the izafe-like nominal rel. cl.: the sg. nom. *yáḥ* has a dual as its antecedent, *ubhaú samudraú*, and the rel. cl. contains two conjoined sg. adjectives, corresponding to the dual antecedent. The clause also begins (*yás ca*) as if it were going to belong to an “X and which Y” construction, in which the X would belong to the main cl. and have the appropriate case for that cl. (acc. in this instance). However, both X and Y are found in the *yás ca* clause, both nom.

X.136.6: Since the muni is flying in the midspace, I take *mṛgá-* here as ‘wild bird’, not the more general sense ‘wild animal’ (which of course is narrowed in a different direction to ‘deer’ in later Skt.). The Avestan cognate *mərəṭya-* means ‘bird’, and other RVic passages seem to call for that sense. Cf. esp. I.182.7 *parṇā mṛgásya patáruḥ* “the feathers of a wild bird in flight”; IX.32.4

mṛgó ná taktáḥ “like a wild bird launched in flight” (comparable to IX.67.15 *śyenó ná taktáḥ* “like a falcon launched in flight”). See also comm. ad IX.32.4.

Apropos *kétasya vidvān* Ge appositely adduces *kéta-vedas*- I.104.3.

The adjectives *svādúr madíntamaḥ*, modifying the muni, seem meant to evoke soma, just before (vs. 7) the poison drink reappears.

X.136.7: The preparation of the poison drink in ab mimics that of soma.

This vs. rouses great excitement in scholars of the history of Indian religion as the (possible) “oldest reference to the Rudra-Śiva cult of traditional Indian civilization” (Maurer, comm. on vs. 7). Since this topic has been (more than) sufficiently treated by others, I reserve comment.

X.137 All Gods

As with the immed. preceding hymn X.136, the Anukr. attributes each vs. of this hymn to a different poet, but unlike the unrenowned poets of X.136, these are the celebrated Seven Seers (Saptarṣi). However, as noted in the publ. intro., the elementary contents of the hymn do not justify the exalted ascriptions.

X.137.1: This vs. seems to be overstuffed with pointless repetitions: four (!) voc. “o gods,” one in each 8-syllable pāda, an *utá* opening each hemistich, and *púnah* ending each one. This leaves each pāda with just four syllables to convey content.

X.137.2: The two occurrences of *ā* + ABL in b might appear to express parallel senses (“from X, from Y”) (so Lub, for AVP V.18.3), but because of the contrastive directions of the winds in cd, I follow the standard interpr. (Ge, Re, Wh [AVŚ IV.13.2]), which takes the first *ā* as ‘from’ and the second as ‘to’.

X.137.5: Both AV versions read *imám* for *ihá*, which makes more sense: an absolute use of $\sqrt{trā}$ ‘rescue’ is awk.

X.138 Indra

On the contents of this hymn and some of its difficulties, see publ. intro.

X.138.1: The first hemistich is quite straightforward: the conveyors (*vāhnayah*) are conveyors of songs, the Aṅgirasas (as in VI.32.3) of the Vala myth, who also stand in for the present-day priests. The opening of the Vala cave by the Aṅgirasas in conjunction with Indra is of course standard fare.

The second hemistich is more problematic, in great part because of its syntactic ambiguity. The two verbal forms in c, *daśasyán* and *riṇán*, can be either nom. sg. masc. pres. participles or 3rd pl. act. injunctives (accented because in a *yátrā* cl.). In the former case, the part. modify the 2nd sg. subj. of *damśáyah* in d, namely Indra; in the latter, the subj. continues to be the *vāhnayah*. Ge, Old, and the publ. tr. take them as part.; Gr, Lü (534–35), and HPS (B+I 145–46) as 3rd pl. There is no way to tell for certain, I just wonder if so much credit would be given to the Aṅgirasas and so little to Indra in this vs. Note that the next vs. (2abc) contains 5 2nd sg. verbs with Indra as subject. Moreover, in my interpr., having cd a single cl. simplifies the interpr. of *ca* in d (see below).

Ge (fld. by JSK [DGRV I.127]) supplies a verb in d: “(beistandest)” to construe with *kútsāya mánman*; this is presumably a form of \sqrt{av} ‘help’, but he doesn’t say (and rather obfuscates in n. 1d; though JSK explicitly supplies *ávīḥ*) – but \sqrt{av} doesn’t ordinarily take the dat. (or the loc.). He (also JSK) assumes (n. 1d) that *ca* connects this ghost clause with *ahyàs ca dāmsāyaḥ*. But I see no reason to manufacture a verb that doesn’t fit the very elements it’s meant to go with.

The interpr. of this pāda is not helped by the fact that the verb *dāmsāyaḥ* is a hapax, though it very probably belongs with *dāmsiṣṭha-* ‘most wondrous’, *-dāmsa-* ‘wondrous power,’ *dāmsas-* ‘id.’, etc.; a form of *dāmsas-* is found in the next vs. (2c). See my *-āya-* monograph (p. 83). Here it clearly governs *ahyàḥ* ‘fertile cows’ in its immediate vicinity; I suggest that it can also be taken with the fem. acc. pl.s in c, *apāḥ* and quite possibly *uśásaḥ*, and that the *ca* in d signals this conjoining. All three are multiforms, as it were, of the females released from the Vala cave; see 2a. What then does *dāmsāya-* mean (assuming its connection to the ‘wondrous power’ words)? In the publ. tr. I render it “exerted your wondrous power”; in the *-āya-* book “made capable (of bearing).” I see no way to decide, but I would now allow the second interpr. as an alternative.

As for *kútsāya mánman*, we should start by pointing out (with HPS 146) that Kutsa is out of place here, since he has no part in the Vala myth ordinarily. In the publ. intro. I suggest (or hint) that he’s being kept in reserve, as it were, for vs. 3, the theft of the wheel of the Sun, in which myth Kutsa regularly figures. Lü (/HPS) think that the thought is Indra’s, on behalf of Kutsa (Lü: “im Gedenken für Kutsa”; HPS same except “an Kutsa”), but Old asserts that *mánman-* is almost always that of a human and so it should not be Indra’s thought. Here I think the *mánman-* is Kutsa’s product, a hymn or sim. for Indra, and in response Indra then acts on his behalf.

X.138.2: This vs. continues the account of the Vala myth, here with Indra the dominant actor.

Note that of the five parallel verbs in abc, only one, *śvañcāyaḥ* (a), is unaugmented.

The “fecund females” (*prasvāḥ*) in pāda a are, in my opinion, all three feminines from 1c, the dawns, the waters, the fertile cows – different designations for the beings imprisoned in the Vala cave.

The sticking point in this sequence of 2nd sg. actions is the referent of *asya* in c. One expects the wondrous power to be Indra’s, esp. after reciting his series of wondrous deeds, but I know of no instances where *asya* (vel sim.) has 2nd ps. reference. Since *asya* is unaccented, it should refer to something already in the discourse. Ge (n. 2c) suggests either soma (b) or the sun (d); Lü (519) opts for the sun. I’d prefer not to have a referent that follows, even as closely as pāda d, and think soma is much likelier on other grounds as well. The publ. tr. reflects what I now think is an over-complex and artificial interpr., that *vanín-* ‘wooden’ refers to the wooden cups Indra drinks soma from, and by soma’s power he strengthened them. I now see that there’s a simpler and more satisfying solution, found already in my *-āya-* book (p. 83 n. 10), that Indra did all these deeds (not only the one in c, but those in the first hemistich) through (soma’s) wondrous power: that is, as usual, drinking soma gave Indra the strength and skill to perform his great deeds. I would now substitute the tr. “you released the fecund females (etc.) ... you made the trees grow – by its (=soma’s) wondrous power.”

X.138.3: The last three pādas belong together, as an account of Indra’s defeat of Pipru for R̥jīśvan, but the relevance of pāda a is unclear. However, the stealing of the sun’s wheel and the defeat of Pipru are found together elsewhere (see, e.g., IV.16.12–13).

The Ārya is R̥jīśvan, the Dāsa Pipru, and it is Indra who’s the “match” (*pratimānam*).

X.138.4: The problem in this vs. is localized at the beginning of c, *māsēva sūryaḥ*. What the sun and moon are doing here is unclear, made harder to interpr. by the lack of scholarly agreement on the form of ‘moon’. See Old’s disc. As it stands, it must be *māsā* and an instr., but Ge (n. 4c) wants to see it as irreg. sandhi for gen. **māsās iva* “wie die Sonne (den Glanz) des Mondes,” which requires too much machinery and doesn’t match any known myth. Better to accept the sandhi form we have and take the instr. moon as parallel to the likewise instr. “flashing (weapon)” (*virūmatā*) at the end of the pāda. Although a myth in which the sun uses the moon as a weapon is also unknown, it doesn’t require altering the text.

X.138.5: Like *daśasyān* and *riṣān* in 1c, *dāśat* in c could be either a 3rd sg. injunc. (accented because it opens the pāda) or a nom. sg. m. pres. part., although there is less riding on the decision than in 1c, since Indra is the subj. in either case. I opt for the part. (so Old) – Gr and Ge for the finite verb.

X.138.6: On the obscure contents of this vs. and their possible relationship to vss. 3–4, see publ. intro.

X.139 Sūrya

On the links between this hymn and the immed. preceding one (X.138) see publ. intro. I do not understand the contents of the hymn and will not try to explain its larger purpose.

X.139.1: The tr. of the bahuvrīhis *sūryaraśmiḥ* and *hārikeśaḥ* by “with” make them sound like instr.; to clarify, better “Savitar, having the rays of the sun and golden hair ...”

X.139.2–4: Note the emphasis on sight and visual survey: 2a, 3b *ṛcākṣāḥ*, 2c *abhī caṣṭe*, 4b *dadrśúṣīḥ*, 4d *pāri ... apaśyat*.

X.139.2: The referents of the two fem. pl.s in c, *viśvācīḥ* and *ghṛtācīḥ*, is unclear and disputed. Since the latter, ‘facing towards ghee’, is obviously the more semantically limited, it seems best to determine its referent and go from there. The first alternative in the publ. tr., “mares,” is based on VII.60.3 *harītaḥ ... ghṛtācīḥ*, in a hymn to Sūrya and Mitra-Varuṇa, in a vs. also concerning visually surveying the world. Re supplies “sacrificial ladles” (my 2nd alt.) on the grounds of VIII.44.5 *juhvaḥ ... ghṛtācīḥ*; see also VII.43.2–3, where ‘ladles’ is obviously to be supplied and they are characterized as *ghṛtācīḥ* (2b) and (sg.) *viśvācī* (3c). In the sg. *ghṛtācī-* regularly refers to the ladle (see Gr’s def. 3). There are other possibilities: Lü (539) supplies “quarters, directions” (*dīśaḥ*, already Sāy., Gr), which better fits the cosmic context here, but requires a metaphorical stretch (which, as always, Lü is ready to make). Unfortunately there are no parallels. Ge (see n. 2c) weakly prefers *dhīyaḥ* ‘thoughts’; see I.2.7 *dhīyaṃ ghṛtācīm* and, with a synonym, VII.5.5 *gīraḥ ... ghṛtācīḥ*. The presence of *dhīyaḥ* in 5d (twice) might support his choice. I do not find any of these suggestions particularly compelling, though I would now downgrade ‘mares’ and add ‘quarters’ as the preferred alt.

X.139.3: On *samará-* see comm. ad VI.9.2.

X.139.4: I have no idea what is going on in this vs. For an elaborate account see Lü (539–41), who thinks it deals with Indra finding the sun, aided by the Gandharva. See also Ge’s extensive notes.

X.139.5: On the precative *avyās* see comm. ad II.38.10.

X.139.6: This vs. presents a reassuringly recognizable account of the opening of the Vala cave (at least in b) and has echoes of the first vss. of the previous hymn, X.138.

X.140 Agni

On the varied meter of the hymn, see publ. intro.

X.140.2: The first pāda is striking with its three bahuvrīhis with *-varcas-*. It is also two syllables too long; I wonder if this an iconic overkill reflection of the 1st member of the final compd, *ánūna-* ‘without lack/deficiency’.

Although act. *iyarti* is usually transitive, there are some intrans. exx., like IV.45.1 adduced by Ge (n. 2b). Two close parallels with transitive forms give me pause: X.37.4 *jágac ca víśvam udiyársi bhānúnā*, X.75.3 *śúśmám úd iyarti bhānúnā*. However, in the absence of any obvious thing to supply, best to accept intrans. sense.

The “two mothers” in c are most likely Heaven and Earth, given the cosmic contents of the flg. pāda. But in an Agni context the two kindling sticks are always a possibility, esp. with Agni identified as *putráḥ*. (And both, of course, could be meant.)

In d *prṇákṣi* would be better rendered ‘pervade’ or ‘permeate’, to distinguish it from a form of $\sqrt{prā}$. However, the matching form in 4d cannot be interpr. that way.

X.140.3: In b *hitáḥ* is ambiguous; it can be the ppl. of both $\sqrt{dhā}$ and \sqrt{hi} and in this case is surely meant to be read as both.

In cd the distribution of nominals is unclear. Although *īśaḥ* could be the nom. subj., it is much more likely to be the acc. obj., with “gods” as subj., on the basis of Ge’s parallels (n. 3cd) I.80.15, VII.82.2. *citrotayaḥ* must be nom. pl. and therefore modify the gods (if they are indeed the subj.), but *bhūri-varpasah* and *vāmájātāḥ* can be either nom. pl. (masc.) or acc. pl. fem. I take both as modifying *īśaḥ*. III.53.1 *vāmīr īśaḥ* “precious nourishments” supports a connection of *vāmá-* and *īś-*, and the *vāmá-* / *īś-* nexus in 5c is even stronger evidence. The fact that *bhūri vāmám* is a fixed phrase (I.33.3, etc.) may attract *bhūri-varpas-* into the orbit. Others distribute them differently: Gr takes both as nom. pl. m. as does Re; in his tr. Ge takes *bhūri-varpas-* with *īśaḥ*, but *vāmájātāḥ* with the subj. (though see his uncertainty in n. 3c). In fact, the distribution matters little.

X.140.4: Note *iraj-* (a) : *ví rāj-* (c).

I interpr. *prathayasva* as a real medial causative, with reflexive sense: “cause yourself to be extended.”

Note *prṇákṣi*, which matches the same form in 2d; see comm. there on the difference in meaning.

X.140.5: Most of this vs. is couched in the acc., but the acc. phrases in ab and cd have distinct referents: while cd describes the various good things Agni establishes, the accusatives in ab must refer to Agni himself. This hemistich is syntactically untethered: there is no verb to govern the acc.s in ab. Old suggests that the phrase anticipates 6b *agním ... dadhire puráh*, and I have adopted this solution.

On *íṣ* √ *kr*, see comm. ad VII.76.2. As I say there, though *íṣ* behaves like a pseudo-preverb in this lexeme, its source is probably the noun *íṣ*- ‘refreshment, nourishment’, and here that sense still (or again) seems to be present. Note *íṣam* in c as well as *íṣaḥ* prominent in 3c.

X.140.6: *sapráthastama*- echoes 4a *prathayasva*.

X.141 All Gods

X.141.1–2: The opening of 1c, *prá no yacha*, is picked up by 2a *prá no yachatu*, and the four repeated *prá*-s in b and c prolong the idiom with a series of different gods. But 2d introduces a new verb, *dadātu*, which responds to 1d (*dhana*-)*dāḥ*.

X.141.3–4: These two vss. are likewise structured by a shared verb, *havāmahe* (3b, 4b) here with a series of objects.

X.141.5–6: Here the shared verbal expression is *dānāya codaya* (5b, 6d). Its construction varies, however: in 5 the obj.s of *codaya*/ subj.s of the infinitive are in the acc. (*aryamānam* ...), but in 6 the obj./subj. has been attracted into the dat. (*devātātaye*) to match the infinitive (as often). So also Old and Ge.

X.142 Agni

On the structure of the hymn, see publ. intro. Since it is found in a group of six-vs. hymns, it is two vss. too long. But the last two vss., in dimeter meter, appear to be an appended charm.

Preverbs/nominal prefixes are esp. prominent and effectively deployed in this hymn. The sharp contrast between aggressively active *úd* ‘up’ and gently settling *ní* ‘down’ is found several times (4a, 5d [extra *ní* in b], 6c [extra *úd*-s in 6ab]), with the calming charm having further *ní*-s in 7ab. See also the *prá*-s in 2a, c, 4b, d, and the *ānu*-s of 4c, 5cd (supplied in 5b), as well as the contrastive *ā*- and *parā*- in 8a.

X.142.1: This vs. contains two forms of accented *ásti* (b, c). The first is existential, as overt forms of the the 3rd sg. pres. to √ *as* generally are, since it is ordinarily gapped in copular usage. However, the form in c does appear to be the copula; an existential interpr. – “for there exists auspicious shelter of [=from] you ...” – can be constructed but seems artificial. Here accent is the crucial factor; as I demonstrated in my 1990 “Tense of the Predicated Past Participle in Vedic” (IJ 33), pp. 4–5, accented 3rd sg. pres. copulas are optionally allowed.

Re points out the phonological play in the final words of a and b: *ápi*#, *áp̄yam*#,

X.142.2: There is no agreement about the etymology, morphology, meaning, or even the length of final vowel of *sācī*. See KEWA and EWA, both s.v. *sākám*, Gr, Old, Re (EVP XIV.99), and

the use of the simile particle (*sācīva*) may signal a certain vagueness on the part of the composer. For want of a clear alternative, I follow the (K)EWA line and connect it with *sākām* ‘at once, all together’, though I have no particular confidence in this interpr.

X.142.3: The sense of *utá ... utá* is not clear. Ge “bald ... bald”; Re “tantôt ... tantôt”; JSK (DGRV I.456) “sometimes ... at other times.” But JSK gives no other exx. of this usage, and I do not see why it’s not merely additive “and ... and” – as if in a somewhat breathless play-by-play.

The lexeme *pāri √ vṛj* usually has the idiomatic sense ‘avoid’, a development of its literal sense ‘twist/bend around’. Although the other tr. (Ge, Old, Re, Th [Gedichte], JSK [DGRV I.456]) take the verb in its idiomatic sense here (‘spare, avoid’), I think the literal one works better: the forest fire takes a twisting and unpredictable course putting all vegetation at risk – rather than sometimes sparing trees and bushes, sometimes not.

X.142.4: More phonological, morphological, and etymological echoes: *udvát-*, *nivát-* flg. *pravát* in 2a; then b *pṛthag pragardh-*, c *vāto ... -vāti*, d *vápṭeva ... vapasi*.

X.142.5: The other tr. (Ge, Re, Th) take b as containing two parallel phrases in the nom.: “one downward course, many chariots” – presumably referring to the single fire with its many flames. I prefer to take *ékam niyānam* as an acc. of extent, supplying *ānu* found in c and d (and 4c), but I would certainly allow the alternative.

Another echo: b *bahávo ... c bāhū*. It seems a bit strange that a raging forest fire would have only two arms (i.e., branching divisions), but the bodily metaphor may have overridden the physical image.

X.142.6: As indicated in the publ. tr., this vs. abruptly returns us from the forest fire to the ritual fire, which, however, shows the same type of intense movement as the forest fire.

There are several different ways to interpr. b, particularly the referent of *śásamānāsya*. Because of the *úd* that opens the pāda, repeating the two *úd*-s of pāda a, the skeletal structure of b seems clear (to me): the verb *jihatām* should be supplied from pāda a, and the nom. *vājāḥ* is grammatically parallel to *súṣmāḥ* and *arcīḥ* in pāda a, though it does not belong to the same semantic realm as the other two, which describe Agni’s physical characteristics. These assumptions about the structure of b are not shared by all other tr. Ignoring the repeated *úd*, Ge simply supplies a different verb “(sollen) ... (kommen),” presumably in tacit recognition of the different semantics of *vājāḥ* (“Belohnungen” for him). Th replicates the structure, but alters the sense of *vājāḥ* to “Kräfte” to accord better with the nominatives in pāda a. Only Re keeps both the structure and the usual sense of *vāja*:- “Que tes crépitements éclatent haut, haute la flamme, hauts tes prix-de-victoire ...” All (incl. Gr) take *śásamānāsya* to be coreferent with *te*, referring to Agni, who is performing his ritual labors. This is certainly possible. But in contrast I think it refers to the human officiant. Although *śásamāná-* can modify Agni (e.g., X.11.5), more often it qualifies the human laboring *for* Agni. See, e.g., I.141.10 *tvám agne śásamānāya sunvaté, rátnam ... invasi* “You, o Agni, impel treasure ... to the man who labors and presses soma,” where Agni rewards the human ritualist. I think the same situation is depicted here: the prizes are for the *śásamāná-*, and the *te* is a dat. to be construed with that part. The attendance of the Vasus in d provides a parallel set of officiants from the divine world.

X.142.7–8: In both these vss. *samudrá-* should be tr. ‘gathered waters’ vel sim., rather than ‘sea’, since in both cases (but esp. 8) the scene is a lushly watered landscape, not the boundary between land and a large body of water. I’d now substitute “here the settling down of the gathered waters” and “these are the homes of the gathered waters.”

X.142.7: Here the wild fire is deflected away from the peaceful place of waters.

Init. *anyám* is a good example of my rule of placement for *anyá-*: indefinite forms take initial position.

X.143 *Aśvins*

See publ. intro. on the contents of the hymn and the identity of its poet.

X.143.1: Old is esp. insightful on this vs., often flg. Baunack.

The first hemistich is couched in the acc. but lacks a verb to govern the acc. phrase. Various verbs have been suggested, but the most likely semantically, and the easiest to implement, is to borrow the verb from cd (\sqrt{kr}) or indeed the whole verb phrase (*návam* \sqrt{kr}) (so, more or less, Old, alt. for Re). “Make new” → “make young” fits nicely with *ṛtajúram*, which probably means ‘grown old in/by truth’ (see Scar 164) and may well refer to growing old in ritual labor, as we find, for ex., in the Agastya-Lopāmudrā hymn, I.179 (sugg. by Old). Although it would be possible just to supply a form of \sqrt{kr} to govern the inf., as a periphrastic caus., “make Atri to drive ...,” context favors the fuller VP.

I take *yádī* in c not as ‘if’, with final-vowel lengthening, but as yet another ex. of my **yádī* “when him ...” (“Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*,” Fs. Cardona, 2002).

This allusion to “making Kaksīvant [the well-known poet of I.116–26] new” is supposedly supported by I.51.13 (so Ge, n. 1cd, flg. Baunack), though that passage is not all that supportive: it simply states that Indra gave K. a little female named Vṛcayā. As Ge also points out, however, the real comparandum is with Cyavāna, whom the *Aśvins* definitely rejuvenate in V.74.5, X.39.4 (etc.).

X.143.2: This vs. is quite problematic both in syntax and in contents, and a number of different solutions have been suggested; my interpr. differs from all of them. What we have to hold onto is the fact that vss. 1 and 2 begin the same way, 1a *tyám cid átrim ... ásvam ná ...*, 2a *tyám cid ásvam ná ...*, both with an acc. phrase with no verb to govern it and a comparison to a horse. I therefore avail myself of the same strategy I used in vs. 1, to supply the verb for ab from cd – in this case *vī syatam* ‘untie, unloose’.

The referent of *areṇávaḥ* ‘dustless’ is unclear; Gr, Old, Ge, and Re opt for ‘gods’, which seems to me to create more problems than it solves. (Moreover, though the Maruts are once so identified, the gods themselves are not.) Of the eight occurrences of *areṇú-*, two modify ‘paths’ (I.35.11, 163.6) and one (VI.62.6, an *Aśvin* hymn) a measure of distance, *yójana-*. In all three passages the adj. ‘dustless’ signifies the ease of travel: note the presence of *sugá-* ‘easy to go (on)’ in I.35.11 and I.163.6. I supply paths here as well: the dustless paths stretching towards the unloosed horse are an image of the open road, promising a journey without obstacles or discomforts.

In d I supply ‘stretch’ as well, to govern *rājaḥ* (so, more or less, Ge’s 2d, though not reflected in his tr.), though now I think a more neutral verb like ‘travel, drive’ (from *yātave* in 1b) might be better.

X.143.3: The expression *átraye ... síṣāsataṃ dhíyaḥ* has given interpr. fits, because (they think) the Aśvins should not be winning insights for Atri; rather *his* insights should themselves win, as in the immed. preceding hymn, X.142.2 *prá saniṣanta no dhíyaḥ* and (if *dhíyam* is to be supplied there) in our 5d. This has led to some over-complex and awkward tr., like Scar’s (531) “... wünscht dem Atri, dass seine Dichtungen den Sieg davon tragen,” where the desiderative feature of *síṣāsataṃ* is attributed to the Aśvins, but the “winning” feature to the insights, a functional split that I don’t think is grammatically legitimate. I think we can take the syntax at face value: the Aśvins are trying to jumpstart Atri’s poetic powers by supplying him with some insights to work with. The gods regularly give *dhî-* to their praisers; see, e.g., VIII.86.2, where the Aśvins *dhíyaṃ dadathuḥ*; X.64.12, where an array of gods ... *me dhíyam ... ádadāta*.

In c although *divó narā* doesn’t have the expected (lack of) accent for a voc. phrase, it surely should be taken as such. See Ge (n. 3c); Old disc. at length and favors splitting *diváḥ* off from the voc. and construing with the rest of the hemistich, though without figuring out exactly how.

The dat. inf. *viśāse* is universally taken to *ví√śams*, a lexeme that barely exists (despite the many many occurrences of the root *√śams*). Of the two occurrences identified by Gr., only VIII.1.1 *ví śamsata* is a certain example (though with an uncertain sense and a likely nonce creation; see comm. ad loc.); III.39.2 #*ví ... śasyámānā*# would show tmesis in a participle, which is not common, and the *ví* seems to add nothing and is ignored by tr. I suggest our infinitive actually belongs to *ví√śas* ‘carve up’, attested in *viśāsana-*, (*a-*)*viśastár-*, and the finite form *ví śasta*. (This root affiliation is explicitly rejected by Old, but with no grounds given.) The sense here is that if the Aśvins help Atri gain poetic insights, the praise-song (*stóma-*) he produces for them will not have to be carried up and parcelled out.

X.143.4: Ge considers *sádane* and *sámāne* to be contrastive, with the first referring to the seat of the sacrifice and the second to contest or battle. However, *sámāna-* is often an assembly or festive gathering, and I take this rhyming pair here as referring to parts of the sacrifice to which the Aśvins are bringing the poet and his colleagues.

X.143.5: On the basis of VII.67.5 Ge (fld. by Re) supplies *dhíyam* with the periphr. caus. *sātáye kṛtam*. The expression here would contrast with the one in 3ab; see above.

X.143.6: Though Ge follows Sāy. in supply “kings” as the referent of the simile *śamyū́ iva*, I prefer the suggestion he floats in his n. 6ab, that it should rather be “parents” as in IV.41.7 *mámhiṣṭhā pitáreva sambhū́*.

X.144 Indra

A metrically varied hymn, which, *pace* the Anukr., mostly focuses on soma, not Indra. Indra’s name appears only once in the hymn, a nom. in 6a, and he is otherwise represented by two occurrences of the oblique enclitic *te* (1a, 5a) (and possibly the voc. *sukrato* in 6c), about as uninsistent a presence as it is possible to have. The two occurrences of *indu-* ‘drop’ (1a, 6a) also evoke Indra phonologically but of course refer to soma.

Some patterns: hemistich-init. *ayám* 1a, 2a, 2c, picked up by vs-init. *yám* 4a, 5a; pāda-init. *enā́* 5c, d, *evā́* 6a. Also, *viśvāyuh* 1c is answered by *ví tāry áyu(h)* in 5c, 6c.

X.144.1–2: I take vs. 1 as implicitly subordinated to vs. 2ab, because of the *hí*(1a).

X.144.2: For ab Ge appositely cites as parallel IX.87.3 *ṛbhúr dhîra usânâ kāvyaena* “an insightful craftsman [Ṛbhu], Uśânâ by (his) poetic skill.” This passage in fact helps solve an (unacknowledged) problem in our vs. The Pp. reads *kāvyaḥ* here, thus a nom. sg. masc. adjectival form of initially accented *kāvya-*, rendered by Ge as “dieser Seherische.” The problem is that *kāvya-* is otherwise only a neut. noun, “poetic skill/art”; the adjectival form is suffix-accented *kāvya-*. Note that in IX.87.3 the root-accented neut. is in the instr. I suggest that here we should read loc. *kāvye*, against the Pp., and, like the instr. in IX.87.3, it is specifying the realm in which the craftsman operates.

There are numerous, sometimes fanciful, interpr. of the bahuvrīhi *ūrdhvā-kṛśana-*, which also furnishes the Anukr. with an alternate name of the poet of the hymn. I am partial to my own: that the “pearls” are the bubbles on the surface of and above the exhilarating drink.

X.144.3–5: These vss. relate, in allusive fashion, the theft of soma from heaven by the falcon. The vss. are difficult to interpr. in places but contain striking images. Needless to say, in various places I go my own interpretational way.

X.144.3: The vs. depicts Soma amid the heavenly fortresses awaiting the falcon to carry him away and looking down from heaven towards earth, the goal of the journey.

The unidentified fem. pl. *āsú svâsu* “among his own (females)” has no clear referent. The default is, as usual for fem. plurals, “cows,” and this would make sense, given that Soma is called a *vāmsaga-* (on which word, see comm. ad X.102.7). But the scenario just sketched suggests another, narratively appropriate, interpr., already raised by Ge (n. 3b): “fortresses” (*pūrṣú*). The stem *pūr-* is of course feminine, and in IV.27, with IV.26 the locus classicus for the RVic Somaraub myth, Soma announces in the first vs. that “a hundred metal fortresses guarded me” (*śatām mā púra āyasīḥ arakṣann*). Thus the image in b sets up a conceptual tension: Soma is depicted both as a virile bull situated in the middle of his cow-harem, as it were, but also as a helpless hostage surrounded by fortifications. These same fortresses are, in my view, also represented in the next vs., 4c, in the bahuvrīhi *śatā-cakram* ‘hundred-wheeled’.

On *ahī-śū-* see comm. ad VIII.32.2 and Scar 538–39. Contra the standard tr., who take the stem as the name of demon(s), I give it a full lexical tr. ‘swelling like X’. (Scar splits the difference: the name of a demon, derived from a lexical reading.) The question is whether the first member is based on *āhi-* ‘snake’ with final lengthening or *ahī-* ‘fertile cow’. For the three passages in VIII (32.2, 26; 77.2) I favor the former; here I think both may be available. The question is – what is Soma looking down (*áva dīdhet*) upon? A possible answer immed. arises from the scenario sketched above: Soma is in heaven looking downward in hopes of spotting the falcon on its journey upward; what he will see is clouds – which can be imagined as “puffing up like snakes: (specifically cobras with their hoods) and/or “swelling like fertile cows” – either/both displaying the puffy curvy contours of clouds seen from above.

X.144.4: The final pāda (c) of this vs. is very difficult; in fact Ge does not tr. it after the first word. It is also metrically problematic: as transmitted it has 9 syllables. This could be raised to 12, with a fine Jagatī cadence by reading *ahīyo avartanīḥ*, that is, restoring the *a-* elided by the Saṃhitā text and distracting the *-hy-* cluster of *’hyò* and assuming an initial **a-* on *vartanīḥ*,

elided without marking in the Saṃhitā text (a solution favored by Old). Whether these manipulations are worth it – esp. the last one – is unclear.

In any case I take acc. *śatācakram* as continuing the acc. phrase of ab, referring to Soma. As noted in the immed. preceding vs., I think “having a hundred wheels” is another reference to the fortresses surrounding Soma in heaven. Recall that acdg. to IV.27.1 there are a hundred metal fortresses guarding Soma. I take the ‘wheels’ are referring to the roughly circular shape of the fortifications.

The rest of c, *hyò vartanīḥ* I take as a nominal *izafe*-like cl., also referring to Soma. Whether to read *vartanīḥ* or **avartanīḥ* (see above) is hard to determine, because neither reading yields a lot of sense. The publ. tr. follows the Saṃhitā text. Cows regularly follow *vartanī-* (III.7.2, X.65.6, X.172.1, 4); identifying Soma as a *vartanī-* for a fertile cow might be an allusion to the mixing of milk with soma in the ritual, which is often depicted as cows racing to join the bull Soma. A negated **avartanīḥ*, though metrically better, is initially harder to interpr. Perhaps, with ref. to *ahīśvāḥ* in the previous vs., if that means “(clouds) swelling like fertile cows,” it indicates that, while still confined in the 100 fortresses, Soma “had no track through the fertile cows [=clouds]” (with *ahyāḥ* acc. pl., not gen. sg.). I suggest this as an alt. tr., for which I now have a mild preference.

X.144.5: On *āndhas-* as ‘soma stalk’ (not the “Saft” as Ge tr. here), see comm. ad IV.1.19. Here I take *āndhasaḥ* as a subjective gen.: “the stalk (*āndhas*) houses (the juice),” not “X houses the *āndhas*.”

On the final pāda, see publ. intro.: I think the “family tie” is that between men and gods, kept in working order by the sacrifice.

X.144.6: Ge (n. 6ab) considers the *māhi tyājaḥ* as a reference to the enmity between the young Indra and the other gods at the time of the soma theft or the enmity with Tvaṣṭṛ because of Viśvarūpa, translating “So mag ... Indra diese grosse Feindschaft selbst unter dem Göttern auf sich nehmen.” But this doesn’t make sense in an otherwise upbeat ending, and the backstory to enable such an allusion is nowhere to be seen. Moreover, *tyājas-* doesn’t mean “Feindschaft,” but “surrender, abandonment; legacy.” I take it instead as one of the first instances of the later notion of sacrifice as *tyāga*, the “surrender” to the gods of men’s offerings. The sentiment seems to follow directly on 5d, and point out that Indra is taking the oblation, which is the symbol for the family connection between gods and men, and fixing it up among the gods – for his sake as well, since *dhārayāte* is middle.

I do not understand the abl. *asmāt*, though perhaps it hints at the “surrender” just noted: the oblation produced by us is separated from us by Indra’s appropriation of it.

X.145 Against co-wives

This hymn is found, more or less identically, in AVŚ III.18 and, in part but also much expanded, in AVP VII.12. See Griffiths’s full treatment of the latter.

X.145.2: On *kuru* see comm. ad X.51.7.

X.145.4: Ge (flg. Sāy. and fld. by Don) takes the husband as the subj. of b and the co-wife the ref. of *asmín ... jāne*: “und nicht hängt er an dieser Person,” for reasons that are not clear to me.

Old is of my opinion, and see AVŚ III.18.3 *nó asmín ramase pátau* “you do not rest by this husband,” addressed to the co-wife.

I do not know who the 1st pl. subj. of *gamayāmasi* is; it obviously includes the wife-speaker and possibly the plant, but in the next vs. (5c) the first dual is used for wife+plant: *sahāvahai*.

X.145.6: On *abhí√dhā* as ‘harness’, see *abhíhita-* V.50.4, X.85.11.

X.146 Lady of the Wilderness (Aranyānī)

On the contents and tone of the hymn, see publ. intro. There are numerous tr. (inter alia, Macd (VRS and Hymns from the RV), Re (Hymnes spec.), Don, Mau, Th (Fs. Kuiper), van Buitenen (Intro. to transl. of MBh 3), Gerow (Lits. of India). I cannot engage with the details of them all.

The hymn contains a number of apparently pleonastic *iva*-s (1b, d, 2c, 3a, b, d), some of which show the aphoresis found also in Middle Indic. The pluti in 1d is another sign of informal register.

X.146.1: On *grāma-* see comm. ad X.27.19. Certainly in this passage it is used as the complete opposite of the *āraṇya-* and whether it refers to a permanent settlement in the RV or (per Rau) not, the implication here is that it offers the safety and domestic stability of a village, in contrast to the wilderness.

X.146.2: The identities of the *vṛṣāravā-* and the *ciccikā-*, beyond probably being animals that make noise, is up for grabs, and many possibilities have been floated. The point, however, is clear: the wilderness is full of alarming noises that serve as a sort of intimidating accompaniment to the progress of the Lady of the Wilderness herself.

X.146.3: I follow Th (who is fld by Don) in taking c as parenthetical. The speaker has reconfigured (or is trying to) the alarming noises and sights of vs. 2 to domestic ones, appropriate to the village. But in c the Aranyānī still looms. The other course, taken by most tr., is to assume that the Aranyānī herself “creaks like a cart,” which I find unlikely.

X.146.4: The speaker’s attempt to domestic the noises around him continues here, until the stark announcement “(something) has shrieked!”

X.146.5: Macd, Th, and Don take Aranyānī as the subj. of cd. This is poss., but I find it psychologically more compelling to assume that the nervous speaker has finally made his peace with the wilderness and gives himself over to its pleasures.

X.146.6: A formal praśasti (*prá ... aśamsiṣam*) ends the hymn.

X.147–148

Although these two hymns to Indra are attributed to two different poets and are stylistically varied, they share some themes and some lexicon, in particular a fondness for the root *√kan* ‘take pleasure’: 147.3a, 4a; 148.1c, 3b, 4c.

X.147 Indra

X.147.1: I take bcd all as *yád* clauses detailing examples of Indra’s effective *manyú-*. Ge parcels them out into a series of subord. and main clauses, but this seems inelegant.

We should expect **ápaḥ* in b, rather than *apáh*, which should be the acc. pl. of ‘waters’; see the same problem in X.76.3 and the comm. thereon. In our passage the association of Vṛtra with (the release of) the waters might have led to a redactional misunderstanding and accent shift.

X.147.2: Ge (n. 2d) believes that *vísṽāsu hávyāsv íṣṭiṣu* stands for *vísṽāsu *hávyam íṣṭiṣu* and should be tr. “to be called upon at all sacrifices,” with *hávyā-* belonging to $\sqrt{hū}$ ‘call’, not \sqrt{hu} ‘pour, libate’. Although *hávyā-* (so accented) does ordinarily mean ‘to be called’, as opposed to *havyá-* ‘oblation’, there are other exx. of *hávyā-* that can or do belong to \sqrt{hu} and ambiguity is inherent in this stem. And in any case I believe we should tr. the text we have, not the one we wish we had. In fact, it seems quite likely that in this passage the poet is playing off less common homonyms of common lexical items. Our root-accented *íṣṭi-* belongs to \sqrt{yaj} ‘sacrifice’, but this form is quite rare (and may be found with suffix accent in II.1.9; see comm. there), esp. in contrast to *íṣṭi-* ‘desire, quest’, which is found in the immediately preceding pāda in the same pāda-final position in *gáviṣṭiṣu* ‘quests for cattle’. The poet surely meant the contrast, esp. given a third rhyming pāda-final form in 3c *páriṣṭiṣu* ‘in encirclements’ (to a different lexeme, *pári* \sqrt{as}). In this playful context, *hávyā-* to \sqrt{hu} rather than the usual $\sqrt{hū}$ would simply add to the joke – amplified by calling Indra *puruhūta* ‘much invoked’ in the next pāda (3a).

X.147.4: I take this vs. as spelling out the reciprocal policy between Indra and mortals: a man who realizes that Indra has to be sacrificed to and, esp., provided with soma will acquire the bounty that Indra has to distribute (as described in 3b). The reciprocity is signalled lexically by the complementary forms *cākandhi* (subj. = Indra, 3a) and *cākanat* (subj. = mortal, 4a).

In b I see *mádam ... asya ráṁhyam* as a type of indirect discourse with *cíkatati* “will realize (that ...),” with the gerundive *ráṁhya-* predicated of *mádam* and *asya* referring to Indra: “his exhilaration is to be hastened” – i.e., soma should be offered forthwith. Ge’s interpr. is quite diff.: “der sich auf seinen eiligen Rausch versteht.” As far as I can tell, Ge thinks that *asya* refers to the mortal subject (though his tr. is ambig.), but in an Indra context the default would be Indra’s *máda-*.

X.147.5: This vs. seems to situate Indra among other gods, mostly by indirection. In pāda a *śárdhāya* may refer to the “troop” of us mortals, esp. the patrons in vs. 3, but since *śárdha-* and *śárdhas-* often refer specifically to the Maruts, they would be available to the audience by association. Mitra and Varuṇa are present in c, though the former is also used as the common noun ‘ally’, and the latter is in a simile. In d *vibhaktā* evokes Bhaga (see V.46.6).

X.148 Indra

Old sees a special relationship between this hymn and II.11, esp. the penchant for a trisyllabic reading of *índra-*. And vs. 2 contains two pādas (b, c) identical to II.11.4d, 5a.

X.148.1: The accent on *stumási* is surprising, since it appears to be a main clause verb. Old (ZDMG 60.726 [=KISch. 201]) explains it by taking ab as the Grundlage of the *á no bhara* clause

in c, but this seems ad hoc. I think rather that the accent is indirectly generated by the two perfect participles, *suṣvāṇāśaḥ ... sasavāṁsaś ca*, which bracket the finite verb. The two participles depict two different occasions for praising Indra: at the sacrifice and after victory in a battle/contest. A fuller expression would be “After having pressed soma we praise you, and also after having won the prize, (we praise you).” Therefore *stumāsi* is effectively doubled and the accent is contrastive (with its gapped self).

The construction in c is more complex than it appears, at least in my view. In the rel. cl. *yāsya* would seem to have a straightforward antecedent, *suvitām* – hence “bring us well-being in which you take pleasure” (so essentially Ge). But this is somewhat incoherent as a wish: why would Indra bring *us* something *he* particularly enjoys? It also doesn’t conform with the usage of \sqrt{kan} in these two hymns. When Indra is subject of \sqrt{kan} (X.147.3, 148.4), what he takes pleasure in is mortal worshipers: e.g., 147.3 *aīṣu cākandhī ... sūrīṣu* “take pleasure in these patron” – though in both instances the complement is in the loc. I therefore think *yāsya* must refer to a ritualist favored by Indra, one among our (*naḥ*) number. As for the gen., this may be a mixed construction: a gen. would work for the recipient of the main cl. (“bring X for him [gen.]” and has been carried over into the rel. cl., where a loc. would be better.

X.148.2: As noted above, bc = II.11.4d, 5a. The pāda II.11.5a refers to Vṛtra, as is clear from the rest of the vs. But most tr. (see Bl’s [RR] comments ad II.11.4–5 in addition to Ge, JSK [DGRV II.189]) take our c pāda with d and assume that “the one placed in hiding” is soma. (The pāda is also found in III.39.6, with unclear referent – maybe sun/light; see comm. ad loc.) In contrast I link pāda c with b, not d, which allows the acc. phrase in c to be a second obj. of *sahyāḥ* (though I supply a past indicative form of \sqrt{sah} for c), with the referent Vṛtra as in II.11.5. Bl splits the difference: he takes c with d, but considers it a ref. to Vṛtra (or a demon) – tr. “we hold (the demon) who is hidden in the waters like soma in a prasrávaṇa (pitcher?).” This doesn’t have much to recommend it. It is also possible that c has double reference – both looking backwards to b, with Vṛtra as reference, and forwards to d, with soma as referent. The soma “hidden in water” would then be the soma plant as it is swelled with water before pressing. There are also a couple of other possibilities for c. It could be a reference to the well-known myth (see esp. X.51–53) in which Agni runs away from his ritual duties and hides in the waters, before being found by the gods. If Agni is the referent, “we” would be bringing the two crucial requisites for the sacrifice: fire and soma. It is also worth considering X.72.7 *átrā samudrá ā gūḍhám, ā sūryam ajabhartana* “then you brought here the sun, which was hidden in the sea,” where it’s the sun, hidden in a type of water, that is brought – although I find it hard to fit the sun into our context. If either of the last two alternates is selected, the tr. of *bibhṛmāsi* should be changed from ‘offer’ to ‘bring/bear’.

X.148.3: The syntax of this vs. is a little loose – beginning with the *vā*, which is not in a clear disjunctive structure. JSK (DGRV II.188–89) suggests apropos 2–3ab that *vā* “conjoins nearly parallel interstanzaic modal clauses interrupted by an intervening indicative clause.” The “nearly parallel ... modal[s]” are 2b opt. *sahyāḥ* and 3a impv. *arca*, which don’t seem all that parallel to me; the intervening indicative clause is 2cd. I think rather that the disjunction signalled by *vā* is conceptual: the difference between Indra as martial hero (vs. 2), as esp. exemplified by the Vṛtra battle (2c by my interpr.), and Indra as the priestly hero of the Vala myth (3ab). This conceptual division corresponds to the one in 1ab, between the ritual and martial circumstances for praising Indra.

The *aryáh* opening pāda a is most likely a gen. dependent on *gírah*; cf. I.112.14 *aryó gírah*. The question is the identity of the *arí-*. Ge (n. 3a) suggests Pr̥thī (see 5a), the Opferherr, who would be a subjective gen. (i.e., he is the singer); Th (Fremdl. 31; see also HPS B+I 155) suggests (rather hazily) that it's Indra himself, or perhaps rather, whatever (divine) stranger is being invited to the ritual: an objective gen. (someone sings to him). Although this non-reflexive doubling of referents in a single clause seems, at best, tricky, the fact that Indra serves as priest and leader of the Aṅgirasas in ab (so explicitly Th) as well as recipient of offerings in d makes this trick at least thinkable.

In b it is unclear what *śīṅām* should be construed with. I take it with *vípraḥ* as a variant of the “king of kings” construction; most take it with *sumatím* “the good thinking of the seers.” This is perfectly possible, and not much rides on it.

The gist of the second hemistich is that we hope to be the ultimate beneficiaries of our offerings to Indra; that is, we hope and expect compensation from him as reciprocity for our ritual service – it is in this way that we derive (indirect) pleasure from the soma drinks. The *áya-*formation *raṇáyanta* is intransitive (or in my old terms “I/T”) with the meaning “find pleasure” in most of its occurrences; a transitive (/double I/T”) *raṇáyati* is found in only two places in the RV, under special circumstances (see my *-áya-* monograph, pp. 75, 143). Ge (with Sāy.) wants it to be transitive here, meaning “cause (you) to enjoy,” but frets about the medial form (n. 3c). This is the wrong thing to worry about: it's simply an *-anta* replacement of my usual type. The real reason that it isn't transitive is that that stem is usually not. But the poet may have enjoyed hinting at a transitive formation on the basis of the *-áya-* (“please [you] with soma drinks”), but opting for a somewhat paradoxical “be pleased by soma drinks (offered to you).”

What puzzles me is the *enā*; it would have been easy enough to conjoin *sómāiḥ* and *bhakṣaiḥ* with *utá*. I assume *enā* is summarizing the whole rest of the ritual hoopla, including the soma drinks.

In the publ. tr. the voc. *ratholha* is not tr. as a voc., since “o chariot-conveyed one” sounded impossibly stilted.

X.148.4: In pāda a *imā bráhmā ... śamsi* is one of the relatively rare exx. in the RV of the inherited syntagm of a neut. pl. as subj. of a sg. verb – here a bit complicated by the fact that the verb itself is a pass. aor. (This morphological analysis, with Sāy. and Ge [n. 4a], more appealing than 1st sg. mid., with Gr.)

X.149 Savitar

X.149.1: Old points out the sequence of cosmic spaces: *pr̥thivīm* (a), *dyām* (b), *antárikṣam* (c), *samuḍrám*.

There are several different ways to interpr. the second hemistich. In c the question is what is the shared element between the frame and the simile. I take it to be the verb: “milked the midspace like a (male) horse.” This is of course absurd on the surface, but would conform to the kind of gender-bending paradox that is often found in RVic cosmic discourse. Ge, who considers the possibility of this interpr. in n. 1c, suggests that it refers to a horse urinating. A less striking interpr, which goes back to Sāy. and is represented in Ge's and Re's tr., takes *dhúnim* as the shared quality: “... the midspace boisterous like a horse.” This is certainly possible, but I prefer the more conceptually challenging interpr.

Re (flg. Lü 124) further considers *adhukṣat* to have a double acc., with the 2nd obj. *samudrām* in d: “milked the midspace for the sea” / “milked the sea out of the midspace,” though he himself thinks that \sqrt{duh} with double acc. is generally middle. Ge seems to take *samudrām* as an appositive to *antárikṣam*. I take *antárikṣam* and *samudrām* as separate objects of *adhukṣat*, one corresponding to the animal being milked, the other to the substance yielded. This is akin to the Lü/Re double acc. interpr., but does not require them to be in a single larger syntagm.

X.149.2: From the sea milked out in 1d the rest of the cosmos arises. This cosmogony flatly contradicts the one in 1ab, where the various parts of the cosmos exist already independently and are set in their places by Savitar.

Pāda c contains one of the rare exx. of the unextended 3rd sg. impf. of \sqrt{as} , namely *ās*. On the artificiality of this archaic-looking form, see comm. ad X.85.6–12. Here it forms a phrasal verb with the ppl. *útthitam*.

X.149.3: The cosmogony gets even murkier here, and interpr. diverge. Ge and Re seems to take *idám* and *anyád* as coreferential, but since the rest of the hemistich seems to define the *anyád* (‘other’) as the heavenly/godly world, the near-deictic *idám* would be out of place. I think the two are contrastive, and – somewhat paradoxically – the point is that this earth was created before the heavenly world.

I would prefer to render *ánu dhárma* “according to his ordinance / principles,” but the phrase *dhartā diváḥ* in the next vs. (4d) constrained me. Still, I think the point is that the sun was born acdg. to Savitar’s overall plan, and so I would favor one of the alternative tr. just given.

X.149.4: Ge pulls *sumánā(h)* out of the simile to modify Savitar (“freundlich wie die ... (Kuh)”). Since the form is ambig. between masc. and fem. nom. sg., this is possible, but it breaks up the sequence of similes in series.

X.149.5: The Anukr. clearly interpr. *árcan* in c as a PN and attributed the hymn to Arcant Hairanyastūpa. Ge takes it both as a PN and as the pres. part. it appears to be (see n. 5c), but this seems unnec., esp. given the attestation of verbal forms to this pres. stem in this stratum of hymns (X.147.3, 148.3).

X.150 Agni

For the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. As noted there, the final pāda of each vs. begins with a form of *mṛṛīká-*; in vss. 1–3 and 5 it’s the dat. *mṛṛīkāya*, but in 4 the acc. *mṛṛīkám*. The refrain in vs. 4 also deviates from the other vss. in another way: 1–3, 5 repeat the last four syllables of pāda c after *mṛṛīkāya*, but vs. 4, which needs five syllables after *mṛṛīkám*, innovates with the dat. *dhánasātaye*, based on, but not identical to, *dhánasātau* in the middle of c.

X.150.1: On the accentuation in the voc. phrase, see comm. ad X.118.5.

X.150.2: On the interpr. of the first hemistich, see comm. ad I.91.10, which contains the identical hemistich. An alt. tr. with both acc. phrases construed with the part. *jujuṣānāḥ*, is also possible.

X.150.4: Pāda a has two extra syllables; III.2.8d is identical save for lacking *devó*, so it is tempting to delete it. Old gives his cautious imprimatur, so also Arnold.

X.150.4–5: On the use of *puróhita-* here, see publ. intro.

X.151 Śraddhā

X.151.3: That the gods make themselves trusted / trustworthy among *ásureṣu ... ugréṣu* “powerful lords/Asuras” shows that even at this very late stage of the RV *ásura-* does not (have to) have a negative sense and designate the eternal enemies of the Devas. Here the “powerful lords” are the equivalent for the gods of “benefactors who offer sacrifice” (*bhojéṣu yájvasu*, 2c, 3c) for men – in other words, positively viewed authority figures.

X.151.4: It is notable that the gods are depicted as performing sacrifice, as in the more famous passages X.90.16 and X.124.6.

X.152 Indra

Found also in AVŚ I.20.4, I.21; AVP II.88.

X.152.2: Starting with Sāy., *vimṛdhāḥ* has regularly been interpr. as the nom. sg. of a them. bahuvrīhi *vimṛdhá-* meaning ‘die Verächter abwehrend’; so Old, Ge (n. 2b), AiG II.1.281, Scar 212 n. 289, as well as the tr. of the AV repetitions of this vs., Wh (AVŚ I.21.1) and Zehnder (AVP II.88.4). The only significant holdout being Gr, who takes it as a gen. to a hapax root noun cmpd *vimṛdh-*, “mit unregelmässiger Fortrückung des Tons.” I am quite dubious about the dominant interpr. for several reasons. For one thing, the importation of the verbal notion “abwehrend” seems unjustified, borrowed from the formulae (to be disc. below) in which the root noun *mṛdh-* participates; only Zehnder’s “der keine Beleidiger hat” confines itself to the elements actually found in the cmpd. Scar justifies the addition of the verbal notion by explaining *vimṛdhá-* as “Hypostase aus *ví mṛdhas + √HAN-, √NOD*, etc.,” but this is simply a description of the interpretational process. I instead think it must have been generated from the formulaic phrases found in this very hymn, involving *mṛdh- ví√han*, occurring twice in tmesis: *ví mṛdho jahi* “smash away the scornful” (3a, 4a; see also VI.53.4, VIII.61.13). Here, given the rt noun cmpd *vṛtra-hán-* immediately preceding, I think we can “borrow” that *-hán-*. Since a cmpd **vi-mṛdh(o)-hán* or **mṛdh(o)-vi-hán-* is impossible, the *hán-* was gapped, and the gen. sg. *mṛdhaḥ* depends upon this gapped head. I do recognize the accentual problem (the sticking point for both Wh and Old), but consider it less serious than the creation of a thematic stem of dubious meaning. In any case I think the poet is playing with formulaics throughout this hymn, esp. involving *ví*. See comm. on 3b..

X.152.3: Since *rákṣaḥ* is entirely parallel to *mṛdhaḥ* in the syntagm in pāda a, and *rákṣaḥ* must be a neut. sg. *-as-* stem, we might expect *mṛdhaḥ* to have the same grammatical identity – and indeed an *s-*stem *mṛdhas-* does exist, albeit marginally. However, Gr and Ge take *mṛdhaḥ* here as acc. pl. The repetition of the formula in 4a is followed by a cl. with a parallel acc. pl. *pṛtanyatáḥ*, which would favor the interpr. of *mṛdhaḥ* there as the acc. pl. of the root noun *mṛdh-*. So the evidence pulls both ways, but given the marginality of the *-as-*stem, best perhaps to interpr. both as belonging to the root noun.

Note the clever misdirection in b: *ví vṛtrásya hán(ū)*. Though *hánū* is of course a noun, “(two) jaws,” and the obj. of *ví ... ruja*, the presence of *vṛtrahā* in 2b and *ví ... vṛtrahan* in the next pāda (3c) invite the audience to assume another instance of *vṛtrahán-*.

X.153 Indra

X.153.1: The identity of these tender female attendants on the new-born Indra is not clear, but perhaps their exact identity is less important than their maternal solicitude.

The med. pf. to \sqrt{bhaj} means ‘receive as share’ (see Kü 334–35). Again, I am not sure why they receive this share of good heroism.

X.153.5: The 2nd ps. ref. of *sá* here does not conform to its ordinary usage (as disc. in my “Sa figé” art.); we should expect an impv. here. But I assume in this late hymn the rules for this distribution are breaking down.

X.154: The dead

X.154.1: As pointed out by Ge (n. 1) *inter alia*, the various foodstuffs are appropriate to gods and pitars in the afterlife. It is to them that the dead man should go in d. The use of the “future imperative” *gachatāt* is a little surprising, since what prior action it should follow isn’t specified. It could possibly refer to the various present tense verbs in abc, but, more likely in my view, it presupposes the subject’s death before his journey to the afterlife.

X.155 Against a witch

On the contents of the hymn see publ. intro. As noted there, the Sadānvās are quite prominent in the AV.

X.155.2: *Pace* Gr, *cattó* represents *cattā + u*.

X.155.4: The verb *ājaganta* appears to be a plupf. to \sqrt{gam} and is so taken by the standard tr. (as also Kü 159). However, it doesn’t make a lot of sense in context (“when you went at/to the breast ...”). I suggest emending the form to **ajaghanta*, a plupf. to \sqrt{han} . The witches are beating their breasts in mourning at the slaying of Indra’s enemies (=their friends and allies). Although I strongly resist emending the RVic text, in this Atharvan hymn with numerous unusual forms, I have fewer scruples.

On *dhāṇikī-* as a term for female genitalia, see already Edgerton, *-ka-* suffixes, 56, citing also TS VII.4.19.3, AV XX.136.3 = RVKh V.22.8. He derives it from *dhāna-* ‘receptacle’. Sim. EWA s.v. *dhānikā-*. See also EWA s.v. *maṇḍūra-*, where it is suggested that the “rust” is menstrual blood.

On *-yāśu-* see comm. ad I.126.6. On *budbudā-*, with its unusual phonology (plain *b*) and morphology (exact redupl.), see EWA s.v. *budbudā-yāśu-*

X.155.5: On the leading around of the cow, see X.165.5.

X.156 Agni

X.156.2: *sénā-* could alternatively be ‘army’, as Ge and Re take it, but ‘weapon’ works just as well. Both senses seem to be necessary in the RV and are often difficult to distinguish, though the cmpd *sena-nī-* must contain ‘army’.

X.156.3: On the SV reading *pavím* ‘wheelrim’ for *paṇím*, see Old and Ge (n. 3c). Neither seems to produce the best argument for retaining the RV form – that it is semantically the more difficult – and more interesting – reading, while the SV form is a trivial correction.

X.156.4: Making the sun mount in heaven is ordinarily Indra’s deed.

X.156.5: Gonda (Vedic Lit. 225) points out the rhyming splvs. *préṣṭhaḥ śréṣṭhaḥ*, which in this late hymn are undistracted.

X.157 All Gods

As indicated in the publ. intro., vss. 4–5 in this hymn have one of the few depictions of the Asuras as a corporate group, counterpoised against the Devas (see also X.53.4). See also X.124 and my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas” (Ged. F. Staal: *On Meaning and Mantras: Essays in Honor of Frits Staal*, ed. George Thompson and Richard Payne, 289–306).

X.157.4: Ge takes all of vs. 4 as a subord. cl.: “when the gods had smashed the Asuras and ...,” but this requires him to take *āyan* as an auxiliary in periphrastic construction with the gerund *hatvāya* (“geschlagen hatten”; see n. 4a). But this would be an unprecedented periphrasis, as far as I know, and the *yád* subordinator would be too deep in the cl. I take pāda a as a somewhat abortive sentence, with *hatvāya devāḥ ásurān* as the beginning of a main cl., and *yád āyan* a subord. cl. having the Asuras as subject. The sentence then begins again in the next pāda, repeating the subj. *devāḥ*, with the main cl. flg. in 5.

X.158 Sūrya

X.158.1: As indicated in the publ. intro., the ablatives in this vs. are conceptually ambig.: do they name the places from which the god exercises his protective function or the inimical forces from which the god is asked to protect us? Opinions differ; see Ge n. 1. Ge opts for the latter interpr., Re for the former. Pāda c of the next vs. (2) favors the Ge solution, but I am still uncertain.

X.158.2: This vs. is a metrical mess.

The morphological identity of *jóṣā* (Pp. *jóṣa*) is disputed. Most (Gr, Ge, Old, Re, Lub, Baums) take it as a 2nd sg. impv., but it would have to be derived from a full-grade thematic stem with root accent, which does not exist. Lub tries to deal with this problem by pronouncing it an imperative to a subjunctive stem, which seems to me a bit of a morphological monstrosity. I prefer to take it as a 1st sg. subjunctive; this does not have to belong to a root aor. as Wh (Rts) takes it – though it could. It might simply be the subj. to the extremely well-attested thematic stem *júṣā-*, with the full grade characteristic of the subj.; in the 1st sg. the expected them. vowel + subj. marker → *-ā-* would be neutralized. However, a major problem is the root accent, and so perhaps Wh’s root aor. subj. interpr. is better, esp. since it can also account for the 3rd ps. *jóṣat(i)*

(see comm. ad X.105.8). Old's objection to a 1st sg. interpr. is the impv. *pāhí* in c, which he thinks should be parallel. But mixing 1st and 2nd ps. in a RVic vs. is hardly unprecedented.

By my interpr. the main cl., consisting only of *jóṣā* (plus the voc.) lacks an antecedent to the rel. phrase *yásya te*; the *te* has been, as it were, demoted to the subord. cl. Those who interpr. *jóṣā* as an impv. take it in absol. usage (“enjoy!”), with the rel. cl. dependent on the voc. (“o Savitar, whose ...)

On *háras-* see comm. ad X.16.7.

I see a pun in *savān* in b. When this stem appears with a numeral (as here), it refers to soma-pressings. See, e.g., IV.26.7 ... *abharat sómaṃ, sahásraṃ savān̄ ayútaṃ ca sākám* “(the falcon) brought the soma, a thousand pressings and ten thousand all at once.” But in a Savitar context (as here) it generally belongs to the stem cognate with that god, meaning ‘impulsion, stimulus’.

X.158.3: I don't understand what the mountain is doing here. Ge (n. 3ab) adduces several passages containing both Savitar and Parvata, but they're just that -- passages with both, but no obvious reason why.

X.158.5: I take *nṛcákṣasaḥ* as a pun, with two essentially opposite meanings: 1) “having the eyes of men,” that is, merely human, not divine, sight; 2) “having ‘the eye of men’ [=sun],” which enables sight.

X.159 Against Cowives

On the style of this hymn, see publ. intro. The hymn is dense with 1st sg. pronouns and presents itself as an *ātmastuti* cum victory paean.

X.159.1: In addition to the striking 1st ps. pronominal adj. *māmaká-*, whose low register status is mentioned in the publ. intro., the *-I*-suffixed form *vid-valá-* also gives the impression of the demotic, against the usual *-r*-form of the suffix (*-vara-*); see AiG II.2.906–9 on these suffixes. There are very few *-vala-* stems.

X.159.5: On cd see Narten, MSS 14: 43 [=KISch 5–6], with disc. of previous lit. The root affiliation of the verb *āvrkṣam* has been much disputed, with $\sqrt{vraśc}$, \sqrt{vrj} , and \sqrt{vrh} to choose among (see Old, Ge n. 5cd). Narten makes a good case for \sqrt{vrh} ‘tear, rip’ on syntactic grounds.

On the negated primary comp. *ástheyas-* see AiG II.2.450, Ge's n. 5cd, and Narten's disc. Its positive is *sthirá-* ‘steadfast’

X.159.6: Note the phonological figure *vīrásya virājani*.

X.160 Indra

X.160.4: The vs. begins and ends with lexemes with the preverb *ánu* (a: *ánu* $\sqrt{(s)paś}$, d *ánu* $\sqrt{diś}$).

The sense of the idiom in c, *aratnaú nīḥ* $\sqrt{dhā}$ “hold/put out/off at/on/by the elbow” can only be guessed at, though it's clear that it's a hostile act. See Old and Ge (n. 4c). Ge suggests it's a boxer's trick; the publ. tr. substitutes the Engl. idiom “at arm's length” (i.e., keeps him at a distance), though I'm not sure what role the elbow would play.

The sense of *ánānuḍiṣṭa-* isn't clear. There are no other exx. of *ánu* $\sqrt{diś}$ in the RV, but the lexeme is fairly common in Saṃhitā prose, meaning ‘point out, specify’. Gr and Ge take it as

‘unaufgefordert’ (unsolicited, unasked), presumably from ‘unpointed-out / unappointed’(?). My ‘unprecedented’ is based on the later use of *anudeśa* in the sense of a rule referring back to another rule. but perhaps the Gr/Ge route is preferable.

X.160.5: On the last two words, *śunām huvema* and their connection to the earlier Viśvāmitra oeuvre, see publ. intro.

X.161 Contra disease

X.161.1: I failed to render the *utā*; the tr. should read “and from the kingly disease.” Also, in c “truly” should be deleted.

X.161.2: Pāda b might read more elegantly as “if he has gone down to the very face of death.”

X.161.3: I don’t know what the oblation is doing “with a thousand eyes,” esp. when the parallel adjectives refer to time periods. But I see no reason to emend or re-semanticize it.

X.162 Contra miscarriage

X.162.1: The morphological identity of *āmīvā* here and in 2a is disputed. Ge and Old consider it an instr. to the fem. *āmīvā-*, but I wonder whether such an under-marked instr. would be freely formed at this late date. I prefer to take it as a nom. sg., but this does cause problems with the masc. rel. *yāh*. Re suggests that a *-van*-stem *āmīvan-* was secondarily formed after the cmpds *amīva-cātana-/hān-*. My solution would be similar, but simpler: because there are masc. stems ending in *-ā*, the gender clash was not overly worrisome to the poet; I don’t think we need to manufacture an intermediate masc. *-an*-stem. Or, with Ge’s alternative adapted from Sāy. (n. 1c), it’s possible that the fem. stem was appositional to *yāh ... durṇāmā*, “als Krankheit.”

X.162.3: On this vs. as depicting successive stages of pregnancy, see Ge (n. 3ab) and the publ. intro.

X.162.5–6: The lexeme *nī√pad* here seems to have a sexual sense, like *nī√gam* in X.10.12 (q.v.).

X.163 Contra disease

X.163.5: Flg. a very tentative alternative suggestion of Old’s that *vanam* might be derived from *√van* ‘love’, I take *vanamkāraṇa-* as ‘love-maker’, a euphemistic designation of the penis. Alternatively, if *vanam* belongs with *vāna-* ‘wood’, it could mean ‘wood-maker’ and refer specifically to the erect penis; cf. American slang “woody” for an erection. The problem with either of these interpr. is that the penis would be referred to twice, by adjacent words, contrary to the practice of the rest of the hymn. But perhaps the fact that both words are euphemistic substitutes and also designate different functions of the same body part would allow this duplication. The other body parts here, hair and nails, do not form a natural class with what precedes, so they are of no help.

X.164 Contra bad thought

For the unifying theme of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.164.3: The three instr. in pāda a, *āsāsā*, *niḥśāsā*, and *abhiśāsā* are unified by their derivation from the root \sqrt{sams} ‘pronounce, proclaim’ plus a directional preverb, but they also all have developed idiomatic meanings. Both the first and last of these lexemes are reasonably well attested: *āsās-* generally means ‘hope, wish’, presumably via a more literal ‘bring/attract by proclaiming’ (like $\tilde{a}\sqrt{kr}$, $\tilde{a}\sqrt{pū}$, $\tilde{a}\sqrt{yaj}$ ‘bring/attract, ... by purification, ... by sacrifice’). *ābhi* \sqrt{sams} - means ‘curse’, via ‘pronounce against’; though *abhiśās-* is found only here, the *-ti*-stem abstract *abhiśasti-* is well represented. The middle term, however, is very limited. The root-noun compd is found only here, and the only other RVic occurrence of this lexeme is *āniḥśasta-* in IV.34.11, whose meaning is underdetermined. The literal sense of the lexeme must be ‘proclaim away/out’ and because of the oppositional preverbs \tilde{a} ‘(towards) here’ ... *niḥ* ‘away, out’ it should be the opposite of *āsās-*, perhaps ‘ban, banishment’ (see *nīṣkṛtim* ‘expulsion’ in the next hymn, X.165.1) – but this doesn’t work well in the passage. Although ‘blame’ is not a true antonym for ‘wish, hope’, it fits better in the trio – and the result of “proclaiming out” may be ‘blame’. On all three words, see Scar 528–30.

The position of *āpa* is unusual for a preverb in tmesis.

X.165 All Gods (Bird of Ill Omen)

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is devoted to averting the potential danger produced by the arrival of a dove. Despite Western associations of the dove with peace and love, it has negative associations in Vedic. The grhya sūtras consider a dove coming into the house a bad omen; see, e.g., ŚGS V.5.1, ĀśvGS III.7.7, etc., which prescribe the recitation of this hymn.

X.165.1: Ge (also Wh AVŚ VI.27.1) takes *yād* as goal of *ichán*; the *tásmai* in c should then pick up *yād*: “what(ever) the dove is seeking, to that we will chant.” But this seems unduly restrictive. I think *ichán* in absolute usage is more sinister: we don’t know what the dove is after, but it’s surely nothing good. And *tásmai* ought to refer to the dove, at least in my opinion.

X.165.2: The imperatival *hí* clause in c gives the grounds for the further imperative d, as often. In other words, because we hope/expect that Agni will enjoy our oblation, we hope/expect that he will arrange for the bird to avoid us.

X.165.3: The fem. loc. *āṣṭryām* is difficult and its interpr. depends entirely on context. Because of the parallel loc. *agnidhāne* it’s generally rendered as ‘fireplace, hearth, stove’ vel sim. (Gr, Wh AVŚ VI.27.3, EWA s.v.), with a bit of a twist in Ge’s ‘kitchen’ (Küche). Re suggests the more general ‘maison’ on the basis of *grhēṣu* in 2b. My longshot ‘corner’ presupposes a connection with *ásri-* (fem.) ‘corner, edge’ (RV *cátur-ásri-* 2x). Its form here would represent either a morphological regularization (substituting a well-known suffix *-trī-* for the rare *-ri-*) or a blend with *āṣṭrā-* ‘goad’ (I’d favor the former).

X.165.5: The leading around of the cow in b is reminiscent of a similar ritual act in X.155.5, as Ge points out. Effacing all difficulties in c is like the effacing of the traces/footprints of death on returning from the funeral, using the same verb. See X.18.2 *mṛtyoḥ padām yopáyanto yád aíta* “Effacing the footprint of death when you have gone.” Here it must refer to the footprints the dove has left in the house (see 3b, 4b).

X.166 Against rivals

The aggressively triumphant tone of this hymn is reminiscent of X.159, the first-person victory paean of a wife having conquered her rival wives (*sapátnī-*), as here the first-person speaker proclaims his triumph over his *sapátna-* (1b, 2a, c). This masc. stem is, of course, a backformation from the fem. *sapátnī-*; see EWA s.v. *pátnī-*, and this hymn may be modeled on the cowife hymn just cited.

X.166.1: The Engl. tr. obscures the difference between the two words for ‘rival’: *sapátna-* (b) and *śátru-* (c). Given the derivation of the former (see just above), it may refer to a more intimate rival than the *śátru-*.

X.166.4: *viśvákarmeṇa* in b is the only thematic form to what is usually an *n*-stem *viśvákarma-*. This thematic stem may have been extracted from a compound like **viśvakarma-dhāman-*, as suggested by Ge (n. 4b), or it may simply be that at this late stage thematization is in the air. Note, however, that the correct *n*-stem instr. sg. *viśvákarmaṇā* is found nearby in X.170.4.

On the arguably trifunctional array in cd, see publ. intro.

X.166.5: JL points out the nice phonetic figure of *maṇḍūkā (...)* *udakān*.

X.167 Indra

pári seems to be the Lieblingwort in the first few vss.: 1a, 1d, 2a.
In the last sentence of the intro., subst. vs. 3 for vs. 4.

X.167.1: I take *sutásya* as dependent on *kalásasya*, not coreferent with it like Ge.

puruvīra- is a standard epithet of *rayí-*; see comm. ad VI.32.4. In most of these occurrences the adj. is masc., but here it is fem. Although it is generally said that *rayí-* can be either masc. or fem., in fact most of the supposed fem. occurrences can be otherwise explained (see comm. ad VI.8.5). However, the fem. occurrences cannot be reduced to zero, and this is one of the stubborn ones. Old thinks the fem. *puruvīrām* here is metrically conditioned.

X.167.3: As Ge points out (n. 3a), *rājīñah* belongs with both Soma and Varuṇa and is positioned between them.

X.167.4: With Ge (n. 3d) I think *bhakṣam akaram* (“I did consuming”) is an analytic version of *abhakṣayam* (“I consumed,” 3d). The reason is obvious: Indra wants to use an aorist and the secondary root $\sqrt{bhakṣ}$ does not have one.

In this vs. Indra explicitly recognizes the reciprocal bargain of the sacrifice: he gets the soma and the praise hymn *if* he arrives with something to give.

X.168 Vāyu

This hymn has attracted numerous tr., which is somewhat surprising for a fairly inconsequential – if pleasingly constructed – hymn. In addition to Ge and Re (EVP XV), see Macd. (VRS), Th (Gedichte), Don.

As noted in the publ. intro. (in addition to most of those just cited), although Anukr. names Vāyu as the deity of the hymn, he doesn’t appear in it – only his less divinized, more

physical alloform Vāta. It's worth noting that *vāta-* is also found in the next two hymns: X.169.1 and, in the compd. *vātajūta-*, X.170.1.

X.168.1: The first pāda consists merely of an acc. NP, but, as noted in the publ. intro., the template GEN [god's name] *nū* ACC [greatness/deeds, etc.] reminds us of openings like the famous beginning of I.32: *īndrasya nū vīryāṇi prā vocam*, and I (like Ge, Macd, Re, Th, but not Don) supply "I proclaim."

Various suggestions have been offered for the real-world equivalent of the "making (things) red" phrase; consult the tr. referenced above. In addition to those, I wonder if it describes the dawn, a frequent referent of *aruṇā-*, as Re points out. Although only *vāta-* appears in this hymn, the Anukr. considers Vāyu, the wind god, to be the dedicand, and Vāyu of course is the first recipient of soma at the dawn sacrifice.

X.168.2: Again, there is a wide range of views on the meaning and referents of *viṣṭhāḥ*, for which consult the other tr. The lexeme *vī* √ *sthā* generally means 'spread out, be dispersed'; here I think it refers to the eddies and countergusts that are part of a strong wind – in my experience, such a wind does not seem to be a single unified movement of air, but varies in speed and direction and therefore seems to consist of numerous parts.

X.168.3: "Companion of the waters" – presumably, as Th suggests, because wind often accompanies rain. But as he also suggests, perhaps because a strong wind sets bodies of water in motion, raising ripples and then waves, thus appearing to play with them.

X.168.4: The expression "his sounds are heard, not his form" is an obvious zeugma. Most tr. add "is not seen" to accommodate the "form," but the Skt. does not – and I think the expression is more striking in its truncated form.

X.169 Cows

The Anukr. ascribes this hymn to a descendent of Kakṣīvant (Śabara Kākṣīvata), but it lacks the flair of his eponymous ancestor.

X.169.1: *jīvādhanya-* elsewhere explicitly modifies waters (e.g., I.80.4).

X.169.2: On the use of the names of the cows in ritual, see Old and V.3.3, adduced by Ge.

The mention of the Aṅgirasas of course refers to the Vala myth.

X.170 Sūrya

Gonda (Ved.Lit. 212) considers this hymn to be banal, mediocre, and devoid of deeper meaning; it hardly seems fair to single out this brief hymn for such scorn, esp. because in fact it has some nice rhetorical flourishes and some tricky gender switches.

Forms of (*vī*) √ *bhrāj* 'blaze (forth)' open hemistichs in all four vss.: 1a / 2a *vibhrāḍ bṛhāt*, 3c *viśvabhrāḍ bhrājāḥ*, 4a *vibhrājan*.

X.170.1: The gender of the subj. changes from neut. in ab (on the basis of *bṛhāt* and part. *dādhat*) to masc. in cd (on the basis of *vātojūto yāḥ*), with the masc. rel. technically not in gender agreement with its antecedent. Old gets rather exercised by this, but it seems simple enough to

supply the neut. subj. ‘light’ (*jyótis-* found in 2d, 3a, 4a) in the first half-vs. and allow the rel. to agree in sense if not in gender. See Ge (n. 1a) and Re. By contrast Scar. prefers to supply “Wesen” = Sūrya, but the insistent presence of *jyótis-* in the other vss. of the hymn favors the former solution.

I don’t know why the sunlight should “drink the somyan honey,” but I suspect that the phrase here refers to water, perhaps “drunk” by evaporation. Alternatively, and in fact simultaneously, like the other gods at the ritual, principally Indra, Sūrya should partake of the soma at the soma sacrifice and offer good things to the sacrificer in return, as pāda b indicates.

The final phrase of the vs., *ví rājati*, nicely echoes initial *vibhrāj-*.

X.170.2: The gender of the subj. remains neut. throughout this vs., though the beginning of the 2nd hemistich flirts with a switch to masc., like 1c: *amitrahā vṛtrahā* appear to be masc., and usually are. However, with AiG III.239 I take *-hā* as serving for the neut. as well (though see comm. ad VI.48.21). If this is considered morphological apostasy, the cmpds can be taken as secondary predications: “As a smasher of foes, as a smasher of obstacles, the best smasher of Dasyus ...” (likewise the two *-hā* cmpds at the end of d). Neut. *dasyuhántamam* puts a stop to this flirtation.

The phonetic figure of 1a *vibhrāḍ bṛhāt* is amplified in 2a with a third term, *súbhṛtam*.

X.170.3: The pattern of vs. 1, with neut. in ab and masc. in cd, returns here. This time the gender flirtation in c is in the opposite direction: since *-bhrāt* in 1a and 2a was neut. and it opens pāda c here, we expect the neut. to continue, but masc. *bhrājāḥ ... sūryaḥ* immediately follows.

Contra Ge (and the publ. tr.), Re takes the neuters of d as appositive nominatives, and *paprathe* as intrans/refl. But it can surely just be self-involved.

X.170.4: Gender trouble continues. The vs. begins with a clear masc. part. *vibhrājan*, which is followed by neut. *svār*, which I take as an appositive to the (unidentified) 2nd sg. subj. The first half-vs. is found also as VIII.98.3, where the 2nd sg. subj. is Indra and *svāḥ* is an unmarked simile.

Ge takes *rocanām divāḥ* as another appositive in the nominative, not as acc. goal as I do (with Re).

Indra is called *viśvákarmā viśvādevāḥ* in VIII.98.2c, the pāda immediately preceding the repeated hemistich just noted.

X.171 Indra

X.171.2: Don tr. *makhāsya dódhataḥ* as “of the rebellious Sacrifice,” presumably on the basis of PB VII.5.6 (also elsewhere in the Br), where the story of Makha and the gods is briefly told and Makha is identified with the sacrifice. Nothing in this vs. encourages that identification. Note that *-makha-* is found in a cmpd in the next hymn (X.172.2).

On *áva √ bhr* see comm. ad VIII.93.23. As I say there, the lexeme can take an acc. of a body part, depicting bringing down an enemy by a downstroke that removes the body part – here severing the head clean from its body.

X.172 Dawn

On the structure of this hymn and its relation to early morning – though less so to Dawn proper – see publ. intro.

X.172.1: The *s*-stem *vānas-* is found independently only here (though in cmpds like *gír-vanas-* ‘having a longing for songs’. It is completely unclear what it is meant to convey here, a lack of clarity made worse by the fact that the identify of the subject is unknown (Dawn? Sūrya?).

The end of b *yád ūdhabhiḥ* must be construed apart from the rest of the pāda, since the verb *sacanta* is unaccented (so also Old). Something needs to be supplied, since “... the cows, when with udders” or “... cows, that is, with udders” doesn’t make sense as an independent unit. The instr. pl. *ūdhabhiḥ* occurs 3x in the RV; once (VIII.9.19) it is construed with *duhré* “they give milk with their udders.” I therefore supply a preterital version of that verb here: the cows have been milked and are now going to pasture. Old rather “strotzen” and Ge “kommen.”

X.172.3: The cmpd. *jārayán-makha-* tr. by Ge “der die Freigebigen weckt,” sim. Old (Gr takes it as a PN, an interpr. firmly rejected by Mayr PN). The problem is that *makhá-* doesn’t usually mean ‘bounteous’, and in fact is used of a hostilely treated being in the immediately preceding hymn (X.171.2). On its dominant meaning ‘battling’ and its acquisition of the secondary ‘bounteous’ sense (via *maghá-*), see comm. ad I.18.9. Here I take the cmpd as a pun: Dawn is well known as one who both awakens and ages mortals, expressed by the homophonous *jārayati* ‘awakens/ages’ (see my *-āya-Formations* 126–27, 154). Though Dawn herself can’t be the subj. here (because of masc. *mámhiṣṭhaḥ*), the subj. is clearly a dawn-related being, who could perform the same dual actions. I suggest both parts of the cmpd are homonyms: *jārayán-* ‘awakening/aging’ and *makhá-* ‘bounteous/battler’. The splv. *mámhiṣṭha-* ‘most bounteous’ helps attract the ‘bounteous’ sense of *makhá-* despite its primary meaning. (I would now modify my statement in *-āya-formations* (127 n. 4) that the cmpd (only) has the ‘awaken’ sense.)

X.172.4: The verb *vartayati* is construed with two preverbs in two different senses, at least in my interpr. (and basically Ge’s, though he toys with supplying a different verb in pāda a [n. 4ab]): *āpa √ vṛt* ‘roll away’ / *sám √ vṛt* ‘roll up together’.

vartaním returns from 1b.

X.173 Royal consecration

This hymn has been much treated: e.g., Don, Schlerath (*Königtum* 117–18), Ober (Relig. RV I.352). It is found in the AV (Ś VI.87-88, P XIX.6) and elsewhere. On *dhruvá-* ‘firm’ as its signature word, see publ. intro.

X.173.2: Note the insistent repetition of *ihá* (a, c, d).

X.173.6: Pāda a repeats 3b and reinforces the ritual aspects of the royal installation.

X.174 Praise of king

A companion piece to the preceding hymn – found in AVŚ I.29, AVP I.11. On the signature lexeme *abhí √ vṛt* ‘roll over’, see publ. intro. Vss. 1–3 contain 10 pāda-initial occurrences of *abhí*, vs. 4 lacks this word, but the first word of b, *ābhavad*, mimics it (and vs. 4 is a borrowed vs. anyway). The final vs., 5, has *abhí* opening b.

X.174.1: Both AV versions substitute an amulet (*mañī-*) for the oblation (*havīṣ-*) here – a nice illustration of the different effective means valued by the two textual traditions.

X.174.2: Both ab and cd are structured as “X and which Y” constructions, though with the “and” missing. In other words, in the second clause of each hemistich the acc. in the main clause has been gapped – although the pub. tr. has inserted it (“those” and “the one” respectively). A more literal tr. would be “over who are hostile ...” / “over who is envious ...”

X.174.3: This vs. is rather cunningly constructed: each of the first three pādas parcels out a bit of the syntax of the whole: pāda a has the preverb *abhí*, b the preverb plus the verb (*abhí ... avīvṛta*), and c adds the obj., *viśvā bhūtāni*. Taking this last phrase as the obj. (with Ge and Zehnder et al. [AVP I online]) is preferable to taking it as subj. (so Wh, AVŚ).

X.174.4: This vs. is identical to X.159.4, a cowife hymn, with masc. *asapatnáḥ* instead of *asapatnā*, spoken by the triumphant wife in 159.4. This is the only verse in our hymn lacking *abhí* (see above), and it surely has been borrowed into this hymn from X.159 – a conclusion supported by the fact that this hymn has too many vss. (5) for its place in the collection and that this vs. is not found in the corresponding AV versions.

X.175 Pressing stones

X.175.2: The “ruddy ones” (*usrāḥ*) are probably the soma plants; cf. “the red tree” (*vṛkṣāsya ... aruṇāsya*) that the pressing stones eat in X.94.3. See also Ge n. 2c.

X.175.4: This vs. is a near repetition of vs. 1, providing a ring.

X.176 Agni

Despite my characterization of this as “a simple hymn” in the publ. intro., it reads more like a real RVic hymn, with unclear referents, metaphorical language, and bold imagery, than the straightforward, repetitive Athavan hymns among which it’s found.

X.176.1: The identity of the “sons of the Ṛbhus” is not entirely clear. Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. take them as the offering fires or their flames; see esp. Ge’s n. 1a, where he argues that the Ṛbhus are priests, here associated with the kindling of the ritual fire (though this is not their usual ambit). Old is dubious, in part because of the verb *navanta* ‘bellow’ – but this isn’t much of an argument, since flames are always making roaring noises in the RV.

With most, I take *vṛjānā* as a nom. pl. appositive to the sons of the Ṛbhus, but what aspect of this multifaceted word (on which see comm. ad X.28.2) is being referred to here is unclear. In its physical manifestation as ‘enclosure, circle’, it could refer to the fireplaces themselves or to the circle of flames; in its metaphorical meaning, to the community of fires or flames. Interpr. vary – see Old, Ge, and Re.

kṣāmā with long final vowel is found twice elsewhere in the RV: IV.2.16 and X.45.4. Although in all three cases the Pp. reads short-vowel *kṣāma*, I think all three are elliptical duals, for *dyāvākṣāmā* ‘heaven and earth’ (see comm. ad locc. for the first two), though here (as in the other passages) the standard tr. take it as sg. In our passage the flames feed (*ásnan*) on heaven

and earth: since flames reach towards heaven while being grounded on earth, a dual source of food makes sense.

It is in this context that I interpr. *viśvādhāyasaḥ*. The interpr. of *-dhāyas-* cmpds is tricky; see comm. ad III.44.3, X.67.7. They can mean ‘having nourishment for X’, with the first member the beneficiary/consumer of the nourishment, but can also have an adj. first member, e.g., *hāri-dhāyas-* ‘having golden nourishment’. Ge and Re both interpr. it in the former sense: ‘all-nourishing’, i.e., ‘having nourishment for all’. But this seems to contradict the verb phrase “they feed on H+E.” Although I render almost all of the 11 occurrences of this cmpd as “all-nourishing,” all of them could also be interpr. as having an adjectival first member “having all nourishment(s)” – it is difficult to identify a diagnostic context that would distinguish between the two. Such *bahuvrīhi*s can be further interpr. not only as ‘providing XY’ but as ‘deriving/acquiring XY’, and here the latter sense seems in play – as they feed on H+E they derive universal nourishment.

X.176.3: In I.35.4, adduced by Ge, *abhīvr̥ta-* is used of an extravagantly decorated chariot

X.176.4: As indicated in the publ. tr., the sense of the first hemistich is obscure, though the syntax is not complex. The verb *uruṣyā-* lit. ‘make wide (space)’, fig. ‘deliver/release’ takes an abl. Here the VP can be construed either as “delivers (himself) from his immortal birth, as it were” (so the publ. tr.) or “... from his birth as if from the immortal.” It is also possible that the abl. *jánmanaḥ* can have a temporal sense as well. I think there may be a play on the ablatives in b: Agni delivers himself from his immortal birth (as a god) after his birth (on the ritual ground), reading *jánmanaḥ* twice. And this may further suggest that Agni inhabits the domain *between* birth and death/immortality, that is, the human realm, where people live – not the divine realm of non-death. This idea may be reinforced by “he was made for living” in d.

X.177 Patamga

On this hymn, see now also Köhler (*Kavi*, 123–25). I will not speculate on the mystical import of the hymn – there’s quite enough of that by others. The grammar is fairly straightforward.

X.177.2: In c *svaryàm* poses two problems. Since it’s modifying *tām ... manīṣām*, it should be fem. and therefore belong to a *vṛkī-*stem *svarī-* (so, sort of, Gr, who sneaks it into the lemma for *svaryà-*). Also, the various tr. take it as ‘sunlike’, ‘sonnenhaft’ – understandably, given the visual context -- but *svaryà-* always refers to noise, and so I tr. it.

X.177.3: Various referents have been suggested for the fem. plurals in c (e.g., Ge ‘waters’). Given the return of “see” from vs. 1: 1b *paśyanti*, 3a *ápaśyam*, I’m in favor of bringing back the light rays (*mārīcī-*) of 1d.

Note also a potential reverse phonetic figure: *patam-gá-* (1a) and *go-pā-* (3a), esp. since the most obvious referent for *gopām* is the bird, who is the object of “see” in 1ab as well.

X.178 Tārksya

On the subj. of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.178.1: For the collocation of \sqrt{sah} and \sqrt{tr} in connection with a horse, see III.49.3 *sahāvā pṛtsú tarānir nārvā* “victorious in battles like an overtaking steed.”

Since Tārṅsya is obviously a horse, *āriṣṭanemi-* modifying him obviously doesn’t ascribe a wheel felly to the body of the horse itself, but rather to the associated chariot. Still Scar’s tr. (15) “der macht, dass der Radkranz unversehrt bleibt” seems a little overfussy.

X.178.1–2: As Old already noted, pādas 1d and 2b play off each other: 1d *svàstaye ... ihā huvema* / 2b *svàstaye ... ivā ruhema*, with *ihā* and *ivā* differing from each other only in the interior consonant and the two 1st pl. optatives having near-mirror-image root syllables.

X.178.2: The referent of the dual in cd is unclear to me. Ge takes it as Heaven and Earth, but this requires ignoring, or rather aggressively reinterpreting, the simile particle *nā*, which seems to me unequivocally to mark (unnamed) H+E, identified by their standard descriptions, as the comparandum. Old decides H+E are a second comparandum serving as obj. to *ā ruhema* “we board T. like a boat, like you two, H+E,” but this doesn’t help. First, that second simile doesn’t make sense: how are H+E like a racehorse to mount? And the discord between 2nd ps. *vām* and the duals in the simile is disturbing. I don’t have a solution to the identity problem, but I suspect that it’s some dual entity connected with horse tackle or chariot parts.

X.178.3: A satisfyingly constructed simile with three parts (nom., instr., acc.), with all three expressed in both simile and frame.

Acqd. to Ge (n. 3d), a “youthful arrow” is one that still has its feathers and so on.

X.179 Indra

On the ritual context of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.179.1: The context strongly favors Ge’s rendering of *mamattāna* as “so wartet noch,” fld. by publ. tr. “wait!” This should belong with \sqrt{man}^2 ‘wait’, on which see comm. ad X.27.20. The problem is that the other forms belonging to this root have clear *man* forms, but this appears to belong to \sqrt{mad} (so assigned by Gr). There is a complex way to get this form by analogy, however. The impv. in X.27.20 *mamandhi* ‘wait!’ is properly analyzed as *maman-dhi*, but could instead be **mamand-dhi*, as if to a root \sqrt{mand} ‘wait’ (distinct from the secondary root \sqrt{mand} ‘be exhilarated’ derived from \sqrt{mad} ‘id.’), with simplification of the geminate in a cluster. From such a putative underlying form, a zero-grade stem *mamad-* could be derived; with the 2nd pl. ending *-tāna* the result will be our *mamat-tāna*. This is perhaps over-clever, but the contextual meaning ‘wait’ is so clear that fiddling around with a “become/make exhilarated” meaning here would be senseless.

X.179.2: On *kulapā* see Ge (n. 2d) and, somewhat less illuminating, Scar (302). As Ge points out, the other early attestation of this stem (AVŚ I.14.3) specifically identifies the referent as feminine.

On *vrājapati-* as ‘Einferchungsmeister’ see KH (Aufs. 572 n. 22).

X.180 Indra

X.180.3: In the voc. phrase *vṛṣabha carṣaṇīnām* the gen. has its ordinary accent. See Old.

X.181 All Gods

On the ritual context of this hymn see publ. intro.

X.181.3: I would now slightly alter the tr. to “did they carry ...,” since impfs. should not have immed. past sense (per IH).

X.182 Bṛhaspati

X.183 Birth of a son

For the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.183.1–2: In pāda a of both vss., I take *mānasā* both with the preceding *āpaśyam* and the following participle (*cékitānam / dīdhyānām*).

X.183.2: On *tanū* see AiG III.188. It belongs to the category of endless locatives discussed by TY (WECIEC Proceedings 2022).

X.184 Birth charm

X.185 Aditi

X.185.2: Old follows Benfey in emending *vāraṇeṣu* to *vāraṇeṣu* < *vā āraṇeṣu* “or on alien ways”: clever, but as Ge (n. 2b) points out, not nec.

X.185.2–3: Ge (n. 2a) convincingly takes *téṣām* (2a) as the antecedent of *yásmāi* (3a), with change of number – rather than referring to the gods in vs. 1. This fits the Weltbild much better.

X.186 Vāyu

X.187 Agni

X.188 Agni

X.188.2: On *vīpravīra-* see comm. ad IX.44.5.

X.189 Sārparājñī or Sūrya

On the dedicand of the hymn, see publ. intro. I will not contribute to the abundant speculation on the identities and activities of the actors in the hymn, for which see Old., Ge, and Re (ÉVP XV) inter alia.

X.189.1: This vs. contains a rare ex. of splitting an NP across a hemistich boundary: *mātāram ... / pitāraṃ ca*. Of course in Gāyatrī the boundary between pādas b and c is less rigid than in meters with hemistichs of equal numbers of pādas.

In c it is possible (with Re and as an alt. of Ge’s [n. 1c]) to take *svàḥ* as an appositive to the subj.; “going forth as the sun.”

X.189.2: This vs. seems to have induced a certain amount of grammatical confusion in our usually reliable tr. + comm.

Ge, Old (with a great deal of verbiage), and Re (in comm. but not in tr.) take *rocanā* as fem. nom. sg. -- but *rocanā-* is not an adj., but a neut. noun. The other supposed fem. nom. sg. of this stem in III.61.5 (adduced by Ge and Old) should not be so interpr.; see comm. ad loc.

Re also tr. *rocanā* as “les deux domaines-lumineux,” though the dual of this neut. -a-stem would be *rocané* – and despite the fact that in his comm. he assumes “une haplogogie **rocanā* (nt. pl.) + *rocanā* (fem. sg.)” (my bolding). Re’s invented dual must result from the fact that *antár* √*car* ‘wander between’ can take a dual, as in I.173.3 *antár dūtó ná ródasī carad vāk* “Speech wanders between the two worlds like a messenger.” But the pl. is also possible; cf. I.95.10 *antár nāvāsu caratī prasūsu* “he roams within the new, fruitful (plants).” The form *rocanā* then is a neut. pl., and only a neut. pl.

As Re points out, this vs. contains the first trace of the opposition of breaths: *prá* √*an* (*prānā-*) and *āpa* √*an* (*apānā-*), already very prominent in the AV

X.190 Cosmogonic

X.190.3: There are three matched pairs serving as obj. of *akalpayat*; as JSK (DGRV II.85–86) points out, they show three different patterns of conjunction: dual dvandva: *sūryācandramāsau* (though with only one accent); double *ca*: *dīvaṃ ca pṛthivīm ca*; and the rather loose *átha* + *u*: *antárikṣam átho svāḥ*. As he also points out, these correspond to different degrees of semantic cohesion between the two members of the pair.

X.191 Unity

On the purpose of the hymn and its placement in the Saṃhitā, see publ. intro. The preverb *sám* ‘together’ and the adj. *samānā-* ‘common’ dominate the hymn: there are 6 occurrences of *sám* in the 1st two vss. (incl. the doubled *sám-sam* that opens the hymn) and 8 occurrences of *samānā-* in the last two vss., as well as one of *sámīti-* ‘assembly’ and two of *sahá* / *sūsaha* ‘together (with)’.

X.191.2: The use of *pūrve* ‘earlier, of long ago’ with the pres. *upāsate* is a bit jarring, but I think the point is that the gods’ agreement made earlier had long-lasting effects into the present, just as ours presumably will.