

## Maṇḍala X.1–60

### X.1-7

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

### X.1 Agni

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## X.2 Agni

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### X.3 Agni

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Decoding the vs. works best by considering the constituents one by one; the syntactic structure is relatively straightforward (at least as I see it – see Ge’s comm., however, and the different deployment of elements by Ge and Re). The vs. is dominated by two long gen. phrases, both referring to Agni: ab *asyá ... agnēḥ sákhyuḥ śívásya* “of this one ... Agni, our kindly companion” (I did not include *brhatáh* in this phrase in the publ. tr., but I am now more open to it) and c *īḍyasya víṣṇo brhatáh* “of the lofty bull worthy to be invoked” (I did not take *svásah* in this phrase, though I’m also more open to it now; see below). The first depends on the nom.

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

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

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

So much for the first hemistich. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> one let us first turn to the gen. phrase in c. The last word of that pāda, *svāsaḥ*, is generally interpr. (Gr, Ge, Re) as a gen. sg. to a cmpd *svās-* ‘having a good mouth’, which does appear in IV.6.8 of Agni. However, I think it more likely to be the nom. pl. m. of *svá-* ‘own’, referring to the *bhāmāsaḥ* that immediately follows in the next

pāda (though ‘having a good mouth’ is also possible, and I would now accept a tr. “of the lofty bull worthy to be invoked, having a good mouth”). I take the remaining gen. phrase with *cd*, while Ge/Re take it with the gen. phrase in *ab*. The journeys (*yāma-*) of *ab* reappear in the loc. sg. *yāman* to a different stem, and just as the gen. phrase of *ab* depended on *yāmāsaḥ*, I here attach it to *yāman*.

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

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

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

accounts for the simile, but what is “the beams purify themselves” meant to convey in the frame. I think it must be read in the context of the previous vs.: there the beams were dark as the nights, because surrounded with smoke; here the purification would involve getting free of the smoke and rising up brightly, amidst the roar of the blazing fire (hence the term of comparison). This compressed expression seems to me a prime example of synesthesia, as noted in the publ. intro.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### IX.4 Agni

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

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

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



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

On *jénya*- see comm. ad I.128.7. Even though Agni is called *jénya*- elsewhere, here the word surely belongs to the simile, with *tvā* intervening in modified 2nd position. Cf. IX.86.36 ... *śísuṃ, nāvam jajñānām jényam* ... “the new-born child of worthy birth.” Although the *śísu*- here could be a human child, the appearance of other domestic animals in the similes of 2–3 suggest that it too is an animal.

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

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

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

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

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

The problematic pāda is c, *asnātāpo vṛṣabhó ná prá veti*. The simile / frame structure is both formally and semantically / pragmatically flawed. The standard view (i.e., Ge/Re and the publ. tr.) is that the meaning of the pāda is more or less what is found in the publ. tr.:

“(Although) not a swimmer, he pursues the waters like a bull.” As Ge points out (n. 5c), the thirsty bull or buffalo is a well-known image in the RV. But this assumes that ‘waters’ is part of the simile as the shared term; yet the simile particle follows ‘bull’ (*vṛṣabhó ná*), with ‘waters’ preceding – which is not the placement we expect. Moreover the form of ‘waters’ is wrong: it should be acc. (*apáh*) but the accent tells us it must be nom. *āpah* when extracted from sandhi. There are a few occurrences of nom.-for-acc. forms to this stem, but the vast majority are properly distributed. Such are the formal problems. The semantic-pragmatic one may be worse: there is no ritual, mythological, or natural-world scenario in which Agni/fire “pursues” water. The closest we come is the myth of Agni running away from his ritual duties and hiding in the waters, but I find it hard to wring this out of this expression. Likewise Agni as Apām Napāt

(vaguely suggested by Tichy, Agent nouns, 146); that figure doesn't behave as he would need to here. There is a very minor rite of aspersion of the hearth, which Ge sees in a couple of RVic passages (VIII.39.10, 102.14), but again this does not seem a compelling explanation here. Ge in his n. suggests an alternative structure: that the waters belong only to the simile, and another object should be supplied for the frame: Agni pursues (firewood), as a bull does waters. This solves the pragmatic problem, but makes the formal structure of the simile even worse, since the *āpaḥ* is not part of the frame at all: we really should then have *āpo \*nā vṛṣabhāḥ*. Moreover, what then is the point of *asnātā* 'no swimmer'?

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

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

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

## X.5 Agni

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

X.5.1: My interpr. of the first hemistich differs crucially from the standard (Ge, Re, Lü [*passim*], Doniger [117], Köhler [*Kavī* in Ṛgveda, 121, 319–20]) in taking pāda a as a nominal clause and assuming a change of subject in b. All the others, save for Ge, assume an identification between Agni and the sea; Ge like me considers the sea to be the sea in the heart and "der Urquell der dichterischen Erkenntnis" (n. 1a). My major reason for separating the pādas is that the sea is sometimes identified with the heart, and therefore the abl. *hṛdāḥ* in b should be, in my opinion, coreferential with nom. *samudrāḥ* in pāda a. For the identification see IV.58.5 *hṛdyāt samudrāt*, 58.11 *antāḥ samudré hṛdy āntar āyusī*; cf. also VIII.102.4–6 *agnīm samudrāvāsasam* "Agni whose garment is the sea" and X.45.3, which relates Agni's birth/kindling in the sea. I therefore think that Agni is within the sea but distinct from it. We also see separation between the sea (of poetic inspiration) and an agent who performs *vī √cakṣ* in X.177.1 *samudré antāḥ kavāyo vī cakṣate* "The sage poets espy it within the sea." I do have to admit, however, that the 2nd phrase in pāda a, *dharūṇo rayīṇām* "foundation of riches" is used of Agni in I.73.4, X.45.5; on the other hand this phrase is not limited to Agni, modifying Indra in X.47.2; see also VII.34.24.

Interestingly, X.47.2 resembles our passage phrasally, in that it is preceded by a numeral qualifying *samudra* — there as a cmpd., here as a free phrase: X.47.2 *cātuḥsamudraṃ dharúṇaṃ rayīṇām* / X.5.1 *ékaḥ samudró dharúṇo rayīṇām*. I don't quite know what to make of this, beyond the apparent use of the sea or seas as an extreme measure of wealth.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is much disagreement about the meaning and the grammatical and lexical identity of the part. *viyántaḥ* in d. Gr assigns it to  $\sqrt{vi}$  with the sense 'durchwandern'; Ge to the same lexeme but with the somewhat bizarre gloss 'abschneidend' (cutting off, snipping). (He also

thinks it's anacoluthon for du. fem. *vīyatī*; on the pl. see below.) Köhler (320) agrees with the assignment of Gr/Ge but with the sense “einzeln zum Nabel ... gehen,” connecting pāda c with d, rather than with ab as most do. Re calls it a “forme baroque” of *váyantah* ‘weaving’. The most persuasive suggestion is Old’s, though he falls short of endorsing it— that it belongs to the root pres. of  $\sqrt{vī}$  ‘pursue’. Although the weak pre-V forms of this pres. are transmitted with initial cluster *vy-*, they are almost all to be read with distracted *v’y-*; cf. for this exact nom. pl. part. IV.5.5, VI.1.4, VII.27.5, all pāda-final as here (only the form in I.127.5 is not distracted). Old is reluctant to ignore the “transmitted spelling” (“überlieferte Schreibung”), but since the original oral version would have had distracted *vīy-*, it is only the later redaction that imposed that form, and it can easily be the result of misunderstanding of the sense of the passage (not difficult, as the various versions demonstrate). The assignment to  $\sqrt{vī}$  is supported by the fact that this root is part of the characteristic lexicon of Trita Āptya; note X.2.2, 4.5, 6.2, 3, 8.5, 7.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

phenomenon that masks light and brightness and is found in the midspace, the same association may be alluded to here.

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

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

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

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

## X.6 Agni

X.6.1–3: As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn begins with annunciatory *ayám sá* "Here he is," presumably gesturing towards the offering fire on the ritual ground, and the rest of the first 3 vss. consists of rel. clauses, one per hemistich, dependent on *sá*. The meter of the hymn is unusual, in that it contains a large number of Pentad (and other 10-syllable) vss. amid the Triṣṭubhs. See Arnold 239, 318 and Old ZDMG 60 (1906): 751–52 (review of Arnold) = KISch 226–27.

Because of the fluctuating meter, it is not always clear which forms we should distract – e.g., in 2d *átyo* is read distracted (*at'yo*) by Gr, Old (hesitatingly), HvN, but Arnold prefers the disyllabic reading. The first gives a Triṣṭubh, the 2nd a Pentad line. The stem *átya-* is more often disyllabic than trisyllabic, but there are undoubted exx. of the latter. In any case it is well to be wary of the distracted readings enshrined in HvN.

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

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

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

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

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

On the reading of *átyah* see above.

X.6.3: This vs. locates Agni as the controller of both the ritual and the natural world, which meet on the ritual ground at the dawn sacrifice: on the one hand, Agni controls “the pursuit of the gods” (*devá-vīti-*, a cmpd that picks up the verb *ā ... vivāya* from the previous vs.); on the other, the kindling of the ritual fire is thought to cause Dawn to dawn. The somewhat awk. tr. “every effort to pursue the gods” for *devá-vīti-* was meant to avoid the more literal “every pursuit of the gods,” which makes it sound like the gods are pursuing their hobbies or playing cribbage or crocheting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The verbal configuration and pāda boundary in the sequence *índram ná réjamānam, agnīm* seem to favor an interpr. of the simile “... Agni, trembling like Indra.” But this is unlikely pragmatically: Indra is not a trembler! So with the other standard interpr. (going back to Sāy.) I

take the participle only with Agni, even though it appears before the pāda boundary. The simile is off-kilter for another reason: it is not a poetic comparison but the equation of two real-world actions: “bring Agni *as you do* Indra,” referring to Indra’s usual appearance at the dawn sacrifice. RVic similes don’t ordinarily have this function.

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

## X.7 Agni

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.7.3: On *sádam ít sákhāyam* see comm. ad I.185.8 and V.85.7.

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

Pāda c seems designed to mislead the audience. On the one hand, the *yám* (b) ... *sá* (c) construction is the standard relative / correlative one, and *sá* should therefore be coreferential with *yám*, namely the mortal worshiper. But the adjectives qualifying the subject of c are better suited to Agni than to the mortal: *ṛtāvan-* is far more often used of gods, esp. Agni, than of



mortals, including in the immediately previous hymn (X.6.2); *rohíḍ-aśva-* occurs 5x in the RV, 4 of them clearly of Agni; *puru-kṣú-* is used several times of gods, including Agni (e.g., III.25.2), but usually modifies ‘wealth’ (*rayí-*), never humans. I think the poet is tricking us by playing syntactic expectations off against lexical ones, in the service of the reciprocal exchange of identities between god and mortal that was the theme earlier in the hymn. The pāda *could* simply modify the subject of pāda b, namely Agni, yielding an alternate tr. “Whomever you, as his own Hotar-priest, safeguard in his house, (you) the truthful one, possessed of reddish horses [=flames] and much livestock, for him ...” But the *sá* in c would nag at the audience (I hope), since *sá* with 2nd ps. ref. only occurs with imperatives. So the listener would ultimately have to conclude that the referent is the worshiper, but now endowed with many of Agni’s qualities. With the reading of c with the mortal as subj., in the publ. tr. I supplied the impv. *astu* from d. However, it could be simply mean “whomever you safeguard, that truthful one is/becomes possessed of ...,” without requiring a modal verb to be supplied.

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

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

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

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

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

## X.8–9

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

## X.8 Agni

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In c there is a lively debate among the aforementioned commentators about the referent of the fem. pl. *áruṣīḥ* ‘ruddy ones’—dawns, flames, or flames standing for the cows of the Dakṣiṇā (for the last, see Ge’s n. 3cd). Given that the same *áruṣīḥ* are found in X.5.5, where they are generally agreed to refer to flames, this same identification seems likely here. As in X.5, the flames rise higher as the fire goes stronger. The lively debate continues with regard to the bahuvr. *ásva-budhna-* ‘having horses as ground’, a hapax but in clear relationship with *ásva-*

*budhya-* (3x). Since the latter always qualifies some kind of wealth (see comm. ad I.92.7–8), Ge believes that the adj. here must refer metaphorically to the Dakṣiṇā, but making this work requires mental contortions that do not seem worthwhile. Here I think the ‘horse’ is actually Agni: the flames have the fire as their base or foundation, even as they and the rest of the fire rises. Agni is regularly compared to a horse (e.g., IV.2.8, VI.3.4, VII.3.2).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.8.5–6: As just noted, these last two vss. in the Agni portion of the hymn introduce a series of roles that Agni fulfills. All four pādas of vs. 5 and the first one of 6 begin with the injunc. *bhúvaḥ* ‘you become’. Listing a set of roles Agni performs and/or a set of divinities with which he is identified is fairly common practice; see, e.g., the lengthy list in II.1; what is novel is that these might be considered alliances—see comm. immed. above. Note that the repeated *bhúvaḥ* has an entirely different function from *abhavaḥ* in vs. 4. Here *bhúvaḥ* refers to the regular assumption of a role in the present; *abhavaḥ* referred to a single event in the past. In this interpr. of *bhúvaḥ* I part ways with Hoffmann (214–15), who takes such usages of the (secondary) injunctives *bhuvas*, -at as expressing “resultative Konstatierung”: as a result of an action in the past, the situation holds now and in the future (that is, “became and now is,” with emphasis on the “is”). Here, therefore, he tr. *bhuvah* as “bist,” not “wirst”: “Du (Agni) bist das Auge ...” In our passage, at any rate, I think the point is not that Agni became each of these entities and remains so, but that he takes up these roles from time to time and then moves on.

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

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

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

an alternative case interpr., which is morphologically entirely legitimate but pushes the syntactic envelope. The point would be that the *rājas-* is only a waystation on Agni’s journey towards heaven and he leads the sacrifice from the *rājas-* to heaven.

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

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

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

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

found in VIII.6.3, again describing the deployment of words as weapons. Pāda c is a bit harder to interpr. in a Vala context: perhaps Trita is seeking the companionship of the cows, or the association (=herd) of cows; “in the lap of the two parents” could in this context mean “in the space between heaven and earth.” Ge (n. 7c) suggests, rather loosely, that it refers to the whole world. (In general, the reconstructions of the story behind these vss. by both Ge and Old are fanciful and not very helpful.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## X.9 Waters

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

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

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

X.9.6–9: As indicated in the publ. intro. and also in the above intro. to the hymn, these vss. are identical to I.23.20–23, verses to the waters appended to a hymn otherwise following the sequence of the Praūgaśastra. The only departure is the omission of I.23.20d *āpaś ca*

*viśvābhesajīh* “and the waters are healing for all” (lit. “possess all healing remedies”) in its equivalent vs. X.9.6 (which has only 3 pādas), but this is somewhat made up for by the last pāda of our vs. 5, *apó yacāmi bheṣajām* “I beseech the waters for a healing remedy.” For comm. on the individual vss. see the comm. to the equivalent vss. in I.23.20ff.

## X.10–19

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

## X.10 Yama and Yamī

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

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

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



There is a considerable amount of concatenation between vss., esp. where one of the speakers twists the words of the other, with the concatenation interacting with ring composition in complex ways. See the color-coded version at the end of the comments on the individual vss.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.10.2: On Yama's first appearance, he picks up—and rejects—the overture Yamī made in her first pāda, by echoing her etymological figure *sākhāyaṃ sakhyā* with *sākhā sakhyām*, while emphatically expressing the rejection (*ná ... vaṣṭi*). This *ná ... vaṣṭi* opens a ring that will emphatically close in vs. 12. Although he speaks of himself in the 3rd ps., *sākhā ... vaṣṭi*, he does implicitly accept Yamī's designation of him as 'partner, companion', by using the same noun stem. He also introduces the first overt 2nd person, in the enclitic *te*.

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

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

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

X.10.3: As is generally noted, Yamī picks up Yama's words, specifically his verb *vaṣṭi*, which he used in his rejection of her proposal in 2a. She begins her vs. with emphatically fronted *uśānti ghā*, which we might render in idiomatic Engl. as “They *do too* want it.” She not only takes his

verb, but she provides it with a more powerful subject: the immortals (a generalizing of the group he referred to in 2cd). She keeps his *etád* at the end of the pāda. We might also note that because of the fronting of the verb the subj. (*té amṛtāsaḥ*), incl. the demonstrative *té*, is displaced to the middle of the pāda, with the *té* taking somewhat unusual non-initial position. Here it teasingly echoes the enclitic *te* in 2a, which, as was just noted, is the first overt 2nd ps. in the hymn.

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

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

In the 2nd hemistich Yamī launches two rings, which will be closed in different parts of the hymn, pāda c in 13b, pāda d in 7c.

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

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

The last pāda is the most direct expression of what she’s been hinting at so far encountered. It also contains the first 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. verb (probably; see below), the pf. opt. *ā vivīśyāḥ* ‘you should enter’. But until we come to the verb at the end of the pāda, her statement seems entirely parallel to her first juridical argument for incest given in 1c. Like that one, this contains two (quasi-) kinship terms, *jāni-* ‘wife’ and *pāti-* ‘husband’, and the optative should give it the same legally prescriptive force as 3rd ps. *ā dadhīta* in 1c. We expect 3rd ps. “a husband should enter the body of his wife,” and so the “as husband, *you* should enter ...” comes as a shock. She may also be splitting the difference, as it were: I wonder if *vivīśyāḥ* can also be read as a nonce perfect *precativē*, in the 3rd sg. Precatives are of course only built to aorist stems, but the athematic *-yāḥ* in the aor. entirely substitutes for the ordinary opt. 3rd sg., expected *\*-yāt* (see my “Where Are All the Optatives?”), and so I think this 3rd sg. prescriptive force could carry over to the pf. here. In this way Yamī can both maintain her tone of legalistic authority and make a direct

personal appeal. Her statement here is reminiscent of Lopāmudrā’s (less explicit) ones in I.179.1–2: 1d *ápy ū nú pátnīr vṛṣaṇo jagamyuh* “Bullish (men) should now come to their wives”; 2d *sám ū nú pátnīr vṛṣabhir jagamyuh* “Wives should now unite with their bullish (husbands).”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The final word of the vs. is *nau*, the 1st dual enclitic. This is the first time in the hymn that we meet a 1st dual, perhaps not accidentally in unaccented, hence syntactically recessive form. But its appearance here is striking; even in this same pāda the 1st ps. was first represented

by the pl. enclitic *nah*. Yama has finally acknowledged, however indirectly, that this is between the two of them alone.

X.10.5: Yamī immediately counters Yama’s triumphant assertion that their highest relationship is blood kinship, by substituting what is (for her) implicitly an even higher relationship. Since they shared a womb (thus acknowledging their full siblinghood), they were created from the first as a married couple, a household pair (*dāmpatī*), lit. ‘two lords [/lord and lady] of the house’. As in 1d with her deployment of the inherited ritual title *vedhāḥ*, she utilizes an archaic, inherited, and resonant word for the married pair, which gives dignity and prestige to her claim. (On the use of *dāmpatī* and its lexical replacements, see my 2019 “The Term *gr̥hastha* and the (Pre)history of the Householder,” in *Gr̥hastha: The Householder in Ancient Indian Religious Culture*, ed. Patrick Olivelle. Pp. 3–19.)

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

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

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

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

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

X.10.6: Yama’s answer is somewhat confusing, I think because he pretends to respond to her claim in 5a but really does not. What does he mean by “this first day” (*asyā ... prathamāsyāḥnah*)? He *seems* to be asking about their time in the womb, about which she spoke in 5a; so Ge (n. 6a): “Der erste Tag ist der ihrer Zeugung.” But the implication of his question “who knows about this first day?” is that no one does: it belongs to the time before time, at the first creation (as presented, e.g., in X.129). He has substituted one (unknowable) time for a knowable one. This twisting of temporal reference makes it seem as if her claim about their birth

is unsubstantiated, in fact unsubstantiatable—whereas, in fact, Tvaṣṭar their creator at least should know, along with the other gods. Surely the birth of Yama and Yamī does not go back to the primordial past.

I would change the rendering of the verbs in b to “who saw it; who proclaims it here.” The first again calls into question the possibility of a witness of primal events; the second raises suspicions about anyone who claims to know or have seen the first day—in this case, Yamī by implication, since she made apparently authoritative statements about the action of the god Tvaṣṭar in 5a.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The word for ‘yield’, another pf. opt. *riricyām*, belongs to the root  $\sqrt{ric}$  ‘leave (behind)’ and may be meant to evoke *tyajāsam*, the personified ‘legacy’ built to  $\sqrt{tyaj}$  ‘abandon, leave’. See my invocation of *rēknas-* ‘legacy, heritage’ ad vs. 3 above.

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

The pāda is not only conceptually challenging, but also grammatically. The noun *cakrá-* is of course neut.; its dual should be, and several times is (X.85.11, 12, 16), *cakré*, and so our form *cakrā* should be neut. pl. In the first part of the simile, *ráthyeva*, the sandhi should be dissolved into *ráthyā iva*, again a neut. pl., rather than expected du. \**ráthye*. A neut. pl. reading is not impossible here, but it seems pretty clunky. The human pair was surely envisioned in the simile

as a matched set of wheels belonging to this light two-wheeled vehicle (on the construction of the chariot, see Sparreboom pp. 10–11), turning rapidly in perfect synch as the chariot tore (/dashed) along the way. Assuming more than two wheels gives us a very different and more plodding picture. Fortunately VIII.5.29 contains the phrase *ubhā cakrā* “both wheels,” which is emphatically dual in sense, and I think we must reckon with the same pseudo-masc. form here. As for *rāthyeva* it is possible that it should be resolved into *rāthye* *’va*, with the truncated simile particle to be read occasionally in the RV and generally in MIA. For *va* for *iva*, see Gr’s list p. 221 and for a similar du interpr. of *-eva* as *-e* *’va* see Macd., VG p. 259.

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

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

His pāda a shows a nice syncopation in *nā tiṣṭhanti nā nī miṣanti*, where *nā Cī* is answered by *nā Cī*, but the rhyming verb *miṣanti* is postponed a syllable.

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

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

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

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



ordinary.

In c she makes clear why she invoked Heaven and Earth as witnesses in 5d. The “couple” (*mithunā*) is a 3rd ps. reference to themselves, Yama and Yamī, and she asserts that they have the same kinship relationship (*sābandhū*) as H+E—the point being that H+E are not only siblings but also an incestuous couple.

In d *bibhryāt* is not a pf. opt., but it is the next best thing, a redupl. athem. opt. that matches *mimiyāt* in b (and perhaps, as JL suggests, to avoid the anomalous redupl. of the pf. *jabhṛ-*). The pāda has very rich semantics with a number of overlapping readings available to the VP *bibhryād ājāmi*. First, note that she has reached back to 4d, where Yama used their *jāmi* ‘kinship’ as an argument against her. (In our vs. I tr. *ājāmi* as ‘unbrotherly’, not ‘non-kindred’ vel sim., because the latter lacks punch in English. However, this translations unfortunately does obscure the lexical repetition in the next vs.) I see at least three readings for her statement here: 1) she would happily bear (=endure physically) the “unbrotherly” sexual act; 2) she would happily bear (=assume the burden, mentally) the guilt associated with this act; 3) she would happily bear (=give birth to) the living result of this act (though ironically any child from this union would be super-related to both parties!).

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

<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/jamsid-i>, inter alia).

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

X.10.11: As noted in the publ. intro., this is the first time in the hymn that the words “brother” and “sister” appear, tellingly in a context that questions the meaning and worth of the very terms.

We can interpret the first pāda in two ways simultaneously. On the one hand, a brother is supposed to provide a refuge for his sister; if he does not, he's not a proper brother. On the other hand, she seems to be saying, "why get hung up on our sibling relationship, when I have a more important relationship to worry about?— I need a husband!" In this connection it's worth remembering that in later Sanskrit *nātha*- can mean simply 'husband'. So she's saying both "you're not behaving like a good brother" and "who cares about 'brother'? It's not the most important relationship we have to each other." The 2nd pāda continues this line of thought. Acdg. to most interpr. (with which I concur), "if Dissolution will come down" (*yān nīrtir nigāchāt*) refers to the non-continuance of the human race after the twins if they don't do something about it. In the face of this potential catastrophe why is he worrying about the word and relationship "sister"?

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

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

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

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

she wants

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

This desired echo would follow her wording and her metrical form exactly, but of course he refuses. His negation would necessarily add another syllable, the *nā*, but I suggest that just one additional syllable would not sufficiently demonstrate how far his reply fails to mirror her appeal—hence the addition of three, *nā vā u*, to introduce the echo (note also that the enclitic *te* flips its position to modified 2nd). The rare (in the RV) and solemn particle *vai* ('verily' or the like) also draws attention to his deliberate, rather pompous style and the finality of his rejection. And the too-many-syllables here is in keeping with the too-heavy-syllables in 10a discussed above. Moreover, the additional syllables at the beginning of the pāda have a complex relationship with what follows: *nā vā u te* is a scrambling of *tanū vā*, which opens 11d: the *t* from

*te*, *na* flipped to *an*, *vā u* likewise flipped – the result is *t-an-u-vā*. This point is made also by Knobl, pp. 133–34 = 73–74. He also suggests that *nā vā u* could also stand for *\*nā vā u*, with the nom. sg. of *nī-* ‘man’: “As a man [and not as your brother] could I have commingled with you” (pp. 134–35 = 74–75), though the absence of the indep. nom. sg. *nā* in the RV (and indeed until quite late) makes this suggestion less compelling. Moreover, it seems psychologically out of character: throughout their dialogue Yama has shown no desire for, or even human/brotherly sympathy towards, Yamī.

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

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

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

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

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

It also contains the striking doublet *bató bata*, found only here in the RV. The latter word *bata* is found as an interjection later (Br+, also Pāli *vata*), the accented stem *batá-* nowhere else but here. There are two exactly opposite schools of thought on these words: 1) *bata* is the voc. of *batá-* and later pressed into service as an interjection; 2) *batá-* represents the nonce substantivization of that interjection. Despite the eminence of the scholars who hold the latter view (incl. Wackernagel, Old, Knobl, and Bodewitz [p. 279]; see the reff. in Knobl pp. 111–12 =

51–52 + nn), I am strongly inclined towards the former. I find it hard to believe that Yamī gave violent vent to her emotions by saying “INTERJECTION, you are (an) INTERJECTION.” Knobl’s artificially constructed and barely parsable “*A LAS, alas*, you are, Yama!” (111=51) demonstrates the difficulty better than I could, but consider also some hypothetical exx. “Argh! you are an argh, Yama!” or “Yikes, you are a yike, Yama!” I think instead that we’re dealing with a pejorative slangy designation, and I see no reason why the voc. of such a designation couldn’t get turned into a swear word or an emphatic particle. Most exclamations are downgraded content words, often verbs (damn! blast!), but not limited to verbs (hell! shit!), in a process akin to the well-known and widespread process of grammaticalization of content words and morphemes. I find it hard to imagine the opposite process, as the argh and yikes examples show. For noun as exclamation one of the best parallels I can think of in contemporary English is the exclamation of frustrated disappointment “rats!” popularized by Charlie Brown in the comic strip Peanuts; synchronically this is surely perceived (via folk etymology) as derived from the rodent, though its history complicates the picture: it is probably from “drat” or its predecessor “(G)od rot.” Consider also how “God” or “Christ” gets used in modern-day English as mere interjection without any blasphemous intent or the use of “the devil” “to make a statement stronger” (funkyenglish.com: <https://funkyenglish.com/idiom-speak-devil>); see also <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/What+the+devil%3F> and <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/what-where-how-why-the-devil>. Some website examples: “what the devil are you talking about” “where the devil have you been?” Cf. also expressions like “the devil he did,” an example of which from Jane Eyre I unearthed on the internet. In any case the initial *b-* of *bata* marks it as belonging to a different stratum of discourse from that usual in the RV. We have no way to know what the word actually meant, but English “jerk” inhabits the right register for me.

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

Yamī’s 2nd pāda is, by contrast, hypermetric, though only by one syllable: it has a good Triṣṭubh cadence, but 12 syllables. It would have been easy for her to make a standard Triṣṭubh, just as it would be easy for us to fix it now: either *evá* or *te* could be eliminated with no detriment to the sense. But once again metrical disturbance calls attention to the message; I suggest that her *naívā te* ... is meant to match his 12a opening *ná vaí u te* ... [note that *ná vaí* and *naívā* are anagrams], though on a slightly lower discourse level—*evá* being a much much more ordinary RV particle than the elevated *vaí*. After her disordered outburst in pāda a, she demonstrates that she can speak as formally and collectedly as he can. This is also conveyed by the 1st pl. *avidāma*. Knobl (116=56) thinks that this plural contains “a multitude of divine peers” along with herself, but I think rather that she is speaking for herself alone but deploying the plural majestatis, as it were – giving herself a detached and authoritative persona, which coolly passes judgment on Yama’s failings. (Queen Victoria’s supposed statement “we are not amused” captures the right note.) With this coolly formal statement, she closes the optimistic ring she opened in vs. 3 (“your mind has been set upon my mind”) with an emphatic negative: “we have not found mind and heart in you.”

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

X.10.14: Yama gets the last word, at least technically, but it seems anticlimactic, not the clincher he may have envisioned. In the first hemistich he simply repeats and elaborates her 13cd with gender switch, and in c he seems to promise that there's another man out there who has the *mānas* that he, Yama, does not. I'm again not sure what he's trying to say: is he condescendingly recommending something outside of her power (find another man) and then reassuring the little lady by saying it'll all be fine? Is he not the least embarrassed to admit that he lacks *mānas*?

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

*anyām ... tvām / anyāḥ ... tvām*  
*tāsya ... tvām / sā ... tāva*

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

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

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

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

VIII.58.1 (q.v.), where a sacrificial *saṃvid-* is made between the Sacrificer and the officiating priests.

Rings and concatenations in X.10. The bold blue phrases, by far the most numerous, are Yamī's words that are repeated by Yama in his response; the single bold green marks Yama's words repeated later by himself in the most significant ring in the poem, but also more immediately by Yamī in her response. The bold red phrases are spoken twice by Yamī and form two rings, with one of the words then repeated by Yama. It is notable that vss. 4–6, the site of their most intense argumentation, entirely lack overt concatenation, though they contain abundant thematic concatenation.

1. (Yamī:) I would turn **my partner** right here on the grounds of **partnership** -- even though he has gone across many (realms), across the flood.

A (ritual) adept should provide a grandson for his father, envisioning his furtherance on the earth.

2. (Yama:) Your **partner doesn't want** that **partnership**, in that she will have the same "marks" [=family characteristics] (though) dissimilar form [=gender].

The sons of the great one, the heroes of the Lord, the upholders of heaven, look around widely.

3. (Yamī:) The immortals **do want this**: a legacy of the one and only mortal.

**Your mind** has (already) been set upon **my mind**, upon me. **As husband**, you should enter **the body of (your) wife**.

4. (Yama:) What we have not done before, should (we do it) now? While proclaiming truths, we would [/should we] murmur untruth?

The Gandharva in the waters and the watery maiden -- that is our umbilical tie; therefore our kinship is of the highest.

5. (Yamī:) (Even) in the womb the Begetter made us two a married couple, God Tvaṣṭar, the impeller who provides all forms.

No one transgresses his commandments. Heaven and Earth take heed of this about us.

6. (Yama:) Who knows about this first day? Who saw it; who proclaims it here?

Lofty is the ordinance of Mitra and Varuṇa. Will you speak about superior men [=gods] with deviant (speech), lubricious one?

7. (Yamī:) Desire for Yama has come to me, Yamī, to lie together in the same womb/place.

**Like a wife to her husband** I would yield **my body**. **We would "let 'er rip" like two chariot wheels**.

8. (Yama:) They do not stand still; they do not blink -- the spies of the gods who roam about here.

With another than me, lubricious one, drive off (impv.) straightaway; with him **"let 'er rip" like two chariot wheels**.

9. (Yamī:) Night and day she would do service to him. She could trip up the eye of the sun for an instant.

The couple has the same (kin-)ties as Heaven and Earth. Yamī could bear the **unkindred** (act) of Yama.

10. (Yama:) Later generations will come, in which kin will perform the **unkindred** (act).

Keep plumping up your arm as pillow for a (real) bull. Seek another than me as husband, well-portioned one.

11. (Yamī:) What will "**brother**" (mean) when there will be no refuge. And what will "sister," if Dissolution will come down?

Driven by desire many times I murmur this: **mingle your body with my body**.

12. (Yama:) Verily, **I must not mingle my body with your body**. They call him evil who will go down on his sister.

With another than me arrange your pleasures. Your **brother does not want this**, well-portioned one.

13. (Yamī:) You jerk, you really are a jerk, Yama! Truly we have not found **mind** and heart in you.

**Another (woman) will surely embrace you**, like a girthband a yoked (horse), like a vine a tree.

14. (Yama:) **You (will embrace) another, Yamī, and another will embrace you** -- like a vine a tree.

Seek his **mind** -- or he yours. Then make yourself a very happy compact.

## X.11 Agni

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

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

- a: *vīṣā vīṣne **duduhe** dōhasā diváh*
- b: *... **ādīter** **ādābhyah***
- c: ***vīśvaṃ** sá veda **vāruṇo** ...*
- d: *... **yajñíyo** **yajatu** **yajñíyān** ...*

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

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

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

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

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

As noted above, pāda a *rāpad gandharvīr āpyā ca yóṣaṇā* is a variant of X.10.4c *gandharvó apsv āpyā ca yóṣā* "the Gandarva in the waters and the watery maiden" and must be interpr. in that context. The version in X.10 is surely the original—it provides one of Yama's most important arguments against incest—with ours a playful adaptation. The most crucial deviation is the substitution of fem. *gandharvī-*, found only here in Vedic, for masc. *gandharvá-*. (The replacement of *yóṣā* by *yóṣaṇā* is a more or less automatic adjustment from a Triṣṭubh to a Jagatī cadence.) So the question is whether the two feminine designations refer to one female or two; another way to phrase this is what is the function of the *ca*?s In X.10.4, of course, it conjoins the "watery maiden" with the Gandharva and is properly positioned to do so. If the Gandharvī and the watery maiden here are two separate individuals, *ca* can be doing the same thing. This is Old's view. The presence of a singular verb (*pātu*) in b, to which they should be the subject, is not actually an obstacle: see the conjoined subject in X.10.5 with singular verb (see comm. ad loc.). However, it's trouble enough to figure out what to do with *one* female here; there's no obvious role for two. Ge and Re both take the two feminines as referring to one individual, but deal with the *ca* in different ways. Ge takes *ca* as subordinating, with domain over the whole pāda despite its position, and tr. "Wenn die Gandharvin, die Wasserfrau, flüstert." This is rightly rejected by Klein (DGRV I.262), in favor of Re's solution, that when the original pāda was adapted here, the *ca* came along for the ride, losing its function ("ca irrationnel"). While also taking the two feminines as referring to one individual, I suggest a slightly different solution. In borrowing the pāda, the poet has repurposed the *ca*, no longer needed to conjoin the two nouns, into a sentential coordinator, introducing the 2nd clause.

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



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

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

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

But what is Agni doing to or for us? Ge (n. 2d) thinks that he is deciding what reward we should receive, Re that he is stating our desire (from c) explicitly. I think it is both more general and more pointed. The lexeme *ví√vac*, in verbal forms entirely limited to the aor. stem *vóca-*, almost always has the sense ‘provide a decisive answer to a question’; see I.105.4, IV.5.12, VI.18.3, 22.4, X.28.5, 88.17. Sometimes it's a question with two alternative answers.; e.g., VI.18.3 *ásti svin nú vīryam tát ta indra, ná svid asti tát ṛtuthā ví vocaḥ* “Does that heroic power now exist for you, Indra, or does it not? You will declare [=decisively answer] that at the proper season”; sometimes the questions are about impenetrable enigmas, on which a mortal seeks enlightenment, as in I.105.4 *yajñām pṛchāmi avamām, sá tát dūtó ví vocati / kvātām pūrvyām gatām, kás tát bibharti nūtanāḥ* “I ask the nearest one [=Agni] about my sacrifice. Will the messenger [=Agni] declare [=decisively answer] this: ‘Where has my earlier “truth” gone? Who bears it now?’” Although in our passage no questions are explicitly posed, this is the last pāda before the omphalos vss., the ordinary locus of enigmas, and I would suggest that now that Agni has been installed (2c; see above), he will provide us with decisive instruction about the mysteries that concern us—esp. because “He knows everything, as Varuṇa does, through his insight” (1c *vísvaṃ sá veda váruṇo yáthā dhiyā*). Perhaps Aditi is the installer in c in order to connect Agni with her most eminent son, Varuṇa, distinguished by both knowledge and ethical stature. I would therefore emend my tr. of d to “Our eldest brother (Agni) will be the first to instruct us.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On *makhá-* see comm. ad I.18.9. The stem is not particularly associated with either Agni or Soma, and the verb doesn’t help. I tentatively assign the phrase to Agni partly because the identities seem to switch pāda-by-pāda rather than clause-by-clause, and partly because Agni does more actual labor at the sacrifice.

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

X.11.7: Although the isolated form *ākṣat* is identified an aor. subjunctive to  $\sqrt{(n)aś}$  by Gr, see Narten’s disc. (sig-aor. 160). She interpr. it as a nonce present injunctive analogically created beside the (likewise isolated) *-iṣ-*aor. Whether her model is correct (I am dubious because the *-iṣ-*aor. is a hapax), I concur with her grammatical analysis: a subjunctive in the generalizing *yāḥ* cl.

does not fit well with pres. *śṛṇve* in the main cl. I would now emend the tr. to “whatever mortal attains ...” Note that *ākṣat* echoes *īyaksati* in 6b and they belong to the same root; although they belong to two different hymnlets, I think it’s possible that well-attested *īyaksati* influenced the form of nonce *ākṣat*.

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

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

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

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

undeniable 2nd sg. Re suggests it might have been attracted by the flg. *syāh*, which is possible. I think it might be a nonce (pseudo-)precative, like *dhāyīh* in I.147.5.

## X.12 Agni

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

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

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

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

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

This leaves *svām āsum yān* as the phrase to be interpr. The stem *āsu-* is fairly common in this set of hymns: *āsum* 14.12, 15.1, *asutīp-* 14.12, *āsunīti-* 12.4 (this hymn), 15.14, 16.2. Interestingly, at least in usage, in these funeral hymn passages the word implicitly refers to a new/other life, at least to a change of state, as in X.14.12 ... *asmābhyam ... pūnar dātām āsum adyēhā bhadram* “Let these two here today grant a fortunate life again to us”; X.15.1 *āsum yā īyūh* “(the forefathers) who went to (their next) life ...” In our passage, with Agni as subject, “going to his own (next/other) life” must surely refer to the rekindling of the ritual fire at every dawn sacrifice (this is also Ge’s view, n. 1d), with this kindling referred to in the next vs., 2c.

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

For *devān paribhūḥ* see V.13.6 *ágne nemír arāṁ iva, devāms tvám paribhūr asi*.

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

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

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

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

We are not yet finished with the problems of this pāda. All standard interpr. take the *yádī* towards the end of the pāda as subordinating the whole pāda to the main cl. in b. This clause lacks a verb, but *svāvṛk* can serve as the predicate: so, more or less, “If/when the immortal (drink) from the cow becomes the possession of the god, ...” This is, in fact, syntactically (barely) possible. However, there is an alternative, which I think works better in the passage: to take *yádī* (or rather *yád ī*) as an izafe-like marker qualifying *amṛtam*: “the immortal (drink) which is from the cow.” As often, I read *ī* as the enclitic prn., variant of *īm*, though I’m not exactly sure what it is doing here, perhaps doubling *amṛtam*. I would point out, however, that it fills a rhetorical role: pāda a ends *yád ī gór* #, pāda c ends *yájur gur* #; without the *ī* the match would be less exact.

What substance are we dealing with? *amṛtam* suggests soma, but the addition of the cow as source makes this unlikely. I think it is ghee, the ordinary ritual offering to Agni. Ge thinks it is the rain and therefore identical to the *divyām ghṛtām vār* “the heavenly ghee, the water” in pāda d, but this seems rather reductive to me: it is more interesting to have two substances,

earthly and heavenly, assimilated to each other rather than simply being the same. (See publ. intro.) And it's also hard for me to understand how Agni would possess the rain.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

My interpr. of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is completely different from the standard tr. See, in addition to Ge and Re, Old's extensive disc. and Schmidt (*Vrata*, p. 88). I will not detail my divergences from these interpr. As noted in the publ. intro., I suggest that Varuṇa's enigmatic and inexplicable hostility to us (ab) is contrasted with Mitra's more reliable support for us: even when angry, or being shifty, he still presents himself loud and clear (like a signal call) and

provides good things (like a prize). The contrast between Mitra, our helper and advocate, and the easily annoyed Varuṇa is found more clearly in 8cd.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

On the secondary thematic stem *ánāga-* beside derivationally correct *ánāgas-* see comm. ad VII.60.1.

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

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

### X.13 Soma Carts

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

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

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

X.13.4: This is the vs. that I take as the charter for Yama’s choice, his Felix Culpa. See publ. intro. The puzzling part is pāda c. Assuming that the gods are the subj. of c, as most do, their action of making Brhaspati into their sacrifice must be meant to contrast with Yama’s own actions with regard to the sacrifice, but figuring out how takes some reflection. Pāda c seems to depict a closed loop: the gods make one of their own the sacrifice, a phrase somewhat reminiscent of the famous statement in the Puruṣasūkta X.90.16 *yajñéna yajñám ayajanta devāḥ* and even more reminiscent of the less famous statement in X.124.6 *havíṣ ṭvā sántam havíṣā*

*yajāma*. Thinking about those passages may help us with this one. In both X.124.6 and X.90.16 I take the VP ACC  $\sqrt{yaj}$  as meaning “sacrifice to ACC”: “with an oblation let us sacrifice to you [=Soma], though you yourself are an oblation” and “the gods sacrificed to the sacrifice with a sacrifice.” (For X.90.16 the standard interpr. is probably “the gods sacrificed the sacrifice ...,” i.e., “... performed the sacrifice” – but X.124.6 supports the former reading.) I wonder now if the same blurring of identity between the recipient of the sacrifice and the sacrificial substance is not found in our passage, with Bṛhaspati filling both roles: “They made sacrifice to the seer Bṛhaspati as the sacrifice.” My discussion of the other two passages in my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124” (Gs. Staal) sees them as depicting the original establishment of the sacrifice. As I said there (p. 297):

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

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

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

Pāda d needs to be read in the context of X.10, the Yama/Yamī dialogue. In that hymn much is made of bodies (*tanū-*): Yamī urges Yama to enter her body (X.10.3d *tanvām ā viviśyāḥ*); she wishes to yield ( $\sqrt{ric}$ ) her body to him (X.10.7c *tanvām riricyām*); and finally she orders him to mingle his body with hers (X.10.11d *tanvā me tanvām sám pipṛgdhi*), a command he refuses (X.10.12a *ná vā u te tanvā tanvām sám papṛcyām*). Yamī also asserts that the gods want what he will leave behind as the one and only mortal, his (personified) legacy (X.10.3b *ékasya cit tyajāsam mártasya*). Thus in our passage it is telling that once Yama has chosen death and un-chosen immortality (that is, has become a mortal), he leaves behind his own body, using the same word *tanū-*, in the form of offspring. This VP also telling uses the same root  $\sqrt{ric}$  (and the same stem, the perfect) as Yamī did in her expressed desire to yield her body to Yama, in the phrase in our pāda d, *tanvām prāṛirecīt*. The semantic nuances of the two occurrences of the  $\sqrt{ric}$  differ, but the echo must be deliberate.

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

#### X.14 Yama

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

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

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

It is more useful to approach the problem by way of the associated instr. pls. Here we first confront two issues: 1) are they instr. of accompaniment or agents with the pf. part. *vāvṛdhānāḥ* ‘having been strengthened’, or indeed a mixture of the two; 2) are the instr. proper names or descriptors. As for 1), both Ge and Re (Hymnes spec.) tr. as a mixture: the first two as accompaniment, the last as agent (e.g., Re “Mātālī avec les Kavya, Yama avec les Angiras, Bṛhaspati que les chantres ont invigoré”). They must assume that since *vāvṛdhānāḥ* is sg., it can only modify one of the nominatives, but this is of course not the case: a series of singulars can take a singular verb. Most of the rest of the numerous tr. of this hymn take all three in only one way or only the other: Macd (VRS), HPS (B+I 56), Maurer (249) as accompaniment, Doniger (43) as agent. The publ. tr. takes all as accompaniment, but I now think this is incorrect: the mutual strengthening (using the same root *√vṛdh*) that is depicted in pāda c supports an agentive reading. Moreover, the Angirases are famous for their use in the Vala myth of their verbal power to effect change, and both *kavyā-* and *īkvan-* suggest similar deployment of words. I might therefore consider emending the tr. to “Mātālī having been strengthened by the poets ...,” etc. I am only given (slight) pause by the fact that the next two vss. (4–5) contain instr. pls. of accompaniment. For another instance of *bṛhaspāti-* with instr. *īkvaḥ* see VII.10.4.

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

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

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

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

X.14.4: The non-god group, defined in the last vs., is assembled here: Yama with the Aṅgirasas, the Pitars, and, indirectly, the *kavyās*. Although the publ. tr. identifies the Aṅgirasas with the Pitars—most other tr. leave it unclear—I now think two different groups are meant, both appearing in vs. 3, with *pitṛbhiḥ* designating the *kavyaḥ* of 3a, which is then reprised in the cmpd. *kaviśastāḥ* ‘pronounced by kavis’ in c. I also think that *saṁvidānāḥ* has the technical meaning ‘come to/make an agreement’, here depicting the fusion of the two groups of non-gods. See the use of *saṁvid-* in the final pāda of the Yama/Yamī dialogue, X.10.14 and comm. there. I would therefore emend the tr. to “coming to an agreement with the Aṅgirasas and the forefathers.”

I did not know how to handle the *hī* in pāda a (and so I essentially ignored it, in tacit agreement with most every other interpr.). Ordinarily when *hī* appears in an imperative clause, it

provides the grounds for a following imperative, but here the action of the immediately following impv. clause logically precedes the action of the first: “sit here; let the mantras bring you here.” However, I now see that the next impv., addressed to Yama as is the first, can fit the pattern: “sit here ... and (then) become exhilarated,” with the middle impv., in the 3rd ps., a parenthetical intrusion.

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

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

With Ge (explicitly, n. 5c), Re (Hymnes spec.), Gonda (Ved. Lit. 238), as well as Whit (AV XVIII.1.59), I take pāda c as a parenthesis, with Yama as the subj. of the gerund *niśádyā* in d, because the structure of vs. 5 is a mirror-image of vs. 4. In 4 Yama is first urged to sit on the grass strew (a: ... *yama prastarám ā ... sīda*) and then to become exhilarated (d: *mādayasva*); in 5 he is urged to become exhilarated (b: *mādayasva*) after having sat down on the barhis (d: *barhīṣy ā niśádyā*). This pattern would be disturbed by making Vivasvant subj. of the gerund in d, as Macd (VRS), Doniger, and Maurer do. Old considers both possible and the uncertainty perhaps intended. The position of the rel. expression *yāḥ pitā te* would not tell against an interpr. with Vivasvant as subj. of d, since it is of the izafe type.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On *suvidátra-* see comm. ad II.9.6, as well as comm. on *durvidátra-* ad X.35.4.

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

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

X.14.13–15: See comm. ad vss. 4–6.

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

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

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

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

## X.15 Pitars

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.15.9: I take *hotrāvíd-* (also V.8.3) as ‘knowing the priestly functions’, rather than Macd’s ‘knowing oblations’ (and sim. for other interpr.). Though either would fit the context reasonably well, I prefer the former: the Pitars, who in life were surely ritualists, knew their jobs and have



returned to the ritual to see them carried out. For a similar use of *hótrā-* see nearby X.17.11 in this same set of hymns.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## X.16 Agni

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.16.2: The hapax rt. noun cmpd *vaśa-nī-* is another ex. of conflict between form and context. Rt. nouns in such cmpds generally have active/transitive value, and in particular -*nī-* cmpds all mean 'leading X' (e.g., *senā-nī-* 'leading an/the army'). However, such an interpr. here of the phrase *devānām vaśanīḥ* would produce "leading the will of the gods," which most interpr. obviously judge unacceptable and therefore for this -*nī-* cmpd alone give it passive value – e.g., Old "in der Götter Willen gegeben" (sim. Ge, Re, Maur). Scar (290) at first hesitates between act. and pass., but reaches an acceptable active sense "den Willen (der Götter) ausführend" (carry out, execute). My interpr. "leading at the will of the gods" also maintains the active sense of the root noun, taking *vaśa-* adverbially, as I do in the same syntagm in X.84.3 *vaśī vāśam nayase* "Exerting your will, you lead at will." Note the independent gen. *devānām*, dependent on the first cmpd member *vaśa-*, thus avoiding a three-member compound. For disc. of this restriction see my forthcoming articles "Limits on Root-noun Compounding in Indo-Iranian" and "Limits on Vedic and Old Iranian Compounds" (tentative title, Holland Ged.).

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

There is much discussion about the sense of pāda c, esp. what *śéṣaḥ* is referring to. (For disc. see, e.g., Ge's n. 5c, Maur's n., Ober I.501.) This *s*-stem neut. means literally 'what is left (behind)' but in all its other RVic occurrences it refers specifically to one's posterity, that is, descendants. So, e.g., Re "Que ... il accède à (sa) descendance." Although the preoccupation

with continuing one's lineage is of course ubiquitous and quite prominent in this Yama cycle (cf., e.g., X.10.1, 3; 15.3, 9) in particular, I do not see that meaning here. Rather pāda c seems to depict the preliminaries to the action in d: the dead man (re-)uniting with his own body in the realm of the Pitars. In c he acquires his new life ("clothing himself in (new) life"; *āyur vāsānaḥ*), which I take to be a new spiritual/non-material life, and this incorporeal being sets out, presumably on the Pitṛyāṇa, the *āsunīti*- "(the way) leading to (the other) life" (cf. vs. 2), to follow his *śéṣaḥ*, his 'remains', which (somewhat like this Engl. word) refers to the physical remains after the cremation, which have already gone to the realm of the Pitars. Once he finds them, he can reunite with them. In somewhat similar fashion, Ober (I.501), flg. Sāy (see Ge's n. 5c), takes *śéṣaḥ* as a reference to the bones, but he also takes it as the subj. of *úpa vetu*, so that what's left of the physical body follows the dead man to the afterlife (rather than vice versa): "Im Lebenskraft sich kleidend soll das Übriggebliebene (= die Gebeine) sich hinwenden [zu dem, was ins Jenseits gegangen ist]." But this is grammatically impossible: *śéṣaḥ* is neut., but the nom. part. *vāsānaḥ* is masc., so *śéṣaḥ* must be acc. and the object / goal of *úpa vetu*.

X.16.6: *agadá-* here may mean 'free of disease, healed', as per most interpr. and as in the other RVic occurrence of the stem (X.97.2). However, it may preserve the "speech" aspect of the root *√gad*. See disc. ad X.97.2; also *vigadá-* X.116.5.

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

X.16.11: *devébhyaś ca pitṛbhya ā* contains an inverse *ca*.

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

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

## X.17 Various divinities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.17.11: The phrase *ánu saptá hótrāḥ* is rendered in the publ. tr. “according to the seven priestly functions,” in agreement with Ge and Ober (II.73), though Kü (572) has instead “nach den sieben

Opfergüssen,” flg. Gr. The phrase “seven priestly functions/offices” is also found in III.4.5 *saptá hotrāṇi*; the problem of course is that the stem there is the neut. *hotrā-*, while here we have the fem. acc. pl. to *hótrā-*, which ordinarily means either ‘oblation’ or ‘invocation’ (see comm. ad IV.48.1). However, *hótrā-* does display the sense ‘priestly function’ in later Vedic.

### X.18 Funeral hymn

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.18.8: This is of course the famous vs. that hints at a momentary, pseudo-suttee, with the widow lying briefly beside her dead husband, before being called back to life and a new

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

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

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

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

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

The earth to which the dead man (or more likely his bones) is consigned is depicted as two benevolent female figures, mother and young girl (though probably already of marriageable age). In this gentle and enfolding context it’s a bit of a surprise to encounter the priestly pitch: the soothing embrace of the earth is only for the man who gave sufficient Dakṣiṇās (priestly gifts) (*dákṣiṇāvant-*) during his ritual lifetime.

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

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

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

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

Note the phonetic figure *grháso ghr̥taścúto*.

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

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

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

The principal syntactic shift that enables my interpr. is a different construal of *mām*: this acc. is well nigh universally taken as the obj. of *ā dadhuḥ*, but I see it rather as bound to *pratīcīne* ‘facing’. The stem *pratyāñc-* (with its derivatives) frequently takes an acc., ‘facing X’, and *mām* is well positioned, in the middle of the NP *pratīcīne ... āhani*, to fulfill this role (though it could be interpr. as occupying Wackernagel’s Position, but with tonic *mām* rather than enclitic *mā* because it precedes a vowel-initial word). As for the obj. of *ā dadhuḥ*, I supply the remains of the dead man who is the subject of the rest of the hymn; what’s likely to be as light as a feather but the ashes and leftover bones of someone cremated? I would also add here a note on the sense of *pratyāñc-*, etc.: the standard tr. must take it as qualifying a day in the vague, but hopefully distant, future, but in fact *pratyāñc-* (& co.) is very much “in your face”—generally referring to something in the immediate vicinity, locationally or temporally (see, e.g., the exx. in X.28.4, 9). So by the usual interpr. the poet would be anticipating his death in the very near future.

In the 2nd hemistich by my interpr. the poet asserts his mastery over the speech appropriate to the occasion, the speech that occurred to him (/ faced him) when confronted with a

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

### X.19 Cows

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

## X.20–26

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

## X.20 Agni

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.20.4: The phrase *gātúr eti* recurs in 6b. I take it as a non-literal idiom somewhat similar to French “ça marche”—that is, because of Agni, things “go well” for both the *arí-* and the *vís-*, specifically because “Agni has reached the ends of heaven,” that is, his light and his smoke have opened the way for the oblations and praises offered by both *arí* and *vís-* to reach the gods and set in motion favorable reciprocal action. In this context it is tempting to interpr. *arí-* as Ge’s “hohen Herr” or Re’s “l’homme privilégié” rather than Thieme’s Fremdling; Thieme (Fremdling 37–38) sees the pairing as a contrast between the wandering stranger and the settled peoples, but it might rather be meant to include the leader and the common people alike.

By my interpr. pāda c further spells out the benefits Agni’s arrival in heaven will provide for the people of pāda a: as “bright-shining poet” (*kavīḥ ... dīdyānaḥ*), Agni, in the form of flame and light, conveys the praise-hymns suggested by ‘poet’; as cloud (*abhrām*), Agni, in the form

of smoke, conveys the oblations. I take neut. *ābhram* as nom., though Ge/Re take it as acc. – Ġe as goal parallel to *divó ántān* in b, Re as obj. of *đidyānaḥ*, though he admits that this part. is ordinarily intrans. I see no obstacle to taking it as nom.

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

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

X.20.6: For *kṣémaḥ* I would substitute ‘peace’ for ‘peaceful dwelling’; see comm. ad VII.82.4.

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

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

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

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

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

X.20.8: *visvét* in b (*visvét té vāmā ā syuḥ*) is troublesome, since it shouldn’t properly represent the masc. nom. pl. *visvé* that seems to be called for here. Taking the sandhi seriously, as *visvā + íd* with a neut. pl., complicates the interpr., leading to Re’s implausible “Les seigneurs quels qu’ils soient ... (et) toutes choses (leur appartenant) ...” Roth (see Old and Ge n. 8b) simply interpr. it as irregular sandhi of the nom. pl., and I agree; I think it may have been influenced by I.40.6 *visvéd vāmā vo aśnavat* and VI.1.9 *visvét sá vāmā dadhate tvótaḥ* (passages also adduced

by Old, who notes the frequent association of *viśvā* with *vāmā(ni)*). In both the just-cited passages *viśvā* is a neut. pl. modifying likewise neut. pl. *vāmā*. Here the form of *vāmā* (Saṃhitā; *vāmé* Pp.) is of course not neut. pl., but the association may have led to the irregularity.

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

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

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

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

## X.21 Agni

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

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

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

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

X.21.1: The hapax *svāvṛktibhiḥ* has elicited elaborate, and to me not terribly convincing, rather legalistic interpretations; cf., e.g., Ge's "aus eigner Berechtigung." I do not think the word can be interpr. without considering its near twin, *suvṛktibhiḥ*, which instr. pl. occurs 18x (in addition to other case and no. forms), almost always pāda-final as here. *suvṛktí-* means 'well-twisted (hymn)' and refers to particularly fine products of poetic skill deployed at the sacrifice. See comm. ad I.61.2. Here I think 'hymns' must be the underlying referent as well, but here the hymns "have their own twists." I do not think it is fanciful to interpr. this as a reference to the twisted construction of all the vss. of this hymn, with the split refrain twining around a pāda (=e) isolated from the rest of the content of the vs. For the phrase "choose (*√ vr*) Agni X-*vṛktibhiḥ*" here, cf. V.25.3 *suvṛktibhiḥ vareṇya* "you [=Agni] worthy to be chosen with well-twisted (hymns)."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## X.22 Indra

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

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

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

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

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

The intens. form *cárkṛṣe* to the root  $\sqrt{cṛ}$  ‘celebrate’ belongs to the reasonably well established intens. stem (*carkar-* / *carkir-*), which is ordinarily act. and tr. (with gen. obj.) and which serves as the only pres. stem to the root. Medial *cárkṛṣe* is found 3x, once as a 1st sg. with the same sense as the act. (X.74.1), twice as a 3rd sg. in passive value (here and X.105.4). The 1st sg. clearly belongs with the 1st sg. *-se* forms to verbs of praising and the like, such as *stuṣé*, as well as the verb of the Vimada refrain *vívakṣase* disc. above ad X.21.1. But the 3rd sg. passives are harder to account for. Note however that *stuṣé*, which is overwhelmingly 1st sg. and transitive “I praise,” is used as a 3rd sg. pass. in I.122.7, 8. It is possible that, since accented *-sé* forms can be interpr. as dative infinitives, the functional voice neutralization in infinitives (“to praise / to be praised”) allowed a reinterpret. of the form, which subsequently could be used as a 3rd sg. mid. with a value more appropriate to the middle. On *cárkṛṣe* see Schaeffer 108–9, though I would not endorse the Rasmussen source for the forms or the Oettinger stative that are both presented as explanations there. The 3rd sg. passive interpr. is reinforced by the responsive verb in 2b, *stáve*, a *t*-less 3rd sg. in passive sense. See also disc. of *stoṣi* in vs. 4 below.

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

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

On *īcīṣama-* see comm. ad I.61.1.

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

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

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

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

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

But pāda d also has a finite verb, *stoṣi*, which considerably gums up the works. Wh (Roots) and Macd (VGS) assign this form to the root pres. of  $\sqrt{stu}$ , so presumably consider it a 2nd sg. indic. pres., but neither of course tr. it. The current consensus (Ge, Tichy [tar-stems, 116–17], Baum [Impv. 58]) seems to be that it is a 2nd sg. imperative with the horses of pāda a as obj.: e.g., Ge “so lobe (die Rosse).” Baum further identifies it as a -*si* impv., and it is certainly the case that  $\sqrt{stu}$  has an *s*-aor. that builds the characteristic subjunctive (*stoṣat*, etc.) that regularly patterns with -*si* imperatives. The problem is the meaning this analysis requires: is it likely that the poet is urging the great god Indra to *praise* some other god’s *horses*?! much less the roads (*ádhvanaḥ* immed. flg. *stoṣi*) that would provide a nearer acc. object (see Old). As Old, who surveys the various previous suggestions, sensibly says, “Das Natürlichste ist doch, dass I. gepriesen wird.” This is the insistent theme of the first two vss., with *cárkr̥ṣe* ‘is celebrated’ and *stáve* ‘is praised’ in addition to the three forms of  $\sqrt{śru}$  ‘be famed’, and vs. 3 contains a good sample of what this praise would consist of. And of course this hymn is dedicated to Indra. With Old (“Liegt vielleicht -*i* als Endung der 3. Sg. med. vor ...?”), I consider this yet another morphological manipulation of the root  $\sqrt{stu}$ , in this case a pseudo-passive aor. built to a sigmatic stem, a variant on *stáve* in 2b and confected much like *cárkr̥ṣe* in 1d. Recall that that form is 3rd sg. and passive (“is celebrated) but was created beside the identical 1st sg. -*se* form

with transitive value (“I celebrate”). The root  $\sqrt{stu}$  has a well-attested 1st sg. *s*-aor. *ástosi* with transitive value “I have praised”; the identical (save for augment) *stosi* here could show the same switch to 3rd sg. and passive value.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On the isolated *prkṣase*, whose root affiliation and grammatical identity have been disputed, see esp. Narten’s extensive disc. (SigAor. 175–76), where she affirms Ge’s assignment to  $\sqrt{pras}$  ‘ask’ and identifies it as an *s*-aor. subjunctive, whose root vocalism she interprets with ref. to that of similarly non-conforming *ḍrkṣase* (SigAor. 146), on which see comm. ad I.6.7.



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As for the problematic words, let us begin with the 2nd. Old gives a rather despairing survey of possibilities, displaying enthusiasm for none of them; AiG II.2.272 calls it "ganz dunkel," though (p. 119) Ge's interpr. (see below) is noted. Gr assigns it to a dubious root *√akṣ* 'erreichen' as a pf. part.; sim. Wh Rts. (with "?"). But the currently prevailing view, if we can qualify it as such since it's basically the only one around, is that of Ge, set forth in ZDMG 71 (1917) 25 and reprised in his n. 11b—that it is a thematic vṛddhi deriv. of a dvandva of *ākṣa-* 'axle' and *anī-* 'axle pin', meaning "im Kampf um Achse und Achsnagel"; see also Spareboom (Chariots, p. 19) and the measured recognition given in AiG II.2.119 and EWA p. 41. Although I have to admit that an axle pin figures as a point of contention in a Śuṣṇa context in I.63.3, I am not convinced by this interpr., which loses a good deal of its cogency if the near-rhyme *kārpāṇé*

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

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

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

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

The hapax  $akudhryāk$  is plausibly explained by Old as a cross between  $akútra$  and  $sadhryāk$ . KH (56 with n. 43, further disc. 54 n. 32) reads  $mā kudhryāk$  (also  $mā kútra$ , not  $mākútra$  in I.120.8), flg. Pischel, but contra Old, who argues against Pischel, Ge, etc. I do not understand the Pischel/Hoffmann objection to the privative, and  $akudhryāk$  fits the striking privative pattern in vs. 8:  $akarmā ... amantúh ... āmānuṣaḥ ... amitrahan$  (and 13  $apádī ... ahastāh$ ). Certainly the expressed wish “let them not go nowhere (/to a non-place)” (i.e., end in

futility) seems to me stronger than “let them not go somewhere else” (KH’s “Nicht sollen ... die guten für uns (bestimmten) Hilfen irgendwohin geraten”). On the other hand, I also don’t see any reason to follow Ge’s separation of a and b into two clauses (fld. by Scar 23); *asmé* as dat. of benefit (/non-benefit) can easily be construed with the *mā* cl. of pāda a.

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

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

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

Note the phonetic echo #śúṣṇam ... śísṇathaḥ#

X.22.15: On *mā riṣanyaḥ* see comm. ad VII.9.5. I would now emend the tr. from “Don’t mean (us) harm” to “Don’t make a mistake.”

On *vasavāna-* see comm. ad V.33.6.

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

### X.23 Indra

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.23.3: An oddly disjointed vs., despite its apparently straightforward content, which, as in vs. 1, associates Indra with his *vájra*-, his fallow bays, his chariot, and his generosity. The problems are the following, in order of appearance (not magnitude): 1) the acc. *vájram* is governed by nothing,

though we expect a verb like ‘took’ (e.g., V.29.2 *ādata vājam*); 2) *hiraṇya-* is generally a noun ‘gold’, not the adj. ‘golden’, which is *hiraṇyāya-*, elsewhere used of *vāja-* (e.g., I.85.9); 3) the *īd* seems functionless; 4) the main clause begins with *āthā rātham* at the end of pāda a, with the main cl. verb coming at the beg. of c, *ā tiṣṭhati*, but most of b is a rel. cl. qualifying *rātham*, which is, therefore, clearly embedded in the main cl., although this type of embedding is almost entirely absent from the RV; 5) *vī sūribhiḥ* at the end of b has no obvious connection either with the preceding rel. cl. nor the main cl., and in fact the two words have no obvious connection with each other. Fortunately the 2nd hemistich, after the main verb, is troublefree.

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

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

X.23.4: Another disjointed and puzzling vs., with the problems concentrated in pāda a and its relations (or lack of relations) with b. The major questions are what case and number *yūthyā* is and whether pāda a is an independent cl. or parallel to b. Ge takes *yūthyā* as fem. nom. sg., modifying *vṛṣṭiḥ*, and the pāda as an independent nominal cl.: “Auch dieser Regen ist als sein unzertrennlicher Genosse dabei.” My publ. tr. instead begins with a neut. acc. pl. *yūthyā*, favored by Old (who, however, doesn’t tr. or discuss further), and takes pāda a as a shadow version of b, with *vṛṣṭiḥ* equivalent to *īndraḥ* and *yūthyā svā* to *śmāsrūṇi*, as obj. of *pruṣṇute*: “as rain he (sprinkles) all things belonging to his herd.” Both Ge and I have to explain what the apparently intrusive “rain” is doing here. Ge (n. 4a) suggests that it’s not really rain, but soma (often called rain in IX), which drops or is sprinkled on Indra’s beard. Under my interpr. it’s Indra who’s identified with rain, via his association with *vṛṣan-* ‘bull’ (as [semen-]sprinkler). Since *yūthā-* ‘herd’ seems generally specified for the female members of the herd, pāda a would be an oblique way of referring to Indra’s powers of insemination (cf. for the insemination of the *yūthā-* III.55.17 ... *vṛṣabhāḥ ... yūthé ní dadhāti rétaḥ*). In favor of this interpr. is the strong association

of *yūthá-* / *yūthyà-* with the various hyper-male animals derived from  $\sqrt{vr̥ṣ}$ : *vr̥ṣṇí-* ‘ram’, a rhyme with *vr̥ṣṭí-* (I.10.2 *yūthéna vr̥ṣṇíḥ*), *vr̥ṣan-* (e.g., IX.15.4 *yūthyò vr̥ṣā*; cf. I.7.8, IX.76.5, 77.5, 96.20), and *vr̥ṣabhá-* (III.55.17, IX.110.9). In other words, the “rain” here is, by etymological and phonological association, homologized to semen and to Indra as semen. Nonetheless, I am not entirely convinced by my own arguments, primarily because I don’t know what to do with *sácā*. This adv. can be a pleonastic marker of a loc. absol. (esp. *suté sácā* / *sácā suté*; see comm. ad IV.31.5, VI.26.4), but there’s no loc. absol. to be pleonastic to in this pāda; Ge’s tr. seems to do a somewhat better job of accounting for the *sácā*, and I would therefore consider an alt. tr. of the type “The rain [=soma] is, in association, his [=Indra’s] own flock-mate” (with apologies for “flock-mate”). Then in the next pāda he sprinkles this “rain” on his beard.

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

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

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

Note the *vī* in *vívāc-*.

*śávaḥ* returns from 2c.

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

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

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

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

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

X.24.2: On the metrically problematic *ukthaiḥ*, see comm. ad V.4.7.

The etym. figure *śácīpate śacīnām* should be tr. “o power-lord of powers,” with a pl.

X.24.4–5: On the obscure myth alluded to in these vss., see publ. intro., Old, and Ge’s n. 4–5. I have nothing to add. The fem. dual *samīcī* to the stem *samyāñc-* is found reasonably commonly

elsewhere in the RV, of Night and Dawn (I.96.5, II.3.6, III.55.12) and of Heaven and Earth / the two world-halves (I.69.1, II.27.15, III.30.11, 55.20, VIII.6.17, X.88.16). Neither of these pairs makes sense as a referent in this context. The dual *samīcī* may refer to the fire-churning sticks in III.1.7, though not to magical ones. As Ge points out, the Aśvins churn out golden fire-churning sticks as embryo (or churn the embryo out of them) in a birth charm, X.184.3 *hiranyāyī arāṇī, yām nirmānthato aśvínā / tām te gárbbham havāmahe, daśamé māsī sūṭave* “The one that the Aśvins churned out of the two golden kindling sticks, that embryo of yours we call, to be born in the tenth month.” Although this passage makes it likely that *samīcī* refers to *arāṇī* here as well, it doesn’t help as much as it might, particularly because the double acc. in X.184.3ab is hard to interpr.

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

The possessive stem *māyāvín-* occurs only 3x in the RV, beside very well-attested *māyín-*. I wonder if it is used here in order to evoke the name *aśvín-*, which is not found in this hymn, where the dedicands are only called Nāsatyā (4c, 5c). I would now substitute “uncanny power” or “magical arts” for “magical powers.”

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

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

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

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

## X.25 Soma

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

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

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

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

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

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

On *pākyā* see comm. ad vs. 5 below.

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

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

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

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



construed with a gen. (or any other case). So, although I'd entertain an alt. tr. "Through their powers these insightful ones, devoted to you who are clever and strong, open ...," I think it runs into syntactic difficulties.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“this one is the choice of the seven; he will advance ...” I still don’t know who or what “the seven” are.

## X.26 Pūṣan

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

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

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

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

Since pāda d is identical to 9b in the final vs., the verbs should have been tr. the same. I would substitute “aid” for “help” here.

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

On the interpr. and metrical shape of *vātāpya-* and their interaction see detailed disc. ad IX.93.5. In origin it appears to be a bahuvr., and in its other three occurrences (I.121.8, IX.93.5,

X.105.1) I take it as adjectival. But here in the publ. tr. I take it as nominal: “the friendship with the wind [/sought-after friendship].” So also Re (“l’amitié digne d’être gagnée”), with expressed reluctance similar to mine. It might be an adj. modifying *mahitvám*, as Ge takes it (“Dessen Grösse, die mit dem Vāta befreundet(?) ist”), but the tr. is hard enough to parse as it is.

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

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

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

X.26.5: On *prátyardhir yajñānām* see X.1.5, as well as VI.50.5 with *abhyardha-yájvan-*, also of Pūṣan, and comm. ad loc. On the prehistory of this disputed cmpd, see JL, “Half and Half” (AOS meeting, 2025).

The gen. *ráthānām* may limit the first member (*aśva-*) of the preceding cmpd. *aśvahayá-*, so, less literally, “driving the horses of chariots / driving the chariot horses,” as in Ge’s “der die Wagenrosse antreibt.” Alternatively – and perhaps better – the independent gen. *ráthānām* may independently limit the 2nd member of the cmpd. *-hayá-* (cf., e.g., VI.45.14 *hinuhi rátham*), and be functionally parallel to the 1st cmpd member *aśva-*, another way of avoiding a three-member cmpd. I would now propose an alternative tr. “driver of horses and chariots,” though this

unfortunately does not capture the syntactic mismatch. On Pūṣan as charioteer, see VI.55.1, 2 and, if I'm right (see comm. ad loc.), VI.56.2–3.

Both of these phrases show the RVic avoidance of over-complex compounds, with what would in later times be the 1<sup>st</sup> member instead a genitive in a syntagm. In the first, even the presence of the preverb *prāti* seems to have interfered with compounding, as in the root-noun cmpds with direct object first members. See my forthcoming “Limits on Indo-Iranian Compounding” and the comm. ad I.124.7, as well as the immed. following remarks on pāda d.

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

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

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

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

But in a perhaps pardonable indulgence of fancy, perhaps also in keeping with the imaginative phraseology of the hymn, I can confect an alternative. The desiderative stems to √*dhā* ‘place (etc. etc.)’ are *dīdhiṣa-* and *dhīṣa-*, the former confined to the RV (except for adj. deriv.), the latter late RV+. I suggest that our *dhīṣa-* is a third, if nonce, desid. to √*dhā*, perhaps built on the model of √*āp*: *īpsa-* (AV+) :: √*dhā*: → *dhīṣa-*, which is a good match both phonologically (roots with *ā*) and semantically (both [sometimes] meaning ‘acquire’). In particular, the lexeme *ā* √*dhā* in the middle can mean ‘acquire’, hence here ‘desiring to acquire’. There’s a very telling specialization of the desid. of √*dhā*, found in the *u*-adj. participial substitute *didhiṣú-* to the first desid. stem listed above. Besides the literal ‘desiring to acquire’ sense, it can be specialized in a marriage context to mean ‘desiring to acquire (a wife)’ = ‘suitor, wooer’. This is famously found in the funeral hymn X.18.8, where the man ready to remarry the

widow is so designated. It is also used of our own dedicand, Pūṣan, in the striking (and somewhat mysterious) statement VI.55.5 *mātúr didhiṣúm abravam* “The wooer of his mother [=Pūṣan] I have spoken to.” Despite Old’s dismissal of the relevance of that passage (“... hilft nicht weiter”), I think it brings us closer to a solution. Recall that at least once Sūryā, daughter of the Sun, has Pūṣan given to her, presumably in marriage: VI.58.4 *yām devāso ādaduḥ sūryāyai, kāmēna kṛtām* “whom [=Pūṣan] the gods gave to Sūryā, (him) prompted by desire.” Note the astonishing reversal of the usual marriage procedure: ordinarily the maiden is given to her new husband (the institution known as *kanyādāna-* in later Skt. legal texts), but here the *husband* is given to the *wife*. This is presumably because of Sūryā’s participation in Self-choice marriage. She is the protagonist of a widespread if fragmentary myth of Svayaṃvara marriage in the RV; see esp. my 2001 “The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara? Formulaic Evidence” (Fs. Asko Parpola). Putting all this together, I suggest that in our passage Pūṣan is presented as the husband (*pātiḥ*) of Sūryā, as in VI.58.4, and she is described as “... her seeking to acquire [a husband],” that is, as a female wooer, complementary to the masc. *didhiṣú-* just discussed, in allusion to her active role in the Svayaṃvara. I would now change the tr. of the first pāda of this vs. to “the husband of her who wooed (him).”

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

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

identifications of the referents, should suffice to show this. Our pāda b then depicts Pūṣan in association with two glowing, blazing entities connected to the early morning sacrifice: Dawn and Agni, the ritual fire. Or such is my more sober assessment of the meaning and reference of pāda b.

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

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

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

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

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

## X.27–29

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

### X.27 Indra

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The supposed root  $\sqrt{śuj}$  appears only here and in nearby X.34.6, both times in the pāda-final phrase *tanvā śūśujāna-*. Given its isolation, it seems best to consider it a nonce confection, quite possibly a deformation of *śūsuvāna-* 'puffing (oneself) up' to  $\sqrt{śvā}$  / *śū* 'swell' (so Insler, p. c.). A form of this part. is found in the next hymn, also by Vasukra, in the same metrical position

in X.28.9 (and the other two nom. sg.s of this part. are also pāda-final: IV.27.2, VII.20.2). Accounting for the -j is difficult; perhaps there's some contribution from *tūtuḥjāna-* (√*tuj* 'thrust'), whose part. is reasonably well attested, but there is no clear textual connection between them. As for the phrase, there is a template of pāda-final *tanvā* + MED. INTENS./PF PART, all with heavy redupl., which could have contributed to its creation; cf. *tanvā śāśadāna-* I.123.10, 124.6, *tanvā jārbhurāṇa* II.10.5, *tanvā vāvṛdhānā* X.54.2. Also, in opposite order, #*śuśruṣamāṇas tanvā* IV.38.7=VII.19.2.

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

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

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

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

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

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



It should be noted that Old suggests an entirely different interpr. of b, though taking *satāḥ* as Ge does: “Sagt Indra: damals waren alle “*maghāvan*” mir gleich, d.h. sie waren mir alle nichts wert, und ich vernichtete sie alle (cd)?” This requires us to assume that Indra would put “bounteous” in scare quotes and mean the reverse, which type of antiphrastic irony seems foreign to Indra’s straightforward personality.

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

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

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

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

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

The bahuvr. *kṛdhu-kārṇa-* ‘of stunted ear’ is found only here in the RV, but twice as fem. *kṛdhu-karṇī-* in the AV (XI.9.7, 10.7). On the accent see AiG II.1.297, 300. It is tempting to compare the mysterious Old Avestan hapax *kərədušā* (Y 29.3 in the famous Lament of the Soul

of the Cow), which has received almost as many interpretations as there have been interpreters (which I will not canvass here). That (the first part of) the word may be the equivalent of Vedic *kṛdhú-* was suggested by Narten (*Die Aməša Spəntas* 88 n. 8) and adopted by Kellens-Pirart (though Narten and K-P differ on the morphological analysis); Insler has a different explanation of *kəṛəd-* but suggests that *-uṣ-* is the (daevic) word for ‘ear’, which is well attested in YA (though since the stem is *uṣ-*, it would have to be a byform). As far as I know, it was Martin West who, putting these two interpr. together, suggested that it is actually a compound of *kəṛadu-* + *uṣ-* ‘small-eared’ (which he reconfigures into an *n*-stem with the suffix *-an-*) [acdg. to my notes this is found in his “The Querulous Cow” in *Iran* 45 (2007), but I don’t currently have access to that article]. I find the compound interpr. appealing – that it is not represented as a compd in the text is not surprising, since it would have lost its transparency quite early – though I don’t think the *n*-stem addition is necessary: it can be simply an instr. sg. to the root noun byform “with stunted ear.”

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

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

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

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

*pátyamāna-* expresses something similar to *śárdhant-*: the men “act (like) the lord, play the lord” – that is, they pretend to power—but they do so “for an arrow,” which is, perhaps, a paltry weapon to boast about.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The 3rd du. *bhūtaḥ* is morphologically anomalous, with primary ending on a root aor. stem. On such forms see KH (Injunkt. 111, 166). He attributes these forms to the attempt to distinguish the injunctive from the imperative, since these 2nd ps. aor. forms with sec. endings are generally imperative.

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

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

X.27.8: Several different scenarios provide possible models for interpr. this vs.; see the various ones sketched by Old, as well as the one presented in detail by Thieme (Fremd. 12–14). (Ge makes no real attempt at interpr.) Mine differs from all of these and turns on a potentially controversial interpr. of *sahágopāḥ* in b. As I say in the publ. intro., the cows (here standing, in my view, for the erstwhile followers of Indra) are grazing in the pasture of the stranger (pāda a), “roaming with their cowherd” (b *sahágopās cárantīḥ*). This tr. might better be “with their cowherds”: I think the point is that the cows have found other leaders to follow, leaders summed up in the word *arí-* ‘stranger’. The appeal – or appeals – of these alternative leaders are found in pāda c, where (in my view) their inviting messages come at the cows from all sides, trying to attract the cows to a new herd. (Thieme thinks these are the cries of the owner of the grain of pāda a, trying to shoo away the trespassing cows; Ge, who construes *aryáḥ* in pāda a with the cows, not the grain, probably thinks the *arí-* is calling them back, but he doesn’t discuss.) In d their *real* own lord (*svápati-*), that is, Indra, is, in my opinion, losing patience with his wayward herd; the pāda is a veiled threat: if the cows continue to follow others and “eat their grain,” Indra will stop finding pleasure in them and treat them as he has the other apostates and non-sacrificers who figured earlier in the hymn (1cd, 6, 7b).

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

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

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

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

It is difficult to see how cd fits with the rest of the vs. (and the sequence in general). Ge (n. 9cd) sees it in terms of a division into the defeated and the victorious in war: in the former case, a yoked horse, having lost its charioteer in the battle, seeks to be released from its yoke, while the victorious forces have their pick of the captured horses of the other side, which they can then yoke for their own use. This seems too elaborate and fanciful a scenario, esp. since (in my view) there’s no hint of a battle scene in these vss. until 10cd. This scenario is favored, however, by an interpr. of the pf. part. *vavanvān* in d as ‘victor’, belonging to  $\sqrt{van}$  ‘win’ (so Gr, Ge, Klein DGRV II.88, Tichy 1995: 10, Kü 450), but I take it rather to  $\sqrt{varí}$  ‘desire, love’. This root forms a pf., mostly with long redupl. (*vāvān-*), but to sequester the forms with short redupl. (as here) and assign them all to  $\sqrt{van}$  ‘win’, as Kü does (447–51), seems unjustified, since variation in the quantity of the redupl. vowel is found in unified stems (type *vāvṛdh-* / *vavárdh-*, etc.). I interpr. it as a participle used absolutely (“the one who desires to”). In this sense it nicely

balances *ichāt* in c: the subject of each clause desires the opposite of his current state. But what is this all about? I tentatively suggest that the big round-up of the scattered and confused animals that Indra performs in ab is physically and mentally chaotic. The herd animals (standing, as I suggested above, for Indra’s straying erstwhile followers) want what they don’t have: those who have followed a false doctrine now wish to be released from it; those who became detached from all doctrine need to be brought back (“yoked”) to proper belief.

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

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

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

X.27.11–12: The last two vss. of the first half of the hymn change topic once again, to a stark contrast between an improperly, indeed fraudulently, arranged marriage, and one where the marital arrangements conform to social and legal norms and lead to a happy outcome. I have discussed these vss. at some length in my 1996 “Vedic *mení*, Avestan *maēni*, and the Power of

Thwarted Exchange,” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 20 [Fs. P. Thieme]: 187–203, esp. 197–200; for vs. 12 see also my 2001 article on the RVic svayaṃvara cited below.

X.27.11: As I discuss in the first art. cited just above, I think this vs. describes a legal situation treated in some detail in the later dharma texts (see, e.g., MDŚ IX.72–73, VIII.205, 224)—namely, the “flawed girl given in marriage.” Acdg. to the dharmic materials, if a man contracts marriage with a girl who is flawed in some way, physically or morally, and the girl’s father, who arranged the marriage, knew about the flaws but did not inform the potential bridegroom, he (the groom) can annul the agreement and abandon the girl. But if the father made the flaws known before the marriage was arranged, the groom has no recourse. I see this legal provision reflected here—uncannily similar (if obscured by the obscurity of RVic style)—one of the pieces of evidence that some of what we find in later dharma materials already existed, as formulated law, in the Vedic period, in striking detail, and such legal anticipations often concern marriage and family law.

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

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

I discussed the problematic word *mení-* in the first article cited above. As the title already suggests, I derive it from the root *√mi* ‘exchange’ and consider it the embodiment of thwarted exchange, which can be mobilized to punish those who don’t abide by the rules of this most Indo-European and Indo-Aryan institution, reciprocal exchange. Here the girl’s father has flouted

the conventions governing marriage exchange, and the injured party has the right to employ *mení-* against him. The only question is whether the wielder of *mení-* should be the bridegroom himself or his proxy, who, in coming to the household for the wooing, would have become aware of the problem first. In the cited 1996 article and in the publ. tr. I tr. the verb governing *mením, prāti ... mucāte*, as ‘unleash’ ( $\sqrt{muc}$  ‘release’). A recent art. by Maté Ittész, “The Interpretation of *prāti ... mucāte* in Ṛgveda X.27.11c” (IJ 58 [2015]: 203–15), takes up this very question. He convincingly shows that this lexeme in early Vedic means “put on, take on, assume”; although he essentially accepts my general interpr. of the vs. and of the sense of *mení-*, he suggests that the verb in pāda c means not ‘unleash’, but ‘take on’—that is, assume the responsibility for punishing the violator of exchange relations, namely the girl’s father. I think this must be correct, given the strength of his case for the meaning of the lexeme elsewhere, and am happy to alter the translation to “which of the two will assume the (responsibility for punishing) violated exchange”; I am glad that this improved understanding of the verb does not materially affect the meaning of the passage. While altering that tr. significantly, I’d also change “who marries” to “who would marry” and “who woos” to “who would woo.”

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

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

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

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

In b I take *śīrṣṇā śīraḥ* as a sort of false āmreḍita ‘head upon head’, rather than construing them separately as Ge does: “mit seinem Kopf hat er (ihm) einen Kopf angesetzt.” The āmreḍita-

type reading would be facilitated by the existence of a plethora of real āmreḍitas to this stem: *śīṣṇā-śīṣṇā*, *śīṣṇé-śīṣṇe*, *śīṣṇāḥ-śīṣṇaḥ*, all pāda-initial as our phrase is. The image is that of multiple flames, each looking like a head, one on top of the other, which collectively look and act like a shield. As Old points out, *śīṣṇā śīṣṇaḥ* is found in AVŚ VI.49.2 immed. fld. by another such figure *āpsasāpsaḥ* “breast with/upon breast,” also of fire. Both phrases are construed with the participle *ardāyan* ‘causing to shake (violently)’ (on this stem, see my *-āya-* book, p. 107). Here also the reference is probably to flames and an interpr. “violently shaking head upon head, breast upon breast” works at last as well as Whitney’s “exciting head with head, breast with breast,” with real instr.

Note the body-part polarization of *pattāḥ* ‘from the foot’ with the ‘head’ phrase, as well as the repetition *pratyāñcam ... prāti*.

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

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

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

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

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



As was noted above, the 2nd hemistich is identical to III.55.13ab; see comm. there for additional remarks. The subj. of both verbs (*mimāya* in c, *ní dadhe* in d) must be the *dhenú*-in d. It is she who “licks the calf of another” (*anyásyā vatsám rihatī*), which indefinite (note initial position) “other” is surely the mother of pāda b, namely the lower *arāṇi*-. It is a rather nice reversal that the ritual fire, which is often identified with tongue(s) and which sometimes is the agent of the verb  $\sqrt{rih}$ , is here the one being licked. The *dhenú*- is in turn the oblation being poured into the just kindled fire or rather the producer of that oblation, most likely the *īdā* on the basis of III.55.13c. While her “udder” (*ūdhaḥ*) refers to the contents of her udder, the oblation itself. On the phrase *káyā bhuvā* see comm. ad III.55.13, where I reject Ge’s interpr. “in which world?” in favor of “with which form?” referring, in my view, to the precise form that the oblation takes: in III.55.14c *īdā* “swelled with the milk of truth” (*ṛtāsya ... páyasāpinvata*), and milk (of truth, or just milk) may be what is meant here as well.

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

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

The identification of the nine and their function is complicated by the fact that the identity of their only attribute (*sthivimánt*- ‘possessing *sthivī*’) is unclear. Nonetheless, Ge’s “sacks,” or some object that can contain grain, seems pretty safe. In the only occurrence of the independent noun (X.68.3) Bṛhaspati strews cows from the Vala cave “like grain from *sthivī*” (*yávam iva sthivibhyaḥ*), which seems diagnostic. The nine come from the west, which is the place of the Gārhapatya fire (also not yet named in the RV, but clearly already part of RVic ritual) and the place where the offerings are prepared. Hence the grain sacks make sense. As for

the ten in the east, traversing, or perhaps better “coming through,” the back of the rock (*sānu ví tiranti áśnah*) sounds like a depiction of the Vala myth. Note that the same lexeme *ví√tṛ* is found in the Vala passage just cited, X.68.3 (a point made by Ge n. 15c). Since, inter alia, the Vala myth involves the release of the *dawn* cows, the east is the appropriate direction.

X.27.16: This vs. returns to the creation of the ritual fire and seems to follow directly from 14b, after the interruption of vs. 15 (and 14cd). The placement of 16 may result from a trivial concatenation: the group of ten in 15d is picked up the first word of 16, *dasānām* ‘of the ten’, though the ten here must be the fingers of the ritual officiant, which is not a possible referent for *dāśa* in 15d in my opinion. Ge (n. 16a and hymn intro.), by contrast, considers the ten to be the same in 15d and 16a and identifies *kapilā-* as the name of the Ur-Ṛṣi, whose birth is depicted here. This seems to take us too far afield, away from the focus on the primal sacrifice. The word *kapilā-* appears only here in the RV; although in the Śvet. Up. (etc.) it is likely the name of a seer (see, e.g., Macd/Keith Vedic Index s.v.), there is no reason not to see our occurrence as a color term (supposedly ‘ape-colored’ ← *kapí-*; see EWA s.v.). It also appears as a color term later. Here I assume it’s a reference to the just-kindled fire, or perhaps better, to the kindling stick being manipulated by the fingers of the priest to produce fire (see vs. 13 above).

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

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

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

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

The dice of pāda b must serve a ritual purpose. Although the more famous instance of dicing in śrauta ritual is in the Rājasūya, where the newly installed king plays dice with representatives of the four varṇas (see, e.g., MŚS IX.1.4.21–25), there is also dicing in the Agnyādheya, the initial installation of the ritual fire for a new Ahitāgni (=śrauta sacrificer), where the sacrificer dices (with his sons in some versions) with a cow for the stakes. See, e.g., Keith, *Relig.&Philos.* 317; Hillebrandt, *Rit. Lit.* 108; and in detail Falk, *Würfelspiel* 136–63; from the śrauta sūtras, e.g., MŚS I.5.5.6–16. Such a ritual context makes sense here, at the first

establishment of the institution of sacrifice and the creation of the sacred fire, and the players would, most likely, be the representatives of the four quarters who assembled in vs. 15. Just as the four varṇas in the Rājasūya dicing match represent the totality of Ārya society, here involving the groups coming from the four cardinal directions would create the same type of universality. In the Agnyādheya the cow, once won, is killed and divided among the brahmins after offering portions to the Pitars. It is possible that the “fat ram” (*pīvānam meṣām*) serves the same purpose here.

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

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

X.27.18: By my reading, in this vs. the groups that had come together so harmoniously in order to establish a common sacrifice clash disastrously over the way the sacrifice should be performed. Note the polarized verbs *sām jagmīran té* “they came together” (15b) and *vī āyan* “they went apart” (18a). This vs., esp. the first hemistich, is strongly reminiscent of the “schism” passage I.33.4–10, which depicts a split, quite possibly in the Ārya community, dividing into sacrificers and non-sacrificers, with the sides going off in different directions and Indra intervening on the side of the sacrificially orthopractic. In our vs. they “went apart in opposite directions” (*vī ... viśvañca āyan*); in I.33.4 in almost the same words *viśunāk te vy āyan*. Moreover, in I.33.4 they depart *dhānor ādhi* “from the (high) steppe,” the place where our people were roaming in 17c. In addition, our people depart “shrieking” (*krośanāsaḥ*), while in I.33.7 the two groups are polarized as (acc.) *etān rudatō jākṣataś ca* “those wailing and those laughing”; though the two roots for the negative sound effect, √*kruś* and √*rud*, are different, they seem to amount to the same thing. In I.33 the divisive issue seems more serious than here: it pits the *āyajvan-* ‘non-sacrificer’ (4d, 5b) against the *yājvan-* ‘sacrificer’ (5b), who is also a presser and a praiser (7d). Here the doctrinal issue is cooking versus non-cooking (shades of Lévi-Strauss!) – in ritual terms, perhaps the cooking of a sacrificed animal (as in 17a *meṣām apacanta*) and therefore the question of whether to perform animal sacrifice itself (so Ge, intro.), or perhaps

simply the issue of offering any type of oblation into the ritual fire, which “cooks” it. The latter is perhaps supported by the second hemistich, where Savitar pronounces the sole victor to be the fire, which consumes wood and ghee (*drvànnah ... sarpíannah*), the latter of course as an oblation.

The doctrinal dispute is expressed by two subjunctives to the same root but different stems, them. pres. versus *s*-aor.: *pácāti ... nahí pákṣat*. Narten (Sig.Aor. 167) ingeniously attributes this difference to aspect: those who will cook (*pácāti*) will occupy themselves with it over time (imperfective), while those who will not cook (*nahí pákṣat*) won’t even begin to do so and therefore reject the activity envisioned as a whole (perfective). As an account of this passage alone, the analysis would be convincing, but since, in general, modal forms to tense/aspect stems fail to display whatever aspectual value such stems have (as I have discussed in a number of publications), I am dubious. And it can be noted that a pres. subj. *pácāt(i)* would not easily fit any metrical slots in the second part of this pāda, whereas *pákṣat* allows a neat cadence. The publ. tr. should be emended to reflect the 2nd subjunctive, however: “for the other half will not cook.”

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

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

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

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

In *c yugā* (lit. ‘yokes’) surely refers, as often, to generations; the question is how to construe the gen. pl. *jānānām* and the likely gen. sg. *aryāḥ*. Ge and Th (1941: 109 = KISch. 34)

take them as parallel and implicitly conjoined (though in slightly different senses), e.g., Ge “die Geschlechter des hohen Herrn (und) der anderen Leute.” However, I think it likely that *yugā jānānām* is a variant of the common expression *mānuṣā(ni)* [*manuṣyā*] *yugā(ni)* “human generations [lifespans],” and I take *aryāḥ* as dependent on that whole phrase. The “peoples of the stranger (*arī-*)” I would take here to refer to the Ārya as a whole.

The lexeme *prā√sac* seems to occur only here in the RV (since *sākṣvā ... prā* in I.42.1 belongs to *√sah*; see comm. ad loc.). Th takes it in hostile sense (“sucht heim” [afflicts]), but (with Gr and Ge) I think it has a neutral and essentially additive value, with the negative sense confined to *praminānāḥ* in d.

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

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

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

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

Interpreted in the context of vs. 19, the two yoked oxen (*etaú ... gāvau ... yuktaú*) ready to drive off could be a reference to a different temporal phenomenon inflicting its unavoidable harm on the vulnerable human. In great part the interpr. depends on the interpr. of *pramará-*, the being to whom the oxen belong. The word occurs only here; Gr, Ge, Debrunner (AiG II.2.65, 88, though in latter location with ?), and Kü (365: “Fortsterben”) take it to mean ‘death’, but I am skeptical. *prá√mṛ* is not found in the RV; indeed the root ‘die’ does not occur with any preverb there. There are some nominal forms later, but the closest in time, *pramārá-* in AVŚ XI.8.33, is in such an obscure context that ‘death’ is not only not assured, but doesn’t make sense there. I suggest instead a connection with *√mṛ* ‘crush’, which is characteristically construed with *prá*; for the conspectus of passages see Scar (390–91). Assigning it to a *ṣeṭ* root might account for the *guṇa* rather than *vṛddhi* in the root syllable if to an old \**o*-grade, inter alia. Although interpr. the form as “the Pulverizer” or “the Crusher” doesn’t get us any closer to a referent, some constraints on the meaning of the passage are removed if the referent is *not* Death. It could be another way of referring to the year, which was the subject of the previous vs., or an anticipation of “old age” in the next one (21d). The two oxen belonging to it could be day and night, the regular recurrent time periods that draw us through the year and that the poet wishes to delay for a moment. I favor this general interpr., though see below for more detail.

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

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

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

Although I don’t have a solution to the meaning of the hemistich, I can point to certain structural considerations that weigh against the usual construction of the two pādas and may open the way to a more satisfactory interpr. To begin with, most tr. (Ge, Klein [DGRV I.227–28], Kü [365]) take the two pādas as two separate clauses; e.g., Ge “Auch die Gewässer erreichen sein Ziel, auch hinter der Sonne ist die Vernichtung zurückgeblieben.” But the two supposed clauses would be conjoined by *ca*, which is usually a subclausal conjunction (Klein [327] describes it here as showing a “looser degree of nexus”), and the verb in the 2<sup>nd</sup> clause would be a predicated pf. part. *babhūvān* parallel to a finite form in c. Neither of these is impossible, but the combination of the two factors suggests we might take a second look at structure. In fact, the *ca* can be read in its usual subclausal value if it is conjoining an NP in pāda

d with one in c – most likely a nom. connected with *āpah*. We have two choices for this nom. phrase: either *sūraś ca markāḥ* “and the harmer of the sun” (with gen. *sūrah* to *svār-*) or just *sūraś ca* “and the sun” (with nom. *sūrah* to *sūra-*). I opt for the latter (note that the same poet uses nom. sg. *sūrah* in X.29.5), with *markā ūparaḥ* then a pred. nom. with *babhūvān*. By this interpr. this pf. part. is not the predicate of a clause, but an adjunct descriptor of one of the conjoined subjects (*sūrah*) of the main clause, whose verb is *vī naśanti*.

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

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

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

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

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

The last issue we need to take up is the phrase *markā ūparaḥ*. *markā-* is a hapax, found nowhere in Skt. but here, but the differently accented *mārka-* is reasonably well represented after

the RV, as a purohita of the Asuras (see, e.g., Macd&Keith, Ved. Index s.v. 2. Marka). For him and his co-purohita Śaṇḍa, offerings are drawn at the First Pressing of the soma sacrifice, and then the two are immediately driven away; see, e.g., TS VI.4.10, ŚB IV.2.1, and mantras in VS VII.16–17 (with extensive parallels in other texts; cf. Vedic Concordance). Although I am certain that our *marká-* does not represent the mythico-ritual figure of later Vedic, as Old remarks, “*marká* trennt man ungern von *márka*, der später als Purohita des Asuras begegnet.” And both must be derived from the root  $\sqrt{mrc}$  ‘harm’. (For the corresponding Old Avestan *marəka-* and YA *mahrəka* see EWA s.v. *MARC*.) As Ge points out (n. 20d), the sun is sometimes associated with the root  $\sqrt{mrc}$  (see AB IV.10, AVŚ XIII.1.40 [Rohita hymn]), though I would not say the association is strong.

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

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

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

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

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



which seems to me as close to clinching evidence as we're likely to get in this maddening passage.

Thus the mace, the Pulverizer, has been deployed (rolled out, *vīṛtta-*) in many ways or places; where this deployment has taken place is indicated in the next pāda, which seems to me a variant on and expansion of 20d “the sun, which has become the Harmer below.” Here the action unfolds “below [the X] of the lofty sun,” in which the sun maintains its usual heavenly position, but the theatre of action is underneath it, again the realm of human activity. To get any further in interpr., we must identify the “X.” The fairly rare word *pūṛiṣa-* (7x, plus *purīṣín-* 5x and *purīṣyā-* 1x) is found twice in this hymn, close together: the 2nd occurrence is *pūṛiṣam* two vss. later (X.27.23d), also pāda final. And it is worth noting that the intervening vs. contains a phonologically similar form in the same location, *pūruṣādaḥ* (22b), seemingly to tie the three vss. together. On the general semantics of *pūṛiṣa-* see comm. ad I.163.1. Unfortunately the presence of two forms of the word in proximity here doesn't help in the interpr. of either. The acc. in 23d must be either the object or the goal of a form of *√ vah* ‘convey’, probably a goal, since *pūṛiṣa-* appears sometimes to be a place. See, e.g., the other two passages with abl. *pūṛiṣāt*, where it is conjoined with *samudrāt* (I.163.1, IV.21.3). The usage of the occurrence in vs. 23 does not appear to be closely connected with the one here, as discouraging (and counterintuitive) as that may be. Here the association is with the sun in heaven. Now in the riddle hymn in I.164.12 the possessive deriv. *purīṣín-* is used of a heavenly body (vel sim.) “in the further half of heaven” (*divāḥ ... páre árdhe*), which is *purīṣín-* ‘possessing overflowing fullness’. Most interpr. take this as a ref. to the sun (or to the year)(see, e.g., Ge ad loc.), though the publ. tr. (JPB) identifies it as the moon. If it is the sun, our phrase would be the syntagm underlying *purīṣín-*, with gen. *sūryasya* dependent on the noun *pūṛiṣa-*: “the overflowing fullness of the sun.” I suggest that this “overflowing fullness” is a reference to its rays, the overwhelming torrent of heat and light coming from the sun, which in some situations, like this one, can be dangerous and harmful.

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

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

The last pāda develops this thought, but it presents difficulties of its own. The principal curiosity is that it contains the only *plural* of the abstract noun *jarimán-* ‘old age’, namely nom. pl. *jarimāṇaḥ*. It is difficult to imagine what a plural of such an abstract would imply, and both Ge and the publ. tr. don't try: we render it as a singular, “das Alter,” “old age.” But I now think it should be taken seriously, and not by transforming it into a covert possessive adj., “aged (ones),” however tempting. But I am stumped – does it refer to the old age(s) belonging to generation after generation / cohort after cohort of humans? I think this the most likely of several not very good possibilities. From time immemorial the old age characterizing the current population has

crossed to the other world, where fame awaits, but there is always more old age in this world because there are always more people growing old. I am not entirely convinced by this interpr., but I don't now see a better one. And I do not see how to render it into English effectively, so I reluctantly stick to the singular of the publ. tr. One curiosity: if pādas c and d are closely connected, as seems likely and if imperishable fame is at issue, there is a significant departure from the standard IE ideology, which generally connects *early* death and eternal fame, not old age.

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

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

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

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

By my interpr. *māna-* and *kṛntātra-* are two successive stages of the laying out of the ritual ground. First the ground must be measured ( $\sqrt{mā}$ : *māne*), and then the boundaries of the ground must be defined. I consider this to be expressed by *kṛntātra-*. Now this fairly rare stem, presumably derived from  $\sqrt{kṛt}$  ‘cut’, is found once elsewhere in the RV, describing a landscape feature, in the Vṛṣākapi hymn, X.86.20, where it is conjoined with *dhānva* ‘wasteland’ and I tr. ‘chasm’ (perhaps better ‘cleft’). But the word has an abstract sense in AB V.16 *yad ratham̐taram̐*

*syāt kṛntatram syāt* “if it were to be the Rathamtara, there would be cleavage (of the Stomas)” (tr. Keith), with regard to the choice of *sāmans* in a particular ritual sequence. I see such an abstract sense here: the “cleaving” involves the tracing of the boundaries. Recall that in classical śrauta ritual this is done with a *sphya*, a wooden sword (see, e.g., Re, Vocab. du rit. véd., s.v.), presumably making a shallow trench. Why the subjects “come up” (*úd āyan*) from this activity is unclear to me, unless it is a sort of pun: since the *kṛntātra*- can also be a cleft or chasm in the earth, the shallow trench can be conceived of as a deep space from which its makers must climb out.

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

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

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

The other acc., *pūrīṣam*, is then the goal to which Indra is being conveyed. For the basic semantics of this word see comm. ad I.163.1, where I tr. ‘fertile ground’ to reflect the range of

“fruitful, loose rich earth, bottom land, as well as overflowing fullness.” I take it here to refer to the sacrifice and would now alter the translation to “to the fertile ground (of the sacrifice).” It thus continues the metaphorical semantics of *anūpāḥ* ‘marshy places’ as a designation of the ritual fires. Both *anūpāḥ* and *pūriṣam* express the luxuriant richness and overflowing fertility of well-watered places—esp. piquant since the ritual ground is dominated by fires.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## X.28 Indra

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

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

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

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

The phrase *vísvaḥ ... anyó aríḥ* is variously interpr., the different readings being driven in great part by likewise variable interpr. of the controversial word *arí-*. For a summary of the various suggestions for this phrase see Schnaus, *Dialoglieder*, 204. The most natural interpr. of the three words is as a single unit, “every other *arí-*,” and this is completely compatible with both the context and the view of the meaning of *arí-* that I follow (see comm. ad IX.79.3), namely that of a stranger who is nonetheless a member of the larger Ārya society. In context, if all *other arís* have come, we must conclude that her father-in-law is also an *arí-*. Further, if her father-in-law is Indra (see immed. above), then Indra also must be part of the Ārya community – and in one sense who embodies the Ārya better than Indra?! Why then is he a ‘stranger’? Given Indra’s busy and peripatetic life as the most active god of the Vedic pantheon, I think we can assume that the standard model of the patrilocal joint family, with the father-in-law living with and presiding over his sons and their wives and families (as exemplified, e.g., in the Purūravas and Urvaśī hymn, X.95.4), did not hold in this case, and Indra was at best an occasional (and not always reliable) visitor.

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

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

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

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

The roasted grains (*dhānāḥ*) that provide the food portion of the sacrificial meal may provide more indirect evidence that Indra is the father-in-law in question, because *dhānāḥ* are a fairly rare part of the ritual menu and are (almost?) always associated with Indra and, esp., his two fallow bays, which are given *dhānāḥ* to eat in III.35.7, with *dhānāḥ* offered to Indra generally in conjunction with his horses (I.16.2, III.35.3, 43.4, III.52.7). They are also associated with the Third Pressing (see, e.g., III.52.6), which is in large part the domain of the Sacrificer's Wife, as I have discussed at length elsewhere (SW/SW, esp. 132–46). This may be the explanation for the question I raised above: why does the Sacrificer's Wife speak the first vs. of the hymn? She would be esp. active in the Third Pressing, when *dhānāḥ* are employed in an offering to Indra, and this establishes an association between women and *dhānāḥ*, found also in the Apālā hymn (VIII.91.2), on which see my Ravenous Hyenas 161–65. The most prodigious use of *dhānāḥ* in the Third Pressing is in the Hāriyojana graha, the cup for “yoking the bay horses,” in which the roasted grains are liberally mixed with the soma (see, e.g., Hillebrandt, Rit Lit. 133 and MŚS II.5.4.2–7). Note that our vs. ends ... *pūnar āstaṃ jagāyāt* “he should go home again”: Indra's departure for home is the action that would immediately follow the yoking of his horses. On the Hāriyojana in the RV, see I.61.16, 62.13. Thus the female speaker is talking specifically about the behavior Indra should exhibit at the Third Pressing, where she plays an important role.

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

X.28.4: Indra’s instruction proper begins here. He introduces it with an injunction to his interlocutor to pay close attention to it, using the fronted near-deictic *idām*. To convey its force, the pāda might be better tr. “This (speech) of mine – mark it well.” There follow three tiny vignettes of counter-intuitive events, one per pāda, the second two (c, d) hinting at animal stories, each barely summarized by its climactic act. The first (b) describes in unequivocal

fashion a physical impossibility: flotsam floating upstream. This provides the framework within which to interpret the more ambiguous animal scenes not only in this vs. but in the vss. to come. The overall lesson of all these condensed episodes appears to be that, using the tools and skills appropriate to its species, the weak can best the strong. This may seem like a strange message for Indra to be conveying, since his strength is so overwhelming that he doesn't need stealth or cunning to prevail. But perhaps it is his hint to the mortal singer/sacrificer that though he is far weaker than the god, his device—the sacrifice—can be appropriately wielded to exert some control over the god, just like the fox over the lion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On the lexeme *ví√vac* see comm. ad X.11.2, where I argue that it means ‘provide a decisive answer to a question’, a sense that certainly fits our context. For our particular phrase see VI.18.3 ... *tád ṛtuthā ví vocaḥ* “you will announce that at the proper season,” also of Indra. The injunc. here seems to have modal or future sense. Pace KH (263) I do not think it is a “hortative injunctive,” the functional equivalent of an impv. Rather the singer expects Indra to instruct him, but to do so at the time the god deems appropriate.

The timing is, in my view, expressed by the adv. *ṛtuthā* ‘seasonably, at the proper time’—contra the standard view (Gr, Ge, Doniger, Etter [Fragesätze, 204], Schnaus) that it means ‘truly’ / ‘richtig’ in this context. The base *ṛtú-* is of course synchronically completely distinct from *ṛtá-* ‘truth’ and means ‘right time, season’ (see EWA s.v.) both in terms of the regulation of time and, in ritual context, of the proper order of ritual acts, the ritual sequence. The adverb derived from this stem, *ṛtuthā*, should not switch its semantic allegiance to *ṛtá-*, and even in conjunction with the roots *√vid*, *√vad*, and *√vac* (despite Gr’s meaning 5) “in rechter Weise, der Wahrheit gemäss”) it refers to timely knowledge or timely speech.

What the singer expects Indra to expound to him, expressed in pāda d, is quite obscure, since it both lacks a verb and is couched in metaphor, indeed several metaphors. The subject is Indra’s chariot pole (*dhúr-*), “that part of the yoke which is placed on the shoulders of the animals drawing the chariot or cart” (Macd/Keith Ved Index s.v.), “Anschirrwerk, Gestänge; means of harnessing a horse to the car, pole, forecarriage” (Sparreboom, Chariots 132, citing KEWA s.v. *dhūḥ*). Because the two draught animals are attached to either end of the *dhúr-* with the chariot’s shaft between them, the two sides can be imagined as “halves” (*ārdha-*). Moreover, with a perfectly matched team, the *dhúr-* would be exactly parallel to the ground, but its actual angle is determined by the comparative heights of the two animals whose shoulders it’s attached to. Therefore, one side of the pole may be higher or lower than the other. See *uttarā dhūḥ* in the next vs. as well as VIII.33.18 and a similar phrase in X.102.10. In the latter two passages, esp. VIII.33.18, the chariot pole and the two yoked animals are a metaphor for marriage, with the higher end of the pole (just a little bit higher) ideally representing the husband. Although I do not think this is the primary sense here or in the next vs., it may be lurking, given the presence of the Sacrificer’s Wife in vs. 1.

Here instead I think the question has to do with who or what Indra plans to team up with. The word “half” invites us to consider a number of standard oppositional pairs: heaven/earth, gods/men, Ārya/non-Ārya, men/women, humans/animals, but I think in this case the answer is narrower: which sacrificer will fill the other side of the yoke? It is the usual worry that Indra will attend someone else’s sacrifice.

The adj. *kṣemyā-* is the closest we come to a verb or verb substitute in the rel. cl. It is found only here in the RV, though it appears in other early Vedic texts: once in an impenetrable passage in AVŚ XII.2.49, more helpfully in passages in MS (III.2.2) and TS (V.2.1.7) concerning the Agnicayana, in which wanderers (*yāyāvará-*) are contrasted with *kṣemyā-* ‘stay-

at-homes, those at rest'. In my view, the singer is asking which sacrificer or group of sacrificers the (other end of) Indra's chariot pole will rest upon. Ge (fld. by Doniger) takes *kṣemyá-* rather as 'peaceful', an interpr. he explains (n. 5d) as indicating that his pole is looking not for battle, but for peace. This seems to me misconceived: though the base noun *kṣéma-* can mean 'peace' as well as 'repose, rest', the war/peace dichotomy does not fit the context. Moreover, interpr. it as 'resting upon' gives the acc. *árdham* something to (quasi-)govern it, whereas a "peaceful chariot pole" leaves *árdham* entirely up in the air (Ge supplies "geht").

X.28.6–7: With vs. 6 we arrive at the paired responsive vss. that form the omphalos of this tightly structured hymn in its exact center. Both vss. are spoken by Indra in my opinion, though most (e.g., Ge and Doniger, flg. Sāy.) divide them between Indra (6) and the sacrificer (7). The vss. begin identically: *evā hí mām tavasām* and continue with Indra's extravagant self-praise, his ātmastuti. I disc. these vss. and their place in the hymn in my Animals art. (pp. 241–43), where I suggest that the vss. constitute the technical epiphany of Indra that was hoped for in vs. 1.

X.28.6: I take the subj. of *vardháyanti* to be the mortal sacrificers, harking back to the pl. subjects of *sunvánti* 'they press' and *pácanti* 'they cook' in vs. 3, where the singer affirmed that ritual offerings were being made to Indra. Cf., e.g., VIII.16.9 *índraṃ vardhanti kṣitáyah* "Indra do the separate peoples make strong"; alternatively it could be the soma drinks or the hymns or some other ritual offering, as in IX.46.3 *eté sómāsa índavaḥ ... índraṃ vardhanti* "these soma drops strengthen Indra." In any case the subject belongs to the human realm, in my opinion. The *evā* 'in this way' may be a blanket reference to these ritual activities as well as a ref. to those activities in vs. 3. I also take *tavásam* as a proleptic adj., the result of the action expressed by *vardháyanti*.

Indra's response to the singer's question about the chariot pole is given in pāda b in his typical hyperbole: his chariot pole is higher than lofty heaven. This would, in fact, not be a good arrangement for a yoked team. As disc. immed. above, the ideal position for a *dhúr-* is parallel to the ground or at most a bit asymmetrical (favoring the husband in the marriage metaphor). But here Indra's end of the pole would be so high that it would be closer to perpendicular, which would make hitching up the other draught animal and driving the chariot quite challenging. But Indra of course does not aim to be a team player, but to assert his overwhelming superiority, and he may even have found the singer's question about the location of his *dhúr-* somewhat insulting.

The *úd-* 'up' (in *úttara-*) in b is complemented by *ní* in the hostile verb *ní śísāmi* "I 'grind down,'" an idiom found elsewhere (cf. VI.18.13, X.48.4 adduced by Ge n. 6c). In all three cases the obj. is neut. *purū sahásrā* "many thousands," which phrase is also found in other contexts (I.62.10, IV.28.3, V.37.3, X.23.5). Interestingly, only in X.23.5 is a referent directly supplied: neut. pl. *ásīvā* 'the hostile', but in IV.28.3 it is likely the Dasyus mentioned in the first hemistich, who are the referents of the gen. pl. part. *yātām* 'of those going' that depends on *purū sahásrā*. In any case in all three cases the object to be supplied to 'grind down' is enemies.

X.28.7: As noted just above, this vs. is generally assigned to the singer. I find this unlikely: I do not believe that the singer would—or could—claim for himself, in cd, the two signature actions of Indra, the killing of Vṛtra and the opening of the Vala cave, esp. with Indra on the scene. Even less likely is Old's take, based on his belief that the hymn contains both a true and a false Indra; by his interpr. the false Indra praises himself in vs. 6, while the true one does so in vs. 7, though addressing the false Indra as "Indra" ironically.

There is one very good reason for the standard view: the vocative *indra* in pāda b. I recognize this as a stumbling block – but not as major a one as putting *cd* in the mouth of anyone other than Indra. I suggest that in b Indra is ventriloquizing the gods calling on him for help “in every action” (*kārman-karman*; i.e., in every battle), that is, saying “o Indra” again and again. Although it is not strongly parallel, cf. a passage like V.40.3 *vṛṣā tvā vṛṣaṇaṃ huve, vājriṇ citrābhir ūtibhiḥ / vṛṣann indra vṛṣabhir vṛtrahantama* “Bullish I call upon you, the bullish, possessor of the mace, with your bright help. / Bullish Indra, with your bulls, best smasher of Vṛtra.” I think it also possible that in ātmastutis the self-praiser can address himself, rather in the manner of the poets’ self-address discussed in my 2005 “Poetic Self-Reference” (Fs. Skjærvø), though I have not yet found parallels. I realize that my solution is ad hoc and not strongly supported, but it saves us from worse.

The pf. *jajñūḥ* in pāda a echoes *jajāna* in the immed. preceding pāda, 6d. The 3rd pl. in our pāda is of course ambiguous, however, as it can belong to either  $\sqrt{jan}$  or  $\sqrt{jñā}$  ‘know’. (Though the 3rd pl. to  $\sqrt{jan}$  is *jajanur* in VIII.97.10 (q.v.), the weak forms of the pf. to that root generally have *jajñ-*, including 3rd pl. act. *jajñuḥ* I.159.3, *jajñūḥ* VII.62.4.) Flg. Sāy., Ge and Don. take the form to  $\sqrt{jñā}$ , while Gr (in Nachtr. col. 1761; it’s missing in the orig. lexicon) assigns it to  $\sqrt{jan}$ , and this interpr. is fld. by Lub and Schnaus (p. 214). (Curiously Kü does not cite or disc. this passage.) Because it immed. follows *jajāna*, the initial audience interpr. would surely be as a form of  $\sqrt{jan}$ , and it is only as the hemistich unfolds that  $\sqrt{jñā}$  might seem like a more appropriate contextual reading, since the gods are more likely to *know* Indra as something than to *beget* him. However,  $\sqrt{jan}$  does not have to refer just to physical birth but can also refer to the metaphorical creation of someone in a new role or behavior; see VIII.97.10 with the unambiguous *jajanuḥ* just discussed, where Indra is fashioned and begotten for ruling: ... *tataḥsur indraṃ jajanuḥ ca rājāse*. The agents in VIII.97.10 are unexpressed but are probably the singers (so Sāy.) or other officiants (see Ge’s n. 10b); obviously Indra already existed, but their actions fit him for ruling. The gods in our passage also have the capacity to shape Indra’s behavior to their own ends, and I therefore think  $\sqrt{jan}$  is a possible root affiliation and *jajñuḥ* here is a pun.

The 2nd hemistich is strongly alliterative, esp. pāda c: *vādhīm vṛtrām vājreṇa ..., vrajám ... vam*. The VP *vādhīm vṛtrām* reproduces the alliteration of the more common formulaic variant *āhann āhim* by other means, with lexical substitution in both terms. The 1st sg. *vādhīm* is of course grammatically “wrong” – we expect \**vādhām*, but it has been mechanically generated to the extremely common *iṣ*-aor. (*á*)*vadhīs*, -īt. The 1st sg. is only found once elsewhere, in I.165.8 in the same phrase #*vādhīm vṛtrām*. Our pāda is identical to IV.17.3 except for the 3rd sg. *vādhīt* found there and has simply been transposed here, with the minimal substitution of the final of the 1st sg. ending -*m* for 3rd sg. -*t*. Note that the expected form \**vādhām* (which, however, is not actually attested) is metrically identical to *vādhīm* and could easily have been used.

An even greater grammatical solecism is found in the next pāda, *āpa ... vam*. Just like pāda c, this one contains an unmistakable formula, here the one for the opening of the Vala cave: *āpa √ vṛ*, which otherwise never shows up in the 1st sg. If it did, we should expect the injunctive to the root aor. to be \**varam*. The formulaic content of the pāda (for *vrajám* in this context, see I.92.4 *vrajám ... ví ... āvar ...*; for the injunc. in the formula, e.g., II.14.3 ... *āpa hí valám vah*) allows the audience easily to interpr. the fairly monstrous form *vam* as a nonce 1st sg. root aor. to  $\sqrt{vṛ}$ . The 2nd/3rd sg. instantiations of the formula involve monosyllabic *vár*, which is always (5x) pāda final and therefore realized as *vah* in pausal sandhi. Based on this pausal form, where the -*r* of the root is not found on the surface, a monosyllabic 1st sg. has been confected, marked

only by substitution of the 1st sg. *-m* for *-h*. Unlike *vádhīm* ∞ \**vádham*, *vam* ∞ \**varam* differ in metrical shape and the expected form would not fit here. I wonder if the easily interpretable—and unnecessary—*vádhīm* in c was used to set the stage for the less transparent *vam* in d.

X.28.8: This may be the most peculiar vs. in this peculiar hymn. It is a one-off, belonging neither with the responsive ātmastuti vss. 6–7 nor with the dialogue or animal fable vss. that surround them. It is universally (beginning with the Anukr.) and I think rightly assumed to be the speech of Indra. It presents itself as a de-contextualized narrative of some actions of the gods in the past. Ge (fld. by Doniger) thinks the point is that the gods can distinguish the good from the bad—supposedly exemplified by cd esp., where they collect the good wood for making their vehicles (“zu ihre Wagenbau”) and burn up the bad. I see no trace of that scenario in the vs. itself.

Instead I generally follow the interpr. of Pischel (Ved. St. I.179ff.), that this vs. depicts the primal institution of the sacrifice. As he says (179–80), “Die Götter werden hier dargestellt als das Holz zum Opfer schlagend und es dann auf die *vakṣāṇās* d.h. den *yoni* legend, wo Agni entflammt wird.” The same original establishment of the sacrifice was treated in the previous, related hymn, by my interpr. See esp. X.27.15, in which various groups come together in this enterprise; the first pāda of that vs., *saptá vīrāṣaḥ ... úd āyan* “seven heroes came up” (and cf. c *nāva ... āyan* “nine came”) is similar to our *devāsa āyan* “the gods came,” with *abhí ... āyan* in the next pāda. In X.27 the emphasis in the sacrifice-instituting vss. is on the creation of the ritual fire (13–14, 16), and our vs. here depicts the gods cutting the firewood with their axes and placing it in the “belly” – here, in my opinion, the hearth where the fire will be kindled. The same loc. pl. *vakṣāṇāsu* is found in X.27.16, also concerning the first kindling of the fire, though with slightly different referent: there it refers to the belly of the lower kindling stick (see comm. there).

The instr. pl. *vidbhīḥ* is found only here. It is universally, and I think correctly, assigned to *vīś-* ‘clan’, though it could in principle belong to the very marginal *vīś-* ‘work’. On the stages of the phonological development of *vīś+bhīs* to *vidbhīs*, see the disc. in my 1991 (MSS 52) “An Ox, a Cart, and the Perfect Participle,” pp. 83–84. But who are these accompanying clans? Acdg. to Sāy., the Maruts, and Pischel follows him. Ge rather “mit ihrer Dienstmännern,” fld. by Don. (“servants”), but this seems a reductive interpr. of *vīś-* particularly in its RVic attestations. Oberlies (I.336), who interpr. the vs. as a depiction of the clearing and settling of new land, takes *vidbhīḥ* as referring not to beings (human or divine) but to places where such beings settle (“mit den Niederlassungen”), which seems to be reflected also in Schnaus’s (215–16) “durch die Siedlungen,” with her identification of the form as “Instrumental der Raumerstreckung.” Again I think a comparison with the similar material in X.27 is illuminating: in X.27.15 the original institution of the sacrifice and the establishment of the ritual fire were accomplished by the cooperative labor of different groups. We seem to have the same picture here: the (various) gods, each with his own *vīś-*, that is, his kin-group and followers, come together in this enterprise.

In contrast to simple *āyan* in pāda a, pāda b contains *abhí ... āyan*. I supply “ritual ground” as the goal of *abhí*.

The interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is hampered by (at least) two uncertainties: 1) the referent of *sudrvām* ‘having / made of good wood’ and 2) the meaning and referent of *kṛpīṭa-*. With regard to the first, despite my publ. tr. ‘good wood’, *sudrū-* must be a bahuvr.; see its other occurrence, VII.32.20, where it modifies fem. *nemí-* ‘felly’, which is ‘made of good wood’. Ge here (n. 8c) supplies *vṛkṣá-* (m.) as referent, ‘(tree) having good wood’, and develops a scenario in which the gods load these good logs into their wagon (“in dem (Wagen)inneren

niederlegten”), leaving behind the stuff that’s only fit for burning. I do not find the fact that *sudrú-* is a bahuvr. fatal to Pischel’s (and my) interpr., as Old and Ge seem to; we just need to find a suitable referent, either masc. or fem. The *vána-* ‘wood’ of pāda b won’t work, because it’s neut., but something like *samídh-* (fem.) ‘kindling (stick), firewood’ or *idhmá-* (masc.) ‘id.’ certainly would, and in fact the latter might be suggested by the bahuv. *svidhmá-*, with the same structure as *sudrú-*, in the phrase *svidhmā ... vanádhitiḥ* “wood pile provided with good kindling” (I.121.7, by my interpr.). I would therefore slightly adjust my tr. to “depositing the (kindling) consisting of good wood ...”

Ge’s interpr. of c requires that *vakṣānā-* refer to some part of a wagon, the wagon-belly/innards, that is, presumably, the cargo bed. This is a leap, since there is no sign of a vehicle in this vs. and the stem *vakṣānā-* is not otherwise so used. Admittedly the stem isn’t used elsewhere directly for ‘hearth’ either, but see X.27.16 just cited, where it appears in the same context of the kindling of the ritual fire. Moreover, the apparent root noun cmpd *vakṣaṇe-sthā-* in V.19.5 has the ritual fire as referent and should mean “(Agni,) standing in the belly [=on the hearth]” (though see the formal issues raised by Scar 654–55).

Another piece of evidence in favor of interpr. this pāda as the primal establishment of the ritual fire is the verbal lexeme, *ní√dhā* lit. ‘set down’, which is often used of the installation of the ritual fire; see I.45.7, III.27.10, VIII.19.17, etc. etc. A particularly succinct version is found in V.21.1 *manuṣvát tvā ní dhīmahi, manuṣvát sám idhīmahi* “Like Manu, we would install you. Like Manu, we would kindle you,” where the kindling immediately follows the installation, as I think it does in our cd. See also *ní√dhā* in the preceding hymn, X.27.14, and *súdhita-* in the same hymn, X.27.16, both of the ritual fire.

*kṛpīṭa-* is a hapax. Given the context, the standard renderings ‘Buschwerk, Gestrüpp’ (EWA s.v. < Neisser), ‘Dürrholz’ (Ge), ‘thicket or firewood’ (Kuiper, Aryans 14), ‘scrub wood’ (Don.) are perfectly reasonable, but all of them assume a sharp contrast between whatever this word refers to and the “good wood” of pāda c, hence the deprecatory nuance of the glosses. But there is no evidence for a contrast in the context; it’s simply been read into the passage by the interpr. In fact, *kṛpīṭam* could in principle refer to the same thing as *sudrvām* in the previous pāda – not the same underlying word, because of the difference in gender: *sudrvām* must be masc. or fem., *kṛpīṭam* must be neut. if it is the subject of a nominal clause consisting only of *yātrā kṛpīṭam* – but the same real-world referent. Interpr. it is severely hampered not only by its isolation but also by the fact that it has no etymology and no derivational web. I do not have a solution, but I would point to one clue that has not been utilized heretofore: the parallelism with Vasukra’s preceding hymn X.27, esp. the vss. concerning the installation of the ritual fire and the establishment of the sacrifice (X.27.13–18), which we have already invoked in the disc. of this vs. With regard to *kṛpīṭa-* I would point to X.27.16 with *kapilá-*, meaning (in my interpr.) ‘the brownish one’ and referring (in my interpr.) to the nascent fire or to the kindling stick; our *kṛpīṭa-* could be a hyper-Sanskritization of that stem – or conversely, *kapilá-* could be a MIA development from *kṛpīṭa-*. I would be more comfortable with this hypothesis if the accents weren’t different (and if the quantities of the medial *i*-vowel matched), but it is perhaps not an accident that these two phonologically similar RVic hapaxes are found in adjacent hymns in similar contexts. If they are connected (and actually even if they’re not), the *kṛpīṭa-* can refer to the just-kindled fire or the kindling stick that produced it, with the subj. of *dahanti* the god-priests.

X.28.9: We here return to the précis of animal fables last encountered in vs. 4, one per pāda. Most (Anukr., Ge, Don.) assign the vs. to Vasukra, though Old (intro.) agrees with me that Indra is the speaker. He is continuing his instruction in the medium appropriate to his simple (*pāka*-) audience. Like the stories summed up in vs. 4, these depict the surprising success of a weakling confronting (or pursuing) a stronger opponent. For possible parallels/sources of these stories, esp. the first about the hare and the razor, see esp. Old, Ge n. 9a, and my 2009 “Function of Animals,” pp. 216–17.

In the first story “the hare swallowed the razor coming towards [facing] it.” Note first that *pratyāñcam* recurs from 4c, a verbal sign of ring composition, marking out the intermediate vss. (5–8) as an extended omphalos. It is not clear from the bare summary how the hare fared: did the swallowed razor tear him apart internally (as real-world knowledge would lead us to predict), or by the clever ploy of swallowing it did he eliminate its threat? It is only in the larger context of the following stories that the latter, the favorable outcome, seems the likelier (if unrealistic) one. It is a story I certainly wish we had the whole of—the elements so ill assorted and the climactic action so dramatic. Although I will not speculate about the plot behind the summary, I do wonder if it’s not a disguised cosmological reference. As I say in my 2009 article (p. 216 n. 34) “it is tempting to see in the hare/razor story an astronomical allusion to the well-known later conceit of the hare in the moon, already found in Vedic (SB X1.1.5.3 and JB 1.28). If the razor is curved, it could represent the new moon, which the hare of the full moon absorbs (‘swallows’).” If this lunar image lies behind it, the lack of injury inflicted by the razor would make sense.

The middle two pādas (b, c) are distinguished from the rest by the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. speaker (b: *vy ābhedaṃ*, c: *randhayāni*, with the verbs in the impf. and subj. respectively). Although all-powerful Indra is the putative subject and agent of both, the theme of the victory of the weak over the strong is maintained: in b Indra uses an inferior instrument (a clod of earth) to split what should have been impregnable, a rock; is this an early variant on the children’s game rock–paper–scissors? In c, in a more standard Indraic act, he uses his power to render the strong subject to the weak. In b the breaking into the Vala cave seems indirectly referred to;  $\sqrt{bhid}$  is regularly used for this action (see e.g., II.24.3, VIII.14.7, X.62.2). And though in the standard story Indra does not use an earth clod, his instrument is another seemingly ineffectual one, namely a song, a formulation. In c the root  $\sqrt{ra(n)dh}$  plus acc. and dat. (as here) is a stereotyped construction regularly used of Indra’s subjecting an enemy (acc.) to a client-beneficiary (dat.)(see I.51.6, II.11.19, etc. etc.). The use of 1st ps. expressions employing typical Indra phraseology in these two pādas reinforces my view that Indra is the speaker of this vs.

Note the phonological figures in c and d: *bṛhántam cid rhaté randhayāni, vayad vatsó vṛṣabham ...*

The dat. *rhaté* is a hapax, clearly employed here to function in opposition to *bṛhántam*. Its general meaning is easy to extract from context, since it must be a semantic opposite to *bṛhánt*—‘lofty’—hence, ‘weak’, ‘low(ly)’, or the like. Its etymology is unclear (see EWA s.v.), and since it is situated between *bṛh-* and *radh-* its phonological shape may have been manipulated to fit the context, esp. given the possibility that the medial *-h-* might represent MIA loss of occlusion. Old suggests a connection with  $\sqrt{arh}$  ‘be worthy, deserve’ (with “small, low” assumed [“sei er noch so klein”] but not overt: a twist on “the deserving poor”). Though the phonology works, I am less convinced by the semantics. The old connection with  $\sqrt{ramh}$ , *raghú-* ‘quick’ (Gr; see EWA) is even more problematic semantically; more attractive is Mayr’s suggestion of  $\sqrt{ra(n)dh}$  in intransitive usage, ‘subject to, subordinate’, so that *rhaté randhayāni* would be a disguised



etymological figure. I would myself suggest a connection with *árbha-* ‘small’ (or even *ardhá-* ‘half’), which would work well semantically. But there is no way to go further here. As for its morphology, Lowe (Participles in RV, 285 and n. 108), flg. Rau (2009: ... *Caland System*, 90), takes it as a Caland adjective, like, in fact, *brhánt-*. But given its isolation, nothing prevents it from belonging to an athematic root formation or a Vith class pres. or thematic aorist, which is otherwise unattested.

The verb of d, *váyat*, is one of the rare subjunctives to  $\sqrt{v\bar{t}}$  ‘pursue’; cf. the 1st sg. injunc. *váyam* in the preceding hymn, X.27.9, and comm. there.

X.28.10: In this vs. the strong are depicted as getting into trouble by themselves, without any direct intervention of the weak. In the first three pādas three different powerful animals, an eagle (or other large bird of prey: *suparṇá-*), a lion, and a buffalo, all get trapped; the implication is that in the arrogance of their power they weren’t paying attention. The traps and snares were, however, surely set by comparatively weak humans, and so the overall theme persists.

With most (Old, Ge, Lü [KISch 515], Don 147, Kü 548, Scar 297) I see the *suparṇá-* in pāda a as another trapped victim. Schmaus (pp. 218–19) suggests rather that the bird has his talon firmly fixed in a prey animal, indeed in the lion of the next pāda—reviving, unaware, the view of Pischel rejected by Old. She sees the mismatch of predator (bird) and prey (lion) in ab as a continuation of the weak-versus-strong theme of the previous vs., and parallel to the pairing of buffalo (c: strong / victim) and lizard (d: weak / predator) in the 2nd hemistich.

The two middle pādas, b and c, once again resemble each other—this time by having a large mammal trapped, using the same ppl. of the same root  $\sqrt{rudh}$  (*ávaruddhaḥ* b, *niruddháḥ* c) compounded with the semantically equivalent preverbs *áva* and *ní*, both ‘down’. I have no idea why the 2nd form, *niruddhá-*, is accented on the suffix, not the preverb, contrary to the usual rule (see, e.g., Macd. VGS p. 462) embodied by *ávaruddha-* in the preceding pāda – esp. since the other occurrence of this form is accented on the preverb, *niruddha-* in I.32.11. For another suffix-accented form prev + ppl. in this hymn, see *avasṛṣṭá-* in 11c.

The acc. *paripádam* in b is somewhat surprising: a loc. “entrapped *in* a snare” would be more comfortable. See disc. of the stem and of the case syntax by Scar 297–98. The simplest solution seems to be that reflected in Ge’s “wie ein in die Fusschlinge (geratener) Löwe,” with a dynamic reading of the ppl. *ávaruddhaḥ*—hence my “into.”

On the sandhi of *godhā* in vss. 10 and 11, see Old, Scar 271, and disc. below ad 11a. The word is discussed at length by Lü (ZDMG 96 [1942] 23–50 = KISch. 490–517, treating this passage pp. 48–49 = 515–16) and Scar (269–72). Lü’s identification of the animal as a monitor lizard, a large lizard widely distributed in the subcontinent and, though terrestrial, also at home in the water, is quite convincing, and his treatment covers vast textual and linguistic ground.

My interpr. of d differs radically from the standard, but is close to Old’s and Scar’s (270). The standard (Ge, Lü [KISch 515], Don 147, Kü 548, Schnaus 218–19) sees the *godhā* as seizing the foot/leg of the buffalo and dragging the hapless animal away: e.g., Ge “Ein Krokodil wird ihm dann das Bein wegschleppen.” This interpr. founders, in my opinion, on three points: 1) the rendering of *ayátha-* as ‘foot, leg’; 2) the interpr. of dat. *tásmai* as a possessive; 3) the necessity of reconciling this interpr. with the almost identical repetition of this pāda in the immediately following one, 11a, with the substitution of pl. dat. *tébhyaḥ* for sg. *tásmai*. To start with 1): *ayátha-* is found only in these two almost identical pādas 10d, 11a. Although ‘foot’ is the standard interpr., the *-átha-* suffix normally forms abstracts shading into nomina actionis (see AiG II.2.171–73), such as *vakṣátha-* ‘growth’. The best comparandum for our form is *carátha-*,

also built to a verb of motion. It is found 5x in the dat. *caráthāya* in (pseudo-)infinitival usage “for moving, to move”. (The 8 [or 9] non-dative forms are morphologically and metrically somewhat troubled [see comm. ad I.66.9, etc.] and are best left out of account here.) If *carátha-* means ‘movement, moving’, then the most likely sense of *ayátha-* is similarly abstract ‘going’, or concretized to ‘a going, a way’, as Old suggests (‘Gang’), in rejecting the ‘foot’ interpr. Scar (270) also brings up the usual abstract function of *-átha-* as a problem for ‘foot’ and accepts Old’s re-interpr. Scar also points out that this reinterpr. makes it easier to accommodate the dative, since with ‘foot’ we would expect a genitive or perhaps “in partitiver Apposition” an accusative. Although the dat. can be used for possession in Vedic, this use is restricted to existential predication “(there is) a foot to him / he has a foot,” in my experience. Rendering *ayátha-* as ‘foot’ also complicates the interpr. of 11a, for there it would not be the buffalo’s foot that was grabbed, but that of the stingy people who taunt brahmans. Although interpreting 11a requires a certain metaphorical latitude, eliminating the “foot” at least removes an extra layer of metaphor.

If the lizard is not dragging the buffalo by the foot, what is it doing? Let us now focus on the verb *karṣat*, which belongs to the root  $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$  (though see other spec. by Scar 270, which he ultimately rejects), an item of agricultural vocabulary whose primary sense is ‘plough’, not ‘drag’. The form itself is synchronically an injunctive to the 1st class pres. *kárṣati* (see, e.g., Gotō, 1st Kl. 112–13; no RVic forms are accented, but see AVŚ XV.13.7 *kárṣet* [though the passage is obscure]), whatever its history may be: the existence of both 1st and 6th cl. presents hint at a root formation in its past. In my opinion the fact that the form is injunctive is crucial to the interpr. of these two vss., because the transition from vs. 10 to vs. 11 takes us from Indra’s narrative animal fables to the current situation pitting non- (or bad) sacrificers against good ones. The injunctive in 10d, found in a narrative verse couched in the past, is to be read as a preterite, but the one in 11a has modal/future value: it is a warning that what happened to the buffalo can happen to you! The functional ambiguity of the injunctive provides an ideal pivot.

And what did happen to the buffalo? Here I think Old is essentially correct: the lizard ploughed a way for the trapped buffalo, ostensibly to free it, but “in Wirklichkeit wohl, wie v. 11 zu ergeben scheint, zu seinem Unglück” – presumably by opening a way for the buffalo that led to a place where the lizard could more easily gain control over it (perhaps a body of water? the buffalo was already “thirsty” *tarṣyāṁvān*). The root  $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$  ‘plough’ is quite apposite: because the monitor lizard has a long, heavy, dragging trail, its tracks show a distinct furrow-like ridge between its footprints (google ‘monitor lizard tracks’). The characteristic tracks of this large lizard would presumably be familiar to any human who lived in proximity to it.

(As an aside, a google search for monitor lizard hunting turns up the title “Giant lizard versus buffalo.” There are a number of videos on YouTube of komodo dragons attacking and killing water buffalo. Unfortunately the lizard in question is the Indonesian komodo dragon, the largest monitor lizard species and not of course found in the subcontinent – but still ...)

X.28.11: With this vs. we return to the outer ring, with its concern for proper modes of sacrifice matching that of the first 3 vss. of the hymn. As was just noted, this return is effected by pivoting on the almost identical pādas 10d / 11a, using the ambiguity of the injunctive *karṣat* to transition from the narrative past to the ritual present. The fate of the thirsty buffalo in 10cd serves as a cautionary example for the greedy men depicted in 11ab. Although an actual monitor lizard is not bringing them to ruin, the point seems to be the one cited from Old above: although it appears that an easy path has been created for these heedless people, as there was for the thirsty

buffalo, it leads to disaster. They think that they can satisfy themselves directly, by eating luxury food (oxen) that others would offer in sacrifice to the gods and, thereby, to the brahmins who perform the sacrifice. But this gluttony and disrespect for gods and brahmins destroy their strength and their bodies.

As I said just above, the first pāda needs to be interpr. metaphorically: the greedy men are not being led astray by a real lizard. However, Scar (270–71) makes the attractive suggestion that *godhā-* in this pāda (though not 10d) is a pun on *go-dā-* ‘cow-giver’ (5x), primarily an epithet of Indra (III.30.21, IV.22.10, VIII.45.19). If Indra is lurking in the background of this word—and identified as the one who provides the bovines in the first place—the expression in pāda a would not be metaphorical and the warning would be more acute: Indra has the power to prepare a path to perdition for those who offend him and wrongly eat the oxen he gives (some of which in turn should be sacrificed to him). I would now slightly emend my tr. to “The monitor-lizard (/the cow-giver [=Indra]) will plough ...”

If Scar’s suggestion is accepted, it may also provide a solution to the problematic sandhi variation in the two occurrences of *godhā-*. In 11a the word appears in hiatus followed by a vowel-initial word: *godhā ayátham*, suggesting an underlying nom. sg. form *godhās* with final -s. But in 10d it appears before *tásmāi*; if the nom. sg. ended in -s, we should find \**godhās tásmāi*. So the form in 10d must lack the ending -s, as it does also in its other occurrence (in a different meaning) in VIII.69.9; such is the Pp analysis too. The apparent -s of the form in 11a (so also Pp) needs an explanation: if it is a pun on *godā-* it may owe its -s to the influence of that word. In its four nom. sg. attestations the form is always underlying *godās*. Curiously, though the pun is Scar’s idea, he only mentions the possibility of morphological influence of *godāḥ* on the form of *godhāḥ* glancingly in a footnote (271 n. 380) as an alternative to his favored explanation, which is both more complex and less plausible.

The offending action that leads to the downfall of the subjects is “mocking the brahmins with food” *brahmāṇaḥ pratipīyanty ānnaiḥ*. Exactly what that means is unclear; Ge (n. 11b) points out that it must be the opposite of *pratiśīkṣanty ānnaiḥ* in the next hymn (X.29.5), also by Vasukra. Unfortunately that phrase is at least as obscure as this one, so it does little to illuminate our passage. I think they “mock” either by words (“we’ve got food and you don’t – nyah nyah nyah”) or, more likely, by actions—in the latter case by ostentatiously consuming food that was meant for sacrifice, some of which would have been distributed to the officiating priests, had it been sacrificed. Their eating is expressed by the same root *√ad* used for Indra’s (proper) eating of the sacrificial animals in 3c: *pācanti te vṛṣabhāṁ ātsi téṣām* “they cook bulls for you. You eat of them,” here echoed by *ukṣnāḥ ... adanti* “they eat oxen.” See also X.27.6, where the non-sacrificers “drink the cooked milk oblation and serve the foreleg without offering to Indra.” The specific mention of the brahmins here is reminiscent of the two fierce AV hymns against interfering with “the Brahman’s cow” (in Whitney’s title), AVŚ V.18–19 / AVP IX.17–18, promising dire penalties to those who do so. The first hymn begins (AVŚ V.18.1 = AVP IX.17.1 [the latter wo/ accents]) *naítām te devā adadus, túbhyaṁ nṛpate áttave / mā brāhmaṇasya rājanya, gām jighatso anādyām* “The gods did not give her to you to eat, o king; do not seek to eat the cow of the brahman, which is not to be eaten, o Rājanya.” The overt hostility between varṇas in the AV hymns, which is especially characteristic of the AV, is absent from our passage, but similar disaster is in store for our unidentified subjects.

The extent of their mockery, indeed their blasphemy, is expressed by the ppl. *avasṛṣtān* ‘released’ in c. Although the lexeme *áva √sṛj* has a number of applications, a particular ritual use is in play here. The sacrificial animal is “released” (*áva √sṛj*) from the post to which it was tied

immediately before it is sacrificed. See the stereotyped usage of this lexeme in the Āprī hymns, where the *vānaspāti*- ‘lord of the forest’, that is, the post, “releases” the animal, generally referred to as “the oblation” for taboo reasons, for sacrifice to the gods. Cf., e.g., I.13.11 *áva sṛjā vanaspate, déva devébhyo havīh* “Release, o Lord of the Forest, the oblation to the gods, o god” (very sim. also 142.11, II.3.10, III.4.10=VII.2.10, X.110.10). The very next action in the Āprī hymn template is the sacrifice itself. An even clearer instance of the usage of this lexeme is found in a non-Āprī hymn, X.91.14, where a list of sacrificial animals, including *ukṣāṇaḥ* ‘oxen’, are *avasṛṣṭāsa āhutāḥ* “released (and) offered.” Although the qualifier ‘released’ might suggest that the animals have been let loose and are roaming free, in fact they are on a narrow path to ritual death. In other words the offenders in our vs. have snatched and themselves consumed the sacrificial animals on the point of being offered to the gods – they have invaded and hijacked the sacrifice. (Ge [n. 11c] also recognizes that *avasṛṣṭā*- describes specifically Opfertieren, but, referring only to a grhya sūtra passage, seems to think it refers to animals that had been bound for sacrifice but were then actually released without being sacrificed.)

On *simá*- see esp. Old ad I.95.7, where he considers all the relevant passages incl. this one—which he renders “sie (und keine Andern).” The Pp interpr. the Samh. *simá* as sg. *simáh*, but *simé* with pronominal nom. pl. ending is the better reading. See Old’s disc. ad I.95.7.

Pāda d depicts the comeuppance that the arrogant eaters bring on themselves—their role in their own downfall emphasized by both *svayám* and *tanvāḥ*, as well as by the middle voice of the part. *śṛṇānāḥ*, the only middle form to this stem. Most take *tanvāḥ* as gen. sg. dependent on *bālāni* (“breaking the powers of (their) body”). This is possible, but because of the number disharmony (one body / plural subjects) and the acc. pl. *tanvāḥ* in the matching contrastive vs. 12b, I take it as an acc. pl. parallel to *bālāni*. However, as to my first argument, the sg. instr. *tanvā* in clear pl. context in the companion hymn X.27.2 *tanvā sūśujānāḥ* “puffing themselves up in body / with their body/-ies” renders that consideration less cogent.

X.28.12: The arrogant, impious, but ultimately self-defeating behavior of the actors in vs. 11 is contrasted here in the first hemistich with the good sacrificers, who bring themselves success. The hymn ends with an address to Indra, asking for bounty for “us” – presumably those who perform sacrifice in ab.

The standard interpr. of pāda a involves two etymologically near-identical instr.: *śámībhiḥ suśámī* “by ritual labors, by good ritual labor.” For a poet of the skill of Vasukra this seems an exceedingly flatfooted way to end this tour-de-force hymn. It also leaves the verb *abhūvan* with surprisingly little to do. Ge (n. 12a) suggests that the verb has the pregnant sense common for *√bhū* in the Brāhmaṇas, namely ‘thrive’ – a sense he also claims for *ābhūḥ* in the preceding hymn, X.27.7—where, however, the straightforward “came into being” fits the context better. I suggest in contrast that *suśámī abhūvan* is a pseudo-/proto-*cvī* construction, a type found in the RV only in *akhkhalī-kītyā* in the Frog hymn, VII.103.3. Here the base noun would be the well-attested indeclinable *śám* ‘weal, luck’. This form in fact is regularly compounded with *√bhū*, in the adjectives *śambhú/-bhū-*, *viśvá-śambhū-*, with the splv. *śámbhaviṣṭha-*. There are also a number of examples with finite forms of *√bhū*: e.g., I.90.9 *śám no bhavatv aryamā* “Let Aryaman be weal for us” (see also I.189.2, II.3.8.11, III.17.3, etc.). But, as the tr. shows, this VP does not mean “become lucky,” but “be luck for” – that is, the subject transfers the luck to the dative recipient. In order to indicate that it’s the subject that possess or acquires the luck, in this late RVic hymn it would not be surprising to improvise with the *√bhū* version of transitive *√kṛ* in the nascent *cvī* construction. Though I do not know of other examples with a root noun (or

whatever we want to call *śám*) as base in the *cvi* type, it is not unlikely that various experiments were tried as the construction was emerging. That the resulting *śám-ī* coincides with the stem of the noun *śámī*- ‘labor’ is, for Vasukra, a happy rhetorical result. By my interpr., then, *śámībhiḥ suśámī* is a punning expression, since the two *śám*-s are unrelated. Rather than the pedestrian doubling assumed by other interpr., we see here yet another example of Vasukra’s poetic artfulness.

On *hinviré tanvāḥ* see comm. ad X.65.2.

The *ukthaiḥ* that ends b contrasts with identically placed *ánnaiḥ* in 11b, characterizing the tools of the bad sacrificers.

The last hemistich is addressed to Indra. Note the framing: # *nṛvát* ... *vīráḥ* #, two words that can be applied to both humans and to gods, but here applicable to Indra. The poet may be underlining the relationship between superior humans and Indra, the qualities they share. “Speaking like a man” (*nṛvát vādan*) may also refer to the verbal instruction Indra has given in the middle of the hymn, which were composed in the human style.

The nom. *vīráḥ* may simply double the subject, in which case the pāda should be rendered “(As) hero, in heaven you have established your fame and name.” But far more likely is that standard interpr. (incl. the publ. tr.) that *vīráḥ* is the actual name, which reverts to the nom. in quoted speech, though *nāma* is in the acc. See a similar ex. in I.103.4.

## X.29 Indra

This last hymn attributed to Vasukra does not let up on the enigmas or the splashy poetic displays. In fact, vs. 1 is a leading contender for the most complex and trickiest single verse I have encountered in the RV. Unfortunately the tight control of structure exhibited in the preceding two hymns, esp. X.28, is not encountered here, so that we cannot use structural clues to help untangle the mysteries of the hymn.

X.29.1: As I have treated this vs. at extraordinary (perhaps wearisome) detail in my 2015 Fs. Gerow article (“Śleṣa in the Ṛgveda? Poetic Effects in RV X.29.1,” *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 19: 157–70), I will simply insert most of the text of that article here. In it I argue that the verse anticipates techniques well known from Classical Sanskrit poetry, such as bitextuality, ambiguity of reference, and other types of punning, while serving to sketch a larger ritual situation than the verse appears to depict on the surface.

Although the various poetic effects operate simultaneously, I will first treat them separately under some of the following rubrics: phonological patterning, syntactic reversal, syntactic ambiguity, lexical ambiguity, dual reference, bitextuality, and thematic allusion. I will be as explicit as possible about the mechanisms, to the point, I fear, of tedium.

The hymn begins with a striking phonological and morphological sequence. The first four syllables, ending with the caesura -- *vāne ná vā* -- are a near phonological chiasmus, with initial *vā* matching final *vā*, and *ne ná* echoing each other internally. This pattern is rendered particularly salient by the unusual sequence of four monosyllables following the initial disyllable: *vāne ná vā yó ní*. Or apparent monosyllables: we will see below that there are several ways to construe this sequence besides the monosyllabic interpretation of the Padapāṭha. The opening calls attention to itself also by the unbalanced *vā* ‘or’ syntactic construction, where *vāne* ‘in the wood’ and *ná* ‘not’ are the apparent non-parallel disjunctive possibilities set up by ‘or’.

The rest of the pāda sets up a syntactic puzzle. The last two words are both finite verbs, *adhāyī cākān* (or better *ní adhāyī*), but their order is the opposite of what Ṛgvedic syntax would

dictate. In the first verbal lexeme *ní adhāyi*, the finite verb is unaccented but immediately follows the relative pronoun *yāh*, which should trigger verbal accentuation (that is, \**ní ádhāyi*) if that verb belongs in the relative clause, while the second finite verb *cākán* is accented, though it appears to be a main clause verb. (The accentuation of a main-clause *cākán* is less problematic than the non-accentuation of a subordinate clause *adhāyi*, because *cākán* in this interpretation would resume the main clause and so possibly count as syntactically initial.)

One solution (going back to Baunack 1886: 377; see Oldenberg, *Noten* ad loc.) has been, as in Geldner's translation, to switch the functions of the two verbs, i.e., to interpret *ní adhāyi* as the main verb and *cākán* as the verb of the subordinate clause. Thus, "[he] has been deposited who takes pleasure ..." For Geldner and other interpreters of earlier eras, a period that subscribed, explicitly or implicitly, to the notion of free word order in Vedic, the order of the verbs assumed here would be unusual but not really problematic. But in the more regulated RVic syntax of our time we expect neither embedded relative clauses nor—worse—embedded main clauses. But the Baunack/Geldner interpretation, which construes the initial locative *vāne* with the final *cākán* ("[he/it] has been deposited who takes pleasure in the wood or not"), requires that the main clause verb *ny ádhāyi* be embedded in the discontinuous relative clause *vāne ná vā yāh ... cākán*. (Even English, which embeds relative clauses with abandon, would have serious trouble with an embedded *main* clause, as here; note that a literal English translation of the proposed interpretation of the pāda is unparsable: "Who in wood or not -- he is deposited -- takes pleasure.")

As it happens, I think the embedded-clause interpretation is the correct one. But not because I believe that embedded clauses were generally licit in Ṛgvedic discourse, but because I believe that they were not. This is a deliberate syntactic violation, and it is also a syntactic-semantic pun. The clause "(he) has been set down/deposited" is literally "set down" (that is, embedded) in the middle of the relative clause; its *meaning* replicates its *syntactic position*. The grammatical embedding is, as it were, iconic of the "setting down" of the referent in the main clause. I do not know if there is a technical term, either in Sanskrit or in the larger literary world, for this type of rhetorical figure, but even if it does not fit into a particular named category in literary theory, in my opinion it displays a remarkably sophisticated consciousness of how grammatical form can be made to follow and mirror semantic function.

There is a way to avoid the verbal accent problem while retaining the relative clause: by interpreting it as a nominal relative clause: *vāne ná vā yāh* "who is in the wood [=Agni] or not." What follows this putative nominal relative clause, the two verbs *ny ádhāyi cākán*, would then be taken as two parallel verbs in the main clause: *ny ádhāyi cākán* "he has been installed (and) takes pleasure." The accent of *cākán* would then be explicable according to the resumptive verb condition alluded to above. This seems to be Ludwig's solution, cited by Oldenberg (*Noten*, ad loc): "Der im Holze oder auch nicht im Holze (weilt), wird niedergelegt, er wars zufrieden." This is possible but not particularly elegant.

This pāda has not yet yielded all its secrets, however. Let us return to the string of monosyllables discussed above: *ná vā yó ní*. In the Geldner interpretation (which I generally follow, as the primary reading), which is based on the Pp. analysis, this sequence is, in translation, "not / or / who / down," each with its separate function in the syntactic complex. But different interpretations are made possible by univervating adjacent syllables in different combinations, and even if these were not meant by the poet as the *dominant* reading these alternatives add an elusive (but I would claim, deliberate) resonance and thematic nuance to the overall "meaning" of the verse.

Let us begin at the very beginning of the line, with *vāne ná*, where we could read the two ostensible words as one, the instr. sg. *vānena* (with erasure of the second accent). As this reading doesn't seem to buy us anything thematically, I will not discuss it at length. Nonetheless, it opens the poem with a possible ambiguity and sets the stage for the following multiple readings.

Proceeding then from left to right, the first two apparent monosyllables *ná vā* could be combined and read as a form of *nāva-* 'new'. What would this contribute to the verse? Note that the first actual nominative in this verse is *stómaḥ* 'praise-song' in pāda b; the two verbs in pāda a lack overt subjects. Given that 'praise-song' is the subject of pāda b, it would not be surprising if a semantically related noun, such as 'hymn', 'song', 'praise hymn', were the underlying subject of the verbs in pāda a, and 'new(er)' is a regular qualification of hymns and songs in the RV, expressing the crucial goal of the RVic bard: to attract the gods to the sacrifice by producing a strikingly novel verbal composition generated from traditional materials. True, if *nāvā* is to modify it, the noun should be feminine, as opposed to masculine *stóma-*, but such feminine nouns are easy to find (e.g., *gír-*, *dhī-*, *dhītī-*, *matī-*, *stutī-*, etc.); fem. *nāvā-* in fact modifies *gír-* in II.24.1 (*ayā ... nāvayā mahā girā* "with this great new song"). Although I do not believe that "new (hymn)" is the primary intended subject of pāda a (*pace* Lanman, Noun inflection 505, flg. Roth), given the lack of overt subject in that line the audience would be pardoned for falling into such a trap, especially as "has been set down/deposited" is certainly a possible predicate for such a subject. See nearby X.31.3 *ádhyāi dhītīḥ* "The insightful thought has been set in place," also in ritual context (additionally, e.g., I.162.7, 183.6). And I venture to say that the poet consciously laid this trap.

Combining the next two words, *vā yó*, gives us several possibilities, one of which has a long interpretational pedigree. Yāska (VI.28) follows this unverbated reading *vāyó*, interpreting it as a patronymic, 'son of a bird' (*veḥ putrah*), i.e., presumably a vṛddhi derivative of the root noun *ví-* 'bird'. Yāska is followed by Sāyaṇa and by Oldenberg. Sāyaṇa's gloss of *vāya-* spells out the implications of the vṛddhi at some length (couched in the accusative because he rewrites the aorist passive as a transitive present): *śakuniḥ sve nīḍe vāyam ātmīyaṃ putraṃ nyadhāyi nidadhāti śisukam ajātapakṣam* "a bird places in its own nest the *vāya*, (viz.) the son of its own self, its little chick whose feathers haven't grown." Here is Oldenberg's translation of the first pāda with the vṛddhi interpr.: "Wie im Wald ein Vogel (weilt), ward er (im Wald = Holz) niedergelegt, fand (daran) Befriedigung," interpreting *ná* as the simile marker, not the negative, and also doing away with the somewhat awkward *vā* 'or'. See also the explicit vṛddhi reading in Klein's (DGRV II.208-9) preliminary translation "As the son of a bird (dwells) in the wood, he (i.e., Agni) has been set down (in the wood)." But this is just Klein's pūrvapakṣa; he rejects the "bird" reading and accepts the Śākalya / Geldner interpretation with *vā yó*.

Not surprisingly the proposed simile is a fairly common image, as in IX.96.23 *śīdan vāneṣu śakunó ná pátvā* "sitting in the woods like a flying bird." The entity compared to the bird must be Agni, a comparison often made in the Ṛgveda. Although this interpretation is tempting and, by eliminating the supposed relative pronoun *yó*, would also eliminate the problem of verb (non-)accentuation in a subordinate clause discussed above, there are some problems with it in turn. The primary one is the fact there is no independently attested stem *vāyá-* 'bird' to which *vāyó* would be the nom. sg. in sandhi -- only the archaic paradigm *ví-* (nom. sg. *vés* as well as synchronically regular *viś*) and a marginally attested collective neuter *s*-stem *vāyas-* with short vowel, generally assumed (see AiG II.2: 227) to have been reinterpreted from the identical root noun nominative plural. The only 'bird' word with long vowel in the initial syllable is the transparent vṛddhi derivative with thematic suffix *vāyasá-* (I.164.52 and later), built to the *s*-

stem. Although a putative thematic *vrddhi* derivative to *vī-*, namely \**vāyā-*, would probably be theoretically possible (see AiG II.2: 127-28 on *vrddhi* derivatives to *i*-stems, but there are no examples given of root nouns in *-ī*), it seems preferable not to invent an otherwise unattested stem for just this passage. Moreover, at least in Oldenberg's rendering (see also Klein's *pūrvapakṣa*), the simile is supplied with a different verb (*weilt* / *dwells*) from the frame (*ward ... niedergelegt* / *has been set down*), a serious violation of Ṛgvedic simile structure (see Jamison 1982). Nonetheless, I do not reject the possibility that a "bird" reading is one of the several recessive alternatives hidden in this syllabic sequence.

But a reading *vāyó* suggests another possibility, though it requires the elimination of the accent -- namely the vocative of the god Wind, *Vāyu*. As with *návā* I am not suggesting that this is the primary reading, but a secondary possibility that actualizes some underlying themes. Why a fugitive reference to *Vāyu* might be appropriate here will be discussed below.

Let us finally turn to the last two monosyllables, *yó ní*. Read together, with elimination of the second accent, they produce the word *yóni* 'womb' in both literal and extended senses. The fireplace at the sacrifice is often called a *yóni* and the ritual fire / god Agni is established therein (generally with the lexeme *ní √ sad* 'sit down', sharing the preverb *ní* with our *ní √ dhā*, e.g., VI.16.41 *ā své yónau ní śīdatu* "let him [=Agni] sit down in his own womb"). Since one of the few things that is clear about this verse is that it at least partially concerns the establishment of the ritual fire in its fireplace, a subsurface reference to *yóni* is entirely apt.

We can map these various possible readings as follows. (Asterisks mark forms where one accent has been erased. Combinations of the listed variants are also possible, e.g., *vāne návā \*yóni*.)

*vāne ná vā yó ní* (per *Padapāṭha*)  
 \**vānena vā yó ní*  
*vāne návā yó ní*  
*vāne ná vāyó ní* (per *Yāska*, etc.)  
*vāne ná \*vāyo ní*  
*vāne ná vā \*yóni*

I find it hard not to see embryonic *śleṣa* or bitextuality in the six superimposable possibilities of this six-syllable sequence, most of which subtly underline the thematics of the verses as a whole.

Such are the verbal intricacies of the first *pāda*, but several larger questions about it remain not only unsolved but as yet unposed. Chief among them is the identity of the unexpressed subject of the two verbs, and this will lead us to the larger question of reference in this verse, which is generally quite coy about the identities of the entities contained therein. For the first *pāda* the verb *ny ādhāyi* is the major clue, for the lexeme *ní √ dhā* is a standard technical expression for the installation of the god Agni as ritual priest (see Geldner, n. 1a, with numerous parallels cited). Combined with the initial word *vāna-* 'wood', a substance not surprisingly associated with fire and the deified Fire, circumstantial evidence strongly points to Agni as subject. This surmise finds some support in the priestly title *Hotar* found at the end of *pāda c*, since Agni is regularly identified as a *Hotar* and identified with the human *Hotar*.

But *pāda c* also raises problems with this identification, because the nom. sg. *hótā* at the end of the *pāda* is matched in case, number, and gender by *índrah* earlier in the line. There is nothing explicit in the *pāda* to disjoin the two nominatives, though an audience's general knowledge of the Vedic context should produce strong opposition to equating *Indra* and the *Hotar*. Nonetheless, Scarlatta (302 n. 430) tentatively suggests the possibility, among many others floated, that *Indra* is being referred to as *Hotar* here. (I find this very unlikely.) *Sāyaṇa*



also takes *hótā* as a qualifier of Indra, but interprets it not as the priestly title, but as a transparent *-tar*-agent noun to  $\sqrt{hū} / hvā$  ‘call’, glossing it *āhvātā*. This contrasts with his gloss of *hótar-* when he is comfortable with a priestly reading – e.g., referring to Agni in I.1.1 *hotāram ṛtvijam / devānām yajñeṣu hotṛnāmaka ṛtvig agnir eva*.

The identification of Indra and Hotar can be blocked, but this produces a different conceptual disharmony. It would be technically possible to divide the pāda into a nominal relative clause (*yásyéd índraḥ*) and a nominal main clause (*purudīneṣu hótā*), with *hótā* [=Agni] as the referent of *yásya*. This seems to be Scarlatta’s (302) preferred solution: “... er, dem Indra ja zugehört, an vielen Tagen der Hotṛ ...” But, the implication, that Indra belongs to Agni, is at least as hard to accommodate within the Ṛgvedic conceptual universe as that Indra is the Hotar. We will return to the syntax of this pāda below.

So, we have implicit reference to Agni in pādas a and c and explicit reference to Indra, who is also the dedicand of the hymn, in pāda c. What is the relationship of the two gods here? This question is further muddled by pāda d in the phrasal etymological figure *nṛṇām náryo nṛtamaḥ* “the manly one, best man among men.” Although the phrase is in the singular, it is actually applicable to either Indra or Agni -- or both. The adjective *nárya-* is generally typed for Indra when it modifies a god, but (*nṛṇām ...*) *nṛtamaḥ* is used of both gods (though somewhat more often of Indra). Out of ca. 50 occurrences of *nárya-*, about 8 apply directly to Indra, including one in verse 7 of this same hymn; it is also used of a few other gods, also of legendary heroes and of humans, as well as of inanimate objects and forces. Indra and Agni are almost the only referents of the approximately thirty independent occurrences of *nṛtama-* (with or without *nṛṇām*), though a few characterize human heroes or the Maruts. The absolute numbers are skewed towards Indra, however, because the word is found in a common Viśvāmitra refrain (14x: III.30.22, etc.). For Agni, cf., e.g., ... *nṛtamo yahvó agnīḥ* (III.1.12, IV.5.2); for Indra, e.g., X.89.1 *índram stavā nṛtamam yásya mahnā*. Of course the splv. phrase (undistracted: *nṛtamasya nṛṇām*) occurs in the next vs. (2b) clearly referring to Indra, but I don’t think this requires the phrase here to apply exclusively to Indra. Thus, the final pāda seems designed *not* to resolve the puzzle set up by the juxtaposition of Indra and (Agni) Hotar, but to allow both gods to be evoked by the descriptive phrase in the singular. Note that this phrase shows an embedding reminiscent of the embedding in pāda a, with the two halves of the superlative phrase (*nṛṇām ... nṛtamaḥ*) surrounding the adjective *náryaḥ*. If the superlative is more likely to refer to Agni and the adjective to Indra, interspersing the words in this fashion further blurs the separate identities of the two gods. What makes this double application especially nice is that the various derivatives of *nṛ-* ‘man, superior man’ select different manly qualities in the two gods: Indra’s superior manly heroism, but Agni’s closeness to men, as the god who lives in their dwellings and mediates between them and the gods. (Recall also that in the final vs. of the previous hymn, X.28.12, Indra speaks *nṛvát* ‘like a man’.)

The final word of the verse, *kṣapāvān*, does little to resolve the duality. In modern times the standard reading of this adjective is ‘protector of the earth’ bleached to simple ‘protector’ (*kṣa-pāvant-*, with the first element a zero-grade from of the archaic noun *kṣám-* ‘earth’). Although this word (thus accented also in I.70.5; with initial accent, *kṣá-pāvant-* 3x) is clearly used of Agni in three of the four other occurrences (I.70.5, VII.10.5, and VIII.71.2; in III.55.17 the referent is ambiguous, but the most likely candidates are Agni and Soma), there seems no reason that an adjective with such a meaning could not equally describe Indra. But the word displays what we might term morphological śleṣa, as it can also be analyzed *kṣapā-vant-*, with the first element containing the word *kṣáp-* ‘night’. Such an analysis has ancient roots, as

Sāyaṇa's gloss shows (though with unjustified additions to its semantics): *rātriparyāyeṣu somabhāgaḥ* "having a share of soma in the rounds of the (Ati)rātra [=Overnight] ritual." With a suggestion of Scarlatta (303), we could analyze *kṣapāvanta-* as based on a syntagm with original predicative instrumental (*kṣapā* "[he is] with night"), which was then provided with a *-vanta-* possessive suffix. Scarlatta (303) also suggests other ways to incorporate *kṣap-* 'night', e.g., by haplology from *\*kṣapā + pā-* 'protecting by night' (his reconstructed initial accent reflects a posited adverbial accent shift from inst. *kṣapā*; see p. 303 and n. 452). The exact details matter less than the fact that the Vedic audience could likely see a pun in this word, between *kṣa-* as a combining form of *kṣām-* 'earth' and *kṣap-* 'night' (for another poss. ex. see I.70.5, 7 and comm. thereon). An analysis involving 'night' would favor Agni as referent, since fire is depicted in the RV as man's defense against encroaching night and, in particular, the kindling of the ritual fire is associated with the return of daylight and the defeat of night.

If pādas c and d can both be read as applicable simultaneously to Indra and Agni, we might reconsider pāda a, where we identified only Agni as the subject of the verbs in that line. Could Indra also be lurking in that pāda as well? I think it possible, on the basis of the odd phrase *vāne nā vā yāḥ ... cākān* "who takes pleasure in the wood or not." Agni as fire certainly does "take pleasure in the wood" throughout the RV, burning his way through both ritual and profane versions of that substance. But Indra is not likely to get any satisfaction from wood. If Indra is a potential subject of the verbs in pāda a, he may be "set down" at the ritual ground as the recipient of the dawn sacrifice whose epiphany is much desired. In this case, he could be the subject associated with the disjunctive negative "or not."

Ambiguity of reference also clouds pāda b, which we have yet to deal with. Unlike the other pādas, the general message of this one is fairly straightforward: *śúcir vām stómo bhuraṇāv ajīgaḥ* "The gleaming praise-song has awakened you two, o bustling ones." The problem is posed by the vocative *bhuraṇau*. First, so far there has been at most one being referred to in the hymn, namely the unnamed subject of the verbs in pāda a, so where do we get a dual 2<sup>nd</sup> person? The general context allows us to surmise who the dual might be. On the one hand, as we saw above, the verb *ny ādhāyi* is likely to have Agni as its subject on the basis of multiple parallel passages and the technical ritual sense of the verb; on the other, the hymn is dedicated to Indra, as the audience would of course be aware. Thus the enclitic *vām* 'you two' and the vocative *bhuraṇau* 'o bustling ones' could easily identify the pair Indra and Agni. Such an identification is supported by the second hemistich discussed above: the presence of both Indra and (Agni) Hotar in pāda c and the epithets applicable to both those gods in pāda d, as well as by the possible lurking presence of Indra in pāda a, as was just suggested. But the adjective *bhuraṇa-* is only found in the dual (3x total; only voc. so unaccented), and the other two duals are addressed to the Aśvins. Moreover, the phraseology of pāda b has reminiscences in explicitly Aśvin contexts. Those gods are twice objects of the verb *ajīgaḥ* (III.58.1, VIII.67.1); III.58.1 is an especially close parallel: *uṣāsa stómo aśvínāv ajīgaḥ* "The praise-song of Dawn has awakened the Aśvins." So, although the pragmatics of our hymn suggest that Indra and Agni should be the referents of the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. dual in pāda b, the larger formulaic system suggests the Aśvins instead. Indeed, this is Sāyaṇa's view – one that causes him some distress (*tad asādhū*), given that the first ṛc of a sūkta dedicated to Indra should not be in praise of the Aśvins.

Can these competing referents be reconciled? I would argue that they can, or rather that throughout this verse we are meant to hold distinct referents in our minds simultaneously and superimpose them upon each other: Indra upon Agni, and Indra and Agni upon the Aśvins. Simultaneous reference is quite common in the R̥gveda. This practice is not quite equivalent, at

least in scale, with composing a poem that narrates the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa simultaneously, but it arises from the same impulse – to encourage multiple readings, rather than forcing the audience to choose one. I would further argue that in our verse these multiple readings are in service of a larger project: evoking the dawn sacrifice and its attendant divinities in a verse that makes almost no overt reference to this ritual complex. The gods associated with the dawn ritual are Agni, whose kindling initiates the sacrifice, the Aśvins, Indra and Vāyu, the pair who receive the first offering, and of course Dawn herself. And, although only Indra is mentioned by name in the verse, (almost) all the others are indirectly present here: Agni, because of his characteristic vocabulary (pādas a, cd), the Aśvins, because of their formulaic evocation in pāda b, and Vāyu, in the śleṣa identified in pāda a discussed above. Note that it is the vocative of his name, *vāyo*, that floats to the surface in the reanalysis of pāda a. This is probably no accident, as it evokes the well-known conjoined address to Indra and Vāyu, *vāyav* [voc.] *īndras* [nom.] *ca*, an archaic construction found in dawn-ritual hymns inviting the two divinities to soma drinking (e.g., I.2.5, 6).

But where is Dawn? She may be evoked by the parallel to pāda b just cited: *uṣāsa stómaḥ ... ajīgaḥ* “The praise-song of Dawn has awakened...” The *śúciḥ* ‘gleaming’ modifying *stómaḥ* in our verse can also be a stand-in for Dawn’s light; see I.134.4 .. *uṣāsaḥ śúcayaḥ*..., etc. But more importantly she appears overtly at the beginning of verse 2: *prā ... asyā uṣāsaḥ* “At the forefront of this dawn here...” Thus, the poet skillfully sets the stage for the dawn sacrifice in verse 1 using none of the standard tropes, but rather by śleṣa and lexical and formulaic evocation. Only then, in verse 2, does he straightforwardly introduce the dawn and proceed to the sacrificial performance that is to draw Indra to our ritual ground. If it is poetic cleverness and linguistic indirection that lure Indra, the poet will certainly succeed.

There remain a few loose ends, concentrated in pāda c. The pāda lacks a verb and, as we saw above, the referent of the rel. *yasya* is unclear. Here I follow Ge in supplying *cākān* from pāda a as the verb and the *stómaḥ* of b as the referent of the relative. I diverge from Ge in taking *īndraḥ* and *hótā* (=Agni) as separate subjects of the supplied *cākān*; Ge nudges pāda-final *hótā* into the next pāda. Ge makes the nice point (n. 1a) that *cākān* can take both loc. and gen. complements, with the first in pāda a and the other in pāda c – though in the midst of all the other poetic complications this effect is hardly noticed.

Pāda c also contains the hapax *purudīna-*, with the ‘day’ element (-*dīna-*) found otherwise only in *madhyāmdīna-* ‘midday’ and *sudīna-* ‘day-bright’ (?), on which see EWA s.v. *madhyāmdīna-*. Since *sudīna-* is an adj., *purudīna-*, with the same accent, probably is too; so Gr “vielleicht ein *vieltägiges Fest*,” EWA ‘viele Tage enthaltend’. It is thus likely that this is the temporal designation of some ritual (a sattrā? or just a soma sacrifice, but reckoning in the days of preparation?), but the exact ritual reference escapes me. Nonetheless the tr. should probably be altered to “at (rituals) of many days.”

In the publ. tr. I limited the number of alternatives presented for the sake of (semi-)intelligibility.

X.29.2: This vs. lacks the verbal tricks of vs. 1 but is discouragingly enigmatic nonetheless.

The multiple days of the sacrifice indicated by *purudīneṣu* in 1c may also be reflected in the expression *asyā uṣāsaḥ ... āparasyāḥ* “of this dawn and a/the later one.” With Old and Ge I take this gen. phrase as a temporal expression; I construe the genitives loosely with the repeated *prā*, which seems associated with the two temporal alternatives (*prā ... asyā uṣāsaḥ prāparasyāḥ*). The *prā* is otherwise difficult to account for; it should not be a preverb with *syāma* in b because

*prá√as* means ‘be preeminent, surpass’, which does not fit the context—*pace* Ge’s “bei deinem ... Antanzen ... den Vorrang haben,” which suggests that we’re hoping for front-row seats. On the temporal genitive see Delbrück, AIS §113, which mentions *uśásah* specifically. Gr construes *uśásah* with *nṛtaú* (see s.v. *nṛtā*), and Ge (n. 2b) suggests this as an additional syntactic connection on the basis of I.92.4, where Dawn is compared to a dancer. However, Indra most definitely dances elsewhere (cf. V.33.6, where Indra’s *nṛmṇāni* appear in the same pāda, with the same word play as here), and I think his “dance” here is his much-desired epiphany.

Like 1d, pāda b contains a sequence of three *nṛ* forms, including the repetition of the splv. phrase *nṛnām nṛtama-*, though in a different order and a different case. But the third word *nṛtaú* ‘at the dance’ is not etymologically bound to this phrase, as *nárya-* in 1d is (though it surely is by folk etymology).

As Ge says (n. 2c), the 2nd hemistich presents a “dunkler Sagenzug.” The problem (or one of them) is *triśóka-*. This word is always a PN, seemingly of a human ṛṣi/poet. In I.112.12 he is one of the many clients aided by the Aśvins, in a series of vss. that name men of similar ilk, like the far better known poets Kakṣivānt (vs. 11) and Bhāradvāja (vs. 13); in VIII.45.30 he is aided by Indra. In both cases the aid he receives allows him to drive cattle up or out (of a mountain in VIII.45.30), in a Vala-like denouement. VIII.30 is also attributed to Triśoka Kāṇva by the Anukr, probably on the basis of his appearance in vs. 30. And in AV IV.29.6 he appears in an overstuffed list (vss. 3–6) of clients of Mitra and Varuṇa that includes many of the best-known RVic poets. (In vs. 6 he finds himself between Medhātithi and Uśanā Kāvya.) What is this rather recessive poet/hero doing here? As indicated in the publ. tr., I think there is a pun here, and that in addition to the man’s name, *triśóka-* is a reference to Agni, who, of course, is represented at the ritual by three fires, hence ‘having three flames’ as an epithet. (Three of the five occurrences of *śóka-* are connected with Agni.) A reference to Agni could continue the theme of vs. 1, the establishment of the ritual fire. But it doesn’t get us much further with the Sagenzug, and in fact I now think that the Agni identification is a red herring planted by the poet.

For the Sagenzug we should start further along, with a name we know better: Kutsa. Kutsa is famous for his association with Indra in the battle against Śuśṇa, in which exploit Uśanā Kāvya also figures. Kutsa regularly rides on Indra’s chariot. See, e.g., IV.16.11 *yāsi kútsena sarátham* “you [=Indra] drive on the same chariot with Kutsa” (sim. V.29.9, also with *sarártham ... kútsena*). It is this phrase that I think underlies the puzzling relationship between the main clause and the relative clause, with the latter having as subject *rátho yáḥ* “which chariot” (nom.), which has no apparent antecedent in the main cl. If *kútsena* belongs to the main clause and allows us to supply the phrase *\*sarátham kútsena*, then the antecedent is covertly there, though locked in an adverb, which, moreover, is unexpressed in the text. (Construing differently, though with more or less the same sense, Ge: he takes *kútsena* with the rel. cl. and supplies *\*ráthena* in the main cl.: “... auf dem Wagen, der durch Kutsa der Gewinnende werden sollte.” On the difference see below.) But Indra not only travels on the same chariot with Kutsa, he sometimes “conveys” (√*vah*) him: V.31.8 ... *ávaho ha kútsam* “you conveyed Kutsa” or they are “conveyed” together: V.31.9 (next vs., same hymn) *índrākutsā váhamānā ráthena*. Now √*vah* provides the verb of the main clause in this hemistich: *ánu ... ávahat*. The subject of this verb is Triśoka, who may or may not also stand for Agni, as noted above – but the subject I would really like to see here is Indra – and I do not see any way to make *triśóka-* an epithet of Indra beyond arbitrary fiat.

There is also the problem of the verbal lexeme: *ānu-ā√vah*, which occurs only here in all of Skt. as far as I can see. Ge also feels (n. 2c) that decoding the hemistich depends on understanding the sense of that lexeme.

And a further problem is the 100 men whom Triśoka conveyed, for which I know no mythological precedent.

I can make some further headway but am far from understanding the whole. Looking at the Triśoka passages elsewhere we can situate him in a web of associations that point to the episode of Indra's slaying of Śuṣṇa with the help of Kutsa and the counsel of Uśanā Kāvya. Triśoka is linked to Kutsa at least marginally, since I.112, which contains one of the few attestations of *triśoka-*, is attributed to Kutsa; Triśoka is directly linked to Indra because Indra aids him in VIII.45.30. On the basis of AV IV.29.6 we can also connect him to Uśanā Kāvya. The phraseology of our passage also points to this same episode, as outlined above. It is almost as if Triśoka is a kind of Zelig figure (from the movie of the same name), a nearly anonymous minor figure absorbed into a well-known plot. Perhaps the 100 men he conveys are reinforcements or auxiliaries for the combat, and the *ānu* of *ānu-ā√vah* means 'convey in addition'. But if this is an variant of and expansion on the more familiar Śuṣṇa slaying tale, this is its only occurrence, as far as I know, and we will never know more about it.

Even if this is all true (and in fact it doesn't fit together very well), what does this contribute to this vs. and this hymn? I remain mostly baffled. One clue to the contribution it makes is the switch from mythological past to potential future: the verb of the main cl. is (most likely) an augmented impf. (so Pp.), though technically it could also be an injunc., *ā vahat*. The verb of the following rel. clause is subjunctive, made even clearer by being periphrastic (*āsāt sasavān*). So the mytho-historical snippet in the main clause must be serving as model for the present: the chariot journey in the main clause led to success and victory (the killing of Śuṣṇa, if I've identified the myth right), and so the chariot with which we're currently concerned will be victorious too. I would suggest that current chariot is the one on which Indra is traveling to our sacrifice – for the epiphany that seems to be the topic and goal of this hymn. (Note that if I am correct about the division between mythological past and ritual present, this provides more support for my view that *kútsena* belongs to the main cl., despite the preceding pāda boundary [*pace* Ge], since Kutsa belongs to the myth, not our current ritual.)

Here and in two other occurrences (VII.87.2, IX.74.8), the nom. sg. of the pf. part. to *√san* should be read with a heavy root syllable, reflecting, one way or the other, the seṭ root. On this issue see KH (Aufs. 544–46), who weighs the merits of *\*sasāvān* and *\*sasanvān*; I would favor the former.

X.29.3–5: These three vss. present themselves technically like an omphalos structure, with the two outer vss. (3, 5) responsive, with their vs.-final *ānnaiḥ* and forms of *√śak*. This would define vs. 4 as the omphalos, and, rather cutely, it also has a form of *ānna-*, but the recessive *ānne* beginning 4d. However, in terms of content this doesn't work: vss. 3 and 4 pattern together, and vs. 5 change the subject, so, although the structure of the three vss. is promising and they are found in the middle of the hymn, I don't think that's what's going on. Instead it's better to concentrate on the similarities of the first two of these vss. (3–4), where the poet peppers Indra with questions about when and how Indra will come to our sacrifice and what will induce him to choose our sacrifice (over those of competing sacrificers).

X.29.3: In pāda a the publ. tr. renders *rāntyo bhūt* as if it were a gerundive periphrasis (“is to be enjoyed by you”), but since *rāntya-* is built to the *-ti*-stem *rānti-*, the tr. oversells its verbal nature. I’d now emend to “... is / will be enjoyable to you.” The injunctive *bhūt* is functionally ambiguous.

In b the verbal lexeme (*abhí ... ví dhāva*) is construed with a double acc. *dúraḥ gírah*. I think it likely that *dhāva* selects a different preverb for each acc.: *abhí* for the goal *gírah* ‘hymns’, *ví* for the doors, through which Indra is to run. *ví* is regularly associated with ‘doors’ elsewhere, esp., but not only, with the lexeme *ví√vr* ‘open’.

But the doors of what? I think it likely that they are the same as the enigmatic “divine doors” (*dvāro devīḥ*) found in the Āprī litanies, generally in vs. 5 (I.188.5, VII.2.5, etc.) or 6 (I.13.6, 142.6). In the Āprī context the doors open up for sacrifice (e.g., I.13.6 *yāṣṭave*) or for the gods to come through (e.g., I.142.6 *prayaí devébhyaḥ*). See esp. III.4.5 *abhīmāṃ yajñām ví caranta pūrvīḥ* “They [=gods] proceed through the many (doors) towards this sacrifice,” with *ví* and a verb of motion, as here. The doors are discussed in detail by van den Bosch in his comprehensive treatment of the Āprī hymns (IJ 28 [1985] 95–122, 169–89), with the doors disc. pp. 104–6, incl. a survey of previous lit. Though the disc. is useful, I cannot follow the au in taking them as real doors, “special gates ... erected for this sacrificial performance” (p. 105) of, in his view, an archaic domestic animal sacrifice. Instead I think they must be the conceptual doors that give the gods access to our ritual ground, that open up for them when we perform sacrifice, and that, when conceptually shut, keep the divine and mortal spheres safely separate.

Note the phonological play *dúro gíro ... ugró*, with parts of the 1st two words combined in the third.

Pāda c poses some questions, beginning with the first word, *kád*. Is it a lexicalized ‘when?’ (per publ. tr.) or the neut. nom./acc. sg. of the interrogative prn/adj. ‘what/which?’ (per Ge, Old [ZDMG 50 (1896) 430 = KISch 8])? I now favor the latter against my previous tr. The final word of the pāda is also problematic: *manīṣā* in the Saṃhitā text. Since *d* begins with a vowel (*ā*), the underlying form should be *manīṣāḥ*, and this is the interpr. in the publ. tr. The presence of an indisputable *manīṣāḥ* at the end of the next vs. (4d) might support this reading. However, the Pp. reads *manīṣā* despite the resulting hiatus; on this reading see Old’s various reff. starting with the Prātiśākhya, which favor the form in hiatus. I now see that I should accept this sg. form, though in fact it will not make much difference in my interpr. (which will change considerably for other reasons). In the publ. tr. I took it as nom. pl.; I now interpr. it as nom. sg., though it could also be an instr. sg. (so Gr).

To understand the pāda we need to consider the meaning and use of the keyword *vāhas-*. (As for its form, I have no opinion on the lengthened grade in this word and some other derivatives of the root *√vah*.) Gr glosses it ‘Darbringung’, which is adopted in EWA (s.v. *VAH*, p. 536); Ge renders it “Anziehungskraft” (force of attraction), I’m not sure on what grounds. (In fact Ge makes no comment on this vs. whatsoever.) The word is discussed at length by Old in the art. cit. above (“Vahni und Verwandtes,” ZDMG 50 [1896] 423–33 = KI Sch 1–11) with his customary acuity: he situates it within the well-known RVic conceptual equation of the sacrifice with a chariot. He notes the fact that *vāhas-* is primarily – and widely – found as a 2nd cmpd member in bahuvrīhis whose first member is a word for ritual speech: *ukthā-vāhas-*, *gír-vāhas-*, *stóma-vāhas-*, etc. Old’s interpr. (429=7) of such cmpds is “dass das Loblied als mystischer Wagen oder als Gespann den Priester zu Erfolg und Gewinn hinführt, oder dass der Priester es dem Gott als Gespann ausrüstet, der Gott mit diesem Gespann zum Opfer fährt.” His 2nd suggestion seems to me the one most generally in play: the poet’s hymn serves as the vehicle that

brings Indra to the sacrifice. Two (III.30.20, 53.3) of the uncmpd occurrences of *vāhas-* involve poets making a *vāhas-* for Indra. Cf., e.g., III.30.20 ... *matībhis túbhyaṃ vípra, índrāya vāhaḥ ... akran* “The inspired poets have made a vehicle for you, for Indra, with their thoughts.” Although *vāhas-* is not cmpd here, it does appear in the same pāda, and probably the same case, as *manīṣā-*, a word for ritual speech, though not one cmpd with *-vāhas-* elsewhere.

The syntax of the pāda is compressed; there is no verb and no Indra, but the phrase *arvāg úpa mā* “near by, to me” suggests that “me” is the goal, and we need a verb of motion (cf., e.g., VII.72.2 *ā naḥ ... úpa yātam arvāk* “drive here near to us”) or perhaps better a form of  $\sqrt{vah}$  with *índram* as supplied object and *mā* as goal. I also now think that initial *kád* should, with appropriate (if silent) adjustment in gender be construed with *manīṣā* as well as *vāhaḥ*, thus equating the two words, as if in a cmpd *\*manīṣā-vāhas-* ‘having inspired thought as vehicle’. Putting all this together I would now emend the tr. to one of the following: “What vehicle, (what) inspired thought (will come) nearby to me?” or “What vehicle, (what) inspired thought (will convey you) nearby to me?” I favor the latter, even though it requires supplying more, because the poet is deliberating about how best to craft his *manīṣā* to bring Indra to him.

The lexeme  $\sqrt{śak}$  is uncommon in the RV and does not seem to have a settled sense or even a settled case frame. I would now change my “would compel” to “would empower”; in other words the poet by the offering of both praise and food would give Indra the power (as well as the inclination) to reward the poet. This rendering also conforms better to the one for the desid. *pratiśikṣanti* in 5d.

X.29.4: The poet’s questions continue in this vs., and indeed, like 3c, it begins with *kád*. As in that pāda *kád* here can be either ‘when?’ or ‘what/which?’. Either would be grammatical, since *dyumnám* is neut., but despite the apparent parallelism with 3c I prefer ‘when?’ here (contra Ge, Old), since we’re not choosing between various *dyumná-*s that Indra has to offer, but hoping that he will arrive with *dyumná-* to bestow. Moreover, *kád* in b cannot be ‘which?’ but should be ‘when?’ or at the very least a question particle as Ge takes it, so intra-vs. parallelism supports the ‘when?’ interpr.

My interpr. of pāda a differs from those of Ge and Old because of divergent interpr. of the final phrase *tvāvato nṛṇ* and divergent morphological analyses of the final word *nṛṇ*. The same phrase is found in II.20.1; see esp. Old ad loc. Both Old and Ge (and indeed a number of scholars; see in general AiG III.211–12) see a morphological multivalence in *nṛṇ* to which I am highly resistant (see comm. ad I.146.4, IV.2.15, 21.2): I think it can almost always be interpr. as the acc. pl. it appears to be, while Ge allows gen. pl. as well (e.g., here and in II.20.1) and Old takes it in those two passages as gen. sg. (and elsewhere even as nom. pl.). There is, in my view, strong pressure to take it as acc. pl. here. On the one hand the same form is a clear acc. pl. in 2c, and there are also two perfectly formed gen. pl. (1d, 2b, as often, better read *\*nṛṇām* to repair the cadence; see Old) and a nom. pl. *náraḥ* in 5d, so the poet must have had the conventional paradigm in his head. Against a gen. singular reading is the nom. pl. *náraḥ* in 5d, who appear to be the same people as our *nṛṇ*. Moreover, 3c, our pāda 4a, and 4b all have the same conceptual structure in my view: all three contain an acc. goal referring to us or our side: 3c *mā*, 4a *nṛṇ*, 4b *naḥ*, and all three are questions about when or how Indra will come to us—though only the last has an overt verb of motion, *āgan*.

In b we return first to the question of *whose* hymn, *what kind* of hymn will attract Indra (as in 3c): *káyā dhiyā karase*. But the next question, which continues into the next hemistich, is about the timing of Indra’s advent.

In c I take *satyā-* as ‘actually present’, with reference to Indra’s epiphany, rather than the standard ‘true ally’ construed with *mitráh* in the simile.

The dat. *bhṛtyaí* is ambiguous: it can either refer to our bearing offerings for Indra (as I take it) or to his support for us (or, indeed, both). There are no other dat. occurrences to this stem, but the two acc. sg. *bhṛtīm* (VIII.66.11, IX.103.1) both refer to our offerings to the gods, and since the next pāda refers to such offerings I favor that interpr.

Ge’s interpr. of d is entirely different from mine: “da eines jeden Sinnen auf Speise gerichtet sein wird.” He thus takes *manīṣāḥ* in an entirely different sense from *manīṣā* in 3c (a vs. that also contains *ánna-*), which speaks against his interpr. In my view, the poet is returning to the issue of competing sacrifices, which is implicit in the urgent questions he’s been raising. Now he makes it explicit: admitting that the sacrifice of someone else (*samasya*) will also feature both food (*ánne*) and *manīṣā*, the two items he promised Indra in 3cd. This admission seems a bit like a strategic blunder – though surely Indra knows it already – but (again implicitly) the poet is asserting the superiority of his own offerings. My interpr. requires loc. *ánne* to refer to the ceremony of food offering, not just to the food itself, but this doesn’t seem like too much of an expansion.

The unaccented pronominal stem *sama-* (13x, excluding reps.) is generally taken as a straight indefinite ‘someone, anyone’, but it’s worth noting that it’s almost always found in clear pejorative context, of unspecified opponents. English ‘some’ can develop the same sort of negative sense – e.g., “some guy” in contexts like “Some guy was Xing ...” generally refers to someone doing something disapproved of (“some guy was making trouble” rather than “some guy was helping an old lady”). For the RV cf. passages like I.176.4 *ásunvantam samam jahi* “Smite anyone who doesn’t press (soma).” For the three passages that appear to have neutral sense (VI.27.3, VIII.21.8, and X.54.3), see comm. ad locc.; all three are best interpr. negatively.

X.29.5: Another vs. studded with puzzles. The first pāda seems to consist of several interlocked similes anchored by *préraya* ‘send forth’, with Indra the unnamed addressee of this impv. in my view (versus Ge [n. 5ab]: self-address of the poet). The first simile consists of nom. *sūrah* (*pace* Gr, who takes it as gen. to *svâr-*, but in agreement with Ge, KH [139], Scar [252]) and acc. of goal *ártham* “send forth (as) the sun (sends forth X) to the task/business,” with the direct object – who or what is being sent there – unexpressed. But it is not difficult to supply the object, since this is the common trope of the dawn / sun / Savitar dispersing humans to their tasks in the morning (cf., e.g., I.113.6, VII.63.4). In the 2nd simile, by my interpr., the only expressed element is the goal, *pārām* ‘far shore’. I supply “boat” as the direct object being sent there, in keeping with the literal meaning of *pārām*, though the others cited above simply take it as the goal in the frame (e.g., Klein DGRV I.122 “Impel forth over to the other side ...”). In his n. 5ab Ge does introduce the possibility of a boat and cites the telling passages II.42.1. *íyartí ... íva nāvam*, X.116.9 *síndhāv íva prérayam nāvam* “I send forth (speech) like a boat on a river.” Although the position of *ná* might seem to speak against my interpr., as has been discussed elsewhere (VIII.76.1, X.21.1), *ná* ‘like’ is blocked from pāda-final position and flips with the simile word in those circumstances. In any case the direct object of the frame is, by general agreement, the gapped masc. pl. prn. *\*tān*, which would serve as antecedent of the rel. *yé* in pādas b and cd.

These two clauses (b and cd), conjoined by *ca*, presumably define the groups of humans who will benefit from Indra’s nudge and who have in some way earned his helpful push. The 2nd



rel. cl. (cd) works very well in this scenario, depicting the humans' ritual activity. But b is a different matter.

The interpr. of b is considerably complicated by the hapax root noun cmpd *janidhā(h)* 'wife providers' (?). By form this can be either nom. or acc. pl., but neither choice contributes helpfully to the interpr. Before tackling the wife problem, it's useful to determine the referent of *asya*. This is generally taken to be Indra (Ge, Old, Klein, Scar, but not KH), but Indra must be referred to in the 2nd ps. in cd, given the enclitic *te* and the voc. phrase *tuviṣṭā ... indra*. As indicated above, I also think that Indra is the addressee of the 2nd sg. impv. in pāda a. Although switch between persons is not unusual even within a single vs. in the RV, it would, I think, be unusual to have a 3rd ps. sandwiched between two 2nd ps. in the same vs. The case for the Indra ref. of *asya* is based on the larger context: if men are trying to fulfill Indra's wish (*asya kāmam*), they deserve his aid, just like the ritualists in cd. But I find the reference sandwich too problematic and think that b is actually less parallel to cd than it appears (or indeed should be). Instead it seems to be a recasting of one of the similes in pāda a: just as the sun sends people to their task(s), so (in b) do people pursue each his own desire. The sg. *asya* would be individuating the various different *kāma*- the plural subjects have.

So what do the *janidhā*- have to do with this, and are they being compared with the subjects, the *yé* who go to the *kāmam*, or with the object, the *kāmam*? Most opt for the former, while the publ. tr. reflects the latter. Before attempting to adjudicate the case identity, we should make a stab at figuring out what the cmpd might mean. I will start with an outlier suggestion, that of KH, which I wish I could adopt but which seems an impossible interpr. His tr. of b (139) is "der einem (*asya*) auf den Wunsch eingehen wie ein zum Eheweib bestimmtes Mädchen (?)." Unlike the standard interpr. noted above, he does not take *asya* as a reference to Indra (as far as I can see), but as a sort of indefinite. But it is his interpr. of *janidhā*- as a nom. sg. fem. "zum Eheweib bestimmtes Mädchen" that is more radical, since it assumes a passive sense of the root noun *-dhā*-, which would be unprecedented for *-dhā*- cmpds (and in fact questionable for most root noun cmpds). But it would yield some sense in the pāda: those fulfilling the wish of the unidentified *asya* would be likened to a new bride fulfilling the wish of her husband. However, I think this interpr. has to be rejected because of the twisting of the root noun cmpd, which is esp. unlikely given the existence of the parallel cmpd *jani-dā*- 'giving wives' (IV.17.16, of Indra). Conforming to the standard model of root-noun cmpds, the first member should be the obj. of the root noun – as in cmpds like *dhiyam-dhā*- 'creating thought', *ratna-dhā*- 'creating / establishing / providing treasure', etc., as well as the just-cited *jani-dā*-. What would a bride-creator/establisher/provider be? Ge suggests "Ehestifter" (matchmaker), which makes literal sense, but I do not know of any evidence for such a role in Rigvedic society (not that we would necessarily have it). Nonetheless, the publ. tr. adopts a version of this, "providers of wives," with the further assumption that men go to such people to fulfill their wish (for a wife). I now think this was an ill-thought-out translation of desperation, though I don't have much better to replace it with. I now think Gr's 'Brautführer' / Scar's 'Brautwerber' are closer to the mark and have some connection to what we know about the mechanics of ancient Indian marriage. As I have discussed elsewhere (see esp. SacWife 221–23 and passim), a prospective bridegroom does not seek the hand of a maiden himself, but sends "wooers" (*varā[ka]-*) to the prospective bride's family to arrange the match. These wooers are already found in the RVic wedding hymn X.85.14, and the institution is treated more straightforwardly in the gr̥hya sūtras. The wooers can reasonably be considered 'arrangers/providers of the bride', and they would perform this task "at the desire" (*kāmam*) of the bridegroom. I now therefore would tr. the pāda "(those) who pursue

each his own desire, like bride-providers (=wooers) at his (=bridegroom's) wish," with *asya kāmam* used in two different senses and syntactic functions (the one in the simile being adverbial) and *janidhāḥ* nom. rather than the acc. of my publ. tr.

After this, the interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is comparatively uncomplicated. As noted above, this clause must express the ritual actions directed at Indra that attract his aid. As in the previous two vss., which treat the same matter, food is a crucial element: *pāda-final ānnaiḥ* matches that of 3d, with loc. *ānne* in 4d somewhat recessive, since it describes the ritual of the rival sacrificer. The previous two vss. also showcase the verbal portion of the ritual, with *manīṣāḥ* (3c, 4d). In our vs. *gīraḥ* is substituted. The use of a form of  $\sqrt{\text{śak}}$  'be able', here the semi-lexicalized desid. *śikṣ* with *prāti*, a combination found only here, also recalls vs. 3 *ā ... śakyām* – though the two uses of *śak* are slightly different. In 3d the object is Indra, who is empowered by the ritual offerings to (display) generosity; here it is the hymns that are empowered, to be offered to Indra.

X.29.6: The worst is now over, and the hymn drifts to its conclusion with no more than normal difficulties.

My interpr. of the first hemistich differs considerably from Ge's, and there are arguments in favor of each—though ultimately I favor my own. The points of difference are 1) what is predicated of what, 2) how *mātra*- 'measure' is used and what it refers to, 3) what root *sūmite*- belongs to:  $\sqrt{\text{mā}}$  'measure' or  $\sqrt{\text{mi}}$  'fix', 4) what the instrumentals in b are doing and who do these qualities belong to.

Ge's tr. is "Die beiden sind für dich reichliche, gutbemessene Massstäbe: der Himmel an Grösse, die Erde an Weisheit." He thus takes *mātre* as predicated of Heaven and Earth, with *te* a dative enclitic. That is, "the two (=H+E) are a measure (/measuring rods / standards) for you." For him *sūmite* also belongs to  $\sqrt{\text{mā}}$  and forms an etymological figure with *mātre*: "the two well-measured measures." As he indicates in his n. 6ab, only Heaven and Earth are vast enough to serve as measuring standards for Indra. By contrast I take *mātra*- as a measure, that is, a unit of mass (like "a measure of grain") and, further, the container that would hold that mass (in a phrase like "quart measure," the "measure" may be the amount of liquid in a quart or the cup that holds it). So H+E are conceived of as very large, hollow containers.

I take *sūmite* to  $\sqrt{\text{mi}}$  'fix'. Syntactically *mātre* is the subject and *sūmite* 'well fixed' is its predicate, referring to the standard cosmogonic deed of Indra's, propping apart Heaven and Earth. Cf., e.g., III.30.4 *tāva dyāvāprthivī pārvatāso, ānu vratāya nīmiteva tasthuḥ* "It is following your [=Indra's] commandment that heaven and earth and the mountains stand (/stay) like (pillars) implanted. By my interpr. *te* goes with the instr.s in b, but occupies standard Wackernagel's position.

And the instrumentals name Indra's powers, which he used to fix the two world halves. For Ge, by contrast. they are the measuring standard for Heaven and Earth respectively ("Heaven in greatness, Earth in wisdom"). There is something to be said for both interpr., though *majmānā* works better for him than *kāvya*- does. The former, *majmān*-, is generally associated with Indra, and it is often the instrument he uses to effect his deeds (e.g., I.55.5, I.130.4), thus supporting my position, but it can also be the standard by which Indra is judged (III.32.7, 46.3 [both cited by Ge]), supporting Ge's. That "greatness" would be an appropriate standard for evaluating both Indra and Heaven is easy to accept; it is harder to see how *kāvya*- 'poetic skill, sagacity' could be a shared standard for Indra and Earth, since I'm not aware of passages in which Earth is credited with mental capacity of this sort. But *kāvya*- can be used as an instrument, even in cosmogonic

contexts. Cf. the following passage, which describes the separation of Heaven and Earth; though the deed is attributed to Soma, the action is one of Indra's standard ones: IX.70.2 *ubhé dyāvā kāvyaenā ví śísrathe* "through his poetic skill he [=Soma] has loosened both, Heaven (and Earth), from each other." Although *kāvya-* is more generally associated with Soma (as here) or Agni, recall that Indra in the Vala myth opens the cave through his verbal skill, not his physical power. In balance, therefore, though I find Ge's interpr. appealing in many ways, I think the evidence points rather in the direction of my own. And in particular, despite the suggestive interlacing of NOM. INSTR. NOM. INSTR. in b, the two instrumentals are Indra's means – the complementary physical power and verbal skill displayed in the Vṛtra and Vala myths respectively – and are used to fix both entities, Heaven and Earth, with no association of one of the instr. with one nom., and the other with the other.

The two pādas of the 2nd hemistich are constructed as parallels, each hoping that one of the substances offered to Indra will be acceptable to him. Given the parallelism, initial dat. *vārāya* "for your liking" should correspond to loc. *svādman*; cf. Ge's "nach deinem Wunsche ... nach deinem Geschmack." Although this is surely the intent, the use of the loc. is somewhat odd.

X.29.7: *ámatra-* in pāda a appears to be playing off *mātra-* in 6a, and since *ámatra-* is a large liquid measure, this may make it more likely that my interpr. *mātra-* in 6 is also one.

Note that *satyá-* from 4c and *rādhās-* from 3d, both used in reference to Indra, are reprised here in one cmpd.

Flg. Ge's cited parallel, VII.21.6 *abhí krátvendra bhūr ádha jmán* "Become preeminent through your will, Indra, on the earth," I supply a participial form of 'be/become' with *abhí* in d.

The *nṛ* theme of vss. 1–2 returns here with *náryaḥ*, doubled by and contrasting with adjacent *paúmsyaiḥ*.

X.29.8: The first pāda here is almost identical to VII.20.3 *vy āsa índraḥ pṛtanāḥ svójā(h)*; see comm. ad loc. Bloomfield (RReps ad VII.20.3) works himself into a state of near apoplexy because of differing translations of the two pādas, esp. different renderings of *pṛtanā-*, which he declares always means 'battle'. Although the two pādas are too similar to be chance resemblances and although I agree with Bl that *pṛtanā-* should be interpr. in the same way in both, I differ from him on two points. 1) I do not think that *pṛtanā-* in general only means 'battle'; rarely, as here (in my view, contra Ge), it seems to refer to the battlers themselves. (For the contribution of the root noun cmpd *pṛtanā-śāh-* to such a reinterpret. see comm. ad III.24.1.) 2) I think the choice of two different but phonologically similar verbs, *ví√as* (VII.20.3) and *ví√(n)as* (here), shows that the poet of the derivative pāda (probably our Vasukra) meant to vary the sense, not reproduce it. In VII.20.3 Bl takes *vy āse* as lit. 'threw himself through', but pregnantly 'pervaded', with our *vy ānaṭ* also meaning 'pervaded'. For the verb in VII.20.3 I prefer 'dispersed', for the one here 'penetrated'. The point here is that Indra has taken position in the middle between the armies, which marshall themselves (pāda b) competing to secure his patronage and help in battle for their side.

Pāda c is somewhat unclear. Ge, who interpr. both instances of *pṛtanā-* in this vs. as 'battle', tr. *ā ... ráthaṃ ná pṛtanāsu tiṣṭha* as "Besteige den Wagen wie in den Schlachten," with the simile consisting only of *pṛtanāsu*. But the position of *ná* speaks against that (and this is not a situation like that in 5a where *ná* is flipped because it's barred from pāda-final position [see comm. there and ad X.21.1], though I admit that \**pṛtanāsu ná* would not work metrically). My

interpr. takes *pṛtanāsu* as the frame and *rātham* as the simile, both construed with *ā ... tiṣṭha*. Since *ā√sthā* can take either acc. or loc., this is an example of case disharmony between simile and frame, of the type discussed in my 1982 IJ article “Case disharmony in RVic similes.” The point is that Indra shows himself superior to both sides in the battle – he mounts (perhaps ‘surmount’ would be better here) them like a chariot. So in fact he does not tip his favor to any side (despite the competition implied between the hosts in pāda b), but takes control of them all. The metaphorical chariot made up of the *pṛtanā*-s he will then drive (pāda d) to his own advantage (and perhaps ours, given his benevolent *sumatī*). The middle voice of *codāyāse* expresses the same self-involved action as the same form in VI.46.13, where Indra spur on his own steeds.

For *sumatyā* and suggested substitute reading *sumatī* see Old ad I.31.18.

### X.30–34

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

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

### X.30 Waters

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

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

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

RVic poet, and in the first vs. of this hymn it frames the action to come as more significant than a little expedition with a bucket down to the river.

The root affiliation of the 1st sg. subjunctive *rīradhā* is disputed. Gr and Lub assign it to  $\sqrt{randh}$  ‘be/make subject’, and I follow them; Old, Ge, Re, Janert all prefer  $\sqrt{rādh}$  ‘(make) succeed’. At first glance ‘make succeed’ is easier to fit into the passage than ‘make subject’, but there are several arguments in favor of the more difficult interpr. ‘make subject’. First, although a causative system, with pres. *randhāya-* and redupl. aor. *rīradha-*, is very well established in the RV for  $\sqrt{randh}$ , the *-āya-*transitive *rādhaya-* to  $\sqrt{rādh}$  is first found in the AV, the corresponding redupl. aor. *arīradhat* first in TS (1x). So the default interpr. of *rīradha-* in the RV would be to  $\sqrt{randh}$ —although it must be admitted that the other 8 exx. are in *mā* prohibitives: this is the only occurrence in positive context. Second, the case frame here, ACC *suṇṛktīm* + DAT *prthujrāyase*, is exactly that found with the causative forms of  $\sqrt{randh}$ , but the dative is foreign to  $\sqrt{rādh}$ . Those who favor  $\sqrt{rādh}$  must therefore resort to makeshifts in rendering the verb (Ge, Janert) or the dat. (Re). In my view “making the hymn subject to DAT” indicates that hymn’s composer recognizes the superior power of the entity denoted by the dative and sends it to do service to that entity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.30.4: By accent *dīdayat* in pāda a belongs to the redupl. pres. that is emerging in the RV by reinterpr. of the old presential perfect *dīdāya*. The act. pres. part. *dīdyat-* (8x) is unambiguous testimony to this present stem. Besides redupl.-accented *dīdaya-* (2x in addition to this passage), the stems *dīdāya-* with pf. accent (6x) and *dīdaya-* (unaccented, so ambig., 5x) are also found. All of these should be subjunctives (whether pf. or pres.), and indeed, save perhaps for this one, all of them are at least compatible with and generally best interpr. as subjunctives (see Narten “Vedisch *dīdāya...*” [1987 = KISch 368–79], n. 5, as well as my 2017 “Vedic Perfect Subjunctive,” 316–18)—including the two other redupl.-accented *dīdayat* occurrences (VIII.6.24, X.95.12). However, our form works better as a general present: it is characteristic of Apām Napāt to shine without fuel in the waters; it is not an action that an offering of Soma (3d) will/should bring about. Cf., from the only hymn devoted to Apām Napāt in the RV, II.35.4 *dīdāyānīdhmah ... apsú*, with the indicative presential pf. *dīdāya* in identical context. That the parallel rel. cl. in our 4b contains an unambig. indic. pres. *īlate* also supports an indic. interpr. I don’t quite know what to do about this conflict between function and form, but think it at least possible that the shifting nature of the verbal system of  $\sqrt{dī}$  allowed a nonce interpr. of *dīdayat* as thematic injunc. On the averbo of this root both in the RV and in later Vedic, see the above cited art. by Narten.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The identity of the “both” that the wave rouses is disputed. Both Ge and Re supply “worlds” (that is, Heaven and Earth), and this is certainly a possible pair. Ge (n. 9b) additionally suggests both races (gods and men), which I follow in the publ. tr., or even the two streams (*dhārā-*) found in the next vs. (10a). The referent of *ubhé* must of course be either fem. or neut. Though the overwhelming number of instances of *ubhé* probably refer to the two worlds (fem. *ródasī*, etc.), there is a subset of passages referring to the two races (neut. *jánmanī*, *jánasī*), and this makes more sense to me in context (though I don’t have strong feelings about it).

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

Ge and Re (and Gr by implication) take *tritāntum* as a modifier of the acc. *ūrmīm* that dominates the vs. (see Old for doubts). But this doesn’t make a lot of sense—how would a wave have three threads?—and it also leaves *pāri* with nothing to do. In contrast, I take *tritāntum* with *pāri*, specifying the location of the action of the participle *vicārantam* referring to the ‘wave’, and I supply *yajñām* as the referent of *tritāntum*. Both Ge (n. 9d) and Re cite *saptā-tantu-* as a

parallel, and this adj. modifies *yajñā-* in its two occurrences (X.52.4, 124.1). The three threads here are presumably either the three fires or the three soma pressings.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

On 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. mid. ending *-ram* in *adṛśram* see the extensive disc. by Old ad IX.7.1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### X.31 All Gods

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

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

X.31.1: Old and Ge take the gen. *devānām* in the phrase *devānām ... śāmsaḥ* as a subjective genitive, but I don’t see why. Although the gods may help us, they don’t ordinarily praise us; the subjects of active transitive forms of the root  $\sqrt{\text{śams}}$  are humans or their counterparts. In asking that the laud of the gods seek us out, we are expressing the usual hope that poetic inspiration and its product, the hymn, will come to us at the right moment for producing praise for the gods.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Although *sūṣá-* is an adjective ‘fortifying, powerful’ (on which see comm. ad IX.97.54), it is often used of praise songs or chants, generally with the headnoun gapped. And that is surely its use here: the poet has been honing his verbal skill and has now achieved his goal, a powerful hymn. For *abhí√(n)aś* with a verbal product as obj., cf. VI.49.8 *abhy ānaḍ arkám* “he has attained the chant,” adduced by Re.

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

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

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

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

The rel. clause in b presents us with several puzzles, though the subject and verb, *savitā jajāna*, are straightforward: “Savitar begot / created.” The first puzzle is the referent of the dative rel. prn. *yásmai*, the second the object to be supplied with the verb (if any). The most obvious

referent for *yásmāi* would be an entity in the preceding pāda, and there is only one (at least overt): Agni. Old again suggests the sacrificer instead, and the publ. tr. follows. Once again I have developed serious doubts and now think the obvious solution—Agni—is probably the right one, or at least the initial reading.

As for the object of *jājāna*, Ge thinks it is the *śūśā-*: the Ansporn = Loblied. (Klein [DGRV II.15, 184] follows Ge's interpr. of both pādas.) This would simplify matters by repeating the supplied material of pāda a, but I am (or was) a bit dubious about the sense: did Savitar create the hymn? This is not part of his usual remit; in fact Savitar seems to have very little to do with begetting or creating. The only passage I've identified in which Savitar is the subject of a form of  $\sqrt{jan}$  is IV.53.2 *ājījanat savitā sumnām ukthyām* "Savitar has given birth to praiseworthy benevolence," which doesn't seem relevant here. However, I think Ge's idea can be rescued and indeed considerably enhanced—if we see it as a diabolical pun, or set of puns, on the part of our poet. The word *śūśā-* is not, of course, derived from  $\sqrt{sū}$ , the basis of Savitar's name, but they are phonologically similar, with an initial sibilant followed by long *ū*, and they can therefore be poetically associated, with Savitar ( $\sqrt{sū}$ ) giving birth to a *śūśā-*. This would be enabled by another diabolical pun. There are two roots  $\sqrt{sū}$ : 1) 'impel', the source of Savitar's name and actions; 2) 'give birth'. They are etymologically distinct, and their verbal systems also don't overlap. But the agent noun Savitar could in principle be derived from either one. I suggest that the poet is playfully associating him with the 2nd root 'give birth', and then lexically substituting the semantically (almost) identical pf. of  $\sqrt{jan}$  for the pf. *sasūva* 'gave birth'. The proposed underlying VP "gave birth to a *śūśā-*" would thus rest on three puns, two phonological (*śūśā-* :  $\sqrt{sū}$  'impel';  $\sqrt{sū}$  'impel' :  $\sqrt{sū}$  'give birth') and one semantic ( $\sqrt{sū}$  'give birth' :  $\sqrt{jan}$  'beget'). The outcome also has the merit of making Savitar the subject of the gender-appropriate 'birth' root:  $\sqrt{sū}$  has the mother as subject, while  $\sqrt{jan}$  generally has the father or a father-like figure. (Note the occurrence of  $\sqrt{sū}$  'give birth' in 10a *sūta*, with female as subj. This root was clearly in the poet's head.)

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

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

These are both possible choices, and we will return to them – but first we should consider the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich on its own. If we do so, we get an interpr. that directly conflicts with the one just offered and that identifies a very different referent for both *īm* in c and *só* in d. The phrasology points strongly to Soma. In pāda c the VP "anoint with cows" (*góbhiḥ √āñj*) is a fairly common phrase in both active and passive; though a few other entities get so anointed (e.g., Agni V.3.2, Mitra and Varuṇa I.51.8, music VIII.20.8), it is overwhelmingly used of Soma (e.g., IX.10.3, 32.3, 45.3, 50.2, 85.5, 86.47, 96.22, 103.2, 107.22), referring to the mixing of milk with the just-pressed soma juice. Similarly in d *cāru-* modifies a number of different entities

mostly connected with the ritual (*yajñá-* itself, e.g., VII.84.3, *adhvará-* I.19.1, *ghṛtá-* X.96.1, etc.), but it is extraordinarily common with *sóma-* (e.g., IV.49.2, X.39.2, etc.) and other words for soma (e.g., *sutá-* I.137.2, *índu-* IX.109.8). If we put this phraseological evidence together, Soma seems the obvious referent: “Bh + A should anoint him [=Soma] with cows; he [=Soma] is pleasing ...” (with the referent of *asmaí* still unclear). But there’s no real place for Soma, even in this ritual context. Indra does not appear in this hymn; there is no mention of pressing or ritual drinking. Certainly in this verse no rhetorical space has been created for Soma. I therefore think that this is another of the poet’s jokes – a deliberate red herring: everything points to Soma, except that Soma makes no sense when the vs. and hymn as a whole are considered.

Let us now return to the possibilities identified above. I now think that the referent of both *īm* (c) and *só* (d) is the hymn, *sūṣá-*, covertly present in each pāda, though overtly absent from all four. The phrase “anoint (the hymn) with cows” is unusual, but interpretable; it means to reward the hymn (or rather its poet) with the gift of livestock. (In one of his shifting interpr., Old suggest something similar: that Bhaga and Aryaman are bestowing Kuhbesitz on the sacrificer [whom he takes as the referent of *īm*].) This brings us back to 2ab, where the poet awaited his material reward “along the path of truth,” on which see comm. ad loc.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ge takes bc as dependent on pāda a, whereas I connect them with d. But there is little actual difference in sense between the two approaches. However, MLW points out to me that the imperfect *āyan* should not have the recent past sense “have assembled.” If I wish to maintain the imperfect analysis, I need to realign pādas bc with pāda a, as Ge does “Might this earth here be like (the place) of the dawns when the possessors of livestock assembled here ...” However, MLW suggests an attractive alternative, to analyze *samāyan* not as impf. *sam-āyan*, but as subj. *sam-ā-āyan*, which will allow the current configuration: “When the possessors of livestock will assemble here with their strength, desiring to partake of the praise of this singer, let the powerful prizes approach us.” I favor this subjunctive interpr.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On *itāūti-* see comm. ad VIII.99.7.

With Ge, I take *jaranta* as intrans. ‘become old’; Gotō (1st Cl., 152) thinks the stem can have either intrans. or trans. value and here favors the latter: “die vielen Morgenröten machen die Tage (mit sich) alt.” I think this unlikely. Although the trope of the dawns making us (etc.) age is well established, that doesn’t seem to be what’s at issue here. For one thing, I don’t know what it would mean for the dawns to make the *days* age. More importantly, as indicated in the publ. tr., the contrast here seems to be the unchanging solidity of the cosmic structures Heaven and Earth and the ever-changing nature of time.

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

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

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



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

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

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

And that's as far as I can get.

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.31.10: With Ge (and despite Old’s doubts), I take this vs. as depicting the kindling of the ritual fire, with a focus on the kindling apparatus. In this it resembles vss. 13–14 (esp. the latter) of X.27, showing once again the connection between the Vasukra and Kavaṣa hymns that Old noted. As in X.27.14 the equipment and the process are both sexualized and, paradoxically, desexualized – or, better, de-fecundized. In X.27.14a the rod that connects the two kindling sticks is described as a tree without leaves or shade, in other words a barren object (see comm. ad loc.). Here in pāda a I think the same entity, the rod, is identified as a barren cow (*starī-*), which nonetheless, paradoxically, gave birth (*sūta*). This identification is surprising because of the rod’s phallic shape, and in fact I think the same piece of equipment is depicted as phallic in d—but dizzying layers of paradox should not surprise us in contexts like this. In both X.27.14a and here the rod is barren because it is the mere connector of the two kindling sticks, but it is also productive through its interaction esp. with the lower *araṇi*. Its giving birth in our pāda happens while, and because, it is *ajyāmānā*: “being driven” by the priests rapidly turning it back and forth (see descrip. ad X.27.14) – but also “being anointed,” perhaps with drops of ghee, as Ge (n. 10a) suggests, or with sparks from the friction.

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

ordinarily a good quality, here it is not. I would now emend the tr. to “she set the unmoving / unwavering (kindling materials) to wavering / to a wavering course.”

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

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

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

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

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

1.117.8 *yuvām śyāvāya rúsatīm adattam mahāḥ kṣoṇasyāśvinā kṇvāya /  
pravācyam tād vṛṣaṇā kṛtām vām yān nāṣadāya śrávo adhyádhattam ||*

In the publ. (JPB) tr.:

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

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

Given the coincidence of vocabulary, there can be no doubt that the two passages are deeply interrelated, though they throw less light on each other than we might hope. I think it likely that

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

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

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

### X.32 Indra

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

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

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

Now *sakṣāni*. Although it could be derived from either *√sah* or *√sac*, an affiliation with the former is more likely on semantic and lexical (other *sakṣ-* forms to this root) grounds. Flg.

Baunack, both Old and Ge (n. 1a) take it as an infinitive in imperatival usage, presumably a loc. inf. to an otherwise unattested *n*-stem *\*saksán-*, and Lub also classifies it as an inf. to *√sah*. In the publ. tr. I took it as a loc. to such a stem, but not in infinitival usage: “in the power of ...” But I now find neither locative interpr. convincing, esp. because there exists an *i*-stem *saksáni-* of the appropriate shape, but no *\*saksán-* (though of course an *n*-stem probably underlies both *saksáni-* [8x, excluding this passage] and *saksána-* [1x]). I return to the view that our *saksáni* represents an irregular shortening of dual *saksáni* in pāda-final position, a view that dates back to BR and is also held by Gr, Delb (AiS 416), and Lanman (Noun Infl. 390). The dual *saksáni* is found in VIII.22.15 modifying the Ásvins, also on a journey, and the very similar *-in*-stem *prasaksín-* (like our *prá ... saksáni*) has a dual *prasaksinā* modifying Indra’s *hárī* in VIII.13.10 (followed immediately in the next pāda by *gántārā*, like our *gmántā*). Despite Old’s contemptuous dismissal of the dual interpr., I find it less problematic than the loc. infinitive one and would now emend the tr. to “The two overpowering (horses) of the one being conjured up [=Indra] are come.” Although the shortening would be irregular, it may have been facilitated by the short *-i* ending pādas c and d.

The first evidence of the bridal motif is found in pāda b, with the ‘wooers’, both acc. and instr. (*varébhīr varān*). This first evidence is also the first evidence of the role reversals that characterize this motif in the hymn. The wooer is already a defined role in the RVic wedding; see in the wedding hymn, X.85.8–9. As I have discussed elsewhere (Sac Wife 222–23 and passim), the function and behavior of the wooer are most clearly set out in the gr̥hya sūtras. The wooer or wooers are proxies for the bridegroom, who go to the house of the prospective bride and perform the formal wooing of the girl in discussion/negotiation with her family. This always involves their journey *to* the bride, but here they—or at least some of them— stay put, and Indra, the pseudo-bride, comes to them. I am a bit puzzled by the plethora of wooers, in two different cases, and am not certain of their identities, but I am now inclined towards the solution sketched by Ge in his n. 1b, that they represent two different groups. The acc. *varān* are the priests and ritual personnel, who are wooing Indra with their *dhī-* and sit awaiting his arrival. The instr. *varébhīh* are the wooers who accompany Indra, the gods or specifically the Maruts. I am not sure why wooers would come along with Indra in this scenario, unless (most likely) the image is of the standard model of wooing, with Indra as bridegroom accompanied by his posse of wooers, coming to woo the *dhī-*. The poet thus superimposes the two models one upon the other, leaving his audience off balance. I would now slightly emend this part of the tr. to “... are come, along with the wooers, to the (other) wooers (who are) taking their seats in front.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The identities of the subjects of the other two pādas, also making their way to the seat, are unclear. Ge (n. 4b) suggests “sonstige Opfer (c) und Lied (d).” In particular (n. 4c) he sees “the foremost mother of the flock” (*mātā ... yūthāsya pūrvyā*) as the Iḍā, on the basis of V.41.19 *īlā yūthāsya mātā*, but we should perhaps also bear in mind *pūrvyā bhūmanā gauḥ* “the foremost cow throughout the land” in the immediately preceding hymn (X.31.6), which we identified as the dakṣiṇā, arisen from Agni’s good favor.

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

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

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

Meanwhile in b Indra, who is the single surpassing one (*ékaḥ ... turvánīḥ*), drives to the place of sacrifice along with the Maruts (*rudrébhiḥ* b) or with the gods in general (c). I would now slightly emend the tr., to more or less match Ge’s “oder mit den Unsterblichen,” to “or

(with) the immortals among whom ...” with gapped instr. in the main cl. and “immortals” demoted into the rel. cl. as a loc. The position of *vā* is then somewhat anomalous, but (in my opinion) anomalous within reasonable limits.

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

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

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

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

The identity of the *vrata-pā-* ‘protector of commandments’ is left unclear, and the poet may be having a little joke at our expense. Sg. *vrata-pā-* is most often used of Agni (I.31.10, VI.8.2, VIII.11.1, possibly X.61.7); the only other sg. god who serves as referent is Sūrya (I.83.5). But since the contents of the Vratapā’s speech concern Agni, he is unlikely to be the speaker. Since Varuṇa is particularly associated with *vrata-*, he might be expected to be the default referent, but the stem is never directly applied to him, and there is no other sign of him in this hymn. In order to avoid multiplying entities, I suggest that Indra, who is explicitly named at the beginning of the next pāda, is also the referent here. By virtue of his militant actions on behalf of the gods and their clients, he can be considered the protector of their *vrataś*.

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

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

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

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



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

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

Note the enclitic doubling in *īm enam*.

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

As a close parallel to ab Old and Ge aptly adduce V.30.12 *bhadrām idām ruśāmā agne akran, gāvām catvāri dādātāḥ sahāsrā* “The Ruśamas have done this auspicious thing, o Agni, in giving four thousand cows.” In our pāda a the poet may be addressing the soma vessel as an object made auspicious by being part of the gift we are giving. By contrast, in addressing Kuruśravaṇa in b, he may be asking covert permission of the king to perform this giving – or more likely calling attention to the unusual *giving* by the poet (& co.) in order to prompt lavish countergiving by Kuruśravaṇa and the patrons, a sort of priming of the pump. Certainly the munificence of Kuruśravaṇa to our poet is described in extravagant terms in the next hymn, X.33.4–5.

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

### X.33 Lament of a singer

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

X.33.1: My tr. of *prayúj-* as ‘advance team’ here and in I.186.9, X.96.12 is not a happy one, sounding too close to the operatives of a modern political campaign. Presumably *prayúj-* refers to the horse(s) at the front of the team, and here the point is that the poet is hitched up even in front of those forward horses, in an especially prominent position. Because I doubt that the “teams of the peoples” (*prayújo jánānām*), a phrase also found in X.96.12, actually did their own hitching, I would like to take *prayújaḥ* as an acc. pl. (as it is in I.186.9, in the phrase *prá yuñjate prayújaḥ*). I would then tr. “They hitched me up (even) in front of (before) the teams of the

peoples,” though I’m not certain the syntax will work: no other forms of *prá√yuj* have a double acc. Old dismisses the possibility of an acc.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I do not understand the function of *prá-* in *prásvādasah*. No other forms built to *svād-* are compounded with this preverb (anywhere in Skt.), nor does it appear with verb forms built to

√*svad* or √*sūd*. There is an orphaned, functionless *prá* in V.7.6 *prá svādanam pitūnām*, but that doesn't help much.

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

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

### X.34 Gambler

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.34.2–3: Note the symmetry between 2d *āpa jāyām arodham* and 3a *āpa jāyā ruṇaddhi*. In 2d the preverb *āpa* in tmesis does not take one of its usual positions, esp. pāda-initial: it is preceded in the pāda by *ānuvratām*. It is immediately after the caesura, but, more to the point, its unusual placement allows the symmetry just noted; in 3a *āpa* is properly placed because it opens the clause.

Note the opening of 3c, #*śvasyā*, matching 2c #*akṣāsyā*.

X.34.3: The mother-in-law of pāda a is actually the mother-in-law of the wife, that is, the *mother* of the speaker. In the system of patrilocal marriage prevailing at this period, terms for in-laws

would only refer to the in-laws of the wife, who would be embedded within them. See disc. ad X.28.1 and Thieme (M+A 14 and n. 5); in M+A (n. 5) and Gedichte (74 n. 5) he suggests that “mother-in-law” is used here because the woman in question no longer considers the gambler her son because of his unacceptable behavior. She has disowned him, and her relationship to him is only through her daughter-in-law.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

X.34.7: This is the only Jagatī vs. in this Triṣṭubh hymn (though see 5c in the otherwise Triṣṭubh vs. 5); it is also the middle vs., esp. if we take vs. 14 as somewhat aside. Falk (p. 183) cleverly points out that Jagatī with its 12-syllable pādas is divisible by 4 – that is, it is essentially *kṛta*, the winning hand, and further suggests that if there’s a Wahrheitszauber in the hymn (as a number have asserted, with various candidates; see Falk 182–83), this is it. He considers it a *nāmagrāha*: the speaker knows the real names of the dice, or rather the real name, *aṅkuśá-* ‘hook’ (in

*aṅkuśín*), which is a phonological scrambling of *akṣá-* (p. 185 n. 534). Although I’m not sure that I’d follow Falk all the way, I am quite taken by his observation that this vs. is the only one that can be divided by 4; he does not make anything of its being the middle vs. (his publication predates my work on the omphalos), but its position fits it to be an omphalos vs., which gives further support to Falk’s suggestion. Rather than considering the various adj.s in the first hemistich, or just *aṅkuśín-*, as the real name(s) of the dice, I wonder if the intent is the reverse, an intent signalled by *íḍ*: an attempt to demystify and disempower the dice by cutting their name down to size, “they are just *akṣáḥ*.” This would make it a kind of reverse omphalos: rather than embodying the enigma of the hymn, it reveals (or tries to) that the apparently irresistible actors, the nuts, are actually just pedestrian objects. But clearly this belittling doesn’t work: the compulsive attraction remains too strong, and the dice are depicted as animate agents in vss. 8–9, 11. For a similar reversion of inanimate actors to mere objects see the end of the pressing stone hymn, X.94.14.

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

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

X.34.8: Although I follow the current standard interpr. of *tripañcāsáḥ* as “three times fifty” (see, e.g., Ge, Macd [VRS], Re [HySpec], Don), this compd can also mean “fifty-three” (so Gr; see also Ge n. 8a, Macd VRS). Since 53 divided by 4 would yield the dreaded *kṛtá-* / *ekapará-* “one left over,” I think this is a possible alt. interpr., esp. since our gambler is down on his luck.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As for *vṛṣalā-*, KH (Vedica 87 [MSS 41, 1982] = Aufs. III, 793ff.) considers this passage as well as the much later ones and settles on "Hausgesinde arischer Herkunft." But this seems too specific a social role for our period and our hymn. It seems more likely that this derivative of 'bull', with its diminutive and deprecatory suffix *-la-* with "popular" *l*, is a familiar and condescending way of referring to a social inferior or someone down on his luck, of the "poor guy" variety. A different species but the same general intent might be "miserable cur" or "mongrel" or "mutt."

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

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

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

The verb in d, *ví caṣṭe*, is given the sense(s) ‘explain / reveal / tell’ in all the tr. cited above. However, I am reluctant to ascribe a trans./caus. sense to this middle root pres., which ordinarily means ‘see’—despite Falk’s ingenious attempt (p. 187 n. 546) to make it a two-way street of lightbeams. I prefer ‘watch out for’ (similarly *ví cakṣate* in VIII.45.16): Savitar’s good and bracing advice is his way of exercising benevolent oversight over the (reformed) gambler.

Although *aryáh* is most likely the nom. sg. of the thematic adj. *aryá-*, it could also be the gen. sg. of *arí-* and modify *me* (“me, the stranger”), indicating that by his behavior the gambler has estranged himself from Ārya social bonds (as is amply demonstrated throughout the hymn), but that he is being brought back into the fold.

X.34.13–14: Note the juxtaposition of *aryáh* // *mitráṃ* across the verse boundary. It almost seems that the gambler is being reintegrated into Ārya society, and the two gods esp. associated with the smooth internal running of that society, Aryaman and Mitra, are indirectly invoked. Savitar seems like a stand-in for Aryaman here.

X.34.14: The particle *khálu*, though extremely common in Vedic prose, is found only here in the RV.

The instr. adj. *ghoréṇa* has been interpr. in a variety of ways: Ge and Th supply “Zauber,” Falk (somewhat anachronistically) “Kali”; Macd. tr. “magic power,” Don “the force of your terrible sorcery,” Maurer “cruelty,” and Re (Hymnes spéc) takes it adverbially “de cette façon cruelle.” I favor supplying either ‘eye’ (on the basis of the cmpds. *ghorá-cakṣas-* and *ághora-cakṣus-*) or ‘mind’ (on the basis of VII.20.6 *mánaḥ ... ghorám*; cf. also the beg. of the Purūravas/Urvaśī dialogue X.95.1 *mānasā tīṣṭha ghore*).

X.35–38: These four hymns are persuasively grouped together by Old (Prol. 229 n. 2, 235), though only the first two, which are a matched pair, are attributed to the same poet. The names of the poets given by the Anukr. for X.37 and X.38 are fanciful and based on the divine dedicand.

X.35–36: The next two hymns, both to the All Gods, are attributed to one Luśa Dhānāka, not otherwise mentioned in the RV. On the structural similarities between the hymns see the publ. intro. to X.36. Both hymns are top-heavy with 1st pl. middles in (-) *īmahe* and *-īmahi*, both in their refrains and outside of them.

### X.35 All Gods

On the matutine character of this hymn and its structure in general, see publ. intro.

The refrain that dominates the middle part of the hymn and the dense repetition found throughout give a slightly claustrophobic feeling to this hymn. Even before the refrain that dominates vss. 3–12 is established in 3d, pronounced chaining links the first three vss.: Heaven and Earth are found in all three vss. (1c, 2a, 3a), in the first as a dual dvandva in the nom., in the 2nd as a gen. du. dvandva (*diváṣprthivyóḥ*), in the 3rd again in the nom., but with the two members separated. The stem *uśás-* is likewise found in all three vss., in different case/number (1b, 2c, 3c), and the adverb *adyá/-ā* ‘today’ occurs in all three (1c, 2d, 3a). The end of vs. 1 (d *áva ā vṛṇīmahe*) is repeated in 2a, and *anāgāstváṃ* (2c) reappears in *ánāgasah* in 3a. Note also *mahī* (1c, 3b), *māṭīṇ* (2b) / *māṭārā* (3b). Lexical and phrasal repetition characterize the hymn throughout. See comm. ad vs. 5, for example. Particularly persistent is the word *adyá* ‘today’, found in vss. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 13, (i.e., half the vss.). It is notable that *adyā* and the VP *ávaḥ ...*

*vr̥ṇīmahe*, which figure prominently in this hymn, form the post-caesura part of the refrain ... *ávo adyā vr̥ṇīmahe* that dominates the next hymn (X.36.2–12).

X.35.1: I am not sure why the fires are said to be *indravant*–; is it because he is a regular at the early morning pressing?

X.35.2: With Old and Gr (contra Ge and Re), I take *śaryaṇāvataḥ* as acc. pl., not gen. sg.

X.35.3: When the refrain gets established in the final pāda of this vs., its verb *īmahe*, in final position, not only repeats the *īmahe* that ends 2c, but echoes pāda-final *vr̥ṇīmahe* (1d, 2a).

X.35.4: The form *sudevyām* occurs twice in the RV, here and in I.112.19, both pāda-final. In I.112.19 I take it, with some but not all interpr. (see comm. ad loc.), as an acc. of a PN *sudevī*– with *vr̥kī* inflection, rather than assigning it to a them. stem *sudevyā*– as Gr (etc.) does. In our passage in the publ. tr. I attempted the same thing, except analyzing it as a nom. phrase *\*sudevī iyām*, with vowel contraction and shortening (*\*sudevīyam > sudevyīyam*) as well as loss of the accent on *iyām*. I wish I could make this work, but on reflection I see that it rests on too many shaky factors – not only the unprecedented sandhi and loss of accent, but the unlikelihood of starting and ending the pāda with the same deictic *iyām* with the same referent. Not to mention the fact that, like *sudevā*–, *sudevī*– should be a bahuvrīhi, which works for the PN in I.112.19, but would not work here, since it would modify a figure who is already a goddess. I would now detach this form from the identical one in I.112.19, still assigning that one to a *vr̥kī* stem *sudevī*–, while accepting the thematic adj. deriv. here (though it occurs nowhere else) and taking it as an adverb. But I would still maintain that it was constructed to evoke *-devī*– and means something like “in the manner of a good goddess.” The emended tr.: “This foremost ruddy one here — in the manner of a good goddess, let her, the rich lady, dawn richly for our gain.” Just as the adv. *revāt* matches the fem. nom. sg. *revātī* “the rich lady richly,” so does *sudevyām* match the unexpressed *\*(su)devī*. Assuming an allusion to the goddess seems preferable to the almost random collection of meanings others have assigned to *sudevyā*–: Gr “Schar der guten Götter”; Ge “Glück”; Re (EVP V.50 tr. of this hymn) “la faveur des dieux” (as obj. of *vy ūchatu*, which is otherwise generally intrans., though see possible exception in 5c), but in the notes on the hymn (EVP IV.112) “fait d’avoir les dieux pour soi” (see also EVP XVI.11 ad I.112.19 “rendant les dieux favorables”).

The stem *durvidātra*–, the negative of the better-attested *suvidātra*–, is found three times in the RV: twice in Luśa Dhānaka’s slender oeuvre (here and in the following hymn, X.36.2) and in X.63.12. The adj. is generally given a generic gloss: Gr ‘Schlechtes austheilend, Böses erweisend’, Ge ‘unzugänglich’, AiG II.2.170 ‘Böses erweisend’. The exception is Re, whose rendering ‘funeste à rencontrer’ has real semantics. As disc. with regard to *suvidātra*– (comm. ad II.9.6), the question is what root *-vidātra*– belongs to. For reasons detailed ad II.9.6, I connect it with *√vid* ‘find’, and my assumption is that this root etymology also underlies Re’s ‘... à rencontrer’: ‘to find’, that is, ‘to run across / encounter’. Two of the three examples of *durvidātra*– actively support this derivation by wishing the entity described as *durvidātra*– to be or go far away: here “set the fury in the distance (*āré*)” and in X.63.12, where repeated *āpa* ‘away’ as well as *āré* ‘in the distance’ apply to a series of afflictions we seek to have banished. The point is that the further away all these things are, the less likely we will encounter them.



Re, somewhat bizarrely, takes *dhīmahi* as passive (“Puissions-nous être placés ...”), which requires him to construe the acc. *manyúm* rather loosely. Since *dhīmahi* is almost never passive, I see no advantage in this.

X.35.5: *uśásaḥ* in b is morphologically ambiguous: it could be the gen. sg. or the (modernized) nom. pl. (as in 6a), agreeing with *yāḥ* in pāda a. Since b is identical to 1b, save for the gender of the nom. pl. pres. part.: m. *bhárantaḥ* 1b, f. *bhárantīḥ* 5b, the gen. sg., construed with *vyùṣṭiṣu* as in 1b, is the more likely choice (so also Re, though he allows for simultaneous readings). However, Ge opts for nom. pl. at least as the primary ident. (tr. *vyùṣṭiṣu* with a pronominal gen. “bei ihrem Aufgang”), and though Old favors the gen. sg. on the grounds of parallelism, he allows for both readings. It is certainly possible that the poet wanted to introduce variation, or at least doubt, in his repeated pāda.

Pāda c introduces another ambiguity: the Samhitā form *bhadrā* can represent either neut. pl. *bhadrā* or fem. pl. *bhadrāḥ* (Pp. the latter). The pub. tr. reflects the former, as acc. obj. with *vy ùchata*. I now think this is wrong: not only is *ví√vas* otherwise intrans. (see comm. ad vs. 4), but unambig. *bhadrāḥ* modifies pl. ‘dawns’ elsewhere (IV.51.7, VII.41.7). I would now emend the tr. to “as auspicious ones, dawn widely today for our fame.” This adj. picks up *bhadrām* in 2d, where it is a neut. substantive, which is perhaps a weak support for taking it as such here. However, the other arguments outweigh that.

The vs. switches from 3rd pl. in the first hemistich (or at least pāda a; b is ambiguous) to 2nd pl. in the second, while maintaining the same subject (dawns) – as is, of course, often the case.

X.35.6: The ambiguous form in this vs. is *āyukṣātām*. The Pp. reads *āyukṣātām*, that is, based on a form with a lengthened augment (which conforms to Prātiśākhya 181), and this preterital interpr. is accepted by the standard interpr. (Gr, Ols, Ge, Re, implicitly Narten [Sig aor. 215]; see esp. Old’s disc. ad V.17.3). But I do not see why in this context we cannot interpr. the Samhitā form as *ā yukṣātām*, with an imperative (or imperatival injunctive) plus preverb. The context favors it, with two parallel preceding impvs., *ā carantu* (a) and *úd ... jihatām* (b). There are, admittedly, countervailing factors in addition to the Prātiśākhya. In favor of the lengthened augment interpr. is the unambiguous form *āyunak* in I.163.2, which cannot have the preverb *ā*, because of the lack of accent; there is also the fact that unambiguous *ā√yuj* is fairly uncommon. But cf. *āyuyujré* at V.58.2, X.44.7, where *ā* cannot be the augment because it is prefixed to a perfect, and so must be the preverb; also III.35.2 *ā yunajmi* with *ā* and a pres. indic. It is true that the other occurrence of *āyukṣātām*, at I.157.1, is very like our passage (*āyukṣātām aśvínā ... rátham*) and is in preterital context with augmented forms (preceded by *ābodhi ... āvaḥ*, followed by *prāsāvī*), so “have yoked” is the most likely interpr. But nothing prevents our form from being analyzed *ā yukṣātām*, versus *ā ayukṣātām* in I.157.1. Or, even if the form in I.157.1 has a lengthened augment and no preverb, it is perfectly possible that our poet misunderstood the form as containing the preverb and, potentially, the unaugmented *yukṣātām*. One could construct a scenario to cover the standard interpr. and explain why the first half of our vs. is in the imperative, but the third verb is an augmented aorist: the Ásvins are notoriously early travelers (*prātar-yāvan-*, etc.), and so perhaps they had already yoked their chariot before we urge the dawns and the fires to spring into action. But on the whole an interpr. with three impvs. fits the context better.

X.35.7: The first hemistich of this vs. contains what is surely a deliberate echo of the Gāyatrī mantra (III.62.10), which begins *tāt savitūr váreṇyam, bhārgah* ..., very similar to our ... *savitar váreṇyam, bhāgām* ... An expanded, Jagatī version of the Gāyatrī mantra's 1st pāda is also found at I.159.5 (see comm. ad loc.), which contains the *adyā* of our pāda: *tād rādhō adyā savitūr váreṇyam*.

On *dhiśāṇā*- see comm. ad IX.59.2.

X.35.8: Although *devānām* is generally (Ge, Re, Lü [506]) construed with *pravācanam*, I follow Old in taking it with the b pāda, as a genitive indirect object – both because of the pāda boundary and because of the standard god/mortal polarity expressed here by *devānām ... manuṣyāḥ*.

I take pāda c as the content of the *ṛtāsya pravācanam*. Although it seems a somewhat banal satyakriyā, it does express a basic truth about the cosmos. Note that nearby X.37.2 contains a *satyókti*- 'statement of reality' that also asserts that the sun rises every day.

X.35.9: The first word of the vs., *adveśás*-, a negated *s*-stem, should by accent be a bahuvrīhi, of the type *cétas*- 'insight': *acetás*- 'lacking insight', *jávas*- 'speed': *ajavás*- 'lacking speed', etc. However, in none of its 4 (or possibly 3 or possibly 2 [see below]) occurrences is a straightforward bahuv. interpr. possible. In all 4 of the passages supposedly containing it, it is pāda-initial in the form *adveśāḥ*, i.e., an apparent neut. sg. N/A, but with no neut. sg. referent in context. In our passage the publ. tr. interpr. it as a neut. abstract noun 'lack of hatred'; Ge's "Friedfertigkeit" also seems to assume an abstract noun ("Wir bitten heute um Friedfertigkeit"), as also, I think, Re's elaborate "Nous demandons qu'on ne nous veuille pas de mal," where the "que" clause seems to be his rendering of *adveśāḥ*, though it's not clear to me how his tr. matches up grammatically with the Skt. An acc. noun as object of *īmahe* works well here; the problem is, as indicated above, that it shouldn't be that kind of compound. But the other three passages are less amenable to an interpr. as a noun. In V.87.8 *adveśó no maruto gātúm étana* "Without hatred, come on your way to us here, Maruts," it seems to be a bahuv. used adverbially, to be more literally rendered as "in a manner without hatred," apparently so interpr. by both Ge and Re. The same interpr. would in principle be available for I.186.10 *adveśó viṣṇur vāta ṛbhukṣāḥ* in a loose series of individual gods' names, but here I think it preferable to take it as nom. sg. masc. of the thematic bahuv. adj. *adveśá*-, marginally but clearly attested as du. *adveśé* at IX.68.10=X.45.12. Ge's "Die nie feindselige Viṣṇu" and Re's (EVP V.10) "Viṣṇu qui exclut l'inimitié" seem to reflect the same analysis, though neither comments. The final ex. is in I.24.4. Although the publ. (JPB) tr. of I.24.4 interpr. it as a noun 'freedom from hatred', this does not seem to be the prevailing view – which, however, is a bit hard to figure out. See esp. Old's elaborate disc. of this problematic vs., which does not mention *adveśāḥ*. Ge seems to take it again as a nom. sg. to the them. adj., referring back to *bhāgaḥ* earlier in the vs.; I *think* he tr. *adveśāḥ* as "unangefochten" (unchallenged, undisputed), but this seems so far from the underlying meaning that I matched the tr. and the Skt. only by process of elimination. Re tr. (EVP V.4) "à l'abri de l'envie," claiming his tr. of the vs. follows Thieme's (Oriens 6 [1953]: 399), who renders *adveśāḥ* as "[so, dass er] ohne Feind [ist]." Neither Th nor Re comments on the morphology or syntax, but judging from Th's representation (brackets and all), I assume he's taking it as the them. bahuv. adj. modifying *bhāgaḥ*. To return to our passage, I still weakly favor a noun 'lack of hatred', but given the problematic morphology (expect a bahuv.) and the distance between this hemistich-init. word and the hemistich-final verb that is supposed to govern it, I

also consider it possible that we have an adverbial usage as in V.87.8, yielding an emended alternate tr. “In a manner without hostility we beg for the realization of our thought ...”

The next issue in this hemistich is the Saṃhitā form *sādha* in b, analyzed by the Pp. as *sādhe*. The two preceding GEN LOC phrases referring to ritual activities invite us to interpr. *sādhe* as a loc., with dependent gen. *mánmanah*, to a them. stem *sādha-*. It is so classified by Gr and Lub, and Re (somewhat defiantly) also holds to this analysis. But such a them. stem would be found only once in the RV (namely here) and in fact in Skt., acdg. to Wh’s Rts and MonWms. Ge suggests rather that *sādhe* is a dat. inf. to the root (an interpr. Re disputes). This is certainly possible. But I am persuaded by Old, who restores *sādhah* for Pp. *sādhe*. This provides *īmahe* with a handy object; if *adveśāḥ* is in fact not a potential obj., *īmahe* will have need of one; if *adveśāḥ* is an obj. of that verb, *sādhah* would be an *s*-stem neut. morphologically parallel to it. The expressed wish for “the realization of our thought” (*mánmanah sādhah*) follows directly on 8b where “we thought up” (*ámanmahi*) a truthful speech.

Finally, in pāda c the question is the identity of the 2nd sg. subj. Acdg. to Ge (fld. by Re), pāda c is a self-address by the singer, but the fire / Agni makes more sense to me. That Agni is referred to in the 3rd ps. in the next pāda is no impediment: that pāda is the refrain, detached from context, and in any case switch of persons is common (see vs. 5 above). The verbal complex *bhur(an)-* relatively frequently has Agni / fire or fires as subj.: e.g., *bhuraṇyúḥ* I.68.1, *bhuraṇyávaḥ* X.46.7, *járbhurat* II.2.5, X.92.1, *járbhurāṇaḥ* II.10.5, and the type of movement – quivering, flickering – expressed by this verb is characteristic of fire, less so of the poet (though cf. *vípra-*).

X.35.10: The first hemistich can be syntactically split in several different ways, none of which is entirely satisfactory. The most obvious disposition, made by both Ge and Re, is to take it as containing two clauses, the first ending after *īle* in pāda b. Although this provides a neat cut and two clauses each with a finite verb (*īle* in the 1st, *sādáyā* in the 2nd), it poses a few problems. For one thing in the first cl. there are two independent accusatives, *barhíḥ* (+/- *bṛhát*) and *devān*, and only the second one is appropriate with *īle*. A related problem is that  $\sqrt{īḍ}$  is never otherwise construed with *ā*. (Ge [n. 10ab] claims that it is also found in IV.3.9, but there the *ā* belongs to the phrase *ā góḥ*, whatever that may mean. See comm. ad loc.) Ge (as he presents it in n. 10ab) and, as far as I can tell, Re construe *ā barhíḥ* together as a rough-and-ready adjunct to the verb: “call (the gods) to the barhis,” which would be unprecedented with  $\sqrt{īḍ}$  (admittedly many of our RVic interpr. are without precedent). Ge also takes *bṛhát* as a modifier of *barhíḥ*, which locates the ritual strew in an odd, presumably heavenly, place. (Re takes *bṛhát* adverbially, which makes more sense.)

Old divides the sequence into two clauses, but with one being discontinuous: *devāṃ īle* is a parenthesis within a larger clause that construes *ā no barhíḥ* with *sādáyā saptá hótīn*, a more natural conjunction of words and supported by X.36.5 *éndro* [= *ā índro*] *barhíḥ sídatu* in the next hymn. But he does not say what he would do with the rest of pāda a (*sadhamāde bṛhád diví*), at least the last two words of which might be expected to belong within his parenthesis, which would then begin to get unwieldy.

My own solution is, I think, superior to both the others but is certainly not without flaw. I split the sequence into three, continuous clauses: *ā no barhíḥ sadhamāde / bṛhád diví devāṃ īle / sādáyā saptá hótīn*. The first is a nominal clause, with *ā* functioning essentially as the predicate “here is ...” (substituting perhaps for *idám*). Alternatively, and perhaps better, the predicate may be the purpose dative *sadhamāde*: “the barhis here is for the joint revelry” or “the barhis is here

for the joint revelry.” (Although Gr takes *sadhamāde* as the loc. to the them. -*māda*-, it can equally be the dat. to the root noun cmpd *sadha-mād*-, as I take it.) I would now, with Re, take *brhāt* as an adverb with *īle*; in this usage with a verb of speaking it reminds us of the Gṛtsamāda refrain in Maṇḍala II (II.1.16, etc.) *brhād vādema vidāthe suvīrāḥ* “May we speak loftily at the ritual distribution, in possession of good heroes.” A slightly revised tr. of the clause here is “Loftily I reverently invoke ...” The sequence *brhād diví* is reminiscent of the cmpds *brhāddiva* / *brhaddivá*-, and Ge points out that the same phrase, *brhād diví*, is found in V.27.6, separated by the pāda boundary. However, none of these forms is helpful in the interpr. of our pāda.

The verb of the third cl., *sādáyā*, is morphologically ambig.; it can be a 2nd sg. impv. with lengthened ending or a 1st sg. subjunctive. I take it as the latter because of the immed. preceding 1st sg., as do Ge/Re, but the Pp. reads *sādáyā*, as the impv. There is very little riding on the choice.

Pāda c contains a list of divine names in the acc., with another purpose dative. We can supply *īle* from c, as Re does. But since 11c has the same structure (i.e., a list of acc. god names) without a prior verb to govern them, it seems best to import *īmahe* from the refrain for both 10c and 11c, as Ge also does (see n. 10c).

X.35.11: It cannot be determined in pāda b whether it is our sacrifice (so Ge) or ourselves (so Re) that we wish to grow strong. The publ. tr. opts for the latter, but “aid our sacrifice for it to grow strong” or “aid our sacrifice to grow strong” is possible as well. Again nothing much rides on it.

X.35.12: The wished-for *supravācanam chardīḥ* “shelter good to proclaim” conflates the Ādityas’ shelter in 9c (*śárman*- not *chardís*-) and our *pravācanam* in 8a, which may help account for the slightly odd conjunction of ideas.

X.35.13: The first hemistich seems to contain an extra *vísve* (*vísva ūtī*).

The last occurrence of the refrain is found at the end of the previous vs. (12d). Here the poet steps away from it gradually by means of a transformation: the acc. sg. NP at the end of the refrain *agnīm samidhānām īmahe* appears in 13b in the nom. pl. *agníyaḥ sámiddhāḥ*. This pāda could also be tr. “let all the fires be kindled” (so Sāy.; see Ge n. 13b), but the parallel clauses in the rest of the vs. speak against this.

X.35.14: The generalizing (“who(m)ever”) 3rd sg. relative clauses of abc (3rd ps. guaranteed, or at least suggested, by c *yāḥ ... véda*) are picked up by a 1st pl. *syāma* introduced by predicated *té* (“may we be those who(ever) ...). For a similar number mismatch with *té syāma* see I.94.15.

## X.36 All Gods

On the parallelism with X.35, see publ. intro. X.36, however, seems to have a more miscellaneous character than its twin.

X.36.1: At best this vs. has been carelessly put together: the first hemistich is in the nom., as becomes clear at the end (*vāruṇo mitró aryamā*), while the second continues the enumeration of gods’ names in the acc., as objects of *huve*. Even within this hemistich the waters are mentioned twice (c, d), and one du. dvandva referring to Heaven and Earth, *dyāvākṣāmā* in b, is replaced by

another, *dyāvāprthivī* in d. If this were all that was required to compose RVic verse, even *I* could do it!

X.36.2. Heaven and Earth return in the first pāda, this time as overtly coordinated singulars. This emphasis on H+E in these first two vss. matches that of X.35.1–3.

On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

The refrain for this hymn gets established in the 2nd vs. As noted in the intro. to the comm. to X.35, it is a minor variant of X.35.1d *adyā devānām āva ā vṛṇīmahe*, with scrambling of word order and the addition of an initial *tād*.

X.36.3–4: The c pādas of vss. 2 and 3 end with the variant optatives *naśīmahi* and *aśīmahi* respectively. In 4 the inherently heavy final syllable of immed. preceding *marūtām* provides the necessary heavy syllable at the beginning of the Jagatī cadence, hence allowing *aśīmahi*—while in 2 *avṛkām* \**aśīmahi* would have a light syllable there and *naśīmahi* usefully makes position. The other 3 exx. of *aśīmahi* at the end of a Jagatī, all close to each other, also follow heavy syllables, each ending with a nasal, as here: X.37.6 *jaraṇām aśīmahi*, X.40.12 *dúryām aśīmahi*. There are no other instances of *naśīmahi* at the end of a Jagatī line (of 3 total), but see subjunctive *násāmahai* at the end of 11c, where it likewise makes position. (Of course full-grade *naś* is expected in the subjunctive, but not the optative.)

X.36.5: In b note the presence of both *sāman-* and *īc-* (the latter implied by *īkvó arcatu*).

The verb *dhīmahi* is, of course, the medial root aor. opt. to *√dhā*. My tr. “compose,” borrowed from Re, is an attempt at an English pun that recognizes the apparent association between *dhīmahi* and *dhī-* ‘thought, vision’. The same VP *mánma dhīmahi* is found in X.66.2, which, however, also contains a loc., making the ‘place, set’ sense more overt.

X.36.6: Flg. Sāy., Ge takes Agni as the referent of the accusatives in c. Although it is true that Agni is almost always the referent of *āhuta-*, esp. when it is construed with an instr. of *ghṛtā-*, *yajñā-* seems an unimpeachable substitute. Ge’s interpr. requires him to supply a new verb, and it also goes less well with *prācīnaraśmim*, which fits the common sacrifice-as-chariot trope. Cf. also VII.7.3 *prācīno yajñāḥ*.

X.36.8: On *péru-* see comm. ad IX.74.4; the somewhat fuller rendering here follows the lead of Ge. See now also Clayton diss. (2023: 61ff.), who suggests that the word, starting from the sense ‘swollen’, means ‘cream’ here, further developed to the ‘best part’ (as in “the cream of the crop” and similar expressions), in an inherited expression with gen. pl. (with correspondents in early Greek).

I have reinterpr. some instances of *-śrī-*compds with ritual items as first members; see I.44.3 and comm. ad III.26.5, and I now think an alt. tr. of *adhvara-śrī-* here as “perfecting/completing the ceremony” should be considered in this passage.

X.36.9: The first pāda has a triple etymological figure, *sanema ... susanītā sanítvabhiḥ*, which I can only call clunky. The two nominal forms, *susanītā-* and *sanítvan-*, are both hapaxes, which makes it difficult to figure out just what kind of winning and what kind of winners we’re hoping to employ. Ge (n. 9a) suggests that the *sanítvan-* are sons, but the parallel passages he adduces don’t support that notion. The double etym. figure in b, *jīvā jīvāputrāḥ*, is less inelegant, but this

hemistich as a whole seems clumsily constructed. The figure *-(d)viṣo viṣvag* in c is somewhat more pleasing.

X.36.11: Pāda a contains another elementary etymological figure, *mahāt ... mahatām*.

X.36.12: The first hemistich redistributes elements from the refrain of the previous hymn, X.35.3–12d *svastī agnīm samidhānām īmahe*, with gen. *agnēḥ samidhānāsya* in pāda a and *svastāye* ending d.

X.36.13: The ostensible dedicands of this hymn appear in a spaced-out nominal relative clause in ab: # *yé ... viśve, ... devāḥ* #

The relative / correlative structure shows some signs of cleverness (rare enough in this hymn). The first hemistich appears to be a normal 3rd ps. relative clause (“which All Gods ...”), with the second hemistich opening with what appears to be a 3rd ps. resumptive prn. *té* (“they”). But d opens with a 2nd pl. impv. *dādhātana*, which forces the audience to reconfigure the whole vs.: the *té* in c reflects the usage of forms of *sá* with 2nd ps. ref. with impvs. (see my “*sá* figé”), which then requires that the nominal rel. cl. of ab have 2nd ps. ref. too (“[you] who are the All Gods ...”).

### X.37 Sūrya

On the relationship between this hymn and the preceding ones, see publ. intro.

As noted above, the supposed poet of the hymn, Abhitapas Saurya (“Scorching Heat, son of the Sun”), is simply based on the divine dedicand.

X.37.1: With Re, I interpr. *mahāḥ* as an adverb; Ge, with Sāy., takes it as an honorary dat., while Scar (231) tentatively has it as a gen. dependent on *devāya* (“... den Gott des grossen [Lichts?]”).

X.37.2: The *satyókti*- ‘expression of reality/truth’ is, in my view, the statement in cd. See the *ṛtāsya pravācanam* “proclamation of truth” in X.35.8 in this same hymn group; in both cases the truth is the fact that the sun rises every day.

The *ca*’s in b conjoin an elliptical dual *dyāvā* ‘Heaven (and Earth)’ and the neut. pl. *āhāni* ‘days’. Although Ge (n. 2b) suggests that *dyāvā* might refer here to day and night, as it sometimes does (though he does not follow this interpr.), I think the poet is making a totalizing statement about both space and time.

In d nom. *āpaḥ* lacks a verb; both Ge and Re supply one. I simply extract *ējati* from the preceding pāda or *eti* (minus preverb) in the same pāda.

X.37.3: The verb that ends the first pāda, *nī vāsate*, is a hapax, and its meaning and root affiliation are disputed. It is discussed sensibly and at length by Old, who rejects affiliation with any of the roots  $\sqrt{vas}$  as well as the roots  $\sqrt{vā}$ , while tentatively favoring  $\sqrt{van}$ , by way of the desid. *vīvāsati*, -te (a suggestion that goes back to Ludwig). See also Gotō (1st class, 297), who refuses to endorse any suggestion. I find the Ludwig/Old explanation (fld also by Re) the most likely, though it does have some problems – chief among them: 1) the desid. stem does not appear with *nī*, and 2) it is more commonly active than middle. However, forms of *vīvāsa-* of this metrical shape (L H L X) are very common at the end of Jagatī and dimeter pādas, and our *nī vāsate* rhymes nicely with *vīvāsati*, necessitating only haplogy of *nī vi-* or—more likely in my

view—the substitution of the preverb *ní* for the reduplicating syllable, which could appear to be the preverb *ví*.

So where does the *ní* come from and what is it doing here? First note the phonological parallelism with metrical shift: 2c ends *ní víśate yád éjati* #, with the preverb *ní* construed with a verb with the template *v\_SIB-ate*, exactly like our pāda. But in our pāda this verbal complex has been shifted to the right, and *yád eta(śébhiḥ)*, which echoes *yád éja(tí)*, pushed into the next pāda (*ní vāsate # yád eta(śébhiḥ)*). The *ní* also polarizes with *úd* in 2d, where “the sun goes *up*” asserts the supreme positive and protective truth. This positive truth is reinforced by a negated negative in 3a: a godless one cannot bring it *down*, however much he wants to. I would prefer that *te* were \**tvā*, but I interpr. this as an oblique expression, hence my “seek the upper hand against you.” Re’s “ne pourra gagner contre toi” is similar. The middle voice simply expresses the subject’s desire to bring the object under his control.

My tr. of *pradīvaḥ* in that pāda as “early in the day” is almost surely wrong. No other forms of this adverbial ablative have this sense; it generally instead means “from of old” vel sim. See for this passage Old’s “altersher,” Ge’s “seit alters,” Re’s “du fond des jours.” In fact the standard sense is perfectly compatible with the meaning I assign to the verb here. *pradīvaḥ* regularly appears with a present-tense verb, depicting a state of affairs that has obtained since hoary antiquity – where English would use the English “perfect” tense. See, e.g., III.47.1 *tvám rājāsi pradīvaḥ sutānām* “You are the king of the pressed drinks from olden days” (more idiomatic English “you have been”) (cf., e.g., III.51.4, VI.44.12, X.5.4, etc.). Here the point would be that no matter how often and for how long the godless has sought to keep the sun down, it keeps rising every day. I would therefore alter the tr. to “No godless one has sought the upper hand against you from olden times.”

The “Night Sun” and the “Day Sun” seem to appear in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich—a pair more often invoked by commentators than I think warranted (see my disc. ad I.115.4–5). However, here the contrast between the one that “rolls eastward” (*prācīnam ... vartate*) and the other, which is light (*jyótis-*) and goes upward, does suggest a picture of the dark side of the sun making a return journey to the east, whence it will rise again. Ge construes *rājaḥ* with *anyāt* in c, but I think *rājaḥ* is an acc. of extent of space, governed by *ānu*. With the verb *vartate* ‘turns, rolls’, ‘wheel’ seems the likely referent.

X.37.5: Both finite verbs in the first hemistich, *rākṣasi* and *uccāraṣi*, are accented. The default interpr. of the two accents would be that both verbs are in the domain of the *hí* in pāda a (so, e.g., Hettrich, Hypot. 188) and are parallel, and that is perfectly possible. However, semantically I think the clause in b is dependent on the one in a, explaining in what way Sūrya demonstrates that he is guarding the commandment – namely by rising. I therefore take b as an unsigned “when” clause.

The standard interpr. of cd seems to be as a relative/correlative clause with gender disharmony: *yád ..., tām ... krátum*: clearest in Re’s “(Ce dessein) pour lequel aujourd’hui ... nous nous adressons à toi, veuillent les dieux agréer ce dessein de nous” (but so, apparently, Ge; also, sort of, Hettrich 535–36). I do not understand why c is not a straight “when” clause with *yád*. Among other things *úpa √ brū* ordinarily only takes an acc. of the being(s) appealed to, not an accusative of the topic of the appeal. The few exx. given by Gr with supposed double acc. (IV.51.11, VIII.25.21, X.97.4) are equivocal and only contain *tád*, which could be adverbial; in any case they are far outnumbered by those with a single acc.

X.37.6: As is recognized by all comm., the first pāda with the patterned variation *tām* [MASC] *no* X [NOM.] *tān* [NEUT] *no* Y [NOM.] is picked up at the very end of the hemistich with the accusative objects of the appropriate genders, *hávam* [MASC] *vācaḥ* [NEUT]. It's a clever, if artificial, construction.

*śūna-* 'want' generally takes a genitive; the loc. *saṃdṛśi* is plausibly attributed to attraction to the loc. *śūne*. The clause could, however, mean "may we not be in want while we still see the sun," though I consider that unlikely.

X.37.7–8: The d pādas of these two vss. are identical, save for the first word of each, and each takes as obj. a 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. phrase referring to the sun.

X.37.7: The enclitic *tvā*, found in Wackernagel's position in pāda a, is pleonastically repeated in the same position in c.

X.37.8: In c I take *brhatāḥ* as a gen. dep. on abl. *pājasah*, supplying 'heaven' with that gen.: "from the surface of lofty (heaven)." Both Ge and Re take it as abl., modifying *pājasah*. This is of course quite possible and simplifies the expression somewhat, but I find the geography easier to envision in my tr.

X.37.9: The first hemistich seems more appropriate to Savitar (who is sometimes assimilated to Sūrya), since Savitar gives the signals both to go forth in the morning and to settle down in the evening. But of course the position of Sūrya's beacon (rising / setting) gives the same type of signal.

The 'blamelessness' (*anāgāstvéna*) should be ours: see *ánāgasah* modifying the 1st pl. in 7b. But it is the Sun, as the spy of Mitra and Varuṇa, who testifies to this state – or its absence. See esp. VII.62.2 *prá no mitráya varuṇāya voco, 'nāgasah ...* "You [=Surya] will proclaim us to Mitra and Varuṇa to be without offense."

X.37.11: Pāda c consists of a series of neut. sg. participles (acd. to most; other analyses of individual forms are possible), arranged in a logical series—from the consuming of food and drink, to the deriving of nourishment from them, to satiation. The neut. sg. referent isn't entirely clear; most take it as a global reference to the two- and four-footed of b. This makes sense, though the syntax is a little lax. I suppose the sg. *jánmane* of pāda a accounts for both the singular and the neuter.

The final term of the series, *āśita-*, is taken, quite plausibly, by Old as the ppl. to a caus. *āśayati* (not attested till the Brāh.). He struggles to account for the initial accent, since *√as* does not otherwise appear with the preverb *ā* and ppls to causatives ordinarily accent the *-tá-*, like ppls to roots (see Wh, Gr. §1051, Macd. VGS §168f), but Old's invocation of *ārpita-* is apposite.

X.37.12: To harmonize the hapax *práyuti-* with my view of the meaning of the ppl. *práyuta-* as 'scattered, dispersed' (see comm. ad V.32.2), I would now tr. *mánasah ... práyutī* "through distraction of mind." Cf. also VII.100.2 *āprayutam ... mánah* "concentrated thought."

## X.38 Indra



As with X.37, the supposed poet Indra Muṣkavant (“Indra possessing balls”) is extracted from the hymn itself, in this case the final pāda of the hymn. The hymn contains some apparently slangy and irreverent expressions; see vss. 2 and 5.

X.38.1: On *śīmīvant-* see comm. ad X.8.2.

X.38.2: The *-in-*stem *medīn-* is glossed by Gr with the anodyne ‘Genosse, Verbündeter’; sim. Ge “Wir möchten deine Verbündeten sein.” My “share the fat” is a somewhat slangy rendering of the stem, based on its presumed relationship to *médas-* ‘fat’, etc. See EWA s.v. *médas-*, esp. 377, where Mayr. labels the semantic dev. of *medīn-* not entirely comprehensible, with the additional parenthetical remark “(Slang?).” Given the positive associations of fat in Vedic, having or sharing the fat that Indra has means having a share in the good things the god commands.

X.38.3: The adj. *suśāha-* takes the dative to express agency; cf., e.g., IX.94.5 *visvāni hī suśāhā tāni tūbhyam* “because all these things are easy to conquer for you.” I therefore take the instr. *asmābhiḥ* not as the primary agent, but as an expression of accompaniment.

X.38.4: Despite its position, *adyā* might be better construed with the verb: “today may we make ...,” as Ge does.

X.38.5: The interpr. of the hapax rt. noun cmpd *svavṛj-* has gone in two basic directions: Old “wer etwas als seinen Besitz an sich reißt” versus Ge “dein eigener Herr bist.” In other words, Old takes the *sva-* as referring to an object that becomes Indra’s property, Ge as referring to Indra himself. Interestingly Scar presents us with both, in different places, without comment: “einer, der [alles] als sein Eigentum an sich reißt” (flg. Old, p. 200 s.v. *\*anudā-*) and “über sich selbst verfügend” (flg. Ge, p. 505 s.v. *svavṛj-*). My ‘tightly wound’ is a slangy rendition, leaning in Ge’s direction (but far from identical); a more literal version would be ‘wound up in oneself, twisting oneself up’.

On the surprising and impertinent ending of the hymn, see publ. intro.

**X.39–41:** All three of these hymns are dedicated to the Aśvins. The first two are attributed to a female poet, Ghoṣā Kakṣivātī, in the family line of the dazzling First-Maṇḍala poet Kakṣivant (I.116–26), who also focused on the Aśvins. The last very short one (X.41) is ascribed to her son Suhastya Ghaṣeya. There is no way to tell whether a female poet actually composed X.39–40, but at least the name is not a wholly invented one, like the supposed female composer of X.109, Juhū Brahmajyāyā “Sacrificial Ladle, Wife of (a) Brahman,” with both of the names extracted from the hymn itself. However, it is the case that a woman identified as Ghoṣā is named in X.40.5, so a fictional woman may have provided the first of the names. For further on these hymns, see the publ. intro. to each hymn and to the series in general.

X.39.1: The voc. *aśvinā* was omitted in tr.; it can be inserted anywhere the English rhythm allows.

In b *uṣāsaḥ* in the temporal expression *doṣām uṣāsaḥ* could be either a gen. sg. or an acc. pl. (with Old and Lanman [Noun Infl. 546] I prefer the latter, *pace* Gr); in either case it must be a species of backformation, with the strong suffixal form *-āś-*, which is in the course of being replaced by weak *-ās-* in the RV even where it is lautgesetzlich, being introduced into a weak

case. Old attributes it to the meter, somewhat reluctantly. He also adduces V.5.6 *doṣām uṣāsam* with the acc. sg., which has the historically expected *-ās-*, as possible influence on our passage, which seems plausible. One wonders, however, why the poet didn't just use *uṣāsam* here: being sg., it would be more parallel to *doṣām* and it is metrically identical to *uṣāsaḥ*.

The sequence *hāv(i)yo havīṣmatā* provides a phonological figure with forms built to two different roots. The second hemistich, which follows immediately, opens with nom. pl. *śaśvattamāsaḥ*, with what would ordinarily be a pāda-opening construction *tām u vām ...* seemingly displaced to the right. I wonder if this is to allow final *-matā* of b to have a mirror image echo in *-tamā*. The final pāda ends with a figure both phonological and etymological, *suhāvaṃ havāmahe*, a sort of poetic repair to the discordant root affiliations of pāda b.

X.39.2: Ge provides an appealing tr. of d, different from mine, but one that has a syntactic problem: “machet uns den Gönnern angenehm wie Soma.” Under this interpr. we are asking to be commended to the patrons, so we can receive abundant rewards. He takes *cārum* ‘dear’ as characterizing ‘us’ (*naḥ*), but of course *cārum* is stubbornly sg. and *naḥ* is pl. It would be possible to finesse this by interpr. sg. *cārum* as attraction to *sómam* in the simile (and this must be Ge’s strategy). But since there’s a sg. noun in the immediate vicinity, *bhāgām* in c, I have gone with the syntactically safer option.

X.39.3: The *bhāgaḥ* of pāda a echoes *bhāgām* in 2c.

X.39.4: Note that the opening of pāda a *yuvām cyāvānam* seems to be telescoped into *yúvānam* in b.

On the apparent unredupl. pf. *takṣathuḥ* see Kü 206–7.

X.39.5: The subjunctive *prá bravā* “I shall proclaim” in pāda a semantically doubles the gerundive *pravācyā* “to be proclaimed” that ends vs. 4. The substitution of  $\sqrt{brū}$  for  $\sqrt{vac}$  in this expression seems to reflect a tricky formulaic play. We would expect the annunciatory 1st ps. to be *prá vocam* as so often (see, of course, the celebrated I.32.1), and this would easily pick up the gerundive to the same lexeme. But *prá  $\sqrt{brū}$*  is considerably less common than *prá  $\sqrt{vac}$* , and this is the only 1st sg. occurrence in the formula – though I must admit that 1st pl. *prá bravāma* is found several times (e.g., X.112.1) in this type of context. My point is that the poet invites us to expect *prá vocam* on the basis of *pravācyā* and then substitutes a less common variant. (Of course *prá vocam* would also not fit this metrical slot, but the poet could have juggled the word order if he had wanted to.)

The logical connection of pāda b with pāda a is not immediately clear. I think the point is the implicit contrast between the Aśvins’ martial activities, expressed by *vīryā* ‘heroic deeds’ in a, with their healing and comforting described in b.

Pāda c introduces further contrasts. On the one hand, the Aśvins’ ‘ancient’ (*purāṇā*) deeds of pāda a contrast with the Aśvins made ‘new’ (*návyau*) here. But more strikingly what *we* are doing to the Aśvins—making them new—is what they implicitly did for Cyavāna in 4ab. It isn’t clear to me how we mortals can make the Aśvins new; we might expect this to be in the power only of the gods. I assume that our renovation involves making new hymns of praise, which, as it were, transfer their youthful luster to the dedicands. Ge avoids the problem by taking *návyau* as an adverb or quasi-adverb (“... bewegen wir euch aufs neue zur Gnade”), with the operative syntagm being a kind of periphrastic causative: ACC *ávase  $\sqrt{kr}$*  “make you (to) help,” like (acdg.

to his n. 5c) X.38.4d in the preceding hymn. But there, like here, there is a predicate adj. (*arvāñcam*) with the acc. *īndram*, inviting an interpr. “make X Y” with double acc. I therefore think that we should take “make you two new” seriously, esp. because it plays off the Aśvins’ action with regard to Cyavāna.

The meaning of the purpose clause of d and its connection to what precedes are somewhat puzzling. The interpr. depends on who we think the *arí-* is and what we think the near-deictic *ayám* is doing. Both Old and Ge (in somewhat different ways) consider the *arí-* to be the patron of the sacrifice (or so I interpr. Ge’s “dieser hohe Herr”). Old, who takes *arí-* to mean “der Geizige,” thinks that getting the *arí-* to trust will unlock his stinginess and cause him to give to us, the priests. If they are correct that the *arí-* is the patron (I think they’re not), then the *ayám* would make sense: he would be right there on the scene. But I don’t see why our actions with regard to the Aśvins would bring all this about – perhaps we’re extraordinarily successful at getting the Aśvins to help us, including the patron? Re comments rather breezily about the *arí-*: “l’Homme (collectif) au nom de qui nous parlons”; I’m not sure what that is meant to mean. Thieme’s view (Fremdl. 38–39) is quite different; he interpr. the *arí-* in the context of the dangers of hospitality given and received, which requires trust on both sides (I may be reading a bit more into his brief treatment than is overtly there). This fits my own understanding of the meaning of both *arí-* and *śrād√dhā* (which latter I think is often specialized for trust in the hospitality relationship; see pp. 176–84 of my *Sacrificed Wife*). Th tr. “Damit dieser Fremdling Vertrauen fasse.” The question is why the activity in the earlier part of the vs. should cause the stranger to trust. I think the answer is that the Aśvins are the guarantors of the safety of all sorts of beings in distress and that our renewing the Aśvins in order to enable them to dispense this aid is what will cause the *arí-* to trust and take heart: help is on the way. The catalogue of the Aśvins’ good deeds that the poet has recited earlier in the hymn gives the *arí-* reason to hope that they will show the same care to him. I might now tr. pāda c as “Now we shall make you new (for you) to help,” without the “us” that I supplied as obj. to *āvase* (it’s not in the Sanskrit); the Aśvins’ help is more generally distributed than just to us. But why “this stranger” (*ayám ... aríḥ*)? I am not entirely certain, but I wonder if *ayám* is a way of adducing a salient example – so it functions as rhetorical deixis rather than expressing physical proximity. In any case it also serves to introduce the initial *iyám* of the next pāda (6a) and the dramatic intrusion of the woman in distress, which may be its primary purpose.

X.39.6: As was just discussed, the fem. deictic *iyám* that opens this vs. explicitly contrasts with the masc. *ayám* qualifying *aríḥ* in 5d. The intrusion of the forceful female voice in this vs., demanding the Aśvins’ attention, points up the poet’s implicit assumption in vs., 5 that he and his colleagues were praising the Aśvins in order to make them inclined to help a *male* in need.

The speaker here is ordinarily identified as Ghoshā, who is named explicitly in the next hymn (X.40.5) as well as being the putative poet of these hymns, per the Anukr. As I argue in the publ. intro., I find this identification unlikely, because Ghoshā in X.40 is the daughter of a king, while the female speaker here emphasizes her utter isolation and lack of relatives and protectors.

As was also noted in the publ. intro., her appeal to the Aśvins is in part modeled on (or echoes) the first vs. of this hymn: her *ahve* “I invoked” is built to the same root *√hvā* that is prominent in vs. 1: *hāvyaḥ* (1b), *suhávam havāmahe* (1d), and the simile involving the father found in *pítúr ná nāma* (1d) is elaborated in her *putrāyeva pítārā* (d).

The series of privative cmpds in pāda c that describe the woman’s plight ends with *āmatīḥ*. Although the other three—*ānāpír ājñā asajātyā*—reference her lack of human ties, I render

*āmati-* as ‘heedless’, seemingly a defect of her own making. I now am inclined towards Re’s interpr. “sans (personne) qui pense à moi” – ‘heedless’ in the sense of lacking anyone to heed me. Unfortunately I cannot think of a single word in English that expresses this – the closest perhaps is ‘neglected’ or, to maintain the privative sequence, ‘without attention’. I would slightly alter the tr. to the latter. For further on *āmati-* see comm. ad X.42.10.

In d I would also change ‘shame’ to ‘curse’.

X.39.7–10: As noted in the publ. intro., the catalogue of the Aśvins’ deeds, interrupted by the direct speech of the woman in vs. 6, continues thereafter, and in fact it is more formally constructed: 7 consecutive hemistichs (7a–10a) open with the dual pronoun *yuvām* ‘you two’ (see also 7d and 8d) whereas only one hemistich in the first part of the catalogue, 4a, begins with *yuvām*. This opening is a characteristic feature of Kākṣīvant’s Aśvin hymns, though not as consistently carried out; cf., e.g., I.117.7a, 8a, 13a, 14a, c, 20c; 118.7a, c, 8a, 9a; 119.4a, 6a, c, 7a, 9c, 10a. (For another such sequence in the Ghoṣā hymns, see disc. ad X.40.) The same deeds are also treated in the Kākṣīvant hymns, often with very similar or identical phraseology. E.g., their bringing a wife to Vimada (our 7ab) is found in I.116.1 ... *vimadāya jāyām ... nyūhātū rāthena*, 117.20 *yuvām ... vimadāya jāyām nyūhathuḥ purumitrāsya yōṣam*, like our *yuvām rāthena vimadāya ... ny ūhathuḥ purumitrāsya yōṣaṇām*. For the parallels to the other stories see Ge’s nn.

X.39.7: Ge takes *śundhyū-* as the name of Vimada’s wife(-to-be)(so also Mayr, PN s.v.), but since *śundhyū-* is otherwise an adj. meaning ‘preening, sleek’, I see no reason not to take it as an adjective here. See also Remmer (Frauennamen 39–40), who also takes *śundhyūvam* as an adj. here and thinks Kamadyū is the actual name of Vimada’s wife.

X.39.8: Ge makes *akṛṇutam yuvād váyaḥ* into a double acc. constr. “Ihr machtet das Alter ... wieder jugendlich,” but this requires interpr. *váyas-* as “Alter.” Re remarks that “*váyas* s’orienté en effet vers <<âge>> au Livre X,” but the passages he cites do not, in my view, support this statement. The very similar expression *tákṣan ... yúvad váyaḥ* in I.111.1 (R̥bhus) is rendered by Ge “... zimmerten ... jugendliches Alter,” but “youthful vigor” is a better creation for the R̥bhus’ parents than simply a youthful old age.

The verb *kṛthaḥ* in d is of course morphologically anomalous, with a primary ending on a root aor. stem. There are a few such forms (see KH Injunkt. 111, 166) – *kṛthaḥ* occurs twice elsewhere (I.112.8, V.74.5), also *kṛtha* (X.97.9), *gatha* (VIII.20.16), *bhūthāḥ* (VI.67.5), *bhūtaḥ* (X.27.7), per KH. He plausibly attributes the creation of these forms to the attempt to distinguish the injunctive from the imperative, since these 2nd ps. aor. forms with sec. endings are generally imperatival.

X.39.9: On the Atri saga, see my disc. in Hyenas (228–31), but I have emended my tr. of this passage (found on p. 230) in light of Houben’s disc. in Fs. Migron, where he argues that *utá* here connects two separate places where Atri was confined. See also Re’s n., suggesting that two separate versions of the tale are conflated here.

X.39.10: This last vs. of the “deeds” sequence is entirely devoted to one story, whereas the first two (vss. 7–8) treated three each, and the following one (vs. 9) two.

I take the dat. *nṛbhyah* as agent with the gerundive *havyam*, as often, not as a dat. of benefit as Ge does (“für die Herren”). But there’s relatively little difference in effect.

X.39.11: Ge (n. 11a) takes the referents of the voc. *rājānau* to be Mitra and Varuṇa, not the Aśvins—both because the Aśvins are never called kings and because of the presence of the voc. *adite*. I admit the justice of these two arguments and think it quite possible that the expression was adapted from an Āditya hymn. However, for me it beggars belief that a hymn that never takes its eyes off the Aśvins, in a vs. that caps a sequence of vss. containing the relentlessly repeated 2nd du. pronoun *yuvām* referring to the Aśvins, along with a sequence of 2nd du. verbs with them as subject, would suddenly address a different set of dual entities, who have nothing to do with the hymn otherwise, and then address the Aśvins again (voc. phrase *aśvinā suhavā rudravartanīc*) in the same sentence in the same vs. I think rather that the poet is borrowing M+V’s qualities to enhance the Aśvins’ prestige, and that this may have been originally suggested by an appeal to Aditi – who as a mother figure may have been addressed because of the females in distress whom the Aśvins helped, as well as the presence of the wife in pāda d. The same infusion of other deities’ power and prestige may be seen in the voc. *rudravartanī*, which brings the Maruts into the mix (see comm. ad I.3.3). For another possible use of voc. *rājānā* for the Aśvins see X.61.23 and disc. there.

The 2nd hemistich is oddly and ambiguously phrased. It contains a double acc. construction with a bahuvr. as predicate adj.: *yām ... purorathām kṛṇuthaḥ* lit. “whom you make (to be) one having his chariot in front.” The clause also contains an instr. of accompaniment (clearly so marked): *pātnyā sahā* “along with his wife.” The question is whether the wife is being conjoined more closely with him or with the chariot – that is, do the Aśvins make the chariot to be in front for him and for his wife, or do they make the chariot and the wife to be in front for him. Although it’s a bit more complex, I incline towards the latter interpr. I consider this another allusion to the new ritual model that includes the Sacrificer’s Wife as a participant in the sacrifice (a model I have discussed endlessly, both in the SW/SW book and in a number of articles addressing the introduction of the wife in the late RV). This model is sometimes presented through the image of a chariot with a team of equals (husband and wife) pulling it. The most striking exploration of this image is the Mudgala / Mudgalānī hymn (X.102, q.v.), where Mudgalānī acting as charioteer brings ritual and personal success. The wife leading here, alongside the chariot, presents a similar image.

X.39.12: The juxtaposition of instr. *jāvīyasā* and acc. *rātham* across the pāda boundary strikes a discordant note, since they are co-referential. But *rātham* is part of the rel. clause, with ‘chariot’ fronted around the rel. prn. (*rātham yām*). This was surely a deliberate effect by the poet to shake us up. (I have silently promoted ‘chariot’ to the main cl., since “Drive here with the swifter-than-thought one, which chariot ...” does not parse well in English.)

X.39.13: Although Gr interpr. the three occurrences of *jayúṣā* (also I.117.16, VI.62.7) as a dual modifying the Aśvins, I follow Ge in taking it as an instr. sg. modifying a gapped ‘chariot’, on the basis of the parallels adduced in his n. 13a. See also Pirart (Aśvins I.219 ad I.117.16). The parallels sketch a myth even less filled out than most of the Aśvins’ exploits, but the duplication of phraseology strongly suggests that the passages belong together. Note the echoes of our ... *yātām jayúṣā ví párvatam* in the three passages, two of which are from Kakṣīvant’s Aśvin hymns:

I.117.16 *ví jayúṣā yayathuḥ sānu ádreḥ* “With your victorious (chariot) you journeyed across the back of the rock.”

I.116.20 *vibhindúnā ... ráthena ví párvatān ... ayātam* “With your chariot that splits apart ... you journeyed through (/across?) the mountains.”

VI.62.7 *ví jayúṣā rathyā yātam ádrim* “With your victorious (chariot), you charioteers drove through (/across?) the rock.”

Ge tr. *yātam* here as an impv. (“Machet eure Umfahrt ...”), and in fact it should be one by rule: the subject-doubling prn. *tā* is proper with 2nd ps. only in the impv. (see my “sa figé”). Nonetheless, the parallels clearly refer to a past deed of the Áśvins, with two (and possibly all three) of them containing a preterital verb: I.116.20 impf. *ayātam*, I.117.16 pf. *yayathuḥ*, VI.62.7 injunc. *yātam* (per Pp.), but note that in the sequence *rathyāyātam* nothing forbids an augmented analysis *ayātam* as in I.116.20 (see comm. ad VI.62.7). Moreover, the rest of the vs. treats previous good deeds of the Áśvins, with two augmented impfs. (*ápinvatam* b, *amuñcatam* d). I have therefore (reluctantly) translated *yātam* as a preterite, against the syntax. Our passage may have been adapted from VIII.87.3 *tā vārtir yātam*, which does contain an impv. Note that it also rhymes with the opening of 12a *ā ... yātam*.

X.39.14: The  $\sqrt{takṣ} + rátham$  “fashion a chariot” motif returns from vs. 4, where the rejuvenation of Cyavāna was compared to it. See also 12b, where the Ṛbhus fashion the Áśvins’ chariot, while here “we” compare ourselves fashioning a praise-song to the Bhṛgu fashioning a chariot.

The syntax and purport of pāda c are very troubled. The problems are 1) the sense of *ny àmrkṣāma* and 2) the function of loc. *mārye*. There is an easy way to solve both, and that is to ascribe a contextual meaning to  $ní\sqrt{mrj}$  that will make the case frame (acc. *yóṣānām*, loc. *mārye*) work. This is the route that Ge takes: rendering  $ní\sqrt{mrj}$  as “hingeben” (give up, surrender), which works well (or well enough) with acc. + loc. This is also what Re’s note seems to suggest, though he floats three different and not entirely compatible glosses for the verbal lexeme: “donner,” “vouer,” and “soumettre (comme en employant la force).” But I think that in this case, as so often in the RV, the easy way is the wrong way.  $ní\sqrt{mrj}$  is a striking idiom, and if the poet simply wanted to express ‘give’ or ‘surrender’ there are easier ways to do that. For  $ní\sqrt{mrj}$  see comm. ad II.38.2, VII.26.3: it means lit. ‘wipe / rub down’ but metaphorically both ‘drag down’ and ‘clasp to oneself’—sometimes, in sexual contexts, both at the same time. Cf. VII.26.3 *janīr iva pátir ékaḥ samānó ní māmṛje púra índraḥ sú sárvaḥ* “As a single common husband does his wives, Indra has dragged down all the strongholds to submission.” This meaning could work in our passage: we clasp our own praise-song to ourselves, as a cherished object; the same sentiment is found in the next pāda, which is part of the same clause, where we hold the song close like a cherished son (*nítyam ná sūnūm ... dádhānāḥ*). I think we should take into account the complex semantics of this idiom. But this suggestion runs headlong into the problem of loc. *mārye*: the dashing youth should be nominative, parallel in the simile to the 1st ps. subject in the frame: *he* should be clasping the maiden to himself. There is a way out of this – though it is slightly tricky. I suggest we are dealing with a mixed syntactic construction. In X.65.7 and X.66.9 we find a reflexive construction with this verbal idiom: *tanvī* [loc.]  $ní\sqrt{mrj}$  “clasp ACC to oneself [LOC],” with the loc. *tanvī* coreferential with the subject. So, e.g., X.65.7 *yajñám janitvī tanvī ní māmṛjuḥ* “They [=heaven-rulers], having created the sacrifice, clasped it to themselves” (sim. X.66.9). I suggest that the construction here is based on this coreferential structure, such that we should have \**māryo* [nom.] *mārye* [loc.] *yóṣānām* \**ní mārṣti* “(as) a dashing youth clasps a maiden to [same] dashing youth.” In this hypothetical sentence the loc. *mārye* should be

replaced by the reflex. prn. *tanvī*, as in the passages just cited. But instead it's the nominative \**māryaḥ* that has been gapped, leaving the loc. *mārye* unreplaced. In the publ. tr. this loc. is tr. as if it were nom., because conveying what I think underlies the passage could not be conveyed in brief. But perhaps it would be a bit clearer if tr. "We have clasped it to ourselves like a maiden to a dashing youth."

Notice that the secondary sig. aor. *amṛkṣāma* (see Narten SigAor. 196–98) rhymes with *ātakṣāma*, which opens the preceding pāda (b), though that form is of course not an aorist.

#### X.40 Aśvins

For my view that Ghoṣā in this hymn is not the same as the woman in distress in X.39 see the publ. introductions, as well as disc. above ad X.39.

The hymn is also tr. by Doniger (pp. 264–66).

This hymn contains another sequence of fronted 2nd du pronouns; see comm. ad X.39.7–10. The concentration here is in vss. 4–8, with such pronouns beginning 4a, c, 5a, 6a, c, 7a, b, c, d, 8a, b, c. Unlike X.39.10, where the only form found is the nom. *yuvām*, this sequence contains varied case forms: nom. *yuvām*, acc. *yuvām*, and gen. *yuvóḥ*, somewhat like the "versified paradigm" of *agnī-* in I.1.

X.40.1–4: Note the emphasis on the two poles of the day, dawn and evening, esp. the former. The āmreḍita *vāstor-vastoh* is found in 1d and 3b, *doṣā (...)* *vāstoḥ* in 2a and 4b, and *prātār* in 1c and 3a.

X.40.1: With Ge, I take the final instr. phrase *dhiyā śāmi* with *prāti ... bhūṣati* in b. Doniger seems to construe them as instruments/agents with *vāhamānam* ("brought by thought and care"), but though the middle pres. *vāhate* is found with instr. of the draught animals, I cannot find a real passive usage of this middle.

X.40.2: The two interrogatives that introduce the question in vs. 1a, *kúha káḥ*, are here separated and given independent clauses, with *kúha* found 4x in ab and *káḥ* introducing the implicitly disjunctive question in cd.

Pāda c provides unequivocal evidence for *niyoga* or levirate marriage already in the (late) RV. See Ge's n. 2c.

The maiden *yóṣan(ā)-* and dashing youth *mārya-* of the end of the previous hymn (X.39.14) reappear here. The word *sadhástha-* ordinarily just means a 'place' or 'seat', but here it must carry the additional of a specific or special place, in this case their trysting spot. Doniger's "as a young woman takes a young man to a room" seems somewhat anachronistic; I imagine trysts in Vedic times were more likely to occur in the open air.

X.40.3: The sequence *jarethe jaraṇéva* "you awake like two old ones" provides a nice phonological figure built to two different roots. The purport of the simile is unclear, however. Is it alluding to the fact that old people are light sleepers? (And is that a human universal or just a fact of the modern West?) The complete obscurity of the hapax *kāpayā* does not help. Morphologically this can be an instr. sg. fem. to a *kāpā-* (so, e.g., Gr) or a nom. du. masc. to a *kāpaya-*. In the absence of any etymological help, even its morphological identity cannot be determined; the interpr. vary wildly, and rehearsing them all would not be instructive (see Old, Ge [n. 3a], Re, EWA s.v. *kāpayā*, etc.). To add another baseless speculation to the array: if we

start with a deriv. of  $\sqrt{krap}$ , *kṛp* ‘long for, mourn, lament’ (*kṛpā*- ‘pity’ would be nice, though it isn’t attested until MBh), and run it through the MIA sounds laws, we get (or could get) \**kapā*-; cf. to the same root Pāli *kaṇa*- ‘pitiable’ and the RVic pres. *kṛpaṇa*-, *kṛpaṇya*-. From there, a vr̥ddhi deriv. might yield *kāpaya*-. But this chain of events has no foundation and my “(?)” should probably have at least two ?? As usual, Old pronounces the sensible verdict: “Mir scheint das Rätsel des Worts unlösbar.”

The second hemistich raises the usual anxious question – whose sacrifice will the gods attend, and whose will they pass over? This is usually formulated with regard to Indra, but it is of course an issue with all the gods. The case of the Aśvins’ non-appearance (in c) is nicely phrased: *dhvasrā bhavathaḥ* means ‘become occulted / occluded / obscured (by smoke or the like)’. See disc. of  $\sqrt{dhvāms}$  and *dhvas(i)rā*- ad IV.19.7. Because the Aśvins travel early in the morning (see *prātar-yāvan*- in 1c), morning mists can hide their passage over the spurned sacrifices while they make their way to the favored one.

As disc. in the publ. intro., the tatpuruṣa *rājaputrā*- ‘king’s son’ is found only here in the RV. As I say there, I think this simile sets up the marriage to be depicted in the following vss. as a svayamvara. Ghoṣā as daughter of a king (*rājñāḥ ... duhitā* 5b) would, at least in later times, be likely to acquire her husband through Self-choice, and the suitors who would be eligible and would attend should be kings’ sons.

X.40.4: Although elephant-hunters probably didn’t set out to catch two (or only two) elephants, the simile *mṛgēva vāraṇā* has been attracted into the dual to match the Aśvins in the frame. The simile is striking and is only loosely connected to the verb of the frame: presumably elephant-hunting did not involve invocations or oblations. Ge’s “locken” (lure, entice) seems to presuppose a more precise knowledge of hunting techniques than I think we possess and is not supported by the additive semantics of *ní*/ $\sqrt{hvā}$  ‘call down’.

The designation *śubhās pātī* occurs 4x in this hymn (as unaccented voc. *śubhas patī* 4d, 12c, 13c, as accented nom. 14b). Ge (also Don.) tr. *pātī* in all four occurrences with “Gatten” (husbands), even though elsewhere, even in the wedding hymn (X.85.15), where it also refers to the Aśvins, he uses “Herren.” Although our hymn is deeply concerned with marriage, I don’t see that this conventional epithet needs to be pulled into the marital orbit – except perhaps in vs. 12.

X.40.5–7: On the unexpected instances of *pāri* in these vss. see publ. intro. All four of the exx. (5a, 6a, 6c, 7c) occur in the same metrical position, in the break after an opening of 5, and the first three are found immediately before the voc. *aśvinā*.

X.40.5: In b *prché* can be a 1st sg. mid. or a dat. inf. (see Old, Ge n. 5b); I am strongly in favor of the 1st sg. The middle may be used to emphasize the special circumstance of a woman, esp. an unmarried woman, speaking.

The standard tr. take the 2nd du verbs in cd, *bhūtām ... bhūtām ... śaktam*, as impvs.; I think rather that they’re injunctives, expressing the questions Ghoṣā is asking the Aśvins.

How to take the datives in d is disputed. As Ge (n. 5d) and Old point out, the same general configuration is found in the previous hymn, X.39.6 *māhyam śikṣatam* “do your best for me,” also in the mouth of a female speaker. Ge takes *āśvāvate rathīne* and *ārvate* as two separate beneficiaries of the Aśvins’ help: “tut für den Besitzer von Ross und Wagen (und) für das Rennpferd, was ihr vermöget,” but (n. 5d) sees the whole phrase as a metaphor, referring to Ghoṣā and her desire to win a husband. Old offers two different interpr., the second of which I



follow: like Ge, he supplies “me” as the real beneficiary, but suggests that she is compared to the *árvant*- ‘steed’, which should be helped to become possessed of horse and chariot, that is, to win the prize.

X.40.6: This vs. contains two of the sequence of *pari*’s (a, c). The 2nd enables a sort of pun, but the first is problematic. Ge divides pāda a into two clauses, with *sthaḥ* (/Saṃhitā *ṣṭhaḥ*) the verb of the first, and *pári* the preverb to a supplied verb “(fahret).” He does not indicate what Skt. verb he would supply – perhaps *√ vah*, which can take acc. *rátham*. I do not see the necessity, or the utility, of this division. Preverbs can follow their verbs, and esp. in this vs. sequence, where *pári* has a fixed place, the order *sthaḥ pári* poses no problem. What the lexeme *pári √ as* means in this context is harder to determine. As Ge points out (n. 6a), it has a different sense (‘encircle [to halt]’) even with *rátham* as obj. in VII.32.10. As I indicated in the publ. intro., I think the intrusive *pári*’s in this sequence are hinting at the marriage theme, by way of the circumambulation of the fire that is part of the wedding ceremony. In 5a Ghoṣā circumambulates the Aśvins; in 6a here the Aśvins seem to circumambulate their chariot—perhaps an allusion to the importance of the Aśvins’ chariot in the RVic svayaṃvara passages. (See my 2001 “The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara? [Fs. Parpola], 306–9.) For a possible association of the chariot with the simile of pāda b, see below.

Pāda b is difficult to interpr, primarily because of the uncertainty of the simile. The problem is to determine what belongs to the simile and what to the frame; in particular, the opening of the pāda, *vísó ná*, seems to plant *vísah* firmly in the simile, given the position of *ná*. In the publ. tr. I take it, much against my principles, as part of the frame (“you arrive at the clans of the singer”). This is given some support by the expression in the next (related—see comm. on X.39–41 above) hymn, X.41.2 *vísó yéna gáchathah* “By which you [=Aśvins] come to the clans ...” But the positioning of the simile particle *ná* immediately after at least one part of the simile is almost exceptionless (save for penultimate position in the pāda), and I have grown uncomfortable with disregarding that here.

The path to a solution has to begin with Kutsa, who must be a part of the simile, since he is in the nom. sg. and the verb (*naśāyathah*) is 2nd dual, so Kutsa can’t directly be its subject. Although, as Ge says (n. 6b), our knowledge of the Kutsa saga “ist leider zu lückenhaft,” what we do know about Kutsa mostly involves his participation, with Indra, in the killing of Śuśṇa – which myth involves an intermediate episode, in which Kutsa and Indra make a chariot journey to Uśanā Kāvya (for counsel or weapons or both—not entirely clear); see comm. ad V.31.7–8, 8, X.29.2, etc. I think this is the journey alluded to here, through oblique hints. First, the Aśvins are *kaví* in pāda a. There is nothing about the rest of that pāda that requires (or even invites) them to be identified as poets, and *kaví*- is a rare designation of the Aśvins, found only in I.117.23 (a Kākṣīvant hymn, note) and VIII.8.2, 5, 23. In the next vs. (7ab) the Aśvins come to a number of named personages, including Uśanā. That the elements of the name Uśanā Kāvya (including *uśānā*- itself) surround the pāda containing Kutsa suggests to me that the Aśvins’ journey in 6b is being compared to Kutsa’s to Uśanā. The somewhat puzzling mention of the chariot at the end of pāda a (see disc. above) may also be a clue to this mythic complex, since Kutsa is especially associated with the chariot (see comm. ad X.29.2).

The sticking point for me has been how to make *vísah* fit into the Kutsa / Uśanā Kāvya scenario, since “clans” don’t form a part of the mythic fragments available to us. Ge simply tr. “Häuser” (followed by Doniger “houses”), and in V.29.9 and X.22.6 Indra and Kutsa in fact drive to the *grhām* of Uśanā. My slightly sleight-of-hand solution here is to take *vísah* with both

frame and simile: “you (Aśvins) arrive at the clans [cf. X.41.2 cited above, also X.43.6 disc. below] of the singer, as Kutsa (arrived) at the “clans” (of Uśanā),” with *viśaḥ* a loose reference to the house or household of Uśanā. (It is also possible that *jaritūḥ* ‘of the singer’ can be read with both simile and frame as well.) I would now substitute that translation for the publ. one. As with a number of other passages involving Uśanā Kāvya, the disiecta membra of the myth have to be assembled from neighboring pādas and arranged into a simulacrum of a story. See disc. in my Rigveda between Two Worlds.

The hapax 2nd du. *nasāyathah* I take as a variant of the already anomalous *asāya-* (4x); see comm. ad VI.33.2. Note that one of the forms of the latter stem is found nearby in X.43.6, construed, as here, with an acc. of *viś-* (*viśam-viśam ... páry asāyata*).

As noted above, pāda c contains a second instance of *pári* in this vs.; it also contains both a simile and a bold image – and, if I’m right, a pun connecting the two, turning on the instr. *āsā* ‘mouth’. The striking image is that of a bee (*mākṣā-*, or fly, though that is contextually less satisfactory) holding enclosed (*pári ... bharata*) the honey of the Aśvins with her mouth. It is not entirely clear what this is meant to convey: the Aśvins are associated with honey (see, e.g., Macdonell, VedMyth 49–50), both as dispensers and consumers of it. So, the bee may either be carrying bee-produced honey to bestow on the Aśvins or, in a role reversal, holding the honey they produced – either physical honey or, perhaps, the honey of their words.

The simile in the same hemistich seems at first to have little to do with this image: *niṣkṛtām ná yóṣanā* “like a young woman a *niṣkṛtā*,” with the young woman compared to the bee and the *niṣkṛtā-* to the honey. A *niṣkṛtā-* is generally a place to which one goes, but often a particular type of secretive place: a trysting place, a rendezvous. Cf., e.g., IX.93.2 *máryo ná yóṣām abhí niṣkṛtām yán* “like a young blood going to a maiden at the trysting place.” Here I think it refers not to the place but to the tryst, the secret meeting itself, and the VP *pári ... āsā bharata niṣkṛtām* is figurative: the maiden “holds the tryst enclosed by her mouth” – that is, she keeps it secret. (Lü [211, 342] suggests the exact opposite: “mitteilen” [inform, notify], taken up by Re “transmettre par la bouche” → “communiquer.”) The Lü/Re view might seem to find support in I.119.9 (in an Aśvin hymn of Kaksīvant) *utá syā vām mádhuman mákṣikārapat* “And the little fly [or bee] whispered honeyed (speech) to you [=Aśvins],” since the *mākṣikā* is conveying her *mádhumat* by speech. But I think this only points up the cleverness of the pun in our passage: the phrase *āsā pári √ bhr* can signal not only that the *mākṣā* has something for/or the Aśvins in her mouth (possibly to say to them), but by another reading of the *pári* that the maiden is keeping her secret within. The *arapat* ‘whisper, mutter’ in I.119.9 also emphasizes the secretive nature of the communication.

X.40.7: The first three personages to whom the Aśvins come are known from other Aśvin contexts – esp. Bhujyu, but also Vāsa and, less commonly, Śīnjāra (see Mayr. PN s.vv.); only Uśanā lacks a stable Aśvin association, but the reason for his appearance here was disc. ad 6ab.

Ludwig’s resegmentation of the first two words of c from *yuvó rārāvā* to *\*yuvór árāvā* has been generally, in my opinion rightly, accepted; *árāvā* belongs to the well-attested stem *árāvan-* ‘hostile, ungenerous’. The Aśvin passage VII.68.7 (adduced by Old), which contains both Bhujyu and a clear *árāvā*, supports this change. Gr lists two occurrences of the supposed stem *rārāvan-*, this one and *rārāvā<sup>a</sup> nām* in VIII.39.2, which should also be resegmented to *\*árātīr árāvā<sup>a</sup> nām* (see comm. ad loc.).

Pāda c also contains another instance of *pári*; the sense of the lexeme *pári √ ās* here is unclear—another instance of the “off” nature of the *pári* occurrences in this section of the hymn.

Some (Old, Re) take the verb to be basically positive: (even) a hostile/ungenerous man will “court / pursue” (umwerben, briguer) the Aśvins, while Ge takes it as negative “verpassen.” I am inclined towards the negative approach; my “circumvent” is meant to reflect the *pāri*, though the term itself is somewhat off – but I think the general sense is either “avoid” or “impede.”

X.40.8: Śayu is another regular client of the Aśvins, including in the previous hymn (X.39.13), but Kṛśa is not otherwise associated with them. The stem *kṛśá-* is of course an adj. meaning ‘emaciated, starving’ and is attested in this meaning several times in the RV, including in the previous hymn (X.39.3). Its appearance in the sequence there, *andhásya cid ... kṛśásaya cid ... rutásya cid* “even of the blind man ... even of the starving ... even of the broken,” guarantees that it has the adjectival sense there and is not a personal name, as it appears to be here, at least in part. In our passage it might be possible to take *kṛśám* as an adj. with *śayúm* (“starving Śayu”), but the rhetorical structure of the pāda, with repeated subj. pronoun, makes that unlikely: *yuvám ha kṛśám yuvám aśvinā śayúm*. The two pronouns define two separate subclausal entities, as in the preceding vs., *7ab yuvám ha bhujoyám yuvám aśvinā vāśam, yuvám śiñjāram ...*

In fact, I now think we are dealing with a pun here: *kṛśá-* and *śayú-* are indeed PNs here, in the manner of the catalogues of the Aśvins’ clients. But they also are adjectives: *kṛśá-* has its usual sense just mentioned, ‘starving’, and *śayú-* the sense ‘orphan’, on which see comm. ad IV.18.12. With these interpretations, the pāda conforms nicely to the following one, esp. the mention of the widow. I would now emend the tr. to “You two make wide space for Kṛśa, you for Śayu / for the starving, for the orphan, o Aśvins, you for the worshipper and the widow.”

As for *kṛśá-* as a PN, it is so twice in the Vāḷakhilya (VIII.54.2, 59.3). The latter passage is esp. suggestive with regard to our passage. In VIII.59.3 “the seven ‘voices’ of Kṛśa milk out a wave of honey for you two” (... *kṛśásya vām mādharma ūrmīm duhate sapta vāñih*). The “you two” in question are, in context, Indra and Varuṇa, the ostensible dedicands of the hymn. But as I point out in the publ. intro. to VIII.59 (see also comm. ad VIII.59.3), the vocabulary is in many cases more appropriate to the Aśvins (e.g., in that very vs. VIII.59.3c and also vs. 5, the voc. *śubhas patī* “o lords of beauty,” which in its numerous occurrences is otherwise only used of the Aśvins). It seems likely that Aśvin phraseology has been adapted to the Indra-Varuṇa context of VIII.59. I would suggest that in our passage the “thundering seven-mouthed enclosure” (*stanáyantam ... vrajám ... saptaśyam*) that the Aśvins open up in our cd can be compared to the “seven voices” of Kṛśa that pour out honey in VIII.59.3 – perhaps the dakṣiṇā, as Ge suggests (n. 8cd), more likely in my view a variant of the Vala cave and its contents, particularly since *saptaśya-* is an epithet of Bṛhaspati in that myth (IV.50.4; cf. IX.111.1) – perhaps both.

“The worshiper and the widow” in b do not form a natural semantic pairing, but are probably grouped together because of their phonology: *vidhántam vidhávām*. But the widow and the orphan of the pun in pāda a form a natural class.

X.40.9: On my interpr. of the images of this vs. in a marital context, see publ. intro. As I say there, the coming of age of the maiden in this vs. reminds us of Apālā’s (VIII.91), esp. the plants sprouting in b, which stand for the growth of pubic hair on the newly mature Apālā (VIII.91.5–6). It may not be an accident that Apālā’s fantasy suitor, Indra, is called a *vīraká-* (VIII.91.2) “dear little hero,” while here, paired with the maiden (*yoṣā*), is a similar *-ka*-form, *kanīnaká-* ‘little lad’ – referring either to the new husband or, as I suggest in the publ. intro., possibly to his penis.

The accent on *áruhan* in b indicates that the *ca* there is subordinating (*pace* Old n. 2). See Klein DGRV I.247.

As most comm. point out, *áhne* in d echoes *áhne ... aktáve* “for the day ... for the night” in 5c. As I discuss in the publ. intro., I see a role reversal in our passage: in vs. 5 she asks the Ásvins to “be there for me” (*bhūtám me*) day and night, but here it is she who (in my reading) will “be there for him” (i.e., the bridegroom; *asmaí ... bhavati*). Here the “for night” is not explicit. Perhaps it would be a sly reference to what happens at night, namely sex, but tactfully suppressed, given the innocent state of the new bride.

I take *tát patitvanám* as a separate nominal clause, not the subject of *bhavati* because that interpr. loses the parallelism with vs. 5. Cf., e.g., Old’s “Ihm hilft zu (glücklichem) Tage diese seine Gattenschaft.” By my reading it is a triumphal announcement of the achieved marital state. The heavy suffix *-tvaná-* (on which see AiG II.2.716–17) may add a bit of gravitas to this final statement.

X.40.10: As disc. in the publ. intro., I take this vs. as concerning the public and social aspects of marriage, in particular the inter-family connection that it forges. However, there are a number of uncertainties in the vs., which has been much discussed; Bloomfield (AJP 21 [1900]) and Gonda (Fs. Norman Brown [1962]) each devoted an entire article to this verse alone, and Old’s, Ge’s, and Re’s remarks are relatively full, esp. Old’s. I will not discuss these treatments in detail, but for the most part simply present my own interpr.

The first question concerns the first clause in pāda a “they weep over the living” (*jīvām rudanti*). As Gonda (inter alia) suggests, *jīvām* implicitly invokes its opposite “the dead”; in fact, 3 of the 4 occurrences of *mṛtá-* in the RV are juxtaposed to *jīvá-*. Since the more natural trigger for tears is death, not life, the phrase “they weep over the living” is, on the one hand, a striking reversal of expectations and a paradox. However, on the other, tears are not an uncommon reaction to any emotionally charged situation, including a joyful one, and many people (including me) cry at weddings. This seems to be what’s going on here – whether as the result of universal human psychology (as I think) or a ritual mandate (so, approx. Gonda, who samples a wide range of the anthropological literature). It could also be more specifically related to the separation of the bride from her natal family as she sets out with her new husband to her new home – an esp. fraught part of the marriage ceremony, as I’ve discussed elsewhere (e.g., SW/SW 223–26). Although it is tempting to interpr. the clause in this light, with her family mourning her departure, the fact that *jīvām* is masc. or neut. makes that interpr. difficult (although it would be possible, but probably inadvisable, to emend to the fem. \**jīvām*, which would be metrically identical in this context).

The sense of the rest of this pāda, *ví mayante adhvaré*, has also been much disputed. I see in it an expression of the mutual exchange between the bride’s family and the groom’s that lies at the heart of marriage socially conceived. Hence my “they make a mutual exchange at the rite.” The middle voice supports this reciprocal interpr., and the specifying loc. *adhvaré* indicates that the arrangements become legal at the marriage ceremony. Re’s suggested “faire un contrat” also has a legal aspect, though his added parenthesis “(lors du sacrifice: paradoxe!)” is puzzling – why would this be paradoxical? Gonda’s (p. 84) “they (i.e., those concerned, i.e., either the bridal couples or their relatives, the priests, etc.) take turns at the (marriage) sacrifice” doesn’t make much sense to me; I assume he means that different people perform different ceremonial actions, but he doesn’t say, and if so, the statement seems trivial. Gotō’s (1<sup>st</sup> Cl. 241, cited also

by Kü 257) “sie wechseln sich bei der [Hochzeits]feier ab” seems to reflect the same general sense as Gonda’s, but even less defined.

In pāda b the interpretational debate has centered on the sense of *prāsiti-* and the phrase *dirghām ānu prāsitim*. On the general sense of *prāsiti-* see comm. ad IV.4.1, where I suggest that the word is a conflation of two etymologically distinct words, one meaning ‘onslaught’ or, less pointedly, ‘trajectory’. Here an attenuated sense referring to a stretch of time seems warranted; see KH Aufs. II.418. In my view this refers to the protracted marriage negotiations between the two families; I find it impossible to follow Gonda’s (p. 85) speculation that “this pāda may allude to the men’s gaining a visionary insight into the meaning of marriage, the deep secret of procreation, the continuation of family and race.”

The second hemistich is less challenging. The two pādas are structurally parallel, with an opening abstract notion (*vāmām* ‘a precious thing’ c, *māyah* ‘joy’ d) followed by a dat. of the beneficiaries of this abstract; the two datives refer, in my view, to the parents and close relatives who arranged the match (*pitṛbhyah*) in c, and in d to the actual parties to the match, the husbands (*pātibhyah*) and the wives they embrace. I do *not* think, with some interpr. (e.g., Old), that the *pītar* in c are the dead ancestors who will be benefited by the offspring of the new couple. As for *sameriré*, I take it to mean “set this [=marriage] in motion,” “brought it together.” The publ. tr. omits the *idām*, and should be slightly changed to one of the tr. just suggested. Although *māyah* in d echoes (*vī*) *mayante* in a, I consider this word play only phonological, not etymological

X.40.11: In contrast to the detailed treatments of vs. 10 just cited, vs. 11 has attracted very little comment, though it is hardly perspicuous – and the first pāda (“we do not know this – proclaim it to us”) makes the unclarity explicit. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think it concerns sex, or rather sex and procreation.

The second pāda seems to allude both to the sexual act itself and to the notion (at least later) that the husband is reconceived/reborn in his wife’s womb: “that/how a young man dwells peacefully in the womb of a young woman” (see also X.85.45 in the wedding hymn). The plural *yóniṣu*, which I’ve silently emended to an English singular (like Ge’s “im Schosse”), is, on its surface, surprising. The stem is extremely well attested and almost always in the singular, including the very common locatives *yónau* and *yónā*, so it is not a case of a body part that is plurale tantum. The only plural forms are 5 exx. of this very loc. *yóniṣu*. In the other 4 cases the wombs can indeed be multiple, including in a passage where procreation is at issue: X.63.15 *svastī naḥ putrakṛthēṣu yóniṣu* “(let there be) well-being for us in the wombs at the making of sons” (though in that passage plurality isn’t necessary). In two of the passages (I.15.4, II.36.4) *yóniṣu* is qualified by *triṣú* ‘three’ and clearly refers to the three fireplaces where Agni takes his ritual position. (The fifth passage is in the Vena hymn, X.123.5, and like the rest of that hymn is hard to interpret.) Despite the clear conceptual plurality in two of the five passages, in our passage (and quite possibly in X.63.15) I consider the pl. of *yóniṣu* a metrical contrivance: loc. sg. *yónau* is very common pāda-final in Triṣṭubh. Both our passage and X.63.15 are in Jagatī, where pāda-final *yónau* won’t fit; I therefore consider the pl. an automatic adjustment to the meter. It is only these two passages where *yóniṣu* is pāda-final.

I now think the publ. interpr. of the first hemistich is wrong, or at least incomplete. The question I did not previously consider is the identity of the 1st pl. speakers and 2nd pl. addressees: *ná tāsya vidma, tād u ṣu prá vocata*. Given the number, neither can have the Aśvins as referent. The only previous 1st pl. in the hymn is *ní hvayāmahe* “we call down” (4b) in the early generic ritual portion of the hymn – though the next vs. (12d) contains the opt. *aśmahī*

“might we reach.” There are no 2nd pls. anywhere else in the hymn. Since pāda a of our vs. clearly sets up an interactive speech situation, we need to try to identify the parties to this exchange. I now interpret the vs. as a continuation of vss. 9–10, which concern the marriage itself. I suggest that the first hemistich treats the announcement of the consummation of the marriage. The 2nd pl. addressees are the elders who would announce the consummation, having been shown the evidence – most likely the bride’s bloody garment, as in X.85.28–29. The “we” who await the news are the bride’s relatives (or the relatives of the couple in general); cf. X.85.28, where, after the garment turns bloody, “her relatives are elated” (*édhante asyā jñātāyaḥ*). Note the verb *prá vocata* ‘proclaim’, which suggests a formal and public announcement. The 1st ps. speakers are not asking for private enlightenment about a mystery (as I first thought), but for an authoritative statement made to the assembled group.

On this basis I would now alter the translation from “*how ...*” (which is not supported by the *yád* in the text) to “*that ...*,” and interpret *yúvā* and *yuvatyāḥ* not as generic “a young man ... a young women,” but as references to the couple in question – yielding an emended tr. “We do not know this – proclaim it to us – that the young man dwells in the womb of the young woman.”

The 2nd half of the vs. expresses the further wish that the marriage just consummated will be procreative and the new husband virile. This is expressed in the familiar bovine terms: the “seed-laden bull” (*vr̥ṣabhāsya retínah*) and his beloved, the ruddy cow (*priyósriyasya*). Less familiar is the trope of the house: “may we go to the house” (of bull and cow), *gr̥hām gamema*, but this image is reinforced in the next vs. (12d), *priyā aryamṇó dúryām̐ aśīmahi* “Dear to Aryaman, might we reach his porticos (/house)” (per publ. tr.) or, perhaps better, “As dear ones, might we reach the porticos (/house) of Aryaman.” On the one hand, “reaching the house” in both vss. is a metaphor for attaining a desired state or situation: 11cd wishes for the new marriage to be generative; in 12d, since Aryaman is the patron of marriage, we are asking for a successful, divinely sanctioned marriage. On the other, we can take “house” more literally as the physical location, the container, of the desired domestic state and representative of it. The motif of the house continues in the final two vss.: 13a *mānuṣo duroṇā ā* and 14d *víprasya vā yájamānasya vā gr̥hām*; in fact *gr̥hām* is the final word of the hymn. In 13 and 14 the “house” shows the more standard RVic usage, as the locus of ritual activity and the goal of the gods, here the Áśvins, coming to the ritual. Nonetheless, the “house” motif resonates throughout this last part of the hymn, even as the focus shifts back to the Áśvins.

X.40.12: As just noted, the Áśvins reappear here, having been absent from the three wedding vss. (9–11).

In b the publ. tr. attributes both the desires (*kāmāḥ*) and the hearts (*hṛtsú*) to us, but this is not explicit in the text. Ge expresses no ownership of the desires and attributes the hearts to the Áśvins: “die Wünsche sind euch ans Herz gelegt worden.” I was hesitant to assign the hearts to the Áśvins partly because of pl. *hṛtsú*: although I would not expect the poet to use the dual (the stem has no dual forms, not surprisingly), I thought it likely that for two beings, with only one heart apiece, he would use the sg. *hṛdī*. However, in at least one passage (I.179.5) pl. *hṛtsú* seems to belong to a single individual, so this argument doesn’t hold. Also, *hṛd-* is generally used of humans, but given I.32.14 with *hṛdī* used of Indra, this argument also falls. I now think that the desires are ours – the desires we just expressed for a successful marriage – but that the hearts are the Áśvins, or the gods in general (see Aryaman in d). Cf. X.64.2d *devéṣu me ádhi kāmā ayam̐sata* “My desires have fastened upon the gods,” with *kāmāḥ* + med. *s*-aor. *ayam̐sata*, as here; only the preverbs, *ní* here, *ádhi* there, differ (though X.64.2 is slightly complicated by

having *hr̥tsú* in pāda a clearly referring to our hearts). I would now change the tr. to “(Our) desires have been fastened down in (your) hearts.”

This is the only place in the RV where the Aśvins are identified as a *mīthunā* ‘(oppositional) pair’. Though the stem *mīthunā-* is by no means limited to a sexual pair – it is used in I.83.3, for example, of the pair of priests, the Adhvaryu and the Hotar – it is often so used, often in sexually charged context, e.g., in I.179.3 of Agastya and Lopāmudrā, VIII.33.18 of the sacrificer and his wife. I therefore think it is used of the Aśvins here to fit the marital context.

On *śubhas patī*, see comm. above ad vs. 4. I think it’s possible that in our vs. this unconventional epithet of the Aśvins (found 3x elsewhere in the hymn) has been attracted into the marital context and might be interpr. “husbands of beauty,” as opposed to the standard “lords of beauty,” though its appearance in vss. 13 and 14 might either speak against this or suggest that they all have a marital undertone.

As disc. ad vs. 11, the phrase *dúryām̐ aśīmahi* echoes *gr̥hām gamema* (11d), and both have both a metaphorical and a literal sense. The house here is that of Aryaman (*aryamñāḥ*), who, of course, presides over the institution of marriage, and I attribute his presence here to that function. In the publ. tr. I construe this gen. with *priyāḥ* (“dear to Aryaman”) and supply him with *dúryān* (“his porticos”). I am now not sure that *priyāḥ* should be limited in that way. It is possible that we are dear to the married couple, or the married couple and their family circle, or to the Aśvins, whereas I am tolerably certain that the dwelling is Aryaman’s. I would now slightly emend the tr. to “May we, as dear ones, reach the porticos of Aryaman.”

X.40.13: The phrase *tīrthām suprapāṇām* “a ford that offers good drink” is somewhat jarring, but it cannot be separated from vs. 7 in X.114, a mystical treatment of the sacrifice: *āpnānam tīrthām ... yēna pathā prapībante sutāsya* “The Opulent Ford ... the path by which they take the first drink of the soma?” with both *tīrthā-* and *prā√pā*.

On *pathe-ṣṭhā-* (also V.50.3) see Scar 649. The anomalous loc. sg. *pathe-* is presumably a rhyme form to fairly common and inherited (cf. Aves. *raθaēštā-*) *rathe-ṣṭhā-* ‘standing on the chariot / chariot-fighter’, with loc. to a thematic 1st member.

X.40.14: As noted in the publ. intro., this final vs. echoes the opening of the hymn, with its anxious questions about the location of the Aśvins.

In c *nī yeme* responds to *nī ... ayamsata* in 12b, though the *s*-aor. in 12b is intransitive and our form is transitive, despite agreement in voice.

#### X.41 Aśvins

On the place of this hymn in the Ghoṣā Aśvins sequence, see comm. ad X.39–41 above and the publ. intro. to X.39–41 and to X.41. Besides the Anukramaṇī ascription there is little to connect this little hymn to the two preceding ones.

X.41.1: All three hymns in this sequence begin with a vs. dedicated to the Aśvins’ chariot – though, since the Aśvins’ chariot often features prominently in Aśvin hymns, this is hardly diagnostic of a shared poetic lineage. This one is esp. close in phraseology to X.39.1 – though there the chariot is in the nom. for most of the vs., while here the first three pādas are couched in the acc., modifying *rātham*, which begins pāda b.

With regard to *samānām* ‘common’, Ge (n. 1a) asks whether the chariot is “common” to the two Aśvins or to all men, offering parallels that could support either. As the 1st word of the

hymn, *samānām* seems positioned for significance, but it isn't possible to determine what its scope is.

X.41.2: The focus on the chariot continues in this vs. The vs. also ends with a mention of the Hotar priest (*yajñām hótṛmantam*), setting the stage for vs. 3.

On *kīrī-* see comm. ad V.52.12.

X.41.3: After the mention of the Hotar in 2d, this vs. presents at least two more ritual functionaries and as many as four: the Adhvaryu and Agnidh are presented as disjunctive goals of the Aśvins' journey, with double *vā*: #*adhvaryúṃ vā ... agnídham vā*. But the presence of a third *vā* in c in the off-balance expression *víprasya vā ... sávanāni* "or to the pressings of an inspired poet" suggests that *vípra-* is a third such personage, esp. since the *vā* immediately follows that gen., while *dámūnasam* 'domestic leader, household master' can either be in apposition to *agnídham* or refer to yet another distinct person and role.

X.42–44: These three hymns are all attributed to Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa and all dedicated to Indra, with clear verbal connections among them, including sharing their two final vss. (X.42.10–11 = X.43.10–11 = X.44.10–11). To a poet of the same name are ascribed three Aśvin hymns in VIII (VIII.85–87), though there is no clear thematic or verbal connection between the two sets that I can see.

## X.42 Indra

The hymn contains a number of striking comparisons, often not overtly marked as similes.

X.42.1: With Ge, I take *lāyam* as an early example of the *-am* gerund (/absolutive), rare in the RV/AV, more common in the Brāh. and Sū. (see Whitney, Gr. §995), to *√lī* 'cling', etc. Ge's invocation of *nilāyam* in AVŚ IV.16.2 is apposite, whatever the form means there. Ge's interpr. here, "geduckt" (crouching), is close to mine ("in ambush"), though mine spells out the scenario I see for the simile in pāda a more clearly—with the poet compared to an archer who, being hidden, can take his time aiming. The ultimate target is, in my view, Indra, who is brought down (like a game bird?) to our ritual in pāda d. The poet must "shoot further" in order to overcome the speech of the *arī-* in pāda c. Old, by contrast, thinks *lāyam* refers to the arrow being shot, flg. Gr (and Ge Gl., inter alia), and that it is compared to the *stómam* in b (which, however, is the object of a different verb). On archery as a metaphor for praising, see my 2020 "Vedic *iśudhyá-* and Old Avestan *iśud-*, *iśūdiia-*: The Aim of Praise" (Fs. Lamberterie).

X.42.1–2: The three even pādas 1d, 2b, 2d all begin with a 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. act. *-aya* impv. preceded by a preverb (*ní rāmaya / prá bodhaya / ā cyāvaya*), all with Indra as object, taking final position (1d, 2b *índram*#, 2d *śūram*#). In 1d and 2b the impv. is immediately followed by the voc. *jarītar* 'o singer'.

X.42.2: Old advances good reasons not to accept Roth's emendation of *dóhena* to *dóhe* \**ná*, primarily parallel passages with *úpa śíkṣ-* + INSTR. Presumably the objection to the instr. that led to Roth's emendation to the loc. is that milking would not be an enticement to a cow – but in reality that is not the case: cows with full udders want to be milked. Ge (n. 2a) toys with the



suggested emendation and in the end settles for a haplology \**dóhena ná*, which seems like the worst of the options. I see no reason why pāda a can't contain a simile without overt marking, just as pāda b does.

On *úpa śikṣa-* with acc. complement, see comm. ad I.112.19, 173.10.

As Ge notes (n. 2b), *jaritar jārām* is a word play, with the words belonging to two different roots.

X.42.3: The hapax nominal *śíśayá-* is assigned by everyone to the root  $\sqrt{sā}$  / *śí*, which furnishes the immediately preceding verb *śíśīhí* 'sharpen!'. I therefore don't understand the apparently universal tendency to give it a gloss that separates it from its root (Gr 'stärkend, kräftigend', AiG II.2.85 'stärkend(?)', EWA s.v. *śā* 'stärkend', and most egregiously Ge "dass du ausgiebig bist"), even though it is explicitly recognized (by Ge and EWA at least) that it is a word play with *śíśīhí*. The poet has heard that Indra is a consummate practioner of  $\sqrt{sā}$  and asks him to perform this action. I might slightly emend my rendering to "you are the sharpener" or "you are sharpening." As to what "sharpen" means here, I assume the poet is asking Indra to sharpen his (=poet's) mental and verbal skills; the immediately following reference (c) to the poet's *dhī-* 'insight', which he hopes to monetize, supports this interpr.

In d the poet calls upon Indra to "bring to us" (*ā bharā naḥ* #) Bhaga, while in 1b the roles were reversed: the priest is urged to "bring to him [=Indra]" (*prā bharā ... asmai* #) the praise – emphasizing the theme of reciprocity that dominates this hymn.

X.42.4: With Old, I accept Ge's (Gl) analysis of *mamasatyá-* as a univerbation of *máma sāt* ("[this] being mine"), with *-ya-* a nominalizing suffix, rather than deriving it from *máma satyá-*.

Pāda b contains the common contrastive juxtaposition of *sām* 'together' and *ví* 'apart, separately'; here the peoples take their stands together (*saṃtasthānāḥ*), that is, reciprocally facing each on the battlefield, while each side calls on Indra separately (*ví hvayante*) for his help.

Since there's no acc. prn. in c, the VP could also be tr. "... makes (him=Indra) his yokemate." My supplied "you" looks back to the 2nd ps. ref. to Indra in ab; "him" would look forward to the 3rd ps. *vaṣṭi śūrah* of d. The choice doesn't really matter.

*śūra-* returns here from 2d, in both cases referring to Indra. That vs. also contains *sākhāyam* 'comrade' referring to Indra (2a), while here *sakhyá-* ('fellowship', perhaps better 'comradeship') is what Indra seeks (or doesn't) with humans.

X.42.5–8: This set of 4 vss. has the formal presentation of a little omphalos. Vss. 5 and 8 define a ring: 5a *bahulám ... tīvrān sómān* / 8b *tīvrāḥ sómā bahulāntasaḥ* // 5d *ní ... yuvāti* / 8c *ní yaṃsan* // 5b *āsunóti* / 8d *sunvaté*. The intermediate vss. 6–7 are responsive (as omphalos vss. tend to be): 6 *ārāc cit ... śātruh* / 7 *ārāc chātrum*. But this set of vss. is not in the center of the hymn and the subject is not consequential enough or enigmatic enough to count as a real omphalos.

X.42.5: This vs. is a sort of duplicate and expansion of the 2nd hemistich of the preceding vs. (4cd), depicting the reward Indra provides to one who makes oblation to him. The reciprocal relationship between the two recipients, Indra and the sacrificer, is conveyed by the balanced dative pronouns: *asmai* (pāda a) referring to Indra and *tasmai* (pāda c) referring to the sacrificer.

The simile that opens the verse (*dhānam ná syandrām bahulám* "like ample streaming wealth" / "ample like streaming wealth") has a somewhat complex relationship with its target,

*tīvrān sómān*), found in pāda b. Ge (n. 5a) suggests that *syandrām bahulām* has been “attracted” by *dhānam*, implying that the phrase really modifies the pl. *sómān*. His suggestion is understandable, because the root  $\sqrt{\text{syand}}$  means ‘flow’ and generally has either liquids or animate beings as subject. In fact Soma is one of the standard subjects of the verb (see, e.g., the multiple occurrences of aor. *āsiṣyadat* in Maṇḍala IX). The adj. *syandrā-* generally modifies gods (in motion). Therefore applying it to an apparently static substance *dhāna-* ‘wealth’ seems off-balance. But as Ge also suggests, the adj. seems to have a double meaning here. The semantically straightforward application to soma, as a substance that flows, is semi-thwarted by the clash of number and the clear positioning of the adj. in the simile. not the frame. This forces a ‘flowing, moving’ reading on *dhāna-*; Ge: “... beweglich, von dem aus Vieh bestehenden Besitz.” In other words, this is wealth in livestock, wealth on the hoof. The use of *syandrā-* ‘flowing’ may reflect the visual impression of a large herd in movement, which from a distance can look like liquid flowing (google videos of “herds in motion”). Note that the Maruts are compared to “streaming bulls” (V.52.3 *syandrāso nokṣānaḥ*) and that other livestock serve as subjects of, or similes with,  $\sqrt{\text{syand}}$  (for example, milk cows in IX.68.1).

In the other direction, *bahulā-* is quite at home modifying ‘wealth’ (esp. *rayí-*, e.g., II.1.12, III.1.19), but in our hymn is found in the cmpd. *bahulānta-* (8b) modifying the same *tīvrā- sōma-* as in our vs. So both adjectives in the opening simile of 5a are implicated, if unequally and in opposite directions, with both simile and frame.

As I indicated above, this vs. is an expanded variant of 4cd – but (if I’m right) with a twist. The first part describes the sacrificer offering soma to Indra in expectation of a reward. In 4c this reward is to form a team with Indra, to become his yokemate – a happy situation; 5cd also involves forming a team, but here the image of the team is negative. It consists of the rivals to the sacrificer, whom Indra makes into a team subject to the sacrificer, to be broken and controlled by him with spurs and goad. For a comparable expression see VII.18.9 *sudāsa índraḥ sutúkām amitrān, árandhayat* ... “Indra made those without alliance (to us) subject to Sudās, (as ones) easy to thrust away / easily goaded,” where the establishment of dominance over the *sutúka-* is more explicit. For the meaning and etymology of *sutúka-* see comm. ad VII.18.9.

I do not entirely understand why this should happen in the early morning, but I assume the temporal expression really applies to the soma pressing of the first hemistich, presumably the Morning Pressing.

The *śátru-* is also a preoccupation in the next two vss., 6–7.

X.42.6: The balanced reciprocity expressed by grammar in the immediately preceding vs. (5a and c) is also found here, in the two relative clauses of the 1<sup>st</sup> hemistich—with the locative *#yásmín ... índre#* of pāda a corresponding to loc. *asmé#* at the end of b. Both pādas contain a verb of setting that governs the locative, with the subject being the other member of the pair of opposites: “we” in *dadhimā* (a) versus Indra (*maghāvā*) in *śísráya* (b). The use of two different verbal roots keeps the balanced expression from giving too pat an impression.

In b in the publ. tr. I assigned the *kāma-* to Indra (“his desire”), thoughtlessly flg. Ge (“seinen Wunsch”), though there is no overt expression of possession. (Kü [526] neutrally “den Wunsch.”) I now think that the *kāma-* may be ours, the reward for our praise – or, at least, that it is ambiguous or meant to be read in two senses. The same expression, *kāmam*  $\sqrt{\text{śrí}}$  (PF), is found in the next hymn attributed to the same poet, with 1st sg. *śísraya* and Indra in the loc. (*tvé*). There the desire is mine—that is, it belongs to the subject. This parallel cuts both ways: on the one hand, if the coincidence between the subject of the verb and the owner of the wish is the

important thing, interpreting it as Indra's wish in our passage would be correct. On the other, if the human 1<sup>st</sup> person's ownership of the wish is crucial, then it should be our wish in this passage as well. If the ambiguity is deliberate, we can interpret it to mean that Indra sets his desire for further praise in us, while at the same time we set our desire for the reward for our praise in him. I would now slightly alter the tr. to "fixed (his/our) desire in us."

In d Ge takes *jánya-* as referring to other people ("die Herrlichkeit anderer Leute"), a sense ascribed to the stem already by Gr (meaning 2). This seems reasonable (or at least arguable) in context: the poet first hopes (pāda c) that Indra's rival will take flight, and then that the *dyumná-* of the poet's enemies should fall to Indra (who might redistribute them to the poet and his people?). But as discussed ad IV.55.5, all clear cases of *jánya-* refer to *our* people. On the other hand, a certain no. of the occurrences of pl. *dyumná-* are found in passages where "we" wish to wrest away, or otherwise take possession, of *dyumná-* belonging to others. Cf., e.g., IV.4.6, 9 (the latter cited by Ge n. 6d) and IX.61.11 *enā́ víśvāny aryá ā́, dyumnā́ni mānuṣāṇām / sísāsanto vanāmahe* "Seeking to gain all the brilliant things of humans (/sons of Manu) from the stranger, with it [=soma] we shall win them." Although I don't think I want to go as far as Ge in rendering *jánya-* here as "other people's," I think it may here define the *dyumná-* as belonging in the first instance to humans rather than gods, which latter might be the default interpr., given the etymology of *dyumná-*. This may be conveyed in part by *mānuṣāṇām* of IX.61.11. But *jánya-* may also have a more narrow interpr., referring to the people with whom we might have rivalrous relationships, fighting over the same goods and bragging rights—the larger Ārya community—rather than people beyond the pale, as it were. The same *mānuṣāṇām* of IX.61.11 with this more specific sense "sons of Manu" singles out the Āryas as members of the group that follows the ritual practices stemming from Manu. See also VI.19.6, also with *mānuṣa-*: *víśvā dyumnā́ víṣṇyā mānuṣāṇām, asmábhyaṃ dāḥ ...* "All things brilliant and bullish that belong to the sons of Manu -- give them to us," which may envisage Indra as the redistributor of goods belonging to our rivalrous co-religionists.

X.42.7: The rival, who was already far away in the previous vs. (6c *ārāc cit sán ... śátruḥ*), now needs to be thrust away (7a *ārāc cháturam ápa bādhasva ...*), which seems narratively reversed.

Pāda b is syntactically interesting, as containing an embedded nominal relative cl., resumed by the anaphoric pronoun of the main clause referring to the subject of the rel. cl.: ... *ápa bādhasva ..., ugró yāḥ śámbarḥ ... téna*. Here the *téna* is to be construed with the impv. *ápa bādhasva* "thrust away with that," and the preceding rel. specifies what *téna* refers to. As I've discussed elsewhere ("Proto-proto Izafe," Fs. Hale), such nominal clauses are exceptions to the ban on (or disfavoring of) relative-clause embedding in Vedic. But this example is esp. striking because it is a reverse izafe: the anaphor follows the relative. In function the relative clause here contains the hapax *śámbar-* and seems designed to formally introduce this unfamiliar word. The construction is so unusual that it cannot be rendered both literally and intelligibly ("Thrust the rival far away – what is the mighty śamba-pole of yours, with that").

Although the noun *śámbar-* is found only here, the *-ín-*stem *śambín-* occurs in the AV (AVŚ IX.2.6 = AVP XVI.76.5), in a passage that helpfully limits the sense to a pole or long stick: AVŚ IX.2.6 ... *prá nude sapátnām chambīva nāvam udakéṣu ...* "I thrust forth my rivals as a man with a pole (does) a boat in the waters." On Pāṇ. *śambā́ √ kṛ*, see KH (Aufs. 315) and for the word in general EWA s.v.

On *kṛdhí dhíyam ... vājaratnām* see VI.35.1. *dhíyah karasi vājaratnāḥ*.

X.42.8: The postponed referent of the rel. prn. (a: ... *yám* ..., b: ... *índram*##) matches and expands the construction in vs. 6a #*yásmín* ... *índre*##, where the prn and its referent were contained in a single pāda.

For *vṛṣa-savá-* Ge (n. 8a) compares III.42.7, VI.44.20 with *vṛṣabhiḥ sutá-* “pressed by bulls” (probably the pressing stones, in my view). But I see no reason to introduce an agentive reading for the 1st member of the compound here. Instead it seems to me to contain the intensifying *vṛṣa-* ‘bullish’, often found as compd 1st member and often rendered by Gr (etc.) as “stark, männlich.”

Gr considers the *ánta-* ‘end(s)’ of soma to be the dregs or sediment (Bodensatz), but Ge cites VI.43.2, which has not only *tīvrá-* soma, but also its middle and end. He suggests, persuasively, that this refers to the three soma-pressings. The first pressing produces the sharp (*tīvrá-*) juice, which presumably mellows over the day (esp. at the 3rd pressing, where at least in later śrauta ritual it is made of re-pressed stalks). Here presumably *bahulánta-* suggests that the supplies remain ample even at the end of the ritual day, or, if we take *bahulá-* to mean ‘thick’ (as Gr does in some passage), that the soma has thickened over the course of the day. But this seems less likely.

X.42.9: The controlling image in this vs. is the dice game, and the interpr. is therefore hampered by our incomplete understanding of the terminology. A similar vs. is found in the next hymn (X.43.5). The passage is tr. by Falk (Würfelspiel 127, 183 [slightly differently]) and is discussed at length by Scar (698–700, with regard to *prahā-*). On the basis of AVŚ IV.38.3 Scar argues plausibly that *prahām* should be construed with *jayāti*, not with *atidīvyā* (contra Ge, Falk, though with Lü, Wurf. 44 [see Ge n. 9] and Wh [AVŚ VII.50.6]). He provides several different possible interpr. of the root noun, of which I find the most convincing the stakes / pool / kitty “left in front” (*pra* √ *hā*), which the gamblers play each other to win. See my disc. of *prahāvanta-* ad IV.20.8.

The lexeme *āti* √ *dīv* in the gerund *atidīvyā* is found only here and in the parallel vs. AVŚ VII.50.6, which has the variant *átidīvā* (Wh “superior player”). (Note that this AV variant without gerund [if it is correctly transmitted] would also support construing *prahām* with *jayāti*; unfortunately there is no AVP parallel.) I take it to mean ‘overplay’ in the sense “go for broke” – that is, play excessively and daringly. (This lexeme might be compared to *ati* √ *prach* ‘ask beyond / over-ask’ in the famous exchange between Yājñavalkya and Gārgī in BĀUp III.6, where Y. warns G. about the dire consequences [=shattered head] of over-asking.) I take the subj. to be the poet (more or less with Ge, n. 9 “Opferer”), taking bold verbal chances to attract Indra’s attention. In this case the extremity of his action pays off.

The expression in pāda b, *kṛtām ví* √ *ci*, also belongs to dicing vocabulary and has a number of parallels in the RV (I.132.1, V.60.1, IX.97.58, X.43.5, X.102.2; see Falk 126–27 for this VP). It is clear that its overall sense is ‘win’, but the mechanism of that win is of course obscured by our ignorance of the minutiae of the game. Assuming the general correctness of the current understanding of the play – pulling out handfuls of nuts that are ideally divisible by 4 – I take the verbal lexeme as containing √ *ci* ‘pile’, and with *ví* to mean ‘pile apart’, which is similar but not identical to Falk’s “Abtrennen von Vierereineiten vom *glāha* [the mass of nuts the player has pulled out],” with the gloss ‘fertig abtrennen, ohne Rest den *glāha* zerlegen’. Acdg. to Falk (pp. 116–17), *kṛtā-* refers to a group of 4 nuts (the best result). In order to avoid the bewilderment that a more technically accurate tr. would occasion, I render the VP as “pull out [*ví* √ *ci*] the perfect [*kṛtām*] (hand of dice).”

*śvaghñín-* lit. ‘dog-killer’ (even more lit. ‘having the dog-killing X’) is a slang term for the winner at dice. I tr. “having the best throws,” again in order to provide some interpretable analog in modern discourse. (Falk, 100–101, seems to make heavier weather of the derivation of this term than seems necessary.)

In c *yó devākāmaḥ* must be a nominal relative clause complete in itself, since *ruṇaddhi* is not accented. The lack of resumptive pronoun *sá* is not surprising, and the position of the *ná* is appropriate if the main clause begins there. This clausal division is supported by the two parallels I.102.10 *tvám jigetha ná dhánā rurodhitha* and X.34.12 *tásmai kṛṇomi ná dhánā ruṇadhmi*, in both of which the clause begins after the caesura, preceded by an independent clause (ending in an unaccented finite verb).

In our passage I take the main clause “he does not withhold the stakes” to mean what I take *atidīvyā* to mean in pāda a, namely that the poet has gone all out; he has not pulled any punches, has pushed his poetic skills to the limit. The two parallels just cited mean something slightly different and different from each other. In X.34.12 I (with most interpr., but contra Falk; see comm. ad loc.) think that the defeated gambler demonstrates by his empty hands that he has no more funds to stake. It is in this way that he holds nothing back. In I.102.10 after Indra is victorious he does not withhold the prizes won, but redistributes them to his clients – a different sense of “holds nothing back” – but both senses are available to the English expression as well.

In d the audacious chances the poet took are rewarded.

X.42.10: In pāda b the affliction to be overcome, hunger (*kṣúdh-*), is combatted with an appropriate remedy, barley (*yáva-*). The connection between affliction and remedy is not so clear in pāda a: how is *āmati-* (here rendered ‘neglect’) to be helped by cows? Here the solution lies in what kind of neglect is meant. The word *āmati-* lit. means ‘without having thought, without having [=receiving] attention’, for which ‘neglect’ is a reasonable single-word substitute. But it often seems to indicate the *physical* results of neglect or lack of attention. It is paired with *kṣúdh-* ‘hunger’ also in VIII.66.14 as well as in the next hymn X.43.3. It appears to refer to a physical state also in X.33.2, where it is paired with *nagnātā jásuḥ* “nakedness and exhaustion.” In I.53.4 it is checked by cows, as here, and by my interpr. of the difficult vs. III.53.15 a notional cow banishes *āmati-*. Hunger and the physical results of neglect can be countered by cows or rather their nourishing products, and that seems to be the sense here. See also X.39.6.

Although the instr.s in ab (*góbhiḥ ... yávena*) are clearly instruments, the function of those in cd (*rājabhiḥ ... asmākena vṛjānenā* “with our kings and our community”) is not clear: are they instr. of accompaniment “along with ... might we win” (that is, the kings and community share in the good fortune) or true instrument instrumentals (that is, we achieve the win by virtue of them)?

Note that *dhána-* is repeated from vs. 9.

In c *prathamā* is ambiguous. The Pp. reads as *-āḥ*, modifying the subject of *jayema* (so also Old, Ge, and the publ. tr.), but Gr as neut. pl. *-ā* with *dhánāni*. Either is possible and not much rides on it.

X.42.11: I take *bṛhaspátīḥ* in pāda a as an epithet of Indra, and promote *índrah* from c to a (against Ge, who gives each a separate clause). HPS (B+I 80–81) also argues that it is an epithet or identification of Indra in this vs. and points out that no other god is mentioned in the hymn. (His dismissal [p. 81 n. 19] of *bhágam* in vs. 3 is rather cursory, however.) Although it is not unusual for the final vs. of a hymn to name more gods than featured in the body of the hymn,

Schmidt's other arg. (p. 80 and n. 18), that parallels to the protector-from-all-sides trope have a single god as subject, is stronger.

Contra Ge (and HPS) I take c with ab and keep d separate (implicitly also Klein DGRV I.343). Both Ge and HPS seem to take the ablatives in c as the source of the *váriveraḥ* made in d – e.g., HPS (80) “Indra soll uns von vorn und von der Mitte ... Weite schaffen.” I know of no parallels for making *váriveraḥ*- out of something. Moreover, if the ablatives of c are not construed with ab, the protective shield is incomplete; in particular the crucial direction “in front” is missing.

### X.43 Indra

On the different deployment of similar verbal elements between X.42 and X.43, see the publ. intro. to X.43.

X.43.2: On the reciprocal expressions involving LOC *kāmam* √*śri* in these two hymns, see comm. ad X.42.6.

On *sadaḥ* as having impv. value, see comm. ad IX.2.2.

I take *asmín* ... *sóme* as a nominal loc. absol., though this is probably not nec.

On *avapāna*- see comm. ad VII.98.1. As disc. there, there is no verbal lexeme *áva* √*pā*, but the noun *avapāna*- occurs 5x in the RV. In three of these it refers to a drinking hole frequented by wild beasts. In I.136.4 (the only pl.) it can just mean ‘drink(s)’, but I tr. it there as “drinking places”, and I think something like that should be at issue here, given the very limited attestation of the noun and its associated lexeme. Perhaps the idea is that we should provide the equivalent of a watering hole for Indra, perhaps an ample receptacle for soma or a suitable place to drink it; cf. the use of “watering hole” to mean a bar in modern English. I would therefore slightly change the tr. to “let there be a drinking place for you.”

X.43.3: The root noun cmpd. *viśūvṛt*- must belong to the root √*vṛ* ‘obstruct, ward off’, despite the homonymous stem based on √*vṛt* ‘turn’ in II.40.3. See Scar 507 and 511–12 respectively.

The pair *āmati*- *kṣúdh*- is also found in the previous hymn, X.42.10.

X.43.3–4: As Old notes, there's a pun on *váyah* in these two vss., with 3d containing the neut. *s*-stem ‘vitality’ and 4a the nom. pl. to *vi*- ‘bird’.

X.43.4–8: Just as X.42.5–8 defines a small internal ring, so too in this hymn we find some evidence of an internal ring, with 4d *vidát svàr mánave jyótir āryam* echoed by 8d *ávindaj jyótir mánave havísmate*. But the material in between is even more various than in X.42, and I hesitate even to call attention to this possible structure. However, it is the case that the immediately following vs., 9, abruptly shifts focus from Indra to (unnamed) Agni, and vs. 9 is the real final vs. of the hymn, since 10–11 are shared with X.42. So the echo of vs. 4 that is found in 8 may close out the Indra hymn proper, in preparation for the ritual vs. that follows. This suggestion is supported by the fact that “sun-finding” is also found in vs. 1 (pāda a), and so the whole Indra portion would be marked by a ring structure.

X.43.4: The VP *vidát svàr* resonates not only with 8d, as just noted, but also with 1a, where our thoughts are *svar-víd*-. Here it is the soma drops, so that both the verbal and the physical parts of the sacrifice are sun-finding.

The appearance of Manu – and the consequent switch to mythological time – is surprising, since heretofore the focus has been on the ritual here-and-now and Indra’s appearance there, a temporal frame to which we return in the next vs. The (aor.) injunc. *vidát* facilitates this balance between ritual present and mythological past. The reprise at the end of the ring, 8d, contains by contrast an augmented imperfect, *ávindat*, which situates the action fully in the past.

Although Gr does not register a lexeme *prá √ dyut* and it is not found elsewhere in Vedic till ŚB, it is difficult to do anything with *prá* in c but construe it with the intens. part. *dávidyutat*. (VB does list this passage as a lexeme, the sole entry under *prá √ dyut* in the Veda vol.) Certainly other verbs of shining / lighting up take *prá* (e.g., *√ruc*). Although *prá* would be in tmesis with a participle, not a finite verb, this is hardly unknown.

X.43.5: The first pāda, with its technical dicing phraseology, is almost exactly X.42.9; see disc. there. Unlike that vs., however, I think Indra is the subject of *ví cinoti*, not the poet.

On *saṃvárga*- see comm. ad VIII.75.12, X.61.17.

The VP *sūryam jāyat* “wins the sun” matches semantically, but not lexically, *vidát svàḥ* in the previous vs., 4d. The verb is also an injunctive (though to a present stem this time), and at least in my interpr. has a present-time sense.

X.43.6: On the stem *asāya*- see comm. ad VI.33.2; the stem is found with *pári* as here also in I.34.7. Though in both I.34.7 and VI.33.2 the verb is active, a 3rd sg. mid. *asāyata*, matching the one here, is found in X.92.1. In nearby X.40.6 the related verb *nasāyathaḥ* takes *viśaḥ* as goal/object, as here. See comm. ad loc.

On *dhénā*- see comm. ad I.2.3, 101.10, and V.30.9. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this portion of the hymn has to do with the forward progress of the Ārya through desirable territory, under Indra’s watchful protection. In pāda a he encircles the clans perhaps to safeguard them (but see below), while in b he watches over the nourishing streams that the Ārya are conquering. The sense of geographical space as defined by these streams may be found in the similar passage VIII.32.22 *ihí tistrāḥ parāvāta, ihí páñca jánāṃ áti / dhénā indrāvacākaśat* “Pass through the three distant realms; pass over the five peoples, / keeping watch over the nourishing streams, o Indra.” Note the pl. *jāna*- there as here. In VIII.32.22 Indra is urged to come to our soma sacrifice rather than someone else’s, and this involves traveling across a good deal of territory. It is possible in that passage that *áva √ cakṣ* would be better rendered literally, as “looking down upon the streams” from the air, as he passes over a series of them. The *dhénāḥ* could also refer to the inviting streams of soma that Indra is keeping an eye out for. And both these interpr. can work here as well. In that case, the āmreḍita *viśam-viśam* in pāda a might refer less to Indra’s protective embrace than to his passing over or circling around other clans to reach ours – where Indra will rejoice in our pressing (cd). Competitive soma sacrifices are also at issue in VIII.32.22.

*śakráḥ* in c picks up *śakat* in 5c.

The finale of the verse seems to sketch an infinite loop of beneficial streams. The successful soma presser pleases Indra with his streams of soma, which enables this same man to vanquish his foes in battle, allowing him (and his fellows) to conquer more territory containing nourishing rivers, streams of water.

X.43.7: The relationship between streams of soma and streams of water (=rivers) suggested in vs. 6 is reinforced in the first hemistich of this vs. by the similes that bookend the two pādas. The

cause-and-effect between water and food is laid out in d, where the rain makes the barley grow. Barley (*yáva-*) returns from X.42.10, where it overcame hunger.

*dānu-* is ambiguous between ‘gifts’ and ‘drops’, and both fit here; indeed the gift *is* the drop, namely rain.

X.43.8: It is not clear to me why Indra should be “like an *angry* bull,” per the publ. tr., and I now think a tr. of *kruddhá-* as ‘raging’ (as in JPB’s V.15.3 *siṃhām ná kruddhām* “like a raging lion”) better conveys the unbridled behavior of a powerful animal. Note that Indra is a “tempestuous bull” (*vṛṣabhāsya śuśmīṇaḥ*) in vs. 3.

Ge (n. 8b) suggests that the *aryá-* who becomes the husband of the waters (*aryá-patnīḥ ... apāḥ*) is Indra. This is most likely true: Indra leads the people in the conquest of the new land defined by rivers. But I think another sense is also latent: the land is being Aryanized by the conquest of rivers, and so the people (*jána-*) of the Ārya collectively become the husband(s) of the waters – though we might expect \**ārya-patnī-*, with the *vṛddhi* deriv. as 1st member.

In c *jīrā-dānu-* incorporates the same pun as *dānu-* in 7d. Here the “drops” would presumably be soma, thus continuing the identification of soma with the life-giving waters of rivers and rain.

On pāda d see disc. above ad vss. 4–8 and on *āvindat* above ad vs. 4.

X.43.9: On this vs. as being outside the rings formed by 1–8 and 4–8, see above ad vss. 4–8.

As Ge (n. 9) points out (flg. Ludwig), the subject of this vs. must be the ritual fire, often compared to an axe (see, e.g., comm. ad IX.67.30). The hortatory impvs. *új jāyatām* (a), *ví rocatām* (c) mark the kindling of the fire in preparation for the ritual day.

As Ge notes (n. 9b), *ṛtāsya sudúghā* recalls VII.43.4 *ṛtāsya dhārāḥ sudúghā dúhānāḥ*. However, in VII.43.4 the Saṃhitā reading *sudúghā* represents acc. pl. *sudúghāḥ*, which is the obj. of *dúhānāḥ*, whereas here *sudúghā* is nom. sg. In VII.43.4 I take “the good milkers, the streams of truth” to be the hymns that the gods milk for themselves (from the poets). This is in general agreement with Ge (n. 4b). Here, though he cross-references VII.43.4, Ge identifies the *sudúghā* rather as the Schmalzlöffel. I do not see why. It can easily be, once again, the praise hymn recited as the fire is kindled. Or, perhaps, the stream of ghee that will cause the fire to flare up and shine out.

The second hemistich with its focus on the blazing fire compared to the sun is a culmination of the sun-finding theme found in vss. 1, 4, and (slightly disguised) 8; it turns out that the “sun” is in fact the ritual fire.

This hemistich also contains an echo of Svarbhānu, in the phrase *bhānúnā ... svàr ná*, split between two clauses (in my tr. and Ge’s). Recall that, by my analysis (Hyenas), Svarbhānu is an epithet of Agni.

This hemistich also provides a sustained ex. of sibilant alliteration: ... *śúciḥ, svàr ná śukráṃ śusúcīta sátpatiḥ*, with three of the words also an etymological figure (*śúciḥ ... śukráṃ śusúcīta*).

X.43.10–11: For these repeated vss. see comm. ad X.42.10, 11.

#### X.44 Indra



X.44.1: The stem *svápati-* occurs three times in the RV, all in X (here, and X.27.8, 31.4). Gr glosses ‘sein eigener Herr’, reasonably enough (sim. AiG II.1.264 ‘eigener Herr’). Other *svá-* cmpds. have the sense ‘(having) self/own-X’, and the well-attested stem *sva-rāj-* ‘independent king’ (lit. ‘ruling by oneself’?; see Scar 450 for disc. of the possibilities) is a superficially good parallel. We might then gloss *svá-pati* similarly as ‘independent lord’, via ‘lord of himself’ or ‘lord by his own (power)’? However, it should be noted that all other *svá-* cmpds in the RV are adjectives (generally bahuvr. like *svá-yaśas-* ‘having one’s own glory, self-glorious’), including probably *sva-rāj-* originally, and so there are in fact no direct parallels to the noun *svá-pati-*. And, though Scar also gives *svápati-* as a virtual synonym (“gleichbedeutend”) of *svarāj-*, in context *svá-pati-* is not as clear as we might hope: the referent of *svá-* is not necessarily the *-pati-* himself.

Clearest is X.27.8 (if anything in that devilish hymn is clear), which depicts cows straying and following false / other cowherds (in my interpr.; see comm. ad loc.). In the final pāda the question is asked *kíyad āsu svápatīś chandāyate*, in my tr. “For how long will their own lord find pleasure in them [=cows]?” with the referent of *svápati-* being Indra. In this passage the most natural interpr. of *svápati-* is not ‘his own lord, lord of himself’, but rather ‘their own lord’, referring to the cows. Although Ge’s interpr. of the larger context is different from mine, he tr. sim. “ihr Eigentümer.” There are (at least) two plausible ways in which *svá-* could have acquired this unexpected sense in this cmpd, and both may have contributed. On the one hand, *svá-* in this cmpd may not have the adj. sense ‘self/own’ but rather be based on the nominalized neut. *svám* ‘own property’, which is marginally attested in the RV (see VI.28.2 *ná svám muṣāyati* “he [=Indra] does not steal the own property [of the sacrificer]”). An analysis of *svá-* as ‘own property’ in this cmpd seems to underlie Thieme’s (Fremdling, p. 12) “der Herr des Eigentums” (master of the property) in X.27.8. Since the “own property” here is in fact the cows, it is not difficult to reinterpret the referent of *svá-* as the cows themselves: “lord of the property of/in cows” = “lord of the cows” → “the cows’ own lord.” The other contributor may be the fact that differently accented *svapatī-* is a bahuvrīhi, found once in the AV: AVŚ VIII.6.16 *yá imām samvívṛtsaty, ápatiḥ svapatīm stríyam*. “... whoever, not (her) husband, tries to embrace (?) this woman who has her own husband” (=AVP XVI.80.7, with *svapatīm*). Here, once again, the *sva-* is not coreferential with *-pati-*, but refers to the woman. (The use of *-pati-* not *-patnī-* in this fem. bahuvrīhi is noteworthy [see AiG II.1.90 with Nachtr.]; I would attribute it to the desire to match immediately preceding *ápati-* in this polarized expression.) This split reference, with *sva-* not coreferential with *-patī-*, might help enable split ref. in our non-bahuvrīhi.

The other two RVic occurrences of *svápati-* are harder to interpr. or, rather, less contextually defined and more amenable to a variety of interpr. In X.31.4 the referent of the whole cmpd. is Agni (or rather, he is the most likely referent of the pāda; see comm. ad loc.). He is also identified there as *nítyaḥ ... dāmūnāḥ* ‘constant / one’s own ... master of the house / domestic leader’. The default interpr. of *svápati-* as ‘self-lord, lord of himself’ could work here: Agni functions independently; at least once (I.36.7) he is called *svarāj-* and is frequently characterized as *svadhāvant-* ‘possessing autonomous power’. On the other hand, Ge tr. *nítyaḥ ... svápatiḥ* as “Der ständige Eigentümer (owner)” without comment; such a tr. might point to an interpr. of *svá-* as ‘(own) goods’, as discussed above. And this is certainly possible: Agni often holds sway over material goods; such goods could be his own or those of the household. And finally Re (EVP XVI.129) remarks that *nítya* reinforces *sva* in *svápati-*. I find this an appealing suggestion, though it requires a small detour through *nítya-*. This adj. can mean both ‘regular, constant’ and ‘one’s own, own proper’; the former is generally the sense continued in later

Sanskrit, but the latter is quite common in the RV, esp. used of relatives and friends. See, e.g., nearby X.39.14 *nītyaṃ nā sūnúṃ tánayam* “our own son who continues our lineage.” Since each household has its own fire, *nītya-* ‘own proper’ is an appropriate modifier of this household fire. If Agni in X.31.4 is “our (own) proper” (*nītya-*), he can also be “the lord of ourselves / our own lord” (*svá-pati-*), and this interpr. is what is reflected in the publ. tr. – though see the revisions to the whole vs. in comm. ad loc.

Finally, the occurrence of *svápati-* in our vs. Here the various alternative possibilities for the interpr. of this cmpd. are unrestrained by context. The referent is Indra. He can be ‘self-lord, lord of himself’ just as he is often *svarāj-* and operates with and possesses *svadhā-*. Certainly his control of all sorts of power is emphasized in the vs. But he could be ‘lord of goods/possessions’, since his power over material goods is constantly on the poets’ minds. And, finally, he can be ‘(our) own lord’, whom we are urging to come to our soma sacrifice. This last alternative underlies the publ. tr., but I would not now rule out either of the other two. Indeed all three may be meant simultaneously.

In bc Indra’s power and energy are expressed by three etymologically independent words beginning *tu / v. tūtuṣṭānās tūviṣmān / pratvakṣāṇāḥ*.

The sense of *dhármanā* is, as often, hard to pin down, but it needs to be evaluated in conjunction with the same word in 5d. I tr. it here as “according to his own principle,” which is shorthand for something like “his foundational essence,” the qualities and acts that define Indra. Indra is in a way the quintessence of power, which is his *dhárman-*, his “foundation.” And his actions projecting this power, as described in bcd, are done according to this foundational principle.

The *vísavā sáhāṃsi* over/beyond which Indra projects his vigor are presumably those of others.

X.44.2: The parallelism of the two *su-* cmpds in pāda a (*suṣṭhāmā ... suyāmā*), echoed by *supáthā* in c, is broken by my tr. “provides a good standing place ... easy to control,” but attempts to produce parallel tr. came out stilted.

X.44.3: This vs. recycles some previous material. Perhaps most obvious is the adj. *prátvakṣasam* beginning c, which matches the part. *pratvakṣāṇāḥ* beginning 1c. Otherwise, *nṛpátim* in a echoes *svápatiḥ* in 1a (though in a slightly different metrical position) and matches *nṛpate* in 2b; *vájrabāhum* recalls the clause in 2b *mimýákṣa vājraḥ ... gábhastau* “your mace is attached to your fist”; *taviṣāsaḥ*, used of his horses in b, is etymologically related to *tūviṣmān* modifying Indra in 1b, and *sadhamādaḥ* (d) echoes *mádāya* (1a); Indra as bull (*vṛṣabhām*) in c recalls his bulliness (*vṛṣnyena*) in 1d. There are also the vs.-internal echoes *indravāhaḥ* (a) ... *vahantu* (d) and *ugrām ugrāsaḥ* (b).

The sole finite verb in the vs., *vahantu*, is postponed till the last word, while its etymological-twin subject *indravāhaḥ* is the first full word; in between is an alternating sequence of nom. pls. and acc. sgs. that further specify the two parts of the cmpd. *-vāh-* and *indra-* respectively. The publ. tr. dampens this poetic effect by inserting two extra copies of the verb “let ... (them) convey,” in pādas a and b. These should, at the least, be put in parens.

X.44.4: The poet plays a few tricks on his audience in this vs., in part arising from the repeated material noted in the comm. to vs. 3. The first is the use of *pátim* in pāda a: since Indra was identified as some variety of *-pāti-* in each of the first three vss., our expectation, on

encountering *pátim* as the 2nd word in this vs., would naturally be that its referent is Indra as well. The next two acc. sgs., the hapax *droṇasācam* ‘companion of the cup, accompanying the cup’ and *sācetasam* ‘like-minded’ do not rule out this interpr.: the first is liable to various interpr. and the second is used once of Indra (I.61.10). But the beginning of b, *ūrjā skambhām* “the prop of nourishment,” would begin to call our identification into question, and the 2nd sg. verb *ā vr̥ṣāyase*, which should have Indra as subj., pretty much demolishes this hypothesis and forces us to produce another referent, namely soma.

The verb itself is ambiguous. The denom. stem *vr̥ṣāyá-* generally means ‘act the bull’; in this sense it is entirely medial, and the voice of our occurrence thus conforms. Indra is often the subject, and he is the likely subject here, and his association with bulls and bullishness is already prominent in the first part of the hymn (1d, 3c). However, several factors complicate this picture: the other occurrences of this stem do not take the acc., but most of the first hemistich here consists of an acc. phrase. And none of the denom. forms appear with the preverb *ā*. There is another, less well-attested stem *vr̥ṣāya-*, belonging to the root  $\sqrt{vr̥ṣ}$  ‘rain’, attested once in as an act. trans. *vr̥ṣāya* ‘make rain’ (X.98.1) and quite possibly in the middle in the meaning ‘rain’ in IX.71.3 (so Gr, Lub; I actually consider it a pun, like the similar form here [see below]). Perhaps more to the point, the zero-grade thematic stem *vr̥ṣa-* (6th cl. pres.? or them. aor.? – see Kü 474–77 [aor.]; Hill, Aor.-Präs 226–29 [pres.]) is also exclusively middle (mostly 2nd sg. impv. *vr̥ṣasva*) and exclusively found with the preverb *ā*. Although Kü argues that this stem belongs with the dominant *vr̥ṣāyá-* stem and means ‘sich erheben, sich ermannen’ (see also Baum, Impv. 130, ‘take courage’), Hill points out that it is almost always found in soma-drinking contexts; he assigns it to  $\sqrt{varṣ}$  ‘schütten’ (=  $\sqrt{vr̥ṣ}$  ‘rain’). Moreover, it can take an acc. (but only III.60.5) or gen. (regularly, e.g., X.116.1, 4) complement referring to soma, and several times also appears with the loc. *jāthāre* ‘in the belly’, as the destination for the soma (I.104.9, X.96.13). Such complements are not compatible with the ‘take courage’ interpr., as far as I can see. The preponderance of evidence thus favors a connection with  $\sqrt{vr̥ṣ}$  ‘rain, pour’, with soma metaphorically standing for rain. Taking account of the middle voice and the *ā*, I tr. ‘drench yourself (in [liquid])’. The *ā vr̥ṣāyase* in our passage tracks *ā vr̥ṣasva* closely, with the acc. phrase referring to the soma (see above). The VP also contains the loc. *dharúṇe*, which can be parallel in function to *jāthāre* in the *ā vr̥ṣasva* passages. Ge (n. 4b), flg. Sāy., suggests it means “die Grundlage in Indra, d.h. sein Bauch”; see also Scar (590 and n. 837). I now find this interpr. of *dharúṇe* appealing, against my colorless “upon its support,” and would now slightly emend the tr. to “drench yourself in the lord ..., (pour it) into your ‘support’.” I have argued for a similar usage for the abstract *dhāman-* ‘foundation, fundament’, transferred to a body part, in VIII.92.24 (Vedic Body Parts, 81–83), also in soma-drinking context. See comm. ad loc.

To sum up, I consider *ā vr̥ṣāyase* here to have a double meaning and a double stem affiliation: on the one hand, it belongs with other forms of *vr̥ṣāyate* meaning ‘acts the bull’, a sense supported by the other occurrences of bull words in the preceding vss. But more dominant is the sense ‘drench yourself, rain/pour into your self’, parallel to *ā vr̥ṣasva* belonging to  $\sqrt{vr̥ṣ}$  ‘rain’. To bring out the double sense I would slightly alter the tr. to “you act the bull / drench yourself ...”

Note the phonological echo in (*droṇa*)*sācam sāce(tasam)*; *droṇa-* and *dharúṇa* also respond to each other.

The image of Indra’s physical assimilation of soma is continued in pāda c with *ójaḥ kṛṣva*: “make it your might / make its might your own,” with the middle voice emphasizing the

internalization of the soma and its power – as well as *sám grbhāya tvé ápi* “take it entirely within you.”

Despite some problems it seems capricious to separate *kenipá-* here from *ākenipá-* in IV.45.6 and the *āke-* in that cmpd from *āké* in II.1.10. For *āké* as ‘in der Nähe’ see Gr s.v. and AiG II.2.519 (contrasting with, e.g., *parāké* ‘in der Ferne’). The unverbated form is found in *ākenipá-* in IV.45.6, and our *kenipá-* appears to be the result of false segmentation of this cmpd. (see, e.g., AiG II.2.744). Although the sandhi context here, *áso yáthākenipānām* in continuous text (analyzed by Pp. as *yáthā kenipānām*), would technically allow an analysis *yáthā \*ākenipānām* matching IV.45.6 *ākenipá-*, this is unlikely because of the caesura flg. *yathā*, as Old points out. Nonetheless some such ambiguous context probably set the stage for the false segmentation. Assuming that *nipá-* derives from *ní√pā* ‘protect’ (whatever the contribution of the preverb *nī*), note that that lexeme is found with contrastive locales in X.63.16 *sā no amā só áraṇe ní pātu* “Let it [= ‘well-being’ *svastī-*] keep guard over us at home and in a foreign place.” As to who “those who keep watch nearby” are, I suggest the patrons, although it could be some other group in the relevant Ārya community.

X.44.5: The first hemistich contains a pseudo figura etymologica, which is esp. clever because the figure is displaced: the two words belong to different clauses (separated by the pāda boundary), but the second, the noun, evokes its gapped twin as the object of the preceding verb. The relevant material is ... *ā hí sámśiṣam, svāśiṣam bhāram ā yāhi* ... The 1st sg. aor. *ā ... sámśiṣam*, to *√sams*, unusually lacks an overt object. It also unusually appears with the preverb *ā*, which is otherwise rare with this root in the RV. The verb is immediately followed, across the pāda boundary, by the bahuvrīhi *svāśiṣ-* ‘having good prayer(s)’, belonging to the root *√śās* and containing the root noun cmpd *āśiṣ-* ‘prayer’. The bahuvrīhi here modifies *bhāram* ‘offering, what is borne (forth)’: this physical offering is accompanied by good prayers. This NP is the goal of the impv. *ā yāhi*. The juxtaposition of the two clauses suggests that *ā ... sámśiṣam* gapped its original object, which can be recovered from the immediately following bahuvrīhi: *ā ... sámśiṣam \*āśiṣam / āśiṣaḥ* “I have pronounced my prayer(s).” This would look phonologically like a figura etymologica, but it of course is not, since *√sams* and *√śās* are distinct roots. Their apparent etymological relationship is furthered by the use of the preverb *ā* with the verb, matching the preverb in the root noun. The publ. tr. assumes a more realized figure than the Skt. text presents: it should read “I have expressed (my prayer),” with parens. (Ge’s rendering of *ā ... sámśiṣam* “denn ich rechne darauf” doesn’t seem to fall within the usual semantic range of *√sams* and can, I think, be ignored.)

The odd English “your cups cannot be ventured against” would be better as “your cups are inviolable.”

X.44.6: Ge suggests that pāda a contains the image of a race; this seems reasonable, and the winning of fame that the invocations achieve for themselves (note the middle *ākṛṇvata*) fits the picture well. I assume that the separate *devāhūti-* originate from separate sacrificers at distinct sacrifices, though if so, how is it that they all seem to win fame?

In any case the second hemistich provides a contrasting picture of sacrificial failures, memorably expressed in the striking “not able to board the ship of sacrifice.” Interpretation of this hemistich is considerably hampered by the impossible (Old “hoffnungslos”) hapax *képayah*, which presumably modifies or indeed is the plural subject of the 3rd pl. verbs in the two clauses, *śekúḥ* and *ny āviśanta*—and therefore presumably belongs to a stem *képi-*. I have no solution to

this word. Gr's connection to  $\sqrt{kamp}$  'tremble' (see also Whitney's [Roots], tentatively) with the gloss 'zitternd, zappelnd' founders on the phonology, not to mention the fact that the root  $\sqrt{kamp}$  is almost exclusively of late attestation (though see Gotō, 1st Cl. 110–12 for Kāthaka-Kap. attestations of the present stem); Kü (510) keeps the tr. ("die zappelnden (?)" ), though presumably as a placeholder. No other suggestion (see Old ad loc., EWA s.v.) is at all compelling. I do think that, as often with impenetrable hapaxes, it was contextually generated, at least partially. First note that the problematic hapax *kenipānām*, discussed at length above, is only two vss. previous (4d), and our word here, *képayah*, shares with that preceding one an initial *ke* (/ké) and a *p*, which seems to begin what might as well be the root syllable. I find it hard to believe that there's not some felt connection between *kenipānām* and *képayah*, esp. since they are both isolated. Note also that two verses later (8b) the hemistich-final *kopayat* shares phonology with *képayah* (6d) in the same metrical slot. These observations get us no closer to a meaning, a morphological analysis, or an etymology, but they do situate the problematic word in a context that favors its shape. The publ. tr.'s "\*non-protectors (?)" is not a serious attempt at any of the three issues just raised, but a mild suggestion that this word may be meant to be a negative contrastive play off the positive *kenipānām*.

X.44.7: Doubled and doubly accented *evaívá* occurs only here and in IV.54.5 as far as I can tell. In the latter passage it correlates with doubled (but singly accented) *yáthā-yathā*. In IV.54.5 the second accent of *evaívá* is secure, but here, as Old points out, the Saṃhitā text is ambiguous (*evaívāpāg*), and the second accent is dependent on the Pp analysis. The reason for the doubling in this vs. isn't clear to me; I doubt that it responds to the single *evā* in 4a; as shown below, in the rhetoric of this vs. it corresponds to *itthā*, which begins the 2nd hemistich, but that form isn't doubled.

Pāda b is 11 syllables and, courtesy of the final *āyuyujré*, has a Triṣṭubh cadence. Gr (also tentatively Arnold) suggests reading *\*āyuyujriré*, which would fix the problem. However, Old sensibly rejects the emendation, esp. in this hymn of mixed Jagatī and Triṣṭubh vss. See comm. ad IX.70.1.

Ge (n. 7) suggests that this vs. continues the thought of vs. 6, esp. 6ab. This seems correct. The apparent racing motif of 6ab is made more literal by the badly yoked horses in 7b, which cause their owners to fall behind. Beyond this there is no consensus on who is being contrasted with who(m), because there is no consensus on the sense in context of the ambiguous paired words *āpare* and *ūpare* or *āpāk* and *prāk*, or whether the first pair are nom. pl. m. or loc. sg. Ge takes the first pair as (near) synonyms (später and künftig). Since this makes it difficult to get a stark contrast between 7ab and 7cd, he decides the contrast is instead between the previous generations, identified as *prathamāḥ* in 6a, and new generations, referred to by *āpare* and *ūpare* in 7a and c. While *āpāk* and *prāk* he takes as opposites (zurück- and voraus), referring to different outcomes of ritual invocations. The point, he thinks, is that just as in the past (6) the results of invocations of the gods were variable (successful in 6ab, not in 6cd), so also are they now (unsuccessful in 7ab, successful in 7cd). Old, focusing on *āpāk* and *prāk*, takes these as cardinal directions, west and east respectively; for him the vs. concerns only one group of people, who are currently (7cd) doing well and facing east (the region of light), but who, as evil-doers, should end up facing west (the region of darkness). It is not clear to me what he does with *dāvāne* in c, which should problematize his interpr. of the people in that pāda as malevolent. Kü (407) also takes *āpāk* as 'westlich', but since he does not consider the 2nd half of the vs., it is not clear what contrasts he sees there.

Another problem for the interpr. is the lack of *syntactic* parallelism in the two halves, contrasting with the strict pairing of *lexical* items in pādas a and c. Lexically the two pādas line up exactly:

a:	<i>itthā</i>	<i>āpāk</i>	<i>āpare</i>	<i>santu</i>	<i>dūḍhyāḥ</i>
c:	<i>evaivā (yé)</i>	<i>prāk</i>	<i>ūpare</i>	<i>sānti</i>	<i>dāvāne</i>

But syntactically the two half-verses are skewed: ab consists of a main clause (a) and a rel. cl. dependent on it (b), but cd is, at least superficially, entirely made of dependent clauses, signaled by *yé* in c and *yātra* in d. We should instead have expected *\*(té) prāk ūpare \*sānti* to correspond with *āpāk āpare santu*. (Though note that 6c is also a relative clause; however, 6d is its corresponding main clause.) Old is troubled by the skewed syntax and considers several possibilities – including the one that I adopt, which he rejects.

Without sorting further through the various proposed interpr. of this vs., I will set out my choices: 1) I take *āpare* and *ūpare* as nom. pl., not loc.; 2) I do not consider them synonyms (as Ge does), though there is overlap in part of their semantic ranges in other contexts; instead, they are here functional opposites: *āpara-* ‘behind’ and *ūpara-* ‘nearer, close by’; 3) I do not take a and c as parallel single clauses, despite the superimposable line-up of the parallel words, but split c into two: a nominal relative cl. *yé prāk ūpare* “(those) who are nearer and facing forward,” with the main clause beginning with *sānti*, hence its accent: “they are (ready) to give.” There is no generational split (in the Ge mode) between vss. 6 and 7; rather both vss. present us with the same picture, of ritualists (6ab, 7cd) and their unsuccessful rivals (6cd, 7ab). As for d, I think it’s a temporal/circumstantial rel. -- the good guys are ready to give when the ritual patterns etc. are in place -- i.e., at the sacrifice. Ge (n. 7d) takes *yātra* as standing for *yéṣām* and pāda d as concerning the Dakṣiṇā; his interpr. depends on a dubious (to me) interpr. of *vāyunāni* as Rechtwege.

X.44.8: We now turn to the heroic deeds of Indra, expressed by an interesting series of tenses. The first deed, giving foundation to mountains and plains, is expressed with an augmented imperfect (*adhārayat* 8a). The actions performed by Heaven (b) are in the injunctive (*krandat ... kopayāt*), while Indra’s propping apart of Heaven and Earth (c), usually treated as another of Indra’s cosmogonic deeds, is in the present (*vī śkabhāyati*). I do not quite understand the present, unless it is a way to transition to the current ritual moment in d, where Indra himself recites (in the present *śamsati*). Or perhaps the separation of the two spaces is considered to be a daily action, since the disjunction between earth and heaven only becomes visually clear at dawn, every dawn. In any case the injunctives in b mediate between the imperfect of a and the present of c.

The depiction of Indra as performing like a poet/reciter at the sacrifice is striking; see Ge’s n. 8d for some parallels.

X.44.9: The hook or crook (*anikuśā-*) that the poet presents to Indra most likely stands for the hymn, as Ge points out (n. 9a), but the exact employment of this metaphorical implement requires discussion. The word appears 3x in the RV. In VIII.17.10 Indra is urged to use a long (*dīrghā-*) *anikuśā-* to hold out (*prayāchasi*) goods to the sacrificer. Although it is not clear from the passage how the long crook will enable Indra to hold out goods, the image must be a compressed one, which is illuminated by the use of the related word *anikín-* ‘having a hook/crook’ in III.45.4. There Indra is urged to shake down goods for us as if shaking a tree for its fruit: the hook allows its user to get purchase on the branch: *vṛkṣām pakvām phālam anikīva*

*dhūnuhīndra ... vāsu* “As a man with a crook shakes a tree for ripe fruit, o Indra, shake (us) goods ...” In VIII.17.10 the tree and the fruit and their shaking by means of the crook must be understood. A long *āṅkuśā-* and a tree branch (and the root  $\sqrt{yam}$ ) are also found in X.134.6, which seems to contain the same image, this time with the mediation of a goat: *dirghām hy āṅkuśām yathā śaktim bībharsī mantumaḥ / pūrveṇa maghavan padājo vayāṁ yāthā yamaḥ* “Because you carry your ability like a long crook, you rich in counsel / as a goat (holds) a branch with its forefoot, you will hold (a branch? fruit? goods?) (with your ability/crook), o bounteous one.” In the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the verse the crook must be understood in the instr. parallel to the goat’s forefoot, the instr. *padā*, with which the animal, on its hind legs, pulls the branch down and keeps it steady with its forefoot in order to eat the leaves and bark.

But in our passage, despite the presence of a hoof or hooves (*śaphārūj-*), it seems impossible to extract the tree branch / fruit / goat+forefoot image; instead Indra is aggressively wielding the *āṅkuśā-* against opponents identified as *śaphārūj-* ‘breaking (with) the hoof’(?). Indra uses the (metaphorical) *āṅkuśā-* to break or shatter them in turn, also with the root  $\sqrt{ruj}$ . This alternative use for the *āṅkuśā-* allows us to formulate a clearer picture of the tool. Since something like a shepherd’s crook ending in a semicircular hook would be an inefficient tool to use for breaking/shattering, the two uses of the *āṅkuśā-* in the RV suggest that the single tool incorporated two different devices (a sort of rudimentary Swiss Army knife), a hook and something suitable to use for breaking – a combination that exactly fits the Indian elephant goad, not coincidentally called an *āṅkuśa* (modern *āṅkus*, etc.). This stick-shaped device ends in a point, but has a hook protruding backwards from the handle right behind the pointed end. (See numerous images on the internet.) At least according to (quite possibly suspect) discussion in Wikipedia, there is archaeological evidence for these tools in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE, and, judging from the many images on the web, the shape of the elephant goad has remained stable for the ensuing two and a half millennia, which might suggest that even prior to its emergence in the archaeological and visual record, its form was set. (On the *āṅkuśa-* see also Trautmann, *Elephants and Kings*, 65–76.) So here Indra must be goading / ramming / sticking the *śaphārūj-* with the end of the *āṅkuśā-*, while in the other two occurrences he is using the hooked part to grab and shake a tree branch. A nice example of textual confirmation of the visual form of a piece of physical realia. We do not have to suppose the device was specialized for elephants at this period; any goadable animal would do.

Let us now turn to the object of the goading / breaking in this passage. The root-noun compd. *śaphārūj-* is found once elsewhere in the RV, in X.87.12, where it qualifies a sorcerer (*yātudhāna-*) against whom Agni is urged to act. But neither of these passages allows us to narrow down what heinous action these enemies perform. Although the publ. tr. (indeed most tr.) render it as a root noun compd with ACC first member (‘hoof-breaker’), there are in fact a number of possibilities, laid out in some detail by Scar (460–61), who does not choose among them. The uncertainty of the meaning is tied up with a formal problem. The Pp analyzes the compd as *śaphā-ārūjah* (likewise the form in X.87.12) (see also Gr s.v.), with the verbal lexeme  $\sqrt{ruj}$ , which is found elsewhere. The Pp also analyzes the opening of the pāda, *yénārūjāsi*, as *yéna ārujāsi* with the same preverb-verb combination. But root noun compounds with a nominal 1<sup>st</sup> member, esp. with object function, and a preverb+verb root combination are rare to non-existent – PREVERB + ROOT formations are of course very common; NOUN + ROOT formations likewise—but the two types are not ordinarily combined. See Scar (649 and n. 921), my 2020 Fs. Lamberterie article (p. 486), where I argue that a preverb has been gapped by rule in precisely this type of underlying NOUN + PREVERB-ROOT formation, and most recently and fully my Fs. Kellens article

(“Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian.” In *aṭ hōi aōjī zaraθuštrō paōuruuīm*; *Habló Zaraθuštra? Homenaje a Jean Kellens en su 80º aniversario*, ed. A. Cantera, E.V. Pirart, C. Redard. *Estudios Iranios y Turanios* 6 (2024): 137–43). This fact about root noun cmpds makes the *-ā-* in *śaphā-rúj-* a problem, one that already exercised Wackernagel (AiG II.1.213) about precisely this form. Obviously in order to avoid positing a preverb between the nominal 1st member and the root, Wackernagel divides the cmpd as *śaphā-rúj-* and hesitates between taking the *-ā-* as an instr. ending (‘breaking with hooves’) or as due to compositional lengthening. Scar considers both those possibilities, as well as the possibility that *śaphā* could be a collective or a dual (both as objects of *-rúj-*). He does also consider the Pp. analysis, with the lexeme *ā√rúj-*, but with the proviso that *ārúj-* would have to have been deeply anchored in the poet’s Wortschatz to allow the violation of root noun cmpd norms. Scar does not say anything about the verb that governs the cmpd in our passage, which, as we’ve seen, is taken by the Pp as *ārújāsī*. If this analysis of the verb were secure it would strongly suggest that the preverb is also incorporated in the root noun cmpd contrary to usual practice. However, the sandhi context is ambiguous: *yénārújāsī* could just as well be cut *yénā rújāsī*, with the final lengthening of *yénā* that is far from rare (acdg. to Lub 21x, v. 98 *yéna*, but the numbers of *yénā* could well be higher, since his *yéna* list contains numerous examples in which the rel. is combined with a following vowel in sandhi).

I can claim no more certainty than Wackernagel or Scar, but given the general ban on NOUN-PREVERB-ROOT combinations in root noun cmpds., I think the Pp. analysis of the cmpd as containing *ā√rúj* is unlikely, and we must find another way to account for the long *ā*. I also think that the finite verb in the same pāda lacks the preverb. For the cmpd. I am at least open to the idea that *śaphā-* is an instr. and the cmpd means ‘breaking/shattering with a hoof / hooves’. The use of an animal body part as a weapon could associate the sorcerer with the bestial and the primitive (as in other vss. concerning the *yātudhāna-* in X.87 at any rate)—though I am perhaps too influenced by the Western Christian image of cloven-footed Satan. In our passage, since Indra is urged to use an (elephant) goad against the *śaphā-rúj-*, the enemies might again be considered animal-like (though not elephants obviously, since they don’t have hooves). In any case, as an alternative tr. I would consider and indeed favor “against those who break with their hooves.”

X.44.10–11: For these repeated vss. see comm. ad X.42.10, 11.

**X.45–47:** The first two hymns (45–46) are dedicated to Agni and attributed to the same poet, Vatsaprī Bhālandana. As Old argued (1888: 236 n. 2), the next one, X.47, dedicated to Indra, belongs here as well on the basis of structural considerations: the three appear between groups identified by the Anukramaṇī as trios and also share Triṣṭubh meter (though on X.46 see below), against the triads on each side with Jagatī. The Anukramaṇī names the poet of X.47 as Saptagu Āṅgīrasa, but this has simply been extracted from vs. 6, where the two halves of the supposed name are qualifiers of the god Bṛhaspati.

The poet of X.45–46, Vatsaprī Bhālananda, is also identified by the Anukramaṇī as the poet of the first of the trimeter hymns in Maṇḍala IX, IX.68. The last hemistich of IX.68 (10cd) is identical to that of X.45 (12cd). Old (1888: 253) explicitly associates IX.68 with the Xth Maṇḍala and, more narrowly, X.45. IX.68 is concerned with the double birth of Soma and hidden versus visible forms of the same god, and these themes are important in X.45 and X.46, esp. the former, which treats the triple births of Agni.



## X.45 Agni

X.45.1: The three births of Agni. The ordinals *prathamám* ‘first’, *dvitīyam* ‘second’, and *trtīyam* ‘third’, distributed through the first three pādas mark this structure well, but note that there is syntactic variation. The first pāda begins with ABL + POSTPOS. (*divás pári*), with close sandhi; in the second the ordinal intervenes in the same syntactic construction (*asmát ... pári*); whereas in the third the location of the birth (*apsū*) substitutes for the source. In b the form of Agni is identified explicitly as Jātavedas; in c the ‘waters’ point to Apām Napāt. The heavenly source of the first birth, in pāda a, suggests Agni Vaiśvānara, the solar form of fire, and *vaiśvānarā-* appears in the last vs. of the hymn (12b), sketching an implied ring.

The second hemistich is structurally ambiguous; see Ge’s (n. 1cd) and Re’s extensive discussions. On the basis of pādas a and b, where Agni is in the nominative, we expect the third birth also to be couched in the nominative, with the verb *jajñe* in pāda a serving for both b and c. This expectation seems to be supported by nom. *ṛmanāḥ*, an epithet characteristic of gods (mostly Indra, however). Re in fact renders the pāda this way, ending the cl. before *ājasram* at the end of c: “une troisième fois (il est né) dans les eaux, (le dieu) qui pense en seigneur.” The *ājasram* must be an acc., object of the part. *īndhānaḥ* ‘kindling’ that begins d, and so the Agni reference must have shifted to the accusative before the end of c. However, it would be awkward to have a nominative and an accusative, adjacent to each other in the same pāda, both referring to Agni, with a clause break between them. This awkwardness is greatly increased by the near paraphrase of 1cd in 3ab *samudré tvā ṛmánā apsv àntāḥ, ... idhe ...* “In the sea, in the waters has the one with a manly mind kindled you,” where *ṛmánāḥ* must refer to a priest-figure, not Agni, who is unambiguously the acc. *tvā* – a paraphrase that gives Re pause. (As an aside, *ṛmánas-* also refers to a human ritualist in X.92.14, by my interpr.) It therefore seems best to follow Old and Ge in taking cd as a single clause, with an unsignaled switch of Agni to the acc. throughout the hemistich and *ṛmánāḥ* qualifying the priestly subject of the participle and finite verb in d.

The verb of d, *jarate*, could belong to either ‘awake’ or ‘sing’; Ge and Re opt for the former, but, with Gr and Gotō (1st cl., 154), I assign it to ‘sing’. Very little rides on this decision.

X.45.2: The four pāda-initial *vidmā* ‘we know’ produce a strong impression of certainty.

Both Ge and Re supply ‘forms’ with *tredhā trayāṇi* “threefold triads.” This seems unduly limiting: the poet is referring to different sets of three that pertain to Agni. Most obvious, given the preceding vs., are his three births, but surely any mention of three and Agni will evoke the three ritual fires. Since *trayāṇi* is pl., we might hope for more than these two triads – three to be exact, but the third is harder to identify: perhaps it’s an oblique reference to the service to the fire at the three soma pressings. Or perhaps to the ritual fire, the household fire, and the cremation fire (or the wildfire), or to the sun, lightning, and the earthly fire. In any case the neatly numbered triads contrast with pāda b *dhāma víbhṛtā purutrā* “domains dispersed in many places,” which I think refers to the fire found in every household; the *purutrā* indicates that there is no limit placed on the number. (For an almost identical expression, see X.80.4; see also III.55.4 and comm. thereon.)

The “highest hidden name” in c is implicitly single, thus contrasting with the multiplication of Agnis in pādas a and b. I don’t know if we are meant to identify this name, but it might be Vaiśvānara, as I suggested also for 1a. The appearance of this name in the last vs. (12b) would indicate that we are displaying the knowledge we assert in this vs.

Pāda d, concerning Agni's source, returns us to vs. 1, particularly the opening phrase *divās pári* "from heaven."

X.45.3: As noted ad vs. 1, the first hemistich of this vs. is a close paraphrase of 1cd. However, the vs. as a whole seems to reverse the neat progression of births in vs. 1. The first pāda here concerns the kindling in the waters (=1c); in our c the ordinal *ṭṛtīya-* opens the pāda, as in 1c, but in the loc., modifying *rājasi* 'realm'. The other occurrences of *ṭṛtīya- rājas-* (IX.74.6, X.123.8; cf. also IX.86.27 *ṭṛtīye prṣṭhé ádhi rocané diváh*), insofar as they can be interpr., seem to refer to heaven, or the highest part of heaven, and so it seems likely that cd here refers to Agni's residence and growth in heaven, which would then correspond to 1a. The middle pāda, b, would thus seem to match the birth in between, found in 1b, but the match is not exact if 1b depicts the kindling of the fire on the ritual ground. Ge (n. 3b) identifies the "the udder of heaven" (*diváh ... ūdhan*) as a cloud, though this is disputed by Lü (390–91), who wants to see yet another Himmelsquell. Ge's cloud would at least place this kindling in the midspace. But as often these riddling locales are hard to penetrate. Re thinks there are only two events in this vs. – Agni, residing in the waters (a), is kindled in b; Agni residing in heaven (c) is raised by buffalo in d. But the parallelism with vs. 1 favors a trio.

Buffalos, Agni, and the lap of the waters are found together in two other passages, neither of which is much help with this one (or vice versa). In VI.8.4 unidentified buffalos "grasped" Agni in the lap of the waters (*apām upasthé mahiṣā agrbhnata*); in X.8.1 Agni is himself the buffalo, but the verb is √ *vṛdh* as in our passage here: *apām upásthe mahiṣo vavardha*. The only possible clue in these passages is that VI.8.4 concerns Agni Vaiśvānara in particular (VI.8.4cd), and if our cd concerns the birth/growth in heaven, this would be (as noted above) Agni as Vaiśvānara. Also relevant may be X.5.1 also treating the birth of Agni in enigmatic terms.

X.45.4: I would now change my tr. of *ákrandat* "has roared" to a simple preterite "roared," flg. immed. on similarly augmented imperfect *avardhan* ending 3d.

With Old I interpr. *kṣāmā* as an elliptical dual; the two world halves of d (*ródasī*) support this interpr. Ge and Re take it as a sg., referring only to earth, presumably following Gr's explanation of the final *-ā* as metrical lengthening. Although the earth is the primary locale for the spreading and "licking" of fire, the rising flames can also be seen as licking at heaven.

X.45.5: *udārā-* is found only here in the RV, though it is fairly common later. Ge renders it 'freigebig' on the basis of later usage, but the usage of the fairly common verbal lexeme *úd√r* in the RV is surely a better comparandum – as in, for example, nearby X.37.4 *yéna sūrya ... , jágac ca víśvam udiyārṣi bhānúnā* "and with which radiance you rouse up every moving creature, o Sūrya" or, with bounties/gifts as obj. (more or less as here), VI.44.12 *úd abhrāñīva stanáyann iyartíndro rádhāmsy áśvyāni gávyā* "Like the thunderer the rain clouds, Indra raises bounties of horses and cattle." It's esp. noteworthy that transitive *iyarti* is found two vss. later in our hymn (7c), with Agni as subject (and smoke as obj.), and the flg. pāda begins with *úd*, though probably to be construed with the participle *ínakṣan*.

Given its accentuation *sóma-gopāh* should be a bahuvrīhi – as I take it (also Old, Re, and Scar [304]), *pace* Gr, Ge. The latter (n. 5b) notes that all commentators take it as a tatpuruṣa, though he reluctantly acknowledges that it could be a bv.

X.45.6: The word order of pāda a favors an interpr. of a pair of GEN – NOUN constructions; so Ge “Das Banner des Alls, das Kind der Welt” (also Gr). This interpr. would also fit well with the chiasitic pair of GEN – NOUN NOUN – GEN that opens the previous vs. (5a). But the very common phrase *vísva- bhúvana-* cuts the other way (so Re as well as the publ. tr.), suggesting that we should take the two genitives together and that this gen. phrase is dependent on *kétuḥ*, with *gárbhaḥ* is to be taken separately. Either interpr. would fit here, and there is little practical difference.

Ge (n. 6cd) identifies the second hemistich as an instantiation of the Paṇi myth. The parallel he cites, I.71.2, certainly concerns the breaking of the Vala cave by the Aṅgirasas, and it is in an Agni hymn. But Agni is not, to my knowledge, elsewhere a principal actor in the Vala affair; he is at best connected by his kinship with the Aṅgirasas and the association of both the Vala myth and Agni with dawn (see, e.g., IV.1, an Agni hymn with an embedded account of the Vala myth). In our vs. I do not know what mythic (or ritual) event is referred to by “he split even the solid rock in leaving it.” The Vala theme recurs in 11cd, where the priests open the cowpen.

X.45.7: I construe *pāvakāḥ* with flg. *aratīḥ* on the basis of the phrase in the paired hymn, X.46.4c *aratīm pāvakām* (a vs. that also contains *uśj-* in its first pāda). Ge/Re/Th (Unters. 35) instead take *pāvakāḥ* with *uśík*; there is precedent for this as well: I.60.4 *uśík pāvakāḥ*, cited by Ge (n. 7a). However, the parallel in X.46, immediately following and attributed to the same poet, should have more weight. Little rides on the decision, however.

X.45.8: I would now take *ḍṛśānó rukmāḥ* as a non-overtly marked simile “appearing (like) a bright ornament,” similar to Ge’s “(Wie) ein Goldschmuck aussehend.” Several parallels adduced by Ge (n. 8a) do have overt similes: IV.10.5 *śrīyé rukmó ná rocata upāké* “For beauty it shines like a gold ornament in the nearness” and VII.3.6 *vī yád rukmó ná rócasa upāké* “when, like a jewel, you glow nearby” (jpb), and *ḍṛśānāḥ* in our passage acts as a de facto simile marker. Note that both the just-cited passages have a verbal form of  $\sqrt{ruc}$  making an etym. figure with *rukmá-*, as does our passage, though postponed till the end of b: *śrīyé rucānāḥ*. Dat. *śrīyé* is also found in IV.10.5.

The phrase *durmárṣam āyuh* is variously construed. I take it as acc. extent of time; Re supplies a verb to which it serves as obj.: “(en sorte d’atteindre) une durée-de-vie inoubliable.” Gr seems to take it as a sort of Inhaltsakk. (s.v.  $\sqrt{ruc}$  meaning 2 [found only here]: “etwas [A] ausstrahlen, herbeistrahlen”). I’m not sure what syntactic role the phrase is meant to be playing in Ge’s “in unvergesslicher Lebenskraft zur Pracht erglänzend.” Sāy. takes *durmárṣam* as an adv., glossed *durabhibhavam*, separate from *āyuh*. Of these choices I favor my extent of time, as requiring less machinery and also belonging to a recognized syntactic class.

Assuming, contra Sāy., that *durmárṣam* is to be construed with *āyuh*, why is this lifetime ‘hard to forget’ (or, less likely, ‘hard to neglect’)? Most likely unforgettable because of its extraordinary length – or its brilliance? The two other occurrences of this stem are not much help. In IX.97.8 (q.v.) it qualifies *vāṇām* ‘music’, but a “music” that may be likened to the raucous honking of geese – hence either ‘difficult to forget’ or ‘... to neglect’ is possible. In VIII.45.18, acdg. to my emended tr. (see comm. ad loc.), *durmárṣa-* also modifies a sonic element, in that case a call (*imām hāvam*) and means “difficult to neglect” (i.e., to fail to pay attention to), and a number of the verbal forms to the root  $\sqrt{mṛṣ}$  also take speech or the like as obj. (I.145.2 *vācaḥ*, III.33.8 *vācaḥ*, VII.22.5 *gíraḥ ... suṣṭutīm*). However, ‘lifetime’ does not fit this semantic pattern.

X.45.10: The transaction envisaged between Agni and his worshiper is more complex than it first appears. Agni is urged to give him a portion in two different things: *sauśravéṣu* (a) and *ukthá-ukthe ... śasyámāne* (b). The second, “in every solemn speech being proclaimed,” identifies it as a ritual act, which suggests that “in (things) deserving good fame” the otherwise unidentified *sauśravá-* falls in the same semantic domain, that of ritual activity (so Ge: “an ruhmreichen Werken”). This further suggests a two-step process: Agni does not directly give the worshiper in question a share in various desirable things (cows, horses, gold, or, in this case [see d] sons), but in the ritual acts that will indirectly yield such things, by pleasing the gods who bestow them.

Although the root noun cmpd *udbhíd-* is attested a robust 8x in the RV, this is the only instance of a verbal form of this lexeme in our text. On the lexeme see comm. ad VIII.79.1, with lit. The literal sense ‘burst out/up’ leads to the metaphorical use ‘be (dramatically) successful, have a breakthrough, get a lucky break’, esp. in gambling context, and that (minus the gambling) must be meant here. Notice that *√bhid* recurs here from 6c, where Agni is subject.

X.45.11: Ge (n. 11cd) again identifies the 2nd hemistich as the Paṇimythos (that is, the Vala myth); see above ad 6cd.

#### X.46 Agni

Although the Anukramanī gives the meter of this hymn as Triṣṭubh, it is actually a mixture of Triṣṭubhs and Virāj (5 / 5) vss. and those that could be either one (depending on distraction or not) or neither. As an ex., consider vs. 1 with three 10-syl. pādas (caesura after 5) followed by a regular Triṣṭubh (likewise caesura after 5). For further on the meter of the hymn see Old, Prol. 91 and Noten ad loc.

X.46.1: The hymn opens with the preverb *prá-*, with no associated verb in the first pāda. Although *prá-* does occur marginally with *√sad-*, which supplies the verb in b (and Gr so identifies this passage), Ge (see his n. 1ab), Re, and the publ. tr. supply a verb of motion with *prá-* rather than construing it with *sīdat* in b. For good reason: in addition to the fact that the expression ‘go forth’, realized by various verbs of motion (esp. *√i-*), is extremely common, elliptical *prá-* is the structural skeleton of the hymn, opening the middle vs. (5) and the last pāda (10d); see disc. ad locc.

The hapax *nabho-víd-* is generally taken as ‘cloud-*knower*’ (Gr, Ge, Re); Scar’s gloss (484) hedges (“des Gewölks kundig; Wolken findend”), but he tr. “Kenner des Nassen” in the passage. Ge explains (n. 1ab) that Agni is at home in the cloud(s), since one of his births takes place there (see X.45.3b, acdg. to Ge, with comm. ad loc.). But are “knowing” and “being at home in” the clouds the same thing? Without any certainty I have opted for ‘cloud-*finder*’, the image being Agni’s smoke and flames rising to the clouds on their way to heaven.

Pāda c (*dádhir yó dhāyi śá te váyāmsi*) is oddly constructed: the rel. cl. / main cl. dyad, with *yáḥ* corresponding to *śá* is of course unexceptionable, but the *dádhiḥ* that opens the pāda is taken by all (Ge, Re, publ. tr.) as the referent of *śá* and the verb substitute in the main cl., with *váyāmsi* as obj. On the one hand, this makes good sense: redupl. nominals of this type regularly show verbal rection; see, for example, the three such phrases in VI.23.4 *babhír vájram papíḥ sómam dadír gāḥ* “bearing his mace, drinking soma, giving cows,” with the well-attested *dadí-* ‘giving’, rhyme form to our hapax *dádhi-* (though with different accent). Moreover, the VP *váyas √dhā* is very common, also in the root noun cmpd *vayo-dhā-*. But the interpr. represented by,

e.g., the publ. tr. “He who has been established establishes vital powers for you” would be an egregious example of an embedded relative clause, with *yó dhāyī* inserted between the main cl. subject and the rest of that cl., and, further, a tr. literally reflecting the word order would be awkward. I now think that *dādhih* is a predicate nominative with the rel. cl. verb *dhāyī* and that we must supply a verb form of *√dhā* in the main clause, with subj. *sá*. I would now alter the tr. to “Who has been established as the establisher, he (establishes / has established) vital powers for you.” Although this creates more machinery, I think it better represents the word order.

The agent noun *yantár-* is found with both nominal and verbal rection, even though the suffix-accented form should only take the genitive. Our form takes the acc. here.

X.46.1–3: Vss. 2 and 3 are partially concerned with the well-known myth of the flight and concealment of the ritual fire and his finding and reinstatement. But the ritual here-and-now exerts its oppositional pull: both vss. begin with the near-deictic *ímám* ‘this one here’, pointing to the fire on the ritual ground at the time of recitation. The vss. are also connected by concatenation, which also ties vs. 1 to vs. 2: 1d *vidhaté* / 2a *vidhánto*, along with 1b *apām upásthe* / 2a *apām sadhásthe* // 2d *ichánto ... avindan* / 3a *avindat ichán*. The question is whether vs. 1 also contains a reference to the flight and concealment myth, esp. in 1b where Agni “sits/sat in the lap of the waters” – comparable to the *apām sadhásthe* in 2a. I’m inclined to think not: that *apām upásthe* in 1b is instead alluding to the same event as in the preceding hymn, X.45.3d, which seems to deal with one of Agni’s births. But since I’m rather hazy about what’s going on in that vs., I am far from certain about this one.

X.46.2: The first pāda is identical to II.4.2, which likewise makes reference to the flight and concealment myth. In both I would now emend the tr. “having done honor” to “doing honor,” in part to match the dat. *vidhaté* “to the man who does honor” in 1d, but also because the act of honoring Agni does not have to precede the following / finding him treated in the rest of the vs. In fact, I would be tempted to assign *vidhántaḥ* to the ritual here-and-now represented by *ímám* except that *√vidh* does not take an acc. of the honoree, but a dative, so *ímám* cannot be the direct obj. of the participle. Assuming the participle belongs with the rest of the mythic material in the vs., the likeliest sequence is that they do honor to Agni hidden in the water *after* they have pursued and located him.

Our pādas bc are also quite close in wording to I.65.1–2, which also treats this Agni myth. See comm. ad loc.

X.46.3: Like vs. 2 the first half of this vs. concerns the seeking and finding of the vanished Agni, but it is not clear that it refers to the same episode. The finder, Trita Vaibhūṣa, is different (from the Bhṛguṣ in 2d), and also, it seems, the find spot: “on the head of an inviolable cow” (*mūrdhāny āghnyāyāḥ*). Ge (n. 3) suggests that this resembles the version of the story in which Agni spends one of his nights on the lam between the horns of a ram (TS VI.2.8.4, ŚB III.5.2.18, etc.), but the two versions seem too divergent. Re cites as parallel I.30.19 *āghnyāsya mūrdhāni* “on the head of the inviolable (bull),” of the place where the Aśvins anchor one wheel of their chariot. This is a good match verbally (save for the gender); I suggest there that this is a mystical expression for the ritual ground, but that is unlikely here. Perhaps it simply refers to the earth. It might be worth noting that Trita destroys a three-headed monster in X.8.8–9 (though the ‘head’ word is *śíras-*), and that in that same hymn Agni seizes the head (*mūrdhān-*) of his parents

(X.8.3) and sets his own head (also *mūrdhān-*) in heaven (X.8.6), but I can't make anything of that for our vs, here.

Trita's patronymic (different from Trita Āptya found elsewhere) is *vaibhūvasá-*, found only here – abbreviated from \**vaibhū-vasava-* (Mayr, PN s.v.), to the bvr. *vibhū-vasu-* 'possessing conspicuous goods', twice of Soma. Trita (without patronymic) is also found in the nearby hymn X.48.2 (by a different poet) as a recipient of cows, though it is not clear if the two Tritas are connected.

The second hemistich brings us back to the ritual ground and current time.

The sense of *śevṛdha-*, presumably haplologized from \**śéva-vṛdha-*, is hard to pin down; see disc. ad V.87.4. I would here slightly alter the publ. tr. to "with kind attention" for the sake of the English.

X.46.4: The phrase *uśíjo nāmobhiḥ* is repeated in pāda a from 2c, both in the post-caesura position.

Most of the first hemistich consists of accusatives (mostly?) referring to Agni; *akṛṇvan* has to be imported from the second hemistich to govern them, as well as governing the accusatives in cd. There are several ways to interpr. the acc. in ab. One way, fld. by Ge and Old, is to allow the agent noun *netāram* to take both an acc. obj. (*prāñcam yajñām* to its left) and a gen. obj. (*adhvarāñām* to its right), although the suffix-accented *-tār-*stem should only take the gen. (but see *yantār-* above, 1d). Hence Ge's "der das Opfer vorwärts führt, zum Leiter des Gottesdienstes." The other, fld. by Re and the publ. tr., is to take *prāñcam yajñām* and *netāram adhvarāñām* as two separate objects of *akṛṇvan*, both with secondary predication: "made the sacrifice (to) advance and (Agni) the leader of the ceremonies." Old provides a good parallel (VII.19.1) for a suffix-accented *-tār-*stem with acc. and gen. rection simultaneously; Ge adduces several passages (X.66.12, 101.2) where *prāñcam yajñām* is the object of *prá √ nī*. These parallels support the Ge/Old interpr., which is also favored by the fact that construing *yajñām* directly with *√ kṛ* would interrupt the parade of statements about Agni. On the other hand, see I.18.8 *prāñcam kṛṇoty adhvarām* "he makes the ceremony advance" and III.1.2 *prāñcam yajñām cakṛma* "we have made the sacrifice advance," with the construction presupposed by the publ. tr., and see Re's comm. In the end I think either interpr. is possible, and I would allow an alternative "... made him the gladdening Hotar-priest, the one who leads the sacrifice forward, and the leader of the ceremonies."

On *aratím pāvakám* see X.45.7 in the immed. preceding hymn.

Re construes *havyavāham* separately from *dádhatāḥ* ("ils firent (de lui) ... convoyeur d'offrandes, en (le) plaçant chez les humains"), but 10a *dadhiré havyavāham* speaks for the VP.

X.46.5: Note that the 2nd pentad of the first three pādas begins with a disyllabic noun with light first syllable ending in *-ām*: a *mahām*, b *purām*, c *vanām*, the second two of which are gen. pl. to root nouns. The fourth pāda is likewise 10 syllables but, with an apparent opening of 4, is a Virāṣthāna vs. (so Arnold, HvN). Analyzed in this way, the simile particle (which is badly positioned anyway – see below) would follow the caesura, coalesced with the flg. noun. Now it is my impression (though I have not sorted through the 2000+ exx. of *ná*) that simile-marking *ná*, like *iva*, does not immediately follow the caesura. Moreover, Arnold (§122) states that *ná* 'as' is ordinarily found in hiatus with flg. vowel (approx. 60x) and combined only 3x – our passage and I.104.5, X.106.7 "no one of the instances being quite certain." If we distract *nārvāṇam* to *ná árvāṇam*, we would get a regular 11-syllable Triṣṭubh, but with a quite irregular break ( \_ \_ ) after

a five-syllable opening (if we assign *ná* to the opening to avoid a post-caesura position). But *árvāṇam* may be our problem (or one of them). It's notable that *árvāṇam* is the only acc. sg., indeed the only non-nom. sg., to the putative stem *árvan-*, beside quite frequent nom. sg. *árvā*, which serves as the de facto nom. sg. to *árvant-*. I wonder if we should read *\*árvām* here, along with distracted *ná*, that is, a pentad vs., *hírīśmaśruṃ ná \*árvām dhánarcam*. This would allow the *ná* to avoid both post-caesura position and coalescence and also provide us with another pentad-opening disyllable nominal ending in *-ām*. This proposed form *\*árvām* would be a nonce, created to the nom. sg. *árvā*, and liable to redactional correction, in this case to match *dharmāṇam*, which ends pāda b.

This vs. presents us with a number of other problems, beginning with the 1st pentad: the sequence as analyzed by the Pp., *prá / bhūḥ / jáyantam*, cannot be easily construed. If *bhūr* (*/bhūḥ*) is taken as a 2nd sg. root aor. injunctive (the only possible verb form, though see Scar below), we are lacking a likely addressee (Sāy., in his first analysis, supplies voc. *stotar*), and the sense of *prá √bhū* 'overcome, dominate' would not work well with Agni as object. Various solutions have been suggested, which I will not rehearse; see Old, Ge n. 5a and vol. IV.269, Re ad loc., Scar 262 and n. 361. The most appealing and perhaps the oldest is *bhūrjáyantam*, registered already by Sāy. as Udgītha's reading. But Udgītha further analyzes it as *bhūrādīm̐ lokāñ jáyantam*. Ludwig (cited by Old and Ge) takes the same proposed *bhūrjáyā*- rather as a denom. to the unclear *bhūrj-* (AV, SV; see EWA s.v.). Whatever its further analysis is, the univerbation to an *-áya*-participle with root syllable *bhūrj*, which requires no alteration to the Saṃhitā text, seems the best of the proposals. In the publ. tr. my "\*glittering" reflects an analysis as an intrans. *-áya*-formation built to the zero-grade of *√bhrāj* 'shimmer, glitter', which is used frequently of Agni, the same zero-grade as is found in *bhūrjā*- 'birch' (see EWA s.v.). Scar's (n. 361) first proposal is close to mine: a denom., to *\*b<sup>h</sup>rHǵ-ó-* (rather than an *-áya*-formation built to the zero-grade root, like me), meaning (acdg. to the tr. in the text) "der hell hervorstrahlt (?)"; unaccountably he gives the resulting form with short vowel, as *\*bhurjáy°*. But the rest of his n. 361 is devoted to an alternative: an attempt to pry a 3rd pl. root aor. out of *bhūr*, which is unlikely. Another alternative analysis has recently been suggested by R. Ginevra (UCLA Conf. Proc. 2016), that *bhūrjáyā*- is the *s*-mobile-free version of *sphūrjáyā*- 'crackle, roar', used of Agni in X.87.11 – both belonging to a putative PIE root *\*(s)b<sup>h</sup>rǵ(h₂)g*. He also derives the name *bhṛgu-* from this root; note the occurrence of the name in 2d. (Ginevra's proposed tr. for our passage, "sizzling," seems inapt, but 'crackling' or 'roaring' would do nicely.) Ginevra's proposal is appealing and certainly possible, but I will stick with the *√bhrāj* derivation. For further on his proposed root, see comm. ad X.68.1.

With the supposed injunctive *bhūḥ* off the table, the initial *prá* needs a home. As I said above (ad vs. 1), elliptical *prá* serves as the structural skeleton of this hymn. Our vs. has echoes of 1a: cf. 1a *prá ... mahān nabhovíd* 5a *prá ... mahām vipodhām*. As for the construction of *prá* here I would supply (or simply read backwards) *náyantah*, which opens the 2nd hemistich (see also *netāram* in 4b). Given the accent on *prá*, this seems preferable to reading it as in technical tmesis with the immediately following participle (as Scar seems to do).

We have already discussed the metrical and morphological problems with d, but the *ná* there poses another difficulty: the adj. it follows does not appear to be part of the simile, despite the well-nigh unbreakable rule that *ná* does not begin a simile. (It of course usually follows the first word, but can sometimes follow the second – and occasionally there is intervening material between the first word and the simile – but never [as far as I know] does it precede the first word.) Here by all accounts the simile consists only of *árvāṇam* (or *\*árvām*; see above) or at most

*ārvāṇam dhānarcam* (see Ge n. 5d). The adj. *hīriśmaśru-* ‘gold-bearded’ is used of Agni also in V.7.7, with the image presumably the flames shooting out of the center of the fire. It is highly unlikely that it is meant to describe the steed in the simile: “like a gold-bearded steed.” I do not have a real solution to the *ná*-flip, but if my proposal for the metrical and morphological situation in d given above is accepted, the rhetorically driven pattern of X-*ām* opening the second pentad of each pāda might have caused the displacement of *ná*, to allow *\*ārvām* to occupy that slot.

Finally we have the hapax *dhānarcam*, on which see esp. Old, with previous proposals. Perhaps influenced by the SV variant *dhanarcīm*, several interpr. take the 2nd member as ‘shining’ vel sim.: Gr ‘Glanz der Beute, des Reichtums habend, glänzende Beute tragend’, Re ‘qui ... brille sous l’enjeu’. Both Ge and Old by contrast connect the 2nd member to ‘sing’; Old’s interpr. (q.v.) seems over-busy. Ge (n. 5d) points out (correctly) that only the first part of the cmpd. is strictly applicable to the ‘steed’ in the simile: the steed receives a prize (*dhāna-*) appropriate to the race, whereas the *ṛc-* is only appropriate to Agni. Ge tr. “der sich den Preis aussingen,” with a verbal interpr. of the 2nd member. I prefer my double noun (*dhāna-* + *ṛc-*) interpr.: “for whom a verse is the prize”; in other words, Agni is rewarded with praise poetry after his victory in the equivalent of a race. Very sim. is Scar’s (262) “wobei die ihm zugeeignete (=dessen) Ṛc der { von ihm gewonnene } Kampfpreis ist.”

X.46.6: It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that nom. Trita in pāda a = Agni here; Agni is clearly the nom. referent in c, and Trita apparently performs the same action (sitting: *sīdat*) as Agni did in 1b. But in vs. 3 Trita is emphatically *not* Agni; rather he finds the vanished Agni. Ge (n. 6a) cites Ludwig’s opinion that Agni is called Trita because Trita discovered him, but this seems a bit ad hoc. In any case the first hemistich depicts the fire’s installation (note *nī* in a, in tmesis with *sīdat* in b) on the ritual ground.

On *pastyā*- see comm. ad I.40.7, IX.97.18.

On *parivīta*- see comm. ad IV.3.2. I think it likely that this refers to the surrounding of the ritual fire by the *paridhī*- ‘enclosing sticks’.

While the 1st hemistich depicts – again! – the installation of the fire on the ritual ground, the second one, in my view, treats Agni’s journey to the gods in heaven conveying the oblations to them. By this interpr. *nīn* ‘superior men’ at the end of the d refers to the gods, as so often. The verbal form *īyā<sup>te</sup>* is regularly used of this journey of Agni’s; cf., e.g., VII.3.3 *sām dūtó agna īyase hí devān* “For as our messenger, o Agni, you speed to the gods.”

The next puzzle is *saṃgṛbhya*: what, if anything, is its object? Both Ge and Re take *nīn* at the end of d as the object (both construing it also with *īyate*). Old instead supplies ‘goods’ vel sim.: “von dort zusammenfassend (Güter, Gaben ...),” adducing I.53.3, also beginning *ātaḥ saṃgṛbhya*, where *vāsu*, which ends the preceding pāda, is to be read as object. Cf. also III.54.15 *saṃgṛbhyā na ā bhārā bhūri paśvāḥ* “Having massed it together, bring to us here an abundance of livestock.” The publ. tr. follows Old: “having amassed (goods?),” but I now wonder if, with my current interpr. of the purport of cd, “the oblations” or similar should be supplied instead.

*vidharmanā* ‘through/with the/his spreading expanse’ can refer either to the expanse of the midspace between earth and heaven through which Agni’s smoke passes or the expansion of the smoke itself. On this stem see comm. ad IX.4.9, 64.9.

On *ayantrā*- Old says firmly “offenbar Bahuvr.” The question is what missing nominal notion it modifies. Old supplies “mit Kräften, Helfern,” while Ge (n. 6d) suggests ‘hands’ or ‘reins’. I think it more likely to be horses : Agni’s reinless horses are the billows of smoke,



which do not make straight and controlled progress towards heaven and are therefore ‘without reins/guiding straps’.

X.46.7: This vs. contains several bold (one might say “jarring”) images describing the fires.

The first is *ajarāsaḥ ... aritrāḥ* the “unaging oars” or “unaging rudders” of the houses (*damām*). Neither ‘oar’ nor ‘rudder’ is easy to understand here, and our lack of knowledge of the technology of boats at this period doesn’t help. If ‘oars’ is the right choice, perhaps the fires are considered to be the things that keep the houses moving; if ‘rudders’, they keep the houses steering on the right course. Ge (n. 7a), Re, and Scar (571 n. 808) all adduce the potentially helpful I.140.12 *rāthāya nāvam utā no grhāya nityāritrām padvātīm rāsi agne / asmākaṃ vīrām utā no maghóno jánāms ca yā pārayāc chārma yā ca* “For our chariot and for our house, o Agni, give us a boat with built-in oars and a foot [=keel? rudder?], / which will carry our heroes and our bounteous (patrons) and our peoples to the further shore and which (will be) our shelter.” In this fuller expression the boat is a metaphor for something that will carry the people out of danger and to the safety of the far shore. The *aritra-* are likely oars, since the ‘foot’ is probably either a rudder or a keel/centerboard. Ge cleverly suggests that “for our chariot and for our house” refers to times of war and peace respectively. The *grhá-* ‘house’ there can correspond to our *dám-* ‘id.’, and the fires as oars here propel the houses (or rather their denizens) to success in a peaceful domestic setting. It would be nice to find a visual analogue to the oars in the ritual fire, but flames don’t look much like oars to me (at least the oars I’m used to); the only other visual candidate I can think of is the sticks of firewood – but the explicit identification in the verse is with “fires” (*agnīyah*), not their fuel.

The sense of the first member of the hapax cmpd *arcāddhūma-* is not entirely clear. Gr’s ‘glänzenden Rauch haben’ associates it with ‘shining’ forms like *arcī(s)-* ‘beam’, etc., but the (pseudo-)participial form suggest an affiliation rather with the verbal forms *ārcatī*, etc., which always mean ‘sing, chant, recite,’ not ‘shine’. So Ge “rauchsingend,” Re “(feux) dont chante la fumée,” the publ. tr. “with singing smoke.” Scar allows both, though apparently favoring the former: “mit dem glänzenden (/sirrenden?) Rauch.” It is hard to know what this synaesthetic description is meant to convey, but I wonder if it is the hissing sound that accompanies the first appearance of smoke from a newly lit fire. Besides the issue of root affiliation there is the question of what type of cmpd it is. I (and Gr) take it as a bahuvrīhi with adjectival first member, but Ge as a 1st member governing cmpd. (perhaps following Bergaigne; see AiG II.1.319). Although I am generally sympathetic to such interpr., in this case I find it hard to see how “smoke” could provide a meaningful direct obj. to “sing”: acc.s with *ārcatī* are either objects of praise (like gods) or the verbal products that provide praise (songs, etc.).

The adjectives of pāda c easily modify fire, but pāda d presents us with a new challenge: what at first glance appears to be a single simile *vāyāvo ná sómāḥ*, with two incompatible terms, “like winds, soma drinks.” This is universally (Old, Ge, Re, Scar) and convincingly interpr. as two distinct similes, each capturing a different facet of the shared quality *vanarśād-* ‘sitting in/on the wood’. Fire of course “sits in the wood” by virtue of its location on the firewood that feeds it. Soma drinks do so by taking their place in the wooden cups after the preparation of the soma, ready for offering (see a number of such passages in IX with *vāneṣu √ sad*). As for “winds,” Ge finds this comparison suspect (verdächtig), a sentiment shared by Scar (571 n. 808). As Scar points out, we might have expected a comparison to birds – and perhaps *vāyāvah* is meant in part to call to mind phonologically similar *vāyah* ‘birds’). To circumvent the problem, Ge tries, not

very hard, to produce an alternative analysis (n. 7d), and already Gr simply declared *vāyāvas* an old genitive form). Old sees a sort of secondary comparison: the fires are compared to soma drinks, and since both flames and soma drinks can be driven by the wind (see Old's citations), they are then compared to the wind. This seems too complex to me; I think the wind simile is (somewhat) more straightforward: wind is more perceptible, both visually and aurally, when it blows through trees than in open country. Winds therefore can also be considered *vanarṣād-*, though 'sitting' might be an odd description, perhaps 'situated'. Given the "off" comparisons elsewhere in this vs., this one seems reasonably sensible.

X.46.8–10: The complex imagery and verbal expression of the earlier parts of the hymn are no longer evident in these final vss., and the meter settles down to straight Triṣṭubhs. From the 2nd hemistich of 8 through the first one of 10, Agni is the acc. object of several different verbs describing his birth, fashioning, and establishment by a variety of gods, natural forces, and primordial ritualists. Note also the near-repetitions: 8d *dadhire yájiṣṭhan#* / 10a *dadhiré havyavāham#* // 9d *mánave yájatram#* / 10b *mānuṣāso yájatram#*

X.46.8: On *vépas-* see comm. ad I.80.8. Here, as there, the verbal component of Ge's "Wortschwall" seems unrec.: the point is that his flame (=tongue), constantly in motion, shows Agni's state of trembling excitation. The middle voice of *prá ... bharate* is appropriate because the *vépas-* is Agni's own.

In b Ge supplies a new verb "(er kennt)," but the repetition of the preverb *prá*, found initially in tmesis in pāda a, strongly favors a gapped form of  $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ . If that surmise is correct, what's happening in b is that the bright light of the fire (its "appearance" – *cétas-*) allows the patterns of the earth (*vayúnāni ... pṛthivyaḥ*) to be discerned.

X.46.9: Notice the reappearance of the Bhṛguś from vs. 2.

X.46.10: The ref. to Agni switches from 3rd ps. to 2nd in pāda a, transitioning to the direct appeal to the god for benefits in c.

The very well-attested rt. noun cmpd. *puru-sprṇh-* generally has the passive sense 'much craved / sought after', but at least in this passage an act. sense 'craving much' works better. So also Scar (670), Ge (n. 10b).

The VP *váyo dhāḥ #* in c responds to 1c *dádhiḥ ... váyāṃsi #* (on the syntax of 1c see disc. ad loc.), forming a ring. It also echoes the middle verse 5a *vípodhām #* and 5c *dhíyaṃ dhuḥ #*.

On elliptical *prá* as a structural element in this hymn, see comm. ad vss. 1, 5. In this vs. the main cl. of d consists only of the preverb and a nom. sg. part.: *prá devayán -- yaśásah* does not belong there, for reasons given below. All the standard tr./comm. (Old, Ge, Re, publ. tr.) take *prá devayán* as an elliptical clause, only differing on what to supply to fill the ellipsis. I think it best to match the initial pāda of the hymn as closely as possible. There I supplied a verb of motion with *prá* ('goes forth'), here the same, though with a diff. English rendering, 'advances', to indicate that the subj. goes forth towards glory.

The phrase *yaśásah sám hí pūrvīḥ* is found also in III.1.11, thus showing that *yaśásah* does not belong directly with what precedes. In III.1.11 JPB tr. "for glory gets the girls." Although not entirely literal, this is far superior to the ploddingly accurate "many (fem.) (assemble) together for a glorious one," and I have adopted it. The phrase has the feel of a

gnomic utterance, an old saying (Ge [n. 10d] Sprichwort) – a saying that leaves open the exact identity of what the glorious man receives. *pūrvīh* is fem. pl., but there are many desirable feminine entities: women/girls, of course, but any fem. noun is fair game: cows, hymns, refreshments, waters, and so on (for other somewhat farfetched possibilities, see Re’s comm. ad loc.). In VI.34.1, which contains a similar phrase, the fem. referent is spelled out: *sām ca tvé jagmúr gíra indra pūrvīh* “many songs have converged on you, Indra.” But I doubt that hymns are what are meant here. In the words of Re, more tentative than necessary, “Peut-être n’était-il pas dans ses intentions de circonscrire le choix.”

#### X.47 Indra

On the authorship of the hymn, see above ad X.45–47 and also the publ. intro. On the structure of the hymn and the persistent ambiguity of reference between Indra and ‘wealth’ see publ. intro. Ge (intro. to hymn) thinks all the acc. phrases qualify ‘wealth’, specifically wealth in sons, but I find this interpr. reductive.

Note that the d pāda throughout is a refrain.

X.47.1–5: As noted in the publ. intro., the non-refrain portions of vss. 2–5 consist entirely of accusative phrases dependent on vs. 1 (though *which* accusative in vs. 1 is the question). Given the syntactic independence of almost all RVic vss. (*muktaka* verses avant la lettre), this run-on sentence is noteworthy – though perfectly easy to interpret. If it were couched in the nominative, it would be an unremarkable example of RVic nominal style.

X.47.1: The syntagm “X-lord of X-es” appears twice in two pādas: b voc. *vasupate vásūnām* and c acc. *gópatim ... gónām*, the latter with the younger gen. pl. *gónām* rather than *gávām*, which wouldn’t work metrically here. The presumed older form of this phrase, *gávām* (...) *gópati-*, does occur on several occasions (I.101.4, VII.98.6, X.108.3; also reversed in X.166.1 *gópatim gávām*).

X.47.2: My tr. of pāda b, “supporting four seas worth of riches,” is not literal, in that *cātuḥsamudram* is a separate qualifier. On the phrase *dharúṇa- rayīṇām* see comm. ad X.5.1. In that passage the phrase is preceded by NUM. *samudrá-* (*ékaḥ samudráḥ*), rather like our cmpd. *cātuḥsamudra-* but a free phrase. Both seem to depict the sea as a particularly vast trove of riches.

X.47.4: Pāda b is found also in VI.19.8, where it modifies *śúṣma-* ‘unbridled force’; see Bloomfield’s (RV Reps.) somewhat acid remarks there about our hymn (“rigmarole”). In c *dasyuhānam pūrbhídā* favor Indra as referent, but ‘wealth’ is not entirely excluded.

X.47.5: The poet seems to have run out of steam here: *vīpravīram* (c) is repeated from 4a and lexically doubled by *vīrávantam* (a). On the other hand, *s<sup>u</sup>varṣām* ‘sun-winning’ nicely echoes 3c *śrutarṣi-* (to be read *śrutarṣim*).

X.47.6: Save for the initial *prá* this vs. seems to be starting like vss. 2–5, with a continuation of the string of accusatives, but pāda b confounds this expectation: we have a different acc. referent *bṛhaspátim*, a nominative (!) *matíḥ*, and a verb *jigāti*.

X.47.7: The hapax *vānīvānaḥ* clearly belongs to the root  $\sqrt{van}$ , or one of the roots  $\sqrt{van}$ , but its morphological identity is uncertain. Wh (Roots; fld. by MonWms) takes it as a primary nominal deriv. of an otherwise unattested intens. *vanīvan-*. The disyllabic redupl. ending in long  $\bar{i}$  would conform to exx. like *pānīphaṇ-* ( $\sqrt{phan}$ ), *varīvart-* ( $\sqrt{vrt}$ ) and thus would not decide for set  $\sqrt{van}$  ‘love, long for’ rather than  $\sqrt{van}$  ‘win’. Schaeffer calls our *vānīvānas* (wrongly cited as \**vanīvanās*) an inten. part. (p. 27 n. 29) and lists *vānīvan-* as an intens. stem (p. 34). The form is not mentioned in AiG. An alternative interpr. takes it as a possessive nominal *-van-* stem built to the *-i-* stem *vanī-* ‘wish’ (so Gr), a stem found mostly as 2nd cmpd member (on this stem, see AiG II.2.31–33 etc.); *-i-* stems generally lengthen the final before *-van-* (AiG II.2.900–901; e.g., *śruṣṭīvān-*). Although this single occurrence gives us little to go on, I’m inclined towards the intensive interpr., because of the lack of a clear possessive sense – though ‘having desires’ is certainly not out of the question, esp. given *sumatīr iyānāḥ* “begging for favors” at the end of the hemistich. If it belongs to a *-van-* stem, it is straightforwardly a nom. pl. masc., as the passage requires. But if it belongs rather to an intens. stem, we must reckon with its aberrant inflection. I would like to analyze it as a haplology of a middle part. \**vānīvan-āna-*. The haplology itself seems quite plausible, but the form in the passage *vānīvāno* (*-as*) has then to be a singular m. nom. This could be fixed by emending the final syllable to \**-ās* (*-ā* in sandhi), and that is my preference, however unsatisfactory. However, there may have been an intermediate nominal form, or so I interpr. Wh’s listing of *vānīvan* as a primary nominal deriv., rather than as a verbal form to the desid. stem. But what kind of nominal? If it’s a pseudo-root noun, then the nom. pl. should be \**vānīvan-as*, with short vowel in the root syllable (cf., e.g., nom. pl. *śatru-hānas*). To get a long vowel in that syllable we have to assume that it belongs to a *-van-* stem, which rather defeats the purpose of assigning it to a desid. stem *vānīvan-* -- unless he’s also positing a *-van-* stem built to that desid. stem (\**vānīvan-van-*), which then underwent haplology – an unprecedented derivational path. It seems less cumbersome simply to emend the vowel of the final syllable to  $\bar{a}$ , as I just suggested. Or, if we want to follow Wh’s path, to assume that a root-noun-like stem *vānīvan-* was reinterpr. as having a *-van-* stem and given a nom. pl. *-vān-as*. In any case, there is no direct route to the form we have.

The sense of the root  $\sqrt{vañc}$  in its various forms has been discussed frequently in this comm. (see lexical list). Since I think the root meant ‘move waveringly’ (sim. already Whitney / Macdonell [VGS 415] ‘move crookedly’; see Kulikov’s [ya-pres. 218] first gloss ‘move (waveringly)’), I find the standard renderings of individual forms as ‘jump’, ‘gallop’, ‘fly’, and the like somewhat puzzling, since these seem like very different kinds of movements. In our passage Ge tr. “mit dem Gedanken fliegend,” Scar (669) “vom Geist in galoppierenden Bewegung versetzen.” The closest passage to ours in content and phraseology is III.39.1 in which ‘thought’ (*matīḥ*) exits our “heart” (abl. *hṛdāḥ ā*) by a movement described as *vacyāmānāḥ*, which I render as “curling herself out of ...” See comm. ad loc. A similar graceful contortion seems depicted here, esp. in combination with the intimate contact expressed by immediately preceding *hṛdispiś-* ‘touching the heart’. The publ. tr. has “intertwining with the mind,” which I still think is fine, but the root sense might be even better conveyed by “curling up with the mind.

X.47.8: *yād ... yāmi* “what I beg” in pāda a picks up 7b *sumatīr iyānāḥ* “begging for favors.”

On this trio of hymns see publ. intro. Of especial interest are the first two, Indra's ātmastuti, couched in the 1st ps. sg. On the genre of ātmastuti see esp. George Thompson (1997) "Ahaṃkāra and ātmastuti: Self-Assertion and Impersonation in the Ṛgveda," *History of Religions* 37: 141–71.

#### X.48 Indra

The 1<sup>st</sup> person self-assertion in this hymn is forcefully established in the first vss.: every pāda of the 1<sup>st</sup> vs. begins with a form of the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. prn.; in the 2<sup>nd</sup> vs. each hemistich begins thus; the third vs. presents itself as a type of versified paradigm (see comm. ad I.1), with four different oblique forms of the pronoun, each opening its pāda: 3a dat. *māhyam*, 3b loc. *māyī*, 3c gen. *māma*, 3d acc. *mām*. Thereafter the pronominal presence recedes: vss. 4–6 each begin with *ahām*, but there is no other tonic form of the pronoun in any vs.; vs. 7 has no tonic form, though here is an enclitic *mā* in the last pāda, along with two 1st sg. verbs, *asmi* (a), *hanmi* (c). Vs. 8 once again begins with *ahām*, and there is a postpositive *ahām* in d; vs. 9 has only an enclitic *me* (a) but two 1st sg. verbs. Vs. 10 lacks any 1st sg. reference at all and stands aside from the rest of the hymn in content. The final vs. (11) has an enclitic acc. *mā* (c) and a 1st sg. verb (*mināmi* [b]). As noted in the publ. intro., the only forms of the 1st sg. prn. absent from the hymn are the poorly attested instr. *māyā* and abl. *māt*.

On the distribution of tenses and moods in this hymn compared with X.49, see intro. to X.49 below.

X.48.1: Each pāda of this vs. has a finite verb; the verbs in bcd are all present indicatives: *sām jayāmi* (b), *havante* (b), *vī bhajāmi* (d), but pāda a contains a 1st sg. aor. injunc. *bhuvam*. In the publ. tr. I render *bhuvam* as a straight preterite: "I was" (sim. Ge. "Ich ward"; Sāy. *abhavam*). Given the present indicatives of the rest of the vs. and its general content, I now think that that rendering is wrong, but I am not certain what the correct one is. I would be inclined to tr. it as a general present ("I am / become") in keeping with the other present verb forms, save for two factors: The next hymn, X.49, which is the ātmastuti companion to this one, contains two forms of *bhuvam* (out of 5 total in the RV): X.49.1c, 4c. Although X.49 is dominated by injunctives and so the temporal values are hard to establish, most of the hymn concerns specific deeds of the speaker (=Indra) in the past, and so *bhuvam* there may have past reference. Moreover in our own vs. the adj. *pūrvyā-* is ambiguous: it can mean 'foremost' with regard to quality or location, with no temporal reference, but it can also mean 'former, earlier' or 'ancient, primordial' or 'foremost' in a temporal sense. If *pūrvyās pātīḥ* here means "earlier / primordial / first lord," then *bhuvam* must have some past reference, but if the adj. only refers to the quality of Indra's lordship, the temporal reference of *bhuvam* is unconstrained. It is probably worth noting that *pūrvya-* is found in the first vs. of the next hymn as well, X.49.1a, though not in the same clause as *bhuvam* in that vs. Although a survey of all the forms of *pūrvyā-* / *pūrvya-* in the RV shows that temporal reference predominates, there is a solid group with the meaning 'foremost' in quality or location, and a very large group where it is difficult or impossible to tell whether temporal or qualify/location reference (or both) is meant. In this case I incline towards the quality interpr. (so also Sāy., who glosses *mukhyah*). Weighing the various factors, I suggest an emended tr. to "I have become the foremost lord of gods," a role Indra has acquired by his regular winning of the stakes, as stated in pāda b. ("I am ..." would also work.) Alternatively IH suggests presential "I become," meaning that he acquires the role on a regular basis; I am not persuaded because I doubt that Indra would ever admit that he *lost* the lordship in between such

episodes. However, if *pūrvyā-* has a temporal sense here, the whole might mean “I am / have (always) been the primordial lord of goods / lord of gods (from) of old.”

Note that the phrase *vasunaḥ ... pātīḥ* reprises *vasupate vāsūnām* in the first vs. of the previous hymn (X.47.1), though they are by different poets. The phrase in our hymn has the newer gen. sg. *vasunaḥ*, found also in *vasunaḥ ... pātīḥ* in I.53.2, against *vasoḥ ... vāsupatim* in I.9.9. The phrase with gen. pl., *vasupāti- vāsūnām* is fairly common.

For *dhānam* √*ji*, see vs. 5 below.

The morphological identity and usage of *śāsīvataḥ* in b are disputed. Gr takes it as a gen. sg. dependent on *dhānāni* in the meaning ‘ein jeder, alle’ (his meaning #10; Sāy. also gen.). Ge takes it as acc. pl. masc. to be (irregularly) construed with the neut. acc. *dhānāni*, tr. “alle Schätze.” But *śāsīvant-* doesn’t mean ‘all’, at least not straightforwardly – rather, it indicates an unbroken, or regularly repeated, sequence: “one by one, one after another, time after time,” shading into “constant, perpetual.” Sometimes the sequence is synchronically distributive: “each and every,” which could be taken as tantamount to “all.” But rather than expressing an undifferentiated “all,” *śāsīvant-* indicates a succession of individual items considered collectively. Ge (n. 1b) cites III.3.7 as exhibiting another ex. of neut. pl. noun construed with masc. pl. adj., but that passage should be otherwise interpr. He also adduces IX.76.3, where pāda-final *śāsīvataḥ* (as here) modifies the masc. acc. pl. *vājān* earlier in its pāda: *dhīyā nā vājāni ūpa māsi śāsīvataḥ*. Presumably he cites this to show that acc. pl. *śāsīvataḥ* can modify a synonym for *dhānāni*, in the right gender, and need not be a gen. here. My interpr. of *śāsīvataḥ* in our passage starts from passages like IX.76.3; I take it as a quasi-adverbial acc. pl. ‘time after time’ that became detached from the NP in which it began because of its location at pāda end at some distance from its noun. In my own tr. of IX.76.3 “As if according to our vision, mete out prizes to us over and over,” *śāsīvataḥ* is also semi-independent, though it properly matches *vājān* in number, gender, and case. (A less independent Engl. tr. might be “ever-new/continuous prizes.”) I thus avoid the awkwardness of mismatch of gender in our passage, though at the cost of recognizing a new adverbial usage. It would also of course be possible simply to follow the Sāy./Gr interpr. and take it as a gen.: “I win the stakes of each and every one.”

As Ge (n. 1c) points out, *jantāvaḥ* has a double sense and should be read with both simile and frame – hence my “creatures ... kinfolk.”

Note the implicit contrast between *sām jayāmi* (b) and *vī bhajāmi* (d). The *dhānāni* gathered in b are redistributed to the deserving in d.

X.48.2: Acdg to Ge (n. 2), the named recipients of Indra’s help in this vs. are among the first Soma-offerers. Unfortunately the mythic incidents mentioned in this vs. are difficult to reconstruct, and the various figures named – Atharvan (if this is a PN, not a title), Trita, Dadhyañc, and Mātariśvan are not clearly connected elsewhere, except that Dadhyañc has the patronymic *ātharvañā-* already in the RV (I.116.12, 117.22; also VI.16.14 *putrāḥ ... ātharvañāḥ*).

In the nominal clause in pāda a, either Indra or the following common nouns (*ródho vākṣaḥ*) could be the primary predicate(s) of *ahám*. Contra Ge’s “Ich Indra ward ...,” which makes the second choice, I take *índraḥ* as the principal predicate, on the basis of vs. 5a, which also opens with *ahám índraḥ*, where the wording of the rest of the pāda suggests the opening two words form a nominal clause. However, the other alternative is certainly possible and changes very little.

Trita is elsewhere associated with cows, but as, himself, a releaser of cows – not the beneficiary of Indra’s action with regard to the cows. See the famous Trita Āptya appendix to the

Agni hymn, X.8.8-9, where Trita first smites the three-headed monster and then ... *nīḥ sasṛje trió gāḥ* “T. let loose the cows.” Indra is also mentioned in that brief passage, but it seems as if he is there being assimilated to – substituted for – the Indo-Iranian \*Trita, who also figures in this myth in Avestan (under the name *Θrita* *Äθβiia*).

What exactly Indra does for Trita in our passage is also unclear, though not because of unclarity of the verbal expression. The *pāda* is unambiguous: *tritāya gā ajanayam āher ādhi* “I begat the cows from the serpent.” See Ge’s tr. “Für Trita *trieb* ich vom Drachen die Kühe *ab*,” with the somewhat dramatic *abtreiben* ‘abort’. There are two problems here (at least). The first involves which myth we’re actually dealing with. The word *āhi*- ‘serpent’ is a powerful clue that it is the *Vṛtra* myth, since *Vṛtra* is constantly identified as an *āhi*- and the encapsulating formula of that myth is *āhann āhim*. But when we can pin down Trita’s activities in the Vedic mythical universe, he is associated instead with the Vala myth. See I.52.5 *índro yád ..., bhinád valásya paridhīm̐r iva tritáh* “When Indra split the barricades of the Vala-cave, as Trita had.” Although the Vala and *Vṛtra* myths are often assimilated to each other, in our case (i.e., X.48.2) I think Trita has been grafted into the *Vṛtra* myth signaled by *āhi*-. This seems preferable to interpreting the serpent (*āhi*-) as an image of the Vala cave. (Nor do I, *pace* Ge [n. 2b], think that the serpent is *Viśvarūpa*, the monster of X.8.8–9.)

So what action does *ajanayam* depict? Presumably a simulacrum of birth: the cows (=waters, probably) are within the serpent and Indra causes them to come out, alive. If what is at issue is the identification cows = waters, the likelihood is that the snake swallowed them, as in X.111.9 (adduced by Ge) *sṛjāḥ síndhūn̐r āhinā jagrasānān* “You let loose the rivers that had been swallowed by the serpent.” The release of the waters from within the serpent would seem like birth – indeed like the breaking of the waters that precedes birth. The image is a striking one, but I think there is another reason the poet chose *ajanayam*: the beginning of this verb recalls and may have been meant to evoke in the audience several verbs more regularly found with “cows” in the Vala and *Vṛtra* myths: *√aj* ‘drive’ and *√ji* ‘win’. Cf. phrases like *gā ajati* (I.33.3) and *gā ājayah* (I.32.12).

I don’t know quite what to make of this mash-up of at least three myths in a single *pāda*: Trita (and Indra) and *Viśvarūpa*, Trita (/Indra) and Vala, Indra and *Vṛtra*, but I think it is deliberate on the part of the poet. Perhaps he is calling attention to the overreach of Indra’s boasting.

In c the verb *ā dade* could be either a pres. indicative to the redupl. pres. stem or a perfect. Because of the mythological content of the vs., I opt for the pf., as does Kü (241).

As discussed ad I.112.19 etc., simplex forms of the old desid. *síkṣa-* (*√śak*) only take the dat., but here the part. *síkṣan* also has an acc. obj., *gotrā*. The lexeme *ā síkṣa-* does take an acc., in the sense ‘seek to obtain’, with *ā* in the same function as the lexemes *ā√yaj* ‘obtain by sacrifice’, *ā√pū* ‘obtain by purification’. See again I.112.19. I suggest that the *ā* is in fact found in our passage: *gotrā síkṣan* can easily represent *gotrā ā-síkṣan* in sandhi.

In the publ. tr. “their cowpens” refers to the cowpens of the *Dasyus*.

As far as I know, *Dadhyañc* and *Mātariśvan* are never otherwise associated.

X.48.3: On the verb *ārya-* see comm. ad VIII.16.6.

The fronting of the oblique 1st sg. prn. is carried through the whole vs., but it is broken in the publ. tr. in *pāda* d, since “me they recognize ...” sounded stilted to me.

X.48.4: The first hemistich lacks a verb and definitely needs one, since it has both a nominative and an accusative phrase. It's easy to supply 'win / gain' – perhaps from *sám jayāmi* in 1b, but cf. also the almost identical expression in V.61.5 *sánat sã áśvyam paśúm, utá gávyam ...* "She gains livestock in horses and cows ....," with a form of synonymous  $\sqrt{san}$

On the slangy idiom *ní√sã* 'grind down' see ad X.28.6. As noted there, the referent of the obj. *purũ sahásrã* "many thousands" is likely to be enemies, perhaps the Dasyus of 2c.

X.48.5: Given the position of the *ná* in pāda a, it seems likely that *ahám índraḥ* is a nominal clause. See comm. ad vs. 2 above. So also Kü (189) "Ich bin Indra."

*ná párá jigya íd dhánam* is the negated opposite to 1b *ahám dhánāni sám jayāmi*, though the image in 5a is specifically from dicing (see Ge n. 5a), while that in 1b seems to be more generalized.

The lexeme *áva√sthā* with dative appears to be unprecedented. Normally it means 'go/step down' with an acc. of goal, incl. in the middle pf. (as here): V.44.9 *samudrām āsām áva tasthe agrimā* "The foremost of those (females) has stepped down into the sea." The sense of our passage is fairly clear contextually: 'descend/step down for death' can mean 'give way, concede' or perhaps simply 'come down [from heaven] to approach'; Gr anheimfallen (fall victim to), Ge verfallen (fall for).

In any case the two pronouncements in ab, each couched in the negative, seem odd things for Indra to boast about, esp. the latter, since Indra should not be susceptible to death anyway. Indra's promise in d is also expressed negatively.

Ge tr. the pres. part. *sunvántaḥ* as a functional impv., as if coordinated with *yācatāḥ*: "Presset Soma aus und bittet mich um Gut!" (Sim. Lowe, Part., 263.) I certainly agree that the two are closely connected and temporally / logically ordered, But such an interpr. fails to account for the *íd* (and I also see no reason to erase the morphological identity of the participle). I think the point is – do your begging only when you're pressing soma for me; don't even think about begging for stuff if you're not engaged in pressing soma.

X.48.6: The verb for pāda a must be supplied from *ahanam* in c (with a rel. clause intervening in b).

The intens. part. *śásvasataḥ* echoes *śásvataḥ* in 1b phonologically, though they are of course etymologically and semantically completely distinct.

Pāda b has a functional periphrastic causative in the present middle: *yudháyé 'kṛṇvata* "they caused to fight." It is not at first clear why this periphrasis is used here, since a morphological causative *yodháya-* exists. However, the various formations to the root  $\sqrt{yudh}$  show subtle functional and syntactic distinctions (see my *-áya-*, p. 151). The causative means 'set X (and Y) to fighting', where the various parties to the fight are in the acc. and the subject is the instigator, who takes no part in the fight himself. The *-ya-*present *yúdhya-* in the act. also takes an obj., but it means 'attack': the subject fights the object. Its middle equivalent, *yúdhyate* means 'contends (mutually)', the non-causative equivalent of *yodháya-*. The periphrasis in our b has yet another sense: "X (subj.) causes Y (obj.) to fight X" – in other words the subject both instigates the fight and participates in it. The middle voice of *ákṛṇvata* expresses this dual role. (For a different, and to my mind less compelling, interpr. see Zehnder, Periphr. Kaus, 24, 66.)

The publ. tr. renders *ánamasyur namasvínah* as "(I) unbowable ... those to be bowed"; very similar is Ge's "die sich Beugenden ... (selbst) unbeugsam." This is what context suggests it ought to mean—but there are problems. The stem *namasvín-* (8x) otherwise means 'reverent,



offering homage’ The gerundive feature in my tr. (“*to be bowed*”) is surely wrong, but even without that, it is difficult to square the usual meaning with the context here. If they are already reverent, why does Indra need to smite them – and how can the “challenging” acc. pl. (*āhvāyamānān*) be reconciled with the meek *namasvīnaḥ* in the same case and number? Negated *ānamasyu-* is found only here, but *namasyú-* does occur twice elsewhere (I.55.4, VIII.27.11), again meaning ‘offering homage’, and it belongs to the larger morphological system that includes the denom. *namasyá-*, which means the same. If we take these observations seriously, the violence that dominates the whole vs. up to this last phrase is suddenly absent. Although I would prefer to keep some version of my and Ge’s interpr., I find that hard to justify. I would now take *namasvīnaḥ* as a proleptic descriptor of the challengers, who, once struck down and rendered humble, offer their homage to Indra. As for him, *ānamasyu-* would be a restatement of *dr̥hā vādan* “talking tough.” Though his opponents have been subdued and offer him *nāmas-*, he does not do so in return. This is not particularly satisfactory, but I can’t otherwise account for the phraseology. I would now emend the tr. to “I struck down with my stroke those who were challenging (me), (I) talking tough, giving no homage to those (now) offering homage.” Note that Gr must have been sufficiently disturbed by *ānamasyuḥ* that he identifies it as a verb form, an imperfect (!) to the denom. *namasyá-* (which, however, doesn’t help matters).

X.48.7: The numerical sequence — “one against one” (*ékam ékaḥ*), acc. “two” (*dvā*), nom. “three” (*trāyaḥ*) — builds on the āmreḍita *dvā-dvā* “by twos” in 6a.

On the shape of the root noun in (*niṣ-*)*śāl-* see comm. ad IV.88.7. The lexeme *nīḥ √ sah* is found only once as a verb form (I.127.3 *niḥśāhamāṇaḥ*) and twice as a root noun, here and in I.181.6. In the other two instances I render the movement implied by the preverb: I.127.3 “going forth to conquer,” I.181.6 “setting out to conquer.” The tr. “utter victor” here does not attempt to do so (nor do Ge’s Sieger, Scar’s “der überlegene Sieger” [603]), though I suppose an alternate “I go forth to conquer, one against one” would be possible.

The verb *karanti* is classified by Wh (Roots) as a root pres., a stem that otherwise doesn’t exist, but it surely is, with Macd (VGS verb list), a root aor. subjunctive. Although grammars give the 3rd pl. act. subj. ending only as sec. *-an*, it does not seem to me that the Sprachgefühl for this part of the paradigm is terribly strong, and it is easy to imagine extending the 3rd *singular* choice between sec. *-at* and prim. *-atī* to the 3rd pl. I would also point out that if it is to be interpr. as a pres. form, it could just as easily belong to a thematic Class I pres. (there being no accent), and have developed from the root aor. subj. A root pres. 3rd pl. should properly have the weak form \**kranti*. A modal sense “can/will do” fits the context better than an indicative. For a parallel see *gāmanti* in VII.34.20, which Wh identifies as a Class I pres.

The publ. tr. is somewhat clumsy, since the simile seems to qualify Indra rather than the multitude, who are being compared to threshed ears of grain. The intrusion of a homely agricultural image here is striking, esp. as one would expect a more exalted comparison from Indra’s own mouth. The word *parśá-* is a hapax, but its probable sense ‘sheaf, ears of grain’ is supposedly anchored by the YAv hapax *parša-* (Yt. 13.71), which is likewise the obj. of a form of *√ han* (/ Av. *√ jan*) – though it should be noted that the Avestan context is hardly diagnostic and there’s a certain circularity whereby the meaning of the Vedic word is supported by the Avestan one and vice versa. On the other hand, *khāla-* ‘threshing floor’ is reasonably well attested in Vedic (esp. AVP, which abounds in agricultural materials) and in Middle and Modern Indo-Aryan (see Turner s.v.), and its presence in this simile certainly helps establish the presumed sense of *parśá-*.

X.48.8: The Guṅgus are otherwise unknown, though they presumably have some connection with the isolated female divine figure Guṅgū in II.32.8. Atithigva is better known. In fact Indra slays the same Paṇaya and Karañja with Atithigva's help in I.53.8, though nothing further is known about these victims. It's also possible that there are multiple Atithigvas (see esp. Macdonell + Keith, Vedic Index, s.v.).

On the lexeme *īṣ* √*kṛ* see comm. ad VII.76.2. Ge (n. 8b) suggests that the simile *īṣaṃ nā* that begins the next pāda in fact goes with pāda a, as a word play; this seems eminently sensible and is reflected in the publ. tr. (though Scar [190] takes it with b). Ge disavows any etymological connection of the two *īṣ*- here, but as indicated in the comm. ad VII.76.2, it is quite likely that they are etymologically the same, though their meanings and functions have diverged; so also EWA s.v. *īṣ*-.

The cmpd. *ṛtra-túr*- (5x, always acc. sg. *ṛtra-túram*) occurs three times in positions 4–7 in trimeter vs., as here (*īṣaṃ nā ṛtratúram ...*). In each case HvN comment that a caesura after 3 is rare, but surely the caesura is simply a late caesura in 5th position as usual, coming at the cmpd seam after *ṛtra*-.

The question is who/what the *ṛtra-túr*- is. Since Indra is the subject, it cannot be him, though he would be the default. Gr suggests Atithigva, and this may be the best solution. Note that in IV.42.8 Trasadasyu is named as a *ṛtra-túr*- “like Indra”: ... *trasádasyum ... índraṃ nā ṛtratúram*, so non-gods qualify. But it is possible that it's Indra's mace: cf. X.99.1 *tákṣad vájraṃ ṛtratúram* “he fashioned the mace that overcomes obstacles.”

The (almost) identically built loc. sg. cmpds *paṇayaghne* and *karañjahé* in c contain two different thematic derivs. of √*han*. Scar (696) plausibly suggests that the *-ha-* in the latter is a metrically conditioned nonce form; he might also have noted *ṛtra-hátye* in the flg. pāda, which would have supported the *-ha-* form preceding it.

I consider the mention of the *Ṛtra*-smashing in d to be an implicit comparison: the smiting of the two presumably human enemies in c is likened to Indra's great paradigm deed. I think it less likely that the *Ṛtra*-slaying is simply lumped in, as a third ex., with two lesser such killings.

The redupl. 1st sg. *ásuśravi* is generally taken as a plupf. (Gr, Wh [Rts], Macdonell [VGS 425]), and it may well be. However, it is possible that it belongs instead to the redupl. aor. associated with the caus. *śrāvāya*- ‘make hear(d)’. This seems to be implied by Klein's (DGRV II.170) “after I had caused my fame to be spread.” The redupl. aor. is otherwise represented in the RV by the single form act. 3rd pl. *asuśravuḥ* (X.20.12). A mid. pluperfect might be expected to have passive value like the single indic. pf. in the middle, *śuśruve* ‘has been famed’, in VIII.66.9. A medial caus. could have the reflexive transitive sense ‘cause oneself to be heard of’, ‘spread one's own fame’, and the engagement of the subject in creating his own celebrity fits the boastful tone of this ātmastuti. No alteration of the publ. tr. is needed, since “I spread my fame” essentially expresses the reflexive nuance (though Klein's tr. is more explicit). The full grade (but light syllable) in both *ásuśravi* and *asuśravuḥ* may also fit the template of the redupl. aor. better than a plupf., though the weak forms of redupl. formations to such roots are quite variable.

X.48.9: Namī Sāpīya is found also in VI.20.6 and I.53.7, in the latter without the patronymic. But in its place is *sakh'yā* as a play on words. Our passage has the patronymic in c, directly flg. *námī*, though without distraction (probably), but in d *sakh'yā* appears in the same metrical position,

echoing the pun found in I.53.7 (though note that in I.53.7 *sákhyā* is the instr. sg. of *sákhi-* ‘comrade, partner’, while here (differently accented) *sakhyā* is neut. pl. to *sakhā-* ‘partnership’.

The double dat. *īśé bhujé* is also found in VIII.20.8. As Ge suggests (n. 9a), *īśé*, the functional obj. of *bhujé*, has been attracted to it in case. The double-barrelled tr. “restoring refreshment” for *īśé* is meant to capture the word play in 8ab. Tichy (KISch 207) takes *me* with *īśé* (“um meine Stärkung zu genießen”), but as Ge points out (n. 9a), in VI.20.6 it’s Indra who bestows *īś-* on Namī.

In d *éše* plays on *īśé*, though they are grammatically and etymologically distinct.

X.48.10: As noted in the publ. intro. as well as the hymn intro. above, this is the only vs. that lacks a 1st ps. reference. It is also entirely unclear why this vs., which violates the stylistic unity of the hymn, is found here at all – though I will speculate on this below.. It is true that the meter changes to Triṣṭubh from Jagatī, also for the immediately flg. final vs. 11, but vs. 7 is also in Triṣṭubh, and both 7 and 11 fit conceptually into the hymn. The puzzling content of the vs. does not help: it has given rise to quite different interpr., esp. because of the hapax *asthā* in b.

The hapax *asthā* is taken by Ge (flg. Ludwig) as the instr. sg. to *\*asth-* ‘bone’ (Aves. *ast*), which he then interpr. as referring to the myth of Dadhyañc and his revealing the location of the hidden soma. His tr. of the hemistich is “Bei dem Einen ward der Soma im Inneren geschaut; den anderen tut der Wächter durch den Knochen kund.” The contortions that he must engage in (see n. 10 and esp. n. 10ab) to fit the wording to the myth are sufficient evidence for the unlikelihood of the interpr. A more likely, though not entirely trouble-free, approach starts with connecting the word to the root noun *√sthā*, a possibility thoroughly discussed by Old; see also Scar (646–47). Although Gr interpr. it as an adverb ‘sogleich’, Old’s negated root noun “der nicht Stehende” yields a richer semantics. He sees the passage as contrasting the good person, in whom the presence of interior soma can be detected (a), and the evil one, who can be shown to be without it (b). “In Manchem (dem Guten) wird der Soma darinnen (verweilend) erblickt. Manchen (den Bösen, vgl. cd) macht der Wächter (über Gute und Böse) sichtbar (kenntlich) durch den (in ihm) nicht verweilenden (Soma).” By this analysis *asthā* is an instr. sg. to the root noun cmpd. This analysis is also fld. by AiG II.2.35 and with some hesitation by Scar, and it is registered, though not fully endorsed, by EWA 766 (s.v. *STHĀ*).

The publ. tr. in general follows Old’s interpr., but questions remain. In particular, who is the *gopā-* who reveals the lack of soma in the second party? And is that *gopā-* the unidentified subject of cd or not? Acdg. to Old, the *gopā-* is the one who watches over good and evil; he says nothing specific about the identities in the 2nd hemistich. My current views slightly emend Old’s interpr., in an attempt to explain why the vs. is found in this hymn. Let us begin with the fact that Indra’s signature deed, the slaying of Vṛtra, is barely mentioned in this hymn, found only in vs. 8 and backgrounded there. In that vs. someone/thing besides Indra is touted as a *vṛtratúr-* (8b) and the Vṛtra slaying is compared to Indra’s slaying of two lesser beings (8cd). I suggest that Indra’s signature deed is treated in our vs., which is the climatic one before the summary vs. 11, but it is an indirect treatment of the Vṛtra slaying, expressed in riddling fashion to escape the clichés of that narrative. I therefore think that the contrast in ab is not between good and evil beings (per Old), but between the one powerfully strengthened by soma and the weakling who does not possess it (who in this case is Vṛtra). In pāda a the soma that Indra drinks to prepare himself for battle is discernible (*dadṛśe*) in Indra, though the soma is within him. Presumably the signs of battle fury and soma exhilaration are evident in his external demeanor. In b the one who is exposed by his lack of soma is Vṛtra, and I am inclined to think that Indra is the *gopā-* who does

the exposing – by showing up Vṛtra’s inability to fight back. This seems more economical than dragging in a third party, and Indra is at least once called *gopā-* (e.g., V.31.1), though the designation is more often of Agni or Soma, less commonly other gods.

As for the subject of cd, I emphatically don’t think it’s the *gopā-*, *pace* Ge (n. 10c) and Heenen (Desid. 207–8). Rather it is Vṛtra (or if my identification of the soma-less being in b is not accepted, some unspecified enemy of Indra). The same desid. part. *yúyutsant-* ‘desiring/trying to fight’ is used of Vṛtra in V.32.5, where Indra in the exhilaration of soma consigns him to darkness (cf. also I.33.6 of a group of Indra’s enemies, also defeated).

By my interpr. the obj. of *yúyutsan*, the “sharp-horned bull” (*tigmáśṛṅga- vṛṣabhá-*), has a double sense. This phrase is several times used of Soma: he is clearly so called in X.86.15, and I argue ad X.28.2 that the same phrase refers to Soma there (contra Ge). See also *tigmáśṛṅga-* in IX.97.9, also of Soma. But the same phrase is used once clearly of Indra (VII.19.1). (The other similar phrase, *tigmáśṛṅga- vámsaga-* [“sharp-horned buffalo (?)”] in VI.16.39 applies to Agni.) The first reading here is probably Indra, with the two primal opponents, Vṛtra and Indra, serving as subj. and obj. respectively. But in trying to fight Indra, Vṛtra is also battling the soma within Indra that gives the god his invincible power.

With Ge (n. 10d) I supply a word for ‘fetter’ (*pāśa-*) with *bahulé*, on the basis of *baddhá-* ‘bound’ and VII.59.8 with the phrase *druháḥ pāśān* “the fetters of deceit” in VII.59.8. Note also that *bahulá-* directly modifies *drúh-* in III.31.19 *drúhaḥ ... bahulá ádevīḥ*. I have not found a passage that explicitly links Vṛtra with *drúh-*, but as in the just-cited III.31.19 anything Indra is against can be so characterized.

To summarize briefly: if I am correct, this apparently aberrant vs. in the otherwise unbroken ātmastuti, which contains no 1st sg. forms and makes no explicit indentifications, is Indra’s indirect boast about his major achievement, the Vṛtra slaying, made possible by Indra’s access to soma and Vṛtra’s lack of it.

X.48.11: Ge takes *devānām* as parallel to the gen. pls. of pāda a: “das Gesetz der Āditya’s, Vasu’s, Rudriya’s, der Götter.” But its positioning after *deváh* invites us to construe the two words together, and the archaic ring of the phrase (“god of gods”) fits nicely with the whiff of Indo-Iranian antiquity in the previous vs., where the arch-enemy of Indra is linked to the Lie.

The negated past participles, near-synonyms, that fill the last pāda, *áparājitam ástṛtam áśālham* “invincible, indestructible, unconquerable” bring the hymn to a powerful close. Note that *áparājitam* harks back to 5a *ná párá jigye* and *áśālham* to 7a *niṣṣāl*.

## X.49 Indra

Although X.48 and X.49 are companion pieces—ātmastutis consisting of the same no. of vss.—there are notable differences in the stylistic impression they make, esp. with regard to pronouns and verb forms.

As noted in the publ. intro., the nom. sg. *ahám* is ubiquitous in this hymn: 16 of the 20 hemistichs (excluding the summary vs. 11) begin with *ahám*, as do 4 of the even pādas (1b, 2d, 3b, 5d). This overwhelming presence contrasts with X.48, where the 1st sg. pronouns recede after vs. 3 (see intro. to X.48 above).

X.49 also presents a remarkable collection of injunctives – 19 in all, in the 10 vss. under consideration: 1a *dām*, 1b *kṛṇavam*, 1c *bhuvam*, 1d *sākṣi*, 2a *dhuḥ*, 3a *śísñatham*, 3c *yamam*, 4b *randhayam*, 4c *bhuvam*, 4d *bháre*, 5a *randhayam*, 5c *karam*, 6b *rujam*, 6d *karam*, 8c *karam*, 8d *vakṣayam*, 9a *dhārayam*, 9d *vidam*, 10a *dhārayam*. (A few of these require some comment.

Thematic 1<sup>st</sup> sg. mid. *bhare* in 4d could be either a present or an injunctive, but context favors a past reading and therefore an injunctive identification. In 5c *āyāve 'karam* the Pp. reads *akaram*, but of course *karam* is quite possible in this sandhi situation: Old says the augment is doubtful and points out that even Sāy. reads *karam*. In 6b and d the Saṃhitā *vrtrahārujam* and *rocanākaram* could conceal augments (*a/[ā]rujam*, *a/[ā]karam*), and the Pp. so analyzes, both times with accent, but injunctives are just as possible.) Against this accumulation of injunctives there are 5 securely augmented forms — 3b *āvam*, 5b *ājihīta*, 5d *arandhayam*, 8b *prāśrāvayam*, 10b *ādhārayat* — and a miscellany of other finite forms: 3 perfects: 2d *dade* (or redupl. pres., but see comm. ad X.48.2), 3d *rare*, 7c *āha*; 2 presents: 7a *yāmi*, 9c *tirāmi*, as well as whatever *kṛṣe* in 7d may be. By contrast, consider the distribution of tenses and moods in X.48: 7 injunctives: 1a *bhuvam*, 8a *iṣkaram*, 8b *dhārayam*, 9a *bhūt* (which, given phonological context, could be augmented (*a*)*bhūt*, but isn't so read by Pp.), 9b *kṛṇuta*, 9c *maṃhāyam*, 9d *karam*; 6 securely augmented forms (by meter): 2b *aṇayam*, 3a *atakṣat*, 3b *avṛjan*, 4d *āmandiṣuḥ*, 6b *ākṛṇvata*, 8d *āśuśravi*, and one likely one (6c *ahanam*, though the Saṃhitā text *hānmanāhanam* would allow an injunc. *hanam* reading); 10 presents: 1b *jayāmi*, 1c *havante*, 1d *bhajāmi*, 3d *āryanti*, 4c *śiśāmi*, 7a *asmi*, 7c *hanmi*, 7d *nindanti*, 10b *kṛṇoti*, 11b *mināmi*; 6 perfects 2c *dade*, 5a *jigye*, 5b *tasthe*, 10a *dadṛṣe*, 10d *tasthau*, 11c *tataṣuḥ*; 2 subjunctives: 5d *riṣāthana*, 7b *karanti*; 1 imperative: 5c *yācata*.

As noted in the publ. intro., I find it surprising that Hoffmann did not treat this hymn as a testing ground for his interpr. of the injunctive. (He does treat a few vss. piecemeal.) In the publ. tr. I render the injunctives as general preterites, except for *sākṣi* in 1d, which I now would rethink.

On the metrical disturbances in this hymn, see Old's various comments.

X.49.1: As just noted, my tr. of *sākṣi* in d (“I have vanquished”) contrasts with my renderings of the other injunctives in this hymn and I would now change to a general preterite: “I vanquished.” There is no functional difference between the present and aorist injunctives in this hymn that I can detect, and although *sākṣi* is the only *s*-aor. form in this hymn, that should not correlate with a different usage.

X.49.2: Pāda c has no overt verb; I have supplied *ā dade* from d. Ge supplies ‘lenke’, though the parallel he cites, I.63.2, has instead the verb *veḥ* ‘pursue’. Ge also couches the whole hemistich in the present: “ich (lenke) ... ich ergreife ...” This is grammatically possible: as noted ad X.48.2 *ā dade* is ambiguous between 1st sg. redupl. pres. and 1st sg. pf. And it would also make sense if the half-vs. is describing Indra's usual preparations for his innumerable deeds in the present/future. However, in the context of this vs. a past tense reading works better: the first hemistich seems to depict the original initiation of Indra into his name and role, and the second half then describes his acquisition of his two most characteristic accoutrements, his pair of horses and his mace.

But I also wonder if 2cd should be read in conjunction with vs. 3, with the whole referring to the Uśanā Kāvya, Kutsa, Śuṣṇa myth. Or rather, that both readings are simultaneously possible — the first given above, that Indra is acquiring his horses and weapon for the first time after being given the name Indra, and the second, that the horses and weapon are specifically those for the Śuṣṇa battle, with this reading providing a transition to vs. 3. For the horses and weapon in the UK / Kutsa / Śuṣṇa saga, recall that when Indra takes Kutsa on his chariot to journey to UK, he first yokes the two horses of the Wind; cf., e.g., I.174.5 *rjṛā vātasya*

*ásvā* “the two silvery horses of the Wind” (cf. I.175.4, IV.16.11, VIII.1.11, X.22.4–5). Then when they arrive at UK’s, the latter produces the weapon for Indra to use against Śuṣṇa. In I.51.10 the weapon is referred to as the abstract ‘might’ (*sáhas*), but UK definitely ‘fashions’ it: *tákṣad yát ta uśánā sáhasā sáhaḥ* “When Uśanā fashions might with might for you.” But in I.121.12 the weapon thus fashioned is a mace: *yám te kāvya uśánā mandínam dād, vṛtrahānam pāryam tatakṣa vájram* “What Uśanā Kāvya gave to you to provide exhilaration, that decisive, Vṛtra-smiting mace had he fashioned.” With more details V.34.2 *yád īm mṛgāya hántave mahāvadhah, sahásrabhṛṣṭim uśánā vadhám yámat* “... when Uśanā, possessing the great weapon, held the thousand-spiked weapon (out to him), to smash the wild beast.”

X.49.3: This vs. names by name two of the participants in the exploit just discussed, Kutsa in b and Śuṣṇa in c. I suggest that Uśanā Kāvya is also present, in the *kaváye* in pāda a; UK is elsewhere referred to by the designation ‘poet’ (*kaví-*), substituting for his patronymic. See, e.g., IV.16.2–3, 26.1, V.34.3 and comm. ad VI.20.4. Note that Sāy. glosses *kavaye* with *uśanase* here. Ge’s identification of the poet with Kutsa (n. 3ab) is a less happy choice and leads him to misinterpret the pāda in my opinion.

But determining the identity of the poet in pāda a is only the beginning of our challenges. On the surface of it, the pāda involves slashing, piercing, or otherwise doing harm to a cloak (*átka-*) for / on behalf of the *kaví-*. This somewhat puzzling action was obviously too much for Ge, who supplies the verb ‘gave’ to govern the cloak, from *raré* in d, and supplies Śuṣṇa from c as obj. of *śíśnatham*, thus manufacturing two separate clauses in the pāda, one lacking an overt verb, one lacking an overt object. (This interpr. was followed in all particulars by Elizarenkova [168].) This redistribution of elements seems somewhat perverse, esp. in this hymn and esp. in this verse, whose construction is so four-square, with an *ahám* at each corner (beginning each pāda)—esp. since there’s a perfectly good transitive verb to govern *átkam* in the pāda in question. Old defends interpreting the syntactic deployment of the pāda as given (that is, with *átkam* as obj. of *śíśnatham*), even though we can’t restore the plot. He also properly rejects the notion, found already in Sāy., that *átka-* here is a PN.

Clearly the cloak and what was done to it are the key to this pāda. Here we are lucky enough to find a cloak in another treatment of the UK/Kutsa/Śuṣṇa myth, X.99.9cd; unfortunately it doesn’t provide a clear key: *ayám kavím anayac chasyámānam, átkam yó asya sánitotā nṛṇām* “This one here [=Indra] led the poet who was being praised, who won his cloak and was the winner among superior men” (by my tr.; others’ v. diff.). The first hemistich of this vs. contains a compressed account of the victory over Śuṣṇa, with Kutsa the beneficiary. In my view the “poet” in c is once again Uśanā Kāvya. Here (in my view) he carries off a/the cloak as a prize, perhaps a reward for supplying the weapon that did Śuṣṇa in. This suggests that the cloak belonged originally to the enemy, probably Śuṣṇa himself. In our passage then, Indra may be rendering Śuṣṇa’s cloak harmless and up for grabs – in which case perhaps ‘struck down’ or the like might be a better tr. than ‘pierced’ for *śíśnatham*. Indra dispatches the cloak (pāda a) before doing the same to Śuṣṇa himself (c). I tentatively suggest that Śuṣṇa’s cloak is a garment of enveloping darkness, consisting of *māyā-* (‘magic art’, etc.). Śuṣṇa’s *māyās* are mentioned several times, as objects of Indra’s attack (I.56.3, V.31.7, VI.20.4, prob. IV.16.9); it is also said that the slaying of Śuṣṇa keeps darkness away (V.31.9), and Śuṣṇa is also said several times to be hidden or in possession of something hidden (X.22.10, 61.13). By contrast Ge suggests (again n. 3ab) that the cloak is Indra’s or Kutsa’s and refers to the apparent switching or blending of the appearances of Indra and Kutsa, glancingly referred to in IV.16.10 and embroidered in

entertaining fashion in the JB. (See comm. ad IV.16.10 and the publ. intro. to that hymn.) I find this unlikely, since the cloak is the object of a hostile act that is identical to what happens to Śuṣṇa. (However, cf. VI.33.3, a passage containing instr. pl. *átkaīḥ* deployed by Indra; I explain these cloaks as a reference to Indra's shape-shifting; see comm. ad loc.)

There is another possible explanation for the cloak here; though I think it is less likely as the primary reference than what was just presented, it may contribute to the overall interpr. In the UK/Kutsa/Śuṣṇa portion of IV.16 (vss. 9–14) we find (IV.16.13) *átkaṃ ná púro jarimā ví dardaḥ* “You shredded their fortresses, like worn-out age a cloak.” The simile is hard to interpret (see comm., ad loc.), but syntactically the cloak is being compared to the fortresses (*púrah*) that Indra destroyed. Since it is Śuṣṇa's fortress(es) that are attacked in some passages (I.51.11, IV.30.13, VIII.1.28), the “cloak” here might be a metaphor for these destroyed fortresses.

In b “with this help” conceals the pl. of the Skt. phrase *ābhir ūtibhiḥ*. As so often, I have suppressed the pl. because in Eng. both “with these helps” and “with these forms of help” are awkward.

My tr. of c agrees with Ge's, in construing *śúṣṇasya* with the agent noun *śnáthitā*. More grammatically punctilious scholars, unwilling to accept that some root-accented agent nouns take genitive complements rather than expected accusatives (and vice versa: suffix-accented *-tār-* stems with genitives), have disordered what seems (to me) the obvious sense of the pāda to accommodate their syntactic scruples, construing gen. *śúṣṇasya* with *vádhaḥ* and supplying an object (from nowhere) for *śnáthitā*. Thus, Tichy (*-tar-* stems, 152; fld. word-by-word by Kü [421]) “Ich habe in meiner Eigenschaft, (jeden Gegner) zu Boden zu strecken, der Waffe des Śuṣṇa Einhaltung geboten”; Tichy cites the similar ploy of Re (BSL 39.110) “c'est moi qui, (le) massacrant, ai arrêté l'arme de Ś.” The Tichy-Kü interpr. introduces a generalized enemy (“jeden Gegner”) that is out of place in the tight confines of the UK/Kutsa/Śuṣṇa saga. (Re avoids this by supplying Śuṣṇa as object of *śnáthitā*, which indirectly restores what I think the grammar says.) These interpr. also require that the *vádhar-* belong to Śuṣṇa and that Indra's act (expressed by the verb *yamam*) involves checking or parrying Ś's weapon in some way. These assumptions are not impossible: *vádhar-* can be the weapon of the enemy (e.g., I.174.8), and *√yam* can sometimes mean ‘restrain’. However, the more likely interpr. is that Indra is wielding the weapon; cf. the very similar phrase (*vádhar úd √yam*) in V.32.7, where Indra brandishes his *vádhar* against Vṛtra: *úd yád índro mahatē dānavāya, vádhar yāmiṣṭa ...* “When Indra held up to the great Dānava his weapon.” It is also worth noting that in another version of our myth Uśanā Kāvya performs a very similar action, proffering the weapon to Indra: V.34.2 (quoted above) *sahásrabhrṣṭim uśānā vadhām yāmat* “U. held out the thousand-spiked weapon (to him).” Ge (n. 3c) also adduces V.34.2 and suggests (n. 1 at bottom of page) that Indra is holding the weapon out to Kutsa, producing a kind of chain of transmission. I think it more likely that Indra is holding it out against Śuṣṇa, as in V.32.7 (though we lack the preverb *úd* here).

Pāda d seems to sum up the fortunate result of the destruction of Śuṣṇa, but what that result is also has to be probed. The Dasyu is presumably Śuṣṇa. Acldg. to Tichy (/Kü), Indra did not give away the Ārya Schar (host / troop) to him (“der ich die arische Schar nicht dem Feind preisgegeben habe”), with an unmotivated substitution of “group / troop” for “name.” (Ge. does not make this substitution: “der ich den arischen Namen dem Dasyu nicht preisgab.”) I think we need to take “name” seriously and read this pāda in conjunction with 2a, where the totality of creatures (“of heaven and earth and the waters”) conferred the name “Indra” on him. “Indra” is in some ways the “Ārya name” par excellence, and in 3d he seems to be saying that by his heroic actions he has not ceded or handed over this proud name to a creature with the opposing name

Dasyu. That is, he has not disgraced the name or allowed the Dasyu to lay claim to it. The middle voice of *raré* reinforces this boast; it can be tr. somewhat heavily “I did not give *my own* name ...” (though such self-involvement of the subject is not as strongly perceptible in all middle perfect forms to  $\sqrt{rā}$ ).

X.49.4: The same personnel (more or less) appear in VI.20.8, VI.26.4; see comm. on the former esp. for some decipherment of the story involved. The presence of the same names in all three vss. makes it likely that a single mythic complex is involved in our vs., rather than a set of unconnected anecdotes, one per pāda. In both passages in VI, Indra works on behalf of Vetasu and Tuji and against Tugra. Vetasu and Tuji are found only in those two passages (the latter in disguised form in VI.20.8, q.v.) and this one; Tugra is better attested, esp. as the father of Bhujyu, but it’s not clear to me that these two Tugras are the same. (It is also worth noting that the client Tuji and the enemy Tugra appear to be etymologically related, with a Caland-y configuration; see EWA s.v. *túji*-.)

Vetasu in VI.20.8 and 26.4 is singular, against the pl. here.

In the publ. tr. I take acc. *vetasūn* with *pitēva* (“like a father to the V.s”) in order to avoid supplying a verb. But when *pitār*- has such a complement, it is normally in the dative (typically *sūnáve* ‘to a son’). I therefore now think a verb needs to be supplied to govern *vetasūn* and the dat. inf., perhaps a form of  $\sqrt{kr}$  (see *karam* in the next vss., 5c, 6d), as in I.129.1 ... *tám abhīṣṭaye, káraḥ* “you will make it prevail” or  $\sqrt{pā}$ , as in X.93.11 *sádā pāhy abhīṣṭaye* (also V.17.5). The latter would fit better with “like a father,” but the former makes fewer syntactic waves. I would now emend the tr. to “I, like a father, (made) the Vs prevail.” Ge supplies ‘help’, Old (ZDMG 55.328 n. 1 [=KISch 788 n. 1]) ‘brought’, citing I.129.1 just quoted, with *káraḥ*.

In b *smádibham* is generally taken as the PN of another enemy humbled by Indra, parallel to Tugra. VI.20.8 contains a similar configuration, with acc. *túgram* and *ibham* in the same pāda, subject to Indra’s will. Ge-Pi (Ved. Stud. I: xvi) take *ibha*- there as a short form of our *smádibha*-, both *ibha*- and *smádibha*- being PN. Old (ZDMG 55.329 [=KISch 788]) follows this interpr; see also Mayr (PN s.vv.). I am dubious. The word *ibha*- otherwise means ‘vassal’ or the like, and I suggest that in the phrase *túgram śásvad ibham* in VI.20.8, *śásvad ibham* is an appositive to *túgram*: “Tugra (as) perpetual vassal (to s.o.).” In our passage *smádibham* is phonologically similar to VI.20.8 (*śá*)*śvad ibham*. I suggest that our passage is based on, or rather deformed from, VI.20.8, with *smád*- an apheresized, phonologically adjusted form of (*śá*)*śvad*. Since *smád* can form cmpds (e.g., VIII.28.2 *smád-rāṭisac*- “(Agni), along with the Gift-escorts”), it has captured *ibha*-. Unfortunately I have to assume a serious amount of misunderstanding of VI.20.8 to arrive at our passage. The real problem is *ca*, which, in our phrase *túgram ... smádibham ca*, pretty unequivocally signals that we are dealing with two conjoined entities, rather than the single one I would like to see in VI.20.8. To get to my tentative interpr. of the passage here, we must first assume that a phrase like *túgram śásvad ibham* in VI.20.8 was reinterpreted as consisting of two people, not the original one: “Tugra (and) (his) vassal.” This interpr. could be made clearer in two different ways—either by adding a *ca* (\**túgram ibham ca* “T and (his) vassal”) or by cmpding with *smád* (\**túgram smádibham* “T along with (his) vassal”)—and our passage represents an irrational blend of the two. This may be far more trouble than it’s worth, and simply accepting a PN Smadibha may be the line of least resistance. But I faintly suggest an alternative tr. “I made Tugra along with his vassal subject to Kutsa.”

The challenges of this vs. continue. Pāda c contains the hapax *rājāni* (≠ differently accented *rājani* loc. sg. ‘king’), over which much ink has been spilled (see, e.g., EWA 445–46,



Keydana [Inf. 190–91, both with lit; most recently Weiss [“King: Remarks on an East-West Archaism,” Fs. B. A. Olsen (2017)]]). The form is surely a loc. sg. and is also fairly surely related to the G and Y Aves. *r̥n* stem *rāzar* / *rāzan-*, which is variously rendered (Barth. ‘Gebot, Satzung, Anordnung’, Insler ‘directive’, Humbach<sub>1</sub> ‘Verkündigung’, KP ‘adresse’, Humbach<sub>2</sub> ‘prayer’). I will not further pursue the Aves. evidence here, on the assumption that, if the more liturgically limited interpr. are correct, they result from inner-Avestan developments; not will I pursue the prehistory of the formations, for an ingenious account of which see Weiss. I also think it is unlikely to be an infinitive, as, e.g., Ge (n. 4c) suggests. (On this question see Keydana cited above.) But, assuming the stem means something like ‘rule, direction, control’ the question is who is doing the controlling – Indra or the sacrificer (*yájamānasya*), who is in the gen. and presumably dependent on *rājāni*. The categorical difference that even subtle changes in wording can express is clear in the two English phrases “X is in control of Y” and “X is in the control of Y”: in the former X controls Y, in the latter Y controls X. (My sympathies to non-native-speakers of English, who have to confront these two semantically opposite expressions, distinguished only by the presence or absence of the definite article.)

To approach this question it would help to know the identity of the sacrificer. Since this pāda is found within a vs. otherwise devoted to the Tugra, Vetasu, Kutsa, Tuji saga, it is unlikely to be a generic, present-day sacrificer; rather it should be one of the participants in the same story. Sāy. identifies him as Tuji, who appears in the next pāda. Given their proximity, this makes contextual sense, and note that in VI.26.4 Tuji is characterized as singing / a singer (*gr̥nānt-*), that is, as a ritual participant. Or it could be Kutsa, who appears in the preceding pāda (b); Kutsa is called ‘pious’ in VI.26.3 (*kútsāya ... dāsúše*), one of the treatments of this saga. In either case the sacrificer would be, not surprisingly, a devotee and client of Indra, not one of the enemies. This only gets us so far, however, because it is possible to construct opposing scenarios in which Indra is either “in control of” or “in the control of” said person. Although the former is, in some ways, the more likely—Indra is all powerful and can exert control over any mortal—I think the latter, the counterintuitive one, may be the more appealing. In response to a plea, phrased as a directive, from one of his clients confronting a threatening situation, Indra voluntarily puts himself under the direction of the emperiled mortal. This role reversal may account for the unprecedented verbal expression, with *bhuvam* + hapax loc.

We come, at last, to pāda d. As was already noted in the intro. to the hymn above, *bháre* could be either pres. or injunctive, and I take it as injunc. because it belongs to the mythological recital in progress, as the presence of Tuji shows. Before probing what the pāda means, we need to address its syntax: is d a single subordinate clause, dependent on c, or is *prá yád bháre tujáye* the subord. cl, with a flg. nominal main cl, *ná priyádhīše*. Both Ge and I take it as the latter, but Old produces two possible tr. both reflecting the former. The choice makes rather less difference than it might appear.

The next question is what, if anything, is the obj. of *prá ... bháre*. One of Old’s suggested tr. takes *priyā* as obj.: “bring forward the dear things (that are) not to be assailed”; Ge supplies “Wagen.” But I think it more likely that this mid. locution is reflexive / self-involved: “bring oneself to the fore, present oneself.” This action would be the logical follow-up to Indra’s putting himself under the direction of Tuji: he “puts himself out” for T, insuring that the T’s *priyā* were not vulnerable. What these *priyā* were, we don’t know: Ge thinks it’s a pair of horses, but horses don’t figure in the other passage(s) with Tuji, and the form does not have to be a dual. I think it’s more likely to be just general beloved stuff, in the neut. pl.

X.49.5: In contrast to the previous couple of vss., the episodes here are unfamiliar, but the verbal expression is more straightforward (with the major exception of pāda b). Note the bookending (*a*)*randhayam* “I made subject” in pādas a and d (echoing 4b). On likely injunc. *karam* in c, see intro. to hymn above.

Śrutarvan figures in VIII.74, where he is explicitly mentioned in vss. 4 and 13, but is in addition the object of the dānastuti in vss. 13–15 (see Anukr.). Vs. 14 of the dānastuti contains a comparison to the rescue of (Bhujyu) *tūgryam* ‘son of Tugra’. Although in my comment on the vs. just above (vs. 4) I am skeptical that this Tugra is the same Tugra as in the Tugra / Kutsa tale, it is possible that this sketch of the Śrutarvan / Mṛgaya episode was attached here because of the connection in VIII.74.14.

No opponent of Śrutarvan’s is mentioned in VIII.74 (which is an Agni hymn). The opponent here, *mṛgaya-*, is found as the designation or descriptor of different enemies defeated by Indra in IV.16.13 and VIII.3.19; because of its likely derivation from *mṛgá-* ‘wild beast’ (see EWA s.v. *mṛgá-*), it is quite possible that *mṛgaya-* is not a name, but an adj. ‘wild, bestial,’ or the like.

Pāda b is quite challenging: the only words that present no (or few) problems are the first two, *yád* and *mā*. Let us begin with the third word, the impf. 3rd sg. *ājihīta* (so Pp.). I assume (with Ge, Th [Unters. 25], and hesitantly Old) that Śrutarvan is the subj. of this verb and *mā* (=Indra) is the complement (though see below). To get further, we must first be clear on what the form is out of sandhi. Old points out that it could actually contain the preverb *ā-*: *ā-ājihīta*, but I think we can dismiss this suggestion quite easily: *ā-* is not otherwise found with *√hā* ‘move’. But this raises another issue: forms of *√hā* are almost never found without preverb; most of those listed as such in Gr either appear with derivational extensions of preverbs or belong to the other *√hā* ‘leave (behind) / be bereft of’. For an ex. of the former see VIII.20.6 ... *dyaúr, jihīta úttarā brhāt* “heaven raises itself higher aloft,” with *úttara-* substituting for *úd*, as in X.35.6 *úd agnāyo jihatām jyótiṣā brhāt* “Let the fires rear up loftily with their light.” In V.32.9d pāda-final *jihāte* does appear without preverb, but it contrasts with the immediately following *ní ... jihīta* in 10a. Only the part. *jihānaḥ* in III.38.1 seems to be a genuine independent ex. without preverb. What then to do with our apparently naked *ājihīta*? I suggest, very tentatively, that the *ānu* underlying *ānuṣāk* is to be understood with the verb; the lexeme *ānu √hā* is reasonably well represented (III.31.17, VI.18.15, VII.34.24, X.89.13) in the sense ‘follow, conform to, yield to’, as in the extravagant X.89.13, also with Indra as object: *ānv āha māsā ānv íd vānāny, ānv óṣadhīr ānu párvatāsaḥ / ānv índraṃ ródasī vāvaśāné, ānv āpo ajihata jāyamānam* “The months gave way to (him), the trees gave way, the plants gave way, the mountains gave way; the two world-halves eagerly gave way to Indra; the waters gave way to him as he was being born.” In our passage Śrutarvan may have yielded to Indra (per the publ. tr.) or simply followed him; in any case he is a client of Indra for whom Indra accomplished the deed presented in pāda a.

We still have more than half the pāda to go, however. Though the next word is the perennially problematic *vayúnā*, we might first address the value of the following word, *caná*, another perennial problem. This word has fortunately been treated in detail by Klein (DGRV I.285–92), though he does not deal with this passage. As he clearly demonstrates, although *caná* overwhelmingly appears in negative contexts, by itself it does not have negative value; the negative is expressed elsewhere in the context and, as it were, bleeds (not his term) into the *caná*, in part because of the coincidence of *-ná* with the negative *ná*. (See however comm. ad II.24.12, IV.18.8.) He finds only one passage where *caná* has “indisputably negative value” (VIII.1.5), but as I argue ad loc., this counterex. is only apparent, because a trio of negative expressions follow

*caná* in the same clause. Klein (p. 286) identifies only two examples of his fourth category of *caná*, “in positive clauses, where *caná* does not possess a negative value.” Our passage can be added to this category, as well as V.34.7 (see comm. ad loc.). In V.34.7 I suggest that *caná* is the equivalent of *cīd* in that context, and it may serve thus here as well. Note that Old says that *vayúnā* is “hervorgehoben” by *caná*. In any case we need not try to include a negative in our interpr. (as Ge does; see below). On the problematic ex. in X.56.4 see comm. ad loc.

Let us now return to *vayúnā*. The first issue is the grammatical identity of the form, which can be either instr. sg. or nom.-acc. pl. neut. Ge (n. 5b) opts for the former, although allowing the possibility of the latter if a participle is supplied. But Ge’s interpr. of the whole pāda renders *vayúnā* entirely too freely: “als er zu mir nicht einmal gebühlich, wie sich’s gehörte, eilte.” I think his interpr. of *vayúnā* is “gebühlich,” with *caná*, interpr. as a negative, accounting for “nicht einmal” and *ānuśák* for “wie sich’s gehörte.” In his note he suggests that Śrutarvan was in such a hurry to get to Indra that he in essence forgot his manners; this doesn’t accord with any other usage of *vayúna-* that I know of. By contrast both Th and Old interpr. *vayúnā* as neut. pl. and *caná* as non-negative. I think both choices are correct (inter alia, because neut. pl. *vayúnāni* is found twice nearby, in X.44.7, 46.8), but neither of the resulting interpr. do I find satisfying. If we take *vayúnā* as neut. pl., we then have to figure out how to construe it. Th takes it as an acc. appositive to *mā* in the meaning ‘protection’ (a semantic extension of his preferred interpr. of *vayúna-* ‘Umhüllung’): “als er (Śrutarvan) in stetiger Folge (immer wieder, unablässig [= *ānuśák* sj]) zu mir (Indra) kam als seinem Schutz.” He notes “[d]er harte Plural der Apposition” (to sg. *mā*) but explains it as expressing Śrutarvan’s repeated seekings of protection. Both the “hard plural” and the lack of other exx. of *vayúna-* as “Schutz” make this interpr. unlikely. It is Old’s interpr. that is closest to mine: “als er zu mir hinstürzte, den Ordnungen richtig folgend.” The syntactically controversial decision here is to construe *vayúnā* with *ānuśák*; he seems to take *ānuśák* as an adjective (“richtig folgend”) modifying the subj. of *ājihīta* and governing the acc. *vayúnā*.

Let us now turn our attention to *ānuśák*, for which see also Scar (588–89). As for adjectival use of *ānuśák*, Scar (589) finds no certain exx. of it, though a number of passages are suggestive and in his opinion the adverbial usage must have arisen from a predicative use of an original adj. Although Scar doesn’t discuss this, I can find no clear exx. of *ānuśák* governing an acc., as Old wants it to. What do I do with the combination *vayúnā ... ānuśák*? As disc. ad II.34.4 and passim, I interpr. *vayúna-* as meaning ‘patterns’, both physical patterns made, e.g., by the alternations of light and shade, and, by extension, ritual patterns, the template of repeated ritual actions, as in VI.52.12 *ímāṃ no agne adhvarām, hōtar vayunaśó yaja* “O Agni, Hotar-priest, perform this ceremony as sacrifice for us according to its patterns.” Now, *ānuśák* is regularly used of the proper ordering of the sacrifice or elements thereof, as in VIII.23.6 *ágne yāhi suśastibhir, havyā júhvāna ānuśák / yáthā dūtó babhūtha havyavāhanah* “O Agni, drive with our good lauds, pouring oblations in yourself in the proper sequence, as you have become our oblation-carrying messenger.” Since *vayúna-* often refers to ritual elements, I think we have the same type of expression here: Śrutarvan’s *vayúna-* ‘ritual patterns’ were properly ordered when he yielded to me or followed after me, and I responded positively to this evidence of Śrutarvan’s piety and helped him out. How does this fit syntactically in b? Since I know of no ex. of *ānuśák* with acc., I take *vayúnā* as neut. nom. pl., with *ānuśák* as adverbial predicate: “the ritual patterns (were) in due order,” in other words as a nominal clause. In the publ. tr. this is presented as an unsigned 2nd *yád* cl.: “when he yielded to me *when* the ritual patterns were in due order.” This is skirting the edge of acceptability, or has even crossed it, I realize. There are two other ways to

configure this, still keeping *vayúnā* as nominative. It may be that b contains two clauses: dependent *yád* ..., fld by *vayúnā canānuṣák* as the main cl.: “when he yielded to [or followed after] me, his ritual patterns were in due order,” such that the *yád* cl. does not depend on pāda a, as it is universally interpr., but on the flg. nominal clause. Or *vayúnā* could be the neut. pl. subj. of the sg. verb *ājihīta*: “when his ritual patterns followed after me in due order.”

I realize that all of these suggestions for pāda b (which now amount to over 1300 words, commenting on the 6 that constitute the pāda) are super-tricky and suspect because of their trickiness, starting with the manufacture of a preverb *ānu* from *ānuṣák*, which nonetheless gets to keep its own integrity. I’m certain of at least one thing – that *canā* isn’t negative here – and certain that several other interpr. are on the wrong track, notably Ge’s. The rest is much shakier, and I do not think anyone has cracked the code of this pāda.

The beneficiary of Indra’s action in pāda c, Āyu, is, as Mayr. points out (PN s.v.), sometimes a client of Indra’s (besides this passage, VIII.15.5), sometimes an opponent (I.53.10, II.14.7, VI.18.13, VIII.53.2 [Vālah., where the preceding hymn, VIII.52, is attributed to Āyu Kāṇva]) — in addition to many passages in which it has the adjectival sense (‘lively’ vel sim.) or refers to a different, primordial Āyu. Since the passages in which Āyu is Indra’s opponent all combine Āyu, Kutsa, and Atithigva into a trio and since Kutsa in our hymn is a client of Indra’s we may assume that we’re not dealing with two different Āyu-s but with different family takes on the Indra / Āyu, Kutsa dynamic.

Ge (n. 5c) interpr. the pāda as a clash between the Ārya, represented by Āyu, and the non-Ārya, identified as *veśá-*, which he takes as the settled (hence presumably indigenous) population subordinated by the conquering Ārya. This interpr. depends on what I consider wrong interpr. of Āyu and of *veśá-*. Although Ge identifies Āyu here as “der arischen Stammeskönig,” as was just noted there seem to be several Āyus, and I doubt that the client/opponent of Indra, associated with Kutsa, is the same as the primordial Āyu. As for *veśá-*, it is not well-attested -- 3x, plus *āsvaveśa-* (1x), *dāsáveśa-* (1x PN?), and *prátiveśa-* (1x) (*niveśá-* (1x) and *svāveśá-* (3x) appear to be independent derivatives of  $\sqrt{vis}$  with the sense ‘entry, entrance’; for the latter see comm. ad VII.97.7) – but its other two occurrences call Ge’s interpr. seriously into question. V.85.7 lists a series of associates against whom we might have committed an offense: *aryamyāṃ varuṇa mitryāṃ vā, sákhāyaṃ vā sádāṃ íd bhrātaraṃ vā / vesám vā nityaṃ varuṇāraṇaṃ vā, yát sīm āgaś cakṛmā śísráthaś tād*, with *veśá-*s of two different types ending the list. The publ. tr. reads “O Varuṇa, the offense that we have committed against any partner, be he one by alliance or one by custom, or against a brother, / or against a neighbor—whether native or foreign—o Varuṇa, loosen that.” I would be inclined to tr. *nitya-* here rather as ‘one’s own’ (see comm. ad X.44.1) and *āraṇa-* as ‘alien’, but whatever the fine-tuning, it is clear that a *veśá-* can belong to one’s own group, that is the larger Ārya community. The difficult vs. IV.3.13 contains a similar, though less elaborated, series of associates of the speaker: *veśá-, āpí-* ‘friend’, *bhrātar-* ‘brother’, *sákhī-* ‘partner’. Given that the other terms define a relationship of some intimacy with the speaker, it seems unlikely that *veśá-* would refer to an unrelated non-Ārya. Again ‘neighbor’ seems a reasonable interpr.; I suggest that this sense for the simplex was extracted from the cmpd *prátiveśa-* (RV 1x, X.66.13, but common starting in the AV, esp. in Saṃhitā and Br. prose), with the literal meaning given by AiG II.1.284 as “die Wohnung gegenüber habend.” Such an interpr. starts with a *veśa-* \*‘house’ (quite possibly accented \**veśa-* and the equivalent of Grk. φοῖκος, etc.), but given that all three RVic occurrences of *veśá-* denote people, synchronically *veśá-* must have the personal sense backformed from *prátiveśa-*. I realize that this interpr. is more complex (or complex in a different way) than the one set forth by Mayr (EWA s.v.), whereby *veśá-* is

from the *IE* nom. ag. \**u<sub>o</sub>i<sub>k</sub>-ó-* (√*ue<sub>i</sub>k* ‘sich niederlassen’) and not directly derived from Ved. √*viś*, but the occurrences of *veśá-* in V.85.7 and IV.3.13 require a relational meaning like ‘neighbor’, not simply ‘settler, inhabitant’. *dāsáveśa-* in II.13.8 is the PN of an opponent of Indra’s, but should mean ‘having Dāsas (/a Dāsa) as neighbor(s)’, so also seems to contain the back-formed personal sense. As for *āsvaveśa-* in the difficult vs. VII.37.7, see comm. ad loc.; it may contain the old ‘house’ sense. For other disc. of *veśá-* see Macd-Kelth Vedic Index, s.v., Thieme ZDMG 91 (1937): 107, Renou EVP IV.100 (ad VII.37.7), and EWA s.v., with further lit.: the word has attracted considerable attention. In any case in this passage I would now substitute “his neighbor” for “the vassal.” This change does not of course get us any closer to knowing what actually happened, but it does eliminate the misleading ‘vassal’ sense. Taking *veśá-* as a PN in this passage (Gr; explicitly rejected by Mayr, PN s.v.) does not advance us any further either.

Pāda d is quite straightforward, with another occurrence of the verb *randhaya-* and two likely PNs, one of Indra’s opponent (*pádgrbhi-*) and one of his client (*sávya-*). Both are almost speaking names. *Sávya-* must be related to the adj. *savyá-* ‘left’ with accent retraction; despite the usual negative associations of the left, he is Indra’s beneficiary here. Note that one Śavya Āṅgīrasa is the poet of I.51–57, acdg. to the Anukr. As for *pádgrbhi-* its transparent literal sense is ‘grabbing the foot’, and it is of course possible that this is not a name, but a description of the enemy. For the retroflex *d*, cf. *pádbīśa-* and the instr. pl. of *pád-* ‘foot’ (*padbhíh*); see Old (ZDMG 63.300–302 = Kl Sch. 316–18), EWA s.v. *pádbīśa-*. For the phonology see AiG I.172, etc.

X.49.6: As noted in the intro. to the hymn above, I interpret the hemistich-final verbs as injunc. *rujam* and *karam* respectively, because of the dominance of injunctives in this hymn. However, this comes at some cost: if we follow the Pp. in reading accented *árujam* and *ákaram*, we can have finite verbs for the subordinate clauses introduced by *yáh* (pāda a) and *yád* (c). By my interpr. both those clauses need to be otherwise configured, and it may not be worth the necessary contortions to keep the unaccented injunctives. However, even taking them as accented imperfects does not produce a smooth interpr. of either hemistich, as Ge’s tr. demonstrates.

To begin with, even if we read *árujam* and make it the verb of the relative clause beginning with *yáh*, it cannot govern the accs. in pāda a, *návavāstvam brhádhratham*, because this phrasal name (or names) is used of a client (or clients) of Agni in I.36.18 and *návavāst<sup>u</sup>vam* alone of someone under the protection of Indra in VI.20.11 (see Ge n. 6a). Therefore he (or they) is/are unlikely to have been shattered by Indra in our vs. To deal with this problem Ge supplies a participle (“schützend”) to govern this acc phrase. If we don’t take a and b together (as I don’t), we simply need to supply a finite verb with a positive sense in pāda a. I see very little difference between Ge’s participle and my finite verb: both need to be manufactured and the accs. in pāda a construed differently from those in b. I tentatively supplied ‘aided’ in the publ. tr.; ‘led’ would be possible on the basis of I.36.18 *agnír nayan nāvavāstvam brhádhratham*, or some other verb with positive sense.

As for whether we’re dealing with one client or two, Sāy. takes them as two, and Ge follows. I prefer one (though not very strongly), with *brhádhratha-* an epithet or descriptor, “N. possessing lofty chariots.” Note that the full phrase *brhánt- rátha-* is found in I.35.4, the hymn immed. preceding the other attestation of *návavāstvam brhádhratham*, suggesting that it is a descriptor in I.36.18 too.

The interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is even trickier. See Old's thoughtful, somewhat discouraging, and ultimately indecisive disc. of the possibilities. Besides the question of *ākaram* v. *karam* and one clause or two, there are the issues of 1) who/what the referent of the acc. caus. participles in c is, 2) what the object of these participles might be (*rocanā* or to be supplied?), 3) what (*ā*)*karam* governs and how it interacts with the participles, 4) what to do with *ānuśāk*. Let us first examine what Ge does with a single-clause interpr. of cd – and how it fails – before attempting one with two clauses. Acdg. to Ge. (nn. 6cd, 6c), the referent of *vardhāyantam prathāyantam* is Vṛtra and as object to these two causatives we should supply *tanvām*, rendering the participles reflexive: "... den sich auswachsenden, gehörig [his tr. of *ānuśāk* sj] sich ausbreitenden (Vṛtra)." But these interpr. would better fit a medial simplex participle, like *vārdhamāna-* in III.30.8, which he cites as semantic parallel. (Note that Sāy. simply glosses the two participles with their medial simplex equivalents: *vardhamānam ... prathamānam*, making no attempt to account for the morphological differences.) The numerous act. forms of *vardhāya-* (and fewer but not negligible ones of *prathāya-*) are never so used: there is always an external object. And although one of the two medial forms of *vardhāya-* does take *tanvām* as object, it is not a mere reflexive but a transitive-causative with internal object: X.59.5: *ghṛtēna tvām tanvām vardhayasva* "strengthen your own body with ghee." Ge then construes *ākaram* with two accs., the participial phrase (X) and *rocanā* (Y), in the sense "make X into Y": "als ich den ... (Vṛtra) ... in Himmelslichter verwandelte." But this is a notion that is foreign to the RV: in all the seemingly myriad treatments of Indra's slaying of Vṛtra in this text, Indra's turning him into heavenly lights, or realms of light, is never the final (or any) act, as far as I know. Ge (n. 6c) cites one RV passage (X.138.6), which should be otherwise interpr. (q.v.), and a few equivocal passages in Vedic prose. Given that his interpr. of the participial acc. phrase is already deeply problematic, Ge's solution of desperation can be properly set aside.

There is another potential comparandum, adduced and discussed by Old, which I think is another red herring: II.11.8, which has *vardhāya-*, a transitive form of *√prath*, and *dūrē pārē*, but the two verbs are construed separately, with two different objects that have no counterparts in our passage, and the whole is quite obscure in any case.

In my view the passage that gives us the best clue is X.94.9, which contains parallel intrans. forms of *√vṛdh* and *√prath*, with Indra as subject: *tébhir dugdhām papivān somyām mādhu, índro vardhate prāthate vṛṣāyate* "Having drunk the somyan honey milked by them [=pressing stones], Indra grows strong, spreads out, plays the bull." On this basis I suggest that Indra [/ "me"] should be the supplied obj. of *vardhāyantam prathāyantam* in our passage, with the whole phrase the transitive equivalent of X.94.9. But who/what is the referent of the participles, their subject? Judging by X.94.9 alone, it should be soma – but soma is not found in our passage, and introducing yet another entity is not a good idea. Looking to the larger context, the subject could be the one who provided the soma, in other words the organizer of the soma sacrifice, the sacrificer. I suggest that this is Navavāstva, who receives Indra's aid in pāda a. He is the one who in c performs the strengthening and spreading out of Indra "in due ritual order" (*ānuśāk*), in other words, during the proper performance of a soma sacrifice. Recall that in the immediately preceding vs. (5ab), by my interpr., Śrutarvan was the beneficiary of Indra's action because *his* ritual patterns were *ānuśāk*; here Nāvastva organizes his sacrifice in the same proper way. In both vss. Indra does something for somebody (5a, 6ab), who does the right thing by him ritually (5b / 6c).

But how would this fit together syntactically? Here we come to the realm of dangerous speculation, which may bring my whole house of cards crashing down. As I just said, I take the

acc. sg. participial phrase in c to be coreferential with *nāvāstvam* in a, which is also acc. sg. In order to construe them together I suggest (very tremulously) that *yád* in c is functioning as a rough izafe connecting the two acc. phrases. Unfortunately this would be the only such ex. in early Vedic, to my knowledge. Although in Old Iranian (both OP and Aves) non-nom. forms of the rel. pronoun can connect non-nom. NPs and in YAves the neut. *yať* substitutes for various oblique forms of the rel. prn. in this type of construction, giving rise to the later Iranian izafe, insofar as Vedic has a similar construction, it shows different parameters. In the RV there exist nominal relative clauses with izafe-like characteristics, but they are always in the nominative, whatever case the antecedent is, and the rel. prn. agrees with the antecedent in number and gender. In early Vedic prose *yád* is in general use, instead of a number- and gender-matching rel. prn., but the clause is also always in the nominative. (For detailed treatment see my “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto-izafe,” to appear in a forthcoming Festschrift.) Here we would have two features that conflict with the other Vedic exx. of the phenomenon – 1) default neut. *yád* rather than matching rel. prn., 2) a (pseudo-)clause in the same case as the antecedent, not the default nominative. Even though both find matches in some of the Iranian materials, I certainly do not want to claim that the construction here is inherited – rather that it was a maladroitness attempt at a fix to a particular contextual problem. The presumed underlying phrase would have been a simple acc. NP *nāvavāstvam brhādratham vardháyantam pratháyantam*, which, however, was too long to fit in a single pāda. For whatever reason the poet inserted the parenthetical main cl. b (... *rujam*) between the name+epithet and the modifying participles, but the latter needed some resumptive device. The poet could have made it all into a rel. cl., \**yó vardháyati pratháyati* – but this would have caused confusion with the opening construction of the vs., *ahám sá yáḥ* “I am he who ...,” where *yáḥ* is of course Indra. A 2nd *yáḥ* clause would have invited the Indra interpr. Wanting to make it clear that Navavāstva remained the referent, the poet kept the phrase in the acc. with an inert introducer. (Too bad this strategy sowed confusion rather than reducing it.)

Pāda d is again an independent cl., expressing one of Indra’s cosmogonic actions. Elsewhere he is said to have ‘upheld’ ( $\sqrt{dṛh}$ ) the *rocaná*:- VIII.14.9 *índreṇa rocanā divó, dṛḷhāni dṛmhitāni ca / sthirāni ná parāṇúde* “Through Indra the luminous realms of heaven are firm and made firm, / stable and not to be shoved aside.” (Cf. also II.27.9=V.29.1 of other divinities.) Here he either created the realms or placed them (/ “made them be”) on the far shore of space. This pāda transitions us away from the specifics of the N. story and into the more general situation found in the next vs.

To summarize the structure I see for this vs.: a and c are a single clause, in which we have to supply a verb like “aided” to govern the long acc. phrase that bleeds from a to c. Their connection is signaled by the pseudo-izafe *yád* opening c. Pāda b is a parenthetical main cl., specifying the aid Indra gave N. – we might supply a dative: “(for him) I shattered the Dāsa ...” The final pāda is another independent main cl.; it is not strictly tied to the Navavāstva story, but falls more into the category of Indra’s cosmogonic deeds. I have no faith that my interpr. of the vs. is correct either in general or in detail, but I do think it is an advance on Ge’s and Old’s attempts.

X.49.7: Another discouragingly obscure vs. The first thing to note about it is that it is set in the present, after all the injunctives with past/mythological reference in previous vss. The first hemistich contains the finite present *yāmi* (a); the second the perfect *āha* (c), which always has present value (see Kü 115–17), and whatever *kṛṣe* (d) is, it’s unlikely to have preterital value, a

point made also by Kü (116 n. 47, *pace* Ge's tr. of *āha* and *kṛṣe* as "riet" and "beseitigte" respectively), but see disc. below.

The first hemistich is fairly straightforward: Indra drives around with the Sun's steeds (a), further specified as pl. *étaśa*-s in b. Since in the sg. *étaśa*- can be the name of Sūrya's horse and since *étaśa* is regularly mentioned in the context of the dim story of Indra's conflict with Sūrya over the latter's wheel, our vs. seems to depict a post-conflict phase, in which Indra has prevailed and has acquired the Sun's steeds for his own use. This surmise is supported by the fact that the other two occurrences of pl. *étaśa*- are in conjunction with the Sun (VII.62.2, X.37.3).

The 2nd hemistich is a different story. Its difficulties begin with the 3rd word *sāvāḥ*. As a simplex, it is a hapax, but (assuming it's the same word) it appears in the cmpds. *prātaḥ-sāvā-* (3x) and *sahasra-sāvā-* (2x). The stem is almost universally (incl. by Sāy.) derived from *√su* 'press', a derivation supported by the cmpds. (presumably 'early-morning pressing and 'pressing of thousand(s)' respectively), but the influential voice of Ge takes it instead to *√sū* 'impel' (see n. 7c), tr. it as "Anweisung" (instruction), a rendering that actually seems relatively far from the root meaning 'impel' to me. Ge's deviating opinion can be discounted here (though Kü [116] allows the possibility of both, with "der Antreib / die Pressung"), even though it makes for a smoother tr.: that is, it is easier to imagine "instruction" as the subj. of a verb "says" than a soma-pressing. Nonetheless, RVic discourse contains far stranger pairings.

The next question is whose *sāvā-* is at issue. There is a dependent genitive, *mānuṣaḥ*, which Sāy., Ge, and Kü (116) take as referring to an unidentified man (see esp. Ge's n. 7; he thinks it might be Uśanas Kāvya). In contrast, with Old and Scar. (285) I take it as referring to Manu(s), the first sacrificer: "the pressing of Manu(s)" is both the primal offering of soma and every re-creation of it since. By associating it with Manu, the poet gives it the charter to make authoritative statements (*āha*).

And what is that statement? It is embodied in a single word, the dat. *nirṇīje* (in sandhi it could also be abl./gen. *nirṇījah*, but this is less likely; Pp. goes for dative). This dat. is found three times closely packed in IX (IX.69.5, 70.1, 71.1), as a purpose abstract / (quasi-)infinitive: "for / to be (s.o.'s) raiment" (see Scar 284–85). Here I think Soma is announcing himself as Indra's raiment – that is, that Indra's ritual drinking of soma, starting with the very first soma pressing, provides him with a protective garment or shield in preparation for battle. Alternatively Soma could just be telling Indra to suit up (which is what Old's "... sagt mich sauber zu machen" and Scar's "mich zum Ausschücken anhielt" more or less add up to), but the point of hearing this from Soma would be lost if Soma is not the garment itself.

The result of Indra's arraying himself is given in the main cl. in d. It is quite clear that Indra seriously damages the/a Dāsa with his *hātha-* ('blows, thrusts' vel sim.), but the verb in the clause, *kṛṣe*, is extremely problematic. It is presumably to be construed with the adv. *īdhak* 'apart, aside', but the morphological analysis and even the root affiliation are hard to determine. On the one hand, it looks like the accented *kṛṣé* found in VIII.3.20=32.3, but there are serious divergences. If *kṛṣé* is a finite verb, it is a 2nd sg.; the other possibility is a predicated dat. infin. (see disc. ad VIII.3.20). In either case, this allows a root affiliation with *√kṛ*, which fits the context. But here the default interpr. is 1st sg. (Gr simply invents an aor. stem *kṛṣa*, to which this is the 1st sg.). Though it would be possible to recast d as the words of Soma addressed to Indra: "you (will) do ..." (on this poss., see Ge's n. 7d) and preserve the 2nd sg. interpr., this doesn't fit the rhetoric of the rest of the hymn, where Indra is always the speaker, and it introduces another layer of complication. And we cannot interpret it as a -ṣe 1st sg. (of the *stuṣé* type), because those forms belong to a tight semantic class, that of praising. There is another factor to keep in



mind: two more exx. of *kṛṣe* are found in the next hymn, X.50.5  $\cong$  6, attributed to the same poet. These three forms must obviously be considered together, but finding a common denominator isn't easy. Among other things, the usual interpr. of the forms in X.50.5–6 is as 2nd sgs. (like *kṛṣé* in VIII), as opposed to the 1st sg. here – though see disc. ad loc. for my rejection of that interpr. Moreover if the repeated *kṛṣé* in VIII is a finite form, it is probably preterital, but that value doesn't fit here. Note Kü's explicit insistence (116 n. 47) that *kṛṣe* cannot be a preterite in our passage.

Taking it by itself (that is, in conjunction neither with *kṛṣé* in VIII nor *kṛṣe* in the next hymn), I see two possibilities, both of which have their problems as well as their advantages. 1) It belongs to  $\sqrt{kṛ}$ . The advantages are obvious:  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  is an overwhelmingly well-attested root; moreover, *īdhak*  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  is found elsewhere, in an appropriate meaning: 'put aside, set aside, separate'. Cf. VIII.18.11 *īdhag dvēṣaḥ kṛṇuta* ... "Set hostility aside" (also IV.18.4 and prob. IV.34.9). The publ. tr. "sideline" is a slightly idiomatic version of this. But the drawback of this interpr. is serious and indeed insurmountable in my opinion: we need a source for the -s-, and I have been unable to find any way to get the -s- that is not breathtakingly arbitrary. There is a marginally attested zero-grade medial s-aor. (*akṛṣi*, *akṛṣata*), found in JB and BSS (see Narten, s-aor. 96), presumably based on the old medial root aor. (so Narten). Our form could belong to such a stem – but 1) the stem is very late, 2) we would still have to assume that it had been reinterpr. as a pres. stem, to explain the -e ending – or else that it shows an archaic -e subjunctive ending (rather than -ai) built to an anomalously zero-grade stem. Just to set this down in writing shows how desperate a confection it is. If we want to preserve the root affiliation with  $\sqrt{kṛ}$ , I'm afraid we have to renounce any attempt to account for the -s-. 2) But there is another avenue: the root  $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$  'plough; drag, draw'. Here the morphology is (relatively) unproblematic. The root has both a 1<sup>st</sup> class pres. *kārṣati* and a 6th class pres. *kṛṣāti*. Although both presents are generally active, both have medial forms in Vedic (e.g., to the 6th cl., *kṛṣasva* RV X.34.13). On the presents, see Gotō (1st. cl. 112–13) and Hill (Aor.-pres. 115–21); on injunc. *karṣat* see comm. ad X.28.10. Our form can straightforwardly be the 1st sg. med. pres. to *kṛṣá-*. Assuming a meaning 'drag, draw', there is no problem with the semantics of our passage: 'draw/drag aside/apart' can produce the same 'sideline' sense for *īdhak*  $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$  as for the same idiom with  $\sqrt{kṛ}$ . There are a few problems: the root is not otherwise found with *īdhak* and in fact forms of the root are relatively poorly attested in general, esp. compared to  $\sqrt{kṛ}$ . Moreover, the 'plough' sense is dominant; in fact Gotō (112) claims that the 6th cl. pres. is only used in this technical meaning, whereas *kārṣa-* has a wider semantic range (sim. Hill). But given the (Rig)Vedic propensity for metaphorical extension, I find it difficult to believe that *kṛṣá-* could not widen in the same way as *kārṣa-*. On balance I favor interpr. *kṛṣe* here as a med. 6th cl. pres. 1st sg. to  $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ . Or, that *kṛṣe* is a blend, a form originally of  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  that has borrowed the -s- from  $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$  on the basis of passages like this, where the semantics were neutralized ('put aside' = 'drag aside'). But the blend idea seems more trouble than it's worth.

The rest of the pāda is unproblematic.

X.49.8–10: These three vss. show concatenation, though their contents are otherwise divergent: 8a *sapta(hā)* matches 9a *saptá* in the same metrical position; 9a *dhārayam* matches 10a *dhārayam*, though in a diff. position. Note also 9b *sīrā(h)* and 10d *āśīram*.

X.49.8: This vs. comes as a relief after the many knots that precede it. It also returns us to the mythological past, with two injunctives (*karam* [c], *vakṣayam* [d]) in addition to the augmented *prāśrāvayam* in b.

On the seven whom Indra smites (*saptahā*) see Ge's n. 8a; of the parallels he cites, X.120.6, with its *saptā dānūn* shattered by Indra, is the most apposite. See also his remarks on Nahus in the same n.

The c and d pādas are implicitly contrastive: the definite *anyām* 'the one' in c evokes an unexpressed *\*anyān* 'the others' as complement, modifying the acc.s of d (so also Ge).

Since *sāhaḥ* is neut. and *anyām* is masc., they must be two parallel objects: the individual enemy (*anyām*) and the abstract power he represents (*sāhaḥ*); for a similar passage (also adduced by Ge n. 8c) where the *sāhaḥ* is Vṛtra's, which is defeated by Indra's corresponding *sāhasā*, see I.80.10 *īndro vṛtrāsya tāviṣīm, nīr ahan sāhasā sāhaḥ* "Indra has smashed forth the power of Vṛtra, has smashed forth the might of Vṛtra with his might."

The apparent act. participle *vrādhant-* is essentially isolated; the sole finite form to the supposed root *√ vrādh* (V.6.7) is plausibly explained by Hoffmann (Inj. 122 n. 32; see also Gotō [1st cl. 302]) as a backformation to *vrādhant-*. Lowe (Part. 291) considers the possibility that it is a Caland adj. In any case it lacks synchronic participial function, serving as a plain adj., but one with shifting value: 'arrogant, overweening' of enemies, 'proud' of clients. For the former, cf., e.g., X.69.11 *āva vrādhantam abhinad vṛdhaś cit* "as strengthener you [=fire] cut down even the greatly arrogant one." For the latter I.122.10, where Nahus, found also in our vs., is so described: *vrādhato nāhuṣaḥ ... śārdhastaraḥ* "more forceful than proud Nahus"; see also I.150.3. Since the ninety-nine here are the object of Indra's strengthening, a positive interpr. is called for. See Ge's n. 8d.

X.49.9: On Indra's holding the waters fast, see comm. ad I.51.4, also I.61.11 (adduced by Ge n. 9a). KH (Inj. 192) takes *dhārayam* as having the same presential-general sense as the identical form in 10 and tr. "ich erhalte die sieben Ströme", but, despite the pres. tense verb in c, I think the rest of the verse is couched in the mythological past.

I do not know why c has a pres. tense verb *vī tirāmi*, while d has the injunctive *vidam* (which could in fact be augmented *avidam* in its sandhi context: *yudhā[avidam]*, though this seems unlikely), esp. since, as Ge asserts (n. 9cd), the actions in the two pādas are elsewhere associated (see esp. X.104.9).

X.49.10: KH tr. and disc. this vs. (Inj. 192). He takes *dhārayam* as "generell" in function (= "allgemeine Eigenschaft bzw. Fähigkeit") and tr. "Ich halte ... fest," while the augmented *ād dhārayat* in b he renders as a semi-modal "festhalten konnte." As he points out, the vs. seems to concern one of the beloved Vedic paradoxes about cows and milk: that "cooked" milk comes from "raw" cows, or that white milk comes from red cows. But in fact the particulars of the vs. point to neither of these (save possibly for the *rúṣat* 'gleaming' in 10b); the content more resembles another standard paradox, that the fetus doesn't fall out of the womb or the sun out of the sky. It is also not clear why/how Tvaṣṭar failed while Indra succeeded, that is, what episode this refers to. Ge (n. 10ab) says that Tvaṣṭar is the creator of animals, but this only makes his failure in this endeavor the more mysterious. Because of the contrast between Indra's and Tvaṣṭar's actions here, I think it must refer to a mythological incident in the past, not a general situation holding now, contra KH.

Pāda b is metrically problematic; for various possible solutions see Old – while Arnold (metrical comm.) suggests reading *tvāṣṭa ádhārayat* with the contraction of *tvāṣṭādhārayat* unloosed and shortening of *tvāṣṭā* in hiatus. What no one seems to have suggested is to read *ná* not as the last word of pāda a, but as the first word of b. This would yield a well-formed Triṣṭubh in pāda a (and the following and final vs. 11 is in Triṣṭubh) and a Jagatī in b, without the need to dissolve the contraction of *tvāṣṭādhārayat*. The break of b would be irregular (two heavies), but it is also under the current pāda division, hence the makeshifts of Old, Arnold, and HvN. My suggested division also eliminates pāda-final *ná*, which is vanishingly rare and places the *ná* in a standard pāda-initial position. (There are numerous examples of # *ná* ... *caná*; see Lub s.v. *caná*.) For disc. of supposed exx. of pāda-final *ná* see comm. ad X.111.7.

The loc. pl. *ūdhasu* (or *ūdhaḥsu*) in c would be better read as degeminated *\*ūdhasu* to avoid a rare break (– – ∪).

The phrase *sómam āśíram* has been variously interpr. The problem is that although the acc.s throughout this vs. have so far referred exclusively to milk, we suddenly have soma, followed by *āśír-*, the technical term for the milk mixed with soma. Ge (n. 10d) suggests that *āśíram* here is an infinitive, with *sómam* as its complement: “to milk-mix into soma” in an awkward English rendering. (His is smoother: “um den ... Soma zu mischen.”) Alternatively he allows for the possibility of a loose cmpd “die Soma-Mischmilch.” The publ. tr. follows Old’s interpr. (given Noten I.411 n. 1), whereby the milk is *identified* with soma, presumably as a particularly exalted liquid, as well as with the milk to be mixed with it. After all it has just been called “the honey of honey,” another valued substance that is not chemically identical with it. (KH’s [192 and n. 162] “den Zusatz zum ... Soma” seems to follow Ge, though he cites Old.)

X.49.11: Unlike its companion hymn X.48, in this ātmastuti Indra does not remain in character through the whole hymn. The final vs. of X.48, vs. 11, continues the 1st sg. reference with *mināmi* in b and *mā* in c. By contrast, the final vs. of our hymn is a 3rd ps. summary, beginning with the formulaic summary-verse particle *evā* “just in this way,” with Indra the 3rd ps. subject of ab, followed by 2nd sg. reference to him (*te* + heavy voc. *harivaḥ śacīvaḥ* ... *svayaśaḥ*) in cd.

There are two problems associated with ab and esp. its verb. 1) The pf. *vivīye* is the only medial form not only to the pf. to *√vī*, but to any stem belonging to the root. (Wh’s and Gr’s root pres. part. *vyānā-* X.85.12 is universally interpr. instead as ‘breath’; see comm. ad loc.) 2) Moreover, the lexeme *prá√vī* is relatively rare in the RV; see comm. ad I.34.4 as well as Scar (501). (Ge’s suggestion [n. 11a] that *prá* “excuses” (entschuldigen) the middle voice is belied by the fact that all other finite forms of *prá√vī* are active.) I propose to deal with one of these issues by the simple expedient of separating a and b into separate clauses. Taking them as a single clause results in an unusual verbal configuration: not only would *prá* be separated from *vivīye* by tmesis, but it would follow it at some distance, introducing the next pāda. Although preverbs in tmesis sometimes follow their verbs, they generally follow them immediately and remain in the same metrical unit; I do not offhand know of another example of this type (which is not to say they don’t exist).

With the *prá* eliminated, we are free to interpr. pāda a with a simplex *vivīye*, which allows us to tap into a common formula. The VPs *devān√vī* and *nṛṇ√vī* are occasionally found as free syntagms (e.g., VI.50.2 and VI.2.11 respectively) and the cmpds *devā-vī-* and *devā-vīti-* are quite common, all in the meaning ‘pursue / seek to attract the gods (/men)’, i.e., seek to attract their attention and their presence. As a summary of the intent of his self-praise (*ātmastuti*), “Indra pursued / sought to attract the gods” seems accurate and would immediately evoke the

stereotyped VP. His string of boasts is meant to impress the audience with his powers and previous deeds and excite their admiration. The unusual middle voice would reflect Indra's intense self-involvement in the action; the verb is otherwise syntactically identical to the active, as Kü remarks (454) with some puzzlement. It is the case that 1st sg. verbs sometimes have a special status because of the special self-involvement of the subject, and this can lead to 1st sg. middles expressing "active" senses. For another likely example, see comm. ad V.4.1.

In the publ. tr. I take *devān ... nṛṇ* as a conjoined phrase without overt conjunction: "gods and men." I now think it at least equally likely that *nṛṇ* refers to the gods, as so often, and the whole should be tr. "the gods, the superior men." Cf. VI.2.11 *vīhī ... divó nṛṇ* "pursue the men of heaven," clearly referring to the gods.

This leaves us with pāda b, independent by my interpr. but lacking a finite verb. This can be easily remedied by attending to the first two words: *prá cyautnéna*. The latter of course is derived from  $\sqrt{cyu}$  'stir, rouse'; *prá* is the most common preverb with  $\sqrt{cyu}$ . I generate a verb form for b from this combination, *prācyāvayat* vel sim., supplying as obj. *devān ... nṛṇ* from pāda a.

It is also possible that the second hemistich should be divided into two clauses, rather than being a single cl, as in the publ. tr. The first (c) would be a nominal clause: "all these (deeds) are just yours," with a displaced *íd*, or "all these (deeds) are yours." Pāda d would then simply supply *tā* as obj. from its nominative in c: "The powerful ones applaud (them)." This separation might allow more of a role for the *íd* in c, though both interpr. are possible and pretty much amount to the same thing.

Since *abhí√gṛ* means rather 'greet, welcome, applaud' rather than 'sing', the tr. should be adjusted accordingly.

## X.50 Indra

The hymn has an intriguing structural omphalos, although it does not seem to correlate with specially emphasized content. In vss. 3, 4, and 5 each hemistich in the vs. has a more or less matching opening: 3a *ké té*, 3c *ké te* (note the accentual and therefore morpho-lexical difference in the 2nd word); 4a *bhúvah*, 4c *bhúvah*; 5a *ávā nú kam*, 5c *áso nú kam*. Vss. 3 and 4 also have echoes of the opening further along: 3a and the beginning of 3b continue the pronominal pattern: *ké té nára indra yé ta iṣé*, *yé te* ..., with 3d opening with *ké* again; 4b starts with the same *bhúvah* as 4a and c.

There are a few other patterns worth noting: the word *nṛ-* and derivatives dominate the first four vss. of the hymn: 1b (*viśvā*)*narāya*, 1d *nṛmṇám*, 2a *nárya*, 2b *naré*, 3a *nārah*, 4c *nṛṇ*. And note contrastive *paúmsye* in 3d. Pāda 5d and 6a are identical save for a minor variation (#*viśvéd etā* v. #*etā viśvā*). And the first (1a) and last (7d) pādas of the hymn end with *ándhasaḥ*, construed, not surprisingly, with a form of  $\sqrt{ma(n)d}$ .

X.50.1: The verb *prá ... árcā* can be either 2nd sg impv. or 1st sg. subj. I have followed the Pp. (etc.) in taking it as the former, despite the presence of 2nd pl. *vah*. As I discuss in "Poetic Self-Reference" (Fs. Skjaervø, 2005: 69 and n. 10), a poet sometimes urges himself, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg., to praise, while referring to his priestly colleagues on behalf of whom he is acting in the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. (regularly *vah*). It is awkward to render the enclitic in English, and so I left it out of the publ. tr.; Ge. takes it as a possessive with *ándhasaḥ* ("an eurem Tranke"), but this seems just like a place to park the pronoun.

With Gr, Old, Scar (360), but contra Pp., I analyze *viśvābhū-* as *viśva-ābhū-* ‘present / available to all’, which distracted reading salvages the meter. The argument against this analysis might be that rt. noun cmpds generally don’t contain both a nominal 1st member and a preverb (see my *iśudhyā-* [Fs. Lamberterie, 2020] 486 and “Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian” [Fs. Kellens, 2024]; Scar 649 and n. 921). However, this restriction seems to be limited to nominals with object function; *viśva-* is more loosely construed with the rest of the cmpd. here.

As disc. ad I.18.9, III.31.7, *makhā-* and its derivatives and cmpds can have both martial and bountiful sense. Here since *súmakha-* modifies *sāhaḥ* ‘strength, power’, it is more likely to be the former, hence my “good-battling strength” versus Ge’s somewhat discordant “des freigebiges ... Siegeskraft.”

I take *māhi* with *śrávaḥ* despite the pāda boundary between them, because *māhi śrávaḥ* is a fairly common phrase (I.43.7, 79.4, etc.), but there is no harm in taking it with *sāhaḥ* as Ge does.

X.50.2: The *sákhi-*, Indra’s “comrade,” doing the praising in pāda a is by implication the “man like me” who is supposed to celebrate Indra in b — which neatly identifies me as having such a privileged relationship with the god.

The various locatives in cd sketch a range of situations in which Indra is hard pressed and needs – and receives (*abhí ... mandase*) – the exhilaration of soma. The English might be more parsable if the locatives had been rendered more uniformly. I now would take the list as a series of unmarked locative absolutes, tr. “Whether it’s a question of ...” The standard interpr. (incl. in the publ. tr.) is that four different circumstances are enumerated: *viśvāsu dhūrṣú*, *vājakṛtyeṣu*, *vṛtré*, and *apsú*, with *vā* preceding the last member of the series in a construction “X<sub>1</sub> ... X<sub>n-1</sub> (*utá*) *vā* X<sub>n</sub>” (see JSK, DGRV II.172–73). I now wonder if there are only two items on the list, each with a characterizing loc.: the two items would be *vājakṛtyeṣu ... vṛtré vā* (with conventionally placed *vā*), with each further characterized by a circumstantial locative, the initial *viśvāsu dhūrṣú* and the final *apsú* – thus producing a chiasmic construction. On this basis I now suggest an alternative tr. “whether it’s a question of seeking prizes among all the chariot poles or of Vṛtra among the waters.” The reason for my change of heart (beyond a better placement of *vā*) is that an independent situation “among the waters” that would require Indra to rev himself up with soma is a bit difficult to conjure up, and “amidst all the chariot poles” is also somewhat hard to construe independently – witness the varying interpr. given by Sāy., Ge (n. 2c), and Klein. My second proposed item, “Vṛtra among the waters,” would refer to Vṛtra’s confinement of the waters, and Indra’s need to smite Vṛtra in order to free the waters.

As for the first item, we must first take a brief detour through *vājakṛtya-*. The 2nd member of this cmpd, *-kṛtya-* is presumably a neut. abstract ‘doing’ (so AiG II.2.828), found also in AV *karma-kṛtya-* ‘doing of deeds’. But what does ‘doing (or ‘making’)) of *vāja-*’ mean? The syntagm *vājam / vājān √kr* is very rare: I have been able to find only one example, the throw-away final pāda of VIII.26, vs. 25 *krđhí vājān apó dhíyaḥ* “(O Vāyu,) make prizes, waters, and insights for us.” I suggest that *√kr* in our *vāja-kṛtya-* is, as it sometimes is, a dummy verb, that is, it serves as the abstract of the denom. to *vāja-*, *vājayá-* ‘seek prizes’; with its associated adj. *vājayú-* ‘seeking prizes’. With this array, we might expect a long-*ā* abstract \**vājayā-* ‘the seeking of prizes’ – cf., e.g., *śravas-yá-* ‘seeks fame’, *śravas-yú-* ‘seeking fame’, and *śravas-yā-* ‘the seeking of fame’. I suggest that *vāja-kṛtya-* is substituting for \**vāja-yā-*, perhaps to avoid a pile-

up of fem. loc. pl. Alternatively  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  in this cmpd might be used in the same way as in VIII.26.25: ‘make’, that is, ‘supply’ prizes to someone else.

In either case the “seeking / making of prizes” happens “amidst all the chariot poles.” This must refer to the disordered scrum of chariots and the horses yoked to those chariots found either on the battlefield or in a contest or chariot race. So acdg. to my two-item interpr., Indra receives an infusion of soma at his (mythological) battle with Vṛtra and in the confusion of (present-day) battles and contests in which he gives aid to mortals.

So I now suggest an alternative rendering of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich “Whether it’s a question of seeking/making prizes amidst all the chariot poles or of Vṛtra amidst the waters, you find exhilaration.” I have not entirely rejected the four- (or an alternative three-) item interpr., however, because the independently construed *apsú* in the next vs., 3d, may respond directly to *apsú* here.

X.50.3: As Ge says (n. 3), the answer to “who are these men (*nárah*)?” is probably a resounding “we are!” This answer has been prepared by the explicit “a man like me” (*māvate naré* 2b). However, since *nṛ̥-* can also be used of gods and in the pl. is especially common with the Maruts, the poet may be setting up a sneaky identification between the human adherents to Indra and the gods who have the same type of relationship to him. In any case the concentration of *nṛ̥-* forms early in the hymn gives weight to the question “who are these men?”

Judging from the various tr., it almost seems that the dative pred. *īśé* could belong to any number of stems *īś-* (several of which don’t exist). I take it to *īś-* ‘refreshment’ (so also Scar 291 and Sāy., who glosses *annāya*), the point being that the men in question provide Indra with *īś-* (in this case, probably soma). Ge “nach Wunsch” (wouldn’t this be an instr.?) or better (n. 3) “zu deiner Freude” (presumably to the same *īś-* as mine); Heenen (Desid. 80–81) “à ta force” (what stem?). Note that VI.68.1, adduced by Ge (n. 3), contains both *īśé* and *sumnāya*, like the *sumnām* in our pāda b. See comm. ad loc. Our passage makes the reciprocity between the two terms clear: we provide Indra with *īś-* and in turn receive *sumnā-* from him.

On *sadhanyām* see comm. ad IV.1.9, VI.51.3, where I accept Scar’s re-analysis of this stem as ultimately based on *sa-dhana-* ‘common wealth’, with the developed meaning of *sadhanī-* ‘companion’, contra the usual deriv. from a rt noun cmpd with  $\sqrt{nī}$ . In Scar’s rendering of this passage he takes the companion to be Indra’s: “dein Wohlwollen, das dein [ständiger] Begleiter ist (?)” I think it more likely that the men are seeking to make Indra’s favor into *their* companion. I would now slightly emend the tr. to “as their companion,” eliminating “travelling,” which is a ghostly trace of the old interpr. with  $\sqrt{nī}$ . Curiously Ge tr. *sadhanyām* here as “deine Mitanteil an der Beute gewährende (Huld)” (fld. by Tichy [1983 = KISch 207 n. 22], W. E. Hale [Asuras (1986) 93, “booty-apportioning”], Heenen [“qui procure des butins”]) though Ge’s renderings of the stem elsewhere are in the “companionship” range.

The 3rd pl. *hinviré* is otherwise always transitive in the RV (for V.6.6, see comm. ad loc.); here it is best taken as reflexive (“spur themselves on”), though ideally we would have an overt object.

In c the “lordly prize” (*vājāyāsuryāya*) for which the men strive matches the prize in *vājakṛtya-* in 2c. Likewise, the loc. phrase *apsú svāsūrvārāsu paúmsye* seems to have a function similar to the locatives in 2cd, except here they express what is at stake for the men, rather than for Indra as in 2cd. The presence of the reflexive adj. *svāsu* ‘their own’ emphasizes the men’s self-interest. Note that *apsú* is found in both 2d and here; in 2d it referred (probably) to the waters associated with Vṛtra, but here it must be the waters that the men are battling for. I

therefore think that *svāsu* not only modifies flg. *urvārāsu* (“their own fields”) but, more importantly, preceding and likewise fem. *apsū* (“their own waters”), in order to contrast with the waters in 2d, which are in Indra’s domain. Gr, Ge, and, flg. Ge, Hale take *svāsu* only with *urvārāsu*. I would now slightly emend the tr. to “when their own waters (and) fields (or) their masculine power is at stake.”

The last loc., *paūmsye* ‘masculine power’, implicitly contrasts with the many forms of *nṛ-* so far encountered, esp. the subj. of this vs., pl. *nārah*. For a similar contrast see comm. ad X.29.7.

X.50.4: The three insistent pāda-initial forms *bhūvaḥ* are of course troublingly ambiguous, because formally they can be either injunctive or subjunctive (see disc. ad IV.16.18, X.8.5–6) and because the influential disc. of KH (Injunk., esp. 214ff.; see also just cited comm.) imposes what to me is an overly narrow interpr. of these forms. In the publ. tr. I take the three *bhūvaḥ* here as subjunctive “you will become” (so also JSK DGRV I.99); this may be supported by the undoubted subjunctives in the next vs. (*āsah ... vārdhāḥ* 5c). However, I now think it possible, though not necessary, to take them instead as injunctives “you become” — meaning that Indra periodically takes on these roles (see comm. ad X.8.5–6). If we maintain the subjunctive interpr., the first hemistich is a promise to Indra from the poet and ritualists, while the second portrays the aid Indra will provide in return. I think it less likely that the forms are injunctives in preterital sense “you became” (pace Ge’s “Du ... wardst ...”) although this is not excluded.

The stem *cyautná-* is otherwise neut. in the RV (pl. *cyautnā(ni)*); as the numerous occurrences in Aves. (both O and Y) of the exact cognate *šīiaoθ(a)na-* are also neut., this seems like an inherited trait. The masc. nom. sg. *cyautnáḥ* here is a grammatical nonce, with the stem pressed into service as a rough-and-ready agent noun. I suggest that it was generated from the last vs. of the previous hymn (X.49.11) where I suggested that *prá cyautnéna* is a compressed expression of \* *prācyāvayat cyautnéna* “With his stirring action he be(stirred) (them),” where in fact *nṛn* forms part of the object. Here, with Old, I take *nṛn* again as an acc. to be construed with the nonce nom. agentis *cyautná-*. The tr. would better reflect this as “you will become the rouser of men” (cf. Ge. Aufrüttler, sim. KH, JSK ‘mover’).

In d identifying Indra as a mantra, a solemn utterance, or if we take its suffix literally, “an instrument for thinking,” is a surprising turn; in fact it is rather like identifying him as a (hastily masculinized) *cyautná-* in the previous pāda. Since the ordinarily word *mántra-* is already masculine, it does not need to be masculinized here, but perhaps our form is the equivalent of masculinized *cyautnáḥ*, a nonce agent noun from a nom. act. (Gr glosses this usage as Berather.) Note also that the pair *cyautná-* / *mántra-* shows the deeply embedded IIr. opposition between deeds and words/thoughts.

Three of the pādas in this vs. contain *visva-* ‘all’: b *visveṣu sávaneṣu*, c *visvasmín bhāre*, d *visvacarṣane* – thus universalizing Indra’s roles. This *visva-* concentration resonates with *visvānarāya visvābhūve* in 1b, with *visvacarṣane* ‘common to all domains’ being esp. similar to *visvānarāya* ‘common to all men’ in sense.

X.50.5: *jyāyān* in pāda a picks up *jyēṣtha-* in 4d.

The hapax *ómatrām* is very problematic; see esp. Old’s detailed disc. He favors a combination of *óman-* (m.) ‘aid’ and *trā-* ‘protect(ion)’ because the two roots regularly appear together. But the morphological details are very difficult. I have rendered it as an unholy (or at least unorthodox) dvandva “succor and protection” without any faith in its correctness.

The conjoined subjunctives in c, *ásah ... vārdhāś ca*, seem functionally untethered, which is why I interpr. them as belonging to an unsignalled purpose clause dependent on (my interpr. of) d. This is not necessary, however – the pāda can simply mean “you will be unaging and will make (us) strong.”

As for *vārdhāḥ*, Gr, Ge, and JSK (DGRV I.80, 83) take it as intransitive (JSK: “grow (even) stronger”), but the active 1st class pres. *vārdhati* is overwhelmingly transitive. Gotō (1st Cl. 290) hesitantly registers only 3 possible intrans. forms of the act. simplex, incl. this one. It seems a simple matter to interpr. it in its usual function and supply ‘us’ (vel sim.) as object, esp. given that the first half of the vs. depicts the help Indra gives to mortals.

The last pāda (essentially repeated as 6a) has two problematic forms, which are run together in the Saṃhitā text: *tūtumākṛṣe*. The Pp. divides as *tūtumā kṛṣe*, an analysis followed by all subsequent tr. (but the publ. tr.) and interpr. (as far as I know), starting with Sāy. Flg from this word division, *tūtumā* is a hapax neut. pl. adj. modifying *sāvanā*, perhaps meaning ‘strong’ (Gr ‘kräftig’) or ‘abundant’ (‘ausgiebig’ BR) to  $\sqrt{tū}$  ‘be strong’ and somehow derived from *tumrá-* (so Gr, AiG II.2.85 etc.). *kṛṣe* is a 2nd sg. verb to  $\sqrt{kṛ}$ , identical to the problematic accented *kṛṣé* found in a repeated passage in VIII.3.20=32.3 (see comm. ad VIII.3.20). The whole assemblage means “you made all these pressings strong / abundant.” There are several glaring problems with this interpr.: 1) The supposed adj. *tūtumā-* is oddly formed; 2) Although it is possible to interpr. *kṛṣe* in the same way as *kṛṣé* in the repeated pāda in VIII, this requires separating it from the identical *kṛṣe* in the immediately preceding hymn (X.49.7) attributed to the same poet as this one. The standard interpr. of that form is as a 1st sg., which would rest on a very different set of morphological processes. Ignoring the nearby form in favor of the distant one is not good philological method; 3) In terms of the content of the pāda, it isn’t really *Indra*’s job to make the pressings strong/abundant; that should fall to the mortal worshippers.

I have a radically different interpr., which depends on a different analysis of the Saṃhitā text: *tūtuma ākṛṣe*. (This requires no emendation of the Saṃhitā text, only a deviation from the Pp.) Note the lack of accent on *tūtuma* and the accented *ā* attached to *-kṛṣe*; both are crucial for the analysis to follow. With this word division we have, first, a 1st plural verb to the reduplicated stem *tūto-* (3x: *tūtos* VI.26.4, *tūtot* II.20.5, 7). All three other occurrences are transitive, and the two in II.20 take ritual objects: *brāhmā* ‘sacred formulations’ and *sāṃsam* ‘laud’, so *sāvanā* ‘pressings’ would be an appropriate obj. for my *tūtuma*. Contra Wh and Macd (VGS), *tūto-* probably does not belong to the perfect system but is a redupl. aor., as identified already by Gr and argued for by Kü (220-21), flg. KH etc. (see Kü’s n. 298); see comm. ad VI.26.4.

Assignment to a redupl. aor. seems reasonable, since the single clear pf. form, *tūtāva* (I.94.2), is intrans. and so the *tūto-* forms are functionally distinct. I am somewhat disturbed that there is no *-āya*-pres. attested (\**tāvāyati* ‘makes strong’), since in my view trans./caus. redupl. aorists are all secondarily dependent on such present stems. However, since verbal forms to this root in Sanskrit are confined to the RV and are quite rare, the absence of \**tāvāyati* may result from the accidents of attestation – esp. since Old Persian has the corresponding stem *tāvaya-* (see EWA s.v. *TAV*<sup>1</sup>; Cheung, Etym. Dic of Iran. Verb 386; Schmidt, Altpers. Wö. 252, etc.), and Vedic could well have inherited the same. That the redupl. aor. is athematic suggests that it belongs to an early layer of such formations. The redupl. aor. analysis also explains the short root vowel – since  $\sqrt{tū}$  is set, we might have expected \**tūtū(-ma)* in weak forms – since the metrical template of redupl. aors. is heavy redupl. + light root syl. (not achievable in the *tūtos*, *-ot* forms however).

Having exchanged an oddly formed adj. *tūtumā-* for a well-formed finite verb, we now must confront my suggested *ākṛṣe*, and this requires revisiting *kṛṣe* in the previous hymn X.49.7.



As argued in the comm. ad loc., I take *kṛṣe* there not as a form of  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  (the universal view), but of  $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$  ‘drag, draw’ – in that case the 1st sg. mid. of the 6th cl. pres. *kṛṣā-*. I assume the same root affiliation here, but take it not as a form of the 6th cl. pres. but rather as a dative inf. *ākṛṣe* with purpose sense: “to draw (you) here.” This makes for a satisfyingly conventional sense for the pāda: we make our soma particular powerful / abundant in order to attract the god. There are a few loose ends to be cleaned up, however. First, *ākṛṣe* is not otherwise attested with  $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$  in Vedic. However, it would be exceptionally easy to create on the model of the numerous lexemes with *ākṛ* like *ākṛ*  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  ‘make (to be) here’, *ākṛ*  $\sqrt{bhr}$  ‘bring here’, etc., and in fact *ākṛ*  $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$  ‘draw to oneself’, etc., is quite common in epic and Cl. Skt. A more serious problem is the accent: in a rt. noun cmpd like this we should expect *ā-kṛṣe*, rather than having the accent on the preverb. I have no good answer for this; I can only suggest that the accentuation was adjusted (with retraction onto the preverb) redactionally on the basis of (*īdhak*) *kṛṣe* in the preceding hymn (X.49.7) after the correct analysis of the form, and the configuration of the pāda, had been forgotten.

X.50.6: The rel. cl. in pāda b, depicting Indra’s assimilation of the pressings, seems to support my interpr. of 5d/6a.

The mantra takes its more accustomed place with other elements of the sacrifice, after its unusual identification with Indra in vs. 4.

X.50.7: On a slight ring with vs. 1, see comm. at the beginning of the hymn.

Ge construes *sumnāsya* with *pathā* “auf dem Pfade (deiner) Gunst,” while I take it with adjacent *mānasā*. There seems no principled way to decide.

## X.51–53

These three hymns concern the well-known myth of Agni’s flight and concealment in the waters to avoid his ritual role as conveyor of the oblations, his discovery by the gods, and his return to his role. The first two hymns are in dialogue form. All three are attributed to Agni Saucika, a name presumably generated from the subject matter of the hymns. On the patronymic *saucika* see Ge’s intro. to the three hymns.

## X.51 Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., the responsion in vss. 4 and 6 define vs. 5 as an omphalos, and it is in this vs. that the gods emphasize Agni’s responsibilities to Manu as first sacrificer. The responsion is esp. pronounced in 4a ABL ... *varuṇa bibhyad āyam* and 6c ABL *bhiyā varuṇa ... āyam*, but note also “this business” (4d *etām ārtham* / 6a *ārtham etām*).

The first four vss. are also characterized by the repetition of the adv. *bahudhā*.

In addition to the usual treatments, see Schnaus, Dialoglieder 233–52.

X.51.1: That Agni was covered with a caul on his entering the waters suggests that the episode is configured in part as a pregnancy and re-birth. On the caul, see below ad X.53.6.

Note the phonetic echo in ... (-) *viṣṭitaḥ* ... (-) *vivésitha*, though the two forms belong to diff. roots ( $\sqrt{viṣṭ}$  and  $\sqrt{vis}$ ). Note also (-) *viṣṭam* in 4b.

Final *ékaḥ* contrasts with hemistich-init. *visvā* as well as *bahudhā*.

X.51.2: The acc. pl. *tanvāḥ* here (and in vs. 4) must be read undistracted – almost alone in the many many forms of *tanū-* in the RV. Otherwise only *tanvāḥ* in I.162.20, also a late portion of the text.

The use of  $\sqrt{kṣi}$ , which ordinarily means ‘dwell’, is somewhat surprising for Agni’s kindling sticks; its usual meaning is found in 5b.

Ge (n. 2cd) suggests that what lies behind Agni’s question about the location of his kindling sticks is his assumption that he could not be visually located in the waters by his pursuers because the kindling wood is not making him bright. That the kindling sticks are said to “lead to the gods” (*devayānīḥ*) seems a little off; perhaps Agni is suggesting what Ge did: that the brightness of the kindling sticks would lead the gods to him. See also comm. ad vs. 5.

X.51.3: The root  $\sqrt{viś}$  from 1a returns, but as a ppl. *-viṣṭa-*, morphologically matching the ppl. to the root  $\sqrt{viṣṭ}$  also in 1a.

On *daśāntaruṣyā-* and *antār*  $\sqrt{vas}$ , see Old and AiG II.2.831.

X.51.4: On undistracted *tanvāḥ* here, see comm. ad vs. 2.

X.51.3–4: The plupf. *aciket* in 3c has clear preterital function, parallel to the impf. *aíchāma*. It contrasts with the presential pf. *ciketa* in 4d (on the presential value of this pf. see Kü 169). The two forms also have different semantic values: ‘perceived’ versus the extended meaning ‘attend to’ ‘think about / consider’.

The opening of 3c *tām tvā* is echoed by the opening of 4c *tāsya me*, both reinforcing an enclitic personal prn. with a form of *sāl tām*.

X.51.5: On the gods’ somewhat disingenuous use of Manu as argument for Agni’s return, see publ. intro.

Opinions differ about the deployment of the gerund *aramkṛtyā* in b. With Ge, I take it with pāda a with Manu as agent, despite the pāda boundary. Like Ge (n. 5b), I supply *\*yajñām* as obj., extracted from *yajñā-kāma-*. Cf. with similar obj. X.63.6 *kó vo ’dhvarām tuvijātā áram karat* “Who will properly prepare the ceremony for you, o powerfully born (gods)?” But most interpr. take it with pāda b with Agni as agent: Old, Don., Schmaus (Dialog, 238–40 with disc.). Sāy. considers both possibilities and gives an alternative interpr. for each; Schnaus cites Tikkanen (Gerund, 352) as favoring the Ge solution. The problem with respecting the pāda boundary is that the result doesn’t make a lot of sense (at least to me). If Manu is the subject, the point is clear: the sacrificer has everything in readiness, but lacks the means (i.e., sacrificial fire) to offer it and convey it to the gods. But if Agni is the subject, what has he previously prepared? Sāy. supplies *ātmānam*, seeming to suggest that Agni has arranged himself so that he can’t be seen. Old thinks the object is the sacrifice: Agni previously prepared (/used to prepare) it (as a general rule?), but now he rests quietly out of the fray. Don implicitly takes *kṣeṣi* as a modal, suggesting (n. 9) that the gods are promising that if Agni will (return to) perform the sacrifice for them “you may rest after serving us.” Schnaus accepts Sāy.’s *ātmānam* and discusses possible semantic nuances, not to much purpose. The range of interpr. if the gerund belongs with the rest of b shows how ill it fits there. Taking it with pāda a fits the urgency of the gods’ address to Agni, with the three 2nd sg. impvs. (*éhi ... kṛṇuhi ... váha*): Manu is prepared and waiting impatiently for your (=Agni’s) action.

Note *tāmasi*: since Agni is a perpetual source of light, his dwelling “in darkness” is

surprising, almost paradoxical. This paradox is also found in the 1st vs. of the famous hymn X.124 (on which see my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas”), where Indra tempts Agni to join his sacrifice, with the argument *jyóg evá dīrghám táma āśayiṣṭhāh* “For a long time indeed you have lain in long darkness.”

On *kṛṇuhi* see comm. ad vs. 7 below.

*devayānīh* in 2d is reprised by *devayānān* in c. As with the two forms of  $\sqrt{kṣi}$  (see comm. ad vs. 2), the second occurrence is more easily interpretable than the first, and we may consider both pairs as showing a species of poetic repair.

X.51.6: On the responsions with vs. 4 see publ. intro. and the above intro. to the hymn.

The Pp. divides *rathīvādhvānam* as *rathī iva ādhvānam*; under this analysis *rathī* would be the nom. sg. of the *-ín*-stem *rathín-* ‘having a chariot’. Old (see also Gr s.v. *rathín-*) prefers to restore *rathīr va*, with the *vrkī*-stem *rathī-*.

Old remarks that *ánv ā ...* is not an exception to the accentual rule regarding two preverbs the second of which is *ā*, whereby the first preverb loses its accent. Here *ánu* is to be construed with preceding *ādhvānam*.

As is generally agreed (explicitly Gr, Old [with copious earlier lit.], Re [EVP XIV.79–80], Schaf. [Intens. 192–93], Schnaus [241], though contra Sāy., who favors  $\sqrt{vr}$ ), on the basis of formulaic context the verb *āvarīvuḥ* must belong to the intens. of  $\sqrt{vr}$  ‘turn, roll’ (*varīvart(t)i*, etc.). But the morphology is wrong, with a mostly missing root syllable: we should expect a 3rd pl. *\*avarīvr̥tur*. Old plausibly suggests that the 3rd sg. pres. *varīvart(t)i* with simplified underlying geminate *-tt-* and the *t*-less 3rd sg. impf. *avarīvar* gave rise to our *t*-less form, by haplology. Old does not, however, provide an intermediate preform. We should expect either *\*avarīvr̥tur* with zero-grade root syllable or perhaps (on the model of the imperfects of redupl. pres.) *\*avarīvarur*, with full grade. The latter would be a candidate for Old’s haplology, the former for liquid dissimilation. Either process would work, but it’s too bad Old wasn’t more explicit. Re suggests that the impetus was “de conserver le quadrisyllabisme, typique dans cette classe d’intensifs” – but the zero-grade form would have done just that.

There is some difference of opinion about the structure of the phrase found in the simile (*gauro ná kṣepnóh ... jyāyāh*). Both forms are abl.-gen.; one of them should be an ablative construable with *avije* ‘I flinched (from)’, with the other a genitive dependent on it. The uncertainty is located in the hapax *kṣepnú-*. This is a clear deriv. of  $\sqrt{kṣip}$  ‘throw, hurl’, but the question is whether it refers to an agent who performs such an action (‘hurler, shooter’) or to an action or abstract. Most tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take it as the former, i.e., ‘hunter, archer’ vel sim., in which case it is a gen. dependent on the abl. ‘bowstring’ (so my “from the bowstring of an archer”). But AiG II.2.742 takes *kṣepnú-* rather as an abstract ‘quickness, swiftness’ (das Schnellen), presumably connecting it semantically with another deriv. of the root *kṣiprā-* ‘quick’. This interpr. flips the case relations, imposing an interpr. “from the swiftness [abl.] of the bowstring [gen.]” as reflected in Schnaus’s “vor dem Schnellen der Bogensehne” (p. 241; see also her explicit case idents. on the same page). Without certainty about the meaning of *kṣepnú-* it is not possible to be certain; however, I still favor the first interpr. “Swiftness” is not the first quality one thinks of in a bowstring, and when an animal is afraid of being shot, its fear would not, I think, be concentrated on how fast the string would go from behind the shooter’s ear to its normal position a few inches in front, but on whether the shooter was going to use the bowstring to propel an arrow its way.

X.51.7: It is worth noting that this hymn contains one of only three forms in the RV of the developing irregular 8<sup>th</sup> class pres. to  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  (*karóti*, *kurutē*), viz. 1<sup>st</sup> pl. act. pres. *kurmāḥ* here – the other two being the 2nd sg. impv. *kuru* (X.19.2, 145.2). The form here is esp. surprising because the standard 5th class pres. impv. *kṛṇuhi* is found two vss. earlier, also in the speech of the god(s). There is more to be said about *kurmāḥ*, some of it puzzling. The first thing to note is that the expected 1st pl. act. of the 5th class present, *kṛṇmās(i)*, is not found in the RV, though its medial counterpart *kṛṇmahe* occurs twice (VII.16.4, X.84.4). The 5th cl. form *kṛṇmās(i)* is, however, very common in the AV (approx. 15 occurrences in Ś, most with P parallels), but the AV entirely lacks the 1st pl. found here, *kurmās(i)*, even though the 8th class present is otherwise far better developed in the AV than the RV. (*kurmāḥ* predominates in the other early Vedic texts, though KS also has *kṛṇmaḥ* in addition to *kurmaḥ*.) That *kṛṇuhi* and *kurmāḥ* not only appear in the same hymn, but within two vss. of each other in the speech of the same individuals (and gods at that!) suggests that, at least for the composer of this hymn, the two forms didn't belong to different paradigms or signal different registers, but that *kurmāḥ* was the de facto 1st pl. act. present to the “normal” pres. stem to  $\sqrt{kṛ}$ . I don't quite know what to make of this, esp. given the strong representation of *kṛṇmās(i)* in the AV.

In context the form also strains to be a modal: the gods seem to be promising that they will do something for Agni (hence my “will make”) rather than that they are doing so at present. A subjunctive would have done nicely; both pres. subj. *kṛṇāvāma* and aor. subj. *karāma* are attested in the RV and would have been available (though not metrically apt).

The rest of pāda a contains an apparent nominal izafe-type clause: *āyur ajāraṃ yád* “a lifetime that is free from old age.” On such constructions, see my article in the Mark Hale Fs. This phrase is so interpr. by all the standard tr. (Sāy, Ge, Re, Don). However, Schnaus takes it differently, and it is worth considering her divergent interpr.: she takes *yád* as subordinator (“wenn”) of the whole pāda. Even though it is quite late in the clause, this seems syntactically possible, since what precedes it is in some sense a single constituent, the VP. So, by her interpr., the first hemistich is subordinated to the main clause found in the second. Like me, she takes cd as a non-overtly-marked question: “Wenn wir dein Leben alterlos machen ... wirst du dann ...?” This could be a solution to the non-modal form of *kurmāḥ* just disc., since in a “when” clause the pres. indic. would be at home. I therefore consider that an acceptable alternative tr. would be “When (/if) we make your life free from old age ..., will you ...?” flg. Schnaus.

The standard tr. take cd as a flat statement: “then you will convey ...,” not a question. This would seem somewhat presumptuous on the part of the gods and also not to square with the hard-ball negotiations Agni undertakes in the next vs. I prefer to take it as a question.

Pāda c reprises 5d, with the 6-syllable pres. part. *sumanasyāmānaḥ* occupying the whole of each pāda after the opening and the subjunctive *vahāsi* matching the impv. *vāha* in 5.

X.51.8: Agni bargains for considerably more than the life without old age that the gods were offering in 7a. The numerous examples of *ca* in this vs. nicely express the pile-up of perks that Agni is demanding, as Schnaus points out (245): “Agni will nicht nur die Voropfer, sondern auch noch die Nachopfer, und die Schmelzbutter und und und.” The “long life” of the original offer is relegated to the final pāda.

The referents of the expressions in c, “the ghee of the waters and the man of the plants,” are disputed, particularly the second. Ghee is of course a prized ritual substance and a main contributor to the blazing up of the offering fire. As to its relationship with the waters, it can be conceived of as the essence of liquids, the distillate of the class of substances whose cover term

is waters, or as the final and best product of the process that begins when cows drink water. Both possibilities have been suggested; I favor the former.

On the model of the first expression we should expect “the man of the plants” to be 1) another ritual substance offered into the fire, and 2) the essence of the class of substances whose cover term is plants, or the product of a process that begins by the ingestion (vel sim.) of plants. It is very difficult to identify anything that meets both criteria. If “man” is taken literally, then we must use the second alternative of criterion 2: “product of process,” since a literal man can’t be the essence of a different class of substances (unless, with JSK I.141, we silently replace “plants” with “animate things,” a superordinate class I doubt if Vedic India had). In the “process” interpr., we must assume that men eat plants and therefore count as the product of plants (the linkage here being rather fragile). Even if we accept this reasoning, what ritual substance would man represent? Old (in his long and thoughtful disc. of the *pāda*), fld by Klein, suggests it’s the dead body that is given to the fire to devour. I think this is unlikely: the “flesh-eating” (*kravyāḍ-*) fire of cremation is carefully distinguished and forcefully separated from the ritual fire that conveys oblations to the gods (see esp. X.16.9–10), and it’s the latter that’s in question here. I very much doubt that the oblation-conveying Agni who is speaking here would associate himself with the cremation fire or remind the gods that one form of fire has this inauspicious job. Though see the anxiety expressed in the next hymn, X.52.3, and also bear in mind that Yama is the one who found him in our vs. 3. Alternatively Schnaus (245) suggest that the man here is the sacrificer, who makes offering to and nourishes Agni – and that plants are the principal nourishment of men.

If we do not take “man” literally but as an entity embodying the essence / best of plants, other interpretational possibilities open up. Perhaps the best is that the “man” is Soma (see Ge n. 8c, Re), an idea that goes back to Hillebrandt. The plants are elsewhere said to have Soma as king (*óṣadhīḥ sómarājñīḥ* X.97.18–19, sim. 22); certainly in the RVic universe Soma would be considered the pinnacle of the plant world. And Soma is a ritual substance. The problem, however, is that soma is not offered into the fire – for obvious practical reasons: unlike ghee, which makes the fire blaze, a liquid like soma would put it out or at least put a damper on it. I therefore doubt that Agni would be requesting soma. Ge (n. 8c) suggests rather offhandedly that “the ‘man’ of plants” might be the tree, which, in the form of firewood, is crucial to the ritual fire’s continued existence. Trees can have a vaguely anthropomorphic shape (trunk and limbs), and “firewood” makes sense as a ritual substance Agni would want— but “soma” has more conceptual oomph. Perhaps this is just a riddle we (and the bewildered gods, who ignore or reconfigure this request in their response) are meant to ponder. But in the end, I favor the tree / firewood interpr.: ghee and firewood together provide the food, the fuel, for the fire.

Schnaus (245) points out that Agni entered into the waters and plants (*apsv óṣadhīṣu*) in 3b, so their return here has been prepared.

X.51.9: The gods echo (and accede to) Agni’s requests from the first hemistich almost word-for-word; the metrical disturbance in 9a (extra syllable) may be meant to call attention to the responson, as elsewhere: see, e.g., comm. ad Yama/Yamī hymn, X.10.11–12.

If (like us) the gods had trouble figuring out what Agni was demanding in 8c, their corresponding offer of “the whole sacrifice” (*yajñāḥ ... sārvaḥ*) in 9c may be meant to cover all possible bases. (Note *sārva-* for *vísva-*, which prevails in the older RV and is found [in the pl.] in vss. 1 and 2.)

## X.52 Agni

Ge asserts that the entire hymn is in Agni's mouth (save for the final summary vs. 6); as noted in the publ. intro., I consider vs. 3 to be an intrusion from a human ritualist. Re tentatively considers 3 and 4cd not to be Agni's speech.

In addition to the usual treatments, see Schnaus, Dialoglieder 253–65.

X.52.1: The two hemistichs are constructed in parallel: a 2nd pl. impv. of speaking addressed to the gods (*śāstānā a, prā ... brūta c*), followed by a *yáthā* clause, with the *yáthā* reinforced / doubled by a second subordinating *yá-* form (*yád b, yéna d*). But this 2nd subordinator makes some trouble for interpr. in the first construction. The construction in cd is fairly straightforward: in *yáthā ... yéna pathā*, the phrase *yéna pathā* more nearly specifies *yáthā* “how, by what path” (at least in my interpr.; see below) and *yéna* is clearly a modifier in a noun phrase. But the function of *yád* in b is more open to interpr. For one thing, it is not adjacent or near-adjacent to *yáthā*. For another, though it could be a neut. sg. NA and function as a modifier like *yéna*, there is no surface noun it can attach itself to, and of course it could instead be a subordinating conjunction, introducing a new clause, or doubling *yáthā* to introduce the old one. Old cf.s *kathā kád* in IV.23.5a, c, but there the two are adjacent and there is a noun *sakhyám* associated with *kád*. Ge (n. 1ab) cites III.32.14 with *yátra ... yáthā*, on which see comm. ad loc. Re compares *yád ... yáthā* in the immed. preceding hymn (X.51.7), but those two forms are quite unconnected contextually.

On first glance it appears that *yád* is pleonastically marking the gerund as a clausette, but gerunds don't require such marking. (See Hettrich, Hyp. 231 n. 41 on this point with regard to this passage.) Re supplies a noun referring to speech for the *yád*, though in a somewhat twisted construction: “... je pourrai concevoir (un thème poétique et) lequel.” Although this solution is in part supported by an expression in the next hymn (X.53.4 *vācāḥ prathamām masīya* “might I devise the foremost of speech,” also with a modal form of  $\sqrt{man}$ ), the context here does not seem to me to be about Agni's poetic development but about his figuring out how to perform the role assigned, that of Hotar. On the basis of the similar construction in cd, I think *yáthā ... yád* are parallel subordinators, but this goes awkwardly into English (“how, what (task) I shall conceive ...”); in the publ. tr. the *yád* is therefore represented by “it.” Ge's rendering (253) is more faithful without losing too much parsability: “wie ich and woran ich ... denken soll” (sim. Schnaus 253), but I would prefer not to use a simple “think (about)” for *manávai*.

This verb may be responsible for much of the trouble, and its presence here is, I think, part of a buried verbal play. Recall that in X.51.5 the gods argued that Agni owed it to Manu, who was all prepared to perform sacrifice, to return and take over the role of his oblation-conveyor. The verb *manávai* looks very like the dat. *mánave* “for Manu,” save for accent (and ending), a dative that regularly occupies just this metrical position (e.g., IV.26.4 *havyám bháran mánave* ...). I take this as the poet's subtle reminder of Manu's part in this scenario.

In contrast to my interpr. of *yáthā ... yéna pathā* as doubled subordinators of a single clause, both Ge and Re both take them as introducing separate clauses, the first being a nominal cl. consisting only of *bhāgadhéyam yáthā vaḥ*, the second spanning pāda d with the finite verb – though Re in his n. considers the possibility of a unified cl. The best evidence I can see for a two-cl. interpr. is the doubled enclitic *vaḥ*, but as seen in the publ. tr., I take the two *vaḥ* as having different functions: as genitive with the nouns referring to the gods' share and as dative indicating them as recipients/goals with *ā (... ) váhāni*. Schnaus has yet another way of configuring cd, with *bhāgadhéyam* as the obj. of *prā ... brūta*, and what follows as a single cl. with double subordinators: “Sagt mir die Anteilsverschaffung, wie ich euch, auf welchem Weg

ich euch die Opfergabe hinfahren soll.” None of these interpr. takes proper account of the parallel structures of ab and cd.

X.52.2: The first hemistich reprises the first hemistich of vs. 1: pāda a *ahám hótā ny àsīdam* ...  $\cong$  1b *hótā ... niśādyā*, while b opens like 1a with the *vísve devāḥ*, though in nom. not voc. But other elements have been added. Agni claims to be “the better sacrificing” (*yājīyān*) Hotar; as Ge suggests (n. 2a), he may be comparing himself to his older brothers or to the human Hotar or both. And in b all the gods are joined by the Maruts, for reasons that are not clear to me (though see the passages cited in Ge’s n. 2b for the Maruts’ presence at Agni’s kindling).

I render the impf. *ny àsīdam* as an immed. past “I have sat down,” though this is not a standard use of this tense (see IH’s work). However, the context certainly favors this interpr.

The publ. tr. of the first part of d is quite different from the standard, which take *brahmā* and *samíd* as two independent subjects of *bhavati*: “the Formulator is (there, and) the kindling stick”; Re “le *brahmán* (est présent), la bûche-flambante est (là).” I take *bhavati* as expressing an equational transformation, “X becomes Y” – “The kindling stick becomes the Formulator.” Although this may not make immediate sense, I think it in fact gives richer semantics. It may be that the crackling of the just-kindled fire is compared to the verbal part of the sacrifice, or that the recitation of the formulation coincides with, and appears to cause, the kindling of the fire. However, as an alternative I would consider the tr. given above.

X.52–3: Both 2c and 3c begin with the āmreḍita *āhar-ahar*, which draws especial attention because in the first instance this produces a very rare opening of four light syllables (as Schnaus points out, 255), slightly ameliorated to three lights in 3c.

X.52.3: As indicated in the publ. intro. and the hymn intro. above, I think that this middle vs. is not spoken by Agni. Besides the third-person reff. in the vs., note that vs. 3 is distinguished structurally from the two flanking vss., 2 and 4. Vs. 2 opens *ahám hótā* rhyming and contrasting with 3a *ayám yó hótā*, while vs. 4 firmly reestablishes the 1st ps. reference by beginning *mām*. Nonetheless, Ge (flg. Sāy.) considers Agni to be the speaker of vs. 3; acdg. to Ge, Agni poses the questions in ab to himself, and answers them in cd. This seems overly complex. Most other comm. (Lanman [Reader, 387], Old, Re, Schnaus) agree that the speaker is “Andrer als Agni” (Old), but there is no consensus on who the speaker is. The most likely, in my view, is a human ritual participant (Re’s tentative “Le récitant?”; Schnaus “Sänger”). On seeing the newly (re-)installed Hotar, the speaker expresses some anxiety about the Hotar’s identity – and esp. his possible connection with Yama. Recall that it was Yama who discovered Agni in hiding in the previous hymn (X.51.3), and Yama’s role as king of the dead raises the unappealing possibility that the fire now installed as Hotar is actually the cremation fire or one closely related to it. Hence “who is he to Yama?” On the need and desire to keep the ritual fire of divine worship and the cremation fire strictly separated, see comm. above ad X.51.8 and passages in the funeral hymns, esp. X.16.9–10.

On *āpy ūhe* see comm. ad VII.104.14, where I uphold the old root affiliation with  $\sqrt{ūh}$  ‘solemnly proclaim, laud’, rather than accepting Kü’s (489–90) assignment to a putative  $\sqrt{vāh}$  ‘anerkennen’. I take *āpi*  $\sqrt{ūh}$  to mean ‘(solemnly) address / call upon’, with the *āpi* contributing the sense of closeness, directness: in both passages the obj. of the verb is a god or gods in a ritual situation, and here especially the speaker is in intimate proximity to the ritual fire, addressing it with the words of the liturgy. With this second question I think the ritual officiant is asking

which actual fire he is addressing in the current ritual, which is a sacrifice to the gods, not the dead.

Pāda c contains two āmreḍitas, *āhar-ahar* and *māsī-māsī* “every day / day after day” and “every month / month after month.” It is not clear if they are meant to be contrastive or sequential. In the publ. intro. I tentatively accepted Lanman’s suggestion (Reader, 388) that the birth every day is that of the ritual fire (for the Agnihotra, destined for the gods) and the birth every month is that of the fire for the Śrāddha celebration, destined for the ancestors (Pitars). I now consider this doubtful, because 1) I am not aware of any RVic evidence for the monthly Śrāddha, and 2) if this is actually the sense, it would mean that there is no distinction between the fire(s) for these two purposes, even though I have just argued that this issue drives the anxious questions in the first half of this vs. I now think it more likely that the fire born every month is for the RVic equivalent of the Darśapūrṇamāsa, with the daily and monthly sacrifices marking the most temporally significant ritual observances.

It is for these sacrifices that the gods established Agni as their oblation-carrier. Note the middle *dadhire*, signaling the gods’ stake in the action. Note also that *havyavāham* reprises 1d *havyām ... vāhāni*.

However, with regard to the Śrāddha, I have to admit that it does seem referred to in the *Atharva Veda*; see AVŚ XVIII.4.63 *pārā yāta pītarah ... / ādhā māsī pūnar ā yāta no ghrān havir āttum* “O forefathers, go away; then in a month come again to our houses to eat the oblation.”

X.52.4: Save for the emphatic reestablishment of the 1st ps. via vs.-initial *mām*, in pāda a Agni repeats 3d verbatim. Although many recommend reading disyllabic *mām* here (Gr, Lanman, Arnold, Schnaus [oddly Old doesn’t comment]), I think this may be another instance in which metrical irregularity calls attention to patterned repetition; see in this hymn sequence X.51.8–9 as well as X.10.11–12 and comm. thereon.

Note the “popular” *I* in *āpamluktam* to the rare root *√mruc*, *mluc*, found only here in the RV.

With Ge (n. 4cd) I take cd as the gods’ words – in my view, quoted by Agni as the verbal accompaniment of their formal installation of Agni in his role. Note that pāda c consists of 8 straight heavy syllables, with the first (and only – the final being anceps) light syllable found in the cadence at position 9. This metrical structure may express the solemn and ponderous nature of the gods’ instructions.

Pāda d is identical to X.124.1d; interestingly that passage also depicts an attempt to coax Agni into becoming the oblation-carrier of the gods, though this time in the context of the “divine revolution” – on which see my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas” (Ged. Frits Staal). I will not speculate on the numerology in this characterization of the sacrifice; there is quite enough such speculation out there already.

X.52.5: The standard tr., incl. the publ. tr., take the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. med. aor. *ā ... yakṣi* in modal/desid. value; KH (Injunk. 253) includes this passage among the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. injunctives he considers to have immediate future value. Given that Agni doesn’t seem to have embarked on his duties yet, some version of these views is probably correct. I do now suggest, however, that pāda b need not be as closely linked to pāda a as all tr. (incl. mine) assume, which would take the pressure off the modality of *yakṣi*. It does not make a lot of sense that Agni would win immortality for the gods *so that* he can make wide space for them: these two actions aren’t causally linked. I now think



that b may rather be a prelude to c: in order to win wide space, Agni wishes to put the mace in Indra's arms, so that Indra can perform his usual martial feats. Winning battles is generally the necessary prelude to gaining wide space elsewhere in the RV. Cf., e.g., VII.98.3 *yudhā devébhyo várivaś cakārtha* "Through combat you [=Indra] made wide space for the gods" (= I.59.5, with Agni as subj.); sim. III.34.7 (Indra). I therefore suggest an alt. tr. for bc: "So that I may make wide space for you, o gods, might I place the mace in Indra's arms. Then ..."

X.52.6: This is a 3rd ps. summary vs. I do not think the speaker is the same as the ritualist in 3, who appears to be on the scene.

In c *aūkṣan ghṛtaīḥ* "they sprinkled (him) with ghee" seems to further specify *samañjānti devāḥ* "the gods anoint (him)" in 3b.

The final words of the hymn *hótāraṃ ny āsādayanta* echo 1b *hótā ... niśādyā* as well as 2a *hótā ny āsīdam*. This ring composition is hardly surprising, since the installation of Agni as Hotar was the aim of the dialogue and the hymn.

### X.53 Agni

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. and the introductory remarks of Old and Ge. See also Schnaus, *Dialoglieder* 267–89 and Köhler, *Kavi*, 114–17 and 326–28.

One of the verbal tics of this hymn is the use of a rel. cl. beginning with *yéna* identifying the means by which something is accomplished: 4b the speech with which the gods defeat the Asuras, 7d the chariot by which the gods lead (something), 9d the hatchet with which Brahmanaspati hews his formulation, 10d the track or word with which the gods achieve immortality. See also 10b *vāśtbhir yābhiḥ* with the instr. rel. in 2nd position and a different gender and number, but functioning in the same way.

X.53.1: Note the annunciatory here-and-now quality of *sò 'yām*, which is difficult to render in English in conjunction with a relative cl.

In c it might have been better to render *yājīyān* as 'better sacrificer', given its use as a true comparative in X.52.2.

X.53.2: For a construction similar to pāda a see I.70.8 *ārādhi hótā ... niśattaḥ*, adduced by Ge. My rendering there is "he has been brought to success, installed as Hotar-priest"; I use "realized" here to distinguish *ārādhi* from the form of *√sādh* in the next vs.

On *yājīyān* see comm. ad vs. 1.

Pāda b is essentially identical to VI.15.15; see comm. there. On the position of *hí* and on the peculiar behavior of forms of *√khyā* with preverbs and *hí*, see comm. ad III.31.12.

I interpr. the function of the injunc. *abhí ... khyát* as presential/general. Ge as modal "so möge er ... sich ansehen"; Re and Schnaus as preterital "il a pris en considération" and "er hat ... beschaut" respectively. I connect b with cd and assume that b indicates that Agni has made the conditions favorable for the sacrifice that we wish to perform. The other tr. take b with pāda a. This is possible but, to my mind, less likely because his success / realization in pāda a is not the result of his watching over the oblations, as the *hí* would suggest.

The second hemistich is notable for the interjection *hānta* and for the two syntactically parallel fig. etym.: *yājāmahai yajñīyān* and *īḍāmahā īḍīyān*. Note also that *yajñīyān* echoes the two previous occurrences of *yājīyān* (1a, 2a)

X.53.3: The opening of pāda a, *sá āyur āgāt*, echoes the end of 1a *sò 'yám āgāt*. Pādas a and d are also entirely parallel in structure: ADJ (FEM. ACC) *akar deva-Xtīm no adyá* “he has made our X-of-the-gods Y today.”

Ge remarks on pāda b (n. 3b) that the hidden tongue is sacred speech (“die sakrale Rede”). This is one possible reading, but surely the primary referent is Agni, who is often called the tongue of the sacrifice (e.g., II.1.13). Although strictly speaking it wasn’t the human ritualists but the gods who found Agni in hiding, they can be pardoned for taking some of the credit. Re in his comm. recognizes both possibilities.

The publ. tr. agrees with Ge and Re in construing *āyuh* with *vāsānah*, as in X.16.5. Schnaus (269–70) takes it instead with *āgāt*, which would certainly be possible, but this leaves *vāsānah* without an object. She takes it as reflexive with a pred. adj.: “sich wohlreichend kleidend,” but I know of no reflexive uses of this present without an expressed obj. In X.16.5 I render the phrase more fully as “clothing himself in (new) life,” of the dead man’s embarking on the afterlife (see comm. ad loc.). The phrase here can be interpr. similarly. As noted ad X.51.1, the prominent mention of the caul in the first vs. of this hymn sequence suggests that Agni’s entry into his hiding place in the waters is configured as a pregnancy, and so his emergence to take up his duties as Hotar is a type of (second) birth.

Schnaus tr. *devahūtí-* as ‘Göttertrank’, a minor lapse, I assume

X.53.4: Pāda b contains one of the rare representations of the Deva/Asura conflict that so dominates the later Vedic mythological scene, but that is essentially absent from the RV, as W. E. Hale has definitively shown. Only in this late hymn and in X.157.4 do we find pretty clear evidence of the Asuras as a group in structural and hostile opposition to the gods. Hale in fact (p. 85) suggests that the Asuras here could instead be human enemies, but this seems unlikely. It’s noteworthy that Agni seems to think that a particularly well-devised speech is what will defeat the Asuras.

On the formation of *ūrjād-* and its problems see Old and Scar (34).

The 2nd hemistich is addressed to both gods and men, the former clearly identified as *yajñīyāsaḥ* and the latter as *pāñca janāḥ* (though see Ge’s n. 4d for some very flimsy evidence that the five peoples may have been deified). Who the *ūrjādaḥ* are is a little less clear, in part because the compd is a hapax. Acdg. to Re, they are gods, but since *ūrjādaḥ* is explicitly (*utá*) conjoined with *yajñīyāsaḥ*, we might expect it to have a different referent. Moreover, we regularly ask the gods to provide *us* with *ūrj-*; cf., e.g., VIII.35.10–12 *ūrjam no dhattam aśvinā* “provide nourishment to us, o Aśvins,” and as far as I know, the only instantiation of the VP *ūrjam* √ *ad* in the RV has cows as subj.: X.100.10 *ūrjam gāvo yāvase pīvo attana* “Cows, eat nourishment in the pasture, eat fat” (though these cows in fact stand for the milk to be mixed with soma). The question cannot be settled without considering the telling variant on the conjoined phrase in the next vs., 5b *gójāta utá yé yajñīyāsaḥ* “the cow-born and those who are worthy of the sacrifice.” Who are the “cow-born”? The word is found twice elsewhere (VI.50.11, VII.35.14); in the former it appears in a list with “earthly, heavenly, and watery,” in the latter, in a pāda identical to ours, with “earthly and heavenly” immed. preceding. Note that in our vs. the second hemistich contains references to both heaven and earth (as well as the midspace), though not to beings identified as earthly and heavenly. In both the other passages there is a presumption that all of these groups are divine in some way, though it is not explicitly stated. Ad VI.50.11 I tentatively accept a suggestion of Re’s, that the cow-born are the Maruts, and that is possible here. But I would not rule out a reference to livestock. To summarize, the referent of

*ūrjādaḥ* in vs. 4 is not certain, and the parallel *gójātāḥ* in 5 isn't as much help as it might be. In balance, I think humans are the more likely referent or *ūrjādaḥ*, but neither gods (or a set of gods) nor even livestock are excluded.

X.53.5: On *gójāta*- see disc. of immediately preceding vs. 4.

X.53.6: This vs. is addressed, presumably by the human ritualist(s), to Agni (ab) and the speaker(s)' fellow priests (cd), who are urged jointly to proceed with the sacrifice. In particular, Agni is to go towards heaven along paths readied by ritual speech. These paths are probably the "work" that the humans are urged to "weave," in a different metaphor. Cloth-making metaphors in fact unify the vs.: Agni "stretches the thread" of the sacrifice (a), while the priests "weave" (c).

The word *anulbaṇā-* occurs twice in the RV, here and in VIII.25.9. Despite superficial similarity, it is generally held that it is unrelated to *úlba-* 'caul'; see the curt rejection by KH (MSS 8 [1958]: 18 = Aufs. 398), followed by EWA s.v. I think this is worth revisiting. To begin with, the only occurrence of *úlba-* in the RV is found in the first pāda of this hymn sequence (X.51.1a); that one of the two RVic occurrences of *anulbaṇā-* is found two hymns later, in the same hymn group, seems unlikely to be a coincidence, esp. given their aberrant phonology – though it could, I suppose, be just a deliberate phonological echo. The negated *anulbaṇā-* is usually glossed 'without bulges / knots' (Gr "ohne Wulst oder Knoten"), for no particular good reason that I can see. It is then considerably widened to 'faultless' (Gr "ohne Fehl"). Let us first consider the example in VIII.25.9, where it modifies *cákṣas-* '(eye)sight, vision'. Since sight generally has neither knots nor bulges, the semantically widened version has to be used – e.g., Ge's "mit fehlerlosem Gesicht" (or, as in the publ. tr., with a reasonable facsimile of knots, there 'motes'). However, if we start with 'caul', an obvious interpretation imposes itself: the blurry vision and semi-opacity of the eye's lens resulting from cataracts were surely known in ancient India (it's a condition that afflicts most people as they age), and a "caul" over the eye is an appropriate metaphor for both the appearance and the experience of this condition. (For a [close-to] current day analogue, note that David Knipe in his *Vedic Voices* [p. 198] records how the smoke from the daily Agnihotra damaged the eyes of some of the Āhitāgnis he studied in late 20th c. Andhra, rendering them blind or close to it – though the fact that these Agnihotras were performed indoors may have exacerbated the eye condition.) The sense of the word in our passage is more difficult to determine, since as far as I know, there is no weaving failure that could be conceived of as a caul. Here I think it must be metaphorical for veiling, unpellucidity, or cloudiness of the poetic product, esp. since in the preceding pāda Agni is supposed to be associated with "paths of light made by insightful thought." I would emend the tr. to "a work without a veil [=clear]." Note that Schnaus (276–77) discusses *anulbaṇā-* at length and comes to similar conclusions.

On the hapax *jógū-*, derived from the intens. of *√gū* 'sing', see Schaef (114). It is presumably a subjective genitive (so Schnaus, 275) with *āpas-*; that is, the singers are to perform the work that has been woven, not to receive it. Both Schaef. and Köhler (*Kaví*, 327) assert that the stem no longer has intensive semantics, but I do not see on what grounds: my "ever-singing" or a more "intensive-like" "laut singend" (Gr) are perfectly compatible with the context.

The last pāda is syntactically and lexically straightforward, but has somewhat surprising content. Agni is urged to "become Manu" and "generate the divine race," on first glance a cosmogonic act not within the capability of a human, even the first human. Ge (n. 6c) is surely

correct, that Manu as first sacrificer *makes them appear* at the ritual (“zum Vorschein, zur Stelle bringen”) by his ritual activity; he thus “begets” them metaphorically at a particular place and time. The relationship between Agni and Manu first highlighted in this hymn sequence in X.51.5 comes to its climax here, with Agni actually transforming into Manu.

X.53.7: On *īṣ* √ *kṛ*, see comm. ad VII.76.2.

Gr, Ge, Schnaus all supply *raśanāḥ* ‘reins’ as obj. of *ā ... piṁśata*. I follow Re (also JSK DGRV I.436), who supplies ‘chariot’, on the basis of the focus on the chariot in cd and the NP in I.49.2 *supéśasam ... rátham*.

Klein (l.c.) points out the unusual position of the second *utá* in this hemistich “following a preverb within a conjoined set of verbal lexemes,” where he would expect *ca*. (The set consists of ... *nahyata-utá ... íṣkṛnudhvam ... ā-utá piṁśata*.) Acdg. to him, this is the only such ex. in the RV, but he defines the context rather narrowly. For another ex. of *utá* between preverb and verb, see V.59.5.

There’s a surprising lack of comment on what the eight seats on the chariot represent in the ritual. I’d don’t mind admitting that I have no idea.

In d it is impossible to know if *priyám* is the object of *ánayan*, as in the publ. tr. (also Gr, Ge, Schnaus) or the goal, with the object “us” to be supplied or none at all: “led to something dear” / “led (us) to something dear” (so Re and Ge alt. in n. 7d). Since *priyám* isn’t further specified, we have no info. with which to make a decision. In any case, the pāda seems to reverse the direction and director(s) of the chariot. In abc it seems that the ritualists are being exhorted to prepare the chariot of sacrifice and drive it (presumably towards heaven and the gods), but in d the gods seems to have taken the reins. This may (as Schnaus seems to suggest, 278) reflect the two-way street of ritual reciprocity: “die Opfergaben werden damit ebenso zu den Göttern gefahren wie die Gaben der Götter zu dem Menschen.”

X.53.8: On the vs. see Old’s comments in his intro. to the hymn. On pāda a see Ge’s long n. 8. As he points out, this vs. is often used in later ritual for a real or symbolic river-crossing. Unfortunately, of course, the word ‘river’ is missing from our text; we must triangulate from the fem. gender of the nom. *ásmanvatī* (most words for river and most river names being fem.) and the meaning of the verb *rīyate* ‘flows’ (cf. X.40.9 *rīyante ... síndhavaḥ* “the rivers flow”). The interpr. of the phrase is greatly aided by the variant verse in AVŚ XII.2.27 *úttiṣṭhatā prā taratā sakhāyó, śmanvatī nadī syandata iyám*, with an explicit ‘river’ modified by *ásmanvatī* and a verb, *synandate*, synonymous with our *rīyate*. This vs. immed. follows one that quotes our pāda directly (AV XII.2.26a *ásmanvatī rīyate ...*) and seems to be meant as a gloss or explanatory expansion – let us hope they got it right.

Ge suggests that the stones are stepping stones (or rather a bridge of them) in a powerfully flowing stream; I am dubious, because I think even a lot of closely bunched stones would provide precarious footing for horses pulling a chariot (if the chariot of 7 is still in question), or oxen pulling a cart, or even for a group of men walking. I think more of a river or stream with a stony bottom that would provide better footing than a soft one, but admittedly I know nothing about the bottoms of the rivers in NW India. (On the potential problems for vehicles crossing a river, see III.33, esp. 9–13, and III.53.17.) In any case the crossing here is metaphorical, but presumably involves the metaphorical chariot from vs. 7.

The medial idiom *sám* √ *rabh* is generally construed with an instr. and means ‘be clasped / embraced by’ metaphorically (e.g., I.53.4–5). Here, however, it appears without instr. and must

mean something like ‘clasp each other’. See X.72.6 where JPB tr. *súsaṃrabdhā átiṣṭhata* as “well clasped to one another, you stood ...” (of the gods). The point in that passage and ours must be that by embracing each other, a group creates a united and formidable front and can proceed to action. My tr. here, “pull yourselves together,” is not literal, but I think it conveys the intent better than “embrace each other” – but perhaps “pull together” or “stick together” might be closer to the literal.

In c the publ. tr. wrongly renders the subj. *ásan* as if it were an imperfect. The tr. should be changed to “those who will be unfriendly.”

In d the question is whether *śívān* modifies *vājān* or is an independent and parallel goal. Although Ge and Re choose the former solution (e.g., “zu günstigem Gewinn”), with Schnaus I think the latter is more likely. *śívān* is obviously meant to contrast with *áśevāḥ* in the previous pāda, as their juxtaposition across the pāda boundary shows. And the *áśevāḥ* in c are definitely beings (probably human enemies), not things. The point being that we want to find ourselves a more agreeable set of companions, as well as acquiring prizes.

X.53.9–11: As disc. in the publ. intro., these three vss., in Jagatī stand somewhat apart from the rest of the hymn, though they also continue its themes—the most important of which is the crafting of effective ritual formulations, as seen esp. in vs. 6 and also 4.

Vss. 9 and 10 are esp. parallel; note the repetition of *nūnām* and forms of the pres. *śísā-* / *śísī-*. More important is the fact that 9cd and 10ab depict the same actions (though with partly varying lexicon) performed by gods (Tvaṣṭar and Brahmaṇaspati in 9) and human poets (*kavayaḥ* in 10): the production by carving with axes/hatchets of the verbal portion of the ritual. Strikingly neither in 9b nor in 10b is there an overt object for the verb of hewing (*ṛścāt*) / carving (*tákṣatha*), despite the clear assumption that it is a verbal product.

X.53.9: See Ge’s note on this vs.

In the publ. tr. the pf. injunctive *vet* is rendered as the preterite “knew,” but, given the context (pres. part. *bíbhrat* b, pres. *śísīte* c, subj. *ṛścāt* d), I now would follow the other tr. in taking it as a general present ‘knows’. KH (Injunc. 169) pronounces it “generell.” In the sandhi context (*māyāvet*) it could be an augmented plupf. *avet*, but this is unlikely.

Calling Tvaṣṭar “the best worker of workers” (*apásām apástamaḥ*) links his activity to that of the human ritualists in 6c, urged to “weave a work (*ápah*).” Tvaṣṭar provides the drinking cups for the soma (pāda b), thus contributing to the oblation/physical portion of the ritual. But more important, in the second hemistich, he sharpens the tool that the “lord of the formulation”—“das göttliche Vorbild des Dichter,” in HPS’s felicitous phrase (B+I 126)—will use to produce the formulation, the verbal portion of the ritual.

Parts of this vs. are reminiscent of the enigmatic X.28.8, which I argue depicts the original instantiation of the sacrifice by the gods (see comm. ad loc.). The first hemistich of that vs. reads *devāsa āyan paraśúm̐r abibhran, vānā ṛścānto abhí viḍbhír āyan* “The gods came; they carried axes; hewing the trees, they advanced with their clans towards (the ritual ground),” with the redupl. pres. *abibhran* matching our part. *bíbhrat*, the axes (*paraśú-*), and the verb ‘hew’ (pres. *ṛścá-*) present in both. I don’t quite know what to do with these similarities.

The most puzzling part of the second hemistich is *étaśaḥ*, which must be a qualifier of Brahmaṇaspati. This stem usually names, or refers to, the sun’s horse or horses, but it is unlikely that Brahmaṇaspati is being identified with that animal. The stem is generally derived from *éta-* ‘mottled, dappled’, and most tr. render it as a color term here (*buntfarbig* / *bigarré*). But why

would Brahmanaspati be multicolored? Th (Stud. z. idg. Wortkunde, 68), adopted by HPS (and see EWA s.v.), interpr. it as ‘bunte Tiere (Kleinvieh) gewinnend,’ but with an unfortunately typical Thieme overreach (-śa- < \*-pśva-). My “(chariot-)steed” is a placeholder, as if the image in this pāda were a sort of transition figure from the chariot image in vs. 7. But this may be worse than useless. However, I do think a whiff of the chariot image recurs in vs. 11 (q.v.).

X.53.10: The poets are now exhorted to follow the the model of Brahmanaspati.

The identity and function of *satāḥ*, which opens the vs., are much disputed. It is generally taken as an adverb (‘equally’ vel sim.: Ge, Re, Schnaus [281 and n. 302], Köhler [327]), but I follow Old’s preferred interpr. as an acc. pl. masc. of the pres. part. of √as, meaning ‘being (t)here’. As for its referent, flg. a suggestion of Re’s I think it picks up the *paraśúm* in 9c, which is the obj. of *śísīte* ‘sharpens’, with Tvaṣṭar as subj. Here the pl. Kavis are the subj. of pl. *śísīta* and we might expect pl. \**paraśún*. Instead we get, in the rel. cl., the fem. pl. *vāśibhiḥ*, a virtual synonym of *paraśú-*, and *satāḥ* referring to the *paraśú-* serves as transition to this synonym, which we might have expected as an acc. pl. \**vāśīḥ* in the main cl. For disc. (and rejection) of other poss. exx. of *satāḥ* as adv., see X.27.4, VII.104.21, IX.21.7.

The connection between pādas c and d is loose at best. On the one hand, the *yéna* with which d opens has no clear referent. Given the structure of the hymn so far, with its *yéna* clauses (see hymn intro. above), we would expect its referent to be the pl. *padā gúhyāni* “hidden tracks/words” of c, but the numbers don’t match. On the other, there is also a mismatch of tenses: c contains an imperative *kartana*, but d a perfect *ānaśuḥ*. I think the clue to understanding the connection is the existence of both these anomalies. To take the second first, we cannot order the poets to create (impv. *kartana*) something that has already produced its effect (“they achieved” *ānaśuḥ*). So I think d presents the already successful model for the type of things the poets are now urged to create. It worked for the gods, so make more of them now. There is thus a disconnect between the two clauses, even though the same type of causal relation is gestured to as in 3cd, 7cd, and, with plurals, 10ab. Because that pattern was strongly set earlier, the audience is invited, in fact more or less compelled, to interpret 10cd in the same vein and to use its ingenuity to deal with the number and tense-mood mismatches. I do not see the advantage of taking *yéna* as a conjunction, despite Köhler’s detailed disc. (327 and n. 1008), and I actually don’t see how his “wodurch” differs from the usual instr. rendering of *yéna*.

Almost all tr. and interpr. take *padā* as ‘words’, and I am in agreement that this is the underlying intent. However, with Schnaus (“Fussspuren,” 291), I think the surface, literal meaning is ‘tracks’. This allows the vs. to be connected with 6b *jyōtiṣmataḥ pathāḥ ... dhiyā kṛtān* “the paths of light made by insightful thought.” The radiant paths to heaven are created by the poets’ insights and the words they are formed into, and so in 10cd the poets are exhorted to create these paths, these tracks, which are in fact words.

X.53.11: Unfortunately, if this final vs. is an example of the *padā gúhyāni* of 10c, as I think it is, the tracks remain hidden indeed. The first question is who the subj. of *ādadhuh* is. With Ge and Re (Old, Schnaus, and Köhler do not specify, though Kö seems likely to favor poets as well), I take it to be the poets addressed in 10 (*kavayaḥ*). They perform their work “with cryptic mind and tongue” (b *apīcyēna mānasotā jihvāyā*), a phrase that resonates with *gúhyāni* of 10c and whose accuracy we can certainly endorse. Old sensibly says about the vs. “die vieldeutigen Rätsel zu lösen versuche ich nicht,” and though I will make a stab at solving them, I acknowledge the wisdom of Old’s forbearance.

Pāda a contains two chiasmic NP paradoxes—*gárbhe* (LOC) *yóṣām* (ACC) ... *vatsám* (ACC) *āsáni* (LOC) “in embryo young woman ... calf in mouth.” Between them is the verb *ádadhuh* “they placed,” which must owe its accent to its contrastive use with both NPs.

The first phrase is the clearer paradox: in real life the embryo would be placed in the young woman—that is, she would become pregnant—not the reverse (so also Ge n. 11). (My tr. “maiden” is somewhat misleading, since a *yóṣā* can give birth; cf., e.g., III.48.2 ... *te mātā* ... *yóṣā jānitṛī* “Your mother, the young woman who gave you birth”). The paradoxical content of the second phrase is more obscure, but it may be that, since mother cows ordinarily lick their calves (e.g., III.33.3, III.55.13=X.27.14, IV.18.10) and this involves putting their mouth, or at least their tongue, on the calf, putting the calf in/on the mouth reverses this image. This is Ge’s interpr. (also n. 11), but I am a bit dubious. The words for ‘mouth’, *ās-* and *āsán-*, aren’t found in expressions of the calf-licking image, as far as I can find, nor even ‘tongue’. However, I don’t have a better solution. (For a reversed image that does involve both cows and mouths, see IX.99.3 and comm. thereon; unfortunately it won’t work here.)

Such are the possible conceptual paradoxes behind these two phrases, but for them to work in the hymn they must have a real-world (that is, ritual) reference, and ideally this reference should connect with the content and themes of the rest of the hymn, the recovery of Agni as oblation-conveyor and the successful progress of the ensuing sacrifice. I think that Agni is present in both NPs in pāda a, but in different cases – loc. *gárbhe* and acc. *vatsám*. Both words, esp. *gárbha-*, are regularly used of Agni; for a passage containing both, see X.8.2 *mumóda gárbhaḥ ... vatsáḥ ... arāvīt* “he rejoices as an embryo ... the calf has bellowed” (as well as X.27.14). If my identifications are correct, we must determine the referent of the other word in each expression: acc. *yóṣām* and loc. *āsáni*. For the first, I think the most likely referent is (one of) the (paired) kindling sticks, who is/are regularly referred to as Agni’s mother(s), particularly the lower kindling stick. See, e.g., III.55.4 and esp. X.27.14bc (and comm. ad loc.) *tasthaú mātā víṣito atti gárbhaḥ / anyásyā vatsám rihatī mimāya* “The mother [=kindling stick] stands still; unloosened the embryo [=Agni] eats. Licking the calf [=Agni] of another [=kindling stick], she [=oblation] lows,” also containing both *gárbha-* and *vatsá-* referring to Agni. Placing the kindling stick in the embryonic fire may simply mean that the sticks are positioned where the fire will begin to catch. Alternatively the young woman might be some piece of ritual equipment with fem. gender (like the *ukhā-* ‘pot’) or even be a reference to Dawn, sometimes called a *yóṣā* (e.g., VII.75.5, 77.1), and be a metaphor for putting light into the newly kindled fire. But I strongly favor the kindling stick.

As for putting the calf into the mouth, what is the “mouth” here? The question is complicated by the fact that Agni himself is often called the mouth of the gods and oblations are poured into his mouth. Such an interpr. would produce the awkwardness of two references to Agni in this two-word phrase, and I do not think it means “they played Agni in Agni.” Instead I suggest very tentatively that in this case the mouth is the hearth or fireplace, rather than the fire itself. Although I cannot find a parallel usage, it seems conceptually possible – the place, roughly mouth-shaped, on the ground in which the kindling materials are set.

(For a quite different interpr. of this hemistich, see Schnaus 283. Though thoughtful, it is not convincing, at least to me.)

As for the 2nd hemistich, again I think we have to think about it in the context of the whole hymn and indeed the three-hymn sequence – the reinstallation of Agni and the successful reinstitution of the sacrifice. After Agni as embryo and then calf has been re-kindled in ab (by my interpr.), he proceeds to glorious victory in cd (again, by my interpr.). I do not think that the

subject of this hemistich is either Indra (tentatively floated by Old) or a man (supplied by Re), but Agni himself. Given the focus in this three-hymn sequence on the return of Agni for the sake of the sacrifice, the supreme victor in the final vs. can hardly be anyone but him. Certainly the vocabulary doesn't impede this identification. The adj. *sumānas-* can modify a variety of referents, but is particularly common with Agni; note esp. that in the first hymn of this sequence, X.51.7, the gods hopefully suggest that Agni should return, *sumanasyāmānaḥ* "showing your benevolence." The recurrence of *sumānas-* here implicitly announces that this has happened. Agni is also one of the most common subjects of the verb stem *vāna-* (e.g., I.140.11, III.19.1, V.3.10, 4.3, etc.). And although the strongly martial tone of the hemistich might at first point in another direction (Old's Indra?), Agni is hardly lacking in martial aspects.

With most of the standard interpr. I take the Saṃhitā *kārā* as loc. *kāré*, against Pp. *kārāḥ*.

The problematic part of the hemistich is *yogyā abhí* in c. By most interpr. *yogyā* is taken as an acc. pl. fem (*yogyāḥ* out of sandhi). with postposition *abhí*, loosely construed either with *sumānāḥ* (Ge, Re, sort of Schnaus, 282) or with *siṣāsaniḥ* (Köhler, 328 and n. 1009). The stem *yogyā-* lit. means 'harness/yoking cords', a sense clearly found in III.6.6. In our passage (and supposedly in VII.70.4) it is taken metaphorically to mean something like 'obligation, task' (lit. 'what is to be yoked [to oneself]?). This is not impossible, and a tr. "well-disposed towards his tasks" is not excluded. But *sumānas-* doesn't otherwise take such a complement, and the desid. *siṣāsa-* takes as object material things we want to gain (prizes and the like), not duties or tasks, so that Köhler's "der die Werke zu gewinnen sucht" seems off. I am also dubious about postpositional *abhí*, though I confess that I haven't checked all 739 examples (per Lub) of the form. For all these reasons I make bold to suggest an unorthodox reading of the two words, as a mangled instr. pl. In III.6.6 (one of the two other occurrences of the stem *yogyā-*) we find a pāda-final instr. pl. *yog'yābhiḥ* in a Triṣṭubh cadence. Here, in a Jagatī cadence, we have *yog'yā abhí*, which I suggest is a species of distraction and misinterpretation of *\*yog'yābhiḥ*. I take it in its literal (or literal-metaphorical value): Agni wins with his yoking strings, that is, with his horses yoked to his chariot. This would continue the chariot metaphor, with its technical terms, of vs. 7 (and possibly vss. 8 and 9d; see above). It's a long shot, I realize, and the tr. floated above ("well-disposed towards his tasks") is a possible alt. Still I favor the emendation. The publ. tr. should have an asterisk before "with the yoking strings."

## X.54–56

The next three hymns are attributed to Bṛhaduktha Vāmadevya, the first two dedicated to Indra, the last to the All Gods, per the Anukr. The Indra hymns have 6 and 8 vss. respectively, violating the usual principle of ordering – a fact that causes Old (Prol. 238–39) some distress. He rejects Bergaigne's suggestion to assign the second hymn to the All Gods, which would restore order since the final, All Gods, hymn has 7 vss. and would follow one with 8. Old's rejection is based on the supposed difference in content between 55 and 56, but, as disc. in the publ. intro. to X.55, I am inclined to follow Bergaigne, for reasons stated there: although 55 and 56 are indeed quite different, X.56 is a kind of one-off, while X.55 has a number of hallmarks of enigmatic All God hymns. Both fall well within the loose parameters of All God hymns. Although X.55 begins and ends with Indra (never named), it is hardly a conventional Indra hymn and its mysterious center (esp. vss. 4–6) strays far from Indra, while sharing themes, particularly "light," with X.56. It does not help Old's case that his only suggested explanation for the violation of ordering in the two supposed Indra hymns is that it reflects "eine alte, traditionelle Reihenfolge" based on



grounds “die sich unsrer Kenntniss entziehen,” if not in fact on chance – hardly a compelling alternative hypothesis, esp. given the rigidity of the ordering in other (and older) parts of the RV.

## X.54 Indra

X.54.1: The hymn begins with a syntactically incomplete pāda, with the acc. *tām ... kīrtīm* governed by no verb. Ge supplies “(will ich) ... (verkünden),” which is certainly possible, but I think something trickier is going on. First of all, the structure of 1ab is very like that of the 1st hemistich of the following hymn, X.55.1ab. The b pādas are almost identical: 54.1b *yāt tvā bhīté ródasī áhvyayetām* / 55.1b *yāt tvā bhīté áhvyayetām vayodhaí*. And the first pāda of 55.1 also lacks a verb and its principal noun, *nāma* ‘name’, is semantically similar to *kīrtí-* ‘reputation, fame’ here. The difference of course is that *nāma* is neut. and can therefore be the subject of a nominal clause (Ge: “Weit ... ist jener ... Name”), whereas the undeniably acc. *kīrtīm* cannot be. On the one hand, I think this is the poet’s little joke.

But on the other it needs to be interpr. in the context of the overall sense of the hymn, at least as I understand it. As disc. in the publ. intro. to X.54, I think that in this poem the poet is implying “that Indra’s great deeds and the words that express them are essentially the same,” in fact that the words generate the deeds. The very first hemistich announces this, by equating Indra’s *kīrtí-* with himself (*tvā*): the frightened world halves are actually calling on his reputation when they call out to him. (It might be noted that *kīrtí-* is found only here in the RV, though it’s fairly common in the AV.)

In the c pāda the two verbs, *právaḥ* and *átiraḥ*, can technically be either main-clause verbs with accented preverbs (*prá=ávaḥ*, *ā=atiraḥ*) or still under the domain of the *yád* of b with accented verb (*pra=ávaḥ*, *ā=átiraḥ*). The Pp. opts for the former, as do Ge and I, although I was tempted by the alternative. But the parallelism with X.55.1 supports the Pp. solution, since X.55.1c *úd astabhñāḥ* with unequivocally accented preverb has to be a main-clause verb.

The referent of *prajāyāi tvasyai* of d is not made clear – again, I think, deliberately. Ge (n. 1d) thinks this already reflects the later notion of the double descent of Prajāpati (gods and demons), but the implicitly contrastive *tva-* form seems to me to set up a dichotomy with both terms in c: the gods whom Indra helped (*prāvo devān*) suggest their antonymic opposite, humans, and the *dāsas* he overcame suggest the other half of that pair, the Ārya. Putting those together, we get the ideal human – namely us, the Ārya.

X.54.2: If I am correct about vs. 1, that it expresses the identity between the verbal reputation of Indra and his actual actions, this same sentiment is expressed considerably less politely in this vs. The first hemistich has Indra going about *proclaiming* (*prabruvānāḥ*) his own powers—that is, representing them in words, rather than performing them as deeds—and this boasting is dismissed curtly in the next pāda (c) as just *māyā*, which in this context comes very close to the later meaning ‘illusion’. Indeed, “what they call battles” are simply Indra’s *māyā*. (Note that Ge’s tr. “da war nur Blendwerk, was sie von *deinen* Kämpfen sagen” [my ital.] is slightly wrong: *te* cannot qualify *yuddhāni*, because this would require an enclitic to begin the clause [... \**te yāni yuddhāny āhúḥ*]; the *te* must go with the main clause and qualify *māyā*.) In this context pāda d has a cynical and deflating tone. It plays on, and against, the triumphal statement found in I.32.4, the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn, which states *tādītñā sátruṃ ná kílā vivitse* “you surely never found a rival since” – meaning that after Indra’s decisive victory over Vṛtra, no one could rival him. But here, despite the near identity of wording, *nādyá sátruṃ nanú purā vivitse* “neither today nor

before have you discovered a rival” seems rather to mean that Indra has done none of his vaunted fighting, has never confronted an enemy – it’s all words and *māyā*. As both Old and Ge point out, this hemistich is quoted in the ŚB (XI.1.6.9–10), where it forms part of a denial of the truth of the tales of the Deva / Asura conflict. I think that it has been partly repurposed there, rather than that our passage already reflects the whole ŚB situation, which in fact primarily concerns Prajāpati’s acts of creation. It’s worth noting that the ŚB paraphrases our pāda d in less ambiguous terms: *nā tvām yuyutse katamāc canāhar nā te ’mītro maghavan kās canāsti* “Not for a single day hast thou fought, nor hast thou any enemy, O Maghavan” (Eggeling).

X.54.3: In this vs. the poet seems to retreat a bit from his extreme Indra-denigration of 2cd, but I think this is more a matter of ambiguous wording than a change of attitude: the intent of the vs. is hard to read. (I now depart in part from my assessment of this vs. in the publ. intro.) The initial impression of the first hemistich is that Indra’s greatness is such that it is impossible even for poets (previous poets) to have entirely grasped it, “reached its end.” This is a fairly common expression emphasizing the unlimited power of Indra. Cf., e.g., I.100.15 *nā yāsya devā devātā nā mātā, āpaś canā śāvaso āntam āpuḥ* “The limit of whose [=Indra’s] vast power no gods in their divinity, nor mortals, nor even the waters have reached.” However, I think in our passage the apparent exaltation of Indra’s *mahimān-* is undercut by the adj. *sama-* in the genitive phrase and, quite possibly, by the deed that exemplifies it in the 2nd hemistich.

To begin with *sama-*: as disc. ad X.29.4, this indefinite stem is always used in pejorative contexts, even when it appears to be neutral or positive. Particularly pertinent here is VI.27.3, which is very like our passage: *nahī nū te mahimānaḥ samasya, nā maghavan maghavattvāsya vidmā / nā rādhaso-rādhaso nūtanasyendra nākir dadṛśa indriyaṁ te*. Ge’s rendering, more or less followed by the publ. tr., puts a positive spin on the phrase containing *samasya*: “But yet we do not know your whole greatness, nor generosity, o generous one”—implying that although we know some of his greatness, we have not yet experienced the full amount. But Ge’s “ganz”/ my “whole” for *sama-* is not a legitimate rendering of *sama-*, and the final pāda “your Indrian strength has not shown itself” (my “your (whole) Indrian strength” is even less justified than the earlier “whole”) indicates that Indra has simply not been there for us at all. Hence my emendation of VI.27.3 to “But yet we do not know any (*samasya*) of your greatness ...” I now would interpr. our passage in a similar way. Once again “whole” (Ge’s “ganz” again) for *samasya* is a contextual invention; once again I think the idea is not that Indra’s greatness is so vast that its limit cannot be reached, but rather that it’s a question whether *any* greatness has been deployed on our behalf. I would now emend the tr. to “what seers before us reached the limit of any greatness of yours?” – with a somewhat scornful emphasis on “any.” They didn’t reach the limit, because there was no limit to reach.

However we interpr. 3ab, the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich sits oddly in relation to it, though since it is introduced by *yād*, it should be dependent on what precedes. On first glance this is just another of the endless expressions of Indra’s cosmogonic powers, while also displaying the RVic partiality for paradoxes of birth, whereby the child gives birth to its own parents. Flg. Sāy.’s plausible suggestion that the mother and father here are Earth and Heaven, the statement at first does not seem *very* different from passages where Indra begets, for example, “the sun, heaven, and dawn” (e.g., I.32.4 *āt sūryaṁ janāyan dyām uṣāsam*). But there are notable distinctions. For one thing, although Indra is often credited with begetting things / beings (generally in the active of the stem *janāya-*, as above), they are not identified as his family members. I do not know of any other passages in which Indra is credited with begetting his own parents. The closest is

I.159.3, in which their sons, that is, the gods (presumably including Indra), are said to have begotten (act. pf. *jaiñuḥ*) their “two mothers” (*mātārā*), Heaven and Earth. But our passage depicts the birthing as much more intimate: it is expressed in the middle, one of the only “real” middle forms (*ājanayathāḥ*) to the extremely common trans./caus. stem *janāya-*, whose middle forms are otherwise almost entirely confined to 3rd pl. *-anta* replacements (see my 1979 “Voice fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial 3rd plural *-anta* in active paradigms,” *III* 21: 146–69) and forms based on them, with the sense of the active. Here, though the form is transitive, the medial self-involvement of the subject is underlined by the reflexive abl. expression *tanvāḥ svāyāḥ* “from your own body.” The middle verb and the reflexive (one might almost say “double reflexive,” since *tanũ-* has quasi-reflexive value in addition to its lexical meaning ‘body’) expression of source highlight the physical aspects of this birth – and in fact depict Indra as a mother, a female from whose body the child emerges. This is, needless to say, uncharacteristic of Indra, at least in the RV—in my 1991 *Hyenas* (pp. 76–81 and passim) I argue that Indra is depicted as a mother hyena in a complex of Brāhmaṇa stories, but even there he is not shown giving birth to them (and, moreover, female hyenas are formidable, Indra-like animals).

But why is this episode here? Is it meant to be a culminating example of Indra’s greatness touted in the first hemistich – or, if I’m correct about the sly derogatory tone of ab, as an example of just how paltry his greatness is? Is his begetting of Heaven and Earth, his own parents, meant to awe us – or should his role as mother diminish him in our eyes? This feat, if feat it is, merits no further mention in this hymn, or elsewhere. What relationship there might be between the invocation of Indra by the frightened world halves in 1ab (also X.55.1) is not clear either. I confess myself baffled. It might be noted that 3cd is essentially the middle of the hymn, so bafflement is to be expected.

X.54.4: This vs. firmly returns us to the equivalence of words and deeds. It is in fact *through / by means of* his names that Indra performs his deeds (see pāda d). The names are presumably epithets like *vṛtra-hán-* (so also Ge n. 4ab) that encapsulate the deeds in question. They are *ádābhya-* — here tr. ‘unfalsifiable’ rather than the usual ‘undeceivable’ — because the very existence of the names testifies to the reality of the deeds. As Ge points out, the adj. implicitly contrasts with the *māyā* of 2c. What exactly the four names are I have no idea and won’t speculate, but see VIII.80, esp. vs. 9, for a similar connection between names and deeds, also with four as the number of names.

X.54.5: As the poet gets closer to the end of the hymn and the implicit “ask,” he softens his tone towards Indra. The last pāda of the vs. contains two agent nouns applied to Indra, *ājñātā* ‘heeder’ and *dātā* ‘giver’, which might be interpr. as among the names referred to in the previous vs.: the reality (or not) of “giver” would be esp. pertinent to the poet. By giving Indra the name “giver,” he is affirming the reality of the (expected and hoped for) act of giving, just as in vs. 4 a name like “Vṛtrahan” makes the act of killing Vṛtra “unfalsifiable,” undeniable. See X.55.6 for another pair of agent nouns.

The tr. of d would be more faithful to the rhetoric as “you are the one who takes heed; you the one who gives, Indra.”

X.54.6: By my interpr. (in part flg. JSK DGRV II.96–97), the first hemistich hangs off 5d, as another characterization of Indra, this time dynamic rather than the static expression via agent nouns. The last hemistich is a meta- hymn-ending summary. On the structure of the last pāda and

the play on the poet's name, see publ. intro.

### **X.55 Indra** (per Anukr.; better, All Gods)

On the disputed dedicand of this hymn, see pub. intro. as well as the intro. to X.54–56 above.

In the publ. intro. of this hymn there is an error in the 3rd para.: "... in the next hymn (X.55.1)" should read X.56.1.

X.55.1: As disc. ad X.54.1, these two initial vss. are very similar, esp. in their 1st hemistichs, with our pāda a syntactically better formed than that in X.54. The emphasis on the name as embodiment of power and of the potential for action is prominent here.

As Ge points out (n. 1b), the verb "prop up" is strictly only applicable to heaven, not to earth.

The identity of the *bhrātuh putrān* "brother's sons" is quite unclear. First, whose brother? Although both Ge and I assume it is Indra's brother ("die Söhne deines Bruders" / "... of your brother"), it could of course be someone else's brother (Heaven and Earth's?), although context favors Indra. The problem is to identify who it might be, since generally Indra appears to be an only child with a traumatic birth and a fraught homelife (see esp. IV.18). Ge starts with the sons and worries about the brother secondarily; he suggests (n. 1d) that the sons are the Maruts, the sons of Rudra, which latter would here count as Indra's brother, since gods seem to use "brother" among themselves as a kind of courtesy title (see his citations). This is, as Old says, possible, but I do not find it compelling (nor does Old). The highlighting of the double kinship relationship, "sons of the brother," seems too prominent for "brother" to be just a courtesy title, and although the Maruts seem to appear, unnamed, in vss. 7–8, that context is quite different from this one: the Maruts don't generally participate in the propping up of Heaven and Earth (though see VIII.94.11). An even less likely possibility: in VI.55.3 Pūṣan is called the brother of Indra in a series of statements about Pūṣan's kin, but this seems a deadend: if Pūṣan has sons they don't figure anywhere, as far as I know.

I will now venture a very fragile alternative suggestion. Although the dominant account of Indra's birth in the RV is the dramatic one found in IV.18 and alluded to glancingly elsewhere, he is also once named (in the MS) among the Ādityas, the eight sons of Aditi, born two by two. Although the RV vss. treating the pair-wise birth of the Ādityas (X.72.8–9) do not name the sons, nor do most of the Vedic prose versions, the MS passage (I.6.2 [104.10ff.]) gives the names in pairs: Dhātār and Aryaman, Mitra and Varuṇa, Aṃśa and Bhaga, and finally Indra and the aborted fetus, Mārtāṇḍa. (For the story and relevant Vedic passages, see KH, Aufs. 422ff.; my Hyenas 404–8; Brereton Ādityas 244–45.) By this account Indra is an Āditya, albeit a minor one barely mentioned among them, and his closest brother, with whom he shared Aditi's womb, is the aborted fetus, "stemming from a dead egg," who – notably – is the ancestor of mankind. So I tentatively suggest here that "the sons of your brother" are actually humans, and his "sparking" (*tītvīṣāṇāḥ*) them, energizing or even vivifying them, establishes the all-important relationship between Indra and his human devotees. Our RVic passage seems late enough to share mythological content with that early prose text the MS. I would now tentatively withdraw the statement in the publ. intro. that Indra has no brother.

X.55.2–3: The numerology in these two vss. is characteristic of All God hymns; the references of these numbers are not clear, as often in such passages.

X.55.2: The notion that it is by means of his name(s) that Indra performs his deeds, as expressed in ab, is also found in the previous hymn in vs. 4, with the same instr. rel. construction (X.54.4 *nāmā* [or -a?] ... *yébhiḥ* ..., 55.2 *nāma* ... *yéna* ...).

Note that the injunc. *janāyaḥ* is multivalent enough to express both the previous begetting and that to come. Contrast this with the impf. *ájanayaḥ* in a similar construction in 4b, which refers only to the past.

Pāda c lacks two syllables; Ge (n. 2cd) suggests supplying another *priyám*, presumably at the end of the pāda, which would have been lost by haplology: \*... *priyám, priyám priyāḥ*. This seems unlikely to me, esp. as it would produce a bad Triṣṭubh cadence. Old suggests various distractions, which are likewise unconvincing; Arnold (§227 iii c) suggests two “rests,” before and after the caesura, with a Triṣṭubh cadence. I think rather than trying to fix the meter, we should accept it as a truncated pāda, whose brevity is in harmony with its syntactic configuration as a kind of topicalized nominal clause, either marked as dependent by *yád* deep in the clause (“which light ...,”) or with *yád asya* as a nominal izafe (“the light that is his ...”), for which see my forthcoming “Proto-proto izafe.” The publ. tr. reflects the latter, but the former would also be syntactically possible.

The lexeme *sám √ viś* is barely attested in the RV (here and in the flg. hymn, X.56.1, as well as X.18.7; cf. also *saṃvśana-* also in the next hymn, X.56.1). Here and in the AV, where it is somewhat better attested, it seems to be partly specialized for funerary contexts, for the merging into or joining with light. If “merging into the light” here refers to death, then the vs. contains the endpoints, birth and death, both associated here with Indra, the begetter in b, the owner of the light after death in c.

The identity of the “five dear ones” cannot be determined. Ge (n. 2d) follows Sāy. in supplying *jánāḥ*. Although the phrase “five peoples” accounts for many of the occurrences of RVic *pāñca*, I do not think that is the referent here. Given the rarity of *sám √ viś* in the RV and its use in the next, related hymn (X.56.1) for the merging of the dead body with light, I find it hard to believe that the occurrence here, which also involves light, simply depicts a sociopolitical fact. Although it seems way too early for this idea to be circulating, could it refer to the later doctrine of the five elements that the dead dissolve into, in expressions like *pañcatām √ gam* (etc.) ‘go to fivehood’, i.e., ‘die’?

X.55.3: The vs. begins as a conventional Indra vs., with his filling of the world-halves and the space in between (pāda a), but the numerology that follows and the multiplicity of Indra’s lights, picking up the light of 2c, soon take it in a new and baffling direction. Ge makes trouble for himself (in my opinion) by construing the acc. in b with the verb in a, *ā ... aprṇāt*. Since the phrase *ā √ prā* WORLDS “fill worlds” is stereotyped in the RV as one of Indra’s deeds, trying to join a very dissimilar direct object, “gods,” to this expression puts both off balance. The presence of the “fill worlds” expression is probably owing to the emphasis on light: what Indra ordinarily fills the space with is light. Contrary to Ge I construe b with cd; besides avoiding the ill-assorted expression resulting from grafting b onto a (see above), this has the advantage of providing the verb in c, *vī caṣṭe*, with an object. Although *vī √ cakṣ* can occur without an object, it frequently has one.

The numerological material in b and c has been amply chewed over by both Old and Ge (nn. 3b, 3c), though there is no fixed consensus on the referents of the numbers – nor do I intend to add to the discussion. Based on my grouping of the pādas, the general outline of what’s going

on seems to be that Indra surveys the ranks of the gods arranged by some numerical principle (perhaps, five groups of seven)(pāda b), by means of the light from thirty-four sources (pāda c), probably a collection of heavenly lights (stars, etc.), which are, however, really underlyingly only one light (pāda d), though with different functions. This single light is presumably the same as Indra's "light born of old" (*pratnām jātām jyōtiḥ*) of 2c, into which the mysterious five merged in 2d. We can also recall Indra's deed in the previous hymn, X.54.6, whereby he "placed light within light" (*ādadhāj jyōtiṣi jyōtir antāḥ*).

X.55.4–6: As disc. in the publ. intro., these vss. do not appear to be Indra vss., esp. 4–5, but rather seem to allude to cosmic mysteries or paradoxes. Since vss. 4–5 are the exact center of the hymn, they fit the omphalos template. In my opinion all three center on astronomical phenomena and form a sequence that sketches the end of night and the beginning of the day, though not quite in sequence. Vs. 4 announces the dawn, while vs. 5 describes the moon amid the stars and its disappearance in the gray of dawn; vs. 6 presents us with the ruddy sun at daybreak. For details see the comm. on the individual vss. below.

X.55.4: This vs. is addressed to Uṣas; her appearance here has probably been motivated by the emphasis on light(s) in the previous vss., esp. cosmic light, as well as by the theme of unity and diversity (see below). As noted in the publ. intro., the final pāda of the vs. seems a deliberate echo of the notable refrain in III.55 (1–22) *mahād devānām asuratvām ékam* "great is the one and only lordship of the gods." It is remarkable that this solemn general pronouncement has been adapted for one of the less majestic (or at any rate non-male) gods.

Each of the first three pādas is a dependent clause under the domain of a *yá*-form: *yád* a, c, *yéna* b. In the publ. tr. I take the three clauses to be sequential and parallel and the *yá*-forms to be functionally similar, expressing cause ("in that ..., because ..., in that"), but I now think that the *yéna* clause in b should be taken separately from the surrounding *yád* clauses and that it is dependent on pāda a. I base this on the other instr. rel. clauses in this hymn sequence that express the means whereby a god (=Indra) accomplishes a deed—namely X.54.4 *yébhiḥ kármāṇi ... cakārtha* and esp., earlier in this hymn, X.55.2 *yéna bhūtām janáyo yéna bhávyam* "by which you begat what has been and by which (you will beget) what is to be." Our pāda contains the same verb (though augmented), *ájanayaḥ* in addition to the *yéna*, and I doubt that this match is accidental. But what is the antecedent of *yéna* here? In both the Indra exx. just cited, the antecedent is "name(s)," and the point is that it is by the name(s) alone that the god performs his action(s). But there is no obvious antecedent in our main clause. Dawn is herself the subj. of *ájanayaḥ* and should not be the referent of *yéna*, not to mention that she's feminine and *yéna* is not. It might be that a singular could be extracted from the gen. pl. *vibhānām* "of the radiant ones" in pāda a, but this hapax stem *vibhā*- is most likely (though not entirely certainly) fem. as well (see Scar's disc. [350]). I think the referent has to be 'light' (*jyōtis*-) plucked from the larger context: 2c, 3d; note esp. instr. *jyōtiṣā* in 3d. The main clause in 4a is suffused with light, even though *jyōtis*- is not found there. I would now emend the tr. of ab(c) to "In that, o Dawn, you dawned as the foremost of the radiant ones, by which (light) you begat the thriving of the thriving, / in that ..."

It is not clear to me what *puṣtásya puṣtām* refers to, but we should begin with the fact that though *puṣtá*- is formally a past participle to  $\sqrt{puṣ}$ , it never shows clear adjectival use in the RV but is always nominalized as '(a/the) thriving, flourishing' vel sim. (see already Gr's definitions 6 and 7, of neut. *puṣtá*-), essentially doubling the fem. abstract *puṣtí*-. Because all clear cases of

*puṣṭá-* are nominal, I doubt that the gen. here is implicitly adjectival referring to a person/being who thrives, with the sense of the phrase “the thriving of the thriving (one)” (implied by Gr’s interpr. of the gen.); rather I think it’s an implicit superlative: “the thriving of thriving” = “the thriving of (all) thriving(s),” “the best thriving.”

Exactly how to construe and interpret *c* is unclear, muddled by the often-paired relational terms *ávāra-* and *pára-*, as well as by the question of whether *te* and *párasyāḥ* are coreferential or to be construed separately. Let us begin with the paired terms *ávāra-/ pára-*, which can show several different spatial or temporal polarized values: “lower/higher” // “nearer/further” // “later/earlier.” As it happens, this pairing is found in the next, related hymn, X.56.7, where the temporal sense is found, referring to earlier and later generations. I think our passage also has a temporal sense, though displayed in a spatial metaphor. I assume it is expressing the familiar trope of the kinship, indeed identity, of all dawns, from time immemorial till the dawn of the current day and on to future dawns.

The trick is to figure out exactly what form this trope takes here. To solve this, we now turn to the second question: is *te* coreferential with *párasyāḥ*? Although Sāy. interprets it that way and Gr so indicates (see also W.E. Hale, *Asura* 97), I think this unlikely, because it requires that the Dawn addressed in pāda a is the Dawn of the distant past, but if she is the past Dawn, how can she be on the scene to be addressed? True, she is called *prathamā* ‘foremost, first’ in pāda a, but in other Uṣas hymns (cf. esp. I.113.8, 15) *prathamā* is used of today’s Dawn, the first of those who are to come, as the passages in I.113 make explicit. I therefore think that *párasyāḥ* is to be construed independently of *te* and it refers to a Dawn long in the past. The enclitic *te*, which here could be either gen. or dat., depends on the *jāmitvām ávaram* and is explicitly contrasted with the previous (*pára-*) Dawn; note that Ge also takes them separately. The whole phrase then indicates that “you,” the current Dawn, have a close kinship (*jāmitvām ávaram*) even with the/a Dawn of the far distant past (*párasyāḥ*), with *ávāra-/ pára-* expressing a temporal relationship through a spatial metaphor. The theme of unity in multiplicity found in vs. 3, with the many lights counting as a single light (3cd) is reprised here, with a more familiar example, that of the fundamental identity of the infinite number of dawns in the past and to come. The unity is emphasized by the adaptation of the “one and only lordship” refrain to Dawn.

X.55.5: This is the most challenging vs. in the hymn and the middle verse of the three astronomical ones (4–6). Each of the pādas presents its own problems. The standard interpr. of this vs. runs counter to the usual: there is general agreement about the *referent* of the principal entity—the moon—but none about the meaning or etymology of its first epithet, *vidhú-*, though it is also generally agreed that it is a riddling designation in a riddling vs.

In my view, the first pāda continues the theme of unity and multiplicity found previously, and this polarity helps in interpreting the much discussed word *vidhú-*. The scholarly back-and-forth about this word has been conveniently summarized by Carmen Spiers in her recent (2020) EPHE diss., “Magie et poésie dans l’Inde ancienne,” 308–10, and I will not repeat this disc. in detail, nor will I engage much with the much disputed question of its etymology and word formation. Instead I will first focus on the rhetorical organization of the pāda in which it’s found: *vidhūṃ dadrāṇām sāmāne bahūnām*, with its final loc.-gen. phrase “in a gathering/crowd of many.” Given the balanced contrast between one and many / unity and multiplicity that we have noted in the previous two vss., the “many” at the end of pāda a invites a “one / alone” interpr. of *vidhú-* at the beginning. And in fact much of the older lit. so interpr. it: Gr (flg. BR) ‘vereinsamt, einsam’, MonWms ‘lonely, solitary’, sim., though tentatively, Old. There are several, not entirely

incompatible, ways to get to this sense, one of which involves a connection with *vidhāvā-* ‘widow’ as ‘the solitary one’ (see Old, again tentatively) and/or derivation from the root  $\sqrt{\text{vidh}}$  ‘divide’ (which, however, is a secondary root with somewhat different semantics). The connection with ‘widow’ was maintained by Tichy in her treatment of *vidhū-* (HS 106 [1993]: 15–17 = KISch 365–67), but she proposes a very different root etymology, to  $\sqrt{\text{vyadh}}$  ‘pierce, wound’ or, in her gloss, ‘jdn. verletzen, mit dem Pfeil treffen’, besonders ‘tödlich treffen’. She considers the interpr. “tödlich getroffen” for *vidhū-* justified by the fact that later in the vs. the referent dies (*mamāra*). But there is a certain rhetorical tone-deafness to this interpr.: it seems to me that the local context of pāda a, which favors ‘alone’ versus ‘many’, should outweigh the dying at the end of the vs., esp. because *mamāra* enters into its own rhetorical pairing with immediately following *sām āna* ‘he breathed’. Moreover, neither the phases of the moon nor the setting of the moon at daybreak (which are both possible real-world analogues for ab) conceptually involve wounding. Nonetheless, Tichy’s interpr. has mostly carried the day, having been adopted by Mayr. in EWA s.v. *vidhū-* (in a fascicle publ. in 1995, soon after Tichy’s art.) and by Kü (254). But note that Lubotsky (“RV *ávidhat* [1994: IXth Fachtagung IGG, 205]) asserts the connection with *vidhāvā-* and with  $\sqrt{\text{vidh}}$ , though with a different and somewhat dubious etymology of the root and a different sense for *vidhū-* ‘divided in two parts, a crescent’. (Since this publication arose from a 1992 conference, the original paper predated Tichy’s article, which is not mentioned.) To summarize my own view briefly, I find Tichy’s etymology and interpr. of the word quite unsatisfactory, despite their current dominance; I am more sympathetic to Lub’s view, but I still find it dubious. (Inter alia, surely ‘divided in two parts’ with reference to the moon would identify a half moon.) To my mind, the ‘alone’ sense is rhetorically the best supported, and a connection with ‘widow’, whatever the further details of root and word formation, can underlie this sense. Thus the first pāda can depict the solitary (moon) running in a crowd of many (stars), as it crosses the sky from moonrise to moonset.

The next question is – what happens to this moon in pāda b? As I have indicated above, I think the image is that of the moon setting into the gray clouds/haze at the horizon at dawn, (or alternatively, as I also suggest in the publ. intro., the gray could be the smoke from the ritual fire kindled at dawn). A possibly similar image, of sunrise through gray clouds, may be found in the Pūṣan hymn VI.56.3 (q.v.), with a different word for ‘gray’ (*paraśá-*), but that passage is even more obscure than this one. I am puzzled by Old’s suggestion that the gray one is the “old sun” (“der alten Sonne”) – I cannot think of a naturalistic situation in which the sun could appear to swallow the moon, and furthermore the sun is hardly gray, esp. at sunrise. Ge’s suggestion (n. 5b) that the *palitá-* is “das personifizierte Greisenalter” is worth more consideration, but I think we are dealing with a semantic association of gray with old age, rather than a personification. The pāda sets us a semantic polarization between the young and the old, via the association of gray (hair) with old age, with the young moon, presumably the new moon, being swallowed up by the gray cloudbank.

One issue that no one dealing with the passage seems to have confronted: despite the universal assumption that the referent of the accusatives in this half-vs. is the moon, the gender is masc. – and the standard word for moon is feminine. (However, other words used for the moon, most notably *sóma-* (already so used in the wedding hymn, X.85.1–5) can be masc.) I don’t know what to do about this, but given the other strong evidence for the identification of this entity as the moon, I do not think the gender mismatch invalidates it. Perhaps this is part of the riddle.

Although pāda c is morphologically and syntactically unproblematic and the words are all



familiar, its sense and its relevance to the rest of the verse are not. To begin with, what is the referent of *devásya*? Is this the moon from ab, once again unusually masc., or is a god external to the rest of the vs., perhaps Indra, who is the subject of the first and last vss. of the hymn? I am inclined towards the former, since it seems to point to the subject of pāda d, who seems to be identical to the accs. in ab.

Then, what does *kāvya*- mean here? I usually tr. it as ‘poetic skill/art’ or, in the pl., ‘products of poetic skill, poems’. In passages with any sort of diagnostic context, the word is found in association with other words for speech and verbal products (e.g., IV.3.16, 11.3, V.39.5, VIII.79.1, IX.97.7). Others render it as “sagacity, understanding, wisdom”. But neither tack works very well here. In particular, if pāda d is meant as an illustration of the god’s *kāvya*- (as the colon after c in Ge’s, Tichy’s, and Kü’s (370) tr. suggests), dying does not seem a great example of his wisdom. But even less is d an example of poetic art. In the publ. intro. I suggest that *kāvya*- here refers to the *previous* hemistich, which is identified as a piece of *kāvya*-, a hyper-“poetic” description of the moon’s journey, which then, in pāda d, is expressed in stark and simple terms. In the absence of anything more convincing, I still think this is the best available interpr. But I remain disturbed by the *devásya*: by this interpr. the *kāvya*- is not a product of the god [=moon], but *about* the god, which is a somewhat odd use of the genitive. I am also disturbed that d does not seem to describe quite the same situation as ab. The first hemistich, by my interpr., describes the moon’s traversal of the sky and its setting at dawn; d is most easily taken as a depiction of the moon’s phases, with “he died” referring to the dark period between the waning crescent and the new moon. But if “yesterday” can refer to the night before the dawn, perhaps the two pictures can be reconciled.

In d *mamāra* presumably owes its accent to the short contrasting clauses in this pāda, or else we should assume unsigned subordination: “(Although) today he died, yesterday ...”

X.55.6: As noted above and in the publ. intro., I think this vs. refers to the sun at daybreak. Ge (n. 6), similarly but not identically, to Indra as Sonnen-*hamṣa*. In favor of the sun as referent is the fact that the phrase *aruṇāḥ suparṇāḥ* is used of the sun in X.30.2 (so Ge’s n. 6a), V.47.3 (see comm. ad loc.), and *suparṇā-* by itself is frequently used of the sun (see Gr’s def. 6, even if the referent in not all these passages is correctly identified). I do not know why the sun is called ‘nestless’ (*ānīla-*)—perhaps because the sun is constantly on the move, even at night when most birds settle down in their nests, while he must make his invisible return journey to the east, to be ready for sunrise.

The first hemistich lacks a verb, and in addition the morphological identity and the syntax of *mahāḥ* is unclear. Ge takes *mahā-* as nom. sg. and supplies a verb of motion with *ā* in b: “der als der grosse ... herbei(kommt).” This may be the easiest solution, though not the most inspired. The publ. tr. reflects an assumed ellipsis of a verb form of  $\sqrt{\text{śak}}$  (a type of haplogy after *śākmanā śākāḥ* opening the vs.), with *ā*, governing *mahāḥ* (prob. an acc. pl., so Old). Note that finite forms of (*ā*)  $\sqrt{\text{śak}}$  are sometimes used as essentially etymological glosses of *śakrá-*, e.g., VIII.32.12 *sá naḥ śakrás cid ā śakat* “He as ‘able one’ will be able for us” (also I.10.6, VII.20.9).

Pāda c expresses the common trope that the Sun, traversing the sky, sees everything and everyone and spies out the truth for Mitra and Varuṇa (see, e.g., VII.60.1–4).

The last pāda of the vs. effects a transition to the final two Indra vss., though it can also be applied to the Sun.

As Ge notes (n. 6d), the paired agent nouns *utá jétotá dātā* # recall the somewhat less tightly knit pair in the previous hymn, X.54.5 *ājñātā ... dātā* #, though interestingly with different

accent. The suffix-accented pair in X.54.5 function as names of Indra, whereas these root-accented forms describe deeds and govern an acc.

X.55.7–8: These two vss. return to Indra, who, however, is not named. But his epithet *vajrín-* and association with the Vṛtra-slaying in 7b make his presence undeniable, and his drinking of the soma in 8c is hardly less diagnostic. Much else remains unclear, esp. in vs. 7.

X.55.7: As was just noted, the unnamed Indra is the subject of this vs., but we must also identify the unspecified “gods” (*devāḥ*, the last word of the vs.) by virtue of whom Indra acquires his manly powers (pāda a) and becomes strong for the Vṛtra-slaying. Here I think Ge is correct (and Sāy. well before him) that these are the Maruts, who are regularly mentioned as Indra’s supporters in the Vṛtra battle. I do not think this necessarily means that Ge’s identification of “the sons of the brother” in 1d as the Maruts is also correct. It’s worth noting that though Sāy. names the Maruts as the referents here, in vs. 1 he has an entirely different (if unlikely) interpr.: the brother is Parjanya, and the sons are “a collection of water(s)” (*udakasamstyāyān*).

With the Maruts plugged in as the referents of *ebhiḥ* (a) and *yébhir* (b), the interpr. of the first hemistich is fairly straightforward. Not so the second. Here the gods, who must be the Maruts, “were born / came into being / arose” under some unclear circumstances. The immediate cause or concomitant circumstance is “the greatness of the deed/action being done/performed” (*kármaṇaḥ kriyāmānasya mahnā*). Given the context, it is difficult not to identify this deed as the Vṛtra-slaying of the previous pāda, which is depicted as happening concurrently, with the present passive participle. But did the Maruts come into being or arise because of the Vṛtra-slaying? Not in the standard accounts – and it is hard to see how they could have supported Indra at the time if they weren’t in existence yet. How to reconcile pādas c and d is made considerably more difficult by the word opening d, *ṛtekarmám*.

There has been curiously little discussion of the hapax *ṛtekarmám* despite the fact that its meaning is unclear (it’s been given two quite distinct senses in the literature), its second member seems to show a very early thematization of the old *n*-stem *kárman-*, and the accent may be anomalous. The only mention in the lit. that I can find is in EWA, s.v. *ṛté*, with a gloss ‘ohne (eigenes) Zutun’, but with no disc. of its formation. It is entirely absent, as far as I can tell, from AiG and from other standard grammars. In the older lit. the first member is taken as the loc. sg. of *ṛtá-*; see Gr’s ‘dem beim Gottesdienste vollbrachten Werke gemäss’ and the large (earlier) BR ‘handelnd nach der Ordnung, nach der Jedermann angewiesenen Bestimmung’ (though with ?). This analysis is also reflected in Sāy.’s gloss and paraphrase *ṛtakarma vṛṣṭipradānakarma*. But in the short (later) BR (/br) the word has been given a radically new meaning: the full entry there is “Adv. *ohne Werk*,” which is reflected in MonWms “without work” (attributed to “BRD,” presumably the short br). I have found no disc. or justification of this abrupt about-face. Ge’s “ohne eigenes Zutun” follows this new view. (Old fails to comment on anything in this strange verse.) This later interpr. obviously takes the first member as the adposition *ṛté* ‘without’, found sparingly in the RV, always with the ablative. This would be the only such cmpd. in the RV (*ṛte-jā-* ‘born in truth’ belongs with *ṛtá-*), but a few exx. begin to appear in Vedic prose, already MS and KS. See AiG II.1.314–15 and its Nachtr., p. 86. The MS contains two accented forms (with unaccented parallels in KS), whose accents clash with each other: *ṛté-mūlam* ‘without roots’ (MS I.10.17; cf. KS XXXVI.12) with 1st member accentuation and *ṛte-yajñám* ‘without a sacrifice’ (MS I.11.5; cf. KS XIV.5) with 2nd member accentuation, both to thematic stems. The only other accented form is *ṛté-gu-* ‘without cow(s)’ in ŚBK I.2.4.10, corresponding to the phrase *ṛté*

*gōḥ* in ŚBM II.2.4.13. With so little data it is hard to draw any conclusions about the accent, but, for what it's worth, the two forms with first-member accent appear to be adjectives, whereas our *ṛte-karmām* and, probably, MS *ṛte-yajñām* are adverbs and so may show adverbial accent shift. As for the apparent thematic ending *-ām*, I am puzzled. Perhaps it is an effort to distinguish the adverb from the case forms to the neut. *n*-stem *kārman-* found in these two vss.: gen. sg. *kārmaṇaḥ* (7c), clearly to an *n*-stem, and acc. pl. *kārmāṇi* (8a), the usual *-n*-stem form, though it could of course belong to a putative *a*-stem *\*kārma-*. We can also note that the word precedes a vowel-initial word *udājāyanta* and so the *m* could have originated as a hiatus-filler.

Let us now focus on the meaning. The fact is that neither the older interpr. nor the younger one fits easily in the passage. To start with the later one and with Ge's tr. of the hemistich: "die [=Götter] durch die Grösse (seines) getanen Werkes auch ohne eigenes Zutun emporkamen" – the tr. implies that because of Indra's ("seines") activity the gods arose / came into being / got born without any action on their part. But does this follow? What does Indra's deed have to do with the birth of gods – esp. if this act is indeed the Vṛtra-slaying, as I suggested above? And does the birth of gods involve their own activity under other circumstances? The Maruts' birth is generally depicted as complex and problematic (see esp. VI.66.1–6, where they do seem to take an active role in their own birth). Or must we reckon with a very bleached sense of *úd√jan* 'come to prominence' or the like? This lexeme is rare (6x in the RV), and it generally refers to real birth or at least to physical (a)rising. In short, Ge's interpr. is not impossible, but it does not conform to any mythological situation I'm aware of, and the formation envisioned, a cmpd with *ṛté* 'without', seems a little early. The older interpr. does not fare much better; here again we'd need an adverb, in this case meaning something like "in the manner of (an) action in (accord with) truth." Such an adverb could qualify the immediately preceding phrase *kārmaṇaḥ kriyāmānasya mahnā* "by the greatness of the action being performed" and indicate that the action was not only great but in harmony with the truth – perhaps a nervous preemption of the blood guilt associated with killing. Once again the word formation is anomalous, but that's a problem with both interpr. Although the publ. tr. follows the later interpr., I am now inclined towards the earlier one: "... which gods arose/came into being by/because of the greatness of the action being done, in a manner of (an) action in accord with truth." This still doesn't solve the problem of what the Vṛtra-slaying (or other deed of Indra's) has to do with the birth/arising of the Maruts, but I think I've gotten as far as I can.

X.55.8: This vs. is blessedly straightforward. Assuming that it follows more or less directly on vs. 7, we can supply "with them/the Maruts" to flesh out *yujā*. The *kārman-* prominent in vs. 7 returns here, obj. of the root *√jan*, which, as we saw, complicated 7d. As was likely there, we have to deal with an attenuated sense of 'beget' -- 'give rise to', vel sim. -- rather than a literal one.

The hymn limps to the end with a 10-syllable pāda (d).

## X.56 All Gods

On the aim of the hymn, see publ. intro. As was disc. there, there are two competing views: that the hymn is the poet's memorial for his dead son Vājīn (Sāy.) or that it concerns a dead horse, either sacrificed (Old) or deified (Ge). The horse interpr. is strongly defended also by Doniger, but Re (EVP XVI.133) questions it: "peut-être l'allusion au cheval est-elle à rejeter?" As was also noted in the publ. intro., I reject both interpr.; there is simply no evidence for a horse save for the word *vājīn-* 'prizewinner', which need not apply to a horse (see the numerous

passages under Gr's definitions 3–8), nor is there any evidence for a father-son connection between the poet and the dead entity. Instead the hymn seems to be a general treatment of what happens after death, picking up and developing some themes found in the previous hymn, X.55, particular that of light.

X.56.1: The fact that this vs. is found in the AV (AVŚ XVIII.7≅ AVP XVIII.69.5) and elsewhere in a normal funeral hymn is another piece of evidence that the dead in question is a person, not a horse.

The three lights are probably more or less as Ge indicates (n. 1a): this one here (*idám*) is the light of earth, quite possibly the fire; the distant one (*paráh*) is that in heaven, probably the sun; the third one is in the furthest distant heaven beyond the sun.

As noted above ad X.55.2, the lexeme *sám* √ *vis* is very rare, and its attestation twice in this vs. and once in a vs. in the preceding hymn is strong evidence for the continuity of thought between the two hymns. Both passages concern the “merging” of being(s) with or into light.

As elsewhere (I.163.4, VII.34.2, 56.2) I take the instrument suffix *-tra-* serious in *janitra-* and tr. it ‘means of begetting’, not ‘birthplace’ with most. Here the point would be that merging with the third light is the best kind of birth.

X.56.2: It must be admitted that this vs. is found in AVŚ in a short hymn to a horse (VI.92.3; the AVP IX.34.13 equivalent is in a longer and more miscellaneous collection).

Sāy., fld by Ge and Don, interpr. *tanūḥ ... tanvām náyantī* as meaning that the body of the horse is carrying the body of its rider, but this seems like a forcing of the horse theme on a phrase that resists it. For ex., Don tr. “carrying a body,” but √ *nī* doesn't mean ‘carry’, but ‘lead’. For Don's suggested meaning we would expect a form of √ *bhr* instead. Re appositely cites the compd. *ásu-nīti-* ‘leading to the (other) life’, found in the funeral hymns (incl. nearby X.59.5–6), referring to the one who guides the dead person to the beyond and reunites him with his faculties, a sort of psychopomp. In fact I now think that the nom. *tanūḥ* does not refer to the body of the dead man in question, which is rather the acc. *tanvām*; 2nd-position *te* can as easily qualify this following form, separated only by a voc. *vājín*, as the preceding *tanūḥ*. (I do not think that the close sandhi *tanūṣ te* requires a syntactic connection to the preceding: a preceding rukifiable *-s* generally seems to ruki before *te* regardless of the syntax. See, e.g., *vidúṣ te* [I.11.6, 7], *nákṣ te* [I.48.6, 69.7].) I would therefore change the tr. to “Let the body, leading your body, establish ...” Who the nom. body belongs to I'm not sure – perhaps it refers to a generic body, the psychopomp, that leads the other dead along the way.

The accent on *dhātu* is motivated by its participation in two clauses, between which it stands.

In d  *jyótiḥ* can be read with both simile (to the left: *divīva*) and frame (to the right: *svám*). I take “own light” as referring to the *idám ... ékam* in 1a, “one light here [on earth]” – in other words, to the light that the person had while alive, which he will exchange for another light, the third one mentioned in 1b. Why the exchange partner is expressed in a simile “as if for the light in heaven” has to do with the three lights of 1ab. The dead is merging with the third light, beyond the one in heaven, i.e., the second light – but since that second one, the sun, is the only one we can see and therefore imagine, the poet compares the merging with the distant invisible third light with the less (but still) distant and visible second one. Ge's interpr. is different: he supplies the sun in the simile, with the comparison between the sun's exchanging its light (alternating between day and night?) and the dead man's exchanging his. But I don't understand

the point of comparison: the dead person's exchange is permanent – he's giving up his own light for a higher one—whereas the sun's exchange happens daily. Still less do I understand Don's "change your own light as one does in heaven."

X.56.3: The them. deriv. *vājina-* is poorly attested and poorly defined; here it seems to be used as a pleonastic etymological qualification of the nom. *vājī* "you are a *vājīn* by your qualify of *vājina-*."

The rest of the vs. is structured by five occurrences of *suvitāḥ* 'well gone' (*su* √ *i*), which forms a non-etym. semantic figure with the single finite verb *gāḥ* 'you have gone' (to √ *gā*). This use of *suvitā-* is highly unusual. It is the only occurrence of this quite well-attested stem with an animate being; it is ordinarily neut. and a noun 'good going, easy passage'.

The real problem in this vs. is the hapax *suvenīḥ* (see AiG II.380 "ganz unklar"), starting with its morphological identification. Sāy., Old, and Re take it as a nom. sg. (in different ways), while Ge, Don., and I take it as acc. pl. fem. Ge and Don think it refers to the heavenly mares (Ge n. 3a), the 'well-loved' ("zu den schönen Geliebten") or 'well-loving' (Don: "who long for you") ones, with an outmoded sense of √ *ven*. I associate it with the fem. pl. *venīḥ* 'female trackers' in VIII.41.3, which I now think refers to the dawns. (See comm. ad loc.) Here the same referent is quite possible; remember that the addressee is on a journey to merge with the distant light, and the dawns, sources of heavenly light, therefore fit the larger context. Recall that in the "light" section of the previous, thematically related hymn, X.55.4, Dawn featured prominently. As a goal in our vs., "dawns" fits well with heaven (*divām* b) and the gods (*devān* d). I would, however, slightly alter the tr., since *suvitāḥ* does not seem to be construed with *suvenīḥ*, as the publ. tr. implies. The new version would be "You have gone to the (dawns?), the good trackers, well gone to the praise, well gone to heaven ..."

X.56.4: On my general interpr. of the vs., see the publ. intro., where I suggest that the vs. describes the step-by-step mechanism whereby the recently dead regain their bodies. The last pāda is the clearest expression of this thought, with the dead entering (*ā ... nī* √ *viś*) their own bodies again. The use of √ *viś* recalls the lexeme *sām* √ *viś* 'merge into' (of the dead) almost confined to these two hymns (X.55.2, 56.1); see comm. above. It is used of the dead merging with light; in this pāda they (re-)merge with their own bodies.

The rest of the vs. is beset with difficulties, though the outlines of the process seem fairly clear – even though I've now changed my mind about some of it (see below). It involves uniting the previous mental force of the dead (*krātu-*, b) with their vibrant energy (*yāny ātvīṣuḥ*, c; see below), and, with this package, entering into their own bodies again (d). What exactly is going on in pāda a is less clear.

The interpr. of pāda a depends on that of *caná*, in particular whether it is positive or negative. There is some difference of opinion here, but weighted towards a negative interpr. So, though Sāy. takes it as positive and both Old and Re consider this as a possibility, in the end Old prefers a neg. interpr. (Re does not decide), and Ge, Don, and the publ. tr. all follow the negative one, without disc. Certainly the apparent contrast between the Pitars in pāda a and the gods in b favors the negative, as Old points out. However, this interpr. collides with the usage facts of *caná* elsewhere. As disc. esp. ad X.49.5, flg. Klein (DGRV I.285–92), although *caná* overwhelmingly appears in negative contexts, the actual negative is always expressed by (an)other explicitly negative word(s) in those contexts. There are almost no clear examples of *caná* as the sole expression of the negative (though see comm. ad II.24.12); unfortunately Klein does not discuss

our passage, which seems like a strong candidate – or at least it is often so interpr. On the one hand, we could assume that the negative sense had “rubbed off” on *caná* in this late passage, and it means “even ... not” as in the publ. tr. in contrast to its standard usage. As I explain in the publ. intro., this could mean that the immediate predecessors of the dead, their Pitars, do not control the “greatness” of those dead, which is in the hands of the gods and powers further above. However, given the overwhelming no. of *caná* passages that conform to the usage facts just set out – there are nearly 100 exx. of *caná*- in the RV – I am now more reluctant to follow this path than when I made the transl. without full consideration of *caná*. But, if *caná* is positive, what then would this pāda mean? That interpr. must in turn depend on what we think *mahimán*- expresses. This well-attested word is of course an abstract meaning ‘greatness’, but that doesn’t get us very far. I would suggest, very tentatively, that the use of pl. *mahimānaḥ* in the famous cosmogonic hymn X.129.5 may help illuminate our passage. Late in the creation depicted therein, the creation becomes sexualized, with polarized male and female features: *retodhā āsan mahimāna āsan* “There existed placers of semen and there existed greatnesses,” with the “greatnesses” likely referring to pregnancies. If *mahimán*- (sg., I grant) in our passage can refer to the pregnant belly and, by extension, to sexuality, reproduction, and all the messy parts of physicality, this could be in the control of the Pitars, who are in fact vitally interested in the reproductive capacity of their descendants, while the mental power and vital energy belong to the gods. Although this suggestion is fairly fragile, given how many exx. of *mahimán*- lack this sense, it fits the context quite well, since the Pitars return in the vs. 6 to establish the continuity of generations. I would therefore now change the tr. to “Even though the forefathers are masters of their “greatness” (=procreative powers), the gods ...”

The next pāda is, by the standards of this hymn, pretty straightforward. By my interpr. the gods have control over the *krātu*- ‘mental force’ of the dead and deposit it among themselves. The mental *krātu*- contrasts with the physical procreative power (if my interpr. of *mahimán*- in a is accepted).

Pāda c presents several challenges: 1) what is *utá* doing in the middle of the pāda? 2) how should we interpr. *yāny átvīsuḥ*? In particular, is *yāni* nom. or acc. and, related, is *átvīsuḥ* intransitive or transitive? 3) What is the subj. of *sám avivyacuḥ*?

The question about *utá* has, I think, not previously been raised: it has simply been taken as connecting c with b, despite its mid-pāda position. See Ge’s tr., whose rendering of c begins with “Und.” Klein (DGRV I.380) is explicit that it connects the clauses across a distich boundary, despite its pāda-internal position. The publ. tr. reflects this shared view (notice my “and” beginning c). But I now think it is wrong. Instead I think it connects the unexpressed first obj. of *sám avivyacuḥ* ‘they enveloped / encompassed’ with the second, which is the relative clause that follows *utá*. In other words, it is the *utá* version of an “X and which Y” construction, usually expressed with *ca* (X *yá*- *ca* Y). The use of the preverb *sám* ‘together’ supports this view that two things are being united. The first object is, in my view, *krátum*, to be supplied from b. In other words they bring together the mental force of b and the vibrant energy expressed by *yāny átvīsuḥ*. Once these have been combined, the crucial parts of the dead person have been reunited and are ready to be (re-)placed in the bodily envelope.

Let us now turn to the rel. cl. and specifically to its verb *átvīsuḥ*. The first thing to note is that a different form of this root was found in the previous hymn, X.55.1 *títviṣānāḥ* tr. there ‘sparkling’, that is, energizing or vivifying. That form is a middle pf. part. and transitive, but opinions differ on the value of our act. form. For intransitive value: Sāy. (*yāni tejāmsy atviṣuḥ dīpyante*), Don (“all things that shine”), and apparently Ge (“Glanzeleistungen”), as well as the

publ. tr. (“those things that were in vibrant motion”). For transitive: Gr (“anregen ACC”), Kü (“welche sie erregten,” p. 500), and Old (“was sie aufgestürmt haben”). It is true that this is the only act. form to this root, and so an oppositional transitive might be expected (most of the middle forms, though not X.55.1, are intrans.). A trans. sense would certainly work within my scenario: “they encompassed the *krātu-* and the parts that they ‘sparked’.” But, despite the morphology, I weakly favor the intrans. version because it is more harmonious with the simple obj. *krátum*. Putting the whole pāda together, I would now tr. “They enveloped / encompassed (the mental force) and those things that were in vibrant motion” – in other words intellect and life force. One final question about this pāda: who is the subj. of *sām avivyacuḥ*? Ge (/Don) thinks it’s the divine racehorses, which we can dismiss. It could be the gods of b, but I think it is more likely the dead themselves, who have reclaimed the various parts of themselves from the various places they ended up after death.

X.56.5: As indicated in the publ. intro., I think the first hemistich of this vs. depicts the newly reassembled dead moving about in the other, upper realm. I’m not sure exactly what their “powers” (*sāhobhiḥ*) are, but I assume that this refers generally to the powers that come from the (re-)combination of mental force, life force, and body.

As also indicated in the publ. intro., in my view the 2nd hemistich refers to a different type of life-after-death. Though each separate being is limited to and held within a single body – even if that body is in heaven, as in the last pāda of the previous vs., 4d — by producing offspring, a single being can extend himself in many different beings. This is of course a standard Vedic sentiment. On the medial reflexive form *prāsārayanta* see my -aya-book, p. 170.

X.56.6: As Ge (n. 6) says, “Schwierige Str.” The first thing to note is that the configuration of two plus a third matches vs. 1, though the referents of the numbers cannot be the same. Since the final vs. of this hymn (7) seems to be a summary vs. applicable to the poet, the matching of 1 and 6 is ring compositional. In vs. 1 we have *ēkam ... ēkam ... tṛtīyena*, whereas here we have *dvidhā ... tṛtīyena*. In 1 the third entity is light (*jyōtiṣā*), here a deed (*kārmaṇā*). Light is represented in this vs., however – by *svar(-víd)-* ‘sun(-finding)’.

The vs. concerns the same subject as vs. 5: the ways in which the dead (or to-be-dead) can assure some kind of continued existence for themselves. This is also generally Ge’s take on the vs. (see n. 6ab), though we differ sharply on details, esp. the referents of the crucial terms. The topic of continued existence is also approached from two points of view, that of the sons of the dead (ab) and that of the already dead forefathers (cd).

With Ge, I take *dvidhā* ‘in two ways’ as referring to two different locales: yonder (i.e., heaven, or whatever we want to call it) and here on earth. My important differences from Ge are that I don’t think the “sons” are the Aṅgirasas, an idea of Sāy.’s that seems a distraction in this hymn, and I think the *āsura-* is the sons’ actual father, not heaven (so Ge) nor the sun (Sāy., Don). The sons have established their father, their “lord,” as a sun-finder—that is, they have made it possible for him to merge with the light, as in 1b. Yonder in heaven this is effectuated by the sons’ performance of the proper funeral rites; on earth by their extending themselves through offspring, thus producing grandsons for their fathers, the standard three-generation model in later Hinduism. This extension is produced by “a third action” (*tṛtīyena kārmaṇā*), which, with Sāy., Ge, and Don, I interpr as procreation. Although we might think that procreation was already covered by the second category, “extending themselves through offspring,” I think the offspring and the sexual intercourse that produces them are considered separately. Sexual intercourse is

definitely an “action,” requiring another person, the ambivalently viewed female, and therefore involving some danger and risk of impurity. The hoped-for result, the offspring continuing the line of the grandfather, is not a given.

This is the extension of the line from the son’s point of view. Their fathers’ is given in the second hemistich. These (now dead) Pitars established their own offspring (*svām prajāṃ*), that is, the sons whose actions we observed in ab, as their “paternal power” (*pítryaṃ sáhaḥ*). In this context “paternal power” seems to identify the offspring as the tool, the secret weapon, that the Pitars wield to ensure their continuity into the next generation(s). The sons will have sons (and so on), and they will stretch like a thread across the generations.

X.56.7: The first hemistich of the vs. is essentially unrelated to the rest of the hymn, simply expressing metaphorically all the difficulties Bṛhaduktha has overcome – though for a possible relationship between the boat in pāda a and the journey to the next world, see comm. ad X.135.4. The real meat is in the second hemistich. There the general statement in the previous vs. (6) is applied specifically to the poet Bṛhaduktha. This application is emphasized by the exact echoes in the two second hemistichs:

6cd #*svām prajāṃ* ..., *āvareṣv adadhuh* ...

7cd #*svām prajāṃ* ..., *āvareṣv adadhāt* ...

Just as the Forefathers establish their own progeny to provide continuity to later generations, so has Bṛhaduktha. This would seem simply to say that Bṛhaduktha, too, has produced sons. But what about the final phrase, *ā páreṣu* “among previous (generations),” found only in the Bṛhaduktha vs.? This is the finale of the hymn (and of the hymn sequence, X.54–56), and, when given some thought, it seems like a radical statement. The Pitars can only produce forward, as it were: their offspring connect them with generations to come. But how can one’s own offspring connect to the past? I venture to suggest, quite tentatively, that this is a statement about poetry. Bṛhaduktha’s “own offspring” are also his hymns, and by producing them he has not only set about ensuring the continuity of the poetic tradition to generations in the future, but he has also provided a continued existence to previous generations by celebrating them in his poetry. He has generated backwards, as it were, and given a new life to the Pitars who preceded him. Bṛhaduktha’s special ability to connect with both past and future is enabled by *mahitvā*, his ‘greatness’.

## X.57–60

On these four hymns (and their possible resolution into three) see publ. intro. to the four hymns as well as the introductions to the individual hymns.

## X.57 All Gods

X.57.1: Technically speaking, *somínah* could be gen. sg., as I take it (also Ge), abl. sg. with *yajñāt*, or nom. pl. agreeing with the 1st pl. subj.

X.57.2: The “thread stretched” (*tántuh ... ātataḥ*) to the gods is Agni: the ppl *āhuta-* is overwhelmingly used of him. The phrase exactly matches (save for case) *tántum ātatam* in the immediately preceding hymn (X.56.6), and, though the referents and contexts are completely different, this agreement may account for the placement of this set of hymns.



X.57.3: The mention of the Pitars also connects this hymn with the end of the last: see X.56.4, 6.

X.57.5: The tr. of *pitarah* here should have been harmonized with that of *pitrñām* in 3, hence “o forefathers.”

X.57.6: *vraté* in this vs. echoes *vrātam* in 5c, despite their different senses. Both vss. end with *sacemahi*.

### X.58 “Return of Mind” (*manaāvartanam*)

On the relationship between this hymn and the previous one, see publ. intro.

X.58.1 (–12): The locational adv. *dūrakām* seems almost contradictory: the base *dūrā-* means ‘distant, far away’, but the suffix *-ka-*, diminutive or deprecatory, seems to undercut its base – with an implication “a little far away, sort of far away.” This may give us some reassurance that we can succeed in calling back the *mānas-* that has gone to those not-quite-so-distant parts.

X.58.6: As was noted in the publ. intro., the “sloping paths” (*pravātaḥ*) lead to Yama in the funeral hymn X.14.1. It is not clear to me whether the preceding *mārīcīḥ* ‘light-beams’ is meant to be identical to the sloping paths or a different destination. Distinct parallel accusatives seem less likely because we might otherwise expect a double *yād* as in vss. 2 (*yād ... dívam yāt prthivīm*), 7, and 8. But I’m not sure whether the sloping paths are really conceived of as beams of light. The word *mārīci-* is found only once elsewhere in the RV, in very late X.177.1; it is more common in the AV, esp. AVP (see Griffiths 2009, ad AVP VI.7.1), but it does not seem to have a technical or particularly well-defined meaning there.

### X.59 Various divinities

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. In Old’s view (Noten, ad 57–60), vss. 1–7 belong together, but 8–10 belong with X.60.

X.59.1: The interpr. of b is disputed; I find both Ge’s and Old’s unsatisfactory because they miss connections between b and pādas a and c. To begin with the subjects of b, the dual *sthātārā*. With Old (also Re, but not Ge) I take the referents to be the two Aśvins; Ge (n. 1b, though see n. 1c) finds a reference to the Aśvins unnecessary (nicht notwendig), but the mention of one of the Aśvins’ clients, Cyavāna, in c, not to mention the fact that the form is dual, makes the Aśvins the prohibitive favorite. The Aśvins are addressed as *sthātārā* in I.181.3. I construe gen. *rāthasya* with the agent noun, *pace* Ge and Re, who take it with *krātumatā*. Cf. for this same phrase III.45.2 *sthātā rāthasya*.

The next question is the referent (and analysis) of *krātumatā*. Although Gr (and tentatively Lanman, Noun Infl. 516) take it as a nominative dual, such disregard for standard morphology should be avoided. Both Old and Ge (and I) take it as an instr. sg.; for them it refers to another person: Ge to another unidentified charioteer, Old to Cyavāna. But we really need no other personnel. Although a word meaning ‘possessing *krātu*’ might be expected to refer to a living being, in fact this is not necessary. In IV.41.1 *krātumān* modifies a praise song (*stómaḥ*) that is spoken by us (*asmād uktāḥ*). I therefore supply a verbal product here as well: the Aśvins did X “with their resolute (speech).”

And what is it that the Aśvins did? Here the well-known saga of Cyavāna comes into play:

the Aśvins are famous for making him young again. This is where pāda a becomes relevant. There we have a passive syntagm “his lifetime has become extended” *prá tāry āyuh*, expressed with the passive aor. of the lexeme *prá √ tṛ*. The owner of this lifetime is the unnamed subject of this part of the hymn. But this extension of his lifetime is comparable to what the Aśvins did for Cyavāna, and in fact the same verbal lexeme is once used of this very deed: I.116.10 *prātīratam jahitāsyāyur dasrā* “You extended the lifetime of him who was left behind [=Cyavāna, mentioned in the preceding pāda], wondrous ones.” I suggest that the syntactic relationship between pāda a (the frame) and pāda b (the simile) belongs to the phenomenon I’ve discussed under the rubric of “case disharmony in similes” (IIJ 24 [1982]). Here pāda a is passive and the neut. *āyuh* is nominative; in b I supply a transitive form of the verbal lexeme (*prātīratam* as in I.116.10 just cited will do), with neut. *āyuh* available to serve as accusative obj. This tight and poetically ingenious connection between a and b, pivoting on a shared neut. noun but changing the voice of the shared verbal idiom, seems preferable to Ge’s invention of an obj. in the simile in b: “wie die beiden Wagenfahrer .... (ihre Fahrt fortsetzen),” which still requires the verb of the simile to be transitive and to be a variant of *prá √ tṛ*, at least as I understand him.

What task or goal (*ārtham*) the unnamed subject, (like) Cyavāna, sets his force to is not clear to me. Cyavāna set out to marry young women (see I.116.10d). Perhaps in the context of this revivifying hymn, the same end is in view.

Note that the adverb beginning the refrain of d, *parātarām* ‘further away’, phonetically echoes the opening of the verse, *prá tāri*.

X.59.2: As was hinted in the publ. intro., the relevance of this vs. to the life-restoring first vs. is not entirely clear. Given the presence of the *sāman* (pāda a) and of a singer (*jaritā* c), the vs. seems to concern the sacrifice and the material and non-material goods to be gained from it. Note also that there is a switch to 1st pl. reference in this and the following two vss. belonging to this section, from the unnamed 3rd sg. whose life was extended in vs. 1. Both these changes seem abrupt, despite the presence of the refrain in all the d pādas.

With Ge I take loc. *sāman* as in essence a truncated loc. absolute: “when the *sāman* (is sung),” “at the *sāman*.” A similar minimalist usage is found in VIII.89.7. With Ge, I reject Old’s ascription to a different stem built to *√ san* ‘win, gain’, represented by Gr’s “2. *sāman*” and fld. also by Re.

I do not understand the doubled *nú* in this pāda. The two other exx. of this phenomenon make rhetorical sense: in VIII.51.7 repeated *ín nú* connects two parallel adverbials (*úpopén nú ... bhūya ín nú* “over and over ... more (and more) ...”); in X.27.7 they connect two contrastive chiasmic clauses: *dārṣan nv pūrvo āparo nú darṣat*. But here there is no grammatical or thematic parallelism between the items adjacent to the two *nú*s, and the second *nú* does not signal a new clause.

The phrase *nidhimát ... ānnam* is somewhat puzzling. A *nidhí-* is ‘a deposit, a treasure or treasury’; it is several times used with *mádhu-* ‘honey’: VII.69.3 *nidhím mādhumantam* “honeyed treasure,” I.183.4=III.58.5 *nidhāyo mādhūnām* “deposits of honey.” All three passages are in Aśvin hymns; if we assume that in this food context *nidhimánt-* has the pregnant sense “possessing treasures/deposits (of honey),” this might provide the link between this vs. and the first one, where the Aśvins are prominent though unnamed, but beyond this I can’t go.

The mid. subjunctive *kārāmahe* takes both *ānnam* and *śrāvāmsi* as parallel and contrastive objects, with the self-beneficial sense “make one’s own” (so also Ge: “... wollen wir ... gewinnen”).

The c pādas of vss. 2 and 3 are almost identical:

2c      *tā no víśvāni jaritā mamattu*

3c      *tā no víśvāni jaritā ciketa*

In the first the speaker asks the “singer” to rejoice in all these things of ours (presumably the food and the fame); in the second the singer is to take note of them (there presumably our manly powers). In both cases I think the singer is not merely a human ritual participant, but must be a god – very likely Agni, who is sometimes called a *jaritār-* (e.g., III.15.5, VIII.60.19, X.100.6). In this I differ from Ge (n. 3c), who identifies the singer as Subandhu, “der Wortführer der Gaupāyana’s.” But as disc. in the publ. intro., Subandhu is only found in the last metrically distinct part of this hymn (vs. 8), which does not seem to be a unified composition.

X.59.3: Gr and Ge take *aryāḥ* as acc. pl.; I follow Th (Fremdling, 54) in interpr. it as gen. sg., supplying a haplogized acc. pl. *\*paúṃsyā(ni)*. However, the Gr/Ge interpr. is certainly possible, producing an alt. “May we surmount the strangers with our manly powers.” The purport is the same.

On pāda c see disc. ad 2c immed. above.

X.59.4: Ge (fld. by Ober [Relig. II.59]) construes *dyúbhir hitāḥ* together and interpr. *dyúbhiḥ* as an agentive ‘heavenly ones’: “das von den Himmlischen bestimmte Alter.” See his n. 4c. But in all clear cases *dyúbhiḥ* has a temporal sense ‘through the days’; see esp. Old’s excursus ad IX.112.2. Re also favors ‘through the days’. Moreover, the form belongs to the noun *div/dyu* and should not have a derived adjectival sense.

X.59.5: On *ásu-* (in *ásu-nīti-*) as ‘(other) life’ see comm. ad X.12.1. The other three occurrences of the cmpd., all in the funeral hymns (X.12.4, 15.14, 16.2), refer to an object, a way or path leading to the other life. But the two vocc. here (vss. 5, 6) address a being capable of agency, perhaps just the animatized path.

Pāda c would make somewhat better sense if *rārandhí* were transitive/causative: “make us take pleasure in seeing the sun.” As it is currently tr., we must assume a certain selfless benevolence on the part of the Leader, who gets joy from the joy of others. It is hard to avoid this tr. because the other two occurrences of *rārandhí* (I.91.13 and III.41.4) unequivocally have the sense given to the form here in the publ. tr. There is, perhaps, a way around this, however. Though *rāran-* must belong to the pf. system originally (Kü 413–14), given that there is a fairly well-attested *-áya*-formation (*raṇáya-*) and given that *rāran-* has a heavy redupl., it is possible that it was reinterpr. as a redupl. aor. associated with *raṇáya-*. And *raṇáya-* has an interesting syntactic profile: most of its occurrences are intrans. (or I/T in my *-áya*-book terminology), with a complement in the loc. “take pleasure in,” but two are transitive (double I/T), with the sense “cause X to take pleasure in” (see my *-áya*-formations, pp. 75, 143). In fact one of these two shows the change in process, with the simile and the frame having different case frames: VIII.92.12 *vayám u tvā ..., gāvo ná yāvaseṣu ā/ ukthēṣu raṇayāmasi* “We will make you take pleasure in our hymns, o you of a hundred resolves, as cows do in their pastures,” with the simile a simple intransitive (I/T), the frame transitive (double I/T). (For further disc. see my 1982 “Case disharmony in RVic similes.”) If *rāran-dhí* has become associated with *raṇáya-*, the latter’s transitive potential may have been transferred to it, allowing the alt. tr. given above. See comm. ad V.54.13 for a more complex possible ex. of this same switch.

On med. caus. *vardhayasva* see comm. ad X.49.6.

X.59.6: Contra Ge I do not take *bhógam* as a parallel object to *cákṣuḥ* and *prāṇam*, partly because ‘use, enjoyment’ is a different type of entity from the first two, partly because only they are marked with *púnar*. I take *bhógam* adverbially, flg. Janert (Dhāsi, 22 n. 5).

X.59.7: The occurrence of *ásu-* here does not have the sense ‘(other) life’ that it does in the cmpd. disc. above ad vs. 5.

The three worlds, Earth, Heaven, and the Midspace, each serves as subj. to *dadātu*, each marked by its own *púnaḥ*. Given their distribution across the hemistich, Heaven (*dyaúḥ*) seems to be qualified as fem. *devī*, hence my tr. “goddess Heaven.” As is well known, *dyaúḥ*, though overwhelmingly masc., is occasionally modified by fem. adjs. and pronominal adjs. (see comm. ad I.57.5 and VIII.40.4). What is surprising about this passage is that Heaven is also called a god(ess), for Heaven is never otherwise called a *devá-*. And indeed he is not a god, but the father of gods, as the morphological derivational relationship implies. See my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of X.124,” p. 298 with n. 16. However, Heaven and Earth together, esp. under the designation *ródasī* ‘two worlds’ are sometimes modified by the dual *devī*, and that must be the source of the (apparently) sg. *devī* here. Note that dual *ródasī* is found in the next vs. (8a) and Heaven and Earth in the refrain (d pādas) of the next three vss.

X.59.8–10: The last three vss. of the hymn are unified by their meters (varieties of Pañkti) and their three-pāda refrain. Note also that vs. 8 begins with *sám*, which is echoed by the initial word of vs. 10, *sám*.

X.59.8: As Re notes, this is the first occurrence of the word *subándhu-* in this hymn cycle – and the only one in this hymn. Though by the standard accounts a man named Subandhu is the focus of the desires for mental and physical restoration in these hymns, in fact the word need not be a personal name (though the occurrences in the next hymn, X.60.7, 10 make this more likely): it could mean ‘possessing good lineage/family’ as it can elsewhere.

Pāda b is identical to I.142.7c, where it refers to Night and Dawn. Its use in that context is responsible for Ge’s tr. “youngest daughters and mothers ...”; see comm. ad loc. I see no reason to see two distinct kinship relations in this phrase; in either passage, since there is no generational difference between the members of either pair. They would be esp. inappropriate here given the underlying gender difference between Heaven and Earth. Note that the dual fem. qualifying *ródasī* puts the apparently singular *devī* modifying *dyaúḥ* in 7b into a wider grammatical context.

X.59.9: Note the *-ká-* suffixed numbers, *dvaké*, *trikā*, and *ekakām*, each agreeing, in the appropriate number, with neut. *bheṣajā-*. Because these suffixed numbers are isolated, it’s difficult to know what semantic or stylistic sense the suffix may contribute. Edgerton (*The k-Suffixes of Indo-Iranian*, 1911: 26) suggests that the suffix forms “adjectives with a sort of distributive force” (rendering them “singly ... by twos ... by threes”). This is certainly possible, even attractive, but the addition of the suffix might just be a way to produce a morphologically parallel and phonologically unified series “two ... three ... one,” since the sequence made from the numerals directly would be more disparate: *dvé ... tríṇi ... ékam*. (And / or) the *-ka-* could convey a “popular” flavor in this popular hymn.

X.59.10: The first hemistich (that is, the non-refrain part of the vs.) is completely baffling with regard to its possible relevance to the rest of the hymn. The fem. name Uśīnarāṇī occurs only here. It is transparently related to the name of a people, Uśīnara, mentioned in the Aitareya Br and later, but that isn't much help. Sāy. considers *uśīnārāṇī* the name of a plant, and Old has a similar view ("Wagen der Kräuterfrau," bringing healing plants). By contrast, Ge (n. 10b, flg. Ludwig) suggests that Uśīnarāṇī is the wife of Subandhu, whose name is really the ethnonym Uśīnara, and Indra is restoring his wife to him. This requires a longer chain of assumptions than I'm willing to accept. But I do think that he is correct that a wedding context is implied, since *ānas-* can be the wedding vehicle for the bride. I have nothing helpful to add, but the vs., with its hope that the ox and the cart should be whole and in good working order, reminds me of the tacked-on section of the composite hymn to Indra (etc.), III.53.17–20, which I describe (in the publ. intro. to the hymn) as "prayers to deflect various possible catastrophes that might befall a team of oxen and the vehicle they pull on a journey, and wish for safe return." Given the outsize RVic interest in chariots and vehicles of all types, it would not be totally surprising that a hymn for the restoration of the health of a man might attract a vs. hoping for the restoration of the health of a draught animal. We can also recall that the journey of a new bride to her husband's household is considered to be fraught with perils (see, e.g., Sac Wife 222–26).

#### X.60 Asamāti, etc.

For the various divisions of this hymn, which probably consists of several hymns combined, see the publ. intro.

X.60.1–4: As noted in the publ. intro., these four vss. form a single sentence, the full skeleton of which is contained in vs. 1 — with the other vss. merely expanding on the recipient of the praise and his stellar qualities, by means of accusatives modifying the object of vs. 1 (vs. 2) and relative clauses dependent on that object (*yāh* vs. 3, *yāsya* vs. 4).

X.60.1: I have followed the line of least resistance, encouraged by Ge and Old (see also Mayr, PN), and taken *māhīna-* as the name of a people. However it might be better, with Re, to take it as a variant of *māhina-* 'great, might' and tr. "of the great ones." Re further suggests that the referent is the gods, but this is not necessary and is in fact unlikely.

X.60.2: On a literal reading, pāda b identifies, or at least implicitly compares, Asamāti to a chariot. This seems perfectly reasonable to me — the man as a juggernaut bearing down on his opponents — but the unmediated image seems to have caused consternation to some interpr. Ge alters it from chariot to chariot fighter by a strategic parenthetical addition: "dem ... Wagen(helden)," while Re considers *tveṣām ... rātham* a decomposed bahuvrīhi in tmesis, for *tveṣā-ratha-* 'having a glittering chariot', which does exist (V.61.13). Neither trick seems necessary to me.

Gr suggests reading *bhajā \*rāthasya* "um zu gewinnen den Herrn des Wagens," with a dat. inf. *\*bhajā*. See Old's disc. Since this would require emendation, and it's hard to understand why *\*rāthasya* would have lost its accent redactionally, I think it best, with most, to see here an otherwise unknown name of a person or place. So Ge, Mayr (PN).

X.60.4: On *marāyīn-* see EWA s.v., citing Ingrid Eichner-Kühn 1976.

X.60.5: On *rátha-proṣṭha* see KH (StII 13/14 [1987]: 129–34 = Aufs. III.855–63, esp. 862), who analyzes the second member as *pra-úṣ-tha-* from the lexeme *prá√vas* ‘spend the night away from home’, with the developed meaning ‘camp bed’. Here ‘whose chariots are their camp beds’. In KH’s view this identifies the Asamātis as “ein ‘reisiger’ Kreigerstamm,” and he further suggests that since the meaning of *próṣṭha-* was not previously understood, this led to the analysis of *rátha-proṣṭha-* as a PN. This seems plausible, and we might emend the tr. to “in the Asamātis, whose chariots are their camp beds” – though the density of PNs in this hymn might suggest that we keep the tr. as given.

X.60.6: Ge (n. 6) calls this “eine kleine Dānastuti,” presumably because of the yoking of the *sáptī*. But that assumes that the subj. of *yunakṣi* is the patron, even though the most likely 2nd sg. referent is Indra, who was addressed in vs. 5. The victories attributed to the 2nd sg. referent in the 2nd half of vs. 6 also fit Indra far better than a putative patron.

X.60.7: Although this vs. is universally taken as meant to heal Subandhu and recall him to life, it presents this healing as a (second?) birth. The lexeme *nír√i* is specialized for birth (see comm. ad I.37.9), and the presence of mother and father in pāda a reinforces this theme, with the movement expressed by *prasárpana-* ‘slithering forth’ also evoking birth.

Note the masc. *ayám* with *mātā*, this mismatch is doubtless due to the fact that the *ayám* is annunciatory: “here is ...,” though the genders match in c *idám ... prasárpaṇam*, which by my interpr. is also annunciatory.

X.60.9: Since the demonstrative is attributive, the genders match in the phrase *iyám pṛthivī*.