

Mandala II

II.1 Agni

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

II.1.1: The only attestation of the desiderative of \sqrt{suc} is this hapax adj. *āśuśukṣāni*- ‘eager to blaze here’.

II.1.2: The accent on *āsi* in d presumably results from its contrastive function in the *ca ... ca* construction. Curiously Old does not comment.

Note the two different words for house in *grhāpatih* ... *dáme*, with the former replacing old *dámpati*- . On these various terms for house-lord, see my 2019 “The Term *grhaṣṭha* and the (Pre)history of the Householder,” in *Grhaṣṭha: The Householder in Ancient Indian Religious Culture*, ed. Patrick Olivelle, and “The Double Life of *gahapati*” (Fs. Schopen, 2025).

II.1.3: HvN suggest the distracted reading *namas'yah* here and in 10a, which produces 12 syllables for the Jagatī line but a very bad cadence (4 light syllables), while reading an undistracted form produces a good Triṣṭubh line. They argue 1) that *namas'ya-* is always otherwise distracted in the RV (though it doesn't otherwise appear in a cadence) and 2) that there are several other similar bad cadences in this hymn (*avidhat* 7d, 9c). These are good arguments, but I would still favor an undistracted *namasyāḥ* in a Triṣṭubh line.

Ge suggests that *vidhartah* in d is a predicate voc. I think rather that it signals the absent middle term, the divinity with which Agni is here identified, namely Bhaga. So Old (SBE). Bhaga is identified as *vidhartár-* in VII.41.2 and is regularly associated with Puram̑dhi.

II.1.4: On this vs. see Thieme, Mitra and Aryaman, 83–85.

sambhújam in c is analysed by Gr as a 1st sg. subj. or injunc. (his “Co.”) to a thematic aorist and is so rendered by Ge (“von dem ich Nutzen haben möchte”), though he expresses doubts in his n. However, this aor. stem does not otherwise exist: the multiple *bhujema* forms, apparent optatives in *mā* prohibitives, are convincingly explained by Hoffmann (Injunk. 95–97) as reanalysed from an expression with the infinitive *bhujé* followed by enclitic 1st ps. pronoun. Moreover, act. forms to this root should mean ‘give pleasure’, not ‘derive pleasure’ (cf. *bhuñjatī* I.48.5). Old (Noten) already disputed the verbal interpr. of *sambhújam*, and it is now generally taken as a nominal (so Thieme, Mitra and Aryaman, although in Fremdling [16 n. 2, 105] he takes it as a verb; Hoffmann, Injunk. 96 n. 197; Re; Scar 358), though WG tr. it as a verb, allowing for the nominal possibility in their n. Assuming that *sambhújam* is nominal, the problem is how to fill out the defective rel. cl. *yásya sambhújam*. Most supply a verb like “we eat” or “we expect,” e.g., Scar “von dem ich Genuss (erwarnte, o. ä.).” The publ. tr. takes GEN *sambhújam* as a possessive expression: “whose common meal (it is)” → “who has a common meal,” further extended to “who offers a common meal.” I find this more satisfying syntactically than the invention of a verb, but it runs into morphological difficulty: by my tr. the meal should be nominative, and if *sambhújam* belongs to a root noun paradigm, it can only be a masc. acc. sg. This forces me into the unhappy position

of assuming a root-accented neut. thematic stem *-bhúja-*, which may be unlikely enough morphologically to persuade me to supply a verb to govern the acc.

II.1.5: Pāda a has the acc. and dat. appropriate to an expression of giving, but no verb; pāda c has the verb (*arise*) but no dative of recipient. The accusatives of gift in the two pādas are formed in parallel: *suविर्यम्* (a), *sुवास्वियम्* (c). The two pādas thus complete each other rhetorically.

In b *gnāvah* is morphologically incoherent. By its ending it should be vocative, but since it occupies non-initial position, its accent should preclude that. Nonetheless, with all the standard interpr. I take it as a voc. An ad hoc explanation could be concocted for its accent -- that the following voc. *mitramahāḥ* induced accent on the preceding one to support the voc. phrase -- but I think too many counter-examples could be adduced. Ge suggests a word haplology, *gnā<h> gnāvah*, but this seems unnecessary and also requires a tr. “you are (the Wives).” It is likely instead that the third term in this pāda is Tvaṣṭar from pāda a, since he is regularly associated with the Wives of the Gods, and in fact the other attestation of this voc. *gnāvah* (I.15.3), correctly accented in pāda-initial position, refers to Tvaṣṭar.

As pointed out by Old (SBE) and Ge, the third term in pāda c is presumably Apām Napāt, who is elsewhere called *āśuhéman-*, including 2x in II. The *āśu-* in that compound echoes the beginning of *āśuśukṣáñih* in 1a, though that form is most probably formed to the desid. stem of *śuc* with preverb *ā*, since the *-ani*-suffix is rather commonly built to desiderative stems and there would be no obvious source of the *-s-* before the suffix otherwise.

II.1.6: I do not understand the cmpd *śamgayá-*. Wackernagel (AIG II.1.309) classifies it with cmpds with governing first-member prepositions, but *śam*, though uninflected, does not function like even the improper prepositions/preverbs of the *áram* type. He does recognize its singularity (314–15), but keeps it in this category, in which it seems out of place.

II.1.7: Pāda d has another bad cadence: *te (á)vidhat*, with 4 light syllables, assuming the normal shortening of *-e* before vowel. The same cadence is found in 9c. I would be inclined to follow HvN in seeing this irregular cadence as characteristic of this particular hymn (see also 3b, 10a), save for the fact that *ávidhat* shows a remarkable tendency to position itself in bad cadences: see II.26.4, VIII.23.21, 27.15, 61.9. As IH points out to me, Arnold (p.129, §169.vi) suggests reading *āvidhat* with long augment. Though in all cases the Samhitā text transmits either short *á* or deleted abhinihita (*á*) and the Pp analyzes it as *a* in all cases, this seems a reasonable explanation – despite Old’s dismissive “recht zweifelhaft.” There is a tendency to lengthen vowels before elements beginning with *v*, not only the augment, but preverbs, and 1st cmpd. members, presumably spreading from forms that originally began **Hv*. In most of the other occurrences of *ávidhat* (I.136.5, VI.54.4, IX.114.1) the augment has coalesced with a preceding *a*-vowel and its weight is therefore unrecoverable. Only in X.83.1 do we find an *ávidhat* that is not improved by a heavy reading: it occurs in the break after an early caesura. But even here *āvidhat* is a possible reading: though *~ ~ –* is the most preferred break, *– ~ –* is the next most common.

II.1.8: Here and in 15a I take *práti* (+/- copula) + ACC. as an expression similar to *pratimāna-* + GEN, meaning ‘be a counterpart to’.

For *rñjate* here, see the fuller expression with instr. in the next hymn, II.2.5.

II.1.9: It is tempting to take *iṣṭibhīḥ* as ‘with sacrifices’, parallel to *sámyā* ‘with ritual labor’ in the next pāda. So Old (SBE), though he gave it up reluctantly in the Noten. Unfortunately ‘sacrifice’ is accented *ísti-*, against *iṣtí-* ‘desire’, and so perhaps the best one can do is suggest a secondary pun (so Scar 455). On the other hand, on the assumption that all *-tí*-stems began with suffixal accent and that the root accent found in some Vedic *-ti*-stems is secondary (see Lundquist 2015, *-ti*-stems), this may be a relic of suffix-accented **iṣtí-* ‘sacrifice’, which has not yet undergone accent retraction. It is worth noting that root-accented *iṣtí-* is found only in I and X. I would therefore entertain an alt. tr. “... (do) men (approach) with their sacrifices.”

On the cadence in 9 see remarks on 7b.

II.1.10: On the cadence in pāda a, see comm. ad 3b.

As Old (SBE) already pointed out, the first three pādas refer to the three Rbhūs and pun on their names: *rbhú-* ‘craftsman / Rbhū’ in a, *vāja-* ‘prize / Vāja’ in b, and *víbhāsi* ‘you radiate / Vibhvan’ in c.

In c *dakṣi* is surely a *-si* impv. to \sqrt{dah} ‘burn’ and should be separated from the identical form in I.141.8, for which see the comm. ad loc. Ge, however, takes *dakṣi* here to \sqrt{daks} .

The form *viśíkṣu-* in d is taken by Gr as belonging to the desid. of \sqrt{sak} and meaning ‘gerne Gut austheilend’, which seems unacceptably distant from both the root meaning of \sqrt{sak} and the function of the desiderative. Moreover, \sqrt{sak} is not otherwise attested with *ví* except, supposedly, in the similar form *ví siksā* IV.35.3 (for which see below). Ge tr. “du bist der Prüfer,” Re “tu es celui que si met à l’oeuvre diversement”; neither discusses the form or its root affiliation, and one can only assume they follow the assignment to \sqrt{sak} , though exactly how is unclear. Old (SBE) suggested an appealing alternative, interpreting it as built to the desid. of the root \sqrt{sas} ‘cut’, which is primarily found with *ví* -- an idea I find eminently worthy of revival. This may also be the view of WG, who tr. “Du bist williger Verteiler,” again without disc., so they may in fact simply reproduce Gr’s understanding of the semantics. Old does not sketch out the morphology, but it presumably rests on **sí-ss-su-*, with zero-grade root and simplification of the medial sibilant cluster *sss* arising from the two radical sibilants and the desiderative suffix. The finite verb *ví siksā* in IV.35.3 (also a Rbhūs context) belongs here as well. Heenen (Desid., 232-33) mentions this possibility though without great enthusiasm (“La possibilité ... n’est pas exclue”).

The publ. tr. “seek to carve up and to stretch out the sacrifice” implies that *ātánih* is desiderative. This was not meant, and the tr. should perhaps be emended to “seek to carve up the sacrifice, as the one who stretches it out” or “... as you stretch it out.”

II.1.13: The relevant construction in d is probably *tvé ... āhutam* “poured into you,” as it is in the even further distracted identical phrase in 14ab. The tr. of 13d should be corrected to “the gods eat the oblation poured into you.”

II.1.14: The first half-verse is simply a rather crudely exploded version of 13d (also found in I.94.3), with *tvé* moved to front of first pāda and the second pāda otherwise intact. See Bloomfield's withering scorn.

In c *svadante* invites distraction to *s^uvadante*, which is taken to reflect an old thematized nasal-infix pres. **suh₂nd-e-*; see LIV² s.v. **sueh₂d* with reff. See also comm. on *svádanti* in VIII.50.5. I confess myself dubious about this supposed deep archaism, esp. in the Vālakhilya passage VIII.50.5. Although that analysis is more plausible in this passage, the fact that *svadanta* (in sandhi) follows immediately after two occurrences of the near-rhyme *adanti* (13d, 14b), combined with the propensity of the *su-* 'good' prefix to distract (see 8c *s^uv-anīka* 'lovely faced' with the same putative initial cluster *s^(u)v-*, as well as 8b *suvidátram* 'easy to find' and 16d *suvīrāh* 'having good heroes', both with *su-* prefixed to a nominal beginning with *v-*), makes an artificial distraction of the verb form not unlikely.

II.1.15: On *práti ... asi*, see comm. ad 8d. As far as I can determine, this is the only occurrence of *sám √as* in the RV and, rather than meaning something like 'be together', it seems to have an idiomatic meaning like *prati* + ACC, 'be equal to' (as if to *samá-* vel sim.).

On the word order in pāda c, see comm. ad VI.15.14.

II.1.16: I do not understand the function or position of *hí*, though the latter question is more tractable.

II.2 Agni

One curious feature of this hymn is that it is the home to the densest cluster of *usás-* occurrences in II (vss. 2, 7, 8); the word is otherwise pretty rare in this maṇḍala, and there are no Dawn hymns in it. The focus on Agni's likeness to the sun probably accounts for this. This likeness is hinted at first in the adj. *svārnara-* 'possessing solar glory' in 1c. This adj. is echoed by three occurrences of the simile *svār ná* "like the sun" (7d, 8b, 10d), where the simile particle *ná* (with close sandhi retroflexion as always after *svār*), though having nothing to do with the *-na-* in the adjective, reproduces it phonologically.

Another notable feature of the hymn is the fact that the stem *citáya-*, which occurs three times (4c, 5d, 10b), in all three cases must be read doubly, as 'appear' in one construction in the passage and as 'perceive' in another construction in the same passage.

II.2.2: Ge (/WG) take *náktīr usásah* as acc. of extent of time, supplying as subj. either prayers or priests. With Old (SBE and Noten) and Re, I take the phrase as subject in the publ. tr. This means that *usásah* must be taken as a nom. (for *usásah*), rather than the acc. it was historically -- but this is common in the RV. Nonetheless, on reflection I wonder if Ge is right: the 2nd hemistich contains two examples of acc. of extent of time (*mānusā yugā* and *ksápah*), and there is also one in 8a, *usáso rāmyāh*, that is very similar to the phrasing here. If the phrase is interp. as acc., the subject to be supplied would presumably be the same as the 2nd pl. addressees of 1ab, namely the priestly officiants. So

I suggest an alt. tr. “Through the dawns and the nights they [=priests] bellow towards you ...”

In addition the pf. *vavāśire* might better be rendered as a habitual pres. ‘(constantly) bellow’.

II.2.3: The gerundive *vēdyā-* in c is universally assigned to \sqrt{vid} ‘know’ (e.g., Ge ‘allbekannt’, Re ‘(re)connaissable’), but surely the Vedic Indians would be more anxious to acquire a chariot (\sqrt{vid} ‘find, acquire’) than simply to recognize it! Agni is found with the same simile in VIII.19.8, 84.1.

II.2.4: A difficult vs. with multiple interpretations, which I will not treat in detail. The difficulties of the vs. arise in part from the fact that it can apply to both the ritual fire and the sun. Note that in contrast to the first three vss. the word *agni-* does not appear in this vs., which absence licenses the double reference. This double reference begins, and is least obscure, in the first pāda, where the entity in question (*tām*) grows “in the airy realm (as/and) in his own house”: “his own house” is clearly a reference to Agni as the fire in every house (see also 11c), but “in the airy realm” can refer both to the strengthening of the sun’s light after it rises and to the smoke and flames of fire rising in the air. Note that there is no simile marker here: the fire is not compared to the sun or vice versa; they are identified.

The second pāda uses the technical ritual term $\tilde{a} \sqrt{dhā}$ ‘establish’ (used of the ceremonial establishment of the ritual fire), but it is also used less technically here for the placement of both fire and sun on their respective paths. Loc. *hvāré* ‘on a meandering (course)’ can refer to the unpredictable motion of fire and its products (smoke/flames). How this word can apply to the sun is less clear, since the sun’s course is certainly not unpredictable. However, derivatives of the root $\sqrt{hvṛ}$ can refer to curves, and the sun’s trajectory up, across, and down the sky can be seen as a curving path. (This second sense should have been registered in the publ. tr.) I should say that I explicitly do not think that it refers to a snake here (*pace* Old [SBE], WG), although the interpr. is tempting due to the similarity of the lexicon and imagery in this vs. to I.141.7, where *hvārā-* refers to Agni as a twisting snake. Such an identification here would require emendation to acc. **hvārām*, which Old was willing to accept in SBE and still defends in the Noten, but which does not conform to our current restrained attitude towards RVic emendation (in part due to Old). I also do not think that *candrām* in the simile refers to the moon (as Thieme [KlSch 78] and WG do).

In c ‘son’ is universally supplied with *patarām* ‘flying, winged’ (e.g., Ge “den geflügelten (Sohn?) der Pr̄ṣni”). But Pr̄ṣni’s son(s) are the Maruts; Agni never seems to be so identified. The closest any interpreter can come is X.189.1, where a *gaūh p̄r̄ṣnih* ‘dappled cow’ may, or may not, refer to the fire, but there is no parental engagement there. The gen. *p̄r̄ṣnyāh* (as here; on the ending see comm. ad 7b) is elsewhere construed only with ‘udder’ (*ūdhar-*, II.34.2, 10; cf. also IV.3.10) or ‘milk’ (*pāyah*, VI.48.22); though it is true that the alternative gen. *p̄r̄ṣneh* is found with ‘sons’ (*p̄r̄ṣneh putrā(h)*, V.58.5); these are the Maruts, as expected. Since the only other attestations of *p̄r̄ṣnyāh* in II limit ‘udder’, I supply that word here. Although “the flying (udder) of Pr̄ṣni” sounds comical, I take it to refer to a rain cloud, as also apparently in II.34. The fire and the sun are thus implicitly compared to this third entity. I read *citāyantam* in two senses,

‘appearing’ and ‘perceiving, observing’ (cf. *citayat* in the immediately following vs.), with the former sense here.

The other sense of *citáyantam* governs the rest of the vs.; the instr. *aksábhīḥ* ‘with eyes’ signals the ‘perceive’ value, as is reflected in all the standard tr. (although WG take the participle as a double tr. ‘make perceive’, which is not supported by the zero-grade root syllable [expect **cetáyantam*]). We are not home free, however, for the simile, *pāthó ná payúm*, gives trouble. The problem is *pātháḥ*. If we try to take it to as acc. to neut. *pāthas-* ‘pen, fold’, which would work semantically (“observing ... as a protector (does) a fold”), the accent is wrong; if we try to take it as gen. of *pánth-* ‘path’, which also works semantically (“like the protector of a path”), the length of the first vowel is wrong. Lub tries to avoid this Scylla and Charybdis situation by identifying it as a 2nd du. pres. to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘protect’, but this makes more difficulties: who are the two subjects? (perhaps he means the two races, but they are in 3rd ps. ref.), and the placement of the *ná* is badly wrong. In the end I follow the ad hoc solution set out by Old (Noten): a gen. of the ‘path’ word makes most sense, and it may owe its anomalous long vowel to phonological attraction to *pāyúm* in the same syntagm along with some conflation with *pāthas-*.

II.2.5: The apparent fem. loc. pl. *vṛdhasānāśu* to the irregular participial stem *vṛdhasāná-* ‘growing, having grown’ is generally taken as referring to the plants among which the fire is blazing, on the basis of X.92.1 ... *śuṣkāsu hárīṇīṣu járbhurat*, with *járbhurat* ‘flickering, quivering’ as here. However, plants do not ‘grow’ when they are burned -- quite the contrary -- and I’m not at all sure that $\sqrt{vṛdh}$ ‘grow, increase, strengthen’ is used of plant growth: we may be misled by translation language. Instead on the basis of IV.3.6 *dhíṣṇyāśu vṛdhasānó agne* “growing in the holy places [=hearths], o Agni,” I interpret *vṛdhasānāśu* as representing *vṛdhasānā(h) āśu*, with masc. nom. sg. + fem. pronominal loc. and irregular sandhi of *-ah ā-*. (See another such ex. in nearby II.6.7.) There are only three occurrences of the stem *vṛdhasāná-*; in addition to IV.3.6 and our example here, the other one, at VI.12.3, is also nom. sg. referring to Agni. One potential problem with this suggestion is that, since the hearths have not been previously mentioned, we might expect accented *āśu*. However, a number of occurrences of unaccented *āśu* lack clear referents in the preceding discourse (e.g., I.95.5, III.55.9, VIII.41.7).

Like *citáyantam* in 4cd, *citayat* in d has two different readings: with the preceding phrase *dyaúr ná stýbhīḥ* it means ‘appear’, while with the following *ródasī ánu* (echoing *jánasī ubhé ánu* in 4d) it means ‘perceive’. The functional split is clearer in this vs. than in 4cd and could be considered a species of poetic repair, or at least “poetic reinforcement.” See also vs. 10 below.

II.2.6: Note the phonological and morphological parallelism of the infinitival datives, *s(u)vastáye, suvitáya, vītáye*.

II.2.6–7: 6c and 7c are paraphrases of each other. Each contains a dual referring to the two worlds, an impv. of \sqrt{kr} , and an indication of directionality.

II.2.7: *sahasrín-* (sg. or pl.) regularly modifies *rayí-* and *vāja-*; *bṛhánt-* has a wider range of referents, but both *rayí-* and *vāja-* are found. Since (sg.) *rayím* occurs in the immediately preceding vs. (6b) and (sg.) *vāja-* in the immediately following pāda (7b),

either is available to supply as the referent for the pl. adjectives in pāda a. I opt for *vāja-*, because of the nearer proximity.

If *śrútyā* in the Samhitā text represents dat. *śrútyai* (so Pp.) and belongs to a *-ti*-stem, it shows the younger ending (borrowed from the *-ī*-stems) *-yai*, confined to 7 stems mostly limited to Maṇḍala X (Macdonell VG p. 282), rather than the extraordinarily common *-aye*. This younger ending may correlate with the younger accent in this *-ti*-stem: as Lundquist has shown (“On the Accentuation of Vedic *-ti*-Abstracts,” *Indo-European Linguistics* 3 [2015]), *-ti*-stems undergo accent retraction in the course of Vedic, and root-accented forms are innovations in the late RV. Vs. 4 contains another fem. short *-i*-stem with a younger ending borrowed from long *-ī*-stems, namely gen. *pṛśnyāḥ*. However, I wonder how secure *śrútyai* is. The use of this dative (quasi-)infinitive here is somewhat unusual, and I take its supposed double (also *śrútyā* in sandhi) in X.111.3 as an ablative. Old (Not.) points out that the gerundive *śrútya-* appears several times modifying *vāja-* (VII.5.9 *vājam śrútyam*, I.36.12 *vājasya śrútyasya*). I am tempted to take our *śrútyā* here as somehow reflecting the gerundive, in a situation where the expected masc. acc. sg. **śrútyam* would produce a bad cadence. But I cannot construct a plausible scenario; Old says that an acc. pl. is not entirely excluded, but that would have to be an acc. pl. neuter or fem., and *vāja-* is masc.

Kü (251) takes *ví didyutah* as intrans., not trans.-caus. (in his terms, “inattingent” not “faktitiv”), interpreting *uṣásah* as temporal. I am doubtful.

The simile in d *svār ná* “like the sun” is perfectly ambiguous. It can be nominative, compared to Agni, the subject of *ví didyutah*, as an entity that makes the dawns shine. (Given the temporal proximity of dawn and sunrise, this causal connection is perfectly in order.) Or Agni can make the dawns shine forth like the sun, with the simile in the acc. In 8b and 10d the same simile is in the nominative, but I do not think this is a sufficient reason to impose the same analysis here.

II.2.8: Note #*sá idhānā(h)* echoing 1c #*samidhānám* and 6a #*sá ... samidhānāḥ*.

With Old (SBE), Ge, Re, I take *uṣásō rāmyā* as parallel in a temporal expression (“dawns and nights”). Hoffmann (Injunk., 121; fld. by WG) rather cleverly separates them, construing only *rāmyā* with *ánu*: “Entflammt alle Morgen, nach den Nächten leuchtet er.” However, because night(s) and dawn(s) are regularly used in parallel (e.g., 2a in this hymn), I am somewhat reluctant to adopt this interpr.

The standard tr. (Old [SBE], Ge, Re, WG) take *dīdet* as a modal, but it is simply an injunctive and I see no reason to attribute modal value to it. So also Hoffmann (see his tr. just cited) and Kü (228).

In the second hemistich *agnīḥ* was omitted in the publ. tr., which should read “With the libations of Manu Agni conducts ...”

II.2.9: As Old and Ge point out, *mānuṣā* should not be a fem. nom. sg. with *dhīḥ*, since the fem. stem is well-attested *mānuṣī*. Nonetheless, the standard tr., including Ge though excluding Re, interpret it with *dhīḥ* -- Ge by taking it as shortened from *mānuṣāñām* at pāda end (some shortening!) and tr. “die menschliche Dichtung” as if it were a simple modifying adjective. I instead take it as neut. pl. and supply ‘lifespans’ (*yugā(ni)*), which is commonly found with this adj., including in our 2c. By my interpr. it expresses extent of time, indicating that poetic inspiration is a constant that will always ensure rewards for

men generation after generation. For a similar thought see III.39.2 *sanajā pítryā dhīḥ* the “ancient-born, ancestral hymnic vision.”

Most interpr. take *isáni* as a loc. infinitive with the preceding acc. as obj. (For the most recent disc., see Keydana, *Infinitive im Rgveda*, 195–96.) This may well be possible, but given its isolation and the unclarity of its morphological shape (see esp. the disc. by Old, Noten), I take it as a simple locative, construing the accusatives in d as Inhaltsakk. with *dúhānā* in c. In any case it produces a bad cadence (4 light syllables); I do not see an easy repair strategy.

II.2.10: As in vss. 4 and 5, a form of *citáya-* (here *citayema*) has two different senses in two different constructions, by my interpr. In pāda a it shows a development of the ‘perceive’ sense, here rendered “get in sight of,” that is, “by our efforts get close enough to see.” The means by which we do so is *árvatā* “by steed,” namely warfare or contest. In pāda b *citayema* has a developed sense of ‘be perceived, appear’, namely ‘be distinguished / distinguish ourselves’. Here the means is *bráhmaṇā* ‘by a sacred formulation’, that is, by ritual or poetic competition. The standard tr. simply supply a verb in pāda a (‘acquire’, vel sim.), but the double usage of the other two forms of *citáya-* in this hymn suggests that this one, too, can be used for both pādas, and it is always preferable to avoid supplying verbs. Both WG and Proferes (68) in different ways take *citayema* with both pādas; Proferes interpr. it as a trans.-caus. in both pādas (“manifest”), WG only for the first (“erscheinen machen,” but “schauen können” in b). As noted above (ad vs. 4), the zero-grade root syllable tells against the trans.-caus. interpr.

II.2.11: With most, I interpr. *isáyanta* as ‘derive nourishment’, though Lub lists it with \sqrt{is} ‘send’ and WG tr. “streben,” presumably assigning it to \sqrt{is} ‘seek, desire’.

The acc. singulars *yám ... yajñám* probably do not belong together, although an interpr. “whom they approach as the sacrifice,” with Agni identified with the sacrifice, is not impossible. Ge considers it attraction from **yásya ... yajñám*, but a loose purpose/goal accusative, almost a pseudo-infinitive “to sacrifice,” seems syntactically acceptable to me. For a parallel passage see VII.1.12 and comm. thereon.

I would now substitute “having prizes” for “prize-winners” for *vājínah*. The patrons have prizes to distribute – I now think that the *sūráyah* in pāda b are the same as the *vājínah* here. See disc. ad VII.1.12.

II.3 Āpri

II.3.2 Pāda a is supposed to contain a lexeme *práti* $\sqrt{aŋj}$ governing *dhāmāni*, but this would be the only ex. of the verbal idiom in the RV; moreover, the *práti* would not be in a standard position for a preverb in tmesis. I therefore take *práti* as an adposition governing *dhāmāni* ‘foundations’, in a parallel expression to *tisrō dívah* *práti* in b, unconnected with the verb $\sqrt{aŋj}$. I supply “of the earth” with *dhāmāni* on the basis of I.22.16 *dhāmabhiḥ* *prthivyāḥ*. The participle *aŋján* would be used absolutely and anticipate *sám anaktu* in d. The early part of the hymn has a tendency to station present participles at pāda ends, and not always with obj. (1d *árhan*, our 2a, 2c *undán*, 3a *árhan*).

II.3.4: The apparent loc. *vēdī* (so Pp.) should probably be read *vēdi* for metrical reasons (see Old: “nur angeblich Pragṛhya” [Noten]; Proleg. 456). AiG III.154–55 is skeptical about a loc. *-ī* to *-i*-stems and suggests that this, the clearest example, is actually to be explained by haplology from **vēdyā[ām] asyām*, which seems highly unlikely, esp. since it would make the cadence metrically irreparable. I think we have to take this form as given and as a locative (not instr.), with a metrically short final vowel, which may result from shortening in hiatus. For a similar ex. see *bhūmī* (*/ -i*) in IX.61.10 and comm. thereon.

The last pāda contains a mixture of voc. (*devā ādityāḥ*) and nom. (*yajñyāsah*), with pāda-initial *vīśve* ambiguous, since the accent may derive from its position. The tr. does not reflect this case mixture, since a meticulous separation would be fussy and serve no purpose.

II.3.5: As Old points out, *suprāyanā-* is metrically bad here and worse in several other occurrences; it should be read **suprayāṇā-*, which presumably belongs to $\sqrt{yā}$, not \sqrt{i} .

I take the adjectives in d (*yaśāsam suvīram*) as proleptic, the result of the purification, though this interpr. isn't strictly necessary.

II.3.6: In b *vayyēva* belongs to a *vṛkī*-type stem *vayī-* ‘weaver’, here in the dual. Old suggests that it doesn't really matter if we analyze it as *vayīyā iva*, with masc. du., or *vayīye (i)va* with fem. du., but given that the other adjectives in the hemistich, *uksité ... rāṇvité*, are feminine in form and that *uṣāsanāktā* is regularly fem., the latter seems more likely.

The vs. lacks a finite verb and there is no verbal form, finite or participial, to govern *ápāṃsi* ‘labors’ in a. Most tr. supply ‘work’ vel sim., but I think it's possible that *sādhū* is an adverbial predicate, “on target” in the publ. tr., and that it loosely governs *ápāṃsi*.

II.3.7: Re and WG supply ‘sacrifice’ as the obj. of *sām añjataḥ*, but since acc. *devān* is already available and was the obj. of exactly the same verb in 2d (*sām anaktu devān*), this is unnecessary.

II.3.8: *sādhāya(nti)* in pāda a and *svadhāyā* in c occupy the same metrical position and echo each other.

II.3.9: *subhára-* here is used in a different sense (or senses) from the same word in 4b, where it referred to the good burden, that is, the seated gods, that the barhis was bearing. Here I think there is a pun: the hero is ‘easy to bear’, that is, his birth, depicted in pāda b, was easy. But the hero so born provides good support to those who depend on him.

With Re, I tr. *vī syatu* in two slightly different senses with two different objects: ‘unbind’ with ‘navel’ (*nābhīm*), referring to the technicalities of the birth process, and ‘release’ with ‘offspring’ (*prajām*), referring to the results of birth.

The Tvaṣṭar verse in Āpri hymns generally directly concerns only his participation in the birth process (see I.142.10, III.4.9=VII.2.9, X.110.9, X.142.10; our pādas abc). Releasing the sacrificial animal and escorting it to (the fold/pen of) the gods is properly the province of the post (“Lord of the Forest,” *vānaspátiḥ*, 10a), and that

expression (“go to [the fold of] the gods”) is a euphemism for the animal’s death. However, note X.70.9–10, where both Tvaṣṭar and the Lord of the Forest convey the animal to the fold of the gods (*devānām pāthah*). Like X.70.9 our pāda d implies that the journey of the sacrificial animal (that is, its death) occurs under the auspices of Tvaṣṭar, and in fact, given the apparent temporal/logical connector *āthā* beginning pāda d, the implication is that the offspring born in abc is to undertake this journey. This seems rather muddled: our new (human) offspring is not the sacrificial animal. I think the roles of Tvaṣṭar and the Lord of the Forest were quite distinct, but conflations like this could occur because the Tvaṣṭar and Vanaspati vss. are always adjacent in Āṛḍī hymns and because the vocabulary is similar: Tvaṣṭar’s *ví √sā* ‘unbind/release’ and Vanaspati’s *āva √sṛj* ‘release/discharge’. The fact that the victim is usually not overtly expressed (presumably a euphemistic avoidance) makes confusion all the more likely.

II.3.11: The *-si* form *vakṣi* would be better tr. as an impv. “convey,” rather than a subj. “you will convey” as in the publ. tr.

II.4 Agni

II.4.1: The stem *suvrkti-* generally refers to a hymn and has in fact virtually been substantivized to mean hymn. However, it must be a bahuvrīhi in origin; I generally tr. ‘having a good twist’, referring to the clever adornments, the turns of phrase, of a skillfully crafted hymn. Here I think it has two senses: first, characterizing Agni himself as ‘having a good twist’, perhaps referring to his swirling smoke and flames, but then, as a sort of secondary or double bahuvrīhi, ‘having [/receiving] (hymns) with good twists’. In this meaning it is parallel to *suprayásam* ‘having [/receiving] pleasurable offerings’. Note that the two are both final in their pādas. I do not think Ge’s “euren Preis” or Re’s “hymne (incarné)” is either necessary or illuminating.

On the desiderative gerundive *didhiṣāyya-* see comm. ad I.73.2. Although the tr. “desirable to install” is somewhat heavy, the complexity of the formation seems to require a weighty tr.

The last pāda indulges in play with the name Jātavedas: *devá ādeve jáne jātávedāḥ*. The first and last elements, *devá* ... *vedāḥ*, are virtual mirror images, with the 2nd word *ādeve* reinforcing the first, and *jáne* making an etymological figure with *jātā*.

II.4.2: The combination of honoring Agni “in the seat of the waters” (a) and the Bhṛgus “once again” installing him among the clans (b) suggests that this vs. concerns the well-known myth of Agni’s flight and concealment in the waters and the Bhṛgus’ discovery, recovery, and reinstallation of Agni as the ritual fire. X.46.2 begins with a pāda identical to our pāda a and then relates the Bhṛgu’s finding of the fire *gúhā cátantam* “hiding in secret”: *imám vidhánto apám sadhásthe, ... padaír ánu gman / gúhā cátantam uśíjo námobhir, ichánto dhírā bhírgavo vindan* “This one here -- doing honor to him in the seat of the waters, they followed him along his tracks ... / With reverences seeking him who was hiding in secret, the fire-priests, the insightful Bhṛgus found him.” (I would now alter the tr. ‘having done honor’ to ‘doing honor’, also in X.46.2; for further disc. see comm. ad X.46.2.) The same myth may be alluded to, in ring compositional fashion, in vs. 9 of our hymn. Note also that the poet to whom this hymn is ascribed is Somāhuti Bhārgava.

II.4.2–3: As IH pointed out to me, *dvitādadur* in 2b can be read, contra Pp. *adadhur*, as *dvitā dadur*, with perfect indic. or pres. injunc.; I now favor the unaugmented reading for reasons given below.

The contrast between the verbs in 2ab *imám ... (a)dadhur bhígavah* and 3ab *agním devásah ... dhuḥ* seems to encode the primal installation of Agni by the gods (3) and the recent installation, by men (2). Why the primal installation is expressed by a root aor. injunc. is not clear to me, but I would now alter the publ. tr. to “Agni did the gods install ...,” from “Agni have the gods installed ...,” to reflect the remote past. Note also that the opening of 3b is metrically aberrant, with an opening of 3. HvN suggest a rest in 4th position. It would be possible to restore **dadhuḥ*, which would match the same verb in the same position in 2b, but I think it’s more likely that the omission of a syllable is meant to call attention to the difference in verb stems. A rest in 3rd position, producing a syncopated *dhuḥ* might be better. If the two verbs are being directly contrasted, an unaugmented *dadhur* in 2 is more likely than augmented *adadhur* (in order to highlight the difference in stems). Discussion with IH has helped me clarify my interpr.

II.4.3: I tr. *dīdayat ... ūrmyā ā* “shine towards the nights,” rather than “illuminate the nights” with the standard tr., because I could not otherwise account for the *ā*. Narten’s tr. (KISch 370 n. 5) is similarly intransitive though with a temporal, rather than goal, acc.: “Er soll die Nächte hindurch leuchten.”

Note *mitrám √dhā* in b reprising the same lexeme in 1c.

On *dakṣāyyah*, whose morphology resembles *didhiṣāyyah* in 1c, see comm. ad I.91.3. As noted there, in this passage it could also or alternatively mean “to be skillfully tended,” though I do not favor this alt.

II.4.4: The predicate adj. *raṇvā* qualifies both *pūṣṭih* and *sáṃdrṣṭih*; for the latter see X.64.11 *raṇvāḥ sáṃdrṣṭau*.

I take *dáksu-* as a pseudo-desid. *u*-participle; also *dháksu-* in X.115.4.

Because *dodhavīti* in d is unaccented, it cannot be the verb of the relative clause beginning with *yáḥ* in c, despite the standard tr. Instead the intensive part. *bháribhrat* must be predicated in the rel. cl. and *dodhavīti* interpreted as the verb of the main clause.

Because of the equine simile and imagery, the primary reading of *dodhavīti vārāṇ* must be “twitches his tail(-hairs),” but a second reading “shakes out choice things” is also invited.

II.4.5: This vs. describes the changes in color and form of the kindled fire as a sight to be wondered at. My tr. follows Ge’s in outline and many details. The first sight is of the shapeless dark cloud of smoke (a), but that sight transforms into color and bright light (bc). On *ábhva-* see my “forthcoming” “The Blob in Ancient India” (UCLA CMRS 2015 dragon conf. vol. [whose appearance now seems unlikely]), and for a parallel passage (also adduced by Ge) VI.4.3 ... *yásya panáyanty ábhvam, bhāsāṃsi vaste sūryo ná śukrāḥ* “He whose formless mass [=smoke] they [=mortals] marvel at ..., he (then) clothes himself in lights, like the brilliant sun,” which seems to show parallel progress from dark to light and also contains a form of *bhās-* as here.

vanád- ‘wood-eater’ assumes a root noun 1st member *ván-*, preserved in a few forms such as loc. pl. *vámsu* (see Schindler, Rt. Noun), against the overwhelming number of forms to thematic *vána-*.

I do not understand the simile in b, *uśígbhyo ná* “as if for the fire-priests.” Perhaps the point is that the fire-tending performed by Uśij-priests would cause the smoke to dissipate and the flames to appear, but that in their absence this change comes about anyway. Note that in X.46.2, quoted above ad vs. 2, the Bhrgus seem to be identified as *uśíj-*-priests, so the simile here may be referring to ritual behavior in ancestral time. WG tr. “wie den (danach) Verlangenden,” but *uśíj-* is elsewhere the designation of a priest (and cf. Old Aves. *usij-*) and is so tr. by them elsewhere (e.g., I.60.4).

For *rámsu* as adverbial loc. pl. to the root noun *rán-* see Schindler Rt. Noun and EWA, both s.v. *ran*. And note *ranyá-* in the preceding and following vss. (4a, 6c).

The last pāda describes the graying of the ash (“having grown old”) and then the rejuvenation of the flames presumably by the addition of more firewood.

II.4.6: The standard tr. take *bhāti* as the operator of the simile (e.g., Ge “Der nach den Hölzern ausschaut(?) wie der Durstige (nach Wasser)”), but this doesn’t make much sense. From *vanád-* ‘wood-eater’ in the immediately preceding vs. I extract ‘eat’ to govern *vánā* and to be compared to *tātrṣānáh* ‘thirsting’ in the same semantic realm, hence my “(eating) wood like one athirst.” This leaves *bhāti* free of complements.

My ‘red-hot’ for *tápuh* contrasts nicely with *kṛṣṇādhvā* ‘having a black road’, but is unfortunately not entirely legitimate: it is more literally just ‘hot’; there is no color component.

Act. pf. *ciketa* in c might be expected to mean ‘perceives’, as generally, but it must mean instead ‘appears’; so all the standard tr., and see also Kü (175) on the unusual sense. It is all the more surprising given med. *cikite* in the same meaning in the immediately preceding vs. (5c). But in this case the two forms may have been seen as metrical variants with identical sense, since *ciketa* is always pāda-final, *cikite* always post-caesura, as here.

The unexpressed concept in the simile “like heaven smiling with its clouds” must be lightning, which smiles (I.168.8) or laughs (V.52.6). Lightning is white, like (some) clouds.

II.4.7: The root *svad* is generally a ritual technical term: the ritual fire “sweetens,” that is, “ritually prepares” the oblations. Here the forest fire performs the same action on the non-ritual ground. Although this might depict some version of slash-and-burn agriculture (so WG), I think it more likely that the point is merely to give a ritual dimension to the wild and unpredictable actions of the forest fire, in the hope of exerting some control over it. The same ritual overlay is found in I.169.3 *agníś cid dhí smātasé śuśukvān, ... dādhati práyāmsi* “For even a fire blazing in the brushwood can produce pleasurable offerings.” The position of *ná* after the verb *asvadayat* in our passage suggests that the simile is targeting the verb, an extremely unusual situation in Vedic poetics. Since, as discussed elsewhere (see comm. ad VIII.76.1 and nearby II.11.3 and now my “Penultimate *ná* ‘like’ in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism” [ECIEC 2024]), simile-marking *ná* cannot take final position, it would be possible to take the simile to be **bhūma ná*. However, I do not

think “ground” is the simile target, but the actual obj. of *asvadayat*, which has no other possible obj. in context.

II.4.8: The phrase *trtīye vidáthe* “third rite of distribution” probably refers to the Third Pressing (though the two other occurrences of “three *vidáthas*”, at VI.51.2 and VII.66.10, do not seem to). Agni is of course present at all the pressings, but is not especially associated with the Third Pressing; however, *trtīye sávane* at III.28.5 is in an Agni context.

II.4.9: In the publ. tr. I supply with *gúhā* a form like *hitám* (cf. I.23.14, II.11.5, IV.5.8, etc.), *cárantam* (III.1.9), or *cátantam* (I.65.1, X.46.2) referring to Agni when he was hiding in the waters, a myth I also think is referred to obliquely in vs. 2 of this hymn (see above). Our vs. 2 is especially close to X.46.2, which relates this story, and X.46.2c begins *gúhā cátantam* (and continues with a ref. to the *usíj-*; see our 5b). I therefore think my suggestion is justified, though I am usually reluctant to supply extraneous material. The point is -- if the Gr̄tsamadas (re)gain the hidden Agni, just as their ancestors the Bhrgus did, they will get the upper hand against their enemies. The standard tr. must construe *gúhā* with *vanvántah* ‘gaining in secret’ (e.g., Ge “heimlich überbieten und überwinden”). Although this is the obvious way to construe the text as given, the notion that our side would win by stealth and secret means seems antithetic to the Rigvedic ideal of combat, whether on the battlefield or the ritual ground. The adverb *gúhā* is extremely common in the flight-of-Agni myth and in an Agni hymn would likely call to mind the whole story. I would now be inclined to emend the publ. tr. to “(the one hiding) in secret,” not “(... deposited) in secret,” because of its apparent dependence on X.46.2 or a passage like it.

II.5 Agni

The first seven of the eight vss. (the 8th being a summary vs.) name and describe the various priestly roles that Agni assumes in the ritual. In all but vs. 3 the priestly title is given; in 3 the title must be inferred from the description, which unfortunately is somewhat muddled. See extensive disc. below.

II.5.1: On *jén̄ya-* see comm. ad I.128.7.

II.5.2: The priestly subject of this vs. is the Potar, found in the final pāda, but there is a teaser in pāda b, in the form of an agent noun *nétar-* ‘leader’ in the expression *yajñásya netári* “to/in the leader of the sacrifice.” But *netár-* is not a technical priestly role; the real priestly title derived from the root $\sqrt{nī}$ is Neṣṭar, found in vs. 5 (*néṣṭuh*).

II.5.3: It is not clear what the disjunctive *vā* is disjoining. Klein (DGRV II.187–88) considers vs. 3 a reformulation of vs. 2, tr. “Or (more precisely) ...” But since vs. 3 most likely concerns a different priestly office than vs. 2 (*brahmán-* by implication, not *pótar-*), this doesn’t work. No other tr. attempts to account for *vā*. Since Agni is the implicit subject of these vss. and the referent of the various priestly offices, I think that “or” is simply introducing a different role that the same Agni performs. If, as I suggest below, the first part of vs. 3 (*dadhanvé ... yád īm ánu* “when he has run after it”) picks up the

last part of vs. 2 (*viśvam tād invati* “he sets all this in motion”), the “or” might emphasize the fact that the same Agni who set the sacrifice in motion is now switching roles to run after what he started. The “or” indicates that an alternative Agni-figure is now in question.

The three verbs in ab, *dadhanvē*, *vócat*, and *véh*, have been configured in every possible way. Ge takes the first two as parallel in the dependent cl. marked by *yád*, with *véh* the main cl. verb (accented because it’s in the initial position of its clause). Acdg. to Re, *dadhanvē* is a main verb, with *vócat* the verb of its associated *yád* cl., while *véh* is the verb of an independent main cl. Old (SBE) takes all three as parallel verbs in the *yád* cl., with c as the main cl. Like me, Klein makes *vócat* and *véh* parallel main cl. verbs, with *dadhanvē* in the *yád* cl. (In his *Particle* u ... [p. 81] Klein specifically takes *u* not only as indicating that *vócat* and *véh* are coordinate but suggests it was syncopated from *utá* in the context ... *u tát*.) And, finally, WG take *dadhanvē* in the dependent cl., *vócat* in the main cl., and *véh* as 2nd sg. direct speech specifying *vócat*. This chaotic diversity shows that we interpreters are uncertain not only about the syntax of the verse but the sense. In what follows I will pursue this sense, with no certainty that what I present is correct.

Ge (/WG) take the subject of *dadhanvē* to be the priest and *īm* as referring to Agni whom the priest pursues, but, as in II.1, Agni is *identified* with the various priestly functions, and I think he must be the subj. of all the verbs here. I don’t really understand the function of *dadhanvē*, but it might simply express Agni’s pursuit of the priestly role or of the formulations that he then speaks (in which case *īm* is better tr. ‘them’, as is quite possible). But I would now suggest that there is continuity with the previous vs., and that Agni in his new rule is running after “all this” (*viśvam tād*, probably the sacrifice or some part of it) that as Potar he set in motion. See above.

The reason that WG interpret *véh* as direct speech is to render it as a 2nd sg.; they clearly reject the standard 3rd sg. interpr. But I do not think that a 3rd sg. can be avoided here or in I.77.2 or IV.7.7 (WG render the former as 3rd sg. but the latter as 2nd sg.), although Gr’s assignment of the forms to an s-aor. to $\sqrt{vī}$ is most likely incorrect. (Curiously Narten does not discuss *veh* in her entry on $\sqrt{vī}$, even to reject the s-aor. analysis.) Instead I would take *veh* (underlying *ves*) as the injunctive to the root pres. of $\sqrt{vī}$, but with the substitution of *-s* for *-t* in the 3rd sg. *as if* it belonged to an s-aor. or a root aor. of the type (*ā*)*var* (2nd/3rd sg.) -- keeping in mind that before voiced sounds *veh* appears as *vér* and so an analogy to phonologically similar (*ā*)*var* would not be surprising. There are no 3rd sg. *-t* forms to this stem, unless augmented *ávet* (V.34.8) belongs here. One of the idiomatic uses of the root $\sqrt{vī}$ is with an acc. of an office or function (see esp. I.76.4 *véši hotrám utá potrám* “You pursue the Hotarship and the Potarship,” adduced by Ge), which is the apparent sense here, and so assigning *véh* to a different root, such as $\sqrt{viṣ}$, should be avoided.

As noted in the intro. remark above, this vs. is the only one of the seven “priestly role” vss. in which the priestly title is missing. Instead we must infer it from the description of Agni’s activity. It is probably no accident that this is the only vs. in the hymn in which the priestly title has to be inferred and supplied, since the priestly role depicted in the vs. involves the clever manipulation of language and the capture, via *bráhmāni*, of hidden truths. The poet is in essence making his audience act the role of the *brahmán-* by figuring out what the vs. is getting at. In my opinion the most crucial piece is pāda b, where Agni “speaks sacred formulations” (*vócad bráhmāni*). The speaker of

formulations (*bráhman-*) is of course the *brahmán*, and this is the title we must derive from this context. That *véh* is used of the pursuit of priestly roles (see above) but here appears without overt object also invites us to fill in the blank in this way. Our inference is reinforced by *cd párí vísvāni kāvyā ... abhavat*, where Agni encompasses “all poetic skills,” that is, the ones necessary to produce effective formulations.

This brings us to the problem of *abhavat*. As IH points out to me, the recent past sense I attribute to this verb here (“has encompassed”) would be highly unusual for an augmented imperfect, and given the perplexing variety of verbs in the earlier parts of the vs. (pf. *dadhanvē*, injunc. aor. *vócat*, injunc. pres. *véh*) and the uncertainty of their syntactic distribution, not to mention the sense of the vs. as a whole, adding to the confusion by attributing an unusual sense to *abhavat* should be avoided if at all possible. It might be possible to read the injunctives *vócat* and *véh* not as present/future as in the publ. tr., but as pasts: “... he spoke formulations and pursued ...,” which would be friendly to a simple past interpr. of *abhavat* “he encompassed ...” However, two things speak against this. First, the rest of the hymn presents Agni’s occupation of the various offices in the present/recent past. And second, injunctive forms of *vóca-* almost always have a performative pres.-future sense, as in the famous and stereotyped opening of I.32.1 *índrasya nú vīryāni prá vocam* “I (will) proclaim the manly deeds of Indra.” Imposing a past interpr. here would contravene the normal usage of this form, esp. since it fits well with the presentential focus of the rest of the hymn and nothing else presses a past interpr. My not entirely satisfactory response to this conundrum is to suggest that *cd* describes Agni’s acquisition of poetic skills in the past – he is elsewhere often called a *kaví* -- which allows him to assume the role of Formulator now. So I would alter the tr. to “he encompassed all poetic skills ...” Many thanks to IH for extensive discussion of this problematic passage.

II.5.4: The standard tr. construe *śúcinā* with *krátunā* (e.g., Ge “mit lauterem Sinne”). This is certainly possible -- though *śúci-* *krátu-* is not a standard collocation -- but not necessary.

The standard tr. also assume a change of subject in *cd* from Agni (ab) to a priest “who knows (Agni’s) *vratas*” (*vidvām̄ asya vratā dhruvā*). I find this unlikely; *vidvān* modifies Agni in vs. 8 (in my view), as well as twice in the next, closely related, hymn (II.6.7, 8). Moreover, *vidvān* is regularly used absolutely, taking an object much less often. I construe *vratā dhruvā* instead with *ánu*: “according to his *vratás*.” The collocation *ánu vratá-* is quite common; here the *vratá-* would be the rules that govern the natural world (plants and fires). The *asya* refers to Agni, the subj. of the sentence, and is therefore de facto reflexive, but this is not unusual.

II.5.5: On the interpretational difficulties of this vs., see publ. intro.

II.5.6: I take *yádī* as *yád ī*, with pronominal enclitic *ī* standing for ‘him’ = Agni/Adhvaryu. See my “RVic *sīm* and *īm*” (Fs. Cardona, 2002).

Ge’s identifications, flg. Sāy., of the mother as the cow and the sister as the offering ladle or, less likely in my opinion, the ghee offering itself, seem reasonable. He suggests that the pl. *tāsām* of *c* picks up a collective in the previous clause, presumably

ghee. This seems less likely to me; I suggest “the arrival of these (fem.)” refers back to the sisters who came here (*svásāro yā idám yayúh*) in 5d.

II.5.7: The convoluted but rhetorically balanced expression *sváh sváya dháyase krñutām rtvíg rtvijam* (“Let him, as Rtvij, make himself Rtvij, to suckle himself”) makes explicit Agni’s double role in this hymn: he is both a divine version of each priest in turn and represents the corresponding human priest. Here as divine Rtvij he makes himself into the human Rtvij, whose function is to give nourishment to the ritual fire, that is, to himself -- a kind of closed and reflexive circle. Once the mechanism of the identifications that have run through the hymn has been laid bare, the poet briskly finishes up the hymn, beginning with the summary 2nd hemistich here.

Most tr. struggle to construe *stómam yajñám ca* with the closest verb, *vanéma*. Somewhat against my principles, I instead take *ād áram*, *vanéma* as parenthetical and construe the first NP with *rarimā*. (I have displaced the tr. of the *ād* clause to the right, because the parenthetical tr. was difficult to parse.) In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the standard tr. require *ād* to be in a highly unusual position, in the middle of its supposed clause. As it happens, WG interpr. the syntax as I do.

II.5.8: Ge (/WG) and Re take the subj. of ab to be the sacrificer, flg. Sāy., but Agni as the priestly mediator makes more sense. As noted above, ad 4c, *vidvān* must modify Agni in the last two vss. of the next hymn, II.6.7–8.

II.6 Agni

II.6.1: The most likely referent to supply with fem. *ayā* is *girā*, given *gírah* closing the preceding vs. and the 2 forms of this stem in the first pāda of the next vs. (3a; see also 6b). Cf. also II.24.1 *ayā vidhema ... girā*.

II.6.5: The vs. lacks a verb, though one can easily be supplied. The standard tr. supply an imperative: I extract ‘give’ out of *vásu-dāvan* ‘giving goods’ in 4b, but ‘bring’ (so Ge, Re) works as well. What is clever about the syntax of this vs. is that the only signal of the absent imperative is the presumed 2nd ps. reference of the repeated *sá*, which of course is ordinarily a 3rd ps. pronoun, but is very frequent with 2nd ps. imperatives (see my “sa figé” article, *HS* 1992).

II.6.6: With Ge (/WG) *girā* could be construed with *īlānāya* “reverently invoking with song.”

II.6.7: With Sāy., Ge, Old (SBE), etc., I take *jányeva* as representing *janya(h) iva*, with double application of sandhi (as in nearby II.2.5), against the Pp. *jányā*. There are various different interpr. of the sociological situation represented by *jányeva mítryah*; mine is closest to Old (SBE). See disc. in my 2001 Fs. Parpola article. Although similar phraseology is used of the public solemnization of marriage, I do not think that is the point here (*pace* Ge, etc.). See comm. ad II.39.1.

II.6.8: The undoubted subjunctive (*ā*) *piprayah* seems to anchor the following *yaksi* and (*ā*) *satsi* as the haplologized s-aor. subjunctives they originally were, rather than in their later imperative function, esp. given the coordination of the first and last terms by *ca* ... *ca*. However, the two *ca*'s could be more or less independent, with the second one conjoining *yaksi* and *satsi* more closely.

II.7 Agni

II.7.1: Note ... *bhārata* # (a) / ... *ā bhara* # (b).

II.7.2: On *īśata* in the *mā* prohibitive see comm. ad I.23.9.

II.7.3: The simile marker *iva* is somewhat displaced, in that it follows both parts of the simile “watery streams” (*dhārā udanyā*).

The verse contains several tricks involving word order. First, the first word of the vs., *vīśvā(h)*, and the last, *dvīṣāḥ*, belong together: “all hatreds.” Their extreme distraction may be iconic of the distance that we must cross to pass beyond them. Notice that they are also near rhyme forms. Further, there is a clever grammatical switch between vss. 2 and 3: 2c ends with (*utā*) *dviṣāḥ* (abl. sg.) / 3c with *dvīṣāḥ* (acc.pl.), and 3a begins with *vīśvā(h)* (*utā*). As just noted, this opening *vīśvā(h)* is to be construed with the distant 3c *dvīṣāḥ*, not with the *dviṣāḥ* immediately before it -- even though they seem bracketed together, sandwiched in by *utā*'s, with phonologically similar *tāsyā* immed. before and *tvāyā* immed. after: *tāsyā utā dviṣāḥ* // *vīśvā utā tvāyā*.

II.7.5: On the *vaśā* cow, see my Hyenas (258–60), building on H. Falk, “Zur Tiersucht im alten Indien” (IIJ 24: 169–80). Although often tr. “barren cow,” a *vaśā* is one that has been mated but has not yet calved -- so possibly barren, possibly not. My tr. here, “mated cows,” is not fully accurate but far less awkward than accuracy would require.

WG supply “verses” with *astāpadībhih*, though they allow the possibility of a cow in their n. Although this pun is probably lurking here -- eight-footed verses would of course be pādas with eight syllables -- the primary reading must be some sort of bovine, given the words with which it is parallel. See Old's comment on this vs. (SBE).

II.7.6: The final word of the vs. (and the hymn) *ādhuṭaḥ* echoes the finals of the last two vss., 4c and 5c *āhutaḥ*.

II.8 Agni

II.8.1–4: The #*ya(sāstamasya)* that opens 1c anticipates the forms of the relative pronoun *yā-* in the next 3 vss. (2a #*yāḥ*, 3a #*yā(h)*, 3c #*yāsyā*, with the last, 4a #*ā yāḥ*, no longer in initial position), though of course it is entirely unrelated to the relative. The referent of all those rel. pronouns is Agni, who is also the referent of *yaśāstamasya*. Phonology and syntax are thus wedded.

II.8.4–6: As the just-mentioned structural device expires in 4a, another takes its place. An unbroken alliterative string runs from the end of 4b through the beginning of 5: ... *arcīṣā*

/ añjānó ajárair abhí // átrim ánu ..., and the first words of the most of the remaining pādas also start with *a-* (5b *agním*, 6a *agnér*, 6c *áriṣyantah*, 6d *abhí*). Since *ádhī* is the 2nd word in 5c, only 6b is not part of the chain.

II.8.4–5: On the disguised Svarbhānu myth in these two vss., see publ. intro. Most tr./comm. are puzzled by the appearance of Atri here, and Ge and Old in particular speculate on possible emendations. But the presence of the Svarbhānu formula guarantees that the text is genuine, in my opinion.

II.8.4: Gr. lists this passage as containing a preverb sequence *ā* *ví* *√bhā*, the only such ex. in the RV (or elsewhere); on RV I.71.6 see comm. ad loc., and on the phenomenon in general ad VII.10.2. In our passage *ā* is initial in the vs. and *vibhāti* comes along in the middle of pāda b; *ā* seems to have the often somewhat vague adverbial value ‘here’, and I do not think it needs to be directly associated with the extraordinarily common lexeme *ví* *√bhā*.

II.9–10 Agni

These two six-verse trimeter hymns follow the two six-verse dimeter hymns (II.7–8), though by the normal rules of hymn ordering they should precede them. In his opening n. on II.9 in SBE, Old tentatively suggests that II.9 and 10 should each be divided into two tr̄cas, but in the Noten he essentially withdraws this suggestion because he sees signs of unity within the two hymns as transmitted.

II.9 Agni

II.9.1: The mid. part. *vídāna-* should belong to the pf. stem of *√vid* ‘know’ (so Ge [/WG], Re). I fully recognize the morphological argument, but I think in this instance it has been assimilated to the homonymous root *√vid* ‘find’ (so Old [SBE], with Re registering the potential ambiguity in his n.) -- quite possibly by way of “being recognized” → “being found.” Here I think it refers to the myth of the discovery and recovery of the fugitive Agni and would slightly emend the tr. to “once recognized / found.” The word forms a weak ring with *suvidátra-* in the final vs., 6a, assuming the latter word is a derivative of *√vid*; see comm. ad vs. 6.

ádabdhavratapramati- is an unusual cmpd for the RV in having three members, and with its initial accent (on which see AiG II.1.293) the accent falls about as far from word-end as it is possible to be.

II.9.4: There is some difference of opinion about the meaning of *manótar-*. Most take it as some version of ‘deviser, inventor’ (so Gr, Ge, HO [SBE], Re, WG), but Tichy (Nomen Agentis, 40 and passim) argues for the sense ‘remind-er, rememberer’. I opt for something in the middle, ‘minder’. That is, I don’t think the term means that Agni creates ritual speech (the standard view), nor that he remembers or reminds the officiants of this speech (the Tichy view), but that he takes account of it, pays attention to it. The English term ‘minder’ (as in childminder) also has the connotation of taking care of someone or something, tending or ministering to it or them, and that sense would fit here as well. See

also comm. ad IV.5.10 citing several passages containing the verb stem *manu-* that underlies this unusually formed agent noun with the sense ‘ponder, bring to mind’.

II.9.5: Various suggestions have been made about the two types of goods in *pāda a* (see the nn. of Old [SBE], Ge, Re, and WG), but Re’s suggestion that it’s livestock and offspring seems the most satisfying contextually, given the wishes expressed in cd. For disc. of similar phrases see comm. ad VI.19.10.

II.9.6: As noted above, I suggest that *suvidátra-* makes a ring with *vidāna-* in 1a, a suggestion that rests on assigning both words, at least secondarily, to the root \sqrt{vid} ‘find’ and on assuming that this root meaning is still apparent in *suvidátra-*. Neither of these assumptions is unchallenged. Gr assigns *-vidatra-* to *dā¹* ‘give’ + *ví* and glosses it ‘vertheilend’. (That $\sqrt{dā}$ is not otherwise found with *ví* speaks against this derivation.) In his brief treatment of the word Debrunner (AiG II.2.170) gives its root etymology as \sqrt{vid} with a question mark, glossing it ‘wohlwollend’. Though no doubt other etymological suggestions have been made, I have not to my knowledge encountered them. The standard interpr. of the semantics, however, are like Debrunner’s -- ‘wohlwollend, gnädig, d’accueil favorable’, etc. Whatever the root derivation assumed, this rather vague meaning is far from ‘find’ (or ‘know’ or ‘distribute’) and the semantic pathway to it is unclear. Moreover, a passage like X.15.3 *āhám pitṛn suvidátrām̄ avitsi* “I have found the *suvidátra-* forefathers (/forefathers that are easy/good to find)” testifies to at least a secondary connection between the form and the root \sqrt{vid} ‘find’, as well as enough semantic connection remaining to allow the phrase to function as a linguistic figure. The word is found twice in the Agni hymns of II, once here, once in II.1.8. Both vss. also contain the word *ánika-* ‘visage, face’ (though in II.1.8 admittedly not in the same clause). Especially in our passage I think the point is that because of Agni’s shining face he is easy to find -- he is the brightest thing around. See also the disc. of *durvidátra-* ad X.35.4, which provides further evidence for a derivation from \sqrt{vid} ‘find’.

That the next hymn (II.10), which is at least metrically paired with this one (see comm. ad II.9-10), is also characterized by a ring linking the first and last vss. and that the first word of the ring is also formed with a *-tra*-suffix (*johūtra-*) lend some support to my speculations about *suvidátra-* here.

II.10 Agni

II.10.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the first word of the hymn, *johūtra-*, forms a ring with *johavīmi*, the last word. The connection between them is emphasized by the intensive redupl. in *johūtra-*; no other *-tra*- stems show redupl., much less intensive reduplication. Gr (and, it seems, WG, here though not in I.118.9; II.20.3 isn’t clear) take the stem as act. (‘laut rufend’), but a passive value makes better sense in all 3 occurrences (so Old [SBE], Ge, Re). The *-tra*- form in the next vs., *víbhṛtra-* (2d), is likewise passive. My tr. “invoked ... on every side” is based on the possibility that the *-tra*- suffix evokes the *-tra* adverbial locatives (such as *átra* ‘here’), although this may be pushing the limits (likewise my ‘dispersed in many places’ for *víbhṛtra-* in 2d). It does, however, work with the thematics of the first few vss.: vs. 2 urgently begs to hear *my* call (*hávam me*, with the possessive prn. emphatically placed *pāda*-final), and the two occurrences of *vícétaḥ*

‘discriminating’ (1c, 2b) suggest that Agni is choosing among the various sacrifices he might attend on the journey described in 2cd.

II.10.2: The urgency of the poet’s desire is conveyed by the isolated precative *śrūyā(h)*, the only precative to this root, hence my “may he please hear.” It also provides a phonological template for *śyāvā* opening the next hemistich (2c) and, more distantly, *uttānāyām* and *sīriṇāyām* opening 3a and c respectively.

II.10.3: The fem. sg. loc. *uttānāyām* is generally simply tr. ‘outstretched’ or sim. I think the image is more precise: the two kindling sticks, athwart each other, are likened to a woman in birthing position with her legs stretched out and open (my “agape”).

The rhyming form *sīriṇāyām* opening the 2nd half-vs. is much more difficult. It is a hapax with no clear root affiliation, and the suggested tr. range widely -- ‘night’, ‘chamber’, ‘hiding place’, etc. (See the standard tr., plus KEWA and EWA s.v.) My own very tentative suggestion links it to *sirā* ‘stream’ (I.121.11) and *sīrī-* (if that means ‘stream’, as JPB takes it, X.71.9), as well as to later *sirā-* ‘vein’ (also found in MIA). By extension I take it to refer metaphorically to the birth canal, in which Agni remains, unborn, during the night -- though he cannot be kept confined for very long. This would again be a reference to the kindling sticks, in whose attenuated interior he is fancied to be hidden. The variation in sibilant would not be surprising, particularly in a body-part word that could be mediated by Middle Indic. All this is very speculative, however, and it might be wiser to leave the word untranslated.

II.10.4: This vs. describes what happens to the fire after the peaceful creature depicted in pāda b is sprinkled with melted butter (pāda a): he takes on an appearance (*dṛśānam*) that is larger and more powerful. Contra Ge, Re, WG (but with Old [SBE]) I construe *ánnaih* with *vyáciṣṭham*, on the basis of III.50.1 *uruvyácāḥ* ... *ebhír ánnaiḥ*.

II.10.5: The first hemistich of this vs., which repeats the verb of the preceding vs., *jigharmi* ‘I sprinkle’, expresses the hope that this sprinkling, which rendered Agni ‘overpowering, violent’ (*rabhasām*) at the end of the last vs., will not make him hostile and dangerous: he should enjoy the ghee “with an undemonic spirit” (*arakṣásā mánasā*).

The second hemistich states that no matter how lovely his appearance is, he is not to be touched; the unexpressed reason for this of course is that he will burn whoever or whatever does touch him. The hapax bahuvr. *sprhayádvaraṇa-* is variously interpreted. I think it means not ‘having desirable color’ (so, approx. Re.) nor ‘desiring color’ (so approx. Ge and WG), but rather ‘having questing color’ -- that is, his color (=flames) flickering here and there (*járbhurāṇaḥ*) look in their random motion as if they are seeking something. In other words, despite their apparent formal match I take *sprhayádvaraṇa-* as a bahuvrīhi based on a karmadhāraya, rather than as a verbal governing cmpd. of the type *dhārayát-kavi-* ‘upholding poets’.

II.10.6: The first pāda of this vs. continues the theme of trying to set limits on the unpredictably powerful Agni. (In my view; it is not so interpr. by others.) Here he is urged (again with a precative, *jñeyāḥ*) to know or recognize his share. I take this to mean that he should take his share and no more, though his power would allow him to take

whatever he wants (*sahasānó várena*). Agni thus controlled will then help the singer to achieve his goals (pādas bcd).

Note that Manu returns from the 1st vs. — another little ring. The adj. *madhupácam* ‘mixing with honey’ reminds us of the later Madhuparka drink offered to distinguished visitors, but I doubt that such a reference is found here. Though it would be generally appropriate for Agni the átithi- (‘guest’), this hospitality theme, though common in the RV, is not found in this hymn.

For the pun in the 2nd half vs., see publ. intro. Notice also that *juh^ūvā* mimics the phonology of the verb *johavīmi*, thus emphasizing the ring of the latter with the first word of the hymn *johūtra*.

[II.11–24 JPB – comments by SWJ]

II.11 Indra (comments SJ; for a complete translation with my modifications, see end)

The hymn has a remarkable number of predicated tense-stem participles. There are also an unusual number of past anteriors of various sorts.

Another notable feature is the large number of occurrences of the particle *nú*, all in the first pāda of the vs., in short runs of adjacent vss.: 3a, 4a; 6a, 7a; 15a, 16a, 17a. The last vs. of the hymn (21) then begins *nūnám*, as if in summary.

Other signature words recur through the hymn: forms of $\sqrt{vṛdh}$ (esp. *vardháya*): 1c, 2d, 4a, 4c, 8c, 11c, 13b, 15d, 20b; \sqrt{mand} (esp. *mandasāná*): 3c, 11b (2x), 14c, 15a, 17a, 20a.

There is also a certain amount of chaining, though it is not applied systematically: 3d/4a *śubhrá*-, 6d/7a *hári*-, 7d/8a *párvata*-, 9d/10a *vṛśno asya* *vájra*-, 10d/11a $\sqrt{pā}$, 12d/13a *syāma*, 13d/14a *rāsi*, 15d/16a *bṛhánt*-, 19d/20a *tritá*-.

On the unusual meter of this hymn see Old Prol. 87–90, who also remarks on its unusual vocab., which, taken together, gives the hymn a “Sonderstellung” among the surrounding hymns (87 n. 1). See also Ge’s intro. for remarks on its stylistic features.

II.11.1: On *mā riṣanyah* see comm. ad VII.9.5. I would now emend the tr. from “intend us no harm” to “don’t fail.”

II.11.2: On the metrically problematic *ukthaiḥ*, see comm. ad V.4.7.

The pf. part. *vāvṛdhānāḥ* would better be rendered as an anterior: “when you had become strong ...”

II.11.3 There are several syntactic problems in this verse. The easiest to deal with is the apparently misplaced *ca* in b. All the standard tr. as well as the publ. tr. take *rudrīyeṣu* as a modifier of *stómeṣu*, with the whole loc. phrase #*ukthéṣu* ..., *stómeṣu* ... *rudrīyeṣu* *ca*# then interpreted as “in the hymns and in the Rudriyan praises,” with the *ca* following the 2nd word of a bipartite NP and at a considerable distance from the 1st. (We would expect **stómeṣu ca* (...) *rudrīyeṣu*.) Klein (DGRV I.54) calls this “the most anomalous position of *ca* within adjective plus noun syntagms.” This difficulty disappears if we take *rudrīyeṣu* not as an adjective with *stómeṣu*, but as a third term in the conjoined phrase: “in the hymns, in the praises, and in the Rudriyans.” The *ca* is then correctly positioned in an X Y Z *ca* construction (on which see Klein DGRV I.86–91). The Rudriyans in

question are the Maruts. It is important to note that the adj. *rudrīya-* is almost never used of anyone or anything but the Maruts, and in the plural never of anything but the Maruts. It is also never used of hymns or praises. It is true that my interpr. produces disharmony in semantic class: two types of verbal products and a group of gods, but Indra does indeed get pleasure and strengthening both from human praises and from the Maruts, who stood by him at the Vṛtra battle (and who also praise him: see, e.g., comm. ad V.52 and my 2006 “Poetic Repair”). My interpr. both solves the *ca* placement problem and also allows *rudrīya-* to refer to its accustomed referent.

A more intractable problem is how to interpr. the loc. relative pronouns in pādas a and c. The standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) seem to take them (it's a little hard to tell) as embedded relatives with the loc. nouns (*ukthēṣu*, etc.) belonging to the main clause whose predicate takes shape in pāda d. The publ. tr. (JPB) takes ab as a separate sentence, supplying an impv. “delight!” as the main cl. verb, governing *ukthēṣu ... rudrīyeṣu ca* and generated from the injunctive pf. *cākān* of the rel. cl. This still leaves the *yāṣu* cl. embedded, since the main clause in cd must include *tūbhýed* that begins c, parallel to *vāyáve* in d. Another wrinkle is the fact that the verbal predicate of this 2nd rel. clause is not finite, but a predicated middle participle (whatever its exact derivational path) *mandasānāḥ* (on which see comm. ad IV.3.6). In favor of the JPB solution is the fact that the *yāṣu* rel. prn. has a clear antecedent in the main clause of cd: nom. pl. *etā(h)*, but it is not clear whether masc. *yēṣu* does. If we take the nominal loc. pls. *ukthēṣu*, etc., as belonging to the main clause, then it does. This seems to be the solution of the standard tr. (e.g., Re's tentative “parmi (?) les hymnes en lesquels tu te complais et parmi (?) les corps-de-louange rudriens ...”).

The rel. cl. problem is compounded by several other factors: 1) that the referent of the fem. nom. pl. *etāh* in c is disputed. Ge (n. 3c) suggests either waters or, with Sāy., praise songs. Old also goes for waters, as does the publ. tr. and, apparently, WG. By contrast, Re: soma drinks; 2) the simile marker *ná* in d is not positioned to mark a simile, and so its contribution to the whole is unclear.

The 2nd issue is, again, easy to deal with. As disc. elsewhere (see comm. ad VIII.76.1) and noted already by Ge, simile-marking *ná* cannot be pāda final. If it would be, it appears to be flipped with its target, as discussed in my “Penultimate *ná* ‘like’ in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism” (ECIEC July 2024). Therefore in this case we can assume an underlying **śubhrā ná* and a conventional simile. As for the 1st, the fem. referent should be something Indra takes pleasure in. Although waters, being feminine and already present in the discourse (2ab), are perhaps the obvious choice, in this type of ritual context waters are not something Indra craves. Re's soma drinks fit this criterion much better: Old points to three other examples of *mandasānā-* in this hymn (14c, 15a, 17a); in the latter two Indra is subject and it is soma drinks that he enjoys. But no standard word, or synonym, for soma is fem.

Having given this more thought than it perhaps deserves, I think I've found a solution to all these various syntactic and referential problems. An imperfect one, but better (in my opinion) than any of the rest. I take the first hemistich as a self-contained rel. cl. – no parts of it belong to the main cl. and there is no embedding. The main cl. is cd; the referent of the rel. *yēṣu* in the main clause is *etāh*, with gender switch – but with semantically the same referent as the *ukthēṣu ... stómeṣu* of ab, namely hymns / praise songs, a word for which should be supplied with *etāh*. This is the Sāy. solution alluded to

above: Sāy. supplies fem. *stutīḥ*; I prefer *gīrah*, which is much more common in the RV. For the phrase *etāḥ* ... *gīrah* see I.25.18. In order to indicate that *yēṣu* and *etāḥ* are coreferential despite the gender switch, the poet inserts after the fem. *etāḥ* a relative clause *yāṣu mandasānāḥ* “in which you are finding exhilaration” that has the same structure as *yēṣu cākān* “in which you delight” in pāda a. The *yāṣu* clause is embedded in the main cl. unfortunately, but the fact that the predicate is a participle, not a finite verb makes the violation less serious. (See my 2022 “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto Izafe.”) Why switch the gender, however? I think it is to accommodate the simile at the end of the vs. There I do think that *śubhrāḥ* refers to waters or rivers – the free-flowing hymns are compared to them, but a masc. in the frame would put the simile off balance. The stem *śubhrā-* is elsewhere used of rivers and waters, and waters serve as subj. to *prā* ... *sisrate* in nearby II.17.3, as Old points out. Unlike all the standard tr., I do not think *vāyāve* belongs in the simile; rather he is parallel (if a bit of an afterthought) to *tūbhya*.

Putting all this together, I suggest a much-emended translation of the whole vs. (leaving out the vocc. for clarity of structure): “In which hymns, praises, and Rudryan (Maruts) you delight – those (songs), in which you are finding exhilaration, flow forth esp. to you, and to Vāyu, like resplendent (waters/rivers).” As noted above, the positioning of *nā* before the simile in prefinal position in the verse line / clause is a regular and robust, if not particularly common, phenomenon.

II.11.4: *śubhrā-*, the last word of vs. 3, becomes the signature word of this vs., found initial in each of the first 3 pādas.

The first two pādas contain two exx. of predicated pres. participles, *vardhāyantāḥ* and *dādhānāḥ*, but unfortunately it’s not clear what they are predicated of. Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. supply “we,” which is a reasonable default, WG “diese Lobreden” (their tr. of *ukthā-*) from 3a, which would entail another gender switch. Since *ukthā-* is neut., the masc. participles would have to refer to masc. *stóma-* in 3b, skipping the fem. in 3c. “We” seems a better choice. In any case, the referents of these participles are not directly reflected in the rest of the verse (save perhaps for *asmé* ‘for us / among us’ in c).

JPB takes c as an independent nominal clause, with ab implicitly subordinated to it. By contrast, all the standard tr. take c with d, with the pf. part. *vāvṛdhānāḥ* expressing anteriority and notional dependence: “... having become strengthened, you should overwhelm ...” Although this alt. is certainly possible, rhetorically c is tightly connected to ab. In ab the unidentified subjects confer *śubhrā-* features on Indra and strengthen him; in c Indra has become *śubhrā-* himself, having become strengthened, with the same root *√vṛdh*. And if the first hemistich has implicit 1st pl. subjects, *asmé* in c refers back to them. So I favor some version of the publ. tr.

II.11.5: I would prefer “wily” or “tricky” to “crafty.”

Pāda c is oddly conceived. The problem is the double object of the pf. part. *tastabhvāṁsam*, namely *apó dyām* “the waters (and) heaven.” The first, in a putative VP *apāḥ* *√stambh*, is perfectly fine, and indeed perfectly fine as a description of Vṛtra. Although *√stambh* ordinarily means ‘prop up, make fast’, in the latter sense it can come to mean ‘stay, block’, with rivers (bzw. waters) as obj. Cf. III.53.9 *āstabhnāt sīndhum arṇavām* “he stayed the river in flood,” depicting Viśvāmitra’s feat in stopping the rivers

to allow Sudās's forces to cross, presented at length in the famous hymn III.33. Also, with *√stambh* in the passive, in VIII.96.18 *tvám síndhūm asṛjas tastabhānān* “you released the rivers, which had been blocked/stayed,” exactly of Indra’s freeing the waters after smiting Vṛtra, as here. But *√stambh* is far more common with *dyām* as object; this VP means “prop up heaven” and is regularly used of one of Indra’s signature cosmogonic deeds – *including* in this sequence of Indra hymns. Cf. in the next (very famous) hymn, II.12.2 *yó dyām ástabhnāt sá janāsa índrah* “who propped up heaven, that, o peoples, is Indra”; II.15.2 *dyām astabhāyad bṛhāntam* “he propped up lofty heaven”; II.17.5 *ástabhnān māyāyā dyām avasrásah* “with his craft he propped up heaven (to keep it) from falling.” It is very strange to assign Indra’s deed and its formulaic expression to Vṛtra. To rescue the phrase, Ge suggests that “heaven” stands for “heaven’s light”; neither Old nor Re (whose tr. in EVP XVII of course lacks notes) comments, nor Klein (DGRV 335), who tr. “the one blocking the waters (and) heaven.” WG tr. “der dazu Wasser und Himmel befestigt hat,” with further glosses in the n.: “mehrdeutig: der Wasser und Himmel gespreizt / zur Festung gemacht / festgebunden / paralysiert hat” – none of which helps with the anomaly of *dyām √stambh* in this context. I find it difficult to imagine that the audience (more alert than us Western commentators), hearing *dyām tastabhāvānsam*, esp. in an Indra hymn, would not immediately associate it with the standard Indra formula and find the attribution of such a deed to Vṛtra (whom Indra will smash in the next pāda) disturbing—twisting the perfectly acceptable *apāḥ √stambh* phrase in a disconcerting direction. But I don’t quite know what to do with this. I would certainly not suggest that they then interpreted this participial phrase to refer to Indra – more that they were forced to rescue it by a semantic reconfiguration, perhaps like the one Ge suggests -- though nowhere else that I’m aware of is Vṛtra credited with blocking the light of heaven.

In any case, against the publ. tr., I would take the pf. part. as expressing anteriority – “having blocked / who had blocked the waters and heaven.”

II.11.6: It seems strange to begin pādas a, c, and d with 1st sg. *stávā*, but b with the 1st plural *stávāma*, which is also not initial. There is some phonetic play between a and b: *stávā (n)ú ta v. utá stavā(ma)*, with *nūtanā* figuring later in b. The mirror-image openings of the two pādas might at least account for the position of *stavāma*.

II.11.7: The three augmented aorists in this vs. are striking, esp. because two of them are extremely marginal in the grammar: the *s*-aor. seen in *asvāṛṣṭām* (*√svar*) is found otherwise in the RV only as 3rd sg. *ásvār* in late X.148.5; *áramsta* is the only form of this *s*-aor. in the RV. Both have well-attested 1st cl. present stems with the same meaning, and it is, at first, surprising in this narrative context that we don’t find imperfects. But as IH suggested to me, if we follow the interpr. of the hymn in the publ. intro. and in Brereton 1985, whereby the apparent events of the mythic past—the spreading out of the earth, the coming to rest of the mountain—actually refer to the ritual here-and-now, esp. the establishment of the fire, then the augmented aorists will force an immediate past interpr. and therefore reveal the poet’s intent behind the apparent recital of mythic events.

What it means for a cry to be dripping with ghee and why it’s the horses’ cry are unclear to me.

I would be inclined to take *cid* with *sariṣyān*, rather than with *párvataḥ*, hence “the mountain, though about to run, came to rest,” rather than “even the mountain ...” Note the use of the future participle to express past prospective value in subordination to a preterital main verb and see comm. ad 10b below.

II.11.8: After the three augmented aorists in the previous vs. and with *akrān* in pāda b, the injunctive *sādi* in pāda a is a little surprising, esp. since this pāda seems to describe the same action as 7d. I wonder whether the poet is playing a trick: the negated participle *áprayuchan* almost seems to have the augment we expect in **asādi* but transposed to the next word (and of course etymologically and functionally quite distinct). Note that *áprayuchan* occupies the same metrical position as the aor. *áprathiṣṭa* in 7c (the immediately preceding hemistich) and shares the same first two syllables.

The *s*-aor. *akrān* in b should be tr. “has roared” to match the other augmented aorists in the immediate context.

The lexeme *ní* \sqrt{prath} occurs only here in the RV and, at least according to Mon.-Wms., in all of Sanskrit. This isolation makes it all the more difficult to figure out what is going on in pāda d, since the reference of the almost equally isolated *dhamáni-* is unclear. (But see below.) Note the placement of the preverb *ní* after the verb *paprathan* at the end of the verse, an almost mirror image of the opening of the vs. *ní* *párvataḥ*. This vs.-final *paprathan* *ní* is also echoed by the end of the 1st hemistich in the next vs. *asphuran* *níh*. Both verbs precede their preverbs, but despite having apparently identical endings, *-an*, the first is a real 3rd pl. *-an*, where *asphuran* represents 3rd sg. *asphurat* in sandhi. On *paprathan* and related forms, see comm. ad VII.86.1. Although it might be possible to interpr. it as subjunctive here, a preterital reading works better, esp. given aug. *aprathiṣṭa* in the previous vs., 7c.

The 2nd hemistich is quite baffling. It bears a superficial resemblance to X.49.6cd and is adduced with regard to that passage by Old ad X.49.6. However, the two passages do not illuminate each other; see comm. ad X.49.6. More helpful is III.30.10, adduced by Ge. That passage has to do with the opening of the Vala cave; its last pāda reads *prāvan* *vāṇīh* *puruhūtām* *dhámantīh* “The choir (of Aṅgirases) aided the much-invoked one [=Indra], blowing (on their instruments),” containing both *vāṇī-* and a form of \sqrt{dham} ‘blow’, like *vāṇī-* and the mysterious noun *dhamáni-* here. This poorly attested noun (RV 1x; more common in AV; in general see EWA s.v. *DHAM*) seems to mean ‘tube, (blood) vessel’ in the AV, but this is most likely a semantic extension based on physical shape. The noun, derived from \sqrt{dham} ‘blow’, was, in the first instance, a nom. act., as *-áni-* nouns generally are (e.g., *vártani-* ‘turning’ → ‘track/course’; AiG II.2.207), with the sense ‘blowing’, but then could have been concretized to a (musical) pipe or primitive flute into which the performer blows, to whose shape a vein or tube could be likened. The abstract sense is still found in our passage; as in III.30.10, it’s used in reference to the (musical) noise the Aṅgirases made to open the Vala cave. I would now render cd “Amplifying their voice to the furthest distance [i.e., making themselves heard that far], they [=Aṅgirases] spread the blast that was impelled by Indra.” I substitute ‘blast’ for ‘blowing’ because the latter makes no sense in that English sentence, though unfortunately ‘blast’ is not all that much better – it’s meant to evoke noise. I also fail to tr. *ní*, since it also makes for semantic complications. As I said above, I think vs.-final *ní* may be here to match vs.-init. *ní* in a phonetic figure with *par-* / *pra-*. If it does have

semantic content, it may mean that the Aṅgirases directed their noise down into the cave. Since the cows are always elsewhere depicted as being driven up out of the cave (see, e.g., nearby II.14.3 *yó gā udājad ápa hí valám váh*), presumably the cave is below ground. Because the hemistich seems to concern the Vala myth, I supply the Aṅgirases as subj. – against the Maruts, favored by most of the standard tr. Although most of the mythological material in this hymn is concerned with the Vṛtra battle (though for Vala see 20d), it is very difficult to fit this vs. into that paradigm; the Vala myth works much better.

II.11.9–10: The final pāda of 9 is almost identical to the first one in 10: the case of *vájrā-* is different, and there are two different intensive forms, to different roots, with different morphological identities (gen. part. *kánikradataḥ*, impf. *ároravīt*), and different subjects (bull / mace) – but the intensives are essentially synonymous and the effect is the same. This is an extreme example of the chaining found off and on in the hymn (see above).

II.11.9: I'd substitute “wily” for “crafty.”

II.11.10: It is unusual to find a subjunctive *nijūrvāt* in a subord. clause whose main cl. has an imperfect intensive (*ároravīt*). The publ. tr. renders it as “was about to grind down” -- this seems pretty close to target, though I'd probably substitute rather “was going to” -- a past prospective. Sāy. simply glosses with a desiderative *jighāṃsatīty arthaḥ*. Of course, the *-āt* isn't metrically guaranteed and could have been introduced from *vájrāt* at the end of 9d, so it is possible that the form was simply injunc. **nijūrvat*. Nonetheless, though the usage of the subjunctive here is unusual, I think it can be reconciled with the function of the subjunctive more generally. Note that its function is very much parallel to that of the future participle *sariṣyān* in 7d.

Both *nijūrvāt* and *papivān* are means of indicating anteriority here.

I would prefer “wiles of the wily” (or “tricks of the tricky,” as in I.32.4) to “crafts of the crafty.”

II.11.11: On *kuksí-* as ‘cheek’, not ‘belly’, see comm. ad X.28.2, etc.

In d JPB takes *paurā* as *pauré* out of sandhi, as a PN – contra the Pp and the standard tr. In VIII.61.6 I take it as ‘multiplier’ (of Indra) in a pun with *purukṛt-*. In VIII.50.5 a clear loc. shows the sense that JPB wants. In V.74.4 there are three exx., one apparently a PN, the other also apparently a pun on *puru-* (JPB tr. ‘muchness’). I'd be inclined here to take it in non-PN fashion, either as loc. “in its muchness” or modifying *soma*: “soma, multiplied” (to *puru*) or perhaps more likely, given *prṇántah* in c, ‘filling’ or ‘in its fullness’. In our passage Ge tr. “Füller,” Re “fait pour beaucoup (d’exploits),” WG as “Paura” (with several different interpr. possibilities registered in the notes) – all as nom.

II.11.12: I would tr. “have abided in you,” not “by.”

I would tr. *dhīmahi* in c as ‘acquire’ -- the idea being that we want to get a *prásasti-* from our actions performed with Indra’s help. Against the standard interpr. as root aor. opt. to $\sqrt{dhā}$, WG seem to assign the verb to $\sqrt{dhī}$ (“... erblicken wir unsere

Preislieder”), but there is no such root formation to $\sqrt{dhī}$, whereas *dhīmahi* to $\sqrt{dhā}$ is remarkably well attested.

Pāda d is a variant of 1d, as pointed out by Ge.

II.11.13: Pāda a is syntactically very fussy: *syāma té ta indra yé ta ūtī*, with two nominal clauses each with its own enclitic *te*, a predicative instr. in the rel. cl., and the “may we be those who ...” construction that defies fluent Engl. tr. If the Engl. seems awk, blame it on the Skt!

Pāda b contains another predicated pres. participle, *vardháyantah*.

The spltv. *śuṣmíntamam* responds to *śuṣma-* in 4a, while *yám cākánāma* echoes *yéṣu cākán* in 3a. Although the publ. tr. treats cd as if *yám cākánāma* were embedded, it’s a perfectly standard preposed rel. cl., though awk. to render: “in which most explosive (thing) we will take delight – (that) wealth consisting of heroic men grant to us.”

II.11.14: The *rāsi* of 13d is not only chained with *rāsi* in 14a, but repeated twice more in the hemistich, always clause initial.

The affiliation and reference of the nominal rel. cl. in c are disputed. Let us begin with the fact that this pāda contains yet another predicated pres. part., *mandasānāḥ*. It cannot belong with the main cl. verb in d, *pānti*, because it modifies a rel. prn. *yé*, and *pānti* is unaccented. The question is whether c is a preposed definitional cl. of the type “(Those) who (c) ..., they (d) ...” The *ca* would then be a clausal conjunction, loosely connecting c with the first hemistich. This is how the publ. tr. takes it, as do Re and JSK (DGRV I.224). However, c could also be more strongly connected to pāda b and participate in an “X [acc.] and which Y ...” construction, where the referents of *yé* would be a conjoined obj. with *śárdhah ... mārutam* of *rāsi*: “Grant us the Marutian warrior band and (those) who are jointly finding exhilaration” – whatever the referents of *yé*. This is Ge’s interpr. As for the referent of *yé*, he sneaks in an “alle” (“und alle, die einträchtig (mit dir) sich berauschen”) and in n. 14c says that *yé* includes the Vāyus (but is not limited to them?). I confess I prefer this syntactic analysis, among other things because it keeps *ca* as a subclausal conjunction. Ge’s “all” is illegitimate, but his suggestion that the *yé* clause refers to the Vāyus is certainly worth considering (see below). (The WG tr. seems more or less of the first type, but takes *ca* as conjoining the adj. *sajóṣasāḥ* and *mandasānāḥ* and also seems to take the antecedent of *yé* as the Maruts [number disagreement, though that wouldn’t be fatal], but *yé* as the subj. of *pānti*, which is fatal, syntactically. In other words, their tr. is a mess.)

The pl. of *vāyú-* is puzzling. The functional distribution of the two words for ‘wind’, *vāyú-* and *vāta-*, is generally pretty clearcut: Vāyu is the god, *vāta-* usually the natural phenomenon. There are over 100 singular forms of *vāyú-*, but only six plurals. (I explain the supposed acc. pl. *vāyūn* in IX.97.14 differently from Gr/Lub [see comm. ad loc.]; Gr’s nom. pl. interpr. of *vāyáva* in sandhi in VII.92.4 is really the dat. *vāyáve*.) Besides the form here, there is one other nom. pl. (X.46.7, a difficult passage; see comm. ad loc.) and four instr. pl. *vāyúbhīḥ* (IX.84.4 and three times in the same hymn, VIII.7.3, 4, 17). All these pl. forms in context refer to the natural phenomenon, lower-case ‘wind’. Our passage is different, though, and conceptually problematic. Pāda d depicts a very familiar ritual situation: the god Vāyu receives the first drink of soma at the morning pressing; this is unequivocally signaled here by *pānti ágraṇītīm* (whatever the problems

with *pānti* ; see below). But in a ritual setting, there should be only singular Vāyu – there is elsewhere no corporate group of Vāyus (like Ādityas or Vasus); the ritual scenario in d is quite anomalous. I don't have a full solution to this conundrum, but I can point the way towards one. The hymn containing the three instr. pl. (that is, half of the occurrences of pl. *vāyú-*) is a Marut hymn. In it the Maruts perform various actions “along with the winds.” In our passage I think the referent of *yé* in c is the winds, the natural phenomena, who act along with – and presumably take pleasure along with – the Maruts, who are the object of *pāda* b and with whom the *yé* in c is conjoined. But the vs. segues into the ritual in the final *pāda* and the poet allows the paradoxical plural to stand, an uneasy compromise between the natural winds and the ritual Wind. (Recall that sg. *vāyáve* was a ritual recipient in 3d.)

The primary ending on *pānti* is disturbing: the context requires a connection with $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’, but that root forms a root *aorist*. For another such form see I.134.5 and comm. ad loc. As noted there, these anomalous forms could be root aor. subjunctives; this could then mean “will drink.”

I would now emend the tr. of bcd to “Grant us the Marutian warrior band, o Indra, and (those [=Winds]) who are jointly finding exhilaration (with them=Maruts). The Winds (will) drink the first offering.”

II.11.15–17: These three vss. all begin X *ín nú*, strongly emphasizing the X.

II.11.15: And another -- or rather the same *mandasānāh* -- in the nominal rel. clause introduced by *yéṣu*. See 3c and 14c, as well as 17a. Given this insistent repetition, all these forms should have the same tr., and I would change “becoming exhilarated” here to “finding exhilaration.” I would also change “among whom” to “in which.”

Though there is no overt chaining between 14d and 15a, the phrase *yé ca mandasānāh* in 14c is almost exactly repeated in 15a *yéṣu mandasānāh*. I also wonder if *vyántu* (unfortunately probably not distracted, though Gr marks it so) doesn't slightly echo *vāyávah* in 14d.

There are several missing, and therefore, disputed referents in this *pāda*, namely the subj. and goal of *vyántu*. I think JPB, flg. Ge, is correct that the subj. is soma drinks (so also Re) and the goal is you (=Indra). Sāy. and WG differ.

On the hapax *drahýát* see EWA s.v. *DARH*.

Pāda c lacks a verb. JPB supplies “be” and Re “come”; I'm inclined to follow Old, Ge (WG) in supplying a form of $\sqrt{vr dh}$ ‘strengthen’, generated from *ávardhayah* beginning d. Ge suggests the impv. *vardhaya* (as opposed to the pret. of Old and WG). I prefer the impv. because it seems more likely that we're asking for Indra's strengthening than describing past occurrence of it. But it would be possible simply to read *ávardhayah* with both *pādas*: “you strengthened us in battles (and) strengthened heaven ...” I would in any case change “have strengthened” to “strengthened,” since the impf. doesn't usually have that sense and the strengthening of heaven should have happened quite awhile ago.

The emended tr. of cd: “(Strengthen) us in battles, surpassing one – you strengthened heaven ...”

II.11.16: In order to avoid a lengthy embedded rel. cl., starting with *yé* in *pāda* a and lasting through c as the publ. tr. has it, I would reconfigure the publ. tr.: either by taking

brhánta ín nú as a predicated nom. cl. on which the *yé* clause is dependent, or by taking all of abc as the rel. cl. signaled by *yé*. The two alt. would be “Just they are lofty who ...” and “Which lofty ones ...” I prefer the former because of the emphatic *íd*, and it is tr. this way by Ge, Re, WG, and JSK (DGRV II.166). The d pāda is then a separate clause.

Pādas bc also have an “inverse” *vā*, i.e., a construction X *vā* ... Y – but with the added twist that X and Y are not syntactically parallel: X is a bare instr. (*ukthébhih* “by hymns”), while Y is a complex participle phrase that occupies the whole of pāda c: *stṛṇānāśo barhīh pastyāvat*. Ge simply fails to render the *vā* (or rather vaguely renders it as “etwa”), but the other tr. capture the *vā* one way or another.

Emended tr. “Just they are lofty who seek to win your favor either through hymns or (by) strewing the ritual grass that provides (you) a dwelling place. Aided by you, they have come to the prize, Indra.”

II.11.17: The fourth and final occurrence of *mandasāná-*. Again I would change the tr. to “finding exhilaration in ...”

II.11.18: The subtle differences in accent: although both *avābhīnat* (init. in b) and *ápāvṛnoh* (init. in c) are 2nd sg. aug. impfs. with Indra as subj., only the first belongs in the rel. cl. introduced by *yéna*, because it is accented on the verb; the second begins a new main cl., because it is accented on the preverb. All the standard tr. correctly represent this.

I would slightly alter the tr. of *ní ... sādi* from the “aoristic” “has been set down” to “was set down / sank down,” since the action seems to be in the same chronological and conceptual realm as the other deeds of Indra presented in the imperfect in b and c. Note esp. the standard polarization between *ārya-* (c) and *dásyu-* (d), which is found again in the next vs. (19b). See *ní ... sādi* in 8a, though – where the action is both mythical and (possibly, per JPB) ritual and might be properly rendered, with JPB, as “has been set down” (though I’m somewhat dubious).

II.11.19: As Old also notes, the first pāda is a reworking and fleshing out of 13a *syāma* (*té ta indra*) *yé te ūtī* – here *sánema* *yé ta ūtībhīs* (*tárantah*), with both the main cl. and the rel. cl. provided with more content in this vs. than in 13. Note yet another predicated pres. part. (*tárantah*) – unless we accept Ge’s configuration of the vs., whereby all of ab is a rel. cl. and *sánema* is within its domain, the main cl. being cd: “(We) who might win, overcoming with your help ..., to us ...” (I think WG also follow this route, but with some twists.) Because of the rhetorical echo of 13a, I prefer the syntactic analysis of the publ. tr. (also Re).

The publ. tr. “overcoming all rivals, (all) Dasyus along with the Ārya” is misleading, since it sounds like the Ārya is included in the group we are overcoming. Instead we are doing this with the help of the Ārya: rephrase as “we who by your help, along with the Ārya, (are) overcoming ...”

In c “it was for us that you ...” rather than “that was for us: that you” The former sounds more idiomatic.

The vrddhi deriv. *sākhyá-* is found only here in the RV, and it is also isolated syntactically in its clause – a gen. with nothing obvious to govern it. JPB’s ‘one of your circle of companions’ is more or less a direct tr. of Re’s “(qui appartient à) notre cercle-

d'amis." Ge by contrast supplies a genitive of Tvaṣṭar, dependent on *viśvarūpam*, who is then qualified as being friendly with Indra (or so I understand Ge; see his bottom-of-the-page n. 1) – so, transformed into dubious English: "... Tvaṣṭarian Viśvarūpa, (son) of companionable (Tvaṣṭar)." This seems over-complex, and the companionship of Indra and Tvaṣṭar is not standard fare – quite the reverse. Although the Re interpr. seems to me to fudge the case relation between Trita and this gen., it may be the best we can do, though "circle of friends/companions" is misleadingly specific. Perhaps better "Trita of (our) comradely (band)."

II.11.20: On the gen. with $\sqrt{vṛdh}$, see Old, who also adduces V.20.2. In our passage gen. complements of verbs of consumption ("drink," etc.) may have played a part. The first three genitives in pāda a refer to the soma, the last (*tritāsyā*) to Trita as the presser of soma; see Old on this as well. The long gen. phrase in the publ. tr. is somewhat hard to parse; I might substitute "having grown strong on this exhilarating pressing of Trita's."

What's going on in pāda c is unclear; see Ge's n. 20c. JPB takes it as referring to a different episode in Indra's heroic biography: making Namuci's head roll like a wheel, found in passages like V.30.7 ... *námuceḥ sírah* ... *ávartayah*, with the same verb. Although it's certainly possible that this pāda is a glancing allusion to that myth – and since the next pāda is about a different myth entirely, skipping from Arbuda to Namuci wouldn't be surprising – it still lacks both Namuci and his head. Given the presence of the sun and the wheel, this could also be an allusion to the episode when Indra tears off the wheel of the Sun's chariot, as in I.130.9 *sūraś cákram prá vṛhat*, but the verb is different and *sūryah* in our passage is stubbornly nom. On the whole I think it's best to supply as little as possible here and would tr. (with Ge, Re) "he made (it) roll like the Sun its wheel" or, possibly, with WG, "he made the wheel roll like the sun." I would further point out that the hymn has numerous occurrences of *vardháya-*, starting in vs. 1, along with other forms of $\sqrt{vṛdh}$, including in pāda b, and *vartáya-* may be a bit of phonological play and ring composition.

II.11.21: On remarked medial opt. *duhīya+t*, see comm. ad IV.41.5.

This vs. is repeated as the final vs. of a series of other Gr̄tsamada Indra hymns:
II.15.10=16.9=17.9=18.9=19.9=20.9.

II.11 complete (incorporating my modifications)

1. Hear our summons, Indra! Don't fail! We would be those to be given good things by you.

For these nourishments, like flowing rivers, strengthen you in their quest for good things.

2. You let loose the great (waters), Indra, which you swelled—the many (waters) surrounded by the serpent [=Vṛtra], o warrior.

You cut down the Dāsa [=Vṛtra], even though he thought he was deathless, when you had become strong through the hymns.

3. In which hymns, praises, and Rudryan (Maruts) you delight, o warrior Indra – those (songs), in which you are finding exhilaration, flow forth especially to you, and to Vāyu, like resplendent (waters/rivers).

4. Now (that we) are strengthening your resplendent explosiveness, are placing in your arms your resplendent mace,

resplendent are you, Indra, as you have become strong among us. Along with the sun, you should overcome the Dāsa clans.

5. The one placed in hiding, the hidden one hiding amid the waters, the wily one dwelling under cover,

and the one who had blocked the waters and heaven—(that) serpent you smashed, o warrior, through your heroism.

6. Now I shall praise your ancient, great deeds, Indra, and we shall praise your present deeds.

I shall praise the eager mace in your arms. I shall praise your fallow bays, twin beacons of the sun.

7. Now your two fallow bays, competing for the prize, Indra, have cried out their cry, dripping with ghee.

The land has spread out equally in all directions. The mountain, though about to run, has come to rest.

8. The mountain, never faltering, has been set down. Bellowing with its mothers, it has roared.

Amplifying their voice to the furthest distance [i.e., making themselves heard that far], they [=Aṅgirases] spread the blast that was impelled by Indra.

9. Indra kicked away wily Vṛtra, who was lying upon the great river.

The two worlds trembled in fear before the mace of him, the bull roaring and roaring again.

10. The mace of him, the bull, bellowed again and again when (Indra), the ally of Manu, was going to grind down (Vṛtra), the enemy of Manu.

He brought low the wiles of the wily son of Dānu, when he had drunk of the pressed soma.

11. Drink and drink the soma, o warrior Indra! May the exhilarating soma-pressings exhilarate you.

As they fill your cheeks, let them strengthen you. When properly pressed in its fullness, (the soma) has helped Indra.

12. We inspired poets have abided in you, Indra. Serving according to the truth, we would gain insight.

Seeking your help, we would acquire a proclamation of your praise. On this very day, we would be those to be given wealth by you.

13. Indra, we would belong to you as those who are with your help, since, seeking your help, we are making your nourishment strong.

That most explosive (thing) in which we will take delight, o god—that wealth consisting of heroic men grant to us.

14. Grant us peaceful dwelling. Grant us alliance. Grant us the Marutian warrior band, o Indra,

and (those [=Winds]) who are jointly finding exhilaration (with them=Maruts). The Winds (will) drink the first offering.

15. Now let just those (soma juices) pursue (you)—those in which (you) are finding exhilaration. Steadfastly drink soma to your satisfaction, Indra.

(Strengthen) us in battles, surpassing one. You strengthened heaven through lofty chants.

16. Just they are lofty who seek to win your favor either through hymns, o surpassing one,

or (by) strewing the ritual grass that provides (you) a dwelling place. Aided by you, they have come to the prize, Indra.

17. Now, finding exhilaration in just these powerful (soma drops), o warrior, drink the soma among the Trikadrukas, Indra,

again and again shaking out (the soma) in your beard, becoming pleased. Travel to the soma drinking with your two fallow bays.

18. Take to yourself the vast power, o warrior, by which you cut down Vṛtra, the son of Dānu, that son of a spider!

You uncovered the light for the Ārya; the Dasyu sank down to the left, Indra.

19. We would win! — we who by your help, along with the Ārya, (are) overcoming all rivals, (all) Dasyus..

It was for us that you made Viśvarūpa, son of Tvaṣṭar, submit to Trita, one of (our) comradely (band).

20. Having grown strong on this exhilarating pressing of Trita's, he laid low Arbuda.

He made (it) roll like the Sun its wheel. Together with the Aṅgirases, Indra split the Vala-cave.

21. Now should the generous priestly gift yield your boon for the singer as its milk, Indra.

Exert yourself for the praise singers. Let fortune not pass us by. -- May we speak loftily at the ritual distribution, in possession of good heroes.

II.12–15 Indra [SJ on JPB]

The first three of these hymns can be usefully read together as different ways to handle a templatic structure. II.12 is the most tightly structured, with a brief, repeated refrain preceded by definitional relative clauses. II.13 explores ways of varying a fairly fixed refrain, while II.14 uses the definitional rel. clauses of II.12 in conjunction with widely different ways of realizing a semantically fixed, but lexically and syntactically fluid, refrain. The hymns are stylistically richer when read together, and one cannot help thinking that the poet(s) saw these as interrelated experiments in structure. II.15 also has a refrain: it is fixed and occupies the entire last pāda and shows none of the intricate connections to the rest of the vs. nor the variations found in II.12–14.

II.12 Indra [SJ on JPB]

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is one of the most famous and most translated hymns of the RV, esp. outside of the “philosophical” hymns. Even more notable than its collection of Indra's great deeds and powers is the tight structure in which they are corralled. Each vs. but the last (15) ends with the post-caesura nominal-clause refrain *sá janāsa īndrah* “he, o peoples, is Indra” (or, as I'm always tempted to render it, in Looney Tunes style, “that, folks, is Indra”). Preceding the refrain in each vs. is a series of definitional relative clauses, in which the relative pronoun, in whatever case (usually nom., occasionally gen., acc., instr., or abl.) always refers to Indra and the clause reads like an (easily solved) riddle. Although not particularly notable syntactically, this

structure – defining rel. cl, identifying main cl. – seems to be a stylistic feature of archaic Indo-European literature; see my disc. in “Draupadī on the Walls of Troy” (1994, Classical Antiquity 13), also *RV between Two Worlds*, 68–69; *RV Guide*, 146–49. On the breaking up of this pattern towards the end of the hymn, see comm. ad vs. 15 below.

Esp. at the beginning of the hymn, the deeds are narrated with augmented imperfects, alternating with perfects. See esp. the string of imperfects *paryábhūṣat* (1b), *abhyaṣetām* (1c), *ádr̥ṇhat* (2a), *áramṇāt* (2b), *ástabhnāt* (2d), *árināt* (3a), *udājat* (3b), all but one 3rd sg. act., near-rhymes *-at* and *āt*.

II.12.1: Interestingly, this is the only occurrence of *mánasvant-* in the RV. The tr. ‘thinker’ for me conjures up a more intellectual and contemplative figure than quite suits Indra, but I’m not sure what to substitute: ‘mindful’, which is a reasonably literal translation, runs into interference from New Age, neo/pseudo-Buddhist terminology. Here I think the idea is that even when just born he had a functioning mind -- he is precocious not only physically but mentally.

On the hapax verb *ábhyaṣetām*, see EWA II.246 and Gotō (1st class, 224–25). Gotō plausibly suggests that because the dual impf. to the standard 1st class pres. to $\sqrt{bhī}$, $*ábhayetām$, would not fit the cadence, this nonce form was created, based on the archaic *s*-stem *bh(i)yás-*, whose acc. *bh(i)yásam* twice has to be read disyllabically, incl. once in II (II.28.6) -- though the derivational pathway from *s*-stem noun to simple thematic present built to a pseudo-root \sqrt{bhyas} isn’t straightforward. On the “repair” of this verb in vs. 13 and the ring-compositional relationship between 1c and 13ab, see comm. ad vs. 13. In order to highlight this echo, I would substituted “feared” for “trembled in fear” and “from whose explosiveness” for “before ...”

II.12.2: Notice the ever-levitating sequence of objects: earth, mountains, midspace, heaven, from lowest to highest.

On *dyām ástabhnāt* see comm. ad II.11.5.

II.12.3: The hapax *apadhā* is probably, flg. Old (and accepted by most; see Scar 250), an instr. of a root noun. As Old also points out, *ápa* $\sqrt{dhā}$ must here be a formulaic variant of *ápa* \sqrt{vr} ‘uncover’, a signature verb of the Vala myth. Old tellingly adduces nearby II.14.3 *yó gā udājad ápa hí valáṃ vāḥ*, whose pre-caesura clause is identical to ours here. The alternative lexeme may have been used here because a root noun to \sqrt{vr} , *vṛ-t-* with empty *-t* as always with roots ending in short resonants, risks being mistaken for a root noun to $\sqrt{vṛt}$. Note that the phrase *apadhā valásya* illustrates the constraint on root-noun compounding that I discussed in my 2025 article “Limits on Root-noun Compounding in Indo-Iranian” (Fs. Kellens), whereby a root noun can be compounded with a preverb or a nominal but not both, and so the nominal must form a syntagm with the PREV- \sqrt{NOUN} , as here.

Because starting fires with stones is not the standard method in the RV -- it usually involves fire *sticks* -- I think the “between the two stones” (*áśmanor antár*) probably refers to the two world halves between which fire would appear, perhaps in addition to stones struck against each other to produce sparks. If I am correct that this is a reference to the world-halves, it would provide some support to the claim that the meaning ‘heaven’ for this etymon, attested in both branches of Old Iranian (*asman-* in

both YAves and OP), was pan-Indo-Iranian, a contested claim (see EWA s.v. *áśman-*, esp. p. 138). AS suggests that, given Indra's penchant for giving birth to the sun (see, e.g., 7c *yáh sūryam ... jajāna*), "fire" could stand for "sun" here.

On *sam* \sqrt{vrj} see comm. ad VIII.75.12, X.61.17 and Scar 504, as well as Th, *Gedichte* 24 n. 5.

Note *samvýk samátsu sa* ...

II.12.4: After the dominance of augmented imperfects in vss. 1–3 (see hymn intro. above), with a sprinkling of perfects (*vimamé* 2c, *jajāna* 3c), this vs. switches to augmented aorists: *ákah* in b and the re-marked medial root aorist *āda-t* in c, as well as a predicated past part. *kṛtāni* in pāda a. In my view pāda a summarizes the cosmogonic and mythological deeds depicted in the first three vss. before turning to activities closer to home, and I would render *kṛtāni* as "were done." JPB takes pāda a as prefiguring what follows in the vs. (hence the colon, flg. Th Gedicht.) and tr. *kṛtāni* as "have been done." (Either interpr. of *kṛtā-* is possible in principle.) As I see it, after the summary of pāda a, the next two pādas move to deeds Indra performed in the human sphere and therefore in more recent times, making the switch to the aorist appropriate. This shift to the recent past in turn provides the transition to the treatment of Indra's current help in the next vss.

cyávana- is ordinarily agentive, 'rousing, rouser', but there is no escaping the sense 'exploit, deed' here (like its fellow derivative *cyautná-*). Perhaps the semantic development is by way of "stirring (deed)" or sim.

I find the tr. "has put ... below and hidden away" somewhat awk, and would rephrase as the slightly less awk. "who has made the Dāsa color/tribe hidden below."

As is well known, the apparent thematic active *ādat* is a pseudo-activization of the medial idiom *ā* $\sqrt{dā}$ 'take, acquire'. On two possible pathways of formation, see comm. ad V.32.8. Once the 3rd sg. *ādat* was established (4x, incl. X.68.6 not registered by Gr, but so identified in Lub), other paradigmatic forms could be built: 1st sg. *ādam* (1x), 2nd sg. *ādas* (1x), 1st pl. *ādāma* (1x).

Note the well-known *arí-* / *dāsa-* contrast here.

II.12.4–5: The phrases *aryáh puṣṭāni* (4d) and *aryáh puṣṭih* (5c) with, respectively, ppl. and fem. abstract to $\sqrt{puṣ}$, both in the plural, do not seem to differ from each other semantically or functionally. The only possible (but weak) motivations I can see for the use of different stems are 1) metrical (neut. pl. *puṣṭāni* would not fit in 5c; however, the shorter neut. pl. form *puṣṭā* would), and 2) gender matching between simile and frame. We don't know the gender of the root noun pl. *víjah* 'stakes', but it is clearly not neut. If it is underlyingly fem., *puṣṭih* would be a better match. For *aryáh puṣṭá-*, see loc. pl. *aryáh puṣṭéṣu* in the Vṛṣākapi hymn, X.86.1. That the ppl. is used in this phrase elsewhere suggests that the ppl. is the more idiomatic form in this phrase.

II.12.5: This vs. breaks the strict patterning of the hymn in several ways. Although it begins as expected with a rel. clause, with the rel. referring to Indra, the rest of the vs. exits the rel. construction, first with pāda b uneasily paralleling pāda a (see immed. below) and more radically with a declarative main-cl. statement about Indra in c and, even worse, a kind of breaking of the fourth wall in d, with an impv. addressed to the audience (*śrád asmai dhatta* "put your trust in him"). Besides the voc. *janāsaḥ* in the

refrain, this is the only intrusion of the 2nd ps. until the final vs. 15. See also 13ab for another evasion of the rel.

Pādas a and b are structured identically (save for one significant feature: see below). They both have an embedded *íti*-marked quotation:

kúha sá íti / naíṣó asti íti

in a clause beginning and ending with a discontinuous acc. phrase:

yám ... ghorám / īm ... enam

governed by a 3rd pl. verb with unspecified subj.:

prchánti / āhuḥ

However the two pādas are syntactically non-parallel in a crucial way: the first is a relative clause with accented verb, the second is non-relative with an unaccented verb. But they are conjoined by *utá*, which is ordinarily a coordinating conjunction. Klein (DGRV I.372–73) says *utá* here shows uncharacteristically “weak nexus” in transition from rel. clause to main cl – a statement that describes, but does not explain. I think the strict formal parallelism of a and b is meant to be in tension with their syntactic mismatch and also prepares the way for the more serious breaches in cd. (PS also suggests that this kind of loose reversion to a main clause might be characteristic of oral style, which the embedded quotes also mark.)

Although in answer to the question in pāda a *kúha sá* “where is he?” we might expect *naíṣó asti* to mean “he is not (here),” I prefer the existential “he does not exist” of the publ. tr. (as do all the standard tr.) for two reasons. In main clauses the pres. copula *asti* is almost always existential, and, furthermore, doubts about Indra’s existence are expressed elsewhere in the RV. See the answer to this in vs. 15 below. The *śrád ... dhatta* of d implicitly answers this existential doubt. This makes pāda c something of an intrusion, and it also essentially repeats/rephrases 4cd.

Pāda c meter: the transmitted text has a 12-syl. line with a Triṣṭubh cadence. Arnold and Oldenberg read *só 'ryáḥ*, with a triple-light break *víja i(vā)*. HvN instead apherisize *iva* to *'va* as is common in MIA and sometimes found in the RV. Either of these produces an acceptable Triṣṭubh line. There is another possibility, which is sort of a version of Arnold/Old.: to read *sāryáḥ*, with coalescence of *sá* with following *a-*, rather like *séti* in pāda a < *sá + í-*. Transmitted *só aryáḥ* would be a redactional restoration. I favor this third way.

II.12.6: This vs. firmly reestablishes the rel. pattern, with four occurrences of nom. sg. *yáḥ*, though the one in pāda c is (playfully?) syncopated, occurring immediately after the caesura rather than initial in the pāda.

It is uncertain whether there are two figures being invigorated in b, the formulator and the weak one needing help, or whether the formulator is himself in need. JPB seems to favor the two-figure interpr.; most standard tr. the single figure. I am more or less indifferent, though weakly favor the single figure. In any case, b transitions from pāda a, which depicts unfortunate figures (“the enfeebled,” “the starving,” matching “the weak one needing help”), to cd with its ritual performers: the one with the yoked pressing stone and pressed soma, who pick up the formulator of b.

On the sense of *kīrī-* see comm. ad V.52.12.

Because *yuktá-grāvnah* (c) and *sutá-somasya* (d) are identically formed, I would prefer a parallel rendering: “of the one who has yoked the pressing stone, who has pressed the soma.”

II.12.7: This vs. is even more insistent on the rel. structure than 6, containing seven rel. prns., two each in a, b, c, and an additional one in d (see vs. 14 for identical distrib.). The first hemistich lacks a verb or verb substitute; it is governed by the loc. construction *yásya ... pradísi* “under whose direction.”

Since c reverts to cosmogonic deeds, I would tr. *jajāna* as “gave birth.”

II.12.8: For *krándas-* as ‘war-cry’ and du. *krándasī* referring to the opposing sides in battle producing war-cries, see Th, KZ 92 (1978).

Note *samyatī vihvayete*, picked up, at least conceptually, but *samānám ... nānā*.

For *nānā* see my disc. in the Hock Fs. “RV *sá hināyám* (VI.48.2) with a Return Visit to *nāyám* and *nānā*,” in *Grammatica et Verba, Glamor and Verve: Studies in South Asian, Historical, and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Hans Henrich Hock*, ed. Shu-Fen Chen and Benjamin Slade, 2013. I follow Th’s 1949 explanation of the form as an āmredita involving the expected nom. sg. of *nṛ-* ‘man’, otherwise unattested in Vedic. For reasons given in my article I prefer this account to Klein’s (2004) derivation from a pronominal āmredita **anā-anā* → **anānā* “in this way (here), in that way (there)” (Jared S. Klein, “Nominal and adverbial āmreditas and the etymology of R̥gvedic *nānā*,” in *The Vedas: Text, Language & Ritual. Proceedings of the Third International Vedic Workshop, Leiden 2002*, ed. Arlo Griffiths and Jan E. M. Houben, 251-60). A sense “every man for himself” would be quite appropriate here.

II.12.9: Given the positioning of the negative between the abl. *yásmat* and the postposition *rté*, the tr. might be emended to “Not without whom do the peoples win” – though this is barely parseable English.

The pf. *babhūva* may be used in a habitual sense: “(time after time) he has been / proved to be ...”

Note the repetitive phonological figure in *acyut-acyút-*, which contravenes the morphological boundaries (*a-cyuta-cyút-*).

II.12.9–11: Note the phonological sequence, with several different interlocking repetitions:

9c *yó vís̄vasya*

10a *yáh śaśvato* ... *śarvā*

10c *yáh śardhate* ... *śrdhyām*

11a *yáh śambaram* ... *śarádi*

II.12.10: I would suggest an alt. tr. for ab, mostly relexicalized: “who has struck with his missile the heedless ones, each and every one, who commit great offense.”

The hapax *śrdhyām* is generally taken as the acc. sg. of a stem *śrdhyā-*, and this is perfectly plausible both morphologically and contextually. However, it might rather be taken as the loc. sg. of a *devī*-type -ī-stem *śrdhī-* “does not yield to the vaunter in his vaunting.” This makes somewhat more sense.

II.12.11: After the focus on present-day and recent-past events in the center of the hymn, we return to the mythological and distant past. Note that *jaghāna* in c must have distant past value, but the same form in 10b seems to refer to contemporary / recent past.

The part. *śáyānam* has two (indeed three) possible interpr., both simultaneously operative and supported by the formulaics of the Vṛtra myth elsewhere. On the one hand, with the publ. tr., it can mean “lying (dead),” proleptically depicting the result of the action of the main verb *jaghāna*. See the multiple occurrences of the root *√sí* in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, expressing just that (I.32.5, 7, 8, 9). On the other, it can refer to Vṛtra lying on or around the waters, as in V.30.6. As a possible third, it can simply refer to the snake as lying (on the ground) as snakes do, as Th suggests.

II.12.12: In order to reflect the structure, I would tr. the beginning of the vs. as “Who — the mighty seven-reined bull — let loose ...” Both Ge and Th point out that the “seven reins” correspond to the seven rivers.

Pāda b is strongly alliterative: *(avā)sṛjat sártave saptá síndhūn*.

II.12.13: This is the first ab hemistich that entirely lacks a relative prn. However, as R. Kluender pointed out, vs.-initial (*d*)*yāvā* phonologically mimics a rel. Instead of the rel. prn. referring to Indra, we have the enclitic demonstratives *asmai* (a) and *asya* (b), while the rel. prn. returns in cd. For a somewhat similar breaking of the pattern, see vs. 5 above.

We seem to be wrapping up this hymn with a bit of tricky ring composition. In 1c we have *yásya śúsmād ródasī ábhyasetām*; in our pāda a the *ródasī* return as *dyāvā* ... *prthivī* with a different verb, while in b we have *śúsmāt* and *√bhī*, but a different subject. Moreover, the orthodox 1st class pres. *bhayante* “repairs” the oddly formed hapax *ábhyasetām*. For detailed disc. of this ring, see my 2025 paper at the Naples conference “The Line and the Circle,” forthcoming in the proceedings. In order to bring out the parallelism with 1c, I would tr. “fear from his explosiveness”: the abl. *śúsmāt* is the only verbatim repeated element in this ring compositional structure.

Pāda b provides a good example of *cid* taking Wackernagel’s position even though the word it should limit occurs later in the vs. line. In the first pāda *cid* correctly follows the word it limits, or rather the first part of the dual dvandva *dyāvā cid* ... *prthivī* “even Heaven and Earth bow to him.” But in b *cid* follows the abl. *śúsmāt*, while the geographical feature corresponding to H+E in a, namely *párvatā(h)* ‘mountains’, is postponed. But surely the clause means “even the mountains fear his explosiveness” (as in the publ. tr.), not “the mountains fear even his explosiveness.” On this analysis see Old, ZDMG 61 [1907] 816 = KISch 247.

In order to reflect the structure and, esp., to show that the rel. structure has been reestablished, I would rearrange the tr. of cd to “who is renowned as the soma-drinker having the mace in his arm, who (is renowned) as having the mace in his hand.”

II.12.14: As in vss. 6–7, after the breach in the rel. structure in 13ab this vs. insists upon it, with seven rel. pronouns, two each in a, b, c, and a seventh one in d. Given this, the tr. might be altered to reflect the pile-up of relative pronouns: “Who helps through his help the one pressing soma, who (helps) the one cooking (an offering), who the one praising,

who the one laboring; / whose is the strengthening formulation, whose is the soma, whose is this gift—he, o peoples, is Indra.

II.12.15: As often, a pattern well established through most of a hymn gets broken, or shaken up, at the end (see also 13ab). Here the 3rd sg. reference to Indra in the first fourteen vss. changes to 2nd sg. address, but this change isn't immediately signaled: the vs. begins with a rel. pronoun *yáh* that apparently matches the monotonously regular occurrence of the rel. with 3rd ps. ref. in the rest of the hymn. Only the verb *dárdarsi* in b, the last word in its clause, shows that the pattern has been broken. The repetition of the participles *suvánt-* and *pácant-* from 14a provides continuity in the midst of the referential shake-up.

The sandhi form *dudhrá* is ambiguous: it can reflect either a nom. sg. *dudhráh* with the Pp. or a loc. sg. *dudhré*. The publ. tr. opts for the latter, a possibility floated by both Ge (n. 15a) and Old, who does not decide; Re chooses the loc. The loc. interpr. has the advantage of accommodating the oddly placed *ā cid*, which would represent *ā* as “Praep. mit vorhergehendem Loc.” (Gr. 169) plus ‘even’ emphasizing that loc. Ge’s tr. follows the nom. of the Pp, and there are arguments in favor of this interpr. -- *dudhrá*-elsewhere modifies Indra (I.56.3, VI.22.4 [2 out of 5 total occurrences]), and introducing a new personage in this vs. seems unnecessary. Like Old I can’t decide, though would probably favor a nom. sg. and tr. “You who, headstrong, rip free ...”

The main clause *sá kílāsi satyáh* “you are certainly real” is an implicit answer to the doubt expressed in 5b *utém āhur náisó astíti enam* “And they say about him, ‘he does not exist.’”

The 2nd ps. reference of *sá* in the just quoted expression is contrary to my rules (“Vedic ‘sá figé’: An inherited sentence connective?” HS 105 [1992]) of such reference with this pronoun -- that 2nd ps. *sá* (etc.) is only found with imperatives and verbs so used. But the whole structure of this hymn, with the refrain *sá janāsa índrah* in the same metrical slot as this declaration, imposes the need for a *sá* here as well. Note that this phrase is an exact metrical match for the refrain.

Though *viśváha* is rendered in the publ. tr. as “throughout all the days,” the *-ha* is not, of course, the ‘day’ word, but the adverbial *-ha* of *ihá*; the tr. should be corrected to “everywhere/always.”

The final pāda, *suvírāso vidátham ā vadema*, is a variant of the standard Gr̄tsamāda Triṣṭubh refrain *brhád vadema vidáthe suvírāh*. The refrain pāda here is found twice elsewhere (I.117.25, VIII.48.14), neither of them in Maṇḍala II or in a Gr̄tsamāda hymn. The reason for this variation isn't clear, since the standard refrain would fit here unproblematically. Perhaps to mark the specialness of this particular hymn?

II.13 Indra [SJ on JPB]

This hymn is extremely challenging, with a discouraging number of puzzles and no clear overall theme -- though Indra’s cosmogonic activities and his help to particular clients dominate the latter part of the hymn. The first four vss. are devoted to the ritual preparation of soma, with Indra a side issue.

Like the immediately preceding hymn, this one is structured by a refrain, but a somewhat shifting one. The first vs. ends *prathamám tád ukth'yam*; this is more or less matched by vss. 2–4 *prathamám sāsi'y ukth'yah*, but the substitution of *sāsi* for *tád* has

repositioned the refrain: after an opening of four, not (as in vs. 1) five. This shift backwards is somewhat disconcerting. The gender has also shifted, and in all three vss. the main cl. *sāsⁱy ukthⁱyah* is preceded by the rel. cl. *yás tākṛṇoh prathamám* matching the rel./main cl. structure that dominated II.12. In the next vss. (5–8) the refrain is reduced to *sāsⁱy ukthⁱyah*, preceded by a variety of forms. *sāsⁱy ukthⁱyah* is also found in vss. 9–10, preceded in both instances by *abhavah*. Vs. 11 breaks the pattern by expanding the refrain but with a phonologically close match: *sá ... (vī)śvāsⁱy ukthⁱyah*. *sāsⁱy ukthⁱyah* makes a final appearance in vs. 12, and vs. 13 is in a different meter and contains the Gr̥tsamāda refrain rather than the one proper to his hymn.

The 2nd ps. reference of *sá* in *sāsi* is, of course, contrary to my rules (see disc. just above ad II.12.15), but our hymn seems to take off from the structure of II.12.15.

A complete retranslation of the hymn is given at the end.

II.13.1: This vs. concerns soma and its preparation, though soma is not overtly mentioned. The first word, *rtúh* ‘season, proper time’, is, I think, to be read in two ways. On the one hand, it can refer to the season of the year when the soma plant grows – here, presumably the rains and their aftermath: the growing season, which is the begetter (*jánitri*) of the soma *plant*. But in the RV *rtú-* more frequently refers to the proper *ritual* time—esp. in the set of sequential offerings known (later) as the *rtugrahās* ‘sequential cups’, treated in this *maṇḍala* in the two hymns II.36–37 (q.v.). In this sense the ritual sequence is the begetter of the soma *drink*, and the rest of the vs. (starting in the middle of pāda a) concerns the preparation of the drink: esp. the swelling of the soma plant with water.

The standard tr. (incl. JPB; see also Gr col. 785, IV.3 s.v. *pári*) seem to assume that *pári* serves as a postposition with *tásyā(h)*, but the interposition of *apáh* and, esp., the close sandhi of *apás pári* pose problems – though not insuperable ones (see below). JL suggested that *apáh* might have a double reading, both as a rare singular form of *áp-* ‘water’, an ablative to be read with *tásyā(h)*, and as the more usual acc. pl., with which the pl. rel. *yāsu* agrees. Thus “just born from this water he has entered the waters in which he grows strong.” But although this is clever and appealing, the most likely referent of *tásyā(h)* is the immediately preceding *jánitri*, which refers to the season (see above), so an abl. of water is unlikely. That *pári* might form a lexeme with *āviśat* could be suggested by 8c *áparivīśtam*, but I now find this unlikely: that form most likely belongs to *√viś*, not *√viś*, and the *pári* here is not in a standard position for a preverb in tmesis.

On the other hand, it is possible to rescue the postpositional account of *tásyāh* ... *pári*. Given that forms of the *sá* / *tám* pronoun regularly take first position in their clause, it would not be surprising if the pronoun had been moved to clause-init. position from an underlying *(*apás*) *tásyās pári*, with close sandhi between abl. *tásyās* and the postposition. The problem then is the close sandhi of the rearranged *apás pári*. This should indicate a close syntagmatic connection between the two – which we have in any case just rejected. In general, as shown by Hale (1990, “... Sandhi and Syntax,” 81–86), when the caesura doesn’t intervene, *pári* shows close sandhi effects with a preceding ablative that it governs (e.g., I.47.6 [etc. etc.] *divás pári* “from heaven”). There are numerous such examples. If it is the syntactic relation that produces this effect, we should expect that a word ending in underlying -s that has no syntactic relationship to a

following *pári* would surface as visarga, even without intervening caesura. Such sequences are rarer, but there are a sufficient number to show that the syntactic distribution holds. See, e.g., for post-caesura position I.162.1 [cf. VII.93.8] (*mā* ...) ... *marútah pári khyān* “(let not) the Maruts disregard us” (also III.3.9, 15.6; IV.43.6; V.15.3, 81.4, VII.103.8, IX.69.5, 85.1, 86.32, 107.2). For pre-caesura position V.53.9 *mā vah pári s̄thāt* “let (the Sarayu river) not hem you around” (also VII.36.7; IX.71.9, 93.1). And for dimeter vs. (with no caesura) VIII.41.3 *sá kṣápah pári sasvaje* “he holds the nights in his embrace” (also V.65.6; VI.51.16; IX.12.5, 62.23; X.85.13). (There are a few functionally ambiguous cases and a very few counterexx.) In almost all cases with *-h* outcome, the *pári* serves as a preverb, usually with the verb immediately following, as in the exx. just given. Its primary syntactic connection is then with the verb not an adjacent noun. In this passage, given that there is no clear relationship between *pári* and the main verb *āviśat* in the middle of the next pāda and given that the underlying syntagm is ABL *pári* “from her,” though the abl. has been displaced, I suggest that the *-s* of the syntagm has been, as it were, transferred to the *apás* that has taken the place of abl. *tásyās*. This is essentially Old’s solution, expressed much more succinctly (see also his disc. in ZDMG 61 [1907] 816 = KISch 247). I would therefore slightly alter the tr. of the first hemistich to “From her, as soon as he was born, he [=soma] entered the waters,” eliminating the “throughout” that vaguely represented *pári*.

Note the alliteration in cd: *pipyúṣī páyo* ... *pīyūṣam prathamám*, with the first terms of each pair echoing each other.

JL suggests that *áṁśóḥ pīyūṣam prathamám* is in apposition to the *páyah* phrase, rather than being, with most tr. incl. JPB’s, a nominative expressing the subject of *ukthyām*, anticipating *tád*. This would allow the refrain to be a separate clause, as it overwhelmingly is in the rest of the hymn.

II.13.2–4: It is notable that these vss., whose refrain pāda contains the rel. cl. *yás tākṛṇoh prathamám* “you [=Indra] who did these things first,” makes no mention of Indra’s deeds, which only start being catalogued in vs. 5, which has dropped the rel. cl.

II.13.2: The ritual preparation and offering of soma remain the focus of this vs., but Indra is obliquely introduced.

Pāda a contains another occurrence of *pári* that is hard to construe. Although Old, Re, and WG take it with the pres. part. *bíbhratīḥ* immed. flg. (e.g., Old “Milch herumführend”), this is highly unlikely. There is no reason why a preverb+participle adjacent to each other, in the right order, and not even divided by a caesura would not univerbate to **paribíbhratīḥ* (see *prabhávantam* in the same position in 4b). It is also worth noting that this extremely well-attested redupl. stem is never attested with preverbs and that the close parallel to our passage adduced by Ge, X.30.13 *páyāṁsi bíbhratīḥ*, lacks *pári*. Instead I take *pári* with *ā yanti* – preverbs in tmesis often immediately follow their verbs – with *sādhrīm* *ā* contrasting with *pári*: as often in Maṇḍala IX the liquids circle around (the filter, the cups, etc.) but ultimately reach their goal.

The Pp. reads *sādhrī īm*, accepted by Old and (implicitly) by WG. (Ge and Re are unclear.) This is possible, but not, in my opinion, necessary – and in any case would hardly affect the tr. I would now change the tr. of pāda a to “They [=the waters] go

circling towards the same goal, carrying the milk” – again eliminating functionless “throughout.”

The pres. part. to the redupl. pres. *bibhratīh* in pāda a seems to contrast functionally with the finite injunc. (prá) *bharanta* in b, with the former expressing the regular, repetitive action of the waters carrying milk, while the latter expresses a one-time or at least notably separate action.

The publ. tr. “bring forth” for *prá bharanta* is somewhat misleading, since it sounds as if they are giving birth. I would prefer ‘present’, but it loses the connection with *bibhratīh* -- perhaps ‘bring forward’.

On *viśvāpsnya*- see comm. ad VIII.97.15. That the waters bring milk to Indra who is himself “the distillate of mother’s milk” for us is a nice conceit. Assuming the referent is Indra, this is the first allusion to him in the hymn (unless we follow the Pp. analysis of *sadhrīm* and take *īm* as referring to Indra).

After this rather low-key introduction of Indra, he reappears in the rather abrupt refrain of d – even though no deeds have actually been attributed to him as yet – nor will they be in vs. 3, which contains the same refrain.

II.13.3: The soma preparation continues. The identification of Hotar (pāda a) and Adhvaryu (b) are Sāy.’s and seem plausible.

Pāda a is syntactically disturbing, in that it seems to have a clear embedded rel. cl.: *ánv éko vadati yád dádāti tād*, with *tād* the referent in the main cl. corresponding to *yád* in the dependent cl. (“... that which he gives” -- so the standard tr. incl. JPB’s). Since such constructions seem strongly disallowed in RV, such a bald example would be striking and in fact begs for a different interpr. The interpr. of this pāda is made more difficult by the fact that the lexeme *ánu √vad* is found only here in the RV and it is not entirely clear what action is being performed. If Sāy/Ge (et al.) are correct in identifying the first *ékah* as the Hotar and the second as the Adhvaryu, a possible solution emerges. The Hotar should not in fact be “giving” anything; his job is to recite in accompaniment (an activity well conveyed by *ánu √vad*) to the ritual actions. It is the Adhvaryu who gives, that is, who actually makes the physical offering. Assuming that this division of labor already obtains in the RV, it seems likely to me that *yád dádāti* begins a new sentence and is a *preposed* dependent cl with the main cl. being ... *éka īyate*. I would tr. the hemistich “One [= the Hotar] follows along with this speech; the (other) one [= the Adhvaryu] hastens when he gives that [=soma/oblation], changing its forms, having that as his work.” If *yád* is rather taken as the neut. rel. pron., the tr. can be modified to “What he gives, he hastens to that, having that as his work ...” My working assumption is that the independent *tād* is coreferential with the *tād* in the cmpd *tād-apas*.

On *titikṣate* see comm. ad III.30.1. With Ge I take c as primarily depicting the soma plant being beaten by the pressing stone(s), but the graphic description of this ritual action (“endures the blows ...”) begins the transition to the deeds of Indra. I would not, with Re, take Indra as the subj. here, however – Indra doesn’t withstand blows; he gives them!

II.13.4: Contra the standard tr. (incl. JPB’s) I wonder if *vibhájanta āsate* has *√ās* ‘sit’ in auxiliary function as later: “keep Xing” (in this case “keep distributing”) rather than having the literal sense “they sit, distributing.”

The sense of this first hemistich, esp. pāda b, is baffling and has given rise to much, not very helpful, disc., which I will not treat and to which I will contribute little. One of the technical questions on which the various interpr. turn is whether the accusatives (*puṣṭím* ... *rayím* ... *prṣṭhám prabhávantam*) are coreferential, parallel, or to be construed separately, and in particular what ‘wealth’ (*rayím* ‘va) is the comparandum for. My own very tentative interpr. separates the accusatives of pādas a and b, taking the former (*puṣṭím*) as obj. of *vibhájantah* and the latter (*prṣṭhám* & Co.) as the goal of the dat. part. *āyaté*, which is itself parallel to *prajābhyah* opening the hemistich. I further take *prṣṭhám* as referring to the back of heaven (*divás prṣṭhá-*) as often. To paraphrase my interpr.: the priests are distributing “prosperity” to their offspring, the fires – that is, they are offering ghee to them. The pl. “fires” of pāda a are then summed up by the sg. *āyaté* ‘(the fire) coming here’ (that is, growing from the butter oblations). The goal of this fire is to reach the back of heaven (a common trope for the ritual fire reaching upwards). This “back” is prominent / projecting (*prabhávantam*) and compared in its prominence to wealth. My tentative tr. of ab is then “They [=priests] keep distributing prosperity to their offspring [fires], to the one (fire) coming toward the back (of heaven), (which is) prominent like wealth.” Among the many shaky parts of this rendering the one that concerns me most is that *āyaté* has the preverb *ā* and should mean ‘coming here’, not going yonder to heaven.

In any case, it is generally agreed that a single fire is the subject of c.

The tr. of *bhójanam* should be changed from ‘food’ to ‘sustenance’, to match the same word in 2b and 6a.

II.13.5: The transition from the ritually focused vss. 1–4 to Indra and his deeds is effected by an echo: the opening of 5a *ádhākṛṇoh* picks up *yás tākṛṇoh* of the refrain of 2d, 3d, 4d. In those vss. there was no mention of actual deeds of Indra’s; this is about to change. The first unambiguous identification of Indra in the hymn is the voc. *ahihan* ‘smasher of the serpent’ in b.

In the periphrastic causative infinitival phrase *akṛṇoh prthivīñ samdṛśe divé*, Re and WG take dat. heaven as subj. and acc. earth as obj. of the dat. infinitive, in contrast to the publ. tr. and Ge. Since the usual obj. of the infinitive *drśe* is the sun, the Ge/JPB interpr. seems more likely, in that it also involves looking heavenward. (This would also somewhat match my interpr. of 4b, where fire is going to heaven.) Note also that in 8ab the datives *prkṣāya* and *dāsáveśāya* are objects of the dative infin. *níhantave*, with the same syntactic pattern as is suggested here. There is also an occurrence of the same stem *saṃdṛś-* in the acc. pl. in 10c, but this seems to have no clear relationship to the dative here and is, in any case, quite opaque.

The use of *vrīc* ‘leave (behind)’ → ‘clear’ vel sim. is somewhat puzzling, but there is a little clutch of such passages in the Indra hymns of II: besides this one, see II.15.8 and II.19.5. Perhaps by way of “give leave to / give free rein to.”

Ge (n. 5cd) finds *ajanan* “they begot” jarring and suggests emendation to *ajunan* “they sped,” for which there is no need. Surely the transmitted text reflects the standard trope of, as it were, creating a god by ritual performance. The odd thing here is that the action is credited to the gods, not mortals – perhaps as the primal institution of the sacrifice. The other puzzling part is the simile, “like a horse with waters.” Although this may just mean something like “revive” a weary horse by sprinkling it with waters, I have

a nagging sense that there is a belief (expressed somewhere in Vedic prose?) that horses are born from/in water, but I haven't tracked this down. Or it could be a somewhat perverse reference to the horse sacrifice – with the priests sprinkling the sacrificial horse with lustral waters and creating, as it were, a better (=dead) horse.

II.13.6: With Klein (DGRV I.135, etc.), I take the double *ca* as conjoining morphologically parallel *bhójanam* and *várdhanam*, despite the preposed position of the 2nd *ca*. This preposing would be supported by 7a where a correctly positioned second *ca* in a double *ca* construction is found in the same metrical position and before an almost rhyming final word, *dhármāṇā*.

Because of the accent on *dudóhitha*, pāda b must continue the relative cl. of pāda a, rather than serving as its main cl. as in the publ. tr., which should be corrected to "You who distribute ... and who have milked ..., / you have hidden ..." I would probably also substitute "you milked" and "you deposited" as tr. for the pfs. in b and c, though their functions are not entirely clear.

If the identifications of the acc. and abl. in 6b are correct, this is a sort of rephrasing of 1a.

The rule-breaking use of *sá* with non-impvs. continues here, with *sá ... ní dadhiṣe*.

I'm inclined to take the loc. *vivásватi* here as "bei/chez Vivasvant" rather than "in Vivasvant" as in the publ. tr. That is, Indra set down a treasure in the vicinity of Vivasvant, presumably as a reward for V's sacrifice, rather than within his body. I do not see any reason to take Vivasvant as a reference to the sun in this context.

JL points out the complex mirror-image figure that straddles the pāda break in cd: #*sá ... dadhiṣe vivásватi, vísvasyaíka íṣiṣe sá ...* The two interior elements, *vivásватi* and *vísvasyaíka(h)*, are phonologically similar and isosyllabic; they are flanked by 2nd sg. mid. perfects with rhyming ending *-iṣe*; and the pronoun *sá* with 2nd sg. reference provides an outer ring.

II.13.7: This vs. consists only of rel. clauses, until the refrain (unlike 6, with rel. cl. in ab, but main cl. in c.). The refrain therefore could function as the main cl.

dāna- in b is almost universally taken as 'pasture' (Weide) or 'earth' (Re 'sur terre'), a meaning attributed to *dāna-* only in this passage. The interpr. goes back, one way or the other, to Sāy: *upalīyante sasyāny atreti dānam kṣetram*. His remark "grain is cut there" implies a connection with $\sqrt{dā}$ 'reap, mow' (EWA's *DĀ²*). His gloss 'field' (*dānam kṣetram*) is repeated thereafter, most influentially in BR, though they seem to derive the word from $\sqrt{dā}$ 'divide' (EWA's *DA⁴*); subsequent adopters of the gloss do not bother to comment on the etymology. Sāy's implied derivation from $\sqrt{dā}$ 'reap' is appealing. There are several clear exx. of the root pres. of this root in the RV (grouped under Gr's 2. *dā*), as well as nominal derivatives (see EWA s.v. *DĀ²*). The reference in this vs. to the establishment of flowering and fruitful plants would have helped preserve a lexical item specific to agriculture, even though it is homonymous with the more common *dāna-* 'gift' (and see differently accented *dānāya* 'to give, for giving' in 13a).

I wonder, however, about the concrete locational sense that Sāy gives it; it might make more sense as an abstract 'in their reaping'. The vs. seems to depict Indra as the orderer of the cosmos, with the solemn etymological figure *dhármāṇā ... ádhārayaḥ* "you

established by your establishment" (or without English cognate expression, "you established by your ordinance"). (I would not follow JPB's attribution of the *dhárman-* to the plants: "according to the foundation (of each).") Most of the hemistich would then show Indra creating the various plants in their crucial function, to be harvested. (The presence of *ádhi* might be counter-evidence to my interpr., in that it generally has a locational sense, but I'm not certain that this is enough to derail it.)

I further think that the last bit of the hemistich, *vy ávánīr ádhārayah*, is a somewhat separate expression. That is, I read *ádhārayah* without preverb with the "plants" segment in *pāda a* / first part of *b* (thus not flg. JPB's "established separately the flowering and fruitful (plants)"), and restrict *ví ... ádhārayah* to the streams of the end of *b*; its position after the caesura in *b* favors this syntactic separation. Note also the use of the agent noun *vidhartár-* only with rivers in II.28.4. If this interpr. is correct, the problematic *dāne* may require further analysis, for in addition to 'in their reaping' for the first part of the hemistich (to $\sqrt{dā}$ 'reap') it could also be taken as a derivative of $\sqrt{dā}$ 'divide', as JPB does: 'in their division'. It is ideally positioned to be read with both.

I would thus tr. the hemistich "You who established by your ordinance the flowering and fruitful (plants) in their reaping (and) established the (various) streams separately in their division." Indra's division of undifferentiated water into separate streams would be part of his fructifying project -- bringing life-giving water to the various terrestrial regions, a sort of irrigation scheme.

Having created the relevant features of the earth -- plants and streams -- in *ab*, Indra then turns to a particular heavenly feature, the *didyút-s*. What exactly is meant here isn't clear. The stem *didyút-*, like its near-twin *didyú-*, generally means 'missile, dart', but often a missile sent flying from heaven by a god (cf., e.g., VII.46.3 [Rudra] *yā te didyúd ávasrṣṭā divás pári* "which missile of yours shot downward from heaven ..."). As Mayrhofer points out (EWA s.v. *didyú-*), *didyút-* has probably been remodeled after \sqrt{dyot} or *vidyút-* 'lightning' (I'd favor the latter). And often it seems to have a naturalistic aspect, as lightning (or the dreaded 'thunderbolt' of old-fashioned Vedic exegesis). Here the naturalistic reading seems esp. prominent, and I suggest that *ásama-* 'unequalled' may also have the sense 'unequal' -- that is, jagged and asymmetrical, zigzagging like lightning.

The last difficulty of this challenging verse is the first part of *d*, *urúr ūrvāṁ abhítah*. Ge (/WG) and the publ. tr. take this as an independent nominal clause (e.g., JPB: "you, the wide one surrounding the containers"). Given the cosmogonic cast of the rest of the vs., I would follow Re, who takes *ūrvāṁ* as a 2nd object of *ájanah* in *c*: "(qui,) vaste (toi-même, as engendré) les mers tout autours." Although *ūrvá-*, lit. 'container', generally refers to cow-pens and the like in the RV, Re's 'seas' (as particularly large containers) seems correct here; cf. the same usage, also in Maṇḍala II, in II.35.3, where the rivers all fill "the same *ūrvá-*" (*saṁnám ūrvāṁ nadyāḥ pṛṇanti*). I would thus tr. *cd* "and who begot the unequal(led) flashing missiles of heaven (and) the 'containers' [=seas] all about, (you) the wide one." The juxtaposition *urúr ūrvāṁ* is a play on words; the two are not etymologically related, at least by most lights.

What is striking about this vs. is that, unlike the usual cosmogonic vss., which refer to large generic parts of creation (heaven, earth, etc.), this one highlights particular idiosyncratic aspects of the grand cosmic divisions.

II.13.8: The PN *dāsáveśa-* presumably means ‘having Dāsas (/a Dāsa) as neighbor(s)’; on *veśá-* see comm. ad X.49.5.

To avoid the need to supply additional unsupported material (JPB’s “would do likewise”) to the brief beginning of *pāda d utaīvādyā purukṛt*, I interpr. *purukṛt* as a predicated voc. (“and even today (you are) a much-doer”), with most tr. This brief nominal phrase seems to function like a main cl., though the *utā* should connect it with the preceding rel.

II.13.9: The syntax of the 1st hemistich is intricate and hard to parse. The first rel. cl. (... *yásya* ...) extends through *ékasya śruṣṭau*, with *yásya* coreferential with *ékasya*. This clause is in turn dependent on the short *yád* clause *yád dha codám āvitha*, with *codám* the referent of *yásya*. The standard tr. take *codá-* as a personal name, but this is not necessary, as Mayrhofer (PN s.v.) points out -- and in fact it would be better not to have another name for Dabhīti (c), who is the ultimate referent of both *yásya* (a) and *codám* (b). After the rel. complications in ab, c presents us with a definite main cl.

Note that *ādiya(h)* at the end of b matches *āsīyam* at end of 8c as well as echoing the (undistracted) (*utaīv*)*ādyā* beg. 9d.

In d *suprāvyāḥ* is ascribed to a thematic stem by Gr and taken as a nom. sg (so apparently by JPB), but that stem does not exist. Of the two forms listed under this stem the one here can be a gen. sg. to the root-noun cmpd *suprāvī-* and the supposed thematic loc. in I.34.4 is actually a dat. to the root-noun stem. See comm. ad I.34.4. To make this clear I’d tr. “and (so) you became (also) for the one who pursues his ritual duties well.” Sim. Ge, WG.

II.13.10: Although *víśved* ... *rodhanā(h)* must belong together semantically, it is difficult to make this work grammatically: *rodhanā* in this sandhi pos. can’t be neut. *-ā*, but must stand for *-ā(h)* -- so Pp. -- (or, far less likely, *-ai*). It therefore can’t properly be modified by a *víśvā* extracted from *víśvēd*. Old sees the problem, but Gr simply lists the form as neut. *-ā*; Ge [/WG], Re don’t mention and tr. as a phrase. The sandhi of either *víśvēd* or *rodhanā asya* has to be tampered with to harmonize the two words; I have no opinion on how to make this work., but I also don’t think it’s worth trying to separate the words syntactically. That the hymn shows the irreg. sandhi *sāsi* throughout its refrain suggests that we need not be too punctilious here. The only other RVic occurrence of the noun is differently accented: *ródhanā*, a neut. pl. (I.121.7); AiG II.2.190 considers our form a fem. stem *rodhanā-* beside root-accented neut. *ródhana-*, accdg. to an existing pattern.

The awkward doubling of *asya* ... *asmai* should be noted in the tr.: “... have conceded his manliness to him,” with both pronouns referring to Indra. Perhaps the *asya* is there because most exx. of *ánu v̄dā* ‘concede’ involve the subject conceding some quality of its/his own to a third party, so the fact that the *paúṁsyā-* is Indra’s to begin with needs to be emphasized.

I do not have a clear idea what the second hemistich is about, except that it obviously involves some cosmogonic activity and the *vistírah* and the *samdrśah* are implicitly contrasted. Ge’s idea (n. 10c) that the two refer to the six spaces and the five directions is appealing, even though *sañdrś-* does not ordinarily mean ‘direction’ – incl. in the dat. inf. *sañdrśe* in 5a. Contra JPB (and Re), but with Ge (/WG), I’d take the two acc. pl.s in c as parallel objects of *astabhnāḥ* and construe *pári paró abhavāḥ* in d

separately: “You propped up the six far-flung (spaces) and the five ‘sights’ [=visible regions], (and) you encompassed (even what is) beyond.”

II.13.11: The first pāda, *supravācanām* *táva vīra vīryām*, is a nominalization of the famous opening of I.32 (found in various forms elsewhere): *índrasya nú vīryāñi prā vocam*. In that hymn this opening is followed by the account of an undoubted heroic deed, the slaying of Vṛtra. Here the specification in b, introduced by *yád* (as often in such proclamations) followed by a promisingly heroic *ékena krátunā* “by your resolve alone,” turns out to be something of an anticlimax: you find goods. This lack of drama is somewhat repaired by d, which sketches a larger world of great deeds. But d poses problems of its own (see below).

The publ. tr. of c is a bit awk; I’d substitute “Of (you), steadfast by nature and mighty, the vigor (is) preeminent.”

Unfortunately the syntax of d is disturbed and disturbing, partly as a result of introducing a variation on the refrain (see hymn intro. above). The standard abbreviated refrain *sās' y ukth' yah* has been distracted, with *sá* separated from *asi ukthyāh* by a vocative (*indra*) and the introduction of *vísvā*, which, combining with *asi*, gives *(ví)svās' y ukthyāh*, a near phonological match for the usual *sās' y ukthyāh*, as was noted above. It’s also worth noting that the beginning of pāda d, *yā cakártha* is a variant of the beginning of the full refrain in vss. 2–4, *yás tākṛṇoh*. In other words, our d, *yā cakártha* *séndra* *vísvāsy ukthyāh*, is a ring-compositional variant of the first instantiation of the refrain (since vs. 1 has something slightly different): *yás tākṛṇoh prathamām sāsy ukthyāh*. This manipulation of the refrain may help account for the problematic syntax, but we still need to address that problem.

The rel. cl. of d is universally tr. (incl. by JPB; only Old explicitly recognizes the difficulty) “all the things you have done,” but “all” (*vísvā*) is not part of the rel. cl. (*yā cakártha*). It has instead been stuck in the main cl. of the refrain, which, only in this verse, has been altered from *sāsy ukthyāh* (2-10d, 12d) to *séndra* *vísvāsy ukthyāh*. Dropping a piece of a rel. cl. into the middle of a main cl. is simply impossible in the RV. It is possible to interpr. *vísvā* as a real part of the main cl., an acc. of respect: “What (deeds) you have done, you are worthy of hymns with regard to all of them.” But somehow I doubt that’s what the poet intended -- though what his intentions were, esp. given the deliberate alteration of the refrain, are opaque to me. I think his focus was on the phonological trick.

Another possible wrinkle in d is that *yā* need not be the neut. pl. of the rel., illegally anticipating the *vísvā* intruding in the refrain. It could be an instr. sg. picking up *váyah* in the preceding pāda: “... the vigor by which you have done ...” But since *yā cakártha* seems a rewrite of *yás tākṛṇoh* in vss. 2–4, this seems unlikely.

II.13.12: *sárapasah* is a hapax. JPB’s interpr. of it as a river name Sarapas, suggested by the rivers Sarayu and Sarasvati, is plausible. He takes it as a gen. dependent on *srutím* (sim. WG), in contrast to Ge and Re, who take it as an acc. pl., obj. of *áramayah*, which requires them to supply another verb to govern *srutím*.

The use of the secondarily shortened stem *śraváya-* here instead of inherited *śrāváya-* may have been favored by the similarly short-root-vowel *áramayah* at the beginning of this vs. (which stem comes by its short root vowel honestly) and by the

denom. *śravasyā-* in the next vs. More problematic is what *prá ... śravāyan* is conveying here. One might think that what the blind and the lame want is not fame but healing. Some such consideration must have led Gr to assign this form (and *prāśrāvayam* X.49.8) to a different root *śru* and a different idiom *prá √śru* ‘vorwärts bringen’. I see no justification for such a separation. It is possible that the causative here means (as it can elsewhere) ‘make hear/heed’ rather than ‘make heard/famed’, though this wouldn’t appreciably improve the situation of the blind and lame. Or that in the idiom *prá √śru*, the *prá* came to dominate, with a sense ‘further, favor (through fame)’. See Ge’s n. 12d for further disc.

II.13.13: The last puzzle in the hymn is found in pāda c and also involves fame. We have just urged Indra to give us a *rādhah* (‘gift, benefit’) in the first hemistich. In c we find the phrase *yác citrám śravasyā(h)*. Since *citrá-* very frequently modifies *rādhah*, it seems natural to supply the recently mentioned *rādhah* here. But then what is Indra doing? *yác citrám* appears to be the obj. of *śravasyā(h)*. But this denom. doesn’t otherwise take an object (IV.42.2 cited by Gr is to be otherwise interpr.), and even if it did, the phrase would have to mean “which bright (gift) you will seek as fame,” which doesn’t seem to make sense. Ge essentially tr. it this way (“... eine ansehnliche (Lohngabe) ... in der du ... deinen Ruhm suchen”), but I don’t see why Indra would be looking for his fame in that direction. JPB avoids the syntactic difficulty by tr. as if *yác citrám* were an instr.: “the bright gift *through which* you will seek fame” (my italics), but this still requires the gift to be something that would provide Indra with fame. Re’s tendency to supply masses of material to smooth over the rough places is on full display here: “ce qui est éclatant, veuille le donner-par-désir de-renom” (so hyphenated). WG seem to have arrived at a novel solution, apparently separating *citrám* from its usual formulaic partner *rādhas* and supplying *śrāvas-* ‘fame’ -- or so I interpret “damit du ... deinen ansehnlichen Ruhm suchen mögest.” However, as far as I can tell, *śrāvas-* is never modified by *citrá-*, and context favors *rādhas-* as referent. I have no good solution. The least unsatisfactory may be to assume that, in our self-serving way, we are telling Indra that giving us a good gift will bring him fame (better than heroic deeds? see 11ab) -- and in some sense it will, since we celebrate his generosity with hymns providing lasting *śrāvas-*. Syntactically I suggest that there is a clause boundary between *citrám* and *śravasyāh*, which then owes its accent to being initial in its clause. The phrase *yác citrám* is then an afterthought nominal izafe specifying *rādhah* in pāda a. I would then tr. the relevant parts “Make your aim to give that gift to us ... / the bright (gift), o Indra. You will (thus) seek fame throughout the days.” If we can render *śravasyāh* as “you will find fame,” it would be even better.

Given the numerous large and small changes I’ve suggested for the tr. of this hymn, I insert a full emended one here.

II.13 complete (incorporating my modifications)

1. His mother is the season. From her, as soon as he was born, he [=soma] entered the waters, among which he grows strong.

Then he became a voluptuous woman, swelling with milk, the plant's first
beestings. -- That one is worthy of hymns.

2. They [=the waters] go circling towards the same goal, bearing the milk. They
bring forward sustenance for him [=Indra?] who is all mother's milk (for us).

The downward sloping (watercourses) share the same road to flow along. -- You
who did these things first are worthy of hymns.

3. One follows along with this speech; the (other) one hastens when he gives that
[=soma/oblation], changing its forms, having that as his work.

He [=soma] withstands all the blows of another [=the pressing stone]. -- You who
did these things first are worthy of hymns.

4. They [=priests] keep distributing prosperity to their offspring [=fires], to the one
(fire) coming toward the back (of heaven), (which is) prominent like weath.

Insatiable, he [=the fire] eats the sustenance of his father [=the priest] with his
teeth. -- You who did these things first are worthy of hymns.

5. Then you made the earth to see heaven, you, o smasher of the serpent, who
cleared the paths of the streams.

The gods gave birth to you, the god, with their praise songs, like a winning horse
with waters. -- You are worthy of hymns.

6. You who distribute sustenance and increase and milked the dry [=the soma plant]
together with its honey [=the soma] out of the wet [=rain],

You hid a treasure nearby Vivasvat. You alone are the master of everything. --
You are worthy of hymns.

7. You who established by your ordinance the flowering and fruitful (plants) in their
reaping (and) established the (various) streams separately in their division,

who begot the unequal(led) flashing missiles of heaven (and) the "containers:e
[=seas] all about, (you) the wide one -- You are worthy of hymns.

8. You who, in order to strike down Pr̥kṣa and Dāsavaśa, conveyed the son of
Nr̥mara together with his goods

to the impregnable mouth of the Īrjyantī (River), and even today you are a doer
of many (deeds) -- You are worthy of hymns.

9. Or when you helped him, the hard-driving—at whose obedience (to you), though
he was alone, you bound his hundred times ten (enemies) all at once—

you tied up the Dasyus for Dabhiṭi in that which has no ropes, and (so) you
became for the one who pursues his ritual duties well. -- You are worthy of hymns.

10. All things that obstruct have conceded his manliness to him. They have set
themselves as the stakes for the successful gambler.

You propped up the six far-flung (spaces) and the five "sights" [=visible regions],
(and) you encompassed (even what is) beyond. -- You are worthy of hymns.

11. Your heroism, o hero, is good to proclaim: that by your resolve alone you take
possession of goods.

Of (you), steadfast by nature and mighty the vigor (is) preeminent. -- What
(deeds) you have done, with regard to all of them, o Indra, you are worthy of hymns.

12. You halted the course of the Sarapas (River) for Turvīti and Vayya to cross.

You led him up who was sunk down and shunned, making famed the blind one
and the lame. You are worthy of hymns.

13. Make your aim to give that gift to us, o good one—your store of goods is great—

the bright (gift), o Indra. You will (thus) seek/find fame throughout the days. --
May we speak loftily at the ritual distribution, in possession of good heroes.

II.14 Indra [SJ on JPB]

Although the publ. intro. characterizes this hymn as “surprisingly straightforward,” a closer analysis suggests “surprisingly *un*straightforward” as a more accurate description.

The most obvious structural feature of this hymn is the voc. *ádhvaryavah* “o Adhvaryus” that opens each vs. but the last, which begins *asmábhyam* “to us.” But there is more to be observed than this superficial exact repetition. The hymn follows the template of II.12, but is not so tightly structured. Like II.12, much of the hymn (vss. 2–7, with a return in 11) presents in the earlier parts of each vs. a series of definitional relative clauses referring to Indra and his deeds. The main clause, occupying cd or only d, then urges the priests to offer soma to Indra. Unlike II.12 this main clause structure is not a strictly repeated refrain but a series of variants, often involving the dat. *tásmai* -- but the offering of soma is always part of it. Part of the pleasure of this hymn is seeing how the poet will realize this refrain in verse after verse.

II.14.1: As often, the first vs. doesn’t directly participate in the structure that is established thereafter (in this hymn in vs. 2), but what will be the repetitive message of the main clauses in that structure is announced in the first pāda of the hymn: *bháraténdrāya sómam* “bring soma to Indra.”

On *asya pūtīm* see comm. on vs. 2 immed. below.

Note that in d HvN’s *eśá* is an error for *esá*.

In order to connect 1d with 2c (see below), I would substitute “desires” for “wishes.”

II.14.2: This vs. inaugurates the rel. cl. / main cl. structure noted above, with Indra’s signature deed, the smiting of Vṛtra (ab), as the rel. cl.; the main clauses of cd contain variants of vs. 1.

The publ. tr. of ab is somewhat awkwardly arranged. It might be better as “who smote Vṛtra, who had enclosed the waters – (smote him) like a tree with a spear.”

The resumptive pronoun corresponding to *yáh* in pāda a is *tásmai* opening c. Most of this clause, *tásmai etám bharata*, is simply a repetition of 1a *bháraténdrāya sómam*, with pronouns substituting for the nouns. The dat. *tadvásāya* at the end qualifies *tásmai* while also recapitulating the final cl. of 1d *tád íd eśá vaṣṭi*. To capture the syntactic structure of c and the lexical connection to 1d I might slightly emend the tr. to “to him bring this (soma) – (to him) who has desire for it.”

Pāda d consists of a second main clause, whose final *pūtīm asya* simply flips *asya pūtīm* of 1c. Given this repetition and the tight connection between vss. 1 and 2, I would render the two phrases the same, with the same referent (soma) for *asya*. (JPB takes *asya* in 1c as referring to Indra, but in 2d to soma.) 1c: “... ever desirous of the drinking of it” / 2d “deserves the drinking of it.”

II.14.3: Dṛbhīka is not otherwise known, but pāda b of course treats the other signature deed of Indra’s, the Vala myth.

As in vs. 2, the second hemistich contains two main clauses, one (c) with a pronoun resuming the relatives of ab, one independent. Both of these clauses exhibit some syntactic/conceptual tension.

The opening of c *tásmai etám* is identical to 2c and strongly invites us to supply *bharata* as in 2c (and see 1a; also II.37.1, which seems closely modeled on our vss. 1–2). But the simile *antárikṣe ná vātam* doesn't work very well in that scenario: “bring (soma) like wind in the midspace”? Various strategies have been tried to deal with this conceptual mismatch. Ge supplies a new verb (a form of *√sṛj*; see his n. 3a) to govern both frame and simile, but this willfully ignores the pattern established in vss. 1–2. Both Re and JPB maintain the pattern of vss. 1 and 2 by supplying *bharata*, but then supply (from nowhere) something to account for the simile. JPB supplies “rushing swiftly”; Re's solution is more egregious; “comme (le dieu a mis) le vent dans l'espace-médian.” WG also supply *bharata* and then cut the clause there, taking the simile with d – but this solves nothing. They must then construe it with the verb *órnuta* ‘cover’ and they supply “with rains” – but does wind get covered with rain? As for my take: given the pattern, I think we must supply *bharata* here. Since the simile doesn't work well with d either, I think we have to keep it with c – and make the best of it. It's possible that *bharata* would be used in two different senses with frame and simile, but I can't pinpoint what the latter would be. Perhaps “bring the wind” simply means “start up the wind / make the wind rise” (“bring on the wind!”). But none of this is very satisfactory.

The tension is d is even worse because it's syntactic. Here we have “cover Indra (*índram*) with soma juices (*sómaiḥ*),” a nice variant on “bring Indra the soma” and an illustration of the poet's elaboration on the underlying refrain. The simile has an instr. *vástraiḥ* “with blankets / clothes,” but what should be the equivalent of acc. *índram* is *jūḥ*. This should be a nominative sg., and is so taken by the standard tr. (incl. JPB); see also Schindler (Rt. nouns), EWA s.v. *jūr* (“offenbar Nom.Sg”). Old (fld. by Re, JPB) assumes that the active transitive construction of the frame has been underlyingly passivized with this nom.: “cover Indra ... as a fast horse (is covered),” with the often-claimed reversion of similes to the nominative (explicitly here in Ge's n. 3d), a notion I hope I demolished for good in my long ago simile article. I would rather assume *jūḥ* to be an acc. pl. to a nonce fem. stem, though I realize this is pretty shaky – tr. “cover Indra with soma juices, like fast mares with blankets.”

I would now (unsatisfactorily) emend the tr. of cd to “Bring him this (soma), like wind in the midspace; cover Indra with soma juices like fast mares with blankets.”

II.14.4: The pf. *jaghāna* should be tr. like the other three occurrences of the same form in 2b, 3a, 5a (also the part. *jaghavān* in 7b) – so either change ‘smashed’ to ‘struck’ here or change the other three to ‘smashed’ – or change them all to ‘smote’, save for 7b, since “having smitten” doesn't work in English.

An *Uraṇa* is not known from elsewhere; Mayr (PN s.v. *úranam*) considers *úranam* here to be a “false reinterpretation” of the acc. of *úran-* ‘lamb’ (though he was considerably more skeptical about their connection in EWA [I.226, s.v. *úran-*]). The reinterpretation would have to be thoroughgoing, since lambs don't have 99 limbs.

On the hapax *cakhvāmsam* see EWA I.451 (s.v. *khā-*) somewhat unsatisfactorily. Since nothing further is known about *Uraṇ(a)* and his 99 arms, determining what action he performed on them is difficult – but stretching them out is a reasonable possibility.

The conceptual refrain occupies pāda d, with the first three pādas devoted to the rel. clauses. The refrain is another elaboration on the model – here with the root \sqrt{bhr} represented by the loc. *bhrthē*, with *sómasya bhrthē* “at the bringing of soma” a nominalization of *sómam bharata*.

II.14.5: The rel. cl. portion of the vs. contains five occurrences of *yáh*.

I would substitute “Devourer” for the PN *Aśna*, as in II.20.5.

The refrain returns to the dat. recipient (*tásmā índrāya*) and a 2nd pl. impv, but relexicalizes the rest, with *ándhas-* for *sóma-* (but see 1b) and *juhota* for *bharata* (but see 1d).

II.14.6: The “warriors” supplied in c is based on VII.99.5 *śatám varcínah sahásram ca ... vīrān*. I would be inclined to substitute “heroes” here, esp. given *vīrān* in 7c.

The refrain, which occupies only the post-caesura portion of d, reverts to the model: *bháratā sómam asmai*.

II.14.7: This is the last vs. in the series that fits the II.12-type rel. cl. / refrain template, and it exactly repeats the structure of vs. 6, with a verb still belonging to the rel. cl. portion opening d and the refrain, identical to that of 6, occupying the post-caesura position.

I would substitute ‘wrenched down’ for ‘slung down’, since the root is $\sqrt{vṛj}$ ‘twist, wring’.

II.14.8: The transition away from the rel. cl. / refrain model is gradual in this vs. Like all the vss. 2–7 there’s a form of *yá-* immediately after the initial voc. *ádhvaryavah*, but it is *yád*, not *yáh* -- and the corresponding main cl. is found in b. But two versions of the refrain are found in cd. Pāda c contains the signature verb *bharata* with relexicalized acc. and dat. for the soma and Indra respectively; in pāda d we have the originals, *sómam* and *índrāya*, with *juhota* substituting for *bharata* (as in 5d, also 1d).

II.14.9: This vs. scraps the rel. clause structure entirely, but repeats the refrain of 8d almost verbatim.

II.14.10: The structure becomes even looser, but the conceptual refrain remains – here transferred to pāda b: “fill Indra with soma juices” (*sómebhīḥ ... pṛṇatā ... índram*), a structure identical to 3d *índram sómair órṇuta* “cover Indra with soma juices”). Like the phrase in c, this one has an associated simile, here found in pāda a.

In the identical pāda VI.23.9 I tr. *bhójam* as ‘benefactor’.

II.14.11: The last vs. (before the vs. repeated from II.13.13) reestablishes the rel. cl. / main cl. structure, with two *yáh* clauses referring to Indra and a variant on the refrain in c and the first half of d, scrambled from 10b: *tám ... pṛṇatā ..., índram sómebhīḥ*.

II.15 Indra [SJ on JPB]

Another hymn with a refrain, which runs from vs. 2 through vs. 9, occupying the whole d pāda. It does not vary, nor is it linked to the rest of the vs. in any interesting way.

The hymn is the epitome of a well-made hymn, a catalogue of Indra's deeds, with each deed generally occupying a pāda, expressed with Indra in the 3rd sg. (until vs. 9, which switches to 2nd sg.), almost entirely in augmented imperfects and occasional perfects (with some injunctives surfacing towards the end). It's very regimented and mostly straightforward.

II.15.1: This vs. is a variant on the opening of the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn, I.32 *índrasya nū vīryāni prá vocam* --- with *prá ghā nū ... vocam* framing the first hemistich, an expanded gen. phrase (but without explicit mention of Indra: *asya mahatō ... satyásya*) and *káraṇāni* for *vīryāni* – along with two etymological figures: *mahatō mahāni, satyā satyásya*. Pāda c is an exact repetition of I.32.3b. The final pāda encapsulates the myth, and then our hymn is finished with it and moves on to other deeds – in contrast to the obsessive attention to it in I.32.

II.15.2: Pāda c = I.103.2; for the form *papráthat* see comm. ad VII.86.1.

The last pāda of vs. 1 is converted into the more generic refrain that continues through the rest of the hymn: *sómasya ... máde* substitutes for *asyá máde* and the all-purpose verb *cakāra* for *jaghāna*.

II.15.3: What to supply with *prācaḥ* is a question; see Ge's n. 3a for a consideration of the possibilities. The publ. tr. follows Sāy. in supplying “rivers”; similar is Ge's “Bahnen” (for [water] courses), on the basis of *pathíbhiḥ* in c (so also Kü 367–68). Old (fld. by Re) instead “mountains” on the basis of II.17.5 *prācīnān párvatān*. WG “die Welt,” taking *prācaḥ* not as acc. pl. but abl. sg. (with Gr). Since the rest of the vs. concerns the release of the waters, “rivers” or “(water)courses” is probably the best choice. I prefer the latter, since rivers are not in fact “fixed,” but moving.

mimāya mānaiḥ is a pseudo etymological figure, since *mimāya* belongs to \sqrt{mi} ‘fix’, not $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘measure’, *pace* Re and WG, who tr. as if an etymological figure. For \sqrt{mi} used of cosmogonic deeds, see IV.56.1, III.31.12, and for \sqrt{mi} with ‘seats’ see X.18.13. I would substitute “like (ritual) seats he fixed apart the eastward (water courses)”; in other words he established separate beds for the various rivers.

Exactly what action “drill with his mace” depicts isn’t clear to me – the mace used as a sort of battering ram?

In c for JPB’s “at his choice” I would substitute “at (their) will,” like Re’s “à leur gré,” referring to the waters, not Indra. *vīthā* is several times used of entities that move wherever they want (I.140.5, 168.4), and it occurs in just this context in I.139.5 *tvám vīthā nadyā indra sártave ... asrjah*, which I tr. “You, Indra, released the rivers to flow at will.” It would seem odd to attribute just this action to Indra’s choice/will, since presumably all these deeds are done under that condition.

II.15.4: The relatively rare lexeme *prá \sqrt{vah}* generally means ‘carry away’, sometimes benignly (as in the Wedding Hymn, X.85.26), sometimes not, as here. For the publ. tr. “the raiders against Dabhbhīti,” I would substitute “the abductors of Dabhbhīti.”

The *s*-aor. *adhāk* is a surprisingly intrusion in this long sequence of augmented imperfects, plus perfects and some pres. injunctives. I do not know why the aor. was used here, esp. since the them. pres. stem *dáha-* is well established and *adahat* would have

been available. Evoking metrical reasons is not sufficient, but I do not think *adhāk* has a specifically aoristic nuance here. For another aor. see 7c.

II.15.5: On the story behind this vs., see publ. intro.

II.15.6: Who the “unswift” and the “swift” are is completely unclear; see speculation in Ge’s n. 6c and WG’s n. At least the swift ones (*javínibhih*) have to be fem. I would suggest ‘mares’ (like the swift mares [acc. pl. *jūh*] I see in II.14.3d), except I don’t see how they could be instruments of hewing apart.

II.15.7: The publ. tr. is misleading, in that it indicates, or at least implies, that the subj. of *pāda a* is the same as that in *b*, namely Indra. This is surely incorrect; instead the distribution has to be as Old already saw: the subj. of *pāda a* is Indra, but that in *b* is the ‘shunned’ one. *Pāda b* and *c* recapitulate, in the active voice, nearby II.13.12cd, where the shunned one, the lame, and the blind were the objects of Indra’s attention: *nīcā sántam úd anayah parāvýjam, prāndhám śronám śraváyan* “You led him up who was sunk down and shunned, making famed the blind one and the lame.” Here the same figures indicated by the same lexical items (save for *anák* for *andhá-* ‘blind’) are found—but in the nom.; Indra’s helpful intervention is implied but not stated: they perform the actions themselves. As for Indra’s knowledge in *pāda a*: the “concealment of the maidens” (subjective gen.) surely represents, as Old suggests, unmarried girls concealing infants born out of wedlock (see IV.30.16, also containing *parāvýj-*). Knowing that the shunned one has been hidden away, Indra arranges for him to reappear. I would therefore emend the tr. to “He (Indra) knowing the concealment of the maidens ...: the shunned one, becoming visible, stood up; the lame one stood firm, the blind one gazed widely.” I am also quite dubious about the speculation in the publ. intro. that this vs. has to do with Indra’s “bringing forth the soma.” The ritual references in this hymn are muted to non-existent, whereas Indra’s deeds are front and center.

This vs. contains the only syntactic trick in the hymn. Everywhere else the ubiquitous nom. sg. subject is Indra, though he is not named except in the refrain. But here we must switch subjects from Indra in *pāda a* to the various unfortunates in *b* and *c*. This subject switch was prepared for in vs. 5, where in *pāda c* there was a switch to a 3rd plural subject, but there there was no chance of ambiguity. The trick here is esp. nasty, because *pāda a* has no finite verb, and this lack invites us to take the subj. of *pāda a* as subj. of the verb in *b*. In fact, *pāda a* trails off or breaks off abruptly; as Ge says (n. 7a) “Partizipialkonstruktion oder Anakolouthie.” The question is whether the first part of *b*, the participial phrase *āvīr bhávan* “becoming visible” belongs to *pāda a* (and Indra) or *b* (the shunned one). Despite the complementarity of hidden / manifest, I opt for the latter. The “shunned one” stands up and shows himself.

In *c* we have another aorist (see also *adhāk* in 4b), this time an injunctive, *práti ... sthāt*, which immediately follows the imperfect *úd atiṣthat* in *b*. I do not know what, if any, contrast is meant here, esp. since the following parallel verb *acasta* is again an augmented imperfect.

II.15.8: On the curious use of *√ric* in this group of hymns, see comm. ad II.13.5.

II.15.9: A shift to 2nd ps. address after the unbroken 3rd ps. reference of the rest of the hymn.

I am inclined not to ignore the case frame in pāda a and therefore to tr. “having strewn C and Dh with sleep.”

As is universally agreed, *rambhín-* refers to an elderly person with a cane or staff; this is nicely illustrated (far more clearly than the RV usually offers) by VIII.45.20 *ā tvā rambhām ná jívrayo rarabhmā* “As elderly men grasp a staff, we have grasped hold of you.”

II.15.10: On this regularly repeated vs. see II.11.21.

II.16 Indra [SJ on JPB]

II.16.1–2: The poet plays with several different senses of *√bhr* in these two vss. In 1ab *prá ... bhare* has slightly different nuances in frame and simile, with the personal dative *hyéṣṭhamāya* and the loc. of substance *agnau* being essentially parallel. In 2b *sámbhrtā* means ‘brought together, collected’, while the four loc./acc. pairs in 2cd are all complements of *bhárati* ‘carries, bears’. Note also the phonological echo in *bṛhatáh* (2a). The root returns in 4b.

In 2d *bhárati* is accented presumably because it participates in a series of contrastive predicates.

II.16.1: As often *vah* (“for/of you”) refers generally to the ritual participants on whose behalf the 1st ps. speaker is acting.

Note the two paradoxical pairs in cd, one of which is also an etymological figure: *ajuryám jaráyantam* “unaging but causing to age” and *sanād yúvānam* “a youth from of old.”

II.16.3: A new sentence should probably not be started with pāda c, since d is more appropriate to ab, esp. b, than to c.

II.16.4: On *krátum* construed with both *bharanti* and *sáscate* see Ge’s n. 4b (though neither Re nor WG so construes it).

Ge (n. 4c) successfully defends taking Indra as subj. of *yajasva*, against Sāy.’s priest and Old’s Agni. He also takes *yajasva* as “active” in sense (“sacrifice”) rather than passive, a possibility floated but rejected by Old but accepted by WG (“sei ... verehrt”).

II.16.4–6: The rather tedious identification of all salient entities as bulls – or, as Ge (n. 4–6) characterizes it: “die beliebte Spielerei mit *vṛṣan*.” See how this trope gets twisted in vs. 8.

II.16.7: I’d change “travel among the soma pressings” to “drive to the soma pressings” – the point, I think, is that the poet’s speech is a conveyance in both pādas: in pāda a it’s compared to a boat; in pāda b the formulation is implicitly identified with a chariot. Cf., e.g., VII.75.6 *yāti ... ráthena*.

I'm inclined to slightly change the tr. of *sicāmahe* from 'draw upon' to the more concrete 'dip/scoop out', since esp. in X.101.5–7 it's clear that \sqrt{sic} refers to hauling/dipping water out of a well rather than pouring it out (impossible manoeuvre with a well!).

II.16.8: As pointed out in the publ. intro., Indra is now likened to a cow, indeed a tender mother cow (b), after the focus on bulls in vss. 4–6. But we have now become bulls (cd), virile ones, who sexually unite with Indra's favors as if with their wives – in language very reminiscent of Lopāmudrā's exhortation to Agastya in I.179.1–2.

The publ. intro. suggests that Indra's transformation into a cow in this vs. "sets up the final verse (9)," with its mention of the *dakṣinā*. This may be the case, but it should be remembered that vs. 9 is repeated from II.11.21 and serves as the final vs. for II.15–20.

II.16.9: On this regularly repeated vs. see II.11.21.

II.17 Indra [SJ on JPB]

II.17.1: For *dr̥mhitāny aírayat* Gr suggests reading *dr̥mhitā vyaírayat*, a change endorsed by Old.

II.17.2: Although Ge (see esp. n. 2a) and Re take *dhāyase* as belonging to $\sqrt{dhā}$ 'place, establish', all clear instances of *dhāyas-*, esp. in its abundant cmpds., belong to $\sqrt{dhā}$ 'suckle'. See comm. ad III.50.3, etc., as well as *viśvā-dhāyas-* in our vs. 5, which both Ge and Re take as 'all-nourishing'.

I do not understand what *mahimānam ātirat* means, though I rather doubt it means "crossed beyond greatness," as in the publ. tr. The lexeme $\tilde{a} \sqrt{tī}$ is rather rare, but seems otherwise, when construed with an acc., mostly to mean 'overcome' (III.34.1, VII.82.6, X.54.1), though also maybe 'pass over' (IV.30.3, 7). But neither sense works well here. I can find no passages in which it appears to mean 'pass beyond', and it's hard to know what that would mean here in context, as well as how \tilde{a} would contribute to that sense. It's also possible that *mahimānam* is a second object to *mīmānah* ("showing the measure of his power and greatness") and *ātirat* should be differently construed, possibly with the dative *prathamāya dhāyase*. In that case the relevant parts of the hemistich could be tr. "... who, showing the measure of his power and greatness, attained to the foremost sustenance." I rather prefer this.

The 2nd hemistich is reminiscent of the more explicit I.173.6 *sām vivya índro vṛjānam ná bhūmā, bharti svadhāvām opaśám iva dyām* "Indra has enwrapped himself in the earth, like a circlet. The autonomous one wears heaven like a headdress" and seems to refer to Indra's "suiting up" in cosmic garb.

II.17.3–5: Note the vs./hemistich openings 3a *ádhā*, 4a *ádhā*, 4c *ād*, 5a *ádhārayat*.

II.17.3: The referent and governing nominal of *asya* are unclear. The publ. tr. (also Old, WG) takes it as dependent on *ágre* with the referent apparently the deed, but this enclitic is in Wackernagel's position and need not be governed by the immed. flg. noun. Semantically I prefer Sāy.'s suggestion (adopted by Ge and Re), that it refers to the

singer and limits *bráhmanā* – so “when at the beginning you roused your explosive power by his [=singer’s] formulation.” However, this runs into the problem that the singer is nowhere in the discourse, and *asya* should have an already existing referent (or, if we were to read **asyá* against the Pp., it should be adjectival). Still I prefer this interpr. to the one in the publ. tr.

II.17.4: Because *abhí* appears in both pāda a and pāda b, I would separate the two pādas and supply the verb “sur(mount)” in the first pāda, on the basis of the parallel IX.110.9 adduced by Ge (n. 4a). The lexeme *abhí* √*vr dh* appears in a limited no. of passages (e.g., III.44.2, V.44.5, probl. IX.47.1) with the acc., meaning something like “wax strong over,” and so the publ. tr. is possible, but I’d prefer “Then he who sur(mounted) all the worlds by his greatness, acting as their master, and, projecting his youthful vitality, waxed strong.”

The verb in c could technically be *ā-á̄tanot* with accent on the verb, not the preverb, and still be part of the rel. cl. of ab (as in I.32.4), but since the “light” of c and the “darkness” of d are thematically linked, they may better be interpr., as in the publ. tr., as two main clauses. I would, however, connect them more closely, by deleting the semicolon and joining them by “and”: “just after that, (as a) draught horse, he spanned the two world-halves with light, and sewing up the bilious darknesses, he wrapped them all together.”

II.17.5: I would delete the comma after “power” in a.

Note the non-etymological play in b: *apām ápah* “the work of the waters.”

I would substitute “uncanny power” for “wiles” in d.

II.17.6: This vs. is a little riddle, whose solution – *vájra-* – is postponed till the first word of the final pāda.

The interpr. of *vēdasah* in b is about evenly divided between ‘possessions’ (Ge [though see his n. 6b], JPB) and ‘knowledge’ (Old, Re, WG). The stem *vēdas-* ordinarily means ‘possessions, property’, but I can see that in this passage ‘knowledge’ is somewhat more appealing.

On the always problematic *krívi-*, see the despairing comm. ad I.30.1 and V.44.5. Since our hemistich almost certainly describes the smiting of Vṛtra (on the basis of *vájrena hatvī*, the verb *ní* ... *āvṛnak* [see *ní* ... *āvṛnak* in the Vṛtra passage V.32.8], and *śayádhya*ī, which recalls the numerous exx. of √*sí* ‘lie’ in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32), it would be nice to rescue JPB’s ‘worm’, against the PN Krivi in the standard tr. This is just barely possible: the ‘worm’ word (AV+) is found both as *kṝmi-* and *krími-* (see AiG I.33 and, esp. Nachtr. 19 [31, 4], on the variation in AV and YV mss. between the two). In MIA intervocalic *m* can become *v* or nasalized *ñ* (see Pischel, Pkr. Gr. §251, von Hinüber, *Überblick*² §§208–11). Via such manipulations we can get *krívi-* here to be a MIA form of *kṝmi-* ‘worm’ – ‘worm’ being of course a deprecatory way to refer to a snake.

II.17.7: The publ. tr. doesn’t make sufficiently clear the relevance of the simile to the larger context, which turns on two slightly different senses of *bhága-*. The *amājúr-* is an unmarried female (hence ‘maiden’ probably better than ‘woman’) who “grows old at

home" with her parents because of her unmarried state; she begs for *bhága-* in the particular sense of good fortune in love (see Ge's n. 7ab), while in the frame *bhága-* has the more general sense of good fortune / luck. This is well brought out in the perhaps overly specific tr. of Scar (163): "Wie eine, die zu Hause alt wird ... [den Bhaga um Liebesglück anfleht], so flehe ich dich um Glück an." The phrase beginning *pāda b, samānād ā sádasah*, should be common to both simile and frame, as Ge and Scar take it (not merely with the latter as JPB, Re, and WG do). In the simile it refers to the house the luckless maiden (reluctantly) shares with her parents, in the frame to the ritual "seat" (=ritual ground) shared by the ritual participants. I would therefore tr. ab "As (a maiden) growing old at home, being with her parents, (begs) from their common seat for luck in love, from our common (ritual) seat I beg you for good fortune." On the connection between *amājúr-* and *bhága-* see X.39.3 (the *Ghoṣā* hymn), adduced by Ge.

The verb *iye* in b belongs to $\sqrt{yā}$ 'beg, beseech', not $\sqrt{yā}$ 'drive', *pace* WG.

It is difficult to know how to construe *pāda d*. To begin with, *tanvāḥ* can belong either to the main cl. or the rel. cl., since *yēna* could be taking 2nd position in the rel. cl., as often. Then, it can either be gen. (/abl.) sg. or acc. pl., and it can mean 'self' or 'body'; if 'self', it could have either 1st or 2nd ps. reference (myself v. yourself). The standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG, Kü [354], JPB) all situate *tanvāḥ* in the main cl., mostly as an awk. substitute for an indirect obj. "to me" – so JPB "to me myself," Re "à moi-même." This seems to me an unlikely use of *tanū-*. WG, by contrast, take it as body ("gib uns den Teil des Leibes"), which is syntactically better, but what would be its sense in context? (In a note they suggest alternatively "deiner selbst" with 2nd ps. ref., which makes more sense than the 1st ps. of the other tr.; this is also the solution of Kü [354].) Scar (163) takes *tanvāḥ* with the rel. cl. and gives it 2nd ps. ref.: "verschaff einen Anteil, durch den du [etwas] von dir selbst gespendet haben wirst," with an unjustified "future perfect" interpr. of the pf. subj. *māmāhāḥ*, but a reasonably plausible interpr. of *tanvāḥ* as a partitive with 2nd ps. ref.

The interpr. is further complicated by the not-always-certain semantics of the root $\sqrt{māh}$, for which see the disc. in my -áya-Formations (130–31). I argue there that the root originally meant 'be ready', a meaning still found in some passages (like VIII.12.6), but that long association with *dānāya* 'for giving, to give' transferred the 'give' meaning to the root: "be ready to give, be liberal". In addition to the pres. stems *māḥha-* and *māḥhāya-*, the pf. *māmah-* belongs to this root (and should be dissociated with \sqrt{mah} , with which it is classified by Gr; see correct affiliation in Lub). The form here, *māmāhāḥ*, is the only active form to this pf. and must be a subjunctive. That its root syl. is weak (expected act. subj. stem in principle **māmāḥha-*) shows that it is a nonce activization of the weak middle pf. stem *māmah-*, which builds a subj. *māmahanta* as well as imperatives based on such an apparent thematic stem, *māmahasva* and *māmahantām* (for which see disc. in my 2018 "The Vedic Perfect Imperative and the Status of Modal Forms to Tense-Aspect Stems" (Fs. Lubotsky).

Putting all this together, I would now take *tanvāḥ* with the main cl. (like most tr., though sympathetic to Scar's alt. interpr.), but with the 2nd ps. reference suggested by Kü and as an alternative by WG: "Give (us) a share of yourself, by which you will display your liberality." This tr. is almost identical to Kü's: "Gib einen Anteil an dir selbst, mit dem du dich grosszügig ziegen wirst."

II.17.7–8: Note the progression *bhágam* (7b), *bhāgám* (7d), *bhojám* (8a).

II.17.8: I prefer ‘benefactor’ for *bhojá-*, or, as in nearby II.14.10, ‘provider’.

The accented voc. *výsann* in HvN’s ed. is (fortunately) a typographical error.

I would change “make us better” to “make us better off.” Such wishes have to do with material, not moral, improvement.

II.17.9: Once again the repeated final vs.; see II.11.21.

II.18 Indra [SJ on JPB]

The hymn is filled [/afflicted] with a fair amount of numerology. Although much ingenuity has been devoted to identifying the referents of the various numbered entities, beginning with Sāy., from my point of view identifying the referent is less important than noting the esoteric play with numbers. For speculations on some of the identifications see publ. intro.

II.18.1: Since pāda a has only 10 syllables, it is possible that we might read **ayoji* (so tentatively Old and Arnold), though there are other possibilities (e.g., HvN’s “rest” at 5). If **ayoji*, it should be tr. ‘has been yoked up’, though ‘is yoked up’ for the injunctive might match the *bhūt* in d.

Because of the sá opening d, I would link c to ab, and start a new clause with d (so also Ge, Re, WG). This would also allow the last numerological term (*dásāritrah* in c) to be part of the clause containing the others: “Early in the morning a new, winning chariot has been / is yoked up ..., having 10 oars, sun-winning, belonging to the sons of Manu; it is / has become ...”

The simple adj. ‘swift’ misrepresents the gerundive morphology of *ramhyà-*, and it also fails to give the instr. their proper reading as agents of the gerundive. I’d tr. the VP *ramhyò bhūt* as “is to be hastened” or more awkwardly “has become one to be hastened,” with the instr. “by our desires and thoughts.”

II.18.2: The opening *sāsmā áram* matches that of II.17.6a in the immediately preceding hymn and should be tr. in the same general way. The ordinal numbers here must be adverbial (“the first time,” etc.), since the masc. referent of *sá* is the Hotar found at the end of the hemistich. Here the temporal adverbs must refer to kindling of the three ritual fires. WG (see the n.) think instead of the three soma pressings, but the rest of the vs. is resolutely Agnaic.

The 2nd hemistich is notable for having three forms of *anyá-*, two initial in their clauses, one in 2nd position. In keeping with my rules, the initial ones should be indefinite but also contrastive with each other; the non-initial one definite. This is more or less how JPB tr. it, but I would refine it to “the embryo of one (fem. [=kindling stick]) -- others [=priests] beget him. He keeps company with the others [=ritual fires] ...”

On *jénya-* see comm. ad I.128.7.

II.18.3: *yojam*, isolated in its averbo, is universally tr. as if it were a subjunctive, though it appears to be a 1st sg. root aor. injunctive (see KH, Injunk. 253). Hoffmann argues that the 1st sg. injunc. and subj. are functionally almost identical, and he cf.s the clear 1st sg.

subj. in I.82.1–5 *yójā nv indra te hárī* “I shall now yoke your two fallow bays, o Indra” with our scrambled but almost identical *hárī nū kam rátha índrasya yojam*. I wonder, however, if *yojam* here actually stands for the subjunctive **yójā*, with the final *-m* originally a hiatus-filler before *āyaí* opening the next pāda. The two passages would then be morphologically identical. In any case, it’s worth noting that these two 1st sg. forms are almost the only active root-aor. forms to \sqrt{yuj} (besides opt. *sám yuṣyāva* in VIII.62.11).

Given its position, I’d take *anyé* as def. “the other sacrificers.”

II.18.4–6: The next three vss. attribute ever-proliferating horses to Indra, from two (4a) to 100 (6b). Most pādas in this sequence, through 6b (only exception 4d), start with *ā* followed by a number in the instr. Each vs. also contains the impv. *yāhi* in the 1st pāda. The reason for this equine explosion is unclear --- much less if there are any referents meant besides the horses (though see publ. intro. for speculation).

Śunahotra is the name of a priestly family (see Mayr PN).

II.18.7: I would rearrange the tr. to reflect the fronted non-enclitic *máma* (see also 7d and 8b): “To my poetic formulation drive here.”

The first pāda of this vs. ends *yāhy áchā*, echoing *yāhy arvān*, which ends 5a and 6a, and *yāhi*, which ends 4a, so there is a transition from the horse-numbering vss. to this one.

In b Indra is urged to attach every pair of fallow bays to the yokepole of his chariot; given vss. 4–6 this would amount to at least fifty pairs.

Flg. IH, I’d take *babhūtha* not as expressing change of state, but rather as a habitual; in IH’s full periphrasis: “you have (typically) been (on various discrete occasions) ...” and so “you are known to be ...” I would emend the tr. to “for you are one to be competitively summoned ...” Since the demons. *asmín* opens the last pāda, I would also ital. “In *this* soma pressing ...,” corresponding to the ital. *my* representing *máma*, which opens the vs. Further, I would connect c with d (changing the tr. to “Since you are one ...”) and treat b as an independent cl., as Ge and Re do.

II.18.8: The question in pāda a is whether *sakhyám* is subject (Gr, Ge, Re, WG) or object (JPB) of *ví yoṣat*. Despite the heavy favoring of the subject role, there is good evidence that favors the object. The lexeme *ví \sqrt{yu}* , esp. common in the *s*-aorist, is generally transitive, with an acc. + instr.: “separate ACC from INSTR” (with the well-known instr. of separation). Several of these passages contain *sakhyá-*, though in the instr. See, e.g., II.32.2 *mā no ví yauḥ sakhyā* “Do not keep us away from partnership (with you)”; sim. IV.16.20. VIII.86.1, X.23.7, all with instr. *sakhyā*; see also V.2.5 with *ví yavanta* and a different instr. than *sakhyá-*. The only intransitive exx. are IV.2.9 “stay distant from X” (with instr. *rāyā*) and X.85.42 reciprocal “go apart” with no instr. Both of these have personal animate subjects, not an abstract like *sakhyá-*. The formulaic evidence (*ví \sqrt{yu}* with *sakhyá-*) thus favors a transitive interpr. Though *sakhyá-* in our passage is not in the instr., that seems an allowable variation. The problem then is who or what is the subject? Given the focus on competing sacrificers in this hymn (see 3cd and 7c), I suggest it is an unspecified representative of this threatening group, here tr. as “no one.” The opening of the next pāda again gives contrastive emphasis to *us* with the full pronominal form

asmábhym. I would slightly alter the tr. of b to “*To us* should the priestly gift yield its milk,” with fronting and ital. – to match the *máma* in 7a and *asmín ... sávane* in 7d.

As suggested by IH, I’d render d as “might we emerge victorious in our every advance.”

II.18.9: On this regularly repeated vs. see II.11.21.

II.19 Indra [SJ on JPB]

The hymn begins by announcing that soma has been drunk, probably referring simultaneously to the ritual situation and to Indra’s drinking of soma in the mythic past – which enabled him to perform the deeds recounted in the narrative portion of the hymn, vss. 2–6. Besides the final vs. (9), which serves as the refrain for II.11, 15–20, the hymn ends with two summary vss. (7–8), each beginning with the summary introducer *evā* ‘so, in just this way’.

II.19.1: The hymn begins strikingly with the passive aor. *ápāyi*, apparently in impersonal usage (so Gr), or rather with an oblique subj. in the gen., corresponding to the pseudo-partitive gen. obj. with transitive forms of *√pā* and other verbs of consumption. JPB tr. “the drinking ... has begun.” Although, acdg. to IH, such an ingressive sense is possible for an aorist, I see no evidence in the rest of the hymn that the drinking continues, but rather that the drinking was an event that gave Indra the power to perform the deeds about to be depicted. So I prefer a less limiting tr. like “it has been drunk – this plant ...,” though this does lose the pseudo-partitive construction. Or, “(it/a drink) has been drunk of this plant ...”

In b I would render *suvānásya* as the participle it is, not as JPB’s “soma pressing”; it modifies *ándhasah* in pāda a. Moreover, *práyas-* is a noun (‘pleasure, pleasurable offering’), not an adj. (‘delightful’). See the neut. pl. in 2d.

Putting this together, I would substitute this tr. of ab: “It has been drunk for exhilaration

In pāda a *asyāndhaso* is analyzed by the Pp. as *asyá ándhasah*, while HvN read unaccented *asya*. The standard tr. (incl. this one) follow the Pp. with the accented *asyá* adjectival as is standard; if we read *asya* instead, it would have to be pronominal, referring to Indra, and be a gen. agent. Although Indra has not yet been mentioned in the hymn, he is obviously present in the ritual context, which would allow this pronominal interpr. An alt. tr. based on unaccented *asya* would be “it has been drunk by him – this plant having been pressed ...” But the Pp. *asyá* seems the better reading, esp. given #*asyá ... mádhvah* opening the next vs.

In cd I would substitute “on which ...” (construing with *vāvrdhānáh*) or (preferably) “in which ...” (construing with *óko dadhé*); JPB’s “at which” doesn’t work with either.

II.19.2–6: As noted above, these vss. depict a series of deeds performed by Indra in the exhilaration of the soma introduced in vs. 1. These deeds occurred in the mythic past, but are still repeated – or repeatable – in the present, as is made clear [well, maybe not *clear*] in vs. 4, which is the central (omphalos) vs. of the narrative.

II.19.2: The pf. part. *mandānāh* should have its usual anterior sense, “having become exhilarated.” This fits with the general preterital cast of vs. 1.

There is some uncertainty about the morphological identity and therefore the function of (*prá ...*) *cákramanta*. Is it an injunc. with a preterital sense (“such that they launched themselves forth”) or a subjunctive with prospective value (“so that they would launch themselves forth”)? See disc. by Kü (147–48). Re opts for the latter, while Ge, WG, JSK (DGRV I.224), and the publ. tr. choose the former. Kü offers both without deciding. I am inclined towards the preterital interpr.

This issue is in part intertwined with another: the apparently functionless *ca* in d. This *ca* causes Old a certain amount of distress: see the various explanatory possibilities he offers, without conviction. It is treated variously in the tr. WG simply ignore it, as apparently does JPB. Re supplies another noun with which *práyāmsi* can be conjoined as double subject of *cákramanta*: “en sorte que (les forces) et les réconforts ... pussent marcher” – “les forces” invented out of whole cloth. Instead of supplying a nominal, Ge supplies a verb parallel to *ví vrścat* on which the *yád* clause can depend; this invented verb would be conjoined by the much displaced *ca* (“an unrechter Stelle” says Ge, n. 2d): “... zerrieb Indra ... und (machte), dass ...” JSK’s (DGRV I.224) “... hewed apart ... and (brought about) that ...” seems directly based on Ge. JSK explains (225) the position of *ca* as “the result of the preposed simile of *pāda c*,” but this seems weak: the simile doesn’t occupy that whole *pāda*. The Ge/JSK approach seems the least plausible of the solutions offered. I am more sympathetic towards Re’s solution, despite his conjuring the other nominal out of thin air. Two of the fourteen occurrences of *práyāmsi* are followed by a *ca* (III.12.8, IX.107.25) and are conjoined with preceding nouns, so there’s at least some syntactic template our occurrence can fit. But there’s no standard noun with which *práyas-* forms a pair that could easily be supplied here, and the two *práyāmsi ca* passages are *pāda*-final. The best I can do is suggest that *práyāmsi ca* was adapted from such passages and slotted in here without function – which is, I’m afraid, tantamount to the WG/JPB strategy of ignoring the *ca*. I would tr. “... hewed apart the serpent, such that the rivers’ delightful offerings (of water) charged forth ...”

I would change the tr. of *práyāmsi* from “pleasing offerings” to “delightful offerings” to match that of *práyas-* in 1b.

II.19.3: The first hemistich is a loose paraphrase of vs. 2: *ahihā* encapsulates 2b *ahím ... ví vrścat*; *árno apām praírayat* picks up the *arno* in *arnovṛtam* in 2b and paraphrases *prá ... práyāmsi ... nadnām cákramanta* of 2cd.

The point of *pāda d* is presumably that by interposing night between days Indra draws temporal boundaries that produce the alternating patterns of day and night – showing the usual Vedic horror at the prospect of an undifferentiated mass of anything.

II.19.4: As noted above, this is the central vs. of the narrative vss. 2–6, and it contains a shock. Embedded in the midst of the augmented and injunctive forms that carry the narrative, we find an undeniable present-tense form, and it depicts the most iconic of Indra’s deed in the mythic past: *hánti vrtrám* “he smashes Vṛtra” – ordinarily expressed by a preterital verb, commonly the impf. *áhan* (see I.32.5, 56.5, etc.). What is going on here? I think the interpenetration of past and present alluded to above is brought to the surface in this omphalos vs. Like JPB I think there’s a parenthetical insertion here, but

unlike him I think it is not the nominal phrase in pāda a, but rather the opening of pāda b *índro dāśad dāśuṣe* (sim. Re). The phrase in pāda a, *apratīni mánave purūṇi*, is, in my view, one object of *hánti* in b. The adj. *apratīni* ‘unopposable’ almost always modifies *vrtrā(ṇi)* (e.g., I.53.6, IV.17.19, etc.); given this and given the fact that *vrtrám* is also found in the same hemistich, pl. *vrtrā(ṇi)* ‘obstacles’ should surely be supplied here (as indeed JPB does) – and the pres. *hánti* can then be read both backwards with this pl. phrase, indicating Indra’s continuing efforts to remove obstacles for us, and forwards with the sg. referring to the arch-Obstacle that provides the model for the present-day action. In between, the brief clause *índro dāśad dāśuṣe* parenthetically characterizes this action of Indra’s as his “pious work”; see X.138.5 *dāśad vrtrahā* “the Vṛtra-smasher, doing his pious work ...” *Pace* Gr, Ge, and WG, the NP in pāda a is almost certainly not the obj. of *dāśat*, which takes the acc. only under special circumstances; see comm. ad IV.31.20, 31. See also Old’s disc.; he aims at the same general interpr. as mine, but does so by emending *dāśat* to accented participle *dāśat*; however, as Ge points out (n. 1 to n. 4ab), the accent on *hánti* complicates Old’s solution. Acdg. to my interpr. the verb *hánti* is accented because it immediately follows the parenthetical interjection. I would now tr. this hemistich “He (smashes) the many unopposable (obstacles) for Manu – Indra does pious work for the pious – he smashes Vṛtra (/the Obstacle).”

On *atasāyyo bhūt* see the almost identical phrase in I.63.6 and the comm. thereon. In I.63.6 the referent is Indra’s help, also in the contest for the sun. In my view the gerundive means literally ‘not to be tugged (back and forth)’, hence ‘unshakeable’. Here the literal meaning fits well, with the dative agent referring to the humans contending with each other. I would tr. the 2nd hemistich, somewhat colloquially, “Who at once came to be one who couldn’t be jerked around by the men contending with each other in the battle for the sun.”

II.19.5: On the curious use of *√ric* in this group of hymns, see comm. ad II.13.5.

On the problematic *stavān* see comm. ad VI.24.8, where I suggest that it was built with the possessive “Hoffmann suffix.”

The mythological situation (or situations) depicted here is/are unclear to me. Also the simile *áṁśam ná*, which is equally opaque in III.45.4 (see comm. there).

II.19.6: Despite the identical tr. in vss. 4 and 6 “in a single day” in the publ. tr., these render two different forms: 4c *sadyāḥ* and 6a *sadīvah*; the latter is a hapax. It might be better as ‘on the same day’.

A small change from “the charioteer Kutsa” to “his charioteer K.” might better represent *sārathi-*, since Kutsa and Indra go on their expeditions on the same chariot.

vy airat in d recalls *praírayat* in 3b and almost forms a ring that brings the narrative portion to a close.

II.19.7–8: As noted above, the hymn proper ends with these two summary vss., each introduced by *evā*, each announcing (7a, 8ab) the hymn just created and dispatched to Indra and in the rest of the vs. expressing what we hope to gain – with vs. 7 more vivid and 8 more generic. In both vss. I would prefer a more explicit recognition of the function of *evā* – “in just this way” or sim.

II.19.7: Though the standard tr. take b with a, this requires supplying considerable machinery; best, with the publ. tr., to attach b to c.

Ge renders *sāptam* as “Freundschaft,” flg. Sāy.’s condensed interpr., with *sāpta-* standing for ‘having seven steps’, referring to the ritual seven steps that seal a friendship. But Ge’s n. 7c seems to recognize the over-elaboration of this explanation and seems to favor the more plausible interpr. of a heptad of gifts, with seven representing a conventional number – the interpr. found one way or the other in the other standard tr.

II.19.8: The standard tr. take the simile in b as including both preceding nom. and flg. acc. (e.g., Re “comme (les gens) cherchant assistance (façonnent) les règles-rituelles”). Better, with the publ. tr., to limit it to the nom., and take *vayúnāni* as parallel to *mánma* in the frame. The simile is still a bit puzzling, but less so.

brahmanyántah in c forms a ring with the same form in 1d and should have been rendered identically (publ. tr. 1d “creating the poetic formulations” versus 8c “creating the formulations” – either one will do). Since this is the last real vs. of the hymn (vs. 9 being the repeated final vs. for a series of Gṛtsamada Triṣṭubh Indra hymns), it does sketch an orthodox first/last-verse ring, though, dependent on a single word, the ring is not terribly salient (though it’s worth noting that *brahmanyánt-* is only attested 6x in the RV). However, there’s also a thematic echo: in vs. 1 both Indra and the formulation-producing men “find a home” (*óko dadhe*), while in 8d those same formulators hope to attain “a good dwelling place” (*sukṣitím*).

II.19.9: On this regularly repeated vs. see II.11.21.

II.20 Indra [SJ on JPB]

On the metrical issues in this hymn see Old and the publ. intro.

II.20.1–2: Besides several forms of the standard 2nd sg. prn., these vss. play with several derivatives: *t^uvā-vant-* (1d), *t^uvā-yánt-* (2b), and the thematic adj. *t^uvá-* (2a), the only form to this stem in the RV.

II.20.1: Note the phonological play of *vayám te váya(h)*.

The parenthetical *viddhí sú nah* would work better in context as “know [=recognize] us!” or “know [=recognize] (this) of ours!” – though ‘recognize’ is usually the province of *√jñā*.

The standard interp. take *nṛn* as a gen. sg. (On alt. morphological analyses of this form see comm. ad X.29.4.) Preferable is JPB’s interpr., which takes it as the acc. pl. it appears to be, as a second obj. of *īyakṣantah*, reading *tvāvataḥ* twice, once as gen. sg. dependent on *sumnám* (“the good favor of one such as you”) and once as acc. pl. modifying *nṛn* (“men such as you”). The acc. pl. reading is reinforced by the parallel acc. pl. *tvāyatāḥ* in 2b.

II.20.2: The analysis of *abhiṣṭipāsi* as a rt-noun cmpd *abhiṣṭi+pā-* with a double sandhi contraction of *-pā(s)* + *asi*, as set out in the publ. intro., is endorsed by Old (though the compd is not treated by Scar). It is hard to see what else it could be: if read as Gr suggests, **abhiṣṭī pāsi*, the accent is problematic – needing to be retracted on the nominal

and erased on the verb. However, I do think Gr is right that *abhiṣṭi-* has instr. function in the compd., as JPB properly represents it “protector by dominance.”

Note that the desid. *īyakṣantah* ‘desiring to obtain’ in vs. 1 finds its fulfillment in 2d *nāksati* ‘obtains’. To reflect this connection, the two forms should be rendered either both with ‘attain(s)’ or with ‘obtain(s)’.

II.20.3: In b *narām astu pātā* seems almost a paraphrase / repair of *abhiṣṭipāsi jánān* in 2b.

II.20.4: The subjects of the two 3rd pl. pfs. *vāvṛdhūḥ* and *sāśadūḥ* are left unspecified. They could be the “men” of 3b. But given the contrast between *purā* ‘previously’ (4b) and *nūtana-* ‘current’ (4d), I think it’s likely the pl. Āyus, contrasting with the Āyu of today in d.

Although in a hymn with so much metrical disturbance, this won’t carry much weight – but if we read subjunctive **pīparāt*, it would improve the cadence.

II.20.5: On *tūtot* in b, as well as 7d, see the extensive disc. ad X.50.5. To summarize briefly, I take these two forms as well as *tūtos* (VI.26.4) and *tūtuma* (X.50.5) as belonging to a redupl. aor. (not to the pf. system) with transitive value.

The instr. *sūryeṇa* can be either an actual instrument (“[he did it] by/with the sun”) or an instr. of accompaniment (“along with the sun”). JPB opts for the former, along with WG, but I find this interpr. quite unlikely, since it would seem to make reference to an unknown myth in which Indra uses the sun as a weapon against the dawns. But esp. given the presence of the Āngirases in pāda a, this vs. probably refers to the Vala myth (see Ge’s n. 5c). Indra “robs” the dawns, that is, he robs the Pāṇi of the cows / dawns imprisoned in the cave. For the full expression with both the *pāṇi-* and the cows in the acc., see I.93.4, sim. X.67.6. By this interpr. the sun was also a beneficiary of Indra’s action (so Ge, probably also Re, though his “avec” is unclear), having also been stolen / freed. I would therefore change the tr. to “stealing the dawns along with the sun.”

I would also change “has pierced” to “pierced.”

On *stavān* see comm. ad VI.24.8 and the occurrence in the immed. preceding hymn, II.19.5.

II.20.6: On the formation of *arśasānā-* and the indirect connection between the occurrence here and X.99.7 see comm. ad loc. As noted there, the phrase *ūrdhvó bhuvat* here corresponds to the pseudo-part. *ūrdhvāsānā-* in X.99.7. I now would substitute “Harmer” for the PN here.

I would also substitute “having prevailed” for “able.”

On *āva √bhṛ* see comm. ad VIII.93.23, X.171.2 and the very similar phraseology in the latter passage. Here I would emend “carried away” to “brought down” or “pulled off.”

The whole 2nd hemistich should then read “Having prevailed, the autonomous one pulled off the own dear head of the Dāsa, the Harmer.”

II.20.7: From *puramdarāḥ* can be extracted *púrah*, to be supplied with acc. pl. fem. *kṛṣṇāyonīḥ* ... *dāsīḥ*.

tūtot in d reprises the same form in 5b, where it is fairly clearly preterital. JPB renders the injunctive as a present here (“he makes ... powerful”), contra the standard tr. I think it could be either (or both), but given the preterital and mythological content of the rest of the vs., I favor the preterital interpr.

II.20.8: Given its etymological connection with *tūtot* ‘made powerful’ (in vss. 5 and 7), I’d render *tavasyām* as ‘power’.

II.20.9: On this regularly repeated vs. see II.11.21.

II.21 Indra [SJ on JPB]

The first four vss. of this hymn have an excessively nominal style, with a string of descriptors of Indra, barely marshalled into minimalist clauses, which are confined to the final pāda of the vs. (or in vs. 1, the last word of c).

II.21.1: This opening vs. is striking, with its nine straight root-noun cmpds in *-jít-* in the dat. *-jíte*.

II.21.2: The 2nd vs. continues the dative sequence, with ten in a row, though with more varied morphology than the repeated *-jíte* of vs. 1. There are smaller patterns within the sequence: the vs. begins with two *abhi-bh...* forms; pāda b has the etym. contrastive figure *ásālhāya* *sáhamānāya*, with \sqrt{sah} reappearing in d *satrāsāhe*, which also resonates with *satrājíte* beginning 1b.

HvN’s unaccented *vanvate* (extracted from Samhitā *vanvaté* *’sālhāya*) should of course be read *vanvaté*, with the Pp.

The hapax *i*-stem *tuvi-grí-* is interpr. by Gr. as having a form of $\sqrt{gṛ}$ ‘swallow’ as 2nd member, like (in his interpr.) *tuvi-grá-* (I.140.9); he glosses ‘viel verschlingend’ (also WG; sim. Re “puissant-dévoreur”) This analysis is accepted by Wackernagel (AiG I.94, II.1.174, 224) and Debrunner (AiG II.2.72), but is not universally held, even by Wackernagel in the same AiG vol. Ge tr. ‘lautrufend’, as does Wackernagel (AiG II.1.98), deriving it from the homonymous root $\sqrt{gṛ}$ ‘sing’. Scar (112) considers both possibilities without deciding. Better is the suggestion of Insler’s that both *tuvi-grá-* and *tuvi-grí-* result from haplology of **tuvi-vigrá-*, a cmpd of *vigrá-* ~ *vígra-* ‘lively, spirited’ (2x, \sqrt{vij} ‘be agitated’). See comm. ad I.140.9.

II.21.2–3: Nominal forms of the root \sqrt{sah} ‘overcome’ dominate these two vss.: *ásālhāya* *sáhamānāya* (2b), *satrāsāhe* (2d), *satrāsāháh* ... *janamsaháh* (3a), *sáhurih* (3c)

II.21.3: After the string of the descriptive datives of vss. 1–2, this vs. presents a similar string of nominatives characterizing Indra in pādas a–c – though this string is introduced with a little trick. The first item is *satrāsāháh*, at first glance built to the same stem as the dat. *satrāsāhe* opening pāda d of the preceding vs., hence a genitive. But it does not belong to that athematic stem (as the accent shows) but to a thematic one, and it initiates the sequence of nominatives, most of them also thematic stems.

Gr glosses *jana-bhaksá-* as a bahuvr., ‘Menschen als Anteil order Besitz habend’, and this interpr. is appealing, because, though the noun *bhaksá-* ‘portion’ is

fairly well established, there is no verbal root \sqrt{bhaks} ‘apportion’ at this period. The single verbal form *abhakṣayam* in the very late X.167.3 (the stem also several times in the AV) is an obvious denom.; see my *āya*-formations (p. 73). However, the accent makes a *bahuvrīhi* interpr. of this cmpd. difficult. The standard tr. properly render it as a tatp., but with an almost random choice of gloss for the 2nd element: Ge “Menschen vertilgend,” Re “mangeur d’hommes” (most likely influenced by his interpr. of *tuvigrí-* in the preceding vs.), WG “über Menschen gebietende,” JPB “consuming the peoples.” AiG doesn’t treat it. I do not have a good solution, but think that the semantics of the 2nd member must come from \sqrt{bhaj} , mediated through its reasonably well-attested *s*-aor. (see Narten, 179–80) and the noun *bhakṣá-*. The *s*-aor. is generally middle in the RV, in the sense ‘share in, take/acquire a share’. I would tentatively tr. ‘taking his share of the peoples’, which is in fact rather close functionally to Gr’s b.v. interpr.

Ge, Re, and WG obviously take the 2nd member of *vṛtamcayá-* as belonging to \sqrt{ci} ‘pile, assemble’, judging from their tr. “Herrsammler,” “qui rassemble les armées,” and “der das Gewählte sammelt,” respectively. (WG also must take *vṛtam* as derived from $\sqrt{vṛ}$ ‘choose’, not $\sqrt{vṛ}$ ‘obstruct, oppose’.) But *-cayá-* more likely belongs with *rṇam-cayá-* PN (lit. ‘requiting a debt’), *cetár-* (VII.60.5) ‘avenger’, etc. See EWA s.v. CAY³, Gotō (1st cl., 132–33, who does not treat this cmpd there). JPB’s ‘punishing opposition’ is, in my opinion, correct.

On *āritá-* see comm. ad VIII.16.6.

The nominative string of abc describing Indra is picked up by the gen. *īndrasya* opening d. Ge (n. 3) calls this anacoluthon, which seems a little backwards to me. In fact, pāda d is a minor interruption of the nominatives describing Indra that continue in vs. 4.

II.21.4: JPB must take *anānudá-* as derived from \sqrt{nud} ‘push’, which, however, does not occur with *ā* in the RV. It rather belongs to *ánu* $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘yield, concede’ (so already Gr); on the long *ā* see AiG II.1.71. The tr. should be changed to “Unyielding bull ...”

The publ. tr. seems to take *dódhataḥ* as an acc. pl. part. (“against those raging”), but it must be a gen. sg.; among other things *vadhá-* always takes a gen. Emend the tr. to “the deadly blow for the one who rages.”

The injunc. *janat* can express Indra’s habitual re-creation of the world in the present time or his mythological cosmogonic acts in the past. JPB opted for the former; the standard tr. the latter. I am on the fence.

II.21.5: This vs. represents an abrupt thematic and stylistic break from the ponderous and restrictive nominal style of the first four vss.. Indra is not mentioned until pāda d, and there is activity rather than the stasis of 1–4: verbal forms with objects, a variety of case forms, and a series of actions accomplished. The effect is freeing.

The rendering of the two root-noun instr. in c, *abhisvárā niṣádā*, could be sharpened. I think Ge is quite right (n. 1, bottom of the page) that they refer to the sacrifice, specifically to the verbal performance and the installation on the ritual ground – but I’m not sure that the publ. tr. “by their cry and assembly” conveys that. I’d prefer “by their recitation and ritual installation.”

JPB re-supplies *dhíyah* as obj. of *hinvānāḥ* in d, on the basis of the same phrase in b (so also Sāy.; see Ge’s n. 5d). This is possible, of course, but seems compositionally clumsy. It is more likely that the poet meant the 2nd *hinvāná-* to be taken differently.

Ge's "sich anspornend" seems rhetorically better; the med. part. *hinvānā-* has both transitive and passive (or, in this case, better reflexive) uses: see the separate groups in Gr. I would therefore re-tr. d as "spurring themselves on, they obtained goods at Indra('s hands)," with loc. *índre* expressing the locus (as it were) of the goods obtained – so essentially both Ge and Re. In order to bring the two occurrences of *hinvānāḥ* into harmony, I would also change the tr. of the form in b to "spurring on their insights."

II.22 Indra [SJ on JPB]

On the unusual and complex meter see Old, Proleg. 115. It essentially consists of 12-syllable lines (i.e., Jagatī pādas) alternating with 4-syllable lines, with a refrain in the first three vss. consisting of two 8-syllable (Gāyatrī) pādas (pace Old, who analyses the refrain as also 12 + 4, though he admits it's artificial; such a division doesn't match the syntactic and phonological patterning). The fourth vs. differs from the first three and its structure is somewhat disputed.

The meter seems to encourage alliterative pairs: esp. the refrain (1gh = 2fg = 3fg), which consists of four such pairs (the last two intermingled) *saínām saścat devó devám, satyám índram satyá índuh*. But see also *mamāda máhi kárma kártave* (1e), *vṛddhó vīryaiḥ* (3c), *táva tyán nāryam nrto* (4a), *prathamám pūrvyám* (4b). The four-syllable pādas also to some extent pattern together, esp. 1d + 2b, 2d + 3b. See further below.

In general, the publ. tr. could have reflected the interaction of rhetoric and meter somewhat better, and I will make suggestions about reconfiguring the tr., even when it accurately reflects content.

II.22.1: The VP of the first four pādas is parceled out in bits, with the verb (*apibat*) only appearing in c and the object phrase *yávāśiram ... sómam ... vīśṇunā sutám* sprinkled across pādas a and c. This is not easily represented in tr. However, I think the two four-syllable pādas, b and d, should be marked off from the rest, likewise in the second major clause in e and f. I would substitute

"Among the Trikadrucas, the buffalo -- snorting mightily --
drank to his satisfaction the barley-mixed soma pressed by Viṣṇu -- just as he wished.

It exhilarated him -- the great and broad one -- to do his great deed."

As for the refrain (1gh = 2fg = 3fg), I'd suggest a slight change: "He attended upon him – the god upon the god -- the real Indu upon the real Indra."

The verb in the refrain, *saścat*, is injunctive and therefore ambiguous between a present/habitual sense and a preterital one. Given that the rest of the first three vss. are mythological in content I'd favor the latter.

On acc. sg. masc. *mahám* see AiG III.251, which explains it as built to the combining form *mahā-*

II.22.2: This vs. lacks alliteration, save in the refrain. But the second word, *tvīśūmān*, phonologically echoes *tuvīśūsmāḥ* in 1b.

On *krívi-* as 'worm' see comm. ad II.17.6.

Since the VP in 2ab is identical to 4f, with a different victim substituted (see comm. ad vs. 4), the two passages should be tr. identically. I would change this one to "overcame the worm with his power in battle."

The four-syllable pāda of b cannot be separated from pāda a in tr.: the preverb *abhí* forms a lexeme with *abhavat*. However, phonologically *yudhābhavat* pairs with 1d *yáthāvaśat*.

I would separate the four-syllable pāda of d, *prá vāvrdhe*, by deleting the “and”: “By his greatness, he filled the two world-halves. He grew stronger.”

Pāda e has a very cute trick. It contains a single form of *anyá-*, in 2nd position -- so, by my rules, definite. This is universally taken (I think correctly) as representing an *anyá- ... anyá-* (“the one ... the other”) construction, with the overt *anyám* referring to *soma* (“he took *anyám* [=soma] into his belly”). But the question is – who is “the other”? There are two candidates, both possible, both possibly meant. Given the refrain pointedly contrasting Indra and *soma*, the gapped *anyá-* could refer to Indra: “(the one) took the other into this belly.” However, the short clause immediately following in the same pāda, *prém aricyata*, suggests a different distribution: the *anyám* in the first clause refers to one portion of *soma*; the other is subject of the second cl. This is the interpr. of the standard tr. (though JPB’s take on it is not entirely clear); see, e.g., Re’s “il prit en son ventre un(e portion du soma), (l’autre) reste-en-surplus ...” By omitting one of the *anyá-s* the poet leaves both possibilities not only open but simultaneously operative. I would tr.

“(The one [=Indra]) took the other [=soma] into his belly; it/he projected beyond him/it.”
“He [=Indra]) took the one [=portion of soma] into his belly; (the other) was left over.”

In the case of the second alt., the *īm* would be one of the rare occurrences of this form without acc. reference; in the case of the first it would be construed with *prá ... aricyata*, though we should expect an ablative.

II.22.3: The adv. *sākám* occurs three times in pādas a and c; *ójasā* (a) reaches back to 2a and forward to 4f.

The four-syllable pāda b, *vavakṣitha*, is semantically equivalent to the same in 2d, *prá vāvrdhe*. (On the absence of accent on *vavakṣitha* see Old [Noten].) Because of its metrical independence and its echoing of 2d, I would not, with the standard tr., construe this pf. with *sākám ójasā* (e.g., WG “... zugleich wuchst du mit Stärke”), but rather, more or less with the publ. tr., independently, and allowing the *sākám* expressions in a and c to be taken together. “Born at once with resolve, at once with power -- you increased—at once grown strong with heroic powers, overpowering the scorners – you, the boundless.”

II.22.4: As noted above, the meter of this vs. diverges from the patterns of the first three. It begins with an eight-syllable (Gāyatrī) pāda, a unit otherwise found only in the refrain. And pāda c seems to contain six syllables, a structure unknown to Vedic metrics; Old, however, suggests zapping the semantically pleonastic *krtám*, which would leave a more appropriate four syllables.

The expression *prāriṇā ásum*, immediately followed by *riṇánn apáh*, with verbal forms to the same root ($\sqrt{rī}$) + acc. obj., is striking and a bit baffling. Ge (n. 4c) plausibly suggests that “you let life(-force) flow forth” indicates that “durch die Befreiung der Gewässer gab es neues Leben” – and this appears to be the interpr. of the standard tr. However, Ge also suggests, flg. Sāy., that it could refer to the flowing out of Vṛtra’s life-force. (See, e.g., I.182.3 *panér ásum* for the *ásu-* of a demonic individual.) That it is a word play seems likely, and so I would add an alt. to the tr.: “you let (new) life-force flow forth / you let (Vṛtra’s) life-force flow away.”

Note *ápah* ‘work’ in b and *apáh* ‘waters’ in e.

Pāda f, *bhúvad víśvam abhy ādevam ójasā* is a scrambled reprise of 2ab *abhí ójasā krivím ... abhavat*, but with a more generalizing force. Instead of a particular target (*krivím*) we have “every godless one.” The verb in 4f *bhúvat* is of course multiply ambiguous – it can be an injunctive (and thereby have preterital or present/habitual sense) or a subjunctive. That it is followed by two undoubted subjunctives, the repeated *vidāt*, a subjunctive interpr. is appealing (so JPB “he will overcome”), but it could also be a generalizing present: “he overcomes.” The tr. of *ójasā* should match that in 2a (esp.) as well as 3a. Altogether: “He will overcome / overcomes every godless one with his power.”

II.23–24 Bṛhaspati / Brahmanaspati [SJ on JPB]

These two hymns are implicitly contrasted, with II.23 withholding any mythological references until the final vs. (before the summary vs.), 18, where the Vala myth is boiled down to its essence. II.24, by contrast, starts with a discursive treatment of the same myth. For further details, see below.

II.23 Bṛhaspati [SJ on JPB]

The whole hymn is tr. by HPS (B+I 104–9, with comm. –112).

The vocatives *bráhmaṇas pate* and *bṛhaspate* alternate throughout the hymn, with a single example in each vs.: *brahmaṇas pate* generally (but not always) pāda final, *bṛhaspate* always pāda initial: *brahmaṇas pate* (1c, 5d, 9a, 11c, 19a [initial]) / *bṛhaspate* (2b, 3c, 4d, 6c, 7c, 8c, 10b, 12c, 14d, 15a, 16d, 18d). The only vss. lacking such a voc. have instead a nom. sg.: *bṛhaspátih* (13d), *bráhmaṇas pátiḥ* (17c).

There is considerable lexical concatenation between adjacent vss., as noted below *passim*.

The hymn has a very unusual structure. For the first 17 vss. of its (considerable) length, it strings together fairly generic descriptions of Bṛhaspati’s powers and activities, alternating between the pain and punishment he inflicts or will inflict on evildoers and the aid he provides to his right-acting devotees. There is no mention of any particular acts in the past, any mythology – until the real final vs. of the hymn (18, since 19 is a meta-summary vs.) – where without warning the Vala myth is boiled down and encapsulated in a single vs. In detailing the powers and qualities that made Bṛhaspati the right god for that job, the whole rest of the hymn turns out to be a discursive preamble to this brief explosive burst of mythology. (The only possible foreshadowing is the cmpd in 3d *gotrabhíd-* ‘cowpen-splitting’, but that modifies Bṛhaspati’s chariot.)

II.23.1–2: These first two vss. contain overlapping definitions of the name of the divine dedicand Brahmanaspati / Bṛhaspati: 1c *jyeṣṭharājam bráhmaṇām* “the preeminent king of sacred formulations” and 2d *víśveṣām ij janitā bráhmaṇām asi* “you are the very begetter of all formulations.” It’s worth noting that *bráhman-* does not appear again in the hymn (save ubiquitously in the god’s name) except in the cmpd *brahma-dvīṣ-* ‘hating the formulation’ (4c).

II.23.1: As Re points out, *bráhmanām* may be construed with preceding *jyeṣṭharājām*, but it formulaically belongs also with following *brahmaṇaspane*, exactly like *gaṇāñām* ... *gaṇāpatim* in pāda a.

II.23.2: On *usrāḥ* as gen. sg., see comm. ad VI.3.6 and AiG III.213. All the standard tr. take it as gen. sg. here.

Give the definitional value of pāda d and its connection with 1c, it would be better to substitute “all sacred formulations.”

II.23.3: As HPS points out (105), *parirāpah* is semantically opposed to *ṛtāsyā* and *támāṁsi* to *jyotiṣmantam*.

II.23.4: All the standard tr. (incl. JPB) except WG attach *yás túbhyam dāśāt* to *jánam*. Although this is not syntactically excluded, pāda b conforms to a common pattern with a preposed generalizing rel. cl. describing proper ritual behavior (“who[ever] does / will do X”) and a main cl. stating the reward. For this pattern, often involving subjunctives in both rel. and main. cl., see, e.g., IV.2.6–7 and disc. in my “perfect subjunctive” article (Fs. J. L. García Ramón). In subsequent vss. (6cd, 7abc, also 9cd, 12abc) we find similar preposed rel. cl. with their results expressed in the main cl. (though in those cases both the actions and the result are negative). I would here substitute “You protect the people. Who(ever) will perform ritual service for you, distress will not reach him.”

II.23.5: This vs. contains paraphrase and expansion of 3a (in 5c) and 4b (in 5ab), with the paraphrase signaled by *ví √bādh* (3a *vibādhya*, 4c *ví bādhase*) and *ná tám áṁhah* (4b, 5a).

II.23.6: More chaining: *gopāḥ* in pāda a repeating the same word in 5d. In c *hvárah* appears to pick up *dhvarás-* in 5c – though they differ by accent, etymology, and semantics; *háras(vant)-* in d also echoes *hvárah* in the preceding pāda. On the various senses of *háras-* see comm. ad X.16.7.

The purport of b would be clearer if rephrased as “we awaken for your commandment with our thoughts.”

II.23.7: Chaining continues with *patháḥ* (c) extracted from *pathi-kṛt-* (6a)

The meaning of the hapax *sānuká-* is much disputed – or, perhaps better, despaired of. See, e.g., Old’s detailed consideration and rejection of multiple possibilities. Ge (fld. by Th [Fremdling 44] and HPS) refuses to tr. it; Gr takes it to *√san* ‘win, gain’ and glosses ‘beutegierig’; Re follows one of Old’s more favored (/least unfavored) suggestions, that it’s connected with *sanutár* ‘far away’ and tr. “dont on cherche-à-s’eloigner.” The most plausible and appealing suggestion is WG’s “aufgeplustert” (fluffed up / ruffled up). This would be a -*ka*-deriv. of *sānu-* ‘back’, probably of a lower linguistic register because of the -*ka*-suffix (see my 2009 “Sociolinguistic Remarks on the Indo-Iranian *-ka-Suffix: A Marker of Colloquial Register,” IIJ 52), and would refer to the raised hackles of a wolf about to attack or showing dominance (see photos on the internet), with a lit. meaning something like “back-y” (reflecting an exclamation like

“look at that back on him!”). I’d tr. “a hostile mortal (or) a wolf with hackles raised” (since “back-y” gets us nowhere), or, if a single-word tr. is desired, “a bristling wolf.”

II.23.8: *trātár-* in pāda a picks up *trāyase* in 4a. To signal the connection I’d tr. “protector of our bodies” (as I suggested “you protect the people” in 4). This hemistich is notable for the occurrence of three *-tár-* stem agent nouns. I would substitute “advocate” for “defender” for *adhivaktár-*, to capture the speech aspect of this lexeme derived from \sqrt{vac} ‘speak’.

On *naśan* functioning as an injunctive aor. after *mā* (rather than the root aor. subjunctive it appears to be), see KH, Injunk. 240 and ref. there. Here, to capture the *úd* in the verbal lexeme *ún naśan* and in the adj. *úttaram*, contrasting with *ní* in c, I would slightly emend the tr. to “Let those of evil ways not reach up to higher favor.” Re’s “higher favor (than ours)” might even be better.

II.23.9–10: These vss. are paired, at least in their first hemistichs: #*tvayā vayám ... dadīmahi / dhīmahi*, though with verbs to different roots and T/A stems. These paired vss. are in the approx. center of the hymn, though there are no other significant omphalos features.

The pairing of these verbs is somewhat puzzling: the first is a 1st pl. middle opt. to the redupl. pres. of $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘give’, whose middle (usually with *ā*) regularly means ‘take’. The 2nd is an anomalous form: it’s also a 1st pl. middle, but to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘put, establish’, whose middle also can mean ‘take, acquire, assume’. It is built to the root aorist stem (as opposed to the redupl. pres. of *dadīmahi*), and it is clearly meant also to be an optative (with opt. suffix *-ī-*), but it has the primary ending *-mahi* though optatives take only secondary endings (expect, and regularly get, *dhīmahi*). (Lub lists it immed. flg. *dhīmahi*, with the parenthetic addition “(nonce)”; Re explains it as “contamination” between *dhāmahi* and *dhīmahi*, at best a description not an explanation.) The easiest way to account for the primary ending is metrically: the Jagatī cadence requires a heavy syllable in that position (... *dhīmahi* *váyah* #); **dhīmahi* would have given three light syllables in a row (– ~ ~ ~ ×). Although I’m wary of metrical explanations, this seems to be the best solution. But there still remains the fact that the poet seems deliberately to have set up an equivalence between two forms to different T/A stems of different roots – almost forcing them to be taken as synonymous, given the parallelism of the clauses in which they’re found. What is he trying to tell us? As I have disc. elsewhere, I do not think there’s a functional difference between modal forms to different T/A stems, so that is not an issue here (in my view); more interesting is the discrepancy in roots, whose semantic differences seem however to be neutralized in these forms. The publ. tr. renders them identically: “we would receive.” As for other tr., Ge tr. them differently (“möchten wir ... empfangen / erlangen” respectively); sim. Re (“recevoir / obtenir”), HPS (“erhalten / erlangen”), WG (“erwerben / erlangen”). These all seem to me distinctions without difference, but if I were to follow the same path, I’d probably do “take / acquire.” It does seem worthwhile to register the difference in forms.

II.23.9: Chaining or pseudo-chaining: *spārhā* (b) and *ávaspartar* (8b), though there are two roots \sqrt{spr} , ‘win’ and ‘rescue’, which are at least synchronically distinct. See EWA s.v. *SPAR*.

I'd prefer "take" or "acquire" to "receive" for *dadīmahi*, as reflecting more activity on our part. See comm. on vss. 9–10.

The curiously formed *tadít-* has no clear etymology (see EWA s.v.), but in its two RVic occurrences, here and I.94.7, it is contrasted with *dūré* and must mean, more or less, 'nearby' – though I would prefer a jazzier rendering for this jazzy formation, "hard by" isn't bad. Although they are not a lexical match, perhaps the slangy "in your face."

As disc. in my -áya-Formations (p. 93), *jambháya-* belongs to a separate root 'crush', distinct from 'snap at' found in the aor. *jambhīsat*, and has an Aves. cognate *zəmbaiia-*. See EWA s.v. *JAMBH*². The tr. should therefore be emended to "crush these" (certainly a more satisfactory fate than 'snap at' for the hostile forces!).

The adj. *anapnásah* is proleptic. This might be clearer with "(to become)" rather than "(now)."

II.23.10: Again, "take" or "acquire" rather than "receive." The question is whether we should attempt to draw a distinction in tr. between the two verbs (whose differences were laid out above, ad 9–10) or tr. them identically, since they appear in almost identical contexts. As noted there, the standard tr. render them differently, and I have now done the same.

Given *úttaram sumnám* "higher favor" in 8d (see comm. there), I would render *uttamám* ... *váyah* as "highest vigor." Note the figure *vayám* ... *váyah*, as in II.20.1.

On *pápri-* see comm. ad I.52.3. The tr. of this instr. phrase would be somewhat less awk. as "with (you,) provider and winner, as yokemate."

In the 2nd hemistich *duhśámsah* (c) and *suśámsah* (d) are obviously contrasted.

II.23.10–11: The chaining between these two vss. is morphological, not lexical, with two redupl. *i*-stems in each vs., as Re points out: *pápri-*, *sásni-* (10b); *jágmi-* (11a), *sásahí-* (11b) (though note accent discrepancy).

II.23.11: On *anānudá-* see comm. ad II.21.4. Since the stem is derived from *ánu* √*dā* 'concede', not √*nud* 'push', "unable to be pushed aside" should be changed to "unyielding."

Because the verb *ási* only opens the 2nd hemistich, I would postpone "you are" to that position (as Ge, Re, HPS do, contra WG and JPB), with the first hemistich a suite of nominals: "Unyielding bull, going towards a challenge, scorcher of the rival, overwhelming in battles – you are the real requiter of debts ..."

The publ. tr. does not make clear that *vīluharsínah* is a gen. modifying "the powerful one" (*ugrásya*) – perhaps better, "even of the powerful one who exults in his staunchness" (against the publ. tr. "excited to tough resistance," whose structure I don't understand).

II.23.12: Chaining with *ugrá-* (11d, 12 b), with repetition also of *manyú-* (d) from 4c and *duréva-* (d) from 8d.

As already pointed out by Old, Gr's supposed fem. nom. ag. *śāsā-* 'Tadler, Schmäher' is unlikely to exist; the other supposed occurrence (besides *śāsām* here), which Gr gives as acc. pl. *śāsāh* out of sandhi (VII.48.3), is better read as instr. sg. *śāsā* there. The form here, *śāsām*, is then gen. pl., to be (loosely) construed with *ugrá-*. I

would slightly emend the pub. tr. “powerful in his commands” to “powerful over commands,” as well as eliminating “us” (or at least putting it in parens.), since there is no *nah* in this hemistich.

JPB takes injunc. *ní karma* in d as the positive continuation of the negative impv. in c (sim. Re, WG). This is an appealing interpr., but, before accepting it, I would like further evidence that the modal force of neg, *mā* + injunc. can carry over to a following clause with injunctive but no *mā*. It is perfectly possible to take the verb as general / presential (so Ge, HPS, and see esp. KH, Injunc. 255) – hence “we put down / thwart ...”

II.23.13: No chaining from the adjacent vs., but *abhidipsú-* returns from 10c.

On *ví* \sqrt{vrh} see comm. ad X.10.7.

II.23.14: Again the lexical repetition is distant: *parirāpah* (d and 3a).

The bahuvrīhi *drṣṭā-vīrya-* ‘of manifest heroism, whose heroism is visible’ in b is further developed in c: *āvīś tát kṛṣva* “make that manifest.” The ref. of *tát* is then most likely *vīryām*. In order to bring out the conceptual connection, I suggest an alt. tr. of bc: “... who put you, whose heroism is visible (/easy to see), to scorn. Make manifest that (heroism), so that it will be worthy of a hymn for you.” The *yád* with subj. *ásat* here seems to express purpose (sim. Re). The point is that latent *vīryā-* is not enough to attract praise; it has to be revealed and deployed.

II.23.15: *aryáh* in pāda a picks up the same in 13c.

Given that *vibhāti* in b is found in a series of dependent cl., with subjunctives preceding and following (*árhāt* [a], *dīdāyat* [c]), it may be subjunctive as well (so in fact Old), though it does not have a distracted reading. The publ. tr. seems to take it so.

II.23.16: No obvious chaining.

The pf. *jāgrdhūh* is the only pf. form to this root in early Vedic, and it is quite possible / likely that it’s stative in value: “are greedy” (see Kü 160–61). I would therefore emend JPB’s “have become greedy,” and also substitute “food” for “supplies,” since food is a resonant symbol throughout Vedic texts: “are greedy for our food.” I am puzzled why the vaguer “supplies” was used for *áんな-*, which actually means ‘food’.

The 2nd hemistich is difficult. Pāda c contains the hapax *vráyas-*, built to the rare root $\sqrt{vlī}$ (*/vrī*), on which see EWA s.v. *VLAY'*. The root probably means ‘crush’, vel sim., with the s-stem meaning something like ‘crushing power’ (exactly contra Ge’s “Schwäche”). The pāda is also oddly constructed, with init. preverb *ā* fld. by *ví* later in the vs., and the accented verb *óhate* in between. Though it is possible to take c as a further extension of the rel. cl. of ab, thus accounting for the accent, it is appealing to follow Ge’s structural analysis (n. 16c), fld. by WG and JPB (sort of) and also (sort of) reflected by Old, whereby *ā* and *ví* mark separate contrastive clauses, both with *óhate* to be understood as verb. This would account for the accent on the verb (and remove the necessity of reading it as a continuation of the rel. cl., as JPB does – though Old still thinks the *yé* is operative). WG’s interpr., with *ā* $\sqrt{ūh}$ expressing a positive sense and *ví* $\sqrt{ūh}$ a negative one, is plausible: “Sie erkennen laut die Übermacht der Götter an, missachten sie aber im Herzen.” Based on this interpr., I would substitute “they laud the crushing power of the gods (in public), but denigrate it in their heart.” There is another

related possibility, however. The slippery verb *óhate* (see disc. V.52.10, X.65.10) is sometimes reflexive; it could be that the first reading of the verb, with *ā*, has this reflexive sense, and the second, with *ví*, is transitive, resulting in “they vaunt themselves (and) denigrate the crushing power of the gods.” The position of *devānām* may speak against this, however.

The final pāda is also puzzling. Assuming the subject remains the thieves and cheats of the rest of the vs., it might seem to declare that they know only the inferior ritual utterance type, the *sāman*, not the superior *brāhmaṇ*. This was the view of Hilldebrandt (see HPS). But the next vs, esp. 17b, makes that unlikely, at least in its strong form. Old, Re, and HPS by contrast think that “beyond the *sāman*” means they know nothing better, that is, more effective than the *sāman* wielded by Bṛhaspati: they are defenseless. It may be possible to rescue the first interpr., however; it may mean that they know the tunes, the singing, of the *sāman*, but do not know how to combine this with the *brāhmaṇ*, whose more effective verbal power is controlled by Bṛhas-/ Brahmaṇas-pati.

II.23.17: The crucial word *sāman*- is repeated from 16d as well as *drúh*- from 16a. In addition *r̥nayā-* reappears from 11c, and *ṛtā-* (here explicitly contrasted with *drúh*-) from 3b, 15c).

I would prefer ‘poet’ or ‘sage-poet’ for ‘sage’, esp. since verbal formulation is at issue.

In light of the disc. of 16d above, the fact that Brahmaṇaspati is born from every *sāman* (or from *sāman* after *sāman*) might indicate that he is a higher, more perfected, being than his source. On this basis I would slightly rearrange the tr. of pāda c. I think the point is that he is born as Brahmaṇaspati: “you are Brahmaṇaspati, the collector of debts, the requiter of debts ...” Like vss. 1–2 at the beginning of the hymn, this vs. at the very end provides a definition of or, better, a historical derivation of the god.

The 2nd hemistich either switches persons (ab: “gave birth to you” / cd: “he is ...”), or *sá* in c has 2nd ps. ref. (there are no verbs that would allow us to distinguish). although cd does not fit the usual pattern for 2nd sg. *sá*, namely the presence of an impv., in this 2nd ps. context (*tvā* 1a; *táva* 17a) I favor the 2nd sg.

II.23.18: On this vs. as the unexpected mythological climax of a resolutely non-mythological hymn, see disc. in the intro. above. Note that Bṛhaspati is addressed as Aṅgiras, an oblique reference to the Aṅgirases, who assist in the opening of the Vala cave. And Indra, Bṛhaspati’s alloform, is introduced in pāda c. These are the first two names found in the hymn, besides the monotonous verse-by-verse foregrounding of Bṛhaspati / Brahmaṇaspati.

I do not understand the basis for JPB’s “for (their) glory to be yours” tr. *táva śriyé*; I would substitute simply “for your glory.”

Though Ge (n. 18cd) thinks that the second hemistich depicts the Vṛtra myth, I am in agreement with HPS that Bṛhaspati elsewhere has nothing to do with the latter and the Vala myth is still the subject. As often, the two myths are conflated, with waters standing in for cows and dawns.

Note *gávām gotrám*, echoing the only previous allusion to the myth, *gotra-bhíd-* in 3d.

II.23.19: Like many final vss., this one makes meta-reference to the hymn just produced (*asyá ... sūktásya, ab*).

II.24 Br̥haspati [SJ on JPB]

In sharp contrast to the immediately preceding hymn (see intro. to II.23 above), this hymn is stuffed with mythological references and an extended treatment of the Vala myth (vss. 2–7, returning in 14). Another clear distinction is in the use of vocatives. As noted, all but two vss. in II.23 contain a voc. *bíhaspate* or *brahmaṇas pate*. The first vs. of II.24 has pāda-initial *bíhaspate*, like most of the vss. of II.23; the last two vss. (15, 16) begin with the voc. *bráhmaṇas pate*. But the interior of the hymn has neither one, save for the dual dvandva *indrābrahmaṇapati* in 12c – but a number of non-voc. case forms of each.

The hymn is tr. by HPS (B+I, 230–35, with comm. –237).

II.24.1: This vs. has an intricately interwoven structure. Pāda a consists of a main cl. followed by a rel. cl. The main cl. is conjoined with another main cl. in d by the conjunction *utá* (in a somewhat unusual position – see JSK, DGRV I.381–82). The main cl. in d is preceded by an associated purpose cl. occupying c (*pace* WG, who attach c to b). And there is an independent, parenthetical cl. in b. The main clause skeleton is clearly signaled by the repeated *sá* with 2nd ps. ref. in pādas a and d: #*sá ... aviddhī ... sīṣadhabh sótá ...*, despite the three intervening clauses.

As I long ago established (1992 “Vedic ‘sá figé’: An inherited sentence connective?” HS 105), 2nd ps. ref. for the *sá / tám* pronoun is found only with imperatives or forms so used. With the *sá* pair here, the first appears with an undoubted impv. *aviddhī*, while the formal injunc. *sīṣadhabh* must have impv. function, as is implicitly recognized by all standard tr.

I would be inclined to render the *yá-* clause in pāda a as a real rel., not a causal.

I think the *prábhṛti-* here refers to the song (*gír-*) explicitly mentioned in b, both modified by forms of the near-deictic *ayám*.

Although I am convinced, flg. Th and KH, that the root \sqrt{vidh} has been secondarily extracted from the lexeme *ví* $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘distribute’ (for details and reff. see my *dheyām* article [Ged. Schindler 1999: 168–70]), in many of its occurrences it has lost the “distribution” feature and means simply ‘honor’ – as is, I think, the case here.

Putting this all together, I would slightly retranslate ab as “Help this (ritual) presentation, you who are its master – with this great new song we would do honor.”

A tr. truer to the clause order can be contrived for cd by pulling out *utá* from d: “And – so that your comrade who grants us rewards [=Indra] will be praised – bring our thought to success, o Br̥haspati.”

II.24.2: The entry into the mythological realm, which will dominate most of the rest of the hymn, is signaled by the augmented imperfects in each pāda: *ánamat, ádardar* (impf. to intens.), *prācyāvayat, áviśat*.

The neut. pl. *sáṁbarāni* to the otherwise masc. *sáṁbara-*, the name of a demon, is striking, though easily interpr. Old plausibly attributes it to the influence of *vr̥trāni*, the neut. providing the only pl. to the masc. sg. *vr̥trá-*. We might otherwise have expected a *vṛddhi* deriv.

The tr. of c might be more elegant as “Brahmaṇaspati set the immovable in motion” than “he moved the immovable forward.”

The accented verb *áviśat* in d is problematic, esp. if we follow the Pp. and analyze *prācyāvayat* in c as *prá + acyāvayat* with unaccented verb, as the standard tr. do. This makes c a main cl. (to the two rel. clauses in ab), and the *ca* in d would seem to conjoin *ā ... áviśat* to this main cl. – but with accented verb. Various solutions to this conundrum have been suggested. Old takes all four verbs as accented, thus contravening the Pp. in c. This would make the whole vs. loosely dependent on either the preceding or the following vs. This is perhaps the simplest solution. Ge tr. *ca* as a (very low key) subordinator, but when *ca* has this function, it ordinarily means ‘if’, which is contextually excluded here. He alternatively suggests (n. 2d) that *áviśat* should be read twice in the pāda, separately with the two preverbs *ā* and *ví* – like the construction of *óhate* in the immed. preceding hymn II.23.16. This is explicitly accepted by JSK (DGRV I.123) and is essentially reflected in the publ. tr. “he entered into and throughout the mountain ...” Although this interpr. is in principle appealing and would account for the verbal accent, the awkwardness of the resulting translation speaks for itself, and furthermore *ví* is otherwise not found with *√viś*. Ge’s final suggestion (n. 1 [bottom of pg.] to n. 2d) is that a different root should be supplied with *ví*, and again contrastive accent could be invoked. This proposal (scornfully rejected by HPS) has the merit of better accounting for the *ví* by supplying a verb with which it is regularly associated, like *ví √bhid* ‘split apart’, *ví √vr* ‘pry apart’ – as in the phrases I.85.10 ... *bibhidur ví párvatam* # (ending exactly like our pāda) or V.32.1 ... *párvatam ví yád váh*. I am somewhat reluctant to supply verbs out of nowhere. However, *ví √dṛ* ‘split apart’, found in b, might be a candidate, and it is the case that *√bhid* occurs in the next vs. (3c *ábhinat*). I will suggest yet another possible explanation for the accent: misunderstanding. Because the preverb *ā* is in tmesis in this pāda, the sequence *cáviśat* must be analyzed as *ca + áviśat*. However, unaccented *aviśat* combined with *ā* into *āviśat* is found several times (I.141.5 and incl. nearby II.13.1), and it might be that **cáviśat* was analyzed as *ca + āviśat* (i.e., *ā-aviśat*) and redactionally accented. Nonetheless, after considering all these competing explanations, I find the one that supplies a 2nd verb with *ví*, taken from context, the least problematic, and I would substitute “he entered the mountain full of goods (and split) it apart.” The *ca* at the beginning of the pāda is then an inverse *ca* connecting the preverbs *ā* and *ví* (and their respective verbs). If this interpr. seems too radical, an acceptable alt. is Old’s interpr. of the vs. as entirely subordinated, containing four accented verbs.

II.24.3: Continuing in the mythic past, this vs. contains six augmented imperfects: b: *áśrathnan ... ávradanta* [pulled out of sandhi, but metrically guaranteed], c: *úd ... ājad* *ábhinat*, d: *ágūhat ... vy ácakṣayati*, all in brief asyndetic clauses.

II.24.4: I would prefer ‘well’ to ‘cistern’ for *avatá-*.

II.24.5: This is a very difficult vs., with a variety of clashing interpr. See, inter alia, Old’s detailed disc., as well as the treatments in the standard tr. Its interpr. is all the more problematic because the logical connection between the two hemistichs is not at all clear.

To begin with ab, the first thing to notice is that the poet uses the *-t^uva-* gerundive that he deployed in vss. 2 and 3 (*nánt^uva-* 2c, *kárt^uva-* 3a), here *bhávīt^uva-* ‘to be come to

be / to come into being'. Old plausibly suggests that "the beings of long ago" (*sánā .. bhúvanā*) are those imprisoned in the Vala cave. "Coming into being" would refer to their emerging from the cave into light and freedom. Most tr. take *bhávītvā* as the predicate: "these beings of long ago are to come into being (again)" (so in slightly different ways Old, Re, HPS, WG, and JPB; Ge's "Diese Geschöpfe müssen teilweise alt sein" is a bizarre outlier.)

It is pāda b that presents the real problem: there are (roughly) two entirely opposite interpr. of the pāda, though both center around the opening (or not) of the Vala cave (or its present-day equivalent). To show my hand immediately, I do not think it's necessary to choose between them; both can be simultaneously operative by virtue of the poet's ingenuity. The verb in b is *varanta*, which can be a subjunctive or an injunctive to the aorist of the root \sqrt{vr} 'cover, close, obstruct'. (Although originally a root-aor. subjunctive, the *vara-* stem is subsequently reinterpr. as a thematic indicative; see, for example, the doubly characterized subj. *varāte* [2x]. *varanta* could then be an injunctive to that them. stem.) The signature lexeme for the opening of the Vala cave is *ví* \sqrt{vr} 'unclose, open', with the preverb *ví* reversing the sense of the root. But *ví* is not found in this pāda, and so the clause as it stands means (as in JPB's tr.) "Through months and years [lit. 'autumns'] they obstruct(ed) the doors for you" (or "the doors obstruct(ed) you"). This is the standard interpr., championed by Old and found in all the standard tr. (Ge, Re, HPS, WG, JPB). The verb in this interpr. is presumably injunc., with both preterital and present-general senses (hence my rendering "obstruct(ed)").

However, this pāda lacks a syllable. Gr suggests supplying *ví*, producing a post-caesura sequence **ví dúro varanta vah*. Old roundly rejects this suggestion (and it obviously did not affect the tr. of others), though Arnold (Ved. Met. 298) tentatively accepts it and is fld. by HvN (metrical comm.). I find this suggestion appealing not only because of the metrical gap, but more because of the slightly puzzling emphasis on *ví* earlier in the hymn. (And in fact I came up with this interpr. independently on that basis before I took note of Gr's suggestion.) In addition to *ví acakṣayat* in 3d, vs. 2 ends its first hemistich with pāda-final *ví* (in tmesis with preceding *adardar*), though pāda- and hemistich-final preverbs are relatively rare, and pāda d has the apparently pleonastic *ví* that causes such interpretational difficulty in that pāda: see comm. above; also the problematic *ví* in 14c. It is almost as if the poet supplies an extra *ví* there and then withdraws it here, signaling its ghostly presence by the missing syllable. Supplying *ví* allows an interpr. "After months and years they will open the doors for you / the doors will open for you," with *varanta* as subjunctive. This refers to the ultimate "coming into being" predicted in pāda a.

As I said, I think both interpr. are simultaneously operative – depicting both the long darkness and confinement the beings endured and their ultimate return to the light, and making the connection between mythic past and ritual present that is so common in RVic discourse. An emended transl. should therefore read

Through months and years the doors obstruct(ed) you. /
After months and years the doors will *open for you.

We now turn to cd. The second hemistich and the duals therein set up an intractable grammatical clash: the negated pres. part. *áyatantā* (or apparent part.; see below) can only be dual nom./acc. masculine and is likely the subject of *caratah*, but the āmreḍita *anyád-anyad* with dual reference is neuter. The gender clash makes a

straightforward identification of the two duos difficult. Further, the rel. cl. in d, which should have a referent in c, has what appears to be a neut. plural obj. *yā ... vayúnā*, although there are no plurals in c for pl. *yā* to be dependent on.

Old identifies the duals as the sun and the moon, which he takes as implicated in the obstruction depicted in pāda b but now, thanks to Bṛhaspati's actions, behaving in a better regulated fashion. Old's sun and moon are the majority opinion (Re, HPS, WG, JPB), though Ge favors the gods and the Pitars (see n. 5cd) and Sāy. Heaven and Earth. Since the standard dual dvandvas for Sun and Moon (*sūryā-candramás-*, *sūryā-mās-*) are masc., they can be modified by *áyatantā*. But then *anyád-anyad* should have another referent and not double the subject. The general solution has been to take *anyád-anyad* as the goal of *caratah*, with the referent being *vayúna-* (neut.); see, e.g., WG "... wandeln die beiden, jeder in einer anderen (Bahn), welche Bahnen (*vayúna-*) Brahmanaspati geschaffen hat." This does the job, but it seems contrived – and I find "Bahn" for *vayúna-* unsatisfactory. (Re's similar interpr. indirectly conveys the contrived nature of the solution with an efflorescence of parenthetical additions.)

My own interpr. may also seem contrived, but it has more textual support. Since *áyatantā* requires a dual masculine, I accept the widespread sun+moon interpr., but I think *anyád-anyad* doubles that subject with a conceptually similar neuter pair, night and day, or the day-halves (du. *áhanī*), in other words the time periods marked by the sun and moon. Important here is I.123.7 *ápānyád éty abhy ányád eti, vísūrūpe áhanī sám carete* "The one goes away; the other approaches: having distinct forms, the two day-halves proceed in tandem," with the day-halves represented by *anyád ... anyád* and subject of the dual verb *carete*, which recalls *caratah* in our passage. I would tr. c as "(Sun and moon), without aligning themselves, proceed (as the day-halves) one after the other." *áyatantā* indicates that the two do not line up next to each other, but follow in order.

As for the form, Lowe argues persuasively (Participles in RV, 277–78) that the form is not synchronically simply a negated participle to *yátati*, -te, because act. forms of that stem are otherwise transitive.

Now, as for d. I do not take *yā ... vayúnā* as a neut. pl. syntagm, but suggest rather that *yā* is masc. du., whose antecedent is the masc. du. Sun and Moon. (It is also possible that *yā* is neut. pl., by attraction to *vayúnā* in an equational syntagm (as often). IH also suggests that it evokes the *tā* of pāda a, the beings that are to come to be again. Then neut. pl. *vayúnā* is the second acc. in a "make X (into) Y" construction with *cakāra*: "which (two) Brahmanaspati has made into the *vayúnā*" (sim. HPS). As I have disc. elsewhere (see esp. II.34.4), I think *vayúna-* refers to repetitive patterns, often visual, incl. the patterns made by light and shade – and, by extension here, by the alternation of the dark and light halves of the day. This is expressed in a nearby passage II.19.3 *aktúnáhnām vayúnāni sādhat* "He perfected the patterns of the days through the night." As I comment there, by interposing night between days Indra draws temporal boundaries that produce the alternating patterns of day and night. Our passage seems to depict the same thing.

What then does the 2nd hemistich have to do with the first? In my opinion, the ultimate freeing of the dawns from the Vala cave reestablishes the vital alternation between light and dark that defines Vedic life.

To put the vs. all together, I'd tr.

All those beings of long ago, whoever they be, are to come to be (again).

Through months and years the doors obstruct(ed) you. /
After months and years the doors (will) *open for you.

(Sun and moon), without aligning themselves, proceed (as the day-halves) one after the other, which (two day-halves) Brahmanaspati has made into the (daily) patterns.

For my interpr. of *mādbhīs* (to *mās-*) see my 1991 “A Cart, an Ox, and the Perfect Participle” (MSS 52: 80–81), though this has recently been disputed by Zachary Rothstein-Dowden.

II.24.6–7: These vss. are twinned, esp. 6cd and 7ab, with *praticākṣyānṛtā púnah* repeated in the post-caesura portion of 6c and 7a, preceded by nom. pl.s of similar meaning. The flg. pāda in both instances opens with an ablative phrase (6d *yátah* “from which” /7b *āta ā* “from there”) fld. by a 3rd pl. verb. The paired vss. do not seem to define an omphalos, however.

II.24.6: The first pāda contains a duplication of the verbal lexeme *abhí √naś / naks*, since *√naks* is, by most accounts (see EWA s.v. *NAŚ¹*), an *s*-enlarged form of the former. Although there is normally no obviously semantic difference between forms of *naś* and *naks*, here the part. *abhi náksantaḥ* seems to have some desid. (vel sim.) nuance; otherwise its duplication by *abhí ... ānaśuh* is kind of flatfooted, as in the publ. tr. “upon reaching (there), they reached ...” Better “approaching (/aiming to reach), they reached.”

Ge (n. 6c) asks whether *púnar* in both this hemistich and 7ab belongs with the first pāda (as the pāda boundary indicates) or the second, where it fits better semantically. I am inclined to entertain the second poss. at least as an alt. “... having observed the untruths, they went up again ...,” though the other is by no means excluded – esp. since we don’t exactly know what’s going on in these vss.

Whether or not we read *púnar* with d, the purport of this pāda is puzzling: it implies that the subjects are going to enter a place they have already come from. Some have suggested that this refers to an earlier, failed expedition to the Vala cave (see, e.g., HPS B+I, 232 and 236), but this is not an episode in the standard myth. However, 7d lends some support to this idea. It might be possible to interpr. *yátah u āyan* as “because of which they had come,” but this seems quite artificial. HPS suggests (236) that it has to do with the reenactment of the myth in the current ritual, but although the boundary between the mythic past and the ritual present is permeable in this hymn, I don’t think “they went up to enter that from which they had come” is how this would be expressed

Syntactically it should be noted that the 2nd hemistich has a short dependent cl. embedded within the main cl.: *yátah u āyan*, which opens d – the subj. of the main cl. occupying pāda c and the main verb *úd īyuh* following the *yátah* cl. This embedding is contrary to the standard practice overwhelmingly observed in the RV, but it seems to be a quirk of this hymn: see 8b and 8c and disc. below.

II.24.7: Note the clear contrast between *ṛtāvanah* and *ānṛtā*.

For how to interpr. *púnar* see comm. immed. above.

The doubling of *ā* is worthy of note: *āta ā* (i.e., *ā-ātah / ā*). The first *ā* must be the preverb with *tasthuh*, while the second one is the particle that often follows ablatives (or ablative elements, like this adv.). Although *ātah* generally stands alone, in some

passages it seems to be followed by the *ā* ablative-marking particle; see esp. IV.50.3 *āta ā ta rtaspŕśo ní seduh*, where, because of its position, *ā* is unlikely to belong with *ní √sad* (though that's not excluded).

The NP *maháh patháh* could technically be an abl. sg., construed with *āta ā*, rather than an acc. pl. But the latter is the universal interpr., no doubt correctly.

In c JPB supplies “mounted” (on the basis of *ā ... tasthuḥ* in b), but this makes no sense [it would be a very bad idea to ‘mount’ a fire!] and has no parallel in the myth. Better, with Ge, to supply “found.”

As noted in the comm. above ad 6b, the last pāda of d supports the suggestion that this expedition is a repeat of an earlier, unsuccessful one. See HPS p. 236.

II.24.8: The account of the Vala myth ends in vs. 7, and the rest of the hymn treats the god’s powers more generally, esp. as displayed in battle and contests.

As noted above (ad 6d), this vs. has two short embedded dependent clauses: b: *yátra vāṣṭi*, enfolded within the instr. NP #*rtájyena kṣipréna ... dhánvanā* #; c: *yābhīr ásyati*, enfolded within the nom. NP *sādhvīr iṣavah ... kárṇayonayah*. Although highly unusual for the RV, these examples cannot be explained away, and the fact that we find several exx. of the same type – brief two-word clauses immediately adjoining their referent – densely packed here suggests a self-conscious poetic choice to transgress syntactic norms.

The adj. *nṛcákṣasah* can be gen. sg., modifying *tásya* (so Gr, Re) or nom. pl., modifying the arrows (the other standard tr.). Given its proximity to the dat. inf. *dṛśaye*, the latter seems more likely, with the publ. tr.

For the bow, the bowstring, the arrows, and the ear see VI.75.3 (the weapon hymn), already adduced by Ge.

II.24.9: The four occurrences of *sá* punctuating the nominal descriptors of Brahmaṇaspati should, in my view, be represented in tr. So, “He, set in front, is the one who leads together, he the one who leads apart; he is well-praised; in battle he is the Lord of the Formulation.”

The first word of c, *cākṣmáh*, is a hapax. Ge refuses to tr. it, and it receives a variety of interpr. in the other tr. (I do not know what the publ. tr.’s ‘penetrating’ is based on.) In addition to the various tr., see HPS (B+I, p. 33, where he also disc. Wüst’s treatment of the word). The word seems to be a vr̥ddhi deriv. of a posited **cakṣ-man-*, which has cognates in Old Iranian: OA, YA, and OP *cašman-* ‘eye’ (see EWA s.v. *cáksus-*). Wüst suggests a meaning “zum Himmelsauge in Beziehung stehend” (see EWA with further reff.), and the logical connection between this pāda and the blazing sun in d supports some such interpr. — though HPS (p. 33) rejects it in its strong form and himself tr. it as “der Schauende.” Since there are dozens of ways of saying “schauend” in Vedic, the use of this hapax with a complex derivation makes it likely that some more specialized sense is intended, and I favor some form of the Wüst interpr., also connecting it to the restoration of light achieved by opening the Vala cave (see esp. my interpr. of 5cd).

What somewhat impedes a Vala interpr. is the predicate “... bears away the prize and the stakes” (*vājam bharate maīt dhánā*), since battles and contests are not a normal feature of the Vala myth. But the means he deploys to bear away the prize is his

(formulated) thought (*matī*), that is, a verbal tool that is associated with this god, and it is by verbal means that the Vala cave was opened. That our passage deals with a verbal contest is strongly suggested by the near-identical phrase in 13b *sabhéyo vípro bharate matī dhánā*, where Brahmaṇaspati is identified with a poet in an assembly prevailing with his thought. The phrasal expansion in 13 can be considered poetic repair of the phrase here. (Another variant of this phrase is found in nearby II.26.3 *vájam bharate dhánā*; in this case the subject is a mortal who ritually serves the god, not the god himself, but still in a ritual setting.) I would tentatively tr. the hemistich “When he, with his relation to the (heavenly) “eye,” bears away the prize and the stake with his (formulated) thought, just after that the sun – the blazing one – blazes at will.”

II.24.10: In I.9.5 the pair *vibhú prabhú* modifies *rādhah* ‘benefit, bounty’; I tr. the phrase “farmost and foremost,” which I prefer to JPB’s “far-going and fore-going” because I don’t think there is motion involved. We both are aiming to capture the PREV-*bhú*- contrast in a somewhat artificial way. I would tr. that pāda “farmost and foremost is the preeminent (bounty) of the one who streams abundance.”

Note the interlocking phonetic/etymological figures *vibhú prabhú prathamáṁ*

On *suvidátra*- see comm. ad II.9.6. The adj. occurs twice elsewhere in Maṇḍala II (II.1.8, 9.6), both times of Agni, and in context it means ‘easy to find’, on account of Agni’s brightness. This sense is also found in the publ. tr., but I would otherwise not follow the distribution of subj. and pred. there. Rather, with Ge and Re, I would take the neut. pl. adjs. in b as modifiers of *imā sātāni* in c.

The gerundive *rādhya*- also requires some comment: although I have supplied *rādhah* in pāda a on the basis of I.9.5, this s-stem noun and the root, and esp. the gerundive, to which it’s related, have gone in somewhat different directions semantically. The s-stem means ‘bounty, benefit’ and the like, often modified by *citrá*- ‘bright’. The gerundive usually modifies a verbal product (like *ukthá*- IV.11.3) or the thought that produced it (*mánas*- VIII.92.28) and means ‘to be realized, brought to light’; the finite forms of the root generally have a similar usage. (It is possible that in the common NP *citrám rādhah* ‘bright benefit’ [I.44.1, etc.], the *citrá*- has absorbed the ‘bring to light’ sense of the root.) The sense I attribute to the root works well with the parallel adj. *suvidátra*- I would tr. bc as “good to acquire, to be brought to light are these winnings of Bṛhaspati, of the prize-winner worth tracking.” (Unfortunately this requires *bíhaspáteḥ* in b to breach the hemistich boundary, unless it should be taken with *mehánāvataḥ* immediately preceding it, though in pāda a.) On *venyá*- see comm. ad VI.44.8.

In d I consider *víśah*, a further specification of *jánā ubháye* (with Ge and Re), not a separate entity (with JPB and WG); I’d emend to “both races [=gods and humans], (all) their clans ...” Pace HPS, *víśah* cannot be obj. to *bhuñjaté* because medial forms of this root are always intrans.

II.24.11: An alliterative vs., at least in its odd pādas: a: ... (á)vare *vṛjáne víśvathā vibhūḥ*; c: ... *devó devān práti paprathe prthú*.

The masc. *vibhū*- picks up *vibhú* in 10a, though here I’d give it a less idiomatically driven tr., “extending everywhere ...”

The first word of b, *mahām*, is morphologically problematic; see Old’s extensive discussion. Although generally rendered as a nom. sg. masc. to *mahānt*- modifying

Bṛhaspati (Ge, Re, JPB), in this sandhi context we should expect *mahām*. That the form is coreferential with *raṇvá-* is indirectly supported by VI.29.1 with the (apparent) acc. sg. phrase *mahām u raṇvám*, but *mahām* is problematic there too, as an acc. It could also be a grammatically impeccable gen. pl. to *máh-*. This is suggested as an alt. by Old as well as Ge (n. 11b) and adopted by Lub and WG. In this case it would presumably anticipate the pl. “gods” in c. The problem then would be how to construe it; Ge casually suggests that it goes either with *raṇvá-* or with *śávasā*, but the former doesn’t take the gen. and surely the point of *śávasā* in this context is that it’s Bṛhaspati’s, not the property of other gods. WG construe it loosely and independently: “unter den Mächtigen,” and this may be the best way.

The publ. tr. renders *vaváksitha* as a main cl. verb, but since it’s accented, it must belong in the *yáh* clause starting in pāda a. The main cl. of cd switches from 2nd ps. ref. to 3rd (*paprathe*), but this mild anacoluthon is very common in the RV.

Putting this all together, I’d retranslate ab as “You who, extending everywhere within the lower settlement, joy-bringing, among the great ones have increased by your vast power ...”

II.24.12: This vs. is couched in the 2nd dual and introduces a second divine figure besides Brahmanaspati, namely Indra, in the dual dvandva voc. *indrā-brahmanaspatī* (c), found only here (though *indrā-bṛhaspatī* occurs six times in IV.49). As disc. extensively elsewhere, Bṛhaspati/Brahmanaspati began as an epithet of Indra in his role in the Vala myth and was only gradually distinguished as a separate figure. This vs. seems a stab in that direction, but the remaining vss. in the hymn revert to the singular.

I would change the tr. of pāda a to “everything of yours comes true, o you two bounteous ones.”

maghávan- is of course a standing epithet of Indra; it is found in the dual (as here) only a few times, several times of the Aśvins, once of Indra and Soma (IV.28.5). The singular is never, as far as I know, applied to Bṛhaspati by himself, so the introduction of Indra here has brought the latter’s epithet in its train.

Pāda b appears to be one of the only passages in which *caná* has negative force by itself, not borrowed from a larger negative context. See the various disc. listed in the Lexical Index, esp. X.49.5. The negative sense here cannot be denied – the formula *ná* (*prá*) *mināti* / *minánti* is quite common – and there are no other negatives in this vs. or adjacent vss. It is not surprising, given the overwhelming use of *caná* in contexts with other negatives and the apparent negative in its 2nd syllable, that *caná* could ultimately carry a negative sense on its own.

II.24.13: The *utá* opening this vs. seems functionless. JSK (DGRV I.393) classifies it in a large group that act “as a mere facilitator of transition from one stanza to another,” which vague usage seems esp. odd when the previous vs. is the only one in the hymn with a dual subject, while vs. 13 returns to the sg.

In b the identification between the god and the poet should be made explicit; “(As) an inspired poet in the assembly, he ...” On the predicate here, see the nearly identical phrase in 9c and comm. thereon; also II.26.3.

Contra Gr, Re, HPS, and JPB, who take *vīlu-dvēśas-* as a tatp. ‘hating the hard’, I think it more likely a bahuvr. ‘whose hatred is staunch/firm’, despite the accent. So also

Ge, WG. Bahuvrīhis with *vīlu-* as first member show variable accent: 2nd-member accent in *vīlu-pavī-* ‘with firm wheel-rims’, *vīlu-pānī-* ‘with hard hooves’ (1x, I.38.11, but *vīlū-pānī* 2x) versus 1st-member accent in *vīlū-jambha-* ‘with firm jaws’ (1x), *vīlv-āṅga-* ‘firm-limbed’ (3x). I attribute the forms with 2nd-member accent to the influence of *puru-* and *bahu-* bahuvrīhis with 2nd-member accent, even though, unlike them, *vīlu-* has a heavy init. syllable. Unfortunately Wackernagel doesn’t disc. *vīlū-* cmpds in AiG II.1.

On *ánu vásarṇám* see Old. He would resolve it as *vásā* and considers it a neut. pl., with crossover to the neut. flg. *ánu vratā*.

I would alter the 2nd hemistich to “He whose hatred is staunch, collecting the debt according to his will, he is the prizewinner in the clash: Brahmanaspati.”

II.24.14: As in 12a I would render *abhavat ... satyáḥ* as “came true,” or in this instance “came to realization.” I also think that the temporal value of the future part. *kariṣyatáḥ* is governed by the tense of the main verb *abhavat*, so “was going to do,” rather than “will do.” For a syntactic parallel see II.11.7. I’d emend the tr. of the 1st hemistich to “The battle fury of the lord of the sacred formulation came to realization according to his will, as he was going to do the great deed.”

The final long vowel of *kārmā* must be, as Gr suggests, metrical; it is read short by the Pp. But the lengthening must have been facilitated by the fact that *n*-stem neut. plurals can have long or short vowels (type *nāmā*), and so the short vowel proper to the singular can be secondarily lengthened.

Pāda c is syntactically anomalous. Although at first glance it seems to contain a simple rel. cl. / main cl. structure (*yáḥ ... sá*), this structure is undercut by the *ca* seeming to connect the two clauses. One solution is to enjamb the *yáḥ* clause across the hemistich boundary, and start a new structure with pāda-medial *sá*. So Ge and JSK (DGRV I.261) (type “... of him about to do the great deed – (him) who drove up the cows. He ...”). This is, however, an awkward solution. Nonetheless I reject a simple “who ..., he ...” interpr. like that of the publ. tr., even though it has Old’s imprimatur. In ZDMG 1906: 737 (cited again in Noten), he adduces this passage as an example of the poets’ tendency to concatenate subordinate and main clauses, but I know of no such tendency. I think we can find a relative-correlative structure in pāda c, but it requires noticing and dealing with several anomalies in the *sá* clause: 1) there’s nothing for *divé* to do; *pace* JPB this dat. should not be rendered “to heaven”; 2) both the preverb *ví* and the *ca* are wrongly placed to conjoin this clause with the preceding *yá-* clause (even if we were willing to do so). In fact ... *ví cābhajat* looks like it should be conjoining this cl. with a clause consisting of *sá divé*. Here I adopt a solution suggested by Ge (n. 14c), though not reflected in his tr. – that we resupply *úd ājat* from the rel. cl. and construe it with *divé*, here in the sense ‘day’ or ‘daylight’ usually found only in the āmreḍita *divé-dive* ‘every day, day by day’. The point is the one made also earlier in the hymn, that the cows are sent out of the Vala cave into the light. I’d tr. “Who drove up the cows, he (drove them up) for daylight and distributed them.” Although this may seem artificial, it deals with the various syntactic problems in the pāda. Note also that we have yet another problematic *ví*, as in 2d, where it also interacted with a problematic *ca* and a verb with the wrong accent.

Note that the rel. cl. replicates the (non-rel.) phrase beginning 3c.

II.24.15: Since Brahmanaspati is, literally, the lord of the *bráhman-*, it should be *his* formulation, not mine, at issue (though, since *kṛtābrahman-* ‘having created formulations’ is used of a mortal ritualist in the 1st vs. of the next hymn [II.25.1] the interpr. of the publ. tr. is not excluded). I would substitute “being master through your formulation.” Note that *yád tśānah* ring-compositionally responds to *yá tśiṣe* in the first pāda of the hymn.

II.24.16 = II.23.19

II.25 Brahmanaspati

II.25.1: In c I take the phrase *jātēna jātám* as expressing an essentially hostile relationship between adversaries: he extends beyond the offspring (of his competitor) with his own offspring. This interpr. would match the similar configuration of etymological figures in 2a *vīrébhīr vīrān vanavad vanuṣyatāḥ* “With his heroes he will win against the heroes who seek to win,” which in turn expands the etymological figure in *vanavad vanuṣyatāḥ* in 1a. The standard tr. take both elements in *jātēna jātám* as referring to the offspring of the subject: “he will extend beyond his offspring with (more) offspring” or “offspring after offspring.” However, the strong parallel in 2a makes this less likely in my opinion.

II.25.2: Ge, Re, HPS (B+I 113) take pres. act. part. *vanuṣyatāḥ* here as gen. sg. dependent on acc. pl. *vīrān* (e.g., Schmidt “... die Männer des Angreifenden”). I find this extremely unlikely, given that the same word in the same etymological figure in 1a and in the following hymn, II.26.1a, must be acc. pl. The acc. pl. *rghāyatāḥ* at the end of 3a with the same morphological structure also supports this analysis.

The thematic form *paprathat* is clearly a subjunctive in context, parallel to *vanavat* in pāda a. On the entwined forms to this stem, see comm. ad VII.86.1.

As Re points out, “la séquence *tmán* : *toká* : *tánaya* forme un tout cohérent.”

II.25.5: Since it is difficult to see how the rivers would provide “unbroken shelters,” I would now take *dadhire* as passive, with Re (and Sāy.; see Ge n. 5b), contra the standard: “(for him) many unbroken shelters have been established.” Alternatively, with WG, supply “the gods” vel sim., as subj., though this requires more machinery, and there are other passive usages of the med. pf. to $\sqrt{dhā}$; see Re’s n. and Kü 273–74.

II.26 Brahmanaspati

II.26.1: With Ge, Re, and WG, I take *rjúr íc chámsah* as a decomposed bahuvrīhi, like *nárā ca śámsam* (IX.96.42, cf. X.64.3), with accent and case ending adjusted. For a similar formation, still compounded, see V.44.5 *rjugātha* ‘o you whose song is straight on target’. It would be possible, however, to take the text as given and make a “straight laud” the subject, as a sort of metonymy; so Schmidt (B+I 115).

For *ví bhaj* see also nearby II.24.14.

II.26.2: The impv. *vihī*, with short root vowel (also III.21.5, IV.48.1, and possibly VI.48.17), must belong to the root pres. of $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, whose properly formed 2nd sg. impv. is *vīhī* (7x). The easiest way to explain its short vowel is by analogy to *ihī* belonging to the root pres. to \sqrt{i} ‘go’, with pres. indic. *émi*, *ési*, *éti*, and impv. *étu*, all strikingly well attested, which match *vémi*, *véši*, *véti*, and *vétu*. And ‘pursue!’ and ‘go!’ are in the same semantic domain. The presence of a form of $\sqrt{vī}$ here, flg. *suprāvīh* in 1c, supports the current etym. of *prāvī-* as derived from $\sqrt{vī}$. See comm. ad I.34.4.

The object of *vihī*, *manāyatāh*, is semantically ambiguous and for that reason its referent is not clear. Its base *manā-* means something like ‘zeal’, a meaning found also in other derivatives to it, but zeal can be positively or negatively viewed; for a negative occurrence see nearby II.33.5. In our passage Gr, Re, and Ge [WG] take it positively, referring to gods (Gr, Re) or priests (Ge), while HPS (B+I 115), flg. Ludwig, negatively, referring to enemies. My tr. is meant to be neutral, since I think both are simultaneously possible.

I would now tr. b somewhat more literally, as “make your mind favorable to the smashing of obstacles.”

II.26.3: The phrase *vājam bharate dhánā* is quite similar to wording in nearby II.24.9, 13, where, however, the subj. is Brahmaṇaspati himself, not his worshiper.

On *śraddhā-* as trust specifically in ritual and hospitality, see comm. ad VI.26.6.

II.26.4: On the apparent bad cadence produced by *ávidhat* see comm. ad II.1.7.

The curious long final of *rákṣatī* is not remarked on by the standard tr./comm.; the Pp simply reads it short. In my view it represents *rákṣati* + *ī*, the latter the enclitic acc. pronoun related to *īm*, which latter follows the first, parallel verb in the pāda, *uruṣyáti* + *īm*. They would show a phonologically motivated distribution here, with *īm* before vowel and *ī* before consonant, and would be positioned identically, immediately after a clause-initial verb and before an ablative.

Wh (Gr. §1316) considers *amhóh* ... *uru-cákri-* “creating a wide place from narrow straits” (also V.67.4, VIII.18.5) an example of a case form (abl. *amhóh*) dependent on the first member of a compound. This seems reasonable, though the fact that the phrase is a paraphrase of *uruṣyáti* ... *áṁhasah* in the preceding pāda no doubt contributed to the creation of the phrase. Cf. also I.107.1 *amhóh* ... *varivo-vittarā* “better finder of wide space from narrow straits.” For further on this phenomenon see my “Limits on Indo-Iranian Compounding” (to appear in Ged. G. Holland).

II.27 Ādityas [SJ on JPB]

This hymn is very name-heavy, esp. in the first half. The stem *ādityá-* appears in each of the first six vss., generally along with the names of several of the principal members of this group; in vs. 7 we find instead of *ādityá-* the mother *áditi-* (also 14), with *ādityá-* returning in 8 (11, 13). Only vss. 9 and 12 lack *ādityá-* or individual names of Ādityas. And only in vs. 10 is the focus on a single Āditya, Varuṇa. With all those names occupying space, there is relatively little left for content, which is, as Re puts it, banal. There is a fair amount of lexical recycling.

II.27.1–2: The first two vss. begin with the near-deictic, *imā gírah* “these hymns here” / *imám stómam* “this praise-song here,” anchoring the hymn in the ritual here-and-now. To make this clear, I would front the phrase in vs. 2: “This praise-song of mine do they enjoy.”

II.27.1: Since *juhū-* is both ‘tongue’ and ‘offering ladle’, *juhvā* here refers to both and represents the common trope of verbal praise as oblation (“pouring prayers”), a conflation also found in “ghee-backed (*ghrtásnūh*) hymns” in pāda a.

II.27.2: I would tr. *juṣanta* as “enjoy,” not “will enjoy,” since it is not subjunctive.

dhāra-pūta- has the standard structure of the common cmpd type *devá-kṛta-* ‘made by gods’, *sóma-sítā-* ‘sharpened by soma’, with a ppl. as 2nd member and an agentive/instrumental first member. However, the cmpd. is not usually interp. as ‘purified by a stream (of soma)’, but rather as a kind of equational simile: Gr “wie Ströme hell,” JPB “pure as a stream (of soma).” I think that this interpretational instinct is more or less correct, but the interpretation should be mediated through the use of the instr. *dhārayā* in free syntagms. It is extraordinarily common with the middle impv. *pávasva* ‘purify yourself’, addressed to Soma, starting with the first vs. of the Soma maṇḍala, IX.1.1 (etc. etc.) *pávasva soma dhārayā*. The instr. expresses the physical form that the purified soma will take, generally rendered in Engl. as “in a stream,” perhaps better “as a stream.” I think this cmpd. represents this syntagm (rather roughly). The standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) of *dhāra-pūta-* reflect this sense correctly. As is usual in such cmpds, the first member has instr. value – but the independent instr. *dhārayā* has an idiomatic sense that is (somewhat loosely) incorporated into this cmpd. The first member, *dhāra-*, is an apparent short *a*-stem here, though the well-attested independent noun is only a long *ā*-stem, *dhārā-*. Though I am leery of metrical justifications for morphological facts, I’d point out that **dhārāpūtāh* would not fit this Triṣṭubh cadence.

Re (ÉVP VII.89) suggests that pāda d reflects the Three Functions, which is clever – though the first two (“free of crookedness (and) disgrace” *ávṛjinā anavadyāḥ*) both seem like First Function to me.

II.27.3: Note the polarized pair beginning and ending cd: #*antáh* ... *ánti* #.

II.27.4: On neut. *sthā(h)* in this formula, see comm. ad I.10.14.

II.27.6: I would attach the first hemistich to 5d, rather than to the second hemistich in this vs. Despite the *téna* beginning c, there is no logical connection (at least that I can see) between the easy path of ab and the Ādityas’ speech in c, whereas the easy path fits well with the metaphorical avoidance of earth-clefts in 5d.

The key to pāda c is to be found in VIII.67.6, another Āditya hymn, adduced by Re. There the c pāda is almost identical to ours, *téna no ádhi vocata*, but it is preceded by *yád vah ... várūtham ásti yáč chardīh*, with the whole meaning “What is your shield, your shelter, with that intercede for us.” In our passage the flg. pāda asks the Ādityas to extend *śárma*, a word almost synonymous with *chardíś-*. I think the *téna* in c anticipates the *śárma* of d, and I would emend the tr. to “With that (shelter) intercede for us – extend

(that) shelter to us that is hard to smash on every side.” I would also end vs. 5 with a dash (... earth —) and end 6b with a period (... straight.)

On the meaning and etym. of *anṛksarā-* see I.22.15.

II.27.7: This vs. reprises both the easy path of 6a and the *sárma* of 6d, as well as *áriṣṭāḥ* from 2d.

II.27.8–9: Act. 3rd pl. *dhārayan* 8a reprises med. *dhārāyante* in 4a, which is based on an *-anta* replacement of my type, and the difference in voice is merely formal. The *-anta* form itself is found in 9a, which is a close paraphrase of 8a.

II.27.8: As an alt. I would tr. cd as “... is your greatness great, is it dear,” with most tr.

II.27.9: In b *śúcayo dhārapūtāḥ* is repeated from 2c.

The bahuvr. *uruśámsa-*, lit. ‘having broad pronouncement’, has several distinct usages, partly because of the functional flexibility of bahuvrīhis, which can mean either strictly ‘having XY’ or more expansively ‘providing XY’ (via ‘having XY [to give]’), and partly because *sámsa-* can mean ‘pronouncement, proclamation’ or more narrowly ‘laud’ (proclamation of praise). In some passages modifying gods (e.g., IV.16.18 of Indra) it seems to mean ‘widely proclaimed’, that is, ‘having/receiving wide proclamations of praise’. But in several passages it modifies a singer (I.31.14 *vāghāt-*; II.38.11 *jaritār-*), where the most natural interpr. is ‘providing wide proclamation / praise’, ‘whose recitations extend widely’. Although the former sense might be in order here, since the adj. modifies the Ādityas (hence JPB’s “widely proclaimed”), I think in this case it may refer to the fact that the Ādityas’ pronouncements are widely authoritative (so, it seems, also Ge and WG) and hold esp. for the morally steadfast mortal. I would suggest an alt. “(they) whose pronouncements hold broadly for the mortal who aims straight.” Sim. in the next hymn, II.28.3, where Ge’s “dessen Worte weithin reichen” is even clearer than here.

II.27.10: As noted above, this is the only vs. in the hymn devoted to a single Āditya – Varuṇa, not surprisingly. For the mirror image, see comm. ad II.28.3.

Note in b the juxtaposition *devā asura*, also remarked on by Re.

II.27.11: The med. pf. *ví cikite* is interpr. by all standard tr. as 1st sg. with “act.” sense (“I see”), though the middle pf. to this root is ordinarily passive / intransitive ‘is seen, appears’ (see Kü [176], who doesn’t treat this passage). Nonetheless, I do not see any alt. to the standard understanding of this form.

Note that *ví cikite* essentially paraphrases the datival inf. *vicákṣe* in 10b.

I don’t understand the force of the double *cid*. If it’s taken in its common meaning ‘even’, it could define the extremes of human mental states – “even in naïveté ... even in wisdom (not to mention the vast territory in between).” Or in its common usage ‘also’, a double *cid* could be the equivalent of “both ... and” or “now X, now Y.” This is the sense it seems to have in IV.10.5 *idā cid áhna idā cid aktóh* “now by day, now by night.”

Pāda d is essentially 14c. Since they contain identical verbs (*asyām*) the tr. should be harmonized: substitute ‘reach’ for ‘attain’ here, and keep ‘reach’ in 14c and for the subjunctive *naśat* in 14d.

II.27.12: On the short vowel in the dat. pl. *rta-nībhyah* of the root-noun cmpd *rta-nīt* see Scar 287. He explains it as taken over from the *i*-stems, though this doesn’t make a lot of sense, since *i*-stems don’t have *-ī-* anywhere in their paradigm that could give rise to such an alternation. AiG III.187 (see also Ge n. 12a) cites a few further exx. in later Vedic of *X-nibhyah*, without venturing an explanation. It’s worth pointing out that the syllable is metrically heavy in any case.

I would give *dadāśa* the presential meaning ‘serves’, which also fits better with parallel *vardhāyanti* in b. On the value of this pf. see Kü (242–43), acdg. to whom it is presential but with the implication of action in the past. In some passages (e.g., I.86.6, VI.3.2) it does have past reference in context, but here and in I.36.4 a presential interpr. is better. The fluctuation in usage may be the result of association with the apparently truncated pf. part., lexicalized *dāśvāms-*, which has the lexicalized presential stative value “pious” < “doing ritual service.”

The position of *ca* makes for difficulties in interpr. pāda b. There are three basic possibilities: 1) the *ca* conjoins the two relative clauses in a and b despite its delayed position (so Re, JSK, DGRV I.256), and it should be tr. (per JSK) “who has worshipped the kings ... and whom the lasting prosperities strengthen ...”; 2) the *ca* signals a third rel. cl., whose subject is the nom. *puṣṭāyah ... nityāḥ* (so Ge, WG, somewhat differently Scar 287 [but see n. 404]), and should be tr. (more or less) as “... whom they [=kings] strengthen and (whom) prosperities (accrue to, vel sim.)”; 3) the *ca* conjoins a 2nd subject phrase with the unexpressed subj. [=kings of pāda a] of *vardhāyanti* (JPB) (“whom they and the prosperities strengthen”). Of the three I prefer the third, found in the publ. tr., as best accounting for the position and usual subclausal function of *ca* and requiring the least extra machinery.

II.27.14: As noted above pāda c is essentially 11d.

II.27.15: It is not clear to me what *sādhū* is meant to express, and tr. vary. But “both sides are straightforward for him” in the publ. tr. is opaque to me. I think it more likely that it means “both sides have him as their goal” – that is, they are focused on him.

II.27.16: For the isolated prec. 1st sg. *yeśam* (to $\sqrt{yā}$) see my 1999 “Vedic type *dheyām*” p. 171 and n. 24, with the lit. cited there – esp. KH, “Der vedische Prekativtyp *yeśam*, *jeśma*,” MSS 20 (1967) = Aufs. 465–74.

II.28 Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

II.28.1: The stem *yajātha-* in its ten occurrences is only found as the dat. *yajāthāya*, and it always has (quasi-)infinitival value, “to sacrifice / to be sacrificed (to).” The other occurrences are construed with Agni as subj. and thus have the active sense; here a passive value is more appropriate. I would substitute “the god exceedingly delightful to sacrifice to.”

II.28.2: The pl. *subhágāsah* looks back to *subhágah* in II.27.15.

The structure of the publ. tr of this vs. is a bit fuzzy, and in particular the affiliation of pāda c is unclear. Since it refers to the advent of dawn, the time when the action of pāda d should take place, I'd slightly alter the tr. to "Might we be possessed of good fortune under your commandment -- we who have praised you very attentively, o Varuṇa -- / at the approach of the cattle-rich dawns awakening [/singing] like fires throughout the days."

The med. thematic pres. *járate* belongs to two different roots $\sqrt{gr} / gṛ$ 'awake' / 'sing' (see, inter alia, Gotō, 1st cl. 150–51, 153–56). Though the standard tr. (incl. JPB and in fact WG) take it only to 'awake' here, both meanings are applicable: fires "awaken" when they are kindled at the dawn sacrifice, but they "sing" by virtue of their crackling and hissing. For a clear ex. of *járate* 'sings' used of Agni at dawn, see I.127.10 cited by Gr.

II.28.2–3: The initial pādas of these two vss. have parallel structure, beginning with *táva*, containing the opt. *syāma*, as well as a loc. on which *táva* depends. The order of the two latter elements is scrambled, however.

II.28.3: In addition to its relationship to 2a, pāda a rephrases II.27.7cd from the last hymn: ... *śárma, úpa syāma puruvīrāḥ* ..., but there *puruvīrāḥ* modified the subject of *syāma* ("we"), while here it modifies Varuṇa. This interchange illustrates the productive ambiguity of *bahuvihi*s, which can mean both "have (to give)" (of gods) and "have (received)" of mortals (see disc. ad II.27.9 above about *uruśámsa*-). And as was established there, *uruśámsa*- in this context seems to mean 'whose pronouncements hold broadly', and I would substitute that meaning here. The double sense of *uruśámsa*- is recognized by Re in his n., but not reflected in his tr.

Just as in II.27 a single vs. (II.27.10) addressed to Varuṇa interrupted the otherwise unbroken focus on the Ādityas, so here a hemistich (cd) addressed to the Ādityas interrupts the sole focus on Varuṇa.

The lexeme *abhí* $\sqrt{kṣam}$ 'be indulgent' occurs only in this limited group of hymns: II.29.2, II.33.1, 7, as well as here. Since it otherwise doesn't take a verbal complement, I would slightly rephrase the publ. tr. "indulge us to be yoked (with you)" to "be indulgent to us, for yoke-fellowship."

II.28.4: On *ví* $\sqrt{dhṛ}$ with rivers, see II.13.7 and comm. thereon.

On the usage of *paptūḥ* here see Kü 293 and n. 474. To bring out the particular nuance of this form, "have been flying" (as suggested by IH) might be better.

II.28.5–7: These middle vss. contain the poet's direct appeal to Varuṇa, mostly to avert bad consequences of his own actions or of Varuṇa's caprice.

II.28.6: As in IX.19.6, the transmitted *bhiyásam* should be read *bhyásam*. Further, the HvN display, with *mát* opening pāda b, should be corrected: *mát* ends pāda a (which conforms much better with the syntax as well as the meter), and b begins with *sámrāl*.

The publ. tr. of pāda d, “I cannot be away from you even for the blink of an eye,” conforms to that of Ge, Re, WG, and comes easily into English, with “blink of an eye” a measure of time. However, it does not represent the Sanskrit. As Re points out in his n. (despite his tr.), it would be the only ex. of $\sqrt{īś}$ meaning “pourvoir (demeurer physiquement).” The root $\sqrt{īś}$ generally takes a gen. and means ‘be master of, be capable of’, so gen. *nimīśah* should be construed with *īśe*. More faithful to the text, flg. Thieme (M+A 69; so also Scar 386), “for at a distance from you I am not capable even of blinking.” Presumably meaning that I am not able to perform even the smallest and most automatic action – though there is interference from the notion that gods themselves don’t blink and see all, as in the immed. preceding hymn II.27.9 *animiśāḥ* ‘unwinking’.

II.28.7: The first prohibitive cl. (pāda a) lacks a verb, though *vadhīḥ* is easily supplied on the basis of the etymologically related *vadhaīḥ* and passages like I.104.8 *mā no vadhiḥ* – although for drama’s sake the incomplete “Don’t with deadly weapons ...” might be enough (see KH 48 and 102).

All the standard tr. (incl. JPB) construe *iṣṭau* not only with gen. *te*, but also with the acc. phrase *énah kṛṇvántam*, which is then only secondarily the obj. of *bhrīṇánti*; see, e.g., Ge “die bei deiner Suche nach dem Sündigen ... (diesen) versehren.” But no other occurrences of loc. *iṣṭau* take an acc.; it is only the infinitival dat. *iṣṭáye* that governs objects. Since there is a transitive verb available to govern the acc. here, I would tr. *te iṣṭau* simply as “at your instigation” (if the multivalent *iṣṭi-* belongs to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send’) or “in your quest” (if to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek’).

The transmitted form *bhrīṇánti* is the only form attested to this IXth Cl. pres. belonging to the root $\sqrt{bhrī}$. As already noted by Old (Proleg. 477–78) and so represented in HvN, it must be read **bhrīṇánti*, the historical justification for which had to wait until the development of the laryngeal theory and its account of the IXth Cl. presents. See EWA s.v. *BHRĪ*. The only other verb form attested to this root in Sanskrit is the s-aor. subj. *bhreṣate* in VII.20.6 (q.v.), though it is well represented in Iranian (see Cheung, *Etym. Dict. Iranian Verb*, s.v. **braiH*).

The injunctive *śisrathāḥ* is regularly used in imperative function; certainly this passage with its string of negative imperatives favors that interpr. here. See disc. ad V.85.7.

II.28.9: The standard tr. take *sāvīḥ* as imperative, I think correctly. Although KH (Injunk. 264) ascribes this usage simply to the lack of 2nd sg. impvs. to *iṣ*-aorists, I think in this case the fact that it is the positive counterpart to a *mā* prohibitive in pāda b also favors the use of the injunctive aor.

Contra the standard tr., JPB takes *máktātāni* as parallel to but independent of *rṇā* “my debts ... and (other) things done by me,” clearly because of the unusual mid-pāda position of *ádha*. Although I am sympathetic to this arg., because of the contrastive *anyákṛta-* in b it might be better to follow the consensus: “the debts made [=contracted] by me.”

On *mā* ... *bhojam* see KH, Injunk. 96.

Although *no jīvāṇ* is the direct object of *ā* ... *śādhi*, the lit. tr. is awk. I would substitute with the impersonal “so direct it for us to be alive at them [=dawns].”

II.29 All Gods

Although the Anukramaṇī assigns this hymn to the All Gods, thematically it continues the Āditya sequence of II.27–28, as is clear from the 1st vs., with addresses to the Ādityas and to Varuṇa and Mitra – though both generic gods (1c, etc.) and specific ones outside the Ādityan orbit (Indra and the Maruts, 3d) also figure. Nonetheless, the stress on offenses committed by the speaker (1, 5) and the mercy and forgiveness sought are of a piece with the preceding hymns, esp. II.28.

II.29.2: The sequence in pāda c, *abhikṣattāro abhí ca kṣámadhvam*, invites interpr. as an etymological figure, but the agent noun, as it stands, must belong to $\sqrt{kṣad}$ ‘mete out, apportion.’ Old tentatively suggests an emendation to *abhikṣantār-* ($\sqrt{kṣam}$), though he also allows that the transmitted reading may be correct and the poet is playing with Gleichklang. This seems the better course, esp. given that the stem is found once elsewhere (VII.21.8), though *abhí* is not otherwise attested with this root. It’s worth noting that *abhí* $\sqrt{kṣam}$ is found only in this little group of hymns (II.28.3, II.33.1, 7, in addition to this).

The three *ca*’s in cd signal two different types of conjunction. The first, in the preverb + verb sequence *abhí ca kṣámadhvam*, conjoins this impv. with *mṝlāyata* in d, in an inverse *ca* construction (X *ca* ... Y); the 2nd two, in d, conjoin the temporal expressions *adyā ca* ... *aparām ca*. This is Klein’s view as well (DGRV I.188, 190, 155; cf. II.39).

The reason for the accent on the main verbs (*abhí* ...) *kṣámadhvam* ... *mṝlāyata* is not entirely clear, since neither begins its clause or pāda and they are not subordinated. They must be implicitly contrasted in some way, but, impressionistically, other such sequences are not accented. Klein (*Verbal Accentuation in the RV* [1992] 43–44) attributes the accentuation to the inverse *ca* construction.

II.29.3: As Ge and Re point out, the unexpressed conditional clause with the first hemistich should be something like “if you’re not going to help us *now*, what’s the use of friendship in the past or in the future.”

II.29.4: Pāda c presents interpretational difficulties, particularly if *rté* is taken as the loc. sg. of *rtá-* ‘truth’ with most interpr. The problem in that case is not merely *rté* but also how it relates to *madhyamaváh-*. None of the suggested tr. seems satisfactory to me, and though Old discusses the passage at some length, he ultimately suggests with some despair that *madhyama-váh-* is an unknown technical term in Fahrkunst. Given the unconvincing solutions suggested by others, I am inclined towards Re’s quite different interpr.: he takes *rté* as the postposition/adv. ‘without’ and construes it with *vah*. Old had already argued against the “without” interpr., on the grounds that there is no ablative and that *rté bhūt* occurs also at pāda end in VI.67.8 (where, however, I interpr. it as I do here). And, though *vah* is not technically an ablative enclitic [since no such form exists], it is fairly all-purpose in terms of case. Its distance from *rté* can be attributed to its taking Wackernagel’s position. With a “without” interpr. the rest of the pāda falls out: we do not wish for our chariot to be without you; *madhyama-váh-* then specifies where the chariot is traveling, possibly “in the middle of its journey” or “in the middle of a battle.” (Though I enthusiastically adopt Re’s analysis of *rté*, I am not at all convinced by his interpr. of

this compound: he thinks *madhyama-* refers to a middling number of draft animals.) If the *vah* ... *rté* interpr. is rejected, the negative concept that prompts the *mā* prohibitive must rest in the cmpd. *madhyama-váh-* and specifically in the 1st member *madhyama-*. Old lays out some possibilities, crisply summarized by Scar (475). (Notably KH does not treat this pāda, though he does treat the immediately flg. 4d.) I would assume in this case that ‘middle’ refers to a middling or less than full effort or a position in the middle, rather than at the forefront. So I would consider an alternative (and in my view less preferable) translation “let your chariot not be traveling in a middling way / in the middle (of the pack) with regard to truth.” Although most X-*váh-* cmpds mean ‘drawing/conveying X’ (e.g., the lexicalized *anadváh-* ‘ox’ < ‘pulling a wagon’; *indra-váh-* ‘conveying Indra’), I don’t see how to get a direct obj. interpr. out of *madhyama-*.

II.29.5: In b we expect the simile “like a father his son”; instead we get the father, but a gambler in the place of the son. We must infer the filial relationship. (The distress of his family, including his father, over the fall of their gambler kin is depicted in X.34.4. Nonetheless the pairing here is peculiar.)

The expected son then appears in d. The purport of this pāda is clear -- the speaker asks that only he be punished for his offenses, not his son -- until we get to the simile. Why does the poet liken himself to a bird, and what can be supplied in the simile to match *putré*? The standard tr. conclude, reasonably enough, that the comparison involves baby birds (or maybe eggs?) (e.g., Re “Ne me saisissez pas en (la personne de mon) fils, comme (on saisit) un oiseau (en s’emparant de ses petits.”). But is this meant to imply that bird parents get more upset by the loss of their offspring than other animal parents do? or that robbing birds’ nests was a particularly prominent behavior? I am baffled. (MLW suggests that raiding birds’ nests for eggs might have been a common practice, which would have provoked strong reactions in the bird parents.) It is possible that the simile only has domain over the acc. *mā*, with no involvement of the loc. *putré*: “do not seize me like a bird” -- expressing the trapping/snaring techniques of bird-catching. But this doesn’t make much sense either.

II.29.6: Technically speaking, pāda d has two ablatives: “rescue us from falling, from the pit.”

On the hapax *nijúr-* see Scar (165).

II.30 Indra and other divinities

This hymn has at least three, possibly four modern ling. features: conditional (*ábhariṣyat* vs. 2), future impv. (*krṇutāt* vs. 5 [though the fut. impv. appears to be inherited, it is fairly rare in the RV and generally seems to belong to a more colloquial speech level]), gerund (*abhikhyāya*, *hatvī* vss. 9, 10), and mid. subj. in *-ai* (*naśāmahai* vs. 11).

II.30.1: The ceaseless movement of the waters is clearly expressed in the first hemistich, and the question posed in the last pāda is a leading one, at least in my view. It asks at what (temporal) distance, i.e., how long ago, did the waters first start this movement. The implicit answer is “when they were released from Vṛtra’s hold,” which prepares for the

account of the Indra-Vṛtra battle in the next vss. (On the unexpected long vowel in *kíyāti*, see comm. ad I.143.3.)

The problematic pāda is c, and this is in great part because of the uncertain interpr. of *aktúh*. Ordinarily this word means ‘night’, but since “the night of the waters” is a curious expression, most comm. instead implicitly derive it from *√añj* and tr. ‘color’ vel sim. (e.g., Ge “das Farbenspiel der Gewässer”). With Old I take the word in its usual meaning ‘night’, contrasted with the āmredita *áhar-ahar* “day after day.” However, I think the expression “night of the waters” is used metaphorically and perhaps has oppositional semantics. The waters are often, esp. in treatments of the Vala myth, identified with the dawns. Here, perhaps, “night” is meant to evoke its opposite, “dawn” (a poetic device we’ve seen elsewhere, e.g., I.103.7; see publ. intro. to I.103 and comm. ad loc.) and the whole expresses the fact that just as the waters keep flowing, so also do the dawns keep dawning. This interpr. may be too radical, however, and the point of the image may simply be how dark waters can look compared to the sky at dawn (or dusk) -- the “night of the waters” would capture this dark appearance under certain lighting conditions. This perception may be reflected in a passage in the Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā: MS IV.5.1 *apó vaí rātrir dívā bhūtē práviśati tásmað āpo dívā kṛṣṇā apó 'har náktam tásmað āpo náktam śuklāḥ* “Truly night enters the waters when it becomes day; therefore waters by day are black. Day (enters) the waters by night; therefore waters at night are bright.” (MLW comments that the Germanic cognates of the *u*-stem do mean ‘dawn’ [Go. *uhtwo*, etc.].)

II.30.2: The first hemistich of this vs. is desperately obscure. It is unclear what is being done to or for Vṛtra in pāda a, much less who is doing it, and the identity of the feminine subject in b is likewise left open. The function of *ábhariṣyat*, the only conditional in the RV, is uncertain, and also, though this is the least of our problems, whether the verb is *ā* + *ábhariṣyat* or is simply an augmented form without preverb (latter Pp.). The unclear meaning of the rare word *sína-* simply adds to the difficulties.

Let us start with the last one first: the stem *sína-* occurs twice in the RV (here and III.62.1, also as object of *√bhr* with dat. complement), as well as in the cmpd. *tát-sína-* (I.61.4) and the deriv. *sínavant-* (X.102.11). As indicated in EWA s.v., its root affiliation depends on what we think it means, and what we think it means depends to some extent on what root we ascribe it to. I will not rehearse the various suggestions; suffice it to say that I think it belongs with *√sā* ‘bind, tie’ and refers to material tied down on a wagon vel sim., a load -- equipment and the like -- hence my ‘gear’. (For a similar semantic development of a derivative of a different root meaning ‘tie’, see my “Sanskrit pāriṇāhya ‘household goods’: Semantic evolution in cultural context,” Fs. E. Hamp [ed. D.Q. Adams], 1997, pp. 139-145.) In this I follow Old.

I also follow Old in my interp. of the rest of the pāda. Someone *was going to bring* equipment for Vṛtra (hence the conditional, as a contrary-to-fact), but was impeded by the action of the main clause in b: a female, identified as a genetrix (*jánitrī*) foils the plot by announcing it to a wise or knowing one (*vidúṣe*). That *ábhariṣyat* is the only conditional form attested before the Brāhmaṇas (so Whitney) must mean that it carries a very particular force, one that could not be easily expressed by more standard parts of the verbal system.

The potential identities of these actors take us yet another step into the speculative wilderness. I *very tentatively* suggest that the potential accomplice of Vṛtra is Sūrya. There are two, rather shaky reasons for this suggestion: There is some evidence in the Rig Veda for enmity between Indra and Sūrya, particularly in the (alas fragmentary) myth where Indra in conjunction with Kutsa steals the wheel of the sun. This hostility is also found, more developed, in the Mahābhārata, as is well known. And within the vs. itself there is a possible reference to Sūrya in pāda c, in the phrase *pathó rádantih ... asmai* “excavating the paths for him.” Elsewhere in the RV Sūrya is the beneficiary of similar actions: VII.60.4 [*sūryah ... yásma ādityā ádhvano rádanti*, VII.87.1 *rádat pathó várūnah sūryāya*. Although I know of no other evidence for Sūrya attempting an intervention on Vṛtra’s behalf, I nonetheless tentatively supply him as subject of pāda a. The mother figure described as *jánitrī* in b could be the Earth, as sometimes (I.185.6, III.31.2), or Indra’s own mother (as in III.48.2, X.134.1). I have more confidence in Indra as the referent of *vidúṣe* ‘knowing’.

As just noted, I think Sūrya may be the referent of *asmai* in pāda c -- or rather one referent, for I think the pāda is deliberately ambiguous. If I am right that Sūrya is the covert subject of pāda a, then the phraseological parallels to the “excavating paths” expression that have Sūrya as beneficiary would suggest him as referent of *asmai*. The feminine pl. agents could be the dawns, who make the path for the rising sun. But in the context of the Vṛtra battle that forms the subject of the first vss. of this hymn, this pāda may refer to the paths dug out by the waters when they were released from Vṛtra, with *asmai* referring to Indra. Both dawns and waters are potential subjects: the phraseology of pāda d would fit either (or both). Both waters and dawns go to their goal (cf. I.158.6 for waters, III.61.3 for dawns). Although *dhúni-* ‘boisterous’ seems more suitable for waters than dawns (cf. *dhúnimant-* 2x of waters, *dhunayanta* once with rivers as subj.), the emphasis on dailiness (*divé-dive*) might point rather to the dawns. In short, at least the second half-vs. seems deliberately ambiguous, with potentially double referents both for the female subject and the masc. beneficiary.

I have no confidence that my interpr. of this vs. is correct, but I find the other published attempts even less convincing. However, IH has suggested an alternative interpr. to me (p.c.) that is definitely worth considering. In this scenario the *sínam* ‘equipment’ is Indra’s mace, his ‘(fighting) gear’ (so IH), brought to him (=Indra) *against* Vṛtra. Dat. *vrtrāya* here would be a dative of malefit, as it were, exactly as it is in the next vs., 3b. The bringer of the *sínam* could be Tvaṣṭar or even Uśanā Kāvya, two regular suppliers of the mace to Indra. In b the *jánitrī* could be Vṛtra’s mother, whom we memorably meet in I.32.9, and the knowing one (*vidúṣe*) Vṛtra himself, with the participle possibly proleptic.

The potential drawback to this interpr. is that we know that Indra *did* get the mace and smash Vṛtra, so the hypothetical value of the conditional isn’t accommodated. But since we don’t actually know what the value of the conditional was in the RV, this should not deter us. Alternatively there may have been a previous episode in the myth in which Indra’s first attempt was thwarted when Vṛtra was tipped off. A revised tr. of the hemistich acdg. to this scenario would be “The one [=Tvaṣṭar? / UK?] who was going to carry the gear here for [=against] Vṛtra -- the mother [Vṛtra’s mother] announced him to the knowing one [=Vṛtra?].” I would not substitute this tr. for mine, but simply offer it as an alternative.

On *divé-dive* see comm. ad 11 below.

II.30.3: This vs. is a fairly straightforward account of the Indra-Vṛtra battle, though Indra's name doesn't appear until the last word.

I don't quite understand the function of *hí* in pāda a. If it is causal (a value I always try to impose on *hí*), it may take up 2b: we know (at least in one interpr. of vs. 2) that Indra already knew (2b *vidíṣe*) about the trickery before the mother's announcement, because he had already taken his position in the mid-space. But this may be over-thinking *hí*. The *hí* in c is even harder to account for, and I wonder if it isn't there to provide a mirror-image figure: *míham ... hīm á(dudrot)* and to serve as hiatus breaker between *úpa* and *īm*. IH offers an alternative explanation for the two *hí*'s. In IH's account of RVic verbal function, aorists in subordinate clauses express anteriority. Here the *hí* would be a fine expression of post hoc, ergo propter hoc, with sequential events acquiring a causal cast: "because he had taken his stand, he bore down his weapon" and "because he had run up to him, he conquered ...".

In b *vr̥trāya ACC prá √bhr* echoes 2a *vr̥trāya ACC √bhr*. In my interpr. these expressions are contrastive and have different subjects and different intents (though see IH's interpr. above): in 2a the dat. *vr̥trāya* is a dative of benefit, in 3b a dative of, as it were, malefit. The same *vajrāya WEAPON prá √bhr* as 3b is found in I.61.12. The *prá √bhr* expression may be slyly alluded to even in our vs. 2, where *prá* opens pāda b and is therefore adjacent to *ábhariṣyat* pāda-final in a, even though it is construed with *uvāca* at the end of b.

In c Vṛtra must be the subj., even though it breaks the pattern: Indra is the unexpressed subj. of a and b and postposed subj. of d. However, Vṛtra has a penchant for mist (e.g., I.32.13, V.32.4), and in this context it would uniquely identify him.

II.30.4: The vs. is nicely framed with vocc., #*bṛhaspate ... indra*#, thus inviting their identification.

Ge (/WG) take *vṛ̥kadvaras-* as a PN, but Wackernagel's explan. (KISchr. 325–26), adducing Aves. *duuar*, a daevic way of moving, is quite convincing.

ardhám √kr 'go halves' (also VI.44.18) strikes me as an idiomatic or slangy expression, which may fit with the rare (and also possibly lower-register) future impv. *kṛṇutāt*.

II.30.6: WG tr. *radhrásya ... yájamānasya* as "des ermatteten Opferers" and further explain that sacrificing under the hot South Asian sun is exhausting. But surely the point is rather that even a resolute enemy gets slammed down by Indra and Soma (pāda a), while even a weakling gets peped up if he performs sacrifice to them.

II.30.7: *tandran* is, of course, a curious form. The Pp., not surprisingly, reads *tandrat* (with *-t* → *-n* before *ná*). Gr emends this to **tandat*; Whitney (Rts) list the form thus, though with ?; and Old allows it as a possibility, without exactly endorsing it. IH suggests following the Samhitā reading and interpreting it as a 3rd pl. med. root aor., with ending *-ran*. The only other verbal form to this root, *tandate*, is medial. If this is correct, there would seem to be a change of no. in the subj. from the impersonal 3rd sgs. of the standard tr. to an unspecified 3rd pl.: "It will not tire nor weary me, and they will not flag." Who

the plural subject might be is unclear -- perhaps the 1st plural that is found in the next pāda. And in fact all three verbs could be 3rd pl.: the Pp. 3rd sgs. *tamat* and *śramat* also appear immediately before *n-*, with *Samhitā -an*. Under this interpretation the forms would not be impersonal but have unspecified plural subj.: “they will/do not tire or weary me nor do they flag.” If we prefer to accept the emendation to **tandat*, the *-r-* can be explained, with Gr., as adopted from the nominal derivatives (*á-*)*tandra-* and *tandra(yú-)* (cf. also AV *tandrī-*).

II.30.8: Note that pāda a is modeled exactly on 6c.

II.30.9: Ge (/WG) supply a verb as the 1st member of the disjunctive *utá vā* constr., contrasting with *jighatnūh* (“Wenn uns ein Unbekannter (nachstellt), oder töten will ...”), invoking VI.5.4 with *yó nah sánutyo abhidāsat* ... But more salient in VI.5.4 is the contrastive pair *yáh* ... *sánutyah* ... *yó ántarah* ... Therefore, flg. Schmidt (B+I 81; also Klein DGRV II.171), I supply *yó ántarah* as the 2nd part of the disjunctive phrase. Re actually proposes a clever variation on the “distant ... near” contrast, pairing *abhikhāya*, which he renders “(regandant) en face,” with *sánutyah*. This avoids the need to supply additional material, but employing the rare gerund simply as a polar term with ‘distant’ seems unlikely.

As Gr points out, the idiomatic sense ‘hand over, deliver’ is characteristic of *pári* $\sqrt{dā}$, not *pári* $\sqrt{dhā}$, which generally means ‘clothe, surround’. He suggests that this sense of *pári* $\sqrt{dhā}$ is attributable to “Verwechslung mit dā.” In a quick scan of the Gr’s conspectus of *dhā* forms, I found only one example of *pári* $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘deliver’, namely our *pári dhehi*. I wonder if *dhehi* for **dehi* is a nonce hypercorrection, for a form that might have appeared to have undergone Grassmann’s Law because of the *-hi* ending.

II.30.10: The literal meaning of *ánudhūpita-* is fairly clear — ‘besmoked’ — but there is disagreement about its sense. Gr suggests that it means ‘puffed up, arrogant’, while Ge (/WG) think it refers to besieging enemy strongholds with fire and smoke. (If this were the case, one would think “a long time” was the wrong qualifier: smoke and fire should do the trick fairly quickly or not at all, I would think.) I am more in favor of Re’s equivalence with *mohita-* ‘bewildered’, a negative mental state. In my view, ‘besmoked’ means either that their minds have been darkened and led astray to evil ways *or* that they have become confused / befuddled by our constant threats and attacks and it is time for us to administer the coup de grâce.

II.30.11: On the ring between 1c #áhar-ahar and 11d *divé-dive*#, see publ. intro. What I failed to note there (as IH pointed out to me) is that the *áhar-ahar* of vs. 1 was “repaired” by *divé-dive* in 2d, and the *divé-dive* here is responsive to both of them.

II.31 All Gods

Ge (/WG) follows Windisch (Fs. Roth) in seeing this hymn as an allegory, with *rátha-* ‘chariot’ = *stóma-* ‘praise’ and the solution provided only in the last vs. I find this interpr. overblown. The equation of the hymn / sacrifice with a chariot is a trite trope in the RV; I don’t see that this hymn treats the theme in a special way, but perhaps I’m missing something.

II.31.1: As pointed out in the publ. intro., the last word of the vs., *vanarṣád-* ‘sitting in/on the wood(s)’, applies both to the simile -- the birds sitting in the trees -- and the frame -- the charioteers sitting on the wooden chariot. The same qualifier could also characterize other aspects of the sacrifice -- the ritual fires sitting on the firewood, the soma drinks in the wooden cups (for both of which see X.46.7). It is more difficult to apply it to the priests, who are presumably the underlying referents of the plural subject here.

II.31.5: The root noun cmpd *apijū-* is somewhat puzzling, in that the 1st member *api-* (*apī-* with lengthening at cmpd seam; for possible explan. see Scar 169 nn. 223, 224) seems to contribute nothing. In fact, the standard tr. simply ignore it. Scar is on the right track, I think, in taking it as only loosely compounded and meaning something like “also speeders,” perhaps, in order to preserve some cmpd sense, “speeders in addition.”

On *návyasā* *vácaḥ* see comm. ad VIII.39.2.

Pāda d in itself and in its syntactic relation to c is also problematic. Perhaps the first, and possibly the easiest, issue is the apparently untethered *ca*. Klein (DGRV I.226–27) takes it as conjoining the two pādas c and d, but this requires supplying a verb (*kṛṇve*, flg. Ge) that has no support. I think rather that it signals a standard syntagm that has been split across the vs.: “the still and the moving” (gen. *sthātūr jágataś ca* VII.60.2, X.63.8, plus other examples with *ca*-less phrases and lexical substitutions) is a common merism for “everything earthly.” In this verse pl. *jágatām* is found in b, where Night and Dawn are the speeders of moving things; here its formulaic partner, the still (in the sg.), is about to receive an underlayer of vigor. The *ca* simply reminds us that b and d are implicitly contrasted: moving things are impelled to even more movement, whereas still things are about to acquire a solid base. To draw attention to the pairing it might be worthwhile to begin the tr. of d with “and as for the still (world) ...”

Another of the questions is the grammatical identity of *trívayāḥ*: is this bahuvrīhi s-stem a nom. sg. masc., as it appears to be, or a nom./acc. neut., modifying *váyah*? Although the latter interpr. might seem ungrammatical, Wackernagel (AiG III.288) tentatively allows neut. -s-stem nom./acc. in *-āḥ*, though the number of exx. he cites is small (see Lanman, Noun Infl. 560, for a longer but less reliable list) and it is possible that they could all be explained in other ways. Nonetheless, in VII.24.2 (see comm. ad loc.) I do take *dvibárhā(h)* as a neut.; in IV.11.3 and X.80.4 *vīrápeśā(h)* must have a neut. sg. reading, sim. *devávyacā(h)* in III.4.4 and *ūrṇamradā(h)* in V.5.4; and a neut. interpr. is the standard one for *trívayāḥ* here (e.g., Re “la vigueur tri-vigorante”). By contrast I take it in the publ. tr. as a nom. sg. masc., modifying the 1st sg. subject of *stuṣé*, hence “I possessing triple vigor ...” I still think this is possible, but I am now inclined to consider the alternative (“... to strew triple vigorous vigor as the underlayer ...”) as more likely.

The last question is who is doing the strewing. In my publ. tr. it is “I,” and again I still consider this possible. But I think it’s also possible that I praise Heaven and Earth so that *they* will provide the underlayer. This is esp. likely if *trívayāḥ* is taken as neut.: “I praise you two ... (for you) to strew triple-vigorous vigor ...” The pair, or at least Earth, makes sense as the cosmic entity that would provide a base for the still, whereas Night and Dawn, in constant motion, make sense as the speeders of the moving things.

II.31.6: The first hemistich begins and ends with *utá*. The pāda-final *utá* of 6b puts a cap on the series of verse-initial *utá*'s that began in 3a (3a, 4a, 5a, 6a). This is perhaps fitting because vs. 6 ends the capacious list of gods of every sort (from mighty Indra to shadowy Aja Ekapad) who have been strung together additively.

The vs., or rather pādas a and d, plays on *s*: *śámsam uśijām* ... *śmasi / āśuhémā* ... *śámi*. This may be in part to showcase the unusual truncated verb *śmasi* ending pāda a; note that verse-final *śámi* is a virtual anagram of this verb. This *śámi* is also echoed by hemistich-final *sám* in 7b (in an unusual position). There are also echoes from earlier in the hymn: *āśu-* picks up *āśávah* (2a) as *ékapād* does *pádyābhih* (likewise 2a). IH cleverly points out that the position of *śmasi* after (*i*)*va* ([*i*]*va* *śmasi*) hints at the root $\sqrt{vaś}$. See *vaśmi* in the next vs.

The Uśij-priests are credited with the production of a particular *śámsa-* elsewhere, the *āyóh śámsa-* (IV.6.11, V.3.4). For further see comm. ad II.32.2.

For echoes of this vs. in X.92.12, see comm. ad loc.

II.31.7: The 1st sg. *vaśmi* may be seen as a type of poetic repair, anchoring the truncated (*u*)*śmasi* of 6a.

II.32 Various Gods

II.32.1: The first hemistich here, with the skeleton *asyá me dyāvāprthivī* ... *bhūtám avitṝ vácasah* ... “become helpers of this speech of mine, o Heaven and Earth” is somewhat reminiscent of the famous refrain in I.105 *vittám me asyá rodasī* “take heed of this (speech) of mine, you two world halves,” though with aid rather than mere attention asked of Heaven and Earth. The different ordering of the two genitives *asyá* and *me* in the two passages conforms to our expectations of the positioning of enclitics.

The syntax of the second hemistich is rather stiff and clotted, with an oblique nominal relative clause (“of which two there is extensive lifetime”) picked up by a long main clause beginning in the middle of pāda c with the 3rd ps. du. prn. *té*. It is only after some time that we discover that *té* is an accusative, the object of verse-final *dadhe*, and that it is doubled by du. enclitic *vām*, which switches the reference to 2nd ps. The enclitic *vām* is very oddly placed, smack in the middle of pāda d, not leaning on any of its adjacent elements semantically, as far as I can see. Moreover, *puráh* ... *dadhe* seems to be a phrasal verb, but with the two parts of the phrase distant from each other and separated by extraneous material.

II.32.2: The first pāda of this vs. is esp. puzzling. As usual in the RV, Āyu sows confusion, and here, since it is not clear who/what Āyu represents, it is also unclear with what to construe the gen. *āyóh*. The standard interpr. take it with *rípah* ‘swindles, tricks’, while I attach it to *áhan* ‘day’ (with no confidence in its correctness; Old explicitly rejects it). The problem is that Āyu is generally viewed positively, including in Maṇḍala II—as in II.2.8, where the ritual fire is “the guest dear to Āyu,” and II.4.2 where the Bhṛgus deposit the ritual fire “among the clans of Āyu.” If Āyu is positive in value, then the “swindles of Āyu” must be those directed against him, as Old points out. But as he also points out, the more natural reading of this gen. would be subjective (“swindles perpetrated by Āyu”), not objective. It must be admitted that once in this maṇḍala

(II.14.7), Āyu is viewed negatively: Indra strikes down the heroes of Āyu along with those of Kutsa and Atithigva, a trio that is subject to Indra's violence elsewhere, though also individually named as Indra's comrades in still other passages. More to the point, in my opinion, is the apparent formula VERB *uśijah śámsam āyoh* “The Uśij-priests X-ED the Laud of Āyu” (IV.6.11, V.3.4). In the immediately preceding hymn, II.31, we find in 6a the expression *śámsam uśijām* “the Laud of the Uśij-priests,” and in the next vs., 7b, the Āyu-s (pl.) figure as fashioners of ritual speech. This suggestive juxtaposition and echo of the fuller expression “Laud of Āyu” found in the preceding closely related hymn suggest that Āyu here is viewed positively and is related to the ritual; I therefore think that “the day of Āyu” is a way of referring to the day of the sacrifice.

Most forms belonging to the thematic stem *dábha-* must be root aor. subjunctives, but here the *mā* requires an injunctive. Formally the root aor. injunctive should have a zero-grade root, **dbhan*, but obviously such a form is not viable. With full-grade restored, the injunctive is identical to the subjunctive. On these forms see Hoffman (Injunk. 242–43), who suggests that a new injunc. *dabhur* was created to avoid this functional coincidence.

sakhyā occurs several times with *ví vyu* ‘keep away’. Narten (Sig. Aor. 214) states that the *s*-aor. to this root is intrans., and Ge (/WG) render it thus here: “Nicht soll sich unserer Freundschaft lösen,” presumably with neut. pl. *sakhyā* as subj. of the sg. verb. However, VIII.86.1 *mā no ví yauṣtam sakhyā*, with dual verb seems to me decisive for a transitive interpr. of this idiom. In the publ. tr. (“Do not keep us far away from your companionship”) I take *sakhyā* as an instr. (sg.) of separation. However, it is also possible that it is an acc. pl., with the tr. “Do not keep your companionship(s) far away from us.” See IV.16.20.

The phrase *viddhí tásya nah* (“know this (speech?) of ours” in the publ. tr) resonates with I.105 *vittám me asyá* “take heed of this (speech?) of mine, which I adduced above in regard to *asyá me* ... opening our 1a. It might better have been tr. with “take heed.”

II.32.3: The priests’ *sumnāyatā mánasā* “with a mind seeking favor” is, hopefully, matched by the god’s *áhelatā mánasā* “with a mind without anger.”

As in the previous hymn, II.31.2, *pádyābhih* is directly adjacent to a form of *āsú-* ‘swift’. Ge (/WG) take *pádyā-* as ‘heels’: “(Wie) en siegesstarkes Rennpferd mit den Fersen.” The image assumed must be from horseback riding, with the rider spurring the horse on by putting pressure on the horse’s flank with his heels. But the evidence for horseback riding in the RV is scant, and, as I understand it, the racing that is done involves chariots. (On the other hand, there may be mention of “a hero on horseback” [*vīrō árvati*] in the next hymn, II.33.1, though it probably refers to Rudra.) Not only does this heel-spurring not fit the realia, as far as we know it, but it makes trouble for the verbal structure, because “with the heels” would at best only be appropriate to the simile (“(like) a swift prize-winner”) not the frame (“you”: we are hardly likely to be poking the god in the side with our heels). And finally, although the heel is of course a part of the foot and so *pádyā-/pádyā-* could in theory refer to it, no other occurrences of either of these stems seems so specialized, and we do have a perfectly good inherited word for ‘heel’, *pārsni-*. I therefore think *pádyā-* means ‘pace, footprint’. In the simile, “with paces” would refer either to the training the horse is put through or to the pace of another

horse running in front or at its side meant to keep the *vājīn-* up to speed. Its use in the frame is more complex. On the one hand, the steps can refer to the movements of the Adhvaryu around the ritual ground; his physical activity is implicitly contrasted with the verbal activity (*vācasā*) of the Hotar (and Udgātar). I also think that *pádyā-* can refer to verses measured in feet, metrical measures. Although Re thinks this unlikely (“tentant, mais trop hardi”), I see nothing against it.

II.32.4: The adj. *śatādāya-* has a more precise meaning than the standard tr. (e.g., Ge “vollwertigen”) and one different from that in the publ. tr. (“having a hundred shares,” flg. Gr). It was long ago established by Roth (ZDMG 41: 672–76) that this has to do with Wergeld or the worth of a man as measured in cows, hence here ‘(for whom) a hundred (cows) are to be given’; cf. Ge’s n. 4d, Macdonell-Keith Vedic Index s.v. *vaira*, and V.61.8 with comm. ad loc. I would therefore emend the tr. to “a hero worth a hundred (cows) ...”

II.32.6: See comm. ad X.85.47 on the female divine figure *dēṣṭrī* at the end of the wedding hymn, an obscure passage that may be illuminated by this vs. addressed to the fertility goddess *Sinīvālī*, who is urged to apportion offspring to us (*prajām devi dididhī nah*).

II.32.8: The divine females named here, including *Sinīvālī* and *Rākā*, are all found elsewhere, except for *Gungū* (*gungū*) (save in the AVP rep. of this vs., AVP XX.11.10). She is presumably connected in some way to the people called *Gungū* (*gungū-*) found in X.48.7, to whom Indra restores one *Atithigva*.

II.33 Rudra

This is a much-anthologized hymn, fully translated by Macdonell in VRS, Doniger, and Maurer. Its popularity is not surprising: it’s lively and varied, but does not pose major difficulties, though it has its share of small knots.

Re EVP XV.157–60.

II.33.1: The only difficult pāda is c, which has received a variety of interpr. The first question is whether *vīrō árvati* should be construed together or *árvati* taken with some other part of the clause. With Ge (/WG) I take the two words together in the publ. tr.; most other tr. (Macdonell, Re, Doniger, Maurer) take it with *nah* or directly with the verb *abhī ... kṣameta*. Ge (/WG) take the hero to be one of us, a human; this leads Ge to interpr. the verb as passive (“Es möge unser Krieger zu Ross verschont blieben”), although all forms of this idiom, med. *abhī √kṣam*, all of which appear in this little group of hymns (II.28.3, 29.2, 33.1, 33.7), have the same meaning, “be indulgent/patient towards” (see esp. vs. 7). With most tr. I instead understand *vīrá-* to be Rudra; it is appropriate to ask for his indulgence or patience. This leads us to the question of whether Rudra is likely to be on horseback. I know of no evidence for or against, but given that Rudra is the Maruts’ father and they are often associated with horses, it is certainly possible. However, the only other occurrence of *árvati* in the RV (VIII.71.12) appears to be an unmarked loc. absolute: we ask Agni for help “when a charger (is at stake).” It is

therefore possible that the same usage is found here, and the pāda should mean “The hero should be indulgent to us when a charger (is at stake).” I leave the question open.

The etym. figure *prá jāyemahi ... prajābhih* is not rendered in the publ. tr. “May we be further propagated with our progeny” would sound more like such a figure, even though it’s not.

II.33.2: On the first sg mid. optative transmitted as *asiya*, see Gunkel (JAOS 142.2 [2022]), who demonstrates statistically that Old’s conjecture of **asiya* in this vs. is correct, though the same transmitted form in the cadence of vs. 6, as well as *disiya* in vs. 5, should be read with long vowel. For other such forms, see *rāsiya* and *tsiya* in VII.32.18 (q.v.), which should be read with short-vowel optative suffix.

II.33.3: This is the only occurrence of sg. *vájra-bāhu-* that doesn’t qualify Indra. (The only non-sg. form is dual *vajra-bāhū* addressed to Indra and Agni in I.109.7.) I do not know why Rudra is thus identified here.

II.33.4: The *sāhūti-*, a joint invocation (with another god or gods), may be a sore subject for Rudra. As pointed out in the publ. intro., he receives only three hymns dedicated to him alone in the RV; otherwise two hymns joint with Soma and incidental mentions in hymns to other gods. He may feel slighted. See also disc. ad VI.49.10.

II.33.5: I am in agreement with most tr. (though not Macd.) that pāda b is the thought of the subject of the rel. cl. in pāda a, namely the over-zealous sacrificer. The verb *áva* ... *disiya* belongs not with *√dā* ‘give’ (with Gr), but *√dā* ‘cut, divide’ (so already Wh Roots); see esp. Narten (Sig Aor. 138–40). The idiom *áva √dā* is generally taken, including by Narten, to mean ‘abfinden’ (propitiate, compensate), but I think it has a more literal meaning here, ‘cut off’. The too-little ritual service of vs. 4 -- poor praise (*dūṣuti-*) and shared invocation (*sāhūti-*) -- meets the contrasting fault in vs. 5: the over-eager worshiper who wants Rudra as his own exclusively. This is a dramatic opposite of the *sāhūti-*; not only an invocation directed only to this god, but one not jointly produced by the group of priests and worshippers. Such a private one-on-one human-divine relationship would be quite anomalous in the RVic religious world, where divine service requires cooperation among various ritual personnel. The personal appeals in the Vasiṣṭha-Varuṇa hymns of VII have such a strong impact in part because they deviate so far from ordinary religious practice.

The standard interpr. of the second hemistich makes the main clause rather loosely attached to the rel. cl. of pāda a. The “us” (*nah*) of c is supposed to pick up the *yāh* of a and the *manā-* of d is supposed to refer rather vaguely to the sentiment expressed in ab: in other words, we don’t want to be the sort of person who might think such a thing or be suspected of thinking such a thing. I think the connection is much simpler. *manā-* is generally ‘zeal’ or ‘enthusiasm’; it is not inherently a negative notion, but becomes negative in the wrong hands (or mind). In my interpr., the “whoever” of the rel. cl. in a is our sacrificial rival, who is trying to cut us out of the deal, as it were, by getting Rudra to himself. We beg Rudra not to make us subject to, subordinate to, his over-zealous action.

The epithet *rdūdāra-* ‘tender-hearted’ is a charming phonetic play on Rudra’s name, which is almost always read trisyllabically (*r^udara*) in this hymn.

Another adj. (see 3b above) otherwise used (almost) exclusively of Indra: *suśípra-* ‘well-lipped’ (of Agni V.22.4; in pl. of Ṛbhukṣans VII.37.1).

II.33.6: On *ghṛṇī* see Old. The sequence *ghṛṇīva* is morphologically difficult. Pp. *ghṛṇī iva*; Gr suggests *ghṛṇer 'va*, but this would be quite an emendation/corruption! The stem is *ghṛṇi-*. Oldenberg suggests the sequence contains instr. *ghṛṇī*, which may be about as plausible as we’re going to get – though it requires a rather loose interpr. of instr. value. (The publ. tr. “during the heat” envisions an instr. of extent of time.) Note that the deriv./compd has -*ī* final: *ghṛṇī-vant* (1x), *āghṛṇī-vasu-*. I wonder if we’re dealing with a fem. byform **ghṛṇī-* with loc. sg. like *sarasī* in VII.103.2. However, in this case we’d expect final accent: **ghṛṇī-*.

I take ‘favor’ (*sumnām*) as the gapped goal of the verb in c, *asīya* ‘might I reach’.

II.33.7: In b the *yó ásti* ... clause might appear to be embedded in the main clause, if c resumes the question posed in a. However, c could simply be part of the rel. cl. Even if b is embedded, it is unproblematic, since nominal rel. clauses are an exception to the no-embedding rule, functioning rather like izafe-s. See my “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto Izafe” forthcoming in a Fs.

In d *abhī* ... *cakṣamīthāḥ* reprises 1c *abhī* ... *kṣameta*. Given that final lengthening in the preverb *abhī* is extremely rare (Lub: 739 *abhī*, 14 *abhī̄*), I am inclined to interpr. the form as *abhī̄ ī*, with the enclitic acc. anticipating the obj. *mā*, esp. given that in vs. 1 in this same idiom *abhī* appears without length. For another ex. of *ī* coalescing with a final short *i*, see *rākṣatī* < *rākṣati* + *ī* in II.26.4.

II.33.8: The verb in c, *namasyā*, can be either 2nd sg. impv. or 1st sg. subj., and translations differ. Because of the surrounding 1st ps. verbs (b: 1st sg. *īrayāmi*, d: 1st pl. *grṇīmāsi*) I opt for the 1st sg. subjunctive, though there are no implications either way.

kalmalīkīn- is obviously a possessive -*īn*-stem built to a -*ka*-suffixed form of *kalmalī-*, found once in the AV (XV.2.1–4) in unclear meaning, as descriptor of a jewel. The *l*’s and the reduplicative rhyming formation (*kal-mal-*) mark it as non-standard and suggest that it is affective in some fashion. My tr. “sparkling one” is similar to those of others, but given the uncertainty of the word and its base, it should have been marked with a question mark.

II.33.9: The tr. should be slight adjusted to “this ... world,” to reflect the adjectival demonst. *asyā*.

II.33.10: Given that the two words for ‘bow’, *dhánus-* and *dhánvan-*, the detritus of an old heteroclite, are suppletive in the RV, with the former supplying the nom./acc. sg. and the latter the rest of the paradigm (see disc. ad VI.75.2), my tr. of *dhánvā* (and indeed the various tr. of Re, Macd, Doniger, and Maurer; Ge’s “trägst du Pfeile und Bogen” is ambiguous, because Bogen is both sg. and pl.) as singular must be wrong, and Gr’s identification of the form as pl. is correct. In fact, though the Pp reads *dhánva* with short final, in the Samhitā text the word spans the pāda boundary and coalesces with the following word as *dhánvārhann* and so could be underlyingly *dhánvā*, with an unambig. pl. ending. In any case I would alter the publ. tr. to “arrows and bows.”

The VP in c, *idám dayase víśvam ábhvam*, is variously rendered: Ge “verfügst du über all diese Gewalt,” Macd “wieldest all this force” (sim. Doniger, Maurer) versus Re “tu détruis tout mal-informe,” WG “... zerstörst du all dieses Unwesen.” I do not think either of these approaches is correct. On the one hand, *ábhva-* does not mean ‘power’, but rather ‘formless(ness)’, often conceived as monstrous (Re’s ‘mal-informe’ [badly shapeless], though odd, seems close). Nor does *dayate*, if belonging to $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘cut, divide, distribute’ as Ge et al. seem to take it, mean ‘wield, have control’. As for the other view, Re simply states that *dáyate* can mean ‘destroy’, while WG explicitly adopt Gotō’s view (1st class pres., 172–74) that there are two distinct roots $\sqrt{dā}$ that have *dáyate* as pres., one ‘divide, distribute’, the other ‘destroy’. None of the passages adduced by Gotō for ‘destroy’ requires segregation in a separate root that has little else to support its existence; they can all be seen as metaphorical extensions of ‘divide, cut apart’ (3 of the 5 passages occur with *vi*), an extension well within the bounds of RVic poetic imagination (though perhaps not of all its commentators). My own view is that the action attributed to Rudra here is a cosmogonic one, regularly performed by other Rigvedic gods, namely the division of the formless chaos of the pre-creation universe into what will later be referred to by the expression “name-and-form” (*nāma-rūpa-*) As I have discussed in numerous other places (see, e.g., my someday (?) forthcoming “The Blob in Ancient India”), the Vedic conception of creation involves division into separate entities, with clear boundaries and names, of an originally fuzzy boundary-less mass, which strikes horror in the hearts of Vedic people. In my view, the verb *dayate* here has its standard root meaning, ‘cut, divide, apportion’, and Rudra is engaged in cosmogonic division. In this sense the verb often occurs with the preverb *vi*, which sometimes occurs directly after the verb occupying post-caesura position (e.g., ... *dáyase vi* ... VI.37.4, VII.23.4). Although the preverb is not found here, *víśvam* immediately follows the verb and evokes the preverb. Note a different use of the same root in vs. 5; also note that *nāma* is found in 8d and *-rūpa-* in 9a, evoking the notion “name and form.”

In my publ tr. I did not fully render the *idám*, however. I would substitute “this whole formless void” or perhaps “the whole formless void here.”

Note that the primary comparative *ójiyas-* is flanked by two occurrences of its de facto positive *ugrá-* (9b, 11b).

II.33.12: Although most tr. (Ge, Re, Doniger, Maurer, but not Macd) take *nānāma* as 1st sg., with nom. *kumāráh* relegated to a simile, I follow Kü (278) (and Macd., see also Gr) in taking *nānāma* as 3rd sg. For one thing, *cid* isn’t a simile particle (*pace* Ge), and so this would have to be an unmarked simile (not, of course, impossible), and for another we might expect (or at least hope for) **nānāma* with short root vowel as a 1st sg. pf. The point of the half-vs. must be that even a little boy knows to honor someone more powerful and distinguished than he is, and so I surely know to do the same.

II.33.13: The *śáṁ(tama)-* here makes a ring with *śáṁtama-* in 2a.

Note that in HvN the voc. *vṛṣano* is wrongly given as accented (*vṝṣano*).

II.33.14: As IH pointed out to me, *gāt* in b should have a modal reading, either as an injunc. matching the precative value of the preceding verb *vṛjyāh* or expressing the

imperatival value often found in root aor. injunctives; hence either “should go around us” or “let it go around us.”

The mid. impv. (*áva ...*) *tanuṣva* suggests that it is Rudra’s own bows that should be un-strung. Recall that he bore the bow in 10a (*bibharṣi ... dhánvā*).

II.33.15: In the publ. tr., the *yáthā* cl. is rendered as a purpose cl. (“... that you do not become angry ...”), but *yáthā* purpose cl. always take the subjunctive, as Macd. already pointed out. It should rather be construed with the vs.-initial *evā*, in the usual “just as ..., so ...” relationship, though with the usual order reversed. Macd. also recognized this, but suggested that *evā* is “to be taken with c, since in the normal syntactical order if should follow *yáthā* in the sense which it has here.” This is a trickier piece of syntax than I think can be justified — hopscotching the *evā* over the whole *yáthā* clause — and the contents of c do not conform to the standard usage of summary *evā*. Instead I think *evā* sums up the successful achievement of the wishes expressed in the preceding vs. (and perhaps in the whole preceding hymn): “even as you are not angry and do not smite, so (it is): the missile has avoided us, the bows are unstrung, etc.” This is somewhat hard to render in Engl., but I would change the publ. tr. to “Just as you are not angry and do not smite, so (it has come to pass).”

II.34 Maruts

A very difficult hymn, whose problems were perhaps not sufficiently signaled in the publ. intro.

II.34.1: Old rejects the cmpd interpr of *dhārāvara-* and takes *-vará-* as a suffix meaning ‘reich an’; Ge (/WG, the latter explicitly) follow his interpr. But as Re pts. out there is no such secondary suffix in the RV -- *pace* Debrunner (AiG II.2.908), who lists this as the earliest example of the *-vara-* / *-vala-* suffix in the sense of *-vant-*. It is also Deb’s only *r*-form; the remaining examples listed have *-vala-*. (Curiously, early in II.2 [p. 98] he glosses *dhārā-vará-* as ‘Regengüsse liebend’, with the cmpd interpr., so he doesn’t seem to have paid full attention to this hapax.) One of Old’s objections to the cmpd interpr. is that the accent rules out a *bahuvrīhi*, but I see no reason why it can’t be a *tatpuruṣa* with *vará-* ‘wooer’ as 2nd member.

It is notable that “unclosing the cows” (*ápa gā avṛṇata*), the standard culmination of the Vala myth, is here attributed to the Maruts, who ordinarily do not participate in that myth. Of course here “cows” could stand for rain clouds; see the flaming cows in vs. 5.

II.34.2–5: Note the concentration of *prsib* forms: 2d *pŕsn̄yāh*, 3d *prkṣám ... pŕṣatībhīh*, 4a *prkṣé*, 4c *pŕṣadaśva* (and scrambled *-śiprā* in 3c, *rapśa-* in 5a).

II.34.2: In pāda a the -ín-stem *khādín-* in the frame corresponds functionally to the instr. *stībhīh* in the simile. See 4d below.

The 2nd hemistich presents a severe mismatch between semantic/contextual expectations and morphosyntax. As we know, Rudra is the father of the Maruts. This vs. contains a nom. sg. *rudrāh* and enclitic 2nd pl. *vah* referring to the Maruts, which can be acc., dat., or gen., and a form of the verb *√jan* ‘beget’. All the standard tr. render the expression “Rudra begot you, o Maruts” (vel sim.). The problem is that the verb is *ájani*,

a form of the so-called passive aor. Re breezily remarks “seul cas de valeur transitive.” But not only are the other occurrences of this form intrans./pass., but it belongs to a formation (the “passive aorist”) that is strongly typed for this function. Moreover, the medial *-iṣ*-aor. forms loosely associated with this form (*ájanista*, etc.) are overwhelmingly intrans./pass. It is inconceivable to me that a Vedic audience would attribute or accept transitive value for *ájani* here, given the robust grammatical support for intrans./passive value.

I therefore think we must interpr. it acdg. to its formal shape, rather than imposing a transitive sense to make the passage easier (or easier by our lights). My way of doing so also requires us to read the sandhi form *śukrá* as nom. sg. *śukráḥ*, rather than the Pp.’s loc. *śukré*. In this interpr. nom. sg. *vṛṣā* ... *śukráḥ* is a secondary predicate of *rudráḥ*: “R. was born as *bullish semen* in the udder of Pr̄ṣni.” It is this semen that combines with Pr̄ṣni to produce the Maruts; it can also, in naturalistic terms, be the rain in the thunderclouds that are Pr̄ṣni’s udder. This gender mingling and loss of distinction between the Maruts’ bull-father (=Rudra) and their mother Pr̄ṣni in the udder are also found, in somewhat different fashion, in IV.3.10d *vṛṣā śukráṁ duduhe pṛṣnir ūdhah* “the bull as Pr̄ṣni milked gleaming (milk/semen) from his (/her) udder” and in VI.66.1d *sak्यं chukráṁ duduhe pṛṣnir ūdhah* “only once did Pr̄ṣni milk the gleaming (milk/semen) from the udder.” See also VI.48.22 and comm. ad loc., which may also refer to the birth of Rudra/his semen as occurring before the birth(s) of the Maruts.

It is somewhat remarkable that both Griffith and Max Müller (SBE) also take *ájani* seriously (“Rudra ... sprang into life for you in P’s radiant lap” and “as soon as R. ... was born for you ... in the bright lap of P.”, respectively; see also von Bradke, Fs. Roth, p. 118). Perhaps the commentators who came later wished to distance themselves from these not-always-reliable role models even when they appear to be right.

II.34.3: My rendering of *nadásya kárṇaiḥ* “with the ‘ears’ of the reed(-whip)” follows Pischel’s sugg. (Ved. Stud. I.191; see Ge’s n. 3bc and Old) that *nadá-* is here ‘reed’ (cf. I.32.8) (beside *nadá-* ‘id.’) rather than ‘roarer’ and that it refers to a whip or riding crop of some sort. I suggest that the “ears” would be some part of the whip, perhaps knots on the whiplashes or the like. Pischel’s idea has been generally rejected (though Oberlies [Relig. II.247] seems to accept it); see esp. Old’s negative remarks. But the alternative notion, that the Maruts are directing their horses by the ears of a(nother? side?) horse makes no sense to me: how would such direction work? And although Old explicitly states that the number is not an issue, referring to plural (not dual) ears of a single horse (or even several horses, since pairs of body parts generally are referred to in the dual even when several individuals are in question) seems problematic to me.

In my interpr. the two instr. pls. *kárṇaiḥ* and *āśubhiḥ* are separate. So also Old, Re, though they otherwise accept the lead-ear theory. But Ge (/WG) construe them together (“with swift ears”), which in my view makes a puzzling interpr. even more so.

The next question is how to interpr. the intensive part. *dávidhvataḥ*. Though the stem is usually transitive, Ge (/WG) take it absolutely (“schüttelnd”), while Re supplies an obj. seemingly at random (“qui secouez-puissamment (le monde”)). I extract ‘lips’ (*śípra-*) from the cmpd. *híranyaśípra-*, since du. *śípre* serves as object to just this participle in X.96.9.

The *prksám* of d should not be severed from *prksé* beginning 4a, though at least in Ge's (/WG's) tr. the connection is not signaled (Re's rendering does connect them). In general, thematic *prksá-* refers to a strengthening substance, esp. nourishment. The corresponding root noun *pŕks-* has the same basic sense (see Schindler, Rt Noun, s.v.), but here in the dat. is used infinitively (so also Schindler, as well as the standard tr.). The phrase *prksám yātha* may well be a syntagm, judging from the PN *prksá-yāma* in I.122.7 (adduced by Old), and the acc. appears to be a goal, contra Ge's (/WG) rendering of *prksám* as an adverb ("kräftig").

II.34.4: The two alternatives marked by *vā* 'or' ("to fortify all creatures or for alliance") seem to have little to do with each other. Perhaps we are meant to assume "for alliance with all creatures" for the second alternative, hence my "(with them)."

As in 2a an element found in a free syntagm in the simile has its correspondent in a compound: loc. *vayúneṣu* matches *dhūr-* and both are governed by the cmpd 2nd member *-sád-*, at least in my interpr. (guided by Th., Unters., 23); the other standard tr. do not take *vayúneṣu* with the simile.

The meaning and etym. of the word *vayúna-* are much disputed; see EWA s.v., which lemma consists only of a list of secondary lit. I follow Th's interpr. (Unters.) to some degree, but consider it more likely a derivative of the (secondary) root $\sqrt{vā}$ 'weave' than of $\sqrt{vyā}$ 'envelop' and the more likely meaning 'pattern, tracery' than 'Umhüllung'. This literal meaning (arising from the repetitive patterns found in woven material) can then be applied, on the one hand, to similar visual effects (e.g., light and shadow produced by sunlight filtering through trees and bushes) or metaphorically to phenomena that show similarly repetitive patterns, such as ritual procedures. In this particular passage both senses may be at play. In the simile (in my view) the birds are sitting on "the traceries (of the branches)": the pattern of light and shade I just alluded to is turned on its head, to refer to the branches that produce those light patterns. But it is also possible to construe it with the frame, where the Maruts sitting at the chariot pole (often a metaphor evoking the chariot of sacrifice; see, e.g., the same cmpd *dhūrṣád-* applied to Agni at the sacrifice in the 2nd hymn in this *maṇḍala* [II.2.1]) could also be sitting among the ritual patterns of the ongoing ceremony. I continue to maintain, however, that *vayúneṣu* here belongs primarily to the simile. I also suggest that *vayúneṣu* subtly evokes the word(s) we might expect in this simile. Birds usually sit in trees, and *váneṣu* \sqrt{sad} is fairly common; compare esp. *vanarṣád-* (with a bird simile) in nearby II.31.1 (and X.132.7 *dhūrṣádam vanarṣádam* with the same pole-sitting as here). There is also the word *vayā-* 'twig', which might be another place birds would be expected to sit (though it does not occur in the loc., unfortunately). A form of this rarer word is found in the next hymn (II.35.8). I therefore wonder if *vayúna-* here is felt as a nonce blend of *vána-* and *vayā-*, in addition to having its own regular sense.

II.34.5: Despite the almost comic image of the flaming cows, the reference in this half-verse is fairly clear. The cows with their teeming udders must be the thunderclouds; their 'enflaming' quality is presumably the lightning. Although the formation of the hapax *īndhanvan-* is morphologically peculiar, it can hardly belong with anything but the nasal-infix present to *vidh* 'kindle', unless it is corrupt (as Old suggests).

The simile “like geese to good pastures” may initially seem unusual -- we expect cows to come to good pastures (see 8c below), not geese. But anyone familiar with Canada geese frequently sees flocks of them in pastures and post-harvest grain fields, and a Google search of “Canada geese in pastures” turns up numerous complaints about their regular mess-producing presence therein, as well as numerous pictures; similar pictures of (Indian) bar headed geese feeding in fields also turn up in a Google search. The image is appropriate to the Maruts, who would fly down in a flock to settle on the ritual ground just as flocks of geese do in fields.

Note the alliterative pāda d: *mádhor mádāya marutah samanyavah*.

II.34.6: The free syntagm *narām* (*ná* *sámsa-* with gen. pl. *narām* is found also in I.173.9–10 and, in reversed order, in VI.24.2 *sámsa* *narām*. It is obviously a variant of the doubly accented cmpd *nárā-sámsa-*, which also occurs in tmesis without conversion of the 1st member to gen. pl. in *nárā* (*ca/vā* *sámsa-* (IV.86.42 and X.64.3 respectively). It is possible that the final *-m* of *narām* was generated by the initial nasal of *ná* and the accent adjusted to produce a case form from an underlying **nárā ná sámsa-* in the three occurrences of this syntagm that have this order; the meter would be unaffected. However, the example with the opposite order makes this less likely. In any case, this scarcely matters; the problem is to figure out the referent of the phrase here, whose head is nom. sg. and therefore must be compared to the subj. of the impv. *gantana*, namely the Maruts. Narāsamsa is a shadowy divine figure or divine epithet (cf. Re, EVP X.76 n. 7: “la Récitation personifiée?”), who has a regular role in Āprī hymns (generally in the 3rd vs.) and is sometimes identified with Agni and less frequently with other gods (see, e.g., Macdonell, Ved. Myth., p. 100). So our vs. may be comparing the Maruts to a divine figure who should be at the sacrifice -- quite possibly Agni. (This interpr. is explicitly rejected by Re. in favor of a common noun “la récitation faite par les officiants,” EVP X.76 n. 7.) Or, in keeping with Re’s view, it may refer to a ritual element, the laud, that should be present at the sacrifice. Alternatively, and in keeping with my interpr. of the expression in VI.24.2 (see comm. there) and the phrase *sámsam āyóh* (IV.6.11, V.3.4), it may refer to the gods as being like the embodiment of the praise they receive, in an idiom like English “the toast of the town.” Under this interpr. I would alter the tr. to “like the Laud of Men.” In any case, by most interpr. of the cmpd (and associated syntagms) the ‘men’ (*narām*) are in subject-relation to *sámsa-*: that is, they are producing the laud, not receiving it.

The 2nd pl. act. impv. *pipyata* belongs to the perfect stem, but shows pseudo-thematic inflection (expect **pipita*). On such forms see my 2018 “The Vedic Perfect Imperative and the Status of Modal Forms to Tense-Aspect Stems” (Fs. Lubotsky); briefly, the act. pseudo-thematic impvs. begin, I think, in the dual act. imperatives (here 2nd du. *pipyatam* 4x, 3rd du. *pipyatām* 1x), which owe their disyllabic desinence to the indic. dual endings *-athus*, *-atus*. Subsequently the *-a-* liaison had a limited spread, here to the phonologically similar 2nd pl.

The phrase *dhíyam* ... *vājapeśasam* “visionary thought that has prizes as its ornament” is a shorthand way to refer to the standard ritual tit-for-tat, with the gods giving material goods in exchange for praise. But it also probably incorporates another element of that exchange, that the gods themselves inspire or create in the poet the poetic vision that he then shapes into praise of them.

II.34.8: The function of the presumed loc. *bháge* (*bhágā* in sandhi) is unclear. Ge (/WG) construe it with *sudānavah* (“die im Glück freigebigen”), but this common epithet never elsewhere participates in a syntagm. Re takes it as an expression of purpose, and my tr. also reflects such a function, though the loc. doesn’t ordinarily express purpose. I wonder if this is not a (deliberately) mangled dative. Our supposed loc. (the only loc. to this stem in the RV) is immediately followed by *ā* (*bhágā ā*), which resembles the dat. *bhágāya* with quantity flip. If this seems too radical, we can simply take it as loc. + *ā* and interpr. it as “in (a state of) good fortune” vel sim.

The simile in c can be viewed as poetic repair for the one in 5c discussed above: “like geese to good pastures” there seemed a bit off (though in fact perfectly compatible with observed realia); here the milk-cow in good pastures provides the expected pairing of cow and fodder.

However, the simile here is off in a different way; it is an example of case disharmony (see my 1982, IIJ 24 article), with the cow (nom. *dhénuh*) in the simile the subj. of an intrans./reflexive sense of *pīvate*, while in the frame the verb is transitive, with *īsam* as obj. (The dat. of benefit stays constant in simile and frame.) This is possible because of the complex semantics of ‘swell’ words in the RV, also discussed in the just-cited article. It would be possible to avoid the case-disharmony explanation, by supplying ‘udder’ as obj. in the simile (“as a milk-cow swells her udder...”). Udders figure prominently in this hymn (see esp. 6c *ásvām iva pīpyata dhenūm īdhani* “make the mare, the milk-cow swell in her udder”). However, since this simile is not only intelligible without supplying an object but conforms to case disharmony patterns elsewhere, I see no reason to do so.

Not only is *pīvate* an ambiguous pivot in terms of syntactic valence, but its very morphology is exploited for ambiguity as well, at least in my view. The thematic Class I pres. *pīvati* is of course well established in the RV, but it is of course also historically a thematicization of a Class V *nó/nu* pres. **pinóti* / **pinuté*, of which a few relic forms are found (e.g., med. part. *pīvāná-*). The 3rd pl. mid. to this pres. would be *pīvāté* (*pīvate* without accent), exactly the form we have here. So in the simile *pīvate* matches its singular subj. *dhénuh* in number, but in the frame it can also match its underlying plural subject, the Maruts, if it’s assigned to an athematic stem.

Note that the caesura splits the bahuvrīhi *rātāhavise*. Though such a split is fairly common with dual dvandvas, it is considerably rarer with more tightly constructed cmpds. (I can’t offhand come up with any other exx., though I haven’t systematically looked.)

II.34.9: The cheating mortal of the rel. cl. has no surface representation in the (first) main clause, the two-word finale of pāda b, but the full clause of c contains *tám* (in unusual final position), which picks up the *yáh* of the rel. cl. The publ. tr. supplies a reference in the b-clause in the phrase “from *his* harm,” and this is certainly possible. It might be better, however, to treat “protect us from harm” as parenthetical as Ge does (see his n. 9b), with the real main cl. found only in c.

Re is insistent on taking *tápus-* only as a noun, not as an adjective with the standard interpr. (incl. Gr), but though he is technically correct that the root accent should mark it as a noun (‘scorching heat’), it seems to have been reinterpr. as an adj., possibly

on the basis of its regular participation in *tápus*-X cmpds (*tápur-jambha-*, etc.). Though these originally would have meant ‘whose X is searing heat’, it would be easy to slip into ‘having scorching X’. Alternatively MLW suggests that *cakrýā* is adjectival here: “with the heat of/belonging to the wheel.” However, the fact that the same form *cakrýā* in vs. 14 seems clearly to mean ‘wheel’ makes this less likely; in fact the other 5 forms of the stem *cakrí-* outside this hymn mean ‘wheel’ not ‘wheel(ed) / associated with the wheel’.

II.34.10: The sense of this vs., or rather its second half, is very uncertain. See esp. Old’s comments. In the first half, the course of the Maruts shows brightly. The intens. 3rd sg. middle with -*t*-less ending, *cékite*, is taken by Schaeffer (Intens., 44, 112) as having the (/an) old stative ending, which she takes in passive sense (“wird immer wieder erkannt”) in all occurrences of this form. The passive interpr. seems unnecessary: numerous formations to \sqrt{cit} mean simply ‘appear (bright)’. In the intens. it can mean ‘appear continuously bright’ or ‘appear ever brighter’, and this sense works well for all five occurrences of *cékite*. As for the form, I doubt that we need to reach into deep prehistory for a stative ending; rather it seems likely to me that it is what we might call a “perfecto-intensive,” built alongside med. pf. *cikité* with adjustment of the redupl. vowel.

A different manipulation of the perfect is probably to be seen in the verb of b, *duhúh* (also twice elsewhere without accent), which appears to have been generated to the -*t*-less middle root pres. 3rd pl. *duhré* (3rd sg. *duhé*) and has acquired the act. 3rd pl. ending -*úh* because those middle forms look like unredupl. pf. forms.

It is not entirely clear who the “friends” are who milk Prśni’s udder. The udder itself is presumably, as elsewhere (e.g., 5a above), the rain cloud; milking it causes rain to fall. In nearby II.29.4 the friends (*āpáyah* as here) are the gods, in V.53.2 more narrowly the Maruts. Either would work here, though the 2nd ps. address to the Maruts in *pāda* a and the 3rd ps. ref. of *āpáyah* in b requires person shift if the referent is the Maruts; nonetheless, Ge and Re opt for the Maruts. It is worth noting that the word participates in a word play with the verb: (*ā*)*páyo duhúh* “milk milk,” with the neut. s-stem *páyas-* ‘milk’ lurking there (cf. VI.48.22 *pŕsnyā dugdhám sakít páyah*, with *páyah* \sqrt{duh} as well as Prśni). This pun may have invited the use of the stem *āpí-*. I do not understand the purport of the immediately preceding particle *ápi*, unless it is meant to resonate with *āpáyo*. *ápi* does not otherwise appear with \sqrt{duh} , though Ge unearths an ex. in MS (where it appears to be contextually driven).

The rest of the verse is close to hopeless because, on the one hand, the role of Trita (or “the third one”) cannot be pinned down and, on the other, the syntax is slippery and there is no main verb. The standard tr. think Trita is assuming the role of scapegoat and taking on scorn and old age, to spare us (or others), on the basis of passages like VIII.47.13. But Trita has other functions in Vedic, including in vs. 14 of this very hymn, where he is responsible for delivering multiple Hotars, and a more positive role for Trita than scapegoat therefore seems likely. He is also associated with the Maruts in V.54.2 as one who bellows when the Maruts come together with lightning (*sáṁ vidyútā dádhati vāśati tritáh*); the presence of a roarer here (*návamānasya*) is reminiscent of that passage. My tr. is provisional; for the main verb I supply a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ on the basis of nearby II.23.14 *yé tvā nidé dadhiré* with *nidé* as here. Although I supplied a 3rd pl. form, continuing the 3rd pl. of b, it could easily be 2nd pl. (so the standard tr.) with Maruts as subject; the voc. phrase *rudriyāh* ... *adābhyāh* may support the 2nd pl. Otherwise I frankly

admit that my tr. is not based on a firm sense of what the passage is meant to convey. Note that scorn returns in 15b.

II.34.12: The relationship between the Daśagvas and the Maruts is not clear. Re suggests that they are identical, but I find this unlikely. The Daśagvas are a rarely mentioned collectivity, generally grouped together with their slightly more prominent kin the Navagvas and associated with Indra in the opening of the Vala cave. The Maruts, though also in Indra's entourage, are not standard participants in the Vala myth. Here they seem to be implicitly compared to the Daśagvas but not identical to them. The point presumably is to associate the Maruts' thunderstorm activity, including both the fecundity of the rain, here symbolized by cows, and the return of the light after the storm, with the powerful mythic image of the opening of Vala. The move to configure the Maruts' activity as on a par with the opening of Vala was already made in the first vs., with the VP in *d ápa gā avṛṇvata* "They unclosed the cows" (see also *śuśucānāḥ* in 1c, comparable to *śucatā* here). Describing their light as *góarnas-* 'flooding with cows, whose flood is cows' is esp. telling, since it connects their floods of rain with the cows of the Vala myth. I supply cows as the obj. of *áporṇute* in the frame on the basis of 1d, but it might be better to take *rāmīḥ*, here tr. 'nights', as 'dark (things)', referring to nights in the simile but clouds in the frame. Hence a slightly revised tr. "As Dawn ... uncloses the dark (nights), so did they unclose the dark (clouds) ..."

II.34.13: On this vs. see Thieme KZ 92: 43–44, though his etym. of *rudrá-* (n. 34) as 'tree-breaking' (< *dru-dra-*) is best passed over in near silence. His explanation of *kṣonī-* as 'cry', here standing for thunder, is convincing. With that interpr., we can see the vs. proceed through thunder, lightning (the ornaments), rain (horse's piss), and post-storm sunshine (or even rainbow).

From the comment just above, it can be seen that I take *méghamāna-* as belonging with *√mih* 'urinate', with a misanalysis of the final *-h* as a velar, not a palatal, influenced by *meghá-* 'cloud'. For an alternative see Gotō (1st Class), 245–46.

II.34.14: The syntax of this vs. is quite broken: a nom. sg. participle (*iyānāḥ*) in pāda a is followed by a 1st pl. verb (*grṇūmasi*), but cd has a 3rd sg. verb (*āvavārtat*) that may (or may not) pick up the sg. subj. of a. The vs. is also notable for the return of Trita (see 10cd above), whose function is no clearer here than there.

With regard to the number/person mismatch of ab, Ge's notion that both the 3rd sg. and the 1st pl. refer to ritual personnel seems convincing. If we take a and b as separate clauses, note that the first one has a predicated pres. participle. Since in the dependent cl. of cd the rel. prn. (*yān*) has *tān* in pāda a as its antecedent (both referring to the Maruts), it seems reasonable to assume that the same subject is working on both: the poet (supplied) who implores them in pāda a will cause them to turn here in cd, presumably by means of his imploring words.

It is the simile that is puzzling, though its syntax is impeccable: Trita corresponds to the unnamed subj. of *āvavārtat*, the five Hotars to the Maruts expressed by the rel. prn. *yān*. But under what circumstances and for what reason did Trita make the Hotars turn to him, and who were these Hotars? Priests are not usually imported from elsewhere, esp. not from above/heaven (as is implied). I have no solution.

II.35 Apām Napāt

The hymn is much translated; in addition to the standard ones, see Macdonell (VRS), Doniger, Maurer.

II.35.1–4: The first words of each hemistich in this series of vss. echo each other: 1a *úpem*, 1c *apām*, 2a *imám*, 2c *apām*, 3a *sám*, 3c *tám*, 4a *tám*. Since similar openings are found only in scattered vss. later in the hymn (9a *apām*, 11c *yám*, 12c *sám*) I consider the effect deliberate.

II.35.1: It is somewhat curious that the hymn *begins* with the expression “I have set loose my eloquence,” with the augmented aor. *asṛkṣi*. Such phrases are more usual in the final vss. of hymns, summing up the hymn that has just been produced. Perhaps here the poet means that he has set his eloquence in motion, in preparation for hymn composition. IH suggests it’s a performative “I (have) (hearby) set loose ...”

kuvíd ordinarily appears with accented verb. Gr allows an unaccented verb only when the particle and the verb are in different pādas -- but in other passages where *kuvíd* and the verb are not in the same pāda the verb can nonetheless be accented, e.g., VIII.91.4cd, VIII.103.9, IX.19.5. (In VII.91.1 the verb is accented though it is in a different pāda, but it may also be in a relative clause -- though see comm. ad loc.) It would be possible to take *kuvíd* here as construed only with *āśuhémā* “surely the Child of the Waters is one impelling swift (horses); he will make (the hymns) well-ornamented.” But this seems rather artificial. Perhaps *karati* lost the expected accent because the *hí*-induced accent of *jóśisat* was syntactically more prominent. In any case the unaccented verb *vanate* in V.3.10 (cited by Gr) is also difficult not to construe with the *kuvíd* in the previous pāda – though now see comm. ad loc., where I suggest that the *kuvíd* there is targeting a participle, not the finite verb. Gr’s rule seems to be variable: in addition to the accented verbs in different clauses cited above, there is at least one example of an unaccented verb in the same clause -- V.36.3 *kuvín nú stośat* ... (pace Gr’s accented *stóśan* s.v. *kuvíd*; he gives correct *stośat* s.v. *stu*). For further on verbal accentuation with *kuvíd* see Hettrich, Hypotaxe 151–52.

As Ge (and Re) point out, ‘well-ornamented’ (*supéśas-*) of hymns means not only poetically skillful but also receiving adequate recompense from the gods; cf. *vājapeśas-* ‘having prizes as its ornament’ in the preceding hymn (II.34.6), esp. in conjunction with *vājayúh* ‘seeking prizes’ in our pāda a.

II.35.2: *aryáh* is morphologically multivalent; I take it as nom. sg. to *aryá-*, with most (Gr, Ge [/WG], Macdonell, Thieme [Fremdling], Lubotsky, Maurer). Re instead interpr. as acc. pl. to *arí-* (“les êtres-privilégiés”), in apposition to *víśvāni* ... *bhúvanā*, and it must be admitted that its position between those two words invites it to be construed with them. Doniger seems to follow Re (“all noble creatures”), but I do not understand how she interpr. *aryáh* grammatically. It could also be gen. sg. of *arí-* (or nom. pl., though this would not fit syntactically).

II.35.3–4: These two vss. are closely knit together verbally. Both contain an etymological figure, with nom. pl. fem. and acc. sg. masc. derived from the same root: 3c *śúcim*

súcayo, 4a *yuvatáyo yúvānam*. The \sqrt{suc} of 3c recurs in 4c as *śukrébhiḥ*, which forms a phonetic figure with adjacent *śíkvabhiḥ*. The repeated PREVERB *yánti* ... PREVERB *yanti* of 3a is echoed by PREVERB *yanti* of 4b, while 3d and 4b both end with a formulaic expression in which only the verb varies: 4b ... *pári tasthur āpah*, 4d ... *pári yanti āpah*. And finally 3d, 4b, 4d (and 5c) all end with forms of *āp-* ‘water’ (nom. pl., loc. pl.), contrasting with the *pāda*-initial gen. pl. *apām* when the god is mentioned (1c, 2c, 3d).

II.35.4: The descriptor *ásmera-*, generally taken as a derivative of \sqrt{smi} ‘smile’, is somewhat curious. It may be simply, as Macd. suggests, that the waters approach their task seriously, not like light-hearted lovers (sim. Doniger). Or (with Maurer) that they are shy. But I somehow think that this hapax is expressing something more particular, though I cannot define it more closely. It may be naturalistic: the circling waters perhaps whirl around without foam, which might be thought of as smiles. Or it may be meant to distinguish these attentive females from other natural phenomena: lightning, especially, is characterized by smiling (see I.168.8) and laughing, and Uṣas also smiles. Though the waters do gleam (see 3c), they are different from those bright celestial females, and the point may be to emphasize the two very different environments in which Apām Napāt finds himself -- the watery and the fiery. Note that in 9b Apām Napāt “clothes himself in the lightning flash” in 9b, but by then his assimilation to Agni/Fire is almost complete.

II.35.5: The identity of the three female goddesses is unclear. They could be, with Sāy., the three who show up in the Āpri hymns (e.g., II.3.8), Idā, Sarasvatī, and Bhāratī -- though even if so, this does not help much, since the role of those goddesses is not well defined. A (possibly) different set of three females associated with Agni is found in II.5.5, but that passage is too obscure to aid interpretation here. Macd (fld. by Doniger and Maurer) suggests that they are the waters of the three worlds, but I am not aware of a “waters of the three worlds” trope.

A more acute problem in this vs. is *kṛtā* (in sandhi before vowel; Pp *kṛtāḥ*) in c. There is no agreement as to what stem it belongs to or what grammatical form it represents. Some simply refuse (or fail) to tr. it (Ge, Doniger, Schaeffer 198–99); others give it a contextual meaning (Macd ‘breasts’, Re ‘plantes’, Maurer ‘nurses’), without attempting etymological justification. WG suggest ‘Spinnerinnen’ (female spinners, spinsters in fact) with a derivation from $\sqrt{kṛt}$. What makes the word so difficult is the root accent; it would otherwise be easily interpreted as a past participle to $\sqrt{kṛ}$. The most sensible disc. of the word is Old’s. He sees it a sexual slang, as in the expression *kanyām* $\sqrt{kṛ}$, glossing “die Engjungferte” (deflowered girl). Certainly in English “to make” or “to do” a girl/woman is a perennial slangy verb for “have sex with,” and one can also adduce the expression “to make (s.o.) a woman,” for “deflower, have sex with a virgin.” He justifies the accent retraction from the ppl. *kṛtā-* (or rather fem. *kṛtā-*) on the basis of AiG II.1.19–20, where substantivized adjectives retract their accent. This seems the best hypothesis of a generally bad lot, and it would fit the context, in that *pāda* d describes Apām Napāt sucking the first milk of females who’ve given birth for the first time (if that’s what *pūrvasū-* means; see Scar 620–21) -- which makes sense if the females just lost their virginity in the preceding *pāda*. I therefore take the word as an acc. pl. fem. to a substantivized *kṛtā-* from the ppl. to $\sqrt{kṛ}$.

II.35.6: In pāda a the grammatical problem is *svār* (to be read as a monosyllable, [almost] uniquely in the RV). Gr identifies it as an acc., Macd (followed implicitly by Doniger and Maurer) as an endingless loc., sim. Re. However, the phraseology, esp. the accented *asyá* (which identifies *asyá* as an adjectival demon., not a pronoun) and the placement of *ca* (*ásvasyātra jánimāsyá ca svāh*, invite, indeed almost impose, a genitive interpr. Ge achieves this by pronouncing *svār* indeclinable (n. 6a). However, it is possible to see it as an archaic genitive with zero-grade ending *-s, as in Aves. *xuuñg* < **sh2uñen-s*, but with the -r of the nom./acc. leveled into the oblique (though we might then expect a disyllable). See Klein DGRV I.96, WG.

The identity of the two entities born must also be sorted out. It is possible that the horse is just a horse, since origin in the water is an equine characteristic (see, e.g., I.163.1 adduced by Ge). But it seems likely that the carefully balanced *ásvasya ... asyá ca svāh* refers to two contrasted entities, quite likely the fire (Agni) and the sun (Sūrya). The obvious way to get that is for the horse to represent fire/Agni and “this sun” the sun, but I wonder if there isn’t a clever reversal: the “horse” is the sun and “this sun here” is Agni.

In b the addressee of the impv. *pāhi* is not identified, though the default assumption would be Apām Napāt. It is striking that this is the only instance of the 2nd ps. in this entire hymn.

The “raw” (*āmā-*) fortifications are convincingly explained by Ge as built from unfired brick. They need not (and in my opinion should not) be further interpreted as cloud citadels (so Macd, fld. by Maurer and, in part, Doniger). Specifying that the fortifications be unfired is a cute reversal if Agni is supposed to be in residence there. It is also possible, if Apām Napāt is at issue, that the reference is to his residence in the waters, which would most definitely be uncooked/unfired. It is also of course difficult in this post-Lévi-Strauss age not to put his conceptual spin on the term “raw,” though exactly how this concept would pertain to this passage is unclear: perhaps it refers to a place and a society so far away (*parāh*) from Ārya civilization that it counts as “raw” to Ārya “cooked.”

II.35.7: Note the slight phonological play -- a: #*svá ā dám(e)*, b: #*svadhām*.

II.35.8: Pāda c is a variant on an idea expressed several times elsewhere. that the other fires are mere twigs of Agni, the god Fire. Cf., e.g., I.59.1 *vayā id agne agnáyas te anyé*. It seems significant that “the others” are not identified here as fires but as entities, beings (*bhúvanāni*) -- in my view, because the identification of Apām Napāt with Agni that brings the hymn to its climax is only partially complete here, and the poet is being canny about not directly referring to fire, though at the same time using diagnostic vocabulary and phraseology.

Note the etymological figure #*prá jāyante ... prajābhih*#.

II.35.9: This is a transition vs. from the watery to the fiery. “Those sloping/aslant” in b can be the waters flowing downward, but they can also be firewood piled to be kindled (cf. I.95.5, where the same phrase seems to refer to firewood, as I interpret it), and the golden-hued maidens who circle around him can be either waters or flames.

II.35.10: This vs. strenuously develops the “golden” theme that appeared in 9d -- a color more descriptive of the fiery than the watery. An even stronger indication of the transition to Agni proper is the gerund *niṣādyā* ‘having sat down’: the lexeme *ní √sad* is closely associated with Agni’s installation on the ritual ground (see, e.g., the next hymn, II.36.4).

II.35.11: See disc. in the publ. intro. on this as the climactic vs. of the hymn -- both introducing unambiguous fire references and identifying Apām Napāt as the secret name of Agni.

II.35.10–11: The ends of the d pādas in these vss. are very similar: 10d ... *ánnam asmai*, 11d ... *ánnam asya*. In 10d “The givers of gold give food to him” implies that his food is gold; 11d further makes clear that the gold(en) food is really gold-colored ghee.

II.35.12: The verb *mārjmi* is accented because of its juxtaposition with clause-initial *dídhīṣāmi*.

II.35.13: As Old noted (see also Hoffmann, Injunk., 121 n. 29), the need for a caesura suggests a reading *výṣā janayat*, rather than the augmented *ajanayat* of the Pp. (In fact, this suggestion is already found in Gr.) That two pres. indicatives, *dhayati* and *rihanti*, follow this proposed injunctive in the same thematic sequence supports interpreting the form contra the Pp, as Hoffmann points out.

The simile *anyásyeva ... tanvā* “as if with the body of another” is, in my view, another reference to the distinction between but ultimate identification of Apām Napāt and Agni.

II.35.14: The acc. participial phrases of ab must be construed with *pári dīyanti* “they fly around (him)” in d, even though the same referent is found in the dat. in *náptre* in c. The latter participates in a clever word play -- *āpo náptre* -- which of course evokes *apām nápāt* even though *āpah* is nom. pl. fem. ‘waters’ and not part of a syntagm with *náptre*. The elision of the first part of his name may be meant: now that he is identified with Agni, he is no longer the child (only) of the waters. But as noted in the publ. intro., that the waters bring him ghee brings the watery and the fiery into harmony. Note that the waters as his cloak here (if I am correct in this interpr., see below) answers to the ghee-cloak in 4d. In the watery vs. 4 the presence of ghee was somewhat anomalous; similarly here in a mostly fiery environment the cloak of the waters stands out.

The phrase *svayám átkaiḥ* is also unclear, and indeed whether it is actually a phrase. Ge takes it as referring to Apām Napāt: “und sich selbst mit Gewändern (bekleidet).” He adduces IV.18.5 with *svayám átkam vásāna(h)*, but in fact the difference in case between the acc. there and the instr. here speaks against his interpr. The simplex root pres. always takes the acc. of the garment, while the causative *vásáya-* takes the instr. Moreover, as Lü points out (*Varuna*, 146–47 n. 8), the position of this phrase (far from the masc. acc. sg. in ab, adjacent to the fem. nom. pl. in d) and the “harsh ellipsis” required makes this interpr. unlikely. Lü himself in his tr. (146) implies the waters are bringing the ghee with their cloaks, though in the n. he sees them as “in Schmelzbutter gekleidet.” Acdg. to Re the waters fly around him “avec des vêtements (qu’elles se sont

donnés) elles-mêmes,” an expression I don’t entirely understand. WG appear to separate *svayám* and *átkaiḥ* but, with Lü, Re, and me, also take the garments as belonging to the waters: “um ihn fliegen die jugendfrischen Wasser von sich selbst mit (ihren) Reisemänteln herum.” The further (and perhaps unjustified) step I take in my tr. is in interpreting *svayám* so closely with *átkaiḥ*, with the waters themselves becoming cloaks for him.

In b ‘paths’ is to be supplied with *adhvasmábhīḥ* ‘unbesmirched’ on the basis of II.34.5 *adhvasmábhīḥ pathībhīḥ* in the adjacent hymn, at least by my interpr. The standard tr. (Ge [/WG, Re, also Lü, 146) supply ‘flames’ instead (though Re in his n. suggests that “chemins” could be supplied). Where exactly he is located (“highest footprint” generally implies high heaven) and which pathways are meant are unclear to me.

II.36 Rtugrahas

II.36.1: The first pāda lacks a syllable, which can be restored by reading augmented *avasiṣṭa*. In the position after the final *-o* of *hinvānō*, the Saṃhitā text could have applied abhinihitā sandhi to initial *a* redactionally, but the transmitted text never acquired an avagraha. This solution was already noted by Gr and endorsed by Old; Hoffmann discusses it extensively (Injunk. 147).

II.36.2: The standard tr. construe *añjīṣu* with *priyā utá* (“and dear in your ornaments”), but the position of *utá* is somewhat against this: *utá* is less out of place if *priyāḥ* is all that it’s conjoining. And *añjīṣu* goes better semantically with “resplendent” than “dear”; cf., for a connection with *śubh*, X.78.7 *śubhamyávo nāñjibhir vy àśvitan*, also of the Maruts.

II.36.3: As sometimes elsewhere, *hí* with the first of two imperatives signals that the second action depends on the first.

Despite the masc. gender of *devébhiḥ*, I do not think it identifies a different group from the wives (*jánibhiḥ*), but that the latter further specifies the neutral *devébhiḥ*. In this I follow Re ad VI.50.13, which contains the same phrase (also X.64.10). Tvaṣṭar is strongly associated with the wives of the gods and in all clear cases only with them. It is worth noting that the RV contains no examples of fem. instr. pl. *devībhiḥ* or indeed of any fem. oblique plural.

My tr. of *jujuṣānāḥ* “having delighted (in the call),” with “call” supplied, followed a claim in John Lowe’s Oxford Univ. dissertation (p. 162) that this pf. part. only occurs with “call,” as a prior action to the event time of the matrix verb. But in the book based on his diss. (*Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit*, 2015) he has revised this view, at least for this passage and allows *jujuṣānāḥ* to be construed with *ándhasaḥ*, with the main verb *mandasva* ‘become exhilarated!’ logically following the action of enjoyment (pp. 210–11, 214–15; passage tr. on 215). I would tentatively revise the publ. tr. to “become exhilarated on the stalk, having delighted in it!” Because of the VP *mándasva* ... *ándhasaḥ* in the first vs. of the next, closely related hymn (II.36.1) I do not take *ándhasaḥ* with *jujuṣānāḥ* here, or at least not primarily.

II.36.4: The lexeme *práti* $\sqrt{vī}$ expresses a reciprocal notion to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, hence ‘receive’; cf. the nominal form *pratīvī-* ‘(gift-)reception’.

II.36.5: This vs. is generally taken as Indra’s, but as I say in the publ. intro., I think it must be Indra as Br̥haspati. The Brahman’s cup from which he drinks supports this identification.

II.37 Rtugraha

II.37.1: As noted above ad II.36.3 the VP *mándasva* ... *ándhasah* repeats the same phrase there; our *ánu jóṣam* echoes the part. *jujuṣāñāḥ* there.

Pāda b and c are similar in phraseology to the Indra hymn II.14.1–2 – most particularly the init. voc. *ádhvaryavāḥ*, the etymological connection between the verb *vaṣṭi* and the cmpd. *tadvaśā-*, and the phrase *tásmai etám bharata*. See comm. ad loc. The phrase *pūrnāṁ vaṣṭy āśicam* also has a counterpart in VII.16.11 *pūrnāṁ vivaṣṭy āśicam*, with redupl. pres. See comm. ad loc.

II.37.1–3: The d pādas of the first three vss. have a rigid structure: PRIEST’S CUP *sóman* *dravīṇodah píbartúbhīḥ*. Noteworthy is only that *píba* is accented in all three vss., though there is no obvious reason for this, and the last three vss. (4–6), which also contain imperatives to $\sqrt{pā}$, though of different form (4d *pibatu*, 5d *pibatam*, 6d *pāyayā*), in syntactically variant constructions, lack such accent. I have no explanation (and it seems not to have attracted any attention) beyond the suggestion that *píbartúbhīḥ* is treated as a detachable refrain, even though what precedes it in the pāda must be construed with it. See now also remarks ad III.32.1.

II.37.2: The nom. *dadiḥ* must be part of the rel. cl., specifying acc. *nāma*. *dadiḥ* is nominative because it is a quotation of the name.

II.37.3: Although the default referent of the voc. *vanaspate* in a ritual context might be assumed to be the sacrificial post (cf. III.8.1, 3, 6, 11), the contents of ab -- both the draught animals of pāda a and *vīdayasvā* in b -- point rather to the chariot. See VI.47.26 cited by both Ge and Re. Why the chariot is addressed and identified with the wealth-giver is not clear to me, save for the fact that in the later ritual the Rtugraha libations take place in the cart shed (see, e.g., Eggeling, SBE 26.319–20). Note that the havirdhāna carts are the subject of the last tṛca of nearby II.41 (vss. 19–21).

The negated stem *áriṣyānt-* ordinarily means ‘not intending harm’, and this is how it is rendered in the publ. tr. However, in this one case I think it shares the semantics of the idiomatic *mā* prohibitive *mā riṣyan* (*l-ata*) “don’t make a mistake, don’t fail” (see comm. ad VII.9.5), and I would emend this tr. from “Allowing no harm to befall” to “Not failing.”

II.37.5: For *yayyām* as acc. sg. masculine (beside *yayím*) see AiG III.131.

Another ex. of *hí* with the first of two imperatives, providing the grounds for the second action. See II.36.3. Note also that although *hí* is found deep in its pāda, it is

actually in 2nd position, since a new clause begins with *ā* (... *mádhunā=ā* ...). For the curious behavior of *hí kam* see comm. ad VI.51.14.

II.38 Savitar

The word *vratá-* ‘commandment’ is prominent in this hymn (vss. 2, 3, 6, 7, 9). The point is repeatedly made that all creatures, incl. the gods, follow the *vratá*-s of Savitar. Another persistent verbal theme is the contrast between *sám* and *ví* (4a, 4c, 6a), which can be discerned even when only *ví* is present (1c, 3a, 5b, 6c, 7b, 8d). The hymn also has a pronounced tendency towards augmented 3rd sg. root aorists (+/- preverb) at the ends of pādas, esp. at the ends of hemistichs: 1b *asthāt*, 3d *āgāt*, 4d *āgāt*, 5c *ādhāt*, 6b *abhūt*, 6c *āgāt*, 8c (*ā* ...) *gāt*, 8d *ākah*, 11b *ā gāt* (cf. also opt. *avyāh* 10b).

II.38.1: The verb of c, *dhāti* with primary ending, is likely to be a root aorist subjunctive like the other two such forms, though neither Ge nor Re so tr. it -- nor do I. However, WG’s “... soll er ... verteilen” does represent the mood (so also Hettrich, Hyp. 177). I would alter the tr. to “will distribute ...” Unfortunately it does not require trisyllabic scansion, which would have supported the subj. interpr. Moreover, the pāda-final *dhāti rátnam* is reminiscent of the formulaic *dāti vār'yan* / *dātivāram* (on which see V.58.2) and may owe its existence to that puzzling set of forms. See my “Vedic Evidence for the *dāti-vāra-* ‘type’” (IEL 2024: 1–18). Curiously the flg. pāda contains a cmpd generally associated with that type: *vītīhotra-*. Note also that *ví hí* in this pāda is echoed by *vītī-* in that cmpd.

The question then arises how to analyze *ābhajat* in d. The Pp. takes it as *ā abhajat*, with unaccented augment. Under this analysis the verb would not be in the domain of the *hí* in c; otherwise the augment should be accented and the preverb unaccented and univerbated. The WG tr. reflects the Pp. by separating the clauses, but Ge, Re, and I (implicitly also Klein DGRV II.74) tr. cd as if they contain conjoined parallel clauses. It would also be possible to analyze *ābhajat* as *ā bhajat*, that is, without augment. An injunctive might fit the syntactic context better, in that it could just continue the modal reading of *dhāti* (“will distribute ... and [will] give a share ...”), but paradoxically this would require the two clauses to be more independent because the verb would be unaccented and therefore could not be conjoined to c with accent-inducing *hí*. In larger interpretational terms the differences among the several possibilities just outlined are fairly minor -- having just given or being about to give actually turn out to be almost identical acts in Rigvedic ritual depiction -- but it is worth noting the multiple ambiguities inherent in an innocent looking form. For two parallel clauses containing first a subjunctive and then an augmented indicative, see 3ab below (*mucāti* ... *áritramat*).

The cmpd *vītī-hotra-* (RV 5x) is much discussed, since it has been considered as belonging to the supposed *dāti-vāra-* verbal governing cmpds, assembled and discussed by Wack. in AiG II.1.320–21 and forming a part of Indo-Europeanist discourse ever since. I have demonstrated in my article on this type cited above that, except for *dāti-vāra-* (on which see comm. ad V.58.2), none of the forms adduced has the sense attributed to it and therefore such a “type” does not exist. I take *vītī-hotra-* as a bahuvrīhi meaning ‘having oblations worth pursuing’, with *vītī-* serving for the common infinitive *vītāye* ‘to pursue’, which often takes *hávya-* (synonymous with *hótrā-*) as object. For further, see the article cited.

II.38.2: The hapax *nímrgra-* must clearly be a derivative of *ní √mrj*, lit. ‘wipe down’, but generally either ‘clasp to oneself’ or idiomatically ‘drag down’ (for the latter see I.140.2, V.52.17). The context here requires something like ‘submissive’, as all tr. take it. See comm. ad VII.26.3, which suggests that forceful dragging down implies coercion by the agent and, conversely, submission (voluntary or not) of the object. Note also that it has an unetymological velar *g*, presumably extracted from forms where the final palatal *j*, followed by *s-*, yields *-ks-*.

The submission of the waters and, especially, the quieting of the wind probably reflect the natural fact that the wind tends to drop at dusk, and this brings about the calming of waves that had been raised by the wind.

II.38.3: The poet seems to get a certain pleasure out of using semi-exotic verb forms that masquerade as something else: in *pāda a yān*, the nom. sg. pres. part. of *√yā* ‘drive’, not the acc. pl. m. of the rel. prn.; in c rhyming *ayām* (< *ayān* < **ayāmst*), 3rd sg. s-aor. to *√yam*. There is also the abl. inf. *ētoh* in b.

The creatures that the hapax *ahyársu-* (‘snakes-stickers’, Ge (/WG), Falk ‘Schlangenspiesser’, Re ‘qui picquent les serpents’) refers to cannot be determined for certain. The consensus is that it is some kind of bird of prey; Ge suggests (n. 3c) the Schlangenadler. Indeed, the short-toed snake eagle (*Circaetus gallicus*) is widespread in India and feeds mainly on snakes (so Wikipedia). The internet (including You Tube) has some remarkable photos and videos of this bird fighting with, swallowing, and feeding its young with snakes, including cobras. The photos with sizable lengths of snake dribbling out of their mouths and esp. the video of one wolfing down a still wriggling spectacled cobra certainly testify to the greed or avidity of these birds. Whether they stop hunting at evening I have no idea, though most birds do.

II.38.4: Though Sāy., Old, and Re identify the weaver as Night, this seems unlikely, if the hymn really depicts the evening. More likely a real human weaver, finishing her daily work.

Note the unetym. phonetic echoes in *avyat* ... *váyantī*.

On the semantic and functional nuance of the intensive *adardhar*, see Schaeffer (Intens., 140–41). The form should be an impf. (see pres. *dárdharsi*), and Schaeffer notes that the iterative value generally expressed by intensives is not appropriate to an aorist, despite rather insistent aoristic context here. She suggests that *ádardhar* in contrast to the surrounding verbs “bezieht sich nicht auf die unmittelbar vorangegangene Handlung des Gottes, sondern nennt eine Tätigkeit, die er von alters her vollbracht hat; die Funktion des Intensivums dürfte eine kontinuative sein: ‘sich aufräffend ist er aufgestanden; (fortwährend) hielt er die Jahreszeiten auseinander; bereiten Sinnes ist der Gott Savitṛ gekommen.’” My ‘always’ is an attempt at reconciling this.

Pāda-initial *arámatiḥ* ‘Proper Thinking’ echoes pāda-initial *áritramat* (3b) (see also *ramate* 2d), though they are of course etymologically unrelated. I now think a pun is meant here, with *arámati-* analyzed as a privative *a-rámati-* and I would emend the tr. to “As Proper Thinking (/unresting) ...”

II.38.5: *ví tisthate* should be evaluated in conjunction with *vísthitah* in 6a and *ví tasthuh* in 7b.

Ge (/WG) take a and b as separate clauses (sim. Falk). My rendering is closer to Re's. I think the idea is that Agni/Fire, though in some ways a single entity, is parceled out into separate domestic fires, one per household, and this holds for a man's whole lifetime after he has set up his household fire. The coming of night brings the (re-)kindling of these fires and so they come into visual prominence then.

The blazing up of the home fire is accompanied by the evening meal, rather charmingly depicted here: the mother reserving the best of it for her son; the son with his appetite stimulated by the coming of evening.

II.38.6: The first pāda of this vs. takes up the idiom *ví √sthā* 'disperse' found in 5b and applies it somewhat differently. Here it refers to all those who were dispersed in various directions pursuing their livelihoods -- who all want to come home in the evening. On *jigīṣū-* see Narten (Yasna H., 122); as she makes clear, the desid. of *√ji* in both Vedic and Avestan lacks martial or battle context and is simply about gaining food and so on. See also Heenen (Desid. 120–25).

The verb *samāvarti* is taken by Kü (465–66) as a (pseudo-)passive aor. to *√vṛt*, with ref. to Hoffmann (Aufs. II.589–92), a form that is attested also after the RV (see Kü n. 884). The lexeme *sám-ā √vṛt* is used in the causative of Dawn's cows rolling up the darkness (VII.79.2), so here I think the nuance is the gathering or rolling up together of everything that was dispersed during the day, playing on the common opposition between *ví* and *sám* that is prominent in this hymn.

Although we might expect *víkṛtam* to mean 'badly/wrongly done', I think the dominant *sám* / *ví* play in this hymn trumps that, and if *sáṃskṛta-* is 'perfected, brought to completion', *víkṛta-* can mean 'incomplete, not done'.

II.38.7–8: These two vss. have been variously interpr. My interpr. is most influenced by Old (whose views also seems to have been adopted by WG). As noted in the publ. intro., the vss. enumerate the separate spheres assigned to the various categories of creatures by Savitar, as an extension of his ability to bring every creature to its proper resting place at night.

II.38.7: In my view, this vs. divides the world into habitats for fish (etc.), wild beasts, and birds. Not surprisingly the watery creatures are placed in water (pāda a). As head noun with *áp Yam* I supply *jánma* from the summary pāda of this two-vs. sequence, 8d.

The problem in 7a is *bhāgám*: it is tempting to tr. "the watery (race) has been placed by you among the waters as their share," but *bhāgám* belongs to a masc. stem and must be acc., which does not accord with the nominal clause in which it would purportedly be found. I therefore construe this last word of pāda a with b, as an appositive to acc. pl. *dhánva* 'wastelands'. Although I would prefer to avoid such enjambment, I see no better choice, and note that a new clause also begins in the middle of pāda c (with *nákiḥ*) and continues to the end of d. Sim. also 9c. Ge's interpr., which keeps *bhāgám* within its pāda by making the whole pāda acc., seems to me to come at too high a cost: he must supply a set of fishermen and a verb 'seek' to govern the acc. ("[Fisherman seek] their watery share ..."); these imaginary fishermen are parallel to the "hunters" that he

takes *mrgayásah* to be, dispersed across the dry land (and presumably hunting wild beasts). I see several conceptual problems with this interpr. For one thing this makes the first two pādas non-parallel with c, for there are no bird-catchers there (Vedic Papagenos?), whereas in my interpr. the three pādas describe the habitats of three types of creatures. Moreover, the hunting has no obvious connection with Savitar, whereas by my interpr. the distribution of habitats is his doing – and is summed up by 8d “Savitar has distributed the races according to their stations.” Nor is the hunting likely to be an activity of night, the other thematic connection it might have to the rest of the hymn: everyone else has gone home, but hunters are out on the plains trying to shoot deer in the dark? For penetrating arguments against the Ge interpr. see Old’s n. 3 ad loc.

Pāda b has its own problem, the anomalous form *mrgayásah*. Ge (n. 7ab) declares that *mrgayás-* can *only* mean ‘hunter’, but gives no evidence for his certainty. Old’s disc. is more to the point (and rather tart about the ‘hunter’ interpr.), though his morphological analysis of it as an *-as*-derivative of the denom. *mrgay-* seems a little shaky (likewise his alternative explan. as a cmpd. of loc. *mrgé + √as* ‘shoot’, like *hrtsv-ás-* [see Scar 41], with older sandhi and a meaning ‘auf das Wild schiessend’, which unfortunately smuggles in Ge’s hunters in another guise). On the other hand, I don’t have anything better to offer. It reminds us of a suffix-accented masc. deriv. like *raksás-* ‘demon’ next to neut. *ráksas-* ‘demonic force’, which itself gets personified. But the assumed base **mrgayas-* (or **mrgáyas-*) ‘wild-beast-iness’ doesn’t exist and it’s hard to see to what it would be generated. AiG II.2.223 dismisses the word with a ? and a ref. to Old’s disc. In any case, Old’s structural arguments that it must refer to the beasts, not the hunters are sound. A third occurrence of *ví √sthā* is found in this pāda.

The *asya* in pāda c anticipates *devásya savitúh* in d – perhaps better to tr. as Ge does: “... diese seine Gebote, des Gottes Savitar.” This doubling may have arisen because the clause begins in the middle of a pāda and continues over the pāda break.

II.38.8: The general purport of this vs. is clear: it both summarizes Savitar’s distribution of the creatures (esp. in pāda d) and hints (esp. in pāda c) at their return to their own special places at night. But the first half-verse is quite challenging and my interp. is not fully worked out.

On *yādrādhyām* see Old’s disc. My publ. tr. “As far as (Savitar’s) benefit extends” is, I’m afraid, opaque. What it means to convey is that Varuṇa’s presence in his watery womb is at the favor of Savitar, whose distribution of the creatures in their proper places extends even to the gods, or at least one of them. A modern equivalent might be the phrase “to serve at the pleasure of (e.g.) the president.” The dependence of Varuṇa (and other gods) on Savitar’s orders and ordering is stated plainly in the next vs., 9ab. It is esp. striking that Varuna follows Savitar’s *vratá-*, since the *vratá-* is primarily Varuṇa’s domain. That Varuṇa is the only god named here is probably meant to emphasize what might almost be seen as Savitar’s usurpation of the power and role of Varuṇa. Savitar’s *rādhas-* recurs in 11b.

This passage shows one of the early examples of what becomes Varuṇa’s principal association, that with water. Again, it may be that Savitar is deliberately relegating him to this restricted role. Varuṇa’s hypervigilance, familiar from other, more standard treatments of Varuṇa in the RV, is undeterred by his watery environment, as pāda b indicates.

Note the phonological play in *ániśitam nimísi*.

The sense of *nimísi* is unclear. My tr. “at (every) blink of the eye” takes it as an implicit āmredita with the frequentative *járbhurāṇah*; it could also be an indication of the great speed of Varuṇa’s movements, like English “in the blink of an eye.” However it shouldn’t be forgotten that the idiom *ní v̄mīṣ* is associated with the gods and esp. the Āditya—generally in its negation: the gods (or their spies) “never blink” (cf., e.g., IX.73.4, X.10.8, 63.4). For Mitra and Varuṇa or the Ādityas see VII.60.7, 61.3, VII.25.9, and esp. nearby II.27.8 *ásvapnajo animiṣā ádabdhāḥ* “unsleeping, unblinking, undeceivable” (of the Ādityas). Is the blinking here (as opposed to the usual non-blinking) another of Savitar’s subtle put-downs of Varuṇa, implying that he does blink after all?

In c *mārtāṇḍā-* is taken by the standard tr. (also Lüders, Varuṇa I.50) as ‘bird’, and this could work well, corresponding to 7c, where the birds are assigned to the forests. However, note that in vs. 7 the other member of the trio of creatures, besides the watery, is the wild beast (7b), whereas here instead of a wild beast we have precisely a domesticated one, the *paśū-*. Its formulaic partner is *mārtāṇḍā-*, lit. ‘stemming from a dead egg’, found otherwise in the RV in the creation hymn X.72.8–9 in the myth of Aditi and the birth of her sons. The last son born (or rather the egg miscarried), *mārtāṇḍā-*, is the ancestor of mortals; for disc. of the word and the myth see Hoffmann 1976 (=1992: 723). That half of this vs. is devoted to Varuṇa and the next vs. has the great trio of Aditi’s sons, Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman, provides further evidence that the Mārtāṇḍa of the Aditi birth story is meant. Under this interpr., the domestic herd animal (*paśū-*) is paired with the likewise domesticated human, each in its own pen.

II.38.9: The first hemistich restates 7cd in almost the same words, but instead of the indefinite *nákiḥ* ‘no one’ specified as the non-violator of Savitar’s *vratā-*, a selection of the greatest gods serve as subject.

II.38.10: As Ge points out (n. 10a), the three divinized principles in pāda a—Good Fortune, Insight, and Plenitude—are what the poet needs for success.

As the layout of the publ. tr. shows, I take pāda b as a parenthetical insertion in the sentence that includes pādas a, cd. It would be possible to take *vājáyantaḥ* as a predicated pres. part. and a separate cl., though this seems less likely to me.

Although *gnāspāti-* presumably contains the old gen. sg. of *gnā-* (e.g., AiG III.119, 129), I tr. it as a pl., since we usually hear of “wives (of the gods)” – though, since I don’t exactly know what Narāśamsa (=Agni?) is doing here, perhaps there’s only one wife. It is also not clear if there are two figures here or if *gnāspātiḥ* characterizes Narāśamsa as I have taken it (so also Ge, WG). Re does so in tr., but suggests in his n. that it might identify a separate individual, perhaps Tvaṣṭar, whose association with divine females is well established. I now am inclined in that direction and would provide an alternate tr. “Narāśamsa (and) the Husband of the (divine) Wives should help us.” That the verb is singular is not an impediment, since a series of sg. subjects can take a sg. verb.

This verb, the apparent precative *avyāḥ*, is a bit of a problem. It is isolated in the averbo of the root *v̄av* ‘help’, which is set and has a well-attested *is*-aor. (on which see Narten 86–89) beside the even better attested them. pres. Although Narten (86) identifies

our *avyāh* (also X.139.5) as belonging to an old root aor. (with maintenance of the full grade despite being opt.); there are no other unambig. root aor. forms attested (though forms like *āvīt* could of course belong to a set̄ root aor. paradigm and have given rise to the *is*-aor.). I think it's more likely an artificial form, makeshift replacement for the non-existent *is*-aor. opt. (see my 2009 "Where Are All the Optatives?" pp. 31–32 on the absence of act. sigmatic optatives, flg. Narten), as well as the relative dearth even of 3rd sg. thematic optatives to present stems (like *āvati*), on which see the same art., pp. 32–34.

As for the point of the pāda: it is possible that the arousing of the three principles in pāda a reminds the poet that he needs the help of the ritual fire (if Narāśāmsa is identified with Agni here). Perhaps *gnāspátiḥ* is invoked because two of the three principles are female. But this seems like groping in the dark.

II.38.11: The verb *āgāt* is interpr. by the Pp as injunc *gāt* and so treated in most editions and tr., but it could just as well be augmented *agāt*, a typical aorist in a summary vs.

II.39 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

This hymn bears some resemblance to the difficult-to-impossible Aśvin hymn X.106, which descends into unintelligibility but whose outer verses can be mostly understood. That hymn is also dominated by similes comparing the Aśvins to various pairs of entities, which are often semantically distant. (See comm. ad loc.) Ge calls our hymn "geistlos" and considers the similes "gesucht" (in this case, presumably in the meaning 'studied, strained, stilted')—I'm afraid this says more about Ge's somewhat pedestrian approach to the literary qualities of the text than about the poet's supposed limitations. WG reproduce Ge's judgment verbatim, which also seems telling. Note that the Aśvins aren't named until the last two vss. (7c, 8a), in the metasummary of the creation of the hymn after the simile portion, so that for most of its length the hymn is an extended riddle.

Besides Re's limited notes (EVP XVI.31-33) it is tr. and comm. by Pirart (*Les Nāsatya*, vol. II), as usual quite idiosyncratically.

II.39.1: The opening of this vs. (and hymn), ... *tád íd ártham jarethe* "you two awaken to just this aim," is reminiscent of the opening of X.106.1 ... *tád íd arthayete* "you two have just this as your aim," with the denom. *arthaya-* substituting for the acc. *ártham* in our vs. The notion 'awaken' embodied in the finite verb *jarethe* in our vs. is postponed to X.106.1c: *sadhṛīcīnā yātave prém ajīgah* "It has awakened you two to drive towards a common goal," with transitive *ajīgah* corresponding to intrans. *jarethe* here. Although 'sing' is also a possible rendering of *jarethe* (see, e.g., comm. ad II.28.2), and it is championed here by Pirart, the parallel in X.106.1 favors 'awaken' as at least the primary meaning. The shared theme of awakening between this vs. and X.106.1 also provides evidence against Ge's (n. 1a) suggested emendation of *jarethe* to **carethe* on the basis of IX.1.5.

Contra the publ. tr. (and Ge), I do not think that pāda b necessarily expresses the "aim" (*ártham*) in pāda a. Rather, b begins the hymn-length suite of semi-independent pāda-length similes. I would replace the colon delete the parenthetical "(you awaken to go)," replacing the tr. of b with "like vultures to a tree, (going) toward the depository (of honey)." On *nidhī-* and its association with honey, see comm. ad X.59.2.

Despite Ge (“Brautwerber”) and Pirart (“paranymph”), I do not think *jánya-* has the sense ‘suitor, best man’ here (or in II.6.7 adduced by Ge). The only likely attestation of that meaning is in IV.38.6 (Dadhikrā); otherwise it appears first in the AV. See Re’s n., which argues strongly against that meaning here. On the other hand, I do think there is a marriage trope in 2d, unrecognized by them.

The phrase *dūtéva ... jánya* is matched in X.106.2 by *dūtéva ... jáneṣu*.

II.39.2: On *prātaryāvan-* and *prātarítvan-*, both ‘early-coming’, see the extensive disc. in my *Sacrificed Wife*, 184–89 and passim. It is typically used of the Aśvins (e.g., V.77.1) or their chariot (e.g. X.40.1) because they are among the earliest arrivals at the dawn sacrifice.

I’d render *váram ā sacethe* as “you accompany each other at pleasure” – the pāda depicts the playful companionship of young goats. For more of this see 3ab.

The publ. tr. of the 2nd hemistich seems to me over-heavily repetitive. I would rephrase c as “Beautifying your bodies like women for exchange”; although *śúmbhamāne* is fem. and technically modifies *méne* – and therefore the publ. tr. is technically accurate – the repetition violates the spirit of the simile structure.

On *ménā-* see comm. ad I.62.7.

With JPB (and no one else), I agree that pāda d treats the marriage ceremony. The passages it most resembles are X.68.2 *jáne mitró ná dámpatī anakti* “As the ally among the people [=Agni] anoints the household pair ...,” depicting the public (*jáne*) ceremonial anointing of a couple in marriage, and V.3.2 *añjánti mitrám súdhitam ná góbhīr, yád dámpatī sámanasā krṇósi* “They anoint you [=Agni] with cows [=milk] like a well-placed ally, when you make the household pair of one mind,” where the same ceremony is depicted, but with Agni, the ally, the recipient of anointment. (See disc. of these passages in my Fs. Parpola, p. 312.) The adj. *sámanas-* ‘of one mind’ modifies *dámpatī* three times (here, VIII.31.5, and X.95.12). I would suggest that *kratuvídā* in our passage is the equivalent, rendered (correctly in my opinion) by JPB as “find[ing] (a common) resolve.” I further suggest that the first member of this root noun cmpd, *kratu-*, stands for *sákratu-* ‘of like resolve’ with the abbreviation common to such cmpds (see my 2024 “Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian” (Fs. Kellens) (though it doesn’t treat cmpds of exactly this structure), and it refers to the creation of the mental union of the newly married couple.

Again, in the tr. I would delete the parenthetical “(in the presence of the people)” to avoid heaviness.

II.39.3: The first hemistich contains two similes comparing the Aśvins to animal body parts.

Since *śrīga-* is neut., we expect du. *śrīge*, which is in fact found elsewhere. The Pp. reads *śrīgā*, which should be pl.; Old suggests **śrīge iva* with pragṛhya of the dual and apharesis of the particle to *va* as sometimes elsewhere in RV. This explan. is also nec. for other neut. or fem. exx. below. See Old for details.

The horns here are described as *prathamā-* ‘first, in front’. This description would only be accurate for animals in a butting posture, with head down and horns forward (otherwise it’s obviously the nose that’s in front). Since head-butting is esp. characteristic of goats among domestic animals (see numerous internet images and YouTube videos),

this simile seems implicitly to take up 2b. I would assign *prathamā* to the simile (despite its masc. gender) and retransl. “Like the horns (of a butting animal) foremost,” deleting “in front.”

As for pāda b, I think this is part of the same goat head-butting scenario. In the moment before they actually butt heads, goats rear up on their hind legs and twist their bodies slightly to the side, with their forelegs dangling in space. This could be described as “hooves quivering” (watch the YouTubes), and I would substitute “quivering like here this hooves ...”

Note polarized # *cakra-* ... *śakrā* #. This is one of only two applications of *śakrā-* to the Aśvins (the other being X.4.4), an epithet otherwise almost exclusively of Indra.

This is the first mention of the cakravāka bird (ruddy shelduck) in Sanskrit literature, and already here it seems to refer to the most common *topos* concerning these birds: the reunion of the devoted conjugal pair every morning after their nightly separation.

Du. *usrā* modifies the Aśvins elsewhere (IV.45.5, etc.), but the pāda-final sequence here, *vástor usrā*, is also reminiscent of the likewise pāda-final phrase *vástausrāḥ / usrāḥ* “at the break of dawn”; see comm. ad V.49.3, as well as Old’s lengthy discussion of our passage. That the Aśvins are addressed as *usrā-* ‘ruddy’ here is probably the common property on which the simile turns, since, as its English name “ruddy shelduck” underlines, the cakravāka bird has a conspicuously red body.

Since *arvāk*, *arvāñc-* occurs three times in this hymn (3a, 3d, 5b), it should have a consistent tr. throughout, rather than “toward us” (3a), “this way” (3d), “here this way” (5b). Best, perhaps, “here this way” in all three cases.

II.39.4: The first hemistich is devoted to modes of transport – first boats (assuming the correctness of Old’s emendation of *nāvēva* to **nāveva*), then more and more specialized parts of a chariot, the last three having to do with wheel construction.

Although the simile in c, “allowing no injury to our bodies like two dogs,” is initially puzzling, both Pirart and WG plausibly suggest that this refers to the two dogs of Yama, who act as guardian psychopomps to the next world in the funeral hymn X.14.10–12.

The comparandum *khýgalā* is isolated in the RV; however, its scanty occurrences in the AV (Ś III.9.3=P III.7.4, and fem. *khýgalā-* P I.58.1) strongly favor the sense ‘amulet’. See the useful discussions of Spiers (diss.) ad P III.7.4 and Zehnder, Hellwig, and Leach (2020; online ed. of AVP I) ad P I.58.1. Pirart connects the word with *khargalā-* ‘(female) owl’ — or other night bird: I suggest ‘nightjar’; see comm. ad VII.104.17 – and adduces a YAvestan passage (Yt. 14.34–36) in which a feather of a bird of prey serves as protection against malediction. Ge tr. as ‘armor’. Scar’s tr. of this hemistich (673 and n. 962) seems uncharacteristically off the mark; among other things he overlooks the fact that (on the basis of the whole rest of the hymn) each pāda is an independent simile, and tr. *khýgalā* as an adj. modifying ‘dogs’ (“wie zwei knurrende (?) Wachhunde”), despite the *iva* following each. He connects *khýgalā-* with *√kharj*, accepting Gotō’s (1st Cl, 86, 324) assertion that the root is a phonological variant of *√sarj* (both meaning ‘creak’ vel sim.). WG in turn cite Scar, though their tr. does divide the pādas, resulting, for d, in “wie die beiden knurrenden (?).” Although it’s not clear to

me why amulets would be invoked just here, the preponderance of the evidence favors this interpr.

II.39.5: Ge (n. 5a) takes *nadyèva rītīḥ* as “loses Kompos.” (“wie die Flossströmung”; sim. Re), but the two-into-one of JPB’s tr. (also more or less WG) reflects the Skt. better.

Pāda b inaugurates a series of comparisons to body parts, which extends through the first pāda of 7. All of the body parts here naturally occur in pairs (on 6c see below). This set is marked off by a rough sort of ring composition, with ‘hands’ (*hástau* in 5c and 7a).

The publ. tr. “*becoming the best blessing*” for *śambhaviṣṭha-* is unnec., since the forms of $\sqrt{bhū}$ as 2nd cmpd member with *śám* serve merely to allow the indeclinable *śám* ‘luck, weal’ to be used as modifier. I would substitute “The best weal for the body, like hands.”

II.39.6: Given that all the other body parts in this sequence are natural pairs, *nāsā* is better ‘nostrils’ than ‘noses’. The question is why they are “the guardians of the body.” Ge (n. 6c, repeated by WG) says “Durch den Geruch,” which is no explanation at all. I think rather that it has to do with the vital role of the breaths, which enter and leave the body via the nostrils, which are therefore the de facto gatekeepers of life. Although the full doctrine of the breaths has not yet developed in the RV (though it is in fairly full swing by the AV, judging by the number of occurrences of the dual dvandva *prāṇāpānā-*), the role of breath in life was obviously well recognized.

II.39.7: I take *śaktí-* here as a pun, meaning ‘spear’ in the simile and ‘power’ in the frame, and I would therefore erase the parens and alter the tr. to “Clasping power for us, like two hands a spear ...” Although the ‘spear’ sense of this stem is generally found later (cf. EWA s.v. *śakti-*, though he is skeptical about RVic occurrences; however, see comm. ad X.134.6), this is the kind of context in which lower register / common parlance items are likely to appear – and the simile doesn’t make sense without a physical object for the hands to clasp. Lü (238 n. 5) suggests rather “wie zwei Hände, die sich zur Hilfeleitung für uns vereinigen,” which has the merit of taking account of *abhí* (which I confess I have not tried to do, though I think it probably simply adds a further sense of contact: “clasp onto”), but ignores the importance of the simile.

As disc. ad I.139.1 and IX.99.7, *samdadí-* must belong to $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘bind’.

There is no agreement about the sense of pāda b; my interpr. is closest to Ge’s though differing little from JPB’s. I think that the simile is bipartite: *kṣāmeva ... rájāṃsi* “like H+E the airy realms [i.e., the midspace].” Unlike JPB and like Ge, I would supply a different obj. in the frame. The lexeme *śám* \sqrt{aj} can take as obj. ‘cows’ (*gās* I.33.3) or their equivalent (V.34.7; see comm. ad loc.): ‘drive together’, hence ‘corral, confine’. H+E, as the spatial limits, confine the midspaces – such is the sense of the simile, but the frame is slightly different: we ask the Aśvins to drive together (assemble+confine) some variety of good stuff: Ge “Reichtümer” / me “cows” vel sim. I would slightly alter the tr. to “as Heaven and Earth (corral) the airy realms, corral (good things) for us.” The stationing of the subj. and obj. of the simile at opposite ends of the pāda (#*kṣāmā ... rájāṃsi*#) may iconically reflect the “corralling.”

With the near-deictic *imā* opening the second hemistich, the hymn turns towards the ritual here-and-now and the poet's summary of the Gr̄tsamadas' efforts. For this reason I would flip the tr. to "These songs here that are seeking you – sharpen them ..."

II.39.8: Again, because of the fronting of *etāni* ... *várdhanāni* I would flip the tr. to "these strengthening formulations, (this) praise song, have the Gs made for you." Most tr. (though not Pirart) keep *várdhanāni* and *bráhma* as separate items, but VI.23.6 *bráhmāni* ... *várdhanāni*, adduced by Ge, favors a syntagm. It scarcely matters, however.

The impv. *yātām* occurs 3x in this hymn: 3d, 5b, and 8c; in the first two instances the publ. tr. has "journey," but here "drive." Though I personally prefer "drive," I'd slightly change the tr. here to "journey," to match the previous exx.

II.40 Soma and Pūṣan

II.40.1: The publ. tr. does not capture the etymological play between the transitive nominal *jánana-* (3x in ab) and the first word of the 2nd hemistich, intrans.-passive *jātā-*, which could have been tr. 'begotten' to reflect this etym. figure. However, this tr. seems a little stiff and would not work with *jāyamānau* in 2a.

It is only in d that it becomes clear that the dual nominal phrases in the first three pādas are in the acc. and are the obj. of *akṛṇvan*.

II.40.2: The etym. figure involving *jan* noted ad vs. 1 continues here with intrans.-pass. *jāyamānau* (a) and transitive *janat* (d). Another figure involves *juṣ* 'enjoy', likewise with trans. versus pass. manifestations: *juṣanta* (a), *ājuṣtā* (b), both pāda-final.

This vs. contains three injunctives: *juṣanta* (a), *gūhatām* (b), *janat* (d), the middle one of which could also be an impv. Ge takes all three as preterital, a course I also follow, but Re takes *gūhatām* as impv. (flg. Gr); WG take the first two as presential and the last as preterital. There seems no decisive evidence for or against any of these choices (or the others that could be made). On the one hand, *imaú* (2x, ab) and *ābhyām* (c) 'these two (here)' would support a here-and-now presential and/or imperatival reading, as perhaps also the pres. part. *jāyamānau* in a. On the other, it seems unlikely that the gods would be *currently* celebrating the birth of Pūṣan (Soma might be another story), and, as for b, inserting an imperative into the mix seems odd to me.

Another ambiguity is posed by *ābhyām* ... *somāpūṣabhyām* in cd, which can be instr., dat., or abl. dual. Ge takes it as instr.: Indra performed this feat along with the two gods; Re and WG (see also Hoffmann, Injunk. 124, 193–94) as a dat.: Indra did it for them. I also interpr. the phrase as a dat. -- though not with any strong conviction. On the one hand this deed (putting "raw" milk into "cooked" cows) is almost always attributed to Indra alone, so having Soma and Pūṣan as his accomplices seems somewhat unlikely. But on one occasion (VI.72.4) it's attributed to Indra and Soma in a dual dvandva *īndrāsomā*. However, that hymn basically lays out Indra's great deeds and attributes them to Indra and Soma jointly, so there's no independent evidence of Soma's involvement in this action. As for how they could benefit from the exploit and thus be in the dative -- Soma would benefit from the creation of milk because he (or the ritual substance bearing his name) is mixed with milk in the Soma Sacrifice (a point also made by WG). But what

Pūṣan would gain from it isn't clear -- unless he likes milk with his habitual food, porridge (*karambhá-*). (We should probably be wary of reading Anglo-American breakfast habits back into Vedic India.)

II.40.3: The referent of this marvelous chariot is disputed. Sāy suggested the year, Lüders (Varuṇa, 690) the sun, Ge the praise-song, the sacrifice, or the wish that the gods bring. As Re points out, a choice does not have to be made; the interpretation is “volontairement polyvalente.” However, I assume that the primary reading is the sacrifice and its associated verbal expression, as so often.

The surprising descriptor of this chariot is *áviśvaminva-* ‘not speeding/moving everyone’. This word has to be evaluated alongside its positive counterpart, *viśvaminvá-*, used of Pūṣan in 6a. In both that verse and this one, Pūṣan (in this vs. along with Soma) is the subj. of \sqrt{jinv} ‘quicken’. This oppositional phraseology favors Old’s suggestion that the chariot lacks something required to “move everyone” until Pūṣan (and Soma) provide the enlivening push. However, Ge’s quite different suggestion, that the chariot only carries gods and qualified priests, gets support from the only other occurrence of *áviśvaminva-*, in the riddle hymn, I.164.10, where the gods (probably) speak speech that knows everything but does not move everyone (*viśvavídām vācam áviśvaminvām*), a formulation that probably refers to profound speech that only affects initiates or those with already prepared minds. As with the identity of the chariot itself, probably both interpr. can be simultaneously applied.

In context the root noun cmpd. *viśūvṛt-* must contain $\sqrt{vṛt}$ ‘turn’ (see Scar 511–12), but a homonymous stem based on $\sqrt{vṛ}$ ‘obstruct, ward off’ is found in X.43.3.

In the publ. tr. *výśanā* appears to be tr. as a voc.; it is not, and the tr. might be clearer as “that do you two bulls quicken.”

II.40.4: The standard assumption (Ge [/WG], Re) is that pāda a refers to Pūṣan and b to Soma, but the opposition between celestial and terrestrial/atmospheric dwelling places doesn’t seem to me to divide so neatly. Pūṣan seems often to be an earthly god, accompanying us on the ragged roads, finding our lost cattle, and Soma certainly has a celestial presence throughout the IXth Maṇḍala. I imagine that this contrastive pairing is meant to be a genuine riddle, which would require its audience to try out different solutions by bringing to mind everything they know about both gods and trying to match those characteristics with the description in this vs.

The two different acc. phrases in cd can both be construed with the verb that lies between them, *ví syatām*. There seems no reason to supply a diff. verb to govern the first acc. phrase as Ge and Re do. The slightly diff. renderings “unleash” and “unloose” in the pub. tr. were simply adapted to better fit their objects.

II.40.5: The contrastive *anyáḥ ... anyáḥ* is generally taken to refer to Soma (a) and Pūṣan (b) respectively (Ge [/WG], Re). But the differential characterizations in this vs. seem even less easily assigned than in the preceding vs. “Begetting all creatures” isn’t a standard action attributed to Soma; in fact the same deed is said to be Apām Napāt’s in nearby II.35.2. And Ge can attribute “watching over everything” to Pūṣan only by identifying him with the sun god, while Soma regularly gazes on things, even with the same participle: cf. the very similar IX.57.2 *víśvā cákṣāṇo arṣati* “he [=Soma] rushes

gazing on all (things/beings).” Again I think this differentiation is meant to be genuinely puzzling and provoke thought in the audience.

II.40.6: Fem. *anarvā* here (and VII.40.4) is assigned to the thematic stem *anarvá-* by Gr. It is more likely simply the nom. sg. to the well-attested *-n*-stem *anarván-*, serving for the fem. as well as the masc., without the fem. derivational suffix *-ī*. See JPB (Ādityas 218) and abundant discussions noted in the lexical commentary.

II.41 Various gods

II.41.1–3: This tṛca is characterized by lexical chaining. The first pāda of vs. 2 reprises *niyútvān* from 1c, *vāyo* from (accented) *vāyo* (1a), and *ā gahi* (1b). Vs. 3 is less closely tied to what precedes, but *śukrā-* ‘clear’, which characterizes the first drink of soma, offered to Vāyu, is repeated in 3a from 2b, and *niyútvant-* also recurs from 1c and 2a. The impv. *pībatam* (3c) picks up (*sóma*-) *pītaye* from 1c. More subtly, *ā yātam* repeats the preverb of *ā gahi* (1b, 2a) and also echoes the unrelated verb *ayāmi* of 2b.

II.41.3: The stem *niyútvant-* (3b) is repeated from 1c and 2a, as noted above, but here as an apparent gen. sg. modifying the soma drink (or rather one of them), not a god or gods. Ge (n. 3b) suggests that it is a metrically conditioned “hypallage” for dual *niyútvantā*, which would qualify Indra and Vāyu. This is a clever idea and would restore parallelism to the phraseology of the tṛca, though I’m not sure that’s necessary: Rigvedic poets enjoy tweaking parallelism in the syntactic equivalent of a slant rhyme. Old floats a truly oddball idea, unworthy of his usual acuity: that *niyútvant-* should modify an unexpressed *rāthena* but in the absence of a head noun in the proper case it gets sucked [not Old’s term] into the gen. by the “benachbarre” gen. Even if this were a reasonable explanation in principle -- that an untethered adj. could be captured by an adjacent or nearby word in another case -- *niyútvatah* is actually in a different pāda from the other genitives and is adjacent only to the dual dvandva *índrāvāyū*.

II.41.5: Note the phonological echo across the pāda boundary: ... *druhā*, *dhruvē* ...

II.41.11: The *ca* here is a subordinator (‘if’) and conditions accent on *mr̥lāyāti*. See II.42.1.

There are several nice phonetic sequences: ab: ... *no*, *ná nah*, where the 1st and last words are the same, with *naśat* at the end. And c: *bhadrám bhavāti*.

II.41.12: I am tempted to take *jétā* as a periphr. future, parallel as it is to the subjunctive *karat*. But this is not nec.

II.41.15: On the morphological and semantic structure of *pūśarātayah*, as well as other aspects of this vs., see the disc. of the identical vs. I.23.8.

II.41.16: Like 15ab, the first two pādas of this vs. consist entirely of accented vocatives.

II.42 Omen-bird

II.42.1: Subordinating *ca* as in II.41.11, also with a subjunctive.

The root noun cmpd. *abhibhā-* occurs only here in the RV, but 5x in the AV, which seems only to make it more obscure. Twice in the phrase “let not *abhibhā* or *asasti* find you” (i.e., parallel to this phrase), but also in conjunction with dogs and jackals once, once *abhibhā*-s can speak, and once in conjunction with diseases. Wh. transl. ‘portent’. Though not a lit. tr., Engl. “evil-eye” seems to correspond well to the contextual sense of the word; I have adopted it from Klein (DGRV II.240).

Pāda d should be read as a Jagatī, though neither Old nor HvN comment. The cadence is a Jagatī cadence and the proper number of syllables is achieved by reading *víśvīyā* as a trisyllable (so already Gr, also AiG III.78). The word is otherwise not found in the RV, but such a cluster begs to be distracted, and by Wackernagel’s analysis of it as modeled on *urviyā* (AiG III.78, flg. Brugmann), it would have *-iyā* by nature.

II.42.2: Similarly, pāda c should also be read as a Jagatī, with trisyllabic *pítrīya-*, as always in the RV

II.42.3: Although the publ. tr. follows Ge (/WG) in rendering *dakṣinatāḥ* as ‘to the right’, it is also possible, given 2c *pítryam ánu pradíśam* “in the direction of the fathers [that is, forefathers/ancestors],” that *dakṣinatāḥ* should rather be ‘to the south’, since the south is ordinarily the quarter of the Pitars.

On *īsata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

II.43 Omen-bird

This hymn seems late enough to allow terms like *sāma(n) √gā*, *gāyatrā-*, and *traiṣṭubha-* to have their full technical ritual meanings, and I have so rendered them.

II.43.1: Again as in II.42.3, *pradakṣinít* might refer to ‘south’, rather than ‘right’, though the idiom *prá + dakṣiná-* seems more limited to the traditional circumambulation of the fire with the right side facing inward.

Pāda c is somewhat oddly phrased. The vocalizer is identified as a *sāman-singer*, but is said to *speak* (both) *speech(es)*. This raises several questions: does a singer speak? and what are “both speeches”? It is tempting to equate the two speeches with the two entities in pāda d, *gāyatrám* and *traiṣṭubham*, but I am not certain that is correct. I think it’s possible that “both speeches” refers to the words and the melody. As for the question of singing versus speech, I wonder if the simile *sāmagā iva* should go rather with d than with c: “It speaks both speeches. Like a *sāman*-singer it regulates both *Gāyatrī* and *Trīṣṭubh* meters.” Unfortunately this hymn is so isolated in the RV that we have no points of comparison.

II.43.2: As HvN remark in their metrical comm., although the Anukramanī identifies the meter of this vs. as *Atiśakvarī* or *Aṣṭī*, it appears simply to consist of 5 Jagatī pādas. That the fifth pāda is a simple variant of the fourth makes it likely that the vs. is just a version of Jagatī.

The “son of the formulation” (*brahmaputrā-*) is presumably the formulator (*brahmán-*) himself, as the standard tr. take it.

II.43.3: The provision of sitting silently reminds us of the actions and role of the Brāhmaṇa priest in later śrauta ritual: associated (secondarily) with the AV, he silently observes the proceedings for errors and omissions. But that development may be too late for even a late RVic hymn.