

Commentary IX

Since all hymns in this maṇḍala are dedicated to Soma Pavamāna, the dedicand will not be identified for each hymn.

In both the publ. tr. and in the comm., I have tried to use lower case soma for the substance and capped Soma for the god, but of course much of the point of the Soma Maṇḍala is that the two cannot be separated. So this convention is not fully workable.

IX.1–67

All hymns in Gāyatrī meter.

IX.1

IX.1.1–2: After establishing the Soma Pavamāna theme in the 2nd pāda of the 1st vs., with the command *pāvasva soma* “purify yourself, Soma,” in the 2nd vs. the poet presents Soma in an expansive role, as demon-smasher (*rakṣohān-*) and belonging to all domains (*viśvācarṣani-*), while at the same time precisely locating him in his seat on the ritual ground. This juxtaposition of hyper-local, ritually defined technical details and the grandiosely universal is typical of the entire IXth Maṇḍala.

IX.1.2: The adj. *āyohata-* ‘metal-hammered’ occurs twice in the RV (also IX.80.2), both qualifying *yóni-* ‘womb’ and referring to something that contains soma. Old suggests that it refers to a wooden vessel that has been hewn out by a metal blade.

What the instr. *drúṇā* is doing here is unclear to me. This instr. appears 5x in the RV; in the two passages outside of the Soma maṇḍala (V.86.3, VIII.96.11) it appears to refer to an implement with which one accomplishes something -- in the latter passage a paddle to propel a boat to reach the far shore. Of the two other passages in IX, IX.65.6 *drúṇā sadhástham aśnuṣe* is quite similar to this one: “you attain to your seat *drúṇā*,” and in IX.98.2 *índur abhí drúṇā hitáh*, which lacks an overt ‘seat’, the interpr. depends on which root *hitáh* is assigned to: $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place’ or \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’. In all three soma passages I take *drúṇā* as an implement (a wooden vessel or even a pusher, a paddle) that allows soma to attain its place or (in 98.2, taking *hitá-* to \sqrt{hi}) to be impelled on its way. This is not the standard interpr.; most (see, e.g., Old’s disc.) take it as referring to the wooden cup or vessel that constitutes soma’s “seat” (e.g., Ge “an seinen Platz aus Holz”), but the instr. in such an interpr. is troubling. Re remarks “Instr. un peu rude pour *d° kṛtām*” and renders (ad IX.1.2) IX.65.6 as “placé (sur la cuve faite) en bois.” Though he further remarks “on ne peut parler qu’avec réserve de l’Instr. de matière en véd.,” an instr. of material is essentially the standard interpr. of *drúṇā* in this passage -- one that I would prefer to avoid, though perhaps at the expense of inventing another implement in the soma ritual.

IX.1.3: The aggrandizing of Soma’s role continues here, with 3 superlatives: *varivo-dhātama-* ‘best establisher of the wide realm’, *mām̐histha-* ‘most munificent’, and *vṛtra-hántama-* ‘best smasher of obstacles’ -- the last of course borrowing Indra’s signature epithet, while *mām̐hiṣṭha-* also regularly characterizes Indra. Re suggests that the three represent the three (Dumézilian) functions, but this does not seem particularly compelling. Vs. 1 also began with two superlatives, *svādīṣṭha-* ‘sweetest’ and *mādīṣṭha-* ‘most exhilarating’, but these are restricted to soma’s ritual role, whereas the three in this vs. attribute universal powers to him.

Pāda c is identical to VIII.103.7d, found in the very last hymn of Maṇḍala VIII, just as this is found in the first hymn of Maṇḍala IX -- so they are adjacent in the Saṃhitā arrangement. But I don't know what, if anything, to make of this. If this is more than just accident, it would suggest that the compilers selected this particular Gāyatrī hymn to begin IX on the basis of this verbal correspondence.

IX.1.6: As indicated in the publ. intro., the standard clichés of the soma maṇḍala gave way here to more novel material. The involvement of the Daughter of the Sun as purifier of soma is puzzling. Ge suggests (n. 6b) that the Daughter of the Sun, also found in this maṇḍala at IX.72.3, 113.3, is the “Dicht- oder Gesangeskunst,” on what seem to me slender grounds (mostly III.53.15, which is not at all clear). Oberlies's notion (Relig. RV I.241, 282; II.60) that this locution indicates that Soma comes from heaven to earth at dawn is more plausible -- though it should be kept in mind that Sūryā, the daughter of the Sun, is not the same as Uṣas, Dawn. I would rather suggest that the presence of this figure in this vs., which immediately precedes two vss. metaphorically concerning ‘maidens’ (*yóṣanaḥ*) and ‘unwed girls’ (*agrúvaḥ*), is meant to showcase the mythological marriageable maiden par excellence: Sūryā exists essentially only to get married. Her appearance in this vs. serves as a positive model for the maidens that follow. However, this interpr. does not fit well with my interpr. of the other passages in which she appears in this maṇḍala; see esp. disc. ad IX.72.3.

The referent of *te* has occasioned some discussion. In this hymn the 2nd ps. referent is otherwise always soma, but the acc. *sómam* already appears in the vs. as obj. of *punāti*. The solution adopted by most (see Old's disc.), which I also subscribe to, is that *te* does refer to soma, but to Soma the god, distinguishing him from soma the liquid, the ritual substance represented by the acc. *sómam*. Ge (n. 6) cites other possibilities that have been suggested -- the ritual patron or Indra -- though he himself accepts the Soma the god hypothesis.

IX.1.7: The adj. *ānu-* ‘delicate, fine’, always in the fem., is used several times of the fingers in their task of pressing soma. Because fingers are, of course, joined in the hand they are also called sisters, as here.

The ‘clash’ (*samaryé*) presumably refers to the pounding of the pressing stones.

IX.1.8: The ‘unwed girls’ are also the fingers alluded to in the preceding vs.: the pl. *agrúvaḥ* is always so used.

In b they are clearly blowing into a musical instrument: *bākurá-* is a hapax, a vṛddhi deriv. of *bákura-* also a hapax (I.117.21), used of a musical instrument one blows (*√ dham*), as here. Both show non-Indo-Aryan phonology. But what does this have to do with soma preparation? and how can fingers “blow” into a pipe? Ge, ad I.117.21, suggests that the skin pipe is the “bildlicher Ausdruck für die Somapflanze”; perhaps the reference is to the stalk, and perhaps the fingers pressing on the stalk produce a noise similar to a pipe. Or -- perhaps the poet has simply gotten carried away by a picture of festivity, with unmarried girls celebrating at a gathering.

The next question is what to do with the acc. phrase in c. I find it unlikely that the “wild honey” is in apposition to the bag-pipe of b, though Ge seems to take it that way. Re supplies another verb “(elles traient),” whereas I take it as a return to the object of *hinvantī* in pāda a, with b loosely parenthetical. It is “threefold” (*tridhātu*) perhaps in reference to the three soma

pressings, or to some other ritual triplet (see Ge's suggestions n. 8c). For further discussion of *tridhātu ... mādhu* see comm. ad IX.70.8.

IX.1.9: Note the openings of vss. 7–9: 7 *tām īm* / 8 *tām īm* / 9 *abhīm(ām)*.

Pāda c is a slight variant on 1c and sketches a ring.

IX.1.10: As just noted, the last pāda of vs. 9 seems to bring the hymn to a conclusion with a reprise of the end of the 1st vs., even though another vs. follows. Indeed vs. 10 does seem to stand apart from the rest of the hymn, while picking up various elements from it. First, note that though Indra was mentioned in the ring-compositional pādas, 1c *īndrāya pātave sutāḥ*, 9c *sómam īndrāya pātave*, he was absent from the rest of the hymn and his characteristics and deeds assigned to Soma instead. But here he reasserts his role as *vṛtrá*-smasher (b *vísṣvā vṛtrāṇi jighnate*), posited of Soma in 3b *vṛtrahántamaḥ*, and as giver of bounties (c *maghā ... māmhate*), also posited of Soma in 3b *mámhiṣṭhaḥ*. The superlative *mádiṣṭha*- 'most exhilarating', describing the stream of soma in the first pāda of the hymn (1a), returns as the exhilarations of soma (*asyá ... mádeṣu*)(10a) that spur Indra on to his exploits, the signature root *√mad* having been absent for all the rest of the hymn. (This particular ring-compositional effect is obscured in the publ. tr. by my use of 'raptures' for *mádeṣu* in 10a.)

IX.2

For the sequence of ideas and actions in this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.2.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn begins with the quintessential command of the Soma maṇḍala: *pávasva* 'purify yourself', found in the previous hymn at the beginning of the 2nd pāda (IX.1.1b).

The 2nd word *devavīḥ* 'pursuing the gods' also matches up with the previous hymn:

IX.1.4 *devānāṃ vītīm*.

The expression "across the filter" is iconically split across the pāda break: *āti, pavítram*.

The last pāda consists of a neat double figure *índram indo vṛśā víśa*. The play between *índra*- and *índu*- 'drop' is ubiquitous in the IXth Maṇḍala and is in fact reprised in 9a *indav indrayúḥ*.

IX.2.2: The standard tr. of (*ā*) *vacyasva* (*√vañc*) here is 'gallop' (Ge, Re), but the root itself means something like 'move crookedly' (see comm. ad III.39.1 inter alia). Kulikov (Vedic -*ya*-presents) devotes considerable space to this -*yá*-pres. (218–24), rather desperately attempting to account for its apparent passive accentuation (*vacyáte*). He concludes that the subject of this pres. "always refers to beings set in motion and directed by someone else, not moving on its [*sic*] own," and was originally the passive counterpart of a posited transitive redupl. pres. ***vívañkti* [double star is Kulikov's]. I find this over-elaborate -- and since the subjects are generally horses, or entities configured as horses, and since RVic horses have considerable agency of their own with regard to movement -- not terribly convincing. In this particular case, the verb is in the imperative, and it is difficult to see how something incapable of moving on its own could be commanded to do so. Four of the ten occurrences of this pres. stem are imperatival, three of them 2nd sg. as here. (the fourth is 3rd pl.). As discussed ad III.39.1, etc., I consider one of the nuances of this verb to be 'coil, twist', and here I see the soma circling and twisting its way into the cup;

the preverb *pári* ‘around’ is a regular part of the description of soma’s movements around the filter and into the vessels.

I take the injunc. *sadaḥ* in the sense of an impv.; see KH (Injunc. 263) for this usage of this particular form.

On the *sa*-aor. *ádhuḥṣa-*, here in 3rd sg. mid. *adhukṣata*, see Narten (Sig.Aor. 143–44).

IX.2.3–4: These two vss. introduce the trope of “clothing,” a metaphor for mixing the soma juice with various substances: after the pressing proper the soma is mixed first with water (vs. 3) and then with milk (vs. 4), the latter accounting for the ubiquitous “cows” of the IXth Maṇḍala. Thus, though an expression “clothe himself with cows” initially strikes the inexperienced reader as ludicrous, it makes perfect sense in the tightly constructed verbal realm of the Soma hymns: clothing = mixing and cows = waters.

IX.2.4: What I don’t quite understand is why we have the rather exotic form, a causative future reflexive middle in 4c, *vāsayīṣyāse* (lit. ‘you will cause yourself to be clothed’), in contrast to the straightforward *-iṣ*-aor. middle *vasiṣṭa* (‘he has clothed himself’) that corresponds to it in 3c. The need or desire to use the future must have triggered the creation of this baroque form. In this connection it is worth noting that *√vas* ‘clothe’ lacks a standard future in Vedic and, acdg. to Wh Roots, has only one occurrence in ClSk. of a future *vatsyati* -- so perhaps the causative allowed a transparent future to be built more easily. This form (repeated in the identical pāda in IX.66.13) is also the only medial form of the caus. to *√vas* ‘clothe’ in the RV. The question then arises – why is the future so desirable in this context that such morphological shenanigans had to be performed? The clue to the usage may lie in part in the sequencing of the verbs: both b and c are repeated in IX.66.13 (likewise as bc), and so the two clauses form a larger unit and must be evaluated together. The b pāda contains a pres. indic., *āpo arṣanti síndhavaḥ* “The waters, the rivers rush,” while c contains the causative future under discussion. On the one hand, the future may be signaling that the second action (clothing in milk) will follow the first (clothing in waters); this is of course the normal ritual order. But we should also remember that the future, esp. the finite future, is relatively rare in the RV, and, curiously, it tends to have a more volitional nuance than the subjunctive, with which it competes. A good ex. of this is found in the famous and well-trodden Agni hymn I.1, where in vs. 6 *yád ... dāśúṣe ... bhadraṃ kariṣyāsi* should be rendered “what good thing you *will* do for the pious man,” indicating Agni’s deliberate choice to favor that man. Here I would suggest that Soma is bound and determined to clothe himself with milk at this point in the ritual proceedings; it is not just the next event on the menu.

IX.2.5: This vs. contains several striking paradoxes, once they have been “unpacked.” First, “the sea has been groomed in the waters,” which seems to reverse volume relations: we would expect “the sea” (*samudrá-*) to be more larger and more extensive than the waters, but evidently the former can be contained and “groomed” (*māṃṛje*) in the latter. The “sea” is of course soma, which is presumably so called on the basis of the usual aggrandizement of Soma’s cosmic associations.

Then, without transition, soma goes from being “the sea” to “the prop and buttress of heaven” -- that is, from something fluid, unstable, and in constant motion to its exact opposite: solid, fixed, steady enough to support heaven itself. Another paradox and another indication that Soma’s cosmic ambitions cannot be contained.

It is tempting to supply “earth” in b, on the basis of IX.87.2 = 89.6 *viṣṭambhó divó dharúṇaḥ pṛthivyāḥ*: “the prop of heaven and buttress of the earth,” but perhaps it is better to stick with the text as we have it.

After the two cosmic identifications in a and b, in c we return to the focused reality of the ritual: the soma in the filter -- the usual toggling between the universal and the hyper-particular.

IX.2.6: Another cosmic association: Soma shines along with the sun, implying that Soma is just as bright -- though this may also be a reference to the timing of the morning pressing, at sunrise.

IX.2.7: Finite forms of the intens. -yá-pres. *marmṛjyá-* are ordinarily transitive, as in IX.38.3 *etám tyám ... marmṛjyánte apasyúvaḥ* “This very one [=soma] do the industrious (fingers) groom,” with the same adj. qualifying the subject as here. Though the transitivity of the verb in 38.3 is quite clear, our passage is more ambiguous -- and has been discussed at some length by Ge (n. 7), Bl (RReps ad loc.), and Re. If we wish the verb to be tr., we can supply ‘you’, as Bl suggests (also Re as an alternative). Or we can take *gíraḥ* as acc., rather than nom., and tr. “the industrious ones constantly groom the songs ...” However, I prefer to take the verb as passive (as two of the three forms of the pres. part. *marmṛjyámāna-* are) and see the vs. as an expression of ritual reciprocity: the songs are groomed by the power of Soma -- that is, the hymns recited at the Soma Sacrifice are refined and perfected by the inspiration given to the poets by Soma -- while those perfected hymns in turn adorn and beautify the soma offering.

IX.2.8: The expression *mádāya ghṛṣvaya* in the Saṃhitā text may be deliberately ambiguous. The Pp. reads dat. *ghṛṣvaye*, which is supported by IX.16.1 as well as VIII.64.12, but IX.101.8 has ... *mádāya ghṛṣvayaḥ* “(cows) avid for exhilaration,” which would allow a tr. here “we, avid for exhilaration ...” Although the publ. tr. follows the Pp. (as do Ge and Re), I think both readings may be intended.

IX.3

As discussed in the publ. intro., this hymn is unified by a simple device, the nom. sg. m. prn/pronominal adj. *eṣá* ‘this (one)’ that opens each vs. The first three vss. (and vs. 5) begin *eṣá deváh*; in a further two vss. (7, 8) the 2nd word *divám* is, of course, etymologically related to *devá-* and a phonological variant (*i* for *e* in the initial syllable). Only vss. 4, 6, 9, and 10 stand aside from this pattern -- and 6 and 9 have *deváh* in their 2nd pādas. The final vs., 10, opens *eṣá u syá* “this one here, this very one,” producing an emphatic summary with the addition of a 2nd prn.

As was also noted in the publ. intro., the maṇḍala’s signature word ‘purify oneself’ is also omnipresent in this hymn, esp. the nom. sg. pres. part. *pāvamāna-* ‘purifying himself’, which opens the pāda in vss. 2(c), 3(b), 4(c), 5(b), 7(c), 8(c); *pavítre* is found (mid-pāda) in 9, and once again vs. 10 marks a change and a summary, by using the finite form *pavate* (mid-c). Only vss. 1 and 6 lack a form of $\sqrt{pū}$. It might be worthy of note (if we understood how this maṇḍala had been assembled) that this flurry of repetitions is the first appearance of the part. *pāvamāna-* in this maṇḍala. The over-abundance of forms of $\sqrt{pū}$ may balance the lack of any overt mention of *sóma-*.

It can also be noted that the hymn is entirely in the 3rd ps.

IX.3.1: The non-literal tr. “bird on the wing” for *parṇavī-* conceals the problematic analysis of this hapax. Although Re (unconvincingly) suggests that -vī- is a simple doublet suffix of -yú-

the most likely (and generally accepted) analysis on formal grounds is as a root noun cmpd. to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, like *deva-vī-* ‘pursuing the gods’ in the preceding hymn (IX.2.1, itself recalling *devānām vītī-* in IX.1.3). However, on the basis of well-attested *deva-vī-* (cf. also *pada-vī-*), we expect the 1st member to express the object of pursuit -- and ‘pursuing the/its wings/feathers’ makes little sense. The best we can construct is an instr. relationship, ‘pursuing with its wings’; see Scar 499. The situation is further muddled by the fact that the 2nd member bears a distinct resemblance to *vī-* ‘bird’, which finds textual expression elsewhere: cf. I.183.1 adduced by Scar, *tridhātunā patatho vīr nā parṇāḥ* “You [=Aśvins] fly with the tripartite (chariot) like a bird with its feathers.” Scar (499–500) sketches a complex scenario whereby *pada-vī-* ‘pursuing the track’ was reinterp. to an instr. **padā-vī-* ‘pursuing with the foot’, giving rise to our cmpd, with a different body part. But I think it’s simpler to assume that our poet was pursuing an imperfect pun with *vī-* ‘bird’, perhaps encouraged by *deva-vī-* in the 1st vs. of the preceding hymn (though we have no way to know how these Gāyatrī hymns were ordered or by whom) and the extreme frequency of that lexeme in the IXth Maṇḍala.

IX.3.2: The expression *vipā kṛtāḥ* ‘created by poetic inspiration’ may seem a bit extreme -- after all soma/Soma exists and previously existed independently of the poets. But the usual RVic power attributed to the word is in play here: poetry brings to realization the gods and divine forces on the ritual ground.

The *s*-stem *hvāras-* belongs to the root $\sqrt{hvṛ}$ ‘go crookedly, swerve’; in a soma context it refers to the curls and tufts of the wool on the sheepskin that serves as the soma filter, trapping the impurities in the just pressed juice. This physical reading seems preferable to the “obstacle” interpr. of Ge, Re, etc. In this regard, I would point out that the smooth, fluffy, brushed sheepskins available commercially now are misleading: sheep on the hoof, particularly the shaggy mountain breeds presumably familiar to the Vedic people, have much more rugged and irregular wool.

IX.3.3: Because of their position in the vs., the instr. *vipanyúbhiḥ ... ṛtāyúbhiḥ* appear to be construed with *pāvamānaḥ*, which is nestled between them. However, with Ge and Re I take them with pass. *mṛjyate* ‘is groomed’ at the end of pāda c. The medial them. pres. *pāvate* is always reflexive (‘purifies oneself’), not passive; when a pass. sense is required, the middle of the IXth Cl. present is used, esp. the part. *punāná-*. Or, to put it another way, the *pāvate* stem, esp. part. *pāvamāna-*, is syntactically inert; as Re says (ad vs. 2), “Le mot *pāvamāna* semble partout étranger à la syntaxe du v. et se distingue à cet égard de *punāná*, *pūyāmāna*, *pūtá*; les exceptions sont de pure apparence.”

IX.3.4: As often, the simile particle *iva* is “late,” following the first two words: *śūro yānn iva sātvaḥ*.

IX.3.7–8: These two vss. are paired; their first two pādas are almost identical:

7ab *eṣá dívam ví dhāvati, tiró rājāmsi dhārayā*

8ab *eṣá dívam vy āsarat, tiró rājāmsi āsṛtaḥ*

I think this close match actually conceals an important difference in intent. Vs. 7 describes the ritual journey of the just pressed soma in the standard grandiose cosmic style -- the journey from filter to cup configured as a journey through the vast realms of heaven and the midspace. The

verb *dhāvati* is pres. indicative. The vs. picks up from vs. 6, which describes the mixing of the pressed juice with water.

But vs. 8 has an augmented aorist *āsarat* (*ā asarat*, so Pp; it could technically be an injunc. *ā sarat*). I do not think this simply indicates the endpoint of the journey depicted in 7. Instead it alludes to the origin myth of soma, the bold stealing of Soma from heaven treated esp. in IV.26-27. The clue is the adj. *āsprta-*. Although this stem is glossed as ‘invincible’ by Gr, reflected also in Re’s tr., *√spr* means rather ‘gain, win’ and even ‘recover, regain’. The other occurrence of this privative past part. is found in an Indra hymn in VIII, in a pāda almost identical to our b (acc. *āsprtam*, not nom. as here). There it also concerns Soma’s journey, but in that passage it is clear that the Somarauh is referred to: VIII.82.9 *yām te syenāḥ padābharat tiro rājāṃsi āsprtam* “That which the falcon brought to you [=Indra] with his foot across the airy realms -- the one that could not be recaptured ...” The adj. *āsprta-* ‘not to be recaptured’ economically encapsulates Kṛṣṇu’s vain fight against the robber *syenā* to keep the bird from making off with the Soma confined in heaven. In our passage here the poet is identifying the (humdrum) ritual journey of soma the juice in vs. 7 with the first journey of Soma from heaven in the foundational myth of the Soma Sacrifice, making the two journeys seem as identical as possible by nearly verbatim repetition and thus investing the ritual progress with the glamour and significance of myth. Thus, although the nearly identical vss. 7 and 8 might seem evidence that the poet was spinning his wheels, in fact the repetition is doing something quite different.

IX.3.9: The mythic resonance in vs. 8 is echoed in *pratnéna jánmanā* “in the way of his ancient birth.”

IX.3.10: An elementary passive / active figure: *jaiñāno janāyan* “giving birth while he is being born,” somewhat reminiscent of the reciprocal figure in IX.2.7.

IX.4

On the formal constraints in this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.4.1: The double *ca* construction especially emphasizes the imperatival function of the *-sī* form *jéśi*, conjoined as it is with a standard impv. *sānā*.

IX.4.4: This vs. stands apart from the rest of the hymn, which is otherwise addressed in the 2nd ps. to Soma. Here we have a ref. to the (human) ritual participants (*pāvītārah* ‘purifiers’), and though soma appears in the vs., it is as the substance not the god, and in the 3rd ps.

On *pāvītārah* see comm. ad IX.83.2. Note in passing that this is a voc. with retracted accent; the form given by Gr for this passage, *-āras*, is incorrect.

IX.4.5–6: These two vss. share not only the refrain pāda (c) found throughout the hymn, but another one (5b = 6a), as well as a common focus on the sun.

IX.4.9: Loc. *vidharman* lit. ‘in spreading apart / in expansion’ is underspecified and its application unclear -- deliberately so, in my opinion. Once again, the ambiguity allows a blurring of the ritual and the cosmic. In ritual terms the expansion may refer to soma’s spreading across the filter or, as Ge sees it (n. 9b), in the water with which it is mixed; in cosmic terms, it would refer to the spreading of Soma across space (see, e.g., Ober [RR II.152] and VI.71.1 *rājaso*

vīdharmanī), becoming as extensive as heaven. Re suggests rather that it refers to Soma's (transitive) spreading (that is, giving) of goods, but I find this less likely. For further disc. see comm. ad IX.64.9.

IX.5 Āprī

On the interaction of the genre of Āprī hymns with the Soma Pavamāna focus, see the publ. intro.

IX.5.1: The part. *prīṇān* may signal the Āprī theme, as Old suggests.

IX.5.6: The placement of the simile marker *ná* seems to make *náktoṣāsā* 'Night and Dawn' part of the simile itself, rather than the frame, but, esp. given the rigid structure of Āprī hymns, where the pair Night and Dawn is one of the key words, this is not possible. We must just assume that the tendency to put *ná* after the first word of the phrase has taken over here.

IX.5.7: My interpr. of this vs., esp. pāda c, differs from the standard. I assume that *pávamānaḥ* and *índro vṛṣā* are two separate entities: Soma Pavamāna and Indra the bull -- and that they are identified with the two divine Hotars (*hótārā daívyā*) of b. Old, Ge, and Re all take c as an equational clause: Soma Pavamāna = Indra the bull; there is just one figure, and it has nothing to do with the two Hotars. In their favor is the fact that pāda c has reverted to nominative, whereas the duals are acc. in ab. However, I find it difficult to assume that mentioning the two major divine figures in the Soma Maṇḍala, Soma and Indra, in conjunction with a dual, is utterly unconnected with the dual divine figures in ab. Otherwise pāda c is a non sequitur. (On 9c and IX.6.2 see below.) As for the reversion to the nominative, I find this somewhat troubling, but it is enabled by the fact that in duals nom. = acc.

IX.5.9: The listing of figures in cd is puzzling. The publ. tr. follows Ge/Re, with Indra identified as the drop in c and Prajāpati as the self-purifying one in d, but I now very much doubt that this is correct. For one thing, Prajāpati as a separate god is found at best only in X (3x); this is the only occurrence of the stem in IX, and in the only other occurrence outside of X (IV.53.2) it is an epithet of Savitar. This two-pāda sequence (9cd), *índur índro vṛṣā háriḥ, pávamānaḥ prajāpatiḥ* is a variant and expansion of 7c *pávamāna índro vṛṣā*, and as in 7 I think it refers to two gods, Soma and Indra. As in 7c the two gods are first identified: here the drop (rather than *pávamāna*-) and Indra. The next word *vṛṣā* 'bull' appeared to qualify Indra in 7c, but could (and often does) qualify either one, and here it's placed between Indra and *hári*- 'tawny', a soma descriptor, suggesting affiliation to both. The opening of the next pāda, *pávamānaḥ*, reasserts the Soma figure. As for *prajāpatiḥ*, I think it's possible that it again refers to both, though I have no idea why this stem appears here. As in vs. 7c I take these pādas as listing other gods to be summoned along with Tvaṣṭar here (*tvāṣṭāram ... ā huve*, like 7b *hótārā ... huve*), with slippage into a free-standing nominative phrase. It anticipates the somewhat random listing of even more gods in 11cd. I don't find any of this very satisfactory, but I resist the supposed identification of Indra and Soma, who are the two poles of the Soma Maṇḍala.

IX.6

IX.6.2: Pāda b *īndav īndra īti kṣara* “o drop, flow as ‘Indra’” is the strongest piece of evidence for the identification of Indra and Soma in the previous hymn (IX.5.7, 9) and is so cited by Ge (n. 7c to IX.5). As noted ad locc., I do not believe that those vss. equate the two gods; I do, however, believe that there is a (partial) equation here, on the basis of the mystical phonological near-identity of the two stems ‘drop’ (*īndu-*) and ‘Indra’ (*īndra-*), a similarity that is frequently exploited in this maṇḍala, as we have already noted. The identification of the two here also depends on the ambiguity of the goal of *kṣara* ‘flow’, namely *mādam* in pāda a. The stem *māda-* often refers to the ‘exhilarating drink’, namely soma itself, as well as to the abstract state of exhilaration. With Soma flowing to *mādam*, the former, concrete meaning is more or less excluded: S/soma can’t flow to itself. But the concrete goal is certainly available to the god Indra; cf. III.42.2 *tām indra mādam ā gahi, barhiṣṭhām grāvabhiḥ sutām* “Come, Indra, to the exhilarating drink, stationed on the ritual grass, pressed by stones,” where the second pāda makes it clear that the concrete substance, not the abstract state, is meant. So if “Indra” substitutes for the drop here, *mādam* as concrete goal is possible. See also 9b and comm. thereon.

IX.6.4: As noted ad IX.3.3, in contrast to *pāvamāna-* ‘purifying oneself’, I consider other medial participles to *√pū* to be passive and have so tr. *punānā-* here, though there is no overt sign of passive value and both Ge and Re tr. as reflexive (also in 9a).

IX.6.5: This is a rel. cl. without a main cl., but it is easily attached to vs. 6 (relative / correlative 5a *yām ...* 6a *tām ...*). So also Re.

IX.6.7: This vs. reestablishes the line of demarcation between Soma and Indra that was blurred in vs. 2, by means of the reciprocal figure *devó devāya* “the god for the god,” with the dat. further specified as *īndrāya*.

The stem *pīpāya-* is ambiguous; it can be both intrans. and trans. (and at least once mixed: I.63.8; see comm. ad loc.). In this passage Ge takes it as intrans. (“wann seine Milch quillt”). The ambiguity is in part the result of the partial coincidence of the pf. subjunctive and the redupl. aor. injunctive (or subj.) (see Kü 301–3), and in this passage we appear to have the trans. redupl. aor. (Kü 302). Partly on the basis of VIII.1.19, Old takes Indra as the subj. of trans. *pīpāyat*. Re also considers the form “probably” transitive, though he does not specify the subject.

IX.6.8–9: As noted in the publ. intro., the theme of poetry appears in these last two vss., and I think it likely that Soma’s actions of “protecting poetic skill” and “making the hidden hymns his own” refer to the inspiration Soma, and the soma sacrifice, provide to the poets. What it means to “protect” *kāvya* (8c) is not entirely clear to me, but the preverb *ní* with *pāti* may suggest protection that involves hiding or depositing the thing in question, thus matching the hidden hymns in 9c. (*pāti* may also pun on *√pā* ‘drink’, of much more common occurrence in the Soma maṇḍala.) As I suggested in the publ. intro., I think the hymns are “hidden” deep within the poets and are stimulated and evoked by Soma and the ritual in his honor. Note also that in the next hymn (IX.7.4a) Soma the poet clothes himself (*vāsānaḥ*) in (pl.) *kāvya*.

IX.6.9: This vs. picks up various expressions from the hymn: *īndrayūḥ* (pāda a) matches up with *devayūḥ* (1b) and *asmayūḥ* (1c), thus forming a slight ring. In b *mādam ... vītāye* “(for Indra) to pursue exhilaration / the exhilarating drink” “repairs” the slightly anomalous *mādam ... kṣara* in 2ab (see comm. there) and also echoes 6b *mādāya devāvītaye*. I might therefore alter the tr. to

“for him to pursue the exhilarating drink.” See also *punānāḥ* in pāda a, repeating the same part. in 4c.

IX.7

As noted in the publ. intro., the word *sóma-* does not appear in this hymn. The word is also absent from IX.3, though there the omnipresence of *pávamāna-* and other forms of $\sqrt{pū}$ takes up the slack. In this hymn *pávamāna-* is found only once, in vs. 5.

IX.7.1: Lü (600–601) sees this vs. as representing the heavenly ascent of Soma, but those not subscribing to all of Lü’s presuppositions will find it difficult to see that. My own interpr. is far more earthbound: the filter is both the path of the soma and its foundation. The referent of *asya* in c is probably the soma, esp. given the near match of 1c *vidānā asya yójanam* and 8c *vidānā asya śákmabhiḥ*: the *asya* in 8c must be the soma. Even though in both passages the subject of the sentence is plural and refers to drops bzw. waves of soma, the sg. *asya* must be a constructio ad sensum.

On the distribution of the 3rd pl. mid. ending *-ram* versus *-ran* see the extensive disc. by Old. Essentially *-ran* is found pāda-final and pāda-internal before consonant; *-ram* pāda-internal before vowel – but see Old for further refinements

IX.7.2: In keeping with his interpr. of vs. 1, Lü (238) sees the “great waters” (*mahīr apāḥ*) here as the celestial waters -- again not necessary, since the ritual soma is mixed with water after it traverses the filter.

mádhvah could in principle be construed either with *dhārā* (“stream of honey”) or *agriyāḥ*, as in the publ. tr. Though both Ge and Re opt for the former, *mádhvo agriyám* in VII.92.2 suggests the latter, as does the parallel expression *vācó agriyāḥ* in the next vs. (3a; also IX.62.25). So Lü (238). Both Ge and Lü take *dhārā* as instr. sg. (Ge: “Mit dem Strome ...”). (Old hesitates but slightly favors instr.) This is certainly possible, though not necessary: nom. *dhārā* and nom. *agriyāḥ* can have different genders because they belong to two different NPs in apposition to each other. In any case, none of these minor differences in interpr. have any real implications.

IX.7.2–3: A verb of motion needs to be supplied with *prá* in the initial pādas of both vss.

IX.7.3: The phrase *satyó adhvarāḥ*, which I take as a separate nominal cl., but which can simply be another appositional nominative as most take it, must identify soma as, as it were, the embodiment of the ritual, the substance that must be present for the *adhvarāḥ* to occur.

IX.7.4: In principle, *kāvya* (and/or indeed *ṇṛmṇā*) could be instr. sg. “... by his poetic skill ...”), though the standard renderings (incl. Lü 265) take it as acc. pl. There is no real way to tell, but in the similarly structured IX.94.3 *pári yát kavīḥ kāvya bhárate* (cf. our *pári yát kāvya kavīḥ*) *kāvya* should be acc. pl. because it is the frame that matches a clear acc. pl. simile in the next pāda. This is suggestive but hardly decisive.

On pāda c *svār vājī śiśāsati* “The race horse strives to win the sun,” see comm. ad IX.74.1, 76.2. In these passages I think that the sun, with its gleaming light, represents the milk towards which the soma is aiming.

IX.7.6: On *rebhā-* see comm. ad VI.3.6.

IX.7.7: Gr takes *rāṇā* as impv. to $\sqrt{\text{ran}}$ (them. pres. *rāṇati*), on the basis of the Pp. reading *rāṇa*, but it is better to interpr. it as instr. sg. to the root noun *rān-*, against the Pp. So already Old ZDMG 63 [1909]: 289 = KISch 305; see also Ge (n. 7c), Schindler (Rt. Nouns, s.v. *rān-*). With Ge I take it as the referent of the rel. prn. *yāḥ* that immediately follows, forming a nominal cl. (“with the joy that is ...”). The drawback to this is that the new cl. would not coincide with a metrical break -- but nominal, izafe-like clauses are not infrequently so positioned. Re also takes *rāṇā* as an instr. sg., but because he expects such a root noun to have fem. gender (see Schindler, who simply says that the gender of this noun can’t be determined), he construes it as part of the rel. cl.: “(ivresse [referring back to *mādena* in b]) qui est joyeusement [= *rāṇā*] (présente) dans ces comportements.” Although this allows clause and metrical boundary to coincide, it otherwise seems too fussy to me.

IX.7.8: As disc. in the publ. intro. and above ad vs. 1, the c pāda of this vs. forms a ring with that of vs. 1; the final vs., 9, is addressed to the two world-halves and seems extra-hymnic. As in vs. 1 the *asya* of c must refer to soma, although the subj. of the sentence is plural.

Medial forms of $\sqrt{\text{pū}}$ when construed with *ā* mean ‘attract / bring here through purification’ and take the acc.; similar is *ā* $\sqrt{\text{yaj}}$ ‘win / attract by sacrifice’. *ā* $\sqrt{\text{pū}}$ is extremely common in IX. See also remarks on *ā śikṣa-* ad I.112.19.

IX.8

IX.8.1: Pāda c, *vārdhanto asya vīryām*, is structured like 1c and 8c in the immediately preceding hymn, IX.7, though here *asya* must refer to Indra, not Soma.

IX.8.2: As noted in the publ. intro., the gods Vāyu and the Aśvins, along with Indra, who was mentioned in the previous vs., are also the gods mentioned as the goal of the soma in IX.7.7.

IX.8.4: Why do the thoughts number seven (*saptā dhītāyaḥ*)? Ge (n. 4ab) links them with the seven *dhātars* in nearby IX.10.3, while Re adds the seven *dhāman* of IX.102.2. These suggestions are reasonably plausible, though they simply displace the numerical problem. We should also note that the seven thoughts recur in the next hymn (IX.9.4), and another, unidentified, group of seven entities is found two vss. later (IX.9.6). IX.8–10 are attributed to the same poet, Asita Kāśyapa or Devala Kāśyapa (responsible indeed for IX.5–24), and he may simply have a penchant for the number seven; in our passage it would be a complement to the ten fingers (a number that of course makes sense). For *saptā dhītāyaḥ* and ten fingers in a hemistich almost identical to this one, see IX.15.8; for further occurrences of “seven inspired thoughts” see IX.62.17 and possibly IX.66.8.

IX.8.7: The “comrade” (*sākhi-*) whom the soma is urged to enter is most likely Indra. The juxtaposition of the voc. *īndo* with *sākhāyam* might be meant to evoke the phonological twin *īndram*.

IX.9

On the structure and often puzzling content of this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.9.1: Some of the uncertainties in this vs. are illuminated by parallel passages, esp. IX.10.2 in the adjacent hymn. Note that Soma is identified as a poet both in pāda a, where he is in fact “the poet of heaven” (*divāḥ kavīḥ*), and in c in the bahuvrīhi *kavī-kratu-* ‘having a poet’s purpose’. See also below ad 6c.

The expression *pāri ... vāyāmsi ... yāti* (split over 3 pādas) is reminiscent of IX.111.1 *viśvā yād rūpā pariyāti* “when he makes the circuit of all his forms ...,” as Ge points out (n. 1b). The journey around the filter must be meant.

The two ‘granddaughters [/nieces]’ (loc. du. *naptyòḥ*) are, in the ritual context, most likely either the two pressing boards (Sāy, Ge) or the two hands of the priest (Re). Because of the similarity between this vs. and 10.2, I favor the latter because of the *gābhastyoḥ* ‘in the two hands’ of 10.2b. In a cosmic context, the dual could refer to Heaven and Earth, who are identified as Soma’s two mothers (by most interpr.) in 3. The kinship flip -- Soma and his two granddaughters [/nieces] here, Soma and his two mothers in 3 -- would not doom this identification, given the RVic poets’ love of paradox, esp. the paradox of generations.

The ppl. *hitāḥ* with which *naptyòḥ* is construed is ambiguous, between \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’ and $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place’. Though both Ge and Re favor the latter, I opt for the former on the basis of *hitāḥ* in 4a and *hinvānāsaḥ* in the parallel vs. 10.2a, both clearly belonging to ‘impel’. Either is possible, however; ‘placed’ would weakly favor the ‘pressing boards’ interpr. of *naptyòḥ*.

IX.9.2: The parallel but oddly assorted dative phrases *kṣāyāya pānyase* “to/for the praiseworthy dwelling place” and *jānāya ... adrúhe* “to/for the race without deceit” I take as a possible elaboration on the disjunctive pair “men and gods.” Although Re wants the latter to refer to “l’être-humain,” he himself points out that *adrúh-* is generally an epithet of the gods (though see *adrúhaḥ* with ‘rivers’ in 4b). By contrast to “the race without deceit [= gods],” *kṣāya-* may refer to the ritual ground as the ‘dwelling place’ and by extension to the humans who create and inhabit it.

IX.9.3: The referent of the fem. du. here is generally taken as Heaven and Earth.

IX.9.4–6: As noted in the publ. intro., I consider this an omphalos hymn, with vss. 4 and 6 with their repetition of “7” defining vs. 5 as the omphalos. The omphalos effect is muted however, since the “message” of vs. 5 is hardly a deep mystery. For further on this sequence of vss., see publ. intro.

IX.9.4: On the “seven insightful thoughts” see also 8.4.

The subj. of *vāṛdhúḥ* in c must be feminine, on the basis of *yā(h)*, but the choice between the “insightful thoughts” (*dhītī-*) of a and the rivers (*nadī-*) of b is not clear.

IX.9.5: This vs. presents the same problem as 4c: because of init. *tāḥ*, nom. pl. fem., the subject of *ā dadhuḥ* has to be feminine, and there are several pl. feminines in play: the “insightful thoughts” (*dhītī-*) of 4a and the rivers (*nadī-*) of 4b. But which one (or both)? In any case, presumably the subjects of 4c and 5 are the same -- though Sāy opts for “fingers” in this vs. but “rivers” in 4c.

The unspecified dat. (or with Re loc.) *mahé* “for/in great ...” has too many possibilities for its referent, and I have made no effort to choose one.

IX.9.6: The problem of the fem. referent continues here. In ab Soma, as the draught-horse (*váhniḥ*) “sees the seven” (*saptá paśyati*); we have just had “seven thoughts” (4a), and “seven” is the canonical number of rivers, which we also encountered in vs. 4 -- so either referent (or a conflation of both) is possible here. A fem. acc. pl. *devīḥ* ‘goddesses’ is the obj. of the verb ‘satisfied’ (*atarpayat*) in the next pāda c. Unfortunately this does not clarify the reference: the pl. of *devī-* is frequently used of waters and at least once elsewhere (VII.50.4) of rivers, but at least in the singular it is quite commonly used of *dhī-* and similar words.

On the hapax *vāvahi-* see AiG II.2.292–93.

On the always ghastly *krīvi-* see comm. ad I.30.1 and V.44.4. Esp. in the latter passage I argue that the word often seems to be used of an equine *and* that it might be a deformation or hyper-Sanskritization of *kavī-*. Both factors are present here: the first two pādas of this vs. depict Soma as a draught horse drawing (*váhniḥ ... vāvahiḥ*), but we also had occasion to note ad vs. 1 above that Soma was twice identified as a *kavī-* there. In the publ. tr. I default to a PN, but I do in fact think that the word has richer semantics, derived from both just mentioned uses, here. I do not see any way to convey that in a single tr. of the word, however.

IX.9.7: The voc. *pumas* ‘o male’ is rather stark. It is in fact the only occurrence of the voc. of this stem in the RV and the only place where the stem is used of Soma. I ascribe its use here to the contrast being drawn with the feminines in vss. 4–6 (as well, perhaps, as the two mothers in 3) and to the martial content of the vs.

As I argued already in my dissertation and the *-āya*-monograph based upon it, I consider the supposed root $\sqrt{kṛ}$ to have been extracted from the *-āya*-transitive *kalpāyati*, itself (in my view) a *-p*-formation to $\sqrt{kṛ}$ with “popular” *l*. The early rarity of the thematic noun *kālpa-*, very common later but found in the RV only here and in the privative form *akalpā-* (I.102.6), supports this view. In the publ. tr. I followed the standard interpr. of *kālpa-* in this passage as ‘ritual work’ (Ge “bei den heiligen Bräuchen,” Re “les rite”), based in part on its later usage. I still think this is a possible reading. However, on the basis of my interpr. of *akalpā-* in I.102.6 (see comm. ad loc.) and the rest of the vs. here, I wonder now if they are not rather (or in addition) *martial* arrangements: the address to Soma as ‘male’ (pāda a), the statement that darkness must be fought (*yódhyā*(b)), and the intensive subjunctive of \sqrt{han} , *jañghanah* (c) all favor a more bellicose interpr.

IX.9.8: The duplication of comparatives with slightly different shapes, introduced by the particle *nū*, produces a nice phonetic figure, *nū nāvyaṣe nāvīyaṣe*.

IX.9.9: As was noted in the publ. intro., ‘sun’ (*svàḥ*) is the last word of the hymn, resonating with the themes of shining and brightness earlier in the hymn (see esp. 3ab and 8c, as well as the darkness to be combatted in 7b).

IX.10

For the poetic structure of the hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.10.1: *svānāsaḥ* can be both the nom. pl. masc. of the adj. *svānā-* ‘resounding’ (\sqrt{svan}) and the med. rt. aor. part. to \sqrt{su} ‘press’, in passive usage as is usual for this part. I consider the ambiguity intentional and render it twice (“while being pressed ... resounding”), but although

both Ge (n. 1a) and Re (with more fuss) recognize the double identity, they render only the ‘resound’ sense that is appropriate to the simile.

IX.10.2: With Ge I take c as an independent nominal cl. Re takes c as a continuation of ab, but as Ge points out (n. 2c) c is the Fortsetzung of the image in ab: in ab the chariots are presumably competing for prizes; the prizes or “takings” (*bhára-*) in c are what these chariots win. For the phrase in c see IX.16.5 *mahé bhārāya kārīṇaḥ* “for the great taking of the decisive victor.”

IX.10.3: The first hemistich contains a simile embedded, as it were, in a metaphor: kings are only metaphorically “anointed” (that is, decorated, adorned) with praises; the soma juices are somewhat less metaphorically “anointed,” since “the cows” are actually milk, which is liquid enough to anoint.

In c the poet seems silently to switch instrumental functions, while holding the structure constant: NOM. INSTR. *añjate*. In both a and b the INSTR. expresses the instrument of anointment, either metaphorical or real, but in c the INSTR. expresses the agents who perform the anointing. The “seven ordainers” (*saptá dhātár-*) are presumably the priests; the priests reappear as Hotars in vs. 7 with “seven siblings,” probably their insightful thoughts or else simply seven other priests. See below.

The relationship between kings and the genre of *prásasti-*, which I discuss in my *RV between Two Worlds* (pp. 146–48), is very clear here.

IX.10.4: The pun on *svānāsaḥ* in 1a recurs here; this time Ge and Re render it only as ‘pressed’.

IX.10.5: On my view of the sense of this vs., see publ. intro. With Ge, I supply *bhāgam* with the gen. *vivāsvataḥ* in a, as well as with gen. *uśasaḥ* in b; unlike Ge I take *bhāga-* to mean ‘portion’ (not “das Glück”) and interpr. it as referring to the radiance of the two divinities, by which Soma transforms himself into the sun (or rather a set of suns -- the radiating golden color on the sheep’s fleece filter). Re’s interpr. is quite different: he supplies “la région” with *vivāsvataḥ*, and takes *uśasaḥ* as an acc. pl., parallel to *bhāgam* and both as names of divinities (“engendrant les Aurores (et) Bhaga”). For the former he must be thinking of the common expression *sādane vivāsvataḥ* “in the seat of V,” but that expression is only in the loc. and never found in IX. As for the latter, even with his explanatory n. I don’t how this improves the sense of the vs.

IX.10.6: “The raging of the bull” must refer to the headlong journey of the soma as it is being purified, which is set in motion and accompanied by the recitation of ritual poetry -- hence the violent opening of “the doors of poetic thoughts” (*dvārā matīnām*). The continuity of the poetic tradition from the *pratnāḥ* (‘ancient’) bards to the current ones is suggested by the use of the pres. *ṃvanti*. I do not think, with Ge (n. 6ab), that *pratná-* gives the present tense verb a preterital sense, and indeed in IX.73.3 *pítā ... pratnó abhí rakṣati* Ge tr. the pres. *rakṣati* with the pres. “wacht,” not a preterite.

IX.10.7: Ge and Re take the seven siblings here as the seven *dhītí-* of 8.4 and 9.4, which is quite likely -- though the priests themselves are also a possibility. Ge adduces IX.66.8 *sám u tvā dhībhrí asvaran ... saptá jāmayāḥ* “Together the seven siblings cried out to you with insightful thoughts,” which has both the 7 siblings and the thoughts -- but the referent of the siblings in that vs. is not clear. Ge there takes it as the fingers, which seems somewhat perverse, given that seven

is not a canonical number for fingers -- and fingers don't cry out. I prefer rivers, since the "seven streams" were mentioned in the previous vs.

IX.10.8: *ā dade* belongs to $\sqrt{dā}$ 'bind', not 'give'; see, e.g., Kü 242. On the idiom see comm. ad I.139.1, IX.79.4.

Ge, Re, and Kü all take *b* as a simile ("wie das Auge an die Sonne"), presumably with *cid* as the simile particle. But, as I have stated frequently elsewhere (see, e.g., comm. ad I.173.7), I am not at all convinced that *cid* is ever so used. Here, the point is the real identification of Soma, or his eye, with the sun, not a comparison to Soma's kinship with me; see *ēkam ākṣi* in 9.4, the transformation of Soma into sun(s) in our vs. 5c, and esp. the transformation of the sun's eye into Soma's eye in the next vs. (9c).

Gr identifies *duhe* in c as a 1st ps.; Ge and Re take it as 3rd sg. passive with *āpatyam* as subj. (e.g., "Die Nachkommenschaft des Sehers wird herausgemolken"), interpr. *kaví-* as a reference to Soma and *āpatyam* as the soma juice. But medial forms of \sqrt{duh} are generally transitive, with the sense 'give X as milk', and I follow that interpr. here, with Soma the unexpressed subject/agent. I suggest that c explains a: "binding his navel to our navel" means that he makes himself our kin and indeed takes responsibility for providing us with offspring. I take *kavéḥ* as referring to the (human) poet. Soma repays our devotion and care (see esp. vs. 7) with the usual ritual rewards, including sons.

IX.10.9: Ge takes *priyā* as nom. sg. fem., with gapped "Daughter of the Sun" -- but it seems unlikely that a new character would be introduced at this point, and it makes more sense for Soma to be the one doing the looking. Better to interpr. *priyā* as a neut. pl. with gapped *padā(ni)*, as in nearby IX.12.8 *abhī priyā divās padā*. Ge (n. 9a) also allows the possibility of a neut. pl., but wants to construe it with sg. *pādam*, which he takes as a "collective singular," a concept that I think we can do without but that seems to be encouraged by Old's remarks. (See comm. ad VI.17.1 for another such ex. proposed by Ge.) I think rather that there are two (sets of) *padā-* (sim. Re).

Ge also suggests that in this instance of INSTR. *gūhā hitām*, the phrase means "hidden from," not "hidden by." Without a better sense of what this vs. is intended to tell us, I prefer not to contravene the usual agentive value of the instr. For my own speculation on the hidden track, see publ. intro., which may be supported by IX.102.2, where the hidden track that soma follows seems to be in the filter.

IX.11

IX.11.1: *asmai* is only the second word in the hymn and is unaccented; therefore it should technically refer to something already mentioned in the discourse. But since soma is the topic of *all* discourse in this ritual context, no prior verbal mention is necessary. Sim. IX.70.1; see also *asya* in IX.29.1a, IX.30.1a.

IX.11.2: Pāda c consists entirely of a rudimentary etymological figure, *devām devāya devayú*. The acc. *devām* is of course Soma as god, coreferential with *pāyah* 'milk', a metaphor for soma the substance, in pāda a; the dative *devāya* is Indra. I take *devayú* as an adverb; so also Re. It is also possible (see, e.g., Re's n.) to take it as a neut. modifying *pāyah*, as Gr does -- and, it seems,

Ge. In that case, *devám* would need to be a neut. adj. ‘divine’ (Ge’s “die göttliche”), but the number of clearly adjectival uses of *devá-* is very low. See, however, IX.13.5 and VII.21.1.

IX.11.4: DAT *gāthám arcata* can be seen as a paraphrase of *úpa* DAT *gāyatā* in 1a, with etymological matching.

The epithet *divispṛś-* ‘touching heaven’ is almost the only departure in this hymn from the tight, earthbound focus on the ritual.

IX.11.6: Pāda c *índum índre* paraphrases *devám devāya* in 2c, though with a loc., not dat.

IX.11.7: Pāda b is almost identical with 3a.

IX.11.9: The *índo- índra-* figure appears yet again, in different cases (voc., instr.).

IX.12

Lü tr. and comm. on vss. 1–6 of this hymn (706–7), with his usual, often overblown, emphasis on the heavenly location of the elements and actions. By contrast, I tend to attribute the heavenly references to the poet’s attempt to project a cosmic dimension on the ritual confined to a small portion of the earth’s surface.

IX.12.3: On *madacyút-* and *vipaścít-* see, e.g., Scar (128 and 122 respectively).

gaurī is the loc. sg. to the *vrkī*-stem *gaurī*, not a dual (per Gr); see AiG III.170 and comm. ad VII.103.2 (*sarasī*) and I.135.9 (*nadī*). As indicated in the publ. intro., of the possible referents for this buffalo cow, with Ge and Re (see esp. Re’s n.) I favor the hide on which the pressing apparatus is placed -- as opposed to Sāy’s ‘speech’, or Lü’s more complex speech-identified-with-the-heavenly-waters.

IX.12.5: This vs. seems to posit a distinction between two somas: one, called *sóma-*, that is in containers and on the filter and another, called *índu-* ‘drop’, that embraces / surrounds (*pári śasvaje*) the first. What distinguishes them is difficult to discern; Ge suggests that the “nachrinnende” Soma is taken in by the pressed juice, but this doesn’t seem to make ritual sense, since the soma in the tubs and on the filter would already have been pressed as well. Lü, predictably, thinks the heavenly soma incorporates the earthly soma. Say identifies *índu-* as the god Soma (*somo devaḥ*). Of the various possibilities, Sāy’s seems the most plausible -- that is, Soma the god encompasses all the forms that soma the substance takes in the course of ritual processing, though physically that substance is somewhat different at every stage. I also considered the possibility -- given the occasional identification and frequent juxtaposition of *índu-* and *índra-* -- that *índu-* here refers to Indra, and “embrace” is a metaphor for “drink, consume.” But I’d prefer to keep *índu-* separate from Indra.

IX.12.6: The *índu-* here “sends forth his speech” (*prá vācam ... iṣyati*), which supports an animate reading of *índu-* in the previous vs. Needless to say, Lü has a heavenly interpr.: *índu* is the heavenly soma, the sea is the heavenly sea, and the *kóśa-* is the “Urquell im Himmel.” In the publ. intro. I interpr. the sea as the soma in the vessel or the mixing water. And the speech is presumably the speech of the ritual participants, prompted by the action of pressing the soma.

IX.12.7: This vs. has no finite verb; I take it as a preamble to 8, in order to capture the play between the two forms of *hinvānāḥ* (7c, 8b).

When *vānaspāti-* (lit. ‘lord of the forest’) does not mean simply ‘tree’, it generally refers to the sacrificial post in the animal sacrifice, particularly when found in the Āprī hymns. The word is not found elsewhere in IX, except in the Āprī hymn IX.5.10, where it seems to have that reference. But here it must refer to soma. Since essentially all the plants that have been suggested as the source of soma are fairly insignificant physically, the use of *vānaspāti-* to refer to it must have seemed slightly comic (like calling a dandelion Lord of the Forest), but also a way of capturing the towering importance of the apparently lowly plant. The word is used of soma once elsewhere, I.91.6 (a soma hymn), in the phrase *priyástotro vānaspātīḥ*, almost identical to *nītyástotro vānaspātīḥ*, esp. because *nītya-* ‘own’ and *priyá-* ‘dear, own’ are near synonyms in some usages. The point, I think, is that Soma has first claim to praise.

On *sabar-* as ‘juice’, see EWA s.v. *sabardúh-* and Narten (YH 212). I construe the gen. pl. *dhīnām* with the first member of the cmpd. *sabar-dúgha-*: “... juice of insights.” I supply *pavítre* with *antár* on the basis of 5b *antáh pavítre* (cf. VIII.101.9). Ge’s “unter Liedern” does not work because *antár* doesn’t take the gen., and though Re’s “Arbres des intuitions” sounds imposing, it doesn’t make much sense. Old’s first interpr. of this pāda is close to mine, with *dhīnām* dependent on *sabar-*, though he takes *antár* as an adverb. However, he considers the obvious solution to be to take *dhīnām* with *antár*, since the gen. is possible with *antár* in the later language. Since “within/amid the thoughts” isn’t a particularly compelling addition to the passage, I prefer my own (and Old’s first) solution.

The common med. part. *hinvānā-* can be both transitive and passive, in approx. equal numbers. In this vs. it is transitive, but in the next passive.

IX.12.8: As noted just above, *hinvānā-* is used passively here, in contrast to the same form in 7c - here referring to the priestly impulsion given to the soma on its journey of purification.

The “tracks of heaven” are, in my view, the traces of the soma on the filter; see 10.9.

Pāda c is identical to IX.44.2c, where I do not construe *vīprasya* with *dhārayā* but with something earlier in the vs. My reason there is that the *dhārā-* ‘stream’ is always otherwise only Soma’s, and so should not belong to the/a *vīpra-*. But in our passage there is nowhere to construe *vīprasya* but with *dhārayā*. I consider ad IX.44.2 the possibility that the pāda was borrowed thoughtlessly here. But there are several ways to make sense of our passage. If the *dhārā-* is Soma’s, the point may be that he is a *kaví-*, a sage, but he also has the fluency of an inspired poet, who simply pours out verbal eloquence, thus identifying Soma with both types of poet. This suggestion is supported by the next hymn, IX.13.2, where Soma is explicitly identified as a *vīpra-*, as well as his parallel identification as *vīpra* and *kaví* in IX.18.2. Or *dhārā-* can be used here metaphorically to refer to a stream of words.

IX.12.9: The impv. *dhāraya* is almost identical to the instr. *dhārayā* in 8c, though their morphology is entirely different.

IX.13

This hymn is dominated by forms of med. *pávate* (vss. 2-4, 8-9), with the first vs. containing instead med. *punānāḥ*. Only vss. 6-7 lack such forms. Perhaps coincidentally, these two vss. are the only ones containing similes.

The hymn is also constructed from bricolage and ready-made phrases, many found verbatim in other hymns. There is a certain amount of chaining between vss.; it is difficult to know if this is just a result of the assembly process (a word in one vs. suggests to the poet another such phrase, which he then attaches) or was meant as a unifying poetic device.

IX.13.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the mention of Vāyu and Indra identifies the occasion as the Morning Pressing, since those two gods receive the first soma offering of the pressing day.

IX.13.2: The publ. tr. does not make this clear, but the addressees are pl., presumably the priests.

The identification of Soma as a *vípra-* supports the suggestion ad IX.12.8 in the preceding hymn that *vípra-* refers to Soma there as well.

IX.13.3: Pāda c, with a medial part. characterizing the soma (*gr̥ṇānāḥ*), followed by the infinitival dat. *devāvītaye*, matches 2c *suṣvāṇām devāvītaye*. The pattern is reinforced by the infinitival dat. *vājasātaye* ending pāda a.

IX.13.4: The chaining continues, with *vājasātaye* likewise ending pāda a of this vs.; see also 6b.

$\sqrt{pū}$ + ACC (here *pāvasva ... iṣaḥ* [etc.]) should rightly have the preverb *ā* in the idiom ‘bring through purification’; see esp. Re’s n. In tr. I have supplied it, partly on the assumption that since this hymn is constructed of ready-made phrases, this pāda may have been adapted from a context where the previous pāda contained the *ā* in tmesis. Re also points out that the construction here can be under the influence of *pāvantām ā* in 5b. I do *not* follow Re in seeing $\sqrt{pū}$ without preverb as becoming indiscriminately transitive in IX, with the sense ‘couler’.

IX.13.5: It is difficult not to take *devā-* here as adjectival, modifying *indavaḥ*. See my reluctance to so interpr. this stem in IX.11.2, and see comm. ad VII.21.1.

IX.13.6: The inf. *vājasātaye* is found here a 3rd time (after 3a, 4a).

IX.13.8–9: The impv. *āpa ... jahi* of 8c is converted into the part. *apaghnāntaḥ* in 9a. The sg. subj. of 8 is also replaced by a pl., but sg. *sómāḥ* / *indo* and pl. *sómāḥ* / *indavaḥ* alternate throughout the hymn.

IX.14

IX.14.1: The ‘decisive act’ (*kārā-*) in question is presumably the purification itself. See Re’s n. on the need to preserve this sense here, rather than giving in to Ge’s convenient “Kampfpreis” (presumably *vāja-*), which Re pronounces “un peu loin.”

IX.14.2: As noted in the publ. intro., the subjects here are the fingers, troops of five (on each hand).

The subord. *yádī* is best taken as an example of my *yádī* -- hence “when him/it ...,” not “if.”

IX.14.3: I am disturbed by the sequence of tense -- or lack of it: the augmented aor. *amatsata* in the main, *ād*, clause does not fit well with the pres. *pariṣkṛṇvānti* in the preceding *yád* clause (vs.

2) or the pres. *vasāyāte* in the following (3c). I am tempted to make the *ād* clause the follow-up to vs. 1: “the poet flowed around and forth ...; after that the gods found exhilaration.” In that case, 3ab would interrupt the sequence of the subordinated present clauses in vs. 2, 3c, but I don’t know of other examples of this kind of alternating structure. Perhaps vss. 2 and 3 should be reversed: the *ād* clause of 3ab would then follow directly after vs. 1, and the parallel subordinate clauses in 3c and vs. 2 would be picked up by the main clause of 4ab, which also has a pres. tense verb.

IX.14.5: As disc. in the publ. intro., in this hymn the poet provides several different metaphorical versions of the same ritual act. This vs. contains two of those alternatives: in ab Soma is groomed “by the granddaughters of Viviasvant,” a reference to the fingers, which were characterized as “troops of five kinsmen” in 2ab; in c Soma makes cows like a garment (*gāh kṛṇvānó nā nirñījam*), a variant of 3c “clothes himself with cows” (*góbhir vasāyāte*). For the exact phrase see IX.107.26 and for variants without the simile particle IX.86.26, 95.1.

As often, *nā* appears before its target when it would be in final position (**nirñījam nā* #). See my paper at ECIEC 2024 and disc. passim in the comm. This pāda is found identically in IX.107.26, a hymn with another ex. of this phenomenon (IX.107.12). See disc. ad locc.

IX.14.6: *śrītī-* is a hapax, on which see Old. It is here an instr. sg. fem., referring to the fine fleece filter, and echoing *śrītāḥ* in 1b.

With Old and Ge I take *gavyā* as instr. to *gavyā-* ‘longing for cows’, rather than neut. pl. with Gr and Lub. Re sits on the fence.

Although *vidé* is ordinarily passive, there are a few precedents for ‘know (as) one’s own’; see VII.40.5, VIII.62.9.

IX.14.7: Here the fingers (*kṣīpaḥ*) are named directly, after the metaphors of 2ab and 5a; the verb *√mṛj* ‘groom’ recurs from 5b.

IX.15

On the structuring principle of the hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.15.1: Pāda c, *gāchann índrasya niṣkṛtām*, echoes IX.13.1c *vāyór índrasya niṣkṛtām*. It is not clear to me whether a different ritual occasion is meant, or it’s simply a variant.

IX.15.2: The phrase *dhiyā yāty* (with non-vocalic *-y* in *yāty*) “drives with insight” in 1a is echoed by the verb *dhiyāyate* “exercises his insight” in 2a, though in different metrical positions. *dhiyāyate* also participates in another phonetic figure, with the final word of b: (*dhi*)*yāyate* / (*devá*)*tātaye*, with the same vowel pattern, but crossed consonants (*y y t / t t y*). Denom. *dhiyāyate* is of odd formation, presumably built to the instr., which makes it seem context-generated (from *dhiyā* in 1a), but there is unfortunately another form to the stem (dat. part. I.155.1 *dhiyāyaté*), as well as a related *-yú*-adjective, *dhiyāyú-* (I.8.6). Still I think generation in this context is likely.

Pāda c contains another mirror-image phonetic figure: (*amṛ*)*tāsa āsat(e)*.

IX.15.3: The ppl. *hitā-* is potentially a pun, both ‘propelled’ (*√hi*) and ‘placed’ (*√dhā*), though in this case the former is dominant, given the journey theme of the rest of the vs. (and hymn).

In c *yádī* is best read *yád ī*; see also IX.14.2.

IX.15.5: The *amśú-* here is in the first instance the shoots of the soma plant, the usual sense of this stem, but I think a possible secondary sense is the tufts of wool on the fleece filter, which can resemble shoots of vegetation. In the former case the instr. expresses accompaniment, in the latter instr. of path-along-which. See the instr. in 1a (*ánvyā*), 2b (*pathā*), and 6b (*páruṣā*), which all refer to the fleece along which soma journeys.

IX.15.6: In contrast to the relative simplicity of the rest of this hymn, this vs. presents a number of lexical puzzles / unusual usages.

On *pībdanā-* see comm. ad VI.46.6. As indicated there, I take the underlying verb as ‘go step-by-step, plod, trudge’. In our passage I think *pībdanā vásūni*, lit. “plodding goods,” is a jocular way to refer to cattle -- the “cows” [=milk] that Soma is rushing towards. Others (Ge, Re) simply see these as the material goods Soma is on his way to gain.

A *párus-* is a link(age), joint, or juncture; see EWA s.v. *párvan-* with considerable lit. as well as comm. ad IV.22.2. In this instance I think it’s abstract ‘articulation’ and refers to the 3-D patterns on the fleece filter. As indicated in the comm. to the preceding vs., I take it as an instr. of the path here. Others (esp. Ge and Re) think it refers to the knots or nodules of the soma plant that remain in the filter when the juice has flown out, but then both the singular and the instrumental are hard to explain. Note that in IV.22.2 Indra wraps himself in the *párvāni* of a river, which I take there as tufts of foam that resemble tufts of wool.

śāda- is a hapax in the RV, but related words are found elsewhere, if rarely, in Vedic: YV texts (VS, MS, KS, ŚB, etc; see Bloomfield Conc.) contain a mantra *śādam* [*śādām* in accented texts] *dadbhiḥ* “*śād(a)* with the teeth,” in a litany listing the disposition of the parts of the sacrificed horse. There is no strong contextual evidence for its identification with a plant, much less with grass or fresh grass. However, in later Skt. *śādvāla-* means ‘grassy’ and matches the fairly widespread MIA word *saddala-* ‘id.’ (Pāli etc.), and ‘grass’ is certainly compatible here, since horses crop grass with their teeth. It is also not possible to tell from the mantra whether the stem is thematic (as in our RVic passage) or a root noun. The JB contains two occurrences in a single passage of what is clearly a root noun and which is somewhat more helpful semantically than the YV exx. It is in a passage that lists several plant substitutes to press in place of soma, of which *śād* is the first: JB I.355 *śuklāś śādo ‘bhiṣunuyuh / somo vai rājā yad imaṃ lokam ājagāma sa śātsv eva tad uvāsa / sa evāśya saṃnyaṅgaḥ / tam eva tad abhiṣunvanti* “They should press white/bright *śād*-s. When Soma the king came to this world, he dwelled then in *śād*-s. That is his mark. Thus they press him in this way.” On this basis Soma seems to have an affinity with *śād(a)-*. However, it is not possible to tell whether the JB passage is an independent witness to this association or was constructed on the basis of the RV passage. In any case, I have no idea what aspect of the soma ritual *śāda-* is meant to refer to. I assume the descent here should be into some type of soma vessel (see *dróṇesu* in the next vs., 7b). I considered the possibility that *śāda-* is meant to evoke some noun meaning ‘seat’, to *√sad*, with the MIA loss of distinction among sibilants enabling such a pun. But there is no appropriate nominal counterpart belonging to *√sad*. Another possibility, starting with ‘in / among the grasses’, is that the image is of a worn-out racehorse put out to pasture. But none of these possibilities is particularly compelling, and I’m afraid the reference must remain a mystery.

IX.15.8: The insights of b form a bit of a ring with the insight of 1a. Furthermore, ab with ten fingers and seven *dhītī*-grooming Soma is almost identical to IX.8.4.

IX.16

IX.16.1: On *onī*- see comm. ad VI.20.4, where I am unsatisfied by the current consensus that it means ‘arm’ (see EWA s.v.) but offer nothing to take its place. Here ‘arm’ works perfectly well.

Etaśa is the sun’s horse, so he would be traveling through the air. On *√tac* as referring generally to birds’ movements, see IX.32.4.

IX.16.2: Ge and Re construe *dākṣasya* with preceding *krátvā*, which is certainly possible: *krātu*- and *dākṣa*- are often associated, and Ge adduces several passages containing *krátvā dākṣasya* (III.2.3, V.10.2 -- though in both cases JPB plausibly construed *dākṣasya* with something else). But since *rathī*- ‘charioteer’ is regularly construed with a gen. (incl. *dākṣasya* IV.10.2, VI.51.6) and since *krátvā* appears without gen. in nearby 4c, I take *dākṣasya* with *rathī*-. Better might be the course suggested (but not followed) by Ge in his n. 2a: “*dākṣasya* wohl nach beiden Seiten zu verbinden.” This would yield the tr. “with the resolve of skill we accompany the charioteer of skill ...,” which seems a bit heavy.

IX.16.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the hapax *ánapta*- is difficult. Insofar as there is a standard view, it is taken as ‘unwatered, undiluted’ (Gr ‘nicht wässerig’, Ge ‘nicht verwässert’; EWA s.v. with lit.), while Re prefers ‘inaccessible’. Although the connection with ‘water’ makes the most superficial sense, esp. given its juxtaposition with immediately following *apsú* ‘in the waters’, it doesn’t make ritual sense, in that the soma *is* watered during these steps in the sacrifice, and in this very pāda the soma is depicted as being “in the waters.” My own desperate suggestion is not appreciably better, that it is formed to *naptī*- ‘granddaughter, niece’, used of the fingers that prepare the soma. Two of the six forms of this word are found in hymns by just this poet (Asita Kāśyapa or Devala Kāśyapa), IX.9.1, 14.5). The word would mean ‘without the granddaughters’ (for the accent, cf. words like *āprajā*- ‘without offspring’ and AiG II.1.239–40), that is, without their ritual ministrations. The point would be (if there is a point) that the soma speeds through the waters and would do so, even if it had not received these ministrations. I do not, however, set much stock in this suggestion, esp. since the morphology is dicey to say the least.

The phrase *apsú duṣṭāra*- is found also in nearby IX.20.6, so this must be the constituency here -- and *apsú* is therefore not to be construed with *ánaptam*. As Re points out, Soma is several times called *ap-túr*- ‘crossing the waters’ (e.g., IX.63.5, 21), and the expression here redistributes the elements.

IX.16.4: In the publ. tr. I construe *punānāsya* with *pavítre*, not with adjacent *cétasā*, as Ge and Re do. I would now emend my tr. to the standard: “with the attention of the one being purified [that is, himself].” Ge comments (n. 4a), “Er weiss von selbst, was er zu tun hat,” and although I’m not entirely sure that this is what the phrase means, my publ. tr. doesn’t make much sense either and overlooks the fact that pāda b, which contains the noun, *pavítre*, on which I hang the gen. *punānāsya*, is found identically in the next hymn (17.3), as well as in IX.37.1, both times without a gen.

IX.16.5: The vs. begins *prá tvā*, reminiscent of the hymn opening *prá te* (1a), and the audience would surely assume -- not least because 2nd ps. is generally restricted to Soma in the IXth Maṇḍala (see Re's comm. here) -- that *tvā* refers to Soma. But this expectation is repaired (or dis-repaired) by the voc. *índra* that opens pāda b. See vs. 8 below.

I take the referent of gen. *kārīṇaḥ* in c to be Indra.

IX.16.6: In c the loc. *góṣu* can be shared by simile and frame: in the frame it refers to the milk into which the soma has entered, in the simile to the cows that a champion wins in the raid or battle.

IX.16.8: Soma is addressed here in the 2nd ps., the first time since the uninsistent *te* in the first pāda of the hymn (1a *prá te* ...) and thus sketches a sort of referential ring. Throughout the rest of the hymn soma is always in the 3rd ps., and the only 2nd ps. reference is found in vs. 5, where the referent is Indra (see comm. there).

Pāda a is troublingly incomplete, with a nom. subj. (*tvám*) and an acc. *vipaścítam* but nothing to govern the acc. The pāda is identical to IX.64.25a, whose b pāda, *punānó vācam iṣyasi*, provides both a transitive verb and a referent for the acc., "being purified, you send forth speech attentive to poetic inspiration." Although supplying a full pāda is something I would prefer not to do, I see no alternative to doing so (nor does Ge; see his n. 8a, where he expresses his reluctance; Bl, RR ad loc., as well). It is made somewhat more plausible by the appearance in nearby 12.6, by the same poet, of the relevant VP, *vācam ... iṣyati*. (See also *iṣṇán* in the next hymn, 17.5, where I supply 'speech' as the obj. [contra Ge, but in agreement with Re].) This is certainly a better solution than Re's: he simply treats the acc. as a nom. and uses it as a modifier of Soma ("Toi, ô *soma*, qui comprends les mots-inspirés ...").

IX.17

IX.17.3: The hapax *áty-ūrmi-* must be modelled on *áty-avi-* 'beyond the sheep('s fleece)', 4x, including twice in the hymns of this poet: IX.6.5 and 13.1. I assume the image is, roughly, of a wave breaking on the shore, with the liquid now beyond the wave-forms on the body of water.

IX.17.5: The *áti-* in cmpd. found in 3a here gives rise to a phrasal expression with cosmic reach: *áti trī ... rocanā* "beyond the three luminous realms."

I supply 'speech' as the obj. of *iṣṇán*; see comm. ad 16.8.

IX.17.8: Both Ge and Re take *ánu kṣara* as transitive ("Lass ... fließen," "Laisse couler ..."), but forms of *√kṣar* are otherwise intransitive, and here the acc. *dhārām* must be governed by the preverb *ánu*.

IX.18

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

IX.18.2: The identification of Soma as both *vípra-* and *kaví-* is quite explicit here; see disc. ad 12.8.

In b Ge takes the *prá* as standing for the predicate "hat den Vorzug" and construes it separately from the *jātām*, presumably because of its separate accent. I am sympathetic, but still

assume that it is loosely construed with *jātām*. The tr. should perhaps be slightly altered to “born forth from ...” On *jātām āndhasaḥ* see further ad IX.55.2.

IX.18.3–4: Note the two occurrences of *viśva-* (3a, 4a), which contrast with the *sarva-* in the refrain.

IX.18.4–7: Vss. 4–6 all (save for the refrain pāda) consist of rel. clauses headed by *yāḥ* and couched in the 3rd ps.; the main clause appears to be vs. 7, with the resumptive prn. *sá* and 3rd ps. verb.

IX.18.5: Both Ge and Re take *ródasī mahī* as acc. obj. of the frame, with *mātārā* as subj. (Re) or obj. (Ge) in the simile: e.g., “qui trait ces Deux grands Mondes ensemble, comme deux (vaches) mères.” In favor of this view is the fact that in VIII.6.17a, identical to our a-pāda, the dual is acc. (though in a very different context); furthermore, the position of *iva* in b might suggest that the simile consists only of the preceding word *mātārā*. However, I prefer to take both duals as part of the simile, parallel nominatives corresponding to the unexpressed subj. of the frame, Soma. Cows (or their correspondants) are the standard subjects of med. forms of *√duh*, with the obj. being the milk (or milk substitute), and therefore the accusatives of Re and Ge would be semantically and functionally anomalous. For Heaven and Earth (i.e., the two world-halves represented by *ródasī* here) as subject of medial *√duh*, see VI.70.2 *ghṛtām duhāte* “the two yield ghee as milk,” in a hymn to Heaven and Earth, which are the default referent of the many duals in the hymn.

IX.18.7: Because of the rel. cl. / main cl. structure of vss. 4–7 (see above), I would lightly emend to the tr. to “he/that one, tempestuous in the tubs, kept roaring ...,” to display this structure more clearly.

IX.19

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

IX.19.2: Note the reverse vāyav indraś ca construction, *indraś ca soma*.

IX.19.3: With Ge (but not Re), I take the pres. part. *sán* as concessive, as the nom. forms of this participle generally are -- although I’m not sure what the concession is. The most likely possibility is that “sitting down on the womb” is an odd action for a horse. The most common simile with “sit” is “like a falcon,” e.g., IX.82.1 *śyenó ná yónim ... āśadam*, with the same lexical material as here. Or perhaps horses don’t thunder.

IX.19.4: I am not entirely certain of the force of *ādhi*: my ‘over’ does not parse very well in Engl. tr. But the point is probably that the verbal part of the ritual, embodied by the fem. *dhītī-* ‘insightful thought/speech’ and therefore conceived of as female, is produced at the same time as the “semen” of Soma, namely the juice itself. This semen is attributed both to a bull, Soma as hypervirile adult male animal, and, if we supply *rétasī* in c for the genitives to depend on (so also Ge and Re), to a calf, presumably not yet sexually mature, who is further the son of these mothers (the words, at least by my interpr.). Ge (n. 4) calls the verse “ein Paradoxon,” though he

doesn't bother to explain what he thinks the paradox is. I assume that it is the identification of Soma as both bull and calf.

I further assume that the "mothers" (*mātārah*) of c are co-referential with the *dhītāyaḥ* of a, though it might be possible to separate them -- with the mothers being the milk-mixture or some other ritual substance. Lü (247) considers the mothers distinct from the *dhītāyaḥ* and referring to the heavenly streams, but this is a predictable result of his *idée fixe*.

IX.19.5: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. metaphorically expresses the complex interaction between poetry, the thoughts (*dhī-* 2c, *dhītī-* 4a, both fem.) recited at the Soma pressing, and the Soma/soma him-/itself. The (female) thoughts "yearn for the/a bull" (*vr̥ṣaṇyā-*) to swell (*√pi* 2c) and impregnate (*gārbham* *√dhā* 5b) them with his semen/juice, while at the same time they are Soma's mothers (4c) and themselves "give the gleaming milk" (*śukrām duhaté páyaḥ* 5c) -- *śukrām páyaḥ* being often a kenning for both soma juice and semen (see Gr, nos. 3 and 7 s.v. *śukrá*). So they both produce the soma/semen and become pregnant by it.

IX.19.6: Re identifies this vs. as displaying the three functions -- an interpr. that utterly escapes me.

The lexeme *āpa* *√sthā* is quite rare in the RV with a fairly late distribution: besides this passage I have found only VIII.48.11 (a "popular" hymn acdg. to Arnold), X.106.2, and X.124.8. It means 'stay/keep away'; in this context, where those who *āpa* *√sthā* are to be courted by Soma, in contrast to the *śātru-*, in whom he is urged to strike fear, it seems to refer to potential allies or members of our group who are currently staying neutral, sitting on the fence, as it were. It nicely contrasts with *ūpa śikṣa* 'seek to win over, seek to entice (here)', on which see I.112.19, I.173.10.

As in II.28.6, the transmitted *bhiyāsam* should be read *bhyāsam*.

I take *vidā* as 2nd sg. impv., with lengthened ending, contra the standard interpr. (Pp, Gr, Old, Lub) as 2nd sg. subj. *vidās*. (Ge and Re tr. as an impv. and do not comment, but it's quite possible that they are so tr. what they consider a subjunctive.) The form is parallel to 2 impvs. in the same vs., *ūpa śikṣa* (a), *ā dhehi* (b), which support an impv. reading; the pāda is repeated twice (IX.43.4, 63.11), but those vss. lack other verb forms that would support one reading or the other. Other occurrences of *vidā* are generally better taken as impv. (I.36.14, VI.48.9, VIII.61.7) or are syntactically and semantically indifferent (I.71.7). (I take the form in V.45.1 as the instr. of a root noun.) The only clear ex. of a subj. is in IX.40.4, where sandhi preserves the final cons.: *vidāḥ sahasrīṇr* ... I assume the almost universal embrace of the Pp subjunctive readings results from the fact that there are no unambiguous imperative forms to this them. aor. stem -- that is, forms where the sandhi does not allow a *-ās* reading -- whereas there are several other subjunctives (e.g., *vidāsi* IX.35.1). But I do not see why an impv. would be excluded on principle; Macd (VedGr §512) gives several exx. of *a-* aorist imperatives, though he states that the mood is "of rare occurrence" -- a statement he also makes (§509) about the subjunctive to the same formation, however. It's also worth noting that KH (Injunk. 263) takes *vidó sú* ... in X.113.10 as impv. *vidā* + *u*, a reading supported by the sandhi of *sú*. On imperatival use of injunc. *vidah* see comm. ad IX.20.3.

IX.20

IX.20.1: *vārebhiḥ*, lit. ‘along the hairs/fleece’ is an instr. of the path-along-which; see comm. ad IX.15.5.

IX.20.3: The sense of the injunc. *vidaḥ* here is uncertain, but my rendering in the publ. tr. as if it were a subjunctive is almost surely wrong. In general, 2nd sg. injunctives to thematic aorists have been taken as modal (see KH, Injunc. 263), and certainly Ge and Re both tr. this form as an impv. The *sá* opening the pāda supports the interpr. as an imperative substitute, since, by my rules (“Vedic ‘sá figé’: An Inherited Sentence Connective?,” *Historische Sprachforschung* 105 [1992]: 213–39), *sá* (and other nominative forms of this pronoun) are found with 2nd ps. ref. almost exclusively with imperatives. Hoffmann (loc. cit.), however, says that modal use of the various occurrences of *vidaḥ* is “nicht durchweg sicher.” Nonetheless I would now change the tr. to an imperativ “find fame for us,” because of the *sá*. I do not think that this calls my interpr. of *vidā* as an impv. in the preceding hymn (19.8) into question. See comm. there. For other occurrences of the form *vidaḥ*, see comm. ad I.42.7–9.

IX.20.5: Both Ge and Re take ab together, but I do not understand how the simile “like a king” (*rājeva*) would work with the VP (“you have entered the songs” *gíraḥ ... viveśitha*). I have therefore taken the two pādas as separate clauses. The simile in pāda a then works well, since it makes perfect sense that a king should “possess good commandments” (*suṽratāḥ*). The splitting of the two pādas gains further support from IX.57.3b, a pāda closely corresponding to our pāda a: *ibho rājeva suṽratāḥ*, where there is no question of entering songs or any similar action and the shared quality of simile and frame must be *suṽratā-*.

For further on the expression “enter songs” in pāda b, see publ. intro.

IX.20.6: On *apsú duṣṭáraḥ* see comm. ad 16.3.

IX.20.7: On the double sense of *makhá-* see comm. ad I.18.9; in our passage the ‘bounteous’ sense prevails, though it could also be making a subtle ring with vs. 1. In 1c Soma conquers all opponents, and here he could be secondarily called a battler as well as bounteous.

IX.21

IX.21.2: This vs. lacks a finite verb and can go either with vs. 1 or vs. 3 (or both): they all have as subj. the plural soma juices.

The lexeme *prá√vṛ* is rare and generally means ‘cover [with INSTR.]’ (e.g., X.16.7). However, here and in VII.82.6 it must mean ‘ward off’ (< ‘obstruct forward’?) vel sim.

IX.21.4: As often in the Soma hymns (see, e.g., comm. ad IX.9.1), *hitá-* is ambiguous, belonging either to *√dhā*, hence ‘placed’, or to *√hi*, hence ‘impelled’. Both Ge and Re opt for ‘placed’, and I admit that this works better with the loc. *rāthe*. But if they are merely “placed” at/on the chariot, we do not learn how they obtained the desirable things, and I therefore think ‘propelled’ is a necessary part of the scenario. Of course, it might be meant to be read both ways: “when placed at the chariot (and) propelled.”

IX.21.5: On my interpr. of this vs., see publ. tr. Both Ge and Re have quite different views. Ge takes the *asmin* to be the sacrificer (flg. Sāy.), with the *piśāṅgam ... venám* (my “tawny tracker,”

his “den goldenen Seher”) “ein innerer Mahner” of this would-be stingy man. This anticipation of an Upaniṣadic-type Inner Controller seems anachronistic to me. Re simply -- in my opinion over-simplistically -- takes all elements to be soma in one form or another: the soma drops are urged to put “le (Soma) Veilleur à couleur-d’or” into the soma liquid. This endless loop doesn’t seem to get us anywhere. I do agree with Re that soma/Soma is represented by two of the elements: the drops that are addressed (*indavaḥ*) are soma the substance and the “tawny tracker” is Soma the god. The drops are urged to put Soma the god into Indra (my interpr. of the referent of *asmin*); cf., from the same poet, IX.11.6 *índum índre dadhātana*.

The subj. of the infin. *ādīśe* is, in my view, the tawny tracker (i.e., Soma), though the act of placing this Soma in Indra may be part of the instruction. On the constr. see comm. on the almost identical expression in 6b.

Loc. *asmin* is unaccented and should therefore refer to something already present in the discourse, but that does not eliminate any of the just-given interpr.: Ge’s sacrificer, in the person of the ‘presser’ (*súṣvi-*), is found in 2, my Indra in 1, and Re’s soma is ubiquitous. In fact even without the mentions in vss. 1 and 2, the sacrificer and Indra are expected personnel on the scene in any Soma hymn.

IX.21.6: The adj. *ráthya-* generally modifies either chariot horses or chariot wheels; here, with the presence of a craftsman, the latter is most likely. So also Gr, Ge, and Re.

As was just noted, pāda b *dádhātā kētam ādīśe* is almost identical to 5b *dádhātā venám ādīśe*. Nonetheless, Ge and Re unaccountably (at least to me) take the VP entirely differently here from 5b: they take *návam*, *dádhātā* as a phrasal verb “renew, make new,” with *ādīśe* filling a different syntactic role. E.g., “Erneuet, um (ihn) zu mahnen, seinen Vorsatz ...” (Sim. Keydana, Inf., 318, who shows no awareness of the parallel in the immed. preceding vs.) First, I know of no other exx. of *náva-* √ *dhā* in the sense ‘make new’, a sense expressed rather by *náva-* √ *kṛ* (e.g., X.143.1). But, more important, the close parallelism between 5b and 6b strongly suggests that they should be interpr. the same way, with the acc. the subj. of the infinitive.

By the Ge/Re (/Keydana) interpr., in the simile the craftsman is “renewing” the wheel; by mine, he is “setting/placing” it on the chariot, with a slightly different sense of √ *dhā* than in the frame.

IX.21.7: *satáḥ* in c is somewhat puzzling. Both Ge and Re take it as adverbial: “in gleicher Weise,” “pareillement.” Ge makes no comment; Re adduces *sató-mahant-*, -*vīra-*. For this 1st cmpd member see comm. ad VII.104.21. As I point out there, though I think the cmpds in question contain this adverbial element, I do not think it exists as an independent word. Supposed exx. of it belong instead to the pres. part. of √ *as*, either gen./abl. sg. or acc. pl. Here I take it as the gen. sg., dependent on *matīm*. Genitives appearing with this stem generally refer to the poet (e.g., IX.64.10 *kavīnām matī*). Forms of √ *as*, incl. the pres. part., can have the extended sense ‘be real / really present’, and that is how I take it here. Cf. for a similar use in a nearby hymn IX.19.7 *dūrē vā sató ánti vā* “whether he be in the distance or nearby” (used of an enemy); also IX.31.6 (of Soma).

IX.22

On the structure and thematics of this hymn, see publ. intro. Note also that the first 5 vss. begin *eté*, while the 2nd hemistichs of vss. 5 and 6 begin *utédám*. Further local chainings are discussed below.

IX.22.1: The preverb *prá*, which must be in tmesis from the verb *ahēṣata* that ends the vs., is very oddly positioned -- in the middle of a pāda (one that doesn't even contain the verb), not adjoining a metrical boundary. I have no explanation, though it may be based on a pāda like IX.64.4 *āsṛkṣata prá vājīnaḥ*, also ending *prá vājīnaḥ*, where the preverb immediately follows its verb, a permitted position.

IX.22.2: As in the immed. preceding hymn (21.2), this vs. lacks a finite verb and can be attached either to vs. 1 or vs. 3 or both.

My supplied "(surging)" isn't strictly necessary -- neither Ge nor Re supplies anything at all -- but it seemed to me that something dynamic was needed here, for wind, rain, and fire.

IX.22.3, 5: Note *vy ānaśuḥ* in both vss. (3c, 5b), implicitly connecting Soma's pervasion of poetry with his pervasion of cosmic space. This repetition could also define vs. 4, the middle vs. of the hymn, as an omphalos, but that vs. doesn't seem to do much if so. For further exx. of $\sqrt{(n)}aś$ see ad 4–6.

IX.22.4: With Ge/Re I take *ná* as neg. with pf. *śaśramuḥ*. In contrast, Kü (524, 551) takes it as the simile particle: "... sind wie [Rennpferde], die gelaufen sind, ermüdet ..." He cites (551 n. 1141) Delbrück (Altind. Syn. 376) for this interpr., but Delbrück in fact takes the *ná* as neg.: "... sind nicht müde geworden, obgleich sie gelaufen sind." I assume that Kü so interpr. because of the position of *ná* after the participle, but in a Gāyatrī pāda the position before the verb is also the position after the NP -- there's not a lot of space. I think it unlikely that the poets would ever say that the ever-running soma could get tired. Moreover, $\sqrt{śram}$ almost always appears with neg.

IX.22.5: See remarks ad vs. 3.

The part. *viprayāntaḥ* presumably belongs to the lexeme *ví-prá \sqrt{i}* , but note that it could also be interpr. as belonging to a denom. **vīpra-yá-* 'behave like [/seek] an inspired poet', which would connect this vs. further with the poetic pervasion of vs. 3. The suggested denom. stem is not attested but could of course be easily formed, and I'm tolerably sure this pun was meant. Note *vipāścītaḥ* and *vipā*, both in the matching vs. 3. I would now slightly alter the tr. to "going forth widely [/behaving like inspired poets]."

IX.22.4–6: More chaining: vss. 4 and 6 end with *rājāḥ*; the exact phrase in 5c is *uttamām rājāḥ*, whose *uttamām* is then picked up in 6a and augmented with *uttamāyyam* in 6c. Meanwhile, 3rd pl. pf. (*vy*) *ānaśuḥ* of 3c, 5b morphs into 3rd pl. root aor. *āśata* in 6b. As Old points out, $\sqrt{(n)}aś$ is also represented by the desid. *īyakṣantaḥ* in 4c.

My "that is to be higher still" is meant to capture the pseudo-gerundive form of the nonce *uttamāy^jya-*.

IX.22.6–7: As noted in the publ. intro., vs. 7 stands somewhat apart from the rest of the hymn, but there is chaining here as well: 6a *tāntuṃ tanvānām* ... is echoed by 7c *tatām tāntuṃ* ...

IX.22.7: Both Ge and Re take *acikradaḥ* as transitive/causative (e.g., "tu l'as fait crier"), but although (*ā*)*cikrada-* looks like a typical redupl. aor. to an *-āya-*transitive, it is not so used. On the

problem of this redupl. aor., see my 1983 *-āya-* book (pp. 110–11)(though I would now disavow a second \sqrt{krand} ‘race’, beside ‘roar’).

IX.23

IX.23.4: On the identification of the soma juices with the $\bar{A}yus$, see publ. intro. Both Ge and Re take $\bar{a}y\acute{a}vaḥ$ here as adjectival (“lebengebend” and “vivaces” respectively), but this loses the connection with the $\bar{A}yus$ in vs. 2.

IX.24

IX.24.1–3: The first 3 vss. are united by the use of the (secondary) root \sqrt{dhanv} ‘run’, with the 3rd pl. *-iṣ-*aor. *adhanviṣuḥ* (found only here in the RV) in vss. 1 and 2, with the complementary subjects soma drops (1) and cows (2)(or so I think: see below), and the 2nd sg. pres. *dhanvasi* in 3.

IX.24.2: Old discusses this vs. at some length and disputes the cows as subject. The problems he sees are that 1) it makes more sense for the soma drops to run than the cows (though he admits that there are some undoubted passages with the latter); 2) the shared verb would more naturally have the same subject than diff. subjects (this is not a stylistic given in soma hymns, where substances swap identities all the time); 3) the part. *punānāḥ* ‘being purified’ is better applied to soma drops than cows (though again he recognizes at least one passage in which the part. is so used). On the basis of these arguments he suggests that *gāvaḥ* here should be interpr. as accusative rather than as the nominative it overwhelming is, with *abhī gāvaḥ* substituted for *abhī gāḥ* on metrical grounds and the soma drops again the subj. This seems both uncharacteristic and unworthy of Oldenberg. Positing “metrical” motivation for RVic anomalies is rarely successful, because the poets are flexible enough to avoid situations where they would be forced to use the wrong grammatical form because of meter. Moreover, the construction of the a-pādas of the two vss. -- PREVERB PL.NOUN *adhanviṣuḥ* -- imposes the subject role on the second noun (*gāvaḥ*, 2a), which is in the same position as *sómāsaḥ* in 1a. The only of his arguments that seems at all worth considering is the one about *punānāḥ*, though given the tendency to identify the substances, esp. the liquid substances, in the soma ritual with each other, I do not find it particularly cogent -- and as Old himself points out, c could be a separate clause with the soma drops supplied as subj. there. (Another possible argument, not brought up by Old, is that this is the only vs. in the hymn where soma [sg. or pl.] is not the subject, but I do not think that is strong enough to contravene the grammar.) He cites another possible ex. of acc. *gāvaḥ*, in VIII.41.6, where the form is easily interpr. as nom. (see comm. ad loc.). Re follows Old’s interpr; Ge does not, though in his n. 2b he suggests that the poet meant the soma drops as subject, but reversed the construction (“... er hat aber die Konstruktion umgekehrt,” whatever he means by that).

IX.24.4: Although in the publ. tr. pāda c is unequivocally applied to Soma (“you who are ...”), the text is ambiguous: the rel. cl. of pāda c, *sásnir yó anumādyah*, could have either Soma or Indra (under the epithet *carṣanīśāh-*, which ends the preceding pāda) as antecedent. In IX *anumādyah* is otherwise used of Soma, including two vss. later (24.6) as well as 76.1, 107.11, but it applies to Indra in VI.34.2. Since Indra was just called “conquerer of territories,” the use of *sásni-* ‘winner’ for the subj. of *anumādyah* makes Indra a distinct possibility. I think the

ambiguity is meant; this is another ex. of the trade-off of identities discussed ad vs. 2. See further below.

IX.24.5: The tr. of this vs. needs to be emended: because *paridhāvasi* has an accented verb, it must belong to the *yád* clause, and pāda c must be the main clause. I would now add to the tr. of c “(you are) fit ...” Alternatively, the vs. could be entirely a subordinate clause and dependent on either 4 or 6, hence, e.g., “purify yourself ... (4), when pressed by the stones you run around the filter, fit for the fundament of Indra (5),” with no alternation of the transl. of 5, but a comma, not a period, at the end of 4.

What *dhāmane* is meant to convey here is unclear, and numerous incompatible suggestions have been made -- e.g., Ge “(Eigen)art,” Re “vocation” (and see his n.). I long ago (Ged. Cowgill) suggested that this is a somewhat heavy-handed pun, with “fundament” both referring to Indra’s fundamental being and to his physical foundation, his bottom.

IX.24.6: As noted in the publ. intro., Indra’s most characteristic epithet, “Vṛtra/obstacle-smasher,” is here applied to Soma instead -- another ex. of identity trading. The gerundive *anumādya-*, which was ambiguously used in 4c for either Soma or Indra or both, may signal the blurring of identity between them here.

IX.24.7: Because of the blurring of identity just discussed, I take the predicate of *ucyate* ‘is called’ to be *sómaḥ*, a re-assertion of the name of the god being celebrated in this hymn after the equation with Indra in vss. 4 and 6 (and with the cows in vs. 2). This re-assertion is esp. appropriate in the final vs. of the hymn. Ge/Re take *śúciḥ pāvakāḥ* as the predicate instead, but this pair of adjectives already characterized the substance identically in 6c. I think the point is that “the gleaming and purified one” has the name / is called “Soma.” In favor of their interpr. is the variant in VIII.13.19 *śúciḥ pāvakā ucyate só ádbhutaḥ* (which also incorporates all 3 adjectives from our vs. 6c). In that passage the adjectives do seem to serve as predicate with *ucyate*, but with a twist -- these soma-epithets are applied to the praiser (*stotár-*) there. I therefore do not think that the two similar pādas need to be construed identically -- rather that one poet (probably the one responsible for VIII.13.19) is playing with the phrase.

IX.25

IX.25.2: *hitáḥ* here fairly clearly belongs to \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’, given the expressions of movement and goal in the rest of the vs. But the ambiguity between *hitá-* ‘impelled’ and ‘placed’ is common in this maṇḍala, as we’ve already seen (e.g., IX.1.2).

Both Ge and Re take *dhármaṇā* to be Soma’s: “nach deiner Bestimmung” and “selon (ta) nature” respectively. However, I take it to refer to the statute or ordinance of the *ritual*, in particular that which establishes Vāyu as the first recipient of the soma drink: *dhármaṇā* is used in this exact sense here as well as in IX.63.22 and I.134.5; see disc. ad the latter passage.

IX.25.3: Soma is given Indra’s epithet *vṛtrahán-* as in vs. 6 of the preceding hymn (IX.24).

IX.25.4: There is disagreement about what it means for Soma to “enter all forms” (*vísṁ rūpāṇy āviśán*): Ge thinks that it refers to the various stages of soma preparation, while Re that it refers

to the divine forms, that is the gods, whom Soma enters when he is drunk. I slightly favor Ge's explanation, since Soma only reaches the gods in the last pāda.

IX.25.6: On *ā pavasva ... pavītram* see disc. ad IX.70.10.

IX.26

On the rhetorical structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. The tr. replicates the fronting of the acc. pronoun 'him' throughout, though in vs. 6 *tām tvā* is represented just by "you," not "that you."

IX.26.2: The phrase *dhartār- divāḥ* (also in opposite order) "supporter of heaven" is well established and used elsewhere in IX of Soma (IX.76.1, 109.6); it is of course the default interpr. here, shared by Gr, Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. inter alia. However, the *ā* in the middle of the phrase (*dhartāram ā divāḥ*) is troubling. It should not be a preverb in tmesis, since it is not adjacent to a metrical boundary and is not in a pāda with a finite verb (nor is there an appropriate verb anywhere in the vs.). The standard use of *ā* in such positions is as an adposition, and in particular, in the position before an abl., with the meaning 'all the way to'. Cf. for this exact expression *ā divāḥ* I.92.17 "all the way to heaven," of a *ślōka*- 'signal call' whose noise goes to heaven. I therefore think there is a syntactic and semantic pun in this vs.: the first reading is "supporter of heaven" with a gen. *divāḥ* (and the *ā* essentially elided), but the second is "all the way to heaven" with an abl. *divāḥ* governed by *ā*. This latter reading indicates that the lowing of the cows found in pāda a (*gāvo abhy ānūṣata*) goes not only to Soma on the ritual ground but also to heaven, where the heavenly Soma is found -- as is made clear in the next vs. That the material going to heaven is noise reminds us of I.92.17 with the same expression.

IX.26.3: On the anomalous acc. sg. *vedhām* to *vedhās*- see Old ad loc.; AiG II.2.225, 725, III.283, 285. Re's suggestion that it may recall "l'origine lointaine *vī-dhā*" is best ignored, since Aves. *vazdah*- rules out a vrddhi of *-i-* in the initial syllable of *vedhās*- (as Re surely knew). Note that the correct pl. to the *-as*-stem, *vedhāsaḥ*, is found in vs. 6.

For the relationship between *ādhi dyāvi* here and *ā divāḥ* in 2c, see immed. above.

IX.26.4: On this vs., and esp. pāda b, see Old's detailed and sensible disc.

The rare and curiously formed word *bhurīj-* (4x), without clear etymology, is always dual, and the gloss 'arm' (flg. Sāy's *bāhu-*), or perhaps better 'hand', works reasonably well in the various contexts. In IV.2.14 it appears in a vs. with other body parts and in a context where artisans are at work; in VIII.4.16 a razor is being sharpened; in IX.71.5 it qualifies the fingers, which are assembling a chariot. Here the context is rather like IX.10.2, which has du. *gābhastyoḥ*, belonging to a stem unambiguously meaning 'hand'. In this passage it's important to note that *bhurī(joḥ)* is in the same metrical position as *bhūri(-)* in 3c and 5c and that *bhurījor dhiyā* is close to a phonological approximation of *bhūridhāyasam* (3c).

There is some difference of opinion on how to construe *vivāsvataḥ*. Re supplies "(dans le domaine)," presumably on the basis of the fairly common phrase *vivāsvataḥ sādane*. Old's interpr. (flg. Pischel), that it depends on *dhiyā*, is the one I adopt: it has the merit of not requiring anything to be supplied, and *vivāsvataḥ* depends on *dhī-* in IX.99.2 *vivāsvato dhīyaḥ*, where the thoughts themselves are impelling soma (*hinvánti*, like our *ahyan*). Ge's interpr. is more complex: he takes *dhiyā* independently with *ahyan* in pāda a ("Ihn haben sie ... durch ihre Kunst

zur Eile getrieben”), but with *vivāsvataḥ* dependent on it with *saṃvāsānam* in b (“der sich (in die Dichtung) des Vivasvant kleidet”), thus reading *dhiyā* twice (see his n. 4b). I think this double reading is essentially correct -- though I see no reason to put the second “in die Dichtung” in parens, nor do I think that the *dhiyā* construed with *ahyan* in pāda a should lack the dependent genitive.

Though Gr classifies *saṃvāsāna-* (2x) with √*vas* ‘dwell’, the later consensus (in addition to the usual, see Gotō, 1st Kl., 295 n. 698), patently correct in my view, is that it belongs with √*vas* ‘wear’, which has a well-attested med. root pres., whose med. participle is esp. common. On ‘hymns’ etc. as garments, see the passages cited by Old.

IX.26.6: With Old I take *girāvīdh-* as a pun, with the first member both instr. sg. of *gír-* ‘song’ and loc. sg. of *gírī-* ‘mountain’ -- both meanings being entirely appropriate to soma. Ge opts for the 1st in his tr. (though he recognizes the 2nd in n. 6b); Re for the 2nd. Scar (516–17) tentatively accepts Old’s double interpr.

IX.27

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn, like the immediately preceding one, is unified by the simple device of a pronoun (here *eṣā* ‘this one’) repeated at the beginning of each vs. and rendered as such in English. Unlike the preceding hymn there is no switch of person at the end.

IX.27.1: On the meaning of the root √*tuś* see comm. ad VIII.38.2.

IX.27.3: The root-noun cmpd *viśva-víd-* is ambiguous, between ‘all-knowing’ and ‘all-acquiring’ (see Scar 489). In this context, given *svar-jít-* ‘winning the sun’ (2b) and *satrā-jít-* ‘winning completely’ (4c), ‘acquiring all’ seems to work better; however, the very next hymn contains two instances of the same cmpd (IX.28.1, 5), where ‘knowing all’ is favored.

IX.27.5: This vs. rather subtly contrasts the cosmic Soma, who is in heaven (*ádhi dyávi*)(ab), with the ritual substance in the filter (*pavítre*, c). See comm. ad IX.26.2, 3 in the preceding hymn.

On the formation and sense of *hāsate* see Narten (Sig.Aor. 285–86).

IX.27.6: The last vs. of the hymn splits the locational difference found in vs. 5: Soma here flows in the midspace (*antárikṣe*), between the heavenly Soma and the soma on earth on the ritual ground.

On *śuśmī* see comm. ad 29.6.

IX.28

Like the last hymn, this one has *eṣā* beginning every vs. Although the hymns share some vocabulary and themes (as which Soma hymns do not?), they are not twinned.

IX.28.1: *hitāḥ* is taken by all standard interpr. (Gr, Ge, Re) to √*hi* ‘impel’, as also by me, presumably because of the verb of motion, *ví dhāvati*, that provides the finite verb in the vs. But it could, of course, belong to √*dhā* ‘place’. This alternative interpr. is almost encouraged by vs. 4bc *daśábhīr jāmbhīr yatāḥ / abhī drónani dhāvati*“(Soma,) held by the ten siblings, runs to the wooden cups,” where a ppl. of static position (*yatāḥ*) precedes the same verb of motion.

On *viśva-vid-* see comm. ad 27.3. Because of *mānasas pātiḥ* (note close sandhi) “lord of mind,” I interpr. the cmpd as ‘all-knowing’ here.

IX.28.2: For c *viśvā dhāmanī āviśān* Ge reasonably cfs. (n. 2c) IX.25.4a *viśvā rūpāny āviśān*, but then goes the further step to “*dhāman = rūpā*” and tr. our passage “alle seine Formen annehmend,” for which I see little or no justification. Yes, the stems in the RV with well-established distinct meanings, and I see no reason to erase that distinction. Ge’s interpr. has implications for vs. 5, for which see below.

IX.28.5: The c pāda, *viśvā dhāmanī viśvavít*, has the same neut. pl. acc. NP as 2c and the third word is phonologically similar to 2c *āviśān*. There are in principle three ways to construe *viśvā dhāmanī*: 1) as a 2nd object to *arocayat* in a (“made the sun shine (and) all the domains”); 2) as the goal of *āviśān*, supplied from 2c (“entering all domains”); 3) as the object of the root noun - *vid-* extracted the cmpd. *viśva-vid-* or as further specification of the 1st member of that cmpd. (so, either “all-knowing, (knowing) the domains” as in the publ. tr., or “knowing all, (viz.) all the domains”). Like the publ. tr., Re chooses the first version of 3), and this seems the most rhetorically satisfying, while Ge opts for a variant of the second version of 3, while being forced to the further step of interpr. *dhāmanī* as “forms” (“all Formen vollständig kennend”) on the basis of his interpr. of 2c.

IX.28.6: On *śuṣmī* see comm. ad 29.6.

IX.29

IX.29.1: The metrical structure encourages construing *ójasā* with *sutásya* -- so Ge “wenn der Bull mit Kraft ausgepresst ist.” However, I think it likely that the *ójas-* expressions are otherwise identical, but *dhāman-* and *rūpā-* are both well-established belongs to Soma, rather than the pressers, and have therefore taken it with the participial VP in c. Re seems to take it with the verb of pāda a: “Ses jets ont coulé en avant ... d’une force-formidable.”

Note the unaccented *asya* in the first pāda, allowable because the referent is unmistakable. Cf. *asmai* in IX.11.1a and IX.70.1a.

IX.29.3: The construction in pāda a is clarified by IX.94.5 *viśvāni hí suśāhā tāni túbhyam* “for all these things are easy to conquer for you,” with a full dative prn. rather than our ambig. enclitic *te*. The *tāni* is clearly specified by *viśvā vāsūni* in 4a, anticipated by the voc. *prabhū-vaso* in our b.

IX.29.5: *áraruṣaḥ* in pāda a can be gen. or abl. sg. Either of them can fit the syntax: as abl. it can be construed directly with *rákṣā* (“protect from ...”) and be parallel to *svanāt* in b; as gen., it can be dependent on *svanāt* and part of the gen. NP *samasya kásya cit*. Ge follows the 2nd path (“vor dem Schnauben eines jeden Geizhalses”), while Re (and I) the 1st. I do so partly because an abl. simply gives more oomph -- protection from a non-giver seems more critical than simply from the sound of one -- but primarily because of the word order: the audience hearing a form that could be abl. immediately after *√rakṣ* would naturally take it as an abl. It’s possible that they would revise their opinion on encountering a 2nd abl. followed by a gen. sg. to which *áraruṣaḥ*

could belong, but it's also possible (likely even) that they would see no reason to reinterpret. *āraruṣaḥ*.

The subordinate cl. in c does not fit with the main cl. very well, as the awkwardness of the publ. tr. shows. The problem is the verb: what is wanted in context is a modal in a purpose-type clause (“so that we will/may become free of insult”); this would work well with protection from the “sound” in pāda b. But *mumucmāhe* is resolutely pf. indicative (or redupl. pres. indic.; see Kü 380 and nn. 677, 678). Both Ge and Re supply material to smooth the transition, Re with a pres. part. attached to ab: “(nous plaçant) là où nous soyons à l’abri de la nocivité” -- thus also sneaking in the desirable modality. Ge starts a new sentence with c, supplying as main cl. “da wollen wir sein.” Kü avoids supplying anything, but sneaks in futurity in parens: “da wir von der Schmach befreit (worden) sind.” I don’t have a good solution and so stick with the awk. publ. tr.

IX.29.6: This is the 3rd hymn in a row, all attributed to Āṅgīrasa poets, with a form of *śuṣmín-*, *śuṣma-* in the final vs. Also in the next hymn IX.30, also an Āṅgīrasa hymn, vss. 1 (*śuṣmín-*) and 3 (*śuṣma-*). As noted in the publ. intro. to IX.30, the word is not characteristic of Āṅgīrasa poets elsewhere, even in the IXth Maṇḍala, although there are numerous hymns attributed to them in this maṇḍala (besides our IX.27–30): IX.4, 35–36, 37–38, 39–40, 44–46, 50–52, 61, 67 [part], 69, 72, 73, 83, parts of 97 and 108, 112). Of these, only IX.50.1, 52.4, attributed to Ucātha Āṅgīrasa, contain members of this word family. In hymns attributed to Āṅgīrasa poets outside of IX, the words are found only in X.43.3 (Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa), VIII.96.8 (Tiraṣci Āṅgīrasa), and -- most noteworthy -- VIII.98.12, 99.6, the only two hymns outside of IX attributed exclusively to Nṛmedha Āṅgīrasa, the poet of our IX.27, 29.

IX.30

On *śuṣma-* (vs. 3) and *śuṣmín-* (vs. 1), see ad IX.39.6.

IX.30.1: Unaccented *asya* in the first pāda of the hymn is exactly like that in IX.29.1a.

IX.30.2: It is not clear how to interpr. *indriyām* in the phrase *vagnúm indriyām*, as also in similar expressions: I.92.1 *ślókam indriyām*, VIII.52.7 *hāvanam ... indriyām*. Most take it to mean “Indra-like,” that is, presumably, loud, powerful (e.g., Ge “ein indrahaftes Geschrei”). I think it more likely that it identifies the cry as “destined for Indra, appropriate to Indra.” Indra is always the special target of invocation in the Soma maṇḍala and VIII.52 is an Indra hymn. Of course, both senses could be meant.

IX.30.3: The idiom *ā√pū* ‘attract (X) through purification’ is found here in tmesis (see also 29.6). Here the *ā* opening the first two pādas is immediately followed by the accusatives that it, as it were, licenses, while the impv. *pavasva* appears in the 3rd pāda with *dhārayā*, which is also appropriate in the intrans./reflex. usage of *pāvate* without preverb (see 4ab).

Re points to the contrast (or at least juxtaposition) of *nṛ-* (*nṛ-sāhyā-*) and *vīrā-* (*vīrā-vant-*) here, though I would not follow him in seeing them as expressions of two of the Three Functions.

IX.31

IX.31.1: The phrasal verb *cétanam* √*kṛ* ‘make manifest’ may be a means of avoiding the problematically ambiguous *cetáyati*.

IX.31.3: Both Ge and Re (also Scar, 336) supply a verb (“blow”) for the winds in pāda a. This seems unnec. to me: although √*iṣ* generally has liquids as subj., it can have a broader sense ‘rush’, and even “flowing winds” would be well within the RVic metaphorical domain. It might, however, better capture the word order to tr. “For you the favoring winds, for you the rivers rush.”

IX.31.5: The accent on the main verb *duduhré* results from the fact that it follows the voc. *bábhro* that opens the pāda and is thus the first real word in the pāda.

IX.32

The Anukr. assigns this hymn to Śyāvāśva Ātreya, the poet of the glorious Vth Maṇḍala Marut cycle. As indicated in the publ. intro., this hymn is clever enough to justify this ascription.

IX.32.2–3: The *āḍ* that begins both these vss. does not seem to have its usual “(just) after that” sense.

IX.32.2: On Trita as the archetypal soma-presser and his “maidens” (*yóṣanaḥ*) as the fingers, see disc. ad IX.37.4.

IX.32.3: This vs. contains two similes (ab and c respectively), each a bit trickily constructed. In the first, the caus. redupl. aor. *avīvaśat* has two slightly different senses in simile and frame: ‘makes bellow’ in the simile: it is the flock (*gaṇám*) that is making the noise, stimulated by its lead goose (*haṃsáḥ*); ‘makes bellow(ed)’ in the frame: it is the thought/prayer (*matím*) of someone else (*vísvasya*) that Soma causes to be heard. This double sense is the counterpart to that of the caus. to √*śru*, both ‘make hear’ and ‘makes heard’. My interpr. here is different from that of Re, who takes both acc. as goal of the sound (“... vers (sa) troupe, ... vers la prière ...”); Ge’s is close to mine, though he doesn’t seem to recognize the slight difference in the function of the object. On this aor. stem, see my *-áya-Formations*, 111, 166. Another ex. with the same sense is found in nearby IX.34.6; see comm. ad loc.

In the second simile, in c, it is not syntactic variation but a pun on the root of the passive *ajyate* that is at issue: this form can belong either to √*añj* ‘anoint’ or to √*aj* ‘drive’, and both are appropriate to the context. Soma can be “anointed” by cows’ milk or driven together with the cows (that is, the milk). The ‘steed’ to which Soma is compared could likewise be both anointed (/groomed) and driven.

IX.32.4: Although *mṛgá-* generally refers to a wild beast in general in the RV and in later Skt. comes to mean specifically ‘deer’, here it seems close to the meaning of Aves. *mərəya-* ‘(large) bird, bird of prey’. Cf. the almost identical pāda IX.67.15 *śyenó ná taktó arṣati* “Like a falcon launched in flight, it rushes.” The participle *avacākaśat* ‘looking down’ also fits a bird better than an earth-bound beast; cf. esp. X.136.4 *antárikṣeṇa patati víśvā rūpāvacākaśat* “He flies through the midspace, gazing down on all forms,” in the famous Muni hymn, which also contains an instance of *mṛgá-* as ‘bird’ (X.136.6). See also comm. on *takva-vī-* ad I.134.5, 151.5. It must be admitted, however, that it is not only birds that √*tac*; see X.28.4 *kroṣṭā varāhām nír atakta káksāt*

“The jackal sprang on the boar from out of the underbrush.” However, there the attack is presumably an airborne pounce, so bird-*like*. Images on the web of jackals pouncing support this notion.

As for what the *mṛgá-* is looking down on, it is surely the two worlds, a notion going back to Sāy., which would fit the bird’s-eye view. Ge suggests other possibilities in n. 4a, but not with great conviction.

IX.32.5: Both Ge and Re seem to make heavier weather of *hitām* than seems called for. Ge (n. 5c) suggests that the acc. is attraction from nom. **hitāḥ* and tr. “Er ist wie ein angesporntes (Rennpferd) in das Wettrennen gegangen.” Re allows it to be acc. but not to modify *ājīm*, requiring him to invent a second acc. phrase: “Elles sont allées [Re seems to have nodded on the number of the verb *āgan*; it cannot be the 3rd pl. of the root aor. to $\sqrt{gā}$, which is (*ā*)*gur*, but must be 3rd sg. to the root aor. of \sqrt{gam}] dans l’arène comme (pour rejoindre le *soma*) mis en branle (par les prières).” I don’t understand the fuss: *ājī-* is masc. (the supposed fem. ex. in I.116.15 is not), so *hitām* is grammatically fine. And I see no reason why a contest can’t be set, as a prize is. Perhaps it is their apparent conviction that *hitām* has to belong to \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’ that impelled them to these unconvincing makeshifts, or perhaps they believe that *yáthā* as a simile marker does not behave like *nā* and *iva* but requires a pseudo-clausal structure. But see the exx. in Gr’s no. 4 s.v. *yáthā* (col. 1083).

IX.33

IX.33.1: *vānāni* must be read with both frame (wooden [cups]) and simile (woods / forest, into which the buffalo go).

IX.33.2: A different word for wooden vessel (*dróṇa-*) substitutes for *vāna-* here.

IX.33.4: On the three voices, see publ. intro.

IX.33.5: Fem. *bráhmī-* is found only here (fortunately!). It is generally taken as a word play based on *yahvīḥ* in the next pāda (see Old with lit.; AiG II.2.412), which is surely correct. But it seems further assumed that it is derived from the adj. *brahmán-* and is adjectival (AiG II.2.421; cf. Gr ‘heilig, andächtig’, Re ‘vouées à la Formule’; Ge’s ‘Beterstimmen’ is less clear). Given its accent I think it’s more likely a nonce fem. form of the noun *bráhman-* ‘formulation’, in order to assimilate its gender to the cows. It might even be based on a putative **bráhmnī-*, like *rājān-* / *rājñī-*, with simplification of the impossible cluster *-*hmn-*.

IX.33.6: See comm. ad IX.40.3 on the repeated pāda b. I might now consider tr. “for us all around” rather than “for us ... from every direction.”

IX.34

IX.34.2: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is almost identical to IX.33.3; the only difference is that the soma is plural (*sutāḥ ... sómāḥ*) in 33.3 and sg. (*sutāḥ ... sómah*) here, which also necessitates a sg. verb (*arṣati* for the pl. *arṣanti* in 33.3).

IX.34.3: Acc. *vīṣāṇam* is one of the two forms (also X.89.9) of this stem with suffixal *-ā-* in the strong stem, against the overwhelming prevalence of *-an-*. See Old. Assimilation to the dominant pattern of *-n-*stems (*rājānam* type) is not surprising; what is perhaps surprising is how well *vīṣan-* resisted the analogic pressure.

IX.34.4: On Trita, see comm. ad IX.37.4.

Ge interpr. the *rūpañ* with which the soma is anointed as its colors (“mit seinen Farben”). However, (*sám*) $\sqrt{a}ñj$ is specialized in IX for cows (that is, their milk). Cf. IX.86.47 *yád góbhiḥ ... samajyāse*, IX.72.1 *sám dhenúbhiḥ ... ajyate*; without *sám* there are multiple passages, e.g., *góbhir añjānāḥ ...* (IX.50.5, etc.), *góbhir ajyase* (IX.85.5), and, esp., nearby IX.32.3 *átyo ná góbhir ajyate*. I therefore think that our passage must refer to “forms” of milk; so also Re in his n., though unusually for him he does not supply it in tr. (which is simply “de formes-concrètes”). That this vs. is sandwiched between two vss. that contain the verb ‘milk’, 3c *duhanti*, 5b *duhaté*, further supports this interpr., though in both 3 and 5 the milk is not literal milk, but soma itself.

The publ. tr. does not reflect the possible pun on *sám ... ajyate* that was noted in IX.32.3 just cited, where *ajyate* could also belong to \sqrt{aj} ‘drive’, hence a 2nd reading “is driven together with the forms (of milk).”

IX.34.4–5: The final words of these two vss. are the phonologically similar *háriḥ* and *havíḥ*, both referring to soma -- though one is masc. nom. and the other neut. acc.

IX.34.5: On the sense of this vs., see publ. intro. Needless to say, this vs. is catnip for Lü; see his disc. p. 606.

IX.34.6: I take *avīvaśat* here as trans./caus, as in nearby IX.32.3 -- an interpr. shared by Ge and Re (“... a fait mugir ...”), though Re takes the same form in 32.3 as non-caus. with acc. of goal. See comm. there.

IX.35–36

The poet here is said to be Prabhūvasu Āṅgīrasa, also named as poet of V.35–36. Here the name seems to have been based on the last word of IX.35, the gen. *prabhūvasoḥ* in vs. 7, modifying soma.

IX.35

IX.35.2: Two heavy cmpds in the voc., each with a 2nd member apparently derived from an *-áya-* trans./caus. governing the first member in the acc.: *samudram-īṅkhaya* ‘setting the sea to swaying’, *viśvam-ejaya* ‘setting all in motion’. Of course the final *-m-* of the 1st member also serves to break the hiatus between the vocalic stem-final of the 1st member and the vowel-initial verb stem. It’s also notable that verbal forms of *ejaya-* are not found in the RV; they first appear in KS (XI.6 [prose], XXXV.14 [mantra]). (My statement in the *-áya-* monograph, p. 108, that the first attestation is in ŚB is wrong, relying on the notation in Whitney’s Roots.)

IX.35.3: I take *vāryam* as an Inhaltsakk.

IX.35.4: The first pāda contains a notable word play. Judging from the number of parallels, the default obj. of \sqrt{is} ‘send’ in IX is ‘speech’; cf. IX.30.1, 64.9, 25, 95.5, and esp. IX.12.6 *prā vācam índur isyati*, a pāda identical to ours, save for one consonant: *vācam* versus *vājam*. Although an emendation to **vācam* has been suggested here (see Old, who rejects it), a word play is far more likely. The poet knew (and knew his audience knew) the idiom *vācam* \sqrt{is} , but substituted the nearly identical *vājam*, which is to be construed with *sīṣāsan* ‘desiring to win’ later in the vs. -- *vājam* being a common obj. to forms of \sqrt{san} ‘win’ and in fact found in the root noun cmpd *vāja-sā* in b, immediately after the desid. part. This root noun cmpd “repairs” the apparent *vājam* problem, and in the next vs. the poet provides the expected *vācam*, 5a *vācam-īṅkhayām*, a 2nd repair strategy.

Ge assigns *vidānāḥ* to \sqrt{vid} ‘know’ (“der sich auf die Vorschriften, auf die Waffen versteht”), while Re (though see his n.) and the publ. tr. take it to \sqrt{vid} ‘find’ (as a root aor. part.). I now think either (or both) is/are possible, but that in either case *vratā* and *āyudhā* are not separate objects as Ge/Re take them, but an equational phrase (as in the publ. tr.). That is, Soma’s commandments *are* his weapons. On the formidable nature of Soma’s *vratā*-s, cf., e.g., IX.53.3 *āsya vratāni nādhīṣe* “The commandments of this one cannot be ventured against.” As an alt. tr. here I would add “knowing his commandments to be his weapons.”

IX.35.5: Reprise of the *-īṅkhayā-* cmpd from 2a. *vācam-īṅkhayā-* occurs once elsewhere, in IX.101.6, where it modifies *samudrāḥ*, which is the first member of the cmpd in our vs. 2, a small web of formulaic associations.

IX.35.6: *dādhāra* here is the only intransitive form of this perfect; see Re’s n. and Kü (261). The root \sqrt{dhr} is prominent here (see the immed. following phrase *dhārmṇas pāteḥ* ‘master of support’) and echoes *rāyó dhartā* in 2c.

The last word of the hymn, *prabhūvasoḥ* (“of the one who brings outstanding gifts”) is the gen. of the name of the supposed poet of this hymn, Prabhūvasu Āṅgīrasa, who is also assigned the next hymn, IX.36. Of course the name in the Anukramaṇī could well have been generated from the final word of this hymn.

IX.36

As noted in the publ. intro., every vs. but the final one has a form of $\sqrt{pū}$ ‘purify’ beginning a pāda (though, interestingly, never the vs.), with each one different: 1b *pavītre*, 2b *pāvasva*, 3b *pāvamāna*, 4c *pāvate*, 5c *pāvatām*. This pattern is reminiscent of the “versified paradigm” of the first hymn in the RV, I.1. And the abrupt cessation of the pattern in the last vs. is of course also typical of RVic style.

IX.37

For the rhetorical structure of the hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.37.3: Note the slight reversed phonetic figure: a ... *divāḥ*## b ... *vi dhāv(ati)*.

IX.37.4: On the sense of this vs., see publ. intro. As indicated there, there is much disagreement about the referents. To my disc. there I will only add a few comments. Relevant for the whole vs. is IX.26.5 *tām sānāv ādhi jāmayo, hārim hinvanti ādribhiḥ* “Him do the siblings [=fingers] impel with the stones on the back (of the filter),” which contains both *jāmayah* and *sānu-* as here, with

the ‘siblings’ being the fingers and the ‘back’ the filter. The ‘back’ (*sānu-*) in soma hymns is basically always the filter, whatever else it may cosmically represent. Moreover, Trita is an archetypal soma-preparer; for this role see, inter alia, Ge’s n. to IX.34,4 and Ober I.197–98, esp. on the similar role that Trita fulfills atq the haoma pressing in the Hom Yašt. In at least two other places in IX his ‘maidens’ (*yóṣanaḥ*), the fingers, are involved: see in the next hymn. IX.38.2 *etám trítasya yóṣanaḥ, háriṃ hinvanti ádribhiḥ* “This tawny one do the maidens of Trita [=fingers] impel with the stones” and almost identical IX.32.2. That the b pāda in these vss. with “Trita’s maidens” as subj. (in pāda a) is identical to the one in IX.26.5 just quoted with *jāmáyaḥ* as subj. (in pāda a) imposes the chain of identifications “Trita’s maidens” = “siblings” = “fingers.” Therefore, though it may be Trita’s back in some sense [he owns and deploys the filter] it’s surely also his fingers, here called *jāmí-*, not Soma’s or anyone else’s (as has been suggested by others), and though they may stand for various things (Dawns, heavenly rivers, whatever -- again based on various scholars’ suggestions), they start out as fingers.

IX.38

Like IX.37 with *sá* opening every vs., every vs. in this hymn begins with a form of the *eṣá-* pronoun. The pattern here is both more complex and more emphatic: there is case variation (vss. 2 and 3 have acc. sg. *etám*, the rest nom. sg. *eṣá*), and in all vss. but vs. 2 the initial pronoun is followed by the appropriate form of *syá-/tyá-*: *eṣá (u) syá, etám tyám*, a phrase that means ‘this very (one)’.

IX.38.1: The two nominatives *vṛṣā* ‘bull’ and *ráthaḥ* ‘chariot’ are juxtaposed, each qualifying Soma. I consider them separate characterizations, with Soma as both bull and chariot; so also Oberlies (RelRV II.71, 229). Ge takes *vṛṣā* as modifying *ráthaḥ* (“Dieser bullenhafte Wagen”), while Re sneaks in a parenthesis to avoid identifying Soma with a chariot: “le-célèbre (*soma*), taureau, (cheval attelé au) char.” If taking them as independent seems too radical, Ge’s solution takes fewer liberties with the text than Re’s.

IX.38.2: As noted above, this is the only vs. where the initial pronoun is not followed by a form of *syá-/tyá-*, though *trítasya* starts promisingly, with *tR*, and ends with *-sya*. See further on this vs. ad IX.37.4.

IX.38.3: The phrase “ten tawny ones” (*haríto dáśa*) helps define the “maidens of Trita” (*trítasya yóṣanaḥ*) in the previous vs. as the fingers: “ten” is the giveaway.

IX.38.4: It may be that the adj. *mānuṣa-* here should be rendered more restrictively as “stemming from Manu,” referring to only those clans that participate in Ārya sacrificial culture.

IX.38.5: It is tempting to read *diváḥ* as abl. with *áva caṣṭe*: “looks down from heaven”; however, *diváḥ śísuḥ* “child of heaven” is found elsewhere (IV.15.6, VI.49.2). It is certainly possible, however, to read *diváḥ* with both: “the child of heaven looks down from heaven.” The word is well positioned to look both left and right.

IX.39

IX.39.1: The hymn opens with a mirror-image phonetic figure: *āśúr arṣa*.

The voc. *br̥hanmate* ‘having lofty thought’ puns on the name of the poet given in the Anukramaṇī, Br̥hanmati Āṅgīrasa -- or more likely provided the name.

On the direct speech in pāda c of this vs., see publ. intro. The speech itself consists only of the word *devāḥ*. The place identified by this speech is soma’s goal, where the gods will partake of it.

IX.39.2: The phrase *pariṣkṛṇvānn āniṣkṛtam* is not as much of an etymological figure as it first appears: in the 1st word, the preverb *pari* is cmpd with the *s*-mobile form of \sqrt{kr} , while the 2nd is the negated form of the somewhat enigmatic lexeme *īṣ* + \sqrt{kr} (the latter without *s*-mobile), on which see comm. ad VII.76.2. As disc. there, the pseudo-preverb *īṣ* may derive from the root noun *īṣ*- ‘refreshment’, and our passage here contains that noun. The phrase *yātāyann īṣaḥ* “arranging refreshments” in b functions almost like a paraphrase, or repair, of the putative phrase *īṣ*- \sqrt{kr} “prepare refreshment” → “put in order, set to rights.”

IX.39.3: The med. root pres. part. *cākṣāṇa*- cmpd with *vī* is found only here. By contrast the bahuvrīhi *vicakṣaṇā-* ‘having a wide gaze, wide-gazing’ occurs nearly 20x in Maṇḍala IX alone (including nearby IX.37.2). The two words are distinguished only by the length of the penultimate syllable (and accent). The cmpd is found almost entirely pāda-final (either in Gāyatrī or in Jāgati), whereas the part. here opens the pāda. However, nothing would prevent *vicakṣaṇāḥ* from taking that position, as it indeed does in IX.97.2 (Triṣṭubh), so the distribution cannot be purely metrical. See also Re.

IX.39.5: The suppressed object of *āvívāsan* is probably the gods (so already Sāy) or Indra in particular (supported by pāda c), but there is no reason to supply this obj. in tr.

IX.39.6: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. forms a notional ring with vs. 1, with both containing direct speech in a ritual setting in their respective pāda c’s. The speech is more clearly marked in vs. 1, with *īti brāvan*, than it is here. Both the speaker(s) and the addressees are also unclear here. It is likely that the former are the officiating priests, the subjects of the 3rd pl. *hinvanti* in b and quite possibly of *anūṣata* in a (so Ge, Lü 602), though Re thinks rather of the soma drinks. As for the addressees of the 2nd pl. impv. *sīdata*, I think the soma drinks are most likely, as in the identical pāda in IX.13.9, which is preceded by a nom. pl. *pāvamānāḥ* identifying the subject. However, the soma referent in our b pāda is sg. (*hārim*) -- though this is not really problematic, given the ubiquitous variation between sg. and pl. soma(s) in these hymns. However, it could also be addressed to the gods arriving at the ritual ground (so Sāy), the gods whose location was specified in 1c.

IX.40

IX.40.2: Both Ge and Re treat *ruhat* as modal, parallel to the clear aor. subj. *gāmat* in the following pāda (e.g., “... soll ... besteigen, ... soll ... gehen”). But *ruhat* belongs to a clear them. aor. *āruhat*, and its zero-grade root syll. would preclude a subjunctive in any case; formally it must be an injunc. I take the sequence of verbs as referring to different stages of the ritual process, one that has just occurred, one that will now occur. KH (Injunk. 222) in fact suggests that the transmitted injunc. *ruhat* might represent a redactional error for *ruhat*, an augmented aor. in this sandhi context. Hoffmann’s suggestion of course results from his idiosyncratic and

restrictive views on the function of the injunctive; in my opinion injunc. *ruhat* would work fine here as an immed. past, preceding soma's departure for Indra. (Maur's tr. [84] is sim. to mine.)

IX.40.3: The expression *asmábhyam ... víśvataḥ* "for us all around" in b I take as a heavy specification of enclitic *naḥ* in Wackernagel's position in pāda a. Most take *víśvataḥ* as qualifying "wealth." The fact that this pāda (*asmábhyam soma víśvataḥ*) appears 3x (also IX.33.6, 65.21) suggests that *víśvataḥ* goes with 'us'; on the other hand, that all three occurrences involve the acquisition of wealth or other good things somewhat undercuts that argument.

On *mahām* see AiG III.251.

IX.40.4: On subj. 2nd sg. *vidāḥ* see comm. ad IX.19.6. As noted there, I think this is the only actual example of *vidāḥ*. The other supposed exx. are actually 2nd sg. impv. *vidā* with lengthened final; their sandhi position is ambiguous and so the forms could represent *-āḥ* as well as *-ā*, and the Pp. analyses them as the former. It is in fact not beyond the realm of possibility that the original reading here was also **vidā*. An impv. would fit the context better, with immediately preceding (4b) and following (5a) impv. *ā bhara*. It is possible that the original sequence **vidā sahasrīṇī* was interpr. as having a degeminated double *-s s-* (**vidās s...*), which was then restored. The meter would be unaffected. The almost identical pāda, IX.61.3 *kṣārā sahasrīṇī īṣaḥ*, is transmitted with an impv. with lengthened final. Note also impv. *vardhayā* in 5c. An alt. tr. here would then be "find refreshments ..." Curiously, both Ge and Re tr. as impv., though they register no discomfort with the subjunctive.

IX.41

IX.41.1–2: These two vss. are somewhat illuminated by IX.73.4–5, containing some very similar expressions: 73.4d *padé-pade pāsīnaḥ santi sétavaḥ* "At every step there are snares that bind"; 73.5bcd ... *saṃdāhanto avratān / ... āpa dhamanti ... tvācam āsiknīm* "...burning up those who follow no commandment, they blow away ... the black skin." Cf. also *bhūrṇayaḥ* in 73.4b, corresponding to *bhūrṇayaḥ* in our 1a, and note also that *āpa dhamanti* in 73.5c with "black skin" as its obj. resembles *ghnāntaḥ ... āpa* in our 1c, also with "black skin" as object.

IX.41.1: This vs., consisting entirely of a rel. cl., is not resumed by a main cl. Vs. 2, which might be configured as the main cl., is couched in the 1st pl., not the 3rd pl. like vs. 1, and it also has a very different tone. There is no reason, with Re, to supply an anodyne introductory cl. "(Je chante les *soma*)" to provide a main cl. -- in fact, the abruptness of the expression and its incompleteness enhance the sense of violence.

As I indicated in the publ. intro., I think the unexpressed soma juices. Many soma hymns begin with the soma rushing its pressing, often compared to a horse or a bull charging; here drinks are also likened to cattle, but stampeding cattle, and this uncontrollable mob tramples the enemy. So the poet has taken a standard opening trope and "weaponized" it, as it were.

This enemy is identified as the "black skin" (*kṛṣṇām ... tvācam*). For this phrase as a designation of non-Ārya "without commandments" (*avratā-*) see I.130.8 and IX.73.5 (in the latter *tvācam āsiknīm*; see above). The term *avratā-* is found in the next vs. (2c).

IX.41.2: As was just noted, *avratām* in c suggests that this vs. belongs conceptually and rhetorically with vs. 1, because *avratā-* elsewhere qualifies those “with black skin.” However, as I also indicated ad vs. 1, I do not think vs. 2 is the main clause on which the rel. cl. of vs. 1 is dependent: “we” are not likened to stampeding cattle in vs. 1, but rather the soma juices are. HPS (*Ved. vratā*, 94 n. 193) rather trickily suggests taking 2ab as parenthetic, with c returning to the soma juices of vs. 1, modified by the part. *sāhvāṃsaḥ*. I see no reason for this: the victory of the soma juices in 1a is reconfigured as *our* victory.

With Old, Ge, Re I take the gen. *suvitāsyā* as the gen. obj. of *manāmahe* and construe *āti* with *sétum* (contra Gr, who takes it with *manāmahe*). In IX *āti* regularly refers to the journey of the soma “beyond” the filter, which here is represented by *sétum*. Re cites other passages containing \sqrt{man} with gen., but it must be admitted that this particular form, *manāmahe*, otherwise resolutely takes the acc.

sétu- is found 5x in the RV; its only two occurrences in IX are here and in IX.73.4 cited above. The word does not yet have its later meaning ‘bridge’, but a sense closer to its root etym. to $\sqrt{sā}$ / *sī* ‘bind’ (with 2ndary full-grade *se* built to the zero-grade): ‘fetter, bond, (or here) snare’. Ge and Re instead take it as a dyke or dam (Damm and digue respectively), but these seem to be an attempt to split the difference between the root etymology and the later sense ‘bridge’. Certainly in other RVic passages the sense ‘fetter’ vel sim. is inescapable, e.g. VIII.67.8 *mā naḥ sétuḥ siṣed ayām* “Let this fetter here not bind us,” with cognate verb, where Ge tr. “Fessel.” As for what physical object the *sétu-* refers to here, I think it is an image of the twisty curls of a sheep’s fleece, which can be seen as fetters or nooses.

durāvyām, modifying *sétum*, is assigned to a stem *dur-āvyā* / *durāvīa* by Gr, misrepresenting the accent, inter alia. As Old points out, however, the stem is really *durāvī-*, a root noun cmpd. (see now Scar 497), and it must mean ‘difficult to pursue / follow’. Since *sétu-* here refers to the curls of the sheep’s fleece (in my view), these curls can be conceived of as the tracks that the liquid would follow as it’s being strained through the fleece, tracks that can be difficult to pursue. So the acc. phrase *sétum durāvyām* jams two different but evocative images into one. Note also that *suvitāsyā ... durāv(i)yam* is something of a phonetic figure, with the semantically contrastive adverbial prefixes *su* and *dus*, but different verbal roots (\sqrt{i} and $\sqrt{vī}$) -- though internal sandhi provides \sqrt{i} with an apparent initial *v* matching *vī*.

IX.41.5: Old takes *uṣāḥ* as acc. pl. (so also AiG III.283) and the object of *ā ... pṛṇa* in the simile (so presumably “as the sun [fills] the dawns with its rays”; cf Oberlies Rel.RV I.238). Although an acc. pl. *uṣāḥ* is morphologically possible (like rare gen. sg. *uṣāḥ*), the simile thus produced does not make sense to me, and despite the parade of citations of supposed parallels that Old provides, no passage has anything remotely like that. I follow Ge in taking *uṣāḥ* and *sūryaḥ* as parallel nom. sg., both participating in the simile. Re seems to take as nom., but pl., for no obvious reason.

IX.41.6: The last pāda begins with a mirror-image figure: *sārā rasā*, though the last vowel is obscured in sandhi: *raséva*.

IX.42

IX.42.1: Like the 1st vs. of the last hymn, also by Medhyātithi Kāṇva, this vs. is syntactically incomplete -- unless we want to take the pres. participles (*janāyan* a, b; *vāsānaḥ* c) as predicated,

which in this case I don't. In this case, vs. 2 can easily pick up the participial vs. 1 and provide a predicate.

IX.42.3: Acdg. to Kü (471), the medial part. of the pf. of √ *vṛdh* is always presential, though both Ge and Re tr. as preterital. My “ever-increasing” makes it sound like an inten., but of course the heavy redupl. *vā-* simply belongs to the pf. of this root.

Note the *v*-alliteration in ab: *vāvṛdhānāya tūrvaye pávante vājasātaye*.

IX.42.4: The adj. *pratná-* ‘age-old’ is repeated here from 2a, linking the “age-old thought” (= hymn) with soma’s “age-old milk.”

p-alliteration in ab: ... *pratnám ít páyaḥ pavítre pári* ...

IX.42.5: Somewhat less insistent *v*-alliteration: *vísṽāni vāryā ... devāṃ ṛtāvṛdhaḥ*.

IX.42.6: This vs. contains almost the same elements as IX.41.4. Our desired rewards are *gómat*, *vīrávat*, *ásṽāvat*, *vājavat*, which match 41.4 except that *híranyavat* substitutes for *vīrávat* there. We also want *bṛhatīr īṣaḥ*, like the *māhīm īṣam* of 41.4. The soma is described as *sutáḥ* in both, though the vocatives are different: *indo* versus *soma*. But the big difference is that 41.4 has the preverb *ā* with *pavasva*, which licenses the accusative complements, while our passage does not. We must simply supply it here, I’m afraid.

IX.43

IX.43.1: The phonological near-identity of instr. pl. *góbhiḥ* and *gīrbhiḥ* allows them to be conceptually assimilated to each other, and note that *vāsáya-* ‘clothe’ is frequently also used with *góbhiḥ*: e.g., IX.8.5 *sám góbhir vāsayāmasi* (also IX.2.4, 14.3, 66.13).

IX.43.2: *gíraḥ ... pūrváthā* “hymns in the ancient way” is reminiscent of 42.2 *pratnéna mánmanā* “with the age-old thought.”

IX.43.3: Medhyātithi’s signature. Mention of the poet’s name is a relative rarity in the Gāyatrī hymns of IX, acdg. to Oberlies (Rel.RV I.549).

IX.43.4: On *vidā* versus *vidā(h)*, see comm. ad IX.19.6.

IX.44

IX.44.1: *mahé táne* “for great extension” is found also in VIII.26.2, 46.25, where it appears to refer to the extension of the family line. This is possible here, esp. if *naḥ* is construed with it, as in the publ. tr. Ge suggests that it refers to the extension of lifetime (“zu grosser Lebensdauer(?)”) and Re to the ritual continuum, but as Re points out in his n., it could also simply describe, physically, the extension of the stream of soma. If that interpr. is chosen, the tr. should de-couple *naḥ* from the phrase: “... rush forth for us for (your) great extension.”

The referent of the simile *ūrmīm ná bíbhrat* is suggested by IX.96.7 *ūrmīm ná síndhuḥ*.

IX.44.2: The stem *júṣṭá-* with expected ppl. accent occurs only here in the RV, beside well-attested *júṣṭa-* with unexpected root accent. The latter form is generally construed with the dative of the beneficiary (“enjoyable to X”), save for the late X.125.5 (Vāc) *júṣṭam devébbhir utá mānuṣebhiḥ* (though this phrase has a traditional ring), with instr. as here.

The usual uncertainty about the root affiliation of *hitá-* in IX: to \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’ or $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place’? See disc. ad IX.1.2, etc. On the basis of finite *hinve* in the next pāda, undeniably belonging to \sqrt{hi} , one could argue either way: as a root repetition or as a pun. Both Ge and Re take it to \sqrt{hi} , the latter with some disc. in his n.; I concur, primarily because of phrases like *dhiyēṣitá-* (I.3.5, III.12.1, 60.5, 62.12) ‘sent by the thought’, *dhiyā jūtá-* (IX.64.16) ‘sped by the thought’, even though the doubling of ‘impelled’ seems crude for a RVic poet.

Ge and Re also construe *víprasya* with *dhārayā* (e.g., “grâce à la coulée du (prêtre)-inspiré”). In the publ. tr. I instead take it with the two types of speech in pāda a, *matí-* and *dhī-* and assume that it has been displaced to c in order to contrast with *kavīḥ*, referring to Soma there. In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the very common instr. *dhārayā* generally appears alone and refers to the physical stream of the soma liquid, not metaphorically to words or the like. However, the identical pāda IX.12.8c gives me pause, as in that vs. there is no alternative way of construing *víprasya* except with *dhārayā*. I think it possible that IX.12.8 is a clumsy borrowing of this pāda, but see comm. ad loc., where I consider the possibility that there is a way to interpret *víprasya dhārayā* phrasally.

IX.44.4: In b I take the mid. part. *cakrāṇāḥ* with a self-beneficial / reflexive sense, contra Ge and Re.

With Ge I take the subj. of c to be the priest, not Soma with Re.

IX.44.5: The first hemistich has no finite verb. Ge somewhat arbitrarily supplies a verb (“empfehlen”) with which to construe the two datives *bhāgāya vāyāve*. If we are to supply a verb, it seems best to be guided by the context in which pāda a is repeated, in IX.61.9a, where the following pāda contains *pavasva*. Re’s “(qu’il se clarifie)” seems to reflect this, though he does not mention the repeated pāda in his n., where he suggests other possibilities. (That *pavasva* appears in the immediately preceding vs. 4 in our hymn might also support supplying it here.) The publ. tr. simply takes ab as a nominal expression, with the datives of pāda a construed with *sadāvṛdhaḥ* ‘growing ever stronger’. The drawback to my interpr. (and to Re’s) is that there’s no clear function for *naḥ*, which both Re and I fail to tr. in its hemistich (Ge uses it as object of “empfehlen”). I take *naḥ* as the fronted Wackernagel-position obj. of *ā yamat* in c, assuming that the whole vs. is a single clause.

Ge’s rendering of *vípravīra-* as “der die Männer beredt macht” cavalierly ignores both accent and the morphology of the first member. It must rather be a bahuvrīhi, as the publ. tr. and Re’s “qui a pour hommes-utiles les orateurs” recognize.

IX.45

IX.45.1: As noted in the publ. intro., *nṛcákṣā* in b may form a ring with *vicákṣase* in 6b, the last vs. of the hymn. For similar phraseology within a single vs., cf. IX.86.23 *tvám nṛcákṣā abhavo vicákṣaṇa*. *nṛcákṣā* also resonates thematically with the following *devāvītaye*, with the *nṛ-* *devá-* contrast.

IX.45.2: The word order in this vs. is quite jumbled, and there are several alternative ways to try to fix it. The one taken by the publ. tr. follows Ge in taking pāda b as parenthetic. Unlike Ge's tr. (though it is the 2nd alt. in his n. 2c), the publ. tr. uses this strategy to allow *devān* in c to be the goal of the verb in a (*arṣābhī*); cf. nearby IX.42.5 *abhī viśvāni vāryā, abhī devān ... arṣati* and in the immed. preceding hymn IX.44.1bc ... *arṣasi / abhī devān*, where the verb ends the hemistich and the preverb begins the next pāda, both reasonable positions for those elements. The latter passage (by the same poet as ours) might help explain the postposed preverb in the middle of the pāda here: *sā no arṣābhī ...*, which is otherwise odd.

However, taking *devān* as goal still leaves the rest of pāda c, ... *sākhibhya ā vāram*, unaccounted for. In the publ. tr. I take the *sākhibhyaḥ* as dat. doubling *naḥ* in a, with an independent adverbial *ā vāram* "at will" (which, however, is usually in the opposite order *vāram ā*). But this ignores the striking parallel cited by both Ge and Re, I.4.4 *yās te sākhibhya ā vāram* (and cf. II.5.5 ... *tisṛbhya ā vāram*), rendered in the publ. tr. as "who is your choice from among your comrades." Although it is always possible that the parallel is a false one, I now think I cannot ignore it and I suggest that this phrase provides a second goal to *arṣābhī*, with *sākhibhya ā vāram* to be construed together (as in I.4.4) referring to Indra, who was mentioned in the parenthetic pāda b. (Indra is also the referent in I.4.4.) Indra is of course soma's particular target among the gods, the best drinker of soma. I would now take this phrase as specifying soma's goal of choice: the juice rushes to the gods, but esp. to Indra – and would alter the tr. to "rush to the gods, to your choice [=Indra] from among the comrades," with *sākhibhyaḥ* referring to the gods in general. Although *sākhi-* in IX generally refers to poets or hymans in general (cf., e.g., IX.97.43), the ABL *ā vāram* idiom could overrule this. This interpr. unfortunately requires (or at least suggests) that *sākhāyaḥ* in vs. 5 has a different referent.

IX.45.4: I am not certain what the simile depicts, what it means for a horse to "step beyond the chariot-pole (*dhūr-*)." Re suggests that the *dhūr-* is being used here as a pole to mark the limit of the racecourse, but I do not know of another example of *dhūr-* in this sense. It's possible that the simile depicts the moment when, as a horse is starting to pull a chariot, it's been hanging back from its tackle and now it pulls on it and pushes beyond it, but my ignorance about the interaction between horses and their tackle makes this interpr. uncertain. Note also that *dhūram* here phonetically echoes *dūrah* 'doors' in 3c.

IX.45.5: As noted ad 2c, if we take *sākhibhyaḥ* there as referring to the gods, *sākhāyaḥ* here is probably not picking up that referent, but likely refers to the human poets.

IX.45.6: Both Ge and Re take *vicākṣase* as transitive 'reveal', but as Re notes, *vī√cakṣ* is ordinarily intransitive, and I see no reason to willfully ignore this usage. As noted in the publ. intro., the verb forms a ring with *nṛcākṣāḥ* in 1b.

IX.46

IX.46.1: Note the unusual position of *iva* after the full simile, not its first word.

IX.46.2: The simile "adorned like a maiden with her patrimony" (*pāriṣkṛtāsaḥ ... yōseva pītryāvatī*) is presumably the first mention in Sanskrit of the major source of *strīdhana* or 'women's property' listed in the dharma lit., namely what a bride receives at her wedding, esp.

from “mother, brother(s), and father” (see Manu IX.194, though there the wedding is divided into two phases and the property from her three types of natal relatives is counted separately, adding up to five of the six types of *strīdhana*). Since these gifts would take the form of jewelry – and since the bride would be especially dressed up for her wedding -- the simile here highlights the special sparkling appearance of the soma juices. Alternatively this might be a reference to the institution of the *putrikā* or “appointed daughter,” who in the absence of sons is made the virtual son and heir of her father, with any children she bears owing their ancestral offerings to him rather than to their paternal grandfather. Oberlies (Relig. RV I.522) calls the maiden in this passage an Erbtochter and seems to be thinking of this institution, and Re may be as well, though his comment (“le **pītrya* ou héritage paternel pouvait donc revenir à la fille”) is vague and may reflect a lack of knowledge of the standard sources on *strīdhana*. I think the “adorned bride” interpr. is far more likely and fits the ritual situation better. This view goes back to Wackernagel (1916 = KISch [1953]: 464–65) and is also championed by H-P Schmidt (Women’s Rites and Rights, 1987: 32).

IX.46.3: With Ge and Re, I take *kármabhiḥ* as referring to the various ritual acts at the Soma Sacrifice. Oberlies (Relig. RV I.534) instead sees these as Indra’s deeds, after the weakened god has been reinvigorated by soma: “... lassen den Indra mit [=zu] seinen Taten wachsen.” This seems farfetched to me, given how frequently forms of \sqrt{kr} are used for ritual activity.

IX.46.4: Old is inclined, flg. BR, to emend voc. *suhasṭyaḥ* to **suhasṭyāḥ*, derived from the stem *suhasṭya-*, hence a masc. nom. pl. referring to the priestly officiants. Re follows him, remarking rather scornfully “il est peu probable que l’auteur ait voulu désigner par ce Voc. ... des entités féminines, à la rigueur toutefois les « doigts ».” But see Ge’s quite sensible n. suggesting that the fem. refers to the fingers, which are frequently assigned ritual agency in the IXth Maṇḍala. Note that the ten fingers (*dāśa kṣīpaḥ*) explicitly occur two vss. later (6b).

śukrā ... manthínā is a discontinuous dual dvandva. The phraseology matches III.32.2 *gāvāśīram manthínam ... śukráṃ ... sómam*; cf. *góbhiḥ śrīṇīta* in c.

IX.47

IX.47.1: Both Ge and Re take *maháḥ* as a nom. sg. masc. to them. *mahá-* (so also Gr), referring to Soma. With immed. flg. *cīd* the phrase is taken as “already great” (“schon so grosse,” “si grand (fût-il déjà)”), as an implicit contrast with the verb, (*abhy*) *ávardhata*, which indicates that he has grown (further) despite his already large size. This if of course possible. By contrast I take *maháḥ* as acc. pl. m. to *máh-*. My reason for this is the preverb *abhí-* in the few occurrences of *abhí√vṛdh*, the lexeme takes an acc. complement even in the middle. Cf. II.17.4 *vísṣvā bhúvanābhí ... abhy ávardhata* “he [=Indra] grew strong over all the worlds.” As to who or what these great ones are, perhaps the gods, since the phrase *mahó devān* is not uncommon. Given that Soma here is being assimilated to Indra – who is the standard subject of both *mandāná-* (I.80.6, etc. etc.) and *vṛṣāyāte* (cf., e.g., IX.108.2) – asserting his mastery over the (other) gods wouldn’t be surprising.

IX.47.4: On the disputed interpr. of *vidhartári*, see comm. ad VIII.70.2. As I disc. there, I interpr. the form not as an infinitive (with many), but as the loc. of the agent noun that it is morphologically. Here I envisage Soma in the role of a facilitator: he wants the *vípra*

(presumably the human poet) to get a dakṣiṇā from the patron (/apportioner: *vidhartār-*), and sets about making that happen.

In c *yādī* is much better read *yād ī*, with the enclitic acc. prn. *ī* doubling the obj. *dhīyaḥ*. It is difficult to construct an “if” reading.

The subj. of *marmijyāte* is unspecified and unclear; it could either be Soma as *kavī* or the human *vīpra* – or both.

IX.47.5: This vs. has a number of difficulties, both morphologically and syntactically. The most immediate is the first word *śiṣāsātū* (Pp. rightly *śiṣāsātuḥ*). Gr takes it as a nom. sg. m. adj. built to the desid. (so already Sāy.; cf. AiG II.2.667), fld by Old, Re, and the publ tr.; the alternative solution is to interpr. it as a 3rd dual perfect-like form built to the desid., as suggested by Ludwig, fld. by Ge (see his n. 5a), Ober. (Relig. RV I.537), and Heenen (Desid. 239 + n. 264). I would be more sympathetic to the du. pf. interpr. if there were a clear way to get a dual subject. But the only indication of a subject in this vs. is contained in the 2nd sg. *asī* at the end of the vs., and the attempt of Ge et al. to invent a dual subject is exceptionally clumsy: by their interpr. Soma, the 2nd sg. referent in *asī*, is on one side or faction, and there is another side that ought implicitly to contrast with Soma’s side, but somehow doesn’t in his tr. Acdg to Ge, the two sides are racehorses (*ārvant-* in b) and “Beutemacher” (the victors in raids in c). Since the putative desiderative pf. is already anomalous, the contextual melt-down and the multiplying of invisible actors make this an unattractive solution. So, better to deal with the alternative morphological anomaly, a desiderative adj. in *-tu-* apparently formed to the desid. verbal stem; this adj., as a singular, can easily qualify the sg. subj. of *asī*. Debrunner (II.2.666–67) cites a few such forms in *-tu-* that could be associated with a them. pres. stem (though all with suffixal accent, i.e., *-tū-*). He suggests that our form is an Ersatz for the *-u-*adj. *śiṣāsú-* (1x I.102.6), and this seems to me the right path to take, though the details aren’t clear. I would tentatively suggest that it is a blend – or, perhaps better, a remarking – of the two verbal adj. suffixes available to desiderative stems: the normal pres. part. act. in *-ant-*, well attested to this stem (*śiṣāsant-*, *-at-*), and the verbal adj. suffix *-u-* specific to the desid. (as in *śiṣāsú-* just cited). It might be possible to image the addition of the *-u-* suffix to the weak form of the pres. part. *śiṣāsat-*. Unfortunately this founders on the accent, which cannot easily be explained; this is the only advantage of the pf. du. explanation, which would have the correct accent.

Even assuming that *śiṣāsātuḥ* is a desiderative adj., construed with gen. *rayīṇām* in the same pāda, we are not out of the woods, and I am not satisfied with the publ. tr. or with the suggested tr. of Old and Re. The three pādas of the vs. have an apparently parallel structure, esp. the last two. All three contain a gen. pl. – *rayīṇām* ‘of riches’ (a), *ārvatām* ‘of chargers’ (b), and *jigyúṣām* ‘of winners’ (c); the last two pādas also contain loc. pls., *vājeṣu* ‘at prize contests’ (b) and *bhāreṣu* ‘at raids’ (c). Pāda b is also marked as a simile, with the simile marker *iva* following the whole simile, not the first word (as also in the last hymn, IX.46.1b). Are all three pādas truly parallel – and in particular should *śiṣāsātuḥ* be understood in b and c, as in a, where it governs *rayīṇām*? Both Old and Re understand *śiṣāsātuḥ* with all three pādas, but take the genitives of b and c in dative function (identifying the groups for which Soma wishes to win riches), not parallel to *rayīṇām*. Cf. “Du bist der Erstreber von Reichtümern, wie für die Renner beim Gewinn der Preise, (so) für die Sieger in den *bhāra*.” This neatly solves the problem that the gen. pls. of b and c refer not to a substance (wealth) one might strive to win, but to animate beings that might be striving to win it themselves, so the morphologically parallel forms do not seem to be semantically or functionally parallel. My own solution in the publ. tr. is, I now see,

considerably inferior to the Old/Re one: I take b with a, but not c, making ‘chargers’ a substance Soma seeks to win and also eliding the simile. I would now reject this interpr. For c in the publ. tr. I made the gen. pl a partitive: “you are among those / (one) of those who are victorious ...” Although this interpr. seems a little artificial, I think it’s possible, and I would now interpr. b in the same way – with the whole vs. meaning “Desirous of winning riches, you are (one) of those who are victorious in the raids, as if (you were one) of the chargers at prize-contents.” Alternatively, I would substitute a version of Old/Re: “You seek to win riches for those who are victorious at raids, as if for coursers at prize-contests,” though this seems more awkward.

In any case, the vs. is problematic on several counts and I doubt that any of the suggested interpr. captures the poet’s intent.

IX.48

As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 3–4 concern the stealing of Soma from heaven (“Somaraub”), a story not otherwise characteristic of IX but treated in detail in IV.26–27. I now think it possible that vss. 1–2 also allude to the same myth, though very obliquely. Details in the comm. to the relevant vss. Our poet, Kavi Bhārgava, also treats this myth in IX.77, one of his Jagatī hymns.

IX.48.1: Ge and Re take *cārum* as referring to Soma, as it, admittedly, often does. I interpr. it rather as a 2nd obj. of *īmahe* ($\sqrt{yā} / ī$ ‘implore, beg for’. (Ge takes the verb to $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘go’ [“nahen wir”], while Re takes it to ‘implore’, but with a single obj.) Either interpr. is possible; I find myself more sympathetic to that of Ge/Re than I originally was, though I am far from disavowing the publ. tr.

The possible allusion to the Somaraub in this vs. is quite muted, but I wonder if the depiction of Soma “bearing his manly powers among the seats of great heaven” (*sadhāstheṣu mahó divāḥ*) could refer to Soma when he is being kept captive in heaven in the myth. A very slight piece of evidence for this is that Kṛṣṇānu, the archer in the Somaraub story (see IV.27.3), is located *sadhāstha ā* “in the seat” in X.64.8, but I would put little or no weight on this.

IX.48.2: This vs. is couched in the acc. and entirely dependent on vs. 1, qualifying Soma.

Contra Gr, the cmpd *sāmvr̥kta-dhr̥ṣṇu-* must be a bahuvrīhi; cf. esp. Old and Scar (504).

The cmpd *mahāmahivrata-* is unusual in having three members, esp. since the first two are etym. identical. With AiG II.1.236 it’s best to take *mahā* as ‘very’ (cf. also Schmidt, *vrata* p. 100).

There is somewhat stronger evidence for a Somaraub connection in this vs. than in vs. 1. In particular Soma is said to be “eager to break a hundred strongholds” (*śatām pūro ruruṣṣānim*); in IV.27.1 these same (or similar) strongholds guarded him (*śatām mā pūra āyasīr arakṣan*) before he was rescued, and so he would be eager to break out of them. Note the phonological similarity between *arakṣan* and *ruruṣṣānim*; the latter is a hapax, with in fact no other desid. forms built to the root \sqrt{ruj} elsewhere in Skt., so the echo may have been deliberately constructed.

If pāda c refers to Soma’s desire to break out of confinement, it’s possible that *sāmvr̥kta-dhr̥ṣṇu-* also refers to this confinement: ‘having his bold(ness) encoiled’, with *dhr̥ṣṇu-* a quality of Soma – rather than my original interpr., that Soma had encoiled the *dhr̥ṣṇú-* of another. Note that Soma is qualified by *dhr̥ṣṇú-* in the immediately preceding hymn (IX.47.2). The use of the idiom *sāmvr̥kta-* ‘encoiled, encircled’ could reflect the circular fortresses.

A connection between the 100 strongholds in this vs. and the explicit Somaraub allusion in the next vs. was suggested by Hildebrandt, but unfortunately rejected by Old—too fastidiously I think.

IX.48.3: The *átah* ‘from there’ that begins this vs. was used by Hillebrandt as evidence for the mythological connection between vss. 2 and 3, persuasively in my view, contra Old.

IX.48.3–4: The phrases *suparṇāḥ ... bharat* (3c) “the falcon brought” and *vír bharat* (4c) “the bird brought” are directly reminiscent of IV.26, where the 3rd sg. (*a*)*bharat* occurs 4x in 4 vss. (4–7), incl. 4cd *suparṇāḥ ... bhárat* and 5a *bhárat ... víḥ*, with the same subjects as here.

IX.49

IX.49.1: The first pāda of this vs. (*pávasva vṛṣṭím ā sú naḥ*) seems syntactically backward, in that we might expect *ā sú naḥ* to open the clause. A cursory glance through the *sú* passages in Lub does not turn up a similarly egregious deviation from left periphery behavior. The solution arises from reading the expression in light of 3c, *asmábhyam vṛṣṭím ā pava*, which is an exact paraphrase with flipped word order. The full dative pronoun *asmábhyam* takes initial position there, while its enclitic equivalent *naḥ* is final in our pāda; the verbs occupy the opposite positions: initial in 1a, final in 3c. The obj. *vṛṣṭím* is identically positioned in the center of the two verses. In 3c the preverb *ā* is more normally positioned than here, right before the verb (... *ā pava*), but, on the other hand, the verb there is morphologically quite anomalous. Thus both pādas have something wrong with them, but their aberrancies can be understood with reference to each other.

IX.49.2: The intent of this vs. is pretty clear, though the expression is a bit contorted: presumably our offering of soma will bring cows as a reward, but how the cows will come “by a stream” of purified soma is unclear. I imagine them in single file, but I don’t think that’s what’s meant.

The adj. qualifying cows, *jánya-*, is generally interpr. as pregnantly ‘belonging to *other* people’ (Ge “die Rinder anderer Leute,” Re “les vaches de l’étranger,” enshrined in Gr’s gloss 2a ‘fremden Leuten ausgehend’), but as I disc. ad IV.55.5, in all clear passages *jánya-* means ‘stemming from one’s own people’. Here it may be proleptic: cows will come here that will by virtue of coming here belong to us.

Note that *úpa naḥ* is somewhat displaced, though not as much as *ā sú naḥ* in 1a.

IX.49.3: On c see the disc. ad vs. 1. The verb here, 2nd sg. impv. (*ā*) *pava*, is the *only* act. form to this extraordinarily well-attested Class 1 pres. stem and is obviously truncated from *pávasva*, in order to fit this exact paraphrase of 1a (see comm. above) into the allotted syllables (*asmábhyam* being a syllable-hog compared to *naḥ*). It may help that *dhāva* in 4b is almost a rhyme. Like many morphological anomalies, *pava* can be accounted for through sensitivity to the larger context.

IX.49.5: *rocāyan rúcaḥ* is a nice cognate acc. construction.

IX.50

IX.50.1: The b pāda consists of a single simile; as in nearby IX.46.1b and IX.47.5b, the simile particle *iva* occurs after the 2nd word in the simile, not the 1st – though here the simile consists of 3 words and so *iva* is non-final.

The c pāda contains a bold image: “spur on the wheelrim of the music” (*vāṇāsya codayā pavīm*). Perhaps not surprisingly, both Ge and Re flatten the image by redefining the verb and one or both of the nouns. Ge’s “Schärfe die Spitze der Rede (des Pfeils)” takes *paví-* as ‘point’, though in all clear cases it refers to a part of a chariot wheel (see EWA s.v. and Sparreboom, Chariot p. 131 with lit.), the tire or wheel rim, while the verb *codayā* means ‘impel, spur on’, not ‘sharpen’. His alternative ‘Pfeil’ assumes that *vāṇá-* is a variant of *bāṇá-* ‘dart’. Re’s “Aiguille la pointe de la parole-rhythmé” follows Ge; he justifies ‘sharpen’ with ref. to IX.17.5, but the verb there also means ‘spur on’ and has (in my view) speech as obj. Old is having none of this: he sensibly and firmly says that \sqrt{cud} is esp. common of the impelling of a chariot [this is not entirely true] and he sees no reason to take *paví-* in anything but its usual sense. To explain the image he suggests that the operation (that is, presumably the playing) of the *vāṇá-*, which he takes as a musical instrument, is conceived of like the driving of a chariot, whose wheel is therefore being metaphorically impelled. This seems correct in its main outlines. The image blends the concrete (the chariot) and the metaphorical (music), both potential objects of \sqrt{cud} , in a phrase with the latter as dependent genitive. For \sqrt{cud} + ‘chariot’, cf. X.29.8 *rātham ... yām .. codáyāse*; the substitution of *paví-* is simply part for the whole. As for \sqrt{cud} + ‘speech’ (vel sim.), cf., e.g., III.62.10 *dhíyo yó naḥ pracodáyāt*.

IX.50.2: The first two pādas of this vs. vary and further specify the opening image in vs. 1 *út te śúṣmāsa īrate*, with the same verbal lexeme though no longer in tmesis (*prasavé ta úd īrate*†) and the identification of the sound that rises as “three voices” (*tisró vācaḥ*). The loc. *prasavé* ‘at your stimulus’ can also be seen as a semantic version of *codayā* ‘spur on’ in 1c.

The three voices, found also in this same context in IX.33.4, are either the voices of the three priests, Hotar, Adhvaryu, and Udgātar, or their three types of ritual speech, ṛc, yajus, and sāman.

Both Ge and Re take *makhasyú-* in the realm of gifts and bounty: “eine Gabe heischend” and “généreuses” respectively. I consider it a pun, referring both to combat and to bounty. Interestingly, for the most part within IX, derivatives of *makhá-* are associated with *vāc-*: besides this one, IX.64.26 *vācam ... makhasyúvam* and IX.101.5 *vācás pátir makhasyate*. Here it could refer to some sort of competition among the three voices/priests in addition to the association of ritual activity with bounties.

IX.50.3: Just as vs. 2 picks up and varies vs. 1, vs. 3 chains with vs. 2: the loc. “on the sheep’s back” (*ávye ... sānavi*) of 2c is immediately followed by “on the sheep’s fleece” (*ávyo vāre*). Given the sandhi of the first ‘sheep’ (*ávya éṣi*) and the juxtaposition of the two phrases, one might at first consider going against the Pp in 2c to read *ávyaḥ*, matching the same apparent form in 3a. However, it is a curious fact of the morphology of these formulae that the loc. phrase containing ‘back’ (*sānavi*, *sāno*) always has the loc. *ávye* to the ‘sheep’ adj. *ávya-*, while the phrase containing *vāra-* ‘fleece’ always has the gen. *ávyaḥ* to the ‘sheep’ noun *ávi-*. To capture this the tr. of the two phrases in vss. 2-3 should be switched: “on the sheep’s back” and “on the fleece of the sheep” – though this is hardly a momentous change.

IX.50.4: It is possible to see 4 as chaining with 3: 3c *pávamānam*, 4a *ā pavasva*, though the ubiquity of the *páva-* stem makes this unremarkable even if true.

On *ā pavasva ... pavítram* see disc. ad IX.70.10.

IX.50.5: The first pāda, *sá pavasva madintama*, is almost identical to 4a *ā pavasva madintama*. This is somewhat reminiscent of the near identity of 1a and 2a.

As noted in the publ. intro., I consider *aktúbhiḥ* a pun. The first reading would be as etym. figure with *añjānáḥ* ‘being anointed’; cf. III.17.1 *aktúbhir ajoyate*, VI.69.3 *añjantv aktúbhiḥ*. But well-attested *aktúbhiḥ* is otherwise a temporal designation, ‘with/through the nights’, e.g., I.50.7 *áhā mīmāno aktúbhiḥ* ‘measuring the days with the nights.’ In this case perhaps it would refer to the Atirātra soma sacrifice.

IX.51

IX.51.2: The ritual impv. here, *sunótā* ‘press!’, is in the 2nd plural and therefore contrasts with the singular *punīhí* ‘purify!’ in 1c, though they occupy the same slot in the vs. The subj. of the impv. in vs. 1 is the Adhvaryu (voc. *ádhvaryo*), while the priestly subjects here are unspecified.

IX.51.3: I assume the gods in b are a different and more inclusive group than the Maruts in c, though *devāḥ* could just anticipate *marútaḥ*.

IX.51.4: The publ. tr. takes the pres. part. *vardháyan* as the predicate of the vs., though it might be possible to take *sutáḥ* instead (“You, the strengthening one, are pressed ...”). Although a predicated ppl. *sutáḥ* would better conform to RVic syntactic patterns, predicating the pres. part. seems to produce better sense: it provides the reason why the gods (and) the Maruts consume soma in vs. 3.

IX.52

IX.52.1: As was pointed out in the publ. intro., two parallel governing compounds, *sanád-rayiḥ* ‘gaining wealth’ (1a) and *mamhayád-rayiḥ* ‘readying wealth’ (5c), open and close the hymn. The former also resonates with the adjacent expression across the pāda boundary, *bhārad vājam*. This phrase cannot help but remind us of the personal name *bharádvāja-*, which is of course in form also a governing compd. This stem is primarily confined to Maṇḍala VI, which is attributed to this ṛṣi and his family, but it would surely be known throughout RVic circles. Note also that some vss. and hymns in IX are attributed by the Anukramaṇī to Bharadvāja or a Bhāradvāja: Bharadvāja IX.67.1–3, Vasu Bhāradvāja IX.80–82, Ṛjīśvan Bhāradvāja IX.98 (jointly with Ambaṛīṣa Vārṣāṅgira), 108.6–7.

The grammatical identify of the *bhārat* part of this phrase can be questioned. The standard view (Gr, Ge, Re, Lub, KH [Injunc. 123], Lowe [Partic. 281]) is that it is a 3rd sg. injunc., with Soma as its subj. This requires a shift of ps. from 3rd (ab) to 2nd (c), given the 2nd sg. impv. *arṣa* in c. Of course such switches, even within a vs., are common. But it is made somewhat more difficult by the preverb *pári*, which opens the vs. and would most naturally be construed with *arṣa*, a point also made by Old. Of the numerous *pári* √ṛṣ passages in IX, cf., e.g., IX.69.2 ... *pári vāram arṣati*. By contrast *pári* is barely attested with √bhṛ and then only with middle forms, as far as I can see. If *pári* (in a) is in tmesis with *arṣa* (in c), a finite verb in

between (that is, putative *bhārat* in b) would have to be parenthetical at best. Re’s attempt to have it both ways (“*pāri* porte sur *aṛṣa* ... à travers *bhārat*”) simply shows the desperation required. I therefore follow Old, as well as AiG II.2.164, in taking *bhārat* as a form of the pres. part. *bhārant*-. Both Old and AiG consider it a neut. sg. (which it is of course in form) used adverbially, but as Old acutely remarks, an adverb taking an object is problematic (and we might expect accent shift to **bharāt*, though adverbial accent shift is controversial). I would analyze it slightly differently: in order to produce a phrase modeled on the compd *bharād-vāja*- (AiG also evokes the PN here), the poet used the weak (neut.) form to stand for the nom. sg. masc. (expected **bhāran*). In this he would be supported by the well-attested nom. sg. of the redupl. pres. *bībharti*, namely *bībhrat* built to the weak stem of the participle, which serves for both masc. and neut. Maṇḍala IX contains several occurrences of this form; cf. for the phraseology here IX.44.1 ... *bībhrad aṛṣasi*. I also find suggestive the two exx. of *bībhrad vājram* (VI.20.9, 23.1) “bearing the mace,” with *vājram* a phonological multiform of *vājam*; since these are both in the Bharadvāja maṇḍala, they are likely meant to evoke that name. See comm. ad VI.20.9.

IX.52.2: The apparent 2nd ps. / 3rd ps. switch recurs in more acute form here. The vs. opens with 2nd ps. *tāva*, which surely refers to Soma, but the finite verb in this single-clause vs. is (apparently) *yāt*, a 3rd sg. One solution is to substitute a slightly different subj. in place of Soma – so Ge, flg. Sāy., who suggests *rāsaḥ* ‘sap’ (sim. Ober. II.231). Another is simply to ignore the problem, as Re and the publ. tr. do. I don’t have a solution (beyond the just mentioned avoidance of the issue), but I somehow think that the isolated and minimalist *yāt*, the only supposed injunctive to this well-attested root pres., is perhaps the artificial result of formulaic cut-and-paste. As Ge (2c) points out, our pāda *sahāsradhāro yāt tánā* is reminiscent of IX.34.1 (*prā svānō dhārayā tánā*, and in fact *tánā* quite often follows *-ā*. If our pāda was somehow based on one containing the very well-attested instr. *dhārayā*, but with the substitution of the nom. bahuvrīhi *sahāśra-dhāra*-, the final *-yā* of the underlying instr. would get detached: x x x **dhārayā tánā* → *sahāsradhāro *yā tánā*, and then this truncated form could have been given morphological identity by extruding (geminating) a *t* from the initial of *tánā* (**yā tánā* → *yāt tánā*), with no metrical implications. On geminations and degeminations in the RV, see my several forthcoming articles. However, even I find this explanation overly tricky, and it also deprives the vs. of a verb (though *aṛṣa* could be supplied from the preceding vs.), so I do not push this possibility strongly.

IX.52.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the “pot” that is to be kicked is mostly likely an stingy patron, as Ge suggests. The whole vs. has a slangy and informal feel.

The problematic pāda is b. On the one hand, if we take the voc. *indo* seriously, this leaves *ná* badly positioned for a simile marker: it should follow *dānam*. But if *dānam* is supposed to be a simile, the expression is pretty slack: if *dānam* is ‘gift’, we want Soma to push the gift itself, not something compared to a gift. For both reasons Ge suggests that *ná* marks not a standard simile but an Utprekṣā, and, even so, that *ná* is in the wrong position. Re’s tr. seems to follow this view, though it’s somewhat hard to square with his comm. Old suggests emending *indo* to *indro*, which allows *ná* to be properly positioned for a simile and also produces a reasonable, if not particularly interesting simile, “give (him/it) a shove, as Indra (does) a gift.” My solution is quite different and, once again, perhaps over-tricky, but I think it captures the tone of the vs. better. I take *dāna*- not as ‘gift’, but rather as the med. root aor. participle to *√dā* ‘give’. The immediate problem with this is, of course, that that form should rather be accented **dānā*-. But given that the RV attests both *dāna*- and *dānā*- meaning ‘gift, giving’, sometimes in parallel

formations (e.g., VI.53.3 *dāñāya codaya* versus VIII.99.4 *dāñāya codāyan*), it would not be surprising if the accent had been changed redactionally to match *dāña-*, which stem accounts for most of the acc. sg. forms (cf. esp. *dānam ínvaṭi* I.128.5, *dānam ínvan* V.30.7). As for the sense, although medial forms of $\sqrt{dā}$ are rare outside of the idiom $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘take’, those that occur seem to mean ‘give of oneself / one’s own store’; cf. V.33.9 *sahásrā me cyávatāno dādānaḥ* “(when) Cyavatāna was giving a thousand of his own to me.” Taking *dānam* as a participle referring to the stingy patron of pāda a allows *ná* to be a negative and therefore properly positioned.

IX.52.4: The main cl. of ab lacks a finite verb; the preverb *ní* suggests several possibilities. Ge supplies *tira* on the basis of IX.19.7 *ní súṣmam ... tira* (his “halte,” my “undermine”), which is certainly possible. However, on the basis of *nijaghñí-* in the next hymn, IX.53.2, as well as the two forms of \sqrt{vadh} in the immediately preceding vs. (52.3 *vadhaír vadhasno*), I prefer a form of *ní√han* (*√vadh*). Nothing depends on the choice, as long as the intent is hostile.

Ge construes *jānānām* in b with voc. *púruhūta* “du vielgerufener der Menschen,” which may be correct, given IX.64.27 as well as the nom. phrase *puruhūtó jānānām* in IX.87.6. (I therefore entertain the alt. tr. “o much invoked of the people.”) But on that basis he should construe *eṣām* in a with the same voc., since IX.64.27 has the same phrase, ... *eṣām, púruhūta jānānām*, where there is no other obvious way to interpret it and Ge takes the *eṣām* with *jānānām*. But here he construes *eṣām* separately, with *súṣmam*. Both Re and I take both genitives with that noun, IX.64.27 notwithstanding.

All of us must face the problem that the rel. cl. in c, which most naturally refers to the blustering people of ab, is in the sg. (*yáḥ ... ādīdeśatī*). This must simply be a constructio ad sensum, or rather the picking out of a particular referent in the group of hostile men mentioned in ab.

IX.52.5: The two numbers in ab, *śatām* and *sahásram*, participate in meaningless syntactic variation. Both must ultimately express an instrumental relationship to the verb; in the first the instr. is directly expressed by *ūtíbhīḥ*, but in the 2nd the instr. must be assumed (“[with] a thousand”) and the enumerated substance is expressed by a partitive genitive. It’s a clever little slippage and barely noticeable. See Old’s disc.

IX.53-60

The next 8 hymns, the last ones before the lengthy hymns assembled from *ṛcas* (IX.61–68) that end the dimeter collection, are attributed to Avatsāra Kāśyapa, also the poet of the legendarily difficult V.44. All of them contain four vss., and a number of them are structured such that the first three vss. form a unity, with the last vs. stylistically or thematically contrastive or completive. See esp. IX.53–57. Old tends to analyze them as a *ṛca* with *Schlussvers*, which is strictly accurate, but I think the point is the interplay of 3+1.

IX.53

On the rhetorical indirection in this hymn, see publ. intro. as well as more detailed comments below.

IX.53.1: The first pāda of this vs. lacks a syllable. It is also identical, save for the last word, the verb, with nearby IX.50.1a *út te súṣmāso īrate* (attributed to a different poet, Ucathya Āngirasa) - with the disyllabic *asthuḥ* here replacing the *īrate* of IX.50.1 and thus responsible for the

metrical truncation. The sense of the two verbs *úd īrate* and *úd asthuḥ* are essentially identical: ‘arise/have arisen’. One can speculate that either Avatsāra Kāśyapa, a tricky poet, is calling attention to the opening of his poem by the manipulation and metrical truncation of the unimpeachable phrase found in IX.50.1, or that he wanted an aorist and there is no aor. clearly related to the pres. *īrte*, *īrate* (though of course there are aor. forms to its ultimate root \sqrt{r}). Given the near identity of the two pādas, it might have been better had the publ. tr. rendered *śúsmāsaḥ* in the same way in both instances, although the two different tr. work better contextually.

As was noted in the publ. intro. and as Ge also points out, this vs. might be more appropriate to Indra, and in particular the voc. *adrivah* ‘possessor of the stone’ in b is otherwise used almost exclusively of Indra: there are nearly 50 occurrences, of which only one, besides this one, is addressed to anyone but Indra (Varuṇa in VII.89.2). There is in fact nothing in this vs. that imposes or even invites the identification of the 2nd ps. referent as Soma; we only assume it (correctly in my view) because this is a soma hymn.

The syntax of c is slightly unusual, in that the obj. of *nudāsva* is a nominal relative cl. *yāḥ parispr̥dhaḥ* “(those) who are the challengers all around,” with the main cl. referent (**tāḥ* ‘those’) gapped. (See also 3c below.) Generally the gapping of the antecedent to nominal relative clauses is found in “X and which Y” constructions, not when the rel. cl. is not conjoined. It’s worth noting that this pāda is very close semantically to IX.52.3a in the immediately preceding hymn: *carúr ná yás tám īnkhaya* “Who is like a pot, give him a shove,” but there the nom. rel. clause *carúr ná yāḥ* that defines the obj. of the main verb does have an expressed antecedent *tám* in the main cl. Note that, IX.52 is also attributed to Ucathya, like IX.50, and both hymns contain expressions on which Avatsāra seems to be ringing changes.

On *parispr̥dh-* see Scar 666.

IX.53.2: This vs. sits somewhat oddly in a soma hymn, and its subject, and indeed its general aim, are not clear until the 3rd pāda.

It begins with a fem. instr. demonstr. *ayā* without expressed referent, and as Re points out, a number of fem. referents are possible. However, the verb that begins c, *stávai* ‘I will praise’, makes *dhī-* ‘insightful thought’ (or some other reference to a verbal product) quite likely, and the phrase *ayā dhiyā* is in fact fairly common (I.166.13, V.45.11 [2x] [in the hymn adjacent to Avatsāra’s V.44 though V.45 is not attributed to him], VI.71.6, VIII.13.8, 93.17). The supplying of *dhī-* here is supported by the contrastive cmpd *dūḍhī-* ‘having bad insight’ in the next vs. (3b). On the basis of the Avestan parallel, fem. instr. *vācā* ‘with speech’ is also a possibility; see below.

Between *ayā* and *stávai*, however, is an image of conflict and contest, with the nom. verbal noun *nijaghnīḥ* ‘slamming down’, the instr. *ójasā* ‘with strength’, and the loc. phrase *rathasaṃgé dhāne hité* “when chariots clash and a prize is set” – all contributing to a picture of violence seemingly inappropriate to a ritual context. It would be most applicable to Indra, who is the usual subj. of *ní√han* (e.g., VII.18.18 *ní jahi vájram indra*), or perhaps to a militant Soma. So the 1st ps. verb *stávai* ‘I will praise’ that opens the next pāda is a surprise: it is instead the inoffensive poet who has been assimilated to an aggressive warrior or contestant, and it is his act of praising that is implicitly compared to smiting down a rival on the field of conflict. Again Avatsāra seems to have deliberately misled us.

However, the situation is more complex. Ge (n. 2a) tellingly cites a strikingly similar Avestan passage from the Hom Yašt, Y 10.2 *uparəmcitē tē hauuanəm / vaca upa.staomi huxratuuō / yahmi niyne narš aojanha* “The upper (part of the) mortar I praise with speech, o you of good

insight [=Haoma], in which it [=haoma] is pounded down with the strength of a man.” This passage clearly refers to the pressing of the haoma, using the lexeme *ní√gan*, exact cognate to our *ní√han*, and also contains the instr. *aojanha* ‘with strength’, identical to our *ójasā*, as well as the 1st sg. verb ‘I praise’ (*staomi* to the same root as our 1st sg. *stávai*) and an instr. of speech *vaca* (instead of our proposed **dhiyā*, though in fact fem. instr. *vācā* could fit in our passage just as well). This Avestan parallel must indirectly provide the solution to our puzzle: why is the mild-mannered priest-poet depicted in a scene of such violence? Because the pressing of soma is inherently an act of violence. Our b pāda provides a metaphorical scenario of contest, but *nijaghnír ójasā* in pāda a simply describes, with the same vocabulary as the Avestan passage, the powerful pounding of the soma stalks. To enhance this interpr., ‘pounding down’ would be better than ‘slamming down’ for *nijaghnīh*.

IX.53.3: Because ‘commandments’ (*vratā-*) are especially associated with Varuṇa and Mitra, the beginning of this vs. might also direct the audience to the wrong referent for initial *ásya*. However, commandments are the property of a number of gods, and nothing else about the phraseology strongly suggests a referent other than Soma. In any case any doubt about the referent is settled by the beginning of b, *pávamānasya*.

Pāda c is constructed almost exactly like 1c, with a rel. clause serving as obj. of the main clause imperative, here *rujá*, without expressed antecedent in the main cl. In this case, however, the rel. clause is not nominal but has a full SOV structure: *yás tvā pṛtanyáti*.

IX.53.4: As indicated in the publ. intro., this final vs. is characterized by specifically somic vocabulary (*madacyútam*, *índum*, *matsarám*), in contrast to the more equivocal vss. that precede it.

IX.54

On the riddling structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. Each of the first three vss. begins with a form of *ayám*, with implicit reference to soma.

IX.54.1: Unfortunately it is difficult to render in tr. the initial position of *asyá*, matching that of *ayám* in vss. 2, 3, which therefore makes the overall structure of the hymn less clear in English. Perhaps “Of this one – following his age-old brilliance ...”

áhrayah in b is assigned to a stem *áhri-* by Gr and taken as a nom. pl.; so also Ge “die nicht Schlüchtern” as subj. of *duduhre* (referring to the fingers or the soma-pressing priests). This stem is otherwise unattested, and the root from which it is presumably derived is set *√hrī*, which attests a root noun *hrī-* (VS+), whose nom. pl. should properly be **-hriyah*. AiG III.187 suggests that the form is an old error for **áhrayāh*, nom. pl. to the well-established them. stem *áhraya-*, shortened to match *páyah*, which immediately follows across the hemistich boundary. I instead follow Re’s suggestion, that it actually belongs to an *s*-stem *áhrayas-* (see also EWA s.v. *HRAY*) and, as a neut. acc. sg., modifies *páyah*. Although the underlying *s*-stem **hráyas-* is not attested, neither is the supposed underlying *i*-stem **hrī-*, and as an *s*-stem neut. the form would be morphologically impeccable and require no emendation (unlike Wackernagel’s suggestion). The accent would match that of the likewise bahuvrīhi *án-āgas-*, though it must be admitted that such cmpds generally have suffixal accent (e.g., *a-cetás-*, *a-rādhás-*); however, the existence of better attested *áhraya-* and *áhrayāṇa-* could have induced initial accent. Another ex. of *áhrayas-* is probably found in X.93.9, q.v. As for sense, *√hrī* means ‘be modest, shy’, and the negated

áhraya- ‘unrestrained, immodest, immoderate’; the primary use of that adj. is with *rā́dhas-* ‘bounty’ (V.79.5, 6, VIII.8.13, 54.8, 56.1), to express a desire for large, that is immoderate, quantities of it. Cf. also VII.67.6 *réto áhrayam*, also adduced by Re, with *ré́tas-* ‘seed, semen’, a substance rather like *páyas-*. In our passage the point would be that a more than satisfying abundance of (soma-)milk was milked. If *áhrayaḥ* is not a nom. pl., the subj. of *duduhre* is not expressed, but priestly officiants would be the obvious subj., often not overtly expressed in Soma hymns.

IX.54.2: Ge takes *dhāvati* as transitive, with *sārā́msi* and *pravátaḥ* as obj. (“dieser lässt Seen, sieben Ströme zum Himmel fließen”), but the thematic pres. to $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘run’ (as opposed to $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘rinse’) is only a verb of motion with acc. of goal, not a causative. Ge’s interpr. is not shared by others: besides Re, cf. Lü (153), Gotō (1st Kl. 183), Scar (229), all of whose interpr. are very like mine.

IX.55

The first three vss. of this hymn all contain a form of the stem *ándhas-* ‘stalk’. On this word see comm. ad IV.1.19; the tr. of Ge (“Trank”) and Re (“jus”) are misleading.

IX.55.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is unusual in its reference to agriculture (see Ober RdR II.118), in particular to ‘grain, barley’ (*yáva-*) in pāda a. Perhaps the fact that soma is a plant, and that its stalk (*ándhas-*) is prominent in this hymn, accounts for the implication that Soma has the ability to provide us with grain and its accompanying fruitfulness (*puṣṭá-*). It may also be an oblique ref. to the occasional mixing of soma with grain; see the enigmatic expression in IX.68.4.

IX.55.2: According to the opinio communis (Ge, Re, Lü 204 [of IX.61.10], Klein DGRV I.402), *jātám ándhasaḥ* in pāda b (and the same expression in IX.61.10) contains a substantivized neut. ppl. *jātám* ‘birth’ with dep. gen. (e.g., Ge “die Geburt deines Tranks”). However, IX.18.2 *mádhu prá jātám ándhasaḥ* “the honey born from the stalk” suggests that ‘honey’ (vel sim.) should be supplied here as well, with *ándhasaḥ* an abl. of source, though Re specifically rejects IX.18.2 as relevant for this passage.

The function of the two *yáthā* clauses is not altogether clear. I assume that they refer to the two prerequisites for the soma sacrifice: the verbal portion with its praise of the god Soma and the physical production of the ritual substance soma. With both accomplished, the god Soma can take his place on the ritual ground.

On injunc. *sadaḥ* as a functional impv. see comm. ad IX.2.2 and KH (Injunc. 263).

IX.55.4: As Re points out, *jīnāti* must belong to \sqrt{ji} , so *jīyate*, which is ambig. between \sqrt{ji} and $\sqrt{jyā}$, surely belongs to the latter as well. The tr. should be slightly emended to “who overpowers but is not overpowered.”

The standard interpr. of the syntactic structure of the passage (Ge, Re, Ober RdR II.168, as well as the publ. tr.) takes pādas a and b as all part of the rel. cl. introduced by initial *yáḥ*, with c as the main cl. and Soma as the subject both of ab and of c. This involves a shift in person, from 3rd (ab *jīnāti ... jīyate ... hānti*) to 2nd (c *pavasva*). Of course such shifts are commonplace in the RV, and in this case the *sá* introducing c is used by most tr. as a pivot (“as such”).

However, the presence of *sá* is fully explained by its regular use with 2nd sg. impvs. (see my “*sá*

figé” article) and need have nothing to do with the shift of person. I do think the standard interpr. of the vs. is probably right (even without the *sá* pivot), but I would point out that it’s not the only syntactically possible analysis: the rel. cl. could encompass only pāda a, with b as the main cl. The accent on the verb in b, *hánti*, would be accounted for by its initial position in the pāda. The vs. could then be rendered “Who overpowers and is not overpowered, he smashes his rival on just confronting him. Purify yourself ...” The referent of the 3rd ps. in ab could still be Soma, but it could instead be the person for whom Soma purifies himself, with the happy results on the battlefield that arise from possessing the purified soma.

IX.56

IX.56.1: The problem in this vs. is how to construe neut. *ṛtām bṛhāt*. Is it an acc., and if so, is it a goal, like *vājam* in the next vs. (“rushes to the lofty truth”), or an expression of the way loosely construed with *pāri* (“rushes around the lofty truth”)? Or is it a nom. and therefore appositional to *sómaḥ*. Ge (and to some extent Re) seem to follow the “way” interpr., as does Lü (582) in his first rendering. But he then rejects this (on somewhat contorted grounds) and, flg. Ludwig, goes for a nom. apposition (or nominal predicate). On the basis of IX.107.17, 108.8 (see also 66.24), I also opt for the appositional interpr. Vs. 2 also contains a nominal apposition, *dhārā apasyúvaḥ*, at least by my analysis.

IX.56.2: This vs. consists entirely of a dependent cl. and can most conveniently be attached to the preceding vs.

As noted above I take pl. *dhārā apasyúvaḥ* as a nom. in apposition to sg. *sómaḥ*. Re explicitly calls it an “Acc. interne,” tr. “(en) cent jets actifs,” but internal to what? Ge’s tr. is similar to Re’s, but he doesn’t commit himself as to case. That *dhārāḥ* is definitely nom. in the next hymn, IX.57.1, also with *vājam* as goal, gives some support to my interpr. here.

āvisán in c is most likely the nom. sg. pres. part. it is universally interpr. as (incl. in the publ. tr.), modifying *sómaḥ* in a. However, it is technically possible that it is a 3rd pl. injunc. *ā-visán* with the pl. *dhārāḥ* of b as its subj. It would be accented on the verb stem because it is still part of the *yád* clause. This would anchor *dhārāḥ* as nom. and produce a tr. “When Soma rushes towards the prize (and) (his) hundred hardworking streams enter fellowship with Indra.” I do not advocate for this interpr., which seems too fussy, but I do point out that nothing in the grammar of the vs. precludes it.

IX.56.3: Note that *yósan-* and *kanyā-* appear together in the same vs. and in fact the latter is explicitly compared to the former. It is not clear to me whether they are meant here to refer to different types or lifestages of a young girl / maiden.

IX.56.4: An elementary type of variant ring composition, with *pāri srava* responding to *pāri ... arṣati* in vs. 1.

IX.57

IX.57.1: On the similarity of this vs. to IX.56.2 in the preceding hymn, see comm. ad loc.

IX.57.2: The neut. pls. of ab, *priyāṇi kāvya*, *viśvā* offer several different possibilities for construal. The publ. tr. takes *priyāṇi kāvya* in pāda a separately from *viśvā* in b, with the former the goal of *abhī ... arṣati* and the latter the obj. of *cākṣāṇaḥ*. The oft-repeated pāda *abhī viśvāni kāvya* (IX.23.1, 62.25, 63.25, 66.1), identical to our pāda a with *priyāṇi* substituting for *viśvāni*, supports my interpr. of the phrase in our pāda a as goal. As for the interpr. of *viśvā* in b as obj. of *cākṣāṇaḥ*, this rests on slightly shakier grounds: the *viśvāni* in the repeated pāda might suggest that our *viśvā* belongs with pāda a, and it is also not clear that the participle *cākṣāṇa-* when uncompounded can take an obj. On the one hand we have cmpd *praticākṣāṇa-* with obj. in IX.85.12 *viśvā rūpā praticākṣāṇaḥ* “gazing upon all his forms” (cf. II.40.5 with *abhī* and *viśvam*); on the other, in I.128.3 uncmpd *cākṣāṇa-* is used absolutely (cf. also X.74.2). I am therefore open to the possibility that all three neut. pls. serve as goal, producing an alt. tr. “towards all the dear (products) of poetic skill does he rush, being observant.” However, I am tolerably certain that both Ge and Re are wrong, in their different ways. Ge takes the whole acc. phrase as obj. of *cākṣāṇaḥ* (“auf alle lieben Dichterwerke achtend”), thus ignoring the evidence of the repeated pāda and opting for the participle as the governing element, despite the uncertainty of its ability to take objects. Re seems to take *abhī* in tmesis with the part. *cākṣāṇa-*, not with *arṣati*, thus taking the acc. phrase with *abhī*, as the repeated pāda strongly supports, but making *abhī* the preverb to *√cakṣ*: “Regardant en direction de tous les arts-poétique.” But, though *abhī* does occur regularly with *√cakṣ*, it is also extremely common with *√ṛṣ*, esp. in IX. Since tmesis of preverb and participle is quite rare, given a choice between construing a preverb in tmesis with a participle or with a finite verb, the latter must be preferred unless there are serious semantic drawbacks.

IX.57.3: Pāda b has been variously interpr., primarily because of *ibha-*. On this word see comm. ad VI.20.8, IV.4.1 and Old’s detailed refutation of the Pischel-Geldner gloss ‘elephant’ (reflected in Ge’s unlikely tr. here ‘Königselefant’) in his n. on this passage. Gr, flg. BR, suggests reading **ibhe* for *ibho*, an emendation that Old considers possible, and Re suggests *ibho rājā* is a “composé ouvert” for **ibharāja-* ‘roi possédant des vassaux’. I do not think we need to change the text, however. Working with the meaning ‘vassal’ for *ibha-* (as is now generally accepted), we can first note that *ibha-* and *rājan-* are a complementary pairing (cf. I.65.7, IV.4.1) expressing a power differential: the king has power over his vassals, who give their fealty to him. This type of relationship between unequal parties is one governed by *vrata*-s, command(ment)s issued by superiors and binding on inferiors (see Brereton 1981). The adj. *svratā-* ‘having good commandments, keeping commandments well’ can therefore technically apply to either side of the equation: the superior issuing the *vrata* or the inferior following it. Elsewhere in the RV the word is only applied to the superior (who is more apt to draw the interest of the RVic poet than the inferior): the Ādityas (VI.49.1), patrons (*sūri-* I.125.7, 180.6), and in this same phrase *rājeva svratāḥ* (IX.20.5) of Soma compared to a king. In our passage I suggest that the other pole, the inferior, is included in a disjunctive choice “vassal (or) king.” The vassal is *svratā-* because he obediently follows the *vrata-* imposed by the king. My only hesitancy about this interpr. is that it implicitly compares Soma not merely to a king, as is standard, but also to a vassal. I can only suggest that the poet was too pleased about tapping into the inherent ambiguity of *svratā-* to worry about a potentially unflattering comparison, or that the manipulation of soma by the priests, here represented by the Āyus in pāda a, entails a kind of vassalage and domination.

The simile particle comes only after the 2nd word. This is in part because the simile has been adapted from IX.20.5 (not to mention the numerous other exx. of *rājeva*), where the *iva* is

properly positioned. But note also that we have encountered a number of other examples of “late” simile particles in this maṇḍala (see comm. ad IX.3.4, 46.1, 47.5, 50.1).

IX.58

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

IX.58.1–3: The first word of the refrain, *tárat*, is grammatically ambiguous. It can be a 3rd sg. injunc. and is so taken by, e.g., Gr, Ge, Lub, and Lowe (Part. 281); certainly the same form in the same position in IX.107.15 *tárat samudráṁ* “he crosses the sea” is most probably a finite injunc. However, flg. one of Old’s possibilities, with AiG II.2.164 and apparently Re (judging from his tr. “en traversant”) I prefer to take it as a neut. sg. pres. part. in adverbial usage, in part because beginning and ending this short pāda-length refrain with two finite verbs, one injunc., one pres. indic., seems clunky: *tárat sá mandī dhāvati*. For another pāda-initial form in *-at* that I take as a participle see disc. of *bhārat* ad IX.52.1.

As to what Soma is crossing, it is most likely the waters (cf. *ap-túr*- IX.61.13, 63.5, 21), as suggested by Ge, Re, et al. – in this case perhaps the waters with which the stalk is swelled. Or, given IX.59.3b *vísṽāni duritā tara* in the immediately following hymn, it could be “all difficult passages.”

IX.59

IX.59.1: The first hemistich is notable for its sequence of four root noun cmpds in *-jít-* ‘winning, winner’. For their possible structural role in the hymn, see comm. ad vs. 4.

IX.59.2: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. contains three occurrences of the impv. *pávasva*, each pāda init. Each of these is construed with a dat. pl. (or abl., acdg. to Sāy.; but see the parallel Ge cites [n. 2] that speaks for the dat.). This tight repetitive syntactic structure suggests that the three datives should form a semantic set. The first two are waters (*adbhyáh*) and plants (*ṣadhibhyáh*). As for the third, *dhiśānābhyah*, Ge interpr. it as “die (priestlichen) Werke” (and see his extensive n. on the word, n.2c), Re as “les inspirations (des humains).” However, in part flg. Pinault (Vedic Workshop, 2007), I take the orig. sense of *dhiśānā-* to be ‘holy place’, and in this context I think it likely that it refers to the hearths holding the ritual fires. If so, the trio of datives would refer to three vital physical elements of the soma sacrifice: “the waters” for swelling the soma stalk and for mixing the pressed soma, “the plants” representing the soma plant itself, and “the Holy Places / hearths” representing the fire into which the soma is offered. The more attenuated interpr. of Ge and Re are not impossible, but are not as tightly bound to the substances in ab as the fires/hearth would be.

Re notes the phonetic play (*pávasv*)*ādbhyó ádābhyah* in a.

IX.59.4: The injunc. *vidaḥ* in pāda a is interpr. by both Ge and Re as imperatival, while in the publ. tr. it’s taken as a general statement in the present. I am now somewhat inclined to follow the imperatival interpr. of Ge/Re (“find the sun”). On *vidaḥ* in impv. use, see comm. ad IX.20.3, I.42.7–9. What may indirectly support my original interpr., however, is a potential ring-compositional relationship with vs. 1. As noted above, vs. 1 contains a remarkably pile-up of root noun cmpds in *-jít-* ‘X-winning’. There exists a very well-attested root noun cmpd *svar-víd-* ‘sun-finding’, which is semantically very close to the X-winning cmpds (and cf. also *svar-jít-* 4x,

incl. 2x of Soma in IX). Indeed, *svar-víd-* is commonly used of Soma (13x in IX) and in a number of passages occupies this same metrical slot, the last four syllables of a dimeter pāda (in the acc. sg. *svar-vídāṃ*, nom/acc. pl. *svar-vídaḥ*; e.g., IX.8.9), as our finite VP *svàr vidaḥ*. This slot is, of course, not available for the nom. sg. *svar-víd*, but the 2nd sg. VP here *svàr vidaḥ* is a reasonable simulacrum, with *vidaḥ* incorporating the nominative subject. Now in vs. 1 the cmpds in *-jít-* are descriptors of Soma, without modal value. If *svàr vidaḥ* here is meant as a ring-compositional variant, evoking the cmpd *svar-víd-* and reprising the X-*jít-* cmpds of vs. 1, the general meaning I assigned it in the publ. tr. may correctly capture this structural feature.

The finite verb in b presents its own problems. The Pp. reads *abhavaḥ*, though the putative augment has to be elided after *jāyamāno* in order to produce the proper number of syllables. As is well known (see, e.g., Old, Proleg. 389ff.), this elision, i.e., Abhinihita sandhi, is fairly rare in the RV, and therefore the orig. text may have had not the impf. *abhavaḥ*, but an injunc. *bhavaḥ*, which was then wrongly analyzed by the Pp. In that case *bhavaḥ* could express the same general sense as I just suggested *vidaḥ* might: “being born, you become great.” However, as both Old (Noten ad loc.) and KH (Inj. 150) point out, the injunctives *bhavaḥ* and *bhavat* are not otherwise found in the RV, and therefore both scholars assume that the augmented *abhavaḥ* is the underlying form here – ‘you became great’, as rendered in the publ. tr.

IX.60

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

IX.60.1: The tr. “sing forth with a song” is meant to capture the etymological relationship of *gāyatrēṇa gāyata*, but *gāyatrā-* of course refers more technically to a hymn in Gāyatrī meter – as this one indeed is.

IX.60.1–2: The chaining described in the publ. intro. here involves repeating *sahásracakṣasam* from 1c in 2a in the same metrical position.

IX.60.2: The deriv. *-bharnas-* in *sahásra-bharnas-* is somewhat puzzling: it is difficult to see what motivated its formation and indeed to fix its meaning. It is found 4x (once as a repetition), only in IX, always in the acc. sg. occupying the last 6 syllables of a dimeter line (here, IX.64.25 [=98.1], 64.26), modifying Soma (here), *vāc-* (IX.64.25, 26), *rayí-* (IX.98.1), though the referent never appears in the pāda with the adj. and so the adj. is loosely connected with its referent at best. Here it is obviously meant to match *sahásra-cakṣas-* ‘having a thousand eyes’ in the same metrical position in the preceding pāda, and for this reason I think it possible that this passage is the locus for its creation. But the match is not very good: though both are *-as-*stems, the suffixes (*-nas-* versus *-as-*) aren’t superimposable. The semantic match is also quite imperfect: whatever *-bharnas-* means, it is certainly not a body part like *cakṣas-*. Since many nominal derivatives of \sqrt{bhr} fall in the semantic domain of ‘present, offering’ and such a meaning fits a ritual context, that seems a safe bet and would work with *rayí-*, though it fits *vāc-* somewhat less well. With a confidence whose basis is not clear, Re rejects the notion of ‘offrande’ and asserts that “le suffix *-nas-* fait décider pour «bénéfice (qu’on tire du culte sômique)»,” for reasons he fails to give. Ge by contrast tr. “Tausendaufwiegenden” with a question mark, which he then glosses (n. 2b) with “Tausendwertigen.” Insofar as the suffix *-nas-* tells us anything (and the *-n-* is not there just to supply the heavy syllable that a straight *-as-*stem *sahásra-*bharas-* would lack), it suggests a meaning in the realm of “stuff,” material substance, esp. with regard to substances of value: cf.

rēkṇas- ‘inheritance, legacy’, *drāvīṇas-* ‘material goods, chattels’, *āpnas-* ‘property’, all with Aves. cognates – so that ‘bringing a thousand (material) presents’ would fit reasonably in this group. AiG II.2.738 glosses *-bharṇas-* with ‘Darbringung’ and considers it probably inherited, despite the lack of non-Indic correspondents. Given its extremely limited distribution, indeed the strong possibility that it was originally created in one passage, I consider inheritance unlikely; rather, it was probably formed as a near nonce on the basis of the inherited words just cited.

IX.60.2–3: Here the chaining is slightly inexact: 2c *āti vāram* / 3a *āti vārān*, each followed by a verbal form of $\sqrt{pū}$.

IX.60.3: This vs. is in Puraūṣṇih meter (12 8 / 8), i.e., a Gāyatrī with an extended first pāda. This pāda is almost at the exact center of the hymn, preceded by 6 pādas, followed by 5. The positioning seems deliberate.

IX.60.3–4: Here the chaining involves only the first word *īndrasya*.

IX.60.4: In addition to the chaining with the previous vs. (on which see immediately above), this vs. participates in other verbal echoes, as noted in the publ. intro. The end of the 2nd pāda *vīcarṣaṇe* forms a ring with *vīcarṣanim* at the end of the 2nd pāda of vs. 1, and the last pāda, *prajāvad réta ā bhara*, is identical to the last pāda of the first vs. of the immediately preceding hymn, IX.59.1 *prajāvad rátnam ā bhara*, with the substitution of *rétaḥ* for *rátnam*. In our case the semen (*rétaḥ*) would be both the actual semen that produces offspring and the liquid soma that mimics it.

IX.61–67

On the place of these long hymns in the structure of the maṇḍala, see publ. intro. to IX.61. All of these hymns consist of collections of ṛcas of varying degrees of cohesion. In fact, it is surprising how few ṛcas display a real attempt at thematic or lexical unity, and what they do show is often simply the byproduct of the fact that both the lexicon and thematic preoccupations of Maṇḍala IX are comparatively limited and so similar words and themes are not unlikely to show up in adjacent verses. This lack of unity contrasts, I think (this is my unsystematic and anecdotal impression) with collections of ṛcas in other maṇḍalas, notably VIII.

IX.61

IX.61.1–3: This ṛca shows some signs of unity. The 1st two vss. are a syntactic unit, with the objects of the verb in 1c partly postponed to 2ab. The third vs. has as its verb *pári ... kṣárā*, which echoes *pári srava* in 1a.

IX.61.1: The publ. tr. fails to render the demon. *ayā* that opens the hymn; more literal would be “flow around in this pursuit (of him) ...” Ge (n. 1) considers *ayā* a kind of attraction from **asya* ‘of him’, the missing antecedent to *yáḥ* in b, but the prominent position of *ayā* should be registered. Presumably *ayā vītī* is gesturing towards the physical ritual activity happening right now.

The unnamed referent in the rel. cl. of bc is of course Indra; the “nine and ninety” are fortresses / strongholds, as in IV.26.3 ... *púraḥ* ... *náva sākāṃ navatīḥ śámbarasya*. This referent is postponed to the 2nd vs.: *púraḥ* opens vs. 2.

IX.61.2: As was just noted, *púraḥ* completes the acc. phrase *navatīr náva* that serves as obj. to *avāhan* in 1c, as the parallel IV.26.3 just cited demonstrates. But *avāhan* has another object in vs. 2, namely *śámbaram* in b, as shown by a different passage in the Indra cycle of Maṇḍala IV, IV.30.14 *āvāhann indra śámbaram*.

The third pāda of this vs. is radically incomplete, consisting only of a particle, a demon., and two acc. PNs: *ádha tyāṃ turváśam yádum*. On purely structural grounds, it would make sense to make these parallel to *śámbaram* in b, as objects of *avāhan* (in 1c). However, this structural argument runs into problems of mythological content. Although Turvaśa and Yadu *are* sometimes enemies of Indra (see, e.g., VII.19.2), at other times they are under Indra’s protection. In particular, in the Indra cycle from which IV.26.3 and IV.30.14, the parallels to our vss. 1–2ab, were cited above, T + Y are rescued by Indra: IV.30.17 *utá tyā turváśāyádū, ... / índraḥ ... apārayat* “And Indra brought these two, T + Y, to the far shore,” just three vss. later than the smiting of Śambara. Note further that IV.30.17a is very like our pāda, a dimeter line with an intro. disyllabic connective, a form of the demonstr. *syá-* / *tyá-*, and the two names, though with a dual dvandva *turváśāyádū* rather than two individual acc. sgs. On this basis, I’m afraid the simple solution of taking T + Y as further victims of Indra should be abandoned, in favor of supplying (or at least assuming) a positive verb to govern them, such as Ge’s (n. 2c) “errettete” or Re’s “sauva.”

IX.61.3: The Inhaltsakk. with *pári ... kṣārā* are disharmonious in formation, with the sg. noun *áśvam* (rendered in the publ. tr. as the mass noun ‘horseflesh’, perhaps a bit too vividly) in pāda a followed by two possessive adj. *gómat* and *híraṇyavat* ‘possessing / consisting of cattle (and) gold’ in pāda b, followed by a pl. NP *sahasríṇīr íṣaḥ* ‘thousandfold refreshments’ in c. In a we might have expected *áśvāvat* ‘possessing / consisting of horses’, to match the adjectival forms in b, but the phonologically similar and adjacent *áśvavíd* ‘horse-finding’ may have blocked it (to avoid **áśvāvad áśvavíd* [though some RVic poets would have loved that phrase]).

IX.61.4–6: There are faint signs of unity in this tṛca: the word *pavítram* ‘filter’ is found in vss. 4 and 5, and both 4 and 6 have pres. mid. participles derived from $\sqrt{pū}$ ‘purify’ (*pávamāna-* 4a, *punāná-* 6a), but since this is a Soma Pavamāna hymn, this is hardly remarkable.

IX.61.4: Both Ge and Re render *pávamānasya* as simply the epithet Pavamāna, but this loses the parallelism between the two gen. sg. pres. participles that open and close the hemistich: *pávamānasya ... abhyundatáḥ*. I render these participles as “while” clauses, to avoid the awkward “we choose the companionship of you who are Xing.”

IX.61.5: We might fault the poet for a certain laxness of phraseology: how exactly is Soma meant to be gracious / merciful to us “with his waves”?

IX.61.6: Note the echo across the b-c pāda boundary: ... *íṣam / íśānaḥ* ...

IX.61.7–9: The *ṛca* is characterized by the mention of gods in all three vss. The Ādityas frame it (*ādityébhiḥ* 7c, *mitré váruṇe ca* 9c), with a more miscellaneous group in between. It is also marked by initial repetition: *sám* opens pādas 7c, 8a, and 8c. This is imperfectly echoed by *sá n(o)* opening 9a.

IX.61.10–12: It is difficult to discern any particular unity in this *ṛca*.

IX.61.10: The topic of the verse seems to be heavenly versus earthly soma. See Lü 204.

On *jātām* as an adj., rather than (with Ge, Re, Lü 204, Ober II.16) the noun ‘birth’, see comm. ad IX.55.2. Another arg. for taking it as adjectival here is that the same form is clearly an adj. in 13a. As in IX.55.2, I take the missing referent to be ‘honey’ (*mádhu*) on the basis of IX.18.2.

Pāda b contains several forms requiring disc., esp. what appears in the Saṃhitā text as *bhūmy*. This is analyzed, irregularly, by the Pp as *bhūmih*. Gr gives the form as *bhūmī* but identifies it as a nom. sg. to *bhūmi-*. Old refers to the considerable lit. on the form, opting for a loc. interpr. (as do all the standard tr.). Wackernagel has a curiously split opinion: in AiG I.337 (1896) he identifies it as a loc., while in AiG III.136–37 (1930) he decides instead for the nom., though referring to his former opinion – and in the same vol. (III.155) he says the same form doesn’t *have* to be a loc. (“... muss nicht notwendig als Lok. *bhūmī* gefasst werden”), but could alternatively be either a nom. *bhūmī* or an instr. *bhūmyā*. The context, with the contrast *diví śāt* “though being in heaven” with loc. *diví*, certainly favors a loc. interpr. for the form, even though taking ‘earth’ as the subject of the clause is possible: “earth took it, though it was in heaven.” In sum, I think the loc. interpr. is most likely, with an *-ī* (or *-i*) loc, to a fem. *i*-stem, like *védī* (or *védī*) in II.3.4 (see comm. ad loc.). A *bhūmi* with short final vowel is metrically better here (as *védī* is in II.3.4), but it may result from shortening in hiatus.

The neut. part. *śāt* has, in my opinion, the concessive value often found with the pres. part. to *√as*, though most tr. don’t render it as such (and Re rejects this interpr.). It modifies the unexpressed *mádhu* in my view, but the neut. *ándhas-* acdg. to most others.

ā dade is another ambig. form.: it can be either a 1st or a 3rd sg. mid. pf. (or a 1st sg. mid. pres.). Gr takes it as a 1st sg. pf., as does Ge (“Den im Himmel befindlichen (Trank) nehme ich auf der Erde zu mich”), but a 3rd sg., with the soma (represented by *mádhu* or *ándhaḥ*) as subject (with Re, Lü, Ober) allows pāda c to serve as obj. of *ā dade* – Ge has to take it as an independent nominal clause – and the Gr/Ge interpr. also introduces a 1st sg. that has no other place in the context, where the 1st pl. reigns.

IX.61.11: On *dyumnāni mānuṣāṇām* see comm. ad X.42.6, as well as VI.19.6. I would now alter the tr. here slightly to “the brilliant things of the sons of Manu,” since, as I discuss ad X.42.6, I think the rivalry over *dyumnā-* (pl.) is confined to the larger Ārya community.

IX.61.13–15: Again no signs of *ṛca* unity, unless the presence of cows in all three verses counts (13b *góbhiḥ*, 14b *vatsám samśísvarīḥ iva*, 15a *gáve*, 15b *dhukśásva*).

IX.61.14: The hapax tatpuruṣa *hṛdamśáni-* ‘gaining the heart’ is curious, in having an apparent acc. in *-am* to the neut. root noun *hṛd-*, as if to a masc. or fem. stem or to a thematic **hṛda-* (see, e.g., AiG II.1.208).

IX.61.16–18: This *ṛca* is unified by the simple device of stationing a form of *pávamāna-* at the beginning of each vs. (16a, 17a, 18a). Note also the two forms of *rása-* ‘sap’ in 17a and 18a (the two *pādas* are scramblings of each other: 17a *pávamānasya te rásaḥ*, 18a *pávamāna rásas táva*, with different case forms of *pávamāna-* and enclitic versus full form of the gen. sg. 2nd ps. prn.). And 16c *jyótir vaiśvānarām ...* matched by 18c *jyótir víśvam ...*

IX.61.16: The question in this vs. is how to interpr. the simile in *pāda* b, *divás citrām ná tanyatúm*. It has been variously rendered. Note first that in none of the available interpr. (that I know of) is the simile particle *ná* positioned in the expected 2nd position, so that conforming to the usual structure of the simile cannot be used as a criterion to decide which interpr. is correct. We have had occasion to note this issue before in Maṇḍala IX; see disc. ad IX.57.3. Re takes the whole of b as a simile, with the “thunder” matching “light” (c) in the frame; in addition he supplies a different subject for the simile: “Pavamāna a engendré la haute lumière propre à (Agni) Vaiśvānara, / comme (les dieux ont engendré) le tonnerre éclatante du ciel.” This is not impossible, of course, but introducing the gods seems unnecessary, and are they the usual creators of thunder anyway? Lü’s (266) interpr. is similar, though he allows Pavamāna as subj. of both the simile and the frame. I find Ge’s interpr. more appealing: he considers *tanyatúm* part of the frame, with the simile restricted to *divás citrām*. “Sich läuternd hat er den Donner, grell wie den des Himmels, hervorgebracht.” The c *pāda* provides a parallel object, rather than constituting the frame as in the Re/Lü interpr. My tr. essentially follows Ge. The “thunder” that Soma engendered is the noise produced by the pressing, esp. by the pressing stones, which is constantly remarked on. It is comparable to the thunder of heaven. All interpr. must silently reckon with the synaesthesia introduced by the point of the comparison in the simile, *citrā-* ‘bright, brilliant, glittering, dazzling’, an adj. that ordinarily characterizes visual phenomena not auditory ones (though it’s a not uncommon transfer; cf. Engl. “brilliant tone,” etc., used of voices and musical instruments). For a similar ex. cf. VI.6.2 *śvitānas tanyatūḥ* “brightening thunder.” This synaesthetic comparison provides a lead-in to the second object, the “light belonging to all men.”

Both Ge and Re take *jyótir vaiśvānarām* as referring to Agni Vaiśvānara specifically. This is certainly possible, though it is not the soma pressing that ordinarily kindles the ritual fire. I prefer to take it more generally as shared light, perhaps localized as the sun, which would continue the heavenly theme of *pāda* b. Alternatively, this *pāda*, which is entirely in the neuter, may be nominative not accusative and refer to Soma himself. This interpr. may be favored by the matching *pāda* at the end of the *ṛca*, 18c *jyótir víśvam svàr dṛśé* “(as) light for everyone to see the sun,” where the soma sap—that is, soma itself—is identified as this light. I would therefore suggest an alternative tr. of *pāda* c here: “(he) the lofty light belonging to all men.”

IX.61.18: I am, reluctantly, taking *dākṣa-* as an adj. here (as in IX.62.4), with Ge and Re, though it is generally a masc. noun. Alternatively a noun interpr. is possible (cf. Ober I.457 “dein Saft ist Fähigkeit”): “your sap shines forth brilliant as skill” or “... shines as brilliant skill,” though I still prefer the adjectival interpr. See Re’s disc.

Scar (237) takes *vī rājati* as ‘rules’ (“dein Saft herrscht weithin als König ...”) A pun is certainly possible here, but the insistent light imagery (*dyumān* in b and the whole c *pāda*) suggests that the ‘shine’ sense is the dominant one.

In c Ge takes *víśvam* as the modifier of *jyótiḥ* (“... ist alles licht”); so also Scar (237). This is certainly possible, and *jyótir vaiśvānarām* in 16c might support it. But “for everyone / all

to see the sun” is a locution encountered elsewhere (I.15.1, 5, VIII.49.8, X.136.1), incl. nearby IX.48.4. My interpr. is shared with Re and Ober (I.457).

IX.61.19–21: Little evidence of unity, though 19 and 20 share ‘smashing’ and 20 and 21 cows.

IX.61.21: As in 16b, the simile in b seems to consist only of what precedes the *ná*, namely *sūpasthābhiḥ*, while *dhenúbhiḥ* constitutes the frame. So also Ge, Re.

IX.61.22–24: The *ṛca* has something of an emphasis on combat and winning, and the Vṛtra topic introduced in 22 is reprised via phonological deformation by *vratéṣu* in 24c.

IX.61.22: A nice example where surface grammar clashes with mythological content and the latter wins. Pāda b, the complex object of *āvitha* ‘you helped’ in a, consists of an infinitival phrase with the obj. of the inf. “attracted” into the dative, while its subject remains acc.: *īndram vṛtrāya hāntave* “you helped Indra to smite Vṛtra.” But c, a further specification of this obj., contains an acc. sg. masc. participial phrase *vavrivāṃsam mahīr apāḥ* “obstructing the great waters.” On the surface, the only noun this can modify is *īndram* because this is the only available acc. sg. masc., but of course it is Vṛtra who obstructed the waters. Though *vṛtrāya* appears in the dative, it must be the referent of the acc. participle – thus suggesting that “attraction” in infinitival phrases is a very late and superficial phenomenon. Unless with Re we want simply to denominate it a “formule morphologiquement non adaptée au contexte.” I prefer to think that the poet enjoyed producing the syntactic misdirection.

IX.61.23: Pāda c ... *vardha no gírah* “strengthen our hymns” is the reciprocal to vs. 14a *tán id vardhantu no gírah* “let our hymns strengthen just him.”

IX.61.24: Pāda a consists of the etymologically identical phrases *tvótāsaḥ* ‘aided by you’ and *távāvasā* ‘with your help’, both containing forms of the 2nd sg. prn. and nominal forms of *√av* ‘help, aid’.

Pāda b contains a curious verbal periphrasis, *syāma vanvāntaḥ* “may we be combatting,” with opt. to *√as* as aux. plus the pres. act, part. to *vanóti*. This expression does not seem to be conveying anything different from the opt. to the same pres. stem, *vanuyāma* (5x), e.g., X.38.3 *tváyā vayāṃ tāt [śátrūn] vanuyāma* “With you might we combat those (rivals).”

As noted above, *vratā-* in this pāda may have been chosen to recall *vṛtrá*-phonologically, forming a faint ring with the *√vṛ* forms in 22 *vṛtrāya ... vavrivāṃsam*. It may even be that *jāgrhi* ‘be watchful’ evokes a form of *√han*, as in 20a *jāghnir vṛtrám*; see also *jahí* in 26b.

IX.61.25–27: This *ṛca* focuses even more strongly on combat, with forms of *√han* in 25 and 26 and ‘do battle’ (*makhasyá-*) in 27. Generosity is also a topic.

IX.61.27: This vs. is rather cleverer than the two that precede it. In pāda a the nom. pl. root noun *hrútaḥ* is, in my opinion, a pun. It belongs to the root *√hvṛ* ‘go crookedly, curve’, and its sense was disc., e.g., by KH (Fs. Thieme [1980] = Aufs. III.753–54). He suggests that here it refers to unevennesses (Unebenheiten) in the fleece sieve (i.e., as I see it, the curvy tufts of wool), just as, in the other occurrence of this root noun (VI.4.5), it refers to the curves of a race course (see comm. ad loc.). The literal sense here then is that though the soma must navigate around the tufts

on the sieve, they will not keep it from completing the course. The second sense is one referring to unscrupulous enemies—Engl. ‘crook’ is an exact semantic match—and the point is that when Soma wishes to dispense goods to us, our crooked enemies can’t divert him.

The word family that includes *makhá-* and the denom. *makhasyá-* found here displays both ‘combat’ and ‘generosity’ senses; see comm. ad I.18.9 and, for the verb, III.31.7. Here I think both are at play, and this double sense is encouraged by the context: as noted, this ṛca focuses on combatting enemies, and the first hemistich of this vs. states that these enemies cannot stop Soma. But the ṛca also concerns Soma’s giving, esp. in the last two vss.: 26a “bring wealth ... 26c “give” ... 27b “eager to give largesse.”

IX.61.28–30: The last ṛca continues the concentration on combat and victory.

IX.61.29: The first two pādas open with somewhat emphatic 2nd sg. genitives, the first with a fronted initially accented demonstr. + enclitic (*ásya te*), the second with a more conventional full form of the prn. (*táva*). See disc. ad IX.66.14.

IX.61.30: The nominal rel. cl. in ab has no resumptive prn. in the main cl. of c, though “with these/them” is clearly the intent.

On the construction of *dhūrvane* here, see Keydana, Infin. 247, though the arbitrary line he tends to draw between “true” infinitives and datival purpose nouns seems over-strict here.

As is shown by IX.29.5 *rákṣa ... svanāt samasya kásya cit* (cited by Ge), *nidāḥ* must be an abl. (as we would expect in any case with a form of *√raks*) with a dependent gen., the indefinite *samasya*.

IX.62

IX.62.1–3: No particular sign of unity in this ṛca, though all three vss. concern the journey of the soma drops across the filter and towards the milk mixture and the rest of the ritual (as do vast numbers of other vss. in IX, of course). Vss. 2 and 3 also both contain the pres. part. *kṛṇvántaḥ* and datives of benefit.

IX.62.2: This vs. has no finite verb, just two nom. pl. participles. With its nom. pl. subj. it can be dependent on vs. 1 or vs. 3 (or both); I prefer anticipatory dependence on vs. 3 because of the repetition of *kṛṇvántaḥ* and the parallel datives.

Note the juxtaposition of the opposites *duritā* lit. ‘ill-goings’ (pāda a) and *sugā* lit. ‘good-goings’ (pāda b), formed with two different verbs of motion (*√i*, *√gā*). It is difficult to capture this relationship in Engl. without awkwardness, as the literal tr. just given demonstrate.

My tr. follows Ge in taking *árvate* parallel to *tokāya* “for our offspring and for our steed”; I am somewhat tempted to take *árvate* as an anticipatory parallel to *gáve* in 3a, with which it forms a more natural class (“making wide space for our steed and for our cow”), but I can’t see how to do that without brutally splitting up 2c, since *kṛṇvántaḥ* is required to govern *sugā* in 2b.

IX.62.4–6: Again no obvious signs of unity, beyond the progress through the preparation of soma. Note, however, that 4b and 5b both begin *apsú* and the opening of 6b, *ásū(subhan)* echoes that opening phonologically.

IX.62.4: As in IX.61.18 I take *dákṣa-* adjectivally (so also Ge, Re); even more than in that passage, a noun interpr. is difficult: “... the skill, abiding on a mountain”?

The loc. *apsú* and the locatively used stem *giri-* implicitly contrast.

IX.62.5: The fluent Engl. of the tr. conceals a syntactic problem: soma should be the obj. of the verb *svádanti* in c, and the first pāda, which is entirely in the neuter, with the NP led by *ándhas-*, allows such an acc. interpr. However, the intermediate pāda (b) is stubbornly in the masc. nominative (*dhūtáḥ ... sutáḥ*). We must either take b as a parenthetical nominal clause, as Ge and I do, or take ab as entirely in the nominative (as Re may do – his structure is not entirely clear) as a separate nominal clause, and supply a resumptive pronominal acc. for c.

IX.62.7–9: The ṛca shows no strong signs of internal unity, save for the “sitting” found in both 7 and 8, but it does echo some of the material earlier in the hymn: *ásṛgram* in 7b matches the same verb in 1a; *āsadaḥ* in 7c recalls *āsadat* in 4c, while *sīdan yónā* (8c) is a different echo of 4c *yónim āsadat*; *arṣa* (8a) picks up *arṣanti* (3b); *svādiṣṭhaḥ* in 9b expresses the result of *svádanti* in 5c; and *varivo-víd* in 9c is a paraphrase of *kṛṇvānto várivaḥ* in 2c. It may also be worth noting that this is the first place in the hymn that the divine recipients of soma are mentioned: *indrāya* 8a, *āngirobhyaḥ* 9b.

IX.62.9: The metaphorical universe of the soma hymns makes it difficult to interpr. the phrase *ghṛtām páyah*, lit. “ghee (and) milk.” In the publ. tr. I take the phrase as the ultimate goal of *pári srava*, referring to the milk with which the soma will be mixed after its trip across the filter. See the esp. explicit IX.31.5 *túbhyaṃ gāvo ghṛtām páyah ... dudhré* “For you the cows have milked out ghee and milk,” which identifies the phrase as referring to substance(s) that the cows produce for soma, real dairy products. But soma is also sometimes *compared* to milk and to ghee (e.g., IX.74.4), and so the phrase can also be an appositive metaphorically characterizing the subject soma, accounting for Ge’s “Laufe du ... als Schmalz und Milch.” However, our 5c *svádanti gāvo páyobhiḥ* “the cows sweeten (soma) with their milk” suggests that the milk and ghee in this vs. are likewise firmly bovine – though see 20b below.

IX.62.10–12: In this ṛca all three vss. have a form of med. *páva-*: *pávamānaḥ* 10b, 11b, (*ā*) *pavasva* 12a. This is scarcely surprising in the Soma Pavamāna maṇḍala, but in fact this stem has not yet appeared in the hymn.

IX.62.10: Several items in this vs. present choices of interpr., none of which are strongly either favored or disfavored.

The first issue is *hitáḥ*: as often in this maṇḍala (cf. comm. ad IX.1.2, 44.2, etc.), it could belong either to $\sqrt{dhā}$ or to \sqrt{hi} . The presence of a verb form belonging undeniably to the latter, *hinvānāḥ* in c, cuts both ways, as the poet could either be reinforcing the sense by duplicate forms of the same root or making a pun utilizing two different roots. In a similar situation in IX.44.2, with *hitáḥ ... hinve*, I opted to take both to \sqrt{hi} (though not with any emphatic feeling about it), while here I take *hitá-* to $\sqrt{dhā}$, as a pun (again, not emphatically). The deciding factor here for me is the deictic demon. *ayám* ‘right here’, which may point to the current location of the soma, expressed by ‘established, placed’. Re also takes it to $\sqrt{dhā}$, but Ge to \sqrt{hi} .

The other uncertainty in the vs. is how to construe *āpyam brhāt* “lofty friendship”: is it the complement of *cetati* or of *hinvānāḥ* -- which brings up the further question of the function of

the latter participle. Med. *hinváte*, etc., can either take an obj. or be passive; in particular the part. *hinvāná-* is about evenly split. For a nearby pass. form, see, e.g., IX.64.9; for a nearby transitive form, see IX.63.7 *hinvānó mānuṣīr apāḥ*. Both Ge and Re take it as tr. here (e.g., “die hohe Freundschaft zur eile treibend”), while I have chosen to take it as passive and to construe the acc. with *cetati*, on the grounds that I don’t know what it would mean to “impel friendship” (though such an image is well within the potential range of a RVic poet). Gotō (1st class, 139) takes it as I do.

IX.62.11: The nom. *pávamānaḥ* in b is helpful in identifying the referent as Soma, in that both *vṛṣā* ‘bull’ (and related *vṛṣa-vrataḥ*) and *aśastihā* could be (and are) just as well used of Indra.

IX.62.13–15: The first two vss. contain forms of *kaví-*. The epithet “wide-going” (*urugāyá-* 13c) may be further specified in the phrase *vimāno rájasah* “measurer of the airy realm” (14b) -- in both cases probably a way of giving a cosmic dimension to the journey across the filter. The third vs. (15) does not participate in these commonalities.

IX.62.15: *girā jātāḥ* “born on a mountain” is in the first instance a phrasal variant of *giri-ṣṭhāḥ* ‘mountain-abiding’ in 4b, with *girā* showing the *i*-stem loc. in *-ā* regular before consonants (see, e.g., Lanman, Noun Inflect, 385). This interpr. is followed by Ge and Re in their tr. (see also Ober II.13). However, *girā* can also be, as Old and Ge (n. 15a) point out, the instr. sg. of *gír-* ‘hymn’; in fact Gr puts it there. The alt. given in the publ. tr. “[/begotten by a hymn]” reflects this other possible analysis; that soma is produced to the accompaniment of hymns would make this statement true in ritual logic. It is also possible that *girā* ‘by a hymn’ could be construed with *stutāḥ* ‘praised’ later in the pāda. And to make things even more complex, *stutāḥ* might also evoke *sutāḥ* ‘pressed’.

The pass. *dhīyate* in b might weakly support taking *hitāḥ* in 10a to $\sqrt{dhā}$ as well.

Pāda c is the third instantiation (always in the c pāda) of the image comparing soma installed in the wooden cups to a bird on a *yóni-*: 4c *śyenó ná yónim āsadat*, 8c *sīdan yonā vāneṣv ā*, our 15c *vír yonā vasatāv iva* – and cf. in the preceding hymn IX.61.21c *sīdañ chyenó ná yónim ā*. Judging from the position of *ivān* our vs., both the bird and the *yóni-* have become so much part of the identity of soma that only the ‘nest’ (*vasatí-*) is considered part of the simile proper – though we must keep in mind the multiple disturbances in the position of simile particles in Maṇḍala IX as disc. passim above.

IX.62.16–18: Several elements link at least two of the vss. in the *ṛca*: the presence of *vāja-* in 16 and 18 (*vājam* 16b, *vājāya* 18b, *vājīnam* 18c) and the dat. inf. *yātave* in 17b and 18b.

IX.62.17: See publ. intro. for the ritual specificity of the images in this vs.

The participle “yoking” in the publ. tr. of c should properly be in parens., since it’s simply generated from the finite *yuñjanti* in b.

The uninflected numeral ‘seven’ (*saptā*) is stationed between two pl. nouns, gen. *īśīṇām* ‘of the seers’ and instr. *dhītībhiḥ* ‘with visionary thoughts’. Of course seven is the canonical number of seers throughout Indian religious history, starting with the RV, but ‘seven’ is also used of *dhītí-* in IX.9.4 *sá saptá dhītībhir hitāḥ* and passages cited there. Most tr. choose to construe it with one or the other (Ge, Ober [II.72] *īśi-*; Re, Lü [710], Ober [II.222] *dhītí-*), with,

surprisingly (to me), more going for *dhītī-* than *īṣi-*. But surely its position helps signal that it should be construed with both (as Re in his n. and Ober in his 2nd tr. indicate).

IX.62.18: This vs. is notable for its 2nd ps. address to the priests (*sotāraḥ ... hinota* “o pressers, impel ...”), also found in vss. 21, 29. Ordinarily 2nd ps. in soma hymns is reserved for Soma (sg.) and his drops (etc.) (pl.).

IX.62.19–21: There is some chaining between vss. (cows/milk in 19, 20; *mádhu* in 20, 21 and two mentions of gods in pāda c in 20, 21, incl. dat. pl. *devébhyaḥ* in each). In addition, all three vss. begin with the preverb *ā* (univerbated and therefore accentless in 19a).

IX.62.20: With Ge and Re, the publ. tr. interpr. *páyo duhanti* as “they milk *your* milk” (or more emphatically, Re “traient *de toi* le lait” [my ital.]); that is, they assume that milk (*páyaḥ*) here refers to the soma juice. See above, comm. ad vs. 9, on the ambiguous ref. of this word in the soma maṇḍala. It is also possible here that *páyaḥ* refers to cows’ milk (see the cows in 19c), and the passage should be interpr. “they milk milk *for you* for exhilaration.”

IX.62.22–24: *grṇānā-* is found in the first and last vs. (22b, 24c); vss. 23 and 24 contain forms of *árṣa-*, *pári-*, and cows. In addition vs. 22 seems to chain with the final vs. of the previous *ṛca*, 21: 22a *asṛkṣata* picks up 21b *sṛjātā*, and 22b *śrávase* echoes (*deva*)*śrút(tamam)* in 21c, while *madántama-* (22b) contains the same splv. suffix as *mádhumattama* (21b), (*deva*)*śrúttama-* (21c).

IX.62.24: For some disc. of this passage see Scar 641 with n. 906. He gives *pariṣṭúbh-* an active value (“ringsum jubelnd, rauschend”) in this passage: “... zu allen, die ringsum Töne von sich geben,” in contrast to my passive “encircled with rhythm,” which follows Re’s “environnées de rythmes.” Since the cmpd modifies *īṣaḥ* ‘refreshments’, it is hard to see how they could actively produce noise, though Scar (n. 906) suggests it might refer to the cows likewise characterizing the refreshments (*gómatīr īṣaḥ*), in the form of bellowing milk streams. This seems a bit farfetched, though it does allow the form to be semantically united with its other occurrence, in I.166.11, where it modifies the Maruts, who are actively making noise. For the idiom see I.80.9 *pári ṣṭobhata* “encircle (him) with rhythm!” where it is parallel to *arcata* “chant!” See also nearby IX.64.28 *pariṣṭóbhant-*. Ge takes *pariṣṭubhaḥ* as a noun ‘lauter Loblieder’, also with active sense.

IX.62.25–27: This *ṛca* shows more signs of unity than others in this hymn, esp. in the 1st two vss. Both 25 and 26 contain pāda-initial *pávasva* (25a, 26c) and the variant phrases *vācō agriyāḥ* (25a) / *agriyó vācaḥ* (26b), as well as forms of *visva-* (25c *visvāni*, 26c *visvam(ejaya)*). In 27a Soma is addressed by the voc. *kave*, while 25c contains the phrase *visvāni kāvya*.

IX.62.25: Both Ge and Re supply an intermediate infinitive to govern *visvāni kāvya*: “um alle Sehergabe zu gewinnen” and “en vue de (nous procurer) tous pouvoirs-poétiques” respectively – on what basis is completely unclear to me. I see no reason why it can’t simply be a goal, as I’ve taken it. See also comm. ad IX.75.1.

IX.62.26: Because of the accentual difference between *vācāḥ* in 25a and *vācaḥ* in 26b, we must construe the two superficially near-identical phrases *vācō agriyāḥ* and *agriyó vācaḥ* quite differently. The first is a single constituent with dependent gen. *vācāḥ*, but in the 2nd *agriyāḥ* and

acc pl. *vācaḥ* belong to different constituents, despite their adjacency: *vācaḥ* is the (or rather, an) obj. of *īráyan*.

IX.62.28–30: No overt signs of unity.

IX.62.28: The first two pādas are simply a word-order variant of IX.57.1ab *prá te dhārā asaścáto, divó ná yanti vṛṣṭáyah*.

IX.62.29: Although it may not be clear from the Engl. tr., the phrase beginning “the strong one ... the lord” refer to Soma (in the acc.), not Indra (in the dat.).

IX.62.30: On the masc. *ṛtáh* and the phrase *ṛtáh kavíḥ* see comm. ad VIII.60.5, which contains the same phrase, save for sandhi variation.

IX.63

IX.63.1–3: No particular signs of unity, though the dat. *índrāya* in 2b anticipates the three datives *índrāya víṣṇave ... vāyáve* in vs. 3.

IX.63.4–6: Thematically somewhat unified by the journey theme.

IX.63.4: Its opening *eté asṛgram āśávaḥ* is reminiscent of the beginning of the previous hymn IX.62.1ab *eté asṛgram ... āśávaḥ*.

On *hvāras*- see comm. ad IX.3.2.

IX.63.5: The phrase *kṛṇvānto víśvam āryam* “making it all Ārya,” esp. in conjunction with *aptúraḥ* “crossing the waters,” most likely alludes to the Ārya expansion in their migration into the northern part of the subcontinent, specifically to crossing frontier rivers and laying claim to the land on the other side. This territorial expansion is implicitly compared here to Soma’s ritual journey. Since, as Ge notes (n. 5b), the Soma cult is specifically Ārya, importing this practice into new lands would be a key part of the process of Arya-ization.

IX.63.7–9: On this ṛca see publ. intro. In these vss. Soma is compared to the sun, and his ritual journey compared to the Sun’s daily journey across the sky. At the same time the purification of the soma is linked with Manu, the first sacrificer (vss. 7–8), and so the cosmic and the ritual are connected.

IX.63.7: It is specifically stated here that the stream of soma “made the sun shine” (*sūryam árocayah*), in other words that the ritual activity produced cosmic effects.

IX.63.8: Soma goes from affecting the sun in vs. 7 to identity with the sun in this vs, since he yokes Etaśa, the sun’s horse, and travels through the midspace as if on the sun’s daily journey – at least in my interpr. and that of Ge. But the vs. can be interpr. in a number of diff. ways, in part because the *sūra* of the Saṃhitā text is multiply ambiguous. If its underlying form is *sūrah*, per the Pp., it can be either gen./abl. to *svār*- (so Sāy., as well as Ge and the publ. tr.) or nom. sg. to *sūra*-; however, it could also be underlying *sūre* and a loc. to *sūra*-. (Re also allows the dat.,

presumably to *svâr-*, but the only clear dat. to this stem is accented *sūré* [IV.3.8]; *sūre duhitā* [I.34.5] is actually an old gen. with close sandhi effect before dental, likewise in IX.97.38; see my Fs. Melchert article, “Sūre Duhitār’s Brother, the ‘Placer of the Sun’: Another Example of -e <*-as in Rigvedic Phrasal Sandhi,” 2010.). In any case, an underlying *sūrah* is more likely than *sūre* because of the *sūro* in the next vs. (9b), which repeats much of the verbal material in this one.

Lü (215–16) objects to Ge’s interpr. of the vs., on the basis that the sun always travels through heaven, and here the travel is through the midspace (*antārikṣena*). So in his view this cannot refer to heavenly Soma identified with the sun, but must refer to the earthly Soma, who takes the name Sūra (hence *sūrah* is a nominative for him) and yokes a horse named Etaśa after the Sun’s horse, and journeys towards heaven through the midspace. In other words, his Soma seems as if he’s trying to steal the sun’s identity by stealing his names. I confess that the subtleties of Lü’s distinctions escape me, depending as they do on his strict separation of earthly and heavenly elements throughout his *Varuṇa* vols. Re seems to adopt some version of the Lü interpr., judging from his tr. of bc “... pour qu’il aille du (domaine de) Manu (au ciel) à travers l’espace-médian,” interpr. *manāv ādhi* as if it contained an abl. *manór* before *ādhi*. (He interpr. the same two pādas two hymns later [IX.65.16bc] quite differently.) I do see the point about the midspace, however, and am willing to concede that Soma-as-Sun is not quite as high a flyer as the Sun himself. Bl (RReps ad loc.) also considers *sūrah* a nom., but in his view this expresses “the complete assimilation of Soma Pavamāna to the sun,” which is a different conclusion from Lü’s. The point is surely not whether Soma is literally in heaven, but that he has acquired and displays the salient characteristics of the Sun and is therefore identified with the Sun despite remaining in the ritual arena.

IX.63.9: Pāda b of this vs., *sūro ayukta yāṭave*, consists entirely of words repeated from the previous vs.; in addition, substituting for *étaśam* in 8a, we find an expanded horse term, *tyā harīto dāśa* “these ten tawny mares” as obj. of *ayukta*. Again Soma is being identified with the sun and his ritual journey identified with the sun’s transit; again the cosmic and the ritual are intertwined, for the ten mares are probably both the Sun’s horses (as Lü points out, p. 216 n. 4, the Sun is credited with ten yoked horses in I.164.14; cf. also *sūryasya harītaḥ* in V.29.5) and the ten fingers of the priests that press the soma, exactly so called (*harīto dāśa*) in IX.38.3.

The third pāda (*īndur īndra īti bruvān*) presents another set of problems: how much of what precedes *īti* is part of the direct speech and what is the content of the speech? See Old’s clear formulation of these questions. The standard solution is to take the speech as including both words preceding *īti* and to take it as a statement of identity; e.g., Ge’s “Der Saft ist Indra” (sim. Old, Lü 216 n. 4, Klein DGRV I.407), in part on the basis of a similar TB statement (see Ge n. 9c), though I don’t think this late parallel should be given much weight. Moreover, IX.6.2 *īndav īndra īti ...*, with voc. *īndo* outside of the quotation, shows that the ‘drop’ word does not have to be included in the quotation here. In addition, the sandhi of *īndra īti* is ambig.: it can represent nom. *īndrah* with the Pp (and the standard interpr.), but it could also be loc. *īndre*, the choice made by Re (“... en disant « c’est bien (pour aller) à Indra »”). In conjunction with the journey theme of this ṛca, I find this interpr. quite appealing and have adopted it.

IX.63.10–12: No particular unity, though vss. 11–12 are concerned with wealth.

IX.63.10: The datives *vāyāve ... indrāya* of course identify this as a ref. to the morning soma pressing, where both those gods receive the soma, and also echo the same datives (in diff. order) in vs. 3.

If *gīraḥ* opening pāda b is an acc. pl. (as seems likely), it is somewhat awkwardly placed between two reff. to soma, *sutām* and *matsarām*, ending their respective pādas (a and b). All the acc.s should be objects of *pāri ... siñcata* ‘pour in circles’, which obviously fits the soma liquid better than the songs. Probably for this reason Gr identifies the form as a voc., the only voc. to the stem, but this certainly does not improve the sense: commanding the songs to pour the soma is appreciably worse than ordering unidentified priests to pour songs as well as soma.

Elizarenkova’s tr. (*Language and Style of the Vedic Ṛsis*, p. 85) exemplifies this awkwardness however unintentionally: “From here make libation rounds for Vāyu, for Indra, of the pressed intoxication, *O eulogies* (or: *O eulogizers*), onto the sheep strainer!” She claims that the root noun *gír-* can be used as an agent (hence her “O eulogizers”; Sāy. and Ludwig also take it as agentive: see Ge n. 10b), but I know of no such usage of this extremely common noun. On the other hand, the trope of “pouring prayers” is not rare in the RV, though pouring them onto the fleece strainer is a bit extreme. Re solves the problem by supplying a separate verb to govern *gīraḥ* (“émettez”), but this seems a typical cop-out on his part.

As in the previous hymn (see comm. ad IX.62.18), the priests are addressed in the 2nd pl. here (*pāri ... siñcata*). See also vs. 19, with the same verb.

IX.63.11: On *vidā* as lengthened impv. rather than subjunctive *vidā(h)*, see comm. ad IX.19.6. It is accented because it is preceded by a voc. in zero-position.

IX.63.13–15: Again no particular signs of unity. The unmixed (“clear” *śukrá-*) soma in 14 is contrasted with the soma mixed with curds (*dādhyāśír-*) in 15.

IX.63.13: As in the *ṛca* vss. 7–9, Soma is again compared to the Sun – but curiously no clear point of comparison between them appears in the vs. The actions attributed to Soma here – purifying himself, being pressed by stones, putting his sap in the tub – are exclusive to him and certainly not characteristic of the Sun.

IX.63.14: In vs. 5 during his journey Soma “made it all Ārya”; here he crosses these Ārya domains (*dhāmāny āryā*) on his journey to the cows’ milk. My interpr. takes this first acc. phrase as an acc. of extent, of space traversed, while the acc. in pāda c, *vājaṃ gómantam* I take as the goal of *akṣaran*. In the next vs., 15c, *pavītram āti* “across the filter” has the same function I see for *dhāmāny āryā* here, and in fact the filter may be identified as the Ārya domains. By contrast Ge takes *dhāmāny āryā* as parallel goal to *vājaṃ gómantam*, while Re characteristically supplies a separate participle (*āviśántaḥ* “ont occupé”) to govern *dhāmāny āryā*. The parallels he cites in the n. do not seem sufficient to me.

IX.63.16–18: No evidence of unity, beyond *vājīnam* (17b), *vājaṃ* (18c), and the vss. are quite hackneyed, even for Soma Gāyatrī hymns.

IX.63.19–21: This *ṛca* has more internal unity, as well as connection to the preceding *ṛca*, than usual. For its external connections, see 19a *vāje ná vājayúm* picking up the *vāj-* forms just noted, *mádhumattamam* in 19c matching the same word (in the nom.) in 16a, and 20a *kavīm mṛjanti*

echoing 17a *tām ī mṛjanti* (note the identical vowel pattern in *kavīm / tām ī*). As for internal connections, see *dhībhīḥ* (20b, 21a), *vīprāḥ* (20b, 21c), and *vṛṣā* (20c), *vṛṣaṇam* (221a).

IX.63.19: This vs. contains a fairly clever double meaning: the verb *pāri* √ *sic* means ‘sprinkle around / in circles’. When soma is the object, as it generally is, it refers to the sprinkling of the drops of soma; in other words, the acc. expresses the material that is being sprinkled. But here in the simile *vāḥ nā vājayúm*, the acc. *vājayúm* ‘prize-seeking’ refers to a horse in a race or contest, which would be the target or the goal of the sprinkling, with some type of liquid being sprinkled upon it. The word play is cleverer still, in that *vājayúm* should be read twice, both as referring to the horse in the simile and to soma, which is elsewhere modified by this word (e.g., IX.44.4 *sá naḥ pavasva vājayúḥ*), in the frame.

Both Ge and Re construe *vāḥ* in the simile rather loosely; I take it as an unmarked loc. absol. of the *dhāne hité* (“when the prize is set,” e.g., IX.53.2) type, though without overt ppl. It adds to the somewhat slant syntax of the simile versus the frame that both contain a loc. (*ávyo vāreṣu* in the frame), but the locc. have different functions. In fact *ávyo vāreṣu* “onto the sheep’s fleece” expresses the goal of the sprinkling and is functionally parallel to *vājayúm* in the simile.

IX.63.20: Note *kavīm* (of Soma) contrasting with *vīprāḥ*, the human poets who groom him.

IX.63.22–24: A form of *páva-* in each vs.: 22a *pavasva*, 23a *pavamāna*, 24a *pavase*, a pattern that is repeated in the next ṛca.

IX.63.22: As in vs. 10, the joint appearance of Indra and Vāyu signals the morning soma pressing.

On *āyuṣák* (also IX.25.5) see the sensible disc. of Scar (589–90). Note the presence of the *Āyus* grooming the soma in vs. 17.

IX.63.23: On (*nī*) √ *tuś* see comm. ad VIII.38.2.

IX.63.25–27: This ṛca shows clear signs of unity, indeed of a monotonous sort. Like the previous ṛca, each vs. in this one contains a form of *páva-*, but in this ṛca all three are the nom. pl. part. *pavamānā(sā)ḥ*, always opening the vs. Each vs. also contains one finite verb, an augmented form of √ *srj* (*asṛkṣata* 25a, 27b; *asṛgram* 26b). The first two vss. also contain nom. pl. *indavaḥ* in the same metrical position (final in the b pāda). The lexeme *ápa* √ *han* found in the previous ṛca (*apaghnán* 24a) also reappears here (26c *ghnántaḥ ... ápa*) (and in the next ṛca).

IX.63.28–30: The *páva-* sequence found in the last two ṛcas is brought to an end with the alternative pres. part. *punānāḥ* ‘becoming purified’, which opens this last ṛca. The lexeme *ápa* √ *han* also found in once each in the last two ṛcas (24a, 26c) occurs in the first two vss.: *ápa ... jahí* (28b, c), *apaghnán* (29a).

IX.63.30: The first pāda of this, the final vs., echoes the last pāda of the first vs.: 1c *asmé śrávāmsi dhāraya*, 30a *asmé vásūni dhāraya*. It is also worth noting that this 2nd sg. impv. *dhāraya* ‘secure’ is phonologically almost identical to the instr. sg. *dhārayā* ‘with/in a stream’, which ends the first pāda of this ṛca (28a) and which is found four other times in the hymn (4c, 7a, 14b, 21b), always in the same metrical position.

IX.64

IX.64.1–3: As noted in the publ. intro., this opening *tr̥ca* is marked by the identification of Soma and his attributes with a bull (*vṛṣan-*). This theme is especially dominant in vss. 1 and 2: all three *pādas* of vs. 1 open *vṛṣā*, with the *bahuvrīhi* *vṛṣa-vrataḥ* ending the first hemistich; vs. 2 is even more insistent, with two forms of the stem (or deriv. *vṛṣṇya-*) in each of the three *pādas*. By contrast, vs. 3 only nods at the theme: *vṛṣā* appears once in 3a, though the final word of the vs., *vṛdhi*, may be meant to echo the word phonologically.

IX.64.1: Old's interpr. of *vṛṣā* in c as a neut. pl. adj. with *dhārmāṇi* seems both unnecessary and unlikely. I know of no other neut. forms of *vṛṣan-* (the few cited by Old are not convincing), which suggests to me that, despite its widely accepted classification as an adj., the stem is synchronically a masc. noun, which, however, can be used as an adjunct strengthener of another noun, hence "bull X" as the equivalent of "bullish X" – a usage similar to English 'horse' as an augmentative, meaning 'strong, large, coarse' (as in, for ex., horseradish). See <https://www.etymonline.com/word/horseradish> Moreover, since nom. sg. *vṛṣā* opens the two previous *pādas* of this vs., it seems unlikely that a morphologically different, and at the least very rare, phonologically identical form would open the third – esp. since, when a neut. adj. is required in the next vs. (2a), the deriv. *vṛṣṇya-* is employed.

IX.64.3: As noted above, the bull theme gets suddenly muted in this vs.; in compensation, as it were, other animals are introduced: a horse (a), cows and steeds (b).

Opinions vary on how to render the first two *pādas*, in part because of uncertainty about the verb *cakradaḥ*. Given the immediately preceding simile *ásvo ná*, the verb should be intransitive in the sense 'roar, whinny'; this matches the usage of the simple thematic (aor.?) *krada-* in passages like IX.97.28 *ásvo ná krado vṛṣabhir yujānāḥ* "Like a horse you whinny on being yoked by the bulls." However, the b *pāda*, *sám gāḥ ... sám árvataḥ*, with two acc. pl.s makes problems. Ge jury-rigs what we might call a semi-transitive usage of the verb with *sám*, "zusammenbrüllen" ('roar [smtg] together') (see also Ober I.518), while registering the intransitive usage in the simile parenthetically: "Wie ein Ross (wiehernd) sollst du, der Bulle, uns Rinder und Rennpferde zusammen brüllen (brausen)." Despite the precarious nature of this solution, it may be the best one available, and I would entertain an alternative tr. "You the bull roar like a horse, (roaring) together cows and steeds." I adopt a similar one in the publ. tr. for the very similar passage IX.90.4 *sám cikrado mahó asmábhyaṃ vājān*, with the variant stem *cikrada-*, also cited by Ge and Re, though I am not certain I subscribe to that now (see comm. ad loc.). By contrast, Re clearly takes *cakradaḥ* as a trans./caus. redupl. aor.: "Tel un cheval, fais mugir ensemble ... les vaches ... ensemble (fais hennir) les coursiers." However, the clear intrans. sense of *krada-* with the simile in the parallel passage cited above speaks against the caus. usage; moreover, as disc. at length in my *-áya*-book (110–11), neither *cakrada-* nor the redupl. aor. *cikrada-* with apparent "caus." redupl. shows true transitive usage until the late RV; they also seem to be essentially interchangeable.

I have a different solution for this passage (though it won't work for IX.90.4): it is of course a commonplace that the preverbs *sám* and *ví* form a complementary pair. Here I suggest that the standard lexeme *ví√vr̥* 'uncover, open up' found in c has given rise situationally to an opposing expression *sám√vr̥* 'cover, surround' in b, with the verb gapped (or rather anticipated:

vr̥dhi at the end of c). The bull is urged to deliver cows and horses to us by confining them. The proposed lexeme *sám* √ *vr̥* does marginally exist; see I.121.15, with *sám ... varanta* in intrans. value, as well as ppl. *sámvr̥ta-* (VIII.17.7). I thus read the verb *cakradaḥ* only with pāda a.

IX.64.4–6: No strong signs of unity. Vs. 4 does link to vs. 3 in the preceding *ṛca* through the mention of cows and horses. The c pādas of 5 and 6 both begin with a finite form of *páva-*.

IX.64.4: In addition to the link to vs. 3 just mentioned, pāda c contains a clever echo of 2a. That earlier pāda ends with the neut. *s*-stem *śávaḥ* ‘strength’; 4c ends *vīrayāśśávaḥ*, to be analyzed as two words *vīrayā āśśávaḥ* “with a yen for heroes the swift ones,” the latter being the nom. pl. m. of the adj. *āśśú-*. But the final + initial vowels have entirely coalesced, and given the accentuation of both words and the underlying long final vowel of the first word, they could have been split *vīrayā *śávaḥ* with the latter entirely matching the independent *s*-stem form in 2a.

IX.64.6: The preverb *ā* that turns *páva-* into a quasi-transitive “bring by purifying oneself” immediately follows the verb, allowing *pávantām* to take a position matching that of *pávante* in 5c and *pávamānasya* in 7a.

IX.64.7–9: As just noted, *pávamānasya* in 7a chains with forms to the same stem in vss. 5 and 6. 7b *prá ... asṛkṣata* also echoes *ásṛkṣata prá*, which opens the previous *ṛca* (4a). The *ṛca* is unified by the similes comparing Soma to the Sun in vss. 7 and 9, possibly found also in the beacon (*ketú-*) of vs. 8.

IX.64.7: The root noun cmpd *viśva-víd-*, like other *-víd-* cmpds, is completely ambiguous between ‘knowing all’ and ‘finding all’ (for *viśvavíd-* itself see Scar 489 and more generally 480–93). In this context, given Soma’s bestowal of “all goods” (*viśvā ... vāsu*) in the previous vs. (6a), as well as Soma’s journey to all forms in 8b, ‘all-finding’ seems preferable.

The simile in c, *sūryasyeva ná ráśmayah*, is redundantly marked, with adjacent simile particles *iva ná*. There is no structural reason for this; it must result from the attempt to fit the simile *sūryasyeva raśmāyah* found elsewhere in trimeter verse (see nearby IX.69.6, also I.135.9, V.55.3, X.91.4) into a dimeter line. Or, to be more precise, to accommodate the fact that when a form of *sūrya-* opens a vs. line, it does not show distraction to *sūr’ya-*, in order to avoid placing a light syllable in 2nd position. In a dimeter line, in which this simile has to occupy the whole pāda, the failure to distract produces a 7-syllable line, and so *ná* was presumably added to fill the gap in the line. In a trimeter line that has the simile in initial position (with undistracted *sūryasyeva*), further material can be added at the end (so I.135.9, IX.69.6), and in a trimeter line where the simile follows the caesura, *sūryasyeva* can be distracted (so V.55.3, X.91.4) in that position.

IX.64.8: As noted above, it’s quite possible, even likely, that the beacon in pāda a is a reference to the sun and therefore another assimilation of Soma to the Sun, as is more explicit in vss. 7 and 9. For the association between *ketú-* and the sun, cf., e.g., VII.63.2 *ketúḥ ... sūryasya*. Lü (702) suggests rather that the *ketú-* is lightning, without argument.

Ge renders b as “... rinnst du ... alle Farben annehmend”; similar Lü (702) “strömst du vom Himmel her in alle Erscheinungsformen.” But the acc. with *abhí* √ *ṛṣ* is always a goal (to choose just one example, cf. nearby IX.62.3 *abhy āṛṣanti suṣṭutīm* “they rush towards the lovely

praise-hymn”), and I don’t see where (or why) they get their alternative interpr. By my interpr. the “all forms” to which the soma rushes could be the materials the soma will be mixed with (water, milk), or everything found on the ritual ground, or indeed everything on earth and in the midspace, the “all goods” of vs. 6.

IX.64.9: Pāda b, *pāvamāna vídharmaṇi*, is found three times (here, IX.4.9, and IX.100.7) in three different syntactic contexts, so this has to be the constituency: the voc. plus the loc. Re takes the ‘speech’ (*vācam*) from pāda a as the implicit subject of *vídharmaṇi* (“pour qu’elle se répande au loin”), but because speech is lacking in the other occurrences of the pāda, this cannot be correct. Most helpful for the interpr. is the fuller expression in IX.86.30 (also adduced by Ober II.152) *tvám pavítre rájaso vídharmaṇi ... pavamāna pūyase* “You, self-purifying soma, are purified in the filter, in the spreading expanse of space ...,” where the spread of the soma liquid across the fleece filter is compared to the spread (probably of light) in cosmic space (*rájas-*).

The simile in the third pāda, *ákrān devó ná sūryaḥ* “you have roared like the Sun-god,” is abrupt in its imagery, in that roaring is not the first quality we associate with the sun. There are several ways to account for the phraseology. In Old’s view (fld by Lü 258), the shared quality of Soma and Sun is not expressed by the verb, which is independent of the simile. This independence would be comparable to that found in the preceding hymn, IX.63.13, where the same simile (*sómo devó ná sūryaḥ*) is found, with a different but equally incompatible verb phrase *ádribhiḥ ... sutáḥ* “pressed by stones,” which is certainly not true of the Sun. This is the easiest solution. Ge (n. 9c) suggests rather that it’s a condensed comparison to the Sun’s horse (sim. Ober I.224). In my view, Old’s interpr. is strictly correct, but I think the poet, by juxtaposing the simile with an apparently inappropriate verb, is forcing the striking image of a roaring Sun, which both works as a kind of synaesthesia (the intense brightness of the sun is experienced as intense noise) and imposes a third intermediate term, a horse or bull, to which both the Sun and Soma are compared.

IX.64.10–12: There are some unifying features in this tṛca. Although this is hardly striking in the IXth Maṇḍala, all three vs. contain a form of $\sqrt{pū}$, with those in vss. 11, 12 being the identical phrase *pavítre ā* “in the filter. The word *indu-* opens the first and last pādas of the tṛca (10a, 12c). The cmpd *devā-vī-* ‘pursuing the gods’ in 11b is echoed by its splv. *deva-vītama-* in 12b. More subtly, the missing obj. of *sṛjāt* in 10c is most likely ‘wave’, found in the resumptive rel. cl. opening vs. 11, *ūrmír yāḥ* ... For the VP *ūrmím $\sqrt{sṛj}$* see VI.17.12 *asṛja ūrmím apām* adduced by Old.

IX.64.11: This vs. is entirely a rel. cl. and most comfortably adjoins vs. 10 (see comm. immed. above) – *pace* Lü (603–4), who attaches 11 to 12.

IX.64.13–15: Again, each vs. has a form of $\sqrt{pū}$, for what that’s worth (*pavasva* 13a, *punānāḥ* 14a, 15a). In 15a *devā-vītaye* links to the rt. noun cmpd *devā-vī-* (*deva-vītama-* in the previous tṛca, 11b, 12b).

IX.64.16–18: The first two vss. of this tṛca both contain nom. ‘drops’ (*indavaḥ*) and their acc. goal, the sea (*samudrām*); their first pādas also both contain nom. pl. pres. middle athem. participles with the extended ending *-āsaḥ*, *hinvānāsaḥ* and *marmṛjānāsaḥ* respectively. The third vs. stands apart.

IX.64.18: The opening of pāda a #*pāri no yāhi* gets remixed into c #*pāhi nah*.

IX.64.19–21: The undiscerning (*āpracetasah*) in 20c are contrasted with the discerning (*prācetasah* 21b) and the indiscriminating (*āvicetasah* 21c). The first vs. (19) of the ṛca does not participate.

IX.64.19: Etaśa, the Sun’s horse, who figured in the previous hymn (IX.63.8), reappears here. In the previous passage Soma yoked Etaśa; here he is identified as Etaśa and is himself yoked.

The interpr. of this vs. is considerably complicated by the universal (Sāy., Gr, Ge, Re, Lü 216, 269) assignment of the main clause verb *mímāti* to √*mā* ‘bellow’. This leaves *padām* in b with nothing to do. In Lü’s 2nd tr. (269) it is the place towards which Etaśa bellows (“... weihert das Etaśa-Ross dem Orte zu”), a transl. that at least does not violate the syntactic structure of the vs. Otherwise the solutions involve on the one hand plucking *padām* out of the b pāda, which remains part of the main clause, and construing it loosely in the dependent clause of c – an egregious violation of RVic syntax. So Ge: “Es brüllt das Zugross von den Sängern angeschirrt, wenn er in den Ozean gesetzt den Schritt vorwärts (tut).” And even with this trick Ge needs to supply a verb (“tut”) with which to construe *padām*. The other solutions violate RVic syntax less dramatically, but violate it they do – by making the b pāda part of the *yād* clause with c, though this would place the *yād* unacceptably deep into its clause. Lü’s 1st solution (216) is almost identical to Ge’s (including the crucial “den Schritt vorwärts (tut)”) except that he takes b with c, not a. Re deals with *padām* differently, but still takes b with c: “Il hennit ... quand, attelé par les chantres, il a été placé en avant, en (son) séjour, (à savoir) sur l’océan.” In addition to sweeping b into the c clause, his interpr. requires *āhitah* to take an acc. of place, *padām* (“placé ... en (son) séjour”), which is resumed by a loc., *samudré* (“(à savoir) sur l’océan”). This supposed acc. usage with *ā* √*dhā* is unparalleled.

The interpr. of the vs. is almost magically simplified by assigning *mímāti* to a different root, √*mā* ‘measure’, which builds a homonymous redupl. pres. *mímāti*, which is in fact far better attested than the one to √*mā* ‘bellow’. Although many of its forms are medial, there are a considerable number of act. forms, particularly the impv. *mimīhi*. I suggest that we have here an idiom “measure (its) pace (<step),” a reasonable activity for a draught horse. I suggest a similar interpr. of the cmpd *mitā-dru-* (see comm. ad IV.6.5), where I take the 1st member as the ppl. of √*mā* ‘measure’. This interpr. allows *padām* to be the obj. of the verb in the main cl. and keeps the two clauses separate. And it certainly makes as much sense for the Sun’s horse to be moving at measured pace through the sky as for it to be bellowing.

IX.64.21: On *venā-* see comm. ad VIII.100.5.

IX.64.22–24: The mention of the divine recipients of the soma in vss. 22 and 24 marks this ṛca, though the middle vs. lacks this feature. The (human) inspired poets (*vīprāḥ*) in 23 implicitly contrast with the *kavī-* Soma, addressed in the voc. in 24. Note also that this is the third ṛca in a row that refers to sitting on (or coming to) “the womb of truth” (17c, 20ab, 22c), a trope found also in 11c; all four expressions are slightly different, though containing the same basic elements: 11c *sīdann ṛtāsya yónim ā*, 17c *ágmann ṛtāsya yónim ā*, 20ab *ā ... yónim hiranyāyam ... ṛtāsya sīdati*, 22c *ṛtāsya yónim āsādam*. For further on this trope see comm. ad vs. 30 below.

IX.64.23: A minor poetic echo, the rhyming openings of pāda a *tām tvā* and c *sām tvā*.

IX.64.25–27: The unusual acc. expression *vācam ... sahásrabharnasam* is found in both 25 and 26 (in different order). For *sahásra-bharnas-* see comm. ad IX.60.2. All three vss. contain the nom. sg. masc. *punānāḥ*.

IX.64.28–30: The contrast between the two types of soma drinks, pure and mixed with milk, are highlighted in this ṛca, at least in my view: 28c *sómāḥ súkrā gāvāsīrah* describes them straightforwardly, while 30ab *ṛdhák ... samjagmānāḥ* “separately (and) uniting (with milk)” is more cryptic.

IX.64.28: On *pari √ stubh* see nearby IX.62.24. It is not entirely clear to me how the *kṛp-* (form, body) of Soma would ‘encircle with chant/rhythm’, since its physical form should not be producing noise. More common is the association of *kṛp-* with light (esp. the light of Agni), as Re points out (cf. VI.2.6 *kṛpā ... rocase*, VII.3.9 *sváyā kṛpā tanvā rōcamānāḥ*), but in our passage *rucā* and *kṛpā* are parallel and independent. A passive sense ‘encircled with chant/rhythm’ (so Re) would work better in context, but that seems precluded by the use of the act. stem *stóbha-*.

IX.64.29: Pāda a contains what appears to be an etymological figure, but I consider it somewhat trickier than that. The first two words, *hinvānó hetṛbhiḥ*, are transparently related and easy to construe together, and IX.13.6 *hiyānā ná hetṛbhiḥ* “like (horses) being driven by their drivers” displays the same apparent configuration. However, the instr. in our passage is followed by a ppl. *yatāḥ* ‘held, guided’, which is regularly preceded by an instr. agent, often *nṛbhiḥ* (approx. 10x in IX), or in this very hymn, vs. 15 *vājībhīr yatāḥ* “guided by the prize-seekers.” So I suggest that *hetṛbhiḥ* is actually the agent for following *yatāḥ*, though also adjacent to its etymological kin – a fine twist on the RVic poetic trick of positioning a word between two words both of which it could be (or indeed is) connected to. A more literal rendering of the pāda would be “... impelled, by the impellers held.”

The simile in c is problematic for several reasons. To begin with, the subject of ab is singular, but the simile must be couched in the plural, given the pres. part. *śīdantaḥ*. This is less of a problem than it appears: first, this hymn and soma hymns in general regularly switch back and forth between sg. (soma) and pl. (soma drinks / drops, etc.) referring to the same substance, and this could easily be a unmarked case of that. Moreover, if the target of the simile is in the pl., it can have attracted the participle into the pl.

But this raises the question: what *is* soma being compared to? and the related but more technical question: is *vanúṣaḥ* nom. pl. (and therefore the simile target) or some other case (acc. pl., abl./gen. sg.)? Because we need something to license the pl. of *śīdantaḥ* and because we need something to compare the soma to, taking *vanúṣaḥ* as nom. pl. seems the most economical solution – although this requires discounting the attractive parallel adduced by Ge, I.26.3 *śīdantu mānuṣo yathā*. In that passage *mānuṣaḥ*, which rhymes with our *vanúṣaḥ*, is gen. sg. (and the pl. impv. *śīdantu* simply agrees with the pl. subject in ab). That *vanúṣaḥ* is nom. pl. is also the judgment of Ge and Re, though with vastly different semantics. Ge “wie die wetteifernden Reiter(?)” (I have no idea where he gets the “riders,” and his question mark shows his uncertainty about it; nonetheless it was taken up by Ober [II.245] as evidence for horseback riding in the RV!); Re “(s’)asseyant au séjour du Ṛta) comme les dévots qui s’(y) asseoient.” Re seems closer to the mark, though still pretty far from it. Because of the repetition noted above (ad

22–24) of the trope “sit on the womb of truth” (4x in this hymn), it seems likely that *śīdant-* here would evoke this recurrent expression, which is certainly appropriate to the soma (drinks) that are the subject of the simile. It is more difficult to identify who or what *vanúṣaḥ* refers to. This stem, and the associated denom. verb, can have both positive and negative values, expressing various types of eagerness and craving: “striving, eager, zealous, etc.” on the one hand (hence Re’s *dévots*), “over-zealous, covetous, rapacious, etc.” on the other. Before identifying its usage in this particular passage, I’d like to introduce a third term into the simile. In similes involving sitting, the comparandum is often a bird – e.g., *śyenāḥ* in nearby IX.61.21 = IX.65.19 *śīdañ chyenó ná yónim ā*, as well as IX.96.23 *śakunāḥ ná pátvā* and with the pl. VIII.21.5 *śīdantas te váyo yathā* “sitting like birds” very similar to our passage. I suggest that birds are the underlying comparandum here as well, and that this underlying target is qualified by *vanúṣaḥ* ‘rapacious’, or, as I render it “raptor (birds).” This produces a more satisfying, or at least more interesting, simile than Re’s “like devotées,” and it is constructed from readily available elements – though it does require more machinery.

IX.64.30: As indicated above (ad 28–30), I believe that the unmixed and mixed soma drinks are referred to here, though no interpr. I know of shares this opinion. The adv. *īdhak* (so accented) means ‘separately, apart’; the form *īdhák* with final accent is found only here, and it is difficult to assess what the accentual difference means: is it just a mistake or meaningless variant? or is it meant to signal some change in grammatical function or meaning? If we can fancifully imagine an internal derivation of adverbs quasi-parallel to that of *bráhman-* → *brahmán-*, *yásas-* → *yasás-*, perhaps *īdhák* refers to something characterized by separateness. With a further flight of fancy, we can suggest that this would be the unmixed soma, referred to unequivocally two vss. earlier as *śukrá-* (28c), and contrasting with the soma that “unites” (*saṃjagmāná-*) with milk, again straightforwardly referred to in 28c as *gāvāśír-*. Although neither of the terms in vs. 30 is elsewhere used of a type of soma, at least as far as I know, the contrastive pairing was set up at the beginning of the *ṛca* and could, I would assert, have been decoded by a RVic audience and applied to the more opaque expressions here. I will not discuss the alternative interpr. (Ge, Re, Lü 259, Ober I.457, II.143), which differ wildly from mine and from each other and, in the case of Ge and Re, depend on an out-of-date interpr. of *īdhak*.

IX.65

On the qualities of this hymn as a whole, see publ. intro.

IX.65.1–3: No particular signs of unity. Vss. 2 and 3 have forms of the pres. part. *pávamāna-* and 3 also the impv. *ā ... pavasva*, but esp. in this hymn, the appearance of these forms is hardly noteworthy. Vss. 2 and 3 also have *devébhyaḥ* in their b pādas, but in different cases.

IX.65.1: The identification of Soma with the Sun, noted passim above in the last two hymns, here begins the hymn.

The tr. “rosy (fingers)” is of course an unauthorized allusion to Homer’s “rosy-fingered dawn” – though it is more legitimate than it might first appear. The word tr. ‘rosy’, *úsri-*, is ultimately derived from the ‘dawn’ word; cf. the related *usrá-*, *usríya-*, both of which are color terms representing the light of dawn (‘ruddy’) generally applied to bovines. The next pāda, with its fem. subj. *svásāro jāmayāḥ* “kindred sisters” is a standard way of referring to the fingers of the priests that prepare the soma (cf., e.g., IX.89.4). Thus the first two pādas superimpose two

images: the ruddy Dawn(s) impelling the sun, the fingers impelling the soma – allowing each to participate in the imagery of the other. Because of the erotic relationship sometimes depicted between Dawn and the Sun, it would be better to tr. *pátim* in b as “their husband” (with Ge, Re), not ‘lord’ as in the publ. tr. – making one more link between the imagery of pādas a and b.

Note that Ge nodded (slightly) in tr. *mahān indum* as “den grossen Indra,” despite the case difference, enabled by the constant association between those two words in IX.

IX.65.2: The āmreḍita *rucā-rucā* evokes the single instr. *rucā* at the end of the preceding hymn, IX.64.28 (also vs. 13 of the same hymn and vs. 27 of this one).

Pāda c is characterized by alliteration of an unremarkable type: *vísṡā vāsūny ā viśā*.

IX.65.3: Both Ge and Re take *devébhyaḥ* as dat. with *dúvaḥ*: “Eifer für die Götter,” “l’hommage aux dieux,” whereas in the publ. tr. I take it as an abl., “friendship from the gods.” The issue is the multivalence of *dúvas-* and its derivatives; in the meaning ‘friendship’ it generally refers to the mutually agreeable relationship between men and gods. In this context it seemed to me odd to order Soma to “bring [us] through purification” friendship *for* the gods, hence my ablative interpr. However, a more detailed examination of the usage of *dúvas-* and the denom. *duvasyā-* shows that the offering / seeking of *dúvas-* generally goes from men *to* gods (or Agni, as the god closest to men, to gods). E.g., *devéṣu kṛṇuto dúvaḥ* “The two [= married couple] do friendly service to the gods”; III.3.1 *agnír hí devāṃ amṛto duvasyati* “For Agni the immortal does friendly service to / befriends the gods.” I therefore would emend the tr. to dative “bring ... friendship for the gods.” Like the parallel obj. *sustutím* ‘good praise’, *dúvas-* is then something that we mortals offer to the gods, but, though it originates from us, it is Soma who stimulates our production of these offerings, hence *ā ... pavasva* “bring by purifying yourself.”

IX.65.4–6: No obvious signs of unity

IX.65.6: On *druṇā* see comm. ad IX.1.2.

IX.65.7–9: Again no signs of unity.

IX.65.7: The vs. contains an address (in pl.) to priest-singers to sing (*gāyata*), with comparison to a previous singer Vyaśva (*vyaśvavāt* ‘like Vyaśva’) who did the same. Why Vyaśva appears here is something of a mystery. Aside from a bare mention in an Aśvin list hymn (I.112.15), Vyaśva is found only in VIII, where he is identified as a ṛṣi (VIII.9.10, 23.10) and his descendants receive the dakṣiṇā at the end of the sacrifice (VIII.24.28–29). The adv. *vyaśvavāt* ‘like Vyaśva’ is found 3x in that little group of hymns in VIII (23–26), attributed in the Anukramaṇī to one of his descendents, Viśvamanas Vaiyaśva. I don’t know why he should surface once in IX; our hymn is not attributed to him or any of his obvious relatives (rather to Bhṛgu Vāruṇi or Jamadagni Bhārgava), and there is nothing particularly somic about his appearances in VIII – though his descendents may once be called *somín-* ‘having or providing soma’ (VIII.24.29; see comm. ad loc.). He is more closely associated with the Aśvins (I.112.15 just mentioned; VIII.9.10, 26.9 [both Aśvin hymns]).

IX.65.8: The construction of the first hemistich is somewhat tricky. The rel. *yásya* must refer to soma, with the rel. cl. hanging off vs. 7. In pāda a the *yásya* qualifies *vārṇam* ‘color’, which

serves as obj. of *hinvánti* in b. “They impel his color” is a slightly odd locution, and it becomes odder in b, with the acc. *hárīm*. The stem *hári-* is a color term and could qualify *várṇa-* (“tawny color”), but it also is regularly applied directly to soma (e.g., in vss. 12 and 25 of this hymn) and also identifies Indra’s horse(s). Ge (n. 8b) cleverly suggests that *hári-* is to be read twice, with the second reading an unmarked simile referring to a horse of the appropriate color. This provides a more appropriate obj. for *hinvánti* (“they impel (like) a fallow bay (horse)”), while connecting the putative horse with the “tawny color” (*várṇam ... hárīm*) that is the 1st obj. of the verb.

IX.65.10–12: Again, no particular signs of unity.

IX.65.10: The function of the *ca* in b is unclear. Klein (DGRV I.256–57) discusses three possible explanations – Ge’s, Re’s, and one of his own – of which he prefers Re’s: that *marútvate ca* conceals an ellipsis “(for the Maruts) and (for Indra) accompanied by the Maruts,” which seems by far the least likely and the most cumbersome. Among other things, the Maruts barely figure in IX (though cf. vs. 20 below), and I also know of no passages containing *marútvant-* that also contain a free form of *marút-*. My solution is admittedly makeshift but simpler, that *ca* conjoins the disharmonious *dhārayā* “in a stream” and *marútvate ... matsarāḥ* “exhilarating drink for Indra.” This is closest to Ge’s, criticized by Klein as assuming “a harsh conjunction in pādas a and b.”

IX.65.11: With Ge (n. 11a) I tentatively assume that the arms (*onyòḥ*) are Indra’s, since he was mentioned in the preceding vs. But as in IX.16.1 they might belong to the officiant.

IX.65.13–15: Again, no signs of unity.

IX.65.15: A rare sign of hostility (*abhimāti-hán-* ‘smasher of hostility’) in these anodyne Gāyatrī assemblages.

IX.65.16–18: The *ṛca* is thematically unified by the journey of Soma and, in vss. 17–18 his conveying good things to us on that journey. Cf. esp. 17 *ā naḥ ... vāhā* and 18 *ā naḥ ... bhara*. All three vss. end in a purpose dative / dative infinitive: 16 *yāṭave*, 17 *ūtāye*, 18 *devāvītaye*.

IX.65.16: *īyate* is assigned to $\sqrt{yā}/ī$ ‘implore, beseech’ by numerous scholars, incl. Gr, Lub, and Lü (214–15: “Der König wird mit Liedern gebeten”), though Ge, Re and the publ. tr. take it to $\sqrt{yā}/ī$ ‘speed’ (so also Sāy., who glosses *gacchatī*). In favor of the latter, Re declares that *īyate* is always “il s’avance” in IX. I would also point out 1) the king is definitely traveling in pāda c (*yāṭave*, to the same root) and 2) the ‘is sped’ interpr. is supported by a passage like IX.26.3 *tām vedhām medháyāḥyan* “They impelled the ritual adept with their wisdom” also containing an instr. of *medhā-* with a clear indication of movement (*ahyan*). Kulikov (495–96) discusses both root possibilities without seeming to decide, though the fact that he lists it with $^2yā(ī)$ ‘implore, request’ probably indicates his choice.

śatagvīnam gāvām pōṣam, lit. “thriving of cattle that possesses hundredfold cattle” (vel sim.), redundantly codes the cattle twice (*-gvīnam gāvām*).

IX.65.18: The *s*-stem neut. *jūvas-* is a hapax, contrasting with the more conventionally formed and somewhat better attested *jāvas-*. The zero-gr. root syllable is of course anomalous (see AiG

II.2.232, without explanation), though see nearby *dúvaḥ* (vs. 3b), whatever its source. It may owe its form (or have been encouraged in maintaining its form) by the properly formed homonymous root noun pl. (*vayo-*)*júvaḥ* (to *-jũ-*) in the same metrical position in 26a below, as well as the aforementioned *dúvaḥ* also in the same position in 3b (cf. also *ābhúvaḥ* 27a, *mayobhúvam* 28a). A somewhat similar explan. is given by Re. Given the contextual triggers in this passage, it is probably wise not to invest too much in a deep diachronic account of the anomalous root syllable.

The simile in b, *rūpām ná* (or *rūpām ná várcase*), is difficult to interpr. Ge simply renders it literally “wie Schönheit unserem Aussehen,” but it is unclear to me what the basis of comparison is. Re’s rendering goes to the opposite extreme, with a flurry of parentheses: “comme (on ajoute) la forme-concrète pour (donner) l’éclat (à une idée).” My own interpr. arises from the parallelism between vss. 17 and 18. In the former we ask Soma to bring material goods, esp. livestock. Here in pāda a we request abstract qualities, “strength and speed,” and I suggest that *rūpām ná* “as if (in) physical form” is assimilating them to the material goods of the previous vs. Re’s alt. interpr., given at the end of his n., “apporte-nous force et vitesse, tel un objet-concret,” is similar and preferable to his more elaborate first interpr.

IX.65.19–21: No clear cohesion, though vss. 19 and 20 both contain a form of $\sqrt{ṛṣ}$.

IX.65.22–24: As noted in the publ. intro., this *ṛca* is thematically unified by a listing of the many place in which soma can be pressed in 22–23; all these clauses share a single verb *sunviré* in 22b. The two vss. are followed by a summary vs. (24) expressing the hope that all these diverse soma types will bring good things to us. The *ṛca* also shows signs of formal cohesion that are rare in these Gāyatrī assemblages: vss. 22–23 consist of six pāda-length rel. cl., all introduced by *yé*, with disjunctive *vā* found in both c pādas, while 24 begins with the resumptive and summarizing correlative *té*.

IX.65.22: The first two pādas contain antonymic locations.

The location in c is taken by Ge/Re as a place name, “in Śaryañāvat,” but a place descriptor seems preferable, given the other locative expressions in these vss. On the word see comm. ad VIII.6.39 and Thieme, *Unters.* p. 40 n. 2.

IX.65.23: Ge and Re (see also Mayr. PN s.vv.) take *ārjīkēṣu* and *kṛtvasu* as referring to peoples. On *ārjīkā-* see comm. ad VIII.7.29 and Thieme, *Unters.* p. 40 n. 2. As for *kṛtvan-*, since in its other two occurrences in the RV (VIII.24.25, X.144.3) it is adjectival, in the meaning ‘active, enterprising’, I see no reason why it should be a proper noun only here. I was tempted to tr. it “ritually active,” but this came uncomfortably close to “sexually active.”

As for *pastyā-* as ‘dwelling place’, rather than ‘river’ (Ge, Re, etc.), see comm. ad I.40.7 and IX.97.18.

IX.65.25–27: All three vss. in this *ṛca* contain a middle form of \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’ (25c *hinvānaḥ*, 26b *hinvānāsaḥ*, 27b *hinvire*, the first two passive, the third transitive. In addition the *ṛca* opens and closes with a form of *páva-* (25a *pávate*, 27c *pavasva*).

IX.65.25: *haryató háriḥ* “delightful tawny one” is a word play, with two semantically different stems. This same word play is the focus of a whole hymn, III.44, and obviously was a staple of RVic phraseology.

IX.65.26: On the relationship of *vayojúvaḥ* in pāda a and *sáho júvaḥ* in 18a, see comm. ad 18 above. Scar (174) hesitates between act. and pass. meaning for this hapax rt. noun cmpd *vayo-jū-*: “die Lebenskraft fördernden” / “von Kraft beschleunigten.” In the publ. tr. I opt for an intrans. + instr. value: “speeding with vigor,” though I now think passive “sped by vigor” would be even better, on the basis of the clear pass. forms in context (*hinvānāsaḥ ... śrīṇānāḥ ... mṛñjata*) as well as a passage in the immediately preceding hymn, IX.64.16 *prá hinvānāsaḥ ... dhiyā jūtāḥ* “Being impelled forth ... sped by insightful thoughts,” with the passive ppl. *jūtā-*.

IX.65.27: The pāda-final dat. *devátātaye* echoes *devāvītaye* in 18c.

IX.65.28–30: As if to make up for scanting ṛca cohesion earlier in the hymn, this ṛca is bound by bonds of iron: 13 occurrences of *ā*, most construed with an acc. of a desirable object, all sharing a single verb (*ā*) *vṛṇīmahe* (28b). In addition the three c pādas are identical. This refrain contains the nom. stem *pānta-* ‘drink’, not the pres. part.

IX.66

This is the second to the last of the composite Gāyatrī hymns in this maṇḍala; the last (IX.67) is attributed to a variety of named poets, while the Anukramaṇī assigns this one to *śataṃ vaikhānasaḥ* “100 Vaikhānases.” Both attributions seems to acknowledge the composite nature of these compositions, as opposed to the previous ones, which have a single poet named for the whole hymn. Still, we would be hard-pressed to assemble 100 Vaikhānases: only one, Vamra, is named in the Anukramaṇī, as the author of X.99, a hymn to Indra, and the patronymic (and its underlying base) are both absent from the RVic text.

IX.66.1–3: The ṛca shows clear signs of unity, esp. lexically. Not only do all three vss. contain a form of *páva-* (*pávasva* 1a, voc. *pa/ávamāna* 2b, 3c), but the stem *visva-* is found 4x (1a, b, 2a, 3b), *kave* (3c) echoes *kāvya* (1b), and pl. *dhāmanī* in 3a echoes du. *dhāmanī* in 2b. These “domains” of vss 2–3 are thematically connected to the voc. *visvacarṣaṇe* ‘common to all the separate peoples’, in defining the spaces over which Soma holds sway.

IX.66.1: The b pāda lacks a verb: Ge supplies (silently) “zu gewinnen,” Re parenthetically “pour (atteindre).” The pāda is found 3x elsewhere (IX.23.1, 62.25, 63.25); in two the vs. contains a form of *√srj* ‘surge’ (*asṛgram* 23.1, *asṛkṣata* 63.25) and I therefore supply that verb here.

IX.66.2: The issue in this vs. is the identify of the two *dhāmanī*, dependent on the answer to that is the function of the du. pronoun *tābhyām*, which could be instr., dat., or abl. Answering the first question is made difficult by the fact that this is the only du. form of *dhāman-* in the RV. Ge tr. “Formen” (likewise Re “formes”) and in n. 2–3 explains these as the different stages (Stadien) the soma goes through in its preparation. This interpr. fails to explain the difference between the du. of vs. 2 and the pl. of 3; nor does it account for how Soma “rules with” these forms (taking *tābhyām* as instr. as he does). Re’s interpr. of *dhāmanī* in 2 as the pure and mixed forms of soma provides a satisfactory account of the dual, but does not explain the transition to the pl. in 3 and

again fails to explain how Soma rules with them. I take the term quite differently, as ‘domains’ (rather than ‘forms’). In vs. 2 the dual refers to Heaven and Earth and alludes to the split of Soma into heavenly and earthly forms, a common trope in IX: he has a home in both places. Taking *tābhyām* as abl., I see Soma as ruling from both those polarized spaces, which together contain everything. This interpr. gives *pratīcī* in c more content than the fairly empty renderings of Ge (“die sich (uns) darbieten”) and Re (“qui se tiennent face (à nous)”): Heaven and Earth as the two cosmic halves face each other.

IX.66.3: My interpr. of the du. *dhāmanī* in 2 as the two cosmic domains allows the contrast between that form and the pl. *dhāmāni* to make sense. We have moved from the cosmic, to the ritual, in particular to the ritual ground – and here the pl. ‘domains’ are the ritual spaces that Soma traverses and encloses. This change of venue and focus is signalled esp. by *ṛtūbhiḥ* ‘according to the ritual sequences’. Thus the themes of space and the cosmic reach of Soma that I identified as characteristic of this hymn find economical expression in the transition from the cosmic Soma in vs. 2 to the ritual Soma of vs. 3.

The main verb of this clause is *pāri ... asi*, in the formula *viśvātaḥ pāri √as* ‘surround entirely’ (on which see my 1998 “Rigvedic *viśvātaḥ sīm*, Or, Why Syntax Needs Poetics,” Fs. Watkins). Within this phrase we seem to have an embedded rel. cl. *yāni te* “which are yours,” dependent on the obj. *dhāmāni*, and embedded relatives are generally blocked in the RV. But as we have noted elsewhere (see, e.g., comm. ad VI.21.2, 22.5), nominal rel. clauses are an exception to this rule, and here the *yāni* seems to be displaying (proto-)izafe behavior. See my forthcoming “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian.”

IX.66.4–6: This trca does not show particular internal cohesion, but it has striking echoes of the preceding trca. Like vs. 1, vs. 4 begins *pāvasva*; 4b begins *abhi viśvāni* like 1b, with a different acc. pl. following; 4c *sākhā sākhibhya ūtāye* is identical to 1c, save for the final word. Vs. 5 contains *dhāmabhiḥ* echoing the two forms of *dhāman-* in vss. 2–3. Only vs. 3 is free of links to the 1st trca.

IX.66.4: As in 1b, I supply ‘surging’ with 4b, on the basis of their identical construction.

IX.66.5: This vs. seems to unite Soma’s two theatres of operation, as laid out in vss. 2–3, the cosmic and the ritual. His “gleaming rays” (reminiscent of the sun) spread both “on the back of heaven” (*divās pṛsthé*) and across the ritual filter (*pavītram*); the instr. *dhāmabhiḥ* “through your domains” can make reference both to this combining of cosmic and ritual and also, more specifically, to the limited ritual domains expressed by the pl. *dhāmāni* in vs. 3. Re’s characterization in his n. – “Soma-soleil ...; en fait, l’image rituelle se combine avec l’image solaire” – expresses this rather nicely, though it’s hard to get it from his tr. On the likening of the soma liquid on the filter to the sun, see IX.10.5 and comm. thereon.

IX.66.7–9: No particular sign of cohesion either internal or external.

IX.66.7: This vs. contains the famous phrase *ākṣiti śrávaḥ* (or a minor variant of it) “imperishable fame,” interestingly acquired not by a human, but by Soma himself.

IX.66.8: It may not be clear in the publ. tr. that “you” and “the inspired poet” are identical.

The referent of the “seven siblings” (*saptá jāmāyaḥ*) is disputed. Ge identifies them as the fingers – and certainly *jāmī-* is regularly used of the fingers of the officiants in IX. But 1) do fingers “cry out”? and more important, 2) why then “seven”? It seems unlikely that the poet would deliberately evoke an image of disfigurement or, at the very least, incompleteness. Ober (II.73; see II.71) tries to rescue this identification by suggesting that seven and ten are “equivalent” indications of totality. But as he himself notes, a number of other groups of seven are mentioned in IX. A reference to one of these in this vs. would save us from positing an defective set of fingers. The most likely referent in my view are the seven streams, *saptá síndhavaḥ* found two vss. earlier (6a). Rivers regularly make noise in the RV, and the proximity of that very phrase in vs. 6 tips the scales for me. Another feminine group of seven is the seven insightful thoughts, *saptá dhītáyāḥ* (IX.8.4, 9.4, 15.8, 62.17). *dhītí-* also make noise, and they also (though not explicitly numbered 7) appear several vss. later doing just that: 11c *āvāśanta dhītáyāḥ* “the insightful thoughts have bellowed.” However, supplying *dhītáyāḥ* here would lead to a poetically clumsy near-redundancy: the related *dhī-*, also ‘insightful thought’, is found in the same clause, and “the seven (inspired thoughts) cried out to you with inspired thoughts” would be, to say the least, awkward. (rather than being a pleasing etymological echo, at least to my mind). Lü (246) also goes for streams, and Re, citing his treatment, seems silently to endorse it. Lü claims that Ge identifies the seven as *dhītáyāḥ*, despite Ge’s clear n. 1 “Die Finger.” I don’t see where Lü got this – I assume it’s simply a lapse.

In IX the figure Vivasvant seems to be the prototype sacrificer (see Old ad IX.99.2), perhaps in his role as father of Manu. For further on Vivasvant see publ. intro. to I.139 as well as comm. to IX.99.2, X.14.5.

IX.66.9: Since they are grooming (\sqrt{mrj}) him, the ‘unwed ones’ (*agrúvaḥ*) are probably here the fingers, continuing the fem. pl. agent but modulating from streams to fingers (whose number is not specified here).

In b the phrase *ádhi sváni* is problematic. It is generally taken as a root noun loc. to \sqrt{svan} ‘sound’: Gr, apparently Ge (see his n. 9b and his locative tr. “unter Gebräuse”), apparently Re (but see his hesitations in his n.), Schindler (Rt. Noun p. 51, but see below), Ober (II.73)—though Lub lists it under a stem *sváni-*, so presumably interpr. it as a nom./acc. sg. neut. Schindler’s disc. suggests a slight variation on the root noun interpr., with the possibility that it is used here as an adj. ‘rauschend’ modifying *jīráu*, as Gr takes it. In that case the independent *sván-* was extracted from the compd *tuvi-sván-* ‘powerfully sounding’, an interpr. that seems over-elaborate.

Whether as root noun or an *-i*-stem, our form is equated with *sváni* in the similar pāda-final phrase *ānu sváni* in VI.46.14. However, I have demonstrated that *sváni* in that phrase must be a verb form, a 3rd sg. passive aor., as Old suggests. See comm. ad loc. Scar, in a detailed disc. of the two *sváni* forms (676–77), suggests that our phrase, too, might contain a verb form. By his analysis pāda b is an (unsignalled) dependent cl., parallel to the *yád* clause of c, and so the accent on 3rd sg. *sváni* would be correct for a finite verb. He tr. “es putzen dich ..., während es über der Wollseihe, unter dem fliessenden Wasser raschelt [und] während du ... gesalbt wirst.” This is clever, but I am disturbed by marking only one – and only the second – subordinate clause overtly. Moreover, this interpr. also must assume that there is a gapped subject to *sváni* or that it is used impersonally (both possibilities floated by Scar). None of this is impossible, but the required assumptions and syntactic twists pile up.

I am drawn rather to an old suggestion of Aufrecht's, endorsed by Old (but rejected explicitly by Schindler and Scar) that *ádhi śvāni* rests on *ádhi *śnávi* "on (the sheep's) back." Because of the morphological difficulties (the nonexistence of a loc. **snávi* to begin with), I would not posit Aufrecht's intermediate form, but simply assume a reduction and metathetic scrambling of *sānavi*, which occurs several times in the pāda-final phrase *ádhi sānavi* (VI.48.5, IX.31.5, 37.4, 63.27); *ádhi* is the standard post- (/pre-)position in this expression; cf. also *ádhi sāno avyāye* IX.86.3, 91.1, 96.13, 97.40 and numerous variants. The presence of *avye* at the beg. of the pāda would set the audience's expectation for "on the back of the sheep." The presence of the "noise" root \sqrt{svar} in the preceding vs. (8a *asvaran*) may have facilitated the metathesis, to produce a form appearing to belong to the phonologically and semantically similar root \sqrt{svan} , reinforced by *rebhā-* in the flg. pāda.

In c I take *rebhāḥ ... ajyāse* as a pun, dependent on the literal sense of \sqrt{ribh} , which, rather than being 'sing' as it generally is glossed, is really 'creak, rasp'. See comm. ad VI.3.6. Here Soma is as usual 'anointed' (*ajyase*) with milk, and in that regard he is identified as a *rebhā-*, a ritual officiant with a particular voice quality. But as disc. ad VI.3.6, in a TS passage \sqrt{ribh} is used for a squeaky wheel, and of course the way to fix such a wheel is to "grease" it ($\sqrt{añj}$). So the unmarked comparison here is "(as) a squeaky (wheel) is greased."

IX.66.10–12: This trca is thematically unified by the journey theme, reinforced by two forms of $\sqrt{sṛj}$ in vss. 10 (*asṛkṣata*) and 11 (*ásṛgram*), the former in an etym. figure. Note the juxtaposition of the newer *s*-aor. 3rd pl. middle and the older root aorist, with no apparent functional or semantic difference. On these two formations see Narten (*Sig.Aor.* 270–71); she claims that they were originally differentiated functionally and still are occasionally (see IX.86.4), but in almost all occurrences this difference has been lost.

IX.66.10: Soma's acquisition of "imperishable fame" in 7c is anticipated, as it were, by his streams, likened to horses, "seeking fame" (*śravasyávaḥ*).

IX.66.13–15: No signs of cohesion.

IX.66.13: On pādas bc and esp. the remarkable causative future reflexive form *vāsayīsyase* 'you will cause yourself to be clothed', see disc. in the comm. to the parallel passage IX.2.4.

IX.66.14: It is difficult to render the vs.-initial *āsya te* lit. "of this here you"; the demon. essentially exists as a prop for the enclitic *te* and a way to emphasize the 2nd ps. pronoun.

I do not know what the difference is between *sakhyā-* and *sakhitvā-*, or if any difference is meant. The former is far better attested and has a fuller paradigm, well distributed across cases and numbers (sg. and pl.); the latter is almost confined to the nom./acc. sg. (with 2 occurrences of the loc. sg.). In any case the vs. comes out a little flat: we want your comradeship because it will benefit us. The poet may have been trying to distract attention from this flatness by varying the derivational realization. It's also worth noting that pāda a is also found in IX.61.29 without *sakhitvā-* in context and pāda c is found in IX.31.6 without *sakhyā-* in context.

In his endearingly crusty way, Bloomfield (RR ad IX.31.6) pronounces our vs. "arrant nonsense": "pādas a and c, borrowed from good quarters, show that the stanza is irresponsible patchwork." This seems rather harsh, but probably results in part from his interpr. of *īyakṣantaḥ* as the desid. of \sqrt{yaj} , rather than the now generally accepted derivation from $\sqrt{(n)aś}$; see comm.

ad VI.21.3. Attributing it to $\sqrt{y}aj$ produces a participial phrase in b that has nothing to do with *sakhyé* in a: “In thy friendship we, sacrificing with thy help, do we, O Indu, thy friendship crave” (Bl’s tr., which justifies his “arrant nonsense” judgment). Whereas a connection with $\sqrt{(n)as}$ sets out the reason we want your comradeship—we stand to gain from it—and makes ab a unified expression.

IX.66.15: The usually idiomatic $\tilde{a} pavasva$ lacks the usual acc. object (“bring [X] by purifying yourself”). Perhaps the \tilde{a} anticipates the \tilde{a} in c, in the idiom $\tilde{a} \dots viśa$ ‘enter’.

The question in b are whether the two datives *mahé ... nṛcákṣase* belong together and what the referent(s) is/are. Ge takes them together and identifies the referent as Indra, who appears by name in the next pāda, which would support Ge’s solution. However, as Re points out, *nṛcákṣas-* is never used of Indra, but generally of Agni or Soma. Re himself separates the datives, supplying *rāṇe* with *mahé* from the beginning of the ṛca (13a) and identifying the referent of *nṛcákṣase* as “le dieu Soma.” Although the first choice seems possible and even reasonable, the second is awkward: it seems odd to order Soma to purify himself for himself, even if the addressee is the substance soma (which shouldn’t actually have such agency) as distinct from the god. Given that the next ṛca but one (vss. 19–21) is addressed to Agni, that god seems a more likely choice. Re’s motivation in separating the two datives in b seems to be to wring the three (Dumézilian) functions out of the vs. (or, I gather, ab), but I don’t see how they would match up. In any case, a modified tr. à la Re, without reference to the three functions, is conceivable: “... for the quest for cattle, for great (joy), for the one of manly eye [=Agni].”

IX.66.16–18: The first two vss. are linked lexically and by their investment in grammatical comparison. The third is unconnected, but 18c echoes vs. 14 in the previous ṛca.

IX.66.16: As Re points out, *sán* here is non-concessive. Instead it seems to have a function rather like the one I identified in III.30.5 (see comm. ad loc.), namely a definitional one: where, on the basis of the description of the god’s activities or qualities, he is assigned an agentive title.

IX.66.17: This vs. expands on the etymological figure and superlative phrase in 16b, *ugrāṇām ... ójīṣṭhaḥ*, but with three pairs of comparatives, beginning with the *ugrébhyaḥ ... ójīyān*, lexically identical to the splv. phrase but morphologically different. The second is also an etym. figure, of less interest than the first because it lacks morphological variation: *sūrebhyaḥ ... sūrataraḥ*. While the third substitutes a synonymic cmpd. for the abl. term: *bhūridābhyaḥ ... māṃhiyān* “more generous than those who give much.” A low-key but pleasing set of variations on a phrasal theme.

IX.66.18: The sole Anuṣṭubh verse in a sea of Gāyatrīs. Note that it is the last vs. before the Agni ṛca, and so it may function as a closing or pseudo-closing vs., dividing the larger hymn into parts.

The first hemistich has received a variety of interpr., splitting into two major camps dependent in great part on the identity of *sūrah*. Ge (see his n. 18ab), Re, Ober (I.494) take it as a gen. sg. of *svār-*, one of a string of gen. dependent on *sātā* ‘at the winning’ – hence, “at the winning of the sun, refreshment, offspring, and bodies.” There are several arguments against this interp., however: 1) *sūrah* has to be nom. sg. to *sūra-* in 22c, and so consistency would be nice (if not entirely necessary); 2) *īṣaḥ* has the wrong accent for gen. sg. (expect *īṣāḥ*); 3) the standard

interpr. of the sequence *éṣaḥ* is *ā īṣaḥ* (already Pp., though see other poss. in Ge's n. 18ab), but the mid-pāda location of *ā*, between two supposedly parallel genitives, is an odd position for a preverb / adposition / adverb, and it has no obvious function in the clause. In fact the clause has no verb and no obvious one to supply – witness the variety of suggestions: Ge “(stehst uns),” Re “(qui t'es préparé),” Ober “(hilfst uns).” I therefore follow the path generally sketched by Old (see also Lü 267 n. 4): a nominal equational cl. with nom. sg. *sūrah* to *sūra-* (note that both Gr and Lub so list the form), *tvám soma sūrah* “you, Soma, are the sun”; followed by a 2nd cl. beginning with *ā*. Though *ā* remains mid-pāda, it is initial in its clause, as we would expect. An imperative of bringing / giving / supplying needs to be supplied, with acc. pl. *īṣaḥ* (properly accented) as obj. Cf. expressions like III.53.1 ... *īṣa ā vahatam* ..., VI.52.16 ... *īṣa ā dhattam*, and, with specifically Somian vocab., nearby IX.65.13 *ā ... īṣam pávasva* “By purifying yourself, bring refreshment here.” More to the point, perhaps, the immediately following vs., 19b, *ā suvórjam īṣam ca naḥ* “impel hither nourishment and refreshment to us,” is quite similar and could provide the missing verb.

A structurally less crucial question is the relationship between the two genitives in b, *tokásya ... tanūnām*. As indicated above, Ge takes them as parallel; Re by contrast takes *tanūnām* as a beneficial “pour nous-mêmes,” independent of the genitives dependent on *sātā*. In the publ. tr. I take them as nested, with *tanūnām* dependent on *tokásya*, though I have no particular objection to the parallel interpr.

As noted above, *vṛṇīmáhe sakhyāya* is a permutation of 14c *sakhitvám uśmasi*.

On *vṛṇīmáhe yújyāya*, see comm. ad IX.88.1. Given the other exx. of this lexeme, I would now alter the tr. to “we choose you for yoking [/use].”

IX.66.19–21: On this *ṛca* see publ. intro. It is so insistently Agni-focused (all three vss. begin with a form of that stem, two as voc.) that the Anukramaṇī lists Agni as the deity of the three vss. But it is of course far more likely that Soma is being *identified* with Agni here. The equation and poetic merging of these two ritual gods is found elsewhere, most notably in “the hardest hymn in the RV” (V.44), which is simultaneously applicable to both gods throughout its length. Their blending is shown here by the use of both Somian and Agnian vocab.: for the latter, see esp. *puróhitaḥ* (20b); for the former, the three forms of *páva-*, one each in each vs.: 19a *pavase*, 20a *pávamānaḥ*, 21a *pavasva*. Note that after this Agni *ṛca* the word *sóma-* doesn't appear until vs. 29 and a likely identification with Indra (as well as comparison with the sun) intervenes.

IX.66.19: Since *pavase* has an obj. *āyūṃṣi*, it would be desirable to have the preverb *ā*, which has transitivizing function with this root. This is easily done: *āyūṃṣi* can be decomposed into *ā āyūṃṣi* without change to the Saṃhitā text, though it is contra to the Pp. This preverb in tmesis shows up apparently 2nd in the clause because it follows the zero-position voc. *ágne*.

IX.66.21: Here, despite the obj. phrase in b, *pavasva* lacks the expected *ā*. It would technically be possible to take b with c: “establishing luster and an abundance of heroes for/in us, wealth and thriving in me,” which would leave *pavasva* intransitive. However, this seems artificial, and the existence of two 1st ps. pronouns in b and c, in different numbers, would be awkward. Moreover, 27c, with an independent *dádhat* clause, speaks in favor of separating b and c here.

IX.66.22–24: No strong signs of unity, though a form of *pávamāna-* opens vss. 22 and 24, but Soma as the sun in 22c returns in the theme of light and the defeat of darkness in 24bc. The adj.

vicakṣaṇāḥ ‘visible afar’ in 23c also participates in this imagery, partly matching *viśvādarśataḥ* ‘visible to all’ in the same position in 22c -- though the Engl. tr. ‘visible’ suggests a closer connection than exists in the Skt., which has √*dṛś* in 22 but √*cakṣ* in 23. The light imagery in this ṛca may pick up on the identification with Agni in the previous ṛca, while the verb *jāṅghanat* that closes the ṛca (24c) may modulate towards an identification with Indra, probably found in the following ṛca.

IX.66.23: *hitāḥ* in b could of course belong to √*hi* ‘impel’, though little would change if did. As it happens both Ge and Re also opt for √*dhā* here.

IX.66.24: With Lü (266), I take *ṛtām bṛhāt* as a nom. in apposition to Soma, rather than another acc. obj. to *ajījanat* as Ge/Re do. Either of course is possible; there are several passages in which an identification of Soma with *ṛtā* seems likely. See comm. ad IX.56.1. But I would certainly accept an acc. interpr. as alternative.

IX.66.25–27: Each vs. opens with a form of *pávamāna-*, which also connects it with the preceding ṛca (see above). An even stronger link to the previous ṛca is the gen. intens. part. *jāṅghnataḥ* in 25a, which picks up the same stem (in the nom. *jāṅghanat*) at the end of the immediately preceding pāda, 24c. As for internal unity, note the free phrase *háreś candrāḥ* in 25b, which is transformed into the cmpd. *hāriścandra-* (only here in the RV, though prominent as a PN beginning in the Br.) in 26c. Superlatives also figure in the last two vss.: *rathītama-* 26a, *śubhrásastamaḥ* 26b, *vājasātama-* 27b.

IX.66.25: With Ge and Re, I supply ‘darkness(es)’ (*tāmāṃsi*) as obj. of *jāṅghnataḥ* on the basis of 24c.

I supply ‘drops’ with *candrāḥ* on the basis of III.40.4 *candrāsa índavaḥ*, though Ge’s “Güsse” and Re’s “coulées de *soma*” certainly fit the context, too. My “drops” is indirectly supported by the additional descriptor *jīrāḥ* ‘lively’, which is most commonly found in the cmpd. *jīrā-dānu-* ‘having lively drops’, with a different word for drop.

Note the play *jīrā ajirā-*. The cmpd *ajirā-socis-* is a bit difficult to fit into context. The 1st member *ajirā-* means ‘quick, nimble, agile’, and the whole bahuvrīhi occurs once elsewhere of Agni, VIII.19.13, where I tr. “of nimble flame.” How this would apply to drops is not entirely clear; I assume it refers to the propensity of drops, esp. moving drops, to catch the light. It is also possible that *ajirāsociṣaḥ* is gen. sg. and modifies Soma, rather than nom. pl. modifying the drops. This would not appreciably change the image.

IX.66.26: The Indraic cast of this vs. is quite clear, and I therefore think that Soma is being identified with Indra here (as he was with Agni in the ṛca 19–21). To begin with, the splv. *rathītama-* is generally used of Indra (e.g., VIII.45.7); *marúd-gaṇa-* ‘having the Maruts as his flock’ is of course characteristic of Indra (e.g., VIII.89.2) and also expressed by other, similar but better-attested epithets like *marút-vant-*. Moreover, the stem *śubhrá-* ‘resplendent’ in the masc. pl., here in the instr. pl. *śubhrébhiḥ*, is almost always used of the Maruts (e.g., I.167.4).

The problem in the vs. is the splv. *śubhrásastamaḥ* in b. The interpr. reflected by Ge and Re stems from Old, who sees it as a haplology from **śubhrá-śasta-tama-*, i.e., the splv. to a ppl. cmpd. Old himself doesn’t provide a gloss, but on the basis of a cmpd. like *kavi-śastá-* ‘praised by poets’ it should presumably be something like ‘most praised by the resplendent’, though

neither Ge's "über die anderen Schönen als der Schönste gepriesen" nor Re's "par rapport aux (êtres) beaux, il est le plus célébré (quant à son fait d'être) beau" reflects this presumption; that is, they do not take the 1st member as agent. Nor does the accent of the cmpd (either reconstructed or as attested) match that of *kavi-śastā-*, though admittedly it does match the standard *devā-hita-* type. And the instr. *śubhrébhiḥ* seems an odd choice – we would expect a gen. pl. with the splv. of course; the anomalous instr. is surely responsible for the knots that Ge and Re tie themselves into, as well as Ge's cryptic (or disingenuous) n. 26b "*śubhrébhiḥ* Instr. = Ablat. in Verbindung mit Superl. = Komparat." The publ. tr. represents a very different analysis, which I now think must be wrong: as the splv. to a root-noun cmpd. 'proclaiming splendor', but, as I realized all along, the accent is wrong (expect **śubhra-śās-(tama-)*), and it is difficult to argue that the accent got misplaced because the word structure was misunderstood, esp. given the root noun cmpd splv. in the next vs., *vāja-sā-tama-* with correct accent. In addition, *śubhrā-* is an adj., 'resplendent', not a noun 'splendour', and *√śams* doesn't take any form derived from *√śubh* as obj. So I now would reject the publ. tr. and return to Old's haplology – though with a semantic interpr. different from the Ge/Re complex. I would take the 1st member in agentive value, as is usual in such cmpds: "most praised by the resplendent (ones)," with the usual number neutralization. The reference is to the Maruts. What then of the independent instr. *śubhrébhiḥ*? Either it doubles the 1st cmpd member, whose function in the cmpd may have become unclear because of the haplology – hence "most praised by the resplendent (ones), by the resplendent ones." Or it may be an instr. of accompaniment: "most praised by the resplendent (ones), *along with* the resplendent ones." This would reflect the fact that the Maruts both praise Indra and receive praise themselves. This dual role of the Maruts, both praising and praised, is the subject of "poetic repair" in V.52, the first of Śyāvāśva's Marut hymns. See comm. ad loc and reff. given there. Although I slightly favor the former explanation, English is better served by the latter, and I would now substitute the 2nd tr. just given; "most praised" should also receive an asterisk.

Unfortunately "gold-glittering" for *hāriścandra-* obscures its relationship to *hāreś candrāḥ* in 25b "of the tawny one, the glittering (drops)."

IX.66.27: In this vs. we seem to have returned to the identification of Soma with the sun, as shown esp. by *raśmībhiḥ* "with his rays" – this instr. pl. being reserved almost exclusively for the sun's rays (see, e.g., nearby IX.61.8 *sūryasya raśmībhiḥ*). The image is of the sun / Soma pervading space, with Soma's rays being the traces of the golden liquid as it spreads across the filter.

IX.66.28–30: No particular evidence of unity, except for an emphasis in the 1st two vss. on the technicalities of soma-preparation.

IX.66.28: This vs. has two passively used participles, *suvānāḥ* 'being pressed' and *punānāḥ* 'being purified', which contrast with the agency implicitly accorded to Soma Pavamāna, "self-purifying" Soma. This more agentive participle returns in the final vs. (30b), just before we ask Soma for his favor.

The repetition of *īnduh* (pādas a and c) is somewhat clumsy, but the 2nd occurrences enables the usual word play with adjacent *īndram*.

IX.67

On the structure and authorship of this hymn and their implications for RVic studies more generally, see publ. intro. as well as Old.

IX.67.1–3: Attributed to Bharadvāja, the ṛca shows elementary unity by positioning *tvám* at the beginning of each vs.

IX.67.1: Gr derives *dhārayú-* from *dhārā-* ‘stream’ and glosses ‘strömend’, an idea that goes back to Sāy. Ge follows suit (“der hervorsprudelnde”), though in n. 1a he entertains a derivation from √*dhṛ*, which underlies Re’s “le mainteneur” (see his n.) I also think that √*dhṛ* is the correct etymon. There would be no reason to shorten the final of *dhārā-* (though *dhāra-pūta-* ‘purified by streams’ (?) and *dhāra-vākā-* ‘recitation for the streams’ (?) do give me pause), while there is a well-established relationship between *-ā-yá-(ti)* verbs and *-ā-yú-* adjectives (type *devayá-/devayú-*). Though it has a different accent and a different functional profile, *dhāráyati* is a very common verb, and it is easy to imagine the creation of a *-yú-* nominal to that stem. However, if it is derived from *dhārā-* ‘stream’, the sense should not be of the type given by Gr and Ge, but rather ‘seeking streams’, as is standard with *-yu-* formations to nouns. The idea would be that the soma, once pressed, goes forth to seek the ritual waters.

IX.67.4–6: The Kaśyapa ṛca: it lacks cohesion across all 3 vss., though 4 and 5 share “rushing across the fleece”; ‘rush’ (*árṣa-*) also provides a link to the last vs. of the preceding ṛca, 3b, as does the verb *acikradat* (4c), which echoes *kánikradat* (3b).

IX.67.5: The preverb/preposition *ví* is insistent, with 4 occurrences in the vs.

Re sees the three functions here, but that seems something of a stretch.

IX.67.7–9: Elementary sign of cohesion in the Gotama ṛca: a form of *páva-* in every vs.

IX.67.9: On *ústrayah* as ‘rosy (fingers)’ see comm. ad IV.65.1.

The publ. tr. contains a grammatical error: *asvaran* should of course be ‘they cried’ not ‘they cry’.

IX.67.10–12: This, the Atri ṛca, shows very tight cohesion. To begin with, Pūṣan, under his name (vs. 10) or characteristic epithets (*kapardín-* vs. 11, *āghṛṇi-* vs. 12), appears in every vs., in particular as the recipient of the pressed and purified soma in vss. 11–12. Since, as noted in the publ. intro., Pūṣan is rarely found in IX, devoting a ṛca to him here is striking, and the assumption that he wants soma is esp. anomalous, since in the hymn devoted to Indra and Pūṣan (VI.57) Indra’s desire for soma is explicitly contrasted with Pūṣan’s for porridge (VI.57.2).

More evidence for strong cohesion: the third pāda of each vs. is a refrain: *ā bhakṣat kanyāsu naḥ* “He [=Pūṣan] will give us a share in maidens.” The connection of this refrain with soma is, to say the least, not straightforward. Ge (n. 10–12) suggests that the idea is that Pūṣan, as a thank-you for the soma, will give maidens as compensation for the poet (Dichtersold) or as a guest-gift (Gastgeschenk). This is certainly possible, though the quid pro quo isn’t evident to me in the text; nonetheless it conforms to the dānastuti concept. Ober refines this somewhat by identifying the maidens as brides (e.g., I.320), but at least in his vol. II he takes *Soma* as the subject of the refrain (“[D]er [Soma] gewähre uns Anteil an den Jungfrauen”; II.51 n. 240). Simply on the basis of rhetorical structure, this seems unlikely: in the vs. containing the first

appearance of the refrain (10) there is not even indirect reference to Soma; the only possible subject is Pūṣan, and there is unlikely to be a switch in subject in the refrain in the following two vss. By contrast, Gr identifies the maidens here as daughters, presumably implying that this expression is a twist on the “give us sons” wish so often expressed. Though I appreciate Gr’s attempt to save Pūṣan from being a pimp, I doubt that any R̥gvedin would wish [at least out loud] for a passel of daughters

The last two vss. of the ṛca are simple variants of each other. Both begin with *ayám* referring to soma; both contain a datival expression identifying Pūṣan as the recipient of the soma; their b pādas both begin *ghṛtām ná pavate*, with a disyllable qualifying *ghṛtām* following.

IX.67.10: The publ. tr. presents the journeys as ours, reading *naḥ* with both *avitā* and *yāmani-yāmani*. Ge and Re instead assume the journeys are Pūṣan’s: e.g., “Unser Gönner ist Pūṣan, der auf jeder Ausfahrt Böcke als Rosse hat.” Since one hymn devoted to Pūṣan, I.42, is almost entirely devoted to Pūṣan’s protection of us on the journey and on the path and in the short Pūṣan cycle in VI (VI.53–58) the god is several times asked to lead or direct us (e.g., VI.53.2) and to clear paths for us (VI.53.4, 54.1–2), I think it likely that the focus here is on *our* journeys.

IX.67.11: *kapardín-* is used of Pūṣan in VI.55.2, though it is also applied to a few other gods in the RV, notably Rudra (I.114.1, 5).

IX.67.12: *āghṛṇi-* is an epithet exclusive to Pūṣan. On the word, see comm. ad VI.53.3.

That Pūṣan is addressed in the 2nd ps. here, while the refrain remains in the 3rd ps., might be taken as evidence for Ober’s identification of Soma as the subject of the refrain – since soma is in the 3rd ps. in this vs. However, refrains tend to operate in syntactic independence from their vss., and, as I argued above, once the refrain is set, it is unlikely to change referents.

IX.67.13–15: Little evidence of unity in the Viśvāmitra ṛca, though the falcon (*śyenā-*) as image of Soma occurs in both 14 and 15. More generally, both 14 and 15 depict the rapid and dramatic movement of soma into the ritual receptacles.

IX.67.13: Soma is obviously “child of the speech of the poets” (*vācó jantúḥ kavīnām*) because ritual speech sets in motion the preparation of soma.

IX.67.14: What is the “armor” (*várma*) that soma “plunges through” (*ví gāhate*)? Ge (n. 14ab) suggests that the image is of a warrior clothing himself in armor, that is, the wooden cup, but he doesn’t construe *várma* with the verb, but takes it as loosely descriptive with a verb used absolutely (“er taucht in seinen Panzer unter”). Re also thinks the *várma* refers to the cup (“la paroi [wall] de la cuve” acdg. to his n.), but has the courage to construe it with the verb: “il plonge dans (le récipient, sa) cuirasse.” But *ví* is not “dans.” I think it refers instead to the filter, whose fleece both represents his armor and a substance that soma must get *through*, hence the slightly off-balance image. Note first of all that the same verb, though with different preverb, is used precisely with the filter a few vss. later in this hymn: IX.67.20 *pavítram áti gāhate* / ... *vāram avyáyam* “he plunges across the filter, the sheep’s fleece.” As for the fleece as Soma’s armor, see the very full expression in IX.98.2 *pári śyá svānó avyáyam ráthe ná vármāvyata* “This one, being pressed, has engirded himself in the sheep’s fleece, as a man on a chariot does in

armor.” Ober (II.77) also considers the armor to be the fleece. The same identification, though with a different word for armor/sheathing is found in X.101.7 *āṃsatra-kośa-*.

IX.67.16–18: This ṛca, ascribed to Jamadagni, is unified first and foremost by its meter, Dvipadā Gāyatrī, the only representative of this meter in the hymn – and in fact in all of the RV (see Arnold p. 244). There is no particular unity in lexicon (though note *mandāyan* 16a and *madīntamaḥ* 18a), but the ṛca does mention the two gods who receive the first soma oblation, Indra (16) and Vāyu (18).

IX.67.19–21: This is the last ṛca of the hymn, attributed to Vasiṣṭha. The 1st two vss. are variants of each other, couched in 2nd and 3rd ps. respectively: their first pādas differ only in their initial disyllable, with the rest identical: ... *tunnó abhiṣtutaḥ*; their second pādas both depict the journey to and across the filter, both beginning *pavītram*. The third vs. stands apart, though the identification of Soma as ‘demon-smasher’ in 20c is thematically linked to the plea in 21 that Soma “smash away” peril.

IX.67.22–27: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss. are a self-contained purificatory spell, with all vss. ending with an act. impv. belonging to the pres. *punāti*: all 2nd sg. *punīhi (naḥ)* except 22c *punātu (naḥ)*. The means of purification is, in the first instance, the filter (*pavītra-*), which of course literally means ‘instrument (-tra-) of purification’. The *pavītra-* is mentioned in vss. 22–25, with other, non-physical means of purification added (e.g., the sacred formulation vss. 23–24), with these means appropriate to the gods who wield them (Savitar’s ‘impulsion’ [*savā-*] vs. 25). The first agent of purification is Soma Pavamāna himself (22), then Agni (23–24), then Savitar (25). The three – Soma, Agni, and Savitar – then appear together in 26, and in the final vs. (27) it opens out to all the divinities. The rhetoric is pretty flat, but the structure is a pleasing example of repetitive variation.

IX.67.22: The nominal rel. cl. *yāḥ potā* seems to be another ex. of the embedded, pseudo-izafe construction discussed elsewhere, though in this case there is a resumptive pronoun beginning the continuation of the main cl. The structure is: ab beg. of main cl. marked by *sāḥ*, no verb; c rel. cl. *yāḥ potā*, followed by rest of main cl., with verb, but introduced by a repetition of *sāḥ*: *sā punātu naḥ*, or, more schematically:

ab *sā* NOMINATIVE NP /

c. *yāḥ* NOM. NP, *sā* VERB

with the two *sā* hunks together forming the main cl. A sort of hybrid construction.

In the publ. tr. I take *pavītreṇa* in b with *pavamānaḥ* in a, unlike Ge and Re, who construe it with *punātu* in c (e.g., “qu’il nous clarifie avec le filtre”). Their interpr. is supported by the INSTR. *punīhi naḥ* constr. in 23–24, 26 (and variant in 25), and since I no longer consider *yāḥ potā* an embedded rel. clause and therefore have no need to consider ab entirely separate from the resumptive *sā* phrase in c, there is no syntactic obstacle to this interpr. I’d be inclined, however, to read *pavītreṇa* with both: “The one who purifies himself through our filter (/purifier) today, the limitless one who is the purifier, with the filter (/purifier) let him purify us.”

The agent noun *potār-* (also *pótar-*) as if to an anīṭ root is surprising, esp. in juxtaposition to the instrument noun *pavītra-* and, a few vss. later, the god *savitār-* to the parallel root $\sqrt{sū}$. We would of course expect **pavitār-* -- a form we almost get in RVic *pavītār-* and do get in AV *pavitār-*. The problem is identical to that posed by the priestly title *hótar-*, derived from $\sqrt{hvā}$ / *hū*

‘invoke’, so we expect **hávitar-* -- although in that instance interference from the likewise ritual verb \sqrt{hu} ‘pour, libate’, whose agent noun should properly be *hótar-*, helps explain the discrepancy. AiG II.2. 672 explains *potár-* by suggesting that it is an inherited word and no longer closely tied to the verb from which it was originally derived. This seems backwards to me – wouldn’t inherited and isolated words be more likely to maintain their expected phonological shape? And, judging from this passage, *potár-* (so accented) has not lost its connection with $\sqrt{pū}$. However, a few pp. later (AiG II.2.676) the much more plausible scenario is proposed, that *potár-* / *pótar-* has followed *hótar-*, which owes its shape to the interference just noted, and *stotár-* ‘praiser’. Sim. EWA s.v. *pótar-*.

IX.67.23: The image of the filter stretched out in Agni’s flame is striking, but I don’t know exactly what the picture is meant to be – in contemplating the fire do we have a vision of a purifying apparatus? Or is the expression simply a fancy way of saying “the purifier that is your flame”? The beginning of the next vs., with *pavítram arcivát*, would support the latter suggestions.

Ge takes *bráhma* as obj. of *punīhi*: “... mit der [=pavítram] läutere unsere feierliche Rede.” But 1) this would break the pattern of *punātu* / *punīhi naḥ* “purify us” in vss. 22, 24, 26) by demoting *naḥ* from object; 2) *bráhma* as a means of purification is found in the next vs. in the cmpd *brahmasavañḥ*. The fairly strict rhetorical patterning of these vss. therefore imposes (at least to my view) an instrument-of-means reading on *bráhma*, and I see no reason why it can’t be part of the definitional preposed rel. cl. *yád te* “what is your ...,” parallel to *pavítram*. *yád* would be appropriate to both, since they are both neut., and they are then both picked up by instr. *téna* in c. That *bráhma* has been postponed till the beginning of c is not surprising, given the long NP containing *pavítram*. The new cl. begins mid-pāda with *téna*; since *sāl tām* forms regularly take init. position in pāda / clause, the mid-pāda position here suggests that it begins a new cl. and *bráhma* is not part of it. Like Ge, Re makes *bráhma* somehow oblique, but I don’t really understand what he’s trying to convey: “clarifies en notre Formule.”

IX.67.24: This vs. has both physical and conceptual purifying instruments: the flame-sieve of 23 and the *bráhma-* also introduced in 23, which, in the cmpd *brahma-savá-*, also provides a transition to Savitar and his impulsions in vs. 25.

IX.67.25: In addition to the introduction of Savitar, we also get a slight rearrangement in word order. The conjoined phrase *pavítrena savéna ca* would not fit in the slot right before the impv. in c, a position it occupies in 23c, 24b, 24c, 26c, so the final enclitic *naḥ* is converted to a full prn. *mām* and placed in initial position. This prn. also has to be read as distracted *mām* to achieve 8 syllables. I wonder why the poet didn’t just use *asmān*, which would fit the meter and better match *naḥ*. One of the only instances in which I think I could compose the vs. better than the poet – though “me” (both tonic *mām* and enclitic *mā*) serves as insistent obj. in vs. 27.

IX.67.26: Initial *tribhiḥ* matches initial *ubhābhyām* in 25a. Since *ubhābhyām* was further specified by a bipartite NP *pavítrena savéna ca* (25b), I would like to see three instr. in this vs., each correlated with one of the three gods mentioned. And this is how I have rendered it, with *vārṣiṣṭhaiḥ* connected to Savitar (and Soma), *dhāmabhiḥ* with Soma, and *dákṣaiḥ* with Agni. By contrast, Ge and Re construe *vārṣiṣṭhaiḥ* with *dhāmabhiḥ*, which they consider to be of three types (that is, “with the three highest *dhāmans* ...”; Re “avec les trois positions les plus

éminentes”) – although in their notes both come close to espousing a position close to mine. Possibly in their favor is the fact that *soma* is unaccented in b, and if *vārṣiṣṭhaiḥ* is followed by a sub-clausal break, the voc. *might* (or might not) have been accented. In the publ. tr. I read *vārṣiṣṭhaiḥ* both with Savitar’s *savañh*, which has to be supplied, and with Soma’s *dhāmabhiḥ*, and tr. the latter slightly differently: “*through* Soma’s domains.”

IX.67.27: This last vs. of the purificatory spell is in a different meter (Anuṣṭubh) and makes reference to a larger variety of personnel – both often signs of finality.

IX.67.28–29: It’s not clear why we return to purely Soma vss. at this point, but the aoristic summary in 29 (*úpa ... áganma bíbhrato nāmah* “up to him have we come bearing homage”) is another typical hymn-ender, summarizing the hymn that precedes.

IX.67.29: The hapax *āhutī-vṛdh-* could be either passive (as in the publ. tr., also Ge) or act. ‘strengthening the oblation’ (Re). Scar (514) considers both possibilities and opts, weakly, for the former. Either could certainly work in context. The long final vowel *-tī-* is found only here, versus the standard *āhuti-*. This can either be a metrical lengthening of the stem vowel, since **āhutī-vṛdham*, with 3 (or actually 4) light syllables in a row, would produce an unacceptable cadence. Or it can be an instr. sg. to the *-ti-*stem (see inconclusive disc. in Scar.), which would clinch the interpr. of the cmpd as passive ‘strengthened by the oblation’. I weakly favor the latter.

IX.67.30: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is extremely puzzling and my tr. and interpr. are at best speculative. Old’s comments are useful in clearing away the detritus of the more fanciful interpr., but neither he nor the other standard comm. have cracked the code: see Ge’s n. 30a with lit. The syntax and the sequence of events are quite straightforward: someone’s axe has disappeared (contra Gr, *nanāśa* must belong to ‘disappear’, not ‘reach’; the ‘disappear’ association is now generally agreed upon), and Soma is asked to bring it back through his purification (the common idiom *ā√pū*). But whose axe? and why an axe in this context? and what does a rat have to do with it?

To begin with the 1st question: most take *alāyyasya* as a PN (“the axe of Alāyya”), which saves trouble but doesn’t help us in deciphering the verse. Gr derives it from *√lī* and tr. ‘sich nicht duckend’; Mayr (EWA s.v.) simply pronounces it “unklar.” I suggest that it belongs to *√rā* ‘come to / be at rest’, with an *l*-form like *ilāyati* (see Narten, “Ved. *ilāyati* ...,” 1968; Jamison, -*āya-*, 48–49, EWA s.v. *RĀ*³). I would interpr. it as a gerundive like *-pāyya-* (*√pā* both ‘drink’ and ‘protect’), as well as the more numerous extended stems of the type *śravāyya-*, whose *-ā-* does not belong to the root. A parallel negated form (though again not to a *ā*-root) may be found in *atasāyya-* ‘unshakeable’; see comm. ad I.63.6. I suggest that *alāyya-* means ‘not able to be brought to rest, not to be stilled’.

This may not seem to advance us very far, but this word must be evaluated in conjunction with *paraśūh*, on which it depends. The *paraśū-* is frequently associated with Agni; cf., e.g., I.127.3, IV.6.8, and VI.3.4, in all of which Agni is compared to an axe. The other common word for axe, *vāśī-*, is also characteristic of Agni: he carries it (VIII.19.23) and possesses it (*vāśīmant-* X.20.6). Agni’s axe must be his flame, and of course fire is always in motion, never still. I therefore suggest that *alāyya-* refers to Agni, the axe to his flame, and the pāda declares that his flame has disappeared or been lost. This may refer to the famous myth in which Agni runs away

from his ritual duties and has to be coaxed back by offering him a better deal – or it may simply record a ritual disaster: the sacrificial fire has gone out. In any event Soma is taxed with bringing him back in pāda b.

If my interpr. of the first pāda is anywhere near correct, it pleases me to fancy that this is the first (very indirect) textual evidence to Paraśu Rāma.

The real puzzle in this vs. is pāda c, which presents *ākhúm* as an apparently parallel object to the *paraśú-* that Soma is supposed to bring back. Both Ge and Re find this relatively easy to deal with because they take it as a simile, marked with *cid*. But as I have noted in a number of places, there are no clear instances of *cid* as a simile marker, and here it is also not clear what similarity the poet might be trying to point to (that moles live hidden seems to be the best guess). My own suggestion is hardly better than this (if that). The *ākhú-* is probably a ‘mole-like rat’ since there are no true moles in the subcontinent (see Katz, JAOS 122 [2002], “How the Mole and Mongoose Got Their Names,” esp. 301–2). The word is found only here in the RV, which complicates the interpr., but it has become fairly common by middle Vedic. In particular, the *ākhú-* is associated with Rudra; already in VS III.57, TS I.8.6.1 the *ākhú-* is Rudra’s victim / portion at the Tryambaka ritual. I therefore think it is *possible* (no more than that) that Soma is being asked also to bring Rudra back, in the form of his totem animal. Of the few hymns dedicated in full or in part to Rudra (there are only 3 dedicated to him alone), 2 (I.43, VI.47) are Soma-Rudra hymns, so there is some association between the two gods, whose rationale unfortunately escapes me.

Why this vs. ended up in this hymn I have no idea – except as a composite hymn it may have attracted various vss. that were floating around, and since it addresses Soma and uses a standard Somian verb (*ā√pū*), the hymn may have seemed as good a place as any to stash this vs. It clearly has nothing to do with the two Soma vss. that preceded nor with the added summary vss. that follow. It also appears to be a younger vs., given the *-l*-form and the non-RVic word *ākhu-*.

IX.67.31–32: On the import of these two vss., see publ. intro. They are obviously secondary additions to the hymn, promising great benefits to anyone who studies the previous vss. of the hymn.