Comm. I.100-191

I.100 Indra

I.100.2: In c, the presumed main clause to the relative clauses of ab, I have supplied a verb of motion ("should come"), but it might be better, with Ge and Re, simply to take c as the anticipatory qualifier of the subject (*índraḥ*) of the refrain in d.

The *svébhiḥ* of c is positioned between two other masc. pl. instr. and could perhaps be taken with both, though I have tr. it only with *évaiḥ* because *svébhir évaiḥ* appears to be a fixed expression: I.62.8, VIII.8.13, VIII.97.3, X.67.11.

I.100.3: Pāda a with its simile is interpreted variously, with the differences primarily dependent on the construal of the participle *dúghānāḥ*. On the basis of III.31.10 *páyaḥ pratnásya rétaso dúghānāḥ* "milking out the milk of their age-old semen," I take the participle to be transitive and supply as object acc. (or perhaps Inhaltsakk.) *páyaḥ*, on which gen. *rétasaḥ* is dependent. Since these are the only two occurrences of the stem *dúghāna-* (as opposed to *dúhāna-*, etc.) and they share the word *rétas-*, it seems best to interpret them in the same way. Ge, however, though adducing III.31.10, takes *dúghānāḥ* as passive, "wie die gemolkenen (Ströme) des Himmelssamens" (sim. Re). Both Ge and Re also take *diváḥ* as dependent on *rétasaḥ*, while I take it as parallel to *yásya*, both dependent on *pánthāsaḥ*. The parallel expression in vs. 2 *yásya ... sū́ryasyeva yā́maḥ* "whose course, like that of the sun..." favors my interpr. of *diváḥ*, though the passages adduced by Ge. (V.17.3, IX.74.1) do show that *diváḥ* can also qualify *rétas-*.

Determining the syntactic structure here requires figuring out what image is being depicted. We can begin with the gender paradox that figures prominently in any interpretation: the milk(ing) and the semen. I do not think this can be separated from Indra's "male powers" (*paúmsyebhiḥ*) in c, and therefore think, contra most other interpr., that it is Indra's "paths" that are producing the semen-as-milk. Most interpr. avoid this difficult image by taking *dúghānāḥ* entirely as part of the simile (the milked-out [streams]), with the property shared by the frame (Indra's paths) and the simile only the anodyne verb *yánti* 'go'. I freely admit that the image produced by my interpr. is, to say the least, not straightforward, but it can be made intelligible and it produces a richer semantics than the alternatives. In vss. 2 and 3 the trajectory of Indra's journeys is depicted as cosmic: his "course" (*yā́maḥ*) in 2 is like that of the sun, his "paths" (*páthāsaḥ*) like those of heaven in 3. (See also his 'routes' in 4c.) I therefore see these journeys as visually inscribed in the sky, almost like contrails (however anachronistic that image is for the Vedic period). The cosmic equivalent of these paths of Indras are likely the clouds, which produce rain. Now the refrain of this hymn emphasizes Indra's connection with the Maruts, and the Maruts are, among other things, the gods associated with the thunderstorm and the monsoon and are closely associated with the production of rain. So, Indra's journey across the sky with the Maruts can also be seen as producing rain, figuratively called semen because of the Indra's intensely male character. His "paths" on this journey are compared to the clouds, whose visual "paths" as they move across the sky are deeply familiar and which are the quintessential producers of rain.

I.100.4: In b *sán* is one of the (fairly few) examples of the nominative of the pres. part. to √*as* that is not concessive (expect "although being ..."). The phrase *sákhibhiḥ sákhā sán* is, as Ge points out (n. 4b), structurally identical to I.76.5 *kavíbhiḥ kavíḥ sán*, where the *sán* also lacks concessive force.

I.100.4–5: The pattern of instrumentals set in vs. 4 -- "X with the X-es," that is, "X among the X-es" -- appears to continue in 5a and c, but the instrumentals there are used differently.

I.100.5: The participial phrase *śravasyā̃ni tū́rvan* has a close parallel in VIII.74.10c *yásya śrávāṃsi tū́rvatha*. I translate the latter as "whose claims to fame you bring to triumph." Given the similarities I would change the tr. here to "along with the nest-mates bringing to triumph (deeds) worthy of fame."

I.100.6: The general opinion is that *samádana-* is simply an extension of *samád-* 'battle'; Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *samád-*) suggests that it's a blend of *samád-* and *samáraṇa-* 'clash, battle'. I consider it rather a blend (with suffixal extension) of *samád-* and *máda-* 'exhilaration, elation', hence 'battle-elation' or, in Re's felicitous tr. 'l'ivresse-du-combat'. In a nicely balanced expression, just as Indra reduces the battle-fury of the enemy (*manyu-mī́ḥ*) he raises the battle-elation of those fighting with him. This notion is continued in the next verse, where in pāda a the Maruts cause Indra to enjoy the battle.

Ge and Re tr. *sanat* as a modal here (but not the repeated examples in vs. 18). The form of course cannot be a subjunctive, given the augmented thematic forms that belong to this paradigm (*ásanat*, etc.), and though injunctives can sometimes be modal, there is no contextual reason for such an interpretation.

I.100.7: The abstract *ūtí-* 'help' is here personified, representing the Maruts. Cf. I.52.9 where the identification of *ūtáyaḥ* and *marútaḥ* is explicit.

karúṇa- is found only here in the RV; neither here nor in its very few other occurrences in early Vedic (AV 1x, TS 1x) does it exhibit any semantic kinship with later *karuṇa-* 'pitiful', *karuṇā* 'pity', though Mayrhofer (EWA s.v.) makes a valiant effort to connect the meanings.

I.100.8: The apparent 3rd pl. med. verb *apsanta* is difficult. Ge simply refuses to translate. Old suggests a connection with √*sap* but without conviction. Re and WG (though both without disc.) must take it as a desiderative to √*āp* 'reach, obtain' ("... cherchent à gagner," "... wollen ... erreichen"). But, though the standard desid. to this root, *ī́psati*, is not attested until the AV, the lack of reduplication and the short root vowel make the stem *apsa-* an unlikely desid. (This analysis is also rejected by Ge in n. 8a.) I tentatively suggest that it belongs to the putative root √*bhas* 'breathe', which Thieme (*Gramm. Kat.* 539) suggests underlies the various compounds in *-psu-*, as well as Grk. ψυχή (see EWA s.vv. *psu-* and *bhas*^{2}) and that it means 'inspire'. It would then be the imperfect of a root pres. (or possibly a root aor.). Though we might expect a weak form of the middle ending, **apsata*, this may well be an *-anta* replacement for act. *-an* of the type identified and described in Jamison 1979 (IIJ 21). Old rejects a derivation from √*bhas*, but presumably referring to the other √*bhas* 'bite'.

I.100.9: The standard tr., also Old and Tichy (1995: 42), take *sáṃgṛbhītā* as the nom. sg. of an agentive *-tar-* stem, parallel to *sánitā* in pāda c, a form that should have full-grade in the root syllable, **sáṃgrabhītā*. I see no reason to reject the past participle it appears to be, in order to assume a wrongly formed alternative. Although RVic poets often make use of morphological parallelism, it is not a compositional requirement; in fact, they often take pleasure in expressing semantically parallel notions in morphologically dissimilar garb (see a nice example in 6a above, not to mention instr. *savyéna*, loc. *dakṣiṇé* in this same hemistich). The verb *yamati* of pāda a can easily be read with b as well, and *sáṃgṛbhītā* also modifies the neut. pl. *kṛtā́ni* with no grammatical difficulty.

I.100.10: On *grā́ma-* as 'horde, roving band' see comm. ad X.27.19.

I.100.11: The verb *samájāti* lacks an overt object; the standard tr. supply 'booty'. This lexeme sometimes takes an acc. expressing the prize one wins (e.g., cows in I.33.3), but other times the enemy one defeats (e.g., VII.32.7), and I see no way to decide here.

Note how (*saṃ)ájā(ti)* echoes *jā(míbhir) ... ájā(mibhir)*.

I.100.12: On a variant of pāda b, see comm. ad X.69.7

The hapax *camrīṣá-* is taken by the standard tr. as a personal name. This tactic may be safe, but it ignores the word's similarity to several others, particularly the hapax *camríṣ-* in I.56.1, a word usually rendered as 'ladle'. Old, ad I.56.1, makes the offhand suggestion that our *camrīṣá-* is related to *camara-* 'yak', a word not attested until the gṛhya sūtras. Although 'yak' might work in our passage, the gap in attestation and the morphological differences make this connection quite shaky. More promising are several words found in the RV for soma cup/beaker: *camasá-* and *camū́-*, as well as the root *cam* 'sip, slurp' (see Gotō 1987: 136). *camrīṣá* (and *camríṣ-*) may be secondarily built to a **cam-ra-* derived from this root (for the suffixes *-īṣá-* and *-íṣ-* see AiG II.2.462–63 and 364–67 respectively) and thus derivationally parallel to *cam-ū́-* and *cam-asá-*. I therefore take *camrīṣá-* as belonging to the same semantic sphere as *camasá-* and *camū́-* and as the designation of a large cup or beaker. The problem that then arises is why Indra would be compared to such a thing; this aberrant simile may be responsible for the resistance to connecting *camrīṣá-* with the other *cam-* words. But this is only an apparent problem. The point of comparison is Indra's vastness (*śávasā*), the capaciousness with which he encompasses the peoples and natural features of the world (see also 14ab). An exactly parallel image is found in I.61.9, where Indra is called "a reverberant tankard" (*svaríṃ ámatraṃ*).

I.100.13: Most tr. take a and b as separate clauses, to avoid direct comparison of the mace (*vájraṃ*) with the bellowing (*raváthaṃ*), but I consider this another example of the condensed and deliberately off-balance syntax of this hymn: the mace that roars is compared directly to the similar sound emanating from heaven; in other words, the verb *krandati* in the frame is transformed into the noun *raváthaṃ* in the simile.

I.100.14: Having described the vastness of Indra's power throughout the hymn, the poet now implicitly attributes the same vastness to his own hymn (*ukthám*) by juxtaposing it

with Indra's *mā́nam* 'measure', which encompasses the two worlds. With Old I take *mā́nam ukthám* as "coordinated and asyndetic."

I.100.17: The first hemistich appears to contain a pun on the patronymic of the poets named in cd, *vārṣāgirā́ḥ* -- with *vṛ́ṣṇe* in a, corresponding to the 1st compound member, and (*abhí) gṛṇanti* in b, to the root √*gṝ* 'sing, greet' found in the 2nd. The pun supports the derivation of *vārṣagirá-* from * *vṛṣā-gír-* 'having a bullish song' (so Gr) rather than from * *varṣā-gír-* 'welcoming the rain', as suggested by Scar (112) and endorsed by Mayrhofer (*Personnamen*, 82–83). The semantics of the proposed bull-compound seem superior to the proposed rain-compound, and the pun provides further evidence in its favor.

I.101 Indra

I.101.1: Supply *púraḥ* with fem. *kṛṣṇágarbhāḥ* in b. So, explicitly, Old, but standard tr. follow.

I.101.2: The adj. *aśúṣa-* almost always occurs with *śúṣṇa-* (6 of its 7 occurrences: II.14.5, 19.6; IV.16.2; VI.20.4, 31.3, and here) and is a textbook example of a phonological figure. It is generally taken as a derivative of √*aś* 'eat', meaning 'gefrässig' (standard tr., as well as Gr, AiG II.2.491, EWA s.v. *aś*) -- hence my 'insatiable', which is meant to produce a similar phonetic figure. I do wonder, though, if it's not a derivative of √*śvas* 'snort, pant', which would make it also an etymological figure with *śúṣṇa-*, used proleptically to mean "(wrenched him down) (to become) breathless." The phrase is almost always the object of a verb of violence, as here, and the proleptic adjective fits these contexts. For similar accent on a negated *-a*-stem compound, cf. *akṣára-* 'imperishable', *ajára-* 'unaging', *adábha-* 'undeceptive'. Vs. 5c has a similar proleptic phrase, *dásyūm̐r ádharān* "(brought) the Dasyus low."

I.101.3: Pāda a lacks a verb. Tr. supply variously: Ge "sich fügen," Re "ont assigné," WG "folgen." I supply a form of √*vṛdh* 'strengthen, increase' on the basis of formulaically similar VIII.15.8 *táva dyaúr indra paúṃsyam, pṛthivī́ vardhati śrávaḥ*, and other passages where *paúṃsyam* is obj. of √*vṛdh* (I.155.3, VIII.6.31).

I.101.4: For the putative root √*ār* 'recognize' (< 'recognize as an Ārya'?), see comments ad VIII.16.6 as well as Old (Noten) on this vs.

I.101.6: The nonce form *jigyúbhiḥ* to a supposed stem *jigyú-* is surely an attempt at an instr. pl. of the pf. part., which is well attested (*jigīvā́n*, *jigyúṣ-*), but whose instr. pl. ought to be the monstrous* *jigivádbhiḥ* or (improperly using the prevocalic weak stem) * *jigyúrbhiḥ* or * *jigyū́bhiḥ*.

I.101.7: For the ring that connects this last Jagatī vs. with vs. 1, see publ. intro.

For the buried pun involving *pṛthú jráyaḥ* and the referent of *yóṣā*, Rodasī, see comm. ad I.168.7.

I.101.8: Ge and Re take *mādáyāse* only with b and supply the copula with a. The strict parallelism of the two clauses favors taking the verb of b with both, as I do, but the question may be whether Indra can reach exhilaration in heaven or can only do so at a human soma offering.

I.101.10: The referent of the dual *dhéne* "two streams" is not clear to me. Ge takes it as 'lips' (< 'the sucking ones'; see ad I.2.3), but in no other passage is 'lips' a possibility (though this doesn't stop Ge). Bloomfield (JAOS 46) suggests it is an elliptical dual, for prayers and libations, expressed by *dhénāḥ* and *dhā́rāḥ* respectively in III.1.9, but this relies on an outdated interpretation of *dhénā-* (see comm. ad I.2.3). H.-P. Schmidt (Fs. Nyberg) also considers it an elliptical dual, but is himself somewhat elliptical about what the ellipsis would be -- it seems that he considers it both literal (streams of milk) and figurative (streams of song). But RVic poets elsewhere do not resort to the dual to express a literal/metaphorical split. Re takes it as two streams of soma (without identifying which these would be), and WG as two milk-streams (again unidentified). I am inclined to assume that it has been attracted into the dual from the more regular pl. *dhénāḥ* by the immediately preceding *śípre* 'two lips', given the strict parallelism in syntax and phonology in the two clauses in this pāda: *ví ṣyasva śípre ví sṛjasva dhéne*, although the existence of another dual *dhéne* in V.30.9 in an obscure context, may weaken this attraction hypothesis.

I.102 Indra

I.102.1: As indicated in the publ. intro., I interpret the first half-verse very differently from the standard tr. The three major deviations from the ordinary interpretations are the following: 1) I take *te* in pāda a as referring to the poet, who is also the subj. of the 1st ps. verb *prá bhare*. This is the most radical of the departures and requires the most special pleading. 2) Rather than the loc. sg. of neut. *stotrá-* 'praise song' (a loc. not found elsewhere in the RV), I take *stotré* as the dat. sg. of the agent noun *stotár-* 'praiser', coreferential with *te* in a. This dat. is very common in the RV. 3) I take the first two words of b (*asyá stotré*) with the main cl. in a, starting the rel. cl. with *dhiṣáṇā*. This accords better with the placement patterns of *yá-* subordinators, which ordinarily do not follow more than one constituent.

As for the first departure, as I have pointed out elsewhere (see comm. on I.70.10), the 2nd sg. middle forms of the impv. (*prá*) *bharasva* / *bhárasva* (I.79.10, VII.88.1) are specialized for the self-address of the poet. Here, with the middle *prá bhare* I think the poet is speaking in the 1st ps. but addressing himself in the 2nd. I do have to admit that *prá* √*bhṛ* + DAT. otherwise has the divinity in the dative and so the *te* in 2nd position in the verse would immediately be interpreted as referring to Indra -- and, I have to argue, only as the verse unfolded would the referent be reinterpreted as the poet. Despite the complications of my interpretation, it solves the difficulties that arise from the standard interpr. First, that interpr. must take the *maháḥ* as coreferential with *te* (e.g., Re "à toi (qui es) grand"), but this makes the whole phrase genitival, and, as noted, the *prá* √*bhṛ* construction takes a dative (of the many exx., cf. I.143.1 *prá ... dhītím agnáye, ... bhare*). Then a referent must be supplied for the *asyá* opening pāda b; most supply "the singer." (Under my interpretation, the genitives *maháḥ ... asyá* are construed together and refer to

Indra, while *te ... stotré* is the datival phrase.) And the problems I already mentioned, that *stotré* is otherwise only the dative of the agent noun and that *yád* comes too late to govern the whole b pāda, also remain in the standard tr.

But what does it mean, in my interpretation, when the poet says "*I* present to *you* this thought," with both "I" and "you" referring to himself. As I suggest in the publ. intro., the poet is announcing that he has finished composing the hymn, which can now be recited to the god at the ritual performance, also by himself (the poet). A slightly attenuated alternative would be to take *te* as referring to a different member of the larger group of ritual performers, who is charged with reciting the hymn that "I" have just composed.

I.102.2: The phrase *dyā́vākṣā́mā pṛthivī́* is striking because *pṛthivī́* 'earth' either doubles the less common 'earth' word *kṣā́mā* in the du. dvandva or else serves as the epithet ('the broad') it historically was. Indeed because *pṛthivī́* is grammatically ambiguous (sg. or du.), it could modify both heaven and earth, or it could stand as a second elliptical du. referring to both. The same phrase is found in III.8.8 and, with *-bhū́mī* rather than *kṣā́mā*, in X.65.4.

I believe that there is a closer connection between the two halves of the verse than the standard tr. seem to. In my opinion the sun and moon roam alternately in order to provide constant illumination, so that we can see Indra's "wondrous form lovely to see" (*darśatáṃ vápuḥ*) and therefore put trust in him, that is, in his existence. Remember that a constant source of worried speculation in the RV is whether Indra exists or not -- a worry that is regularly alleviated by his epiphany on our ritual ground. Here the mere sight of his form will allay our worries and allow us to trust that he exists. Ge attributes the actions of cd just to the fact that Indra is the creator of sun and moon, while Re has us looking at the sky.

I.102.3: Re takes c with d as a single clause, but I follow Ge (/WG) in supplying 'help' from ab as the verb of c. Passages like I.176.5 *ājā́u ... prā́vaḥ... vājínam* support this latter interpr.

I.102.5: *hávamānā(ḥ)* is one of the uncommon, but not vanishingly rare examples of a pres. part. functioning as the main verb of a clause. See also 103.4 below.

Given the fronted full pronoun *asmā́kam* in c and its contrast with the various peoples in ab, more emphasis should have been placed on "our" in the publ. tr.

I.102.6: I tr. *amita-* as 'matchless' rather than 'immeasurable' because of its etym. connection with *pratimā́na-* 'match' (6c, 8a), *amātrá-* 'matchless' (7c).

The Pp. reads *akalpáḥ* in c, and following this reading has led to very "free" (so Old) tr. of the word and interpr. of the syntax (e.g., Ge "Durch seine Stärke macht Indra ein Gegengewicht unmöglich"; Re is even freer), where "(macht) unmöglich" for *akalpá-* seems distinctly odd and the syntactic relation between it and *pratimā́nam* is loose at best. The difficulties disappear if we instead read loc. *akalpé*. As Old points out, by accent the word should be a bahuvrīhi. The one example of *kálpa-* in the RV seems to refer to arrangements, ritual or martial (IX.9.7: *ávā kálpeṣu naḥ pumas, támāṃsi soma yódhyā* "help us in our arrangements, o male; the shades of darkness must be fought"), and a

bahuvrīhi "without arrangement/order" modifying an underlying 'battle'-word (perhaps *khaja-* 'tumult' extracted from immediately preceding *khajaṃkaráḥ*) makes perfect sense in context.

This leaves an equational sentence *índraḥ ... pratimā́nam ójasā* "by his strength Indra is the match," and we need only supply the specification of what he is the match for. I sc. 'all' on the basis of II.12.9c, also describing Indra: *yó víśvasya pratimā́nam babhūva*. However, esp. in conjunction with 8ab, it might instead be the earth, or heaven and earth. Cf. I.52.13 (also of Indra) *tvám bhuvaḥ pratimā́nam pṛthivyā́ḥ* (also 12); X.111.5 *índro diváḥ pratimā́nam pṛthivyā́ḥ*.

I.102.7: As in 2b we find an original epithet of the earth, *mahī́* 'the great one', which comes to be used as a straight designation of it, doubling a word that may also refer to the earth, *dhiṣáṇā*. This combination also occurs elsewhere (III.31.13, X.96.10); the former passage is an esp. close parallel to this one, in that *mahī́ ... dhiṣáṇā* sets Indra on the attack. With Kü (224: "Dich ... hat die Dhiṣaṇā entflammt") I therefore take *titviṣe* here as transitive, though in its other occurrences it is not. For another passage in which the earth aids Indra in his heroic deeds, see IV.16.7b *prā́vat te vájram pṛthivī́* ...

I.102.8: Contra most tr., I prefer to take ab as separate clauses, rather than as anticipating *bhúvanam* in c.

The difference between *triviṣṭi-dhā́tu-* and *tri-dhā́tu-* (used of *bhū́ma* in IV.42.4) is not clear to me. The stem *triviṣṭí-* on its own (IV.6.4, 15.2) qualifies Agni's ritual actions as performed "with triple toil" (√*viṣ* 'be active, labor'), but that sense doesn't work here. As far as I can see, it's a way of indicating that the divisions each have three divisions of their own, but the semantic pathway to this value is unclear.

I.102.9: The standard tr. take *upamanyú-* as a PN. Mayrhofer (*Personenname*) voices skepticism, however, and I see no reason not to take it as an adjective qualifying the bard (*kārú-*). Though *manyú-* 'battle fury' can be a negative quality, it often is not so viewed (esp. when it belongs to the gods), and the passionate energy it implies would be a good trait for a poet.

The impv. *kṛṇotu* in d should be read (with the standard tr.) with both c and d, with slightly different values: in c it has a straight "make X Y" sense, while in d it participates in the idiom *puráḥ* √*kṛ* 'make (i.e., put) in front'.

I.102.10: On the sense of *ná dhánā rurodhitha*, see comm. ad X.42.9.

In b the singular loc. *ājā́* appears to be modified by two loc. plurals *árbheṣu* and *mahátsu* (so Old, Ge, Re); cf. I.81.1 *mahátsu ājíṣūtém árbhe* with a different imbalance of number. WG take the plurals separate from the singular ("im Wettkampf um kleine (Dinge) und um grosse") (see their note). This is possible but unnecessary.

I.103 Indra

I.103.1: On the interpr. of this verse, see publ. intro. Although my interpr. generally follows Ge et al., I take the first two pādas as referring disjunctively to the two locations

of Indra's power (not just to the heavenly one), an idea that is more straightforwardly expressed in c, which I consider grammatically connected to ab.

For the notion in d of a *ketú-* linking heaven and earth, see III.55.2 and VII.9.1. Despite its position I take *iva* as marking the following *ketú-* as a simile.

I.103.2: On the morphology of *papráthat* see comm. ad VII.86.1. It presumably owes its accent here to starting a new clause (or clause within a clause).

The presence of the shadowy Rauhiṇa here (otherwise only II.12.12) is an intrusion in this Vṛtra-oriented verse. The verb that governs him, *ví √bhid* 'split apart', returns in the next verse with 'strongholds" as its object. The distraction of verb and preverb with object in the middle (*ábhinad rauhiṇáṃ ví*) is almost iconic for the splitting apart. For a potentially similar ex. see V.30.7.

I.103.3: The iconic splitting of verb and preverb in 2c is complemented here in b by the polarized positioning of the NP "Dāsa strongholds," the object of *vibhindán*, at the beginning and end of the pāda: #*púraḥ ... dā́sīḥ* #, while the preverb+verb are univerbated in the participle (as against 2c).

Ge (/WG) take *śraddádhāna ójaḥ* as transitive-reflexive, "trusting in his own power," but as Old argues, *śrád √dhā*, a signature word of this set of hymns, expresses the trust that people have in Indra, and the medial participle should therefore be taken as a passive (so also Re). For the other occurrences of *śrád √dhā* that support this interpr., see vs. 5 in this hymn (structurally paired with 3; see publ. intro.), as well as I.102.2, 104.6–7.

I.103.4: The syntax and purport of this verse are somewhat murky, and my interpretation differs from the various other standard ones (though it is closest to Re). I will only present mine here, without cataloguing the differences from the others. First, I take *tád ūcúṣe* as a separate clause, with a new clause beginning in the middle of pāda a with *mā́nuṣemā́ yugā́ni*, which I take as an acc. of extent of time, as it is several times elsewhere (e.g., II.2.2).

The rest of the verse concerns the epithets or "names" Indra has and, in part, how he acquires them: *maghávan-* 'bounteous' in b, *vajrín-* 'mace-bearer' in c, and *sūnúḥ* (*śávasaḥ*) 'son (of strength)' in d. Note that the names are all in the nom., though appositional to acc. *nā́ma*. For a parallel see, e.g., X.28.12. On Indra's acquisition of a sequence of names, see also VIII.80. I take c as containing the predication of the main clause, with the pres. part. *upaprayán* functioning as the main verb (see I.102.5 above).

The referent of *tád* in the first clause is unclear. Though it may be *nā́ma*, as most tr. think, I'm inclined to take it as an internal reference to the hymn that the poet is presenting to him.

In d the expected epithet "son of strength" is truncated, lacking the *śávasaḥ*, but the phonologically and derivationally parallel *śrávase* that immediately follows *sūnúḥ* would evoke it.

On this verse as an omphalos, see publ. intr.

I.103.7: For the "deep-structure pun" in pāda b, see the publ. intro. and Jamison 1982/83 and 2007: 110-12. That the action in this clause is not to be taken literally is, I think,

signalled by the *iva* in the main clause in pāda a, which introduces the heroic deed (*vīryàm*) supposedly depicted in b. My "as it were" renders the *iva.*

In c Ge takes the wives (*pátnīḥ*) as the wives of the gods, but in this Vṛtra context it makes more sense to take them as the (fem.) waters whom Indra had just released. Recall that in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32 (as well as in V.30.5, VIII.97.18), the waters are called *dāsápatnīḥ* (vs. 11), "whose husband was a dāsa" (that is, Vṛtra). This might be clearer if the publ. tr. read "His wives."

The interpretation of the final part of this pāda, *váyaś ca*, is disputed. Ge (/WG) and Re take it as an acc. of *váyas-* conjoined with *tvā* ("dir ... und deiner Kraft"). However, already Sāy considered it the nom. pl. of *ví-* 'bird', which is equally possible grammatically, and I have adopted this interpr. (Old seems tacitly to accept this interpretation, by citing X.80.5, which also contains birds.) Sāy's suggested referent is the Maruts, which makes good sense. The two groups on site at the Vṛtra battle and able to give encouragement and praise to Indra then were the waters and the Maruts, who, in many accounts of the myth, provided Indra with moral and tactical support.

I.103.8: *kúyava-* 'bringing bad harvest' is ordinarily an epithet of Śuṣṇa, and I so take it here even though it is separated from *śúṣṇam* by another PN. I ascribe this position to the fact that *kúyava-* always appears after the caesura. However, in the next hymn (104.3) Kuyava seems to be an independent personage, or rather there is no overt mention of Śuṣṇa -- so perhaps he should be accorded an independent existence here as well (with the standard tr.).

I.104 Indra

I.104.1: As noted in the publ. intro., *sᵘvānó nā́rvā* in b contains a triple pun, since the participle *sᵘvānáḥ* can be read in three different ways: 1) as nom. sg. to the adj. *svāná-* 'sounding' (√*svan* 'sound') (so Old, Re, WG); 2) as athem. med. part. to √*sū* 'impel', used passively (so Ge); 3) as athem. med. part. to √*su* 'press', also used passively (mentioned by Ge in n. 1b). In this last case the simile would compare Indra seating himself on the ritual ground to soma placed at the soma press. The diction in the rest of this hemistich is quite similar to that found in soma hymns. Cf., e.g., IX.70.7 *ā́ yóniṃ sómaḥ súkṛtaṃ ní ṣīdati*, with *yóni-*, a form of √*kṛ* characterizing it, and the verb *ní* √*sad*. In the publ. tr. only the first of these is given, because including a set of bracketed alternatives -- "[/ like a steed having been impelled [/ like (soma) the steed being pressed]" -- seemed disruptive and distracting.

Pāda b contains the word *váyaḥ*, which raises the same question as in 103.7: is this the plural to *ví-* 'bird' or the neuter sg. *s*-stem *váyas-* 'vitality, vigor'? Neither of them is an entirely natural object to *vimúcyā* 'having released' in this context. Ge (/WG) opt for the latter, Old and Re for the birds. In the publ. tr. I treat it as a pun, but I am not certain what either phrase would represent.

In d *váhīyasaḥ* is of course a comparative, but, again, so rendering it would be awkward.

I.104.2: Unlike the standard tr. I take the two acc. plurals in b, *tā́n ... ádhvanaḥ*, separately, with the first referring to the 'men' (*náraḥ)* of pāda a. One might object that

since they "have come" (*guḥ*) to him in that pāda, he has no need to go to them in the next, but, at least in English, "go to for help" is tantamount to "ask for help" and need not involve any actual travel on the part of the men. And in any case he would need to join them at the place of battle. I.71.9, which contains the phrase *ádhvanaḥ sadhá éti* without *tā́n*, may support me.

For the pf. opt. *jagamyā́t*, see Jamison 2009 (*East and West)*; as exhaustively demonstrated there, the pf. opt. has no special "perfect" value and here means simply "should go."

The publ. tr. reflects the emendation of *ścamnan* to **śamnan*, suggested by Gr and argued for in Jamison 1983: 103 n. 62. I am now less certain about this emendation than I was then, being more sympathetic to Old's questioning how this corruption could have arisen. On the other hand, the Aves. gerundive *scąϑβa-* (V.13.40), adduced by Ge as a cognate to a supposed root √*ścam*, provides no support for a separate etymon of this shape, since it is, with Insler, better attributed to the root **skand* 'break', well attested in Avestan and elsewhere in Iranian. For details see Jamison 1983 loc. cit.

I.104.3: For my general interpr. of this verse see publ. intro. I will not discuss the various other interpretations in detail here or repeat what I said in the intro. I *will* point out that most tr. take the subject of both a and b to be the Śiphā river in 4, but this assumes that a and b are essentially repetitions of each other, which would constitute an unartful duplication in a very artful hymn. Since pādas cd contain dual feminines, it makes more sense to take ab as an implicit "the one ... the other" construction, with the two subjects the same as the duals in cd. One problem with this interpr. is that the verb *áva ... bharate* in pāda a lacks an overt object; I suggest in the intro. that it might be defilement or pollution that is also removed ritually by the *avabhṛthá* bath at the end of the classic Vedic sacrifice.

In d we find a periphrastic passive construction: *haté ... syātām* "may the two be smashed." Though this periphrasis is somewhat unusual, even a stray thought of what the 3rd du. middle opt. of the passive of √*han* would be (**hanyeyātām*) may explain the substitution. According to Macdonell (VG), such forms are not attested in Vedic.

I.104.4: Likewise consult the publ. intro. for my interpr. of this verse.

In b *prá ... tirate*, whose regular object is *ā́yus-* 'lifetime' (which I supply here), plays off the name Āyu in the previous pāda. With Old and WG I supply 'dawns' with *pū́rvābhiḥ*, on the basis of V.48.2, adduced by Old.

I supply Sarasvatī in c, because the only other occurrence of *vīrápatnī* (VI.49.7) refers to Sarasvatī.

I.104.5: Again, consult the publ. intro. As noted there, I think the unidentified female in b is Dawn, who leads the Ārya forces across the river(s) and against the Dasyu. The other standard tr. take her rather as Saramā, Indra's canine sidekick, on the fragile basis of III.31.6: the only point of contact between the two passages being the rather generic *jānatī́ gāt* "recognizing, she went." I see no reason to introduce Saramā here; Dawn has been anticipated by the apparent reference to the dawns in 4b (*pū́rvābhiḥ*), and the revealing (*ádarśi* -- a standard item of Uṣas vocabulary) of the Dasyu's streambed / strategy could easily happen at dawn.

In d *niṣṣapín-* is a hapax, but 'without care, careless' (√*sap* 'serve, care for') makes sense.

I.104.7: The *śrád √dhā* lexeme is repeated here from the immediately preceding pāda (6d; cf. also I.103.3, 5). Curiously the announced "trust" seems to be undercut by *manye* "I think." The phrase *te asmai* expressing the recipient of the trust requires some comment. Ge seems to take *te* as a dative, parallel to *mahatá indriyā́ya* in 6d, and *asmai* adverbially ("dafür"). But 6d also contains a *te*, which must be the genitive limiting the dat. phrase, and such an interpretation fits better here, with *te* dependent on *asmai*. What is the referent of *asmai*, whose referent should already be present in the discourse because of the lack of accent on *asmai*? The easiest interpretation is that it simply picks up *indriyā́ya* of 6d (so Re), but again, as in 3ab, this would seem an unartful duplication. Although my interpr. requires taking into account a longer stretch of discourse, it avoids the repetitive scenario. In I.103.1 Indra is credited with *indriyá-* in two locations, heaven and earth, and I think the dual nature of this *indriyá-* is what is at issue here: the heavenly one in 6d, the one right here (hence the near-deictic *asmai*) in 7a. So although *asmai* picks up the *indriyā́ya* of 6d, it also refers to a different aspect of this referent.

Hoffmann (1967: 53, followed by WG) tentatively suggests taking cd as a single clause. This avoids the need to supply a verb in a, but the "unprepared womb" (Hoffmann's "an unbereiteter Stätte") of c does not seem to have much to do semantically with d.

The object phrase *váya āsutím* in d, in conjunction with the dat. part. *kṣúdhyadbhyaḥ* 'hungering', invites an interpretation of the pair as "food and drink" (Ge "stärkende Speise und Trank"; Hoffmann just "Speise und Trank"; WG "Nahrung und Trank"). But the abstract nature of *váyas-* should be respected, and I also doubt that *āsutí-* is just any drink, rather than referring to the soma pressing. As for what it all means -- I would suggest that cd be interpreted in the context of the rest of the hymn, particularly the outer framework depicting Indra's aid to the Ārya in conflict. They are here asking him not to drop them into battle without proper means ("into an unprepared womb"); the d pāda then expresses what they need: vital energy, that is, the physical and mental vigor required for combat, and the soma pressing, that is, the ritual means to attract Indra and secure his aid. Vs. 9 then issues the invitation to the soma drinking.

I.104.8: This verse details various possible bad outcomes if they do not manage to secure his aid. As indicated in the publ. intro., I take the "eggs" (*āṇḍā́*) and "cups" (*pā́trā*) as slangy references to male and female genitalia, or in the latter case perhaps better 'wombs'. I tr. *-jānuṣāṇi* loosely 'contents', but if the "cups" are wombs, then 'progeny, offspring, brood' would work.

I.105 All Gods

For the structure and meaning of the hymn as a whole see the publ. intro. as well as Jamison 2007: 82-85. In what follows here I will comment only on the details of particular verses.

In discussing previous interpretations of the hymn, I misrepresented Bloomfield, who seems to have meant his interpretation of the old poet out of a job only for X.33, which contains our vs. 8 distributed across two vss. (X.33.2, 3).

I.105.1: The waters in which the moon finds itself are probably, with Lü (577–78), the heavenly ones, though I generally resist Lüders's celestial floods. The waters here may be the same as the heavenly waters in vs. 11, as Lü suggests.

Most tr. take *suparṇáḥ* in b as referring to the moon (*candrámāḥ*) in a, but in fact when *suparṇá-* refers to a single heavenly body (see vs. 11), it is always the sun. In keeping with the depiction of cosmic and earthly order at the beginning of the hymn, the regular alternation of the journeys of sun and moon opens the verse.

Most tr. take *vidyutaḥ* as referring not to the lightning flashes the word usually denotes, but to stars -- a departure that is simply incomprehensible to me. The point of this verse seems fairly clear: three different sources of light in heaven are mentioned: moon, sun, and lightning. The alternation and the courses of sun and moon are predictable and regular, but that of the lightning is not -- as "they do not find your track" announces.

As stated in the publ. intro., I think the refrain is calling on Heaven and Earth to bear witness to the poet's musings. The double genitive (or dat.-gen.) *me asyá*, with accented demonstrative, contrasts with *te asmai* in the last hymn (by the same poet), I.104.7a. In that passage I take unaccented *asmai* as picking up a referent already in the discourse, *indriyá-* in 6d (in accord with the usual distribution of the accented and unaccented oblique forms of the demonstrative). Here I take it as referring to a referent not yet in the discourse, the poet's speech, again in accord with the usual distribution. Ge (/WG) oddly tr. as if it were a loc. ("in solcher Lage" / "in dieser Lage"; sim. Scar). Re takes it as coreferential with *me:* "moi tel (que je suis)." Old (ZDMG 61.826 [KlSch.257]) is closest to my interpr. For a somewhat similar expression see II.32.1ab, also X.10.5 in the Yama/Yamī hymn, in which Yama asserts that Heaven and Earth know "this" about them: *véda nāv asyá prthivī́ utá dyaúḥ*.

Note the juxtaposed contrastive verbs: *vindanti* (d) to √*vid* 'find', *vittám* (e, refrain) to √*vid* 'know'.

I.105.2: Although pāda a lacks a verb, the parallel VIII.79.5 *arthíno yánti céd ártham* suggests a form of 'go'.

The rest of the verse depicts sex between a married couple, a particularly important activity in maintaining earthly order and continuity. The mutual action, expressed by the middle dual *tuñjā́te*, probably refers to the expressing of semen, as in d, although the sexual juices of both husband and wife might be meant. In d either the husband or the wife may be the subject of *duhe*, depending in part on which root the gerund *paridā́ya* is assigned to: √*dā* 'give' (with *pári* 'deliver, surrender') or √*dā* 'bind'. I favor a pun.

I.105.3: The first half-verse expresses fears about cosmic order, the second about earthly order as maintained by the sacrifice. The verb in b*, áva pādi*, also picks up the sex/procreation theme of 2cd, in that *áva* √*pad* is an idiom specialized for miscarriage (Jamison, *Hyenas*, 203–4).

I.105.4–6: The questions that the poet asks Agni (in my view, vs. 4) and the gods (vss. 5–6) are reminiscent of the questions the poet (/Zarathustra) regularly directs to Ahura

Mazdā in the Gāthās, esp. Y 44, all of whose vss. except the last (20) begin "This I ask you – tell me straight, o Ahura."

I.105.4: Most tr. take *avamám* as modifying *yajñám*, but I take it as referring to the addressee, namely Agni (more clearly identified by his messenger role in b, *dūtáḥ*), in the usual double acc. construction with √*pṛch*. For Agni as *avamá-* see IV.1.5 *sá tváṃ no agne 'vamó bhavotī*. The poet asks Agni about the fate of the sacrifice/hymn (the "truth," *ṛtám*) when it has been offered: where does it go and does anyone get and keep it (in heaven). He wants Agni to answer, because Agni, as the messenger, has access to both worlds.

I.105.5: Just as Agni was located in his realm, as the nearest one, in vs. 4, here the gods' location is given before they are asked their questions. The poet now worries about what happens to his "truth" once it disappears from his sight and enters the realm of the gods -- is his "truth" theirs? Where did the offering he dispatched to them end up? The opening of the vs., *amī́ yé*, anticipates the omphalos in vss. 9–10.

The first pāda lacks a syllable. Old suggests reading *devā(ḥ)* as a trisyllable, but particularly since the identical voc. is disyllabic in 3a and nom./voc. pl. thematic endings (*-ās*) are not normally (/ever?) so resolved, I am not convinced. Rather I think that the metrical disturbance here may deliberately call attention to the opening *amī́ yé* and thus prepare for the omphalos verses that also begin that way. If the poet had wanted a trisyllabic voc. here he could easily have used the extended *devāsaḥ*.

Note the number discrepancy in *triṣú ... rocané*. Though it is possible to separate the two words (so WG) "in the luminous realm, in the three (worlds)," this seems unnec., esp. in light of expressions like I.102.8 *trī́ṇi rocaná*, V.69.1 *trī́ rocaná*. Better to assume a truncated *rocané(ṣu)*. I wonder if this truncation is also meant to complicate the audience's processing of this vs., as preparation for the omphalos vs.

I.105.6: The formation of the reasonably well-attested adj. *dharṇasí-* is unclear; AiG II.237 classifies it as having the almost unparalleled suffix *-así-*, and if it is formed to √*dhṛ*, as seems likely, the intrusive *-n-* is another problem (though cf. RV hapax *dharṇí-*). The *-n-* could perhaps be gotten from an extreme reduction of the *-man*-stem(s) *dharmán-* / *dhárman-*, but the rest is hard to generate.

The function of the word in its pāda is also unclear, as there is no obvious neut. for it to modify. (This adj. is otherwise always masc. and generally modifies soma, which does not help here.) I take the two syntactically parallel pādas a and b as each incomplete, to be completed by the other. In other words, I supply neut. *cakṣaṇam* from b in a, and the neut. adj. *dharṇasí* from a in b.

The publ. tr. fails to tr. *vaḥ* in a, so modify the tr. to "Is your (vision) of truth steadfast?" This helps solve one of the small puzzles of the verse: given Varuṇa in b and Aryaman in c, we might expect Mitra in a -- but instead we have "you," as in 5c, referring to the gods in general. As for the larger meaning of the questions, it may be that the poet is asking whether *ṛtá* is always the same (= *pūrvyám ṛtám* of 4c and *pratnā́ ... ā́huti*ḥ of 5d) or whether the gods change the rules on us.

I.105.7: I take the force of *purā́* + PRES as past progressive / habitual: "was always speaking, used to speak."

Since the verse contrasts the previous behavior of the speaker (a good ritualist, a hard-working poet) with his current mentally unhinged state, I take *tám mā* as "this (same) me" -- -- identifying the new careworn me with the old unfazed me. However, the nearly rhyming 8a (see below) may have had something to do with the *tám* here.

Note that *ādhī́yaḥ* occupies the same metrical position as *dūḍhī́yaḥ* in 6d.

I.105.8: This vs. breaks the paṅkti meter by substituting a 12-syllable pāda for 8 in c. (The vs. is also found distributed across two vss. in X.33.2, 3.) This metrical disturbance may set up the omphalos vss. that immediately follow.

Pāda a is almost a rhyme form with 7c *tám mā viyanti ādhíyaḥ* / 8a *sám mā tapanti abhitaḥ*, and 8c *ví adanti mā́dhíyaḥ* cleverly picks up *viyanti ādhíyaḥ* of 7c in a different metrical form (post-caesura trimeter, instead of dimeter).

Unlike the standard tr., I take the ribs (*párśavaḥ*) as a second simile, not marked with a simile particle (unless also covered by the preceding *iva*) because in the hymn in general the poet seems to express a "higher" distress than a backache -- instead a questioning of his previous mode of existence and his religious beliefs. That *pṛṣṭyāmayī́* 'having a stitch in his side' in 18d is also in a simile gives further support to the simile interpr. here.

I.105.9–10: As noted in the publ. intro., these verses are the omphalos and are marked, as often, by responsion and numerology. They seem to express the poet's vision of his connection with his distant ancestor Trita Āptya and also his vision of (somewhat unclear) cosmic phenomena.

I.105.9: Various referents have been suggested for the seven reins. I tentatively take them as the seven seers (note the phonological echo between *raśmáyah* and *ṛ́ṣayaḥ*), which would allow a connection to be established both with the poetic tradition and, if the seven seers are already equated with the stars in the Big Dipper (in the Great Bear) as they are later, with that astronomical structure. That the next verse also presents what appears to be an astronomical image supports this interpr. Moreover the phrase *tátrā me nā́bhir ā́tatā* "to there my umbilical cord is stretched" recalls the idiom "tie navel to navel" (*sám* / *ā́* √*dā*), which asserts a family connection between the earthly poet and divine or semi-divine figures and elements in heaven. See comm. ad I.139.1.

The verb 'rasps' (*rebhati*) may convey the sound of old man's voice, as would be appropriate for an ancestor.

I.105.10: I have no idea what the exact referent of the "five oxen" is, but given their stationing in the middle of heaven and their apparent retrograde motion, it seems that an astronomical body (a constellation?) is referred to. Ge (/WG) take *ní vāvṛtuḥ* as "sind ... verschwunden," but *ní* √*vṛt* ordinarily means 'turn back / home', of bovines, and given that the subject is oxen, albeit metaphorical ones, this idiom works fine in the passage. It also works nicely as a characterization of the 2nd vs. of the omphalos, on which the poem turns, leading back to the step-by-step verses that brought us to the center, but in reverse conceptual order. It is possible that *tasthúḥ* should be tr. "stand still / are standing still"

rather than just "stand" – a frequent usage of √*sthā* without preverb (see, e.g., the negated *átiṣṭhant-* 'not standing still' of the waters in I.32.10). This moment of stasis would precede the about-face to the return journey.

Ge eliminates the metaphor by rendering *ukṣáṇah* directly as "Sterne" (see his n. 10a) and in his n. 10 simply asserts that the vs. depicts the ending of the night. This oversimplifies the image and blurs the structural position this vs. occupies in the architecture of the hymn.

I.105.11: I am completely baffled about what this verse actually describes, although an astronomical reference is very likely. The many clashing interpretations of the verse do not inspire confidence in any of them. I will simply point out that we seem invited to identify the *suparṇā́ḥ* here with the *ukṣáṇaḥ* of 10a on the basis of the repetition of the phrase *mádhye* (...) *diváḥ* and the semantic match between *tasthúḥ* "they stand" (10b) and *āsate* "they sit" (11a), though the sg. *suparṇáḥ* in vs. 1 should also be recalled. The waters here are likely to be the same as those in vs. 1; see above.

I.105.12–15: This set of verses forms a small internal ring: 12 and 15 contain *ṛtám* and *návyam* / *návyaḥ* (though not to the same stem: *návya-* in 12, the comparative *návyas-* in 15, both neut. sg.), while 13–14 contain the responsive *sattó* (...) *manuṣvád ā́*, *devā́n ... vidúṣṭaraḥ*.

I.105.12–13: Each vs. contains a form of *ukthíya-*, which probably should have been tr. identically. However, note that the two nouns they modify are quite different: in 12a *ukthyà-* refers to something spoken, probably a hymn; in 13a it refers to friendship, which should be celebrated.

I.105.12: The *supravācanám* in b recalls *pravā́cyam* in 10c.

Note the contrast of *ṛtám* and *satyám*.

I.105.13–14: I do not know why 13cd and 14ab are virtually identical, save for switch in person (Agni in 2nd ps. in 13, 3rd in 14). Perhaps it shows that the poet/sacrificer can now make the ritual happen. The *yakṣi* of the 13d is a praiṣa of sorts, and then the poet somewhat triumphantly reports that his command worked. Agni, the god on earth and the messenger to the gods in heaven whom the poet questioned in vs. 4 has (re-?)established the ritual links between earth and heaven.

I.105.13: The pāda-final *ā́pitvam* recalls the likewise pāda-final patronymic *āptíyaḥ* in 9c.

I.105.16: Contains echoes of a number of previous vss. First, the *asaú yáḥ* opening recalls the *amī́ yé* openings of the two omphalos vss. (9–10), as well as the the *amī́ yé* of 5a, which anticipates the omphalos.

The "Ādityan path" (with one of the very rare instances of *ādityá-* used adjectivally), which is not to be overstepped (*ná ... atikráme*), recalls exactly 6cd ... *aryamṇáḥ ... pathā́, áti krāmema* "Along the path of Aryaman might we pass beyond [/step over] ..." The path theme is also found in 11c and later in 18b.

The *pravā́cyam* of b repeats the proclamation theme that has also been prominent in the hymn: *pravā́cyam* in 10c (an omphalos vs.), *supravācanam* (12b).

I.105.17: This verse, which provides Ge (and the Sanskrit tradition from which he got it) with his "Trita im Brunnen" interpretation, does not seem to me to fit into the rest of the hymn, though Trita is found in 9cd in a context much more in harmony with the rest. In the next hymn, I.106.6, it's Kutsa the poet who find himself in the same plight and calls upon Indra for help. The situation fits I.106 much better than I.105, and I wonder if it has been adapted from I.106.

I.105.18: On the destabilizing effect of this verse on the structure of the hymn, see publ. intro.

The pāda-final position of *hí* in b is quite curious.

I.106 All Gods

I.106.3: *supravācana-*, here used of gods, is found also in the preceding hymn, I.105.12.

I.106.4: The singular part. *vājáyan* in pāda a clashes with the 1st plural verb *īmahe* in b. With Ge (/WG) we can supply a 1st singular verb ("bitte ich") in the first pāda, but the discordance could be ascribed simply to the loose structure of this hymn.

I.106.5: Ge (/WG) take the 1st member of *mánurhita-* as functionally a dative ("für Manu bestimmt." Although this fits smoothly into the passage, I think it likely that the standard agentive reading of 1st members of ppl. compounds should stand here. Ge cites I.114.2 as parallel -- *yác cháṃ ca yóś ca mánur āyejé* -- but that passage states that it was Manu who won the luck and lifetime by sacrifice. In other words he was the agent, as he would be here in this compound.

I.107 All Gods

I.107.1: I take *ā́ ... vavṛtyāt* as transitive, with *vaḥ* as object, contra all standard tr. An intransitive tr. is tempting (and see VII.59.4), but this stem is overwhelming transitive elsewhere.

In the phrase *aṃhóḥ ... varivo-vittarā́* the abl. *aṃhóḥ* depends on the first member of the cmpd. For a nearly synonmyous expression see II.26.4 and comm. thereon.

I.108 Indra and Agni

I.108.1: The image of the chariot looking upon the creatures is a slightly odd one. Elsewhere (VII.61.1, X.85.18) almost identical pādas are used of the sun, and it may be that Indra and Agni's chariot here is identified with the sun, though such an identification would be unusual for these gods. Bl (RR) thinks rather that the poet "has borrowed and applied with a rather frenzied metaphor" the image of VII.61.1. It is worth quoting his characteristically acerbic comment on the image: "The students of the Rig-Veda are

steeped in the experience of its bold, often grotesque figures of speech, so that even a chariot that looks down from heaven excites no unusual emotion."

I.108.3: The signature word of this vs. is *sadhryàñc-* / *sadhrīcīná-* 'joint(ly), conjoined', which occurs prominently in the first three pādas. The final pāda is dense with phonological and etymological play: *vṛ́ṣṇaḥ ... vṛṣaṇā́ vṛṣethām*.

Ge (explicitly) and Re / Klein (DGRV I.373) / WG (all implicitly) take *vṛtrahaṇā* in b as a predicate vocative (so, "you two, conjoined, are Vṛtra-smashers"). I would prefer this interpretation, but think that the lack of accent should be taken seriously. Moreover, given the repetition of *sadhryàñc-* / *sadhrīcīná-* just noted, it may be that the conjunction of Indra and Agni is what is being highlighted, not their Vṛtra-smashing.

I.108.3–4: As noted in the publ. intro., vs. 3 attributes Indra's characteristic deed (Vṛtra-smashing) to both gods, while vs. 4 attributes Agni's characteristic ritual behavior to both.

I.108.4: Ge (/WG) construes the instr. phrase of pāda c with *ānajānā́* of pāda a (thus, "being anointed with soma"). Since pāda b intervenes, depicting two further ritual actions, I consider the syntactic connection of a and c unlikely, although I am sympathetic to the desire to find something to construe the instr. *tīvraíḥ sómaiḥ páriṣiktebhiḥ* with. I take that phrase rather as a loose circumstantial instrumental, almost equivalent to a loc. absolute.

Another reason not to take this instr. with 'being anointed' is that soma is an unlikely anointing medium for Agni, since it is more likely to quench the fire than to make it blaze up. An unexpressed 'ghee' is the likely medium in a.

This argument leads indirectly to an issue that all comm. (Ge, Old, Re, WG, Kü [p. 577]) raise: the actions of the first 3 pādas should be performed *for* the two gods, not *by* them. Much energy is expended in these comments in trying to make the gods into recipients, with the unexpressed agents being priests (e.g., Old's quotation of Benfey's tr. of pāda b "*für welche* der Opferlöffel und das Barhis ausgebreitet ist" [my italics]). This energy seems to me misplaced and the grammatical interpretation over-fussy. One of Agni's standard roles is that of priest, and the actions ascribed to him (and Indra) here fall squarely within this role. Since Indra is identified with Agni, he is just along for the ride, as it were -- just as Agni was in the preceding vs. as Vṛtra-smasher. Though it may seem a bit strange to have the gods already present on the ritual ground, performing the preliminaries to the sacrifice in abc, but, in pāda d, driving to the sacrifice, this merely switches the viewpoint to Indra's perspective: he always drives to the sacrifice; Agni is always already there. Since the two gods are identified here, we see the characteristic actions of each separately, but ascribed simultaneously to both.

I.108.5: I read *cakrathuḥ* of a also with b, though in a different sense. Ideally for this sense ('assumed, made your own') the verb of b would have been med. *cakrāthe*.

The referents of *tébhiḥ* in d are syntactically the neut. *yā́(ni)* phrases in abc, but it doesn't make much sense to "drink with" those particular referents. It would be possible to tr. *tébhiḥ* more heavily as "because of these" or the like, but I think the answer is simpler: rhetorical patterning trumps semantics. The poet is leading up to the loosely

attached refrain of vss. 6–12, whose last pāda is identical to 5d but with *áthā* rather than *tébhiḥ*; the *tébhiḥ* here serves as a transition between the earlier verses, where the d pāda is integrated into the verse and the refrain-marked verses to come. It is grammatically connected to but semantically estranged from the first three pādas of 5.

I.108.6: See the publ. intro. for the place of this vs. in the structure of the hymn.

The "choosing" of pāda a reinforces the priestly roles of Agni (and Indra) in the preceding vs., since the sacrificer's choosing of the priests is one of the first actions of the sacrifice -- particularly common is choosing Agni as Hotar.

The lexeme *ví √hvā* means 'vie in invoking', generally referring to our competition with other sacrificers in attempting to bring the gods, esp. Indra, to our sacrifice. This is precisely the sense that it has here, in my view. With W. E. Hale (*Asuras* 84–85), I take *ásuraiḥ* as referring to other human 'lords', in competition with us for the attention of the gods. Given the almost complete absence from the RV of the Asuras as a semi-divine group hostile to the Devas (for which see
Hale passim, also Jamison [2016 = Staal Ged.]), and given the standard use of *ví √hvā* for competition between mortals, I cannot follow the near-universal assumption that the later Asuras are present in this passage. The competitors that the poet is thinking of may well be the brahmin and king in 7b and the various named groups in 8ab.

The phrasing of pāda c is unusual, and the interpretation depends crucially on one's interpretation of *śraddhā́*. As I have discussed elsewhere (1996: 176–84), I take this resonant term to mean 'trust', particularly the trust between the parties involved in a hospitality relationship (of which the sacrifice is a most important and fraught subtype). Here the trust (*śraddhā́m*) of the 1st ps. speaker that his choosing will bear fruit and his competitive invocation will be successful comes true (*satyā́m*) and serves as a concretized goal of the gods' journey that demonstrates that the trust was not misplaced. *satyá-* is almost a proleptic adjective here. Most of the standard tr. approximate this interpr; Re's is closest to mine.

The *hí* in the refrain fragment *ā́ hí yātám* (through vs. 12) is difficult to account for under its usual functional headings. I have tentatively taken it as emphatic (a cop-out, I realize) and tr. it as "yes!" I am not convinced by Hettrich's treatment (*Hypotaxe* 376, 379–80) ascribing its use to a conditional structure.

I.108.8: For the named peoples in ab as the sacrificers with whom the poet is competing in vs. 6, see comments on that vs.

The two-pāda refrain of the rest of the hymn has finally taken shape here, out of partial phrases found earlier. Note also that the beginning of the c pāda (*átaḥ*) and that of the d pāda (*áthā*) are phonologically very close.

I.108.9–10: I do not see the purpose of two almost identical vss., but with the relative positions of the various earths reversed. Re calls it a "renversement formulaire, d'un type exceptionel" (EVP XIV.122).

I.108.11: The locations in pāda a are appropriate to both gods, but those in b are distinctly odd, esp. for Indra. An almost identical pāda is found also in I.91.4, of the domains of soma, where all three terms are fitting, and in I.59.3 of the locations of goods over which

Agni presides. A similar listing but without the mountains is found in III.22.2 of Agni (*yád óṣadhīṣv apsv ā́* ...), which again is apt for Agni. One has the feeling that the poet is trying to multiply the "wherever you are" verses and is not too scrupulous about his sources.

I.109 Indra and Agni

I.109.1: The kinship theme of the first hemistich is continued in pāda c, with *prámati-* 'solicitude', since this abstract noun is regularly identified with the father -- e.g., I.31.10 *tvám agne prámatis tvám pitā́si naḥ*. See further disc. ad I.71.7.

I.109.1–2: These two vss. are parallel in structure, with an initial *hí* clause with a 1st sg. augmented verb of perception ('see', 'hear'), with kinship terms in the second pāda, and in the last pāda a 1st sg. verb of production ('fashion', 'beget') with a verbal product as obj. ('thought', 'praise').

I.109.2: The standard word for son-in-law is simply *jā́mātar-*; the *ví-* is presumably a disparaging prefix (see Ge's n. 2a), here rendered by "no-count." *syālá-* is found only here in the RV, but is reasonably well attested in later texts and has good MIA correspondents.

I.109.3: The context of this verse is clearly the soma sacrifice, but there is no general agreement on the identity (/-ties) of the participants. I am inclined to see the pl. bulls as the pressing stones, which are then renumbered as dual in the last pāda. Pressing stones are called bulls, are yoked, have reins, and are plural in pressing-stone hymns (for all these, see, e.g., X.94, esp. vss. 6–8). But it is also possible that the bulls here are the priests guiding the stones. I find highly unlikely Old's view that the two stones in d are Indra and Agni.

I.109.4: In the ritual actions depicted in pāda d, *apsú* most naturally goes with *ā́ dhāvatam* and *mádhunā* with *pṛ́ñktám*. Old insists that this must be the interpr., and all standard tr. follow him one way or the other. However, both the word order and, more importantly, the accent on *pṛ́ñktám* make that impossible, if we take the text seriously. The poet must have meant the ritual reversal.

I.109.5: The first hemistich echoes 2ab, with a 1st sg. past tense of √*śru*, a dual pronominal obj. referring to Indra and Agni, of which a compared adjective (comparative / superlative) is predicated. See also Watkins 1995: 187.

In d I read with Old (and the standard tr.) *prácarṣaṇī*; see also Thieme (KlSch 252). This requires no change to the Saṃhitā text, but only to the Pp., which analyses the sequence as two words. The next pāda begins *prá carṣaníbhyaḥ*, which definitely consists of two words, which could easily have led to the Pp. separation.

I.109.7: I do not entirely understand the purport of the second half-verse. Ge compares VII.76.4, which shows some similarities and which refers to the forefathers finding the light of the dawn cows in the Vala cave. Much closer by is vs. 12 of the last hymn

(I.108), in which Indra and Agni are urged to become exhilarated at sun rise in the middle of heaven. One way or another this must be a reference to the dawn sacrifice.

I.110 Ṛbhus

I.110.1: As Ge points out, the mention of the All Gods (*viśvádevya-*) marks the ritual reference as the Third Pressing, which is dedicated to the All Gods and in which the Ṛbhus have their share. This suggests that the repeated stretching in pāda a need not refer only to the periodic nature of Vedic sacrifice over the ritual year, but also perhaps to the repeated rites of the Soma pressing day. Since the theme of the "left-over" is prominent in the Third Pressing (see Jamison 1996: 129–32), "being stretched out again" fits this context.

I.110.2: As indicated in the publ. intro., the wandering Ṛbhus seem here to be compared to the poet and his ilk, tramp craftsmen in search of skilled work -- as Ge already suggests. (For more on itinerant priests and poets, esp. the Prātaritvan, see Jamison 1996: 184–89.) This transposition of divinities into a milieu conceived as human may account for the use of *dāśváṃs-*, a stem ordinarily used of mortal worshipers, for Savitar – with the god Savitar standing in for a pious man to whom the itinerant poets might offer their services. For more on divine *dāśváṃs-*, see comm. ad X.104.6.

In pāda b *ápākāḥ* is universally interpreted as 'westward', derived from *ápāñc-*, contrasted with immediately following *práñcaḥ* 'facing eastward'. So, e.g., Ge "Als ihr ... westwärts, ostwärts weiter zoget." Although the direction words frequently co-occur, one might expect the stem formations here to be parallel, that is, using a form of *ápāñc-* rather than a derivative. Cf., e.g., *prág ápāg údāk* (III.53.11, VIII.4.1=VIII.65.1). Moreover, the Ṛbhus' journey seems to be purposeful and directed, given the two *prá* forms (... *prá ... aítana ... práñcaḥ*) and the fact that they reach a goal. I take *ápāka-* instead as a privative form of *páka-* 'callow, simple(ton)', hence 'not simple; clever, shrewd'; cf. *ámūra-* 'not stupid, no fool' to *mūrá-* 'stupid'.

The tone of the locution *máma ké cid āpáyaḥ* is somewhat hard to read; it is reminiscent of V.52.12 *té me ké cin ná tāyávaḥ*. The effect seems to be approximative -- "some kind of X," "more or less like X" -- and slightly slangy. The referent of the *máma* is the 1st ps. speaker of vs. 1, contra Re, who takes the phrase as the direct speech of (one of?) the Ṛbhus.

I.110.3: *ā́suvat* 'impelled' is of course a pun on Savitar, its subject.

The final pāda is parallel to 2a: ... *prá yád ichánta aítana / ... yác chravayánta aítana*, each with a pres. part. combined with the main verb *aítana*. What exactly is happening in 3d is unclear, since Agohya is a shadowy figure in Ṛbhu mythology. In Ṛbhu hymns they sleep in his house (I.161.11, IV.33.7); the most similar passage to ours is I.161.13, where the Ṛbhus after their sleep ask him *ágohya ká idáṃ no abūbudhat* "O Agohya, who has awakened us here/now?" In our passage the mirror-image action seems to be depicted -- they're making him heed, that is, waking him up. I do not know what to do with this observation, however.

I.110.4: I do not understand why the Ṛbhus are called *vāghát-* here, since this term is ordinarily used of ritual officiants (see comm. ad I.3.5) and the Ṛbhus only indirectly participate in ritual. Ge tr. "die fahrende (?) Sänger," but he provides no support for the itinerant part of the tr.

As Ge points out, *sū́ra-cakṣas-* is characteristic of gods; in I.89.7 it is used almost as a definition of such. So it may well here be an ancillary indication that the Ṛbhus achieved divine status.

I.110.5: *úpastutā* in the Saṃhitā text is universally taken, flg. the Pp., as the nom. pl. of the past part., *úpastutāḥ*. I take it rather as the loc. sg. of *úpastuti-* 'praise-invocation'. It doesn't make sense to me that, after having been praised, they would be "crying in want" and seeking (further?) fame, whereas if they lack praise at the praise invocation, their seeking fame is understandable. Loc. sg. *-ā* to *-i-*stems is found only interior in the pāda as here, but almost always before consonants. However, AiG III.152 counts 9 occurrences before *-u-/-ū-*, as here.

Ge and Re take *upamám* as the obj. of *nā́dhamānāḥ*, but that stem is never transitive (as Re admits), and it appears in the preceding hymn (I.109.3) in clear intransitive usage. I take the adj. with *śrávaḥ* in d. It would also be possible to take it as an adverb: "in utmost need." WG construe it with the cup in b; this seems the least likely possibility, since the miraculous deed of the Ṛbhus is depicted only in the first hemistich, quite separately their quest for fame in the second.

I.110.6: The conceptual basis for the common trope of "pouring prayers" is made clear here by the simile "like ghee with a ladle."

Because of its lack of accent *asya* cannot modify *pitúḥ* and it should have a referent already present in the discourse. The referent is generally taken as the cup of vs. 5 and its father as Tvaṣṭar. I do not have anything better to offer.

Ge's tr. of c seems very loose and somewhat puzzling: "... die die Pünktlichkeit seines Vaters erreichten ..." He seems to be taking *taraṇitvā́* as neut. pl. rather than instr. sg. (like *taraṇitvéna* in 4a) and imposing a meaning "erreichten" on *saściré* that stretches the semantics of that stem. Re makes a good case for the instr. interpretation, and supplies an acc. "(l'exemple)" that allows the usual 'follow' sense for the verb. My tr. is similar.

vā́ja- in d is a low-key pun on the name of one of the Ṛbhus.

I.110.7: In my interpr. the individuation of the Ṛbhus continues in ab, though not with their usual names.

Note the switch in number between the opening of 6d *ṛbhávo vā́jam* (pl. – sg.) and that of 7b *ṛbhúr vā́jebhiḥ* (sg. – pl.).

In b the instr. pls. *vā́jebhir vásubhiḥ* are ordinarily taken as proper names and instr. of accompaniment. I instead take them as defining the quality for which the Ṛbhu gets designated 'good one' and 'giver'. My tr. also assumes a chiastic structure in *vā́jebhir vásubhiḥ vásur dadíḥ*, with the first instr. construed with the last nom. sg. and the middle two terms belonging together.

The analysis of *pṛtsutí-* is debated (see, e.g., Re EVP XIII.108; AiG II.2.640 §473a*β*A.; III.73, §29b; II.1 Nachtr. 67). On the one hand, it appears to be a compound consisting of the root noun *pṛ́t-* and a primary *-ti-*stem, probably to √*sū* 'impel' (with

shortening, like *sú-ṣuti* to the other root √*sū* 'give birth'). On the other, since the root noun *pṛ́t-* is only attested in the loc. pl. *pṛtsú* (though the root is also found in the derivatives *pṛ́tanā-*, etc.), *pṛtsutí-* appears to be a secondary *-tí-* stem anomalously built to a case form. This seems to be the current standard view. However, it seems entirely possible to me that we are dealing with a haplology of **pṛtsu-sutí-* (or *-sūtí-*), and my tr. reflects this analysis.

I.110.9: Again the standard tr. take *vájebhiḥ* as a proper name.

I.111 Ṛbhus

I.111.1: *vidmanā́pasaḥ* is formally odd, though clear in meaning. Given the independent instr. *vidmánā* in the preceding hymn (I.110.6), we might expect a phrase **vidmánā *apásaḥ* "working with know-how," with the internally derived *apás-* 'laboring' to neut. *ápas-* 'labor'. But though the sandhi would support this interpr., the accents are wrong on both words. For Wackernagel's somewhat confused treatment of the cmpd., see comm. ad I.31.1. The correct analysis is, in my view, *vidmanā-ápas-*, a bahuvrīhi built to the neut. *s*-stem *ápas-* 'labor', work', with the instr. to *vidmán-* as 1st member. The 2nd member receives the accent, somewhat unusually for a bahuvrīhi, like some other cmpds. with *-as*-stems as 2nd member.

Ge refuses to tr. *víṣaṇvasū*, which seems just peevish, given the far more difficult words he's willing to tr.

I.111.3: On √*mah* 'bring to pass', see comm. ad I.94.1.

I.111.5: Ge takes *bhárāya* as a (quasi-)infinitive with *sātím* as obj. ("dass wir den Gewinn davontragen"), but the other exx. of dat. *bhárāya* do not show such verbal usage.

I.112 Aśvins

On the structure of the hymn, see the publ. intro. The challenging verses are the first four. I will not comment on the many obscure mythic fragments that constitute the Aśvins' various rescues, nor attempt to etymologize the many personal names.

I.112.1: *pūrvácitti-* is variously interpreted and much discussed: see the long notes of Ge and Re ad loc., as well as Old, KlSch 1152–56 (=NG 1916). The stem always occurs in the dat. and displays (quasi-)infinitival usage. Although it would be possible to take it as "(for me/us) to think first (of them)" and in the first pāda of a hymn this would be easily interpretable as a ritual reference, I consider it to have the opposite value: "(for them) to think first (of me/us)." Kutsa repeatedly calls on Heaven and Earth to be witness to his speech in the refrain of I.105: *vittám me asyá rodasī*. Cf. also X.35.1 *mahī́ dyā́vāpṛthivī́ cetatām ápaḥ* "Let great Heaven and Earth take cognizance of (our) work." For further on *pūrvácittaye* see comm. ad IX.99.5.

The stem *iṣṭí-* is a perennial problem, since it can belong to several different roots: √*iṣ* 'desire, seek', √*iṣ* 'send, impel', or √*yaj* 'sacrifice'. Ge (n. 1b) takes it here to an intransitive *iṣ* 'rasch, gern willig kommen, eilen', though his tr. 'sich beeilen' might seem to connect it with a reflexive sense of 'send, impel'. By isolating *iṣṭáye* from the acc.

gharmám, he then needs to supply another verb to govern that acc., namely "(zu kochen)." Old (KlSch 282–84 [=ZDMG 62 (1908)]), however, gives good reasons to connect our *iṣṭáye* with 'seek', though his interpr. of this pāda differs somewhat from mine. So also Re (see his n.). WG opt for 'send'.

I.112.2: This verse is very dense and has been subject(ed) to a variety of interpretations, the details of which can't be laid out here. The first hemistich depicts gifts or some other desirable things mounting the chariot of the Aśvins to be given. The gifts are qualified as *subhárāḥ* 'easy to carry (away?)' and 'inexhaustible' (*asaścatáḥ*); the latter word generally qualifies 'streams', objects that are not ordinarily capable of mounting anything. This already odd image (of gifts [implicitly compared to streams] performing the mounting) is made odder by the simile in b, which compares the chariot to something eloquent (*vacasám*) for thinking (*mántave*). It is of course not unusual for a verbal product (a hymn vel sim.) to be compared to a chariot, but the semantic distance traversed in this hemistich is quite far. This outré simile referring to the chariot may anticipate 4c below.

I wonder if the hapax thematic *vacasá-* (in acc. *vacasám*) is wrongly accented for * *vacásam*, which could be an internally derived possessive adj. to the neut. *s*-stem *vácas-* 'speech'. Although this putative **vacás-* 'having speech, eloquent' would likewise be a hapax, it would belong to a more standard derivational type. (There are no other attestations of a putative * *vacasá-* in the Saṁhitās, and thematic derivatives to *-as*-stems are only spottily attested.) BR (and Monier-Williams) take just this word as a derivative of √ *vañc* 'move waveringly', which certainly would better fit a chariot. But the following the following *mántave* strongly favors a derivative of √ *vac*, given the common conjunction of thought and speech.

The final phrase of c, *kármann iṣṭáye* echoes that of 1b *yā́mann iṣṭáye*, and the two forms of *iṣṭáye* should therefore be interpreted in the same way. I take *dhíyaḥ* 'insights' as the object of the seeking and supply "(us)" as the subject of the infinitive. Others tr., with different interpretations of *iṣṭáye*, have taken different routes.

I.112.3: The phrase *divyásya praśā́sane* can be read in (at least) two different ways: either the Aśvins are "*in* command" of the divine (that is, they command the divine) or "*at* the command" of the divine (that is, the divine gives them the command). I follow Ge in taking it as the latter; he cleverly suggests that this shows the Aśvins in their proper position between gods and men -- in other words, they are middle management.

I.112.4: As discussed in the publ. intro., this verse seems to display extended double reference between three gods associated with the morning pressing and the Aśvins' chariot, an association produced by shared epithets, though I must admit that there are many loose ends in this interpretation. See also Re's n.

In pāda a *párijman-* 'earth-encircler' is a standard epithet of their chariot (I.20.3, IV.45.1, X.39.1, X.41.1, IV.3.6) (and, in the dual, of the Aśvins themselves: I.46.14, X.106.3). In a verse in an Aśvin hymn in which this is the first real word, it is hard to imagine that an audience would not first think of their chariot. However, the term also qualifies the Wind (e.g., VII.40.6, II.38.2), and the rest of pāda a*, tánayasya majmánā*, fits a divinity better than a chariot.

In its other three occurrences *dvimātár-* 'having two mothers' refers to Agni, as produced by the two kindling sticks. It is somewhat difficult to see how this word could refer to the chariot, unless the Aśvins are configured as two mothers. On the other hand the phrase *dhūrṣú taráṇayaḥ*, like our *tūrṣú taráṇiḥ*, is found in an Aśvin hymn (VII.6.78) qualifying their horses in a verse also containing their chariot. (Cf. also *taráṇi-* twice in another Aśvin hymn [IV.45.5, 7], but used of a priest, probably Agni.) Note also that *tūrṣú* not only plays on the *dhūrṣú* in the passage just cited, but also phonologically matches the *ū ṣú* of this hymn's refrain. On the adj. *taráṇi-* see III.11.3; here I would slightly alter the tr. to "advancing in his advancing," though that doesn't help very much.

In c *vicakṣaná-* 'wide-gazing' is otherwise esp. found as an epithet of Soma, though occasionally of other gods. As a qualifier of a chariot, it could mean 'conspicuous' (< 'widely seen'). What it would mean for either Soma or the chariot to be 'of triple thought' (*trimántu-*) is not clear to me. The word is a hapax, but it should be interpreted along with the *mántave* of 2b, where the word is connected with an image (however attenuated) of a chariot. It's worth keeping in mind that the Aśvins' chariot is characterized as having three of everything in I.34.2, 9, 12, and its three wheels are mentioned elsewhere. As for a potential connection with Soma, the 'three' of course suggests the three soma pressings, though exactly what the *-mántu-* would have to do with them isn't clear to me. Perhaps more likely is the three types of ritual speech deployed in the soma sacrifice.

Note that there is an implicit numerical ordering of the subjects of the three pādas: (*párijman* = 1), ***dvi***mātár-, ***tri***mántu-.

In sum, although the vocabulary of this verse has tantalizing resonances with other passages and although I am fairly certain there is a pervasive double meaning, I do not feel I (or anyone else) has entirely "cracked" this verse. The tack taken by Ge (/WG) of simply taking Parijman, Dvimātar, and Trimantu as PNs is the easy way out but does not advance the interpretation.

I.112.5: In "rasping Rebha" (*rebhá-*) I have incorporated the gloss into the name. The word occurs in the next hymn (I.113.17) in its lexical meaning.

I.112.6: On *ā́raṇa-* see comm. on VIII.70.8.

I.112.8: On *kṛtháḥ*, with primary ending on a root aor. stem, see comm. ad X.39.8, adopting KH's explanation that the primary ending is meant to distinguish such forms from imperatives. In other such passages the ending is supported by other verbs with *-th-*, but not here.

I.112.9: The adjs. *mádhumantam ásaścatam* might better be tr. proleptically: "you revived the river (so that it was) honied and inexhaustible." Ge (/WG) simply supply a verb in pāda a: "(machtet)."

Note the phonetic echo in *śrutáryaṃ náryam*.

I.112.10: *atharvī́-* as 'den Weg verfolgend' from Hoffmann (see EWA I.805 and Scar 496–97). Ge's "pfeilschnelle (?)" is distinctly odd, and I don't know the basis for his interpr.

I.112.11: Kakṣīvant is the next poet in the collection after Kutsa. He's explicitly identified as an Auśija in I.18.1 and by implication in I.119.9, 122.4–5. What the merchant (*vaṇíj-*) is doing here I have no idea – unless it's just the echo of the unusual suffix *-ij-*.

I.112.15: On the lexeme medial *ví √pā* 'extract by drinking, separate fluids by drinking' see disc. ad VII.22.4. Why this lexeme is used here of an ant (or someone so called) isn't clear. Perhaps it reflects a folk belief or observation about the eating/drinking habits of ants. Popular Science Monthly (of May 1877) reports that "Some species—such, for instance, as the small brown garden ant—ascend bushes in search of aphides. The ant then taps the aphis gently with her antennæ, and the aphis emits a drop of sweet fluid, which the ant drinks." This could possibly be considered extraction. And a more recent article (Smithsonian.com, Aug. 16, 2012) has photographs of transparent Indian ants whose abdomens change color depending on the color of what they drink. The photographs of the ants' mouth parts attempting to penetrate drops of colored water could also be viewed as extraction.

I.112.16: Though some of the occurrences of *śayú-* have been reinterpreted as meaning 'orphan' (see comm. ad IV.18.12), given the density of PNs in this set of vss. and the lack of particular "fit" of 'orphan', I would keep the PN here, and probably likewise in the other Aśvin catalogue hymns I.116.22, 117.20, 118.8, 119.6, as well as VII.68.8.

Śyumarśmi in the publ. tr. is a typo for Śyumaraśmi.

I.112.17: Note the phonological play in ***páṭhar**vā **jáṭhar**asya*. Because of its accent, Ge (/WG) take *jáṭhara-* as an adjectival deriv. of *jaṭhára-* 'belly', hence 'paunchy' (supposedly of his wagon). But I think it likely that its accent simply follows its phonological twin *páṭharvā*, which immediately precedes (see also Old). The only possible indication of the independent existence of *jáṭhara-* is *jáṭhala-* in I.182.6.

I.112.18: The problem of the sg. voc. *aṅgiraḥ* is treated by Old.

The verb *niraṇyáthaḥ* is also problematic; in fact Ge declines to tr. it. Re suggests that it might be a corruption of **ni(r)-riṇīthaḥ* to *nír √rī* 'let flow, let escape', but the corruption involved would have to be fairly massive and would be unmotivated. Old sees it as a denom. to a form derived from *√ran* 'take pleasure'. WG tr. "ihr ... innerlich Freude habt," following Gotō 1987: 258 n. 582, who accepts Gr's connection with *√ran* 'take pleasure', though he attributes the accentuation not to a passive stem *raṇyá-* (as Gr does, despite the active ending) but to a shift from the standard pres. stem *ráṇya-* by association with denominatives like *turaṇyá-* (or perhaps to its being a denominative itself). This analysis is accepted by Kulikov (Vedic *-ya*-presents, pp. 605–5), with further discussion. Although a connection with *√ran* makes more sense than Re's suggestion, it does not make much sense in context -- or rather, although the tr. is harmless and not jarring, it has nothing to do with the Vala myth treated in the following pāda. It is also the case that *√ran* does not otherwise occur with *ní* and forms of this root are also almost always construed with a source from which the pleasure is derived. By contrast, my tr. follows a suggestion of Brereton's that it is haplologized from **nirayaṇa-yá-* 'seek/find a

way out'. Despite the further machinery required, this interpr. makes more sense in the Vala myth context.

I.112.19: The original desid. stem *śíkṣa-* to √*śak* 'be able' has become essentially independent of its root and is extraordinarily well attested. In my view it means 'do one's best / exert oneself' by way of a more literal 'seek to show one's ability'. It is overwhelmingly construed with a dative of the lucky recipient; cf. a passage chosen almost a random: VI.28.2 *índro yájvane pṛṇaté ca śikṣati* "Indra does his best for the man who sacrifices and delivers in full." There is no other case complement with the simplex forms. Here, however, we encounter *ā́ śíkṣa-* (*ā́ ... áśikṣatam*) with an acc. (*aruṇî́ḥ*). Ge tr. "die Rötlichen zu gewinnen (?) suchen"; Pirart (Nāsatya I.150 "vous avez procuré les Aruṇi [?] ...," without registering the desid. morphology. (Re [EVP XVI.11] suggests rather "gratifier qq'un (de dons)," without further support; for a different interpr. see Klein [DGRV II.193] "ye tried to master(?) the ruddy ones.") My tr., "did your best to obtain," is similar to Ge's. I think that *ā́* with *śíkṣa-* functions in the same way as in the idioms *ā́* √*yaj* 'obtain [i.e., (bring) here] by sacrifice', *ā́* √*pū* 'obtain [i.e., (bring) here] by purifying'. There is another disguised ex. of *ā́ śíkṣa-* in X.48.2 (q.v.). The preverb *úpa* also triggers an acc. complement with *śíkṣa-*; see I.173.10, III.52.6, IX.19.6, X.42.2, X.95.17.

Gr assigns *sudevyàm* to a them. stem *sudevyà-* 'Schar der guten Götter', and Ge tr. it as "Göttergunst." However, in his (bottom of the page) n. 1 he offers the alternative "die Sudevī heimführet," and others have followed the PN interpr.: see Re (EVP XVI.11), Klein (DGRV II.193), Macd/Keith (Ved. Index s.v. Su-dās), somewhat dubiously Remmer (Frauennamen, p. 95) – rejected by Pirart (Les Nāsatyas I, ad loc.). There are two stumbling blocks to this interpr.: 1) the *vṛkī*-inflectional form to the eponymous *devī́-* stem; 2) the same form found in X.35.4, where this interpr. isn't possible (but see comm. at that passage). As for 1), AiG III.179 cites a few *vṛkī*-forms to *devī* nouns, and Remmer cites as parallel the *vṛkī* name *yamī́-*. Given the syntactic and lexical parallelism between pādas a and c in this vs., with the verb √*vah*, an acc. obj. (clearly fem. in pāda a), and the dative of a male PN, and given the "wife-bringing" theme of pāda a, I favor the personal name interpr. despite the morphological issue.

I.112.20: The problem in these obscure fragments of tales is to decide which of the words are PNs and which are adjs. In c Ge takes the three fem. acc. as separate names, but I prefer to take *omiyā́vatīm* and *subhárām* as proleptic adjectives, since both stems are found earlier in the hymn in full lexical usage (*omyā́vantam* 7b, *subhárā(ḥ)* 2a). Sim. Scar (p. 639), Remmer (Frauennamen, p. 85).

I.112.21: Pāda c presents a major disruption of the pattern that has monotonously structured this hymn since vs. 5; this disruption may signal the approaching end of the hymn. Unlike every c-pāda in the hymn (starting indeed with vs. 1) save for the immediately preceding one, the pāda doesn't begin with *yā́bhiḥ* (11c doesn't actually *begin* with *yā́bhiḥ*, but it is found within the pāda). Moreover the verb *bharathaḥ* is not accented and therefore cannot be in even a notional relative clause, despite the *yád* that immediately follows it. Curiously, most interpr. ignore or explain away these deviations. Ge. tr. as a "wenn" clause and considers *yád* "Attraktion für *yā́bhiḥ*" (attraction to what

he doesn't say). Old ascribes the substitution of *yád* for *yā́bhiḥ* to metrical needs and wishes to accent *bharathaḥ*, because switching to a main clause is "recht unwahrscheinlich." Since the poet clearly had no problem maintaining his template in verse after verse, I find it impossible to believe that the departures from this structure here are not deliberate -- a kind of putting on the brakes before the end, just as the full template took awhile to take shape at the beginning of the hymn. More recent tr. reflect the verse's structure better: WG make c a parenthetical clause (though, oddly, repeating the "attraction" explan. in the n.); Scar (p. 444) also treats the clause as parenthetical.

The formally ambiguous *saráḍbhyaḥ* is taken by Ge (/WG) as dative, but given real-world knowledge -- bees produce honey and don't need it brought to them -- it surely makes better sense as an ablative (so also Lü., Scar.), in what looks almost like an izafe construction: *yát saráḍbhyaḥ*.

I.112.24: To avoid vegetative confusion, 'fruitful' would be better tr. as 'profitable' (*ápnasvatīm*). See *ápnaḥ* in the next hymn (I.113.9d).

Ge tr. *adyūtyé* as "wo nicht der Würfel entscheidet"; this is certainly possible, but I think it more likely refers to a situation dire enough that we don't want to take chances.

I.113 Dawn

I.113.1: Ge suggests, probably correctly, that b concerns Agni.

Though most tr., explicitly or implicitly, take Night as subj. of c as well as d, it makes more sense to me for Dawn and Night to be contrastive subjects of the final two pādas, with Dawn going forth as Night cedes her place. The balanced contrast is brought out strongly in the next two vss.

I.113.4: Ge and Re take *citrā́* as the subj. of *ví ... āvaḥ*, not of *áceti*, but the phonological and etymological figure *áceti citrā́* and the position of the preverb *ví* in tmesis (surely initial in its syntagm) make this unlikely.

I.113.5: The form *ābhogáya* (thus in sandhi) has been much discussed. With Old I take it as a loc. *ābhogáye* to the same stem (whatever its source) as *ābhogáyam* in a previous Kutsa hymn, I.110.2. I do not think it is a dative, either in infinitival use or as a dat. obj. parallel to *rāyé* of the infinitival *iṣṭáye*.

I.113.6: Ge takes *ártham iva* as a real simile, containing a pun on *ártha-* (though he does not call attention to it): "um (an sein Geschäft) wie nach einem Reiseziel zu gehen," with *ártha-* 'business' in the frame and 'goal' in the simile. This is clever and may well be right. In my publ. tr. I take *iva* as a sort of indefinitizer: "whatever his goal." WG by contrast seem to take it as a definitizer: "um just zum Ziel zu gehen," which seems an odd use of *iva.*

The standard tr. construe c with d and the phrase *vísadṛśā jīvitā́* as object of *abhipracákṣe* (e.g., Re "Afins qu'ils considèrent les (modes d') existence divers, l'Aurore a éveillé toutes les créatures"). I am skeptical of the syntax, because the d-pāda is a refrain. Although in some refrain hymns, the refrain is sometimes integrated into the verse as a whole, this refrain does not seem to work that way. Moreover, the sense

conveyed seems contrary to what preceded it: the creatures in 5–6ab seems single-mindedly intent on their own particular goals, not open to contemplating different "lifestyles." I therefore take c as an independent clause, summarizing 5–6ab: different people have different aims. This requires taking neut. *jīvitā́* as 'living beings', rather than 'modes of living'. I would prefer that it was not neut., but cf. neut. *bhúvanāni* (in the refrain and often elsewhere) 'creatures'. *jīvitá-* is found only once elsewhere in the RV in IV.54.2, where it seems to mean 'lives'.

I.113.7–13: These verses have a surprising density of forms of *ví √vas* 'dawn forth' (7b, d, 8c, 9b, 10b [2x], 11b, 12d, 13a, b, c), whereas vss. 1–6 lack any such forms -- though there's a teasing echo in 4b *ví ... āvaḥ* 'She opened, uncovered', belonging, however, to *√vṛ*. See also comments on vs. 14.

I.113.8: On *ánv eti pā́thaḥ* see comm. ad VII.63.5.

I.113.10: As noted in the publ. intro., this is the most challenging verse of the hymn.

Note the phonetic figure ***kíyāti(y) ā́ yát*** *samá***yā** *bhávāti*, which may help account for the unusual lengthening in *kíyāti* (for expected *kíyati*, which is the Pp. reading). The only other occurrence of this loc. (II.30.1) is also followed by *ā́*, though the figure stops there. See AiG III.256 for various alternative explanations of the long *ā*.

The crucial term for the interpr. of the verse is the instr. adverbial *samáyā*, which is universally taken as 'in the middle' in its various occurrences, presumably from something like "with the same (on both sides)." But this doesn't really make sense here: since today's Dawn is precisely in the middle between the former ones and the ones to come, at what point she will be there is *not* a question we need to ask. A different interpr. of the word arises from examining all the occurrences in context. Every passage crucially contains the preverb/particle *ví* (save for VII.66.15, where *víśvam* takes its place):

I.56.6	*ví vṛtrásya* ***samáyā*** *pāṣyàrujaḥ*
I.73.6	*ví síndhavaḥ* ***samáyā*** *sasrur ádrim*
I.113.10	*kíyāty ā́ yát* ***samáyā*** *bhávāti yā́ vyūṣúr yā́ś ca nūnáṃ vyuchā́n*
I.163.3	*ási sùmena* ***samáyā*** *vípṛktaḥ*
I.166.9	*ákṣo vaś cakrā́* ***samáyā*** *ví vāvṛte*
VII.66.15	*śīrṣṇáḥ-śīrṣṇo jágatas tasthúṣas pátiṃ* ***samáyā*** *víśvam ā́ rájaḥ*
IX.75.4	*rómāṇy ávyā* ***samáyā*** *ví dhāvati*
IX.85.5	*vy àvyáyaṃ* ***samáyā*** *vā́ram arṣasi*

Since *ví* 'apart' and *sám* 'together' are oppositional preverbs that frequently work formulaically with each other, *samáyā* seems to partake more in the semantics of *sám* than of *samá-* 'same' and to mean 'altogether', 'all at once', or 'together with'. I take it in the last meaning here: the question being asked is when the current Dawn will be (re)joined with her sister Dawns, both preceding and following her.

I.113.11: With Gr (et al.) I take *praticákṣyā* as the gerundive; cf. I.124.8.

I.113.12: Pāda b contains complex phonetic echoes: ***su***mnāv***árī sūnṛ́***tā ***īrá***yantī, with repeated *su/ū* as well as mirror-image *árī* / *īrá* mediated by *ṛ́*; the *n* in each word and the final *ī* of the first and third could be added.

In c the phrase *bíbhratī devávītim* is somewhat puzzling; *devávīti-* generally refers to humans' 'pursuit of the gods', that is, the fervent invitation to the gods to partake of our sacrifice. It should not, therefore, be something that Dawn "brings," as she brings prizes, for example. I therefore take the fem. part. *bíbhratī* in its birth sense: she bears / brings to birth our pursuit of the gods by waking us up to initiate this pursuit. Cf. a similar birth context in 19d.

I.113.13: Note that in this verse a single Dawn subsumes the various temporal dawns of the surrounding vss.

I.113.14: This verse plays on the lexeme *ví* √*vas* that dominated vss. 7-13. The verse begins with the preverb *ví*, setting up the expectation that a form of √*vas* will follow. But instead the pāda ends with *adyaut*, a near synonym. The next pāda does end with *āvaḥ*, which matches (*vy*) *ā̀vaḥ* of 13b but belongs instead to the root √*vṛ* '(un)cover'. The verb is here construed with pāda-initial *ápa*, but the dominant preverb *ví* is implied by the immediately preceding word (*de)vī* (*devy ā̀vah*). Cf. also remarks on 4b *ví ... āvaḥ* 'She opened, uncovered' above.

I.113.15: Another in the series of *ví* SHINE verbs is found in d *vy àśvait*, whose *ví* is reinforced by the pāda-initial *vi* in *vibhātīnā́m*.

Note also the chiastic phonetic figure in b: ***ci**trā́ṃ **ke**túṃ **kṛ**ṇute **ceki**tānā́*; the distribution of *i* and *u* vowels is also chiastic, but skips the verb. This is also a triple etymological figure, of course (minus *kṛṇute*).

I.113.17: Ge and Re take the singer, the subject of ab, as the human singer, which in turn requires them to interpret the mid. part. *stávānaḥ*, which is overwhelmingly passive in value, as having active meaning. I (and independently WG) take the referent in ab to be Agni (so already, tentatively, Old). This not only allows *stávānaḥ* to be interpreted in its usual fashion, but also fits the rest of the lexicon. Agni is regularly called *váhni-* in his standard role as conveyor of the oblation, and he is also called 'hoarse-voiced' because he crackles (cf. I.127.10, VI.3.6, VI.11.3).

I.113.18: My interpr. of the 2nd hemistich differs in several respects from the standard. In d I take *aśvadā́(ḥ)* 'giving horses' as acc. pl. fem. with the dawns (so also Re, Scar), not nom. sg. masc. with the soma-presser. Although the latter is possible (and *aśvadā́-* is elsewhere used of mortal patrons), it seems here to belong with the characterizations of the dawns in pāda a: *gómatīḥ ... sárvavīrā(ḥ)*. Note that Dawn is addressed as *aśva-sūnṛte* 'liberal with horses' in V.79.1–10.

More radical is my interpr. of pāda c, which is much discussed (see elaborate notes of Old, Ge, and Re; also Scar 66–67, somewhat differently 202, 617). Most take the simile *vāyór iva* to refer to the surging up of gifts *as swiftly* as the wind; in other words the unexpressed common quality is the speed with which the gifts come. I think rather that the hapax *udarká-* refers to the 'raising' of the litany that accompanies the distribution of the dakṣiṇās at the Morning Pressing. (Cf. *udṛ́c-* RV 2x "when the chant is raised.") And this litany is compared to the one accompanying the first offering of the Morning Pressing to Vāyu. Note that personified *sūnṛ́tā* is closely associated with Vāyu

in the two nearby Vāyu hymns I.134.1 and I.135.7. That it is not the physical aspect of wind that is at issue is suggested by the use of *vāyú-* not *vā́ta-*, as Re points out.

I.114 Rudra

By RVic standards this hymn is almost laughably simple and elementary, very different from Kutsa's usual products.

There is much repetition and chaining of vocabulary in this hymn: *kṣayádvīra-* is prominent at the beg. (1-3, + 10), with *vīra-* reprised in 3 and 8. See also *śám* 1, 2; *aśyāma* 2-3; *sumatí* 3, 4, 9 + *sumnāyán* 3, *sumná* 9, 10; *ní hvayāmahe* 4-5 [*havāmahe* 8]; *námasā* 2, 5 + *námaḥ* 11; *tvéṣam* 4-5; *kapardín-* 1, 5; *mṛḍá* 2, 6, 10 + *mṛḍayátama* 9; *tokátánaya-* 6, 8; *havíḥ* 3, *havíṣmant-* 8; *rā́sva* 6, 9; *pitár marútām* 6, 9; *vṛṇimahe* 4, 9; *āré* 4, 10; *śárma √yam* 5, 10). The first 5 vss. are also marked by 1st pl. verbs.

I.114.2: The weak pf. form (*ā*)*yejé* is anomalous in two regards: it does not agree with the standard weak pf. *īj-* and it produces a bad cadence here. The form is found twice elsewhere in the RV: *āyejé* in X.63.7 where Manu is also the subj. and the form is in the same (bad) metrical slot – the two passages seem to be connected – and VI.36.2 with the preverbs *ánu prá* and in an acceptable metrical slot. The weak pf. stem *īj* is not found with preceding preverb. The forms are disc. at length by Kü (391–92) with ample citation of previous lit. Schindler considers *īj* the older form, to the laryngeal-initial root (PIE**Ḫiag*) with reduplication **Hi-Híj-*, in contrast to **i̯a-*initial roots, which redupl. **i̯a-iC*. For Schindler the *yej* forms are metrically driven replacements and serve to avoid the coalescence of the vowel of the preverb + *īj*, esp. in the cadence. (Neither he nor Kü seems to recognize that the *yej* forms produce bad cadences, a problem that undercuts the arguments that both of them use to explain their appearance in this context.) Kü by contrast questions Schindler's posited distinction in redupl. between initial laryngeal roots **Ḫi̯aC* and glide-initial **i̯aC*, since the development of super-weak forms of the type *ūcúr* to *√vac* happens to roots without initial laryngeals, only glides. Kü argues that whether or not the root had a preceding initial laryngeal the redupl. to a **(H)i̯/u̯aC* root was originally always **(H)i̯/u̯a-*. The *u/i-*type redupl. developed by analogy to **(H)a̯i̯/u̯C-* roots. Therefore *īj* is an inner-Vedic development, not an archaism per Schindler. Yet – even though he thinks *yej* shows the older reduplication pattern – he still allows the possibility that it's a new formation nonetheless. Kü's disc. is ultimately indecisive.

As for the metrical problem, Ludwig and Arnold want to emend to **āyajé,* of somewhat dubious morphological provenance. I very tentatively suggest another possibility, that in this preverb-verb combination the underlying form was **ā (H)i(H)ij-ai*, with the *i-*reduplication becoming a glide between *ā* and the redupl. syllable, which was then originally short: **āyíjé*. The drawback to this explanation (or one of them) is that there is no obvious source for the *-ej* that was substituted at some point in the redaction.

I.114.3: Note the cognate acc. in *juhavāma ... háviḥ*.

I.114.4: *vaṅkú-* is variously interpreted and etymologized; see EWA s.v. In this passage Ge takes it as 'den fliegenden' with ?, Re sim. ('volant' without ?); WG refuse to tr., but mention the common gloss 'krumm' in their n. Assuming (with most) that it belongs to *√vañc* 'go crookedly, meander', I take it here as 'meandering' → 'wandering',

characterizing an itinerant poet. See *ā́ cara* in the previous vs. (3c), which suggests such wandering. For a different specialization of the root meaning, see I.51.11.

I.114.5: Note the rhyming figure *śárma várma chardír*.

I.114.6: With Klein (DGRV I.190) I take *ca* in c as conjoining the two impvs. in polarized position in the hemistich: #*rā́sva ca ... mṛ́la*# in an X *ca* ... Y construction.

I.114.7: "wee little one" reflects the suffixation of the (sometimes) diminutive -*ká-* to *árbha-,* which already means 'small'.

I.114.8: The bahuvrīhi *áriṣta-vīra-* 'possessing heroes who cannot be harmed' in 3d is echoed by *vīrā́n mā́ ... vadhīḥ* "Don't smite our heroes," with the cmpd evoked by *rīriṣaḥ* 'don't harm', which ends the preceding pāda. I suggest that the pattern of pāda-init. *mā́* found through all of vs. 7 and the 1st half of 8 is broken here so that *rīriṣaḥ* / *vīrā́n* can be juxtaposed.

The final pāda of the vs. also recalls vs. 3, in a somewhat sly way: 3d ends *juhavāma te haví*ḥ "We will pour you an oblation," with an etymological figure as noted above. Compare 8d *havíṣmantaḥ ... tvā havāmahe*, also with a form of *havís-* and a 1st pl. verb, which, despite its superficial similarity to *juhavāma*, belongs to the separate root √*hū, hvā* 'call', which has been amply represented in the hymn by the alternative pres. stem *hvayāmahe* (4b, 5b).

The adv. *sádam* 'always' is almost always followed by *íd*, which seems to add no special nuance.

I.114.10: The standard tr. supply 'weapon' with *goghnám ... pūruṣaghnám*, and this is certainly possible. I supply 'anger' (*héḷas-*) because of the similarity of this clause (*āré te goghnám utá pūruṣaghnám* to 4c *āré asmád daívyaṃ héḷo asyatu*.

On neut. *dvibárhāḥ* see comm. ad VII.24.2; for the phenomenon in general comm. ad II.31.5.

I.115 Sūrya

For a more confident interpr. of the enigmatic verses 4–5 than is found in the publ. tr., see comments on those vss. below.

I.115.2: The image of men stretching their yokes across may refer in part, as Ge suggests, to the beginning of the "Tagewerk des Landmanns." But as most interpr. mention, it surely also (or, in my opinion, primarily) is a reference to the beginning of the morning sacrifice: the root √*tan* 'stretch' is regularly used of the sacrifice (probably because of the "stretching out" of the sacrificial ground by carrying the offering fire to the east). That the men are characterized as "seeking the gods" (*devayántaḥ*) supports a sacrificial interpr.

I.115.3: For *étagva-* see comm. on VIII.70.7.

I.115.4–5: As indicated in the publ. intro., although at the time I was not certain what these verses depict, I was (and remain) skeptical of the notion that the two hemistichs refer to the so-called day-sun and night-sun respectively, as Ge (/WG in part) and Re take it. Among other things, I find it unlikely that the unequivocal proclamation of the Sun's supremacy that begins this verse (*tát sū́ryasya devatvā́m tán mahitvám* "This is the Sun's divinity, this his greatness") would pertain to what these scholars see in 4d: the rather ignominious bundling up of the Sun in Night's garment to sneak him back across the sky to rise again the next day. I now feel I have a much clearer understanding of what is going on in these verses -- I think I have cracked their code -- and it all refers to the rising sun. I will lay it out below.

I.115.4: Pāda b fairly clearly refers to Night interrupting her weaving of darkness and gathering up her work when the Sun hitches up his horses for his morning journey. I take Night to be the subject of *sáṃ jabhāra*, not the Sun (as do Ge, Re, Maurer), based on the similarity to II.38.4 *púnaḥ sám avyad vítataṃ váyantī, madhyā́ kártor ny àdhāc chákma dhī́raḥ* "Once again the weaver has wrapped up what was stretched out; in the middle of his work the mindful (worker) has set down his craft," where the weaver is the one who wraps up his own work.

I would now likely connect c with b, rather than only with d: "in the middle of (her) work (Night) has gathered together what was stretched out, when he (=Sun) has yoked his tawny horses from their seat." This would more clearly explain what the divinity and greatness of the Sun consist of and sketch a cause-and-effect relationship between the sun's beginning his journey and Night's breaking off her work.

This leaves pāda d. As noted above, Ge and Re think Night covers the sun with her dark garment and turns him into the night sun (see Ge's n.: "Die Nacht hüllt jetzt den Sūrya in ihr Gewand, d. h. in Dunkel; sie macht die Tages- zur Nachtsonne"). However, the actual wording of the Sanskrit text doesn't work particularly well in this night-sun scenario: stretching the garment for him is not the same as wrapping him in it. Still, on the surface it works even less well in my scenario in which only the day-sun is depicted in this verse. Others take this pāda as I do, as continuing the depiction of sunrise, but have not produced convincing ways to make the Sanskrit work that way. Maurer tr. "then upon herself Night spreads her garment," with the comment (p. 174) "she puts the garment she has woven upon herself, thus removing it from the world and allowing the light of the sun to take its place." This would solve the problem, but "herself" must render *simásmai*, which must be masc. (or neut)., not fem. (though see Ge's suggested way out of this difficulty in his n. 5 to his n. 4d: that *simásmai* stands for a reflexive like *ātmán-* and is therefore masc.). WG also believe that this verse concerns only the morning sun. See disc. in the notes, though I am puzzled by how their disc. and their tr. relate. Their interpr. of d seems to me to fall short.

In my view Night's stretching her garment for him is in part a gesture of submission: she recognizes the sun's ascendancy (both literally and conceptually) and removes her black garment and spreads it out for him to pass over, to indicate that she yields to his superior power. (Fortunately she doesn't have Clytemnestra tendencies.) But this image also depicts a real-world phenomenon, that of the sun rising through morning mist or dark clouds clustering at the horizon. These can be seen as the remnants of the darkness of Night, the garment she has discarded at the place on the edge of the visible

world where the sun first emerges. The pāda begins with *ā́d* 'just after that' -- namely, just after he has yoked his horses from their seat, the beginning of his journey -- suggesting that this is the first moment of sunrise.

I.115.5: This verse (esp. cd) works better in the day-sun / night-sun model than vs. 4, but I am still skeptical about that interpr. and can provide one that allows the verse to confine itself to sunrise. I am especially dubious about the version of the day-sun / night-sun model promulgated by Ge (/WG), Re -- that the two surfaces of the sun are Mitra (bright) and Varuṇa (dark) respectively -- since this interpretation is likely anachronistic, as it rests on a later Vedic conception of the two deities. Freed from that model, I take the genitives *mitrásya váruṇasya* of pāda a as dependent not on *rūpám* in b with most tr., but with *abhicákṣe*, following Maurer's rendering of the syntax, hence my "for Mitra and Varuṇa to see." This interpr. may be syntactically problematic, as we would expect a dative subject -- and do find a dative subject with this infinitive, even several times in Kutsa's oeuvre (I.102.2 *asmé sūryācandramásābhicákṣe* "for us to see the sun and moon"; I.113.6 *dabhrám páśyadbhya urviyā́ vicákṣe* "for (even) those who see (only) a little to gaze out widely"). The case discrepancy troubles me, but I must assume that, given that infinitives are verbal *nouns*, nominal rection prevailed here. It might better be translated "for the sight /seeing of M+V."

This interpretation fits the verse better conceptually and makes a nice thematic ring with 1b, which contains the common trope of the sun as the eye of Mitra and Varuṇa, using the word *cákṣuḥ,* derivationally related to *(abhi-)cákṣe*. The expression in our vs. is ambiguous; it could be turning the notion of sight on its head -- M+V are seeing the sun, not seeing by means of him -- or, more likely, intends the same idea as "the eye of M+V" in 1b, "so that M+V can see (the world)."

The position of *anyád ... anyád* in cd requires that they be definite and in a "the one ... the other" relationship (so all tr.). The gleaming surface of c fits well into my scenario -- it is another image of the bright eye of M+V depicted in ab. I think it is called *anantá-* 'unbounded' to represent the fact that it is not possible (certainly not advisable) to look at the bright sun in the sky and see its outline, its edge. But the complementary black surface of pāda d seems, on first thought, to impose the night-sun image. However, it is easily interpretable within the framework provided by the other troublesome d-pāda, 4d. As I just argued, the garment that Night stretches for the sun in 4d is her discarded black raiment that lingers at the horizon as mist and clouds. When the sun rises through clouds, it can seem almost dark, certainly in comparison to an unclouded sun, and its outline is clearly visible, as opposed to the *anantá-* surface of the bright sun in pāda c. At such an occluded sunrise, individual bright rays can shoot out of the clouds. In our passage these would be the *harítaḥ* 'tawny horses' that are jointly bringing him (*sám bharanti*), the same *harítaḥ* he hitched up in 4c before beginning his journey through the mists of 4d.

Thus we can construct a consistent and convincingly naturalistic interpr. of these two verses as referring only to sunrise, without the dubious baggage of the "night-sun." The second of the two verses, which is the last real verse of the hymn, also forms a ring with vs. 1: not only is the sun identified as the eye/sight of Mitra and Varuṇa (1b, 5a), but the "brilliant face" (*citrám ... ánīkam*) of 1a is reprised by the "gleaming surface" (*rúśat ... pā́jaḥ*) of 5c.

[I.116–20 JPB]

I.121 Indra or the All Gods

This is a very problematic hymn, and both the publ. tr. and this comm. are tentative and tenuous on many points. There are some quirks that reappear throughout the hymn: a remarkable no. of pāda-final *góḥ* (2b, 2d, 7b, 9a) – is this some sort of hidden encoding? It's also part of a pattern of favoring pāda-final monosyllables (*vr̥̄m* 2c, *rā́ṭ* 3a, *dyū́n* 3b, 7c, *dyā́m* 3d, *vaḥ* 4d, *nr̥̄n* 12a, 13a, *dā́t* 12c – and, flg. Hoffmann, *daḥ* 10d). Also a fondness for *pári* and *prá*, the former esp. in opaque contexts.

I.121.1: Ge (/WG) take pāda a as a separate clause and consider *pā́tram* 'cup, vessel' a metaphorical designation of Indra ("Ist er wohl das rechte Gefäss für solch gottergebene Männer?"). With Old I consider this to be an anachronistic application of the much later sense of 'cup, bowl' to mean 'appropriate recipient'. (It is true that Indra is referred to as a 'tankard' [I.61.9] and a 'beaker' [I.100.12] elsewhere, but in those cases it is his capacious size that is at issue.) Old and Re both avoid the Indra = cup interpretation by supplying a verb (different verbs in each case). I see no reason to supply a verb, since *pā́tram* can be an acc. goal with *turaṇyán* (see X.61.11 for another acc. of goal with the same stem), a possibility also allowed by Old.

Although in the publ. tr. I took *nr̥̄n* as gen. pl., flg. Old, Ge, etc. (see in general AiG III.211–12), I now believe that all or almost all instances of this form are actually the acc. pl. they appear to be. In this case I would emend the tr. to "hastening to the men, to the cup of those seeking the gods." Note the acc. pl. *nr̥̄n* in vs. 12 in similar context. See comm. ad I.146.4, X.29.4.

I.121.2: Ge and Re take *náro* as the nom. sg. of a thematic form of the 'man' stem, a nom. sg. that is otherwise not found in the RV (save possibly in *svàrṇara-*) and only very sparingly in the rest of Vedic (see AiG III.212). I follow Gr, Old, and WG in taking it as a gen. sg. of the athematic 'man' stem, even though the other two occurrences registered by Gr are better taken as nom. pl. It replaces expected **nur* (cf. Aves. *nərəš*). It is parallel here to *góḥ*, and this gen. expression characterizes the type of *drávi̯ṇa-* that Indra is providing as a prize. Since *drávi̯ṇa-* is a derivative of √*dru* 'run', it really is 'moveable wealth', and both cattle and men would qualify. The pair *náro góḥ* is echoed by the more conventional expression *cátuṣpade ... dvipā́de* in 3d, which also contains the qualifier *náryāya*.

The opening *ṛbhúr vā́jāya* contains the names of two of the three Ṛbhus, though the words are not so used here.

As indicated in the publ. intro., the second hemistich is much discussed, and I will not treat other interpretations in detail. It depicts a buffalo (*mahiṣá-*) gazing after (and probably longing after) three females, or, in my interpr., one female in three different shapes. These shapes are three standard female roles, arranged chronologically: marriageable girl (according to my interpr. of *vr̥̄-* as 'chooser'; see comm. VIII.2.6), wife/consort (*ménā-* < 'exchange token'; see comm. I.62.7), and mother. The *mahiṣá-* is Indra, as often; this word also evokes the term for the chief wife of a king, *máhiṣī-*, thus indirectly adding another female role. I identify the female referent of all three as Dawn.

Kakṣīvant calls Dawn "begetter of cows" (*gávāṃ jánitrī*) in nearby I.124.5, like our *mātáraṃ góḥ*, and also compares her to a *vr̥̄-* in I.124.8. Since Dawn is always depicted in motion, "gaze after (a retreating figure)" is an appropriate verb. (Cf. IV.18.3 where Indra *anu* √*cakṣ* his mother who is going away: *parāyatīṃ mātáram ánv acaṣṭa*.) If the referent is Dawn, then the horse whose consort she is is probably the sun. For Dawn and the horse = sun, see VII.77.3.

The term *svajā́-* 'self-created' has two applications in the passage. On the one hand, it characterizes the *vr̥̄-* particularly. Since she is a 'chooser', the female protagonist of a svayaṃvara (self-choice) marriage, she is 'self-created' because she is not being given to someone by someone else, but is doing it herself. If marriage is the equivalent of upanayana and second birth for women, then she's her own parent. On the other hand, it can characterize all the role transformations she undergoes in cd, loosely "(re)creating herself as ..." For further on *vr̥̄-* and this passage in general, see Jamison 2003 (Fs. H.-P. Schmidt) pp. 45–47, also X.111.3.

I.121.3: In the publ. tr. this verse is couched in the English future because I took two of the three verbs in the verse (*nákṣat* and *tastámbhat*) as subjunctives and the third (*tákṣat*) as an injunctive but a rhyme form to *nákṣat*, each of them beginning a hemistich. I considered the verse a continuation of the prospective questions in vs. 1. about Indra's coming to the sacrifice. I have now accepted the view of Narten (Sig.Aor. 160; see also Hoffmann Injunk. 144) that *nákṣat* is instead an injunctive to the thematic stem of the enlarged root √*nakṣ*. This then seems to strand *tastámbhat* as a lone subjunctive in this sequence; Kü (575) labels it a subjunctive in preterital context. However, the passage may originally have had the indic. pf. **tastámbha*, and *tasthámbhat* may have picked up a final dental from the initial of the following word: *tastámbha**d dy**ā́m*# to match preceding *nákṣat* and *tákṣat*. Since *dyā́m* begins with a cluster, the meter is unaffected by a reading **tastámbha dyā́m*. The cadence is terrible (four heavy syllables), but the only thing that would improve it is reading **tastabha(d)*, with a zero-grade root syllable appropriate neither to the indicative nor to the subjunctive. On this and similar forms see my "False Segmentations and Resegmentations in the Rigveda: Gemination and Degemination," to appear in a forthcoming Fs.

Revising my understanding of the morphology requires revising the translation as well. I would now take the whole verse in the past: "The surpassing king *came* through the days to the age-old call of the clans of the Aṅgirases for the ruddy (cows). He *fashioned* the mace, his team-mate; he *propped* up heaven for the sake of the two-footed and four-footed belonging to men." The verse then provides a reassuring model in the past for Indra's hoped-for activity in the present. Note that *nákṣat* picks up the aor. *ā́naṭ* (approximately) from 1c and *tastámbha(t)* the aor. *stámbhīt* of 2a.

Ge takes *aruṇī́ḥ* as nom. sg. fem., appositive to *rā́ṭ*, which must then be fem. and mean 'queen' ("die Morgenröte, die Königin"). Both of these are grammatically possible: *rā́ṭ* must be fem. in V.46.8; *aruṇī́ḥ* must be nom. sg. in IV.1.16, 14.3. But this leaves the apparent masc. nom. sg. adj. *turáḥ* without a head. I therefore take *aruṇī́ḥ* as acc. pl., loosely construed with *hávam*. See Old. The ruddy ones are presumably the cows imprisoned in the Vala cave, who reappear (with a different color term, *usríya-*) in vs. 4.

I.121.4: Unlike the standard tr. I take c with ab rather than with d. I also take the subject of that pāda, the referent of *trikakúb* 'three-humped', as the herd, not Indra with most tr. The problem is the verb, *nivártat*. On the surface it is the only active form to the quite well-attested them. pres. *vártate*. It could be taken as an oppositional transitive active built (however temporarily) to the intransitive middle. Since *ní √ vṛt* generally means 'turn back' (of bovines), it could mean '(make) turn back', with Indra as subject (called *trikakúb*). The problem is that this doesn't make a lot of sense in context. He has just released them (or so I take ab); why then at their "forward surge" (*prasárge*) would he make them reverse direction? What I think the pāda depicts is the cows milling around in cow-like fashion and beginning to move, but something stops or confuses them, turning them back (pāda c), and Indra has to step in and show them the way out (pādas ab, d). A (partial) solution to this difficulty was seen by Hoffmann (Aufs. II, 590), who identifies several forms as belonging to an *intransitive root aorist* to √ *vṛt*, to which this would be the subjunctive, rather than belonging to the them. pres. stem. Since the forms are intransitive, this solves my valency problem, but the subjunctive causes some difficulties. Hoffman takes pāda c as a purpose clause "Damit er beim Losrennen (der Kühe) als Spitzentier zurückkehre," but why, again, would Indra turn back? To make it fit my scenario, with the herd as subject, I need to read it as a past prospective. Indra got them on the way to truth when they were going to / would have turned back. I would slightly amend my tr. to "when the three-humped (herd) was going to turn back in its forward surge."

There is another possible conceptual solution, also utilizing Hoffmann's intransitive root aorist subjunctive. As already noted, *ní √ vṛt* means 'turn back' of bovines -- see the extraordinary concentration of this lexeme in X.19, a hymn urging the cows to return. If we assume that once the cows trapped in the Vala cave are released, they will *return home* (which would be expressed by *ní √ vṛt*), then *nivártat* is compatible with *prasárge*: "so that the three-humped (herd) will return (home) in its forward surge" – a possible alternative tr.

In d I take *ápa ... vaḥ* in two slightly different senses with two different objects: 'uncover' with *drúhaḥ* 'deceits' and 'unclose' (= 'open') with *dúraḥ* 'doors' (note the phonological similarity of the two objects). Unlike many tr. I therefore do not take *drúhaḥ* as gen. dependent on *dúraḥ*; I also consider *mā́nuṣasya* as a gen. of benefit rather than construing it with *drúhaḥ* (for both, cf. Re's "les portes du Mal humain").

I.121.5: Under this elaborate disguise, the verse is simply about soma and Indra's possession of it. The parents are, acdg. to most, Heaven and Earth. The second hemistich is also found in X.61.11, which is painfully obscure. See disc. there.

One of the things glossed over in the publ. tr. is the difference in number between the dual parents of ab, who brought the soma to Indra, and the unidentified plural subjects who acquired it through sacrifice in pāda c. In X.61.11, also in the context of the Vala myth, I identify those plural sacrificers as the Navagvas, who are named in the previous vs. (X.61.10). Here I suggest the Aṅgirases, even more likely actors in a Vala context, who are mentioned in vss. 1 and 3, with their sacrificial activity prominent in vs. 1.

For other shared phraseology between the two vss., esp. *śúci ... rékṇaḥ*, see comm. ad X.61.11.

I.121.6: Another verse about soma.

Note the position of *ná* in the simile, where it is placed after the two-word DET+NOUN phrase (*asyā́ uṣásaḥ*) rather than after the first word. I do not know if this placement is by rule; it might be worth looking for other examples with this configuration. In fact, see I.129.1g with *imā́ṃ vā́caṃ ná*.

The syntax is somewhat clotted in the 2nd hemistich. With Ge I take *yébhiḥ* as standing for **yád ebhíḥ* vel sim., since there is no masc. pl. referent in the main clause. Ge (/WG) and Re construe the instr. without further verbal support (Ge "mit Hilfe der ihren Schweiss opfernden (Priester)"). I supply 'being impelled' to account for the instr.; such expressions are relatively common in soma hymns; cf. IX.30.2 = 107.26 *índur hiyānáḥ sotṛ́bhiḥ*, etc. For sweat as an oblation, see Jamison 2015 ("Avestan *xšuuīd-*: A Relic of Indo-Iranian Ritual Vocabulary," BAI 25).

The *siñcán* of d causes some conceptual problems. Active forms of this very common stem are transitive ('pour x'), but if the subject remains the drop (*índuḥ*), a passive 'being poured' would seem to make more sense. However, this attribution of agency to the drop -- to pour himself, as it were -- fits with the general tendency to animatize soma and attribute exceptional powers to him.

WG take *jaráṇā* as a nom. sg. fem., an abstract "Langlebigkeit," conceived of as a goddess, as opposed to its standard interpr. as a neut. pl. adj. modifying *dhā́ma* and essentially identical to differently accented *jaraṇá-* 'old' (Ge, Re, though not Gr). For WG this goddess is the one who pours with the spoon and reaches the seat. This is clever but runs into difficulties. First, forms to √*jṛ* generally convey a negative sense of 'age' -- not 'long life'. And it interferes with a standard soma trope, of the pressed soma going to / reaching his "domains," which is straightforwardly present here as long as *índuḥ* remains the subject. And as far as I know, there is no other evidence for this goddess.

I.121.7: Another very obscure verse with multiple competing interpretations. I will only discuss my own. As indicated in the publ. intro. I think the larger point of the verse is that Indra's presence alone is sufficient for an effective sacrifice, even if the standard ritual trappings (like the wood for the fire) are absent. This rests in part on very different interpr. of the individual lexical items from. the standard ones, esp. in pāda a.

To start there, the hapax *vanádhiti-* is interpr. by Ge (/WG), Scar (57), going back to Sāy, as an axe, the Holzmacherin, in part because of the phonological play with a standard word for 'axe' *svádhiti-*. I follow Gr (Old, Re, Schmidt B+I 147) in taking it rather as the pile of wood for the kindling of the ritual fire, formed like *vásu-dhiti-* 'treasure chamber, depository of goods'; cf. also *mitrá-dhiti-* in the adjacent hymn (I.120.9). The verb in this clause, *apasyā́t*, is universally considered a subjunctive to a denom. stem *apas-yá-* 'be active' (a stem that would appear only here, though there are related nominal forms); I interpret it rather as the optative of *ápa* √*as* 'be' (hence *apa-syā́t*) 'be away, be distant'. True, this lexeme is not common -- I have found only one other RVic example (X.83.5) -- but it would be easy to create, with additive semantics, and semantically parallel *ápa* √*bhū* is better established.

There is no agreement on the sense of pāda b or even its syntactic status: because it lacks an overt verb, it is not clear whether it continues the subordinate clause of pāda a or functions as the main clause. (With Ge et al., I assume it is the main clause, since otherwise the verse consists only of subordinate clauses.) It is generally assumed that a

finite verb should be supplied with *pári*; I supply the inoffensive 'go'. My interpr. of the pāda is, on the other hand, rather bold -- there seems no other choice with pādas like these. I take the cowpens (*ródhanā góḥ*) as a reference to the ritual ground or to the vessels containing the milk to be mixed with soma or perhaps to places where animals are kept for sacrifice. The "sun" that goes around them is either Agni performing the *paryagnikaraṇa*, the circling around ritual objects or sacrificial animals (the latter might make more sense with cowpens), or Soma circling through the purifying filter. Both Agni and Soma are frequently identified with the sun.

But the mediating image for pāda b is the radiant Indra of pāda c. When *Indra* (such is my identification of the subj. of the 2nd sg. *prabhā́si*) shines forth, there is no need of wood for the fire (pāda a). He can stand in for the ritual fire and/or the gleaming soma and bring the sacrifice to a successful conclusion by himself, as it were.

My identification of Indra as the subj. of c makes him unavailable to be the referent of the datives in d, as Ge, Re take them. In my view, the poet Kakṣīvant is a better candidate (see WG, who suggest "Sippenführer," so at least not a god). For one thing, if the curious hapax cmpd *ánarviś-* contains the (pseudo-)loc. *ánar-* to *ánas-* 'cart', it seems unlikely that this would qualify anyone directly associated with Indra -- the cart is not a warrior's vehicle -- while on the other hand the Pajras, Kakṣīvant's clan (cf., e.g., I.116.7, 117.6), are *ánasvant-* 'possessing carts / wagons' (or, more accurately, compared to people who are *ánasvant-*) in I.126.5. Although *turá-* was used of Indra in 3b and would here be applied to Kakṣīvant, this poet would surely not mind getting a little reflected divine glory. Note, in passing, the phonetic echo in *ánarviśe pas*^{au}*viṣe*.

I.121.8: The major puzzle in this verse is the grammatical identity of its first word, *aṣṭā́*. Ge takes as the agent noun to √*aś* 'attain', which is not otherwise attested (and for which we should expect full grade **naṣṭár-*), while Old, Re, Scar (602), WG take it as 'eight' (which of course requires some clever manoeuvering with its head noun, dual *hárī*). I follow Sāy, Gr in taking it as the ppl. to √(*n*)*aś*.

On *ā́daḥ* see comm. ad II.12.4.

On the sense of *vātā́pya-* see comm. ad IX.93.5. The scansion of this stem is unclear: HvN give it as *vātā́pyam*, that is, presumably, *vāatā́pyam*, Arnold (p. 294) *vaatā́pyam* (with short first vowel), but Old *vātaā́pyam*. Ad IX.93.5 he also suggests *vātā́piyam* (which wouldn't work here), pronouncing the scansion favored by HvN the least likely. Gr also goes for *-piya-*.

I.121.9-13: Hoffmann (Inj. 191 and n. 157) transl. and comments on these mythological verses.

I.121.9: The puzzle in this verse is what is happening to the cow (*góḥ*) -- which depends on what case the word is in and on the interpretation of the VP *práti vartayaḥ ... áśmānam*. If the VP is taken as hostile ("turn the stone against X"), *góḥ* is difficult to fit in, since as a gen.-abl. it can't easily be a target. See the standard tr., plus Hoffmann (Inj. 191), for various attempts to wrestle with this possibility. However, the VP can instead mean "roll the stone back," with *góḥ* an ablative "from the cow" and the action depicted a friendly and helpful one. I consider this to be a variant of the Vala myth, referring to the opening of the cave. The problem is that the Vala myth does not ordinarily intersect with

the Śuṣṇa story, which occupies the 2nd hemistich, but, as indicated in the publ. intro., the two myths are woven together in this part of the hymn. See also X.61.13 where the same intertwining seems to occur.

The publ. tr. omits the dat. *kútsāya*. It should read "when ... vanquishing Śuṣṇa for Kutsa, you kept encircling him [=Śuṣṇa] ..."

Another problem is the present tense *pariyā́si* of d, in a hymn otherwise couched in the mythological past. In conjunction with *anantá-* 'endless', I suggest that the present is used here to express a past continuative 'kept Xing'.

I.121.10: The sequence of tense/mood in this verse is somewhat puzzling, with an impv. in the first hemistich (*asya*, pāda b) followed by a 2nd sg. impf. (*ā́-adar*, so Pp.) or injunctive (*ā́-dar*, so Hoffmann, Inj. 191). This discrepancy must be why Ge puts the first hemistich in quotation marks, though he doesn't explain who is speaking.

In my opinion the first hemistich concerns the Vala myth: the word *phaligá-* 'bolt' is associated with the Vala myth in two of its three other occurrences (I.62.4, IV.50.5), once of the Vṛtra myth (VIII.32.25), never of Śuṣṇa. However, if this is the Vala myth it is somewhat puzzling why the sun is *entering* the dark, since the Vala myth is usually set at dawn. Perhaps this refers to a version in which the sun is also trapped in the Vala cave.

I supply 'fold' in the temporal abl. expression in pāda a, since I would expect an acc. of goal, and *pā́thas-* 'fold' is common with *ápi √i* (I.162.2, II.3.9, III.8.9, VII.47.3). On the other hand, perhaps the abl.(/gen.) *támasaḥ* is simply by attraction to the abl. infinitive *ápīteḥ*.

As noted earlier, *ā́daḥ* is analyzed by Hoffmann as an injunctive in mythological context. Note also that it probably belongs to *√dṛ* 'tear', not *√dā*, despite *ā́do* to the latter root in 8a. However, it could technically be underlyingly identical to *ā́do*, and that pāda also contains a *diváḥ*. In that case it would mean "you took ..."

I.121.11: Hoffmann (191 n. 157) insists that *ánu ... madatām* must be an impv. This interpr. is of course possible, but I do not see its necessity. He also interprets *siṣvapaḥ* as a subjunctive. This is also possible, esp. because the other two forms to this redupl. aor. are athematic (*síṣvap*). However, again it is not necessary, since redupl. aorists are overwhelmingly thematic, and old athematic ones get thematized (cf. augmented *ádīdharat* beside *dīdhar*).

I have no idea why it's worth mentioning that Heaven and Earth have no wheels, a seemingly obvious fact, unless to contrast them with Etaśa and the Sun's wheel in 13b.

In d the easiest thing to do with acc. *varā́hum* 'boar' is to take it as an appositive to *vṛtrám* (much earlier in the hemistich). But the problem, of course, is that Vṛtra isn't a boar but a cobra (/serpent). Indra's boar opponent is Emuṣa, and that may be the referent. (See I.61.6–7, where the Vṛtra and Emuṣa myths are told in two successive verses.) However, given that the Śuṣṇa myth is related here in the two preceding verses (9–10), I think that Śuṣṇa may be the referent. He does, after all, snort (e.g., I.54.5 *śvasanásya ... śúṣṇasya*).

I.121.12: Pāda a contains two ambiguous forms: *yā́n*, which can be either acc. pl. masc. of the rel. pronoun or pres. act. part., nom. sg. masc., to the root pres. of *√yā* 'drive'; *ávaḥ*, which can be either the 2nd sg. injunc. act. of the them. pres. to *√av* 'help' or the

acc. sg. neut. of *ávas-* 'aid, help'. If we take *yā́n* as a rel. pron., there is the problem that there is no referent for it in the main clause (save for the Wind's horses, which are not likely). Despite the majority of tr., I therefore take it as the participle, with the consequence that *ávaḥ* is a noun, serving as acc. of goal, rather than a finite verb. (Its accent would be a problem in a non-relative clause.) As it turns out, there are no injunctives to the thematic present of this root: we find either augm. *ā́vaḥ* (etc.) or subj. *ávāḥ* (etc.); this is an additional, if weak, argument for not taking it as a finite verb.

The adj. *mandínam* 'exhilarating' in c seems semantically far enough from its apparent referent, *vajrám* in d, that Ge supplies a verb "(trink)" to produce a new clause and allow *mandínam* to qualify the expected soma (see the same adj. in 8c). This is unnecessary. Uśanā Kāvya's major job is to give Indra the mace (see also V.34.2) and for Indra to reach exhilaration in his company (I.51.11). In our passage it seems as if these are conflated, and the vajra itself is what provides the exhilaration (= the energy to kill Vṛtra bez. Śuṣṇa).

I.121.13: I take *nṝ́n* as a gen. pl. (see 1a) in beneficial sense.

For *nā́yám* see comm. on VIII.2.28 and Jamison 2013 ("RV *sá hināyám* (VI.48.2) with a Return Visit to *nā́yám* and *nā́nā*," Hock Fs.).

In c *rathyàḥ* could simply mean 'charioteers', a parallel gift to the prizes (*vā́jān*). So WG.

I.121.15: The root affiliation of *sám ... varanta* is disputed. Most take it as belonging to √*vṛ* 'choose' (Ge, Re [apparently, see below], WG); I follow Gr and Lub in assigning it to √*vṛ* 'cover'. Although it is difficult to judge, there are more clear root aor. subjunctive middle forms to 'cover' than to 'choose' (though cf. I.140.13 where *varanta* does belong to 'choose' and takes *íṣam* as object). Moreover, *sám* does not appear to be found with 'choose', but is at least marginally attested with 'cover' (cf. VIII.17.7 and X.16.7).

The other question about this verb is what is its subject. Ge takes *íṣaḥ* as the acc. pl. obj. and supplies the singers or rich patrons as subj. (sim. WG): "Sie bitten sich alle Genüsse (als Lohn) aus." Inserting a 3rd ps. subject is a bit awkward in a verse in which the human petitioners are otherwise in the 1st ps. (a *asmát*, c *naḥ*, d *syāma*). Re takes *íṣaḥ* as the subject, in one of his finer sleights of hand: "Puissent les jouissances-rituelles affluer (-comme-par-choix!)," where the supposed root verb appears only in the parenthesis and the Sanskrit justification for "affluer" is entirely unclear. I take *íṣaḥ* as the subject, with 'us' supplied as object: "completely cover (us)" expresses the abundance of refreshments Indra will provide.

I.122 All Gods

I.122.1: On *pā́ntam* see Old's lengthy n. ad loc. The stem *pā́nt(a)-*, generally read with distracted root syllable, occurs 8x in the RV. As Old demonstrates, there are most likely two different stems involved: a them. noun *pā́nta-* 'drink' and the act. part. of the root aor. of √*pā* 'drink'. The noun is the more common (6x), while the part. is most likely found only in vs. 4 of this same hymn (du. *pā́ntā*) and as nom. pl. in IX.98.8 (q.v.). This distribution of forms is found in Lub, with the part. listed under √*pā* ('drink') and the nom. stem *pā́nta-* separate.

The construction of the second hemistich is much discussed, including the function of the instrumentals. See esp. Old and Re.

In this context "the lord (*ásura-*) of heaven" is most likely Rudra (see also Hale, Asuras, 75), who is also the gapped object of the verb *astoṣi*: his heroes are his sons, the Maruts mentioned in d.

On *iṣudhyā́* and the related verb, see comm. ad I.128.6 and my 2020 "Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūidiia-*: The Aim of Praise" (Fs. Lamberterie). In light of my reconsideration of the word family of *iṣudhyá-* in that article, I now interpr. this vs. somewhat differently from the publ. tr. Instead of taking *ródasyoḥ* as the target of the aiming expressed by *iṣudhyā́* ("as if aiming at the two world-halves"), I now take *iṣudhyā́* as an independent instrumental adverb of manner, with a dependent "praise" understood: "... as if by the aiming (of an arrow of praise)." The simile particle *iva*, which here, unusually, does not mark an explicit simile, draws attention to the underlying metaphor of the aiming of praise. This image is especially appropriate for Rudra, a god of course famous as an archer, and the Maruts, who are depicted in I.64.10 *ástāra íṣuṃ dadhire gábhastyoḥ* as "archers taking arrows in their fists." As for *ródasyoḥ*, I take it as semi-parallel to *diváḥ* in c, with the two locations positioned at the beginning and end of the hemistich. Just as Rudra is the "lord of heaven" (*diváḥ ... ásurasya*), the Maruts are associated with the midspace defined by the two world-halves, not to mention their association with their consort Rodasī -- so this is also a pun. I would now tr. the hemistich as "I have praised (him) along with the heroes of the lord of heaven; (I have praised) the Maruts of the two world-halves as if by the aiming (of an arrow of praise)."

I.122.2: The root affiliation of *vyùta-* is disputed. WG (flg. Rau) take it to √*vā* 'weave' and tr. 'geflochten'; so also Gr. and (ultimately) Re (though he vacillates in his n.). Most other tr. to *ví* √*yu* 'separate'. My 'cast-off' comes via 'separate, i.e., set aside, get rid of'. Re's "serti (d'étoiles)" (sertir ='to set', of jewels) does not seem to have much to do with 'weave', but supplying "with stars" (*stṛ́bhiḥ*) as a play on *starī́ḥ* is clever enough to make his interpr. appealing, though I do not in the end accept it. A bejeweled Night does not fit well with her being *starī-* 'barren': the contrast is as usual between dazzlingly beautiful Dawn and dreary dark Night. Cf. the black garment Night spreads at the horizon for the Sun in I.115.4. Night does get her chance at ornaments in the one hymn addressed to her, X.127.

I.122.3: The 2nd member of the cmpd *vasarhā́* is taken by Gr and Re as *-hán-*, hence 'striking at dawn', but a connection with √*hā* 'change position, move' makes more sense (so Ge [/WG], tentatively Scar 700). Wind does regularly rise at dawn, but it is hard to conceive that it smites then. This probably requires us to take the underlying form as *-hā́s*, contra the Pp. The 1st member *vasar-* is only attested here, as a variant to the (likewise secondary) locatival *uṣar*. See Lundquist 2014 (25th UCLA IE Conf., Proceedings). The somewhat better attested *vanar-* 'in the wood', also found as 1st cmpd member, may have provided the model for the shape of *vasar-*.

Ge (/WG) construe *apā́m* with *vṛ́ṣanvān* as "der Fuhrmann [coachman, teamster] der Gewässer," while I follow Re in tentatively supplying 'child' with gen. *apā́m* on the basis of the next verse, which contains *nápātam apā́m*. Note that elsewhere in the hymn (12b / 13a) an incomplete expression (*dáśatayasya*) is repaired by the fuller form

(*dáśatayasya dhāséḥ*). I don't see how 'possessing bulls' would develop to 'coachman'. In any case, neither of the alternatives makes much sense as a designation of the wind; I do not know why he would be a coachman of the waters, but I also don't understand why he'd be the child of the waters -- perhaps because of the association of wind with rain or because wind blowing over open water is very perceptible? (For another interpr., see Keydana, Inf., 315 n. 126 "der Besitzer der Wasserhengste [water-stallions]," which seems to split the difference between the 'bull[s]/male[s]' of the nom. and the fem. waters in a way not exactly sanctioned by grammar.)

The curious dual dvandva *indrāparvatā* 'Indra and Mountain' is found 3x in the RV (I.132.6, III.53.1 as well as here), always in the voc. I interpret the 'mountain' as a reference to Indra's *vájra-*. For other passages with the *vájra-* as 'mountain', see VI.22.6 and VII.104.19, as well as Re, EVP XVI.117 (ad VII.104.19).

I.122.4: The first hemistich is structured like vs. 2, with a nom. subject of a purpose infinitive.

The root √*śvit* is a Dawn word (see I.92.12, 113.15, 124.11, the last in a nearby Kakṣīvant hymn); I wonder if *śvetaná-* is feminine because it's evoking Dawn as the brightener.

Despite their similarity, with most tr. I take *pā́ntam* in 1a and *pā́ntā* here as belonging to separate stems, the first to *pā́nta-* 'drink', the second to the act. part. to the root aor. of √*pā* 'drink' (see disc. above ad v. 1). Immediately preceding *vyántā* can be the clue to its participial identity; for the sequence see I.153.4 (of Mitra and Varuṇa) *vītám pātám páyasā* ...

The second hemistich with *prá vaḥ ... kṛṇudhvam* echoes 1ab *prá vaḥ ... bharadhvam*, though in vs. 1 the verb is further distanced from the clause opening.

rāspiná- is a hopeless hapax, surely related to the likewise hopeless hapax *rāspirá-* in V.43.14, a passage that also contains a mother (*mātúṣ padé*) and *āyóḥ*, though not in the same configuration or meaning as here. Ge (/WG) wisely fail to tr. Re: 'fougueux' (fiery, ardent), or, in his notes, 'bouillant' (boiling), though without serious argumentation. (For other possibilities see KEWA s.v.; AiG III.215.) Although it is foolhardy even to sketch derivational possibilites, I will toss out several, with no conviction. My tentative tr. 'abundant'(?) depends on a possible deformation of reasonably well-attested *virapśín-* 'id.' (beside *virapśá-* 'abundance') (derived in turn from *vīra-p(a)śu-*, in a well-known and generally accepted etym.). The initial *ví-*, perceived as a preverb, could be lopped off, and the unusual internal cluster *-pś-* metathesized and normalized to *-sp-*, whose order of segments and sibilant type are both more phonologically natural. The apparent vṛddhi might be like that of *mā́hina-* though they are differently accented. To account for *rāspirá-* we must assume that *rāspiná-* was analyzed as containing a *-ná-*suffix, for which *-rá-* was substituted for no discernible reason. Another even less good possibility, which partly goes back to Bollensen (ZDMG 22; see KEWA s.v., AiG III.215), starts from the fact that in context both *rāspiná-* and *rāspirá-* could use an extra syllable. The first member could be analyzed as a *y*-less genitive **rāás* to *rayí-* / *rāy-* 'wealth', compounded with a form of √*pi* 'swell'. (Note that *rāyás* regularly shows *-s* sandhi in syntagms before *p*: esp. *rāyás póṣam*, but cf. also *rāyás pūrdhi*.) However, our current understanding of the historical morphology of the 'wealth' word makes it well-nigh impossible to get such a *-y*-less form (since *rāyás* < **raḤi-as*)

without a series of arbitrarily constructed analogies. Thus, the second possibility is essentially ruled out, and, insofar as I think it's worth even thinking about an etymology here, I favor the deformation from *virapśín-*.

I do not know what role Āyu is playing here, as is often the case with this figure.

I.122.5: Again the first hemistich has a predicated infinitive, like 2ab, 4ab. In fact the structure is identical to that in 4: *auśijó huvádhyai*# (4b, 5a). But otherwise the verse is difficult to comprehend (as Ge says in n. 5, "Voll dunkler Beziehungen"), and tr. differ considerably. I will not treat them in detail.

The object(s) of *huvádhyai* should first be sorted out: the two acc. *ruvaṇyúm* and *sáṃsam*. Are the two coreferential and what is/are their referent(s)? *ruvaṇyú-* is a hapax but clearly derived from the denom. (/deverb.?) stem *ruvaṇya-* (also a hapax) and ultimate from the root √*ru* 'bellow, roar'. Ge (/WG) takes *ruvaṇyúm* as a qualifier of *śáṃsam*, which he treats as a PN ("den lauten Śaṃsa"), perhaps standing for Nāraśaṃsa. This is not impossible, but given the mysterious *āyóḥ* in 4d and *auśijáḥ* in both 4b and 5a, I am reminded the phrase *uśíjaḥ śáṃsam āyóḥ* (IV.6.11, V.3.4). In both passages we (SWJ and JPB respectively) take *śáṃsam āyóḥ* "the laud of Āyu" as a designation of Agni; in both we take the form *uśíjaḥ* as the nom. pl. designation of a type of priest, who do homage to Agni under this name. Note also that II.31.6 contains *śáṃsam uśíjām*, with the Āyus featuring in the next verse (II.31.7b) as makers of hymns. I therefore think that *śáṃsam* in this verse should be combined with the mysterious *āyóḥ* at the end of the previous verse into a putative underlying phrase **śáṃsam āyóḥ*, referring to Agni, modified by *ruvaṇyúm*. Incomplete phrases straddling verse divisions are found in vss. 3–4 and 12–13 (though in those instances the complete phrase appears in the 2nd vs.); see comm. above on vs. 3. I would thus change the text of the publ. tr. to "It is for (Kakṣīvant), son of Uśij, to call the bellower, the 'Laud (of Āyu)' [=Agni], for you." Agni can be characterized as 'bellowing, roaring' because of the crackling of his flames. The "you" are the priests (etc.) on whose behalf Kakṣīvant is acting. Agni was ritually presented in the previous hemistich (4c) under a different epithet, and his "mothers" (the kindling sticks) in 4d. A "roaring" Agni would come into being following the kindling about to take place in 4d. An invocation to Agni's comrades ends this verse (5d). The context thus favors Agni.

The next problem is *ghóṣeva*. Ge (/WG) takes this as the fem. PN Ghoṣā, the erstwhile spinster, found in a nearby Kakṣīvant hymn (I.117.7) where the Aśvins bestowed a husband on her, as well as in the famous sequence of hymns X.39–41 attributed to her (with the patronymic Kākṣīvatī) and her son. Despite the close connection of Kakṣīvant with this Ghoṣā, I doubt that she figures in the strictly liturgical context here, and those who think she does must assume that Arjuna is the name of her acquired husband, for which there is no evidence. I take the form rather as the old instr. *ghóṣā* to the masc. common noun *ghóṣa-* 'shout, cry', though I admit the simile seems a bit flat. Re's grammatical interpr. is the same as mine; his tr. "semblable à une rumeur (de guerre)" is less flat, but even less supported.

náṃśé occurs twice in the RV, here and in 12b in this hymn, both times preceded by a genitive. There seems no reason not to take it, with Gr etc., as the loc. sg. to a stem *náṃśa-* 'at/on the attainment' construed with the gen. As for *árjunasya*, lit. 'silver(y)', I suggest that it refers to soma; cf. *ṛjīṣín-* 'possessing the silvery drink [=soma]' (so

Thieme), with the Caland form *ṛji-* to this same etymon. Unfortunately *árjuna-* doesn't elsewhere characterize soma. Nonetheless, the fact that the other occurrence of *náṃśe* (12b) takes a genitive that also probably refers to soma
gives
some support to this interpr.

The initial *prá* in c, echoing those in 1a and 4c, suggests that this hemistich has a structure parallel to those two. Hence my "(put him) forward"; other tr. supply other material to complete the clause. The meter of this pāda is deficient, lacking three syllables. Various restorations have been suggested (see Old, Prol. 113 n. 1 [=Engl. tr. 133 n. 3]; HvN metrical notes ad loc.). Old (Prol.) suggests an impv. like *arcata* or *gāyata*, noting the structural similarity to 4c, but in the Noten he suggests that the metrical irregularity of Kakṣīvant's I.120 might indicate that the text here is correctly transmitted and that the meter must be taken as is. It is certainly difficult to see how a trisyllabic verb form would have simply got dropped here.

I do not understand how Pūṣan comes to be named in this august divine company, and I wonder if the abbreviated meter of this pāda has something to do with the dedicand: the only hymns addressed solely to Pūṣan in the RV, VI.53–58, consist entirely of dimeter hymns save for the last. The 8-syllable pāda here might signal his more humble stature.

vasútāti- is another word that occurs in the RV only here and in vs. 12 of this same hymn. Its formation is of course transparent, but its meaning is less so. Most take it as a true abstract to *vásu-* 'good(s)', but with a slight twist to 'generosity' (Freigebigkeit). But the lexeme *ácha √vac* seems to be a technical ritual term for 'invite' (cf. *áchokti-* and the later priestly title *acchāvāka-*) with gods as the object. Gr suggests the meaning 'Schaar der Guten, d.h. der Götter' for the occurrence in vs. 12 (but not this one), which I have adopted for both instances. It would be equiv. to *devátāti-* 'assemblage/conclave of gods'. The pāda would then refer to the group of divinities that Agni regularly conveys to the sacrifice.

I.122.6: This last verse before the dānastuti is free of the manifold difficulties that clot the first five verses of the hymn, but it is not devoid of Kakṣīvant's poetic flourishes. Note first the play on *√śru* 'hear', which reaches a climax in pāda c: *śrótu naḥ śróturatiḥ suśrotuḥ*. What is particularly clever here is that though the pāda contains three forms *śrótu*, the first is completely different from the second two: it is the 3rd sg. act. root aor. impv., while the other two belong to the nominal stem *śrótu-* and are 1st and 2nd compound members respectively. The pāda has only 10 syllables, with a likely rest after *śrótu naḥ*, which would call attention to the phonological identity / morphological difference.

The phrase *viśvátaḥ sīm* occurs 5x in the RV; I have discussed this formula at length elsewhere ("Rigvedic viśvátaḥ sīm, or why syntax needs poetics", *Mír Curad*, Fs. C. Watkins [edd. J. Jasanoff, H.C. Melchert, and L. Oliver], 1998, pp. 291-300). The two occurrences in Kakṣīvant's oeuvre (I.116.20 and here) ring changes on the basic formula in his usual deft and unexpected ways. I will not reproduce the entire discussion, but summarize the main points. Four of the five passages (all but this one) concern the theme "surrounding," marked by *pári* + VERB. In three of these (all but the two Kakṣīvant examples) the object is the two worlds / heaven and earth. In I.116.20 it is the *subject* (the

Aśvins), not the object, that is dual. In other words, Kakṣīvant has transformed the underlying formula by transferring the abstract grammatical category DUAL from one of the arguments of the verb to the other.

This analysis of I.116.20 is necessary to understand the more attenuated -- and more radical -- instantiation of the formula found in our verse here. As in I.116.20 the DUAL that is inherent in the formula surfaces on the subject, here Mitra and Varuṇa, but the "surrounding" motif is not present, except in *viśvátaḥ* 'on all sides' itself, which seems to have no semantic connection with the rest of its clause. Why is it here? Because it is crossed with a different formula through surface phonological similarity. Consider the word *sádane* in the same pāda, which has connections with another RVic formula. The phrase "in the seat of Vivasvant" occurs five times in the RV (I.53.1, III.34.7, III.51.3, X.12.7, X.75.1), twice as pāda-final *sádane vivásvataḥ#* (I.53.1, X.75.1). This provides an almost perfect phonological scrambling of our pāda ending. (In fact, according to Oldenberg [Noten, ad loc.], Ludwig suggested emending *viśvátaḥ* to *vivasvataḥ* [no accent given].)

sádane vivásvataḥ#
sádane viśvátaḥ sīm#

Thus our phrase may have been employed in order to evoke the other formula, which is a kenning for "der Opferplatz," so Geldner ad I.53.1. Thus Kakṣīvant deftly marries the grammatical deep structure (the dual) of the *viśvátaḥ sīm* formula with the surface phonology of *sádane vivásvataḥ* in a way that allows the semantics of both to be alluded to. (Perhaps an appreciation of the formulaic manipulations involved here would have led Bloomfield (RR) to reconsider his assessment of this verse with its "hysterical repetition of the root śru" as "secondary clap-trap.")

I do not understand why the Sindhu is esp. gifted with hearing.

I.122.7: The transition between the All God portion of the hymn and the dānastuti is eased by verbal repetition: Mitra and Varuṇa, who were the last gods invoked (6ab), are again called on here, though in opposite order and not in a dvandva but in individual vocatives (*varuṇa mitra* versus 6a *mitrāvaruṇā*). Independent *rātíḥ* picks up the 2nd cmpd member in *śrótu-rātiḥ* (6c) and the PN *śrutáratha-* (7c) also echoes *śrótu-rātiḥ*.

Accented *stuṣé* I take as a (quasi-)infinitive with passive value, though unaccented *stuṣe* is generally 1st sg. with "active" value.

The locc. *pajré* / *śrutárathe priyárathe* mark these men as givers, which makes some trouble, since Kakṣīvant's family seems to be called Pajra (quite possibly in the next verse and in I.126.4–5) and Kakṣīvant himself *pajriyá-* (I.116.7, 117.6, 120.5). Nonetheless, grammar can't be gainsaid, and they must be patrons here. See Ge's n. 7bc for attempts to reconcile the discrepancies.

I.122.7–8: The passively used 3rd sg. *stuṣé* (7a), *stuṣe* (8a) contrast in function with the great majority of *stuṣé* / *stuṣe* forms, which are 1st sg. and "active" in sense ("I [will] praise"). This rare usage may be mediated through the perception of the accented forms as infinitives; see disc. ad X.22.1.

I.122.8: See Old on this vs. I follow him in taking cd as a single rel. cl. hanging off Nahus in b, rather than a rel. cl. / main cl. structure. The uncertainty about the relationships of the various named patrons makes any interpr. tentative. See publ. intro.

I.122.9: This cautionary example of what happens to men who cheat the gods of proper offerings is clearly meant to warn stingy patrons.

Note the echo between the openings of b #*apó* and d #*ā́pa*, which are entirely distinct grammatically. As for the latter, as Kü also notes, various forms of the perfect of √*āp* have presential value.

I.122.10: Ge refuses to tr. *dáṃsujūta-*. Re "ayant été mû (comme) par miracle," clearly connecting it with *dáṃsas-* 'wondrous power', etc.; my tr. makes the same connection. The stem *dáṃsu-* is probably also found in *dáṃsu-patni-* (IV.19.7), though this is disputed. WG tr. *dáṃsujūta-* "als Heimkehrer," with the 1st member the loc. pl. of *dám-* 'house' -- so, more literally, 'in die Häuser eilend'. This is clever, and the two independent uses of *dáṃsu*, both nearby (I.134.4, 141.4), do seem to be that loc. pl. However, *jūta-* means 'sped, spurred on' and the fairly numerous compds in which it occurs have a 1st member that provides impetus (cf., e.g., *vā́ta-jūta-* 'wind-sped'); 'sped into the house' sounds more like an act of cowardice or retreat than of triumph.

bāḷhasṛ́tvā in c is even more problematic (though Ge does tr. it: "geht er [*yāti*] festes Ganges"). Independent *sṛ́tvan-* means 'running, streaming'; *bāḷha-* means 'thick, squeezed', to √*baṃh*. Although it would of course be possible to attenuate that meaning to 'firm, powerful', I think that Kakṣīvant, by using this unusual compound, and esp. the unusual 1st member, had something more precise in mind than a firm stride -- esp. in a dānastuti, where slang is most at home. I have therefore used the Engl. idiom 'pumped up' (approximating the 'squeezed, dense' sense of the Skt.), which is defined by an online dict. (http://www.thefreedictionary.com) as "tense with excitement and enthusiasm as from a rush of adrenaline," with the following example: "we were really pumped up for the race."

I.122.11: The dual part. *gmántā* of pāda a does not match the pl. impv. *śrótā* of b nor the pl. voc. *rājānaḥ* in the same pāda. Drawing the distinction did not seem worth it in the publ. tr. -- which would have to be something like "as you two go ..., (do all of you) hear ..." The number discrepancy is generally (see, e.g., Old, Ge)—and in my opinion correctly—interpreted as first a reference to Mitra and Varuṇa and then to the Ādityas as a group. M+V were prominent earlier (vss. 6–7, 9; see also 15c, the final vs.) and in fact in vs. 7 ushered in the dānastuti. The plural phrase in b is used precisely of the three principal Ādityas, including explicitly M+V, in X.93.5: *té ghā rā́jāno amṛ́tasya mandrā́, aryamā́ mitró váruṇaḥ* ... In my opinion there is no reason either to emend the text (as Gr does) or to take *gmántā* (with Lowe, Part. 185 + n. 30) as a "pseudo-absolutive."

This parallel also shows that Scar's clever idea (171, followed by WG) to construe *amṛ́tasya* with the verb *śrótā* cannot be correct.

In c Old takes the hapaxes *nabhojū́-* and *niravá-* in full lexical value, rather than as PN, and, at least acdg. to Mayr. (PN, svv.), this remains a live possibility. However, in the dānastuti context names are more likely, though they can be speaking names. That *-jū-* echoes *-jūta-* in 10a and *-ravá-* echoes *ruvaṇyú-* in 5a (assuming an analysis *ni-ravá-*

with Old, rather than *nir-avá-* with Gr) is presumably no accident: puns on personal names are a standard RVic poetic device.

I.122.12: My interpr. differs from most (though it is closest to Old's). There are two major reasons for the different interpr. in pāda a: 1) most take *dhāma* as part of the rel. cl., but this is impossible because the verb is unaccented; 2) most take *śárdham* as a reference to the Marut troop. This is, of course, its standard use, but in this hymn it should first be interpreted in conjunction with *śárdhastara-* 'more forceful' in 10b, where it qualifies an unnamed patron. Here we want to establish our patron (*sūrí-*) as such a force. In my interpr. the rel. cl. is a nominal cl. consisting only of *yásya sūréḥ*, in which * *vayám* (or **smás[i]*) can be supplied (from the 1st pl. inherent in *dhāma*), as an expression of possession: "of which patron (we) [are]," i.e., "who is (our) patron." Cf. the type VIII.92.32 *tvám asmā́kaṃ táva smasi* "you are ours; we are yours."

The speakers in b are the poet(s) and priest(s). The gen. *dáśastayasya* 'tenfold' must be interpreted in light of the fuller expression *dáśastayasya dhāséḥ* in 13a "tenfold gush," probably a kenning for soma, though there is no agreement on its sense. The fact that the fuller expression serves as a complement of the verb *mándāmahe*, a standard soma verb, in 13a supports this identification. The 'tenfold' characterization is not clear; Old plausibly suggests that it refers to the number of servings to be divided among that number of priests.

Ge (/WG) and possibly Re take cd as a resumption of the direct speech of pāda a. This is not impossible, but the 3rd persons of c and d have no clear referents in a.

I take *dyumnā́ni* in c as a fronted object of *sanvantu* in d, more or less following Old. This technically makes *yéṣu ... rārán* appear to be an embedded rel. cl., which I'm afraid I will just have to live with.

As indicated in the comm. to vs. 5, I take *vasútāti-* here as a reference to the collectivity of good ones, namely gods. I then take the pl. *víśve* opening the next pāda as referring also to the gods. In this Viśve Devāḥ hymn, the poet cleverly makes reference to them here in this off-kilter expression, with *devā́ḥ* suppressed and anticipated by the sg. *vasútāti-*. (The full expression is found in 3d.) My only reservation about this interpr. is that in a dānastuti it should be mortals who are doing the winning, and certainly the phrase *prabhṛthéṣu vā́jam* "the victory prize in the forays" fits a mortal context better. I might then modify my tr. to remove the bracketed "[=gods]" and leave the identity of the subject open. It may in fact be that the two objects *dyumnā́ni* and *vā́jam* will be won by gods and mortals respectively, and *víśve* refers to both, hence "let all (the gods) win the brilliant things in which the assemblage of good ones takes pleasure, and let all (the mortals) win the victory prize at the forays."

I.122.13: On the phrasal repair of 12b *dáśatayasya* by *dáśastayasya dhāséḥ* see comm. vss. 3, 5, and 12.

The "twice five" in pāda b may be the fingers, as I suggest (almost the default identification in a RVic ritual context), or the number of priests, indirectly conveyed by the tenfold soma of 12b and 13a. Ge (/WG) takes the "twice five" as directly characterizing *ánnā*: the twice five foods.

Ge (/WG) and Re take *iṣṭā́śvaḥ* and *iṣṭáraśmiḥ* as PNs of patrons. (Actually Re omits the first, presumably inadvertently.) I also take them as referring to patrons but

with full lexical value: the one who has "desirable horses" and "desirable reins" [latter probably a stand-in for "chariots"] to offer. That "those showing mastery" (*īśānā́saḥ*) are patrons is strongly suggested by I.141.3, where that participle modifies *sūráyaḥ* 'patrons'. The Saṃhitā text *táruṣa* is analyzed by the Pp. as *táruṣaḥ*, which could be a gen. with *īśānā́saḥ* (so Gr, Re, WG) or nom. pl. (so Ge). Old suggests that it could also be read as dat. *táruṣe*, against the Pp., which is how I take it. I then interpr. *nf̍n* as referring not to the singers (so Ge et al.) but to still other patrons with whom they are competing to provide the best recompense to the singers.

I.122.14: As is recognized by all, the flood (*árṇaḥ*) is the herd of gift cows, whose constant turbulent motion must have suggested the metaphor. Accentless *maṇigrīvam* Old considers a "monstrosity" due to faulty transmission. It must be a bahuvrīhi like immediately preceding *híraṇyakarṇam*, and I now wonder if the phrase *híraṇyakarṇam maṇigrīvam* actually represents a dvandva consisting of two bahuvrīhis ('possessing golden ears and ornamented necks'), which could account for the single accent. The geminate *m* across the compound boundary (*-karṇam* ***m****aṇi-*) might have been redactionally introduced from **-karṇa-****m****aṇi-*). The first members of the two compounds *híraṇya-* and *maṇi-* are the constituents of the phrase *híraṇyena maṇínā* in I.33.8, on which see my extensive discussion in "A Golden Amulet in Vedic and Avestan" (2018, Ged. H. P. Schmidt). Against my interpr. of the forms as one cmpd is the fact that cmpds of more than two members are vanishingly rare in the RV.

Pāda b is repeated verbatim from 3d, but because it has an object (the flood) it has a slightly different sense from there.

The reason for the doubled *á* in c is not clear to me.

cākantu is taken, plausibly, as haplologized from **cākanantu*. See, most recently, Kü (131).

I.122.15: In the publ. tr., there should be a comma after "victorious."

What verb to supply in ab seems up to the interpreter.

I do not understand the image in *syū́ma-gabhasti-* 'with hands as its guiding rope'. On the other occurrence of this stem, see VII.71.3, where JPB (publ. intro.) suggests that the "hands" are the hands of the priest who control the ritual. This is possible here as well.

I.123 Dawn

After the almost impenetrable last two hymns, the Dawn series comes as a welcome relief, though it does not lack puzzles or Kakṣīvant's characteristic flourishes. Note also the prevalence of āmreḍitas and similar expressions (*gṛhám-gṛham*, *divé-dive*, *śáśvat*, and *ágram-agram* all in vs. 4; then *ékaikā* in 8 at long remove, *bhadrám-bhadram* in 13).

I.123.1: Against the Pp (and standard tr.) I read dat. *dákṣiṇāyāi* rather than gen. *-āyāḥ*. If it's a gen., it has to be construed with *ráthaḥ* "the chariot of the priestly gift." The identification of the chariot and the dakṣiṇā in 5d supports neither of these interpr.

I.123.2: The vs. begins and ends with *pū́rva-* (*pū́rvā ... pūrvá(hūtau)*), a very tight species of ring composition.

punarbhū́- here seems to lack its later technical sense (a remarried widow) and have only its literal meaning 'come into being again'.

I.123.4: The hapax *ahaná* is difficult. Gr connects it with (*áhar* /) *áhan-* 'day'. Ge tr. 'unverwüstliche' (indestructible); he does not comment, but judging from the tr. I assume he takes it from a negated derivative of √*han* 'smite'. Old tentatively suggests a connection with √*ah* 'say', though he doesn't gloss the result (for perhaps obvious reasons). Re 'lascive' with caution, connecting it possibly with *āhanás-* 'swollen, lusty' (usually of soma). WG refuse to tr. but suggest in the n. an adverbial derivation of the particle *áha* 'certainly'. My tr. rests on the possibility that it represents **máhanā*, with the initial *m* lost after the final *m* of the preceding word: *gṛháṃ-gṛham ahaná* ... This would make for better meter; otherwise there are four consecutive light syllables, spanning the (early) caesura, and in addition Arnold (194) deems × – ⏑ ⏑ an "occasional" (that is, relatively rare) pattern of the trimeter opening. But what would such **mahaná* represent? I suggest that it should be grouped with the trisyllabic form *mah·ná* (IV.2.1, X.6.7 [possibly; see comm. ad loc.]); this appears to be a variant of *mahiná*, the longer version of the instr. sg. to *mahimán-*, whose shorter version is the very common disyllabic *mahná*. The medial *-a-* here would result from matching the second vowel of *mahánt-*, *mahá-*, *mahás-*/*máhas-*, as well as the combining form *mahā-*. Or it might actually reflect a different syllabification of the inherited instr. **magH-mn-aH* as * *magH-m̥n-aH*, with the suffixal *m* vocalized between two consonants, rather than the preceding laryngeal.

I.123.5: The final phrase *dákṣinayā ráthena* with two instr. identifies the dakṣiṇā and the chariot, unlike either of the proposed readings in 1a (see comm. there). Gr, followed (perhaps surprisingly) by Old, suggests reading **dákṣiṇāyā(ḥ)* here, with the gen. supposedly found in 1a. Old ascribes the change to attraction to the instr. *ráthena*. The proposed emendation would do no violence to the meter (and would in fact produce a somewhat more common break), but since the text is easily comprehensible as transmitted, I see no reason to emend.

I.123.7: The du. *parikṣítoḥ* is universally taken (Ge [/WG], Re, Old, Scar [p. 96]) as referring to Heaven and Earth (e.g., Ge "das Dunkel der beiden umgebenden (Welten)"). In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the two other occurrences of the form do refer to H+E (III.7.1, X.65.8). However, I prefer to take it as referring to the pair already in the discourse, Night and Dawn. The cycling and circling movements of these two are highlighted in 7ab (and note *pári yanti* in 8d of the pl. Dawns). I also do not understand what "the darkness of H+E" would refer to, whereas Dawn's role in hiding the darkness of night is well known. There is also a weak syntactic argument in favor of my interpr. Definite *anyá-* forms ordinarily take 2nd position (see Jamison 1997, Fs. Beekes); note the position of the two *anyád* in pāda a, each after the fronted preverb in its clause. (The *anyā́ḥ* in 11d belongs to the "(all) the other" construction, which is positioned differently.) If *parikṣítoḥ* is loosely connected with what follows, *anyá* here follows the first real word of the clause *támaḥ*; otherwise it appears late.

I.123.8: I take *pári yanti* in two different senses, one with each pāda of the hemistich: in c the verb describes the literal circuit of the thirty days whereas in d it is used in the metaphorical sense 'encompass', hence 'achieve'. The two pādas also contrast the series of dawns needed to add up to the thirty-day cycle (c) with what each one of them accomplishes in a single day (d).

I.123.9: I think *ná* in c does double duty: first and primarily as the negative with *mināti*, but also as a simile marker following *yóṣā*. The rest of the simile (*niṣkṛtám ācárantī*) follows in the next pāda. For *yóṣā* explicitly in a similar simile see VI.75.4 *té ācárantī sámaneva yóṣā* "The two ..., like a maiden faring forth to (festive) gatherings."

I.123.10: On √*śad* see comm. ad X.120.5.

I.123.11: In the publ. tr. "auspicious one" sounds like a vocative, which it is not. Perhaps better "as the/an auspicious one."

I.123.12: Likewise "easy to invoke," which is not a voc. either. Better "as one easy to invoke."

I.124 Dawn

I.124.2–3: *áminatī* (2a) and *ná ... mināti* (3d)(cf. also *ná mināti* I.123.9) receive different tr. here both because they have different objects and because *áminatī* is contrastively paired with *praminatī* (2b).

I.124.4: My interpr. follows that of Thieme (KZ 79 [1965] -- KlSch 214–27), cited also in the publ. intro.; for doubts, esp. about the interpr. of pāda b, see Scar 272–73.

I.124.5: The hapax *aptyá-* is connected by Gr, Old, and, tentatively, EWA (s.v. *ánapta-*) with 'water'. Ge leaves it untr.; WG as 'äussere' without comment. I follow Re's tentative suggestion 'inaccessible au vol' (to √*pat*), with perhaps more enthusiasm than he shows for it.

I.124.7: On the female figures here, see publ. intro.

The first simile (in pāda a), *abhrātéva puṃsá eti pratīcī* "Like a brotherless (girl) she goes right up to men" (publ. tr.), I take as expressing wanton behavior on the part of a girl who lacks a brother to protect her and/or to identify potential husbands for her and who therefore must seek opportunities herself. However, it is often interpreted as a reference to the institution of the *putrikā* 'appointed daughter', the daughter of a sonless father whose offspring will serve as descendants of her father, not her husband's father and who is therefore a poor marital prospect. See for example P.V. Kane, "Vedic Basis of Hindu Law," JBBAS 26 [1922] 57–82, at 58–60, who sees it as a forerunner of the provisions in VDS XVII.16 concerning the *putrikā*. (See also YDŚ I.52–53 on not marrying a brotherless girl.) (Ludo Rocher several times cites Kane's treatment; see *Studies in Hindu Law and Dharmaśāstra*, 47, 64.) Kane's tr. reflects this interpr.: "As a

(woman) without a brother comes back to (her) male (relations).” This view does not seem sufficiently supported.

As for b, though most interpr. (see recently Scar [463], WG) see only a male figure in the simile in b (a charioteer seeking prizes), I find it unlikely that the middle simile of three, the two outer of which depict striking female types, would compare Dawn only to a male. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think it is a double entendre, with not only the prize-seeking male competitor on his chariot seat but also a prostitute displaying herself on a platform or stage for money (or whatever counted for money in that period).

The root noun cmpd *gartārúh-* ‘mounting a seat’ has *gárta-* as first member. It is therefore tempting to interpr. the 2nd member as *āruh-*, belonging to the lexeme *ā́ √ruh* ‘mount, climb on’ (as in the cmpd. *āruh-* X.44.6). Scar (463–64) rejects this interpr. on the grounds that rt. noun cmpds with direct object noun as 1st member do not also contain preverbs, a statement with which I am in agreement; see my disc. in “Vedic *iṣudhyá-…* (Lamberterie Fs., 2020: 486) on the gapping of *práti* in such a cmpd. (See now my forthcoming “Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian.) Scar attributes the long *ā* to the effect of the root-initial laryngeal, as in *upārúh-*, etc. This is certainly possible, but I wonder if, in what must have been a nonce formation, the lexeme *ā́ √ruh* didn’t play a part. On *puru-niṣṣídh-*, see comm. ad I.10.5; on *karmaniṣṭhā́-* and *puruniṣṭhā́-* see comm. ad X.80.1 and VIII.2.9 respectively; on *viśva-ābhū-* X.50.1. The only true exception (and even it may not be) is *yajña-niṣkṛ́t-* X.66.8; see comm. ad loc.

I.124.7–8: *suvā́śā(ḥ)* in 7c is neatly echoed by *svásā* opening 8a.

I.124.8: As indicated in the publ. intro., I believe that this verse continues the series of female portraits, this time with two vignettes of the svayaṃvara (‘self-choice’) marriage.

On the basis of I.113.1, Ge suggests persuasively that the subj. of pāda a is Night and her older sister is Dawn. Nonetheless, I take the subj. of b to be Dawn, who is going away from Night. The crucial word in b is *praticákṣyăl ā* (latter Pp.), which can be either a gerund (*-ă*) or a gerundive (*-ā*). Most (though not Old) take it as the latter, as I do, but with the sense “to be seen again” (e.g., Ge “die man wiedersehen soll”), that is, as one who will return. But this is not the standard meaning of *práti √cakṣ*, which simply means ‘gaze upon’. Here I think “to be gazed upon” represents the display motif of the svayaṃvara marriage: before the girl exercises her choice among the assembled suitors, she enters the arena (vel sim.) and is announced and displayed for all to see (for disc. see esp. Jamison 1999 [Penelope] and for this passage in general Jamison 2003 [Fs. H.-P. Schmidt], pp. 42–44).

The choosing maidens (*vrā́ḥ*) of the same marriage type are the topic of pāda d. The anointing of maidens going to marriage assemblies is also depicted in a simile in VII.2.5.

I.124.12: The “one being at home” (*amā́ sánt-*) may contrast implicitly with the “Early-coming” one (*prātarítvan-*) who forms the subject of the 1st half of the next hymn (I.125). In that hymn the Prātaritvan engages in dialogue with a person who is probably a householder, that is, in the words of our verse, one being at home.

This vs. is identical to VI.64.6; for further comm. see there.

I.125 (The Early-coming one) Svayana's Dānastuti

For a sustained treatment of the "early-coming one" (*prātáritvan-*) see Jamison, Sac.Wife 184–89.

I.125.2: The first three pādas of this verse are in the standard high Rigvedic register and present the unsurprising themes of prosperity and reciprocity, but the fourth pāda violently wrenches the verse in an unexpected direction. The placidly happy relationship between host and guest depicted in vss. 1 and 2abc takes a sinister and coercive turn, but what precisely that turn consists of is partly obscured by the fact that pāda d contains two hapaxes (*mukṣī́jā-* and *pádi-*) and a very rare lexeme (*úd √sā́si*, otherwise only AV VI.112.2–3). What is clear is that the host derives great benefit from the visit of the early-coming one *if* he forces him to stay -- "ties him up" in fact.

A simile adds precision to this picture, or it would if we understood it: *mukṣī́jayeva pádim* "(binds you up) like a *pádi* with a *mukṣī́jā-*." Ge tr. "wie den Vogel in der Schlinge," which certainly yields sense though it is essentially contextually inspired guesswork. (In content it is reminiscent of the clearer III.45.1 "Let no one hold you down, as men using snares do a bird.") I have tried pushing it further, though with no confidence in the correctness of my speculations.

I treated *mukṣī́jā-* elsewhere (Ged. Cowgill, 1987, pp. 89–91). I suggested there that the word is a deformation of *muṣká-* 'testicle' and that Kakṣīvant is making a play on his own name (which may itself mean 'having a crotch'), esp. the *-kṣī*, with this deformation -- as he does elsewhere in his oeuvre. Taking this further, the *-jā-* may be the root noun to √*jan*^{i}, a root noun very common as a 2nd compound member (see the numerous exx. in Scar. 132–53). Those compounds are invariably accented on the *-já-*; I would attribute the accent here to the poet's play on his name *kakṣī́vant-*. But what would this baroque confection *mukṣī́jā-* mean? If it literally means 'originating from/at the testicles', it could refer to a loin cloth, a strip of cloth that covers the genitals -- a thong -- and as a long strip of material it could be used to bind or tie up an animal.

My interpr. of *pádi-* rests on even less evidence. I suggest, *very* tentatively, that it comes from a MIA form **pṛdi-*, related to the Iranian forms borrowed into Greek as πάρδαλις, etc., as well as to Skt. *pṛdāku-*. In earlier lit. this word was said to mean 'leopard, panther, tiger' only in lexical texts, while its earlier occurrences mean 'spotted snake'; see EWA, KEWA s.v. Mayrhofer attributes the later lexical meaning to borrowing from Iranian. But it clearly refers to a large wild feline in AVP II.18.1, since it is parallel to *siṃha-* 'lion' and *vyāghra-* 'tiger'; see Zehnder, *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2*, p. 59. In keeping with the racy tone in these two hymns, it could also be a pun on √*pṛd* 'fart' (though this root is not attested in Vedic [see EWA s.v. *pard*], its representation in the younger language and in Iranian, incl. Avestan, suggests that it was known to Vedic speakers but subject to taboo avoidance), and the desire to make the pun would have led K. to use an otherwise obscure word for wild animal here. Given the discrepancy in morphology (no forms of the shape **pṛdi-* are attested in any relevant language) and the chronological gap, this gossamer hypothesis probably should be discarded -- but there is nothing stronger to take its place (and it gave me the opportunity to use the English word 'pard').

I.125.3: *iṣṭéḥ putrám* "the son of my seeking" picks up the immediately preceding part. *ichán* 'seeking' to the same root and means essentially the product of my successful search.

Indra is the likely recipient of the soma in c and the strengthening in d, but the epithet *kṣayádvīra-* (8x) is never applied to Indra, rather usually to Rudra (5x). But Rudra is highly unlikely to be the target here.

I.125.4: The two conjoined phrases *ījānáṃ ca yakṣyámānaṃ ca* (b) and *pṛṇántaṃ ca pápuriṃ ca* (c) have the same referent, and their syntactic parallelism invites a completely parallel interpretation of their verbal semantics. But the pairs are not morphologically parallel: the first phrase consists of a perfect part. and a future part., the second of a present part. and a reduplicated *-i-*stem adj. In the publ. tr. I render *pápuri-* as preterital ("who ... has granted"), but following Grestenberger (JAOS 113.2 [2013]) I now see such forms as imperfectives, often with habitual or iterative sense; unfortunately in this context the conjoined phrase then seems almost pleonastic, though perhaps "the one who grants and keeps granting" would work.

I would also slightly alter the tr. of the phrase in b to "the one who has sacrificed and will sacrifice," to make the parallelism of the two phrases in bc clearer and also to rule out a reading in which the two participles in b have different referents.

I.125.6: The dakṣiṇā (priestly gift, more literally gift-cow) theme comes to the fore here.

I supply 'bounties' (*rā́dhāṃsi*) with *citrā́* 'bright' on the basis of the cmpd *citrá-rādhas-* and the numerous occurrences of the phrase *citrá- rā́dhas-*.

I.125.7: I do not entirely understand pāda c, which must contrast with d. I assume the referents of *téṣām* are the generouss patrons of ab, who are distinguished from the *ápṛṇantam* 'non-granter' of d. This non-granter is to be entirely engulfed (*abhí sám √i*) by *śókāḥ*. The stem *śóka-* and the various forms of the root to which it belongs (*√śuc*) otherwise refers to blazing flames in the RV, but in later Skt. it has come to mean 'pain, affliction'. I think that both senses are present here, hence my portmanteau tr. "flames of pain." The flames in this pāda may help in interpreting the previous one. One of the uses of *paridhí-* 'enclosure' is for the "enclosing sticks" placed around the Āhavanīya fire (already X.90.15 and common in ritual lit.). If the non-giver is being surrounded by flames in d, the givers in c deserve a different and benign enclosure (*anyáḥ ... paridhíḥ ... káś cid*), not the *paridhí-* that ordinarily surrounds the fire. Its nature remains unspecified: both the initial position of *anyá-* and the final *káś cid* mark the referent as indefinite.

I.126 Kakṣīvant's Dānastuti

I.126.1: Negated *ámanda-* 'not feeble' contains the adj. *manda-* 'stupid, lazy', which is otherwise not attested until the Up. and epic. The audience's first interpr. of *ámandān* would be as a form of *√ma(n)d* 'exhilarate', though obviously *manda-* 'stupid' must have existed in everyday speech to allow it to be used here. As with *śóka-* in the last verse of the preceding hymn (I.125.7), Kakṣīvant is availing himself of words/meanings belonging to a different register to spice up the discourse. The prominent placing of *ámandān* as the initial word of the hymn calls further attention to this stylistic departure.

I.126.2: The root √*nādh* '(cry/be) in distress' is often used of people in dire straits (see, e.g., in Kakṣīvant's I.118.10); here the king's distress comes not from danger but from want of fame. There may be a touch of humor in this overdramatization of his plight, though see I.110.5 where the Ṛbhus cry out in want at an invocation, likewise seeking fame (*śráva ichámānāḥ*, exactly as in our 1d).

On *ā́dam* see comm. ad II.12.4.

The patron–poet reciprocal bargain is managed with striking economy here: the king seeks fame in 1d, the poet receives many goods in 2abc, and the desired fame is dispatched to heaven in 2d.

I.126.3: The temporal expression *abhipitvé áhnām* is universally taken as a reference to evening. In the RV dakṣiṇās are distributed at the morning sacrifice (hence their association with Dawn), though in classical śrauta ritual the time has changed to the midday rite. Perhaps Kakṣīvant knows an alternative practice, or he's slyly indicating that the largesse was so enormous that it took all day to distribute. I favor the latter.

I.126.5: Having employed a no-nonsense style in listing the gifts he acquired in vss. 2–4 (for a similar detour into straightforwardness, see the expression of his desires in I.121.14–15), Kakṣīvant returns to his tricks in the last vss. of this hymn.

Since I discuss this verse at length in Jamison 2003 (Fs. H.-P. Schmidt) pp. 47–51, I will not repeat the details here. The first hemistich is reasonably intelligible and continues the listing of gifts. It's notable that the amount that Kakṣīvant managed to acquire "for you" (*vaḥ*) is a small fraction of his own haul. One question is who the "you" are: I take them as the Pajras, his kin, who cleaned up with him in 4d and are mentioned again in 5d, though in the 3rd ps.

As I point out in the Schmidt Fs., the elaborate simile in cd seems typed as a wedding scene by the telling words *ánasvant-* 'possessing carts' and *vrā́-* 'female chooser'. The cart (*ánas-*) is the wedding vehicle par excellence and hardly appears in the RV except in conjunction with females, particularly in marriage context, and, as I argue in that art., *vrā́-* is the designation for a girl exercising her choice at a svayaṃvara marriage. The image presented in the simile is of well-connected young men traveling to svayaṃvaras in hopes of acquiring a bride (that is, being chosen by a bride) of acceptable family and clan. I therefore take the *vrā́ḥ* phrase as acc. pl., not nom. with most interpr. and take the simile as beginning with *subándhavaḥ*.

I.126.6: On the meaning 'smell' for the intensive *jáṅgahe* see Lubotsky (JAOS 117 [1997]: 562–63 [rev. of Schaeffer, Intensiv]); Griffiths and Lubotsky (JAOS 119 [1999]: 480–81). The word *kaśīkā-* is found only here. If it refers to a mongoose (or perhaps the related civet cat), the naturalistic description makes sense, as Lubotsky (JAOS 117) argues: squeezed on the back, mongooses release a musky odor. (This is characteristic of both sexes at least of civet cats, though Lubotsky seems to think it is only true of male mongooses.) As I have argued elsewhere (Ged. Cowgill, 1987, p. 89), this hapax may appear in this passage because Kakṣīvant is making another play on his own name (see above, comm. I.125.2).

The second hemistich appears to be a fairly graphic depiction of sexual intercourse and, like other such passages, is difficult to interpret because of the obscurity of the vocabulary and the slangy style. The difficulties here reside primarily in the hapax *yā́durī* and the near hapax *yā́śu-*. The rest -- *dádāti máhyam ... bhojyā̀ śatā́* -- is relatively straightforward: "She gives me 100 ..." I differ from the standard tr. in taking *bhojyā̀* not as acc. pl. neut. 'pleasures', but as a fem. sg. gerundive. Although we would expect the accentuation **bhójyā*, the suffixal accent here may be a redactional change to follow *bhojyā̀* in nearby I.128.5 after our passage was no longer understood. I take this gerundive as belonging to both roots √*bhuj* 'enjoy' and 'bend, coil': the woman in question is to be coiled around (in sex) and thus to be enjoyed.

As for *yā́śu-* this word appears a few other times in compounds: *budbudáyāśu-* (X.155.4), where it seems to refer to ejaculations (as insubstantial as) bubbles; fem. *suyā́śutarā* (X.86.6), where Indrāṇī boasts about herself -- I tr. "gives better sex" -- and *ayāśú-* (AV VIII.6.15) as an epithet of hideous minor demons tormenting pregnant women, where Whitney plausibly but tentatively tr. 'impotent'. I take it to mean something like 'ejaculation', which I've rendered as 'spurts' to avoid a clinical tone.

yā́durī- appears to belong to the marginal root √*yād* 'unite' (see EWA s.v. *YĀD*); I render the nominal here by 'fusing'.

As often, I think the presence of these rare words serves more than one purpose — in this case to produce an encoded pun on the root √*yabh* 'fuck'. Note the repetition of *yā́*'s, starting with *yā́* in b, but taking off in cd: ... (*mah)ya yā́(durī) yā́(śūnāṃ bhojí)yā ...* This repetition of the initial of the root might have the same effect as the English expression "the f-word," and it also gives the impression of a stutterer saying "*ya ... ya ... ya ...*" while the *bh* eludes him -- until he reaches *bh(ojyā̀*) and finally achieves the whole word.

I.126.7: This is presumably the speech of the woman whose charms were described in vs. 6. I have tr. it with what I consider appropriate vulgarity.

In pāda a *úpopa* 'nearer' and *párā* 'away' might seem to be preverbs that would cancel each other out, but here their conjunction perhaps invites the interpr. that she's asking for ever more intimate contact (*úpopa*) with parts that are usually off limits (*párā*).

Ge (/WG) take *dabhrā́ṇi manyathāḥ* to mean "think that (my hair) is meager" vel sim., with the hair borrowed from the second hemistich. I think rather that *dabhrá-* √*man* means 'belittle, think little of', but that *dabhrā́ṇi* should also be read as the object of that compound verb. This latter *dabhrā́ṇi* I take as a euphemism for her private parts ('little things'), in the way that *priyā́* 'dear things' is used by Indrāṇī in X.86.5 to refer to the same. (The contexts -- explicit female boasting about sex -- are similar, not to mention rare.) I thus take *dabhrā́ṇi* twice.

Although it is clear why a ewe, even a little ewe (*avikā́*), would be a fine example of a hairy female, I have no idea why *Gandharī* ewes would be especially hairy. Cold climate, one assumes.

I.127–139 Hymns of Paruchepa Daivodāsi

This sequence of hymns, composed primarily in Atyaṣṭi meter, is one of my favorite collections in the RV. The elaborate meter showcases the patterned repetitions, echoes, and variations that are one of the specialties of Rigvedic poets. The meter is

configured as 12 12 8 / 8 8 / 12 8, generally with exact repetition, rhyme, or some kind of controlled variation between pāda b + c and f + g. This series is the only sustained set of Atyaṣṭi hymns in the RV; to Paruchepa's son (/descendant) Anānata Pāruchepi is attributed the short Soma hymn IX.111.

I.127 Agni

I.127.1: The patterned connections of the 8-syllable pādas to their preceding pādas are detailed in the publ. intro. to this hymn group.

I.127.2: Although "earth-encircling heaven" fits easily into our modern cosmology, I don't know what is meant by this in a Vedic cosmological context. This problem clearly troubles both Ge and Re, who both supply the sun to do the circling, with heaven as the object (Re: "Lui qui circule autour (de l'aire) comme (le soleil autour du) ciel"). Although I understand the impetus, these interpr. introduce too much extra machinery into a simple two-word simile. For disc. see also Old, ZDMG 61 (1907) 818–19 = KlSch 249–50.

Agni was compared to a *vípra-* in 1c and then addressed as one in 2b. In 2c we invoke Agni with our own *vípra*-s, with *víprebhiḥ* occuping the same position as *vípram* in 1c. This type of implicit identification between Agni and his mortal worshipers is also found in 2a, where we sacrificers (*yájamānāḥ*) invoke him as best sacrificer (*yájiṣṭham*).

2f is a relative clause that lacks a verb; the verb ([*pra-*]*ávanti* vel sim.) can be supplied from the verb in the 8-syllable tag (2g), which contains the impv. *prā́vantu* with the same subj. (*víśaḥ* 'clans'). The g-pāda also adds an infinitival dat. to this verbal complex, indicating what the clans help Indra to do. Constructing the verb in 2f from the one in 2g is not a matter of simple gapping, because imperatives cannot appear in relative clauses. Ge supplies a different verb in f (huldigen) from that in g (ermutigen), but this ignores the patterned interplay characteristic of the 8-syllable pādas with what precedes them.

I.127.3: This verse is richly studded with problems. One of the lesser ones is the referent and grammatical identity of *purū́* in the first pāda. Gr classifies it with singular (presumably NA neut.) forms; Ge. takes it as an adv. 'gar sehr'; WG as instr. sg. (?) with *ójasā* ("mit ohnehin viel ... Körperkraft"). On the basis of the sequence (3d) *vīḷú cid*, (4a) *dṛḷhā́ cid*, (4f) *sthirā́ cid* (also with *ójasā*), all containing neuters, most plural, I take *purū́* as the neut. pl. it appears to be (so also Re: "qui brille en maint endroit"). Each instance of *cid* 'even' in this sequence emphasizes the formidable targets Agni is exercising his will upon. Unfortunately this value of *cid* is not so much in evidence in our phrase *purū́ cid ... dī́dyānaḥ* because 'shining' (at least as expressed with the root √*dī*) is not ordinarily a forceful or hostile act. I have therefore (reluctantly) not rendered the *cid* here, though I feel I have missed something, since the phrasal parallelism is otherwise so clear. Perhaps *dī́dyānaḥ* has something of the sense of similar forms of √*śuc* 'blaze (against)': so "shining (against) even the many with his radiant might."

Pāda b and its tag-pāda c contains a śleṣa, whose correct interpretation goes back at least to Benfey (see Ge's n. 3c). As indicated in the publ. intro. to I.127, *druhaṃtaráḥ* has two possible analyses: *druhaṃ-tará-* 'overcoming deceit' or *dru-hantara-* 'better at

striking wood'. The first is appropriate to the first instance of the word, but in c the presence of *paraśúḥ* 'ax' forces the 'wood' interpr.

The verb of de, *śrúvat*, is the problem in that clause. Wh (Roots) takes it as a (zero-grade) 1st class pres. to √*sru* 'flow', but √*sru* has no such zero-gr. formations (and there's the problem of the initial sibliant of course). Gr puts it with a root √*śru* 'zerinnen, zergehen' (separate from √*śru* 'hear'), but the formations he assigns to said "root" are a hodgepodge (and see Old on the likely nonexistence of the root). Re (flg. Cardona, see Re's n.) takes it to √*śru* 'hear', but this requires *supplying* the verb of destruction (by his interpr. 'fall' [tomber]) required by the context, with the perception verb that is actually found in the passage superfluous: "on les entend (tomber) ..." (The same root assignment seems to underlie the WG tr., though with a different overall interpr., which I confess I don't understand.) Even if the semantics worked better, there are no such stems to √*śru* 'hear'. Ge attributes it to √*śṝ* 'crush', which is reasonable on both semantic and textual grounds; see esp. the parallel he cites X.89.6 *śṛṇā́ti vīḷú rujáti sthirā́ṇi*, with very similar phraseology. Unfortunately I can see no way to get a stem *śrúva-* from *śṝ*. Old questioningly suggests a connection with √*ru* 'break', but needless to say the initial *ś* can't simply be omitted. I dare to suggest yet another root: √*srīv* 'abort'. Although some forms of this root (caus. *srevayet* [KS], RVic part. *sreváyant-*; aor. *asrāvīt* [JB]; pres. *srīvyati* [AB]) have an initial dental sibilant, others have the palatal: AV *śrīvayāmi,* MS *śrīvayeyuḥ*, *śrevuka-*. (On the forms, see Narten [Sig.Aor.] 282–83. Jamison [áya-] 145.) Such phonetic fluctuation is not surprising in a root that presumably was at least partially tabooed and was also probably more at home in a lower register, with, perhaps, the MIA neutralization of sibliants. Although a stem *śrúva-* or *srúva-* is not otherwise found to this root, the spotty attestation to this root in general makes its isolation unsurprising. The stem would probably be a zero-grade thematic injunctive (aor. or pres.?), though a root subjunctive can't be ruled out (though less likely in context). The loss of the *i̯ / i* would follow the same pattern as √*dīv / d(y)ū*, √*sīv / s(y)ū*, via **sRi̯ uH* → **sRuH*. I do not understand the accent, however. As for 'abortion' in this context of destruction, see, inter alia, the use of the caus. part. *sreváyant-* in VII.18.8, the Battle of the Ten Kings; possibly also *áva* √*sru* in nearby I.129.6.

The final two pādas (fg) of this verse also present their share of difficulties. We can begin with the final word of each pāda, *nā́yate* in the Saṃhitā text, which needs to be metrically distracted. The Pp. (followed by HvN) analyses this as *ná ayate*, but this produces a very bad cadence: we should expect a heavy syllable as the first syllable of the verb. This is easily remedied, without emending the Saṃhitā text, by *ā́yate* (i.e., prev. *ā́* + *ayate*). This analysis was also tentatively suggested by Gotō (1st cl., 92 n. 10).

Most tr. (and Old) take the point of *yamate nā́yate* to be that though Agni is victorious, he doesn't go further: he stays in his hearth. See, e.g., Re "(Bien que) triomphant, il tient (les rènes), il ne va pas (plus loin)." But the preverb *níḥ* 'forth' (with √*sah* only here and in the root noun *niṣṣáh-*) seems to presuppose motion (hence my 'going forth to conquer'), and certainly most treatments of Agni victorious depict him laying waste to his surroundings, as in the immediately preceding two pādas and in the following verse (4). The notion that Agni is suddenly showing self-restraint here seems contrary to the message of the context. I therefore take *yamate* as meaning not 'hold himself back', but 'hold/keep his place' (against counterattack) and *ā́yate* (/*ayate*) as a quasi-passive 'be moved'. Medial forms of √*i* are rare enough that a consistent meaning

to such a stem is hard to determine, and though some forms of *áyate* probably belong to a thematized stem (so Gotō, 92ff.), the parallelism with the root aor. subj. *yamate* here strongly suggests that our form is also a subjunctive (to the root pres. *éti*) and thus further separated from the thematic indicative forms. I therefore think that the somewhat idiosyncratic meaning I have attributed to the form is plausible, esp. as a negated semantic twin to *yamate*.

The final problem in the verse is the cmpd. instr. sg. *dhanvāsáhā*. This is almost universally (Gr, Old, Ge, Re, Scar 603) interpreted as 'conquering with a bow' (*dhánvan-*), which interpr. generally requires an additional personage to be supplied, generally Rudra. Gotō (1st cl., 92, n. 10) seems to favor this interpr., but also suggests the possibility that the first member is *dhánvan-* 'Land': "auf dem das Land ersiegenden [Weg]," with the whole pāda meaning that Agni will not go further and burn the land. WG have adopted this latter interpr. (though the 'bow' interpr. is referred to in the n.): "Auf dem trockenen Land ersiegenden (Weg) eilt er nicht hierher." I also am convinced that *dhánvan-* 'wasteland' is the correct interpr. of the 1st member. Given that the 'tree' theme is prominent in this verse and a 'bow' theme lacking, a reference to another landscape feature fits the context better. There is the problem that cmpds with *-sáh-* are ordinarily adjectives modifying animates (see the numerous exx. in Scar.), and my tr. assumes an abstract sense or at the very least an instr. manner adverb ("in/with his wasteland-conquering [manner]"). Despite this slight difficulty, this solution seems more economical than inserting Rudra into a context that has no other allusion to him.

I.127.3-4: In the publ. tr. *ójasā* in 3a and 4f should have been tr. the same, rather than 'might' and 'strength' respectively.

I.127.4: I generate the subject "(the pious man)," i.e., *dāśvā́n*, from its verb *dāṣṭi*.

I.127.5: After the respite of vs. 4, this verse returns to puns and word plays in full force. The syntax of this verse is complicated enough without unintended ambiguity in the English. In the pub. tr. "This fortifying power of his might we acquire ..." 'might' is a modal verb ("might we acquire"), not an abstract noun (*"his might").

In my opinion the hapax *dívātarāt* in bc is a śleṣa somewhat like *druhaṃtaráḥ* in 3bc, again utilizing the echo pāda (c) to instantiate a 2nd value for a word found in both pādas. Most take the word as a nonce substantivization of the adverb *dívā* by the addition of the comparative suffix found also in the preceding *sudárśataraḥ* 'more beautiful' (see AiG II.2.608; Re n. ad loc.). I agree that this is one reading, but I also think that *-tara-* can be a thematic nominal to √*tṛ* 'cross over' (cf. *tára-* etc.), and that the whole compound can mean 'traversing [the sky] by day' as a descriptor of the sun. For a similarly formed rhyme word, also referring to the sun, cf. *divākará-* 'day-maker' (AV+).

The hapax *áprāyuṣe* in c also poses difficulties. On the one hand, it is very similar to *áprāyu-* (3x) 'unremitting, not faltering', which most deriv from *prá* √*yu*; Old and Re opt for this analysis (Re "à (l'homme qui veille) infatigable"). However, I am persuaded by Ge's pointing out (n. 5) the unity of theme provided by *áprāyuṣe* (c) ... *ā́yuḥ* (d) ... *ajárāḥ* (fg), *if áprāyuṣe* contains the 'lifetime' word. However, I do not think either Ge's "ohne zu altern" or WG's "zum Nichtverschwinden der Lebenskraft" is the correct analysis. Rather I think the word evokes the common idiom *ā́yuḥ pra* √*tṛ* 'lengthen

lifetime' and refers to a man whose lifetime has not *yet* been lengthened. Note that the √*tṝ* part of the idiom can be pulled out of *dívātara-* (a 3rd sense for this compound). Agni is called *viśvā́yu-* 'providing/affording all lifetimes' in the next hymn (I.128.8) and is also regularly asked to lengthen (*prá* √*tṝ*) our lifespan (e.g., I.94.16, VIII.44.30). I now also believe that *áprāyu-* also contains the 'lifetime' word (the less well-attested *á́yu-* beside *á́yus-*); see comm. ad V.80.3.

In the next pāda Agni's own lifespan (that is, his immortality, more explicit in fg) is a model for our own: it provides a handhold (*grábhaṇavat*) or, as we would say, "a leg up" for the man hoping to have his lifespan extended.

I don't quite understand *bhaktám ábhaktaṃ vā*. It is probably an implicitly temporal expression: the help that has already been apportioned and the rest that has not yet been apportioned (but will be, we hope).

I.127.6: The verse has an extra pāda (h), which serves as the tag-pāda to g. Given the difficulties in the verse, the extra pāda just provides more occasion for bewilderment.

The hapax *iṣṭáni-* in the paired pādas bc has been variously interpreted. Gr takes it to *(n)is* + √*stan* 'thunder' ('thunder' explicitly rejected by Old). Ge does not comment but his tr. 'sich ausbreitend' suggests a derivation from √*tan* 'stretch'; his tr. is echoed by Re ('s'étendant'), though in his n. he suggests that the first element is the zero-grade root noun to √*yaj* 'sacrifice', encouraged by Old. The currently prevailing interpr. is probably Hoffmann's (reported in KEWA, EWA) 'spreading nourishment', found in WG. This is certainly possible; however, I favor √*stan* 'thunder', despite Old's disapproval, but with the preverb *ví*. The Saṃhitā text reads ... *urvárāsviṣṭánir* (b) / *ā́rtanāsviṣṭániḥi* (c), but both loc. plurals require metrical distraction: *urvárās^{u}viṣṭánir* (etc.). The Pp. reads *urvárāsu* / *iṣṭániḥ* (etc.), but nothing prevents reading *urvárāsu* / *viṣṭániḥ* from the distracted *-s(u)vi-* sequence. Although *vi* √*stan* is not found until very late, it would not be a difficult idiom to create, esp. given the widespread *ví* √*dyut* 'flash forth as lightning' in the same pragmatic sphere. The thunder would thematically continue the noise of the first pāda and the association with the Maruts, storm gods.

Pāda c contains a 2nd hapax, *ā́rtanāsu*, which both Ge and WG refuse to tr. (though see WG n. for a different suggestion) and Old, having offered a few suggestions, refuses to analyze. Re tr. "les terres steriles" but without comment (though the tr. probably stems from Gr's 'übel, öde, Misernten bringend'). My own suggestion is quite speculative, but in this situation there seems no other choice. The pāda is a syllable short; HvN in fact divide up the first vowel, reading *ā́ ártanāsu*, but a stem *ártanā-* does us no more good than *ā́rtanā-*. I suggest supplying the syllable *nir* to open the pāda (and the word, hence **nirā́rtanāsu*); this *nir* can be generated from the final syllable of the preceding pāda (*iṣṭán)nir*, or rather we can imagine a haplology: *iṣṭánnir*, **nir*ā́*r*tanāsu. This posited stem **nirā́rtanā-* would belong to *nír* √*ṛ*, most prominent in the well-attested *níṛti-* 'chaos, disorder, dissolution'. The loc. pl. pairing in bc would then contrast the productive (*ápnasvant-*) fields/meadows with their negative counterpart, disorderly and useless.

Note the alliteration in d: ***ā́dad dh****avyā́ny* ***ādadí****r*, followed by ***ádh****a* beginning f (as well as ***ā́d*** beginning 5d).

As Ge points out (n. 6d), *ā́dat* can be the impf. to √*ad* 'eat' as well as belonging to *ā́* √*dā* 'take' (on which see comm. ad II.12.4), though he doesn't incorporate this pun into his tr. Agni as the eater of oblations is of course a common trope.

hárṣato hṛ́ṣīvataḥ in f is a nice etymological figure, though in the context of this hymn barely deserving mention.

Most tr. take the *náraḥ* of h as ordinary, human men, but I think it refers rather to the Maruts. *śubhé* (and *śúbh-* in general) is one of their signature words; cf., e.g., I.88.2 *śubhé kám yānti* and, with *náraḥ* referring to them, V.52.8 *... té śubhé náraḥ*. The indirect mention of the Maruts here would form a ring with their appearance in pāda a.

I.127.7: Most take *kīstá-* in pāda as a PN, a further specification of the Bhṛgus, and this is a tempting way to avoid dealing with the word. However, it is more difficult to take it as a PN in its only other appearance in the RV (and indeed anywhere) at VI.67.10. I therefore follow the interpr. going back at least to Sāy, 'praiser'. EWA has a reasonably plausible scenario for getting it as a hypersanskritization of a MIA form of **kīrtha-*, beside *kīrtí-* 'praise', etc.

I take *mathnántaḥ* in c as a pun on √*math* 'steal' (referring to the Bhṛgus' theft of fire; see Narten, KlSch. 23-24) and 'churn, rub', a common word for the production of the fire on the ritual ground.

The identity of the "dear coverings" is not clear. Ge suggest, for example, that they are what keep Agni within the kindling sticks, WG that they are everything a fire burning in a field would incorporate in itself. Since Agni is identified as the holder (*dharṇí-*) of goods in e, I wonder if the coverings are the enclosure itself -- though what this means physically I'm not sure.

On the isolated precative *vaniṣīṣṭa* see Narten (SigAor. 236-37), who points out that its object is also a hapax and considers it an "Augenblicksbildung des Dichters." The "wise one" (*médhira-*) is probably Agni himself, as often, and the med. form of the verb would support this identification.

I.127.8: This verse begins straightforwardly enough but its syntax deteriorates (or gets more convoluted) towards the end.

The three-member cmpd. *satyágirvāhas-* in c is implicitly analyzed by Ge as *satyágir-vāhas-* ("ihn den wahrhafte Reden anziehen"; sim. WG), but, on the one hand, *gírvāhas-* is an established bahuvrīhi (8x; "whose vehicle is songs" -- that is, the god [Indra] who is conveyed to the sacrifice by the songs dedicated to him) and, on the other, *satyá-* never modifies *gír-* as far as I can tell. Old (SBE) tr. "who truly art carried by prayers as by a vehicle," with the correct internal structure, in my opinion. My "trusty" for *satyá-* may be pushing the term a bit, but the idea is that the song-vehicle is real and so a trustworthy conveyance.

The *ca* in f is generally rendered 'also', and it is one of only three examples (out of approx. 1100) of *ca* to which Klein (DGRV I.212-13) attributes that value. None of the examples is strong, and all can be interpreted with functional values more commonly found with *ca*. In this case I think *amī́ ca víśve amṛ́tāsaḥ* is conjoined with a gapped *vayám* 'we', as in exx. like VII.88.3 *á̱ yád ruhā́va váruṇaś ca nā́vam* "When [I] and Varuṇa boarded the boat ...," though with pl. rather than sg. 1st ps. gapping. The 1st ps. pl. is found in the opening verb of the verse *havāmahe*, and although some pādas intervene, that main verb still has domain over the whole verse (save for the last pāda), with ef a rel. cl. attached to that main clause. True, the verb in this rel. clause must also be supplied. I suggest a medial form of √*dhā*, meaning 'acquire'; see in fact *dhīmahi* in this meaning in

5a -- all that is needed is an accent. For the identical VP *váyas-* + med. √*dhā* in this same hymn cycle, cf. I.136.2 *áthā dadhāte ... váyaḥ* "then they two [=Mitra and Varuṇa] acquire vigor," and for a 1st pl. in this collocation (including the instr.) see II.23.10 *tváyā vayám uttamáṃ dhīmahe váyaḥ* "Through you might we acquire the utmost vigor." In nearby I.141.13 (though not a Paruchepa hymn) *amī́ ca* is overtly conjoined with *vayám*, as I suggest is covertly the case here: *amī́ ca yé maghávāno vayáṃ ca* "those who are our patrons and we (ourselves) ..."

As for pāda g, which also lacks a verb, my publ. tr. assumes an active imperatival form of the same root √*dhā*, addressed to Agni. Agni quite regularly participates in such collocations; in this case the verb might well be the imperatively used root aor. injunctive *dhāḥ* or else the redupl. pres. impv. *dhehi*. This short pāda blends two constructions: "set oblations among LOC" and "establish vigor for DAT," both with √*dhā*. For the first, with Agni as subject, see, e.g., V.14.1 *havyā́ devéṣu no dadhat*; for the second, likewise with Agni as subject, see, e.g., II.4.9 *smát sūríbhyo gṛṇaté tád váyo dhāḥ* "establish this vigor for the singer along with his patrons." Since in our passage the recipients of the *váyas-* have already been identified in the previous pāda ([us] and all the immortals), the dative recipient with the second construction need not be specified. A more literal tr. of my understanding of this pāda might then be "(place) the oblations among the gods and (establish) vigor," but this seemed too clotted for the publ. tr.

The trick of this tag-pāda then is that the final *ā́ váyaḥ* is twice the object of an unexpressed form of the root √*dhā*, but with two different valences. Unusually for tag-pādas, g is not syntactically parallel to f.

I.127.9: The hapax splv. *sáhantama-* does not require the positing (with Gr) of an otherwise unattested *n*-stem *sáhan-*. A nonce derivation from the pres. part. *sáhant-* (with simplification of the cluster *sáhan(t)-tama-*, with AiG II.2.597, etc.) is certainly possible, and the full grade with nasal might have been constructed as a partial match for its parallels *śuṣmíntama-* and *dyumníntama-*.

I.127.9-10: The ends of both a-pādas are variants of each other: 9a ... *sáhasā sáhantamaḥ*, 10a ... *sáhasā sáhasvate*, each following a metrical rest.

I.127.10: The first three pādas are an esp. nice example of the syntactic complementarity between the tag-pāda c and what precedes. The subject and the verb are withheld until c (*stómaḥ* and *babhūtu* respectively), with the preverb determining the verbal lexeme (*prá*) and the possessive pronoun limiting the praise (*vaḥ*) found in the first pāda -- and the recipient *agnáye* the only thing held in common between ab and c. Thus neither ab nor c is complete in itself: their elements need to be intermingled to produce the full sense. The name of the recipient is also held until the end of the two-pāda opening, though prepared for by a series of datives.

Schaeffer (Inten. 114) argues persuasively that the intens. *joguve* is "lokaldistributiv" with the loc. phrase *víśvāsu kṣā́su* "in all lands." The form here is most likely 3rd sg., despite the lack of *-t-*, as if to a perfect stem. The identical form in V.64.2, also in the phrase *víśvāsu kṣā́su joguve* could be 1st sg. See comm. there.

I.127.11: The latter part of this verse shows a nice phonological pattern, with the initial words in the pāda being c *mahó*, d *máhi*, f *máhi*, but g *máthīr*. The first three all belong of course to the *mah* ('great') family, but the last is a verb form whose apparent near match with the two preceding *máhi* belies its independent grammatical identity.

There is probably also a phonological impetus for the use of *sácanas-* instead of the much more common *sajóṣas-* in b: ***sácanās*** better matches ***sucetúnā***.

In de most tr. (including me) take *máhi ... nas kṛdhi*, *saṃcákṣe* ... as an infinitive phrase, "make us regard (something) great." Keydana (Infin. 342) allows this possibility, but also raises the possibility of an adjunct usage: "make something great for us, for seeing." Although I recognize that the latter is not excluded, I think the infinitive reading is the more likely -- on the basis of the other dative phrase in e, *bhujé asyaí*. The final position of *asyaí* here is odd, and in fact the use of it at all is odd, given that an unadorned *bhujé* ends 8b and its tag-pāda 8c. I think that we have a demonstrative adj. with *bhujé* in this verse in order to anchor *bhujé* as a noun and to distinguish it from the immediately preceding dative, also built to a root noun, but in infinitival function. In other words, the *asyaí* serves to polarize the grammatical functions of two identically formed nominals.

In *máthīḥ* I see the same pun on the two roots √*math* as was found in 7c. Here the plundering sense is appropriate to the simile *ugró ná śávasā* "like a mighty (warrior) with vast power," while the churn sense is attached to Agni as fire the substance. Although the ritual fire is churned (passively), we can imagine Agni using the same means that produced him (churning) to produce something for us. (So, more or less, Ge.) Narten (KlSch 24; followed apparently by WG) feels that *máthīḥ* here can only have the 'rob' sense, because only fire can be the obj. of the 'churn' sense, but this opinion displays, at least in my view, the often deficient poetic and imaginative sense of the Erlangen school.

I.128 Agni

I.128.1: The phrase *mánuṣo dhárīmaṇi* is variously rendered. Re takes it as an infinitive ("pour être porté par l'Homme"); Gr and Old (SBE) interpret it in an abstract or ethical fashion ("nach altem Brauch"; "in Manu's firm law"; sim. Brereton in his survey of *dhárman-*). Hoffmann (Inj. 121, fld by WG) as 'hands'. But given the emphasis in the verse on the activity on the ritual ground (bc) and indeed the fire's placement on said ground (fg), Ge's "im (Feuer)behälter des Manu" seems the most likely interpr. -- rendered by me as "the foundation of Manu," making reference to the fact that Manu was the first sacrificer and so every subsequent ritual ground can be ascribed to him. See 7a *mā́nuṣe vṛjáne* 'in the ritual enclosure belonging to Manu' for another association between Manu and a physical location on the ritual ground.

As usual the line between human priests and Agni as priest is blurred in bc. Agni is regularly identified as an *uśíj-* (I.60.4, etc.) but *uśíjaḥ* in the plural are humans.

"In the footprint of refreshment" (*iḷás padé*) is a standard kenning for the ritual ground or, more narrowly, the place where oblations are offered; a similar expression is found in Old Avestan, at Y. 50.8.

I.128.2: My interpr. of *ápi* √*vat* roughly follows Tichy's (Die Spr. 26 [1980]: 3–5, esp. n. 8 [= KlSch 108–10]) 'mit etw. (Akk.) bekannt, vertraut sein' (contra Thieme's Fs. Weller)—though perhaps with a bit more oomph.

I construe *ṛtásya pathā́* in b with *yajñasā́dham* in a, flg. Lü (Var. 463) -- contra most interpr., who take it as roughly parallel to the other instr. expressions in b. It is true that there is some distance between the two expressions I put together, and Ge also cites two parallels where *ṛtásya pathā́* is adjacent to *námasā*. However, in both those instances the two instrumentals are better taken with different parts of the verse, and since Lü's interpr. yields richer sense, I maintain it here.

I.128.3: The standard tr. (as well as Scar. 110-11) take *-gír-* in *muhurgī́r* to √*gṝ* 'sing', rather than, with Gr, to √*gṛ* 'swallow'. This is certainly possible, though "'plötzlich, augenblichlich willkommen geheissen' (?)" (Scar 110; sim. WG) does not have much to do with what proceeds or follows in the verse. I prefer to keep Gr's 'auf einmal verschlingend'. The expression completes the description of Agni's journey in the preceding pāda. The speed of his journey around the world, completed in a single day, is conveyed by the image of "swallowing up" the route instantly -- similar expressions are found in English. EWA (s.vv. *GAR*$^{\text{II}}$, *GAR*$^{\text{IV}}$) is uncertain of the root affiliation.

I.128.4: The part. *iṣūyánt-* in d is generally tr. 'shooting arrows' (though cf. Re's "qui cherche la jouissance-rituelle"; sim. Old SBE [but not Noten]), but *shooting* arrows seems out of place in this context, even with Ge's suggestion (n. 4d) that the priest is compared to a shooter because his words are arrows. Although I maintain the connection with 'arrow', I think it means simply 'go (straight) like an arrow', readily translatable into the English idiom 'straight-arrow', namely a person of utmost rectitude.

On *yátaḥ* √*jan* see comm. ad III.10.6. Here it could also be rendered "as soon as."

On the interpretational difficulties of *-śrī-* cmpds see comm. ad III.26.5. I am now open to a transitive interpr. such cmpds with ritual items as first members and suggest as alt. here "bringing the ghee to perfection."

I.128.5: A complex vs., esp. in its earlier parts, with a variety of tr. I will treat only my own. But first a few textual adjustments. In b I read (with most interpr., going back to Ludwig; see Old and Ge's n. 5b) *agné ráveṇa* rather than Pp. *agnér áveṇa*. Note also that the sandhi between b and c has been wrongly resolved by HvN into *bhoj'ye / a...* rather than *bhoj'yā / i...* (here Pp. is correct). And the first word of c has the wrong sibilant in the HvN text: it's correctly *iṣirā́ya*, not *iśirā́ya*.

Also in b I take the simile as consisting only of *marútāṃ ná* rather than including *bhojyà*. This genitive modifies *ráveṇa* and is parallel to *agné(r)*. The roaring of Agni is being compared to the roaring of the Maruts, personifications of the thunderstorm. This syntactic distribution is found in Old SBE, but subsequent tr. have not followed him.

I take the *bhojyà* as nominative and the subject of an intrans./passive use of med. *pṛñcáte*, a usage found elsewhere. However, it is not impossible that this med. form is transitive -- cf. *ā́ ... pṛcīmahi* in the next hymn (I.129.7) -- in which case I would supply 'priests' as subj.: "(The priests) infuse the (offering-)foods into his forces."

In pāda a I take *táviṣīṣu* 'forces' as a reference to Agni's flames. Although *táviṣī-* ordinarily belong to Indra, see, e.g., III.3.5, 26.4 for *táviṣībhiḥ* in conjunction with Agni.

I tentatively take Indra as the referent for *iṣirā́ya* in c, as he is addressed as *iṣira* in the first vs. of the next hymn (I.129.1) and is several times the referent of this stem elsewhere. But I do not insist on this identification.

The *ca* in de is problematic, and this problem is connected with the question of the affiliation of *vásūnām*. Ge (fld. by Klein, DGRV I.234) takes *ca* as a clausal conjunction and supplies a 2nd verb "(beschenkt)" in d, parallel to *ínvati* in c. This requires that *vásūnām* be construed with *majmánā* ("mit einer Fülle von Gütern"). But *majmánā* does not take a genitive of specification but only of possession and in any case its contexts favor 'might' over 'abundance'. Several times it appears parallel with *krátvā* (including nearby I.141.6, 143.2) in the collocation "with resolve and with might," as it would here, though at some remove (see *krátvā* in pāda a). Forms of *vásu-* regularly occur with forms of √*dā* 'give', however, and so the most natural collocation here would be *dā́nam ... vásūnām* "the giving of goods." But what, then, to do with the *ca*? I think the clue is to be found in X.50.7 *vásūnāṃ ca vásunaś ca dāváne* "for the giving of goods and of good"; in other words, I think the *vásūnāṃ ca* in our passage is a truncated formula, with *vásunaś ca* gapped. But the omitted sg. *vásu-* is immediately inserted in the first pāda of the next verse (6a) and the number-neutralized stem occurs three times in vs. 8: *vásudhitim* (8a), *vasūyávaḥ* (8f, g). Note also that a different form of *vásu* appears to be gapped in 6ab. The poet slyly sets the *vásu-* agenda in 5de by introducing it with an off-balance expression that requires repair. For a similarly problematic *ca* involving (in my opinion) gapping, see the previous hymn, I.127.8 and disc. there.

The phrase *śáṃsād aghā́t* corresponds to the well-attested bahuvrīhi *aghā́śaṃsa-* 'possessing evil speech', found in the next hymn (I.129.6).

I.128.6: With Ge, Re, and Old I supply an acc. pl. *vásū(ni)* as obj. of *dadhe*, on the basis of IX.18.4 *vásūni hástayor dadhé* (cf. also X.54.5). The gapping of a form of *vásu-* here, accepted by most, corresponds nicely to the gapping of the same stem I suggest for the previous vs. Thieme (Unters.), fld. by WG, instead take *dadhe* as passive: the fire "is taken in the hand" (of the priest, so Th). This seems pragmatically unlikely: although firebrands are ritually carried about under certain circumstances, picking up the entire ritual fire (as *víhāyāḥ* and *aratíḥ* seem to imply) would be risky and painful. Moreover, the rest of the verse depicts the good things that Agni does for people, and taking goods in his hand fits this context.

KH (Injunk. 100 n. 215) identifies *śiśrathat* in the repeated phrase *ná śiśrathat* as a subjunctive (so also Lub). However, other forms of this shape (2nd sg.: *śiśráthas*) are injunctives, mostly in imperatival usage. I see no value in positing an athematic stem **śiśrath-*, which we would need as the basis for a subjunctive, and prefer to ascribe its use here to the functional polyvalence of the injunctive.

The rarely attested verbal stem *iṣudhyá-*, here in the part. *iṣudhyaté*, has a counterpart in Old Avestan, *išūidiiāmahī* 3x in the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti, which exists alongside a noun *išud-*. The form is carefully discussed by Narten (YH 159-61), who accepts Humbach's etymology (Gathas 1959, II, ad Y 31.14; repeated 2nd ed. 1991): *išud-* is a compound of *iš-* 'nourishment' and the zero-grade of *√*vadh* 'lead', to which root noun compound a denom. is built meaning 'strengthen'. (For a rehearsal of the history of this scholarship, see Scar 63.) I am not convinced. I prefer to see it (couched in Vedic terms for the moment) as a compound of *íṣu-* 'arrow' and √*dhā* 'place'. That lexeme is specialized in the meaning 'aim' and is a well-attested metaphor for the "aiming" of a praise-hymn towards the divine recipient; cf. IX.69.1 ***íṣur*** *ná dhánvan práti* ***dhīyate*** *matíḥ* "Like an arrow on a bow, my thought is aimed." (For the affinity of *íṣu-* and √*dhā* cf. also

I.64.10 *ástāra íṣuṃ dadhire gábhastayoḥ* "The archers have taken their arrows in their fists" and the cmpd. *iṣu-dhí-* 'quiver'.) Such an analysis works also for the Avestan forms, since Avestan has both the 'arrow' word and the verb, and I see no reason why it could not be reconstructed for Indo-Iranian. An 'arrow' derivation works extremely well in our passage because *iṣudhyaté* echoes *iṣūyaté* ('going straight like an arrow') in vs. 4, likewise ending the d-pāda, likewise a denominative participial dat. of benefit. For extensive and updated disc. see my 2020 "Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūidiia-*: The Aim of Praise" (Fs. Lamberterie).

The 2nd person of pf. *óhiṣe* is puzzling in a verse, and a hymn, in which the god is otherwise entirely referred to in the 3rd ps. (see the surrounding verbs in this vs.: *dadhe* (a), *śiśrathat* (bc), *ṛṇvati* (fg) -- with pāda f esp. entirely parallel to de with 2nd ps. *óhiṣe*). I think it must be a transposition of the phrase found in VIII.19.1 *devatrā́ havyám óhire* "They have carried the oblation among the gods." The expected 3rd sg. pf. *óhe* would not fit the meter here.

Though pādas f and g share both a subject (Agni) and a verb (*ví*) *ṛṇvati* they seem semantically somewhat at odds. This semantic disparity is, however, ameliorated by the fact that their objects, *vā́ram* and *dvā́rā* respectively, are phonologically very close, which similarity was already pointed out by Re.

I.128.7: *jénya-* is of unclear formation (see EWA s.v.), and opinion is generally split between a derivation from √*jan* 'be born' (e.g., Gr 'edel') and √*ji* 'win' (e.g., WG 'siegreich'), with EWA tentatively opting for the latter. In contrast, I find that a meaning 'noble' vel sim. better fits most passages and consider it a pseudo-gerundive to √*jan*, built to the zero-grade formant *jā-* (cf. in this hymn *jāyata* 1a, *ájāyata* 4f, g), with the semantic development '(worthy) to be born, noble, thoroughbred'; its use with inanimate *vásu* (e.g., the cmpd. *jenyā-vasu-* 'having noble goods') is simply an extension comparable to English "noble metals" (vs. base metals).

I.129 Indra

This hymn is particularly studded with indefinite expressions: *pṛ́tanāsu kā́su cid* 2a, 4d, *káṃ cid* 3b, *káyasya cid* 5a; later in the hymn *rátham kám cid* 10d, *anyám ... kám cid* 10f.

I.129.1: Pādas de show two different constructions with √*kṛ* 'make'. On the one hand, *abhíṣṭaye kárāḥ* is a periphrastic caus. "make to prevail," with *abhíṣṭaye* parallel to the infinitival *medhásātaye* 'to gain wisdom' in 1a; on the other hand, *kárāḥ ... vājínam* is a predicate adj. construction "make (it=chariot) a prize-winner." Separating the two constructions is the embedded tag *váśaś ca* "if you wish," with subordinating *ca* (see Klein DGRV I.250). Though subordinate clauses are almost never embedded, this functions as a parenthetical like later *manye* 'methinks' and it also intervenes between two clauses.

Most tr. supply the chariot as subj. of f, but this makes difficulties with the acc. of g, since, by the conventions of Atyaṣṭi meter, f and g should form a syntactic unity. I assume instead that *sá* here refers to Indra in the 2nd ps. and an imperative should be supplied to make a classic "sa figé" construction (see Jamison 1992); note that the next vs. begins with a stripped-down version of the same construction: *sá śrudhi* "Listen!" As

to what imperative to supply, I generate it out of the participial voc. *tūtujāna* 'o thruster' to the root √*tuj*. Alternatively, it could be generated from the verb found in bc *prá* (...) *náyasi*, hence "lead forth."

In g the word order of *imā́ṃ vā́camṃ ná* makes a slight difficulty. If *imā́ṃ vā́cam* is a simile, then we might expect the order **imā́ṃ ná vā́cam*. However, note I.121.6 *asyā́ uṣáso ná* discussed above, also with deictic + noun followed by the simile marker, so it may be that the placement is by rule (though this requires more investigation). In any case, *ná* following the 2nd word of a simile is not uncommon. Note that in 5b of this hymn the *ná* follows a clear two-word simile (without deictic), similarly, if I'm correct, 8g and 5g (cf. also 130.2, 9). Another factor that may have helped determine the placement of *ná* here is that f ends *(tūtujā)na vedhásām* and g *ná vedhásām*, so the displacment of the simile particle would facilitate the echo pattern. Alternatively we might separate *imā́m* and *vā́cam* and take the former as part of the frame "(thrust forward) this one like speech." If "this one" refers to the chariot, we must then assume gender attraction from **imám*. WG's tr. reflects a separation analysis, but with *imā́m* also representing *vā́cam*: "... dieses (Wort) wie das Wort der Vertrauenswürdigen."

I.129.2: The exact semantic relationship between the noun *dákṣa-* 'skill' and the related (pseudo-)gerundive *dakṣā́yya-* is unclear and may be somewhat fluid. Here 'besought, approached for skill' seems to fit the context better than 'to be skillfully served' vel sim. (e.g., Re's "(apte) à être servi-efficacement"). See disc. I.91.3.

The cmpd *bhára-hūti-*, here tr. as 'battle cry', actually contains part of the quoted cry as its first member: "the cry 'carry (the day)'." That is, I interpr. *bhára-* as derived from the impv. *bhára* with omitted object. For the analytic version of this expression see V.29.8 ... *víśve ahvanta devā́, bhárām índrāya yád áhiṃ jaghā́na* "all the gods called "*bhara*" to Indra when he smashed the serpent."

Pādas de show nicely balanced alliteration, ***śū**raiḥ **s**[ṇ]**v**aḥ **s**anitā ... **v**iprair **v**ā́jam*, with responsion between *yáḥ* / *yó*, *-aiḥ* / *-air*, and the final *-itā* / *-utā*.

The verb *iradhanta* and nearby inf. *irádhyai* (I.134.2) are the only two forms showing the formant *iradh.* I connect them with √*ṛdh* (/*rādh*) 'succeed, bring to success', though the morphological details escape me.

In g the simile marker *ná* is superficially positioned as in 1g, after the first two words of the pāda, but in this case the placement is correct, since the simile only begins with the second word, *átyam*.

I.129.3: What "swell the bullish skin" means isn't clear. Ge suggests that it refers to Indra giving in abundance. I interpr. it in conjunction with the phrase in the next hymn, I.130.8, *mánave ... tvácaṃ kṛṣṇā́m arandhayat* "he made the black skin [=barbarians] subject to Manu." If "black skin" is characteristic of our enemies, I suggest that the successfully swollen "bullish skin" refers to us, primed for battle.

My "(in that)" introducing c follows Ge: some sort of subordination is required to account for the verbal accent on *parivṛṇákṣi*, since otherwise **pári vṛṇakṣi* would be expected.

The placement of *utá* 'and' in d is peculiar, since it precedes a series of concatenated datives lasting through pāda g. See Klein DGRV I.357-58, though he can only describe, not explain, this effect.

I.129.4: Both abc and de are constructed pleonastically. In a(bc) the phrase *uśmasīṣṭáye* (i.e., *uśmasi iṣṭáye*) "we wish to seek" is semantically but not etymologically pleonastic (roots √*vaś* and √*iṣ* respectively), while in cd *ūtáyé, 'vā* (i.e., *ūtáye, ávā*) "help to help" is both. When in fg we encounter the etymological figure *stárate stṛṇóṣi* (*... stṛṇóṣi*), we expect another pleonasm, but here of course the etymologically related words do not duplicate each other functionally because they have different subjects, though they do essentially mean the same thing: "(he) will (not) lay (you) low (whom) you lay low."

Because of this structural pattern in the verse, I do not follow Ge's (and others') attempts to mitigate the pleonasm of abc (e.g., Ge "Wir wünschen, dass ... Indra ... gern komme").

The *vaḥ* in a is difficult to render in tr. I take it as the usual offhand address to the patrons on whose behalf we, the ritual officiants, perform all our actions. Because of the awkwardness I omitted it in the publ. tr., esp. since the benefit to 1st ps. "us" is so heavily emphasized by fronted full genitive *asmā́kam* (also in d). These fronted pronouns were also impossible to render in that position without violence to the English.

The positioning of *yám* in fg is worth a brief note. In f it appears immediately after the first word of its clause, *stṛṇóṣi*, a standard position. This happens also to be the last word of its clause. In the tag pāda g *stṛṇóṣi yám* takes the same position as in f, but since more material has been added at the front, the *yám* is now out of position.

I.129.5: I borrow *śátru-* 'rival' from 4fg to construe with the indefinite *káyasya cid*; cf. VIII.25.15 ... *vanúṣaḥ ... abhímātiṃ káyasya cid* "the arrogance of every zealot."

The phrase *téjiṣṭhābhir aráṇibhiḥ* "with piercingly hot kindling sticks" appears in Paruchepa's I.127.4, which suggests that this phrase must constitute the simile and the *ná* is displaced to the right as in 1g. (WG try to avoid this difficulty by construing *téjiṣṭhābhiḥ* first with *ūtíbhiḥ*, but the nearby parallel makes that unlikely.)

The relation between d and e is not clear. Ge makes e part of the *yáthā* clause, but *purā́* seems to call for a past tense and *mányase* is a present. Moreover, as Old points out, *yáthā purā́* is a common self-contained tag. The problem, though, is that *mányase* is accented. Old suggests that it is accented because the clause is by its nature a Nebensatz. The publ. tr. should probably have signaled this by "(in that)" vel sim.

What is going on in f is unclear, since, as Ge points out, Pūru is depicted in a positive light in other nearby Paruchepa passages (I.130.7, 131.4). He suggests supplying *énāṃsi* with *víśvāni*, flg. Sāy, thus "carry away all (the guilts) from Pūru." But this won't work with g (as it should in the Atyaṣṭi template), because the guilt would be coming to us. Perhaps the poet is urging Indra to redistribute the goods of the patron (Pūru) to us.

This verse is one of the very few places in the Atyaṣṭi series in which the strict verbal repetition at the end of fg is breached (see also the next vs.). Here *váhniḥ* should be final in the pāda, but has been displaced by *no ácha*. I have no real explanation for this, save for the fact that when *no ácha* are adjacent they go last (I.165.3, III.35.1, IV.34.10), but this hardly seems a sufficient reason.

The g pāda is a syllable too short. I suggest that the simile particle *ná* has been haplologized in the sequence *āsā́ váhnir* ***ná*** *no ácha*. The descriptor *āsā́ váhni-* (X.115.3) or more usually *váhni- āsā́* (I.76.4, VI.11.2, VI.19.9) 'conveyor by mouth' is otherwise used of Agni, which makes ritual sense; here, without the simile particle, it would have to

be applied to Indra, which does not (hence Ge's diluted "Wortführer"). If I am correct, this is another example of a displaced *ná* simile marker; of course in this case *āsā́ váhniḥ* would be a quasi-compound 'conveyor-by-mouth'.

I.129.6: The vs. begins a little oddly with a solemn proclamation to a drop (*índave*), but in my opinion this is actually indirectly evoking the word-play, esp. common in Maṇḍala IX, between *índu-* 'drop' and *índra-*, the more natural addressee here. The transition between drop and Indra is effected by the beginning of the next pāda, *hávyo ná*. I take *hávya-* as a pun; though the occurrences of this stem are overwhelmingly associated with the root √*hū*, *hvā* 'invoke', hence 'to be invoked', it could technically also be built to the root √*hu* 'pour', hence 'to be poured' (see the differently accented but identically formed *havyá-* 'oblation'). I read *hávyaḥ* with both meanings here, with 'to be invoked' in the simile and referring to Indra and 'to be poured' directly referring to the drop. Both Indra and the drop stimulate the verbal skills of the poet. I see no reason to assume that the referent is Bhaga, *pace* Ge, Re (and tentatively Old). The *rakṣohán-* 'demon-smasher' in c may be, as often, soma, but is more likely Indra, given *hantā́ pāpásya rakṣásaḥ* and *rakṣoháṇam*, both of Indra, in vs. 11.

The repeated final verb *réjati* (bc) is nicely echoed in e by *(vadhaí)r ajeta*.

The cmpd. *aghá-śaṃsa-* finds its analytical parallel in I.128.5 *śáṃsād aghā́t*.

The lexeme *áva* √*sru*, lit. 'flow down', appears only here (fg) in the RV; I suggest that it may idiomatically mean 'be miscarried, aborted', and the *kṣudrám* 'speck' in g is the embryo/fetus. For abortion in a hostile context in this group of hymns, see I.127.3, at least acdg. to my interpretation; the phonological similarity of the two verbs (in I.127.3 and here) supports this interpr.

Like the last verse, this one, quite unusually, disrupts the strict final repetition of the fg pādas, with *áva sravet* opening f, but distracted to *áva ... sravet* in g. I again have no explanation for this.

I.129.7: The pun on *hávya-* in 6b is continued by the same double meaning in *hótrā-*, a stem that by most accounts does belong both to √*hū* and √*hu*. (The standard tr. only render it by 'oblation' here, however.)

The fem. *citántī-*, which looks like a participle to a 6th cl. pres. or (so Wh Rts.) a root aor., is formally isolated and requires metrical distraction. Gr suggests (on no particular basis) emending to **cetáyantyā*, but how would such a corruption arise? WG's **citáyantyā* is more plausible but perhaps unnecessary. Lowe (*Participles* 289) takes it as a Caland adjective beside *citrá-*, but this also seems unnecessary.

The part. *sántam* in c at first seems pleonastic; it does not have its regular concessive value. But it was most likely included here in order to indicate which noun the adj. *raṇvám* modifies. By itself *raṇvám* could qualify either *rayím* or *survī́ryam* in b, but *sántam* identifies it as a masc. and therefore belonging to *rayím*, since *suvī́ryam* is neut. (WG's use of *suvī́ryam* as an adj. with *rayím* in bc is contrary to the usage of this stem elsewhere.)

I.129.8: With the repeated *prá-pra* I supply a form of the copula for the idiom *prá* √*as* 'be preeminent'.

Note the common use of instr. pl. adj. (here *sváyaśobhiḥ*) with (apparent) sg. pāda-final *ūtī́*. This interpr. seems preferable to WG, who supply "gods" with the pl. adj. and take *ūtī́* separately. For a possibly similar ex. of mismatch in number, see comm. ad V.8.4.

As in 4a this clause contains both a full 1st pl. pronoun (*asmé*) and the enclitic 2nd pl. *vaḥ*. As there, I think the 2nd ps. referent is the patrons, in addition to the 1st ps. ritual officiants, but, once again, a tr. "be preeminent among us for you" seems clumsy, and I did not render the *vaḥ* in the publ. tr.

I take the fem. subject of d-g to be personified *durmatí-*, with Ge. Others, going back to Sāy, take it to be the *jūrṇí-* of g (see Ge n. 8d), but I think that belongs to a simile.

The opening of d, *svayáṃ sā́* echoes that of 6d *svayáṃ só*.

Ge refuses to tr. *vakṣati* and feels that it cannot belong either to √*vah* or to √*vakṣ*. I take it with √*vakṣ* / *ukṣ* 'grow', as a malformed nonce subjunctive to *úkṣa-* / *ukṣá-* (or preferably a derivationally prior, unattested root formation).

In g I take *ná* as both the simile marker and the negative. (This is rather like the haplology of **ná no* I posited for 5g.) "*Like* a firebrand ... she will *not ...*" If I am correct this is yet another example of the *ná* simile marker displaced to the right.

I.129.9–10: Note identical openings to these two vss: *tváṃ na indra rāyā́* ..., with the final word of the pādas showing very close phonological patterning: *párīṇasā* / *tárūṣasā*.

I.129.9: On the basis of my reeval. of *anehás-* (ad X.61.12), I would now change the tr. in b from "faultless path" to "flawless path," describing physical rather than moral perfection.

I.129.10: The standard tr. construe e with fg, such that *rátham* of e is the referent of *anyám* in f. But this seriously violates the structure of Atyaṣṭi, where de always constitute a unit. Moreover, "another chariot than us" would be a strange expression; we expect the *anyám* to refer to an animate opponent in such a construction, esp. if it is "intending harm" (*rírikṣantam*). I therefore generate a verbal form 'help' from the agent noun voc. *ávitar* that ends d: √*av* + *rátham* is found elsewhere (I.102.3, 112.12, etc.).

I.129.11: I do not understand the participle *sán* in c. It does not have concessive force, nor does it serve (like *sántam* 7c) to anchor an unclear gender assignment. It may convey something like "since you are a god / in your capacity as god," though this hardly seems necessary to express of Indra, whose divinity isn't in question here.

I.130 Indra

I.130.1: After my reconsideration of *nā́yám* (see disc. ad VIII.2.28), I would delete "to the landing site" from the publ. tr.

In c the simile marker *iva* seems to be displaced to the right, like *ná* several times in I.129 (1b, 5b, 5g, 8g). Such placement seems to be characteristic of Paruchepa.

I.130.2: *áhā víśveha* in g (repeated in 9g) appears to show the same displaced simile particle found elsewhere in the Paruchepa hymns; see disc. ad I.129.1.

I.130.3: Nice phonetic figure in d *vrajáṃ vajrī́ (ga)vām iva*. Note esp. the floating *r* in *vrajáṃ vajrī́* and the syncopated *īḷí(...)vāḷa*.

I.130.4: In f the standard tr. take *vanínaḥ* as an acc. pl., the object of *ní vṛścasi* in the frame, parallel to acc. *vṛksám* in the simile. But after all the build-up earlier in the verse towards the smashing of Vṛtra, I find it hard to believe that Indra is just cutting down trees here, and the doubling of 'tree' in *vṛkṣám vanínaḥ* seems flat ("like a carpenter a tree, you cut down wooden things [=trees]"). Instead I take *vanínaḥ* as gen. sg. referring collectively to a forest (the thing that has wood) and supply Vṛtra / the serpent as object in the frame. Both *vṛtrám* and *áhim* are found elsewhere as obj. of *vṛśca-* (though, I admit, not with *ní*, but usually with *ví*).

I.130.5: For *vṛ́thā* in this context see II.15.3.

For *itá ūtī́ḥ* see comm. ad VIII.99.7.

I.130.6: Pādas bc show one of the only alterations of syntax and conceptual structure between ab and its tag-pāda c in the Atyaṣṭi corpus. The Āyus fashioned speech *for you* (*te*) in ab, but fashioned *you* (*tvā́m*) in c. The rest of the verse is then applicable to both speech and you.

One of the rare scramblings of the ends of the fg pādas, which are ordinarily identical. Here the last two words get flipped: f *sātáye dhánā* / g *dhánāni sātáye*. For other such instances (though not so neatly structured) see I.129.5, 6. The flip in g here allows it to match the opening of 7g *víśvā dhánāni ...*

I.130.7: Note in pāda a *... púro ... pūráve*# and see I.131.4.

I.130.8: Following Ge, I read *tatṛṣāṇám* in both simile and frame. In the simile it is the dried material that feeds the fire; in the frame the thirsty or greedy.

The PN *arśasānám* in g neatly matches *tatṛṣāṇám* in the same position in f. On the formation see comm. ad X.99.7. I would now suggest a tr. "Harmer" for the straight PN.

I.130.9: As indicated in the publ. intro., this verse, which treats Indra's theft of the sun's wheel and his visit to Uśanā Kāvya, is quite opaque. The first pāda straightforwardly announces the mythical deed at issue, but things disintegrate after that.

The next two pādas (bc) introduce a theft of speech and a figure identified as *aruṇá-* ('ruddy') that are not elsewhere associated with the myth. However, since the verb *muṣāyá-* 'steal' and the temporal expression *prapitvé* are found in other accounts of the myth (I.175.4, IV.30.4, VI.31.3 and IV.16.12, VI.31.3 respectively), these pādas must contain at least some covert reference to the myth. However, I treat them as parenthetical because pādas de seem to follow directly from a, and the present tense *muṣāyati* does not fit well with the injunctive *prá vṛhat* of a and the plupf. *ájagan* in e.

Pādas de depict Indra's journey to Uśanā's dwelling, an incident associated elsewhere with the wheel-theft narrative. First, note that initial *īśānáḥ* in c is echoed by init. *uśánā* in d. I have treated the peculiar morphology of *uśánā* at length (Jamison 2007 Fs. Jasanoff) and concluded that the stem is essentially uninflected and that it is therefore

possible to take *uśánā* here, with Ge, as an acc. of goal (or as gen. with a gapped 'house'), however odd such interpr. may seem at first. Esp. in later Skt. Uśanā is seldom found without his patronymic *kāvyá-*, and in the RV even when the patronymic is absent there is often an indirect reference to it. Here that is found in the voc. *kave*, addressed to Indra, which ends pāda e; #*uśánā* and *kave*# thus occupy polarized positions in this two-pāda unit.

I have even less idea of what fg really mean than the rest of the verse. The repeated word *turváṇiḥ* usually means 'surpassing, victorious' -- see nearby I.128.3 -- but this sense does not fit this passage well, esp. with the acc. *sumnáni*. I have therefore taken *turváṇi-* as expressing a simple motion sense, but have no confidence in the correctness of this interpr. (and in fact fairly strong confidence in its error).

I.131 Indra

The hymn contains a concentration of intensive forms: *ánamnata* 1a, *kárikrat* 3f, *carkiran* 5a, *saniṣṇata* 5fg. This parade of intensives may express the prolonged and continuous struggle of the Ārya to subdue their rivals and gain territory with the constantly sought help of Indra.

I.131.1: A form of *índra-* is positioned at the beginnning of all structurally significant pādas (a, b, d, f) in Atyaṣṭi.

The intens. *ánamnata* in my opinion expresses habitual action. Schaeffer suggests that it is a "Hin- und Her-" or "Auf- und Ab-" motion, but I don't see the dignified and stately Heaven and Earth bobbing up and down.

I.131.2: Pādas de contain what we would call a mixed metaphor: "we would place you at our chariot-pole like a boat." In a RVic context this does not seem a solecism, but simply an example of the usual piling of image upon image.

I am uncertain of the value of the part. *citáyantaḥ* in f. In keeping with the zero-grade root syllable it should mean 'appear' or 'perceive', but the case frame makes these interpr. hard to impose. In the publ. tr. I take it as a double I/T (in the term used in my 1983 book) 'make (Indra) take notice', that is, 'cause to perceive', but I am disturbed by the mismatch of the formal and the functional: in this meaning it should be full-grade *cetáya-* and there is no easy way to explain a redactional change to zero-grade. (Ge, Re tr. 'auszeichnen', 'distinguent' respectively, but this doesn't conform to any standard meaning of *citáya-* or *cetáya-*. WG take it as an intrans., "wir glänzenden Nachkommen des Āyu," which respects the formal shape but leaves the rest of the pāda without a syntactic skeleton.) Since it has the same value that I ascribe to *īkṣáyat* in the next hymn (I.132.5), it may be that *citáyant-* here adapted the sense of *īkṣáya-*, since they both have apparent zero-grade stems.

Another problem with this final sequence is the function and position of *ná* in f. It should mark *índram* as the compared term in a simile ("... like Indra"), but since Indra should be the target of sacrifice and praise, deflecting him to the simile is unlikely and leaves us without a corresponding term in the frame. I am loosely taking *ná* as having domain over the whole pāda, which implicitly compares *us* (the subject of *dhīmahi* in e) with the Āyus, though this is not how simile marking generally works -- and will also not work if "we" are identical to the Āyus rather than compared to them. The mention of the

Āyus in the preceding hymn, I.130.6, and in I.139.3 (also Paruchepa) allows but does not require this identification. In sum, the interpr. of fg is quite uncertain.

I.131.3: Although the general semantic range of the root-noun cmpd *niḥsṛ́jaḥ* in bc is fairly clear -- it refers to the releasing of the cows enclosed in the cowpen -- its grammatical identity is not. It can be either a transitive nom. pl., as I take it in the publ. tr. (so also tentatively Old and, it seems, Re, Narten [SigAor. 266–67]), or a gen. or abl. infinitive (so Scar, WG). In a sense it scarcely matters.

I follow Narten (Sig.Aor. 266–67) in taking *sákṣanta(ḥ)* [-*aḥ* so Pp., not -*e*] to √*sah* 'conquer, be victorious' rather than √*sac* 'accompany' (so Gr; Ge's and Re's tr. do not easily reflect either root). WG take it as a type of desiderative with -*s*-formant, but also to √*sah*. Support for this root affiliation comes from *sāsahānáḥ* in the next verse, likewise opening the c-pāda.

Note the paired opposition of the two verbs *ví* √*taṃs* 'yank (apart /) back and forth' and *sám* √*ūh* 'shove together', with complementary subj./obj. pairs: people (yank) Indra / Indra (shoves) people. The point is that the opposing forces fight over having Indra on their side, each trying to pull him to its side, while Indra sets the two sides to fighting by pushing them together.

Again I take the intens. *āvíṣ kárikrat* as expressing habitual or continuous action: Indra is always showing off his mace.

I.131.4: Note the word play across the pāda boundary of a-b: *pūrávaḥ, púro*. The same play is found in I.130.7a *... púro ... pūráve*#, though not so neatly juxtaposed.

In d *tám* is somewhat curiously positioned; it may have been displaced to allow the verb *śā́sas* to take initial position in order to echo *sāsahānáḥ*, which opens the previous pāda.

I.131.5: I take *kārā́ṃ* √*kṛ* in d as an expression from gambling: lit. "to do (the decisive) deed," "to make 'game'," that is, "to win." See *kārā́ṃ* √*hvā* in V.29.8.

I.131.6: I take the final *juṣéta hí* of pāda a as a parenthetical remark, contrary to the standard tr. The rest of the verse (as well as the preceding verse) addresses Indra in the 2nd ps.; moreover, the position of *hí* is most easily explained if *juṣéta* opens the clause, and a gen. complement with √*juṣ*, as suggested by Gr, would be (almost?) unprecedented. The standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) take *asyā́ uṣásaḥ* as a temporal expression "on/during this dawn here," but supposed exx. of this usage elsewhere are not convincing. The collocation in fg *... asyá vedhásaḥ ... śrudhi ...* is structurally identical to *asyā́ uṣásaḥ ... bodhi*, a parallelism that supports my interpr.

If, as I believe, *asyā́ uṣásaḥ* is to be construed with *bodhi* in b, the first term in b, *arkásya*, can serve as transition, since this word means both 'chant' and 'ray'; as 'ray' it would group with *uṣásaḥ*, as 'chant' with *havíṣaḥ* 'oblation', linking the coming of dawn with the dawn sacrifice.

I.131.7: The standard tr. take the *yó no aghāyáti* clause as the only obj. of *jahí* in d ("smash [him] who wishes us ill"). This may be correct, but I have opted for the "(X and) which Y" construction.

I.132 Indra

I.132.1: In the publ. tr. I treat the first member of the three-member cmpd *índratvotāḥ* as if it were a voc., since the lit. "aided by you, Indra" seems clumsy.

The verb *ádhi vocā* could also be a 1st sg. subj., but with most tr. I take it as 2nd sg. impv.; "I" am a less likely advocate for the presser than Indra is.

With Ge I consider *ví cayema bháre kṛtám* (f) a gambling expression; for another such expression see the previous hymn, I.131.5d.

I.132.2: Pādas abc consist entirely of four locative expressions (with their genitives); this heavily signposted syntactic pattern allows (/forces) the first word of d, *áhan(n)* to be interpreted as the loc. sg. of *áhar* 'day' rather than the 2nd/3rd sg. root impf. of √*han*, which otherwise would be strongly favored in an Indra context. (Note that the identical opening, *áhann índro*, is found at IV.28.3, with the verb.) The locatives in 1d, f also reinforce the loc. reading, esp. *asmín áhani* (1d). I don't know exactly what to call this poetic trick -- it is aggressively a non-pun.

āprá- in a is a hapax, and there is no consensus on its meaning or derivation; see EWA s.v. I am inclined to follow Ge (etc.)'s connection with *āprī́-* (a noun that doesn't occur in the RV, though the verbal syntagm does) with a meaning 'propitiator' vel sim. This fits its dependence on *vákmani* 'at the speech' and may also thematically echo *ádhi vocā* 'advocate, speak on behalf of' in 1e. It could indeed refer to the reciter of Āprī hymns. The other leading etymological candidate is *á* √*pṛ* 'fill' (so WG; see Old), but "the filler" seems to have less connection with speaking than "the propitiator."

The way the reflexive adj. *svásmin* works in bc is a little tricky: "of X, at his very own anointing."

On the basis of I.134.2 I follow Ge in taking *krāṇásya* as passive and referring to the soma. Thus in bc we find the anointing (*áñjasi*) of the two primary ritual substances, fire (b) and soma (c). Alternatively, if it seems desirable to keep the referent the same in the two pādas, one can follow Re, WG in taking *krāṇá-* as "active," referring to Agni.

The use of 'head' (*śíras-*/*śīrṣán-*) to refer to an individual person is not, as far as I know, otherwise found in the RV, though the semantic dev. is obvious and precedented in English.

I.132.3: A very opaque verse, which has received multiple interpretations. I will discuss only my own, very tentative, one here.

I take pāda a as the announcement to Indra of the "pleasurable offering" (*práyaḥ*) currently set out for him at this sacrifice (*asmín yajñé* 1f); see nearby I.134.1, 135.4 for similar usage of *práyas-*. This glittering offering reminds the poet of a previous one (*pratnáthā*). I take the next two pādas (bc) as describing this previous one; the relative locative *yásmin yajñé* is a temporal expression that picks up the temporal *pratnáthā*.

The crux in bc is the pair *vā́ram* (b), *vā́r* (c). Since the former is an obj. of *ákṛṇvata* and the latter a (possible) subj. of *ási*, an analysis as a masc. (or at least gendered) root noun suggests itself, but such a noun has at best a precarious existence (see Schindler WurNom s.v.). Nonetheless, I think it must be posited here; the other solutions, which include taking the two forms to two separate stems (see, e.g., Gr, Lub)

or decomposing them into *vā + a...* (Hoffmann apud Schindler, WG), do too much violence to the patterns of Atyaṣṭi meter. With Ge and Re in their separate ways ("Schirmer(?)" "protecteur") I take the form to √*vṛ* 'cover' and tr. 'shield' (as in X.93.3). In b this noun in the acc. is in apposition to unexpressed *tvā* 'you', i.e., Indra -- which is the first obj. to a double acc. √*kṛ* construction 'make X into Y'. (For Indra as a home, see 5fg. For *kṣáya-* in a metaphorical sense, see the next hymn, I.133.7a.) In the tag-pāda the construction has been switched from acc. to nom., and the 2nd sg. ref. is now overt (*asi* 'you are'). A nom. *vā́r* conforms to this case switch; however, since *kṣáya-* is masc., we should expect **kṣáyaḥ* here. I explain the anomaly by the pressures of Atyaṣṭi, which requires strict identity between the finals of b and c; *kṣáyam* is simply repeated from b or made an honorary neut. for the occasion. It is possible to avoid this problem by assuming that *vā́r-* has verbal rection (so implicitly Ge "der Schirmer(?) des Hauses"; see also Schindler WurNom), but this introduces further complications, and I prefer the double acc. interpr. anyway.

If bc refers to a time in the distant past when Indra was made into our protector, d may then call for the restatement of this fact at the current ritual (depicted in pāda a by my interpr.) The expression *nú itthā́ te pūrváthā ca pravā́cyam* "Now in the current way and in the earlier one it is to be proclaimed of you" in 4a supports my interpr of the larger stucture of this verse, namely that it concerns the conceptual intersection of the current ritual and the previous one and that what has been said before needs to be restated at the current sacrifice. Note also that, though the form of √*vac, voceḥ* in this case, now has the preverb *ví*, the sequence *vocer ádha*, with the adv. *ádha*, echoes *ádhi vocā* in 1e.

In e I take *raśmíbhiḥ* as a temporal expression "with the rays (of the sun)," identifying the time as dawn, as is very common. The standard tr. take it as an instr. of the means of seeing; this is not impossible, but seems less idiomatic. See further ad I.135.3.

I don't quite know what to do with *ánu* in f, but given the other difficulties in the verse, this is a minor problem.

I.132.5: For *īkṣáyat* see Jamison 1983: 123. It has the same double I/T value I also ascribe to *citáyanta(ḥ)* in I.131.2f.

In de I take *bā́dhe* as an infinitive with *tásmai* [=Indra] as subj. and *ā́yuḥ prajā́vat* as obj. This requires √*bādh* to have a positive value ('thrust [s.th. good] towards [s.o.]'), rather than the usual negative 'thrust away, repel', but see I.61.2 for a similar positive sense.

I.132.6: The dual dvandva *indrā-parvatā* 'Indra and Mountain' raises the question of the identity of 'Mountain'; as in III.53.1 I think it is a designation of Indra's mace (*vájra*). That the mace shows up in the instr. in the same pāda as the dual verb that has Indra and Parvata as implicit subj. (c *vájreṇa ... hatam*) does not, I think, rule out this interpr.: as "Mountain" the mace is animatized; in the instrumental it is an inanimate instrument.

The *tám* of pāda a is an anticipatory placeholder for *táṃ-tam íd* in b, c.

Re and WG take *chantsat* (√*chand*) in d as meaning 'appear': "there will appear a *gáhanam* for him ..." -- that is, 'come into view, take shape'. But though 'appear' in modern European lgs. can cover that sense, the 'appear' sense of √*chand* is generally 'have the appearance of, look like'. Ge's interpr. is more complex: he takes the *vájra-* to

be the underlying subject, which to the fugitive will look like a *gáhanam*. This interpr. represents the sense of √*chand* better, but at the cost of producing something close to nonsense, at least as I tried to understand it. I instead use the developed sense 'be pleasing' of √*chand*: the point is that once Indra and Parvata start smiting him, even falling into an abyss will be preferable.

I.133 Indra

I.133.1: The popular, Atharvan-like character of the first hymn of this composite (see publ. intro.) (vss. 1–5) is partly signalled by the two *l*-forms in this verse: *abhivlágya* and *vailasthāná-*. Both forms are found only in this hymn. The first belongs to the putative root √*vlag*, confined to this hymn (this gerund 1c, 2a; nominal *abhivlaṅga-* 4b); the second, in the variants *vailasthānaká-* and *mahā́vailastha-*, appears also in 3c, d. Neither has an agreed-upon etymology. For √*vlag* EWA suggests a connection with √*vṛj* 'twist'. I see it rather as an *l*-form of √*vraj* 'proceed, advance upon', which in several of its (few) occurrences also appears with *abhí*. The nasal in *abhivlaṅga-* might be a problem, but roots ending in *-j* are prone to secondary nasals (√*raj, rañj* 'color', √*saj, sañj* 'hang', probably √*svaj, svañj* 'embrace').

As for *vaila(-sthana-)*, it also has been subjected to multiple etymologies (see disc. WG ad loc.). I take it as an *l*-form of vṛddhied *vīrá-* 'hero'; the vṛddhied *r*-form is found in *vaíra(-deya-)* (V.61.8) '(payment) of wergeld'. The 'place of *vaira-*/*vaila*' would be 'the place of heroes or heroism', i.e., the battlefield.

Note the juxtaposition across pāda-boundary of *ṛténa* 'with truth' and *drúhaḥ* 'deceits'. I take *anindrā́ḥ* as implicitly contrastive with *mahī́ḥ*: though the lies may be great, they lack Indra and therefore lack ultimate power.

I.133.2: *vaṭūrín-* (/*mahā́vaṭūrin-*) in cd is an impossible hapax, and the wisest course (taken by Ge, WG) is not to tr. it. (Re tries out éperonné 'spurred on', with no indication of where he got it.) Unwisely I tender both a tr. ('overcoming obstacles') and an etymology, though more in a spirit of adventure than with any confidence that they are correct. I start with the idiom *vṛtrá-* √*tī* 'overcome obstacle(s)', found, e.g., in the fairly well-attested neut. noun *vṛtratū́rya-* and adj. *vṛtratúr-*. A hypothetical Middle Indic form to an underlying **vṛtratū/ur-* would be **vaṭṭa-tū/ur-* (since dentals following original **ṛ* often undergo retroflexion: see von Hinüber, Mittelindisch[2] 165). This could then undergo haplology to **vaṭṭū/ur-* and then simplification of the cluster (though we might expect **vāṭū/ur-)* to the form to which an *-in*–suffix was affixed. This is more machinery than should be deployed to explain a hapax, but the explanation falls (loosely) within the realm of possibility -- and a MIA source would fit with the other words in the hymn belonging to a lower or aberrant register. Still it would probably be more sensible to follow Kuiper (see EWA s.v.) in taking it as a non-Indo-Aryan word.

Even leaving aside *vaṭūrin-*, the verse doen't make a lot of sense: what does it mean for Indra to cut off heads with his *foot*?

I.133.3: In an unpubl. paper Arlo Griffiths argues that *armaká-* means 'mudflat'.

Note the *-ka-* forms, *vailasthānaká-* and *armaká-* (2x) -- pleonastic *-ka-* often being a sign of colloquial register (see Jamison, *-ka-*). Since diminutivization (or

diminishment/belittling) is one of the apparent nuances of the -*ka*-suffix, it is somewhat amusing that we find "diminutivized" *vailasthānaké* beside *mahấvailasthe*.

I.133.4: I have tr. the fem. gen. pl. rel. *yấsām* as 'when', to make the structure of subord. cl. (ab) – main cl. (cd) work better. However it is possible (and perhaps preferable) to take the *yấsām* cl. as simply continuing vs. 3: "Smash down the troop of those witches ... of which (witches) you scattered afar thrice fifty." 4cd would then be an independent sentence.

Who the subject of cd is depends on what the verb *manāyati* means. Ge takes the subj. as a generic, or at least unidentified, "er": "das merkt er sich fein von dir." Re thinks the subj. is one of the witches, but like Ge he takes *manāya-* to mean something like 'pay attention, note, understand'. The verb is an obvious denom. to *manấ-*, which is interpr. by some as 'Andacht' (prayer, reverence) (see EWA s.v. *MAN*[1]), with the verb then meaning 'andächtig sein' (be reverent towards) (so WG here, again with a generic subject, "man"). But since I interpret *manấ-* as 'zeal', for me the verb means 'display zeal', with the implicit subj. Indra's deed, represented by the neut. pronouns *tát* (c) and *takát* (d).

Pronominal -*ka*-forms, like *takát*, are an extreme sign of colloquial register -- or rather of the poets overtly signalling their conscious deployment of this register.

I.133.5: This last verse of the colloquially bloodthirsty first hymn of the composite pulls out all the stops with striking interlocking phonetic figures in ab: #***piśa***ṅ*ga* ... #***piśā***c*im* ... and (*piśáṅg*)***abhṛṣṭim ambhṛṇá***m# ... (*s*)***ám mṛṇa***#

The latter sequence helps explain why we have another impossible hapax: *ambhṛṇá-*; as often, difficult words appear in contexts that play on their phonological shape. Again, wisdom would suggest leaving it untr. or at least tr. with a vague contextually generated term like 'monstrous', but I have had the temerity to suggest another very shaky etymology. I suggest that this is a colloquial deriv. of the lexeme *ánu* √*bhṛ*, a euphemistic idiom that refers to sexual assault and penetration -- e.g., in the cosmic incest myth (X.61.5). See comm. ad I.88.6 and Jamison 1981 ("A Vedic sexual pun: *ástobhayat, anubhartrī,* and RV I.88.6," *Acta Orientalia* 42 [1981] 55-63). The initial *am* would represent an apocopated form of the preverb *ánu*, a change that fits the register in the rest of the hymn. My 'ballsy' is an attempt to capture the slangy irreverence. Since Piśācas are later associated with sexual misconduct towards women -- at least on the basis of the Paiśāca "marriage" (e.g., MDŚ III.34), which involves taking advantage of a maiden who is asleep, intoxicated, or disordered -- a sexual interpr. of the adjective qualifying the Piśāci here would be entirely fitting. The same idiom, with an even more MIA cast, may be found in AirĀr *ambhaṇa-* 'Bauch der Laute' (belly of the lute); as discussed in my 1981 paper, the vīnā bears some resemblance to male genitalia and jokes about its shape are still current in South Asia.

I.133.6: Although the adverb *avár* 'downward' occurs only here, beside more common *avás*, it is probably not the result of secondary alteration of *avás-*, since it has an Old Aves. correspondent *auuarə* (Y. 29.11).

The accent on *dāḍṛhí* must be owing to its juxtaposition with immediately following *śrudhí*.

ápūruṣaghna- is universally taken as ‘not smashing men’, and this is certainly possible. However, since the focus of this composite hymn is on Indra’s destruction of various demonic beings, I think an interpr. ‘smashing non-men’ fits better. The context remains violent, so remarking on Indra’s forebearance towards men would break the martial mood.

I.133.7: On *áva √yaj* ‘dash down through sacrifice, banish through sacrifice’, see comm. ad VII.60.9, IV.1.5.

I.134 Vāyu

I.134.1: For *makhá-* as ‘bounty’, see disc. ad I.19.8.

I.134.2: *vāyav índavo* somewhat echoes the double voc. construction *vāyav índraś ca*, several exx. of which are found in the next hymn.

I.134.3: In f *prá cakṣaya ródasī vāsayoṣásaḥ*, *ródasī* is most naturally the obj. of *prá cakṣaya* and *uṣásaḥ* of *vāsaya*, but this seems to leave unaccented *vāsaya* opening its clause. The solution is easily found: in the tag-pāda g the same sequence *vāsayoṣásaḥ* is preceded in its clause by *śrávase*. Whether we attribute lack of accent in f to redactional erasure (so Old) or assume that *vāsaya* was originally unaccented because of its repetition in the tag-pāda does not matter much.

I.134.4–6: Fronted forms of the 2nd sg. pronoun begin most of the metrically significant sections in this sequence of vss. (4a, d, 5a, d, 6a).

I.134.4: I take *dáṃsu* here and in I.141.4 as the loc. pl. of the root noun *dám-* ‘house’ (so also WG) rather than as adv. ‘wondrously’ (Gr, Re). Ge refuses to tr.

As with *raśmíbhiḥ* in I.132.5 I take *raśmíṣu* here as a temporal expr., contrary to the standard tr. The extended phrases in I.135.3, 137.2 support this view.

On *vakṣáṇā-* ‘belly’ as a pl. tantum, see comm. ad X.27.16.

I.134.5: Note the plethora of *-an-*forms in abc: *turaṇyávaḥ, iṣananta, bhurváṇi* (2x).

In b *iṣananta bhurváṇi* is echoed by *iṣanta bhurváṇi* in the tag-pāda c. WG take *iṣananta* and *iṣanta* to two different verbs (“treiben” and “wünschen” respectively), but as Re remarks, the formal variation is insignificant in Atyaṣṭi (see *duhre, duhrate* in 6fg below), and it would be far more disruptive to this structure to change the verb root in the echo. This twinning of *iṣananta* and *iṣanta* here makes it likely that the former has only minimal connections to the other forms belonging to a stem *iṣaṇa-*, otherwise confined to the Indra hymns of IV. See comm. ad IV.16.9.

I take *bhurváṇi* as an adverbial complement to the verb (“set themselves aquiver”) (sim. Old and Re, AiG II.2.900), and therefore in c I am reluctant to construe *apā́m* with *bhurváṇi* as Ge (and differently WG) do. My solution, which is admittedly ad hoc, is to supply a simile containing **ūrmáyaḥ* (cf., e.g., IX.95.3 *apā́m ivéd ūrmáyas tárturāṇāḥ* for soma drinks [as here] compared to waves of water constantly in motion). On the interpr.

of some scholars of *bhurváṇi* as a loc. infinitive, see Keydana (Inf. 190–91), who rightly rejects it.

In its two occurrences (I.151.5, X.91.2) *takva-vī́-* '(in) swooping pursuit' refers to a bird of prey. In this passage most tr. take *tsā́rin-* 'stealthy one' as a hunter in pursuit of game; this may be correct and is reflected in the publ. tr. However, it's possible that the stealthy one is the bird of prey, becoming weary as he circles in the air ("in his swooping pursuit" *takvavī́ye*). It might seem odd for the bird to "reverently invoke" Indra, but this is hardly beyond the range of RVic discourse.

The verb *pāsi* in fg is universally taken as belonging to √*pā* 'protect', and this is morphologically the easier interpretation: it would be a straightforward root present. However, context favors a connection with √*pā* 'drink'. As Old points out, *dhármaṇā* is used in IX.25.2, 63.22 to refer to Vāyu's right to the first drink of soma, and the next verse here, 6abc, spells out this entitlement in almost over-literal detail; it can be considered a species of poetic repair, making it clear that *pāsi* here belongs to 'drink'. (See also I.135.1de.) Moreover, "protect from every creature" seems an odd expression, since "creatures" are generally positively viewed or at least neutral. The problem with 'drink' of course is that this root makes a root *aorist*, not a root present. But at least one other form with primary endings is universally taken to the 'drink' root: *pānti* in II.11.14, which in fact describes the same situation as here, Vāyu's first drink of soma: *prá vāyávaḥ pānty ágraṇītim* "The Winds drink the first offering." These two primary forms may be nonce presents or subjunctives (in which case the tr. here should be "you will drink ..."), or *pāsi* here could be a nonce *-si* imperative.

I take the two abl. in fg in different senses: *víśvasmād bhúvanāt* as a temporal expression, but *asuryā̀t* as causal.

I.134.6: For abc as a "repair" of *pāsi* in 5fg, see disc. there.

Most supply barhis as the obj. of the perf. part. *vavarjúṣīṇām*, and this is quite possibly correct. By contrast I take it in the metaphorical sense "twist s.o. towards oneself," that is, attract to the sacrifice -- though we might prefer a medial form in that sense. And the mention of barhis at the beginning of the next hymn (I.135.1a) may support that standard view. As Kü points out (461 and n. 873), there's no obvious explanation for the full-grade stem (expect * *vavṛjúṣ-*).

I.135 Vāyu

I.135.1–3: The fronted forms of *tvám* (etc.) found in I.134.4–6 continue here, though not as densely: 1d, 2a, d, 3d.

I.135.1: Unaccented *niyutvate* in bc appears to be a voc. to an otherwise unattested *-i-*stem *niyutvati-*, whose formation would be morphologically peculiar (a secondary *-i-*stem built to a *-vant-*stem?!). It must be a nonce manipulation of the standard *-vant-* stem *niyútvant-*. As Re points out, vocatives in *-pate* may have had some influence in producing this rhyme form. Since Vāyu is almost the only referent of *niyútvant-*, it is highly unlikely that the form represents a dative to the *-vant-*stem that lost its accent for some reason.

I.135.2: On *váha vāyo niyúto yāhy asmayúḥ* see disc. ad VII.90.1.

I.135.3: As indicated in the publ. intro., this hymn is divided into tṛcas and each tṛca was probably originally a single hymn. This then is the final verse of 1–3, and it exhibits very heavy ring-composition: 3b ... *úpa yāhi vītáye* reprises 1a *úpa no yāhi vītáye* almost exactly, and 3ab *... niyúdbhiḥ śatínibhiḥ ... sahasríṇibhiḥ* ... echoes 1bc *sahásreṇa niyútā ... śatínībhiḥ*. Note also 3d *távāyám bhāgáḥ ...*, which is identical to the beginning of 2d.

As discussed ad I.134.3, the expression here, *sáraśmiḥ sū́rye sácā* "accompanying the reins [=rays] when the sun (rises)" seems to me a fuller version of the temporal expression *raśmíṣu* (/*raśmíbhiḥ*) "at/with the reins=rays." See also I.137.2e *sākáṃ sū́ryasya raśmíbhiḥ* "simultaneous with the reins=rays of the sun."

I.135.4–6: As indicated in the publ. intro., this tṛca is constructed in parallel to 1–3, but addressed to the two gods Vāyu and Indra rather than Vāyu alone. I will not call attention to the pervasively parallel phraseology: a simple skimming of the two sets of verses will amply demonstrate it.

I.135.4: The *vā́yav índraś ca* construction here unfolds over two pādas.

I.135.7: Here the *vā́yav índraś ca* construction is stretched from a to c, and in f the sequence *índraś ca yāthaḥ* (lit. "and Indra, you two drive") presupposes a 2nd ps. sg. to produce the conjoined subject. This latter construction further attenuates the *vā́yav índraś ca* construction.

Note the little figure *sasató ... śáśvato*.

I.135.8: As indicated in the publ. intro., I have no idea what the figtree represents here. Some of the verse seems anagrammatic for *vāyú-*: the repeated *jāyávo* (bc) and *yávo* (d).

The rel. / correl. dyad is skewed, with *yám* not correspondint to *té* in the main cl. I have no explan.

The accent on *súvate* in d must result from juxtaposition with *pácyate.*

I.135.9: The references here are also murky, but I am inclined to see the plural referents as both Maruts and soma drinks. In favor of the Maruts: 1) they are called *bāhv-òjas* -in VIII.20.6; 2) they are sometimes called *ukṣán-* (e.g., V.52.3); 3) the non-waning cows of 8ef are also found in the Marut hymn V.55.5 *ná vo dasrā úpa dasyanti dhenávaḥ*; 4) they fly (e.g. V.59.7), and they're associated with the shaking of mountains and the flowing of rivers (flying in the river could be rain); 5) approaching the figtree in 8b might be like V.54.12, where they "shake the gleaming berry (*píppalam*)" -- the pippala is supposed to be a fig.

nadī́ is one of the rare loc. sg.s to a *vṛkī́*-fem.; see *sarasī́* in VII.103.2, *gaurī́* in IX.12.3, and AiG III.170. I would now consider these forms endingless locatives (rather than the result of contraction of the stem vowel with a loc. sg. ending *-I*, on the basis of TY's disc. of this type; see comm. ad VII.103.2.

I.136 Mitra and Varuṇa

I.136.2: In the publ. tr. I blindly followed Ge and Re in supplying *jyótiṣe* 'light' with *uráve* in a. Although this makes fine sense, neither scholar cites parallel passages. It is certainly true that *jyótis-* is qualified by *urú-* elsewhere (e.g., I.117.21, II.27.14, VI.3.1) and that *jyótiṣmant-* is found twice in the next vs. (I.136.3), but I think I would now be inclined to be more circumspect about what *uráve* refers to.

I.136.3: fg is somewhat hard to construe, in that there are three gods and two occurrences of *yātayáj-janaḥ* 'setting the peoples in order'. Moreover, Varuṇa and Āryaman are directly adjacent to that epithet, but it is Mitra whose stable characteristic it is (cf., e.g., III.59.1 *mitró jánān yātayati ...*). Mine is only one of the ways to handle the 3-into-2 problem.

I.136.4: The punctuation in the publ. tr. may not make it sufficiently clear that it is Soma "who gives shares in the drinking places." On *avapā́na-* see comm. ad VII.98.2 and X.43.2.

I.136.6: As noted in the publ. intro. there is abundant evidence of ring composition between this verse, the real final verse of the hymn, and vs. 1: 1a *bṛhán námo* / 6a *námo ... bṛhaté*; 1bc *mṛḷáyadbhyām* / 6c *sumṛḷīkā́ya*; 1e *úpastutā* / 6d *úpa stuhi.* Cf. also 2d *dyukṣám* / 6e *dyukṣám*, and 2c *bhágasya* / 6e *bhágam*.

I.137 Mitra and Varuṇa

I.137.1–2: *ā́ yātam* is parenthetical and in 2nd position, breaking up syntactic constituents (*suṣumá ... ádribhiḥ* and *imé ... índavaḥ* respectively), in the initial pādas of both these verses.

I.137.2: For the temporal expression in e, see disc. ad I.135.3.

I.138 Pūṣan

I.138.2: Note *kṛṇvá ṛṇávo* in b.

The rather surprising appearance of the camel in c is best explained as Ge does: the simile is incomplete and should read "as a camel (does) its load." Still the camel adds a specificity that seems out of keeping with the context.

I.138.3: The syntax of this verse is quite contorted.

The hapax *sárī* is problematic. Flg. Old, I think it must be interpr. in the context of the idiom *vā́jam √sṛ* 'run for the prize'; cf. the root noun cmpd. *vāja-sṛ́t-* and passages like I.62.16 *sómo vā́jam ivāsarat*. But what sort of form is *sárī*? Gr takes it as an *-in-* stem, which would be the simplest solution save for the accent, which should fall on the suffix (**sarī́*). AiG II.2.328 explicitly rejects this analysis, suggesting instead (p. 407, flg. a brief mention by Old, in turn inspired by Ludwig) that, with following *bhava*, it is an early example of a *cvi* construction. But again, we should expect suffixal accent (see Whitney, Gr. §1093), and moreover the *cvi* construction is at best embryonic at this period (*akhkhalīkṛ́tya* VII.103.3 being the only fairly certain example in the RV, though

see my disc. of *suṣámī abhūvan* in X.28.12). Taking it as a *rathī́*-type masc. confronts the same issue with accent. Since an analysis as an *-in*-stem encounters only the accentual problem, not the chronological one of the *cvi* construction, and since *-in*-stems are considerably better attested than *rathī́*- masculines, an *-in*-stem analysis with unexplained accent retraction seems the best among the poor choices. As for my tr., since "be a runner after" seemed clumsy, I have substituted "be a contender."

I.139 All Gods

I.139.1–2: For the sense of these vss., see publ. intro.

I.139.1: The pass. aor. *saṃdā́yi* is taken by Gr (etc.) to √*dā* 'tie', surely correctly. But there are several other occurrences of this lexeme *sám* √*dā* that also appear to express the same idiom, but, with different morphological realizations, are generally assigned to √*dā* 'give' (though see, e.g., Kü 244). The idiom, in its fullest expression, is *sám* √*dā nā́bhim* [ACC] *nā́bhā(u)* [LOC] 'tie navel to navel', that is, to assert a family connection (often between gods or semidivine figures like seers and us humans). In the passive the first navel is of course in the nom. – a nom. that is gapped in this passage. Another ex. of the idiom is found in IV.44.5, also passive, this time with the loc. gapped (or substituted for by a prn.): *sáṃ yád dadé nā́bhiḥ pūrvyā́ vām* "because (our) ancient umbilical tie is attached to you (or, to your [navel])," of the Aśvins. Instead of *sám* the preverb can be *ā́*: see IX.10.8 with the fullest form of the idiom, containing both case forms of 'navel': *nā́bhā nā́bhiṃ na ā́ dade* "he has bound his navel to our navel." Also IX.79.4 *diví te nā́bhā paramó yá ādadé* "It was in heaven, to its navel, that your highest (navel) was bound." (This last tr. is different from the publ. one; see comm. ad IX.79.4 for the alteration and the difficulties in the passage.) Another ex. of the idiom is probably found in the noun *saṃdadí*- in IX.99.7, though the telltale navel is absent. See disc. there. The other occurrence of *saṃdadí*- in II.39.7 even more attenuated, but still expresses the sense of attachment. A variant of the idiom, *ā́* √*tan nā́bhim* LOC is found in I.105.9; see comm. there.

I.139.2: With Ge (etc.) I supply 'throne' with *hiraṇyáyam* in e on the basis of V.62.8.

I.139.3: The part. *āśrāváyanta(ḥ)* is best taken as predicated, substituting for a main verb. The standard tr. supply a finite verb ("invite" vel sim.), but this seems unnecessary.

This form also participates in a fine example of case disharmony in a simile (in the sense of Jamison 1982): *śrāváya-*/*śraváya*- can mean both "cause to be heard" and "cause to hear." In the simile (pāda b) it takes *ślókam* as obj. and means "cause to be heard"; in the frame (pāda a) it takes *yuvā́m* and means "cause to hear," while in the tag-pāda (c) it likewise takes *yuvā́m* but also a 2nd acc. *havyā́*, with the meaning "cause X to hear (about) Y." With Ge I supply "of the pressing stone" with *ślókam* on the basis of 10e *ślókam ádreḥ*.

Unlike the standard tr. I supply "chariot" as the obj. of *anuśā́satā* and take *rájaḥ* as an acc. of extent.

I.139.7: On the difficulties of interpr. of this verse, see publ. intro.

In f Ge and Re take *aryamā́* as subject of *duhre* and are then at pains to assemble enough other personnel to count, at least conceptually, as a plural with pl. verb *duhre*. (Cf. Re "Aryaman (ainsi que) l'officiant (et autres) l'ont traite-à-fond.") But not only does this not work grammatically but it does not make sense: since the gods gave the cow to the Aṅgirases (de), surely *they* are the ones who have milked her dry. Although major syntactic breaks in the middle of pādas are rare, in this case we must take sg. *aryamā́* as starting a new sentence (so also WG). Note that pāda a also seems to have a syntactic break after *śṛṇuhi*, though it is less jarring because the subject of the next clause remains the same.

As for the sense, I am quite baffled. The Aṅgirases seem to have mistreated the cow, or at least gotten everything they can out of her. But Aryaman also has knowledge, and perhaps use, of her. I suggest very tentatively that since Aryaman is associated with the householder's fire and with hospitality rites, this may be an early and oblique reference to a division between what will later be known as śrauta rites and gṛhya rites. But I have no confidence in this.

I.139.8: On *asmád abhí* see comm. ad V.33.3.

The standard tr. supply 'word' (*vácaḥ* Ge n. 8a) as the neut. sg. subject with *yád ... citrám* ... in de, but a singular form of *paúṃsya-* in ab is more easily supplied from context, and deeds can easily "resound" by semantic transference.

I interpr. the structure of d–g differently from the standard interpr., which take *tád* as the antecedent both of the *yád* clause in de (*yád ... ghóṣāt* ...) and the one in f, *yác ca duṣṭáram*, echoed by g. By this interpr. the two *yád* clauses are overtly conjoined (*yád ... yác ca*) around the main clause referent (*tád*), with the 2nd embedded in the main cl. before the verb *didhṛtā́* in the echo pāda. Klein explicitly accounts for this disruption of structure by asserting that the *yác ca* clause "has been postposed in pāda c because its required repetition in d provides a coherent punaḥpadam" [he must mean f and g respectively]. This seems like a bit of a cop-out to me – it wouldn't be "required" to be repeated if it hadn't ended up in that position in the first place, for other reasons. Contrary to this analysis, I take f(g) as containing an "X and which Y" (*tád ... yác ca*) construction of the familiar type, with two different referents. The X is also further specified by the preposed rel. cl. in de (*yád vaḥ ... ámartyam*), but the *yád* clause in de and the one in f (echoed by g) are entirely unconnected and have different referents. The placement of the *yác ca* clause and the *ca* seem to me strong evidence for my interpretation.

As for the referent of *yác ca duṣṭáram* (fg), I supply *dyumnám* also from context (b *dyumnā́ni*); cf. also III.37.10 *dyumnáṃ dadhiṣva duṣṭáram*.

I.139.10: The praiṣa quoted at the beginning of this verse, matching the one opening the hymn, situates this verse in the ritual here and now, and such a context gives clues for the solution of some of the difficulties. Because the context is the soma sacrifice (the praügaśastra is part of the morning soma pressing; see also the pressing stone in e), I follow Ge in taking *vanínaḥ* as the gen. sg. of 'wooden' (rather than as the nom. pl. of a putative *vanín-* 'winning', with Re). The 'wooden' is the wooden cup and by extension its contents: soma. This interpr. in turn makes it unnec. to take *vanta* as a haplology of 3rd pl. **vananta* (see Old). The bulls of b are likewise interpretable in a ritual context as the soma drinks.

Pāda f contains an incomprehensible hapax *araríndāni*, which, as so often, may have been stimulated by the phonological context: **ádhāra**y**adara**rin**dā**ni. Given the construction of the tag-pāda g it should refer to something compatible with *sádmāni* 'seats'. My 'fittings' is only a placeholder, loosely implying a connection with √*ṛ* 'fit together' (also in *arā́-* 'wheel-spoke', etc.) and inspired by the (presumably entirely accidental) echo of ἀραρίσκω. What *-ind-* would be under this analysis is utterly unclear.

I.140 Agni

I.140.1: The referent of *dhā́si-* ordinarily 'wellspring' (see comm. I.62.3), which is identified here as Agni's *yóni-* 'womb', is unclear. In VIII.43.7, 29 and III.7.3 (also perhaps III.7.1) the *dhā́si-* is the plants (=firewood) to be "eaten," i.e., burned, by the fire, hence the source ('wellspring') of the fire's growth. Since whatever it is here can be carried (*prá bharā*), firewood makes sense, and this interpr. is supported by the fact that the plants that Agni burns are an important theme in this hymn (vss. 2ab, 6–8). Though in I.122.13, a passage adduced by WG, I render *dhā́si-* as 'gush' (developing a different aspect of 'wellspring, fountain'; cf. also VI.67.6), that sense does not work well here because it must be identified with the *yóni-* and capable of being carried.

I.140.2: I take *trivṛ́t* as a qualifier of *ánnam* 'food' (so also Re, Old [SBE], Sāy, WG); however, I am not sure what tripartition of food is meant. Ge in his n. (2a) suggests wood, ghee, and soma (more or less flg. Sāy), but because the next pāda concerns only the plant food that Agni has eaten and that regenerates in a year, I am reluctant to divide the focus. It is also possible to take *trivṛ́t* as an adverb, as Ge does ("... eilt dreifältig ..."), but this merely transfers the problem.

In the second hemistich "the one / the other" are easier to identify. Pāda c concerns the ritual fire, while d treats the wildfire, each represented by a characteristic animal: in c the "thoroughbred bull" (*jényo vṛ́ṣā*), which, despite its power, is a domesticated beast, while the (wild) elephant (*vāraṇáḥ*) of d rampages in the forest.

I don't understand the position of *ī*. *ī(m)* and *sīm* generally occupy Wackernagel's position. In this case it may mark *jagdhám* as a notional relative clause, as in my tr. "what was eaten," though the following word *púnaḥ* unfortunately must be construed with the main verb *vāvṛdhe*.

In c the initial position of *anyásya* violates my rule (1997, Fs. Beekes) for definite *anyá-* placement, but *anyéna* in d is correctly positioned.

I.140.3: The middle voice of *tarete*, fairly rare for forms of √*tṝ*, is responsible for my "move athwart each other," against a more standard "hasten towards" or the like. It is also a reasonable representation of the movement of the kindling sticks rubbing against each other.

On the sense of √*dhvaṃs* see comm. ad IV.19.7; on the intrans. value of *dhvasáya-* see my *-áya*-Formations pp. 54–55. On the supposed transitive sense of the form in X.73.6 see comm. ad loc.

Both *sā́cya* and *kúpaya-* are hapaxes, though the likely root affiliation of the former with √*sac* 'accompany, attend upon' makes its interpr. easier. With AiG II.2.793, 798, I take it to be a gerundive to this root. As for *kúpaya-*, I find it hard to separate it

from the root √*kup* 'quiver, quake', despite the unclarity of its formation (suffix? accent?), and find the alternative analysis as *ku-paya(s?)-* (most recently, tentatively WG) unlikely.

várdhanam pitúḥ "the increaser of his father" is one of the RVic poet's beloved paradoxes. The priest generates the ritual fire and is therefore its father, but the well-tended fire in turn produces prosperity and increase for the ritual officiants.

I.140.4: The thrust of this vs. is a pile-up of adjectives describing Agni's flame-horses, set within a frame consisting of the verb *úpa yujyante* "they are harnessed," postponed until the final pāda, and a dative of benefit occurring in the first: *mánave mānavasyaté*.

mānavasyaté is found only here, and both its sense and its formation are unclear. It is generally rendered as if it were a denominative (Ge 'dem Menschenfreundlichen', Re 'agissant en homme'), but this would assume a *-yá-*formation built to a vṛddhi-derivative pseudo-*s*-stem **mānavas-* (beside *mānavá-,* loosely like *mánus-* beside *mánu-*). I instead interpret it as a (pseudo-)future participle in *-syánt-* built to the common vṛddhi deriv. *mānava-*. The future suffix reinforces the sense of the vṛddhi deriv. 'descending from Manu' by emphasizing the fact that (some of) these descendants are still to come. (If such a derivation seems too radical, it could be mediated by a denom. **mānava-yá-* + *-syánt-*, which underwent haplology.)

asamaná- means lit. something like 'not together, not gathered'; 'breaking ranks' seems a dynamic tr. of the underlying concept (Re 'allant en sens divers'). (See also VII.5.3; the sense of the 3rd occurrence in VI.46.13 is slightly different.) It thus forms a semantic pair with *mumukṣvàḥ* 'seeking to break free' in a. I do not follow Ge (/WG) in their derivation from the extended meaning of *sámana-* as 'battle', hence (Ge) 'ohne Kampf'.

Note the phonetic figure opening the vs.: *mumukṣvò mánave mānavasyaté*.

I.140.5: The vs. contains three "intensive" participles: *kárikrataḥ*, *mármṛśat*, and *nā́nadat*. All three, in my opinion, express repetitive or repeated action. In particular *kárikrataḥ*, in my tr. 'making and remaking', nicely reflects the constantly changing shape of the smoke rising from the raging flames.

I take *mahī́m* 'great' (fem.) separately from *avánim* and referring to the earth; by this interpr. the whole earth serves as Agni's course ('stream bed').

I.140.6–8: This trio of verses treats the union (by burning) of the hyper-masculine Agni/fire and the plants (feminine). This must be the "der erotische Grundton" of the hymn that Ge mentions in his intro. This sexual union leads to the death of the plants (8b) and their regrowth and transformation into a different form (7cd, 8). Or so is my interpr.; acdg. to some, the flames are sometimes the referents, rather than the plants. This proposed split reference seems to me to break the thematic unity of the verses and the climax in 8 of the death and renewed life of the females who unite with Agni.

I.140.6: The concentration of intensives continues in this verse: *námnate* (a), *róruvat* (b), *davidhāva* (d).

The 'bending' of pāda a of course describes the flickering motion of the flames.

Because of the theme mentioned ad vss. 6–8, of the bodily transformation of the plants by burning, I take *tanvàḥ* in c as referring to the bodies of the plants, not, with most tr., that of Agni.

I don't entirely understand the position of *ca* in c. Klein (DGRV I.222–23, 259–60) suggests that it has been bumped by the participle opening the clause and pāda. It is certainly the case that *ca* could not immediately follow that first word without metrical distress: five-syllable *ojāyámānaḥ* entirely fills the opening, and since the caesura cannot precede an enclitic, placing *ca* after the participle would result in an opening of 6.

I.140.7: The idiom *punar √ vṛdh* 'grow again' recurs from 2b, again referring to the plants immolated by the fire (at least in my opinion; others take the subject to be the flames). Here their regeneration is linked with their contact or merger with divinity.

The final pāda is variously interpreted. I take the plants still to be the subject and the form "different from their parents" refers to their burned residue as ash and cinders, as opposed to the branches and leaves that were fed to the fire. But if *pitróḥ* is taken as a loc., the referent may be different; some take it as referring to Heaven and Earth (Sāy, Old [SBE], WG).

I.140.8: Again there is a difference of opinion as to referent. With Old (SBE) I take the plants once again as the subjects of pāda a (so, partly, WG), contra Sāy, Ge, Re, Kü (419), who interpret them as flames.

I.140.9: The hapax *tuvigrá-* in b is generally interpr. as having a thematized form of *√gṝ* 'swallow' as 2nd member, hence 'powerfully swallowing' vel sim. But to a seṭ root we should probably expect **-gira-* (like *-tír-*: *-tira-*; (-)*túr-*: *túra-*). I follow instead a suggestion of Insler's, that it represents a haplologized **tuvi-vigrá-* 'powerfully spirited'. See comm. ad II.21.2 on the related hapax *tuvigrí-*.

With most, I take *śyénī* as the fem. of the color term *śyetá-*, rather than, with Ge, as the fem. of *śyená-* 'falcon' (Adlerweibchen). Among other things, we would probably expect the fem. of 'falcon' to have *vṛkī́-* inflection, like *vṛkī́-* itself and *siṃhī́-* 'lioness' to *siṃhá-* 'lion'; it should therefore have suffixal accent, and in this sandhi context the nom. sg. should have come out as **śyenī́ḥ*. Moreover there is no obvious role for a female falcon in context. The white trail of ash here contrasts nicely with the black furrows (*kṛṣṇásīta-*) the fire creates in 4b.

I.140.10: I read pāda b with cd, contrary to the standard tr., which take it as independent. I might now, however, replace the tr. of *ádha* as 'then' with 'and' or the like.

The first word of c, *avā́sʲya*, is generally taken as the gerund to *áva √as* lit. 'throw down'. I am dubious about this interpr., since that lexeme is not found elsewhere in the RV or, acdg. to Monier Williams, anywhere else in Sanskrit. I therefore derive it rather from *áva √sā / si* 'let loose, unhitch', despite the formal difficulties. The idiom is used regularly for letting loose horses, to which Agni's flames are compared here, and see X.61.20, where Agni is the subject of *áva syati*, a verse that contains vocabulary that resonates here: *dvivartaní-* and *śíśu-*. The problem is that we should expect *avasā́ya* with full-grade root and root accent (cf. I.104.1) or possibly **avasʲyà* (this zero-gr. form is recorded in Whitney's Roots). I can only explain the accented long vowel in *avā́sʲya* as

arising from confusion produced by augmented forms (cf. *ávāsuḥ* 'they unhitched' I.179.2).

I take the *śíśumatīḥ* '(females) possessing young' to be Agni's flames; they have young because flames beget more flames as they spread.

I take d as a paradox: the fire is in constant circling motion (*parijárbhurāṇaḥ*), but still produces a protective encirclement like armor.

I.140.11: Most take the expression in b to mean "let it be dearer to you than a dear thought"; this seems to me nonsensical or at least rhetorically weak. I suggest that there is a pun on *priyá-*, which can mean both 'dear' and 'own'. Here the poet suggests that his composed thought will be dearer to Agni than anything the god himself might produce.

I.140.12: See publ. intro. for speculation on the "foot" of the boat.

Ge suggests persuasively that "chariot and house" are used metaphorically for (times of) war and peace.

I.140.13: The problem in this verse is to determine which pādas go together. Ge and Re construe ab and cd together, but this leads to a gender problem: the subj. of cd should be fem. pl. *aruṇyàḥ* in d, but c contains a nom. pl. *masc.* part. *yántaḥ*. (Old [SBE] suggests that this form is corrupt because of the metrical problems in the pāda; he treats these at length in Noten, but does not seem to favor emendation of the participle.) The problem is not entirely solved by taking c with (a)b, as Old (SBE) and I do, but it becomes somewhat attenuated by the variety of possible subjects: Agni (m.), Heaven and Earth (*dyā́vā-kṣā́mā*, dual dvandva, whose gender is listed by Gr. as fem., but there are no diagnostic passages), the rivers (*síndhu-*, sometimes fem., sometimes masc. [see common acc. pl. *síndhūn*]) -- with masc. prevailing either because masc. is the default in such gender clashes or because *síndhavaḥ* is the closest subject to *yántaḥ*. WG also take d with the nominatives of b, by somehow taking *aruṇyàḥ* as a temporal expression "bei den (Morgen)röten," but one would expect a loc. for this meaning (as opposed to the extent of time in the temporal *dīrghā́hā* "through the long days" of c).

I.141 Agni

See published intro. for discussion of enjambement and other special effects in this hymn.

I.141.1: On *yáto jáni* see comm. ad III.10.6; the phrase could also be rendered here "as soon as he was born."

Most tr. take the subj. of *úpa hvarate* to be the same as that of *sā́dhate*, namely the thought (*matíḥ*), and therefore must take the subord. cl. as concessive (more or less "even if / although it moves crookedly, it goes straight ..."). However, I take Agni as the subj. of *úpa hvarate*, which expresses the usual crooked motion of fire, and the *īm* in this clause as standing for *matíḥ*, the subj. of the main clause and the goal of *úpa hvarate*. (*īm* and *sīm* almost always have real accusative reference; see Jamison 2002, Fs. Cardona, and *īm* in 3a and 3c below.) The verbs do of course contrast -- the zigzaging motion of the fire as opposed to the straight path of the poetic thought -- but this is the result of the different natures of their two subjects, which are acting in tandem for the success of the

sacrifice. That *hvārá-* is used of Agni in 7b supports taking him as subj. of *hvárate* here. However, see comment in I.142.4 below.

Most tr. take the streams of truth (*ṛtásya dhénā(ḥ)*) as acc. pl. and the object of *anayanta*, and supply various subjects: e.g., Ge "wise ones" (*dhī́rāḥ*), largely on the basis of V.45.10, which has *dhī́rāḥ* as subj. of *anayanta*. Since that passage in a Viśve Devāḥ hymn has no other points of contact with ours, I see no reason to supply an otherwise unrepresented subject here and to bump the possible surface subj., fem. pl. *dhénāḥ*, into the acc. I would adduce rather I.148.3 (also Dīrghatamas), where Agni is the obj. of *prá ... nayanta*, as I think he is here. It is true that I.146.4 has *dhī́rāsaḥ ... kaváyaḥ* "clever poets," who guide (*nayanti*) Agni's step (*padám*), which would give a nearer parallel for the *dhī́rāḥ* supplied here by Ge (who oddly doesn't cite this nearby passage), but the phrase "streams of truth," that is, true poetic formulations, seems to me just another way to refer to "clever poets" and actually supports taking the fem. pl. expression as the subj. and Agni as obj.

I.141.2: This verse concerns the three forms of Agni, with "form" expressed by neut. *vápuḥ* in a, which should be supplied with *dvitī́yam* in b and *tṛtī́yam* in c. (Contra Ge [/WG], who take *vápuḥ* as an adjective and the ordinals as adverbs. Since *vápuṣe* is clearly nominal in 1a, an adjectival usage in the following vs. would be surprising, esp. as there are, in my opinion, no certain exx. of adjectival *vápus-*.)

In a I take *pṛkṣáḥ* as the gen. sg. of *pṕ́kṣ-*, rather than the nom. sg. of *pṛkṣá-* (so Gr, Old [SBE], Ge, WG) or acc. pl. of *pṕ́kṣ-* (so Re). It is a descriptive or qualifying gen.: the "wondrous form *of nourishment*." It is not entirely clear what this phrase refers to, but I would suggest that it is the plants, which are often said to contain the fire in embryonic form (thus wondrously). In this form he is "abounding in food" both because the plants feed the fire and because plants supply nourishment to the living world. Such a qualifying gen. is also found in *vṛṣabhásya* in c acdg. to my interpr. (but not those of others). The root noun *pṕ́kṣ-* is probably found also in *pṛkṣúdh-* in vs. 4 below, qualifying plants (*vīrúdhaḥ*), which supports my interpr. here.

The second wondrous form is the fire in the waters, which has come to be identified with Apām Napāt. The "sevenfold-kindly (*saptáśivāsu*) mothers" must be the seven streams. The compound is oddly formed, and Gr, inter alia, suggests reading **saptá *śivā́su*, an unnecessary emendation, particularly if we maintain the compound reading of *dáśapramatim* in d (see immed. below).

The third form of fire, presented in cd, appears to be the ritual fire produced by the kindling sticks wielded by the fingers, which are characterized, as so often, as "young women" (*yóṣaṇaḥ*). The cmpd. *dáśapramatim* 'having ten(fold) forethought' suffers from the same formational oddity as *saptáśivāsu* and has been even more eagerly emended to **dáśa *prámatim* (see, e.g., Old, Noten, who keeps *saptáśivāsu* as a cmpd but supports emending the other to two words). The *dáśa,* liberated from the compound, would qualify the fingers, as often. However, in my opinion we must either keep both compounds or neither, and since the cmpds are the more difficult readings and Dīrghatamas is a tricky poet, I see no reason to emend.

Note that *janayanta* in b rhymes with *anayanta* in 1d in the same metrical position.

I.141.3: This verse describes several mystical and, probably, mythical productions of fire, couched in the present (clear pres. *mathāyáti* in d, which suggests that the injunc. *kránta* in b has the same temporal value). I do not completely understand either of the scenarios, esp. fire's hiding in the mixing vessel in cd.

Ge's suggestion that the first hemistich deals with Agni in the waters is supported by the parallel passages he adduces, and so it may continue the theme of 2b.

In d *mathāyáti* is entirely ambiguous between 'churns, rubs' (Old [SBE] 'produces ... by attrition', Ge 'ausreibt') and 'steals' (Re, WG), and both are appropriate: 'churns' would continue the theme of fire-production, but 'steals' would refer to Mātariśvan's theft of fire from heaven. No doubt both are meant, and there is both a mythical and a ritual application of the passage. Cf. I.148.1 *máthīt ... mātariśvā*.

I.141.4: This vs. concerns the production of fire by the friction of the two kindling sticks.

His "highest father" (*pitúḥ paramā́t*) is probably Heaven (Dyaus Pitar), as most take it; it also contrasts with the "depth" (*budhnā́t*) that is his source in 3a. The pāda-final *pári* is probably not to be construed with the verb (*prá*) *nīyate,* though *pári* is common with √*nī*, but, as often, governs the abl. (*pitúḥ paramā́t*), despite the intercalation of the verb between the abl. phrase and this postposition.

The hapax *pṛkṣúdh-* in b is variously explained. E.g., Old (Noten) suggests that it is modeled on the immediately following *vīrúdh-* and also *śurúdh-*. In the published tr. I followed Humbach's explanation (*Gathas* [1st ed. 1958] II.28; accepted by Narten, YH p. 161), which takes *-udh* as a zero-grade root noun belonging to widespread PIE *√*u̯edh* 'convey', otherwise unattested in Indo-Aryan. But I now no longer believe that etymology (see my 2020 "Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūidiia-*: The Aim of Praise" [Fs. Lamberterie]), and I would now follow Old's suggestion. Note the progression and phonetic play in the pāda: *ā́ pṛkṣ**udho** vī**rúdho** dáṃ**su roh**ati.* I would also slightly change the published tr. from "nourishment-bringing" to "nourishing."

On *dáṃsu* see I.134.4. As noted there, I take it as a loc. pl. to the root noun *dám-* 'house' (so Old [SBE], tentatively Ge, WG), rather than as an adverbial deriv. of √*daṃs* 'be wondrous' (Gr, Re). Here it presumably refers to the domestic fire established in the house(s); since words for 'house' in the plural often refer to only a single domestic establishment (presumably because it is made up of several buildings), "in the house" rather than the publ. "in the houses" is also possible.

Pāda c contains a curiously doubled *yád* in a single clause (*ubhā́ yád asya janúṣaṃ yád ínvataḥ*), which has attracted little attention. Old (SBE) notes it but makes no attempt to explain it, and otherwise the standard tr. (including mine) do not reflect or mention it. The exception is WG, who take the pāda as a kind of stuttering set of false starts: "Wenn die beiden seine Geburt -- wenn (sie überhaupt) -- antreiben." This seems to be the only way to represent what the text has, since it is impossible to manufacture a separate clause dependent on the second *yád*. But since both clauses in the WG rendering share subject, object, and verb, and the adverbial addition "überhaupt" reflects nothing in the Skt., it may be just as well to pass over the doubling in silence, assuming that the second *yád* comes from the occasional tendency for the relatively pronoun to immediately precede a pāda-final verb. Cf., e.g., for this verb stem, I.55.4d *kṣémeṇa dhénām maghávā yád ínvati* (also V.28.2c, VIII.13.32c ... *yám ínvasi*).

Pāda d contains an augmented impf. *abhavat*, which contrasts with the presents *nīyáte* (a), *róhati* (b), and *ínvataḥ* (c), esp. since it begins *ā́d íd* "just after that," which suggests that the past tense action of d should follow the actions of the earlier part of the verse. Most tr. (Old [SBE], Ge, Re, WG) take c and d together, separate from ab, which produces a jarring sequence of tense: "when they spur on ..., then he became ..." I connect c rather with ab and indeed with vs. 3 and start a new syntactic sequence with 4d, which is continued by the preterital expressions *ā́d íd + āviśat* in 5a, *ví vāvṛdhe* in 5b, and *áruhat* in 5c. Although this is not a complete solution, in that the *ā́d íd* "just after that" of 4d and 5a begs for a sequentially prior preterite, it keeps the disharmonious sequence of tenses from inhabiting the same sentence. This division is also compatible with the syntactic enjambement characteristic of the hymn.

I.141.5: The mothers (*mātṝ́ḥ*) of pāda a contrast with the father (*pitúḥ*) of 4a.

The standard tr. take *ví vāvṛdhe* in b as the verb of a rel. cl. begun by *yā́su* in a. The problem is that *vāvṛdhe* is not accented. Ge suggests that it lacks accent because the rel. pronoun is in a different pāda, but this separation does not pose problems elsewhere (cf., simply within this hymn, 3ab *nír yád* ..., ... *kránta*, 3cd *yád ..., ... mathāyáti*, 6cd ... *yád ..., ... véti*); Old is in favor of emending to *vivāvṛdhé*. Taking the text as given, I construe the rel. clause with *yā́su* as a nominal locational clause; similarly (but independently) WG with a different distribution of elements. It is true that there are several *yā́su* √*vṛdh* passages; cf. esp. II.13.1 ... *apáḥ ... āviśad yā́su várdhate* "he [=Indra] entered the waters, within whom he grows strong" (cf. V.44.1), but I think we must take the lack of verbal accent more seriously than these few phraseological parallels.

Again, contrary to most, I attach c to ab and take d separately, on the basis of the distribution of verb tenses.

I.141.6: Another instance of *ā́d íd*, which seems, in this hymn, to mark the progress of the ritual.

With *bhágam iva papṛcā́nāsaḥ* in b compare *bhágam ... papṛcāsi* in 11b. The difference of voice is significant: in 6b the mortal officiants "(en)gorge themselves (med.) with/on good fortune" while in 11 Agni engorges (i.e., swells)(act.) good fortune for us." The similarity of these striking expressions makes it unlikely that *bhágam* in 6b is primarily the goal/object of *ṛ́ñjate*, as Ge, Re, WG take it.

The phrase *mártaṃ śáṃsam* may be a de-compounded version of *nárāśáṃsa-* with lexical substitution. Note that *nárāśáṃsa-* is found in the next hymn, the Āprī hymn I.142.3. See also *devā́nāṃ śā́ṃsam* in 11d of this hymn. The double object of *véti* -- *devā́n* and *mártaṃ śáṃsam* -- is a zeugma of sorts, made possible by the fact that √*vī* can take both animate and inanimate objects.

I.141.7: I take this entire verse as dependent on vs. 6. It is full of rare and unclear words, but the pile-up of descriptors of the violently moving fire is exhilarating.

In b *hvārá-* (to √*hvar* 'move crookedly, twist'; cf. *hvárate* in 1c) is taken by Ge and Re as 'bird', but I am persuaded by Roth's suggestion, enshrined in Gr (and see Old [Noten]), that the referent is a snake -- the creature of "twisting/serpentine motion." The quality held in common between the *hvārá* and fire is *vákva-*, derived from the root √*vañc* 'undulate, curl, meander', and the image is that of fire winding its way through the

dried-up plants that serve as its fuel. From this tr. it is clear that I take *jaráṇā* as *jaráṇāḥ*, with the Pp., and as an acc. pl. fem. 'old (things = plants'). Gr. identifies it as an instr. sg., and this interpr. is followed by others (most recently by WG), but the sandhi situation, with *-ā* before *a-* essentially excludes it (though see Old [Noten] who finds it barely possible).

The sense of *ánākṛta-* is likewise unclear, though its formation is transparent. The tr. of Old (SBE "whom it is not possible to drive to a place"; sim. Noten), Ge ("ohne Antrieb"), Re ("sans y avoir été poussé") seem to reflect a sense of the common idiom *ā́ √kṛ* 'bring here' extended to 'push/force (here)', with the 'here' elided. However, in his n. 7b, Ge adduces PB XXIII.13.4.5, which concerns wild animals that are *anākṛta-*. Caland tr. 'unfostered', but I see another possible extension of 'brought here', namely 'kept here' → 'confined', with its negative then 'unconfined'. This certainly fits the PB passage and also matches Sāy's gloss *anivāritaḥ* (Ge's tr. 'ungehemmt').

The second hemistich is entirely couched in the gen., save for the loc. *pátman* 'flight' off which all those genitives hang. I construe *pátman* with *ánākṛtaḥ* in b. Although 'flight' may seem to support the 'bird' interpr. of *hvārá-* in b, note that *hvārá-* is in a simile syntactically independent of the rest of the sentence; moreover, Dīrghatamas hardly feels constrained to confine himself to one image at a time.

dakṣúṣaḥ is a pseudo-perfect-participle, like the pseudo-desiderative-adjective *dákṣu-* (II.4.4) to √*dah* 'burn'. Both are hapaxes.

On *-jaṃhas-* see comm. ad VI.12.2 and VI.3.5.

vyàdhvan- can contain either *ví* 'without' or *ví* 'through, wide(ly)' (so also Old [SBE], Re). I have opted for the latter, but others (Ge 'wegelosen Flug', WG 'Wegelosen') for the former. Either would work, though the phrase *rája ā́* seems to me to express extent of space and to favor my interpr.

I.141.8: What quality of a chariot is expressed by the ppl. *yātá-* to √*yā* 'drive' is unclear. Because of the phrase "made by dexterous (men)," which seems to refer to the chariot as object rather than to its current situation, I suggest that it's a particular type of chariot, perhaps one made for long journeys. But it is also possible that it refers to the current situation, in which case it could mean "like a driven chariot" (i.e., one that is speeding).

Pāda c is full of difficulties, esp. the unaccented *dakṣi* and the semantically anomalous *sūráyaḥ* 'patrons'. There is also the question whether the pāda is syntactically independent or forms a clause with d. With Ge (but contra most other interpr.) I take cd together. Otherwise pāda c would be a nominal clause of some sort, but the introductory *ā́d* (recalling *ā́d íd* of 5a, 6a) seems to call for a dynamic verb. As for the "black patrons" I take this to be, as it were, a two-part phrase: "black" first refers to the plumes of smoke, picking up *kṛṣṇájaṃhas-* 'having black plumage' in 7c; the clouds of smoke surrounding the fire are then implicitly likened to the sacrificial patrons who would gather around the ritual fire.

What then to do with *dakṣi*? Two main solutions are found in the lit.: it is a 2nd sg. impv. (or *si*-imperative) to √*dah* 'burn' as it is in II.1.10 (Re), or it is a voc. of a nominal stem of unclear formation likewise built to √*dah* (Old, WG). Ge refuses to tr. and AiG II.1.408 floats both possibilities. The first (impv.) has the merit of matching an actual existing form, but otherwise has little to recommend it. In particular, if it forms a parenthetical independent clause it should be accented. The second (voc.) does not create

syntactic problems but leaves the question of the morphology unresolved. I do not favor either of them, because either one requires 2nd ps. reference, which I think would violate the structure of the hymn. As noted in the publ. intro., the first 8 verses are couched entirely in the 3rd person describing the fire and entirely lack the word *agní-*; both the 2nd ps. and *agní-* are forcefully introduced at the beginning of vs. 9 (*tváyā hy àgne*), and this 2nd ps. address prevails in the next three vss. (9–11). I find it difficult to believe that the wily Dīrghatamas would spoil his schematic division by introducing a muddled 2nd person in vs. 8. Moreover, the *asya* in 8c surely has Agni as its referent, which should probably preclude a 2nd ps. reference to him in the same pāda. Unfortunately I do not have an acceptable solution to *dakṣi*, however. With the others I take it as an unclearly formed nominal derivative of √*dah*, *but* as the 1st member of a tatpuruṣa with *sūrí-*, hence 'the patron(s) of the burning one', but this is a solution of desperation and carries no conviction.

The grammar of d is scarcely less contorted than that of c. The verb *īṣate* belongs to a clear thematic stem and should therefore of course be 3rd sg., but the apparent subject, *váyaḥ*, is ordinarily a nom. pl. 'birds' to the stem *ví-*. To make the grammar work, it needs to be interpreted as a neut. s-stem collective in the nom. sg. ('bird flesh, poultry'; cf. Re's 'la gent-ailée'), a formation that is found later (already AV) but not otherwise in the RV (unless in VII.69.4, q.v., maybe I.104.1). Moreover, if pāda c is to be construed with d, its pl. subj. *kṛṣṇā́saḥ ... sūráyaḥ* also clashes in number with the verb *īṣate*. My somewhat uneasy solution to this is to assume that *váyaḥ* here has been reinterpreted as a singular collective and, as the noun closest to the verb, has determined the number of the verb. But since *váyaḥ* refers to the collectivity of birds, the pl. *kṛṣṇā́saḥ ... sūráyaḥ* can match it in sense and therefore function as subj. of *īṣate* as well. (Another possible solution is to assume that *īṣate* has been assimilated to the athematic formations of similar shape, *ī́rte*, *ī́rate* and, esp., the near rhyme *ī́ṣṭe*, *ī́śate*, with 3rd plural in *-ate*. This does not seem impossible to me, esp. since their 1st sgs. in *-e* would coincide.)

The publ. tr. reflects a double reading of initial *śū́rasya* 'of a champion' with partial emendation to **sū́ryasya* / *sū́raḥ* 'of the sun' in its 2nd reading. In my view, the juxtaposition across pāda boundary of *sūráyaḥ* and *śū́rasya* was designed to bring to mind a third term, the sun, sharing its initial with *sūráyah*, its gen. case with *śū́rasya*, and its *-ūr-* with both. Though the patrons might shrink from the attack of a champion, birds are more likely to shrink from the flaring of the sun, either retreating from its heat or avoiding flying too high and therefore too near it. This double reading helps unify the two-part NP of c, the black (plumes) = patrons, and takes us back to the flight of the bird Agni in 7cd.

I.141.9: After the extravagances of the last few vss., this vs. brings us back to earth and opens the last section of the hymn, addressing Agni and praising his benefits.

The morphological and phraseological parallelism of *vibhúḥ* (c) and *paribhū́ḥ* (d) are difficult to convey in tr. On the basis of the *viśváthā* 'everywhere' with the former and the passages containing *víśvā* (...) *paribhū-* (I.91.19, II.24.11, III.3.10), I have supplied 'everything' with the latter (so also Ge, WG; sim. Old [SBE]).

As in I.37.9 I construe *ánu* with preceding *sīm* "following them."

I.141.10: *dhīmahi* in d is probably has a slight double meaning: we want to acquire Agni like good fortune, but in the technical ritual sense we want to install / establish him. For the technical sense see *dádhānaḥ* in 13b.

There is also a pun on *bhága-*, both 'good fortune' and the name of the god, a pun continued in the next vs.

I.141.11: Ge (also Kü 306) takes pāda a separately from b and supplies 'give', but this seems entirely unnecessary.

For *bhágam √pṛc*, see comments ad 6b. *bhága-* also participates in a nexus with the previous verse: in 10d it appears in a simile, but here it has been promoted to the "real" object to which other entities are compared. In the first hemistich the common noun usage of the stem is dominant, but in the 2nd it is the god Bhaga.

Contrary to Ge (/WG/Kü) but with Old (SBE) and Re, I take *dámūnasam* as an adj. with *rayím* rather than as an independent nominal referring to the master of the house (Ge 'Hausgebieter').

Note *devā́nāṃ śáṃsam* here matching *mártaṃ śáṃsam* in 6d. As there, the object of the verb *yámati* here involves a zeugma, of animates (the races of gods and men) and the inanimate laud of the gods.

The last clausal tag in d, *ṛtá ā́ ca sukrátuḥ* could simply be taken as a nominal sentence with copula to be supplied ("and he is of good resolve in truth" vel sim.). However, I supply a passive form of *√yam* (presumably ppl. *yatáḥ*) corresponding to the act. subj. *yámati* of c. Cf., for *ṛtá ā́*, VI.7.1 *ṛtá ā́ jātám* "born in truth" and, for *yatá-* + LOC, VIII.92.7 *víśvāsu gīrṣv ā́yatam* "held in place amidst all your hymns" (also V.44.9). I recognize that this extra material may be unnecessary, however. On the other hand, see comm. on I.144.3 for possible support.

I.141.12: The acc. goals in d, *vāmáṃ suvitáṃ vásyaḥ*, may be a triplet (with *vāmám* and *suvitám* separate; so Ge, Re, WG); it is not easy to tell and has little effect on sense.

The hapax splv. *néṣatama-*, to the unattested *a*-stem **néṣa-*, is generally taken as agentive ('best leader[s]'; e.g., Ge "mit den besten Führen"), but I see no reason for this. The expression seems parallel to II.23.4 *sunītíbhir nayasi* "you guide with good guidance," X.63.13 *náyathā sunītíbhiḥ,* where agentive readings are out. (Note that in both passages the abstract is in the plural, as here.) Moreover, since Agni is doing the leading, he would not need additional leaders (though WG suggest that they are the horses in pāda a). In any case note the ring with *anayanta* in 1d.

I.141.13: The *arkaíḥ* of pāda a can refer both to the chants of the ritual participants and to Agni's flames, though only the first sense is registered by most tr. In the second sense the instr. is not an agentive/instrumental phrase with passive *ástāvi*, but an instr. of accompaniment/description.

The "further forward" (*pratarám*) of b presumably refers to the installation of the new Āhavanīya fire, carried towards the east. The *dádhānaḥ* of this pāda forms a ring with *dhāyi* of 1a.

In cd the mixed 3rd and 1st ps. pl. subject *amī́ ca yé maghávāno vayáṃ ca* "both those who are our bounteous (patrons) and we (ourselves)" takes a 3rd pl. verb, *níṣ*

ṭatanyuḥ. I take *níḥ* with the frame ("extend outward") and *áti* with the simile ("extend beyond").

I.142 Āprī

I.142.4: *mátiḥ ... vacyáte* "the thought is twisting its way" gives potential support to the interpretation of *úpa hvarate* in the previous hymn I.141.1 as having *matíḥ* as its subj. (contrary to my view), but the other considerations raised ad loc. weigh more strongly for me. As for *vacyáte*, the "passive" accentuation of this apparently intrans. verb of motion is treated at length by Kulikov (-*ya*-presents, pp. 218–23), who acknowledges the standard functional interpr. of this pres. but attempts (rather too ingeniously in my view) to take it as originally passive ("is being directed towards you" in his tr.). Since √*vañc* seems to me to express precisely *non*-direct(ed) action, this interpr. does not capture the sense. I do not have a good explanation of the suffixal accent, beyond noting that there are other non-passive medial -*yá*- formations, most notably *mriyáte* 'dies', that have failed to retract the accent.

I.142.5: Ge (/WG) treat this verse as containing an anacoluthon, with the *plural* pres. part. *stṛṇānā́saḥ* modifying the 1st *singular* pres. *vṛñjé*: "(We) strewing ..., I twist ..." This seems unnecessary to me. I take the participle as predicated in a main clause, with the *vṛñjé* clause parallel: "They ... are strewing the ritual grass; I twist (the grass) ..." Although predicated present participles are much rarer than their past participle equivalents, they are not non-existent: the commentary so far as identified a fair number of examples that can be so interpr. and whose alternative interpretations are forced.

I.142.7: The part. *bhándamāne* is the only verbal form of this root outside a small group of passages in III. Our passage is clearly based on III.4.6, also an Āprī hymn. Our *ā́ bhándamāne úpāke, náktoṣā́sā supéśasā* has been expanded into two dimeter pādas from the Truṣṭubh in III.4.6 *ā́ bhándamāne uṣásā úpāke*.

Ge takes the two duals *yahvî ... mātárā* as signalling two different relationships between Night+Dawn and truth, depending on chronology – both mothers and daughters (supposedly *yahvî*). This interpr. doesn't pass for the repetition of the pāda in X.59.8, where it refers to Heaven and Earth (see comm. ad loc.), though Ge deploys the same tr., and it seems too tricky here.

I.142.10: On *turī́pa*-, whose sense is fairly clear but whose etymology is not, see EWA s.v. It is found only in Āprī hymns, this one and III.4.8=VII.2.9.

purú vā́ram is emended by most to the bahuvrīhi *puruvā́ram* 'having many choice things', but there seems no reason not to accept the text as given. (The odd Pp. reading *vā áram* can be ignored; for the same unnec. analyisis see VII.7.6.)

I.143 Agni

I.143.1: I now find 'seasonal, at its season' a somewhat misleading tr. for *ṛtvíya*- in a ritual context and would substitute 'at the proper time' here; see comm. ad III.29.10, X.28.5.

I.143.2, 4: The two examples of *majmánā* (2c, 4b), both characterizing Agni (in my opinion), should have been rendered in the same way in the publ. tr., rather than as by "might" and "greatness" respectively.

I.143.3: The bahuvrīhi *bhā́tvakṣasaḥ* in c is generally taken as a gen. sg., modifying Agni, who is amply represented by genitives in b and in the two forms of *asyá* in a. I prefer to take it as a nom. pl. modifying the beams (*bhānávaḥ*) that remain the subject of the sentence. However, either interpr. is possible.

The rest of pāda c presents other difficulties: it contains two apparent nominatives, sg. *aktúḥ* and pl. *síndhavaḥ*, both apparently part of the same simile (though see below). Moreover the prep./prev. *áti* has nothing to govern or construe with. Old allows an emendation to acc. pl. **aktū́n*, producing the prep. phrase *áti* **aktū́n* "across the nights," which produces good sense. Ge refines this by suggesting that there is really a word haplology from **áty aktúm aktúr*, with *aktúr* and *síndhavaḥ* forming what he calls elsewhere a loose karmadhāraya, tr. "gleich dem Farbenspiel der Flüsse" (sim. Re "comme la surface-ointe (des) fleuves"). Since both also render the haplologized **aktúm* /*aktū́n* as 'night(s)', they are also silently assuming a pun on *aktú-*, both 'night' and a derivative of √*añj* 'anoint, adorn'.

Although I can seem no good reason for a clear acc. **aktúm* or **aktū́n* to be corrupted to *aktúr*, I am otherwise in favor of Old's emendation. As for the rest, what really complicates the interpr. is the felt compulsion to make *aktúḥ* part of the simile (... *aktúr ná síndhavaḥ* #) since the simile particle immed. follows it – this has led to the haplology-cum-loose-karmadhāraya confections of Ge and Re and my own contribution, with an invented gne. sg. *aktúr* to a supposed *r*-stem to 'night'. However, I now recognize that the explanation is much simpler: as I have disc. elsewhere (and as Ge recognizes in other passages), *ná* is blocked from pāda-final position and similes that would ordinarily have the configuration *X *ná* instead take the shape *ná* X #. See my "Penultimate *ná* 'like' in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism" (ECIEC 2024). So I would now emend the tr. to "... are churning like rivers across *the nights ...).

I.143.5: *senā́-* can mean either 'weapon' or 'army'. Despite the publ. tr. (and most other tr.), 'weapon' might work better with *aśániḥ* 'missile' than 'army'.

I.143.6: The verb *āvárat* in b is morphologically problematic. Given the context, its root affiliation is surely to √*vṛ* 'choose' rather than to √*vṛ* 'obstruct, hinder' (despite nearby *várāya* [5a] belonging to the latter). But forms to √*vṛ* 'choose' are overwhelmingly medial -- save for a tiny collection of forms resembling this one, with the preverb *ā́*, full-grade of the root, an apparent thematic vowel (which is more likely the subjunctive marker), and act. endings: *āváraḥ* VIII.13.21, 19.30. In the publ. tr. I render both as "you (will) choose," but it is possible that "you (will) grant" would be better. The answer depends on what gave rise to these active forms. By one scenario we might view them as contrastive actives generated to the middle, specifically the middle root aorist found in a few forms like (*ā́ ...*) *av*^{a}*ri* (IV.55.5). In that case the complementary reciprocal active sense to medial 'chose' would be 'grant'. However, there is another possible pathway to the act. forms, suggested by Dīrghatamas's own usage. In I.140.13 the final VP is *íṣaṃ*

váram ... varanta, which I tr. "they will choose refreshment as their boon (for us?)." *varanta* is a well-formed 3rd pl. med. subj. to the root aorist; however, because of its *-anta* ending it could have been interpr. as an *-anta* replacment to an active form (* *varan*) of the same meaning (for *-anta* replacements see Jamison 1979 [IIJ 21]). On this interpr., further act. forms could have been generated to this supposed act. stem. Although this explanation might work best for the form in this hymn (as opposed to those in VIII) because it is also a Dīrghatamas product, the problem is that our form here pretty clearly means 'grant' not 'choose', as the scenario would suggest. (Unless of course *varanta* in I.140.13 actually does mean 'grant', which is not impossible.) In short, these forms are morphologically puzzling and their meaning(s) not entirely clear.

I.143.8: With most interpr., I take unaccented *iṣṭe* at the end of c, also found at the end of its pāda in VI.8.7, as a voc. to a *-ti*-stem, built to √*iṣ* 'seek'. Although such a form and usage would be unusual, Ge's suggestion, that it is truncated from **iṣṭébhiḥ* (Ge 'lieben'), seems less likely. See Old's scathing criticism of the same emendation ad VI.8.7 in ZDMG 55.296 (=KlSch. 755).

I.144 Agni

I.144.3: This verse contains a number of elements reminiscent of I.140 and I.141. E.g., Agni's wondrous form (*vápuḥ*) is found also in 141.1, 2; the repeated transverse movement of the kindling sticks, expressed by the intensive part. *vitáritratā* here, echoes *tarete* in 140.3; and *bhága-* reprises the numerous exx. of that stem in 141 (6b, 10d, 11b). The opening of c*, ā́d īm*, reminds us of the ritual-ordering expression *ā́d íd* in 140 (4d, 5a, 6a; cf. simply *ā́d* in 8c). The *īm* in our pāda c is functionless; that is, there is no possible acc. role it can fill in its clause, and it may have been substituted for * *íd* because of the 2nd position *īm* opening the next two verses (4a *yád īm*, 5a *tám īm*).

I differ from the standard tr. in my interpr. of the rest of cd. The others divide the two clauses at the pāda boundary, with *sám asmád ā́* belonging with the rest of c. This would of course be the default syntactic division. However, this assumes that *sám* is construed with *hávyaḥ* 'to be invoked'. But √*hū* is not otherwise combined with *sám*, and moreover preverbs should be univerbated with gerundives (e.g., *vihávya-* II.18.7). To my mind, the material beginning with *sám asmád ā́* belongs with d, and the *sám* that opens it is repeated right before the verb in d (*sám ayaṃsta*). This repetition indicates a complicated structure, and, in my opinion, the whole also bears a complicated relationship to 141.11. The repeated *sám* signals two different uses of the verb *sám ayaṃsta*. The first is transitive, with 'reins' as object (*vóḷhur ná raśmī́n* "... (as if) holding firm the reins of a draught-horse"), and it matches the similar expression in 141.11 *raśmī́ṃr iva yó yámati* "who will hold [them] fast like reins," though with a different voice, tense stem, and mood of √*yam*. The voice difference is crucial, because act. *yámati* in 141.11 can only be transitive, whereas med. *ayaṃsta* admits both transitive (as in the simile here) and passive interpretations; for the latter, see nearby I.136.2 *pánthā ṛtásya sám ayaṃsta raśmíbhiḥ*. And that is what I think is found in the frame of this passage: Agni, who is compared to a chariot-driver actively holding the reins in the simile, is in turn held by us in the frame, with a rare but not unprecedented abl. agent *asmád ā́* with the passive sense of *ayaṃsta*. In other words, this is another example of case disharmony

in similes of the type discussed in my 1982 article (IIJ 24). Taking *ayaṃsta* as passive in the frame also avoids the problem of the lack of second object parallel to 'reins', which the various tr. struggle with and mostly deal with by supplying 'reins' a second time.

Now recall that in 141.11 I wanted to see a similar passive value in the final tag *ṛtá ā́ ca sukrátuḥ* "and (who himself), of good resolve, (is held fast) in truth." To achieve this, I had to supply (that is, invent) a passive form of √*yam*, namely the ppl. *yatáḥ* to contrast with act. transitive *yámati*. But in 144.3, because of the dual value of *ayaṃsta*, both transitive and passive, it is not necessary to supply anything, but simply to read the verb twice, once each with each occurrence of *sám*. I therefore think that 144.3 reinforces my interpr. of 141.11 and that, in turn if somewhat circularly, 141.11 supports my double reading of 144.3.

Note that Old in SBE follows the syntactic division at pāda boundary in our 3cd, but in the Noten explicitly changes his view, taking *asmád ā́* with what follows as I do. I cannot follow his interpr. thereof, however: "Agni lenkt die Fahrt zu uns hin."

I.144.3–4: The pair *sávayasā* 'of the same vigor' in these two verses have been variously identified: Sāy, Old (SBE, by implication), Hotar and Adhvaryu; Ge, Re, the two arms of the fire churner. I think it rather to be the two kindling sticks. As noted above, the dual participle in *vitáritratā* 3b here reminds us of the dual verb *tarete* in I.140.3, whose subj. is, by consensus, the two kindling sticks. In that same passage they are described as *sakṣítā* 'sharing the same abode', which matches *samāné yónā ... sámokasā* "in the same womb ... sharing the same dwelling" in our 4b.

I.144.4: The phrase *dívā ná náktam* is universally taken as "by night as by day" (that is, "always," as Sāy points out), with a very extended sense of the simile marker *ná*. I take *ná* rather as the homonymous negative: "by day, not by night." This would reflect the simple fact that the ritual fire is kindled only in the morning and draw attention to the oddity of this practice, since in everyday terms fire is more needed and desired at night, for light and warmth. The position of *ná* allows either interpr.: it is in expected 2nd position for a simile, but in my interpr. it immediately precedes the word it negates, which is standard when *ná* is not a sentential negation, but negates a single word in a clause.

I render the verb in this clause as preterital, in keeping with the Pp. reading *yúvā ajani*. However, to match the presential *saparyátaḥ* of pāda a and the generality of the statement about his birth it would be possible to read (without emending the Saṃhitā text) *yúvā jani*, with an injunctive, which could have presential/timeless sense: "he is born ..."

I.144.5: *vríś-* is a hapax, but the generally accepted meaning 'finger' seems well supported by context. Though suggested etymological connections do not enforce this sense, they do allow it. See EWA II.597 and lit. referred to there.

In 5d I have followed the Pp. and tr. augmented *adhita*; however, as in 4c the sequence *návādhita* could be read *návā dhita* with injunc., which would have presential/timeless value to match the presents *hinvanti* (a), *havāmahe* (b), and *ṛṇvati* (c). Although no other unaug. *dhita* forms occur, there is no reason it should not exist.

I.144.6: Opinion is divided over whether the two females of cd are Heaven and Earth or Night and Dawn. On the one hand, the heavenly and earthly realms of ab seem to favor the former pair; on the other, Heaven and Earth are not easily movable and would find it difficult to come physically to the ritual ground. (On this issue see Jamison, Staal Mem. Vol., 2016].) Night and Dawn might make better sense, in that the kindling of the ritual fire occurs at their temporal intersection and so they might appear to be both present at that moment. For such a sentiment see I.146.3. *vákvarī* 'surging, undulating' is also a more likely epithet of Night and Dawn (with their changing light) than of Heaven and Earth. Remember Agni's beams "churning like rivers through the nights" in the immed. preceding hymn I.143.3.

I.145 Agni

I.145.1: I take the two occurrences of *īyate* in b as passives to √*yā* 'implore, beseech' (with putative underlying accent *īyáte*)(so also WG), not to *ī́yate* 'speeds' as most do. This echoes *tám pṛchata* "ask him!" that opens the verse and the two forms of √*pṛch* opening vs. 2.

As recognized by all, *sā́ nv ...* is difficult. Since a feminine subject is pretty much excluded, I interpr. *sā́* as *sá ā́* (already floated as a poss. by Old [Noten]). In this clause, repeating immediately preceding *īyate*, *ā́* and *nú* add locational and temporal specificity. (The publ. tr. might make this clearer with "he is here and now implored.")

Although I think the primary sense of *iṣṭáyaḥ* is 'wishes' (nicely contrasting with *praśíṣaḥ* 'commands'), the secondary sense 'offerings' (to √*yaj*) can also be present. Although that sense is rare and usually associated with root-accented *íṣṭi-*, puns often ignore accent, and moreover, since root-accent is secondary in this class and spreading in Vedic (see Lundquist, *-ti*-stems), it is likely that there existed an old (*)*iṣṭí-* 'offering' that underwent accent retraction in the course of time.

I.145.2: In b *yád* can be the neut. sg. acc. object of *ágrabhīt* (so most tr.), rather than a subordinating 'since' as I take it. Either is possible, and there is little appreciable difference between them. If it is an acc. obj., we must supply a dummy obj. to *pṛchati* in the main clause: "he does not ask about (that) which he has grasped ..." As in English ("... ask about what he has grasped ...") this dummy obj. can be easily gapped.

In d Ge, Re, WG take the subj. to be an unidentified other man (Re "(tout homme)"), not Agni, as Old and I do. The question in part rides on *asyá*. Those favoring a change of subject may have done so in part because they wished to avoid having *asyá* be coreferential with the subject. However, this is a non-issue: there are abundant exx. of such coreferential constructions; a reflexive pronominal/adjective isn't required. On the other hand, they may be correct in this passage, in that b opens with an overt reflexive expression *svéna ... mánasā* "with his own mind" marking Agni as subj. of the verb in that clause, and so *asyá* might be used contrastively, to mark the referent of the pronoun and the subject of *sacate* as different. On balance, though, I consider Agni still to be the subject, in part because the focus is so relentlessly on him otherwise.

I would, however, change the "resolve" of the publ. tr. to something more in keeping with the rest of the verse, perhaps "intellect, mental force."

I.145.3: The identity of the 'mares' (*árvatīḥ*) is unclear; it should simply be a ritually related entity of fem. gender used in the plural, which leaves the field pretty wide open (hymns, prayers, ghee streams, etc.). It is unlikely to be the ladles (*juhvàḥ*) though they are feminine and plural, because the *tám ... tám* construction invites two different subjects, like the *tásmin ... tásmin* constr. in 1c.

Apropos of *-praiṣa* in c, Ge (fld by WG) claims that this does not refer to the technical ritual sense of *praiṣa-* found in the later ritual. I would disagree. The word clearly is meant to mean something different from *praśíṣ-*, also 'command' (though to a different root entirely), in 1c, and this verse (3) is quite ritual-centric. See further at I.180.6

I.145.4: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. seems meant to illustrate the secret knowledge that we are begging Agni to impart. It clearly concerns (some of) Agni's actions at the ritual in conjunction with other being(s), but, in the usual fashion of such RVic riddling descriptions, the identity of the referents is left blank and the verbs are not sufficiently precise to define the actions. The publ. tr. gives some tentative identifications, and others are suggested by other tr.; I will not go further here.

I.145.5: As noted in the publ. intro. this vs. forms a ring with vs. 1 (so already Ge n. 5cd). Note also that *vy àbravīd vayúnā ...* "he has declared the (ritual) patterns ..." recalls *vayúnā návādhita* "he has established the new (ritual) patterns" in the preceding hymn (I.144.5).

The *īm* of pāda has no function, that is, no possible accusative reading. See *īm* in I.144.3 (though that had a possible explanation).

Because of the position of *hí* in d, contra the standard tr. I do not think that *agnír vidvā́n* should be construed with this last part of the verse (*ṛtacíd dhí satyáḥ*), despite the pāda break that seems to put them together. Rather the *hí* clause explains why Agni is knowledgeable and can provide the answers requested so forcefully at the beginning of the hymn.

I.146 Agni

I.146.1: The "three" and "seven" have received various identifications; mostly likely for the "three" in my opinion are the three sacrificial fires, for the "seven" perhaps the priests or, as a generic number, his flames.

Most (explicitly Old [SBE], Re) take Agni's two parents to be Heaven and Earth, and certainly some cosmic resonance may be secondarily meant. But the repeated focus on the fire-churning sticks in the birth of Agni in Dīrghatamas's oeuvre (see reff. in publ. intro.) and the fact that the expression *pitrór upásthe* is used elsewhere of Agni's birthplace in the kindling sticks (most clearly III.5.8, VI.7.5) make it likely that they are meant here as well. If so, this provides a solution for the two gen. sg. in c, *cárato dhruvásya*. Instead of supplying yet more cosmic entities here (e.g., Old "and of whatever moves or is firm"), I take the two gen. singulars as specifying the two entities making up the pair in the dual gen. *pitróḥ* "of the two parents [lit. fathers]" in b, with one kindling stick held firm and the other moving across it to produce friction. I take the *asya* in c as referring to Agni; because it is unaccented, it should be used pronominally not

adjectivally (despite WG "... dieses Gehenden"), and it should refer to something already in the discourse (as Agni is).

I.146.2: This verse seems to transition from narrow reference to the growth of the kindled fire at the kindling sticks to an enlarged frame involving Heaven and Earth. I take the dual *ene* in pāda a as referring still to the kindling sticks of vs. 1, but as Agni stands up in b, he reaches further -- putting his feet down on the back "of the broad one" (*urvyā́ḥ*), a clear reference to 'earth', and licking the udder, presumably of heaven -- thus filling the intermediate space between them.

I.146.3: This verse has another unidentified dual as subject, here almost surely Night and Dawn (cf. also I.144.6), although a simultaneous reference to the kindling sticks cannot (and should not) be excluded.

The contrastive *saṃcárantī / ví caratāḥ* is hard to capture in tr.

I.146.4: Pāda c is universally taken as a reference to Agni's flight, his hiding himself in the waters, and the gods' discovery and recovery of him there. I find this unlikely, but I do not have a better idea.

nṝ́n at the end of d is problematic. Ge takes it as a truncated gen. pl., hence "the sun of men," but I would prefer to avoid such grammatical inventions. Sāy takes it as a dat. (*nṝ́n nṛbhyaḥ*), and Old (SBE and ZDMG 55: 286–88 [=KlSch 745–47]), with a delicate adjustment of that interpr., states that *nṝ́n* can "stand for" different cases, in this instance the dative, though it is an acc. pl. in form. This interpr. makes it functionally parallel to *ebhyaḥ*, hence Old's (SBE) "He the Sun became visible to them, to the men." I would prefer to keep it functionally the acc. pl. it appears to be formally, and I therefore construe it as a goal with *sū́ryaḥ* "the sun towards men." The syntax of my interpr. is pretty dubious, however. The same phrase, *sū́ryo nṝ́n*, is found in III.14.4, where it is also possible to wring out an acc. pl. interpr.

I.147 Agni

I.147.1: All other tr. take *dadāsúḥ* as preterital (e.g., Ge "... haben ... aufgewartet"), but Kü (243) interprets this pf. stem as having presential meaning with an implication of past action ("präsentische Bedeutung mit Implikation einer vergangen Handlung"), and I take both this verb and injunc. *raṇáyanta* in d as presential, establishing the ritual situation as so often in Dīrghatamas's hymns. The present moment continues in vs. 2.

I.147.2: Ge (/WG) and Re take *tanvàm* in d as a reflexive pronoun and tr. "I extol myself" (e.g., Re "(étant) ton laudateur, (c'est en fait) moi-même (que) je loue.") Although I accept this as a secondary reading, I think the primary sense of *tanvàm* must be 'body' here, namely the body of Agni. Such is Sāy's interpr., followed by Old (SBE). The expression seems just a variant of V.28.4 *ágne vánde táva śríyam* "O Agni, I extol your glory"; moreover, *tanvàm* is found in a number of Agni passages referring to ritual procedures done on/to the body of the fire (e.g., III.18.4, VI.11.2, VII.8.5).

I.147.3: In this vs. (which is also repeated as IV.4.13, where it is transparently secondary; see comm. there) the masc. pl. rel. *yé* seems to have a referent in the main cl. expressed by a form of the *sá* / *tám* prn., as would be expected: acc. *tā́n sukṛ́taḥ* "those of good (ritual) action." The publ. tr. reflects this apparently transparent relative / antecedent relationship: Agni's protectors are themselves protected by Agni. However, the problem is that the *sukṛ́taḥ* would normally be the sacrificers, not Agni's protectors (*pāyávaḥ*), who should be helping Agni to protect the *sukṛ́taḥ*. Hence the move by Ge and Re to supply a parenthetical "with them" in the main cl.: "your protectors who guarded ..., (with them) he guarded those of good action." The instr. pl. *pāyúbhiḥ* is elsewhere used in constr. with an impv. 'protect!' addressed to Agni (I.31.12, 95.9, 143.8). In contrast to Ge and Re, Old (Noten) argues for interpreting the syntax as it stands, and the renderings of WG and Kü (412) also do not supply an instr. in the main clause. I am of two minds; on the one hand, a rendering with supplied instr. seems to reflect the usual RVic situation better, but, on the other, syntactically the *yé ... tā́n* construction is unimpeachable and the poet may have been aiming to express something slightly out of the ordinary. In the end I'll let the publ. tr. stand, but with some question.

The juxtaposition of impf. *arakṣan* in the rel. cl. and *rarákṣa* in the main cl. is striking and begs for some functional differentiation. Kü (412) tr. "schützten" and "geschützt hat" respectively but doesn't otherwise discuss. The action of the rel. cl. took place in the (semi-)mythological past while the main cl. may refer to the ritual near-past with present relevance.

I.147.5: On the curious and isolated form *dhāyīḥ* see my disc. in Jamison 1999 (*dheyām*, Ged. Schindler, 174–75), contra Hoffmann (Injunk., 63–64), who takes it as reformed from a passive aor. (**dhāyi*). In brief, I take it instead as a 3rd sg. act. precative that has been "precativized" from a 2nd sg. root aor. opt **dhāyās.* (For details consult the original article.) Although the standard tr. (Ge, Re, KH [Injunk. 63] take the form as 2nd sg., in my view *mā́kis* only has 3rd ps. ref. (see comm. ad X.11.9).

I.148 Agni

I.148.1: As in I.141.3 the homonymous roots √*math* 'steal' and 'churn' probably both contribute to this passage, with the former in mythological, the latter in ritual context.

The identity of the second member of the hapax cmpd. *viśvā́psu-* here and in the apparently related *viśvápsu-* (3x) is disputed. The explanation now current (accepted by Mayrhofer, EWA s.v. *psu-* and reflected in WG's tr.) is Thieme's derivation (Gram.Kat. 539) from √*bhas* 'breathe', hence 'ganz aus Atemhauch bestehend'. However, this sense does not fit the passages very well, and for these compounds I therefore prefer Re's derivation from *vásu-* (EVP 3.29, 12.107–8), despite Thieme's criticisms and the phonological difficulties. Dīrghatamas seems to play with this word: note the scrambling in pāda d *vápuṣe*, and in his I.162.22 *viśvápúṣam* 'all prospering' seems another variant. Somewhat more tenuous, note that the companion qualifier here, *viśvádevyam* twice elsewhere appears with *pūṣán-*, once also in I.162., vs. 3 (also X..92.13).

I.148.2: Kü (239), WG take *mánma* as the subj. of *dadabhanta* (Kü: "Den Spender werden wirklich nicht schädigen die Gedichte"). This avoids having to invent an

unidentified set of beings inimical to Agni, but raises the question of why anyone would think that *mánma*, which are generally benign and positively related to the ritual, would harm Agni. (See, e.g., the *mánma* in I.151.6–8, also a Dīrghatamas hymn.) I don't think it's a question of "sticks and stones may break my bones, but words will never hurt me" -- a very non-Vedic sentiment.

I.148.4: The expression in pāda a, "dissolve with his fangs," sounds odd, but since Agni's fangs are surely his flames, the image is less contorted than it first seems.

I.148.5: Contra the Pp., Gr, and all standard tr., I read *reṣaṇā́* and take it as a cognate instr. with *reṣáyanti*, rather than reading *reṣaṇā́ḥ* and interpreting it as a nom. pl. The instr. possibility was suggested by Re in a note, though he follows the standard interpr. in his tr. There is no crucial difference between the two interpretations, however.

I.149 Agni

I.149.2: As noted in the publ. intro., the name Agni does not appear in this hymn, and in the earlier verses there is some ambiguity as to who the referent is. E.g, in 1c the stones (*ádrayaḥ*) might suggest Soma. In this vs. also there seems to be dual reference to Agni and Soma, esp. in the compound *jīvápītasargaḥ* (already unusual for having three members, a rarity in the RV). The middle term *-pīta-* can belong either to √*pā* 'drink' or √*pyā* 'swell'. In the former case the cmpd means 'whose surge is drunk by living beings' vel sim. and should refer to Soma (and most emphatically not to Agni, if 'drink' means what it usually does -- though "to 'drink' smoke" is an idiom in certain languages); in the latter 'whose surge is swelled by living beings' and should refer to Agni, whose flames are fanned by the priests (though Soma would also be possible). Most interpr. (Gr, Old [SBE], Ge, WG) opt only for the 'drunk' interpr. without fully explaining how the word can qualify Agni. Old (Noten) has second thoughts and suggests instead 'swell', which Re also goes for. I think the poet intended the ambiguity.

Pāda c, however, might seem to tip the referential scales towards Agni: fire can easily be envisioned as running forward (with its spreading flames) while not moving from its original place of kindling. This is not an appropriate image for soma, which is always on the run after its pressing -- flowing towards the milk it will be mixed with and towards the cups from which it will be drunk. But the "remain fixed" interpr. depends on *śiśrīta* having a root affiliation with √*śri* 'prop, fix'. So, inter alia, Gr and Kü (528), who takes it as a pf. mid. opt. to √*śri* (as do I and WG). However, other interpr. assign it to √*śrī* 'mix, etc.' (Old [SBE] 'has ripened', Ge 'gemischt(?) wird') or an unprecedented verbal form beside root noun *śrī*, hence √*śrī* 'être beau' (Re 'resplendit'). Narten ("Ved. *śrīṇā́ti ...*," 281 = KlSch 351) is uncertain which root to assign it to, though her tentative tr. ("angelehnt bleiben dürfte") reflects a √*śri* affiliation. In any case, if *śiśrīta* could belong to *śrī* 'mix, prepare', it could easily apply to Soma ("was mixed/prepared in his womb"), since Soma is regularly the object of forms built to this root. The poet may well have meant this ambiguity, which my publ. tr. does not reflect. I would therefore tentatively emend the tr. to "would still remain fixed [/was prepared] in his womb."

Note the phonetic figure *sasrāṇā́ḥ śiśrīta*, with redupl. + *r*-cluster involving two different sibilants, plus *a .. ā* matched by *i ... ī*

I.149.3: *nā́rmiṇīm* in pāda a is a hapax. Ge and Re take it as a place name qualifying *púram* 'stronghold': Ge "die Burg Nārmiṇī." This is of course a safe choice, but the fact that the pāda lacks a syllable and that each of the other pādas contains a simile marked by *ná* invite a reading *ná ármiṇīm* "the/an *ármiṇī-* like a stronghold." This possibility was already noted by Old (SBE). I suggested that it is derived from *arma(ká)-* 'flatland' (see also Gr s.v. *nā́rmin-*); the same deriv. must underlie WG "der wie auf eine verödete Palisade leuchtete," with the meaning 'ruined place' attributed by some to *arma(ká)-*. If such a derivation is accepted, a few questions arise. First, *-in-*stems are always accented on that suffix, as are the *-ī-*stems that serve as their feminines (cf. *garbhínī-* 'pregnant'). Hence we should expect *ná *armíṇīm*. This might be easily solved by assuming the second accent was lost when *nā́rmíṇīm* was re-interpreted as a single word. The second question is why we need a feminine in the first place. There are several possibilities: 1) **armíṇī* refers to something inherently feminine; 2) it has been "attracted" into the fem. by fem. *púr-* in the simile; 3) *púraṃ ná *armíṇīm* is to be interpr. as a single unit (with WG) "illuminated as if (illuminating) an *armín-* stronghold." If **armín-* does mean 'having flatland, low-lying' or the like, the third possibility is not likely, because of the discrepancy in meanings (strongholds/fortresses presumably generally have commanding sites) -- though other proposed senses of the word might be more compatible with 'stronghold'.

Although problems remain with *nā́rmiṇīm*, like many hapaxes it participates in phonetic play: note b *nā́rvā*, read *ná árvā* and 2a *narā́m ná r-*.

I.149.5: The annunciatory *ayáṃ sá hótā* "here he is, the Hotar ..." opening the verse is a typical final-verse signal of the epiphany of a god. Because Agni is on the ritual ground already, he doesn't usually have an epiphany, but this phrase may indicate here the first sight of the kindled fire. The effect is particularly noticeable here because vs. 5 repeats some of the key portions of vs. 4: (4 *... dvijánmā ...*, *víśvā ... / hótā ...*; 5 ... *hótā ... dvijánmā, víśvā*).

I.150 Agni

I.150.1: On "the great goad" as the sun, see comm. ad VI.6.6.

I.150.2: This vs. is constructed in opposition to vs. 1. In vs. 1 the poet declares himself under the protection (*śaraṇé*) of Agni (gen.) as if under that of the sun (gen.); vs. 2 contains a number of genitives qualifying a negatively perceived person, who is therefore implicitly contrasted with the genitives of vs. 1. To support this balanced structure I supply "from the protection" (**śaraṇā́t*) for the genitives to depend on (sim. WG) and a verb of motion with the preverb of separation *ví* that opens the verse (hence "(I go) away (from ...)"). There are, of course, other ways to supply the supporting structure.

aninásya 'of the one lacking force' in pāda a recalls *iná inásya* of I.149.1b.

I.150.3: As Ge (/WG) suggest, the exaggeratedly successful mortal in ab is probably meant to be the speaker himself. I have therefore supplied *voce* from 1a. The lack of a

verb in our ab keeps the description from being typed as 3rd ps.; even the *sá* can have 1st ps. ref. (see Jamison "sa figé").

I.151 Mitra and Varuṇa

The publ. intro. gives a conspectus of the hymn, esp. the difficult first 5 vss.

I.151.1: For the ritual application of the various portions of this vs. see publ. intro. Most tr. take *góṣu* and also perhaps *apsú* as the desired objects of battle (e.g., Ge "(im Kampf) um die Rinder"), but these seem to me to refer rather to the accoutrements of the soma sacrifice. The cows and the waters reappear in ritual context (at least in my view) in 4d and 5b respectively.

The standard tr. also supply a verb with pāda d, but this seems unnecessary.

I.151.3: As noted in the publ. intro., I consider the birth described here to be that of Agni (as throughout the rest of Dīrghatamas's corpus and esp. in vs. 1 of this hymn), not of Mitra and Varuṇa (with the standard tr.). I construe the Wackernagel-positioned *vām* with *dákṣase* in b. This *dákṣas-* is then the referent of *īm* in c.

I also take c as subordinated to d (with Re), not ab (with the others). That both c and d have 2nd du. pres. verbs (*bhárathaḥ ... vīthaḥ*) is suggestive, and the present in c does not work very well with the mythological past in ab.

I.151.4: The voc. *asura* with short final probably stands for the expected dual *asurā* (so read in the Pp. and accepted by the standard tr. and AiG III.53), though it is barely possible that only Varuṇa (or Mitra) is addressed. The numerous duals (*ṛtāvānau*, *ghoṣathaḥ*, *yuvám*, *yuñjāthe*) make this unlikely.

I consider the *dákṣam* in c to be Mitra and Varuṇa's (like the *dákṣas-* of vs. 3) and take *divó bṛhatáḥ* as an abl. of source: √*yuj* + abl. 'yoke from' is a fairly common idiom.

Re takes *apáḥ* in d as 'labor' ("l'oeuvre (sacrée)"), but the accent is wrong (though see below). Both Old and Ge opt for 'waters' (though Ge. suggests the possibility of 'work' in his n. 4cd). I also think "waters" is the correct interpr.: as indicated in comm. to vs. 1, the waters here make a pair with the cows of 5b, both as ritual substances. However, on the likelihood of a secondary neut. *apás-* 'labor', see comm. ad I.64.1, so this interpr. is not excluded, as a pun or an alternative.

I.151.5: The standard tr. take *mahī* in pāda a as a loc sg. (Ge 'auf Erden'). Since loc. sg. *-ī* is extremely rare, I prefer to take it as the du. nom./acc. it appears to be, referring to the two world halves (see *ródasī* in 1c) in an unmarked simile.

In b the root noun *túja*ḥ is grammaticaly ambiguous; with Gr, Ge, WG, Schindler (RtNoun) I take it as nom. pl., against Re (gen. sg.). (Old considers both nom. and acc. pl., without deciding.) The image, in my view, is of a herd of cows milling around in confusion on the ritual ground, but not raising dust as a real herd would do -- because, after all, the "cows" are really milk.

In cd, following Re's interpr., I see reference to the times of the three soma pressings. With Re I tr. *uparátāti* as zenith, referring to the sun's position at the Midday Pressing; *ā́ nimrúcaḥ* is an abl. with *ā́* "until its setting," referring to the Third (or evening) Pressing. Unlike Re I do not take *uṣásaḥ* as 'à l'aurore' (as if a loc. sg.), but

rather as an acc. of extent of time, "through the dawns," though an abl. sg. with the preceding *ā́* (Ge "(bis) zum Morgen") might be possible -- in any case, a ref. to the Morning Pressing.

The stem *uparátāt-* occurs twice in the RV (here and VII.48.3), both times in the loc. Its meaning and its derivational relationship are both somewhat puzzling. As just noted, I take it here to mean 'zenith', i.e., 'above-ness, overhead-ness'. This well matches Aves. *uparatāt-* "Überlegenheit, Superiorität" (see Ge's n. 3b to VII.48.3). However, it does *not* match the sense of RVic *úpara-*, on which it's presumably based, which has the near-opposite meaning 'near(er), low(er)'. (The meaning 'lower, below' presumably developed from 'near(er', as referring to what is on earth, hence nearby, not heaven.) In our pass *uparátāt-* seems closer to the adv. *upári* 'above'. The meaning of *uparátāti* in VII.48.3 is disputed (see comm. ad loc.), but there I think it belongs with its *úpara-* and means 'in the nearness, nearby'. I suggest that the 'zenith' sense here results from the interference of *upári*.

On *takvavī́-* see also I.134.5. The stem occurs also in X.91.2, which is perhaps the passage in which the 'bird' sense is the clearest. Although 'swoopingly/swiftly pursuing' need not have a bird as its referent, and in our passage here the standard tr. take it as simply a pursuer (presumably human; e.g., Ge [/WG] Verfolger), I am inclined to take it as a bird of prey rather than simply a hunter, because *taktá* (and other √*tak* forms) seem to be used esp. of birds and of beasts considered to be like them; see comm. ad IX.32.4. In our passage the point of comparison between the cows in the frame and the *takvavī́-* has to be the crying out (*sváranti*), which fits the sharp squawking of birds of prey, but not the general behavior of human hunters.

I.151.6: Pāda-final *gātúm árcathaḥ* seems to echo likewise pāda-final *gātúm árcata* in 2c, but in fact, at least according to me and the other standard tr., the similarity is misleading. In our passage *gātúm* is surely the object of du. pres. *árcathaḥ*, but in 2c *gā́tum* is better taken as the object of the preceding verb *vidatam*, and *árcata* in sandhi before *utá*, which opens the next pāda, is better taken as having the underlying form *árcate* (so Pp.), the dat. sg. act. participle, rather than du. injunc. *árcataḥ*, which is technically possible. This teasing but false superimposibility seems the opposite of "poetic repair" -- "poetic breakage" perhaps?

I.151.7: *vīthó adhvarám* exactly matches *vītho adhvarám* in 3d (save for the accent). Here, unlike the false identity in vs. 6 just discussed, the phrases have identical sense and reference.

In b the nominatives *kavíḥ* and *hótā* seem each appropriate to one part of the rest of the pāda: the poet to *manmasā́dhanaḥ* and the Hotar-priest to *yájati*. Re's tr., with his trademark verbosity, makes this division of labor explicit.

I.151.8: I take b with c, rather than with a as do the standard tr., since the NP "the yoking of mind," whatever it may precisely mean, harmonizes better with the thought, songs, and mind of the rest of the verse than with the more physical manifestation of the sacrifice in pāda a. As for the meaning of the phrase, I assume that it is part of the larger conceptual complex likening the sacrifice and its various elements to a chariot and its associated elements. The yoking or harnessing of mind refers to embarking on concentrated and

deliberate mental effort for the sake of the sacrifice. Cf. Mitra and Varuṇa's yoking of their skill in 4cd.

"Yoking of mind" actually contains the pl. *práyuktiṣu*, but the pl. form is probably the result of a mechanical metrical adjustment: *mánaso ná práyukti* (short-vowel instr.) is found at pāda end in X.30.1 in a Triṣṭubh cadence, and this phrase was converted into a Jagatī cadence here by the addition of *-su*. The other two occurrences of the stem *práyukti-* are likewise pāda-final in Triṣṭubh and end in *-ti(ḥ)*. One of these, ... *ná práyuktiḥ*, is found two hymns after this one, in I.153.2, where I (so also Re) take the phrase as abbreviated from **mánaso ná práyukti-*, as here.

I.151.9: The voc. *nárā* in b was carelessly omitted in the publ. tr. Insert "o superior men."

I would now probably substitute "uncanny powers" for "magical arts."

In c the phrase *dyā́vó 'habhiḥ* is rendered "the days with their daytimes" by all standard tr. However, although there are undeniable instances of pl. *dyā́vaḥ* meaning 'days' (e.g., VI.24.7, 38.4) and *áhabhiḥ* is suggestive, I prefer 'heavens', which is the more common meaning of nom. *dyā́vaḥ*. I.130.10 *áhobhir iva dyaúḥ*, with the nom. sg., where 'heaven' is the only possible interpr., supports 'heavens' here. The context of our passage gives no help either way: *dyā́vaḥ* is conjoined with *síndhavaḥ* 'rivers', which would not seem to form a natural class either with 'heavens' or with 'days' (though see Klein, DGRV 2.144 for other exx. of 'heaven' conjoined with waters of some sort), and the statements "the heavens have not attained your divinity" and "the days have not attained your divinity" are almost equally puzzling -- though I'd give the edge of sense of the former.

I.152 Mitra and Varuṇa

I.152.1: Ge (/WG) take the "garments of fat" to be rain, though WG consider a reference to a libation also possible. Given the ritual focus of the previous and following hymns, and esp. I.151.8a *yuvā́ṃ yajñaíḥ prathamā́ góbhir añjate* "They anoint you first with sacrifices and with cows," I take the garments of fat to be the oblations offered to them.

Pāda b is likewise unclear, in part because the sense of *mántu-* is not entirely understood: see comm. ad IX.73.6. Assuming 'counsels' is a reasonable rendering, I think the point is that M+V provide us with an unending stream of good advice.

I.152.2: On the basis of *acíttam bráhma* in 5c, I tentatively supply *bráhma* as the referent of *etád* here, which is the object of *ví ciketat*, and of *tád* in 3b, the object of *ciketa*. The web of neut. sg. + √*cit* is tight in these vss.; note also that our *bráhma* is touted as the ultimate weapon in the last hemistich of the hymn (7c). Pādas a and b in this verse are implicitly contrastive, so the referent of *etád* should be something that harmonizes with *mántra-*, but it cannot be *mántra-* itself, because that word is masc. Neut. *bráhman-* fills the bill.

The gen. pl. *eṣā́m* could be dependent on *tváḥ* 'many a one' (so Ge [/WG]), rather than on *etád* (Old, Re, me). In either case the referent is not clear. If it limits *etád*, as I think (based partly on *tád vā́m* 3b; so Old), then it may refer to the gods, esp. Mitra and Varuṇa, or to mortal poets inspired by the gods, in contrast to the hapless 'scorners of the gods' (*devanídaḥ*) in d. If it is dependent on *tváḥ* I assume it refers to the general run of

clueless mortals. As argued in the publ. intro., I take ab to mean that, whether or not it is comprehensible to ordinary people, speech properly pronounced by poets comes true.

Whether the four-edged and three-edged weapons have precise referents is not clear. Old and Ge [/WG] state that *cáturaśri-* is used of the *vájra-* in IV.22.2; this is actually conjecture and probably false. The bahuvrīhi *cáturaśri-* is used without a head noun in IV.22.2a, as the object of the part. *ásyan* 'hurling' (or 'shooting'). The next verse contains a form of *vájra-* (3c), but the context is not a direct restatement of 2a; in other words, the two words need not have anything to do with each other. Closer to the occurrence of *cáturaśri-* in 2a is *áśman-* 'stone' in 1d (i.e., the pāda immediately before). Since stones can be hurled (cf. I.172.2 *āré áśmā yám ásyatha*), and this is not a standard characteristic of a *vájra* (though see I.130.4, as well as Slaje's recent assertion [Vájra: *Zur Schleuderwaffe im* Rigveda, 2022] that the *vájra* is a slingshot, specifically the projectile launched thereby), if *cáturaśri-* has any clear referent in IV.22.2, it is probably the stone, not the mace. It is perhaps worth noting that IV.22.1c contains a string of words referring to ritual speech: *bráhma stómam ... ukthā́*, which suggests at least an indirect connection between ritual speech and the four-edged weapon, as here. This leaves the three-edged weapon. Does it have a precise reference (say, a trident associated with non-divinities) or is the poet simply expressing the truism that higher numbers beat lower ones and four edges is better than three?

I.152.3: See the publ. intro. for my view of the structure of this verse. I do not believe that the four pādas need to fit into a consistent cosmological scheme, as other tr. seem to, and in particular I do not think that cd refers to the morning sun or the like.

The accent on *píparti* in d probably results from its being in an antithetical construction with *ní tārīt*, though antithetical accent generally arises when the verbs are directly adjacent.

I.152.4: The description of the Sun's garments in c uses two technical weaving terms, one of very limited distribution. *ví* √*tan* describes the stretching out of a piece of (unfinished) cloth on the loom for weaving; the very rare root √*prajj* refers to the 'abbrechen', 'abschliessen' of the finished garment (EWA s.v. *PRAJJ*, flg. Hoffmann, Fs. Knobloch = Aufs. 813ff.; Rau, Weben, 18), that is, presumably, the removal from the loom and tidying up of the completed fabric. The garments (or fabrics) that the Sun is wearing here are therefore *not* completed. Ge renders *ánavapṛgṇā* very loosely, as 'endless' ("ohne Ende") and further interprets the garment without end as time (die Zeit); WG's tr. is scarcely more precise ("nicht abgeschlossen") and in their n. they follow Ge's time interpretation. But it is hardly likely that such an outré form to a root confined to technical usage (and found in the RV only here) would be used for such a simple concept, which could easily have been expressed by *anantá-*. Re's "denués de franges" (without fringe) at least reflects the textile associations of the word (which Ge's and WG's do not), but otherwise seems somewhat bizarre. The poet must have something very particular in mind: the Sun's garment is unfinished, still stretched on the loom. But what visual image corresponds to this bit of weaving lore? I am not certain but suggest that the sun is rising through mist (the garments, or, better, fabric) stretched along the horizon, and the ragged edges of this mist look like the unfinished edges of fabric still on a loom. For a similar image see I.115.4 and my comm. thereon.

This interpretation helps explain the first half of the verse, in which we see the Sun when he is going forth (pāda a: *prayántam*) but not when he is settling down near (b: *upanipádyamānam*) -- near to the maidens presumably (a: *kanī́nām*), who are, also presumably, the Dawns. I think we need to read these participles in reverse chronological order. The settling down near the maidens happens before the visible rising of the sun, the going forth. The Sun is nestled cozily (and erotically) with the maidens below or at the horizon, and the ragged fabric provides a welcome veil of modesty over their activities.

I.152.5: The first hemistich is taken universally as a reference to the Sun, and my publ. tr. follows this understanding. However, this identification may not be very strong: although, as Ge says, the Sun is sometimes imagined as a horse, sometimes as a chariot, it can scarcely be thought to whinny (*kánikradat*) -- this detail must simply be attached because of the horse image -- and the 'high' or 'arched' back (*ūrdhvásānu-*) may be appropriate to the path of the sun across the sky but does not fit the round shape of the actual heavenly body. Nonetheless, I don't have a better idea.

In the publ. tr. the rendering of *acíttam* in c should be "(Though it) cannot be comprehended ..." not "(Though it cannot be) comprehended ...," since the negation is plainly there. This should be corrected also in the first line of the intro. I do not understand the unusual accent (rather than expected **ácitta-*). AiG II.1.226 cites a few other examples (e.g., *amṛ́ta-*) but gives no explanation.

In the publ. tr. "their ordinance" does not sufficiently make clear that it's the ordinance of Mitra and Varuṇa (as in 4d *mitrásya váruṇasya dhā́ma*), not that of the youths.

I.152.6: The son of Mamatā is, of course, Dīrghatamas, our poet.

In my view, the verse is describing the feeding of the fire with streams of ghee, the milk-cows (*dhenávaḥ*) of pāda a; the "same udder" (*sásmin ū́dhan*) is the fire place. Ge (/WG) see the cows instead as the rains and give a more cosmic spin to the whole verse. But pāda c esp. supports a ritual interpr., as does the instr. 'by mouth' (*āsā́*) in d, so characteristic of the ritual Agni.

For my transitive interpr. of *brahma-prī́-* 'pleasing x with the formulation' (contra 'loving the formulation' or 'friend of the formulation' of all others, including Scar [338]), see comm. on I.83.2. In that passage the transitive value is strongly favored by context; here, given Agni's usual middle-man role as both sacrificer and sacrificed to, it is less clear. I could accept 'loving the formulation, pleased by the formulation' here.

In d the literal sense of *á-diti-* 'boundless(ness)' works well with the main verb *uruṣyet* 'he should make broad space'. What, if anything, the goddess Aditi is doing here is unclear to me. Ge suggests that the sense vacillates between the goddess and the abstract noun, with the goddess the obj. of *avívāsan* 'seeking to win' and the abstraction of *uruṣyet*. This seems reasonable: because Agni's mouth is the conduit of the oblations to the gods, "seeking to win" the goddess "with his mouth" would mean attracting her to the sacrifice to consume the oblation by means of his mouth (/flames), while the abstract sense of the word expresses our own wish for boundlessness or freedom. I would now emend the publ. tr. accordingly to "Seeking to attract Aditi with his mouth, he should make broad space for boundlessness."

Note that Aditi is identified with a milk-cow in I.153.3 below, a hymn with many verbal and ritual ties to I.151–52. There Aditi the cow herself swells (*pīpā́ya dhenúr áditiḥ*), while the cows in this passage cause Agni to swell (*pīpayan*).

For a quite different interpr. of the vs., see JPB's Ṛgvedic Ādityas, pp. 200–1.

I.152.7: The first hemistich, inviting Mitra and Varuṇa to come here and partake of our oblation, seems like a fuller and more straightforward version of 6d *āsā́vívāsann áditim* just discussed, with the 1st ps. poet substituting for Agni as the enticer of the gods.

In cd the two fronted *asmā́kam* have somewhat different uses, which are not sufficiently reflected in the published tr. In c the formulation (*bráhma*) is one produced by us -- 'ours' in that sense. But in d we should be the recipients of the heavenly rain; we do not produce it. Ge (/WG) and Re convey the difference more clearly. I would slightly emend the publ. tr. of d to "for us should be ...," supplying a copula with its optative value borrowed from precative *sahyā́ḥ* in c.

I.153 Mitra and Varuṇa

This brief hymn reprises a number of the ritual tropes found in the preceding two hymns, I.151–52.

I.153.1: In the second hemistich the clause beginning *ádha yád* raises some syntactic/interpretational issues. The standard interpr. (also incl. Klein DGRV II.127) assume that *yád* stands here for *yébhiḥ*, rendering the clause, in Klein's tr., "and (with) what(ever) they bear among us for you with their (poetic) thoughts, (just) as the Adhvaryu's (do)." Besides arbitrarily modifying the relative marker, this interpr. also requires supplying a 3rd pl. subj. for *bháranti* different from *adhvaryávaḥ*. I prefer to keep *yád* as a subordinating conjunction and read *ná* as having domain over the whole clause, not just *adhvaryávaḥ*. Although I am unhappy with this stretching of the function of *ná*, the other alternations seem to me more radical. For a similar use of *ná* (in my interpr.), see I.131.2fg and comment thereon. What Adhvaryus bear to a god is soma (II.14.1 *ádhvaryavo bháraténdrāya sómam*; cf. I.135.3).

I do however now note that *bháranti* with unidentified subject is found in I.151.7, where they bring songs (*gíraḥ*) along with thought (*mánmanā*) to the gods. Given the verbal connections among these three hymns (I.151–53), I may need to rethink the interpr. here along the lines of the standard tr: "They bring you (songs) along with insights (*dhītíbhiḥ*), as Adhvaryus (do soma)."

I.153.2: As discussed ad I.151.8, I take *ná práyuktiḥ* (-*ir* in sandhi) as short for *mánaso ná práyukti-*, as in that passage and X.30.1. I would in fact now go further and suggest that the nom. sg. *práyuktir* here is a redactional change for *práyukti*, the short-vowel instr. found at VI.11.1, X.30.1, and I would change the publ. tr. to "as if *with the yoking up (of mind)." The form would have been changed to match the two other nom. sg.s to -*ti*-stems in this hemistich, *prástutir* and *suvṛktíḥ* (both given in their sandhi forms), and it would also avoid hiatus over the pāda boundary.

As for *dhā́ma*, I take it, as I do in I.152.4d, as an accusative of respect: "following/with regard to the ordinance."

This verse has another reminiscence of the preceding Mitra and Varuṇa hymns in pāda c: the Hotar here anoints (*anákti*) Mitra and Varuṇa as an unidentified plural set of ritual officiants do in I.151.8 (*yuvā́m ... añjate*), the same verse containing the yoking of mind.

I.153.3: As noted ad I.152.6, that verse contains both milk-cows (*dhenávaḥ*) and Aditi, though not identified with each other as here. In that verse the cows cause swelling, rather than swelling themselves. Nevertheless, I see thematic connections between the passages. *áditi-* 'boundlessness' (with one reading of the word in I.152.6d) perhaps qualifies the swelling milk-cow here: she swells without limit for the good sacrificer. Again, an emended tr. might read *"The milk-cow swells as boundlessness for ..."

All the standard tr. take *ṛtā́ya* as an adj. qualifying the *jána-* (e.g., Ge "für die rechtwandelnden Mann"), but adjectival uses of *ṛtá-* are rare to non-existent and the conjunction of an abstraction and an animate being is not rare. Cf. in one of the associated hymns, I.151.3 *yád īm ṛtā́ya bhárathe yád árvate*, where the double *yád* shows that two entities are in question ("for truth and for the steed"). Again, in I.151.6a *ā́ vām ṛtā́ya keśínīr anūṣata*, where the dat. *ṛtā́ya* is universally interpr. as the abstract *ṛtá-*.

The standard tr. take d as a continuation of c, whose referent is still the man who gives offerings who was first met in b. Since this man is clearly human, it seems awkward to *compare* him to a human Hotar (*mā́nuṣo ná hótā*). I take d separately, with the initial *sá* signaling here a new, nominal clause, whose referent is Agni. The simile then makes sense, because Agni, though a god, regularly plays the role of Hotar at the sacrifice (and could in fact be the Hotar in 2c). Agni is elsewhere qualified as *rātáhavya-* (I.31.13, IV.7.7.), as are other gods (V.43.6, VII.35.1, VII.69.6), so this epithet does not require a human referent.

I.153.4: The med. 3rd pl. *pīpayanta* here echoes act. 3rd pl. *pīpayan* in I.152.6b and both are transitive: the form in our vs. is simply an *-anta* replacement/variant of the usual type. Both have cows as (partial) subjects (*dhenávaḥ* and *gā́vaḥ* respectively), but in I.152.6 the cows are, in my view, the streams of ghee swelling the fire, while here the cows and waters are the usual additions to the soma drink. Agni is not absent, however, at least in my view: the lord of the house in c is probably Agni, and his position as 'foremost' (*pūrvyáḥ*) refers to his placement to the east as the Āhavanīya fire.

In d the naked *vītám* can be fleshed out by comparison with I.151.3 *vītho adhvarám*, despite Ge's "Bekommet Lust" and Re's "Goûtez"; WG's "Verfolgt!" at least reproduces the same verb they use for *vīthaḥ* in I.151.3.

I.154 Viṣṇu

I.154.1: The hymn begins with an almost exact echo of the famous opening pāda of the Indra hymn I.32 *índrasya nú vīryā̀ṇi prá vocam*. In place of *índrasya* we have *víṣṇoḥ* and the missing syllable is made up by inserting the fairly functionless particle *kam* after *nú*.

I.154.2: The covert identification with Indra continues in pāda b, which is identical to X.180.2a, where Indra is the referent.

I.154.6: *bhūriśṛṅga-* is tr. by all as ‘many-horned’, but this doesn’t make a lot of sense: each cow should have only two horns, unless Viṣṇu and Indra’s dwelling is a place of fantasy creatures. I have therefore rendered it ‘ample-horned’, meaning that the horns are quite sizeable. ‘Many-horned’ would be possible if the reference is to the whole herd of cattle: each cow has two horns, but the collectivity has many. I still prefer ‘ample’.

I.155 Viṣṇu and Indra

I.155.1: 2nd pl. *vaḥ* is one of those vague oblique references to the ritual personnel, here something like “on your own behalf.” Because such a throw-away Sanskrit word requires such a heavy English tr., I omitted it in the publ. tr.

pā́ntam here belongs to the nominal stem *pā́nta-* ‘drink’; see comm. ad I.122.1.

As Ge points out, loc. *sā́nuni* and instr. *árvatā* show case disharmony between frame and simile, in this case presumably because instr. *árvatā* is idiomatic. This is one of the few instances in the RV referring to horseback riding.

I.155.2: The Pp. interprets *sutapā́* as *sutapā́ḥ*, hence a nom. sg., and this interpr. is accepted by Re and WG. However, Ge argues persuasively for du. *sutapā́*, and I follow him. The others must invent a mysterious soma-drinker who gives wide space and freedom to Viṣṇu and Indra; as indicated in the publ. intro. I assume that the clash (*samáraṇam*) in pāda a is what opens up the space.

The stem *uruṣyá-*, the verb ending both b and d, must be read in two different senses (as recognized by all tr.); ‘go wide’ is a useful English idiom for an arrow or other missile missing its target.

I.155.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the sense of these enigmatic paradoxes is not clear, as so often when family relationships and implied incest are in question. The females who “strengthen his great masculine nature” are left unidentified, but in some sense this scarcely matters: the point is that *feminine* beings strengthen his *masculine* nature and shortly thereafter there’s semen in play. The dual *mātárā* can (and probably does) stand for the two parents and is so tr. by all; however, it is more piquant for the two mothers to enjoy the semen presumably of their son, and the mother word contrasts with the father in c. For other contextually appropriate use of the dual parental designations, see Dīrghatamas’s I.159.2–3.

In c it might be better if “names” were in parentheses: although *nā́ma* in d can be either sg. or pl. (and is the former in conjunction with flg. *tṛtī́yam*), it can’t be dual, as the pair of adj. *ávaram páram* “lower and higher” might require.

I.155.4: With Ge (/WG) I take the pronominal āmreḍita *tád-tad* as emphatic rather than distributive, despite the identical pāda in X.23.5, where I opt for a distributive sense because of context.

I.155.6: *vyáti-* from **vi-yati-* (√*yam*), flg. Re.

Re takes *vimímānaḥ* in d as reflexive ‘se mesurant’, and Ge’s ‘sich richtend’ is close. Since med. forms of (*ví*) √*mā* are regularly transitive (cf. *vimamé rájāṃsi* in the previous hymn, I.154.1b, sim. I.154.3cd), I would supply an object here. In the publ. tr. I

tentatively suggest "the realms," as in 154.1, but given the contents of this verse I would now supply "the year."

I.156 Viṣṇu

I.156.3: The Pp. reads *vidá* here, the 2nd pl. act. pf., though *vidé* or indeed *vidáḥ* would be equally possible in this sandhi situation. Old says we're not obliged to read *vidé*, and the standard tr. follow the Pp. The cross-pāda sandhi *-a ṛ-* suggested by the Pp is impeccable. As Dieter Gunkel points out to me (pc 11/5/15) "'underlying' /-e ṛ-/, /-a ṛ-/, and /-as ṛ-/ are all transmitted as <-a ṛ-> in the saṃhitā text. Where the hemistich boundary intervenes, as here, they are also metrically identical, and therefore identical in the restored text. I gathered examples of /-a ṛ-/ at hemistich boundary from the first four books and found these: 1.15.12ab, 1.68.4ab, 1.116.23b, 1.152.3cd, 2.35.8ab, 3.14." Nonetheless, against the Pp. I opt for the 3rd sg. mid. *vidé*, which is common in this phrase (*yáthā vidé*).

The standard tr. interpr. *pipartana* in fairly generic ways: Ge "ihn heget," Re "comblez (le de louanges)" (taking it to √*pṛ* 'fill'), WG "den ... fördert." In the context of the birth motif found in pāda c as well as in 2c, I take the verb as more precise and idiomatic: the usual 'carry (to the far shore)' narrowed to 'carry to term' of birth. The same sense is found in VI.48.5 (a passage adduced by Ge) *gárbham ṛtásya píprati* of Agni's birth.

nā́ma in c is ambiguous as to number (sg. or pl.), but is taken by all standard tr., I think correctly, as plural. Given that Viṣṇu is being identified with a number of gods in this hymn, he has multiple names, and this middle verse gives the clue to this trick of the hymn.

I.156.4: The publ. tr. "does ... follows" should be corrected to "follow."

I don't know why Varuṇa, the Aśvins, and the Maruts -- gods that don't usually interact -- appear together as followers of Viṣṇu's *krátu-*. Syntactically it is mildly interesting that a singular nom. (*váruṇaḥ*) and a dual nom. (*aśvínā*) together form the subject of a plural verb (*sacanta*). By simple addition this is what we would expect, but verb agreement often is governed by more local rules.

I do not understand the second hemistich either. Part of the problem is the cmpd. *ahar-víd-* 'knowing (or finding) the days'. I interpret it in light of the last verse of the previous hymn, I.155.6, concerning Viṣṇu's apparent control over the days of the year. Since Viṣṇu is several times in this hymn (including in this vs.) called *védhas-* 'ritual expert' (2a, 4b, 5c), the reference may be rather to knowing the ritual day, as in I.2.2. But others see pāda d as depicting the Vala myth, and WG interpr. *aharvíd-* in this Vala context: "das Tageslicht zu finden."

I.156.5: The lexeme *ā́* √*vī* unusually takes a dat. inf. with dat. subj. as complement (*sacáthāya ... índrāya*), at least by my interpr. Despite the superficial similarity to X.6.2 (*ā́ yó vivā́ya sakhyā́ sakhibhyaḥ*), the two passages have very different syntax.

[I.157–58 JPB]

I.159–60

On the structural near identity of these two hymns see the publ. intro. to I.160.

I.159 Heaven and Earth

Alliteration is especially prominent in this hymn: e.g., 2ab ... *manye ... máno, mātúr máhi*; 3a *sūnávaḥ sᵘ́apasaḥ sudáṃsaso*; 3d *putrásya pāthaḥ padám*; 4c *návyaṃ-navyaṃ tántum ... tanvate*.

I.159.1: *prá √bhūṣ* is found only here (though cf. *úpa-pra √bhūṣ* in III.55.1 and *ánu prá √bhūṣ* in IX.29.1) and the meaning of *√bhūṣ* in all its manifestations is notoriously slippery. My tr. here is somewhat illegitimate: I generally tr. the lexemes in III.55.1 as 'tend to', 'attend upon'; my 'tender' here (a verb that has nothing to do synchronically with '(at)tend') is a pun on the English. Nonetheless, something like it seems called for here: busy oneself with something to present and bring it forward.

I.159.3: The identity of these sons as the gods is clear from *devá̀putre* in 1c: 'the two [=Heaven and Earth] having the gods as sons'.

The referent of the son in d is disputed. Sāy (followed by WG) takes it as the sun, on the basis of I.160.1; Ge as "jedes lebende Geschöpf"; Re as the human son. I suggest rather that it is Agni. In 2 of the other 3 occurrences of *ádvayāvin-* it modifies *hótar-* (III.2.15, VII.56.18), and in at least one (III.2.15) it's clearly Agni. It's also the case that Agni is frequently associated with *padá-*. The hemistich may convey that Heaven and Earth protect the general world of reality (c) and the specific world of the ritual (d). I think it esp. unlikely that it is the Sun here, because of the complementary relationship between I.159 and I.160, with the latter being the realm of the Sun. See publ. intro. to I.160.

I.159.4: I would substitute "uncanny" for "magical,"

I.159.5: As Ge notes (n. 5ab), the first hemistich is reminscent of the Gāyatrī mantra (III.62.10), with our pāda a *tád (rā́dho adya) savitúr váreṇyam* an expanded version of III.62.10a *tát savitúr váreṇyam* and our b *devásya ... manāmahe* perhaps meant as a partial paraphrase of III.62.10b ... *devásya dhīmahi*, with a misanalysis of *dhīmahi* as belonging to *√dhī* 'think', rather than being the root aor. med. opt. of *√dhā* 'place' — hence the subj. *manāmahe* 'we will think about'. This may provide significant evidence of the status and interpr. of the Gāyatrī mantra at this early period.

I.160 Heaven and Earth

I.160.1: It is striking that the Sun, by most interpr., is called a poet (*kaví-*).

The fem. stem *dhiṣáṇā-* is a perennial problem, with a distressing number of interpr. and no agreement on etym. (see EWA s.v.). I take it, in part flg. Pinault, as "Holy Place," referring esp. both to the Earth and to the ritual ground. Support for this comes, in the first instance, from two sources. On the one hand, a surprising proportion of the attestations of this stem are dual (*dhiṣáṇe*) (7, as opposed to 21 sg. and 3 pl.), as here, and a number of these are clearly associated with Heaven and Earth, also as here. See also

VI.8.3, 50.3, 70.3; X.44.8. Such usage is reminiscent of the use of pregnant du. *pṛthivī́* for (Heaven and) Earth, as well as of fem. du. *ródasī*. In the sg. *dhiṣáṇā-* is sometimes qualified by *mahī́-*, a regular modifier of Earth (I.102.7, III.31.13, X.96.10). That the *dhiṣánā* is also conceived of as a goddess follows from the divinity of the Earth. That a word used of Earth would also be applied to the ritual ground is, of course, not surprising, since the ritual ground is conceptually the concentrated essence of the Earth. In some passages the ritual paraphernalia are located "in the lap of the Dhiṣaṇā" (I.109.3, X.17.12) or she herself performs ritual activities (e.g., I.102.1, 109.4; IV.34.1; X.30.6). The use of the word in other passages is more attenuated, but the balance of the evidence favors this interpr.

I.160.2: Old suggests emending *sudhṛ́ṣṭame* 'boldest' to **sudṛ́ṣṭame* 'loveliest to see', but this not only seems unnecessary but weakens the striking image. The girls, dressed in their best by their father, presumably to attract potential husbands, seem to be on public display -- a very bold move for previously sheltered damsels.

I.160.3: Note the alliteration in ab ... *putráḥ pitúr róḥ pavítravān, punāti ...*

In b I would substitute "uncanny power" for "magical power."

The standard tr. take *śukrám páyaḥ* as two entities, "semen (and) milk," against my "blazing milk." I do not know of any passages in the RV where *śukrá-* must mean 'semen'; it is overwhelmingly adjectival, and I prefer to render it so here. The "blazing milk" that the Sun milks is presumbly sunlight. I take the *asya* here as referring to the Sun and thus coreferential with the subject of the sentence. As discussed ad I.145.2, overt reflexive forms are not required in this syntactic situation. By contrast Ge thinks *asya* refers to Heaven and Earth (/the cow and the bull), but conceived of as a single person and hence represented by a singular pronoun. Re takes *asya* as referring only to the bull.

I.160.4: Ge and, apparently, Re (but not WG) take *ānṛce* not to √*ṛc* 'chant, praise', but to a different root 'hold' (with *sám* 'hold together'). (See also Old's disc., though he ultimately opts for 'praise'.) But as Kü says (106), such recourse to "eine sonst unbekannte Wurzel" is not helpful. Though Ge claims that in context 'chant, praise' is excluded, in the context of the whole verse it works fine, as Old points out. That the first verbal form in the next verse is *gṛṇāné* 'being sung' (though modifying Heaven and Earth, not the Sun) supports this interpr., esp. since *ānṛce* and *gṛṇāne* are near anagrams.

[I.161 JPB]

I.162 Praise of a horse (Aśvastuti)

I.162.1: Although the collection of gods serving as witnesses in ab seems somewhat random, the same set recurs in V.41.2, as Ge points out. The reason for their association there is no clearer than here.

Pāda d, *pravakṣyā́maḥ (vidathé) vīryā̀ṇi*, is a variant on the famous opening of I.32, the great Indra hymn, *índrasya nú vīryā̀ṇi právocam*. The gen. *índrasya* of I.32.1 is matched by the long gen. phrase in our c: *(yád) vājíno devájātasya sápteḥ* "of the prize-winning, god-born race-horse." For another variant on this phrase in Dīrghatamas's

oeuvre, see I.154.1. It is striking here that *vīryāṇi* 'heroic/manly' deeds are attributed to a horse; the establishment of "personhood" for the horse, discussed in the publ. intro., begins here in the very first verse.

I.162.2: It may not be clear in the publ. tr. that it is the horse that is bedecked (*prā́vṛtasya*), not the goat.

viśvárūpa- modifying the goat in c is taken by most as a bland color term (Ge/WG 'allfarbig', Doniger 'dappled'), but, esp. because in the next vs. (3b) the goat is called *viśvádevya-*, I think the qualifier is meant to convey more meaning: perhaps to indicate that the goat stands for all the other animals (which, as disc. in the publ. intro., are literally tied up for sacrifice in the later versions of the Aśvamedha), hence my "representing all forms."

I.162.3: It is appropriate that the goat, if it "represents all forms" (see disc. of the previous vs.), should belong to all the gods. That it should also be "Pūṣan's portion" (*pūṣṇó bhāgáḥ*, 3b and 4c) probably follows from the fact that Pūṣan "has goats for horses" (*ajā́śva-*: 5x, always of Pūṣan) and is generally associated with goats.

As for Tvaṣṭar's involvement, Ge (sim. WG) simply says that Tvaṣṭar is the creator esp. of animals, but I think there is a tighter connection. Tvaṣṭar is a required presence in the Āprī hymns, the litanies that accompany the animal sacrifice. The verse devoted to him in each hymn occurs immediately before the "Lord of the Forest," namely the stake to which the sacrificial animal is tied, releases the animal for sacrifice. Just before that, Tvaṣṭar both produces life (e.g., II.3.9, III.4.9-VII.2.9) and assists at the sacrifice (V.5.9), escorting the sacrificial animal to the gods (X.70.9) or at least pointing the way (II.3.9). Most strikingly Tvaṣṭar is once called *viśvárūpa-* (I.13.10) and several times enacts that epithet dramatically: I.188.9 *tváṣṭā rūpā́ṇi hí prabhúḥ paśū́n víśvān samānajé* "Because preeminent *Tvaṣṭar* anointed all the beasts (with) their forms"; X.110.9 *rūpaír ápiṃśad bhúvanāni víśvā* "he adorned all the creatures with their forms." In our verse Tvaṣṭar stimulates/quickens the goat immediately before its sacrifice and indeed *for* its sacrifice, and that goat has just been characterized as *viśvárūpa-*. Thus Tvaṣṭar's constant appearance in the Āprī hymns shows that this god has a defined role in the animal sacrifice, and that role, somewhat paradoxically, involves both giving life and setting the stage for taking it away by sacrifice. This is less of a paradox in the conceptual context of the animal sacrifice: as noted in the publ. intro., a good deal of this hymn is devoted to reconstituting the sacrificed horse and endowing it with life-breath. Tvaṣṭar thus has a role in both, and we see it here first in connection with the goat that represents all creatures. Tvaṣṭar recurs in vs. 19 below.

I.162.5: The list of priests contains the hapax *ávayā(ḥ)*, whose derivation and meaning are unclear. For suggestions and disc. see, e.g., Old, Ge, Re. I tentatively favor a connection with *áva √yā* 'propitiate, expiate', but the form presents grave difficulties for that analysis. For one thing, we should expect a root-noun cmpd. (*)*avayā́-* with short initial vowel and accent on the root -- and in fact we get just that form in I.173.12. See detailed disc. by Scar (404–7, with our form treated in n. 565). However, it can be pointed out that this lexeme is mutilated elsewhere -- e.g., in nearby I.165.15 (but Agastya, not Dīrghatamas), where *vayā́m* is better read '*vayā́m* (i.e., *avayā́m*), which sandhi form its

position after *tanvè* would allow. Thus, the connection with *áva √yā* reflected in the publ. tr. is quite insecure, and it may be best to follow Old in accepting the traditional analysis as *ā́-vayas-*, rendering it 'whose life force is (right) here'. This avoids the formal difficulties, but I don't see what kind of priest this would be.

There is a mild disconnect between the two hemistichs: the first half is a list entirely in the nominative, but the second contains a 2nd pl. impv. *ā́ pṛṇadhvam*, whose 2nd ps. subjects should be the nominatives of ab.

I.162.6: The list of personnel involved in the sacrifice here includes some apparently marginal and humble roles, perhaps to implicate the largest possible group in the potential blood-guilt of the sacrifice.

I render the *utó* in d with 'also'; this is also Klein's tr., though his disc. of the passage seems to seek a straight conjunctive role (DGRV I.448–49). See the same expression in 12d.

I.162.7: I analyse *prā́gāt* as *pra-ágāt*, rather than Pp. *prá agāt* -- in other words with an accented verb, which is in a non overtly marked subordinate clause, with *adhāyi* in the main clause. I then supply the same verb again in b. This may seem over-tricky, but it avoids taking *smát ... mánma* as a parenthesis and ties together the two ritual actions, the procession of the horse and the production of the poem.

I.162.8: The exact referents of these pieces of horse tackle are not clear.

Pāda d contains a nice ex. of a neut. pl. subj. with sg. verb.

I.162.10: As disc. ad III.29.8, suffix-accented *sukṛtá-* has been substantivized to 'good (ritual) work, good deed', but it is hard to incorporate that understanding here. I assume that *sukṛtā́ √kṛ* has an idiomatic sense here.

I.162.12: I do not believe that *bhikṣā́-* has yet developed the later ubiquitous sense 'alms' and tr. it here with full desiderative sense, contra Ge (/WG) "ein Fleischalmosen."

Wack (AiG II.1.31) claims that the gen. *árvataḥ* depends on the 1st member of the cmpd. *māṃsa-bhikṣā́-*, as is not uncommon. Although this analysis is likely, I don't think it's excluded that *árvataḥ* depends on the whole cmpd.

I.162.14: The *-ana*-suffix on the nominals in pāda a marks them as transitive / causative in sense; I take these neut. singulars as referring to the tack that produce the various movements of the horse.

I.162.15: On *abhí vikta* see comm. ad X.27.1.

I.162.16: The placement of *árvantam* amid the pieces of tackle associated with him seems strange at first, but in fact it can be seen as iconic: these various items *hold* him, and so he's surrounded by them. It's also clever that the various things are in the neuter, and so it is not till the verb appears (*ā́ yāmayanti* at the very end of the vs.) that it becomes clear that they are the subjects of the verb and therefore nominative, while *árvantam* is clearly accusative.

The second hemistich is metrically quite disturbed; I will not attempt a fix, but see Old, Arnold, and metrical comm. of HvN, all ad loc.

I.162.17: The first hemistich is one of the few places in the RV that depicts horses being ridden (see also I.155.1, 163.2 -- though for an alternative for the latter see comm. ad loc. -- 163.9): both *sādé* lit. 'in the seat', here tr. 'in riding', and the mention of goading with a heel require a rider physically on a horse.

I follow the general interpr. of *śū́kṛta-* as containing a syllable *śū́* used to urge on horses, hence my "come on, come on." Although Google tells me that "chirrup" and "tchick" are so used (in English, or whatever we might call it), I judged that such a tr. would simply sow confusion.

The three disfavored ways of goading a horse -- heel, whip, and excessive *śū́*-making -- are not parallel, or rather heel and whip go together and *śū́* is something else, and they are therefore summed up with useful vagueness by *sárvā tā́* "all these" in d. The vagueness is also useful because none of the three is a particular suitable object for *sūdayāmi* 'I make sweet', even in its most attenuated sense (Ge "... mache ich ... wieder gut").

The neut. pl. *tā́* in the simile in c is more mysterious. *hávis-* 'oblation' is a standard obj. of *sūdáya-*, but it is coopted here by the gen. *háviṣaḥ*. I have nonetheless supplied 'oblations' as the referent of *tā́*. Ge supplies "die Fehler" on grounds of contextual sense only. He also cites Mah. as explaining *tā́* as "nur Füllwort" -- an explanation I'd like to be able to use more often!

I.162.18: The preverb *sám* 'together' in *sám eti* may seem an odd choice in a verse concerning cutting the horse *apart*. However, it sets up a contrastive pairing with *ví śasta* 'cut apart / carve up' at the end of the 2nd hemistich, and it also anticipates (or promises) the rejoining of the parts of the horse that ends the hymn.

As it turns out, horses have 36 ribs, not 34. Max Müller noted this in 1875 and got a potential explanation from T. H. Huxley -- that it may be that they're cutting the rib cartilage and they don't cut the last two ribs in order to keep the carcass together: [http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Popular_Science_Monthly/Volume_7/June_1875/A_Curious_Question_of_Horses'_Ribs]

I.162.19: In d I didn't tr. *píṇḍānām* as a partitive gen. because the English got too fussy. Ge thinks that the *píṇḍa-* are rice balls, but this seems anachronistically to reflect later ritual use of the word.

I.162.20: In b *tanvàḥ* is probably to be read undistracted – one of the very few such exx. in the RV and confined to late portions of the text. See acc. pl. *tanvàḥ* in X.51.2, 4.

The caus. redupl. aor. *ā́ tiṣṭhipat* is tr. by most as 'cause enduring pain' vel sim., which is far from the lit. meaning of the lexeme. The caus. to *ā́* √*sthā* sometimes means 'make stand still', and I think that sense is in play here. The horse is about to go on a journey (*apiyántam* 'going along' in pāda a; more fully described in 21b), but various mishaps can keep that journey from happening and make the horse stop.

I.162.21: This vs. contains one of two strengthened forms of the root noun *yúj-*, viz. du. *yúñjā*, on which see comm. ad X.102.9. The corresponding unstrengthened form *yújā* is found in II.24.12. Its position in the vs. favors a heavy root syllable here: *hárī te yúñjā*. Acdg. to Arnold (188), the fourth syllable of an opening of 5 is overwhelmingly heavy.

I.163 Praise of a horse (Aśvastuti)

Krick translates and comments extensively on this hymn (307–11), though with a particular point of view.

I.163.1: The tr. of *púrīṣa-* as 'fertile ground' is an adaptation of Krick's (Feuergrundung, 101 n. 253). The basic meaning is 'fullness, fulfillment', but it can indicate fruitful, loose rich earth, bottom land, as well as overflowing fullness. 'Fertile ground' provides a nice semantic bridge between the abstract sense and the younger meaning 'dung'.

I follow Re in taking pāda c as containing two de-composed bahuvrīhis at least functionally. Though Re generally overuses this explanation, in this case we have almost documentary proof, in that 9a contains both a real bahuvrīhi and a decomposed expression like this one in parallel: *híraṇyaśṛṅgó 'yo asya pā́dā* "having golden horns, his feet copper." In our pāda c the expressions are technically nominal sentences with possessive value, with the possessive pronoun *te* to be supplied from pāda d: "(your) wings (those) of a falcon, (your) forelegs (those) of an antelope." But these are tantamount to bahuvrīhis and go more smoothly into English that way.

I.163.2: I do not pretend to understand the myth or myths here; for an attempt see Krick 307 and nn. 794–95. I would point out, however, that stylistically this vs. is reminiscent of the famous vs. in the wedding hymn about the previous bridegrooms of the bride in question. In both, four separate beings act, each segregated in a single pāda, and it has some of the same vocabulary (note *prathamáḥ*, *gandharváḥ*, and *tritáḥ* / *tṛtī́yaḥ* both 'third'): X.85.40 *sómaḥ prathamó vivide, gandharvó vivida úttaraḥ / tṛtī́yo agníṣ te pátis, turī́yas te manuṣyajā́ḥ* "Soma acquired (you) first; the Gandharva acquired (you) next. / Agni was your third husband. The fourth was human-born." I do not know what, if anything, to do with these similarities.

Krick supplies a chariot for the horse to be yoked to in pāda a and for Indra to mount in b, but see 9d, where Indra clearly mounts the horse.

Note *āyunak* with an unambiguously lengthened augment. For other possible such cases (and non-cases) with √*yuj*, see my comm. ad X.35.6 and Old's comm. ad V.17.1.

I.163.3: Again, I do not understand the mythology here. It is worth noting, though, that in vs. 2 the various divinities acted on the horse (or such is the likely object, though unexpressed), whereas here the horse (addressed in the voc.) is identified with the (same) divinities. He is here identified with Yama (a) and Trita (b), while in 2a he was given by Yama and yoked by Trita. The third identification is with Āditya (3a), most likely the sun. Of the three remaining characters in vs. 2 (Indra, Gandharva, and the sun), the last is the most likely, and of course Āditya is a later name for the sun.

On the meaning of *samáyā* see comm. ad I.113.10. The abrupt separation from Soma is another puzzling feature, but I suggest that we have here the generally later identification of Soma with the Moon, found already in the wedding hymn already cited

(X.85.1–5), which would make sense (well, some sense) if the horse is being identified with the Sun. Krick (308 and n. 797) very different: "Du bist mit Soma zur Hälfte durchgemischt," which depends on her view concerning the relationship between soma and the horse. But, inter alia, her tr. depends on what I consider a wrong interpr. of *samáyā*.

From context alone the "three (kinship) bonds in heaven" could be identified with the trio in ab: Yama, Āditya, and Trita. The Sun of course is associated with heaven, and Yama's realm of the dead is also placed in heaven (see the funeral hymn X.14.8). What Trita's connection with heaven might be is less clear -- Trita is a shadowy figure in the RV – but consider I.105.9, where the poet's umbilical tie is stretched apparently to heaven and Trita Āptya vouches for the kinship relationship.

I.163.5–7: Note the *apaśyam* 'I saw' in all three verses (5c, 6c, 7a): the poet bears witness to his sight of various mystical visions of the horse.

I.163.5: As in I.162.14 I take the -*ana*-nominals here (*avamā́rjana-* and *nidhā́na-*) as having trans./caus. value.

Contra Gr, I take *sanitúḥ* as the gen. of the agent noun, rather than an adv.

I.163.6: As indicated in the publ. intro. to both I.162 and I.163, I take *ā́tman-* in these hymns as referring to the lifebreath of the horse, as opposed to his sacrificed body; see I.162.20-–21. Although *ā́tman-* can mean 'self' in the RV and sometimes perhaps even 'body', the contrast between the horse's *ā́tman-* and his *tanū́-* (see I.162.20ab) seems to exclude those meanings here, *pace* Ge's "dein eigenes Selbst" and WG's "Rumpf."

I.163.7: There are multiple conflicting interpretations of the personnel and import of this verse; I will not add another.

Pāda d raises several questions: 1) is *óṣadhīḥ* to be construed with *grásiṣṭhaḥ* (so, e.g., Ge, Doniger, and me) or with *ajīgaḥ*, 2) who is the referent of *grásiṣṭhaḥ*, and 3) what person is *ajīgaḥ*? I take the plants with the splv. ("foremost devourer of plants"). (For acc. rection with -*iṣṭha-* forms, cf., e.g., VI.37.5 *vṛtráṃ hániṣṭhaḥ*.) Within the RVic domain of discourse, the greatest devourer of plants is likely fire/Agni, the answer, therefore, to 2). With that identification in place, I take *ajīgaḥ* as 3rd sg. For an opposite interpr. on all 3 counts, cf. Krick's "... dann wahrlich hast du, der Gefrässigste, die Pflanzen erweckt (verschlungen?)." Acdg. to her the subject is the horse=sun, addressed in the 2nd ps. She takes the verb as suggesting a 2ndary pun on √*gṝ* 'swallow', and considers the larger sense to be that the rising sun (in spring) awakes the plant world to new life, and is at the same time their "Fresser." This builds a lot of super-structure into the vs. In my opinion, the pāda simply expresses the conceit that the kindling of the ritual fire causes the sun to rise; assuming, with Krick et al, that "you" is the horse=sun, it can be the object of *ajīgaḥ*, with Agni as the subj.

I.163.8: The preverb *ánu* is insistently repeated in this verse: twice each in a and b, once each in c and d. The first hemistich lacks a verb, but this can easily be supplied from *īyuḥ* (√*i* 'go') in c; d then varies this pattern with a different verb *mamire* (√*mā* 'measure') to be supplied with *ánu*.

I.163.9: On the syntax of pāda a, see comm. on 1c, as well as further disc. on the stylistics of decomposed bahuvrīhis in my forthcoming contribution to Ged. Gary Holland, as well as comm. on V.62.7.

Against the Pp (and all standard tr., as well as Krick) I take the sandhi form *ávara* as standing for loc. sg. *ávare*, not nom. sg. *ávaraḥ*. Although *ávara-* is a pronominal adjective, and several instances of *ávare* are nom. pl., there are also several that are undeniably loc. sg. (II.9.3, 24.11). Taking it as a nom. sg. requires attributing lesser powers to Indra, which strikes me as pragmatically unlikely (cf., e.g., Old "geringer (an Schnelle) war Indra"). My interpretation identifies the horse/sun-bird with Indra and situates him in a lower realm (the midspace, presumably).

I.163.10: This difficult vs. has been subject to numerous interpretations. Mine is guided by Thieme's (Gs Nyberg = Kl Schr (II) 829–30), who sees this as a description of the V-shaped formation of geese in flight (of which Google Images supplies many pictures, including bar-headed geese flying to/from their wintering grounds in India). The "nose" is the lead goose and therefore a particularly crucial figure, the *śū́ra-* 'champion, hero' of the cmpd. *śū́ranas-* 'having a hero as a nose' (an analysis that goes back to Bloomfield, RR 150; Bl's other analyses there are less compelling). *sílika-madhayama-* has a hapax as first member; if Th's interpr. ('hollow space') and etymological connection (with *sirā́-* 'vein') are accepted, the cmpd. means 'having a hollow space in the middle', which accurately describes the V-formation. The other problematic bahuvrīhi is *īrmā́nta-*. Th takes *īrmá-* as 'foreleg, thigh', not *īrmá-* 'quiet, at rest'. The 'foreleg' sense is found in the AV (X.10.21), and Aves. *ar(ə)ma-* 'arm' appears to be cognate (so EWA s.v.). The sense of the cmpd, 'having (fore)legs as its edges', must reflect the fact that, looked at straight on, the V-formation (roughly an isoceles triangle) can look like a stick-figure human from the waist down, with the legs being the two equal sides, meeting at the tip, which is equivalent to the waist.

The verb in d, *ā́kṣisuḥ*, is generally taken as an isolated *-siṣ-*aor. to √*naś* 'attain' (so Gr, Narten 160; Wh Roots puts it under √*akṣ* as *-iṣ-*aor., but takes √*akṣ* as a secondary root form from √*aś*). This is certainly possible, but I prefer to analyze it as an isolated (and nonce) *-siṣ-*aor. to √*aj* 'drive', which would then take a cognate acc. *ájmam*, hence 'have driven their drive'.

I.163.11: I take *caranti* as aux. with *járbhurāṇā(ḥ)*, but it could be an independent verb: "they wander (while) flickering" (e.g., Ge "... bewegen sie sich auf und ab hüpfend").

I.163.13: The relative expression *paramám yát sadhástham* is an izafe-type construction and therefore can be embedded in the main cl. (see my 2022 "Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian" [Fs. Hale]). However, it is not a well-formed one, since we should expect **sadhásthaṃ yát paramám*. But the syntactic parameters of this construction obviously loosened with time.

I take *júṣṭatamo hí* as a parenthetical explanatory clause, which would account for the unusual position of the *hí*.

[I.164–65 JPB]

[I.165 Indra and Maruts (misc. comments by SJ to JPB tr.)

This hymn is full of somewhat "off" forms, some of them unique to the hymn -- *yujmahe* (5c), *ūgrá-* (6c, 10c), *cyavam* (10d) -- a few confined to this hymn and one or a few other passages -- *vadhīm* (8a), *kariṣyā́* (9d). It is not clear to me whether these are the result of faulty transmission or of the poet's manipulation of form, though I incline towards the latter explanation, given Agastya's characteristic self-conscious artfulness. In either case the clustering of these anomalies in a single hymn makes it unlikely in each individual case that they belong to the systematic grammar of Vedic or reflect deep archaisms or old sound changes, as has been suggested for several of them. For further remarks see the individual discussions below.

The trajectory of the hymn might be seen as the battle of the lexicon: words pass back and forth between the two speaking parties, with twists in their usage and with terms that seem to belong to one of the parties appropriated by, or devalued by, the other. Among the most important words are *éka-* 'alone, only' and the multiple forms of √*kṛ* 'do'. Note esp. the extraordinary concentration of √*kṛ* in the middle of the hymn: 7a *cakartha*, 7c *kṛṇávāmā*, 8d *cakara,* 9c *kariṣyā́ kṛṇuhí*, 10b *kṛṇávai*, 11b *cakrá*, including two of the rarest pf. forms, 1st sg. *cakara* and 2nd pl. *cakrá.*

I.165.1: I'd be inclined to take *samānyā́* not as an adv. ('altogether') as in the publ. tr., but as a fem. instr. sg. forming part of the phrase *káyā śubhā́*, hence "with what joint/common beauty?" -- with the sense "what's their joint insignia? how shall I recognize them?" Note that *samāná-* is differently formed from the two preceding phonologically similar adjectives *sávayasaḥ sánīḷāḥ*, which do match each other. Note also following *sám m...* The adj. *samāná-* returns in 7b in a charged context.

JPB's tr. cleverly reads *étāsaḥ* twice, once as the nom. pl. 'antelopes', once as the nom. pl. of the ppl. *á-ita-* 'come here'.

In d *śúṣmam* may be adverbial as JPB takes it ('explosively'), but it may be a real obj. of *árcanti* ("chant their explosive power"). I'm inclined to follow the latter course, because *śúṣma-* must be a real noun in 4b. But in this case I interpr. it as an Inhaltsakk., further specifying the chant (*"chant their chant" → "chant their explosive force") not the object of their praise as Ge, for example, does: "preisen den Kampfmut" (sim. WG).

I.165.2: I'm not certain that the 2nd hemistich is an embedded quotation, *pace* JPB.

I.165.4: The act. forms *iyarti*, etc., are usually transitive, but Old cites a few passages with the intrans. value that must also be present here.

Although various tr. (e.g., WG) take *ukthā́* as acc. pl. and supply subjects for the pl. verbs *ā́ śāsate* and *práti haryanti* (men and gods respectively, WG), taking it as nom. pl. not only avoids the need to cast around for unexpressed subjects but also captures Indra's extreme egotism: even the hymns long for him, or so he thinks.

I.165.5: *yujmahe* is a famous crux: though it should belong to the well-attested root aor. (seen presumably in part. *yujānā́ḥ* in pāda a), it has a primary ending and therefore looks like a pres. formation. It has received a plethora of explanations. Ge calls it a non-reduplicated perfect ("Perf. ohne Redupl."); Whitney (Rts.) simply allows for a root pres.

for a few forms, incl. this one, in addition to the standard root aor. Probably the currently prevailing interpr. is Hoffmann's (MSS 2 [1952/1957]: 130–31 =Aufs. II: 366), that it shows dissimilatory loss of the first nasal from *_yuñjmahe_ belonging to the nasal-infix pres. Although this explanation has a plausible foundation (as opposed to Ge's motiveless non-redupl. pf.), the coexistence of _yujmahe_ with _yujāná-_ in the same verse, and the general trickiness of Agastya's poetry, incline me to a nonce, contextual explanation. The oddly placed _nú_ 'now' (though see 9a) immediately following the verb form and ending the pāda seems Agastya's signal that he's twisted and tweaked the aorist to his own ends -- a temporary present. Thanks to JL for assembling the relevant lit. and for illuminating disc.

I.165.5–6: Indra seizes the Maruts' assertion of independent power (_svadhā-_ 5d) by taxing them with the absence of (their exercise of) that power (6a) at a crucial moment. Another skirmish in the battle of the lexicon.

I.165.6: I do not understand the length in _ūgrá-_ here and 10c. Lubotsky (2000 ["Vedic root vṛ ...," _Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik_]: 320 n. 16) attributes it to compensatory lengthening from *_hí uHgrás_, after laryngeal metathesis from *_hi Hugrás_, but I find the proposed metathesis counterintuitive (despite the other exx. he adduces); one would rather expect the laryngeal to remain where it is as a hiatus-filler. Moreover, assuming that this remained as a synchronic rule in the RV is quite hard to accept.

Indra adroitly manipulates the wording here to contrast his own solitary state with the Maruts' collectivity: ... _mā́m **ékaṃ sam**ádhatta_ "... me **alone together** you..."

I.165.7: In vs. 5 the Maruts spoke literally of yoking their teams to bring them for the journey, but in this vs. the same root √_yuj_ is used metaphorically, in the gerundive _yújya-_, to indicate the Maruts' powers that were _available_ to be yoked/deployed by Indra, though he didn't. Note also the adj. _samāná-_ 'common, joint' (repeated from 1b) referring to the powers shared by the Maruts, in contrast to Indra's constant lone state.

The interpretational question in this vs. is _whose krátu-_ do the Maruts plan to follow. Acdg. to the JPB tr., it is Indra's, but the tr. can't stand exactly as given for syntactic reasons. Because _marutaḥ_ is unaccented, either _krátvā_ has to belong to the _yád_ clause or _marutaḥ_ has to belong to the main cl. But the publ. tr. assigns _marutaḥ_ to the dependent cl. and _krátvā_ to the main cl: "we shall do many things in accordance with your purpose, o most powerful Indra, when we, o fellow Maruts, shall wish it." Following the two syntactically licensed alternatives above, we must rather tr. either "We shall do many things, o most powerful Indra, when, o Maruts, we shall wish it in accordance with our/your will." Or "We shall do many things, o most powerful Indra, in accordance with your/our will, o Maruts, when we shall wish it." _krátvā_ is perfectly placed for maximum ambiguity, between Indra and the Maruts. Taking it with the main cl. (the 2nd alternative tr. just given) favors an interpr. of _Indra_'s will; taking it with the subord. cl. (the 1st alternative) favors the _Maruts_' will. That, I think, is the correct interpr. The Maruts contrast Indra's actions, which were performed with the Maruts' standing by on the scene, with their own prospective actions, which will depend on their own intention, not Indra's design or timetable.

The dueling vocatives in d, *índra* and *marutaḥ*, are notable, esp. because they encase the word *krátvā* whose crucial ambiguity we have just discussed. Since we must assume that the 1st-ps. speaker is a Marut or Maruts, the pl. vocative to the group is of course striking -- though well within the limits of poetic self-address we find elsewhere in the text (see disc. in my "Poetic Self-Reference in the *Rig Veda* and the Persona of Zarathustra," Fs. Skjaervø, 2009). In this case I imagine a "spokes-Marut" who takes the lead in addressing Indra but also turns to his own group for a chorus of affirmation (of the type, "right, guys?!").

I.165.8: Injunctive 1st sg. *vádhīm* belongs to the root aor. stem of this seṭ root, whose well-attested 2nd and 3rd sg. are *(á)vadhīs, (á)vadhīt*. The 1st sg. should be **vadham*, which is nowhere attested. The *-ī-* has simply been imported from the 2nd/3rd sg.; *vádhīm* is attested once elsewhere in the RV, in the late hymn X.28.7.

The juxtaposition of *maruta indriyéṇa* recalls the immediately preceding (7d) *índra ... marutaḥ*.

Pāda-final *viśváścandrāḥ* produces an irregular cadence of four heavy syllables; three of the remaining four occurrences of the stem occur in the same position (though once in dimeter vs.) and have the same effect. As is often remarked, the cmpd. would be metrically regular if the 2nd member were the related *-candra*, hence **viśvácandrāḥ* with the light 2nd syllable appropriate to a Triṣṭubh cadence. The same problem afflicts the other cmpds of *-ścandra-* (*áśva-*, *svá-*, *hári-* and *puru-*, *su-*), which either show up in metrically indifferent positions or positions in which a light 2nd syllable would be favored (besides Triṣṭubh cadence, also right after an opening of 4, where a break ˘ - - is distinctly bad). There are no forms where the meter is improved by reading *-ścandra-*. Although the obvious solution is simply to read *-*candra-*, I am puzzled as to how the *-ścandra-* forms won out. The duplicate pair *ścandrá-* / *candrá-* are for the most part in complementary distribution, with *candrá-* an independent adj. and 1st cmpd member and *ścandrá-* 2nd cmpd member (after vowel); *ścandrá-* appears 3x uncompounded, but in these cases it is in a sequence that functions like a quasi-cmpd (*purú ścandrám* III.31.15, *pṛthú ścandrám* IV.2.13, and possibly *ádhi ścandrám* VIII.65.11). So *viśvá-ścandra-* has the expected alternant, though in almost all cases a metrically unfavorable one. Must we reckon with a replacement of the originally correct *-ścandra-* by *-*candra-*, yielding a metrically usable form, and then redactional restoration of the *-ścandra-*? This hypothesis seems over-complex, but I don't have a better one. In any case the poet seems to be toying with the form: the next pāda (8d) contains the offending sequence *śc*, though split across a word boundary (*apáś cakara*), and in 12c a *candrá-* compd., *candrá-varṇā(ḥ)* occupies the same pāda-final slot. Its initial also participates in the *śc* sequence: *marutaś candrá-*, so that the first member is effectively **ścandrá-*.

I.165.9: The form *kariṣyā́* is problematic for several reasons. Despite its sandhi position before *k*, it seems best to assume it represents 2nd sg. *kariṣyā́s* out of sandhi, even though *kariṣyā́ḥ* would be the proper sandhi form in this context. (The Pp. simply reads *kariṣyā́* like the Saṃhitā text, but the standard tr. and comm [e.g., Old, going back to BR] take it as 2nd sg.) Moreover, this form must be a *subjunctive* to the future stem, an unusual morphological combination at best (but see Whitney, Gr. §938). Reading the transmitted *kariṣyā́* won't help: that would simply be a 1st sg. subj. to the future, or perhaps a 2nd sg.

imperative to the future, neither of which is any better morphologically. The other long-shot possibility is to assume it's an unusual gerundive formation in *-iṣyá-* in the neut. nom.-acc. pl., yielding "what things are to be done ..." (so Sāy.). AiG II.2.368 mentions this possibility but prefers the subjunctive interpr.

I.165.10: In most tr. the rel. cl. of pāda b seems loosely construed with the main clause of pāda a, with the *yā́* referring to an unexpressed acc. of respect in the main cl.: "Let my force be far-reaching with regard to (those things), which I will do ..." However, the vertical parallelism of 9d, 10b, and 10d suggests a different syntactic arrangement

9d *yā́ni [kari]ṣyā́ kṛṇuhí ...*
10b *yā́ nú [dadhṛ]ṣvā́n kṛṇávai ...*
10d *yā́ni*

Not only do these pādas match phonologically as in the display above, but 9d and 10d show the same syntactic structure: a preposed rel. cl. introduced by an acc. pl. referring to deeds and a verb governing it referring to the doing of the deeds (*yā́ni *kariṣyāḥ*; *yā́ni cyavam*), followed by a main clause where the doer of the rel. clause is also subject: *kṛṇuhí, īśē*. I suggest 10b should be interpr. in the same general pattern. Indra says "Which (deeds) (I am) bold (to do), I will do." In other words, pāda b contains two clauses, not one, and is independent of the preceding pāda.

The 1st sg. *cyavam* is the only non-causative active form to this root. Hoffmann (Injunk. 247–48) takes it as a subjunctive, an ersatz for the unenlarged 1st sg. subj. ending *-ā*. I agree that the form has been tampered with, but would suggest that what really underlies the form may be medial subjunctive 1st sg. **cyavai*, which should have yielded **cyavā* in this sandhi position. The *-m* serves as a pleonastic hiatus filler (perhaps originally *-m̐*). An alternative that would work better phonologically is to assume a 1st sg. indicative **cyave*, not a subjunctive. This would yield **cyava* in sandhi, to which the *-m* could be added without adjusting the vowel length. Since the verb in the main cl., *īśe*, is likewise present indicative (as opposed to impv. *kṛṇuhí* in 9d and subjunctive *kṛṇávai* in 10b), an indicative in the subord. cl. would match.

I.165.11: The final pāda of this vs. brings the vocabulary into reciprocal alignment and thus signals that harmony has been restored: *sákhye sákhāyas tanvè tanū́bhiḥ*.

I.165.12: The med. part. *dádhānāḥ* is generally tr. 'receiving', as the middle voice of √*dhā* often is, and interpr. to mean that the Maruts also get fame as part of Indra's reflected glory (see *práti ... rocamānā(ḥ)* in a). But in this charged context of tributes given and received, I think it likely that it is ambiguous. Indra is both graciously yielding the Maruts some glory, but he is also reminding them that they have just produced praise for him (vs. 11) and will presumably continue to do so. In this second sense it could be tr. "setting out praise (for me)" with the middle voice reflecting the mutually intertwined relationship between Indra and the Maruts.

With most interpr. I take *ánedyaḥ* as a nom. sg. m. implicitly modifying an unexpressed *gaṇáḥ* 'troop', a construcio ad sensum with the pl. *dádhānāḥ*. I would like to find some way to ally it with *nédīyas-* 'nearer', as a neut. sg. modifying *śrávaḥ*, but this seems beyond the realm of possibility.

The *saṃcákṣyā* of the Saṃhitā text is read *saṃcakṣya* by the Pp. and taken as a gerund, an interpr. followed by Old inter alia. The meaning would be "having looked upon (me)" vel sim. Gr (fld. by Ge [WG], etc., incl. the publ. tr.) takes it as a gerundive, whose pausal form would be *saṃcákṣyāḥ*. Both forms are possible. I do not have a strong feeling either way.

On *-ś candrá-* see disc. ad 8c.

Note the pāda-final *nūnám*, reminiscent of *nú* in 5c and 9a.

I.165.13: The reciprocal lexical harmony of *sákhīn ... sakhāyaḥ* recalls that found in 11d *sákhye sákhāyaḥ*, but there is a small mystery: the voc. pl. *sakhāyaḥ* surely refers to the Maruts, but who are the *plural* expressed by *sákhīn*? We would expect a singular referring to Indra. It seems unlikely to be the priests plus/minus Indra because the speaker is a singular (note *me* in d, the sg. inter. prn. *káḥ* in the rhetorical question in pāda a, and the sg. poet in vs. 14). I take that speaker to be Agastya (contra the publ. tr., which identifies him as the narrator). Perhaps a pl. maiestatis for Indra?

If *návedā(ḥ)* belongs to the *s*-stem *návedas-*, it should be nom. m. singular here, in disagreement with the plural subj. of *bhūta*. Gr's solution is to set up a them. stem *náveda-* for just this passage, which would allow a plural interpr. To avoid this ad hoc multiplication of stems, we can assume the same type of constructio ad sensum invoked for *ánedyaḥ* in the immed. preceding vs. (12b)(so Old), with the sg. referring collectively to the Marut troop. Cf. also the parallel passage IV.23.4 *devó bhuvan návedā ma ṛtā́nām*, with a legitimate singular; the post-caesura portions of the pādas are identical. On the origin of *návedas-* from a false segmentation of *-tana védas-* see Schindler, Fs. Knobloch, 1985.

I.165.14: The first hemistich of this vs. is quite problematic; see Old's long disc. The problems lie in the verbs (or apparent verbs). The pf. *cakré* in b only makes sense in this context if it is construed with the preverb *ā́* in pāda a: *ā́ √kṛ* 'make (to come) here, bring here'. By contrast, the verbal stem *duvasyá-* is never otherwise construed with *ā́*, even though it appears to be here. Moreover, the recipient of the friendship offered by the verb *duvasyá-* is always in the accusative, not the apparent dat. *duváse* here. (Note also that the suffix-accented *duvás-* appears only here and in nearby I.168.3. It seems to show the regular possessive sense of *s*-stem adjectives built to *s*-stem neuters by accent shift: hence *dúvas-* 'friendship' → *duvás-* 'possessing friendship, friend'.) The best solution seems to me Roth's suggested emendation of *duvasyā́d* to **duvasyā́*, instr. of an abstract in *-yā́*, an emendation endorsed by Old. Hence I would alter the publ. tr. to "When/Since the wisdom of the son of Māna has brought us here with friendship, like a bard to a friend" vel sim. The emendation only requires de-gemination of the *-d d-* and has no effect on the meter; the addition of a *-d* might have been encouraged by the repetitive phonological pattern in a (which I will represent with false word division): *yádduvas yā́(d)duvás(e)*. Note also the dental geminate in *vartta* in c, where the double *-tt-* may have been restored etymologically (since R*tt* and R*t* generally fall together). Although there is no nominal stem **duvasyā́-*, there is the variant *duvoyā́-*, showing external sandhi (see AiG I.343), also appearing as in instr. (V.36.6, perhaps not coincidentally in an Indra hymn in a vs. addressed to the Maruts).

I.165.15: As noted in the publ. intro., the tr. assumes underlying *avayā́m* (‘ *vayā́m* in sandhi) ‘propitiation’. This does not require emendation to the Saṃhitā text, since the word appears after vowel-final *tanvé*.]

I.166 Maruts

I.166.1: It may not be sufficiently clear in the publ. tr. that “the beacon of the bull” refers to the Maruts themselves. They are presumably Indra’s “beacon” because they are regularly his comrades and they are of glittering appearance -- a little bit like Rudolph the Red-nosed Reindeer.

The pair “kindling” and “battle” in cd may not seem to form a natural class, but they probably represent two aspects of the Maruts’ naturalistic identity as the thunderstorm: the lightning may be the kindling and the thunder the clash of battle.

Note the phonological echoes in *aidhéva*..., *yudhéva*...; similarly *tuviṣvaṇo... taviṣā́ni*.

I.166.3: The simile *hitā́ iva* is compared by Ge and Re with a similar expression in IV.57.1, with the meaning “good (friends)” (Ge “wie gute (Freunde)”) or, more technically, “like contracted (allies)” (see the bahuvrīhi *hitá-mitra-*). This doesn’t mean much in the context here. WG are somewhat skeptical, but simply tr. literally “wie die Hingesetzten” without explaining what that might mean here. Both the Ge/Re and the WG tr. assume a ppl. to √*dhā* ‘set, establish’. I take it rather to √*hi* ‘impel’ (as does Gr) and assume that the underlying subject is horses and that the image is of horses led out to piss before contests. See esp. I.64.6 (also a Marut hymn) *átyaṃ ná mihé ví nayanti vājínam* “They lead (their horse) out to piss like a prize-seeking steed” (also cf. II.34.13, IX.74.4). This image fits well with the sprinkling here.

I.166.5: I previously (1983: 61) took *nadayanta* as intransitive “they roared and made the mountains stir ...”, but I now accept a transitive value.

I.166.6: *áriṣṭagrāmāḥ* is a bahuvrīhi, but the tr. ‘having an invulnerable band’ seemed too heavy.

On *krívis-* see comm. to I.30.1, where I suggest a relationship with *kravís-* ‘raw, bloody flesh’ as a re-formed *-i-*stem to the underlying root *krū* < **kruH*. A number of other interpr. have been made.

I supply “(a path)” as obj. of *rádati* because words for ‘path, way’ are frequently obj. of this verb (e.g., VII.87.1 *rádat pathā́ḥ*; also II.30.2, V.10.1, V.80.3, VI.30.3, VII.47.4, VII.60.4, X.75.2).

In my reading the structure of pāda d is quite complex and intricate, unlike the standard view. Both Ge and Re supply ‘waters’ as the obj. of *riṇā́ti* in the frame (see also Old), since waters are several times elsewhere the obj. of √*rī*. (WG take *paśváḥ* as obj. of both simile and frame.) I prefer to find the object nearer at hand, namely trees, based on *vánaspati(ḥ)* in the previous vs. (5c). In another passage trees liquefy at the Maruts’ assault: V.58.6 ... *riṇaté vánāni*, and a transitive version of this phrase is found with Agni as subj. at V.41.10 *ní riṇāti vánā* (cf. I.127.4).

As for the simile, Ge takes *barháṇā* as fem. nom. sg. with *súdhitā* ("wie der beharrliche Eifer ..."), but *barháṇā*, which is fairly well attested, is otherwise only an instr. sg. used adverbially (so rendered by both Re and WG). Like Re and WG I take *didyút* (fem.) of c as the referent of *súdhitā* 'well-placed', but *didyút-* in a slightly different sense: not as a thrown missile but as a sharp-pointed object used as a goad. The verb *riṇáti* is held constant between simile and frame, but again it has different senses in the two structures: in the simile it does not mean 'liquefy, dissolve, i.e., destroy', but 'make to flow, i.e., to cause to move', a more appropriate meaning with *paśváḥ* 'livestock' as object.

I.166.7: The rendering of *alātṛṇá-* as 'restless' follows the suggestion of Hoffmann's ('unruhig') registered in KEWA III.807 and EWA s.v., derived from √*rā* 'be at rest'. The word is found elsewhere only in III.30.10, of Vala. In neither passage does 'unquiet, restless' fit the context terribly well, but in neither is it excluded. Kuiper (Aryans, 84–85, in part restating his 1955 Fs. Kirfel views) objects to Hoffmann's explanation and suggests instead the meaning 'irresistible' for our passage and 'not offering resistance' for III.30.10. (On a side note, these two meanings, reflecting passive 'not (to be) resisted' and active 'not resisting' senses respectively, do not seem to me derivationally compatible and should not be found in a single word.) He considers it to be a substrate borrowing and thinks it's not realistic to expect it to have an etymology. Kuiper has some good points: as was just noted, the meaning produced by the Hoffmann etymology is not a perfect fit contextually and the morphology is somewhat dubious. However, I do not see confidently proposing two incompatible meanings for a single word (with the one suggested for this passage not particularly compelling in context) while forswearing any attempt at etymology. Better to leave it untranslated in that case.

Pādas c and d are in reverse logical order. The contents of the chant that the Maruts chant (c) must be the deeds of Indra, which they are said to know (d); the knowledge logically precedes the verbal expression of it.

I.166.8: As pointed out, e.g., by Ge, *śáṃsāt* in d must stand for **aghād śáṃsāt* "from evil utterance," borrowing the *aghát* of pāda a (and cf. the bahuvrīhi *aghāśaṃsa-* 'of evil speech', referring to the utterer thereof). It may well be (with Ge, etc.) that *śáṃsāt* should likewise be supplied in a, but "guard from evil," without the addition of "utterance," is also perfectly acceptable.

I.166.9: Ge and Re make *taviṣā́ṇi* part of the frame, not the simile. This actually does not alter the sense very much, since they still read *mithaspṛ́dhyā* with *taviṣā́ṇi* in an "as if" construction. Given the structure of the hemistich and the need for something for *mithaspṛ́dhyā* to modify, I prefer to take it with the simile. My only reservation about putting *taviṣā́ṇi* in the simile is that the Maruts' *taviṣā́ṇi* are mentioned in 1d.

More crucial is the grammatical identity and function of *mithaspṛ́dhyā* (so Pp.). Old follows BR in taking this not as a gerundive but as a gerund, but, strikingly, neither suggests a tr. for it. Since a simile consisting of a gerund would be highly unusual (unprecedented, I think, though I haven't checked the entire RV), a neut. pl. gerundive agreeing with *taviṣā́ṇi* makes more grammatical sense. But what meaning is being conveyed? I think the point is that there are so many good things on the chariot that one

can't single out just one: like opposing forces (*taviṣā́ṇi*) they contend with each other as rivals to be the best and most desirable. The sentiment is similar to VII.26.4 *mithastúra ūtáyo yásya pūrvī́ḥ* "whose many forms of help compete for the lead," meaning that they are all eager to be the most helpful.

The loc. sg. *prápatheṣu* is taken by all standard tr. as "on (your) journeys" (vel sim.), agreeing with the endpoint of Gr's def. 'in die Ferne führender Weg, Reise in die Ferne, Reise', which seems to me to follow a slippery path indeed. I interpr. the stem *prápatha-* (4x) rather as lit. 'the path forward', but figuratively as 'vanguard'. The *-in-* stem superlative *prapathíntama-*, found nearby at I.173.7, then means 'most in the vanguard' (/ 'most forward on the path'), used of Indra there and VI.31.5 (the 3rd occurrence, at VIII.1.30, is a PN). Although the difference between 'journey' and 'vanguard' is not crucial in our passage here, the two non-PN occurrences of *prapathíntama-* both refer to Indra, with I.173.7 specifically to Indra as warrior, and 'most in the vanguard' works much better than Re's "toi qui (vas) les grands chemins par excellence" or WG's "der am meisten auf dem Weg bist." Ge's "der am meisten auf der Kriegsfahrt" seems to recognize this. For *prápatheṣu* here I'd be inclined to emend my publ. tr. to "on the paths forward," because of the plural.

What is going on in d depends on the interpr. of *samáyā*, for which see comm. ad I.113.10. Most take it to mean 'in the middle' vel sim.; this certainly produces an acceptable image, since the axle is between the two wheels. But as discussed ad I.113.10, the totality of passages containing *samáyā* suggest a meaning 'altogether, all at once, at the same time', and in all these passages it contrasts with a form of *ví* (as here). The image I see here is somewhat more complex than the standard one, namely that through the action of the axle the wheels, though separate, turn at the same time. This is close to the kind of paradox much loved by RVic poets. This interpr. requires medial *vāvṛte* to be transitive (rather than intransitive-reflexive, *pace* most tr. and also Kü 464), but the self-involved nature of the action (the axle is turning its own wheels, as it were) makes this unproblematic. Potentially more troubling is that by this interpr. *cakrā́* should be dual acc., and the stem *cakrá-* is neuter, whose dual should be (and several times is) *cakré*. However, in at least one passage, VIII.5.29, we have a clear masculine dual: *ubhā́ cakrā́ hiraṇyáyā* "both your wheels are golden" (note the 'both' *ubhā́*), which would match the form here. Alternatively, we could take *cakrā́* as neut. plural, assuming four wheels -- and though this would technically require two axles, "the axle" as a mechanical marvel could stand for both. (Rather like saying "the internal-combustion engine powers most of the cars on the highway," even though every car has its own.)

I.166.10: The adj. *rabhasá-* ordinarily characterizes action ('violent, frenzied'), but here must have a visual aspect. So also III.31.12. Such synaesthesia is not uncommon in the RV.

In d all standard tr. supply 'they' [=Maruts] as subject of (*vy ánu*) *dhire*, with *śríyaḥ* as object (e.g., Ge "... haben sie ihre Herrlichkeiten entfaltet"). This amounts to a change of person, for these same tr. identify the many good things of a-c as 'yours' [=Maruts], following similar statements in vs. 9 with *vaḥ* (a, cd). Though there are no overt 2nd ps. pronouns in vs. 10, the voc. *marutaḥ* in pāda shows that 2nd ps. reference continues in this verse. Rather than changing person in d, I see another ex. of case disharmony between frame and simile, which is facilitated by the middle voice of *dhire.*

The simile *váyo ná pakṣā́n* "like birds their wings" uses the middle in transitive but self-involved sense, but, in my reading, in the frame *dhire* is intransitive, with *śríyaḥ* as subject. I must admit, however, that the person switches to 3rd in vs. 11, so that a switch here in the last pāda of 10 is not impossible. I prefer my interpr., with constant 2nd ps. in vs. 10, both because -- all things being equal -- it's best to keep verses self-contained and, more important, because Agastya likes doing tricky things with similes.

I.166.11: I have not rendered the *yé* in b because in this verb-less string of nominal qualifiers it is difficult to decide where the relative clause ends and the main clause begins. (Both Re and WG take d as the main cl.; Ge seems to take it as cd, insofar as I can interpret his punctuation.) Alternatively, the whole vs. could be a relative clause hanging off vs. 10, or more specifically 10d. This structure would support the change of person in 10d seen by most tr., as opposed to my interpr., for which see immed. above.

I.166.12: This vs. has ties to earlier parts of the hymn. The opening *tád vaḥ ... mahitvanám* "this is your greatness" echoes 1ab *tán nú vocāma ... mahitvám*. There it was their previous (*pū́rvam*) greatness; this vs. presumably brings this greatness into the present time.

Pāda b seems a paraphrase of 7a *anavabhrárādhasaḥ* 'whose gifts are not withdrawn'.

The connection between the main clause and the relative clause in cd is somewhat loose: as a correlative to the rel. cl. *jánāya yásmai* "for whatever person" we would expect *tám*, not *tád*, which must refer to the gift, not the recipient of it.

I.166.13: I take cd as a concrete example of the statement in ab, that the Maruts' connection with the older generation arises from their favoring its "laud" (*śáṃsam* -- note that this positively viewed *śáṃsa-* contrasts with the evil *śáṃsa-* of 8d). Manu is of course a member of the older generation, and because of his "insight" (*ayā́ dhiyā́*) the Maruts favor him and show themselves to him with all their wondrous qualities.

I.166.14: The relations among the clauses in this vs. might be problematic, primarily because of an apparent gender mismatch: *párīṇas-* 'abundance', which in the instr. *párīṇasā* goes with the rel. *yéna* in the rel. clause occupying ab, would be the most likely referent of both *yád* in the parallel rel. clause of c and *tád* in the main clause of d. And in fact that is how I (and the other standard tr.) take it. However, *párīṇas-* is said to be masculine and *yád/tád* are of course neuter -- an obstacle that Old for his part considers too large to be overcome. However, the noun is most likely neuter. This is what we'd expect of a stem built with suffix *-nas-*, and the only diagnostic form for a masc. is acc. sg. *párīṇasam* in III.24.5. Otherwise the forms are singular obliques, esp. in the collocation *rāyā́ párīṇasā* "with wealth in profusion" (4x), and hence ambiguous as to gender. The masc. acc. sg. is most probably a nonce form created to match its usual formulaic partner, masc. *rayí-*, in the phrase *rayíṃ vīrávantam párīṇasam*. See AiG II.2.738 and EWA s.v. Substantially the same argument is made by Lubotsky ("Avestan *x^{v}arənah-: The Etymology and Concept*," 1998, 483).

abhī́ṣṭim in d is analyzed by the Pp. as *abhí íṣṭim*, as might be expected. Since (vanishingly rare) root-accented *íṣṭi-* is derived from √*yaj* and means 'sacrifice', the

standard tr. exert a good deal of effort to introduce this sacrifice into their interpretation, somewhat embarassingly in a pāda that already contains *ebhír yajñébhiḥ* "with these sacrifices." Cf. Re's rather overblown "puissé-je l'obtenir grâce aux sacrifices que voici, pour (que vous soyez présents à mon) oblation" (the "l' " in "l'obtenir" is the *párīṇas-*). I take it rather to *iṣṭí-* 'desire', in a phrase *abhí *iṣtím* "to my desire, to my liking'. Either the annealed sandhi form **abhīṣṭím* lost its 2nd accent redactionally, or the accent retraction that was ultimately to affect all *-ti*-stems (see Lundquist, *-ti*-stems) was already spreading to this stem, producing the occasional *íṣṭi-* 'desire'.

I.166.15: This signature verse of Agastya's Indra/Marut hymns appears in I.165.15, 166.15, 167.11, and 168.10, but not in all of his Triṣṭubh hymns even to Indra. The tr. of I.165.15 (JPB) differs somewhat from the others (SWJ). JPB interprets *mānyá-* as a patronymic to a PN *mā́na-*, while I take it as an adj. 'respectful' derived from *mā́na-* 'respect'. It is possible that both are meant.

Both tr. follow Old in reading '*vayā́m* 'propitiation' (SWJ) / 'reconciliation' (JPB) for *vayā́m*. This requires no emendation to the Saṃhitā text, only to the Pp. My tr. should, however, have an asterisk before 'propitiation' in all three cases.

I.167 Maruts

I.167.2: What noun to supply with *jyéṣṭhebhiḥ ... bṛhádd*i*vaiḥ* is an open question. Ge confesses to uncertainty in his n. 2b, but implicitly supplies "help(s)" from pāda a in his tr. However, the disjunctive *vā* 'or' would seem to exclude this solution, unless it's signaling a contrast between the Maruts' "help(s)" and those stemming from heaven, which seems unlikely. Klein (DGRV II.157) suggest "riches" (a suggestion that goes back to Sāy), in part on the basis of *rayím ... jyéṣṭham* in VIII.46.19; see also IV.29.5 *bṛ́hádd*i*vasya rā́yaḥ*, adduced by Ge. The fact that "help(s)" and "riches" both appear in vs. 1 (a and c) supports this view.

My tr. of cd differs from the standard ones and follows Jamison 1983: 84. I take *dhanáyanta* as transitive, a straightforward ex. of *-anta* replacement (see Jamison 1979). This involves taking *niyútaḥ* as accusative, not nominative, pl. and *paramā́ḥ* as modifying the unexpressed Maruts, subjects of the verb. The standard tr. "when their furthest/highest teams are running ..." is certainly acceptable, however.

I.167.3–7: Hoffmann (Injunk., 194–97) translates and comments on these verses.

I.167.3: For the punning and diametrically opposed, negative and positive, readings of this vs. mediated by *sabhā́vatī*, see the publ. intro. Rodasī is depiced both as fit for the sabhā (gaming hall) like a young woman who goes there in secret [=whore], but also fit for the sabhā (assembly) like speech to be publicly uttered there (cf. the *sabhéyo vípraḥ* "the inspired poet appropriate to the sabhā" in II.24.13). For the association between the sabhā and licentious sexual activity, see Falk (Bruderschaft, 90–92).

Ge (/Hoffmann, WG) take *úparā ... ṛṣṭíḥ* as the lower part of the spear and consider the shared characteristic between simile and frame to be *híraṇyanirṇik* 'garbed in gold', presumably referring to the decorated hilt or handle of the spear. But I take *úparā* as meaning 'nearer, very close' (so approx. Re) and the point of comparison is how

close Rodasī is to the Maruts ("to whom she has been joined, positioned well": *mimyákṣa yéṣu súdhitā*) -- as close as their spear, which is attached to their shoulders: cf. I.64.4 *áṃseṣv eṣāṃ ní mimṛkṣur ṛṣṭáyaḥ* "On their shoulders spears have rubbed." (The verbs *mimyákṣa* and *mimṛkṣuḥ* belong to different roots, but echo each other phonetically.) By this interpr., the *ná* has been flipped from final position, as often: the simile consists only of **ṛṣṭír ná*.

The standard tr. take *mánuṣaḥ* as gen. sg., dependent on *yóṣā*, whereas I see it as acc. pl. Either is of course grammatically possible.

Hoffmann (194–95, fld. by WG) sees *sáṃ vā́k* as a new, separate clause ("Dabei ist die Vāc."). Although I don't entirely understand the position and function of *sám*, I do not think making these last two words into an abrupt appendage works well.

I.167.4: The polarized positive/negative treatment of Rodasī continues in the first half of this vs., in my interpr. With Hoffmann (/WG) I take pāda a as separate from b and supply a verb of motion with *párā* 'away'. In b, in my interpr. only, the fem. instr. *sādhāraṇyā́* 'common' refers both to the fact that Rodasī is held by them in common and that this type of relationship leaves her open to the charge that she is no better than a whore. (As noted in the publ. intro., even Draupadī in the Mahābhārata sometimes receives this insult because she is the common wife of all the Pāṇḍavas.)

The 2nd hemistich puns on the name Rodasī (once again, this is only my interpr; others see it very differently), providing us with a grammatical problem. The form found in the text, *rodasī́*, should by accent be the name of the Maruts' consort, but as a singular *-ī*-stem, it should be nominative, a grammatical identity that does not fit the context well. Old takes it as an instr. Ge suggests that the word here is flexionslos, which conveniently allows him to construe it as an acc. with *ápa nudanta* (so also Re, without comment on the morphology). Hoffmann (fld. by WG) suggests it's an elliptical dual, standing for Rodasī and Vāc. I instead think it is a grammatical compromise that enables a pun -- a compromise between dual **ródasī*, the standard word for the two world halves (so accented) and sg. **rodasī́m*, the acc. sg. of the personal name. In other words, the *rodasī́* we have in the text is a formal compromise: the right form for the dual worlds but the wrong accent; the right accent for the singular woman but the wrong case form. This is where the pun comes in, depending on a further implied pun on the *ná* that opens the line. On the one hand it is the negative, to be read with the personal name: "did not push Rodasī away" (so most tr.); on the other hand it is the simile marker, to be read with the two worlds: "as they did push apart the two world halves." This refers to the cosmogonic deed, generally attributed to Indra, of separating the two world halves to create living space between them. The *ná* is of course in the wrong position for the simile marker, but I think Agastya relies on his audience to actualize his plays on words with hints like this. The full version of this very condensed expression would be *ná *rodasī́(m)* [/*ródasī*] *ná* "not Rodasī like the two world halves.

In the next pāda both Rodasī and the two world halves are then the objects of a (quasi-)infinitival *vṛ́dham* (again, my interpr. differs from others'). Cf. the similar expression in I.85.1c *ródasī hí marútaś cakriré vṛdhé* "the Maruts made the two world halves grow strong," with a clear dative infinitive in periphrastic causative usage. The only other ex. of acc. *vṛ́dham* in III.16.2 also has infinitival value and even has the Maruts as subj.

I.167.5: This vs. depicts a svayaṃvara (self-choice) marriage likened to the mythological prototype of the svayaṃvara, that of Sūryā. The identification of the two female figures is underlined by the echo between *asur*[*í*]*yā* 'her ladyship' (pāda a, referring to Rodasī) and *ā́ sūr*[*í*]*yā* (opening pāda c, naming Sūryā).

jóṣat is most likely an aor. subjunctive (see comm. ad X.105.8, 158.2). As the first word of the verse, it introduces the "choice" theme. I take *jóṣad yád* as a type of politeness formula "if X will be pleased to ...," archaic English "an it please ..." Note that dat. *sacádhyai* 'to accompany' is complementary to dat. *sakhyā́ya* 'for companionship' in 4d and of course etymologically related. The complementarity extends to the implied subjects: in 4d the Maruts are taking steps to produce companionship; in 5a it is Rodasī who decides to accompany them.

The bahuvrīhi *nṛmáṇas-* usually means 'manly minded' and so it is interpr. here by most (Ge [/Hoffmann/WG] 'mannhaftgesinnt'; Re 'l'âme virile'). But though she does display a fair amount of gumption, I find this an odd characterization of the very feminine Rodasī. In this context I take it rather as 'having her mind on (the) men' (that is, the Maruts, who are regularly called *nṛ́-*). See *vṛ́ṣamaṇas-* in 7c.

Pāda c presents the crucial moment in the RV svayaṃvara, the bride's mounting the chariot of the groom (see Jamison 2001, Fs. Parpola). On a possible preterital tr. of *ā́ ... gāt* see comm. on the next vs.

I.167.6: The decisive moment of mounting is repeated immediately in this verse, in the causative *ā́sthāpayanta*. The *-anta* form can be simply an *-anta* replacement of act. *-an* of the usual type (Jamison 1979), but it might also be semantically justified: "They cause(d) her to mount (their own chariot)."

As Hoffmann points out, *ā́sthāpayanta* need not be read as impf. *ā́ asthāpayanta* with the Pp., but can be an injunctive *ā́ sthāpayanta*. The publ. tr. has preterital "caused ... to mount.," and I still think that is correct, though a general present could provide an easy transition to the here-and-now of the ritual found in cd. My reason for preferring the preterital reading has to do with my view of the structure of the middle section of the hymn: vss. 3-6ab treat the mythological relationship between Rodasī and the Maruts, while 6cd–7 bring Rodasī and the Maruts into the ritual present. I see *vidátheṣu* in 6b as the pivot: on the one hand it echoes *vidathyā́* in 3d and provides ring-compositional closure to the mythological section of the hymn; on the other hand it looks forward to the ritual present 6cd. Since the chariot mounting of 6a is part of the mythological past, a preterital (or timeless) tr. fits it better. (It might also be better to tr. the injunc. *ā́ ... gāt* in 5c in the same preterital fashion.)

In the publ. tr. I take *śubhé* with the preceding pāda: "mount for beauty," since *śúbh-* is very commonly used in Marut hymns to refer to their journey (cf., e.g., I.88.2 *śubhé kám yānti ...*). However, the juxtaposition of the first two words in III.26.4 *śubhé sámmiślāḥ pṛ́ṣatīr ayukṣata* is suggestive of a connection here between *śubhé* and *nímiślām* (though in the publ. tr. of III.26.4 *śubhé* is not construed with *sámmiślāḥ* but with *ayukṣata*). Still I remain inclined towards my "mount for beauty," because I think *nímiślām* refers to Rodasī's intimate connection with the Maruts, which was emphasized at the very beginning of the mythological section, 3a *mimyákṣa yéṣu ...*, hence my "commingling (with them)."

As was just noted, I take 6ab as the end of the little Rodasī myth and 6cd as the beginning of the section treating the current ritual. I therefore (contra the standard tr.) take cd as dependent on 7, not on 6ab.

I.167.7: For my tr. of *víṣamaṇas-* see disc. of *nṛmáṇas-* in 5b.

Ge suggests that the greatness of the Maruts (pāda b) is demonstrated by the fact that Rodasī happily brings along their other lovers without jealousy. This seems like an interpretational male fantasy to me (though I realize that our poet is also male and therefore likely prone to the same fantasy). I have a much soberer and less entertaining interpr. based in ritual. In the plural, *jánī-* is regularly used of the wives of the gods, esp. in regard to their attendance at certain rituals. They are ordinarily brought by Tvaṣṭar, but here Rodasī, one of their own, as it were, seems to stand in as their chaperon and cicerone. In the Ṛtugraha offerings (the "sequential cups"), in which a fixed order of gods receives oblations, the offering to the Maruts is followed immediately by one to Tvaṣṭar along with the wives of the gods; see I.15.2–3, II.36.2–3 (II.36.3d *tváṣṭar devébhir jánibhiḥ sumádgaṇaḥ*). Thus, given the temporal proximity of the oblations made to them at this ritual, one might expect to find both the Maruts and the wives of the gods together on the ritual ground.

I do not understand the force of *cid* in d, and in fact I think it's been automatically imported from the passages containing *sthirā́ cid* where the adj. is a neut. pl. and the point is that our hero (whoever it happens to be) has destroyed various items "even though they are firm/hard" (I.127.4, IV.7.10, VIII.20.1). In other words, I do not think it has a function here.

I.167.8: Because the verb in pāda a, *pā́nti*, is plural, not dual, at least one additional subject is needed in addition to du. *mitrā́váruṇā*. The obvious one to supply is their partner Aryaman, who appears in the next pāda.

In d Old, Ge, Re, and WG identify *dā́tivāraḥ* 'wish-granting' as the mortal sacrificer, although, as they all acknowledge, the other two occurrences of this stem modify the Maruts (III.51.9, V.58.2) and therefore the Maruts should be presumed to be the default referent here as well. I see no reason to contravene this expectation. In V.58.2 the adjective is singular, modifying *gaṇá-* 'flock', a regular cover term for the Maruts, and I have supplied *gaṇá-* here as well. I also consider d to be an unsignaled dependent clause "(when)," indicating the circumstances under which the unstirrable things stir (c), viz. when the Maruts get strong. The verb would have accent in any case because it is initial in its pāda. I do not, however, understand the *īm* in d, which has no referent, since *vāvṛdhé* is intransitive (*pace* Gr). Taking the Maruts as the subj. of *vāvṛdhé* also fits nicely with 9, which treats the "swelling strength" (*śávas-*) of the Maruts.

On the famous cmpd type of *dā́ti-vāra-* see comm. ad V.58.2.

I.167.10: *ṛbhukṣā́* in d may refer to the Maruts collectively, as I've taken it, or to Indra, already mentioned in ab. Re suggests both possibilities, though he goes for Indra in his tr. (as do Ge, WG). It is true that singular *ṛbhukṣā́ḥ* generally refers to Indra, while it is plural *ṛbhukṣánaḥ* that qualifies the Maruts (VIII.7.9, 12, etc.). As in 8d I'm taking interpreting the singular as collective referring to the Marut flock. If the referent is taken

as Indra, the tr. should be altered to "the Ṛbhu-master of the superior men," which seems a bit awkward.

I.167.11: See comm. ad I.166.15.

I.168 Maruts

I.168.1: Ge takes b as parenthetical. Although I agree that the 1st sg. subject of cd is also the subj. of pāda a, I think it less awkward to take pāda a as a nominal sentence, given the sheer amount of material that intervenes between it and the verb in d, *vavṛtyām*.

tuturváṇi- is a hapax, but it can hardly be anything but a pleonastically redupl. form of *turváṇi-* (8x)(though it should be admitted that this latter stem is used only of gods). The redupl. form is sometimes credited with a desiderative sense ('zu erlangen strebend' versus *turváṇi-* 'siegreich', etc.: Gr; 'zu gewinnen strebend' versus *turváṇi-* 'überwältigend': AiG II.2.906, reproduced in EWA s.v. *TŪR V*; 'cherche à l'emporter': Re), but I see no contextual or morphological justification for this. WG's iterative/repetitive "immer wieder überwältigend" is probably closer to the mark, and it would fit with the repetitive ritual actions indicated by the āmreḍitas *yajñā́-yajñā* and *dhíyam-dhiyam*. I would be inclined to emend the publ. tr. to "(am I) ever victorious" or "continually victorious." I do not understand Ge's 'zuvorkommend'.

The position of *u* in b is somewhat surprising. Klein (DGRV II.10 n. 16) groups it with a set of passages in which *u* appears as the penultimate word (or "word") in its pāda after *-ā* and classifies it here as "expletive," whatever that is meant to convey. Closest in configuration is VII.68.4 *... devayā́ u ádriḥ#*.

The standard (and I think correct) interpr. of *devayā́(ḥ)* here is that it is fem. pl., agreeing with the implicit plurality of the (sg.) āmreḍita *dhíyaṃ-dhiyam* -- an interesting syntactic constructio ad sensum.

I.168.2: For the image in pāda a see the publ. intro.

The point of the simile in the final pāda is somewhat obscure. The frame -- "to be extolled by the mouth" (*āsā́ ... vándyāsaḥ*) -- is unimpeachable, referring to the poet's oral praise, but why would gods be compared to cows and/or oxen for this quality? Surely the Maruts are inherently more praiseworthy than cows! Ge suggests that it's like the praise of bovines at work (like the horses in I.27.1, though this passage does not seem similar); WG tr. "(sie sind) die Kühe mit dem Mund, wie die zu lobenden Jungstiere" and suggest that such cows are esp. sichtlich. This interpr. loses the connection with the poet's praise "by mouth" and, at least to me, doesn't make much sense as a way to refer to particularly visible cows. I suggest that there's an imperfect pun here on *vándya-*, which is phonologically close to *bándhya-* 'to be bound' (not found in the RV or, acdg. to Wh Rts, till epic, but easy enough to generate, and the stem occurs in the name of the *anūbandhyā* cow, a fixture in śrauta ritual, already in the BYV Saṃhitās). The simile would then pivot on the verbal pun, not on the visual image, with "by mouth" used in two different senses with *vándya-* and **bandhya-*. In the latter case, it evokes a halter, the assemblage of straps that go behind the animal's ears, across the jaws, and around the muzzle, to enable it to be led. The "bound" image adds another layer of meaning to the

verse, suggesting under the surface that we can exert control over the Maruts, bind them to us, by praising them.

One small issue is whether *gā́vaḥ ... ukṣánaḥ* is a single compound NP or two different entities. Ge suggests the possibility of the former in his n. 2d, though his tr. does not reflect it. The position of the simile particle would be slightly better if this were the case, though my tr. doesn't reflect it either, mostly because "bovine oxen" doesn't work well in English -- or probably in Sanskrit.

I.168.3: The first hemistich has a nice chaining of similes, as Ge persuasively shows. The Maruts are compared to soma drinks -- not, probably, for any quality proper to physical soma, but because, like friends, soma drinks are thought to "sit in the heart" (cf., e.g., I.179.5 ... *sómam ... hṛtsú pītám* ... and other passages adduced by Ge in n. 3ab). So the Maruts are "like soma drinks" only because soma drinks are themselves "like friends"; the first simile is mediated by the second. Within the first simile is embedded another metaphor describing the soma drinks "whose stalks are satiated" (*tṛptā́mśavaḥ*), referring to the originally dry stalks which swell when soaked in water (preparatory to pressing them). The result is a very dense set of nested imagery.

In c Kü (418) takes the *rambhínī* as a person with a crutch and WG as an old man with a cane or staff. Although VIII.45.20 ... *tvā rambhā́ṃ ná jívrayo, rarabhmā́* ... "Like elderly ones a staff, we have grasped onto you" shows that *rambhám* can have such a meaning, the feminine *rambhínī* requires a feminine referent in the simile, and I.167.3 in the preceding hymn, with Rodasī cozying up to the Maruts like their spear (*úparā ná ṛṣṭíḥ*), supplies the thematic parallel. That the spear is found in the two following vss. (4d, 5a) in this hymn also supports supplying it here.

kṛtí- is a hapax, but it is generally agreed that it means 'dagger, knife', derived from √*kṛt* 'cut'.

I.168.4: I supply 'horses' as subj. of a and obj. of b. Ge (/WG) take *codata* in b as intransitive/absolute/reflexive [it is somewhat difficult to tell from the tr.] 'treibt selbst ... an', but this verb otherwise takes an obj., and if it were reflexive we might expect middle voice. Re supplies the same obj. as I do.

I interpr. *tmánā* in its full lexical sense 'with breath', as sometimes elsewhere (see also 5b). The "breath" of the Maruts would of course be the storm winds. However, it is certainly possible that it simply means 'by yourselves', as in the standard interpr. I then take *káśayā* as an implied simile matching *tmánā*, since the whip is not usually associated with the Maruts, but with the Aśvins. However, in I.37.3 *ihéva śṛṇva eṣā́m, káśā hásteṣu ...*, the Maruts do have a whip, so an alternative tr. could be "spur them on with your own breath as whip" or "spur them on by yourselves with a whip." The use of *tmánā* with a clearly marked simile in 5b may lend support to my interpr. of *káśayā* as an unmarked simile here.

The qualifier "dustless" (*aréṇavaḥ*), in combination with *codata* 'spur on' (b) and *acucyavuḥ* 'have made stir' (c), evokes the common notion that dust gets stirred up by violent activity (see, e.g., I.56.4=IV.17.13, IV.42.5). It is thus a paradox: although the Maruts set many things in motion, they themselves remain unaffected by this movement and therefore dustless.

I.168.5: Another vs. displaying Agastya's tricky manipulation of double readings.

The standard tr. (but cf. Scar. 127) take *vaḥ* as the obj. of *réjati* ("who sets you atremble?"), but this seems semantically unlikely to me. The Maruts are always the initiators and causers of violent motion, as is esp. emphasized in these vss. (4–6); no one external to them is likely to have the power to make them tremble. (This seems to be implicitly recognized in Re's supplied modal: "qui (donc pourrait) vous faire trembler au dedans ...?") I instead construe *vaḥ* with *antár* ("among you"). The question "who among you?" is a variant on the occasional rhetorical attempt to differentiate among the Maruts. Ge (/WG) and Re take the *antár* as the locus of the Maruts' trembling ("within"; see Re's tr. cited above). Rather than taking *vaḥ* as the obj. of the verb, I supply *dṛḷhā́ni* 'fixed places' from 4d as obj. of *réjati*; *dhánva*, extracted from the cmpd. *dhanvacyútaḥ* in c would be equally possible. Scar's (127) tr. is similar to mine, but he takes *réjati* as absolute ("Wer aus eurer Mitte ... bewirkt ... das Beben ..."). This is also possible. Scar also takes *tmánā* as "durch seinen Hauch" as I do, contra the standard reflexive interpr.

The simile shows (or implies) a different syntactic configuration from the frame, as Ge also points out (n. 5b), reflected also in Re's tr. Although the frame has a transitive verb *réjati* (possibly, with Scar, in absolute usage), the simile assumes an intransitive form of the same verb stem; cf., e.g., III.31.3 *agnír jajñe juhvā́ réjamānaḥ* "Agni was born quivering with his tongue," with the tongue as here. I read *antár* also with the simile (so also Ge), governing *hánvā*, interpreted as dual (du. also Old, Ge, Re; WG take as instr. sg., which is morphologically more satisfying but produces an image that makes no sense to me).

The third pāda continues Agastya's crafty syntactic slippage between simile and frame. I take the gen. pl. *iṣā́m* as parallel to the 1st cmpd member *dhanva-* in *dhanva-cyút-* 'stirring the wastelands, stirrer of the wastelands'. The simile would then be an analytic (i.e., de-compounded) **iṣā́ṃ cyút-* 'stirrer of refreshments' parallel to the synthetic rt. noun cmpd. *dhanva-cyút-*. 'Refreshments' here probably refer to rain. For the root √*cyu* in this sense, see V.53.6 *diváḥ kóśam ácucyavuḥ* "The [=Maruts] have stirred the bucket of heaven," and for *íṣ-* as rain, e.g., V.68.5 *vṛṣṭídyāvā rītyā́pā, iṣás pátī* ... (of Mitra and Varuṇa as lords of rain). This analysis allows the loc. *yā́mani* (like more common *yā́man*) to refer as usual to the Maruts' journey. Ge (/WG) and Scar take *yā́mani* as part of the simile, resulting in a very unlikely image: Ge "wie bei der Ankunft der Speisen," with the shaking produced by the Maruts compared to that produced by a herd of cattle or by the wagons bringing in the harvest! (Re's rendering is close to mine.)

The point of the last pāda is probably that the Maruts set many in motion, just as the Sun (or in this case, his stand-in, the Sun's horse) sends people to their tasks on his daily appearance. The common property between simile and frame is *purupraíṣa-*. Although in I.145.3 *praíṣa-* in this cmpd seems to have the technical sense 'ritual command' common in later Vedic, I do not see that sense here, since neither the Maruts nor Etaśa issues such commands. Re unaccountably takes the second member as passive: "vous qui êtes multiplement incités."

I.168.6: Ge (/WG) take c with ab, with d independent, while Re configures the vs. as I do. There are no implications either way.

The publ. tr. doesn't render the *ā́* 'here' with the verb in the rel. cl. *āyayá*. The point is that they have arrived here despite the vastness of the space in which they were driving, but "in which you have driven here" doesn't work in English.

The frame and the simile in c do not agree in number: sg. *sáṃhitam*, pl. *vithurā́-iva*. The number difference has a semantic function; the entity that the Maruts are stirring is solid and a unity, hence hard to move, but they make it shake as if it were comprised of a number of small unconnected pieces that are easily set in motion. Although *vithurá-* is a deriv. of √*vyath* and does not contain the preverb *ví*, its initial syllable plays off the *sám* in *sáṃhitam*, in the common contrastive pairing *sám* 'together': *ví* 'apart'. The real preverb *ví* opens the next pāda.

Ge (n. 6d) makes heavier weather of pāda d than seems necessary to me. I think the "turbulent flood" (*tveṣám arṇavám*) is simply the dusky realm (*rájas-*) of pāda a, i.e., the midspace in which the Maruts often find themselves. It is a turbulent flood because of the storms the Maruts are producing. The stone (*ádri-*) need not be a feature of the landscape (Fels, with Ge/WG), but a weapon of some kind, as often.

I.168.7: Ge's n. 7 summarizes the gist of this verse, that what the Maruts bring is both disruptive and welcome. Their gift is rain (*vṛṣṭí-*, which never surfaces but accounts for the fem. adjectives throughout the verse), but it is accompanied by the violence of the storm. The positive/negative pairings are found in the first hemistich; the second one is only positive and ends by indirectly comparing the gift to the Maruts' own consort Rodasī.

The curiously formed hapax fem. *pípiṣvatī* is best explained, with Old, as based on the perfect part. to √*pi* 'swell', *pīpivā́ṃs-,* fem. *pipyúṣī*, crossed with a *-vant*-stem to match *ámavatī svàrvatī* in pāda a. Despite the tricky morphological manipulation required, I prefer this to the easier derivation from √*piṣ* 'crush', assumed by Ge's 'zerschmetternd' (with ?), fld. by WG., and Re's 'pulvérisant'. Gr (flg. BR) takes it as built to a desiderative to √*pi*, but there are no desiderative forms to this root, whereas the pf. part. is quite well attested, esp. in the fem.

The last pāda has formulaic echoes that identify the female referent in the simile as Rodasī. There are only two other occurrences of fem. *asuryā́-*, one in VII.96.1 referring to Sarasvatī (wrongly classified by Gr with the neut. noun), one in the hymn immediately preceding this one, I.167.5, where it refers to Rodasī. Similarly the bahuvrīhi *pṛthujráyī* 'possessing broad expanse' brings to mind another passage adduced by Ge, I.101.7 *rudrébhir yóṣā tanute pṛthú jráyaḥ* "Along with the Rudras [=Marut], the maiden [=Rodasī] stretches her broad expanse." Although it might seem somewhat unflattering to attribute "broad expanse" to a lovely young maiden (esp. to us moderns; the ancients obviously had different canons of beauty), I think this is a buried pun. The two world halves (*ródasī*) do have this quality, and it has simply been transferred from that dual common noun to the fem. sg. *rodasī.*

jáñjatī has only one relative, *jañjanābhávant-* in VIII.43.8, where it modifies Agni and must mean something like 'flickering'. On its formation see Hoffmann (IF 60, 1952 = Aufs. p. 40). Here 'scintillating' captures the feminine quality better.

I.168.8: The identity of the subj. of *udīráyanti* in b is left undefined. Re takes it as the rivers of pāda a, WG as the Maruts, and Ge leaves it undefined ("diese"). Although my

publ. tr. likewise uses a noncommittal pronoun, I am inclined to think it is the rivers, because of the *úd* 'up', contrasting with the *áva* 'down' qualifying the action of the lightning in c. The noise the rivers make would be the roaring resulting from streams swollen by rainfall, hence the qualifier *abhríyam* 'coming from clouds" for their speech.

In d I take *yádī* as standing for *yád ī*, with acc. *ī* referring to the earth.

I.168.9: This is the final vs. of the hymn, since vs. 10 is repeated from I.165.15, etc. The *svadhā́-* in d forms a slight ring with 2a *svajā́ḥ svátavasaḥ*.

I.168.10: As just noted, this vs. is identical to I.165.15, tr. by JPB. See comm. ad I.166.15.

I.169 Indra

I.169.1: A difficult vs. to construe, esp. the first hemistich. In general I follow Old's somewhat bold interpr. He points out that pādas a and b are quite parallel, with pāda a #*maháś cid ... yatáḥ* matched by b #*maháś cid ... tyájasaḥ*. He then suggests that the parallelism would be furthered if pāda-final *-tár-*stem agent noun *varūtā́* (b) were matched by a similar formation at the end of a, which is possible if we read **etā́* (agent noun to √*i* 'go') rather than *etā́n*. The final *n* of the transmitted form would have been acquired from the pāda-initial nasal *maháḥ* that immediately follows. Hence my "the one who goes," which should properly be asterisked in the publ. tr. I have supplied "(before)," to allow it to be construed with the abl. phrase beginning *maháḥ*. Old sim.: "Selbst eines grossen Gehenden Gänger (d.h. Ueberholer oder dgl.) bist du." As for the abl. phrase, I assume the referent is the Marut *gaṇá-* (flock). I also note the bad cadence and tentatively emend *yatáḥ* 'going' to **yātáḥ* 'driving', although keeping the transmitted form would not appreciably alter my interpr. semantically. Although Old's (and my) interpr. requires changing the text, the standard interpr. need to supply extra material and/or juggle the supposed pronoun *etā́n*, which lacks an obvious referent, and since Old's way builds on the parallel structures in the verse, I think the textual alteration is worth it.

What to do with *marútām* in c is the next question. Ge (see n. 1c) construes it with both *vedhaḥ* and *cikitā́n* ("Du Meister der Marut, der (sie) kennt"), Re and WG with the latter. However, neither *vedhás-* nor *cikitvā́ṃs-* ordinarily shows up with a complement -- though the passage adduced by Ge, I.156.4 *mā́rutasya vedhásaḥ* with vṛddhi adj., gives me pause, and in the publ. intro. to I.156 I entertain the possibility of a syntagm *vedho marútām* here. Since all three tr. then construe this gen. pl. also with *sumnā́*, the only reason to attach it to either or both of the other two words would be its position in the same pāda, which doesn't seem to me sufficient.

None of the standard tr. renders *naḥ* in c (though see Tichy [*-tar-*, p. 192], who does), but the sense of the first clause in cd must be "win the Maruts' favors *for us*." This makes the second clause, "for they [=favors] are dearest *to you*," a bit puzzling. Why would Indra, who has been quite disdainful of the Maruts in this hymn cycle, find their favors esp. dear? And if he does, why would he be willing to win them for others? I do not know how to resolve these questions on the basis of the transmitted text, which has verse-final *préṣṭhā*, which must therefore be a neut. pl. (or fem. nom. sg.). I would point out, however, that two hymns before (I.167.10a) we find the phrase *vayám adyéndrasya*

préṣṭhā, with *préṣṭhā* pāda-final, but standing for masc. pl. *préṣṭhāḥ* before a voiced sound. It is therefore possible that *préṣṭhā* has been adapted from there, without adjusting the sandhi and that it could therefore mean "for they [=Maruts] are dearest to you." Unfortunately, though this makes *better* sense, it doesn't make complete sense, since Indra and the Maruts are depicted as still at loggerheads in this hymn. Perhaps *préṣṭha-* here reflects one of the senses of *priyá-*, viz. 'one's own'. The Maruts would be "most your own" because they have been, and will be again, Indra's posse. If *te* in 2a should be rendered as I take it, "your (Maruts)," this provides support for the "most your own" interpr. here.

I.169.2: Just as the standard tr. do not notice *naḥ* in 1c, they are also silent on *te* in 2a. I tr. "your (Maruts)"; it could also be a dat. with *áyujran* "they have hitched themselves up for you." But the point is that Indra is a party to the action one way or the other.

The simplest way to construe cd is to take *hā́samānā* as a predicated pres. part. (so Ge), but it is possible with Re to supply a verb ("va," in his case) or with WG to take it as a nominal clause of possession ("Den Marut gehört Kampfaktion ...").

I.169.3: Both Ge and Re in different ways separate *ṛṣṭí-* from the well-attested 'spear' word and simply invent an otherwise non-existent stem (Ge 'Hoheit', Re 'exploit'). Ge justifies this by saying that 'spear' doesn't make sense in context (never a strong argument in RV interpretation, since so many contexts don't) and that Indra never otherwise has a spear. (Re's EVP XVII, where the tr. is found, has no notes, so his reasons are lost to us.) Ge then interprets *ṛṣṭí-* as a *v*-less form of *vṛṣṭí-* in I.52.5, 14 of the same meaning (in his opinion, though not others'). Even if Ge's derivation were more solidly grounded, the presence of 'spear' in the preceding two hymns (I.167.3, I.168.4, 5), once with the same verb as here (I.167.3ab *mimyákṣa ... ṛṣṭíḥ*; 169.3a *ámyak ... ṛṣṭíḥ*), makes a separation from 'spear' extremely unlikely (as WG recognize). As to what Indra's spear might represent here, I suggest that "fixing a spear" is like planting a flag: it means staking a claim with a physical symbol of power or authority, and Indra has in this way asserted his claim to the sacrifice, despite the Maruts' counter-claims, symbolized by the (cloud) mass they are sending this way. Another possibility: although I sternly resist nature-mythology explanations in general (and Indra's "thunderbolt" in particular), in this context, with the storm-producing Maruts, it may be that a little conceptual flexibility is called for. In I.168.4 the Maruts are credited with lightning as their spears (*ṛṣṭividyutaḥ*), and in our vs. it is possible that, while the Maruts speed the clouds in b, Indra wields a spear of lightning.

The precise application of cd to ab is unclear. It seems to present two real-world analogues -- one involving fire, the other (in a simile dependent on the first) water -- to the mythological situation in ab, but what do these analogues contribute to interpreting what precedes? Before tackling that question, we must first decide what cd actually means. Ge and Old both take *dádhati* as a 3rd pl. indic., which requires finding a plural subj. Ge supplies priests and relegates the fire to a simile, presumably marked by *cid* (which Ge takes as a simile marker on a number of occasions, though I do not think it can function that way). Old tries other strategies. But taking *dádhati* as a short-vowel 3rd sg. subjunctive allows *agníḥ* to be subject without problem (so also WG). The point of both the fire and the water examples seems to be that these uncontrollable natural substances

can produce unexpectedly positive results and that, though both substances ordinarily destroy matter, sometimes they create it. The "waters make an island" image is perhaps the easier one: when waters wash away large amounts of soil and other material upstream, this material often silts up downstream, forming islands in the river's delta (as in the Bay of Bengal -- not that the RVic geographic horizon extends that far). It is almost a magical process -- dry land created from flowing liquid -- and provides an appealingly striking paradox. As for the fire image, fire burning in brushwood must be implicitly contrasted here with the normal ritual fire, and the former is potentially destructive. I'm not sure how it makes pleasurable offerings (usually associated with the ritual), perhaps by roasting foodstuffs that happen to be in its path. It's worth noting that in II.4.7 fire "scorching the brushwood" also "sweetens the ground," another positive outcome: *agníḥ śocíṣmāṁ atasā́ni uṣṇán ... asvadayan ná bhū́ma*.

What does this have to do with Indra and the Maruts? Perhaps in this verse addressed to Indra (note *te* in a), the poet is suggesting to him that despite their unruly natures the Maruts might turn out to have something to contribute to Indra.

I.169.4: The instr. *dákṣiṇayā* seems to be what we might call an instr. of material or specification; it expresses what the abstract 'present' (*rātí-*) consists of. Despite the position of the simile marker *iva*, I (and all the standard tr.) take *ójiṣṭhayā* as belonging in the simile. Such configurations are found elsewhere, in addition to the far more common 2nd position of the simile marker.

As Ge also saw, the frame and the simile pivoting on *pīpayanta* have different syntactic constructions. In the frame *stútaḥ* is the subj. of an intrans. (or possibly reflexive) verb ("the praises swell / swell themselves"), whereas, since *stánam* is masc., it must be the obj. of a trans. use of *pīpayanta* ("[they] make the breast swell"). This clash is an example of the larger phenomenon of case disharmony in similes, treated at length in Jamison 1982 (IIJ 24); this particular passage is discussed pp. 263–64, where the syntactic properties of the verbal stem *pīpaya-* are also noted. I did not identify there the likely subj. of the transitive use in the frame, but flg. a suggestion of Dieter Gunkel's, in the publ. tr. I supply gift-cows, adapted from the sg. *dákṣiṇayā* in b. There is another case disharmony in this same simile, with instr. *vā́jaiḥ* corresponding roughly to gen. *mádhvaḥ* in the simile.

I.169.5: This vs. expresses the poet's willingness to let Indra supersede the Maruts if he provides sufficient wealth. The Maruts used to be the leaders, but now leadership passes to Indra, by indirection: the poet ascribes the leadership to his riches. (The cynical might think this ascription is not merely metaphorical.) As Ge points out, the poet is essentially apologizing to the Maruts and hoping (pāda c) that they will excuse his defection.

The *iva* in d is unusual in occurring after the verb *gātuyánti.* Ge tr. it more or less as I do. Re seems to ignore it, as do WG (unless this is what their "just" in "die ... just den Weg wiesen," though "just" [precisely] would seem to convey a sense opposite to the approximative *iva*). It might be possible to consider *iva* displaced to the left as sometimes, to be read with *devā́ḥ* ("like gods"), but this seems unlikely, given that the Maruts *are* gods.

I.169.6: The question in the first hemistich is what to do with *maháḥ*. Ge must take it as an acc. construed with *yatasva* : "vergleiche dich mit [come to terms with] den Grossen ..." But this pushes the sense and syntax of medial √*yat*, which generally refers to physical placement (an interpr. encouraged by the seat [*sádane*] here) and never otherwise takes an acc. Re takes it as adverbial, while WG maintain Ge's acc. pl. but read it with *nṝn* in the previous pāda ("den ... grossen Männern"), starting a new clause with *pārthive*. I take it as gen. sg., referring to the Marut flock, as in 1a. Alternatively it could refer to Agni and the earthly seat could be the ritual ground.

On *pṛthubudhná-*, lit. 'broad based', see Thieme's brief remarks (Fremdling, p. 63 with n. 1). As he points out, it should not refer to the antelopes' broad Untergestell (with Ge), since antelopes are not particularly bulky, but rather to the large amount of ground they cover. I take 'base' as equivalent to 'stride', somewhat like English 'wheelbase'.

I.169.7: The various gen. pl. adjectives in ab can modify either the antelopes or the Maruts; with Ge I take them all with the Maruts. Despite the placement of *ghorā́ṇām* and *ayā́sām* flanking *étānām*, both those adjectives are used of the Maruts in nearby I.167.4 belonging to this same hymn complex.

I do not know what the debtor (*ṛṇāván-*) is doing here.

I.169.8: The instr. phrase *stávānebhiḥ ... devaíḥ* can express both agent (as in the publ. tr.) and accompaniment; that is, Indra is praised both *by* the Maruts and *along with* them.

[I.170–71 JPB]

I.172 Maruts

One of the shortest hymns in the RV.

I.172.3: Tṛṇaskanda appears only here in all of Sanskrit, as far as I can tell. The English gloss is a direct calque on the two parts of the name, *tṛ́ṇa-* 'grass' and √*skand* 'spring, leap'.

I.173 Indra

The beginning of the hymn is characterized by pāda-initial injunctives in *-at* (1a *gā́yat*, 2a *árcat*, 3a *nákṣat*, 3b *bhárat*, 3c *krándat*; note also non-initial *ruvád* 3c and *carat* 3d). It is not surprising that this assemblage attracted the attention of Hoffmann, who tr. the first three vss. (Injunc., 143–44). The function of these forms is of course underdefined; I render them as simple general presents, more or less with Hoffmann ("die generalle Beschreibung eines Opfers"), sim. Ge. By contrast, Re takes them all as modal ("qu'il chante ...," etc.).

Another verbal pattern is the repetition of forms of the root √*bhṛ*: 2c *bhárate*, 3b *bhárat*, 4b *bharante*, 6d *bhárti*. In this case the poet seems to want to display how many different idiomatic meanings he can find in this root.

I.173.1: IH suggests tr. *gā́yat* and *árcāma* as Engl. progressives: "he is singing .. we are chanting." He points out that the (implied) presential nature of the nominal cl. of c and the future-referring final clause that depends on it in d support this interpr.

The standard tr. take *véḥ* as a nom. sg. In Ge's tr., however, the bird seems to be compared to the sāman, not the singer: "Er stimme den Gesang an, der hervorschiesst wie ein Vogel." So also Re, it seems. Hoffmann (/WG) make the more natural (and grammatically acceptable) comparison with the singer, with *véḥ* as a nom. sg. However, although it requires some extra machinery, I prefer to take *véḥ* as gen. sg. I think Ge is on the right track, that the comparison is not the rather banal one between singer and bird, but the quality of "bursting forth" (*nabhanyàm*) characteristic of bird song, a natural effusion. If this is the comparison meant, then only a gen. will work, dependent either on *sā́ma* read a second time or on a different word for (bird) song to be supplied. Although there are undeniable exx. of *vés* as nom. sg. (VI.3.5, IX.72.5, X.33.2, possibly III.54.6), in addition to the expected gen. sg. of an ordinary *i*-stem – nom. sg. *vés* being a cornerstone of Schindler's reconstruction of the IE ablaut pattern of this word and so beloved of Indo-Europeansits – not all the *vés* forms listed as nom. sg. by Gr should be so analyzed. Besides the form in this vs., the one in III.54.6 (q.v.) is also possibly gen.

The obj. of *árcāma* must be neut., which unfortunately excludes the cognate *arká*- (m.). Any neut. word for verbal product will do (*vácas*-, *bráhman*-, etc.).

The pf. part. *vāvṛdhānám* would be better tr. "that has grown strong." I would thus now tr. ab as "He is singing the sāman that is bursting out like (the song of) a bird; we are chanting this (chant) that has grown strong ..."

The syntax of cd is ambiguous; c can be an independent nominal cl., with d dependent on it (so Ge, Re, and me) or the two can be read together as a single subordinate cl. (so Hoffmann [/WG]), with the subordinating conjunction *yád* postponed until pāda d. This is not impossible, since pāda c is a single NP, but it seems a bit awkward. I prefer the two-clause solution.

I.173.2: An intricate verse, in which Indra both officiates as a singer at the sacrifice and receives the sacrifice as his due. In pāda a Indra as bull is, by the standard accounts, the subject, chanting along with the hard-laboring human priests (for *svédu-havya*-, see Jamison 2015, BAI 25) and, in his fervor, eager to out-sing (*áti ... juguryā́t*) them. This is the only occurrence of *áti* with this root, but it can hardly mean anything else.

The Hotar in pāda c is most likely not Indra, but Agni, as in the next verse. This identification makes it easier to interpret the last pāda, where Indra, here called a "young blood" (*máryaḥ*), supports "the pair," who are likely (Ge's parallels are apposite here) the two priests Udgātar (the likely subj. of *gā́yat* in 1a) and Hotar (2c).

I.173.3–4: The *-at* injunctive pattern noted above comes to a climax in vs. 3, with 5 such verbs. The next *-at* form, *júju̯oṣat*, pāda-initial in 4c, is a subjunctive. The change in mood, while keeping the formal expression *-at* the same, is surely deliberate.

I.173.3: As Ge hints (n. 3a), the first pāda depicts the paryagnikaraṇa, a ritual episode that involves carrying a firebrand around various objects. In the animal sacrifice the objects include the animals to be sacrificed. On the basis of passages like IX.97.1cd (... *páry eti ...mitéva sádma paśumā́nti hótā* "as the Hotar goes around the fixed seats provided with [sacrificial] animals"), the fixed seats are the places where the sacrificial animals are tied. The fixed seats here (*sádma mitā́*) must be the same things, and the circling around is conveyed by *pári ... yán*, which rather nicely encircles the seats in the word order.

The problematic pāda is the second one. All the standard tr. take *śarád-* as a gen. sg. in the sense of 'autumn', not 'year', with *gárbha-* metaphorical for 'fruit, product'; cf., e.g., Ge's "die herbstliche Frucht der Erde" or Hoffmann's grammatically more punctilious "die Frucht des Herbstes der Erde." This echo of a harvest-home festival strikes me as extremely incongruous. Although śrauta ritual does have a "first-fruits" ritual (Āgrayaṇa Iṣṭi, on which see, e.g., Keith, Relig. and Philos., 323–24; Hillebrandt, Rituallit., 119–20), it is a minor, gṛhya-like rite and quite marginal, and I am not aware of any mention of it in the RV, which tends to confine itself to the far grander Soma sacrifice. I take *śarádaḥ* as an acc. pl. in the 'year' sense, expressing extent of time ("for years"), as it almost always does elsewhere. What then does the pāda refer to? In ritual context *gárbha-* almost always refers to Agni, either when just about to be kindled (and thus still in the womb of the wood) or just kindled -- though occasionally to Soma. The referent here is most likely Agni. The phrase *bhárad gárbham* probably has two senses. On the one hand, it is an idiom meaning 'be pregnant', and the acc. extent of time *śarádaḥ* is appropriate to this sense: "(s/he) carried/carries the embryo for years." Cf. V.2.2 *pūrvī́r hí gárbhaḥ śarádo vavárdha* "For the embryo grew for many years," in a clear pregnancy context. The question then is who is the subject; I suggest the Earth, whose embryo it probably is (see below). On the other, this can refer to a particular ritual moment, when the Āhavanīya fire is taken out of the Gārhapatya and carried to the east to be set down (*puróhita-*) as the offering fire. In this reading the *śarádaḥ* may refer to the regular repetition of the ritual year after year, and the subject would be the priest, perhaps the human Hotar.

What I don't understand in this pāda are the preverb/adposition/adverb *ā́* and the relevance of the earth (gen./abl. *pṛthivyā́ḥ*). The most likely explanation of *ā́* is that it is simply a preverb with *bhárat*, displaced to a position after the VP because the pattern of *-at* injunctives in this hymn imposes pāda-initial position on *bhárat*. In that case the publ. tr. should be slightly emended to "He bears the embryo ... here ..." This seems to be the solution of Ge and Hoffmann [/WG], the latter two with clear "herbei," though no one comments on it. However it is possible that *ā́* should be construed with *śarádaḥ* or even *pṛthivyā́ḥ*, though I do not see a way to make that work. As for *pṛthivyā́ḥ*, I take it as a gen. with *gárbham* "embryo of the earth," though Agni is usually called the embryo of the plants or of the waters. Perhaps Agni is the embryo of the earth because the plants in which he is immanent are themselves products of the earth. As noted above, in the pregnancy reading of *bhárad gárbham* I take the unexpressed subj. to be the Earth herself. In the ritual reading "embryo of the earth" may signal the fact that the new Āhavanīya fire is being transported in a clay pot.

In c Ge and Re identify the horse neighing while being led as Agni; this would fit nicely with my hypothesis that b depicts the carrying of the Āhavanīya fire to the east, though neither of them takes b that way. Ge also identifies the bellowing cow of c as the Speech (*vā́k*) of d, which seems reasonable.

I.173.4: Old begins his n. on this verse with the cheerful comment "Wohl hoffnungslos," and it is well to bear this in mind. The difficulties are located in the first pāda, which is seriously deficient in syllables (at best 9, probably 8), has a bad cadence, and contains a hapax *á/āṣatarā* at which all tr. and comm. throw up their hands. The line is probably corrupt, and my attempts to fix it should be read with skepticism. The meter can be

ameliorated by assuming a haplology of acc. pl. *kárma* adjacent to the identical verb, 1st pl. *karma*: *tấ <kárma> karma* (or *tấ karma <kárma>*). [I now see that a similar haplology is proposed by WG in the n. to this passage.] (For a less dramatic proposed haplology in Agastya's oeuvre, see comm. ad I.180.3.) If we detach *á/ấṣatarā* from sandhi with the preceding word (contra HvN's *karmấṣatarā*), the line would have eleven syllables, though it still would have an irreparably bad cadence.

As for *á/ấṣatarā*, the only (more or less) clear thing about it is that it is a comparative in *-tara-*, probably agreeing with *tấ*. Ge [/WG] refuses to tr. it -- though in their n. WG render the passage tentatively as "Diese (Opfer)werke haben wir für ihn (gerade) zu den gesprenkelteren (bunter) gemacht." I do not understand what they are doing with *áṣatarā*, though the rest of the tr. reflects the haplology proposal above. Re tr. "plus forts," but without a note his reasons for this are lost; in his introduction to AiG I (p. 59) he comments that the word is "sans doute corrompu." AiG I.239 tr. 'annehmbarer' without further explanation and floats the possibility of "nicht rein ai. Ursprungs," a suggestion that Kuiper takes as fact (Aryans, 25). Mayrhofer refuses to speculate. I suggest, very tentatively, that it may be a dissimilated form of **ấṣṭa-tara-* 'more obtainable', built to the ppl. *aṣṭa-* to √*(n)aś* + *á*. The initial long vowel in my reconstruction is contra the Pp., but the preverb *á* is necessary to account for the initial accent and it is also the case that the ppl. to √*(n)aś* does not seem to appear uncompounded in Vedic.

If this gossamer suggestion is correct, then the first two pādas outline a two-step strategy: we have first perfomed the easier ritual requirements in a, but more concentrated attention is needed, and in b those fixated on the gods advance the ritual activities. The second half-verse predicts that Indra will look favorably on these efforts and will come to our ritual.

I.173.5: In its contexts *sátvan-* clearly refers to a successful warrior, but it is of course a possessive *-van*-stem to the neut. pres. part. to √*as* 'be', whose participle, lit. 'being', often has the extended sense 'actually being' → 'real'. I take the semantic dev. of *sátvan-* to be a slangy 'having the real stuff', 'the real thing'. Cf. the similar Engl. expression "the right stuff," the title of a novel by Tom Wolfe (and the movie based on it) about the astronauts in the space program. For another conjunction of *śū́ra-* and *sánt-* see 7a below. It is possible that *sát-pati-*, ordinarily interpreted as 'lord of settlements' (see comm. ad VIII.69.4), an analysis that is championed by Wackernagel in AiG II.1.55 (and goes back further), could also contain this slangy *sát-* and meaning 'master of the real thing/right stuff'. I am increasingly skeptical of the *sádas-* interpr. and open to a connection with *sánt-*.

Where to put *maghávā* is a minor question, since word order could support grouping it with *śū́raḥ* (Ge, WG), separating it from both *śū́raḥ* and *ratheṣṭhấḥ* (Re), or grouping it with *ratheṣṭhấḥ* (me). What I am now certain of is that making *maghávā* the primary focus of the rel. cl., with *ratheṣṭhấḥ* an adjunct, as I do in the publ. tr. ("who is a benefactor, standing upon his chariot"), is wrong, since the parallel relative clauses name Indra in various combat roles. I would now change my tr. to "who is a bounteous chariot-fighter" or "who is a chariot-fighter, a benefactor."

The acc. pl. pf. part. *vavavrúṣaḥ* simply shows perseveration of the redupl. syllable (so also Kü p. 456) for expected ** va-vr-uṣ-*. The additional reduplicating syllable

may have been added because the root syllable is swallowed up in the weak stem of the participle.

I.173.6: Pāda-final *bhūmā* with long *-ā* must nonetheless be sg., as Old points out.

The athem. root pres. *bhárti* is found only here and in VI.13.3; in neither case do I think it represents an inherited archaism (despite claims to the contrary). Here the use of the form is similar to that of the redupl. pres. *bíbharti* with items of clothing – as in VII.77.2 *vā́so bíbhratī* "(Dawn,) wearing a garment ..." I suggest we have a truncated form from **bíbharti* here. On the form in VI.13.3, see comm. there.

I.173.7: For *-ín*-stem superlative *prapathíntama-*, found also in VI.31.5, and *prápatha-* (4x, incl. nearby I.166.9), to which it is built, see comm. ad I.166.9.

Pāda c is problematic. The standard tr. take *kṣoṇī́ḥ* as subject, but this is grammatically problematic: *kṣoṇī́-* is fem., but the subj. of c is the most likely referent of masc. *yé* in d. The gender disagreement disturbs both Ge and Old; the best solution they can come up with is a constructio ad sensum. I therefore take *kṣoṇī́ḥ* as acc. pl. The problem then is the absence of a verb -- a problem also for those who take *kṣoṇī́ḥ* as nom. Ge uses the infinitive *paritaṃsayádhyai* from b, but I am reluctant to assume that kind of enjambement. Both Re and WG seem to do without a verb, allowing pāda c to dribble off unfulfilled into the rel. cl. of d. I supply a verb like 'direct, send', with no confidence in its correctness. As for the subj., I take it to be the warriors referred to by *samátsu ... satā́m* in pāda a, although Old considers this gekünstelt. If, on the other hand, *kṣoṇī́ḥ* is the subj., I would tr. "the battle cries [=opposing sides] (call out) to Indra ..."

Ge takes *sūríṃ cid* as a simile, with *cid* as the simile marker. As I've said elsewhere, I don't believe that *cid* ever has that function, a view in which I am joined by Old, I'm happy to say. (See his remarks on this passage.) The point here is rather that the people call upon Indra as a fighter in battle, but also call him a patron when he distributes the prizes won in battle: he fills both roles.

I.173.8: Ge's assessment that the vs. refers to the mixing of soma with water (a) and milk (b) seems correct. As often in soma contexts, the rhetoric is high-flown and the real-world references indirect.

The *āsú* of b must anticipate the cow(s) of c; it is presumably accented because its referent has not yet appeared in the discourse.

Both Ge and Re endow the gerundive *jóṣyā* with caus. pass. value 'to be satisfied' ("Jede zu befriedigende Kuh," "Toute vache propre à être satisfaite"), but even the "causative" *joṣáyate* doesn't have this value, but simply means 'enjoys'. The cows are surely there for Indra to enjoy them, not for him to labor to give them enjoyment.

Note that the idiom *ánu* √*mad* 'applaud' found in *anumádanti* in 7d is broken down into its components, with *mádanti* in our pāda b and *ánu* in c.

My tr. of *dhiṣā́* follows that of Pinault given orally at the Vedic Workshop at Univ. Texas, 2007.

I.173.9: The *yáthā* purpose clauses of this vs. are to be roughly construed with the initial *evā́* of 8a.

Inspired by Ge, I read instr. *ena* in two different ways, as accompaniment in pāda a and as indirect agent in b.

Note also the decomposed *narā́ṃ ná śáṃsaiḥ* (also 10a) recalling *nárā-śáṃsa-*. For further disc. of these expressions see comm. ad II.34.6 and VI.24.2.

The curious hapax *vandane-ṣṭhā́-* 'standing on praise' must be a play on the phonologically similar, likewise hapax *vandhure-ṣṭhā́-* 'standing on the chariot box' (III.43.1), which is modeled on the venerable *rathe-ṣṭhā́-* 'standing on the chariot', two forms of which appear earlier in this hymn (4d, 5b).

The part. *náyamāna(ḥ)* is identical to the form in 3c, but there the part. is clearly passive, and here such a reading is well-nigh impossible to impose. WG's tr. has a self-beneficial meaning, "indem er (seine) Preissprüche mit sich führt," but even that seems contextually difficult -- although I guess any praises Indra "leads" are ultimately for him. For leading song, see *gāthā-nī-* (I.190.1 [also Agastya], VIII.92.2), the latter also of Indra.

I.173.10: The vs. describes the competition between rival sides (either in battle or in ritual or both) to secure Indra for their side. I take it as depicting much the same situation as in vs. 7 (esp. 7b), where Indra is the object of a tug-of-war (*paritaṃsayádhyai*). I therefore interpr. Indra also as the target. of *madhyāyúvaḥ* 'seeking (one) in the middle' in 10d, contra Ge (/WG) for whom Agastya is the middle-man, the mediator.

As elsewhere (see III.52.6, X.42.2, 95.17), *úpa* triggers an acc. complement to *śikṣa-*, whose simplex forms only take the dative. The sense of the lexeme is 'seek to entice / attract here'.

My interpr. of the vs. requires some rearrangement of the elements, most particularly the phrase *narā́ṃ ná śáṃsaiḥ*, which I construe with the simile in c -- parallel to *yajñaíḥ* in the frame in d. Although this displacement may seem radical, neither Ge's "Im Wetteifer geratend wie durch das Lob der Herren ..." (sim. WG) nor Re's "(Soyons) en rivalité comme par l'effet des paroles-qualifiantes des seigneurs ..." makes any sense to me.

This passage is one of the comparatively few where a real modal value of the subjunctive might be preferable to the expectant future: "let/may Indra be ours," rather than the publ. tr. "Indra will be ours." Perhaps adjusting the English to "shall be ours" will do the trick. The subjunctive may express the speakers' certainty that their sacrifices will be successful and exercise control over Indra's actions. This seems to be the point of the next vs.

I.173.11: As indicated in the publ. intr., the syntax of this vs. mimics the meandering attributed to the finally successful sacrifice and the long road that brings a man home. One of the striking features of the word order (at least in my interpr. and Ge's) is that *índram* behaves almost like a Wackernagel's Law clitic, in taking modified 2nd position in pāda a, though it is to be construed with *ókaḥ ... ā́ kṛṇoti* in cd. One factor that might impede that interpr. is that, as Old points out, the finite verb *kṛṇoti* in d is not accented, despite the *hí* in pāda a. Old feels that the end of the verse is no longer governed by *hí*. I would suggest rather that the rambling road the vs. has traveled from its beginning, including two complex similes, led the poet to forget or dismiss the *hí* with which he began.

I take *juhurāṇá-* to √*hvṛ* / *hru* 'go crookedly, go astray' (with Ge and Re, as well as Gr), rather than with √*hṛ* 'be angry' with Insler (JAOS 88, 1968), apparently followed by WG: "wenn es (das Opfer) auch erzürnt im Denken Umwege macht." The parallel participle *pariyán* 'going around, meandering' supports this identification, and it is somewhat difficult to imagine why/how a sacrifice would be (or make) angry. Agastya uses the same participle in the same sense in I.189.1.

I.173.12: The first pāda, beginning with a *mā́* prohibitive, lacks a verb, but something like "(get) us (involved) / (drag) us (into)" is likely. Perhaps Agastya delicately omitted it to avoid insulting Indra too explicitly.

On *avayā́ḥ* and the verse in general see also Scar's extensive disc. (404–6, esp. 406).

I.173.13: Pāda b could also be "find the way for us" (so Ge [/WG]). On the multivalence of *vidaḥ* see comm. ad I.42.7–9 and IX.20.3.

I.174 Indra

Agastya indulges in a certain amount of skewed ring composition and verbal echoes in this hymn. See, e.g., 1d / 10c *sahodā́ḥ*; 1c *nṝ́n pāhí* (though this syntagm is only apparent; see comm. ad loc.) / 10b *narā́m nṛpātā́*; 1b *asmā́n* / 10a *asmā́kam*; 2c / 9b *ṛṇór apáḥ*, 2a *mṛdhrávācaḥ* / 7d *kúyavācam mṛdhí*; 2b *púraḥ ... dart* / 8c *bhinát púraḥ*; 4a *śéṣan ... yónau* / 7d *duryoṇé śret*, as well as the triple figure with *śū́ra-* disc. ad vs. 6.

I.174.1: All the standard tr. (also, e.g., Schlerath, *Königtum* 143, Hale *Asura-* 70, Oberlies *ReligRV* II.177) construe the rel. cl. *yé ca devā́(ḥ)* loosely (*very* loosely) with *rā́jā* (e.g., Ge "Du, Indra, bist der König über alle Götter," which entails not only assuming that *rā́jā* can govern such a clause, but also ignoring the *ca*). Within the same general interpr. framework WG do try to account for the *ca:* "... der König über (alle), auch die die Götter sind." This can all be avoided by interpr. the rel. cl. as part of the familiar syntagm "X and which Y," but in an inverse version with the conjoined rel. cl. first (rather like the inverse Vāyav Indraś ca construction with the *ca* constituent first): *yé ca devā́ḥ, ... nṝ́n*. Re, fld by Klein (DGRV I.127), does interpret it as an "X and which Y construction," but supplies a gen. "of mortals" with *rā́jā*: "... le roi (des hommes) et de (ceux) qui (sont) les dieux." This is unnec. because *rákṣā* can govern the conjoined NP. It is accented because it opens the pāda. Another intricate "X and which Y" construction is found in vs. 3 (by my interpr).

WG unaccountably take *rákṣā* absolutely and construe *nṝ́n* with *pāhí*, which is ungrammatical because *pāhí* is accented; its object (*asmā́n*) follows. But note that the surface syntagm *nṝ́n pāhí* is echoed in 10b *narā́m nṛpātā́*.

Acdg. to Hale (70), Indra is referred to as an *ásura-* only 4x in the RV; it is possible that the occurrence here is connected to the elaborate play on *śū́ra-*, on which see comm. ad vs. 6.

Notice the openings of cd, #*tvā́m sát(patir) ...*, #*tvā́m sat(yó) ...*

I.174.2: The derivation of the 2nd sg. verb *dánaḥ* is unclear. Most (see EWA s.v. *DAM*[I]) associate it one way or another with √*dam* 'tame, subdue' -- beginning with Sāy.'s gloss

adamayaḥ. Old and Ge suggest that there is a by-root *dan* beside *dam*; Re (GLV 81) concurs that it belongs to a "fausse racine," probably generated from athematic forms where the root-final would have been followed by an ending beginning with a dental (type 2nd-3rd sg. *ágan* to √*gam*). Bloomfield (153) suggests it's a nonce blending of √*dam* and √*han*. I wonder if it is not the detritus of the expected 9th cl. pres. **damnā́ti*, which would be cognate with nasal presents elsewhere in Indo-European and is the stem underlying attested *damāyá-* (< **d(a)m-n-H-yé/ó-*) and *damanya-*. In our 2nd sg. injunc., expected **damnā́s*, the interior nasal cluster could have been simplified and the whole remodeled as a thematic form (unfortunately requiring also accent retraction). Better, in fact: **damnā́ti* might not be the expected form; a reconstructed **dm-ne-H-ti* without restoration of a full-grade root syllable should yield **danā́ti*, which would have lost its obvious root connection with √*dam* and could without too much difficulty be remodeled to the thematic stem we appear to have. The 9th class *ramṇā́ti* would have pursued a different remodeling path.

In their n. WG suggest an unlikely deriv. from √*dā* 'divide', with an **-éno-* nominal suffix, hence "Der ist Abtrenner des nachlässig redenden Stammes," taking the nominals as gen. sg. rather than acc. pl. (as is grammatically possible). The only advantage I see to this is that it works better with the ostensible 3rd sg. *dárt* in b, but there are other ways to handle that form.

As was just noted, the verb of b, pāda-final *dart* (√*dṛ*), appears to be a 3rd sg., in an otherwise 2nd sg. vs. It also ends in a (more or less) illicit cluster (*-rt*, with non-radical *-t*). With Old I assume that the original form was **daḥ* (< **dar* <**dar-s*). A final *-t* was falsely restored, possibly redactionally, on the basis of the identical pāda in VI.20.10c, where the 3rd sg. is appropriate and the sandhi situation favors the retention of the *-t*. See comm. there.

Note the double phonetic figure in *śárma śā́radīr dart*, with *śárma śā́ra-* and *-dīr dart* responding to each other.

Note the phonetic play in #*ṛṇór ... árṇā(ḥ)*#.

Purukutsa is chronologically out of place here. Elsewhere he is a semi-historical figure, the father of Trasadasyu and a contemporary of Sudās, so Vṛtra should be out of his league and his time period. But he does figure in VI.20.10, immediately after the pāda identical to our b: VI.20.10d *hán dā́sīḥ purukútsāya śikṣan* "He [=Indra] smote the Dāsa (clans), doing his best for Purukutsa," where the action described can be contemporary (or in the immediate past) and therefore chronologically possible. I think it likely that Purukutsa has been imported from VI.20.10 to anticipate the more properly mythological Kutsa in vs. 5. These two agreements with VI.20.10 support each other and are good evidence for the dependence of our vs. on that vs.

I.174.3: Ge suggests that the *śū́ra-* in *śū́rapatnīḥ* 'whose lord is a champion' is Indra himself, which seems correct. Note that Indra is addressed as *śū́ra* in vs. 9; see also comm. on *śū́rtá-* in vs. 6.

Ge (/WG) takes *vṛ́taḥ ... dyā́ṃ ca* as the conjoined obj. of *ájā* 'drive'; the two objects are then picked up by *yébhiḥ* (Ge: "Führe die Heere ... und den Himmel, mit denen ..."). The problem (besides the question of whether it's possible or desirable to drive heaven anywhere) is that *vṛ́taḥ* is fem. pl. and *dyā́m* is masc. sg., and *yébhiḥ* is neither one. I follow Old's interpr., also adopted by Re, that sees an "X and which Y"

constr. -- with the twist that the *ca* does not follow the rel. prn. (as in *yé ca devā́ḥ* in 1a), but precedes it, with another part of the rel. cl. fronted around it (*dyā́ṃ ca yébhiḥ*).

By either interpr. the rel. cl. lacks a verb. Old, Re, and I supply 'gain, conquer' with heaven as obj. (And in keeping with the constant theme of these Agastya hymns, I assume the referent of *yébhiḥ* is the Maruts; Old simply "die Leute"; Re doesn't specify.) Ge [/WG] "verbündet bist," which seems kind of weak.

Initial *rákṣo* in c is Pragṛhya in the Pp., presumably 2nd sg. impv. *rákṣa* + *u*.

The standard tr. take *aśúṣaṃ tū́rvayānam* as two PNs, but I see no reason to. As noted in the comm. ad I.101.2, *aśúṣa-* is otherwise only used of the demon Śuṣṇa, but this strong association surely results from their phonetic similarity. Semantically it fits Agni quite well. As for *tū́rvayāna-* it is sometimes a PN (e.g., I.53.10), but its first member must be based on the verb stem *tū́rvati* 'go in triumph' vel sim., and the literal sense of the compound is appropriate for Agni. See the very similar analytic phrase VI.15.5 *tū́rvan ná yā́man* "like the one going in triumph on his course," where Agni is the referent.

There is difference of opinion on how the simile works in d. Flg. Old, Re, and the line of least resistance, I resupply the verb *rákṣa* from c, maintaining Indra as subj., compared to a lion. Ge (/WG) take the subj. as Agni and then must supply another verb, not available in the context. This seems like too much machinery to me, since the pāda is readily interpretable on the syntactic pattern in c.

I.174.4: Ge takes ab as a direct quote (uttered by unidentified speakers). He presumably does this because of the difference in tense/mood (subjunctive vs. injunctive) and person (2nd vs. 3rd) between ab and cd. But since such switches are common in the RV, the direct speech does not seem necessary or contextually supported.

I.174.5: One of the few "future imperatives" in the RV: *vṛhatāt* in c, following *váha* in pāda a. Ge and Re also supply an impv. in b ("lenke," "attele"), but this pāda makes a fine nominal clause (so also Hoffmann, Inj., 190).

I.174.6: This vs. joins Indra's overwhelming aggressive power with the moral force of the three principal Ādityas. Those who offend against the strictures of the Ādityas get utterly destroyed by Indra, in a partnership that one might expect to be more prominent in the RV; X.89.9, adduced by Old, shows the same cooperative enterprise in clearer form.

I take the pf. part. *jaghanvā́n* here as the equivalent of a pluperfect (in the English grammatical sense), a past anterior, since there are no finite forms with that function.

The standard tr. take both *mitréru-* and *codá-* as PNs. This is certainly the easy, and tempting, way out. But both can be (and in my opinion should be) given lexical weight. The easier one is *codá-*, a transparent derivative of √*cud* 'bestir, incite'. Gr's interpr. of the compound (< Roth), that *codá-* 'inciting, goading' is used of soma, makes good sense in context, since Indra performs his feats of strength under the influence of soma.

As for *mitréru-*, my interpr. is based on, but modifies, Old's suggested *mitrā-íru-* "die Mitra (zur Rache ihrer Treulosigkeit) in Bewegung setzen." He seems to envision the god Mitra being sent to punish the disloyal, but those who send Mitra to effect this punishment should be on the side of good, not subject to Indra's smiting as here. I take *mitra-* here as the common noun 'ally" and the *-īr(u)-* as expressing a hostile dispatching

of their erstwhile allies. Both those who dishonor their alliances in this way and those who lack piety (*ádāsūn*, b) violate the norms of Ārya society that are overseen by the Ādityas.

Although of the trio of principal Ādityas only Aryaman is named in this vs., Mitra lurks in the compound just discussed. Varuṇa, unnamed, is present along with Mitra in the dual pronoun *ayóḥ* (in *sácāyóḥ*; see the same sequence in III.54.2). Although the Pp reads *āyóḥ* and Ge accepts this reading (though see his n. 6c), I follow Old's alternative analysis (so also Re, WG) as gen. du. demon. *ayóḥ* and his identification of the two as Mitra and Varuṇa. I assume that "saw before them Aryaman with those two" implies that the evil-doers have a vision of the three Ādityas sitting in judgment (vel sim.) before Indra destroys them.

śūrtá- is generally taken with *śṛṇā́ti* 'crushes', etc. (√*śṝ*), but the vocalism is surprising; we would expect **śīrtá-*, like AV *śīṛṇá-*. Alternatively JC (as yet unpubl. paper on rounding of syllabic liquids in IIr.) suggests (modifying an old idea of Hopkins) that *śūrtá-* is a nonce creation to a pseudo-root √*śūr*, extracted from *śū́ra-* 'hero'. The apparent ppl. *śūrtá-* is positioned in this hymn approx. halfway between *śū́ra-patnīḥ* in 3 and the voc. *śūra* in 9c, another ex. of Agastya's somewhat skewed ring composition in this hymn. One can almost see Indra earning his champion-hood: in vs. 3 he is indirectly called a *śū́ra-*; in our vs. he exercises the *śūr* that (playfully) underlies the designation *śū́ra-*; in 9 he can therefore be so addressed. Note that this *śūr* phonological figure may be supported by phonetically similar *asura* addressed to Indra in 1b and *sū́raḥ* 'of the sun' in 5c. I am persuaded by Clayton's disc., esp. since this is exactly the sort of thing that Agastya would do. How to render *śūrtá-* in English as a passive is difficult: "they were be-be-championed / overrun by a champion" doesn't work. JC tentatively tr. 'were conquered'; I might stick with the publ. tr., though it is misleading about root affiliation.

I.174.7: As often in a mythological context, *kaví-* by itself seems to refer to Uśanā Kāvya. The previous mention (vs. 5) of Kutsa, often associated with UK, supports this assumption.

arkásātau probably has a double sense. In the ritual context the *arká-* are the chants (see nearby I.176.5), but in the mythological context supplied by vs. 5 (esp. c), it can be the rays of the sun. So VI.26.3, which contains both UK and Kutsa.

"Making earth a pillow" is surely a euphemism for sending him to "his eternal rest," "putting him to sleep" among other such sayings. The "woeful womb" of d is a similar expression. Both remind us of 4a "they will now lie in the same womb," clearly also referring to the grave.

Ge tentatively takes the referent of fem. "three" (*tisráḥ*) as rivers, and he is followed by Re and WG. Although this identification handles the gender and the fact that the adj. *dā́nucitra-* (3x) is once used of waters (V.31.6), it runs into the problem that the canonical number of rivers is seven, not three. It is rather the divisions of the world/earth that are regularly triadic; cf. fem. *tisráḥ pṛthivī́ḥ* (I.34.8), *tisró bhū́mīḥ* (II.27.8). Although "bright with drops" may not be the most natural way of referring to the three worlds, I think the numerology trumps the adjective -- which could, in fact, mean 'bright with gifts', not 'drops'.

Ge takes the loc. *mṛdhí* as parallel to loc. *duryoṇé* ("in ein böses Nest, in Missachtung"), and as so often he is followed by Re and WG; all of them also take

kúyavācam as a PN. But given *mṛdhrávācaḥ* 'of scornful speech' in 2a, it seems better to give *kúyavāc-* lexical value and construe it with *mṛdhí*.

I.174.8: There is much disagreement about the first hemistich because of the uncertain grammatical identity of several forms as well as a sandhi problem in pāda a and a hapax in b. Let us begin with the sandhi problem. The clear neut. pl. *sánā tấ* "those old (things [=deeds?])" that opens the verse seems rhetorically paired with *návyā* 'new' towards the end of the pāda, but in its sandhi situation, before vowel-initial *ấguḥ*, *návyā* should underlyingly end in *-āḥ*, a masc. nom. pl. or fem. nom./acc. pl. (so Pp). Most standard tr. try to reflect this sandhi one way or another: Ge takes the ref. to be *nábhaḥ* in b, which he takes as a fem. pl. root noun *nábh-*. But "These are your old (deeds). New (clouds) have come" is, with all due respect to Ge, absurd. Old takes both *sáhaḥ* and *nábhaḥ* of b (with better semantics than 'clouds' -- viz., "neue Siege und Berstungen") as the referent of *návyā(ḥ)*, though he does show some sympathy with Gr's suggestion that *návyā* is the neut. pl. we want, in hiatus. Re supplies "hymns" with *návyā(ḥ) ... nábhaḥ*, which has no contextual support. Only WG, at least by implication, allow the neut. pl. interpr.: "Alt sind diese deine (Heldentaten), o Indra. Neue sind (gerade) (hinzu)gekommen." I think this is the only sensible way to interpret the passage: rhetorical patterning outweighs sandhi. The same hiatus of *návyā* before a vowel is found in V.29.15 *yấ ... návyā ákarma*, where two vss. before (V.29.13) *yấ ... návyā kṛṇávaḥ* essentially guarantees the neut. pl. interpr.

The fem. pl. interpr. of *návyā(ḥ)* is even less likely if *sáhaḥ* and/or *nábhaḥ* are not taken as fem. pl. root nouns. As already noted, Old does so take them, and Ge has the same analysis of *nábhaḥ*, but not *sáhaḥ*, which he appears to take as a 2nd sg. verb in imperatival usage. Re takes *nábhaḥ* as a fem. pl. adj. and *sáhaḥ* as the neut. sg. of the *s*-stem; for WG *sáhaḥ* is a nom. pl. fem. to a root noun and *nábhaḥ* a gen. sg., also to a root noun, dependent on *áviraṇāya*. The lack of agreement on basic grammatical identity almost reminds us of the interpretive chaos created by the Old Avestan Gāthas. For my part I take both *sáhaḥ* and *nábhaḥ* as 2nd sg. injunctives -- *sáhas* as the only act. finite form of the thematic stem *sáha-* (though cf. part. *sáhant-*), which is fairly well attested in the middle; *nábhaḥ* as the act. transitive corresponding to med. intransitive 3rd pl. impv. *nábhantām* "let them burst," found esp. in the famous Nābhāka refrain (VIII.39-42). The fact that the next two pādas (8c, 8d) open with 2nd sg. injunctives (*bhinát* and *nanámaḥ* respectively) and that I.173 is characterized by pāda-initial *3rd* sg. injunctives (see comm. above) supports the verbal interpr.

As for the rest of pāda b, I supply 'strongholds' (*púraḥ*) from pāda c with *pūrvī́ḥ*, as in, e.g., I.63.2, II.14.6. The hapax *áviraṇa-* I take as containing *ráṇa-* 'joy' / 'battle', with both meanings in play in the cmpd. The form contains both the privative *a-* and what I consider a pleonastic *ví*, both meaning 'without'. Although these elements might be expected to cancel each other out ("not without joy/battle"), I think the *ví* is included to allow a buried pun on *avī́ra-*, suggesting "for their unmanning" in addition to "for lack of joy / for non-battle [=end of battle]." The godless are supplied from the 2nd hemistich.

After the travails of ab, the rest of the verse is fairly straightforward. I supply *víśaḥ* 'clans' with *ádevīḥ* on the basis of the occurrence of this expression elsewhere (e.g., VI.49.15) and take *bhídaḥ* (which, unlike the two *-aḥ* forms in b, I do interpr as the acc. pl. of a root noun) as a kind of proleptic cognate acc. with *bhinát*: "split ... into

smithereens." I would in fact now substitute this more colorful expression for the publ. tr. "split into pieces."

I.174.9: This vs. is identical to VI.20.12. This connection, in addition to the identical pāda I.174.2b=VI.20.10c establishes a relationship between the two hymns that makes the dependence of *dart* in our 2b on the one in VI.20.10c more likely.

The apparent *-si* impv. betrays its origins as an *s*-aor. subjunctive by appearing here in a subordinate clause, where impvs. are not licit.

I.175 Indra

I.175.1: The simile and frame in 1ab seem on the surface somewhat flat-footed, and the standard tr. try to fix it one way or another. Both Ge and Re take the simile to be *máhaḥ, pā́trasyeva* (e.g., Re: "telle la grandeur de la coupe-à-boire"), with *mádaḥ* the frame ("A été-juste bu ... le breuvage-d'ivresse ..."). But this requires the simile to straddle the pāda boundary, with the simile marker *iva* in the wrong place. I think it is instead a sort of reverse simile, with the actual object (*mádah* 'exhilarating drink") put into the simile and the element in the frame what one would expect it to be compared to (*máhaḥ* 'might') "might has been drunk like an exhilarating drink." Such a poetic trick should not be utilized too often, but the reversal of expectations is a bracing way to begin the hymn.

I.175.4: As noted in the publ. intro., the poet (*kave*) addressed here is surely Uśanā Kāvya.

I.176 Indra

I.176.1: Pāda b contains a pleasing if elementary figure *índram indo vṛ́ṣā viśa*.

śátrum opening d is neatly positioned so that it can serve as obj. both to *invasi* and to *vindasi*; note that these verbs rhyme and their root syllables are almost mirror images of each other.

I.176.2: The syntax of the simile in cd is surprisingly intricate. First, though *ánu svadhā́m* [/*svadhā́m ánu*] is a common syntagm ("following / in accord with (one's) independent will," e.g., I.33.11, 88.6, 165.5), the two words are not to be construed together here (sim. V.34.1). However, their common association probably accounts for the displacement of the rel. *yám* to the right of *svadhā́* even though *ánu* governs *yám*. Further, though *yávam* 'grain' in the simile logically matches *svadhā́* in the frame (at least in my interpr.), they are in different cases: nom. and acc. respectively (*yáva-* is masc. and must be acc.). The acc. is due to the fact that *yáva-* is several times obj. of √*kṛṣ* 'plough' (I.23.15, VIII.22.6). Thus, though, given the way Sanskrit similes work (with the verb held constant and the nominal elements matched), *yáva-* should be nominative, the presence of the part. *cárkṛṣat* 'ploughing' has attracted it into the acc. appropriate to the obj. of that verb. The various tr. treat this difficult construction in various ways, but mostly bleach or manipulate the meaning of the pass. *upyáte* in ways that seem illegitimate to me -- starting with Gr, who glosses *ánu ... upyáte* first as 'sich jemandem nachwerfen' but then waters this down to 'nachgehen, nacheilen'. Ge's "dem die Svadhā nachzieht" essentially

follows Gr's lead, an interpr. that makes nonsense of the simile ("wie der pflügende Stier der Gerste"), since the animal ploughing does not *follow* the sown grain but necessarily precedes it. (Without a ploughed furrow, there's no place to sow.) WG give *upyáte* its due lexical value, but this again twists the simile into semantic knots: as with Ge's interpr. the nom. bull (*vṛ́ṣā*) is made parallel to nom. *svadhā́* in syntactically satisfactory fashion, but this means that the bull is being sown, which is not at all *semantically* satisfactory: "dem hinterher die Svadhā gesät wird, wie der Stier der die Gerste pflügt." Only Re seems to manage both syntax and sense, though his tr. introduces considerable machinery: "lui derrière qui (sa propre) autonomie est semée comme (on fait en) labourant (le champ d') orge, (lui que est) le dieu mâle."

What the hemistich is conveying is another issue. I do not understand how *svadhā́-* can be strewn. The picture evoked by the simile is of a powerful bull (not the usual plough-animal -- ideally they are more docile) pulling a plough, with lavish amounts of grain being scattered in the resulting furrow. It could be that the *svadhā́-* refers to the autonomous power of others, which gives way to (/is strewn down after) the progress of Indra the bull. Or his own *svadhā́-* is metaphorically sown to bear fruit in due course. But neither of these explanations do I find convincing.

I.176.3: On the specific nuance of *spāśáyasva*, with the root variant *spaś* (versus *paś*, so common in *páśyati*) and middle voice (again, versus *páśyati*), see Jamison (-áya-, 167).

I.176.4: I take *sūríś cid ohate* as logically concessive, with this value signaled by *cid*, although I would prefer an accented verb.

I.176.5: This vs. has elicited an extraordinary amount of discussion and disagreement, which cannot be fully rehearsed here. I will only sketch my own interpr., which is closest to Old's. I take the *ā́vaḥ* that opens the verse as the verb of the main clause and the only surface word of that clause. The obj. 'him' (**tám*), referent of the following rel. prn., has been gapped, exactly as in 3c. The cmpd. *sānuṣák* in b I analyze as *sā́nu-ṣác-* (rather than *sa-ānuṣák-* with Gr and others); it is a reference to soma, which famously grows in the mountains. For detailed disc. of the cmpd and the passage see Scar (594), though I cannot follow his suggestion that the 2nd member belongs to √*sañj* 'hang' and refers to a quiver 'hanging on the back'.

In d the publ. tr. "helped him to prizes" goes a little too fluently into English. The loc. *vā́jeṣu* might better be taken as the usual truncated loc. absol. "when prizes (were at stake)."

Most other tr. take c with ab, with d separate, whereas I attach c to d. There is no way to tell, but I think the contrast set up here is between the ritual (signalled by the loc. *arkéṣu* "at the chants"), where Indra will receive what he wants (soma), and the contest (*ājaú*), where Indra's client will do so.

I.177 Indra

I.177.1, 3, 4: The appearance of two instances of the gerund *yuktvā́* and one of *niṣádya* may be a sign of the hymn's lateness since the gerund is quite marginal in the RV.

I.177.3: The hemistich-internal enjambment in ab -- *... vṛ́ṣā te, sutáḥ sómaḥ ...* -- is noteworthy, esp. because b is a repeated pāda (VII.24.2b), and in its other occurrence the pāda is syntactically self-contained. In fact, WG tr. the two pādas separately here, with *vṛ́ṣā* in pāda a referring to Indra and *te* a gen. with *rátham*: "Auf deinen stierhaften Streitwagen steige als Stierhafter." This isn't impossible, but the other interpr. (fld. by Ge and Re) seems more natural.

I.177.5: Ge takes *vástoḥ* as dependent on *vidyā́ma* ("Wir Lobsänger möchten ... den neuen Tag erleben"), but *vástoḥ* is almost always a temporal marker elsewhere (e.g., in nearby I.179.1). I think rather that *vidyā́ma* simply anticipates the identical verb that opens the refrain pāda. For further disc., see comm. ad VI.24.9, whose pāda c is identical to our c (also X.89.17).

I.178 Indra

I.178.1: The crucial word *śruṣṭí-* is ambiguous: it may refer to the attentive hearing Indra gives to our praises and desires or to the obedience (based on *our* "attentive hearing") that we have shown towards Indra. The publ. tr. reflects the first possibility, but I think both may be meant, though Indra's role as a hearer in 3b may support the first interpr. The other exx. of *śruṣṭí-* are not clearly diagnostic.

Ge takes "us" (*naḥ*) as the implicit obj. of *mahā́yantam* ("der uns gross macht"), but *mahā́ya-* ordinarily takes a god (indeed ordinarily Indra) as obj., and most tr. so render it.

For the difficult phrase *páry ā́pa āyóḥ*, see publ. intro. It is variously rendered in the standard tr.

I.178.2: See publ. intro. for the mismatch in b between the dual subj. *svásārā* and the pl. verb *kṛṇávanta*, with the possible semantic explanations given there (multiple days and nights or multiple fingers on the two hands). It's also worth noting that the verb we expect, the middle 3rd dual athematic subjunctive, may not have been thoroughly anchored in the poets' Sprachgefühl, since relatively few such forms are attested to any stem type. We should expect **kṛṇávaite* (or *-ete*), which is not found, though we once get *kṛṇvaíte* (VI.25.4) with the wrong grade of the subjunctive suffix. In the absence of a firmly established form in this slot in the paradigm, the poet may have opted to fall back on a more familiar and easily generated one, the 3rd pl.

Gr assigns *aveṣan* to a separate root √*viṣ* 'sich ergiessen', not to the well-attested √*viṣ* 'labor'. This division is tentatively accepted by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *VEṢ*), argued for by Narten (s-aor., 245), and accepted by Gotō (1st class, 299). The tr. of both Ge and WG reflect this analysis, though Re's does not. Since 'labor, toil' works fine for the three forms that Gr assigns to this other root (nearby I.181.6 and VIII.75.11 in addition to this one) and for the one added by Narten (X.114.1), I see no reason to make the separation.

Ge unaccountably tr. *sakhyā́ váyaś ca* as instr. The reasons he gives (n. 2d) seem insufficient, esp. as a conjoined acc. phrase makes perfect sense.

I.178.3: For the odd position of *ca* see Klein DGRV I.75.

I.179 Agastya and Lopāmudrā

I.179.1: The first hemistich contains a predicated perfect participle *śaśramāṇā́*.

I.179.1–2: The final pādas of these two verses depict a neatly contrasting sexual conjunction, with the males serving as subject of the first version and the wives the second. The pādas are almost identical (an effect difficult to convey in English), with only the initial preverb in tmesis and the form of 'bulls' differing, since the form of "wives," though acc. in 1d and nom. in 2d, is the same:

1d *ápy ū nú pátnīr vṛ́ṣaṇo jagamyuḥ*

2d *sám ū nú pátnīr vṛ́ṣabhir jagamyuḥ*

Both seem to convey a legalistic prescriptive force. See disc. ad X.10.3.

I.179.3: I take the first two of the three 1st du. subjunctives (b *abhy áśnavāva*, c *jáyāva*, d *abhy ájāva*) as hortatory, with the third, in a subordinate clause, as future in value.

Pāda d has been variously interpreted. The major issue is what (if anything) is the object of *abhy ájāva*, a problem made slightly more acute by the fact that *abhí* is not otherwise found with √*aj* until the ŚB (see Ge n. 3cd), making it likely that it owes its *abhí* to the parallel verb in 3b, *abhy áśnavāva*. Thieme's solution (Gedichte 76) is the most radical: he makes the duals *samyáñcā mithunaú* the object: "wenn wir die beiden [Heer-]Hälften dem gleichen Ziel entgegenführen," seeing Agastya and Lopāmudrā as leading two different wings of a metaphorical army. This is not impossible, but the fact that the duals are so appropriate to be the dual subject makes assigning them elsewhere seem somewhat perverse. Other tr. suggest other objects: Ge, on the basis of ŚB II.3.3.16, supplies 'ship', Re (and WG) 'chariot' (WG 'Rennwagen'). Re tentatively specifies "le char de la vie?"; I would suggest rather the chariot of the sacrifice, given that that image is extremely common and that Agastya seems to be trying to redirect Lopāmudrā's energy into ritual pursuits. However, I'm not sure that any object needs to be supplied; the publ. tr. reflects an absolute usage 'drive on'. Another small issue is the sense of *mithunaú*. For Insler (Vedic *mith*, 165), it is used contrastively with *samyáñcā*: "if we, who are now opposed, shall race on in harmony." But the standard use of *mithunaú* to refer to the complementary oppositional halves of a pair, esp. a married couple, makes this otherwise appealing reading less likely.

Note the phonetic echo: c *ājím* # / d *ájāva* #.

I.179.4: As noted in the publ. intro., with the Anukramaṇī and Sāyaṇa as well as Thieme, I take Agastya as the speaker of this vs., contra the standard modern assignment to Lopāmudrā (Ge, Re, Doniger, WG). The question is of some importance, because it determines the identity of the "me" whom desire has overcome. I see the verse as expressing Agastya's sudden surrender to his own latent and then aroused sexual desire; others must see Lopāmudrā as continuing to assert her desire as in vss. 1–2 to the chaste Agastya. But in that case I don't see how the sex would have taken place, since Agastya was unwaveringly against it in vs. 3. Certainly assigning it to Agastya makes for a more psychologically complex portrait.

Crucial to the interpr. that assigns the verse to Lopāmudrā is the syntactic function of the gen. phrase *nádasya ... rudhatáḥ* and the meaning of the part. *rudhánt-*. In the

Lopāmudrā-speaker view the genitive is an objective genitive: "lust *for* the *náda-rudhánt-* has come to me [=Lopāmudrā]." The participle then belongs to √*rudh* 'obstruct' and refers either to Agastya's ascetic self-control by withholding his semen (Ge flg. Sāy, Doniger) or to his warding off the importunate advances of his wife (WG). In the Agastya-speaker view the genitive is subjective and the participle belongs to √*rudh* 'grow, mount'. Although Re claims that 'grow' is "faiblement attesté" for *rudh*, "feebly" isn't "not," and in any case the attestation is more robust than Re seems to recognize. With the 'grow, mount' meaning, *nádasya ... rudhatáḥ* is a pun: the mounting bull (*nadá-*) and the growing reed (likewise *nadá-*), with the latter a metaphor for the penis. For a somewhat indecisive disc. of the possible meanings of the phrase see Old.

I.179.5: As Thieme points out, the last pāda, "for of many desires is mortal man," bears the mark of a popular saying, with the *l*-form *pulu-* in place of standard *puru-* 'many' in *pulu-kā́maḥ*. *pulu-* is found only once elsewhere in the RV, in *pulv-aghá-* in the Vṛṣākapi hymn (X.86.22), which also belongs to a more vernacular register.

I.180 Aśvins

I.180.1: Contra Ge (/WG) I supply 'honey' as the obj. of *pruṣāyan* on the basis of IV.43.5 ... *mádhu vām pruṣāyan*, etc.; it can be recovered contextually from pāda d.

I.180.2: This is a difficult verse to construe, primarily because of the anomalous *yád* that ends pāda a. It cannot (or should not) mark that pāda as a subordinate clause because the verb *nakṣathaḥ* is unaccented. But if it is taken as marking what immediately follows as a subordinate clause, this is awkward at best, because the gen. phrase of b should simply specify the gen. *átyasya* in a. The Ge (/WG) solution is to supply an acc. goal for *nakṣathaḥ* ("Schnelligkeit"), which is picked up by the *yád* and the following genitive phrase: "reach (the speed) of the steed, which (speed) (is) of the ..." Old suggests that the *yád* that should subordinate pāda d has simply been stuck in early at the end of pāda a for metrical reasons -- an unlikely tyro's error for a skilled poet like Agastya and an interpretational hypothesis that essentially tells us that all bets are off in Rigvedic syntax. This is not a worthy representative of Old's usual acumen. Re suggests either the Ge solution or an anticipation of the *yád* of c.

There is a much simpler solution, which avoids these syntactic contortions and also avoids the need to supply an acc. goal with *nakṣathaḥ* or to allow *áva* √*nakṣ* to take a goal in the genitive. The solution is to take *yád* (/*yát*) as the substantivized neuter NA sg. of the present participle to √*i* 'go' ('going' → 'movement'); for a similar interpr. see *āyát* in III.55.8 and also vs. 3c below. It is the goal of the verb, and the genitives of ab are dependent on it; there is then no syntactic break between the pādas. Hence my tr. "You descend to the movement of the steed ..."

Contra Ge, I do not think that the first member of *vípatman-* is *ví-* 'bird', but, with Gr, etc., the preverb *ví-*. The lexeme *ví* √*pat* is found elsewhere, incl. in an Agastya hymn I.168.6.

Ge (sim. Gr, WG) suggests that the referent of the genitives is the Sonnenrosse or Dadhikrāvan. This does not fit spatially with the *áva* 'down' of *áva nakṣathaḥ*. I think rather of the ritual fire: Agni is often compared to an *átya-*; 'of wide flight' would well

describe the movements of the newly kindled fire; although I could not identify an unambiguous example of *nárya-* referring to Agni, 'belong to men, manly' is a reasonable description of his role; as is *práyajyu-* 'foremost at the sacrifice', which is applied to Agni at III.6.2. Reference to the ritual fire also makes sense in the context of the second hemistich where Dawn escorts the Aśvins to the sacrifice and a ritual officiant (to be supplied) solemnly invokes (*ī́ṭṭe*) them. The root √*īḍ* is essentially restricted to such ritual situations.

I.180.3: The construction of this vs. is, if anything, even more challenging than the previous one, at least in its second half. As noted in the publ. intro., the first half concerns the favorite paradox of the "cooked" milk coming from the raw cow. My only deviation from the standard tr. is to take account of the odd position of *áva* in b, which I take to signal a transition from a general statement about the paradoxical nature of milk to a particular statement about the ritual situation. I re-supply *adhattam* with *áva*, but here it refers to the deposit of the ritual milk *down* on the ritual ground.

The problems lie in the 2nd hemistich, and the knottiest one is posed by the apparent mismatch between the case of the simile and its supposed correspondent in the frame. To allow Ge's tr. to represent the standard, he takes *yád* in c as a neut. acc. referring to the milk of the previous hemistich and functioning as obj. to *yajāte* in d (roughly, "which (milk) the oblation-offerer sacrifices to you"). But the milk is also compared to the undoubted nominative phrase *hvāró ná śúciḥ* -- a discrepancy he attributes to "Der Nom. statt Akk. im Vergleich," a false explanation that I hope I dispatched for good in my 1982 IIJ article on case disharmony in RVic similes (and that Thieme [KlSch 79–80 n. 4 = 1951: 8–9] also excoriates him for, though without an adequate alternative solution in my view). Another problem posed by this interpr. (even for those who deal with the simile in another way) is that it requires 'milk' to be the obj. of *yájate* with *vām* then an oblique case, but √*yaj* (without preverb) almost always takes an acc. of the divinity and an oblique case (generally instr.) of the offering substance. (Gr gives templates with acc. of the offering, but the passages supposedly conforming to them are few and far between.)

Again, a more radical approach to the text can eliminate the problems without compromising the grammar. I suggest that *yájate* in d is not the verb of the rel. clause introduced by *yád* in c, but starts a new cl., consisting only of *yájate haviṣmān* -- a simple statement ending a complex verse. The verb is accented because it opens its clause. What precedes in cd is a nominal clause, with 'milk' as *subject*. It is possible to assume that there is no verb at all but a gapped copula, but I actually think that there is a haplologized present participle **yát* following the rel. prn. *yád* (hence *yád* **yád*), again, as in vs. 2a, the neut. N/A pres. participle of √*i* 'go'. Assuming a haplologized monosyllable here fixes the meter, making a 10-syllable line into a proper Triṣṭubh, with an opening of 5 and a fine break and cadence. Hence, the milk "which (*yád*) is going (**yát*) within (*antár*) the wooden cups (*vanínaḥ*)." With milk as a nominative subject, the nominative simile is grammatically impeccable, without (in the mode of Thieme [/WG]) having to apply it to the *haviṣmān,* which does not work well. I believe that the "blazing twisting" entity is an image of a snake, but refers to the snaking flames of fire, going into the woods. Thus *vanínaḥ* is read with both frame and simile. In the publ. tr. "is (now) going" should be marked with an asterisk.

I.180.4: This vs. also presents a number of difficulties. The easiest to deal with is *avṛṇītam*, the 2nd du. active imperfect, to the 9th class pres. to √*vṛ* 'choose', which is otherwise only middle. We should hypothetically expect middle **avṛṇāthām*, but in fact, acdg. to Macdonell, *no* athematic present in Vedic attests such a form, whatever the present class. The 2nd /3rd ps. middle dual forms seem to have been avoided. and this active nonce form is probably modeled on 3rd *singular medial* impf. *avṛṇīta*, which is fairly common and occurs a number of times in just this metrical position, after an opening of 5 in trimeter verse. Ge (p. 258 n. 3) attributes the active voice to the fact that the Aśvins are choosing on behalf of someone else; this is an ingenious suggestion and merits consideration, but I think the formal problems tipped the balance.

The real crux in this vs. is *eṣé*, which has received almost as many analyses as there are RVic interpretors. For some of the various suggestions see Old ad loc., Ge's n. 4ab, Re ÉVP XVI ad loc., Scar (60–61), Keydana (Inf. 236 n. 135); there is no space (and I have no patience) to discuss them all here. I take it as a dat. inf. to √*iṣ* 'send' + *-á*, built directly to the root. This root identification may be supported by vs. 6 of the next hymn, I.181.6b *pūrvī́r íṣaḥ ... mádhva iṣṇán* "sending many refreshing drinks of honey," with similar sense.

I take the simile *apó ná kṣódaḥ* as obj. of this inf., parallel to the gharma drink that the Aśvins are sending here. With Gr, I take *apáḥ* as one of the rare sg. forms of *áp-* 'water', preserved here in what is almost a deconstructed compound. For the gen. with *kṣódaḥ* cf. I.112.12 *kṣódasā-udnáḥ* "with a gush of water."

As for the 2nd hemistich, against the standard interpr. (incl. Old), I take cd as a single clause. I supply "refreshing drinks" (*íṣaḥ*) as subj. of *práti yanti* with *mádhvaḥ* dependent on it (not a nom. pl., per Gr), on the basis of the phrase cited above from I.181.6 with *íṣaḥ ... mádhvaḥ*. The goal of *práti yanti* is *vām* in pāda c. I take *páśvaiṣṭī* with the simile, despite the pāda break and position of the simile particle: *ráthyeva cakrā́* is a fixed phrase with the *iva* firmly planted within (cf. X.10.7–8, 89.2, 117.5). As for the form, the Pp reads nom. sg. *-iṣṭiḥ* (apparently fld by Ge, WG, Scar); Gr suggests rather du. *-iṣṭī*. I also read *-iṣṭī*, but interpr. it as an instr. sg. or even as one of the rare loc. sg. *-ī* to *-i*-stems (see AiG III.155). The parallel stem *gáviṣṭi-* is primarily attested in the loc., though its sg. is the more orthodox *gáviṣṭau* (pl. *gáviṣṭiṣu*).

I.180.5: Yet another near impossible verse.

The standard tr. take *gór óheṇa* as a phrase (e.g., Ge "durch Anpreisung der Kuh(milch)"). This interpr. is favored by the adjacency of the two words and even more by the retroflexion in *óheṇa*, which must be triggered by the final *-r* or *gór* and speaks for a close syntactic bond. Nonetheless, in the publ. tr. I construe *góḥ* with *dānā́ya* ("for the giving of a cow"), in part because pāda d (in my interpr.) identifies the poet as lacking cattle and in part because "by praise of the cow" doesn't make much sense as a way to attract the Aśvins. However, the close sandhi of *gór óheṇa* gives me pause, and I might change the publ. tr. to "With a laud of the cow might I turn you here for giving."

Thieme gives a complex, sensitive, and in many ways appealing treatment of this vs. in KZ 92 (1978): 40–42. In the first hemistich he takes *dānā́ya* as ambiguous, between "for (our) giving (to you)" and "for (your) giving (to us)." The ambiguity is also reflected in his double reading of *góróheṇa*: with a division *gó róheṇa* (already suggested by

Pischel), this can mean "by the rising of the milk" and refer to the boiling up of the milk offered to the Aśvins in the Pravargya ritual. With a division *gór óheṇa* it simply means "mit dem Ruf eines Rinde" and refers to the loud cry with which Bhujyu summoned the Aśvins. Given Agastya's seemingly limitless verbal trickery, Thieme's suggested double readings are certainly possible, though I wonder if *gór óheṇa* needs to be confined to the simile, rather than referring to the cry with which we attract the Aśvins.

The second hemistich is more contested. Most tr. take *kṣoṇī́* as dual acc, which it of course can be, with the fem. adj. *mā́hinā* the subject and wanting a referent: e.g., Ge (/WG) 'help' (*ūtíḥ*). I instead follow Thieme (and in fact Gr) in taking *kṣoṇī́* here as nom. sg., and I read *mā́hinā* in two ways, as nom. sg. with *kṣoṇī́* and dual acc. with *vām* (Thieme only the latter). Thieme also takes all of the 2nd hemistich as referring to the story of Bhujyu, the Aśvins' client whom they saved from the sea. This allows him to take *apáḥ* as ablative sg.: "a cry from the water," where Bhujyu was languishing. I believe the Bhujyu reference is confined to pāda b, though Agastya's extensive treatment of the story in nearby I.182.5–7 gives me pause and might lead me to reconsider. Meanwhile I take *apáḥ* in c as gen. sg., as in 4b. Note the similarity between 4b *apó ná kṣódaḥ* and 5c *apáḥ kṣoṇī́*. In my interpr., pāda c is parenthetical, describing the noise that attends the Aśvins' journey, produced both by their quick progress in the chariot and by the cries of us ritualists seeking to bring them to us. I then take d as a return to the 1st sg. speaker of a(b) and supply the verb from pāda a, *ā́ ... vavṛtīya* "might I turn you here." My interpr. depends crucially on Thieme's ingenious (and to me convincing) analysis of *ákṣu-* as 'without cattle', formed in opposition to *kṣumánt-* 'having cattle', and containing an underlying **p(a)śu-*. (See EWA s.v. *ákṣu-*[2]; Mayrhofer accepts this analysis.) The standard tr. are founded on *ákṣu-* 'net', found several times in the AV; Thieme allows the possibility of a second reading with the 'net' word, which seems a bit stretched.

I.180.6: As noted in the publ. intro., I take the 2nd hemistich as a punning depiction of the poet's patron, anchored by two adjacent and rhyming verbs that have double readings, *préṣad véṣad*. The former is generally taken as the *s*-aor. subj. to √*prī* 'please' (Wh Rts, Gr, Narten [176], as well as the standard tr.), but it could also be assigned to *prá* √*iṣ* 'send forth' (*pace* Re, who explicitly rejects this analysis) and refer to the *praiṣa-* 'ritual prompt', a technical term in the later ritual but already reflected in the RV, at least in my view (cf. *purupraíṣa-* I.145.3 and comm. ad loc.). I think that both readings are present. Those who assign the form to √*prī* interpret it as an unusual intransitive / reflexive ("becomes pleased, pleases himself"), in contrast to the standard transitive use of the active forms of this root. But this is unnecessary. The subject is the ritual patron (*sūrí-*), whose function is to distribute largesse to the poet and priests. It is used without object here to enable both the √*prī* and the *prá* √*iṣ* senses to be actualized. The same goes for the next verb *véṣat*. This latter verb is generally taken also as an *s*-aor. subjunctive, to √*vī* 'pursue' (e.g., Gr, Narten [246], as well as the standard tr.), and I agree that this is one of its readings. But I would also take it as an injunc. to √*viṣ* 'toil', two forms of which are found nearby (I.178.2, 181.6). The two injunctive forms "gives the prompt and toils" express activities strictly limited to ritual performance; the two subjunctives "will please and will pursue" remain tied to the ritual but express its larger goals: "will please (the poet and priests) and will pursue (the gods)."

Pāda d expresses the redistribution of goods that characterizes the Vedic ritual system. The patron acquires goods, hence the *ā́ ... dade* 'has taken'; in this case the *vā́ja-* 'prize' must be the 'abundance' (*púraṃdhi-*) sent by the Aśvins in b. The gods give these goods in response to the praises produced by the poets. The patron then distributes these acquisitions to his clients, here the ritual functionaries who prompted the gods' gifts in the first place. There are several possible grammatical analyses of *mahé*, but the dominant *mahé* is the dat. sg. to the athematic stem *máh-*. Given the patronage situation depicted, I take it as short for *mahé *rā́dhase* "for great (generosity)," as in I.139.6, II.41.6=VI.45.27, VIII.2.29, 24.10, 45.24, 64.12, 93.16.

I.180.7: The nonce verbal form *vipanyā́mahe* has attracted a remarkable amount of discussion; for a detailed and clear summary see Kulikov (*-ya-*presents, 143–46), though his passive/reciprocal interpr. I cannot follow. Insofar as there has been a standard analysis of it, it has been as a passive to √*pan* 'admire' (Wh Rts, reflected in Ge's tr.), but other root associations and morphological analyses abound, which I will not discuss further. It belongs with a group of other, better-attested formations: fem. noun *vipanyā́-* and adj. *vipanyú-*, which I take as 'admiration' and 'seeking/expressing admiration' respectively. (This point was made forcefully by Thieme in Fs. Risch [1986: 165–66], though I do not follow his ultimately etymology.) (For a similar system, cf. *vasūyá-*(*ti*), *vasūyā́-*, *vasūyú-*.) I take *vipanyā́mahe* as a denominative *-yá-*verb associated with these nominal forms, derived from the root √*pan* (in my view); it is transitive in value and takes *vā́m* as object.

With Thieme (an analysis fld. by subsequent interpr. Kulikov WG), I take the last part of pāda b, *ví paṇír hitā́vān*, as a separate nominal clause, but unlike these interpr. I take it as the main clause attached to the causal clause beginning in pāda a. The phonological play of *vipan(yā́mahe) ví paṇ(ír)* clearly contributed to the word choice here, as Kulikov also notes. As for the sense of this hemistich, it simply rephrases the purport of vs. 6: because we singers are doing our job in the ritual economy by praising the gods, our patron is being generous to us and cannot be labeled a 'niggard'.

I.180.7–8: The poet then turns to the Aśvins' part in this system and in 7cd presents another causal clause, parallel to the one in ab. Note the parallel openings 7a *vayáṃ cid dhí* and 7c *ádhā cid dhí*. This subordinated causal expression continues into vs. 8, with another parallel causal clause occupying 8ab and introduced in a similar way: 8a *yuvā́ṃ cid dhí*. In my, admittedly complex, interpr. of these verses, the 1st plural singers of 7ab modulate into the single (3rd ps.) singer Agastya in 8cd; this modulation is eased by not naming him until we reach the triumphant main clause of 8cd, where he boasts of the great wealth he has acquired from his poetry -- just like the singers of 7ab. And the transition from 1st ps. singers to 3rd ps. singer is enabled by omitting both subj. and verb in 8ab, where a human ritualist or ritualists should be the agents (see below) but where the ps. and no. of any verb would be problematically telltale.

The series of causal clauses begins by highlighting the Aśvins' benevolent participation in the ritual system (7cd) and then the complementary activity of the priest in summoning them to the sacrifice and offering to them first (8ab) -- before coming to the logical conclusion in 8cd: that Agastya has achieved his just reward and is himself acclaimed among men.

With the standard tr. I take *anindyā* in 7c as a predicted voc., with c and d separate clauses, as the double *hí* suggests.

I.180.8: Based on my interpr. of the structure of vss. 7–8, I supply Agastya as the subject of 8ab, which not only lacks an overt subject but also an overt verb, for the reasons sketched above. Ge supplies "(opferte er)," WG "(ruft man an)"; I favor something like the latter (my 'summons'), on the somewhat fragile basis that *yuvā́m* is fairly frequently the obj. of √*hū* 'call, summon' (cf., e.g., I.47.4=VIII.5.17 *yuvā́ṃ havante aśvinā*).

Curiously enough *prá* does not appear with verbal forms of √*sru* 'flow', but the preverb probably indexes the ritual fact that Aśvins receive their offering at the Morning Pressing, the ritual event that leads off the soma offerings of the day.

vírudra- is a hapax and difficult (but what is not in this hymn?), but with Ge, etc., I take it as a bahuvrīhi 'having Rudra (or rather the Rudras=Maruts) away', referring to soma. As Ge hints (n. 8b), this probably is a reference to the Agastya – Indra – Marut cycle that forms such a dramatic part of Agastya's oeuvre. It would refer in part simply to the fact that this is the Morning Pressing, and the Maruts receive their soma at the Midday Pressing. But also more specifically to the fact that whether the Maruts should have any part in the soma sacrifice and whether in particular they should have a share in Indra's part were fraughtly disputed in those hymns. Agastya is in effect pointing out that there was never any question of the Aśvins having to share with the Maruts. (That by some accounts the Aśvins only got included in the soma sacrifice belatedly might make this a question that would exercise them.) The actual form, *vírudra-*, is reminiscent of the nominal clause *ví paṇíḥ* ... "the niggard is away" in 7b.

Pāda c is fairly straightforward, and it is worth noting that *prá* √*śaṃs* here is used of a human (though not a king, unfortunately), reflecting what I think is its original domain. There is some debate about the value of *citayat*, which belongs to the functionally malleable stem *citáya-*. But in the absence of anything that could serve as an object, I take it as the intransitive it regularly is, 'appear, be conspicuous'. As for *sahásraiḥ*, everywhere else where it's clear, this instr. pl. refers to cows or other countable forms of wealth (so also WG in n.), and I take it as indicating the reason for Agastya's perceived prominence.

Yet another hapax troubles us: *kā́rādhunī*. Both Ge and WG refuse to tr. it. But given the other intractable problems in this hymn, it seems one of the lesser issues. The 2nd member *-dhuni-* is surely *dhúni-* 'noisy' or probably, substantivized 'noise, tumult'. It also seems reasonably possible to connect *kā́rā-* to *kārú-* 'bard' and assign it a tenative meaning 'praise-song' (so also EWA s.v. *kārú-*, citing also AiG II.2, etc.). The form in the text (with probable but not certain *-ī* final, so Pp.) can be an instr. sg. The remaining problem is the accent, which should make the cmpd a bahuvrīhi, a grammatical identity at odds with my tr. "with a tumult of praise-songs." AiG II.1.221 simply says it has abnormal accent, and with nothing better to offer, I will simply allow Wackernagel the last word on that subject. I take this simile with what precedes ("proclaimed as if with ...") rather than what follows ("is conspicuous by thousands as if by ..."). Its position would allow either, despite the pāda break.

I.180.9: The phrase *sūríbhya utá vā* is elliptical. Klein (DGRV II.171) suggests supplying 'singers', while I prefer 'us'. Either is possible. Passages like *sūríbhya gṛṇaté* (II.4.9,

VI.4.8) favor Klein, while those like V.16.5 *yé vayáṃ yé ca sūráyaḥ* favor my solution. The explicit 1st pl. in the next pāda (*syāma*) tips the balance in my opinion.

I.180.10: On the thematic and punning ring composition of this vs. with vs. 1, see the publ. intro.

In the finale of b, *suvitā́ya návyam*, *návyam* is at least superficially adverbial and works well in that guise. However it's worth nothing that *suvitā́ya návyase* with two datives is found in Jagatī cadence in III.2.13, V.11.1, VI.71.3, IX.82.5, and I imagine that ours is simply adjusted to the demands of Triṣṭubh (though we should of course expect *návyaḥ* if this involved simple truncation).

I.181 Aśvins

I.181.1: The 2nd du *(un)ninīthā́ḥ*, with primary ending, is formally problematic. It is tentatively assigned to a redupl. pres. by Whitney, but there is otherwise no evidence for such a pres., while the pf. is well established. Macdonell (oddly) calls it a pf. subjunctive, but the mood sign of the subjunctive is absent. It can't be an example of simple avoidance of a paradigmatically shaky form, as in the case of **avṛṇāthām* in the preceding hymn (I.180.4), because the expected pf. indic. *ninyathuḥ* is actually attested, with the same preverb (*úd*) and the Aśvins also as subject (I.116.8, 24). Kü suggests (280–81) that the form is aiming to be an injunctive (that is, I assume, an unaugmented pluperfect) meant to be distinguished from a putative imperative **ninītám* with 2ndary ending, and therefore it takes a primary ending (a solution endorsed by WG). This seems needlessly complex and, *pace* Hoffmann (Injunc., 111), I find the notion that an injunctive would adopt primary endings for this purpose somewhat bizarre, since secondary endings are what *define* the injunctive. A simpler solution is to assume the form is a nonce present generated to ambiguous perfect forms like opt. *ninīyāt* (2x).

How to construe the genitives *iṣā́ṃ rayīṇā́m* and *apā́m* is another problem. I take them as parallel partitive genitives, roughly flg. Old, rather than taking the former pair as dependent on *préṣṭhau* and the latter as a pseudo-ablative as Ge does.

I.181.3: The adjectival descriptor of the chariot *ahampūrvā́ḥ* is transparently derived from a nominal clause "I am in front / I'm ahead," however unlikely this may be as the utterance of a chariot.

The second hemistich consists entirely of a nominal relative clause referring to the chariot, with two vocatives, the phrasal *vṛ́ṣṇa sthātārā* "you mounters of the bull" in initial position and *dhiṣṇi̯yā* near the end. The latter is commonly used of the Aśvins (see, e.g., I.182.1c, 2a, in the next hymn). Here the voc. is followed by the rel. pronoun *yáḥ*, which ends the clause. This is a remarkably odd position for a rel. pronoun, and since this supposed rel. cl. consists of nominative qualifiers of the subject of the main clause, *ráthaḥ*, it need not have been a relative clause at all: the whole of the vs. could simply be a main clause. I think the *yáḥ* got stuck pleonastically on the end of this pāda to provide a monosyllable to make a Triṣṭubh cadence. (Cf. VI.63.6, a Triṣṭubh that ends *dhiṣṇi̯yā vām*, likewise with a final monosyllable.) No harm is done by this last-ditch conversion of the string of epithets in cd into a nominal rel. clause, but it is a metrically driven

afterthought in my opinion. It should certainly not be taken as a standard ex. of rel. cl. word order.

The phrase *mánaso jávīyān* is an analytic version of *manojū́-* in 2c, there applied to the horses, not the chariot.

I.181.4: Yet another troublesome dual verb form: *avāvaśītām*. It is generally agreed (Wh Rts, Ge [more or less], Re, WG, Schaeffer [179–82], Kü [486–88]) that it belongs to the root √*vāś* 'bellow'. (Gr assigns it to both √*vaś* 'wish' and √*vāś* without comment; for reff. to further lit. on this form see Schaeffer 181–82, Kü 487–88.) But forms to that redupl. stem are overwhelmingly middle, while this form is active. Whether it is assigned to the intensive (Schaef.) or the pluperfect (Kü), we should expect a medial 3rd du. with secondary ending. However, as was already noted with regard to *avṛṇītam* in the immediately preceding hymn (I.180.4), athematic 2nd and 3rd medial duals are simply not attested, and in that case the 2nd du. *active* form was substituted. I think the same thing happened here, and there is therefore no reason to construct specifically active semantics for this form, as do WG.

Ge (fld. by Re and WG) supplies *putráḥ* with c as well as d and also takes *súmakha-* as a PN, hence "(the son) of Sumakha." These two decisions lead to the interpretation that one of the Aśvins is of human origin, the other divine. So, most clearly, Re: "Dissociation inattendue des Aśvins, l'un d'origine humaine, l'autre divine." This is a major and unnecessary interpretive leap, and based on dubious though not impossible analyses of two details: there is no syntactic or rhetorical reason to supply *putráḥ* in c, and *súmakha-* is ordinarily an epithet of gods; acdg. to Mayrhofer (PN 102) this is the only possible passage in which it would be a personal name and would refer to a human, not a god. Although this vs. does, unusually, distinguish between the two Aśvins, I see no reason to ascribe human origin to one of them on the basis of this passage, which is more naturally interpreted in another fashion. It should be noted that Ge expresses some doubt about his interpr. in his n. 4c.

I.181.5: *nicerú-* is a hapax (though cf. *céru-* VIII.61.7). It almost surely belongs to √*ci* 'observe, discern', with Debrunner (AiG II.860), despite Mayrhofer's doubts (EWA s.v. *céru-*). The Aśvins are themselves called *nícetar-* in nearby I.184.2.

The 2nd member *rūpa-* in *piśáṅga-rūpa-* seems pleonastic, but it perhaps should have been rendered in tr., 'whose form is tawny', vel sim.

Pāda c causes several problems, both in grammar and in interpretation. To start with the latter, *anyásya* is universally taken as referring to one of the two Aśvins, as the paired *anyáḥ*-s of 4ab do. However, as noted in the publ. intro., I think the referent of this stem has shifted. Both Aśvins together are referred to in the first hemistich of 5, with the dual pronoun *vām*. They are contrasted with a new "the other" in c, who can only be Indra: the presence of the two fallow bays (*hárī*) guarantees his presence, since these horses are uniquely Indra's.

The grammatical problem is the apparent number disharmony between the dual *hárī*, if taken as the subject, and the pl. verb *pīpáyanta*; the accent of this verb is also potentially problematic. The standard interpr. construe the pāda in this way (cf. Ge "Die beiden Falben ... sind ... geschwellt"; so also Old, WG). The accent on a main cl. verb is attributed to the *anyá-* (... *anyá-*) construction (so Ge, n. 5), though he expresses some

concern that in fact there's only one *anyá-*. While it is true that the first of two clauses in a double *anyá-* construction generally has an accented verb (e.g., I.164.20, II.40.4-5, VI.68.3), this is not universal (cf., e.g., VI.57.2), and it is not the case with single *anyá-*. But the real problem is that a plural verb should not have a dual subject. Both these difficulties can be avoided if we supply a (dual) form of √*gam* in c, generated from the precative *gamyāḥ* ending b, and start a new clause with *pīpáyanta*, which then owes its accent to its clause-initial position. The plural subject of this verb then includes both Indra's pair of fallow bays (c) and the Aśvins' tawny lead horse (a). (Ge [n. 5] somewhat similarly suggests that *pīpáyanta* is pl. because the *kakuhá-* of 5a is also thought of [gedacht wird], but my suggestion allows a grammatical solution, not merely a notional one.)

The adjective opening the next pāda would apply to all three horses and serve as a further plural specification of the group. Although the Pp. reads du. *-ā́*, in sandhi it can as well be pl. *-āḥ*. The stem of this adjective is uncertain. Sāy., followed by Müller, reads *mathnā́*; Aufrecht, *mathrā́*. This is one of the relatively few variant manuscript readings in the RV; see Müller vol. I, p. 62, Aufr. vol. II, p. iv., and Old ad loc. On the basis of *mathrā́* in VIII.46.23, Old opts for *mathrā́*. This seems reasonable, though in terms of sense which suffix we choose matters little, since either form would most likely belong to √*manth* 'churn, stir, shake'; used of horses, I take it to mean 'agitated, excitable, skittish'.

I supply a participle of a verb of motion with *ví*, which governs *rájāṃsi*. The two parts of this phrase are separated by the intrusive voc. *aśvinā*. See 7b below.

I.181.6: This vs. is quite parallel to vs. 5: it begins *prá vām*, with a verb of motion in the 2nd pāda to be construed with *prá* (*gamyāh* and *carati* respectively); the 3rd pādas are identical save for their first word, X *anyásya pīpáyanta vā́jaiḥ*. I therefore construe the vs. as I did vs. 5 with "lead horse" the subj. of ab, Indra the referent of *anyásya* in c, and a new clause beginning with *pīpáyanta*. That the subj. of d is plural gives support to my suggestion that 5d also contains a plural not a dual.

śarádvant- 'having autumns/years' in pāda a is a hapax, but presumably means 'having (many) years' -- thus 'experienced', of the lead horse.

As was noted ad I.178.2, I do not believe that we need a separate root √*viṣ* 'sich ergiessen' for three passages, including this one; 'toil, labor' works for all the passages. My 'roil' here, besides conveniently rhyming with 'toil', is meant to express the physical motion of the waters at work.

I.181.7: I do not understand why the song would be flowing 'in three parts' (/'threefold'; *tredhá*), nor is the meaning and referent of loc. *bā́ḷhé* clear. But comparison with *tribarhíṣi sádasi* "on the seat with three (layers) of barhis" in the next vs., 8b, may help. Assuming *bā́ḷhá-* belongs to √*baṃh* 'be/make thick, firm', we can assign *bā́ḷhá-* the sense 'thickened, plumped up' and suggest that *bā́ḷhé* refers to the barhis, which has been plumped up invitingly, like a sofa cushion, for the gods to sit on, with its three layers ensuring a soft seat. As for *tredhā́* I now think it qualifies not the song, as in the publ. tr., but the seat, and would now tr. "... flowing to the (ritual grass) plumped up threefold/in three parts." As in 5d the two parts of this phrase *bā́ḷhé tredhā́* are separated by the intrusive voc. *aśvinā*.

I.181.8: The gen. phrase *rúśato vápsasaḥ* is standardly taken as the PN (Ruśant Vapsas) of the singer. As often when a PN explanation is offered, this is a convenient way of evading an unclear word or phrase. But *rúśant-* is a very well-attested adj. with a clear sense 'gleaming, bright' and does not otherwise form part of a PN. This leaves *vápsas-*, which I take as 'wasp' both here and in VIII.45.5 (*girā́vápso*, which I divide as *girā́ vápso*, contra Pp.; see disc. in EWA s.v. *vápsas-*). The resultant "gleaming wasp" is, in my opinion, a description of fire; *rúśant-* is not infrequently a descriptor of fire, and 'wasp' would refer to the random movements of flames and/or the "sting" produced by flying sparks hitting skin. At least acdg. to the internet, one of the most common species of wasp in South Asia is Ropalidia marginata (often called the Indian wasp), a type of paper wasp that is remarkably flame-red in color, and, in YouTube videos, a cluster of such wasps on top of their nest looks rather like a flickering fire. Its sting is quite painful. Its "song" in this passage would either be the sound of the crackling fire compared to the buzzing of the wasps or else simply the hymn recited at the ritual fire.

The publ. tr. takes *nṝ́n* as gen. pl., flg. the standard interpr. Since I resist this interpr. in general (see comm. ad I.146.4, X.29.4), I would now take this as parallel to the *mánuṣaḥ* 'sons of Manu' favored in pāda d, with loose construction "swells (towards) men" and emend the tr. accordingly. Although this is not particularly satisfactory syntactically, a multivalent *nṝ́n* seems even worse to me.

The publ. tr. careless omits the *vām*; I would emend the tr. to "this very song ... swells for you ..."

The second hemistich concerns the soma, in my view, though Ge and Re both take the bullish cloud as an image of generosity and WG as morning mist. I take this phrase as referring to the soma swollen with water after its soaking; this image is then given both a real-world and a ritual sense, playing on two senses of *gór ná séke*. In the real-world image the bull is depicted as sexually aroused (swollen) in mating with a cow, lit. "at the insemination of a cow." The root √*sic* frequently takes *rétas-* 'semen' as obj., and this is a shorthand way of expressing "at the pouring out (of semen) into a cow," vel sim. But in the ritual image, "at the pouring out of the cow" refers to the pouring of milk and its mixing with the soma, a very common image that is regularly sexualized.

I.181.9: This vs. seems to be trying to aggregate as many divinities into the final summons as possible, and it does so rather awkwardly. On the basis of I.117.19 *áthā yuvā́m íd ahvayat púraṃdhiḥ* "P. called upon just you two [=Aśvins]," I take *púraṃdhiḥ* here as the separate (female) figure, rather than as a qualifier of Pūṣan like Ge. Also on the basis of that passage I supply 'summoned' (generatable from *huvé* in c) rather than making this part of the b clause with the verb *jarate* -- though very little depends on one or the other decision.

In c *gṛṇānáḥ* must be, quite unusually, transitive: it is ordinarily passive. I think the transitive value for this medial participle was induced by its etymological relationship with transitive *jarate* in b, mediated by the medial participle to that pres. stem, which also takes the singer, not the besung, as subj. See the very similar passage VI.62.1 *aśvínā huve járamāṇo arkaíḥ* "I call upon the Aśvins, singing with my chants."

I.182 Aśvins

I.182.1: On *ā́ √bhūṣ* with *vayúna-* see VIII.66.8

The first hemistich addresses the ritual performers in the plural, as they make final preparations for the sacrifice. Ge (fld. by WG) takes phrase *rátho vṛ́ṣaṇvān* "the chariot has its bulls" as referring to the Aśvins' chariot, which is presumably hitched up and on its way. This is certainly possible, but I think the chariot may rather refer to the sacrifice, as so often, and "its bulls" may be the Aśvins, who have arrived and so the sacrifice can be set in motion, or they could be the priests or even the paraphernalia of the prepared sacrifice. However, I have to admit that the next vs. focuses on the Aśvins' chariot (2cd) and their skill as charioteers (2b), so Ge's interpr. may be correct.

Ge takes *mádatā* in b as transitive, with the Aśvins, under the guise of the various duals in cd, as obj. But *máda-* is rarely if ever transitive, and it seems best to take cd as containing an annunciatory phrase pointing to the Aśvins' presence (or soon-to-be presence) at our ritual.

The hapax *viśpálāvasū* is presumably a bahuvrīhi, like *vājínīvasu-* 'having prize-winning mares as goods', though Ge tr. as a tatpuruṣa, 'die Gönner der Viśpalā'. WG's "mit (der Rennstute) Viśpalā als (ihrem) Gut" reflects the compound type better and may well be correct. However, the cmpd must allude to the story (or wisp of a story), found mostly in Kakṣīvant's oeuvre, about Viśpalā and the Aśvins: Viśpalā is a mare whose legbone the Aśvins stick back together so she can win a race. The most relevant passage for interpreting this cmpd may be I.112.10 *yā́bhir viśpálāṃ dhanasā́m atharvyàṃ sahásramīḷha ājā́v ájinvatam* "with which you revived Viśpalā, to pursue the way, to gain the stakes in the contest with a thousand battle-prizes." (Cf. also I.116.15, 117.11, 188.8; X.39.8.) From these references to Viśpalā it does not appear that she belonged to the Aśvins (was their "Gut"), but rather was benefited -- healed -- by them in order that she could herself *win goods* in the contest. Hence my more convoluted tr. "who provided the goods to (the mare) Viśpalā." The idea in our passage is presumably that they made it possible for her to race and therefore to get the goods, so a lot is concentrated in that single cmpd.

I.182.2–3: The two 2nd dual middles, *vahethe* (2c) and *āsāthe* (3a), would both be better metrically with light 2nd syllables. On this phenomenon, see Arnold 129–30. A number of 2nd and 3rd dual middle forms invite this shortening. I do not understand it historically since Aves. has the *ā* in the athematic forms and the equivalent of *e* in the thematic ones (*-aēte, - ōi̯9e*). As disc. at various points above (ad I.104.3, 178.2, 180.4, 181.4), 2nd and 3rd du. middle forms are problematic in general.

I.182.2: Parallel *índratamā* and *marúttamā*, superlative in form, are generally taken to mean 'most similar to Indra / the Maruts' (Gr, Ge, WG). I suppose that is their ultimate purport, but I think the effect is stronger: the Aśvins are said to possess the qualities of those gods in an even higher degree than those gods themselves do. Idiomatic English would use the comparative: "more Indra than Indra" (or, in a well-known colloquial expression, at least in my childhood, "more Catholic than the Pope").

I.182.3: The sense of pāda a would be better conveyed by "what are you doing *there*?"

The main cl. *kím āsāthe* lacks an expressed antecedent to *jáno yáḥ* in the following rel. cl., but it is not difficult to supply.

I.182.4: On *jambháya-* 'crush', see comm. ad II.23.9 and my *-áya*-Formations, p. 93.

I.182.5: The story of Bhujyu, son of Tugra, is treated in I.116.3–5, also a Kakṣīvant composition. (See also Agastya's mention of it in nearby I.180.5.) Bhujyu was abandoned by his father in the middle of the trackless sea; the Aśvins make a boat for him and bring him home. Just as here, the boat(s) is(/are) described in I.116.3 as *ātmanvánt-* and in I.116.4 as having wings. The former is generally tr. as 'breathing' (atmend, WG) or 'possessing a soul' (beseelt, Gr, Ge). I wonder rather if the 'body, trunk' sense of *ātmán-* is at issue here, and it refers to a boat with a cockpit or hollowed-out well for sitting, rather than a flat raft. The "paunchy" (if that's what it means and if it refers to the boats) in 6c would support this interpr. The wings would then be sails. (The latter is an easy transfer; e.g., in English sailing downwind with the mainsail on one side and the jib on the other is referred to as "wing and wing.") Of course, I am not denying that the Aśvin-made vessel did actually fly (see pāda d), but I do suggest that there's a germ of realia in the description -- and that a boat with a body makes more sense than a boat with a soul.

With most interpr. I take *supaptaní* as an instr. sg. to a fem. nomen act.; see Old's exx. of similar phrases with a verb and *su*-compounded cognate instr. It is perhaps worthy of note that the new-style weak pf. *pet-* coexists here with the old style redupl. *-papt-*.

I.182.6: The construction and meaning of the last two words of pāda c, *jáṭhalasya júṣṭā(h)*, are uncertain. Ge (/WG) and Re construe the gen. with *júṣṭā(ḥ)*, though Re readily admits that *júṣṭa-* never elsewhere takes a genitive. He does not comment on the meaning or reference of *jáṭhala-*, but Ge (/WG) takes it as referring to the "bauchig (Wagen)" of the Aśvins; Ge further comments, "Die Schiffe trugen den grossen Wagen der Aśvin oftmals über das Meer." This conjures up a ridiculous image, of four ships towing a bulbous wagon across the water like a water-skier or a barge -- a wagon that, moreover, we have no evidence for either in this hymn or in the other passages concerning Bhujyu. (In the fullest treatment, I.116.3–5, the Aśvins carry him with their ships [*naubhíḥ*, 3a] after Bhujyu has mounted a ship [*nā́vam ātasthivā́ṃsam*]. There are no wagons, bulbous or otherwise.) And further, not only the case frame with *júṣṭā* but its sense would be very peculiar; Ge tr. "die des bauchigen (Wagens) gewohnt sind" (not the usual sense of *júṣṭa-*), WG "die dem bauchigen (Wagen) angenehm sind." What would it mean for the ships to be "used to" or "agreeable to" a wagon? (Ge tries to get out of this difficulty by setting up a veritable towing service, operating "oftmals.") This can all be avoided by separating the two words and interpr. *jáṭhalasya* as a genitive of description, 'of paunchy (shape)', applicable to the boats, which, as noted with regard to 5b, would support an interpr. of *ātmanvánt-* there as 'possessing a body'. The one to whom the ships are *júṣṭa-* 'agreeable, welcome' is then Bhujyu, who had been floundering in the sea and would surely be cheered at the sight of them.

I.182.7: With Gr, etc. (incl. Scar, p. 648) I take *níṣṭhita-* to √*sthā* + *nís*, not *ní*.

Ge seems to take *paryáṣasvajat* either as contrary-to-fact in a rhetorical question or as a true anterior pluperfect, but as Kü points out (591–92), the pf. of √*sva(ñ)j* is presential, so the pluperfect is simply a past tense. The form is anomalous in several respects. First, it has a retroflexed initial, despite following *-a-*, but this is easily

accounted for: the verb is always accompanied by the preverb *pári*, and the retroflexion has simply been carried over into this environment. (This is the only place where the *s*-initial of the verbal form doesn't immediately follow the preverb.) The root is also otherwise middle in inflection: pres. *pári ṣvajate* (5x, beside 1x act. *pariṣvájat* VI.60.10, q.v.), pf. *pári ṣasvaje* (4x). But our plupf. is active; it also has apparent thematic inflection (expect athem. **áṣasvak*). These two morphological features are highly reminiscent of the *aduhat*-type actives built to old *t*-less middle presents of the type *duhé*, with expected *t*-less imperfect **aduha*, remarked with the act. -*t* ending – so brilliantly analyzed by Wackernagel long ago. It seems that the pf. ending of *ṣasvaje* was analyzed as (if) a primary ending, with a corresponding secondary *-a*, which then required remarking.

parṇā́ has a double reading: in the frame 'leaves' (of the rescuing tree in ab), in the simile 'feathers', as Ge (n. 7c) points out.

The *mṛgá-* seems to be specifically a wild *bird*, like its Avestan cognate *mərəγa-*. See comm. ad IX.32.4, X.136.6.

Ge tr. *śrómatāya kám* as "(euch) zum Ruhme"; that is, the Aśvins will accrue fame from their rescue of Bhujyu. This is certainly possible, and the stem *śrómata-* does mean 'fame' once elsewhere (cf. VIII.66.9), though it usually means, by my interpr., 'attentive hearing' (VI.19.10, VII.24.5). Here also I take it to mean 'hearing': 'for hearing', that is, for the story to be heard. WG tr. "zur Gehorsamkeit" and in the n. specify that it is Bhujyu who should be obedient. Since as far as I know Bhujyu hadn't been disobedient, and certainly not to the Aśvins, I don't understand the interpr., esp. as *śrómata-* doesn't elsewhere mean 'obedience'.

I.183 Aśvins

I.183.2: Given its position, I do not think that *ánu* is a preverb in tmesis with *tíṣṭhathaḥ* (with Gr and apparently Ge [/WG]), since such preverbs usually move to a metrical boundary (or directly after the verb). Re suggests that we should supply *vratā́ni*, after *ánu vratā́ni* in 3b, but doesn't provide a tr. or give any indication of what the whole would mean. However, I think his instinct is correct, that *ánu* implicitly governs an acc. with the meaning "following/according to X." The X is, in my view, to be found in *krátu-mant-* 'having resolve'; the construction is a blend of this possessive adj. and an underlying *ánu *krátum* (cf. VIII.63.5, though the phrase is not as common as I'd expected). Pāda-final *pṛkṣé* is infinitival, like *iṣayádhyai* in 3c.

I.183.4: The first hemistich shows a nice phonological progression (noted also by Re): the zero-grade *vṛk* of the wolf and she-wolf (*vṛ́ko ... vṛkī́r*) in pāda a develops into the full-grade *vark* of the etymologically and grammatically unrelated impv. *varktam* in b, which is followed by the rhyming impv. *dhaktam*. In the 2nd hemistich the lexeme *ní* √*dhā* 'deposit' appears both as the verbal adj. ppl. *níhita(ḥ)* and the noun *nidhí-*.

I.183.5: I agree with Ge that *ná* and *iva* in 5c mark a single simile, not two as WG tr. it.

I.183.6: "We have crossed to the further shore of this darkness" announces the end of the night and the beginning of the early morning ritual, to which the Aśvins come.

Given the well-established idiom *práti √dhā* 'aim (a praise-hymn like an arrow), I would now slightly change the tr. of b to "a praise-hymn has been aimed at you," particularly in light of VII.73.1 *práti stómaṃ devayánto dádhānāḥ* "aiming our praise song as we seek the gods." The pādas preceding these two expressions, I.183.6a and VII.73.1a, are identical. For further disc. of the 'aim' idiom see my 2020 "Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūidiia-*: The Aim of Praise" (Fs. Lamberterie).

I.184 Aśvins

I.184.1: Just as the voc. *aśvinā* breaks up the phrase *rájāṃsi ... ví* in I.181.4 and *bāḷhé ... tredhā́* in I.181.7, the phrase *divó nápātā* referring to the Aśvins breaks up *aryáḥ ... sudā́starāya*, but more radically, since a pāda boundary intervenes.

I.184.2: The form *éṣṭā* is generally taken as the ppl. to √*iṣ* 'wish, desire' + *ā́* (so Ge [/WG], Re; e.g., Ge 'herbeigewünscht'). This is not impossible, but it should be noted that √*iṣ* 'desire' is not otherwise attested with *ā́* in the RV. I prefer the interpr. of Gr, fld. by Pirart *(Les Nāsatya* I: 385), which assigns it to √*yaj* 'sacrifice'. The lexeme *ā́* √*yaj* is quite common and means 'bring here/attract by sacrifice', which fits the passage well.

I.184.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is rather puzzling. In the first hemistich the simile involving arrow-makers seems to have little to do with the content of the frame regarding the bridal procession of Sūryā. Nonetheless I think the two activities are related and, rather than supplying a verb 'came' to govern *vahatúṃ sūryā́yāḥ*, with Ge (/WG), I follow Old's interpr. (with Re). Old pulls the verb 'make' out of the root-noun cmpd. *iṣu-kṛ́tā* 'arrow-makers' and supplies a transitive form of the root to govern *vahatúm*: "... wie zwei Pfeilverfertiger (den Pfeil zum Glückschuss zubereiten, bereitet ihr) o zwei Nāsatyas, als Götter die Brautfahrt der Sūryā." This interpr. is supported by the fact that forms of √*kṛ* regularly govern *vahatúm*: VII.1.17 *ubhā́ kṛṇvánto vahatū́* ...; X.17.1 *tváṣṭā duhitré vahatúṃ kṛṇoti*; X.85.14 *syonā́m pátye vahatúṃ kṛṇusva*; cf. also X.32.3 *puṃsá íd bhadró vahatúḥ páriṣkṛtaḥ* with a ppl. The connection of these two semantically ill-assorted activities, arrow-making and bridal-procession-making, is facilitated by two features of the passage. On the one hand, *iṣu-kṛ́t-* is reminiscent of *íṣ √kṛ* 'make ready, set right', with the pseudo-preverb *íṣ-*. On the other, *śriyé* can be read in slightly different senses with simile and frame. As Old points out, Pischel already compared X.95.3 *íṣur ná śriyé* with our *śriyé ... iṣukṛ́tā.* (Though I should point out that I read gen. *śriyaḥ* contra Pp. in X.95.3, the association remains.) In our passage the Aśvins are compared with those who make arrows "for glory" (in battle vel sim.), whereas they ready the bridal procession "for beauty" -- both senses being within the normal range of the multivalent *śrī́-*. I would therefore now add to the publ. tr. "... (make ready) the bridal procession of Sūryā for beauty."

The second hemistich is more problematic. Ge (/WG) takes c and d as separate clauses and in c Ge reads *apsú* twice, once as the location of the action of the verb ("Es schweben ... auf dem Wasser") and once with *jātā́ḥ* ("die Wassergeborenen"). Ge (/WG) then takes d as a nominal clause, "Abgenutzt sind die Joche wie die des reichen Varuṇa." Such a statement seems not only like an utter non sequitur (what do Varuṇa's worn-out yokes have to do with the Aśvins or their horses?), but also puzzling on its own (what are

Varuṇa's yokes, worn out or otherwise?). Moreover, as Ge, etc., point out, there is evidence from parallel passages that c and d belong together, since *jūrṇá-* appears in an uncannily similar passage about the Aśvins' journey: I.46.3 *vacyánte vāṃ kakuhā́so, jūrṇā́yām ádhi viṣṭápi* "Your lead (animals) twist and turn upon the (sea's) broken surface." Thieme (rev. of Lüders, *Varuṇa* I [ZDMG 101 (1951): 411 n. 2 = Kl. Sch. 646 n. 2]) produces a tr. that puts the two pādas together: "in Sprüngen gehn eure ... Spitzentiere, die in den Wassern des vielfachen (reichen?) Varuṇa (d.h. im himmlischen Meere) geborenen, über die gleichsam gealtertem (d.h. von Rissen durchfurchten und deshalb unwegsamen) Joche (=d.h. Wegstrecken von der Länge je eines Vorspannes ...)." Though I do not follow it in all regards (he construes *váruṇasya* with *apsú*), his interpr. is considerably more convincing than the two-clause solution. He takes *yugā́* not as 'yokes', but as "Wegstrecken von der Länge je eines Vorspannes" (rather like *yójana-*), hence the surface on which the horses *vacyánte*. The 'worn' *(jūrṇā́)* surfaces of Varuṇa are then, with Old, the waves of the sea, here called Varuṇa, after the association of that god with water, which is prominent later but already present in the RV.

I.184.4: Unaccented *mādhvī* is of course a dual voc. addressed to the Aśvins, but given its proximity to fem. nom. sg. *rātíḥ* 'gift', it seems possible that it was meant to evoke also an accented *mā́dhvī* modifying this word. (However, Re points out that the fem. of *mádhu-* is generally identical to the masc. in the RV.)

I.185 Heaven and Earth

I.185.2: As noted in the publ. intro., I consider the embryo here to be the sun, but various other identifications have been proposed.

I.185.3: Ge (n. 3ab; see also JPB Ādityas, p. 212)) plausibly suggests on the basis of parallel passages that the "gift of Aditi" is "das Lebenslicht." On the basis of my rethinking of the adj. *anehás-* (comm. ad X.61.12), now think this gift is 'without (physical) defect', not (morally) 'without fault'.

The them. adj. *anarvá-* is clearly derived from the well-attested bahuvrīhi *-n-*stem *anarván-* (cf. also the thematized *anarváṇa-*). The neut. NA to the *n*-stem should be **anarvá*, which is not found. In two instances in which it should modify a neut. acc. (I.37.1, VI.48.15) we find instead the masc. *anarvā́ṇam*, an adjustment probably meant to make the form more transparent (see comm. on those two passages). As for the supposed them. stem *anarvá-*, in two of the occurrences listed by Gr. the referents are neut. (*cakrám* I.164.2, *dātrám* here). In both passages the neut. NA *anarvám* comes at the end of an odd pāda before an even pāda beginning with a consonant. I think it is at least arguable that the original reading in both cases was **anarvá*, the expected neut. to the *n*-stem, which was redactionally altered to a thematic acc. The alternation has no metrical consequences. As for the other two forms that Gr lists to the them. stem, both (II.40.6, VII.40.4) qualify Aditi in the nom. sg. and have the form *anarvā́*. They both most likely actually belong to a fem. *n*-stem (see JPB, Ādityas 210), whose nom. sg. has exactly that form, and though they are fem., they do not exhibit the fem. derivational suffix *-ī* (expect **anarváṇī-*?).

I.185.4: The lexeme *ánu √as* is fairly uncommon, but Agastya uses it twice elsewhere (I.167.10, I.182.8); the rather more common *ánu √bhū* can mean 'be devoted to' (< 'follow'), and that seems to be the sense here.

Most interpr. take *átapyamāne* as 'free from suffering', but the more literal meaning of *√tap* 'be hot, scorch' seems appropriate in the solar context I see here.

In "the pair among the gods" (*ubhé devā́nām*), referring to Heaven and Earth, *ubhé* 'pair' is dual, while in "along with the pairs among the days" (*ubháyebhir áhnām*) 'pairs' (*ubháyebhiḥ*) is plural. This is presumably because Heaven and Earth are a unique pair, whereas the two day-halves, Day and Night, are recurrent and can be thought of as multiple pairs -- though the dual can also be used of them, as in *áhanī* in 1d.

I.185.8: As in V.85.7 and X.7.3 *sádam íd* seems to qualify *sákhāyam*. It was not rendered in the publ. tr.; I would insert "a comrade in perpetuity" – perhaps contrasting with a comrade by circumstance.

I.185.9: Ge (/WG) take *ūtī́* as dual nom. (WG "beide Hilfen"), but Ge allows the possibility of an instr. and Re takes it as instr., as do I. I think it likely that Heaven and Earth have resurfaced here, in anticipation of their appearance in vss. 10–11, and they are the subj. of *sacetām*.

I.186 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is knit together by a shifting pattern of repeated initial preverbs and particles: 1a / 2a *ā́* (with *ápi* 1c), *úpa* 4a, which morphs into *utá* 5a, 6a, 7a, 8a -- the last 3 with *utá na īm* -- followed by *prá* 9a, 9b, 10a, 10b (which was anticipated by *pṛ́* ... 8c. For the *prá*-s note 9a *prá nú*, 9b *prá yu*(...), 10 *prá ū*, 10b *pra pū*(...). Vs. 11 falls outside the picture. The repeated *utá*-s of vss. 5–8 reinforce the frequent additive quality of Viśve Devāḥ hymns.

I.186.1–3: The c-pādas of all three verses consist of a *yáthā* purpose clause with subjunctive.

I.186.1: This vs. signals the dedicands of the hymn obliquely: *viśvā́naraḥ* 'belonging to all men' in b evokes its opposite number "all gods," esp. since the sg. *deváḥ* occurs later in the same pāda. 'All' appears again in d, but with a different referent, 'world' (*víśvaṃ jágat* 'the whole moving world'). The gods are presumably the addressees of pāda c, but only under the designation 'youths' (*yuvānaḥ*).

The initial *ápi* of c is somewhat puzzling. Ge (/WG) render it 'auch', which is harmless. Re takes it "au sense de *abhí*" (on what grounds?), as a perfectivizing preverb (again, on what grounds?). I am inclined to take it as a locational 'nearby', construed loosely with *naḥ*, despite the distance between the two words.

In d *manīṣā́* can be nom. or instr. I follow Ge in taking it as the former, while Re and WG take it as the latter, with Re taking Savitar as implied subject and WG *víśvaṃ jágat*. There is general agreement that a verb 'come' should be supplied in d.

I.186.3: On pāda c see Thieme, *Fremdling*, 36–37, and his revised interpr., *Mitra and Aryaman*, 66, which I follow here. Ge's "dessen Name in Ehren steht" (sim. Thieme

[*Fremdling*], Klein [DGRV I.228], WG) for *sukīrtí-* cannot be correct, because *sukīrtí-* is otherwise a noun.

I.186.4: The standard tr. make rather heavy weather of pāda b, where the simile *sudúgheva dhenúḥ* is nominative, but *uṣā́sānáktā*, the most likely comparandum, makes most sense as the acc. goal of *éṣe* in pāda a. (Note in passing that HvN's accentless *eṣe* is simply wrong.) The simile "like an easily milked cow" should not apply to the 1st ps. subj. of that verb. To deal with the apparent case mismatch (and to avoid the specious explanation "nominative for accusative in simile"), most interpr. take b as a parenthetical nominal sentence (e.g., Ge "-- Nacht und Morgen sind wie eine gutmelke Kuh --"; so also Re, Janert [*Dhāsi*, 29], Narten [*Yasna H.*, 122], WG). But this seems unnecessary: this is a repeated pāda, found also in VII.2.6, where the dual *uṣā́sānáktā* is nominative. Since that form is ambiguous, it can be adapted here to an accusative environment, without bothering to adjust the case of the simile. So Bloomfield (ad I.186.4, anticipated by Old).

In cd note the chiastic pairs of *sám ... ví | ví ... sá(m)*: *samāné ... vimímānaḥ ...*, *víṣurūpe ... sásmin ...*

I.186.5: The standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) take the root aor. injunc. *kaḥ* as modal (e.g., Ge "soll ... bereiten"); Hoffmann doesn't treat this passage. Although I do not think that *kaḥ* regularly shows such value, formulaic considerations suggest it does here: the phrase *máyas √kṛ* occurs at the end of a Jagatī pāda as *máyas karat* (subjunctive: I.89.3, V.46.4, VIII.18.7, X.64.1), once *máyas kṛdhi* (impv.: I.114.2). Truncating it to fit a Triṣṭubh cadence here would yield monosyllabic *kaḥ*, which may maintain modal value because of its association with the true modals in Jagatī cadences.

I.186.6: The end of b, *abhipitvé sajóṣāḥ*, is a sort of mash-up of 1d and 2b, and *ā́ gantu* echoes *ā́ ... gamantu* of 2a.

I.186.7: The cmpd. *áśva-yoga-*, bahuvrīhi by accent, is somewhat peculiar; it might be closest to the type *vájra-bāhu-* 'having an arm that has a mace (in it)', hence 'having a yoke that has horses (attached to it)'?

I.186.8: I take *-senā-* here and in 9d as 'weapon', not 'army' (contra the standard interp.), because I think 'weapon' works better in 9d with the simile in 9c. However, 'army' (that is, warrior band vel sim.) is certainly not excluded.

Given the sequence *vṛddhásenāḥ ... píṣadaśvāso 'vánayo ná ráthāḥ*, opening with two bahuvrīhis, the last term *avánayo ná ráthāḥ* looks very like a decomposed bahuvrīhi **aváni-ratha-* 'having chariots (like) streams'. Curiously, though Re is usually quick to suggest such an interpr., he does not mention such a possibility in his notes.

I.186.9: As disc. ad X.33.1 my tr. of *prayújaḥ* as 'advance teams' smacks too much of a modern political campaign, and I would now slightly alter that tr. to 'teams' or 'teams in front'.

I.186.10: I take *adveṣáḥ* here not as the neut. *s*-stem (as Gr, Lub classify it), but as the nom. sg. masc. of the them. adj. *adveṣá-* marginally but clearly attested as du. *adveṣé* at

IX.68.10=X.45.12. As far as I can see, the them. sg. interpr. is also followed by Ge and Re. On the problematic *s*-stem see disc. ad X.35.9.

I.186.11: The *dīdhiti-* 'visionary hymn' of this vs. makes a thematic ring with the *manīṣā-* 'inspired thought' of 1d.

I.187 Food and Drink

I.187.1: This vs. is classified as Anuṣṭubgarbhā (5 8 / 8 8), the only such vs. in the RV. The first 5 syllables (*pitúṃ nú stoṣam* "Now I shall praise food") are almost like a heading or title; without that pāda the vs. would be a straight Gāyatrī like the following one (and also vss. 4, 8–10), though it would lack a verb to govern the acc. in b.

The suffix-accented masc. *dharmán-* is rare and confined to the late RV, as opposed to the common neut. *dhárman-*. Here 'supporter, upholder' would be a more accurate tr. than 'support'.

I take *víparva-* here as proleptic: the result of Trita's shaking of Vṛtra is that his joints go apart. Gr takes the *ví-* instead as privative ('gelenklos'), which could make sense for a snake. But the passages adduced by Ge, like VIII.6.13 *ví vṛ́trām parvaśó rujā́n* "breaking V. apart joint by joint," demonstrate that Vṛtra is conceived of as having joints, which can be parted.

I.187.2: On metrically bad *vavṛmahe*, see Kü (459) and comm. ad VI.4.7.

To reach 8 syllables, *tvā* must be read distracted.

I.187.5: For the interpr. of this vs., see publ. intro.

I.187.7: On the idiom *áram √gam* DAT, see comm. ad X.9.3.

I.187.8: *pariṃśám* is a hapax, and as Mayr. points out, its proximity to phonologically similar *āriśāmahe* suggests that it's an Augenblicksbildung, perhaps as a blend of *pári* and *áṃśa-* 'portion'.

I.187.10: My tr. of the hapax *udārathí-* follows a suggestion registered in EWA s.v. *udārá-* for lack of anything better. Ge refuses to tr.; WG 'erregend' takes Sāy.'s gloss into account.

I.188 Āprī

The beginning of this hymn is preoccupied with "thousands" (1b, 2c, 3c, 4b).

I.188.2: *dádhat* is grammatically ambiguous. With most tr. I take it as a masc. nom. sg. act. part. to the redupl. pres., but it could also be a (short-vowel) subjunctive to the same stem (so Old [SBE]). There are no implications either way.

I.188.6–7, 9: These three vss. all contain *hí* in their first clause, which I render as causal, contra the standard tr.

I.188.9: The double acc. *rūpā́ṇi ... paśū́n víśvān* poses some difficulties. Ge construes *rūpā́ṇi* with *prabhúḥ* ("der die Formen bemeistert"). But I know of no other passages in which *prabhú-* governs an acc., and *prabhvī́ḥ* in 5a would discourage such an interpr. in any case. X.110, the Āprī hymn most like this one, has in the corresponding vs. *rūpaír ápiṃśad bhúvanāni víśvā*, with an instr. of *rūpá-*. In both cases I think the *rūpá-* further specifies the primary object, in this case "all the beasts": it is their *forms* he is anointing.

The logical sequence in this vs. is broken in Ge's tr. because of his use of abstract vocab. for concrete notions: "hat ... fertiggemacht" for *samānajé* 'anointed' and "Gedeihen" for *sphātím* 'fat'. Surely the point is that the addressee of c (probably Agni or the Hotar, with Ge) is urged to win the fat that Tvaṣṭar used to anoint the beasts -- however conceptually transformed such fat may be.

I.188.10: "of the gods" in the publ. tr. would be better rendered "for the gods."

I.188.11: As in vs. 9, symbolic anointing, here by means of a chant or song, is still represented as physical: Agni "shines" because of it, presumably gleaming from the conceptual fat. I take *gāyatréṇa* as referring specifically to the Gāyatrī meter (in which this hymn is composed), though it may merely be 'song', as Ge (/WG) take it.

I.189 Agni

I.189.1: The dat. *rāyé* with √*nī* may go too easily into English as a goal, "lead to wealth"; '*for* wealth' might be more faithful to the case form. However, I do not subscribe to WG's interpr. of *supáthā* as a neut. pl. goal ("zu den Orten, wo gute Wege sind"), which seems awk. and unnec. when an instr. sg. works well and is paralleled elsewhere.

(*víśvāni*) *vayúnāni vidvā́n* is a standard phrase, used esp. of Agni (I.72.7, III.5.6, VI.15.10, X.122.2), referring presumably to his deep knowledge of the ritual as the god most enmeshed in ritual.

I take *juhurāṇá-* to √*hvṛ* / *hru* 'go crookedly, go astray' (with Ge and Re, as well as Gr), rather than with √*hṛ* 'be angry' with Insler (JAOS 88, 1968), apparently followed by WG ("den zürnenden Frevel"). The contrast between the easy path in pāda a and the *énas-* that goes crookedly/astray in c supports this ascription, as does *abhihrút-* in 6d. Agastya uses the same participle in I.173.11, where its affinity to √*hvṛ* rather than √*hṛ* is even clearer.

I.189.2: Pāda c provides a fine parallel to "A mighty fortress is our god." The word order is somewhat unusual, in that we might expect *naḥ* to take Wackernagel's position in the pāda as a whole; instead it seems to have taken up a version of that position in the post-caesura phrase *bahulā́ na urvī́*, which simply modifies the nom. sg. *pū́ḥ* that begins the pāda. There might be several reasons for this. For one thing *ca* occupies that position, but this is not a particularly compelling suggestion because the function and positioning of that *ca* are somewhat puzzling. Klein (DGRV I.220 n. 81) suggests that it connects *pū́ḥ ... bhávā* with the clause earlier in the vs. whose verb is *pārayā*. I would suggest rather that it is an inverse *ca* conjoining the two predicate nominatives construed with *bhávā*, i.e., *pū́ḥ* and *śáṃ yóḥ*. (This would, among other things, eliminate another ex. of supposed sentential or clausal *ca*, ascribing to it its more usual role as conjoiner of nominals.) It

may also be that the alliteration in the phrase *pū́ḥ ... pṛthvî́* would stand out more starkly without *naḥ* in between, but that should apply to *ca* as well.

I.189.3: The verb in b, *abhy ámanta*, is accented; though there is no overt subordinator, I take pāda b as a purpose clause dependent on pāda a. That the obj. of *yuyodhi* in a, *ámīvā(ḥ)* 'afflictions', forms an etymological figure with the verb in b supports a close relationship between the pādas. *ámanta* is best taken as a subjunctive, to the seṭ root pres. *amīti* and as an -*anta* replacement for act. *-*an* of the usual type in this otherwise act. verbal system (Jamison IIJ 21 [1979] 150). This avoids imposing an interpr. as a reciprocal middle, as noted as an alternative by WG with ref. to Hoffmann and Dunkel, although the WG tr. does not reflect it.

The 2nd hemistich lacks a verb. I supply *kaḥ*; the idiom *púnar √kṛ* 'make new, renew' is fairly common (see Gr., s.v. *púnar*, 2), and see also Agastya's I.174.7 *kṣā́m ... kaḥ*, with the same object as here though with a very different sense. The publ. tr. should signal the lack of verb by a device like "Re(new) ..." or "(Make) new ..."

I.189.4: It is not clear what (if anything) *utá* is conjoining. Klein (DGRV I.371) says there's an ellipsis of the verb in the 2nd clause, but he doesn't say what verb. I am reluctant to add semantics to *utá* of the type 'even', 'also', 'especially', as Re and Ge do in their different ways. In the publ. tr. the pf. part. *śuśukvā́n* is translated ("and when you blaze ...") as if it contrasted with an unexpressed different activity of Agni's. I might now be inclined to take it as an implicitly subordinated circumstantial clause to be construed with the prohibitives of cd: "and when you blaze ..., let not ..." However, the tr. "when you ..." obscures the fact that the verbal notion is expressed by a nom. sg. participle, which should (and does not) modify the subject of the *mā́* clause(s) in cd. However, note that Agni *is* the subj. of the *mā́* clauses that occupy all of vs. 5.

I.189.7: The *ví* with *vidvā́n* picks up the *ví* that both opens and closes the preceding verse (*ví ... yaṃsat / viṣpáṭ*), linking this verse to the apparently different topic that precedes it. This provides a clue for the referent of *tā́n ... ubháyān* "those both." Ge (/WG) take the "" to refer to the two time periods mentioned in this verse, *prapitvé* and *abhipitvé*, but, on the basis of the larger context, with Old (SBE) and Re I think it refers to good and bad men, or more narrowly to sacificers and non-sacrificers. Agni's eagerness for the sacrifice is expressed by pāda b, where he pursues (*véṣi*) the sons of Manu, i.e., the sacrificers, at the earlier mealtime, and his satisfaction as the sacrifice proceeds by the gerundive *śā́syaḥ* 'to be directed/instructed, tractable'.

The configuration *ví vidvā́n* with accented preverb adjacent to the participle with which it is construed, is initial surprising, since we would expect univerbation and loss of accent on the preverb. But, as disc. with regard to the same phrase in VII.10.2 (q.v.), *ví* remains separate and accented in order to avoid interpr. expected * *vividvā́n* as belonging to √*vid* 'find'.

In b Ge (/WG) supply 'nourishment' (die Nahrung) as object of *véṣi* with *mánuṣaḥ* as gen. sg., but this seems unnecessary.

There is no consensus about the meaning or etymology of the word *akrá-* (5x), generally a descriptor of Agni; see EWA s.v. Gr glosses 'Herrzeichen, Banner', but since it is once called *navajā́-* 'new-born' (IV.6.3), an animal (or at least a living thing) is more

likely. Since several of the contexts refer to the kindling of the fire, it seems likely to be a young animal, an identification that *navajā́-* of course favors. And *marmṛjénya-* 'to be groomed' in our passage suggests a horse, since the root √*mṛj* generally takes a horse or something so conceived as its object. Hence the tr. 'foal'.

Despite the position of *ná*, *uśígbhiḥ* is unlikely to form part of the simile.

I.190 Bṛhaspati

For the hymn as a whole, see H.-P. Schmidt, *Bṛhaspati und Indra* (1968), 72–77 and passim.

I.190.1: The main cl. verb *vardhayā* is entirely ambiguous between 2nd sg. imperative and 1st sg. subjunctive. With Re and Schmidt (B+I) I opt for the 1st sg. subj., while Gr, Ge, and WG take it as 2nd sg. impv. There are no implications either way.

I.190.4: There are a number of syntactic questions and problems in this verse. To begin with, in pāda a the sequence *divī́yate* could be resolved as either *diví ī́yate* (so Gr, Pp.) or *diví ī́yate*. In the latter case, with accented verb, we could have a subordination without an overt subordinator. I have chosen to interpret it so, contra the standard tr. and interpr. (though with Scar 371 n. 516), because the other likely connections between pādas a and b favor this closer nexus.

The next questions arise because of the opening of pāda b, *átyo ná yaṃsat*. The simile goes semantically most naturally with the preceding pāda, "like a steed, it speeds ...," but the lack of accent on *yaṃsat* makes that impossible because this verb would then be initial in its clause. The situation is complicated by the fact that *yaṃsat* exactly replicates *yaṃsat* in 3b, where it governs *ślókam* in the accusative, whereas here a nominative *ślókaḥ* is subject of the preceding pāda and in order to get it to be object of *yaṃsat* here, the subject has to change and an unexpressed acc. **ślókam* be supplied. Moreover, the steed in the opening of b is a very likely object of *yaṃsat*, but is in the wrong case. There are several (ad hoc) ways to handle this problem. The first is simply to interpret the text as given, with the steed compared to the subject of *yaṃsat*, who is probably Bṛhaspati. This is in fact the interpr. of the standard tr., though each one needs to supply material and adjust interpr. in order to make it work semantically. I do not find these various makeshifts satisfactory. In order to confront the semantic problems noted above, it is possible to assume that the verb in 4b was originally really accented **yáṃsat*, which lost its accent redactionally because of *yaṃsat* in the preceding verse. This would allow the tr. "When his signal-call speeds in heaven and on earth like a steed, he will control it [=signal call/steed]," with the simile taken with pāda a and a new clause beginning with **yáṃsat*. This may be the simplest solution, though it is not exactly the one in the publ. tr. Instead there I (more or less) follow the suggestion sketched out by Old and discussed in more detail by Scar (371 and n. 516), whereby *átyo ná* stands for **átyaṃ ná*; Old explains the nom. as attraction to the preceding pāda. Scar seems to endorse Old's attraction hypothesis, but his tr. is more complex (and essentially identical to mine), in that he reads the simile both as nom. with pāda a and (in brackets) as acc. with pāda b. Although this may seem over-fussy, it addresses both the syntactic and the semantic problems.

The second hemistich presents a more conventional type of double reading, whereby the word *hetáyaḥ* is taken to belong both to the simile and to the frame, which its position in the pāda facilitates. In the frame *hetí-* has its common meaning 'missile, lance', a development from the general 'impel' meaning of √*hi*; there is a further metaphorical development here: the missiles of Bṛhaspati are his words. In the simile, with the gen. *mṛgáṇām*, the *hetí-* are the charges or drives of the wild beasts, using a more abstract or etymological sense of the *-tí-*stem. This double interpr. is found in Old, Re, and Scar; it seems significantly more satisfying that Ge's notion (fld by WG) that takes *mṛgáṇām* as a datival gen. -- the missiles/weapons *for* the wild beasts -- which requires that the two genitives *mṛgáṇām* and *bṛ́haspáteḥ* be non-parallel.

With Scar I take the *ca* in c as coordinating cd with a.

I do not understand exactly what *yakṣa-bhṛ́t-* in b refers to, nor do I understand why the heavens are *áhimāya-*. For the latter, one can recall that in V.40.6, 8 the *māyáḥ* of Svarbhānu hide the sun and that in my extensive treatment of the Svarbhānu myth (Ravenous Hyenas, 1991) I interpret those *māyáḥ* as the swirling clouds of smoke issuing from Agni. So here the "serpentine wiles" that the heavens possess might be the clouds of smoke from the ritual fire produced at the same time as Bṛhaspati's ritual signal call (though *áhimāya-* when applied to the gods would have to have a different sense). This further suggests that the wondrous apparitions (*yakṣá-*) that Bṛhaspati brings are other marvelous sights associated with the sacrificial performance. But these are just guesses.

I.190.5: The standard tr. take *pajráḥ* as a PN, as it can be elsewhere, but there seems no reason to drag in Kakṣīvant's kin for vilification, and I prefer taking it as a simple descriptor.

The hapax *usriká-* is a nice example of a *-ka-*suffixed form in slangy and deprecatory context. See my article on *-ka-* (IIJ 52, 2009).

There is disharmony in number between the two hemistichs: the relative cl. in the plural describing the evil rivals is picked up by dat. singular *dūḍhyè*.

The accent on *cáyase* is probably due to the following *íd*, which does condition verbal accent -- though in fewer passages than listed by Gr (s.v. *íd* 5), since in many of his exx. the verb is pāda-initial. It can also be noted here that the verb immediately follows a pāda-initial voc. and is contrastive with *ánu dadāsi* in c, either of which would also favor verbal accent.

I.190.6: In b the point is presumably that an ally who is constantly solicited by everyone around is likely to change sides without warning.

With Old, Re, and Schmidt (B+I) I supply 'cows' with *ápīvṛtā(ḥ)*, while Ge (/WG) opt for 'doors'. Since they all take the Aṅgirases as the implied subject, both interpr. refer to the Vala myth.

I.190.7: The bahuvrīhi *ródha-cakra-*, lit. 'having their banks as wheels', may seem slightly jarring, and Ge (/WG) attenuate the sense to "die die Ufer entlang rollen." But *cakrá-* is definitely the noun 'wheel' (all the way back into PIE), not a transparent derivative of a verbal root meaning 'roll', and I think the cmpd must be taken in its literal sense. (So also Re: "ayant pour roues les hautes-rives.") The point of comparison must be not the speed or movement of the chariot but its physical configuration, with the wheels

defining the outer limits of the vehicle as seen from above or behind and rising above the bottom of its body, just as river banks do the river.

A different watery image is found in the 2nd hemistich. With Ge I take *táraḥ* here as a ford (like the etymologically related *tīrthá-*, both to √*tṛ* 'cross, pass,' etc.) or perhaps more generally a means of crossing (water). Bṛhaspati, likened to a bird of prey, keeps his eye on both the ford and the (deeper) waters -- presumably watching for fish to swim into the shallow water of the ford, so they can be snatched close to the surface. This image is highly reminiscent of the feeding behavior of water birds like cranes, egrets, and herons, whose preternatural stillness and single-minded vigilance as they stand in shallow water waiting for prey, followed by a swift but graceful lunge with their beaks, can only impress the observer and could well provide a model for the "knowing Bṛhaspati" and his sharp eyes depicted here. (For those who haven't had the pleasure of seeing this in the wild, there are numerous YouTube videos.) Such birds are found in the appropriate geographical areas of NW India/Pakistan, and since *gṛ́dhra-* lit. means 'greedy', it need not specifically designate a vulture, *pace* Ge (/WG), Schmidt ('Geier'), and Re ('vautour').

ā́paḥ here must be acc. pl., one of the handful of examples of the spread of the nom. pl. to acc. function in this stem.

I.190.8: The standard tr. take *devā́ḥ* as a predicate nominative (vel sim.) with *dhāyi* (e.g., Re "... a été installé (comme) dieu"). This may be correct, but it does assume that Bṛhaspati only secondarily came to be considered as, or was made into, a deva (so, e.g., Ge n. 2d). Following H.-P. Schmidt's hypothesis that *bṛ́haspáti-* was originally an epithet of, and aspect of, Indra, it would be possible to interpret this passage as referring to the moment when Bṛhaspati emerged as a deva in his own right; on the other hand, since Indra is most definitely a deva from the beginning, a particular aspect of him should not require promotion to deva-status. It should be noted that Schmidt explicitly disputes the standard interp. (B+I, 75–77) and tr. *devā́ḥ* as a simple descriptor: "So wird der grosse, machtgeborene, mächtige B., der Stier, der Gott eingesetzt." I follow Schmidt.

I.191 Against poisonous animals

Because of the popular character of this hymn and the idiomatic specificity of the entities mentioned, much of the vocabulary is obscure. I will not discuss the supposed real-world identifications or etymological speculations for each lexical item. Reasonably up-to-date treatments of the sec. lit. are available in EWA, s.vv.

I.191.1: I do not understand the double *íti* of pāda c. But I assume that the "two" in this pāda refers to the two differently identified *káṅkata-* in ab, the one that is not (really) a *káṅkata* and the one that is a true (*satīna-*) *káṅkata-*. These are then re-identified as *plúṣi-*.

For the accent of *adṛ́ṣṭa-* see AiG II.1.226 and Nachtr. p. 66.

I.191.2: The feminine nemesis is not identified. As Ge notes (n. 2), Sāy. suggests it's the healing plant, Henry both the plant and dawn.

I.191.3: I take *kúśara-* as containing the pejorative *ku-*prefix (as in *kú-yava-* '(bringing) bad harvest') and a play on the preceding word *śará-*.

The three vṛddhi derivatives, *sairyá-*, *mauñjá-*, and *vairiṇá-*, I interpret flg. Sāy.'s suggestion for the last two, namely that they refer to the *adṛ́ṣta-* bugs found on those particular grasses. Many of the most annoying biting insects lurk in tall grass waiting for their victims to present unshielded ankles and calves -- in the US chiggers, fleas, and ticks come to mind.

I.191.4: This vs. seems an attempt at sympathetic magic: animals, both domestic and wild, and humans (symbolized by their lights, presumably their fires) are all settling down for the night (though the time period is not explicit), and so should the bugs. As anyone who's ever been outside in a buggy place after dark knows, this magic is not necessarily going to work -- though it's true that some types of bugs are active at dusk and then stop.

I.191.5: This vs. does seem to refer to such insects, those that become active at twilight when the wind drops. For example, although there are numerous types of mosquitoes and different species have different feeding patterns, it seems (from a quick Google search) that most species feed at dawn and dusk and a few hours into the dark.

I.191.6: It is unclear to me why the bugs are being credited with such a grand pedigree. Perhaps to indicate that they are ubiquitous in the space between earth and heaven?

Sāy. suggests this vs. and the next are addressed to snakes, but there seems no reason why *adṛ́ṣta-* would change its referent. As I noted in the publ. intro., the impulse to demand that a troublesome unswattable bug settle down long enough to be squashed is likely to be universal.

I.191.8–9: The rising of the sun may reflect the fact, mentioned above, that many bugs feed at twilight (dawn and dusk), and sunrise portends the end of the (pre-)dawn feeding frenzy.

I.191.8: On *jambháya-* 'crush', see comm. ad II.23.9 and my *-áya*-Formations, p. 93.

I.191.10–13: For the irregular meter of these vss. see HvN metrical comm. ad locc. and Arnold (VedMet. p. 163).

I.191.10: As noted in the publ. intro., the second part of the hymn begins here, but it clearly pivots on the sun, which figured in the two preceding vss.

My interpr. of this much discussed vs. is presented in the publ. intro., but in compressed fashion. As noted there, I think this has to do with the separation of noxious liquid from beneficial liquid, a feat ascribed in natural terms to the sun and in mythological terms to Indra. When "I fasten the poison on the sun" (pāda a), I am counting on the purificatory power of the sun to neutralize or banish the poison. This ritualistic action is matched in pāda b by fastening the skin onto the house of the surā-possessor. Surā is an alcoholic beverage of some sort (generally tr. 'Branntwein', 'brandy', et sim., though, acdg. to James McHugh [p.c.], it is unlikely that the technology of distilling was known to Vedic India, so probably some sort of beer; see now

McHugh's 2021 "The Ancient Indian Alcoholic Drink Called *Surā*: Vedic Evidence" [JAOS 141.1]) and a universally condemned evil twin to soma, though it gets used in some śrauta rituals, particularly the Sautrāmaṇī. The appearance of the surā-possessor (*súrāvant-*) in b is owing to two factors: on the one hand, as just noted, surā is a taboo drink and is therefore equivalent to the poison (*viṣá-*) in pāda a. On the other, the word *súrā-* is phonologically reminiscent of 'sun' *sū́rya-* in pāda a.

The natural/ritual action depicted in the first pāda is, in my interpr., matched by the mythological action of the second pāda. I therefore do not take pāda b as a simile (as Ge does), but as a parallel action -- the attachment of a skin (*dṛ́ti-*) full of poison/surā on the house of the surā-possessor, who, in my view, is Indra, who appears by epithet in pāda e. (Though Ge and others tentatively identify *hariṣṭhā́-* as the sun god, the 'mounter of the fallow bays' can only be Indra.) Later Vedic has a cmpd. *surā-dṛti-* 'surā-skin', found in PB XIV.11.26 and JB III.229. Both passages concern the *vipānam* of a liquid; *vi* √*pā*, lit. 'drink apart', is used for the separation of two kinds of liquids that have been mixed together (or separation of a liquid from something containing it); see comm. ad VII.22.4. In the late RV and later, this lexeme is specialized for the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, whose mythological foundation is the healing of Indra by the Aśvins and Sarasvatī, after he had drunk too much soma. They make him drink surā, which was mixed with soma (perhaps the soma he had already drunk), and he performs the feat of separating the two liquids. This myth is already present in X.131.4–5 with precisely this detail. When in pāda b here we fasten the skin of poison onto Indra the surā-drinker's house, we are implicitly asking him to perform the same feat for us. The refrain (found in vss. 10–13, pādas c-f) makes it clear that he has succeeded. At least in my interpr., it is said that Indra has put the poison far in the distance (e) and the honeyed (plant?) has made honey (quite possibly soma, as often)(f): the two liquids have been separated and are separate, with the good one available to us. The result is that the mythological model, Indra, will not die (c) -- nor will we (d) -- and the poison with which we began has been rendered ineffective.

I.191.11: The extraordinary density of *-ka*-suffixed forms begins here and lasts till the end of the hymn. That little birds eat the poison and destroy it may reflect the fact that many birds eat noxious insects without harm to them and with benefit to us. But the insects may no longer be the subject of this part of the hymn.

I.191.12: Sāy. suggests that the "little sparks" (*viṣpuliṅgaká-*) are little sparrows. This makes sense not only because of the birds in vss. 11 and 14, but because of the visual effect of flocks of small birds feeding: esp. when they are in bushes or underbrush they can burst up, out, and around at random almost like sparks. The *viṣ-* of course also recalls *viṣá-* 'poison'. I do not understand why there are 21 of them, save for the fact that thrice seven is a satisfying number. Similar numbers are found in the next two vss.

I.191.13: The "tormentors" (/harmers, destroyers) of poison, the hapax gen. pl. *rópuṣīṇām*, are feminine. The referent is entirely unclear, but the removers of poison in the next vs. are all feminine as well.

I.191.15–16: The *-ka-* suffix is particularly prominent in these vss, appearing not only on the designation of the bug (*kuṣumbhakáḥ*, 2x), but also on the pronominal adj. *iyattakáḥ*

('such a one'), the pronoun *takám*, and the participle *pravartamānakáḥ*. The word for 'scorpion', *vṛścika-* only appears in that form, but appears to contain the *-ka-* suffix as well, very common in words for noxious insects (see my "-*ka*-suffix," IIJ 52 [2009]: 318).