

## Commentary V.41–87

### V.41–51 All Gods

As noted in the publ. tr., this group of hymns to the All Gods contains some of the most challenging poetry in the RV. It is also located in the center of the older RV, where it seems – perhaps fancifully – to serve as an omphalos for the whole collection.

### V.41 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn consists of verses dedicated to a sequence of gods, both major and minor, seemingly unordered. The full list consists of 1 Mitra and Varuṇa / 2 Mitra, Varuṇa, Āyu, Indra, Maruts, Rudra / 3 Aśvins, Rudra / 4 Trita, Wind, Agni, Pūṣan, Bhaga / 5 Maruts / 6 Vāyu / 7 Night and Dawn / 8 Men (Maruts?), Lord of the Dwelling Place, Tvaṣṭar, trees, plants, Holy Place / 9 Mountains, Āptya / 10 Trita, Apām Napāt, Agni / 11 Maruts, Bhaga, waters, plants, woods, mountains / 12 Agni, Waters / 13 Maruts / 14 Indra (maybe) / 15 Shielding Goddess, Rasā / 16 Maruts, Ahi Budhnya / 17 gods / 18 gods, goddess / 19–20 Iḍā, Urvaśī. The Maruts regularly recur in this sequence, and though, as noted in the publ. intro., there is little Marut imagery (though perhaps more vocab. than I recognized at the time), if there *is* focus in this hymn, it is probably on the Maruts, who dominate much of the rest of the maṇḍala after the All God hymns.

V.41.1: The conjunction *vā* ‘or’ dominates this vs.: there are 4 overt occurrences (twice in b, once each in c and d), as well as covert encodings, beginning with *vā(m mitr)āv(aruṇ)āv* (the latter two inverted) in pāda a and ending with the last word of the vs., *vā(jān)*. The end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda, *vā dé*, with two monosyllables that, inverted, produce *dévā(h)* (though with wrong accent for \**devāḥ*), draws further attention to *vā*. As noted in the intro., the prominence of *vā* may establish a theme of choice or alternatives appropriate to the mass of gods mentioned in the rest of the hymn, and *vā* also echoes the last syllable of the phrase *vísve devāḥ* “All Gods,” to whom the hymn is dedicated.

Given the plethora of *vā*-s and the absence of any finite verb, save for intrusive *trāsīthām* in c, it is not surprising that interpretations of the structure and syntax of the vs. are all over the map. In addition to the standard tr. (Ge, Re [EVP IV, V], WG), see also Old, Lü (Varuṇa 585–86), Schindler (Root nouns, 24–25), Klein (II.203–4), Scar (581), Keydana (Inf. 155 n. 142). I will not rehearse them all here. Like many of these interpr., I take the three *vā*-s of bc as defining a tripartite structure of roughly parallel entities. I then assume that the *vā* of d is situated on a higher level of structure and is contrasting abc with a new clause inaugurated in d. The two clauses (abc and d) are separated by the independent interjection *trāsīthām naḥ* closing c. As Ge points out (n. 1c), *trāsīthām naḥ* has a similar role elsewhere (IV.55.1, VII.71.2); IV.55.1 is especially similar, since it is in the first vs. of an All God hymn that begins *kó vaḥ* (like *kó nú vām* here), with Mitra and Varuṇa as the subjects of *trāsīthām*. On the anomalous form of this verb, see comm. ad VII.71.2.

My interpr. of the larger structure rests on taking *dé* at the end of b as an infin. (with many, but not all) and assuming that the poet has exploited the voice neutrality of infinitives to give it passive value in abc (“[is] to be given”) and active value in d (“[is] to give”). This further assumes that *kāḥ* refers to the (mortal) recipient in abc and,

resupplied in d, to one of the gods. With these assumptions in place, the case relations in the two syntactically distinct parts of the vs. fall into place: the nom. *kāḥ ... ṛtāyān* “who, performing the truth ...” of pāda a is the mortal worshiper and recipient of the gods’ largess; his counterpart in d is the dat. *yajñāyaté*. The *vām* of pāda a is to be interpr. two different ways: in the first part it expresses the divine beneficiaries of the mortal’s service; resupplied in d, it should be construed with likewise resupplied *kāḥ* (or better *katarāḥ*) “which of you two?”

The tripartite *vā* structure of bc details the three sources of gifts that may be given to the worshiper: heaven, earth, and the ritual ground. They are subtly unparallel: ‘heaven’ is a straight noun, either in abl. (as in the publ. tr.) or gen.; earth is represented by a deriv. adj. ‘earthly’ in the gen. (*pārthivasya*). It is a partitive gen., and if *divāḥ ... máhaḥ* is gen., it too is partitive. If it’s an abl., it expresses the source. The third term, “at the seat of truth” (*ṛtāsya ... sádasi*), expresses the place where the gift is to be given. Scar supplies ‘at the seat’ for all three terms. This is not impossible, but the poet seems to be aiming for slightly skewed and off-balance phraseology, and three different types of expressions for three parallel terms would suit his purposes admirably.

In the new structure of d, with active value of the infinitive *dé*, *vājān* is its object. The last grammatically unparallel functional parallel is *yajñāyaté ... paśuṣó ná*. Assuming that it is a gen. sg. (Old and Re take it as acc. pl.), *paśuṣáḥ* ‘of one who wins cattle’ is in some sense parallel to *yajñāyaté* ‘for the one who sacrifices’, in that the *vājān* (‘prizes’) come to both. But *paśuṣáḥ* is a gen. dependent on *vājān*, while *yajñāyaté* is the indirect object with the infin. *dé*.

V.41.2: After the cat’s cradle of vs. 1, this vs. comes as a welcome relief -- or at least in its first half, which consists of a list of gods in the nom. and a verb they can all serve as subject to. With 6 gods (and an epithet -- or 7 gods if *rbhuḥṣā* is taken separately) to fit into 22 syllables, the poet can’t get into too much trouble.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is slightly more complex. It consists of an elliptical *vā* rel. cl.: “or (in those) who ...,” with the gapped ‘those’ parallel to enclitic *naḥ* in pāda a. The final word *sajóṣāḥ* I take as referring to the gods; the stem(s) *sajóṣa(s)*- is generally used of gods (see *sajóṣāḥ* in 4b), and note that their verb *juṣanta* ends the first hemistich. But, with the standard tr., it may refer to the mortals providing the gods’ praise.

V.41.3: I take the passively used inf. *huvádhyai* with a gapped agent “by the priests” vel sim., to match the implicit 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. subj. of *prá ... bharadhvam* in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich. The use of a passive inf. in the 1<sup>st</sup> half, contrasting with an active usage (though not an inf. here) in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half, recalls the structure of vs. 1. In our vs. there is a switch of 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. reference from the (two) gods in ab to the (pl.) mortal officiants in cd.

The use of the derived adj. *ráthya*- ‘belonging to the chariot’ rather than its base noun *rátha*- recalls *pārthivasya* in 1c substituting for a form of the noun *pr̥thivī*-.

Ge (flg. Sāy.) identifies the “lord of heaven” (*divó ásurā*-) as Rudra, on the basis of parallels (see his n. 3c).

V.41.4: The parade of ill-assorted divinities and semi-divinities continues. The sequence is made more muddled by the fact that Trita is always a shadowy figure, who is probably (but not certainly) the same as Āptya in vs. 9 (Āptya being Trita’s usual patronymic) and

Trita in 10 and who is probably (but not certainly) the referent of pāda a here: “the heavenly victor with Kaṇva as Hotar.” If he is the referent of pāda a, it is slightly odd that he is both qualified as ‘heavenly’ (*divyāḥ*) and said to be ‘from heaven’ (*divāḥ*, pāda b). It might be best, with Ge (/WG) to take *divāḥ* as the place-from-which of all the figures mentioned; however, Wind and Agni are normally associated with the midspace and the earth respectively, and Pūṣan and Bhaga are not particularly heavenly deities. It’s worth noting that *divyā-* continues the poet’s habit of using deriv. *-ya-*adjectives in place of (or perhaps here beside) their nominals, and so the doubling *divyā- / divāḥ* might not be so odd after all.

I do not know exactly what to do with *prá* initial in the vs., but it is noteworthy that it fits into a sequence of *prá*-initial expressions, where the preverb is in tmesis, beginning with 3d *prá ... bharadhvam* and continuing with 5a *prá ... bharadhvam* again and 6a *prá ... kṛṇudhvam* (followed by initial *prá* in 6b and 7b). In our vs. there is no finite verb to construe it with in tmesis, but note the loc. *prabhṛthé* in c. My assumption is that vs.-initial *prá* simply reinforces *prabhṛthé* in a vs. sandwiched between two full *prá ... bharadhvam* expressions. It could also be construed with *jagmuḥ* in d, though one might expect a more prominent, metrical-boundary-adjoining *jagmuḥ* in that case.

The loc. *prabhṛthé* and the acc. *ājím* both serve as goal with *jagmuḥ* -- another ex. of the poet’s penchant for slightly off-balance parallels.

V.41.5: The first hemistich consists of a syntactically “active” 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. verb (“present / proffer!” -- *prá ... bharadhvam*, though it is morphologically middle) paired with a passive (“should be produced” -- *dadhīta*) without overt agent, structurally similar to vs. 3 with a passive infinitive (*huvádhyai*) without agent and the same “active” 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. *prá ... bharadhvam*. This structure is further reminiscent of vs. 1 with passive and act. uses of the same infinitive *dé*.

In this vs. it is not altogether clear who the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. subject of *prá bharadhvam* is. Ge thinks this is about the dakṣiṇā and suggests as subj. either the Opferveranstalter or the Maruts. I don’t see the dakṣiṇā connection, and given the reciprocal relationship between gods and men depicted already in the hymn (vss. 1 and 3), in the next vs. (6) with *dhiyé dhuḥ* playing off *dadhīta dhīḥ* in our 5b, and elsewhere, I think it likely that the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. addressees here are the (All) Gods in general, who are asked to provide tangible wealth in exchange for the praise embodied in the *dhī-* (‘visionary thought’) produced by the poets. The use of the exact same verb *prá bharadhvam* in 3 and 5, with opposite but complementary subjects (priest-poets / gods), is a neat reversal.

The standard tr. take *auśijásya* as a PN and construe it with *hótā*. This is not impossible, but since, as we’ve seen, the poet is fond of using *-ya-*deriv. adjectives for nouns, I think it more likely that, using a different kind of derivational adjective, the poet used the vṛddhi deriv. to stand for *uśij-* ‘(type of) priest’ in the pl. Assuming as usual, that the Hotar is Agni, who mediates between men and gods, it is reasonable that he would be pleased both by the activities of this priestly group and by those of the gods, represented by the Maruts. For the association of Hotar and *auśijá-* see also IV.21.6–7, though that passage is exceptionally opaque.

The vs. contains several instances of phonological and morphological play. In b the pāda-final phrase *dadhīta dhīḥ* shows tight phonological similarity though the two words belong to different roots. The same play is found in the next vs. (6d), likewise

pāda-final, in *dhiyé dhuḥ* -- same noun *dhī-*, verb to the same root  $\sqrt{dhā}$  -- though the phonological relationship is not as tight. In 5b *dadhīta dhīḥ* yields a very bad Triṣṭubh cadence, whereas 6d *dhiyé dhuḥ* provides a completely orthodox cadence. This may be an example of metrical poetic repair, where the metrical violation of the first calls attention to the phrase, which is satisfactorily resolved in the next vs.

In the second hemistich we find # (*sus*)*éva éva(ir)* ... # (*y*)*é va évā*, evoking (*d*)*eva-* again. Pāda d lacks a syllable. It is tempting to emend the opening to *yé \*vā va évā*, given the prominence of *vā* in the hymn -- as Old also suggests. But this emended sequence makes less sense and also disturbs its phonological echo of pāda c. It should also be noted that *yé va évā* is also found in 13a in a different metrical position and cf. also scrambled *evayā* in 16b. If *\*vā* were to be inserted, the tr. could be changed to “is well disposed because of the ways of the ... Priests or (those) which are the ways of you powerful ones, o Maruts.”

V.41.6: There are again a number of ways to construe this vs., and I will concentrate on my own. Given the alternation I see in this hymn between the actions of gods and men, I think (with most) that the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. subj. of *prá ... kṛṇudhvam* is back to the mortal ritual officiants (as in 3cd), rather than the gods (as in 5a). I also take *prá kṛṇudhvam* to be the verb of all of abc, reinforced by *prá* opening b. This further means that the nominatives of c (*iṣudhyáva rtaśāpaḥ*) refer to the mortals and the *púramdhīḥ* is acc. pl., not nom. as many take it. Crucial to this interpr. is the parallel cited by Old, X.64.7 *prá vo vāyum rathayújam púramdhim, stómaiḥ kṛṇudhvam sakhyāya pūśāṇam*. “Set in front with your praises Vāyu, who hitches up the chariot, Plenitude, (and) Pūśan for partnership,” with clear acc. *púramdhim* a parallel obj. with *vāyum rathayújam* (as here) to *prá ... kṛṇudhvam*.

I then take d as displaying the usual reciprocity found elsewhere in the hymn, but with a grammatical twist. The last set of divine beings honored by mortals, the acc. object *púramdhi-* of c, are, in my opinion, the unexpressed subjects of d and participate in a grammatical play. The noun *púramdhi-* is fem., though it is at most the animatization of an abstract ‘plenitude, abundance’. Furthermore, it looks synchronically like a cmpd. with a form of  $\sqrt{dhā}$ , even though that is not the current standard etym. (cf. EWA s.v.). I therefore think that the pl. obj. *púramdhīḥ* of pāda c, reconfigured as subjects of d, are depicted as explicitly female -- as ‘good wives’ (*vāsvīḥ ... pātñīḥ*) -- and serve as subject to a form of  $\sqrt{dhā}$  (*dhuḥ*) folk-etymologically extracted from *púramdhi-*. The unexpressed obj. is then (mis-segmented) *\*púram* ‘plenty’. As was discussed ad vs. 5, *dhuḥ* also participates in a figure with *dhiyé* that reverses *dadhīta dhīḥ* in 5d.

I do not entirely understand the position of *ā*, which appears to be a preverb with *dhuḥ* (so Gr), but appears to have been moved in tmesis to a position adjacent neither to a metrical boundary nor to a syntactic one (though this would be easier to argue). It may have been flipped (from a putative *\*dhiyé ā dhuḥ*) to allow the figure just discussed (*dhiyé dhuḥ* picking up 5b *dadhīta dhīḥ*).

On *iṣudhyú-*, see comm. ad I.128.6 and my 2020 art. “Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūdiia-*: The Aim of Praise” (Lamberterie Fs.).

V.41.7: The hymn contains three exx. of *éṣe* (5b, 7a, 8d). Though Lub classifies them all as locc. to the thematic stem *éṣa-*, I follow the standard tr. in taking the one in this vs. as a

1<sup>st</sup> sg. pres., while the other two are locc. in the phrase *rāyá éṣe* “in the quest for wealth.” The parallel for 7a cited by Ge, I.186.4 *úpa va éṣe ... uṣāsānāktā*, seems to clinch this interpr., and the next vs. (8), beginning *abhí vo arce*, also PREV *vaḥ* 1<sup>st</sup>-sg. VERB, reinforces it.

In d I read *āhā* not *ā hā* (a change only in the Pp. not the Saṃhitā text), and analyze this sequence as *ā + āhā*, the neut. pl. of ‘day’. This is one of only two supposed exx. of the particle *ha* with long vowel; the other one (IV.31.5) also follows *ā* and is susceptible to the same analysis. See disc. there.

V.41.8: Ge takes *nṛn* as gen. pl. rather than acc., but this is unnec. The stem *nṛ-* is regularly used of gods, esp. the Maruts, so there is no reason that they cannot be addressees here (so Re, WG).

The standard tr. take *dhányā sajoṣā dhiṣāṇā* as nom. sg. and parenthetic; e.g., Ge “—einverstanden ist die reichmachende Dhiṣāṇā—” But the instr. sg. in *-ā* to fem. *-ā-* stems is still quite common in the RV, and that is how I construe the phrase here.

V.41.9: *svāitu-* in b is a hapax. Following a tentative suggestion of Ge’s (n. 9b), I take it as a vṛddhi form related to Aves. *x<sup>v</sup>aētu-* ‘family’, pace Narten (YH 266 n. 59), who, however, does not give reasons for her rejection of the association (though it’s true that we should really expect a thematic *\*svaitava-* or the like). I confess, however, that my rendering of ab is merely a guess (as, it seems, are the other divergent tr.). I don’t know why the mountains should be associated with our production of offspring; the sexual connotation WG suggest in their n., that mountains are felsenhart and knotig, seems farfetched. My own tentative suggestion is that the progeny here belong to the mountains, not to us, and refer to the material goods originating from mountains that we will enjoy: see I.55.3 *párvatam ná bhójase* “like a mountain to be enjoyed” and Ge’s parallels adduced there; also passages like VII.37.8 *ā rāyo yantu párvatasya rātaú* “let the riches of the mountain come here at (the time for) giving”; II.24.2 *vásumantam ... párvatam* “the goods-filled mountain.” If I am correct, the simile, in which the mountains are said to be *vásavo ná vīrāḥ* “like good heroes” may be a bit of a pun, with *vásavaḥ* actually referring to the material goods of the mountains. To make my interpr. clearer, I might slightly emend the tr. to “to thrust out their progeny for us.”

The alternative etym. of *svāitu-* found in Gr, favored by Narten, and represented in the tr. of Re and WG analyses it as *svá-etu-* ‘having their own going’, which seems singularly inappropriate. It is regularly emphasized that mountains can’t be moved — except when they’re in fear of some greater force (like the Maruts) — so “going” should not be one of their properties. It could refer to the myth of the winged mountains (the wings then clipped by Indra), but this does not seem the context for a reference to this myth. WG attenuate the sense to a figurative “die ein Eigenleben führen,” which avoids the mountain-movement problem, but essentially denies the force of the etymology. By contrast, a reference to ‘family’ fits comfortably with the production of progeny.

I don’t know what Āptya is doing here, either. Again, the sexual connotation suggested in WG’s n. is invisible to me. It does seem likely that he is the same figure as Trita in 10b, since both are associated with the production of praise. Trita in 4b is less clearly tied in.

Note *sámsam náryah*, which reminds of *nárā-sámsa-* (though they don't belong to the same syntagm here) and also continues the poet's fondness for *-ya-*derivatives.

V.41.10: WG take Trita as the persona of the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. speaker of *astoṣi* ("ich, als Trita ..."), whereas I follow Ge and Re in supplying a 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. form of  $\sqrt{stu}$  for b.

The form *etārī* is, of course, problematic, but is most likely a loc. sg.; for disc. see Tichy (-tar-stems, 59–61). Tichy considers such forms locatives to verbal abstracts; though some such forms seem simply to be straight agent-noun locatives (see, e.g., *kartārī* in I.139.7), Tichy's analysis fits *etārī*. It is found only here and in VI.12.4, in the same pāda-final phrase *etārī ná sūṣaīḥ*. In our passage there is some phonetic justification for the form (though not in VI.12.4); note the *nilri* sylls: *gṛnū́é agnir etārī ... / ... ní riṇā́ti*.

V.41.12: This vs. presents a number of difficulties. The first is the easiest solved: who is the referent of ab? Although this is almost universally taken to be the Wind, I think it is more likely Agni. Only Agni is called *ūrjām páti-* "lord of nourishments" (otherwise only in the voc. *ūrjām pate*), also *ūrjó nāpāt* "child of nourishment." Given this exclusive identification, it seems unlikely that the audience would assign a different referent, esp. since *ūrjām pátiḥ* is the first epithet encountered and sets the frame of reference; the others only show up in pāda b. Moreover, though *párijman-* 'earth-circling' is used of the Wind, it also refers to other entities, including, fairly often, Agni (VI.2.8, VI.13.2, VII.13.3, I.127.2, III.2.9). The other descriptor in b, *iṣirá-* 'vigorous', is applied to a variety of beings and things, including the Wind, but also Agni (III.2.14, 5.4). The only activity posited of the subject of this hemistich is *nábhās tárīyān* (for which see below), which is also applicable to either.

The pāda-final *sá* in pāda a is quite unusual. A cursory glance through Lub for parallels yields only II.35.1, III.13.3, (VII.86.6 *sā*), IX.71.8, IX.79.3, X.108.4 (a careful search might produce a few more: now see disc. ad VII.60.9.) All of these exx. are either rhetorically contrastive, or *sá* takes its proper position in a new clause. Although it is possible that the *sá* here also begins a new, purely nominal clause with b, this seems clumsy. I have a quite speculative suggestion about it, linking it with the immediately following *nábhās tárīyān*. The standard — and quite persuasive — interpr. of this phrase is "quicker than a cloud," but this imposes an abl. sg. interpr. on *nábhah*, which should then belong to a root noun *nábh-* 'cloud', beside the standard *s-*stem *nábhās-*. This root noun does not otherwise exist: the supposed root noun *nábh-* (glossed 'Zerspalter, Zerbrecher' by Gr) in I.174.8 is more likely a verb (see comm. ad loc.). And in any case we should expect an accent *\*nabhás*. Re's suggestion that *nábhās* is simply haplogy for *\*nábhāsas* is probably correct, but I suggest that it left a trace of its vanished final *-as* in the pāda-final *sá* immediately preceding — a tangible sign of the effects of speed: the final syllable got cut off and left behind.

The second hemistich is very puzzling and has given rise to very different and incompatible interpr. (WG being esp. distant from the rest). Mine more or less follows Old (or one of his alternatives), who discusses the passage with his customary acuity; I will not discuss other renderings in detail. I am not at all certain that mine (/Old's) is correct, however. The framework of the passage compares the waters, subjects of the verb, with fortifications (*púraḥ*), the point of comparison being their resplendent appearance (*śubhrá-*). So far also Ge; Re also follows this structure, but floats the

possibility that *púr-* can mean ‘corps’, which would be convenient but is of course unsupported. With Old and Ge (we now lose Re, who takes *d* as a separate clause with the ladles as subj.), the fortifications are those of a mountain (*ádreḥ*), and this mountain is characterized as *pári ... babṛhāṇá-* ‘enclosing’ (*pári* √*brh* has this meaning in the Brāh.). Although we would not ordinarily expect tmesis of a participle, esp. a part. in an oblique case, the tmesis here is iconic: the enclosed object is located between preverb and participle. This object is *srúcaḥ* ‘offering ladles’. Now of course in a literal interpr. a mountain enclosing a bunch of ladles sounds very odd, Old cleverly suggests that the ladles stand for cows -- living ladles, as it were, from which ghee comes as it does from the offering ladles. These cows are then the cows trapped within the Vala cave. The hemistich thus starts jointly in the physical world and on the ritual grounds, since the listening waters are probably both “real” natural waters and the waters standing by for the soma sacrifice. It then moves, via the simile, to the natural world (mountain fortifications) and the world of myth (the Vala cave), and back to the ritual ground, with the enclosed ladles. If this interpr. is correct, it is a very condensed and clever expression.

V.41.13: Another opaque vs., whose difficulties begin with the first word *vidā*. This is taken as the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. pf. by Gr, Ge, WG. (Re unaccountably takes it as a 1<sup>st</sup> sg. ‘Je sais ...’, without comment -- presumably a careless error for *véda*.) I follow Old in taking it as the instr. of the root noun to the same root.

The phrase *yé va évā(h)* recurs from 5d though in a different metrical position. Here as there it refers to the “ways” (*évāḥ*) of the Maruts (so Ge, Re, flg. Sāy., contra Old’s tentative *Ādityas*) -- the ways which by our knowledge (*vidā*) we are in a position to proclaim (*brāvāma*), presumably in the form of a hymn, for which we expect reward (*vāryam dádhānāḥ* “acquiring what is choice”) -- just as in vs. 5 a visionary thought (*dhīḥ*) was to be produced in return for wealth (*rāyá éṣe ávase* “for help in the quest for wealth”). The part. *dádhānāḥ* has almost a purpose function, and to make the reciprocal action clearer I might emend the tr. from “as we acquire” to “while acquiring ...” or even “for acquiring.”

The first sticking point in the second hemistich is *caná*. This is universally taken as negative (as *caná* generally is). However, in this case I think that it is simply equivalent to *ca ná* (so also Klein I: 289–91 with n. 8) and that the *ná* here is serving as the simile-marking particle, not the negative. *váyah* is often used in a simile at the beginning of a pāda: I count seven #*váyo ná* passages, incl. V.59.7 in this maṇḍala, where it’s the Maruts who are compared to birds (cf. also I.87.2 #*váya iva marutaḥ*) — though I do have to admit that two #*váyaś caná* passages (I.24.6, 155.5) contain the negative.

Therefore, contra all the standard tr./interpr., I take the subject of *cd* not as ‘birds’ (*váyah*), but as the Maruts compared to birds (like V.59.7, I.87.2). The adj. *subhū-* ‘of good essence’ is regularly used of the Maruts in this maṇḍala (V.55.3, 59.3, 87.3) and would identify them as the referent to an alert audience. In this 2<sup>nd</sup> half-vs. we make good on our promise to proclaim the ways of the Maruts -- this exploit is one of these ways.

Unfortunately exactly what that exploit involves is unclear. That the Maruts should come down like birds is unproblematic: they regularly fly through the midspace and come down to interact with mortals, generally at the ritual. But the target of their descent, expressed in pāda *d*, has no parallels, as far as I can find. In my interpr. the mortal (*mártam*) to whom they come is in distress and receives their help. Unlike the

standard tr. I take the hapax root noun instr. *kṣubhā* as characterizing the Maruts' movements (fluttering like birds), not the state of the mortal, which is expressed by *ánuyatam vadhasnāḥ* "held/controlled by murderous weapons." I assume that he is under attack by hostile forces and requires the Maruts' assistance to free him.

The phonological play with *va/ā* that we noted earlier in the hymn (particularly vss. 1, 5) has returned here: ... *yé va evā, brāvāma ...vāryam ... váya(h) ... subhvā(h) ... vadhasnāḥ* — which draws attention to the thematic connection between this vs. and vs. 5.

V.41.14: Since Indra is several times called *súmakha-*, I assume he is the referent here -- though nothing much depends on it in this generic vs. and both Ge and Re take it to be the sacrificer or the patron of the sacrifice.

WG suggest that *candrāgrā(h)* modifies both 'days' and 'hymns'; this is a good idea, with 'gold, gleam' used in two slightly different senses. The days begin with the gleaming of the golden sun, while the hymns offered to the gods are metaphorically tipped with the gold given by the gods in response to praise.

In d *udā* is generally taken as the instr. sg. of a root noun 'water' (so, e.g., Gr and all the standard tr., though Ge hesitates), beside the more common oblique *n*-stem instr. *udnā*. However, I follow Schindler (Root nouns, 12–13), who argues that it is better taken as the nom./acc. pl. to the same *-n*-stem.

The somewhat curious expression *abhīṣātā árṇāḥ* "conquered floods" finds its formulaic match in nearby V.50.4 *árṇā ... sánitā* 'winner of the floods'; this may well be a general reference to the progress of the Ārya into the Punjab, winning territory river by river. Ge cites as parallel I.131.5 *té anyām-anyām nadyām saniṣnata* "They kept winning one river after another."

V.41.15: The action in pāda a is a positive one: the speaker is assured he will make it to old age. See 17de and disc. there, as well as X.59.4 (disc. ad vs. 17 below), 100.12.

The construction in b, which expresses the agent of *ní dhāyi*, is complex. Its underlying model is the "X and which Y" construction, but it is inverted, with the rel. cl. member first: "(by her) who is ... and by the protectors." Moreover, it contains both *vā* and *ca*. As Klein says (II.174–75), "the construction should most likely be viewed as a conjunctive anacoluthon in which the poet begins by intending alternative conjunction and finishes with an additive sequence. Within each member the conjunction occupies its normal enclitic position: (*vārūtrī vā śakrā yā*) (*pāyúbhiś ca*)."

On *ṛjuvāniḥ* see Scar 467–68. Note that this form produces a bad cadence.

On the connection between cd and vss. 19–20 see disc. below.

V.41.16: *upamātivāniḥ* in 16e also produces a bad cadence. On this form and on the meter of both *-vāniḥ* forms, see Scar 467. On *úpamāti-* see comm. ad VIII.40.9.

The opening of the vs., *kathā dāsema*, echoes 11a *kathā ... bravāma*. In both cases the object/goal of our action is the Maruts. Another echo is found in *evayā(h)*, which is a scrambling of *yé va évā(h)* of 5d and 13a (though *yé* and *-yā(h)* are completely different grammatically), in both cases of the Maruts. The sequence in our pāda b, *evayā marútaḥ* "the Maruts traveling their ways," is also matched by the punctuating

exclamation *evayāmarut* found in every vs. of the Anhangslied to the Maruts that ends this maṇḍala (V.87.1–9, tr. there “Maruts on the march”).

V.41.17: As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 16–17, in a different meter from what precedes (and follows), seem to provide a summary of the preceding hymn, esp. 17, with its self-conscious internal quote *īti cin nū* “in just these (words) now.” See Janert (Dhāsi, pp. 16–17), who argues this position in some detail.

All the standard tr. (as well as Janert, 42) agree in taking d and e as separate clauses and supplying a verb for c. All consider the clauses contrastive: in d I hope to be granted a pleasant or benevolent *dhāsi-* for my body, while in e I express the wish that Nirṛti should swallow my old age. But this is directly contrary to what was said in 15ab, where the securing of his old age was an occasion for celebration by the poet. It is true that two different words for ‘old age’ are involved: *jarimán-* in 15, *jarā-* in 17, but these words do not contrast semantically elsewhere as far as I can see (cf. X.32.5, 8, which contains *jarā-* followed by *jarimán-*)—even though Re remarks “noter l’opposition.” An important parallel is provided by X.59.4 *dyūbhir hitó jarimā sū no astu, parātarāṃ sū nīrṛtir jihītām* “Throughout the days let our old age be secured for us. -- Let Dissolution move herself further away.” There old age is ‘secured’ (*hitāḥ*) as it was in our 15a *jarimā ní dhāyi* (both to  $\sqrt{dhā}$ ), and Dissolution (*nīrṛtiḥ*) is urged to move away. (It should be admitted that that pāda is a refrain to the first three vss. of X.59 and so not necessarily as closely tied to the preceding pāda as it might be.) I therefore doubt that in our vs. the poet is hoping that Dissolution will swallow the old age that he (and other poets) elsewhere want to keep safe. Instead I think de is the expression of his fear that if he fails to win the gods (abc) Dissolution will succeed in depriving him of his wished-for old age. I have pushed *ātrā* perhaps a bit too much -- to ‘otherwise’; I would prefer a ‘lest’ (*néd*) clause or even a *mā* clause, but *néd*, which becomes well developed in Vedic prose, barely exists in the RV and the poet may have been casting about for a way to express this modality.

A further piece of evidence in favor of my interpr. is the word *dhāsi*. Although this word often means ‘well-spring’ or ‘source’ (see comm. ad I.62.3, 140.1), in some cases it seems to mean ‘place, depository’ and be associated with (/derived, at least synchronically, from)  $\sqrt{dhā}$ . Here the *dhāsi-* seems to be the nominalization of *ní dhāyi* in 15 (cf. *hitāḥ* in X.58.4) — that is, the place in which old age is securely held. I therefore take it as coreferential with *jarām* in e.

V.41.18–20: If, as suggested above, 16–17 are the finale of the hymn proper, these 3 vss. (or 2 ¼) were tacked on. They certainly lack the complications of the rest of the hymn. The dominance of female figures is striking.

V.41.18: Despite the word order, I follow Janert (contra the standard tr.) in construing pāda-final *góḥ* with *īsam*, rather than with immediately preceding *sāsā*, which saves us from determining what the recitation or instruction of the cow is.

V.41.19–20: The single pāda of 20 simply continues vs. 19 thematically and syntactically, as Old points out. They constitute a single vs.

The signature word of the beginning of the hymn, *vā*, returns in force: *urvāśī vā ...urvāśī vā bṛhaddivā ... ūrṇvānā*. Note also *urvāśī ... urvāśī ... abhyūrṇvānā ... ūrjavayāsya*.

This vs. sequence seems inspired by 15cd. Vs. 15 has a similar focus on female figures, and 15c #*sīṣaktu mātā mahī rasā naḥ* is echoed by 20a #*sīṣaktu naḥ*, whose subject is likewise a female. The ‘mother’ *mātā* of 15c is matched slightly earlier in this vs. sequence, in 19a, and there she is accompanied by rivers (*smān nadībhiḥ* 19b), even as the mother of 15c is identified as the river Rasā.

In fact 19–20 depict a matriarchal lineage of sorts, as Ge points out (n. 19bc). Besides Idā, explicitly “the mother of the flock” (*yūthāsya mātā*) here, there is Urvaśī, twice: 19b and 19c. I am not entirely sure what to make of this doubling. I doubt that two different Urvaśīs are meant, rather the familiar Urvaśī in two different guises (so Ge). In 19b she is associated with rivers. This reminds us of the attendance of her fellow Apsarases and of the rivers on the birth of Urvaśī’s son in X.95.6–7, with Urvaśī herself qualified as ‘watery’ (*āpyā* in X.95.10b) and her son as “born from the water” (*jāniṣṭo apāḥ*, X.95.10c). Urvaśī Bṛhaddivā (‘of lofty heaven’; on the accent *bṛhaddivā*- see AiG II.1.109, 120) in 19c may refer to a return to her residence in heaven after breaking with Purūravas (the return not, however, mentioned in X.95, though it is implied in vss. 16–17). In any case, Urvaśī’s son is named Āyu; his paternal grandmother is Idā, the mother of Purūravas (addressed as *aīda* in X.95.18), so the title ‘mother’ given to Idā in 19a has another resonance. Because of Urvaśī’s relationship to Āyu, with Ge and Re I supply ‘mother’ in 19d and 20a to govern the various genitives. Thus with Idā, Urvaśī, and Āyu we have a three-generational family.

I am uncertain what to do with *ūrjavayāsya* in 20 (PN or not), and I also do not know what *abhyūrṇvānā* in 19d is conveying.

#### V.42 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., like V.41 this hymn enumerates a number of divine dedicands with no apparent ordering, save for the middle vss. (7–9), where Bṛhaspati dominates. The list includes 1 Varuṇa, Mitra, Bhaga, Aditi, Aryaman / 2 Aditi, Mitra and Varuṇa / 3 Savitar / 4 Indra / 5 Bhaga, Savitar, Aṃśa, Vāja, and Puramḍhi / 6 Indra / 7-8 (-9) Bṛhaspati / 10 Maruts / 11 Rudra / 12 Sarasvatī, Bṛhaddivā, Rākā / 13 Tvaṣṭar (+ Viśvarūpa?) / 14 Parjanya / 15 Maruts / 16 Earth (etc.) / 17 gods / 18 Aśvins. Note no Agni, unless he’s hidden in 1cd. The hymn is much more straightforward, and less interesting, than V.41, but provides a relaxing interlude in the overheated rhetoric of the All God hymns of V.

V.42.1: Technically speaking, there is only one “reach” in this verse. The tr. should probably be emended to “May the ... hymn now reach Varuṇa, (and) Mitra, Bhaga, (and) Aditi.”

On *dīdhiti*- as ‘visionary power’ see comm. ad VII.1.1. Here it is contrasted with the hymn that owes its existence to this power.

As Ge (etc.) point out, *ātūrtapanthāḥ* is the clue to the identification of the referent of cd, since this epithet only occurs once elsewhere in the RV, in X.64.5, where it is explicitly used of Aryaman. In that passage he is also qualified as *saptāhotā* ‘having 7 Hotrars’, like *pāñcahotā* here. And of course Aryaman makes sense in this highly

Ādityan context. Nonetheless, I think pāda c (*pṛṣadyoniḥ pāñcahotā*) flirts with a different identification -- of Agni -- before sealing that of Aryaman by *ātūrtapanthāḥ* in d. Agni could plausibly have a womb of dappled (ghee) (*pṛṣadyoni-*), similar to *ghṛtāyoni-* ‘having a womb of ghee’ used of Agni in V.8.6, as Ge points out (n. 1cd), and of course Agni is both associated with Hotars and is the Hotar par excellence himself. Since, as noted above, Agni is not otherwise found in this hymn, the poet may have gestured towards him covertly in 1c.

V.42.2: This vs. is quite straightforward until we reach pāda d, where the nom. *ahám* ‘I’ demands a verb that isn’t there. Keeping in mind the theme of divine/human reciprocity that runs through the last hymn and the rest of this one and employing our usual method of attempting to supply missing material from context, it seems best to supply a form of *prāti* √*grabh* complementary to *prāti ... jagṛbhyāt* in a with Aditi as subject. The poet wishes to grasp the *bráhma-* produced by the gods (c) in order to turn it into praise (*stóma-*) for the gods (a). This reciprocal relationship may be signaled by the first word in the vs. *prāti* ‘in return, in response’.

The other question in d is what to do with the untethered locc. *mitré varuṇé*. I have followed Ge in loosely construing them with *mayobhú* ‘joy itself’, even though this stem does not elsewhere take a loc. Ge (n. 2d) cites a series of parallels with locc. *mitré váruṇe* that seem to have similarly loose beneficial value.

V.42.3: Note the distinction in no. between the two 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. impvs. in ab: sg. *úd īraya* and pl. *unátta*. As commonly, the sg. is probably a self-address by the poet to himself; that his object is “the best poet of poets” (*kavítamaṃ kavīnām*) simply emphasizes the closed loop of reciprocity. The pl. impv. is presumably addressed to his fellow celebrants, in this case the priests charged with the physical activity (the Adhvaryu and his helpers, quite possibly). The pl. impv. *unátta* has a strong stem form where we properly expect weak, but the expected form *\*und-ta* → *\*untta* → (probably simplified to) *\*unta* would have been difficult to parse. The number distinction between the impvs. would be clumsy to render in English and so I have not done so.

V.42.4: Ge thinks it’s *our mánas-* that’s at issue, but context makes it more likely to be Indra’s (so also Re and WG).

Pāda c is a minor variant of 2c and in fact makes clear what the structure of 2c is and where the rel. cl. begins. A minor example of syntactic repair.

V.42.5: In pāda a it is unclear with what noun to construe gen. *rāyáḥ*. Ge and Re take it with *savitā* (Ge: “der Zuweiser ... des Reichturns”), while WG seem to agree with me in taking it with *ámśa(h)*. Since Savitar is a far more defined divine being with a name that, though having the literal sense ‘impeller’, is normally used just as a name, I think *Amśa*, whose animatization is fairly shaky, is more likely to be used in a literal abstract value and construed with a gen. of the same type.

The problematic form in the vs. is *saṃjítah*. Properly speaking, this should either be an abl./gen. sg. or a nom./acc. pl. of the root noun cmpd *saṃjít-* ‘complete victor’. Gr analyzes it as gen. sg., modifying *vṛtrásya*, as, apparently, does Re, while Ge and WG take it as nom. pl., presumably applicable to all the gods listed singly before. All construe

the gen. pl. *dhánānām* with it (e.g., Ge “die Erbeuter der Schätze”), but this leaves *vṛtrāsya* stranded, since it would be perverse to attribute the victory over Vṛtra to Bhaga, Savitar, and Aṃśa in addition to Indra. Therefore all the standard tr. supply sg. \**hantā* (vel sim.) as an appositive to Indra, to govern *vṛtrāsya*. I consider this unnec. Our pāda seems to be based on a much-repeated pāda, couched in the acc. sg., in the Triṣṭubh refrain vs. of the Viśvāmitras’ Indra hymns: III.30.22 (etc.) *ghnántaṃ vṛtrāṇi saṃjítam dhánānām*. I consider our pāda a nonce adaptation of the orig. pāda, construed as if orig. *saṃjítam* belonged to a them. stem -- in other words *saṃjítaḥ* is a thematic back-formation, nom. singular, that allows the formula to remain metrical. The last part of 7b, with sg. *sanitāraṃ dhánānām*, gives some support to this interpr., and note that Indra alone is called *jiṣṇú-* ‘victor’ in the next vs. (6a). Of course, it must be admitted that in III.30.22 *vṛtrāṇi* is the obj. of a form of  $\sqrt{han}$  and so supplying such a form here (as the standard tr. do) also gets some support. But *vṛtrá-* has been transformed from acc. (pl.) to gen. (sg.) in our passage and should be parallel to *dhánānām*.

V.42.7: The splv. *śámbhaviṣṭha-* recalls *śámtama-* in 1a. Both stems are reasonably well attested, though *śámtama-* has the edge. They do not seem to be consistently distinguished in usage, but *śámtama-* seems more common qualifying inanimates while *śámbhaviṣṭha-* and its base *śambhú-/ũ-* are more common with animates. Such is the case in this hymn, where *śámtamā* in 1a modifies ‘hymn’ (*gīḥ*) and *śámbhaviṣṭhaḥ* in 7c modifies Bṛhaspati. Nonetheless, the tr. of the two forms should be harmonized. I have chosen to change the tr. in vs. 7.

V.42.8: The standard tr. (incl. also Schmidt, B+I 84 and Scar 202) take ab as a separate nominal cl. The difference is trivial.

Less trivial is the difference between my rendering of the last part of d and that of all the others. They take *subhágās téṣu rāyaḥ* as the nominal main clause to the rel. cl. (*yé aśvadāḥ ...*) that occupies the rest of the hemistich. Cf., e.g., Ge “denen gehören die beglückenden Reichtümer.” In contrast I take *subhágāḥ* with the rel. cl., qualifying the givers, and *rāyaḥ* as acc. pl. in the main cl., and in the main cl. I supply a verb ‘confer’ (vel sim.) extracted from *ratnadhéyam* in 7a. In favor of the standard tr. are the facts that by accent *rāyaḥ* is better analyzed as nom. than acc. (though acc. pls. so accented are not rare) and that no verb need be supplied. Although I am usually reluctant to supply material, in this case there are countervailing factors. First, with the exception of one late passage (X.140.5), *subhága-*, which is quite well-attested, is only used of animate beings, not of wealth or the like. Moreover, the standard rendering leaves Bṛhaspati with little to do. The givers are “accompanied by your help” (*távotíbhīḥ*), but otherwise seem to do quite nicely on their own -- whereas we might expect him to be acting on their material behalf by giving to them, just as in the next vs. he is asked to strip the niggardly of their possessions and do worse by other anti-ritualists. By my interpr. the vs. expresses the usual Rigvedic trickle-down theory of material redistribution: the gods give goods to the patrons of the sacrifice (kings, etc.), who then confer them on the priests and poets.

V.42.9: The stilted nominal syntax with dummy verb  $\sqrt{kr}$  + acc. masc. abstract (*visarmāṇam kṛṇuhi*, lit. “make dissipation”), which together govern a neut. acc. *vittám*, must result from the lack of a transitive pres. to  $\sqrt{sr}$  ‘flow, run’ -- *pace* Narten (“Ai. *sr*

...” 1969: 83 and n. 16 [=KISch 130 and n. 16]), who characterizes several forms of *vi*  $\sqrt{sr}$  as “transitiv,” though the acc. expresses the goal/place-through-which, not a real transitive object.

The expression *prasavé vāvr̥dhānān* is not entirely clear and is variously rendered — Ge “die im Befehl gross sind,” Re “qui (se croyant) renforcés pour la compétition,” Schmidt (B+I 85) “bei (unserer) Regsamkeit wachsen,” WG “obwohl sie in ihrem Unterfangen erstarkt sind” — differing primarily in what *prasavá-* is taken to mean. By my interpr. these foes, who violate all the norms of Ārya society by refusing to participate in reciprocal exchange, by acting contrary to *vratá-* (the chains of command that structure Ārya society), and by hating the verbal formulations that express the Ārya view of the cosmos and their place in it, nonetheless show their strength on the attack, the forward thrust. All the tr. reflect this notion one way or another: the regrettable strength of the enemies despite their antisocial behavior.

V.42.10: This vs. continues the theme of the impious foe, though the divine ally the poet calls on to destroy the foe has changed from Bṛhaspati to the Maruts. Here (pāda a) the enemy chooses to praise demons (*rakṣásah*) when gods (*deva-*) are being invited to the ritual and (c) mocks the ritual labor of the devotee. Because of the strong association of sweat with ritual labor in the RV (see my “Avestan *xšuuīd*: A Relic of Indo-Iranian Ritual Vocabulary,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 25 [2011 (2015),] and for  $\sqrt{sam}$  ‘labor’ with  $\sqrt{svid}$  ‘sweat’ I.86.8), I assume that the enemy himself is engaging in (what we hope will be fruitless) ritual in pāda d, perhaps in service of the demons, not the gods (cf. pāda a). In post-RVic texts the Asuras would probably serve as the polar opposition to the gods, not the Rakṣasas, an indirect piece of evidence for the well-known fact that the Asura-Deva opposition almost entirely postdates the RV.

In the publ. tr. *óhate* in pāda a is tr. as an indicative (‘whoever lauds’), but it should really be a subjunctive (‘whoever will laud’), both on the basis of the morphology (it belongs to a root pres., whose 3<sup>rd</sup> plural is also *óhate*) and of the parallel subjunctives in the passage, cd *yáh ... nindāt, ... karate*.

V.42.11: One of the striking passages in which the same divinity, in this case Rudra, is called both *devá-* and *ásura-* (*námobhir devám ásuram duvasya* “with acts of reverence offer friendship to the god, the lord”), strong evidence that the strict division and eternal enmity between Devas and Asuras in later texts has not yet developed.

V.42.12: The grammar of this vs. is quite straightforward; what difficulty it presents lies in the uncertain and permeable boundary between PNs and common noun/adjectives. In b *vibhvataṣṭāḥ*, modifying the rivers, is universally taken as containing the PN Vibhvan, hence ‘fashioned by Vibhvan’. Since the referents of pāda a are the Ṛbhū and Vibhvan is the name of an Ṛbhū, this makes some contextual sense. However, fashioning *a river* seems beyond even the Ṛbhū’s expertise, and, further, in VI.61.13 Sarasvatī, a river after all, is *vibhvāne kṛtā* “made for wide extension / wide ranging.” I think that sense is meant here as well, and there is simply some sly play on the Ṛbhū’s name.

I am less certain about what to do with *bṛhaddivā* in c. In the immediately preceding hymn (V.41.19) I take the same form as an attributive adjective with *urváṣī*: *Urvaṣī Bṛhaddivā* “Urvaṣī of lofty heaven.” Here it could likewise be attributive to

Sarasvatī or it could be a separate goddess. See Klein (DGRV I.328–29, 337) on this mild dilemma. If Bṛhaddivā is a distinct entity, she is featureless, so there is little at stake here.

V.42.13: The phrase *návyasīm jāyamānam* “the newer (hymn), being born,” with comparative of ‘new’ and the pres. participle seems designed to refer to the current hymn in the process of composition.

Tvaṣṭar is both the possessor and producer of “all forms” (cf. I.13.10 *tvāṣṭāram ... viśvārūpam*) and the father of a being called Viśvarūpa (likewise *viśvārūpa-* ‘possessing all forms’ (cf. II.11.19, X.8.9 *tvāṣṭrā- viśvārūpa-* with the patronymic *tvāṣṭrā-*). In one sense the second hemistich seems to be an attempt to reconcile these two aspects: Tvaṣṭar as a lone creator god, the fashioner of all forms, “(ex)changing his forms” (*rūpā minānāḥ*) as sole agent -- but doing so “bulging (?) in the body of his daughter” (*āhanā duhitūr vakṣānāsu*) (if that’s what it means), which introduces a sexual (indeed incestuous) element that would be appropriate to the fathering of a son. On the one hand, we seem to have a model of primitive embryology, with the fetus changing and developing within its mother’s womb; on the other hand, the half-vs. mirrors the later Sanskrit notion that the father enters the body of the mother and is reborn as the son. Unlike the incest of Dyaus and of Prajāpati, the story of Tvaṣṭar’s incest (if that’s what this is) is otherwise muted and not securely attested elsewhere as far as I know.

The meaning and etymology of the *s*-stem *āhanās-* are deeply uncertain. In context it seems to mean ‘swollen, bulging, luxuriant, lubricious’. As for the etym. see EWA s.v. and, for a recent etymological attempt, Kulikov in the Lubotsky Fs. (2018). The word has gained a certain notoriety in IEist discourse because it is argued that it preserves the old suffixal accent of *s*-stem bahuvrīhis (see, e.g., Stüber, *s*-stems [2002] 27, 189). However, it is dangerous to pin the reconstruction of a whole category on a word whose meaning, structure, and etymology are radically uncertain. For disc. of the word, as well as demolition of the accentual theory it is supposed to support, see Jesse Lundquist, “*αἰνοπαθής*.”

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

V.42.14–16: This trio of vss. echoes vs. 1 and ring-compositionally seems to bring the hymn to a close, with the single pāda of 17 and the final vs. 18 tacked on (and indeed the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich of 16: see below). The template is *prá* [HYMN, etc.] [GOD] *nūnám aśyāḥ*, realized in 1ab as “May the hymn (*gīḥ*) now reach Varuṇa (etc.).” In 14ab we again have all the elements, while 15ab omits the initial preverb *prá* in favor of *úd* immediately preceding the verb and omits *nūnám* entirely and 16ab reinstates *prá* but still lacks *nūnám*:

1ab *prá ... váruṇam* (etc.)... *gīr ... nūnám aśyāḥ*

14ab *prá suṣṭutīḥ ... ilás pátim ... nūnám aśyāḥ*

15ab *eṣá stóma mārutam sárdhaḥ* (etc.)... *úd aśyāḥ*

16ab *praśá stómaḥ pṛthivīm* (etc.) ... *aśyāḥ*

The impression given by this sequence of syntactic and lexical parallels -- that this is the finale of the hymn -- is supported by the fact that the rest of the hymn, 16cd–18, is repeated as 15cd–17 in the next hymn, V.43.

V.42.14: Despite the position of *prá*, opening a pāda (d) that ends with the part. *ukṣámāṇaḥ*, I take the *prá* not with that participle but with immediately preceding pāda-final *íyarti*. For one thing, *prá* is found elsewhere with *íyar-* while it is not with  $\sqrt{ukṣ}$ , and in addition tmesis of preverb + participle is fairly uncommon (though certainly not unheard of). Ge and Re seem to follow the other route, taking it as license to interpr. *íyarti* as intrans. or at least objectless (Ge ‘heraufzieht’, Re ‘s’avance’). But *íyar-* is otherwise always transitive, and though we would prefer the two world halves not to be in motion, the point here is that Parjanya’s thunderstorm is powerful enough to shake them. WG’s interpr. is like mine.

### V.43 All Gods

The listing impulse so evident in the last two hymns (V.41–42) is less pronounced here, though a variety of gods receive praise -- with Agni especially prominent, as indicated in the publ. intro.: 2 Heaven and Earth, 3 Vāyu, 5 Indra, 6 Aramati, Agni, 7 Gharma pot, 8 Aśvins, 9 Pūṣan and Vāyu, 10 Maruts, 11 Sarasvatī, 12 Bṛhaspati as Agni, 13 Agni?, 14 Agni?, 15 Agni, Earth.

V.43.1: I would now render *tūrṇy-ārtha-* as ‘having a goal to advance to’; see comm. ad III.11.5.

On *mahó rāyé* see comm. ad IV.31.11. Again the publ. tr. carelessly follows Ge’s tr., which takes the two forms together, as if they were an adjective-noun syntagm despite the difference in case. I would now take *maháḥ* adverbially with Old. See further ad VI.1.2.

The seven lofty and joy-bringing feminine beings (*brhatīḥ sapṭá ... mayobhúvaḥ*) in cd, the target of our invocation, are not further specified. I have supplied ‘cows’ on the basis of ab and IX.86.25, which contains *sapṭá dhenávaḥ*, but this is by no means certain. See other suggestions in Ge’s n. 1. The problem is that there is no reason for the cows to number exactly seven; either “seven” is, as Oberlies (Rel. RV II.74) suggests, simply an indication of totality, or some more standard group of seven, like the rivers, is being referred to (either via the image of cows or directly).

V.43.3: The subject of the impv. in c must also be Vāyu, because he regularly receives the first drink of soma.

V.43.4: In b the agent noun *śamítár-* most naturally belongs with the forms of  $\sqrt{śam}$  referring to ritual labor. See, e.g., in the preceding hymn V.42.10 *śámīṃ śaśamānáśya* “the (ritual) labor of the one laboring.” However, already in the Aśvamedha hymn of the RV it has acquired the euphemistic meaning ‘queller’, that is, slaughterer, of the sacrificial beast; cf. I.162.9–10, as well as the simile in V.85.1 *ví yó jaghāna śamitéva cárma* “who like a butcher a hide split apart ...” in this maṇḍala. I think it likely that both senses are meant here; in post-RVic ritual texts Soma is regularly presented as a sacrificial victim.

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich Ge and WG (cf. also Old) take c and d as separate clauses, utilizing the verb *duduhe* for both and supplying a priest (Ge: Adhvaryu) as subj. of c. The reason is nom. *sugābhastih* lit. ‘having good fists’, which must otherwise modify *aṃśú-* ‘plant’. With Re, in the publ. tr. I take cd as a single clause with *sugābhastih ... aṃśúh* a single NP, assuming that ‘having good fists’ of the soma plant means that the plant has received good handling from the fists of its preparer. (Re, by contrast, tr. “aux beaux rameaux,” with *gābhasti-* referring metaphorically to the growth habits of the plant.) I now think my interpr. pushes the *bahuvrīhi* further than it should go, so I would now emend the tr. to “(The priest,) having good fists, has milked out the sap of the honey that dwells on the mountain; the plant has milked out its own shimmering, pure (sap).” It is likely that the verb underlying pāda c should be active (perhaps *\*dudoha*); when middle forms like *duduhe* take an object, the subject is usually a cow or cow-substitute (as here) producing milk from itself.

V.43.7: On the position of this vs. in the hymn and its significance, see publ. intro. If the vs. is an omphalos, it may focus attention on the mysteries of the Pravargya ritual. The vs. is structured as a riddle, with the referent of *yám* (pāda a) withheld till d, with three similes and several technical references to ritual activities in between.

The first simile (pāda a) is oddly structured, in that one expects something to be compared to the unidentified acc. *yám* but there is no overt acc. expressed. Instead we must supply this acc., as the most likely object of the participle *pratháyantaḥ* ‘spreading’ (transitive), which, in default of the acc. obj. itself, carries the simile particle *ná*. The object to be supplied is *barhīḥ* ‘ritual grass’, which at every ritual is spread as a seat for the visiting gods. Generally the verb in the expression “spread (barhis)” is  $\sqrt{str}$  ‘strew’, not  $\sqrt{prath}$ , but, as Old points out,  $\sqrt{prath}$  can also be used, generally for the intransitive sense “(barhis) spreads” (V.5.4, X.70.4, etc.). The object of transitive  $\sqrt{prath}$  is generally something much more prominent, like ‘earth’. It may be that  $\sqrt{prath}$  was used here to give a cosmic resonance, but it may also be partly ascribed to the alliteration in the vs.: *prathayanto ... víprā, vapāvantam ... tāpantaḥ / pitúr ná putrá upási prāyīṣṭha(h)*. The *barhīḥ* is also sometimes anointed; cf. II.3.4 *barhīḥ ... ghṛténāktám*. Thus, the absent *barhīḥ* is at the intersection of the two ritual verbs ‘spread’ and ‘anoint’, and supplies the missing point of comparison in the simile “They anoint ‘which one’ (*yám*) like X.” The poet is inviting his audience to solve for two variables — the identity of the focus of the vs. expressed by the rel. prn. *yám* and the object to which it is compared, but he makes the second riddle easier by providing two verbs that could govern it. The overlap of the two produces the answer.

The next simile, in b, targets a different ritual substance to compare with the still unidentified *yám*. This time an accusative does appear on the surface, but it in the form of an associated adjective, *vapāvantam* ‘possessing the/an omentum.’ In classical śrauta ritual the omentum (*vapā*) is the first and probably the most important part of the sacrificial animal to be dealt with; after the death of the animal, the omentum is removed and heated on two different fires, first preliminarily singed on the Śamitar’s fire (NB: see vs. 4 and comm. thereon), then cooked on the Āhavanīya fire (see my Hyenas, pp. 104–5). Here we can assume that what is identified as ‘possessing an omentum’ is the sacrificial animal (an identification supported by the occurrence of *vapāvantam* in ŚB XIII.7.1.9), which itself is cooked on the fire. Sacrificial animals are also anointed; see

IV.6.3 *paśvó anakti* in a hymn that treats the animal sacrifice in some detail. Once again, the incompletely identified target of the simile is at the intersection of two ritual actions: ‘heat’ and ‘anoint’. In this case the similarly unidentified *yám*, the gharma pot, is also subject to both these actions in the Pravargya ritual.

The third simile, in pāda c, is the only one with all its parts, and is also the only one without a ritual reference. It is a version of a standard trope.

The *gharmāḥ* (pot / drink) set on the fire is said to be *ṛtáyan*. Flg. Lü (361, 481), I tr. “truth-(sing)ing” (contra, e.g., Ge “regelrecht,” WG “nach aller Kunst” [?]) on the grounds that a boiling pot makes noise. But see comm. on the other occurrence of this stem, V.12.3.

V.43.8: The last pāda is difficult, primarily because of *dhúram*. This would ordinarily be the acc. of the root noun *dhúr-* ‘chariot pole’, and indeed that is how I take it. Ge interprets it rather as an acc. infinitive (‘festzuhalten’) to  $\sqrt{dhr}$ . But that anīṭ root has no set forms in *dhur-* (unless *dhúr-* ‘chariot pole’ itself; so Whitney Roots, but see now standard alternative etymology in Schindler, Rt nouns, and EWA, both s.v.). WG’s semantic interpr. (‘zur Sicherung’) is similar to Ge’s, though derivationally distinct: they see it as a secondary abstract(ion) from the ‘chariot pole’ word. Either of these analyses eases the interpr. of the pāda. But given the chariot-part vocab. in the rest of the pāda (*āṇí-* ‘axle-pin, peg’, *nābhi-* ‘wheel-nave’), it seems highly unlikely that a standard word for a part of the chariot would in just this context *not* be so used -- and cf. *sudhúr-* ‘amenable to the chariot pole’ a few vss. back (5c). I think *dhúram* has to be an unmarked simile, an acc. goal parallel to *nidhím*. The Ásvins are asked to go to the *nidhí-* as draft animals come tamely to the *dhúr-*, then to enter it as the pin enters the nave.

I supply ‘honey’ with *nidhím* on the basis of the phrase *nidhí- mádhūnām* used twice in Ásvin hymns with sim. vocab.: I.183.4 *ayám vām bhagó nīhita iyám gīr, dásrāv imé vām nidháyō mádhūnām* “Here is the portion deposited for you, here the hymn, o wondrous ones, and here the deposits of honey for you” / III.58.5 *éhá yātam pathíbhīr devayānair, dásrāv imé vām nidháyō mádhūnām* “Travel here along the paths leading to the gods. Wondrous ones, these stores of honey belong to you two.” Since ‘honey’ is thematic in the previous parts of this hymn (1b, 2c, 3a, d, 4c, 6c), supplying it here (esp. in Ásvin context) is easy.

V.43.9: The function of *utá* in the pāda-final phrase *utá tmán* is unclear. Klein (I.347, 349) treats it as an example of an X Y *utá* construction (suggesting several diff. possibilities), but does not consider the positional tendency of *tmán(ā)* or the dossier of rhetorically similar phrases. Both *tmán* and *tmánā* have a distinct preference for pāda-final position, with a word consisting of two light syllables preceding as here -- frequently *iva*, also *úpa*, etc. As a parallel to our passage, cf. esp. IX.88.3 ... *draviṇodā iva tmán*. I’m inclined to think that *utá* is in fact empty here (though perhaps orig. adapted from places where it made sense) and Klein’s piecemeal attempts to make sense of the various passages misplaced. Here the *utá* was perhaps slotted in because *iva* was inappropriate. One can also keep in mind that *-a tmán-* recalls (and replicates metrically) *ātmán-*. Re’s characterization of *utá tmán* as “type de clause inert” seems close to my “empty.”

V.43.10: The instr. pl.s *nāmabhiḥ* and *rūpébhiḥ* identically positioned in pādas a and b seem both to refer to individuated Maruts and also to make reference to the concept later to be called *nāmarūpa* ‘name and form’ referring to the pairing of words and things differentiating the separate entities of creation. This unusual distinguishing of individual Maruts is then countered by the insistent repetition of *viśve* ‘all’ referring to them as an undifferentiated class in pāda d. In that pāda I take the first *viśve* as voc. pl. with *marutaḥ* (accented because pāda-initial) and the 2<sup>nd</sup> as a nom. with the verb, but this grammatical separation may not be nec. if the two *viśve*-s are there to match ‘names’ and ‘forms’ respectively. Viśve Marutaḥ also semi-equates them with the Viśve Devāḥ.

Contra Gr but with Ge, I take *huvānāḥ* as pass.

V.43.12: *sādād-yoni-* belongs to the cmpd type with a verbal-governing 1st member (*sanād-rayi-*, etc.), and given the referent, who was just the object of the caus. phrase *sādane sādāyadhvam* “make him sit on his seat.” it must mean “sitting on the yoni.” The problem of course is the long vowel in *sādāt-*. This has been taken as a reflex of an old lengthened-grade present or similarly lengthened-grade aorist (for reff. see AiG I.2 Nachtr. 88, EWA s.v. *SAD* p. 693). For a contextually driven hapax like this, reaching into deep antiquity seems unrec. and likely wrong. Old suggests we should perhaps read \**sadāt*, with the long vowel introduced (redactionally) from the immed. preceding *sādāyadhvam*. I would suggest alternatively that it might indirectly reflect the pres. *śdati*, matching the heavy root syllable of that present, even though marked present stems (outside of *-āya*-formations) seem blocked in this cmpd type.

V.43.13: In d *tridhātu-śṛṅga-* ‘having tripartite horns’ may refer to the three hearths, though see the tripartite cows (*tridhātavaḥ ... gāvāḥ*), probably of Agni, in nearby V.47.4.

V.43.14: On *rāspirā-* see comm. ad I.122.4.

V.43.15: Both Re and WG take pāda a as a separate nominal clause. This is certainly possible, and an alternative tr. of the hemistich could be “to you, the lofty one, there (belongs) lofty vigor, Agni. The ... (priestly) pairs attend upon (you).”

#### V.44 All Gods

The poem is attributed to Avatsāra Kāśyapa and others. Avatsāra Kāśyapa is also assigned the hymns IX.53–60. Here the name seems to have been extracted from vs. 10, where in my opinion it has the meaning ‘stealthy’.

On the manifold difficulties of this hymn and a possible framework in which to interpret them (as a hymn simultaneously applicable to Agni and Soma), see publ. intro.

V.44.1: Save for the fronted pronoun *tām*, this hymn opens with a remarkable series of universalizing adverbs, identically formed with *-(ā-)thā* suffix and linking the current ritual situation (the final one in the series, *imāthā* ‘in this way here’, a hapax) to that of every time and place: *pratnāthā pūrvāthā viśvāthā*. This may give us a foretaste of the poet’s laying bare the underlying identity of the two central ritual substances, fire and soma, and of the service accorded them in the sacrifice.

The poet then, in my opinion, produces a red herring: most of the descriptors found in this vs. could apply to Indra -- esp. *āsúm jáyantam*; cf. *āsúm jētāram* of Indra in VIII.99.7. And most interpreters fall into this trap: as Ge says in his n. 1, "all commentators" identify *tám* as Indra -- incl. Ge himself, Re, and Old (WG forego referents). However, both Agni and Soma receive these or similar descriptors elsewhere. Agni and Soma are both located on the ritual grass (Agni: III.14.2, etc.; Soma: I.16.6, etc.); both are called *svarvíd-* (more often than Indra; Agni: III.3.5, 10, etc.; Soma: VIII.48.15, etc.), *jyēṣṭha-* (Agni: I.127.2, etc.; Soma: IX.66.16, etc.), and *āsú-* (Agni: IV.7.4, etc.; Soma: IX.56.1, etc.). Soma is qualified as *jáyant-* (I.91.21, etc.), and though Agni is not modified by this participle, he is the subject of verbal forms of *√ji* (e.g., VI.4.4). All of these are, of course, fairly generic characterizations; the point here is that nothing requires us to leap to the conclusion that Indra is the referent.

Another way to approach the question of the referent of *tám* is to consider what referent is appropriate as an obj. to *dohase* 'you will milk' -- which first may require us to identify the subj. of this 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. verb (by most lights: Re takes it as a sigmatic 1<sup>st</sup> sg., which seems unrec. and doesn't fit the semantic profile of *-se* 1<sup>st</sup> singulars). With Sāy. and Ge., I take it as the self-address of the poet, who will perform his milking task 'with song' (*girā*). The middle of *√duh* generally takes milk (either real or metaphorical) as its object, and both Agni and Soma can be conceived of as milk products -- the churning of the fire sticks and the pressing of the soma plant both involve physical actions not unlike milking and what is produced is a fluid or something (fire) that behaves rather like one. Indra is not entirely excluded, however; he could be configured as a cow, "milked" with a praise hymn for him to produce goods. However, as I just said, the milk itself, rather than the cow, is the typical obj. of medial *√duh*, and so the substances fire and/or soma are more likely referents.

Let us now turn to pāda d. This also contains a 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. med. present, *várdhase*, in a relative clause whose rel. prn., fem. loc. pl. *yāsu*, has no possible referent in the rest of the vs. Before turning to that problem, I will first say that I do not consider the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. subj. of *várdhase* to be the same as that of *dohase*. Instead I think we have switched to the unidentified god/ritual substance referred to by the acc. sg. in the rest of the vs. Although this introduces an interpretational complication, I would point out that in the next vs. (2cd), the god/substance definitely appears in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person, and note also 8b, which contain a similarly structured rel. cl. ... *yāsu nāma te#*, where the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. refers to the god/substance. And, most important, the rel. cl. of 1d shows a closer affinity to Agni and Soma than the generic epithets in the rest of the vs. But first we must identify a possible referent or referents for the fem. *yāsu*. The standard ploy, which I think is basically correct, is to supply a fem. pl. obj. to *jáyantam* 'winning' -- generally 'cows' (Ge, Re, WG). Old suggests rather 'waters', which Ge argues against (n. 1d). Certainly both 'cows' and 'waters' (both fem. pl.) occur as objects to *√ji* -- and I see no reason to choose between the two; in fact the reason for not specifying either one is to allow both to be understood, under the neutralizing rel. prn. *yāsu*. Both Agni and Soma have connections to both cows and waters: Agni is nourished by the streams of ghee (a milk product) poured into the fire, and in a well-known myth he ran away and entered the waters. Soma is mixed with cows' milk, as is endlessly emphasized in the IXth Maṇḍala, and before soma is pressed, it is soaked in water to swell the stalks. A third possible fem. pl. referent connected with Agni is plants, in which he is invisible and inherent until

kindled. Let us consider some passages whose phraseology resembles our own. In II.13.1 ... *apáh ... āviśad yāsu vārdhate* Soma, unnamed, “entered the waters among which he grows strong.” (Note the nearly identical rel. cl.) For Agni cf. I.95.5 ... *vārdhate ... āsu* “he grows strong among/in them” (here prob. = plants); I.141.5 *ād ín māṭṝr̄ āviśad yāsu ... ví vāvrdhe* “Just after that he entered into his mothers, within whom .... he grew widely” (again prob. plants; note that *vāvrdhe*, as transmitted without accent, is not part of the rel. cl. if the transmitted form is correct). The connection of a fem. loc. pl. and a form of  $\sqrt{vrdh}$  in these passages is striking, and it is Agni and Soma who participate in this phraseology.

Thus, in my opinion, by the end of the vs. the poet has narrowed down the possible referents and set up the rhetorical situation that will dominate the rest of the hymn: an unidentified masc. sg. referent, who can be simultaneously Agni and Soma, and a set of fem. pl. attendants, likewise unidentified, who are connected to the masculine figure.

V.44.2: The first hemistich of this vs. contains those same personnel, again without overt identification, and with the further complication that there is no finite verb until pāda c. Pāda a contains fem. plurals, at least partly in a relative clause (here nom. pl. *yāḥ*, versus loc. *yāsu* in 1d); pāda b has an unidentified masc. sg. as subject. This is the same configuration as 1d. Again I think the duo Agni / Soma is lurking under the masc. sg., and the fem. pl. refers to phenomena associated with each. In addition I take the gen. *kakúbhām* (a fem. cons. stem) in b as the referent of the fem. rel. prn. *yāḥ* in a, rather than attempting to construe it one way or another with *acodāte*, as most interpr. do.

Most take Agni as the referent of the masc. sg.; I think this is correct, but doesn’t go far enough. Certainly Agni is an appropriate referent for *virócamānaḥ* ‘shining forth’, as he is elsewhere (e.g., I.95.2), and the lovely fem. pl. entities of pāda a can easily be his flames (or, in my scenario, the tips [*kakúbh-*] of his flames). Their collectivity can be identified as “the sun of the lower realm” (*úparasya ... svàḥ*). (I see no reason, with Ge [and, at least in tr., with Re] to take *svār* here as gen., referring to Agni.) But the same phraseology can also be applied to Soma. Although nowhere near as commonly as Agni, Soma can also serve as subj. of  $\sqrt{ruc}$  (e.g., IX.11.1 *dhārā sutāsya rocate*), and the streams of soma are often compared to the rays of the sun (usually with masc. *raśmí-*, but cf. fem. *tvíṣṭh ... sūryasya* “the glitterings of the sun” IX.71.9). Moreover, pāda c, whose subj. is most likely the same as that in b, is almost identical to IX.73.8a *ṛtāsya gopā ná dābhāya sukrātuḥ* of Soma, which strongly invites a Soma identification here.

Another problem is *acodāte* in b. This form looks like a dat. sg. to a negated participle, but the accent is wrong (expect *\*ácodate*), a discrepancy that leads Lowe (Participles in RV, 274 n. 81) to reject this interpr., in favor of a *t*-stem *acodát-*. I’m not at all sure that in this hymn one can make arguments of the type “can’t be X because of some grammatical feature that usually holds,” and in any case Lowe does not seem to suggest a different case/no. interpr. or different semantics. For further disc. of the accent see AiG II.1.216 and Old ad loc. Because I construe *kakúbhām* elsewhere, I supply *rādhaḥ* ‘largesse’ as the obj. of this apparent part., since *rādhas-* is frequently the obj. of  $\sqrt{cud}$ . The idea would be that the ritual fire and ritual soma shine for the generous and stingy alike. However, the supplied obj. may not be nec., and the sense would be something like “for the unrousing / unstirring one.”

In d I borrow *hitáh* from 3d (see also *dhāyi* in 8c), producing “was (set/placed) in truth,” but the pāda can certainly be interpr. simply with the pf. *āsa* “was in truth.” I take “your name” (*nāma te*) to refer to both Agni and Soma.

V.44.3: Some of the challenges of this vs can be approached by noting the series of phonetic plays it contains: *sacate śac ca dhātu ca / dhātu ca, ariṣṭagātuḥ / śa hótā saho bhāriḥ / saho bhāriḥ ... barhír.*

Let us begin with the first. The curious double *ca* phrase *śac ca dhātu ca* is difficult to render on its own. On the surface it appears to form part of a conjoined NP with the subj. *havīḥ* ‘oblation’, but its ill-assorted nature comes out in tr. like Ge’s “die Opferspende und das Seiende und das Element (?)” Moreover, though *dhātu-* does not otherwise occur uncompounded in the RV, after the RV it is masc., while this form must be neut, which would be anomalous if it is a noun here. Ge suggests (n. 3a) emending to the bahuvrīhi *saptádhātu* ‘having 7 parts’ (RV 3x), though this is not reflected in his tr. As a bv the neut. gender would be proper, as a modifier of *havís-*. Re suggests rather that *śac ca dhātu* “resolves” an old cmpd. *\*sad-dhātu*, tr. “et (sa) foundation est réelle.” I am in accord with his rendering but analyze the underlying form differently: I take *śac ca* as a play on MIA *sacca-*, the Middle Indic product of *satyá-*. (That Middle Indic phonological developments are already to be found even in the RV family books needs no further demonstration.) The whole sequence gestures towards a bahuvrīhi *\*sacca-dhātu-*, whose neut. gender would be appropriate. Note that very similar *satyá-dharman-* (RV 5x) is found at V.51.2 [in this VD seq] and V.63.1, the only attestations in the family books. The putative first member *sacca* here is then provided with an alternative Sanskritic analysis, *śac* [i.e., *sāt*] *ca* -- I’m not suggesting an emendation here, but a word play. The second *ca* connects the underlying bahuvrīhi to the noun it modifies, *havīḥ*, hence an underlying sequence *havīḥ ... \*saccá-dhātu ca*. I further suggest that this word play is actualized in a different word in the first word of the pāda, *átyam*, which rhymes with *satyá-* (save for accent).

As just noted, pāda b participates in a number of phonetic plays: *-gātuḥ* echoes *dhātu* in pāda; *śa hó(tā)* anticipates immediately following *saho(bhāriḥ)*, and *-bhāriḥ* is a scrambling of *barhír* in the next pāda. This last is particularly worth noting because *-bhāri-* is a Vedic hapax (Whitney, Rts., lists it as RV.C., and its only RV occurrence is here) of somewhat unusual formation (see AiG II.2.295). It is clearly a contextually inspired nonce here and should be given no weight in considering *i*-stem morphology.

The last lexical problem in the vs. is *visrúhā* in d, otherwise found only in VI.7.6. Gr glosses ‘Strom’ and connects it with  $\sqrt{sru}$  ‘flow’, which is phonologically impossible (where would the *-h* come from?). Ge tr. ‘Arm’, which is just a contextually inspired rendering, as far as I can see. Re tr. ‘flamme’ (fld. by Kellens, Noms rac. 82–83), though ad VI.7.6 (EVP XIII.127–28) he floats (only to reject) the possibility that it is a variant of *vīrúdh-* (‘sprout, shoot, growth’) on the basis of the similarity between VI.7.6 and II.35.8, which contains a form of *vīrúdh-*. This suggestion fits with Sāy.’s gloss *oṣadhi-* ‘plant’ (for this passage; in VI.7.6 Sāy. glosses the pl. *visruhaḥ* as *nadyaś ca gaṅgādyāḥ* “rivers, Gaṅgā, etc.’). The word has received the most attention from Scar, first in his Root noun book (464–65) and then in the n. to V.44.3 in WG (in which Scar is responsible for Maṇḍala V). In the former Scar pronounces *visrúh-* “ganz unklar,” echoed by the somewhat less pessimistic “unklar” in WG, where he tr. “Reisig und Zweigen” and

suggests it's derived from \**vi-sr-u-* 'sich weit erstreckend', contaminated with *-rúdh-*, *-rúh-*, with the result reminiscent of *vīrúdh-*. I also believe that the word is in the semantic realm of plant growth and that it should be connected with  $\sqrt{ru(d)h}$  'grow'; this is esp. clear in VI.7.6, which contains a verbal form of that root: *vayā iva ruruhuh saptā visrúhaḥ*. However, I do not think that  $\sqrt{sru}$  or  $\sqrt{sr}$  needs to be brought in, at least directly. Instead I attribute the extraneous *-s-* to a sort of analogical backformation involving the preverbs *ví*, *ní*, and *nís*, starting from the form *vīrúdh-* cited above. Although the lengthening of the preverb *ví* in that form results from the initial laryngeal of the etymon of  $\sqrt{rudh}$  (see EWA s.v. *RODH*), it appears synchronically to result from the sandhi form of a byform \**vis* before *r-*, just as there is a *nís* beside *ní* (with different meanings in that case of course). In particular note the form *nīrohá-* in a TS mantra repeated 3x (III.5.2.5, IV.4.1.3, V.3.6.3 *saṁrohò 'si nīrohò 'sī*), which could be derived either from *ni+√ruh* (cf. Keith's tr. 'descender') with the same lengthening as in *vīrúdh-* or from *nīs+ruh* (so Viśva Bandhu). I therefore explain our *visrúh-* as a learned (and/or playful) but false "restoration" of the putative \**vis-* underlying *vīrú(d)h-*. It is here that  $\sqrt{sru}$  may have played a part, by facilitating a false segmentation of *vis-rúh-* into *vi-srúh-* (on the basis of the phonological similarity of the roots) and thus blocking the application of morpheme-boundary sandhi between \**-s* and *r-*. I tr. 'outgrowth'. On a separate but related note, I do not think we need to emend the form to gen. pl. \**visrúhām*, an idea that goes back to Sāy., tempted Old inter alia, and is accepted by Scar in WG.

Having dealt with the details of this vs. piecemeal, we should now consider whether it too can be applied to both Agni and Soma, and the answer is yes. *átya-* is regularly used of both in passages too numerous to cite. Though Hotar is an esp. characteristic role of Agni's, Soma is also compared to a Hotar sometimes (IX.92.2, 6, etc.). Both are called both *vṛṣan-* and *śísu-*. We have already noted their positioning on the barhis ad 1b. Both are called *yúvan-*. The 'outgrowth' can be the flames of Agni and the traces of the spreading of the soma juice on the filter, often depicted on IX. However, it does seem that Soma is never qualified as *ájara-* 'unaging' -- a minor lack. The vs. situates both substances on the ritual ground at the moment of the offering.

V.44.4: My interpr. of both the syntax and the referents of this vs. generally differs from those of others. I will not undertake a detailed disc. of these differences. However, I will note that Ge (n. 4) suggests that both Agni and Soma may be the topic of the vs., in agreement with my general thesis.

In my opinion, a new element enters the ritual scene here, namely ritual speech, referred to by the unidentified *eté* of pāda a. Given the masc. pl. pronoun, the exact referent must be masc. -- perhaps *stómāḥ* 'praises' (cf. nearby V.42.15 *eṣá stómaḥ ...*, 16 *praiśá stómaḥ* in the same All God cycle, reminiscent of our *prá va eté ...*). These praises are conceived of as horses, which are easy to yoke (a: *suyújaḥ*) and directed by easily controlled reins (c: *suyántubhiḥ ... abhīsubhiḥ*). As Ge points out (n. 4c with reff.), the reins of priests are their speeches, an association that makes the identification of 'praises' as the subject of pāda a all the more likely. The 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. enclitic *vaḥ* refers in my view to the priests who are launching/driving the praise-horses. The *prá ... yāman* "forth on the course/journey" invites a verb of motion to be supplied, perhaps a form of  $\sqrt{sr}$ , suggested by *prasársrāṇaḥ* beginning the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich of the previous vs. (3c).

The other question confronting us in pāda a is the identity of the dative inf. *iṣṭāye*, which is of course multiply ambiguous: it could belong to *√iṣ* ‘seek, desire’, *√iṣ* ‘send’, or *√yaj* ‘sacrifice’ (on this issue, see Old, ZDMG 62: 473-78 = KISch 282-87). With Old, I take it to the first, but I also think it takes an acc. goal/obj., and that that acc. is the fem. acc. phrase in b, *nīcīḥ ... yamyà rīāvīdhaḥ*. Old also takes this phrase as acc., though he supplies a different verb to govern it; the other interpr. take the phrase as nom. and the subject of an independent nominal clause. With Ge (n. 4b) I take the downward-facing twinned sisters to be both the streams of ghee offered into the ritual fire and the streams of water with which soma is rinsed (the milk streams with which soma is mixed could also be in play). The praises’ seeking of these streams expresses the union of verbal and physical activity in the sacrifice, with the hymns accompanying the pouring of the liquid into/onto the ritual substance. The dat. prn. *amúṣmai* I take as the goal of this pouring: the fire and the soma respectively. The use of the comparatively rare distal deictic *asaú* is noteworthy, since this stem generally refers to the upward or heavenly world or items located there, esp. the sun (for the sun, cf., e.g., I.105.3, 191.9, VIII.12.30). Yet here the streams are going ‘downward’ towards it. This paradox can be resolved by recalling the phrase in 2a *úparasya ... svàḥ* “the sun of the lower realm,” which made reference to well-known conceptions of Agni and of Soma. Agni is frequently considered the earthly counterpart of the heavenly sun, since both blaze brightly and they also make their appearance at the same time (dawn) of the ritual day. Soma, likewise, is often compared to or identified with the sun because of its bright gleam, and there are both a heavenly Soma and his earthly counterpart depicted in the IXth Maṇḍala. Here, in my opinion, *amúṣmai* makes implicit reference to the heavenly Sun [=Fire] and heavenly Soma, while depicting the ritual activity centered on their earthly embodiments, thus erasing the distance between heaven and earth and the distinction between the entities found therein.

Pāda d, which I take as a separate clause, brings its own set of problems, not least with the always enigmatic word *krívi-* (on which see also comm. ad I.30.1). First, however, note the phonological echo of b *amúṣmai* / d *muṣāyati*, though this does not help with the interpr. As for *krívi-*, I take it here as a conflation of two putative stems. On the one hand, at least once (I.30.1) *krívi-* seems to refer to a race horse (there compared with Indra). Since the intertwined Agni/Soma figure in this hymn was just referred to as a steed (*átya-*) in 3a, *krívi-* here seems to be picking up that joint referent. Ge [n. 4d] makes the same identification of *átya-* with *krívi-*, and he also suggests that the pāda expresses the entry of the butter offerings into the fire and/or the streams of water in the soma. I think he is correct as far as he goes, but I think there is a third referent, the poet who is responsible for the praises I suggest are the subject of pāda a. In this case *krívi-* can be seen as a hyper-Sanskritization of *kaví-* (as if from *\*krvi-*) with the *ri* that interchanges with *r* in words like *kṛmi-/krími-* ‘worm’ (cf. AiG I.33 and Nachtr. 19 [31, 4]), aided of course by the *krívi-* already referring to Agni/Soma. See also disc. ad 9c below.

What does it mean that this *krívi-* “steals (their) names”? Here Old’s suggestion is surely correct for the Agni/Soma *krívi-* (for Old, only Soma): that the streams (of ghee/water) lose their identities when they merge into Agni/Soma, and the result is simply called fire/soma. As for the poet, whom I consider the third referent of *krívi-*, he may “steal their names” by using them in his poetry, or perhaps by referring to them but not naming them, as he does in this vs. (and throughout the hymn).

V.44.5: As usual in this hymn, this vs. swarms with difficulties (Re calls it “une suite de *cruces*”), but it continues to depict a relation between a singular masc. entity and a group of feminines. I see this as the thread that leads us through the labyrinth of this hymn. Note also that, as in vs. 3, there are phonetic figures: ab: *saṃjārbhurāṇas tārubhiḥ ... susvāruḥ / suteḡfbham ... cittāgarbhāsu* (with mirror-image *su*).

The instr. *tārubhiḥ* in pāda a is a hapax, obviously built to a stem *tāru-*. Both Ge and Re both take it as ‘tree’, which is tempting given the following *vayākín-* ‘twiggy’. But II.39.3 *jārbhurāṇā tārobhiḥ*, with the instr. pl. to the better-attested *s-*stem built to  $\sqrt{tṛ}$  ‘endure, etc.’, suggests that *tāru-* is more likely connected to that root (see on this point EWA I.630). However, I confess that my tr. “quivering with your powers of endurance” conveys little sense. I think the instr. here may do little more than reinforce the intensive (that is, frequentative) value of the participle: the subject keeps quivering with continued force (“staying power”).

As usual, I think the subj. of the participle *saṃjārbhurāṇaḥ* is simultaneously Agni and Soma. Agni is elsewhere subject of this intensive (e.g., II.10.5), clearly with reference to his flickering flames. The semantic connection with Soma is not as strong, and Soma is nowhere the subject of this verb, but the scintillating, undulating waves of soma are a common trope in Maṇḍala IX.

Both these substances are aiming towards the *vayākín-*. The most sensible interpr. of that word is as an *-ín-*possessive built to an unattested diminutive *\*vayāká-* ‘little branch, twig’ to *vayā-* ‘branch’, hence ‘twiggy’ (see Scar’s n. in WG, referring to his treatment in Rt Noun Cmpds). For Agni this twiggy substance can be brushwood or kindling; the association with Soma is again less straightforward, but it can either refer to the twigs of the soma plant itself or, more likely in my opinion, refer metaphorically to the tufts of wool on the sheep’s fleece filter that catch the impurities in the pressed soma juice. This suggestion is supported by the cmpd modifying it, *sute-gfbh-* ‘grasping at the pressing’. If the *vayākín-* is the fleece filter, it most definitely ‘grasps’ the solids that accidentally end up in the pressed juice. For Agni, ‘grasping at the pressing’ is less clear, but the firewood may seem to hold onto the fire burning in it, and the ritual fire burns during the soma pressing.

The rest of the first hemistich consists of *cittāgarbhāsu susvāruḥ*. The standard interpr. all analyze the latter word as containing *svāru-* ‘(sacrificial) post’ (though note that Gr does not provide a gloss for it). Although this analysis works formally, it does not fit easily into the vs. semantically. I am inclined instead to take it as containing a form of  $\sqrt{svar}$  ‘sound’; cf. *svará-* (2x, unfortunately with different accent), *svarí-*, etc. Ge (n. 5b) in fact suggests an alternate tr. ‘schön tönend’ (vaguely following Sāy.). *-svāru-* would show the same conversion to a *u-*stem as the hapax *tāru-* in pāda a and perhaps follows that word in accent as well. The noise-making capacities of both Agni and Soma are well known.

On *cittāgarbha-* ‘visibly pregnant’ see Ge’s n. 5b and the TB passage cited there. These females would be, in the Agni realm, the pieces of firewood, which are frequently depicted as having an embryonic Agni inside; for Soma most likely the waters in which the soma plant is soaked, swelling him as their embryo, or perhaps the cows whose milk is mixed with him.

I follow Old (ZDMG 62 [=KISch 284 n.1]) in taking *dhāravākéṣu* as referring to a particular ritual moment, the litanies or recitations when the streams of the oblation are offered, but the equational metaphorical interpr. “recitations (like) streams” found in most tr. is also possible.

The voc. *ṛju-gātha* ‘whose song is straight’ is somewhat puzzling. I think it is best illuminated by II.26.1 *ṛjúr íc chāmsaḥ*, a phrase I take as a decomposed bahuvrīhi (see comm. ad loc.) meaning ‘whose laud is straight on target’. I would now slightly alter the tr. here to ‘whose song is straight on target’ to make the voc. a little less opaque.

The last pāda is surprisingly straightforward, at least for this hymn. The subject of *vārdhasva* is once again Agni/Soma, who derive their strength from their wives (*pātnī*), the plants/firewood and waters/cows’ milk respectively.

V.44.6: As I pointed out in the publ. intro., the first pāda is both a cruel joke -- insisting on the utter transparency of the subject of the hymn -- and a claim on the poet’s part that his verbal formulations about the subject are in complete conformity with the underlying reality, however obscure they may at first seem.

My interpr. of the rest of this vs. differs significantly in both syntax and semantics from the standard ones, which I will not treat in detail. I take pāda b as having an unexpressed masc. sg. obj., with *cd* further characterizing that obj. The object is simultaneously Agni and Soma, and it is in this pāda that the identification of the two is most clearly expressed in the hymn (until the last 2 vss.). The unidentified subj. ‘they’ -- most likely the poets and/or priests -- put together / unite the one (of Agni and Soma) with the other, his counterpart or ‘shadow’ (*chāyā-*). As the two central deified ritual elements, they are mirror images of each other. The union takes place in the waters (*apsú*) for several reasons. Both Soma and Agni have significant presence in the waters -- Soma of course through the ritual use of waters both to swell the dessicated soma plant and to rinse it, Agni in two mythological guises, both as Apāṃ Napāt and as the runaway ritual fire that hid in the waters. Moreover, it is also the case that water reflects and was indeed probably the only reflective material readily at hand in this period, so the uniting of one substance and its conceptual equivalent as visual reflections of each other would most naturally take place in water.

The clearest part of pāda c is the cmpd. *uru-ṣām* ‘winning wideness’, which I take as a modifier of the unexpressed masc. sg. obj. of b (that is, Agni/Soma). (Since the 2<sup>nd</sup> member is the rt. noun *sā-*, the cmpd can be masc.) I take the other accusatives in *cd*, *mahīm*, *urú jrāyaḥ*, and *sāhaḥ* with its modifiers, as objects of an underlying form of  $\sqrt{\text{san}}/sā$ , extracted from *uru-ṣā-*. For a similar play between a root noun cmpd with 1<sup>st</sup> member obj. and an independent acc. obj., see VIII.1.2 and comm. thereon. Although this syntactic interpr. may seem over-tricky (to others, not to me), it saves us from positing an extraneous creation myth as Ge and Re do. In my interpr. the various objects won are well within the powers of Agni and Soma to deliver to us. Note that Agni is once called *urujrāyas-* (V.8.6, in this maṇḍala) and both Agni (III.5.8, V.24.3 [this maṇḍ.], X.176.4, etc.) and Soma (I.91.15) can be subj. of the verb *urusyá-* ‘make wideness’.

V.44.7: Again my interpr. differs markedly from those of others. Again I think the unexpressed subj. of the whole vs. is Agni/Soma, not the sun (*sūryaḥ*) with most others. The nom. *sūryaḥ* is instead used to characterize both, since both Agni and Soma can be

identified with the sun; that is, each is (equivalent to) the sun in his own way. Cf. “the sun of the lower realm” in 2a with reference to phenomena related to both Agni and Soma.

In pāda a I take the two adj. *ágruḥ* ‘unmarried’ and *jānivān* ‘possessing wife/wives’ as expressing two stages in the development of Agni/Soma, rather than as paradoxically simultaneous with Ge and Re (WG interpr. resembles mine). The position of *vaí* supports an interpr. with two clauses. In the first stage Agni/Soma pursues females/wives; cf. VII.96.4 *janīyānto nv ágravaḥ* “bachelors in search of wives.” Again we have unidentified (and here unexpressed) plural females -- in Agni’s case I surmise they are the plants that supply firewood and/or the streams of ghee poured in the fire; in Soma’s the cows, with whose milk he is mixed, or even the waters that swell him. Once Agni and Soma have “married” these females and are *jānivān* ‘possessed of wives’, each can use the extra power acquired from these females to best his rivals. In this second clause I supply a second verb, perhaps a form of  $\sqrt{tṛ}$ , because  $\sqrt{vī}$  does not otherwise occur with *āti*, whereas *tuturyāma+āti* is found in the next hymn (V.45.11).

In cd I take the verb *vanavat* in two senses, negative and positive, both well represented for this stem. With the obj. *ghraṃsám* ‘heat’, the verb has the sense ‘win’ = ‘vanquish’, as in nearby V.29.9 *ávanor ha śúṣṇam* “you combated / vanquished Śuṣṇa”; with the obj. *śárma* ‘shelter’, ‘win’ = ‘gain’. I take *rákṣantam* as a qualifier of *śárma* (more or less; see below), with the participle itself taking the obj. *gáyam* (“shelter ... protecting our patrimony”). In taking *gáyam* as obj. of *rákṣantam* I am flg. Old, who cites as parallel I.74.2 *árakṣad dāśúṣe gáyam*, which seems pretty conclusive to me. There are also two passages (VI.71.3/X.66.3) in which *gáyam* is the object of the semantically parallel verb *pári*  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘protect all round’ (e.g., X.66.3 ... *pári pāhi no gáyam*); note *pári* immed. flg. *rákṣantam* here. By contrast, Ge, Re, WG all take *gáyam* as an immed. object of *vanavat*, modified by *rákṣantam*, which itself governs *ghraṃsám* (cf., e.g., Re “Qu’il nous assure une demeure protégeant de toutes parts de (son) ardeur ...”). This interpr. not only ignores the  $\sqrt{rakṣ}$  + *gáyam* parallel, but also requires a significant attenuation of the meaning of  $\sqrt{van}$  (see Re’s n. on the pāda), and I also don’t know of parallel uses of  $\sqrt{rakṣ}$  meaning ‘guard against / from’. Against this we must balance one clear defect in my interpr., that *śárman-* is neut. and the part. *rákṣantam* is masc. To account for the gender discrepancy I would suggest that the immediate referent of *rákṣantam* is not *śárma*, but a different, underlying, *masc.* noun to which *śárma* is an appositive -- perhaps *kṣáyam* ‘peaceful dwelling’, as in I.133.7 *vanóti ... kṣáyam*. Or it might be enough to invoke the distance between *rákṣantam* and *śárma* in the hemistich, which might account for the gender mismatch. (I prefer the former, grammatically blameless, possibility. In this case the tr. might be slightly changed to “will win (peaceful dwelling) as shelter for us, protecting (our) patrimony on all sides.”)

V.44.8: Old’s stark statement about this vs., “Ich wage keine Erklärung,” is somewhat lowering to the spirit. Nonetheless, I think some sense can be wrung from it. As I said in the publ. intro., I think a new figure enters the scene at this, the midpoint of the hymn -- namely the poet, learning and perfecting his craft -- and in my opinion he is the subject of the vs., though Agni and Soma are still very much present.

By my interpr. the unnamed would-be poet “pursues/proceeds towards/practices” (*carati*) “the older (/superior) sonority of the seers” (*jyāyāmsam ... ṛṣisvarám*), that is, he

imitates and aspires to the sound of the legendary poet-seers who preceded him. He does so by means of *asyá yatúnasya ketúnā* “by the beacon of this *yatúna*.” Unfortunately *yatúna*- is a hapax, and there is no agreement on its meaning or etym. (see, e.g., EWA s.v.). However, we can approach the sense of this phrase from several angles. The most promising of these, in my opinion, is the recognition that the phrase *yajñásya ketú-* “beacon of the sacrifice” is a very common expression in the RV (I.96.16, I.113.19, etc. etc., incl. in this maṇḍala V.11.1). Moreover, both Agni and Soma are identified as *yajñásya ketú-*; Agni: the three passages just cited, plus I.1127.6, III.11.3, etc.; Soma: IX.86.7. I take *yatúna*- as a nonce substitute for *yajñá-*, with vaguely similar phonology, built to  $\sqrt{yat}$  ‘arrange’. (This is the root affiliation suggested by most [cf., e.g., AiG II.2.485].) Unfortunately this root does not seem to be generally used in ritual context, but a generalized abstract ‘arrangement’ can stand in for the more specific ‘sacrifice’. This hapax *yatúna*- echoes immed. following instr. *ketúnā* (though obviously the morphology is different) and also reminds us of the two unexpected *-u*-stems in 5: *táru-* and *-sváru-*. Putting all this together, I would claim that the poet is pursuing the model of the previous poets by means of the beacon of the sacrifice (‘arrangement’), and that this beacon is actually the usual amalgam of Agni and Soma, who, as we just saw, can be so called. In other words, the shimmering leaders of the sacrifice, the two ritual substances fire and soma, provide the (en)light(enment) as the poet follows the progress of the sacrifice as it leads him to his poetic goal.

Unlike most interpr. I take the loc. rel. cl. ending b (*yāsu nāma te*) as parallel to the one beginning c (*yādśmin dhāyi*), also with a loc. expression. Both remind us of 2d ... *ṛtā āsa nāma te*; besides the identical final *nāma te*, note the echo between *yāsu* and *āsa*. The fem. loc. *yāsu* refers to the now familiar mix of fem. plurals -- waters, cows [=milk], streams of ghee -- with the possible addition of fem. words for mental and verbal products: insights, hymns, etc. In any case the poet finds the *jyāyāmsam ... ṛṣisvarām* he is looking for at the place where the names of Agni and Soma have been set -- that is, at the heart of the sacrifice. I take the referent of *tām* to be *ṛṣisvára-* of b. To find it he needs not only the beacon provided by Agni/Soma but also his own industry (*apasyā-*).

The final pāda reiterates that the poet must rely on himself: he must make the journey to poetic mastery by himself, and if he does, he will get it (that is, the poetry) right. The phrasal verb *āraṃ karat* of course reminds us of *alaṃkāra*, the later technical term for poetic ornament. Cf. already in the RV VII.29.3 *kā te asty āraṃkṛtiḥ sūktāḥ* “what is the proper way to prepare for you with hymns?” for a connection between hymns and proper preparation. (Contrary to the standard tr., I do not think that *yá u svayám váhate* has anything to do with marriage and bringing the bride home.)

V.44.9: In my interpr., the first half of this vs. depicts the offering of ritual oblations, while the second one connects the poet, whom we first met in the previous vs., with this ritual activity.

The fem. phrase *āsām ... agrimā* “the foremost (fem.) of these (fem.)” must refer yet again to the females we’ve met before: waters, cows, streams of ghee, as was just noted above. In pāda a the first such female goes down into the ocean (*samudrām*); this could be the ocean of soma as often or the undulating flames of the ritual fire (see I.71.7 where the offerings entering the fire are compared to streams entering a *samudrá-*). In pāda b the word *sávana-* ‘pressing’ limits the reference to soma, but throughout the hymn

we have seen phraseology that is more appropriate to one of the gods than to the other (generally, in fact, in favor of Agni). That b is a clear soma pāda does not, in my opinion, invalidate the general interpr. of the hymn as applicable simultaneously to the two gods. It is also worth noting in passing that *sávana-*, which occurs approx. 100x in the RV, is found only once in the IXth (Soma) Maṇḍala.

Why it is necessary to state that the pressing is not harmed when the female enters it is not clear. Perhaps it is meant as understatement: it is not only not harmed, but is positively benefitted. Or perhaps there is a whiff of the fear of contamination caused by females.

Pāda c brings us another impenetrable hapax, *kravaṇá-*. The first thing to notice, perhaps, is that it rhymes with *sávana-* (though it does not match it in accent). As with the hapax *yatúna-* in 8a beside *ketúnā*, one of the contributors to the formation of the hapax may be phonological echo. There is, as usual, no consensus on the etym. or sense of the word; Ge and Re (inter alia) take it as a PN -- a convenient strategy, but in a hymn that contains no other PNs (at least in my opinion) an unlikely solution. WG take it as ‘Opferschlächter’, related to *kravís-*, a suggestion mentioned but not endorsed by Old (see also EWA s.v.). My own tentative suggestion has no better support. I consider it, like *krívī-* in 4d, to be another phonologically scrambled encoding of the word *kaví-*, here perhaps crossed with a form of  $\sqrt{kr}$ , hence my tr. ‘working poet’. (A putative participial *-āṇá-* might have been remodeled under pressure from *sávana-* in b.) Although I will not attempt a spirited defense of this despairing attempt, it does have certain points in its favor. First, if *krívī-* in 4d and *kravaṇá-* here are both deformations of *kaví-*, which itself appears in 7b, we have a little ring of references to the poet in the midsection of this hymn. More important, reference to a poet in 9c fits well with the subordinate clause in 9d. Just at the time when oblation is made and the soma is prepared (9ab), the poet who is not intimidated (“his heart does not tremble”) finds the poetic expression (*matí-*) that connects him to the purified ritual substances soma and fire. (Though *pūtá-* almost always refers to soma and never to fire directly, other forms derived from the root  $\sqrt{pū}$ , like *pāvaká-*, are standard qualifiers of Agni.) If I am correct that vs. 8 depicts an apprentice or neophyte poet embarking on his journey to poetic mastery, then 9cd shows him achieving his first success at a climactic moment in the sacrifice, which provides inspiration to his undaunted heart.

V.44.10: Ge and Re deal with the difficulties of this vs. by taking all (or almost all) the genitives as PN, a solution going back to Sāy.: (Ge) Kṣatra, Manasa, Yajata, Sadhri, and Avatsāra, to which Re adds Evāvada. (Note that, as mentioned above, the Anukr. ascribes this hymn to one Avatsāra Kāśyapa, but this is, in my opinion, based on a later misunderstanding of this vs.) Since all of these forms, on the one hand, either are, or bear a strong resemblance to, real words in the language and, on the other, are not used as names elsewhere, the Ge/Re PN strategy seems like an evasion of responsibility. It is to the credit of WG that this makeshift is not resorted to; all these forms are given full lexical weight. And the WG interpr. of ab is not too distant from mine, in that they take the subject to be a/the poet, who has some connection to the *cítī-* of the figures mentioned in the gen. (WG: “Denn er is es [ein Ṛṣi?] durch die Einsichten dessen ...”), though our treatments of the genitives differ.

My interpr. of the relation between *sá* and *cíttibhiḥ* calls upon the ‘bond’ (*báandhanī*) of 9d, where the poet found the thought that binds him to the ritual substances soma and fire. I think 10ab elaborates on this notion, by ascribing the insights to Soma and Agni themselves.

The second set of genitives, *evāvadásya yajatásya sádhreḥ* in pāda b, by my interpr. refer to Agni and Soma simultaneously. Both Agni and Soma are elsewhere described as *yajatá-* ‘worthy of the sacrifice’ (Agni, e.g., I.128.8; Soma, e.g., IX.86.14). Assuming that the hapax *evāvadá-* has the sense ‘speaking thus’ it transparently presents, it can apply to both Agni and Soma because both substances are often said to speak or sound: for Agni cf., e.g., VI.4.4, 13.6; for Soma cf. esp. IX.113.4, 6. As for *sádhreḥ*, the obvious connection with *sadhryāñc-* ‘directed towards the same goal’ is affirmed by Gr, AiG II.2.154, EWA s.v *sadhrīm*, etc. It is the morphology that is puzzling, made more complex by the fact that it should be trisyllabic with a short penultimate, hence *\*sádhriyaḥ?* (so approx. Gr). (HvN simply pronounce the pāda as having 11 syllables, but since this would be a metrical irregularity in a Jagatī hymn and since there is no independent stem *\*sádhri-* to which *sádhreḥ* would obviously belong, it seems better to perform the metrical distraction.) I have no answer for the morphology or for the accent, but given the morphological flexibility in the rest of this hymn, this is not surprising.) The “same goal” that Agni/Soma are aiming at is the eloquence that the poet is also seeking to harness.

I take this second set of genitives, referring to Agni/Soma, as dependent on, not parallel to, the first pair of genitives, *kṣatrásya manasásya*. My “mental lordship” refers to the mastery those two gods have of the poetry and the insights that produce it. The adj. *manasá-* is a hapax, but it fits an attested, though relatively rare, pattern of deriving suffix-accented thematic adjectives to *s-*stems; cf., e.g., *vacasá-* ‘eloquent’ (also a hapax) to *vácas-* ‘speech’ and AiG II.2.136.

The second hemistich takes advantage of the double meaning of *rāṇa-* and its derivatives (*rāṇa-* ‘joy / battle’, *raṇvá-* ‘delightful / battle-lusty’, etc.). I take the referent of the pl. *rāṇvabhiḥ* to be poems (or perhaps the ‘insights’ *cítti-* of pāda a). As warriors fighting alongside us they allow us to win the prize (*sprṇavāma ... vājam*), but as poems they are also delightful or joy-bringing. That winning the prize requires wisdom, not just brute strength, is expressed by *vidúṣā cid árdhyam* “to be brought to success only by the wise,” a signal that it is insights or their products, poems, that are being deployed.

It remains to identify “the stealthy one” (*avatsārā-*), assuming as I do that it is not a PN. As I just noted, not only do Ge and Re (but not WG) take it as a PN, but the Anukramaṇī ascribes this hymn to Avatsāra Kāśyapa, who is also purported to be the Soma hymns IX.53-60, a group of short Gāyatrī hymns with no obvious connection to V.44. It seems obvious to connect the word with the lexeme *áva √tsar* and the root *√tsar* ‘creep’ more generally. The root is poorly attested, and *áva √tsar* only occurs once (I.71.5 in the notorious heavenly incest story). Agni is once the subject of *√tsar* (I.145.4), and the occurrence of *áva √tsar* is found in an Agni hymn (though not with Agni as subject). Soma is never subject of this verb, but its rarity makes this unsurprising. Both Agni and Soma can be conceived of as creeping or stealthy because of their slow and gradual movements -- Agni as the fire slowly catches in the kindling, Soma as the juice spreads across the filter.

V.44.11: If it is possible for this hymn to get *more* obscure, it does so in this vs. (Note that Old simply gives up in vss. 11–13.) Nonetheless, I think a consistent interpr. can be constructed and one that fits well with the increasing pace of the depiction of the ritual in the last few vss. The theme that unifies the vs. is that of ritual binding and unbinding -- conveyed by the words *áditi-*, which I take as the abstract ‘unboundedness’ not the name of the goddess, *kakṣyà-* ‘girding’, and *viṣāna-* ‘unharnessing’.

The first half of pāda a (*śyená āsām áditiḥ*) refers to the pre-ritual situation. While Soma is still a falcon, swooping about in freedom before the sacrifice begins, he is/represents freedom also for the classes of females we keep encountering: waters, cows, hymns. Neither the waters nor the cows (=milk) have taken on their ritual roles, and the words have not yet been pressed into service as ritual speech. (It’s important to note that Soma himself is often called a *śyená-* in IX; the bird is not simply the conveyor of the stolen soma.)

In the second half of pāda a (*kakṣyò mádaḥ*) Soma has been transformed into the *máda-*, the exhilarating ritual drink, and that change in turn brings about the girding of the female entities in question. They are hitched up in their various ritual roles, and the sacrifice begins. This ritual commencement is both for the benefit of and involves the active participation of the two gods, Soma and Agni. It is thus that I interpret the genitives in pāda b (*viśvāvārasya yajatásya māyínaḥ* (note the recurrence of *yajatásya* from 10b), also referring, in my opinion, to Agni/Soma. (Once again both Ge and Re take all three genitives as PNs; once again WG do not.)

In pāda c I take the priests as the subject of *arthayanti* ‘cause to seek as goal’. They are now directing the ritual proceedings. The first object of *arthayanti* is unexpressed, in my view: it is the female ritual elements, waters, milk, hymns. The priests send them to their ritual tasks, the waters and the cows’ milk to soma, the hymns to Soma and Agni. The two gods are here represented by the āmreḍita *anyám-anyam* ‘the one, the other; one after the other’. So far in the hymn the two gods have been fused into one, verbally speaking; here the āmreḍita is an intermediate step towards separating them, a step that allows for the introduction of a third god, Indra, in the next vs.

In pāda d the priests realize that with the mobilization of all the elements of the ritual performance -- the soma, the ritual fire, the waters, milk, and hymns -- the climax of the sacrifice has been reached. The unharnessing of these elements can take place because all that remains is for the prepared soma to be drunk. This sets the stage for the premier soma-drinker, Indra, to appear on the scene, which he does in the next vs. The parallel forms *viṣāṇam paripānam* are both best taken as *-ana-*nouns to *-ā-*roots, although Gr identifies the first as a root participle. Cf. AiG II.2.193.

V.44.12: As I just said, I think this vs. represents the epiphany of Indra, come to drink the just-prepared soma. Although, in keeping with the practice of the hymn, he is not named, the presence of a new actor in the hymn is strongly signaled by the verb phrase in pāda a: *ví dvīṣo vadhīt*: Indra is almost always the subject of verb forms to the root  $\sqrt{vadh}$ . Although the subject of pāda a is also called *yajatá-*, a word used in the two preceding vss. (10b, 11b) of Agni/Soma (in my opinion), ‘worthy of the sacrifice’ is a generic descriptor of gods, is used elsewhere of Indra (e.g., II.14.10), and can be so applied here. And ‘always giving’ (*sadāpṛṇa*, though a hapax, is a good description of Indra -- or at least as we wish him to be.

In b Ge and Re take the three words *bāhuvṛktāḥ śrutavít táryaḥ* as PNs yet again. I think they are all further qualifications of Indra. The first depicts the physical actions of the priest, who by the ritual activities performed by their arms (*bāhú-*), “twist” Indra to the ritual ground. (For the use of  $\sqrt{vrj}$  to refer to bringing a god to one’s ritual, see VIII.76.1.) There is also a sly echo of the common *bahuvrīhi* *vṛktā-barhis-* ‘having twisted ritual grass’, a ritual action that would indeed be performed by the priests’ arms. Indra is also easily qualified as *śruta-víd-* ‘finding [/knowing] what is heard (=praise)’. The third term *táryaḥ*, a hapax, is more difficult. It may simply be a *-ya-* deriv. to  $\sqrt{tṛ}$  (see WG “der Überwinder [?]”), though this isn’t terribly satisfying morphologically. I tentatively take it as a primary comparative to  $\sqrt{tṛ}$ , with the short suffixal form *-yas-* rather than *-īyas-* (*tárīyas-* 1x in nearby V.41.12); cf. *návyas-* / *návīyas-*. In that case it would be an adverbially used neut. (‘surpassingly’) and the predicate is the *vaḥ sácā* “(is in) partnership with you.” For another predicated pāda-final ENC + *sácā* see VIII.92.29 *ádihā cid indra me sácā* “And so, Indra, (you are) in partnership with me.”

The second hemistich begins with an explicitly marked dual *ubhā ... várā*, separated by a nom. sg. *sá*. Here we have the triad that has just, in this vs., interrupted the fused identification of Agni and Soma. With Indra represented by *sá*, the two other gods are for the first time in the hymn separated into a grammatical pair (though see the forerunner *anyám-anyam* in 11c), rather than sharing grammatically singular descriptors applicable to each. (For *ubhā ... várā* referring to animate beings, see X.85.9, where the two are the *Aśvins* -- though in that case *vára-* means ‘wooer’.) Indra “comes in response” (*práty eti*) to these two, i.e., to the ritual fire where offerings will be made to him and to his own ritual drink. The second verb *bhāti* ‘is radiant’ is not a typical Indraic verb, but pāda d with its reference to the *ganá-* ‘troop, throng’ easily brings the rhetoric back to Indra and his close ties with the Maruts, so often identified as a *ganá-*. The lexeme *prá √yā*, found here in *suprayāvan-* ‘driving forth easily’, is also particularly associated with the Maruts; cf. III.29.15 *marútām iva prayāḥ*, and verbal instantiations like I.37.14 *prá yāta*, also I.165.13, V.53.12, 58.6. I’ve supplied ‘chariots’ because *rátha-* several times used in a simile with *pra √yā* (IV.19.5, VII.74.6, IX.69.9).

V.44.13: As indicated in the publ. intro., in this last real vs. of the hymn I think the poet, who has been learning his trade, is extravagantly celebrated as the figure on whom the whole sacrifice depends and the representative of various sacrificial personnel and equipment. By contrast, Ge and Re once again opt for a PN, this time *Sutambhara* whom they consider to be the patron of the sacrifice. I take *sutambhará-* as the transparent cmpd it appears to be, conforming to the model of other *-bhará-* tatpuruṣas (cf., with acc. 1<sup>st</sup> member, *puṣṭim-bhará-*, *vājam-bhará-*, etc.) For the underlying syntagm see VIII.66.7 *sutám bhara*, where the subject is a priest or similar figure (also IX.6.6 *sutám bhārāya*). I construe the gen. *yájamānasya* with the 1<sup>st</sup> member *sutam*, though it could also be a gen. of benefit (‘for the sacrificer’) and loosely construed with the whole cmpd. I do not think it is dependent on *sátpatih*, pace Ge, Re, and WG.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda identifies the poet with the source (the cow’s udder, *ūdhaḥ*) and distributor (the ladle or scoop, *udāñcanaḥ*) of all poetic visions (*víśvāsām ... dhiyām*), which are here equated with ghee oblations. (For *ud √añc* meaning ‘turn / scoop up’, see V.83.8, AV X.29.8, etc.; in AB and ŚB *udañcana-* is a ‘dipping vessel’.) The conflation

of poems with liquid offerings we have already met before in this hymn, though it is only here that the *dhî-* is explicitly referred to.

In c the Pp and the standard interpr. take *dhenū* as the sandhi form of nom. sg. *dhenús* before *r-*. This is of course perfectly possible; however, I take the form as given, as the dual nom./acc. of the same stem. By this interpr. the poet who was the subj. of ab remains the subj. here, with the *-bhará-* of the cmpd in pāda a extracted and converted into a finite injunctive *bhārat*. Who are the two milk-cows he bears? It is of course tempting to identify them as Agni and Soma, the pair that has been hiding in this hymn all along. And in part I think that is the correct answer: the poet, whose verbal formulations are the foundation of the sacrifice, thereby supports the two ritual substances (/gods) that provide the material realization of the sacrifice. Agni and Soma would be called *dhenū* because of the benefits they provide through sacrifice. But dual *dhenū* is several times used of Heaven and Earth (of the other four occurrences, at last III.6.4, IV.23.10), so that the poet through his sacrificial labors may be supporting the whole cosmos. Moreover, the milk of Heaven and Earth has a special connection with poetry. Cf. the curious passage I.22.14 *táyor íd ghṛtávat páyo, víprā rihanti dhūībhiḥ* “The inspired poets lick the ghee-filled milk of this very pair [=Heaven and Earth; see vs. 13] with their poetic insights,” though the meaning of this vs. is obscure (see comm. ad loc.).

In any case their milk is brought to perfection (*śísriye*) in the rest of the pāda. Contra Narten (1987: 281) and Kümmel (p. 528), who follows her, in the publ. tr. I take this med. pf. as passive, contrasting with the act. trans. *asíśrayuḥ* (2x). However, it is possible that the verb is transitive, as they take it, and the poet remains as subj.: “he brings/has brought their milk to perfection.” This might be preferable, in that it emphasizes the poet’s control over the sacrifice and its cosmic resonances.

The final pāda of the vs., and thus of the hymn, brings us back, abruptly and somewhat reductively, to the poet’s training: “pay attention to your teacher; don’t nod off or go wool-gathering.” The lexemes *ánu* *√brū* and *ádhi* *√i* belong to pedagogical vocabulary (for the latter see Apālā VIII.91.3 and comm. ad loc.). The final phrase *ná svapán* “not the one who sleeps” provides a transition to the final two responsive verses with their insistently repeated *jāgāra* ‘is/stays awake’.

V.44.14–15: As was just noted, the final *ná svapán* of 13d provides a segue into this two-verse appendix with its 6 occurrences of *jāgāra* ‘is/stays awake’. The two vss. are strictly responsive -- so strictly responsive that the replacement of *yó* in abc by *agnír* produces an awkward set of 12-syllable lines with Triṣṭubh cadence, an awkwardness surely meant to call attention to their tight twinning. The vs. pair is structured as a riddle + solution, though, given what we have just waded through, not a very challenging puzzle. The focus seems to be on Agni, since he is the solution to the riddle; the balance of the two ritual substances found in the rest of the hymn (if I am correct) thus appears to be disturbed. But I do not think that this means that Agni is the sole subject of the hymn, as Scar suggests in his final comment (in WG). Rather the final word is found in the last pāda of both vss., the direct address of Soma to Agni (*tám ayám sóma āha* “to him does this Soma say”): *távāhám asmi sakhyé nyòkaḥ* “I am at home in fellowship with you.” It is the fellowship of Agni and Soma, intimately joined here and identified by name, though

neither of them was named previously in the hymn, that we are left with and that allows us to revisit the many obscurities that preceded this statement.

#### V.45 All Gods

Acdg. to the Anukr, the poet of the hymn is Sadāpr̥ṇa Ātreya, found only here. The name seems to be based on *sadāpr̥ṇá-* ‘always giving’, found in the *previous* hymn (V.44.12) and characterizing Indra (in my view).

On the structure of the hymn and the grammatical patterning that supports that structure, see publ. intro. Note that this patterning imposes presential renderings of the injunctives in the first three vss.

V.45.1: The Pp. interprets *vidā* as *vidāḥ*, and this interpr. is followed by Sāy., Gr, Ge, Re (EVP XVI.107), and WG inter alia. It has the merit of providing a verb form for the opening pāda, but the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. subjunctive it appears to be does not fit well in context. I prefer to take it as instr. sg. of the root noun *vid-* (*vidā* against the Pp.), as tentatively suggested by Old and, in different ways, adopted by Lüders (*Varuṇa* 325), Thieme (rev. of Lüders, ZDMG 101 (1951) 417 [=KISch 652]), Schmidt (B+I 175–76), and Hoffmann (Inj. 173–74). My interpr. follows Hoffmann in particular in taking pāda b as parenthetical, with the singular verb appropriate to pāda a postponed until *ápāvṛta* in pāda c. I far prefer this solution to allowing the sg. part. *viṣiyán* in pāda a to be construed with the pl. phrase *arcíno guḥ* in b, with Lü et al. The sg. subj. of a, c is most likely the sun.

In b *arcín-* is interpr. either as ‘having chant, singing’ (by most) or ‘having rays, bright’. Again with Hoffmann, I prefer the latter. Hoffmann (174 n. 125) suggests supplying *ketú-* ‘beam’, regularly associated with the dawns, and this seems contextually appropriate.

Pāda c contains another *-ín-* stem, this time a hapax, *vrajín-* ‘possessing enclosures’, in the fem. acc. pl. Gr, Ge, Hoffmann, and WG take the referent to be ‘cows’, but the usual obj. of *ápa √vr̥* is the cow-enclosure (often the base of *vrajín-*, namely *vrajá-*) or the doors thereto, and ‘door’ is also fem. This noun, *dúraḥ*, is found in the next pāda as the obj. of the nearly identical lexeme *ví ... āvaḥ*. In taking ‘doors’ as obj. also of *ápāvṛta* I am in agreement with Lü, Thieme, and Schmidt.

With Hoffmann and against the Pp. I take *ápāvṛta* as an injunc. *ápā + vr̥ta*. The verb of d, *ví ... āvaḥ*, is undeniably augmented, however; I take it as a summary comment on the description found in the rest of the vs. See Hoffmann’s disc. 174–75.

V.45.2: On *ámati-* see comm. ad I.73.2.

The problematic pāda is c. The rivers who are its subject are not, in my opinion, either real-world rivers (so, it seems, Ge) or the heavenly streams so beloved of Lü. Rather, to fit the context, they must be, metaphorically, the outpourings of light at dawn, which are so intense that they threaten to destabilize the world with their floods -- a threat countered by the solidity of Heaven described in pāda d. The two bahuvr̥his in c, *dhánv-arṇasaḥ ... khādo-arṇāḥ*, have been much discussed. Noteworthy first is the fact that they have (almost) the same final member: if both cmpds are nom. pl. the 2<sup>nd</sup> members are *-arṇas-* and *-arṇa-* respectively. Thieme rejects the variation in stem, taking both as containing *-arṇas-*, which requires the 2<sup>nd</sup> form to be nom. singular. In his interpr. the

many rivers described by *dhánvarṇasaḥ* have joined into one, modified by singular *khādoarṇāḥ*. It is a clever solution, but rather over-clever and in fact unnecessary. Both *árṇas-* and *árṇa-* exist independently, and the plural built to a cmpd. with *árṇas-* as final member (that is, *-arṇasaḥ*) would not fit a Triṣṭubh cadence, while one built to the parallel stem *-arṇa-* does nicely, as if truncated from a Jagaṭī cadence with *-arṇasaḥ* (see such a cadence in I.182.7).

What then do the cmpds mean? Again, a variety of interpr. have been suggested. I take *dhánv-arṇas-* as an equational bv., ‘whose floods are *dhánu-*’. A *dhánu-* appears to be a high flat plain or steppe; two of its five occurrences in the RV are characterized as *brhatī-* ‘lofty’. In our context I think it refers to what we often call a “wall of water,” a mass of oncoming water far above flood stage, perhaps already flooding over the banks and across the adjacent land. As for *khādo-arṇāḥ*, it should mean something like ‘whose floods are a biting/devouring’; in this case, I think Ge (flg. Sāy.) is correct that the rivers are devouring their banks, eating away at the solid ground. The sturdy pillar of heaven in d provides a bulwark against this featureless undulating torrent of light.

V.45.3: This vs. describes dawn as happening in response to and as a result of the hymn recited at this very moment (hence *asmai*) at the dawn sacrifice. The two heavy dative phrases, polarized at both ends of the first hemistich, *asmā ukthāya* and *janúṣe pūrvyāya*, have different functions in the clause. The gaping mountain is an allusion to the opening of the Vala cave, metaphorically applied to the advent of dawn from the night darkness.

In the second hemistich, in c “heaven achieves success” must, in my view, allude to the successful emergence of dawn’s light from the heavenly realm. This is contrasted with d, where an unnamed plural subject is desiring to win the earth (*āvīvasantaḥ ... bhūma*) -- in my opinion, this refers to the fact that features on the earth come only slowly to visual definition at dawn, even as the light comes streaming out of the sky. The unknown subjects are probably the poets responsible for “this hymn here” (*asmā ukthāya*) in pāda a; they must continue their verbal efforts, “exhaust themselves” (*dasayanta*), in order to bring the earth into focus. Supplying ‘poets’ as subj. generally follows Hoffmann, who thinks esp. of the Aṅgirasas (174 n. 126), contra Ge, who takes *bhūma* as subj. (sim. Lü). On *dasayanta*, see my *-āya-Formations*, p. 59. Some take the verb rather to *√dams* ‘work wonders’; see esp. Thieme (loc. cit., n. 7), fld. by Schmidt, WG. This cannot be excluded, but I find the ‘exhaust’ meaning more poetically compelling.

V.45.4: The *vaḥ* in Wackernagel’s position can be construed in a number of different ways. I take it as the poet’s address to his colleagues to praise and importune the two gods. Since the next two vss. (5–6) consist of 1<sup>st</sup> pl. exhortations to proceed with the sacrifice and achieve effective ritual poetry, my interpr. fits the larger context well. Ge also seems to assume the referents are human, but are rather the potential beneficiaries of the poet’s own plea to the gods (sim. WG). By contrast Schmidt (and less clearly Lü) take it as direct address to the gods; Schmidt “... wollen wir jetzt euch, Indra und Agni, zur Hilfe rufen.” Given the number discrepancy between pl. *vaḥ* and the dual dvandva *indrā ... agnī*, this seems unlikely. Note also that the non-initial accent on *agnī* precludes a voc. interpr. of the dvandva, though that alone would not prevent *vaḥ* from referring to them.

I do not understand the intrusion of the Maruts here. They are not gods of the dawn sacrifice, nor are they associated with the Vala myth or with the Aṅgirasas. Perhaps their prominence elsewhere in the Vth Maṇḍala (esp. V.52–61) is responsible for their brief appearance here, prompted by the mention of Indra. They are presumably not only the objects of *yájanti* but also of *āvívasantah*: “winning” them would involve persuading them to come to our sacrifice.

V.45.5–6: As noted in the publ. intro., these two vss. form an omphalos and are structurally parallel, with the poet addressing his priest-poet colleagues with hortatory subjunctives. The immediacy of the vss. and the sacrificial context of the hymn make this a more likely scenario than Sāy.’s suggestion that the Aṅgirasas are speaking these vss. For strenuous arguments against Sāy.’s interpr., see Lü p. 327.

V.45.5: As suggested already by Ge (n. 5b) and, independently, Thieme (ZDMG 95 [1941] 82–83 [=KISch. 7–8]) and accepted by all subsequent tr., a better reading is obtained by segmenting *duchúnām inavāma*, against Pp. *duchúnā minavāma*. This requires no emendation to the Saṃhitā text.

V.45.6: Unlike the first hortatory vs., this second one is not entirely tied to the here-and-now; rather it provides three separate historical/mythological models for the effective poetic vision (*dhî-*) that we are aiming to create now (pāda a). The first model (b) appears to be a variant of the Vala myth so prominent in the rest of the hymn, but those in c and d are obscure.

In b the first question is the grammatical identity of *yā*. It is generally taken as nom. sg. fem., but Old suggests that it might alternatively be a (short) instr. sg. fem. In the former case the referent of *yā* would be the *dhî-* of pāda a, which would be the subj. of *ṛṇuta* and identified with the “mother of the cow” (*mātā ... góḥ*); in the latter it would be parallel to the two instr. sg. fem. *yáyā* opening c and d. I favor the second interpr.; although the former is not impossible, I find the syntactic parallelism a stronger argument, and *yā* could owe its abbreviated form to being displaced from initial position by the preverb *ápa*. If the instr. interpr. is correct, this leaves the subj. of *ṛṇuta* and referent of “mother of the cow” open. Old and Ge both consider it to be Uṣas. Again, this is not impossible, but I think it may be Saramā, whose finding of the cows is treated in vss. 7–8 -- though Dawn as “mother of cows” (*gávām mātā*) is found in vs. 2 and is also a strong candidate.

Ge remarks apopos of pāda c “sonst unbekannte Sage” (see also Lü, p. 329), and it is likely that we will not get further than that. Ad VII.99.4 Old tentatively suggests that the name of a Dāsa, *vṛṣaśiprā*, that occurs in that passage might have something to do with our *viśiśiprā-*, but even if so (and it’s certainly possible), this is a deadend, since all we know of Vṛṣaśipra is that he’s a Dāsa and killed by Indra and Viṣṇu. Like the Maruts in 4d, the fleeting intrusion of Manu here is unexpected and unexplained.

Even more so the “wandering merchant” (*vañíg vañkúh*) of d. On *vañkú-* see comm. ad I.51.11 and, esp., I.114.4. Although the standard rendering is ‘flying’ (see, e.g., Ge, Schmidt), its derivation from  $\sqrt{vañc}$  ‘move crookedly, meander’ makes ‘meandering, wandering’ more likely. In I.114.4 it modifies *kaví-*. I suggest there that it refers to an itinerant poet, and merchants are at least as likely as poets to be itinerant, following a

meandering course as they peddle their goods. But who this particular merchant is meant to be and how and why he needs a *dhī-* to attain his *pūrīṣa-* remain unclear. If I had Dumézilian tendencies, I might suggest a trifunctional interpr.: pāda b = 1<sup>st</sup> function, c = 2<sup>nd</sup> function, and d = 3<sup>rd</sup> function (at least the latter two might work -- 1<sup>st</sup>-function b is a bit of a stretch). But even if this interpr. were persuasive, it doesn't explain what the material is doing in this hymn at this point.

V.45.7–8: Here the mythic model of the dawn accompanying the dawn ritual, the opening of the Vala cave through the verbal efforts of the Aṅgirasas, is spelled out.

Note the variant versions of the phrase “Saramā found the cows”: 7c *sarāmā gā avindat*, with augmented imperfect; 8d *sarāmā vidad gāḥ*, with aor. injunctive (per Pp.) or aor. indicative (*sarāmāvidat*, with augmented *avidat* is a possible reading). For Hoffmann's interpr. of this vs. pair see Injunk. 164–65.

V.45.7: Note that 3 of the 4 verbs are augmented (*ánūnot*, *ārcan*, *avindat*), the 4<sup>th</sup> a preterital pf. (*cakāra*).

V.45.8: The subordinator *yád* comes quite late (2<sup>nd</sup> position pāda b) in the subordinate clause presumably occupying the first hemistich, and it is preceded not only by the subj. (*vísve*) but by a heavy temporal loc. expression (*asyā vyúṣi māhināyāḥ*) -- in violation of standard RVic subordinator placement. This anomaly may have led WG to take pāda a as a nominal main clause: “Sie alle (waren) ... (zugegen).” I am sympathetic, but think the clause division is unnecessarily radical. It is possible that b is a conversion into a subordinate clause of IV.3.11b *sám aṅgirasō navanta góbhiḥ* with pāda a acting as a preposed afterthought.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich brings another syntactic problem: in c the Pp. interprets *útsa* (before a vowel) as nom. *-aḥ*, a grammatical ident. that in turn requires that c be an independent clause. The Pp. reading is defended by Old and fld. by many, incl. Ge, Hoffmann (Injunk. 165), WG. With Lü (385 n. 2; fld. by Schmidt p. 177, Janert p. 10) I prefer the loc. *útsē*, parallel to *paramé sadhásthe*, and defining the place where Saramā found the cows in d.

V.45.9: The first hemistich is metrically problematic. HvN put the pāda break after *saptāśvaḥ* and distract *sūryo*, *yātu*, and *saptāśvaḥ*; their 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda, beginning *kṣétram*, has a caesura after 3 (though see their n.). It is also possible to take *kṣétram* as the last word of pāda a (see Schmidt's layout, p. 178) and to restrict the distraction to a single word, either *sūryaḥ* or *saptāśvaḥ*, though this produces a bad cadence. In that case I would suggest that the 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda orig. began *\*yád yád*; reading *\*yád yád asya* produces an opening of 4 and, with post-caesura *urviyā dīrgayāthé*, makes a fine Triṣṭubh. The 2<sup>nd</sup> (or 1<sup>st</sup>) *yád* would be the neut. sg. N/A participle to *√i*.

Even if this possible emendation is not accepted, it is still possible to take *yád* as the neut. participle, not the subordinator: this interpr. is represented in my tr. by “stretching” and by the lack of a relative cl. With double *yád* the tr. would read “to the tract of land which is stretching widely at (the end of) his long course.”

The 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich contains a pres. injunctive, *patayat*, and a pf. [/redupl. pres.] subjunctive *dīdayat*. In the publ. tr. they are both rendered as imperatives, matching the

pattern set by *yātu* in *pāda* a. I now think that this interpr. lacks refinement and should be altered. The *vs.* in general concerns the coincidence between the sunrise and the ritual activities of the dawn sacrifice. We hope for the sunrise (hence the *impv.*), which is in fact realized in the next *vs.* By contrast, the ritual activities in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich are under our (=priests’) control and can therefore simply be described. Exactly what the referents of the falcon (c) and the young poet (d) are is disputed (see the various interpr., incl. those that do not consider them ritual referents at all [notably Lü 329–31]). Starting with d, *yúvan-* *kaví-* is frequently an epithet of Agni and  $\sqrt{dī}$  is a typical Agni verb, so it seems likely that this is a reference to the kindling of the fire at the dawn ritual. Although “going among the cows” sounds more like soma (mixing with milk), the cows here can be the ghee oblations poured into the fire, which will cause it to flame more brightly. If d refers to Agni, then c is likely to refer to Soma; certainly the *ándhas-* ‘stalk’ is Soma vocabulary, and the falcon is Soma’s vehicle in the Somaraub. What exactly is going on eludes me, however. As for the tense/mood distinction between *patayat* and *dīdayat*, it may be that the distinction is illusory: one of them was simply brought into superficial harmony with the other, so that both end in *-ayat*, though they should be *inj.* and *subj.* respectively. Or it may be that the *injunc.* is followed by a *subj.* to indicate that the 2<sup>nd</sup> action follows the first (“the falcon flies to the stalk; the young poet will shine ...”).

V.45.10: The structure of this *vs.* matches that of the last one: the first half describes a cosmic event outside of human control; the second ascribes control to the ritualists. What is striking is that the *same* event is treated in both halves: the rising of the sun. In ab the Sun has agency; he yoked his own horses and mounted the sky. But in c it is the priest-poets (“the wise” *dhīrāḥ*) who guide him, through the waters that stand still for this progress, “giving heed” (*āśṛṇvantīḥ*) presumably to the poets’ words. (I owe the germ of this interpr. to Dieter Gunkel [p.c.] )

V.45.11: Most interpr. construe *apsú* with *dadhiṣe* and tr. the latter as ‘you have placed’, hence “you have placed your *dhī* in the waters.” But med. forms of  $\sqrt{dhā}$  generally mean ‘acquire, assume’, and furthermore the standard interpr. is either nonsensical or requires a substantial backstory -- such as Old’s “[ein] Zauber für Wiedererscheinen der Sonne nach langen Regengüssen.” I follow Ge in taking *apsú* with *svarṣām* “das ... die Sonne im Wasser gewinnt”; the sun was manifestly in the water(s) in the immediately preceding *vs.* -- however metaphorically we wish to interpret those waters (I would take them as the floods of dawn light we encountered in *vs.* 2). Thus “winning the sun in the waters” is simply an expression for causing the sun to rise at dawn. For further disc. on the place of this *vs.* in the hymn, see publ. intro.

The number discrepancy between 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. *vaḥ* and 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. *dadhiṣe* is easily accounted for in the same general manner as the *vaḥ* in *vs.* 4 (see comm. thereon): *dadhiṣe* is the poet’s self-address to himself, while *vaḥ* is addressed to his colleagues. As in *vss.* 5–6, these two distinct 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. references are joined in a joint 1<sup>st</sup> pl. in *cd* (*syāma ... tuturyāma*).

## V.46–49 All Gods

These four All God hymns are ascribed by the Anukr. to four different Ātreya poets, each with a name beginning Prati-: 46 Pratikṣatra, 47 Pratiratha, 48 Pratibhānu, 49 Pratiprabha. The sources for the 2<sup>nd</sup> parts of these compounds are not clear.

#### V.46 All Gods

On my hypothesis concerning the reason for this hymn, viz., support for the ritual innovation of the Patnī, see publ. intro. Save for the final two vss. devoted to the wives of the gods, there seems no rationale for the deities included or excluded from the enumerative vss. or for the repetition of some and not others.

V.46.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this preliminary vs., preceding the apparently unconnected series of enumerative vss. calling on various gods, esp. female divinities and the wives of the gods, sets up the scenario: in pāda a the poet-sacrificer has yoked himself to the chariot pole (*dhúr-*) along with his wife, the recently introduced ritual Patnī, an image found elsewhere for the same pairing. Since *dhúr-* is feminine, the remaining feminines in this vs. (b *tām ... pratáranīm avasyúvam*, c: *asyāḥ*) can refer both to the chariot pole and to the Patnī. In b the feminine obj. is said to be “furthering (the sacrifice)”; though the default obj. of *prá √tī* is *āyus-* ‘lifetime’, *yajñám* can also serve as obj.: cf., e.g., III.17.2 *yajñám prá tira*. (On *avasyúvam* see comm. ad vs. 7 below. One might also note that, while ‘seeking help’ makes sense in context, esp. when read with vs. 7, this word could also be taken as a phonological scrambling of *āyus-*.) In c the speaker asserts that he does not wish to revert to the old ways or be released from the yoked pairing. In other words, he has accepted the ritual innovation of the Patnī.

Most interpr. take *patháḥ* as gen. sg. with *vidvān*. Since that pf. part. is generally used absolutely (“[as] knowing one”), I take *patháḥ* rather as acc. pl. extent of space with *néṣati*. For a clear acc. of the path with *néṣa-* see I.91.1 *tvám rájiṣṭham ánu neṣi pánthām*.

V.46.2: Among this group of mainly male divinities we find the Wives (*gnāḥ*, a word only used for the Wives of the Gods in the RV) and Sarasvatī in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich.

The first pāda consists only of vocatives, each accented since there is no inherently accented word preceding. In b the accent on *māruta* (modifying pāda-initial *śárdhaḥ*) is surprising, however, since it follows the verbal lexeme *prá yanta* with accent on the preverb, and the following voc. *viṣṇo* lacks accent following *utá*.

Notice the coincidence of verbal endings for two different person / number / voice combinations: *yanta* 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. act. impv. *√yam*; *juṣanta* 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. med. injunc. *√juṣ*.

V.46.3: The previous vs. consisted of vocatives in ab and nominatives in cd. Here we find accusatives, with the governing verb *huvé* postponed until the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich. The first four divinities in vss. 2 and 3 are the same, but the four individual vocc. *ágra índra váruṇa mítra* of 2a are arranged in 3a in two dual dvandvas *indrāgnī* and *mitrāváruṇā*, in opposite order. The Maruts, Viṣṇu, Pūṣan, and Bhaga (*bhága-*) are also repeated from vs. 2. Otherwise the emphasis is on divinized natural elements. As for female divinities, we find Aditi immediately after her offspring Mitra and Varuṇa, as well as the waters (*apáh*).

Unfortunately the repetition of *bhága-* is obscured in the publ. tr. by its rendering as “Fortune” in 3d, though both 2d and 6c call him Bhaga. “Fortune” in 3 should therefore be changed to “Bhaga.”

V.46.4: In pāda a *asrídhaḥ* is clearly pl., though it occurs in dual context (*utá ... víṣṇur utá vāto asrídhaḥ*). There seem to be 3 possibilities: 1) it also modifies the gods in pāda b, the Treasure-giver (*draviṇodāḥ*) and Soma; 2) it refers to the gods in general, as in I.3.9 *vísve devāso asrídhaḥ*; 3) it refers to goddesses or the trio of goddesses so denominated in I.13.9 *īlā sárasvatī mahī tīró devīr mayobhúvaḥ / ... asrídhaḥ* (note *mayobhúvaḥ* like *máyās karat* in our pāda b). There is no clear way to choose, and it scarcely seems to matter. I would of course prefer the third possibility, since it involves a female presence in this vs., but the support for this possibility is not strong.

The vs. contains the 3<sup>rd</sup> mention of Viṣṇu and the 2<sup>nd</sup> of the Aśvins; the other divinities are newly named.

V.46.5: The Maruts recur for the third time (the 2<sup>nd</sup> time in the corporate entity, the Marutian troop [*mārutam sárdhaḥ*]), as does Pūṣan, with Bṛhaspati substituting for the Brahmanaspati in 3c. Varuṇa and Mitra also make their 3<sup>rd</sup> appearance, this time with their regular companion Aryaman, rather than the Aditi of 3a.

V.46.6: The mountains of 3b reappear here; the waters, their companions in 3b, are replaced by the rivers (*nadyàḥ*), also feminine of course. Bhaga also recurs from 2d and 3d. It seems significant that Aditi is the last divinity named before the “wives” vss.

V.46.7: The help for which the wives of the gods are insistently entreated (*avantu naḥ, prāvantu naḥ*) reminds us of the adj. qualifying the chariot pole / Sacrificer’s Wife in 1b, *avasyúvam* ‘seeking help’ and provides a type of ring.

With Ge and WG, I take *tujáye* as referring specifically to the propagation of children, a function appropriate to the wives of the gods, against Re’s insistence that it refers to the production of inspiration (though in his long n. he admits that there is “une certaine association entre *túj* et la notion de procréer”).

V.46.8: This last vs. is in a diff. meter and also shows some metrical irregularities (see HvN notes). It seems tacked on, to allow an enumeration of the gods’ wives in question, most of whom (save for Indrāñī) have a very shadowy existence. It is also not clear whether *aśvínī* and *rāṭī* refer to a single individual or two.

The last phrase, *yá ṛtúr jānīnām* “which is the regular season for women,” is somewhat puzzling, made more so by the fact that there is no overt referent in the main clause for the *yáḥ*, since the verb *vyántu* lacks an object (also in pāda a). I follow Ge (flg. Sāy.) in taking this as a reference to the *patnīsamnyāja* offering (or its forerunner), and I therefore supply ‘offering’ as obj. for *vyántu* (*havís-*, etc., is a common, though not invariable, obj. to this root). The rel. cl. is then also a pun: it refers not only to this offering, which is the ritual “time/season” allotted to women, but probably also to their menstrual periods, since *ṛtú-* is regularly so used later. For a similar pun, using the adj. *ṛtvíyāvati-*, see VIII.12.10, 80.7.

## V.47 All Gods

V.47.1: As noted in the publ. intro., I take the subj. of this riddling vs. to be *manīṣā* ‘poetic inspiration’, but until this word appears (end of pāda c), the vs. both invites an identification of the subject with Dawn and makes that impossible. The nom. sg. participles *prayuñjatī* and *bodháyantī* are characteristic Dawn vocabulary, but Dawn is also regularly identified as “the daughter of heaven,” which phrase is here in the genitive: *diváh ... duhitúh*. It is her “great mother” (*māhī māṭā*) who is the grammatical subj.

My interpr. generally follows that of Old. Others (Ge, Re, WG) seek to make Dawn subj. at least of the first hemistich and are thus forced into awkward interpretations of the phraseology and into division of the vs. into two clauses. Assuming (with Old and me) that *manīṣā* is the subj. of the whole vs., the point would seem to be that the inspiration that produces the poetry of the early morning ritual has the power to beget even Dawn herself -- the usual semi-hubristic boast by the poets that even the cosmos is regulated by the ritual performance and the poetry recited there. The phrase “(coming) from the fathers” (by my interpr.; some others take *pitṛbhyaḥ* as dative) reflects the transmission of the poetic tradition from older generations to younger ones. For *manīṣā* ‘constantly calling’ (*jóhuvānā*), see VII.24.2 *jóhuvatī manīṣā*, also adduced by Old.

V.47.2: Again I take the vs. as having one referent, while Ge, Re, and WG split it into two sentences with two different subjects. In my view, the intent is again to mislead -- that is, in this riddle hymn, to suggest one referent to the audience and then spring a different one on them towards the end of the verse, in this case the very last word *pánthāḥ* ‘paths’. These are presumably the paths that connect heaven and earth and enable the gods to come to the sacrifice and the sacrificial offerings to make their way to heaven. Although paths are not ordinarily credited with much agency -- and the descriptions in the first hemistich attribute bustling activity to their referents -- the lively traffic between heaven and earth can spill over onto the paths that bear this traffic.

*tádapah* is most likely adverbial here (so already Gr), though Ge suggests it is nom. pl. “mit Abfall der Endung,” for which there is no motivation.

The “nave of the immortal one” (*amṛtasya nābhim*) can refer both to the ritual ground and to the height of heaven, again suggesting the connection between those places that is established by the paths.

For *anantá-* see disc. ad vs. 4.

For the formula *viśvátaḥ sīm pári* and the unusual placement of *sīm*, see my “Rigvedic *viśvátaḥ sīm*, Or, Why Syntax Needs Poetics” (1998, Fs. Watkins).

V.47.3: In this riddle vs. the referent is not explicitly named, and in fact an initially bewildering set of incompatible identifications comes pouring out: a bull, the sea, a bird, a stone. But all of them are possible aspects of the sun (for similar vocab. see IX.83.3), and esp. in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich the position specified (“in the middle of heaven”) and the actions depicted point strongly to the sun -- a referent generally agreed upon by interpreters.

The “womb of the age-old father” (*pūrvasya yónim pitúh*) is a gender-bending, though understated, paradox. It is likely that the sun’s age-old father is Heaven (Dyaus Pitā) -- on the parental relationship of Heaven and Earth to Sūrya, see esp. I.160 -- in

which case the womb is probably (lower-case) heaven, the place through which the sun travels. In the next pāda he is unambiguously situated there: *mādhye divó níhitah*, so at least in this instance one of the side-riddles of the vs. is solved almost as soon as it is posed.

V.47.4: As often elsewhere in the RV, numerology begets obscurity. Nonetheless, the most likely referent here is Agni. As Ge points out, the four and the ten in the 1<sup>st</sup> hemistich may well refer to the four priests (so already Sāy.) or the four arms of the two main priests, the ten, as often, to the fingers. The “bearing” by the four might refer to the transport of the new Āhavanīya to the east end of the ritual ground and the depositing there (hence the “rest”); the ten (fingers) are making offering into the fire (“giving it suck”), to cause it to flare up. Hence the balanced opposition of rest and motion in ab.

The threefold cows of pāda c are puzzling, but three is of course a number closely associated with Agni: the three ritual fires, his three births (e.g., X.45.1), the three pressings, etc. For Agni’s triads, cf. X.45.2 (right after the three births just referred to) *vidmā te agne tredhā trayāṇi* “we know your threefold triads” (also VIII.39.9 for his three domains). See also *tridhātu-śṛṅga-* ‘having tripartite horns’ of Agni in nearby V.43.13, where it may refer to the three hearths – not candidates for our tripartite cows, I’m afraid. For these threefold cows Sāy. (see Ge n. 4c; so also Re) suggests sun’s rays, WG milk-streams, but ‘threefold’ is not a standard characterization of either set. Note also *tridhātubhir áruṣṭbhiḥ* “with threefold ruddy (cows)” in IX.111.2, where the phrase refers to accoutrements of Soma, and Soma is a possible, if somewhat unlikely, referent for this vs. as well: the ten (fingers) are a common trope in the soma maṇḍala, referring to the priests pressing and preparing the drink. Pāda a is harder to apply to soma, beyond the generic notion of four priests. The circling threefold cows could, I suppose, be the streams of the heavenly soma. Still, Agni seems a better, though not perfect, candidate.

Pāda d, with *diváḥ ... ántān* # “the ends of heaven,” echoes 3d *rájasah ... ántau* # “the two ends of the airy realm,” and both contrast with the “endless” (*anantāsaḥ*) paths of 2cd. The dual in 3d points to a straight trajectory from one end to the other, reinforced by the verb *ví cakrame* ‘he strode’ (though it’s not in the same clause with the “ends”): the sun’s journey across the sky from one horizon to the other. The plural in 4d is more diffuse, as is the verb *caranti pári* “they wander/circle around.” The phrase *divó ánta-* [pl.] “the ends of heaven” is quite common, but I am not sure what the plural conveys -- that there are numerous divisions of heaven, each with its own boundaries? that heaven is effectively end-less (like the *anantá-* paths of 2) because there are always more ends? In any case the sun’s purposeful trip from one place to another in vs. 3 seems contrasted with the more comprehensive travels of the subject of *caranti* in 4d. Is that subject the threefold cows of 4c? If so, many of the possible triads suggested above are eliminated. Save for the ‘threefold’ (and, I guess, the cows), Agni’s plumes of smoke would make the most sense in d. But I confess bafflement.

V.47.4–5: Note the parallel openings of 4a *catvāra im bibhrati ...* and 5c *dvé yád im bibhṛtāḥ ...* But this parallelism gains complexity from the fact that *√bhṛ* is used in two different senses: in 4 it means ‘carry’, but in 6 it refers to the bearing of children.

V.47.5: The opening *idám vápur nivácanam* “Here is the wonder, the enigma” announces this vs. as potentially even more obscure than what precedes. Each of the three following pādas is presented as a paradox, but the contents do not seem significantly more enigmatic than the rest of the hymn; in fact, the explicit paradoxes point the way to their solution.

The first -- the rivers move, but the waters stay -- seems unconnected to the themes of the hymn, simply presenting a wonder of the natural world: no matter how much the rivers flow, there is always water in them (see Ge n. 5b). The verb *cáranti* repeats that of 4d (and see *cárase* in 4b), but does not echo its meaning there.

The second hemistich does continue the ritual and cosmic focus of the rest of the hymn (see the parallel openings of 4a and 5c cited just above). It treats the surrogate parentage of an unidentified figure. Ge (n. 5cd) suggests that this figure can be both Agni and the sun, with two different mother-substitutes referred to depending on the original identification of *īm*. In Ge’s view, Sūrya’s “real” mother is Dawn, but the two other females who bear him are Heaven and Earth; for Agni, the kindling stick is the mother, but the two other females are Night and Dawn. In both cases the two have different places of birth, but form a twin pair. Although I am not overwhelmingly convinced by Ge’s identifications, I do not have better ones. Of his two suggestions, Agni seems significantly more likely than the sun. The sole passage he cites as evidence for Dawn as the sun’s mother (VII.63.3) does not seem to me to say that, and of course Dawn is more commonly his lover. The evidence for Night and Dawn as Agni’s surrogate mothers is much more robust; the two passages he cites (I.95.1, 96.5) both depict the two giving suck to Agni using the same verb as found here (4b), though not in this vs.: I.95.1 *anyānyā vatsám úpa dhāpayete*; I.96.5 *náktoṣāsā ... dhāpayete śísuṃ ékam*.

V.47.6: This is the last real vs. of the hymn, preceding the meta-reference to the hymn itself and wishes for its efficacy (vs. 7).

In the first hemistich the subj. of *vī tanvate* appears to me to be the poets / ritualists; I am not sure of the identity of *asmāi*, but given its lack of accent, it should be someone already present in the discourse -- probably the *īm* of 5c, which, as was just discussed, can be either/both Agni or/and, less likely, Sūrya. Pāda b continues the motherhood theme of 5cd. With Re, I consider the mothers here to be an unmarked simile: the production of ritual poetry by the poets is implicitly compared to the weaving of baby clothes by mothers.

The “paths of heaven” of vs. 2 return in the phrase *divás pathā* (6d) “along the path of heaven” (note the close sandhi). Who the referents are and what is going on in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich are unclear, made more so by the grammatical multivalence of the principal actors in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich: *vṛṣanaḥ* can be nom. pl. or, less likely, acc. pl. (or, even less likely though the solution of most [Ge, Re, WG], gen. sg.: the gen. sg. is otherwise *vṛṣnas* and, as far as I know, never read trisyllabically); *vadhvāḥ* can be nom. pl. (Ge, Re, WG), acc. pl., or gen. sg.; the part. *módamānāḥ* can be nom. pl. masc. or fem. or acc. pl. fem. Ge in his Nachtr. does confront the morphological problem of *vṛṣanaḥ*, suggesting that it’s an irregular gen. sg., but he also provides an alternative transl., with *vṛṣanaḥ* as nom. pl., that my own tr. follows. In this interpr., acdg. to Ge., the gods are the bulls on their way to unite with their wives, “die Dichtungen der Sänger.” Assuming that the referents of *vadhvāḥ* are the *dhīyaḥ* of pāda a, the sexual union of these thoughts and the gods for

whom they're composed seems plausible (in a RVic universe). The only question is who is going to whom, and the two-way street of Vedic ritual allows movement in either direction: the hymns going to heaven to unite with the gods, or the gods coming from heaven to the ritual ground to unite with the hymns. I have gone for the latter. See disc. of the paths ad vs. 2.

With Old I take *upaprakṣé* as loc. to a them. stem *upaprakṣá-*

If this interpr. of the vs. is correct, it provides the hymn with a thematic ring compositional structure. The first two vss. provide the materials that will return in vs. 6. Vs. 1 introduces the inspired thought coming from heaven and established at the sacrifice, thus linking the divine and human worlds, and vs. 2 sketches the highway linking these two worlds, the encircling paths. In vs. 6 the inspired thought of vs. 1 is represented by the *dhíyah* (insightful thoughts) produced by the unnamed priests (ab), and these thoughts are configured as the new brides of the bullish gods who have utilized the paths of vs. 2 to come to the sacrifice and unite with them. The interior vss. present the sun (vs. 3) but concentrate on the ritual fire (vss. 4–5). Given the emphasis on the ritual and its connection to heaven, I'm not quite sure why the sun intrudes in 3—perhaps its journey across the sky is compared or contrasted with the journey between heaven and earth we find elsewhere in the hymn.

#### V.48 All Gods

V.48.1: My interpr. follows that of Old in most particulars, but is also informed by my view that the hymn as a whole is a Dawn hymn (see publ. intro.). I therefore think that in the 1<sup>st</sup> hemistich the dative recipient of the poets' compositions is Agni, not, per Old, Varuṇa, nor, per Re, Indra. (Ge and WG do not identify the recipient.) Although the descriptors in b are not strongly typical of Agni, the “own dear foundation” (*priyāya dhā̃m(a)ne*) in pāda a would be appropriate for the establishment of the offering fire at the beginning of the morning sacrifice.

With Old I take the subject of cd, identified as feminine by nom. *māyínī*, as Dawn, and I also follow him in considering the hapax *āmenyá-* as dissimilated from \**āmemyá-*, a thematic nominal deriv. of the intens. to  $\sqrt{mī}$  ‘(ex)change’, formed like *vitarturá-*, *ādarkirá-*, as he suggests. Modifying *rájas-* ‘(dusky) realm’, it would express the constantly changing color of the sky at dawn, and is comparable to the intens. part. in I.96.5 *náktoṣāsā várṇam āmém(i)yāne* “Night and Dawn, ever exchanging their color,” as Old also points out. Whatever the etymology of *māyā-* (whose possessive deriv. *māyínī* closes the vs.) -- I favor Thieme's connection with  $\sqrt{mī}$  ‘(ex)change’, which, however, is rejected by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v.) -- the polarized initial and final words of the hemistich, #*āmenyásya ... māyínī*#, provide a phonological and, if Thieme is correct, an etymological frame for the hemistich.

And what happens within that frame? In my view the image is that of dawn in a partly cloudy sky. The conceit is that the rays of Dawn spreading across the cloudy sky look like streams of water -- water that Dawn has appropriated from the cloud (“choosing the waters in the dark cloud” *abhrá ām̃ apó vṛṇānā*). Since the image makes sense with the transmitted *apáh* ‘waters’, I see no reason to follow Old (and partly WG) in assuming it stands for \**ápah* ‘work’. The same phrase “choosing the waters” is also found in

IX.94.1, though in a very different context. I explain it there as a deliberate poetic deformation of the common expression *apó vasāná-* “clothing oneself in the waters.”

I would substitute “mistress of uncanny power” for “... of artifice.”

V.48.2: The image in 1cd is repeated with variation in 2ab. The fem. sg. subj. of 1d has been replaced by the fem. pl., easily interpr. as plural Dawns, as often. The verb is held constant, though the root aor. *atnata* substitutes for the pres. *vitanóti*. The waters/rays of light that the Dawn spread out in 1cd are now characterized as forming a pattern or tracery across the dusky realm (*viśvam ā rájah*) that also figured in 1cd. The spreading performed by the Dawns is done “along the same course” (*samānyā vrtáyā*) by my interpretation -- that is, the same course that the successive Dawns follow day after day. I do not understand why their pattern of light is “hero-strengthening” (*vīrá-vakṣaṇa-*). Perhaps this is simply a reference to the usual trope that dawn rouses all people to undertake their daily labors.

The adjective may also prepare for the more human-oriented 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich, in which the pious man seems to do battle with time itself, embodied by the ever-advancing dawns. The interpr. of the hemistich is complicated by the shifting senses of the words *ápara-* and *pūrva-*. If these have temporal reference here, the sense would have to be that the man repels later dawns, while lengthening his life with earlier ones (so in fact both Ge and Re). But this does not accord with Rigvedic conceptions of time: there is no preventing the dawning of each new day; even a hero cannot contravene the cosmic laws of time. It would also be somewhat odd to say that a man lengthens his life with *past* dawns; this would seem to indicate that he has no future, unless he can fight off the dawns to come. It therefore seems preferable to follow Old (also fld by WG), who takes the two adjectives as spatial: *ápara-* ‘behind, to the west’, *pūrva-* ‘in front, to the east’. With these values in play, the man sends each new day behind him -- the dawn facing backwards as she passes from east to west -- and piles up his future with the dawns in front of him, to come.

This vs. is full of alliteration and sound play, esp. in pāda c: a: **tā atnata vayúnam vīrávakṣaṇam** / c: **ápo ápācīr áparā ápejate** (noted also by Watkins, Dragon 109) / d: **prá pūrvābhis**.

V.48.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is the hardest in the hymn and, as the middle vs., serves as an omphalos. It contains several temporal expressions and thus continues the theme of the passage of time found in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of vs. 2, but the rest is rather unclear. My rendering is tentative and also differs considerably from those of others, the details of which cannot be fully covered here.

Already in pāda a the alternation of days and nights is alluded to with the polarized expression *ahanyèbhir aktúbhiḥ*. Although the adjectival form of *ahanyà-* seems to invite an interpr. whereby the word modifies the adjacent instr. pl. *grāvabhiḥ*, the result, “with the daily pressing stones” (Ge “mit den täglichen Presssteinen”), doesn’t make sense, and I prefer to follow Re in considering it “une variante probable de *áhabhir aktúbhiḥ*.” Cf. *áhobhiḥ ... aktúbhiḥ* X.14.9 and, with lexical substitution, *dyúbhir aktúbhiḥ* (I.34.8, I.112.25, III.31.16).

A more serious problem is figuring out what action is being performed in the first hemistich. In literal terms, the subject, whoever it is, sprinkles the/a superior mace, along

with or by means of the pressing stones. Assuming we take the verb *ā jigharti* seriously -- unlike Ge and Re, who tr. contextually ('schleudert' and 'brandit' respectively), with Ge suggesting a possible derivation from  $\sqrt{hr}$  not  $\sqrt{ghr}$  -- the action is difficult to interpret, whoever the subject is. Why would one 'sprinkle' a mace? Old, flg. Bergaigne, suggests that the mace is really soma, but although we might think this would get us out of the difficulty, in fact the object of (*ā*)  $\sqrt{ghr}$  is never the liquid sprinkled, but the object that is sprinkled with it.

Working backward from vss. 4–5, which have pretty clear references to Agni, I take Agni as the subject of *ā jigharti* here. He prepares the mace by "sprinkling" it with his sparks, a sort of final or symbolic forging, while the soma produced by the pressing stones is sprinkled on the weapon at the same time. The two acts of sprinkling make the weapon ritually fit for use. (Agni's 'streaming' *rū́-* is found in 4a—another configuration of Agni as a liquid or as controlling liquid.) Under this interpr. the three apparently anomalous forms of *ā*  $\sqrt{ghr}$  in the RV, here and in IV.17.14 and X.6.4, can be given a unified interpr. All three have Agni as subj. (in my view), and in all three Agni "sprinkles" an object with his sparks. See comm. on the two other passages.

The loc. *māyīni* is a separate problem. The standard view is that it refers to an enemy at whom the vajra is wielded, hence tr. like Ge's "... schleudert er die beste Keule auf den Zauberischen," which, as we saw, requires the verb *ā jigharti* to be semantically twisted. But the near rhyme *māyīnī* at the end of vs. 1 refers to a positively viewed figure (in my interpr.), the goddess Dawn, and I suggest that *māyīni* here, which occurs in the same prominent hemistich-final position, also identifies a positive figure -- in fact, Indra. Indra is called *māyīn-* in VIII.76.1 and his *māyā-* are often referred to (see the passages listed by Grassmann, s.v., including V.30.6 in this maṇḍala). If it is Indra, the loc. does not have to refer to the goal of a brandished weapon, but can simply be a type of loc. absolute: "when the *māyīn-* (is there)," that is, when Indra attends the sacrifice. As for tr., I would substitute "master of uncanny power" for "... artifice."

The doubled preverb *ā*, found both at the beginning of the hemistich and directly before the verb, seems to be a case of redundant repetition.

The second hemistich also contains a temporal expression, *saṃvartāyanto ví ca vartayann āhā* "rolling up the days, they unroll them (again)." The idiom *sám / ví*  $\sqrt{vrt}$  is used of rolling up or out hides (*cárma*, VI.8.3, VIII.6.5), and this action is then metaphorically applied to darkness (*támas-*)(cf., e.g., V.31.3). The rolling up and out of darkness is thus a way of expressing the alternations of darkness and light, night and day -- in other words, a more poetic instantiation of the phrase in pāda a *ahanyèbhir aktúbhiḥ*. The problem is how to connect this fairly straightforward expression to pāda c, if it is connected. Although it is an easy assumption that cd has a subord. clause / main clause structure (so Ge and Re), it is possible to take c as attached to the first hemistich and d independent (so WG and me). The next question is whether the pl. subject of *pracáran* and that of *ví ca vartayan* are coreferential, and if so, who are they? and whose "own house" (*své dáme*) do they enter? The latter question is easier to answer: (*své*) *dáme* is almost always Agni's. I therefore think that *yásya* also refers to Agni, and this is indirect evidence for my identification of Agni as subj. of *ā jigharti*. But who enters Agni's house "by the hundred" (*śatám*) and rolls up and unrolls the days? In the publ. tr. I tentatively identify the subj. as "dawns," with full awareness that this is grammatically problematic: the pres. part. *vartáyantaḥ* in d is masc., and so the only way to make this work is to

assume that dawns are the subj. of c, but the subj. of d reverts to a generic masc. I suggested the dawns as subj. because they are the standard regulators of time (for this see VII.79.2, 80.1 with *sám* √*vrt* and *ví* √*vrt* respectively). Others (explicitly WG) suggest the gods or some subset thereof, but the gods don't really have the role of causing the alternation of days and nights. I must leave the identity of the subject uncertain, although I am still inclined to think that it is at least an indirect ref. to the dawns.

I do not understand the function of *vā* in c; JSK (DGRV II.203) despairs of this passage. As for the *ca* in d, I think it contrastively conjoins the preverbs *sam* and *ví*, even though the morphological formations to which these preverbs are attached are not parallel. The *ca* also enables a sort of syncopated phonological figure, with (*pra*)*cáran* in c deconstructed to (*ví*) *ca vartayan*.

V.48.4: This vs. is characterized by words regularly (though not exclusively) associated with Agni: *ánika-* 'face', *várpas-* 'form', *rátanam* √*dhā* 'establish a treasure'. This vocabulary gives support to my suggestion that Agni is also the subject of vs. 3, esp. since the *asya* in pāda a (and b) should refer to something already present in the discourse.

As for the *tām ... rītīm paraśór iva*, most comm. appositely compare V.7.8 *prá svádhitīva rīyate* "(Agni) streams forth like an axe" (if that's what it means; see comm. ad loc.). I consider the *rītīm* to continue the liquid imagery of 3b. The abstract *rīti-* in its 4 other occurrences is either construed with the gen. pl. *apām* (VI.13.1, IX.108.10) or implicitly with other liquid vocabulary; cf. also the compd. *rītyāp-* (2x). The attempts by most interpr. to impose a different sense (e.g., Re 'l'élan-destructeur') on this transparent deriv. of √*rī* 'flow' seem to stem from discomfort with the image, and esp. the simile of the axe. But the arc of sparks that sprinkle the mace in 3b (by my interpr.) would look like a stream, and anyone who has ever watched a person swing an axe (properly) would recognize the image: the fluent movement in a stream-like curve. (There are numerous You-tube videos.)

For *bhārahūti-* see comm. ad I.129.2, V.29.8.

Ge, flg. Gr., reverses 4cd and 5ab. I do not see the necessity for this. It puts the two forms of (-)*ánika-* in the same vs. and continues the description of Agni begun in 4ab, but leaving the hemistichs in their transmitted order certainly causes less thematic disruption than most changes of topic in the RV.

V.48.5: Ge emends *váruṇo* to *áruṇo* 'the reddish one', but this seems completely unnecessary. Although putting people in their places (generally *jána-* √*yat*) is ordinarily Mitra's duty not Varuṇa's, these closely linked gods trade off qualities. That there is no simile marker is not surprising; gods are often equated directly with other gods when they perform the others' functions. See, e.g., the series of identifications of Agni with other gods in II.1.

On the formula *dāti vāryam* see my 2024 article on *dātivāra-* (in *Indo-European Linguistics*). Although *dāti* here looks like an anomalous root present, it is most likely a root-aor. subjunctive, which works very well here.

## V.49 All Gods

V.49.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the first hemistich seems to pick up the last one of the previous hymn (48.5cd), where Bhaga and Savitar are identified as the givers of desirable things. Āyu is always a somewhat mysterious figure in the RV, and in this case it is difficult to tell whether the gen. *āyóḥ* dependent on *rátnam* (also in 2d) is in possessive or indirect object use -- that is, are the two gods distributing treasure to Āyu or Āyu's treasure to others. Ge seems to opt for the former, Re and WG the latter. In this case, the end of the last hymn may be helpful: V.48.5cd *ná tasya vidma ... yáto bhágaḥ savitā dāti vāryam* "We do not know that from which Bhaga and Savitar will give what is choice." The ablatival *yátaḥ* 'from which' indicates the source from which they will acquire what they then distribute. If 49.1 is in some way responsive to this, *āyóḥ* should likewise indicate the source not the recipient of the treasure.

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich I tr. the vocc. *narā purubhujā ... aśvinā* as if acc., to avoid extra fuss.

V.49.2: The standard tr. construe *vidvān* with *prayānam ásurasya* (e.g., Ge "Der Ausfahrt des Asura gewärtig," with a slightly odd rendering of *vidvān*, perhaps because he construes it with *práti?*). But pāda-final *vidvān*, which is quite common, is generally used absolutely, without an object (and tmesis would be unusual, though not unprecedented, with a participle). The absolute usage would be reinforced by likewise pāda-final *vijānán* 'discerning' in c; the two participles define the subject as a sagacious and perceptive poet/sacrificer.

The referent of the acc. sg. adj. *jyēṣṭham* is entirely ambiguous: it can be neut. and modify *rátnam* or masc. and modify *vibhájantam*. Since *jyēṣṭha-* 'distinguished, pre-eminent' is used of both animates and inanimates, there is no way to tell -- and the decision hardly matters. More interesting is the *ca* in d, which must link the phrase *jyēṣṭham ... rátnam vibhájantam āyóḥ*, which refers to Bhaga (see 1b), with a gapped Savitar, who, though present in pāda b and conjoined with Bhaga in 1ab, is not found in the clause in 2cd. See Klein DGRV 127.

V.49.3: The hapax *adatrāyā* is universally taken as an adverbial instr. built to a fem. \**adatrā-* with the meaning 'ohne Geschenk empfangen zu haben' (Gr), 'ohne ein (Gegen)geschenk zu verlangen' (Ge), 'nicht geschenkweise' (AiG III.76), etc. But the morphology rests on very little (there is no independent fem. *-ā* stem), and, so interpreted, the word is also hard to make sense of. If it means 'in a non-giving/distributing fashion', it is immediately contradicted by the statement that the gods do distribute good things (*dayate vāryāni*). To make it work somewhat better, most interpr. sneak in the notion of *counter-gift*: that is, the gods distribute good things without expectation of getting something in return. But this hardly fits the Vedic conceptual universe any better. Gods don't selflessly hand out "free gifts"; they expect praise and oblations in return. This is, after all, the reciprocal arrangement that the whole RV rests on! I therefore suggest an entirely different analysis of the word, as *adatra-yā-*, a root noun cmpd. with *√yā* 'travel, drive' as 2<sup>nd</sup> member, hence 'traveling to those (so far) without gifts'. The accent is correct for such a cmpd. We need a nom. sg. with underlying final *-s*, but \**-yās* in sandhi would yield the *-yā* found in the passage, so only the Pp. would need emendation. The cmpd. would refer to the standard journey of gods to the sacrifice, bringing goods to distribute to the sacrificers; note the presence of the same root *√yā* in *prayānam*

‘advance’ in the preceding vs. 2a, referring to the same advent of the god(s) at the sacrifice.

As noted in the publ. intro., the vs. seems to refer to the distribution of dakṣiṇās, a ritual event that in RVic times happened at the dawn sacrifice (as here: *vāsta usrāḥ*), not at the Midday Pressing as in classical śrauta ritual.

This phrase *vāsta usrāḥ* is found 3 other times, all pāda final, with the other three occurrences (IV.25.2, VII.69.5, VIII.46.26; cf. also VI.3.6 *vasta usrāḥ*) containing *usrāḥ*. Although Gr classifies *vāsta* as the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. med. pres. of  $\sqrt{vas}$  ‘wear’ (that is, pausal form *vāste*; so Pp.), it is clear from the phraseology that it must belong with  $\sqrt{vas}$  ‘dawn’, and is most likely a form of the loc. to *vāstu-* ‘dawning’; see AiG III.153–54 with lit. cited there. I do not entirely understand the mechanism that produced the form we have, and in fact several different pathways have been suggested. Wackernagel simply attributes it to shortening of *-ā* in *\*vāstā usr...* < *\*vāstāvusr...*, but I find the shortening hard to motivate. Others (e.g., Oldenberg) suggest that it rests on a *u*-stem loc. sg. *\*-av / -o*, which would yield the sequence directly. Although I was dubious about Old’s suggestion because of the cost of positing an alternative loc. sg. that is not directly attested, I have been persuaded by TY’s view that it continues an IE endingless loc. (in full grade), and this archaism was preserved in a cadential formula that enforces a light syllable in this position.

V.49.4: The standard tr. supply a verb (such as ‘grant’) in pāda a, but this seems unnecessary. The clause can be an equational expression; gods are called upon to be *vārūtham* ‘defense’ elsewhere: cf. I.59.8 *bhāvā vārūtham grṇatē ...* (Agni); sim. VII.32.7 (Indra), VIII.67.3.

V.49.5: There is no overt referent in the main clause (c) for the *yé* in ab, but ‘they’ (namely the poet/sacrificers) are clearly to be the beneficiaries of the good actions in c, who, in d, appear in the 1<sup>st</sup> ps.

### V.50–51 All Gods

Svastyātreya Ātreya is said to be the poet of these two hymns. The word *svastī-* is found multiple times in these two hymns, esp. V.51.11–15.

### V.50 All Gods

As often, the poet embellishes a fairly simple message by playing with personal reference, cycling through all three persons in very short compass. See the disc. in the publ. intro. as well as more details in the comm. on individual vss. below.

V.50.1: The vs. (and hymn) opens cleverly: the 1<sup>st</sup> two words are *vísvo devásya*, and until we encounter the genitive ending on the 2<sup>nd</sup> word, we expect the “every god” that would be appropriate to an All God hymn. Instead, the 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda opens with the real referent of *vísvaḥ*, namely the polar opposite of ‘god’, *mártah* ‘mortal’.

On *iṣudhyati* see comm. ad I.128.6 and my 2021 “Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūdiia-*: The Aim of Praise” (Fs. Lamberterrie). In the course of re-examining the members of this word family, I have somewhat changed my interpr. of this passage. In the publ. tr. I take “wealth” as the target or goal of *iṣudhyati* ‘aims at’; however, insofar

as the Vedic and Avestan verbs express the target, it is in the acc. (see VIII.69.2), and it is the divine recipient of praise, not the desired counter-gift to the praise. The Pp. interpr. *rāyá* as dat. *rāyé*, which is neither the desired case nor the desired goal. It would be possible to read it as acc. pl. *rāyáh* ‘riches’, which *could* be an acc. goal (“everyone desires riches”), but since this still deviates from the preferred expression with *īśudhyá-*, I now prefer to supply “god Leader” as the goal, with dat. *rāyé* expression what we hope for in return: “Everyone aims (praise) (at god Leader) for wealth.”

Pādas b and d both contain a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. mid. to  $\sqrt{vr}$  ‘choose’, in the same metrical position and with the same metrical shape: root aor. *vr̥ita* and 9<sup>th</sup> cl. pres. *vr̥ita*. The first is clearly an optative, though it has a somewhat unexpected shape and is quite rare (only twice in the RV); its unusual root syllable (*vr̥* < \* $\underline{ur}H$ ; expect \**ur* as in part. *urāná-*) is found elsewhere only in *hotr-vūrya-* (2x, with pre-C outcome). The second, *vr̥ita*, is formally ambiguous: it can be an optative parallel to *vr̥ita*, as I have taken it (so also at least Re), or simply an injunctive. I would suggest that the poet first deploys the rare but unambiguously optative *vr̥ita* to set the modal tone and then uses the more common *vr̥ita* as its morphological parallel. But it would of course be possible to argue that the poet wishes to contrast the two modalities; so I interpr. Ge. IH (diss.) suggests that the poet is deliberately allowing both readings – aorist optative and habitual present – and tr. “(everyone) would choose brilliance – and does so – in order to thrive.”

V.50.2: As discussed in the publ. intro., this vs. effects a transition from the undefined 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. sg. “every mortal” (*vísvaḥ ... mártah*) of vs. 1 to a 1<sup>st</sup> ps. pl. referring to us. This has been definitively accomplished by pāda d, which opens with the finite 1<sup>st</sup> pl. *sácemahi* ‘may we be accompanied’, but earlier in the vs. this plural is carried by the insistent masc. nom. pl. pronominal forms *té ... yé ... té ... té*. These forms invite a 3<sup>rd</sup> plural reading (“they ... who ... they ... they”): although the *sáltám* pronoun is capable of having both 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. reference, 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. is the default. The first 3 pādas of the vs. cleverly avoid forcing the reference by using predicated dative infinitives (*anúsáse ... āp̥r̥ce*), which leave the person unfixed, rather than finite verbs, which would force such a reading of the person. The poet draws attention to his syntactic modulation through the singsong effect of *té te de(va) ..., yé ca ... / té (rāyā) té (hí āp̥r̥)ce, sáce(mahi) saca(thíyaiḥ)*.

The syntax is further complicated by the parenthetical expression embedded in pāda c, *té hy āp̥r̥ce*.

The thematic continuity with vs. 1, despite the fancy referential footwork, is emphasized by d *sácemahi sacathyaiḥ*, which echoes *sakhyám* in 1b.

V.50.3: The reference-shifting game continues here and also pulls in some polarized lexical choices. The 1<sup>st</sup> pl. of vs. 2 becomes the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. of the impv. in 3b *daśasyata* ‘[you all,] show favor’, but a trace of the 1<sup>st</sup> pl. is left in the enclitic *naḥ* ‘our, for us’ in 3a. This is the familiar scenario whereby the poet addresses his fellow officiants in the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl., urging them to do something on behalf of ‘us’ -- with ‘you’ and ‘us’ coreferential but distinguished pragmatically.

Although the identity of the addressees -- the officiants -- and the recipients of their favor -- the gods and their wives -- is ultimately clear, the lexicon complicates this interpr. The verb *daśasyá-* generally has a god or gods as its subj. and a mortal (vel sim.)

as its obj., often *naḥ* (e.g., VI.11.6 *daśasyā naḥ purvaṇīka hotaḥ* “Be favorable to us, o Hotar of many faces [=Agni]”). Here we must reverse the verbal arguments. The 1<sup>st</sup> object in the 1<sup>st</sup> pāda, *nṛ̥n* is ambiguous: although it of course means ‘man’ (or ‘superior man’), it is frequently used of gods as well as mortals; it would be possible to interpr. *naḥ* ... *nṛ̥n* as ‘us men’, rather than taking *naḥ* as a genitive (as I and the standard interpr. do). What helps clinch the divine reference is the 2<sup>nd</sup> acc. in that pāda, *átithīn* ‘guests’. This is the only pl. form of this stem in the RV; the sg. forms are exclusively used of Agni, thus skewing the word towards the divine, and of course the model of the sacrifice as guest-reception for the visiting gods is always conceptually present.

The presence of the gods’ wives, *pátnīḥ*, in b may allude to the shadowy “God Leader” (*devá-netár-*) who opens (vss. 1–2) and closes (vs. 5) this hymn, since an agent noun to the same root  $\sqrt{ni}$  ‘lead’, namely *néṣtar-*, is the leader of the wives of the gods and, later, of the sacrificer’s wife in classical śrauta ritual.

On *patheṣṭhā-* see comm. ad X.40.13.

V.50.4: This vs. is quite obscure, but seems metaphorically to depict the soma sacrifice. The problems are, as usual, compounded by the fact that the two (or one?) principal actor(s) are not identified. Interpr. of the vs. differ, and I will not discuss them all in detail.

In the first hemistich I take the draft animal (*váhniḥ* ... *paśúḥ*) to be soma, as often; the adj. *drónya-* ‘belonging to/seeking the *dróna*’ seems to clinch this, since *dróna* is always the soma cup. The action depicted is the standard flowing of the soma towards and into the soma vessels, regularly conceived as a (male) animal running (here  $\sqrt{dru}$ ) to a goal. The verb *dudrávat* is a pf. subj.; as I have established elsewhere (García Ramón Fs.), pf. subjunctives are simply subjunctives in value, with a future (not a future perfect) sense.

I take the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich as the main clause construed with the dependent *yátra* clause in ab. Its predicate is the agent noun *sánitā* lit. ‘winner’. Because of the future-value subjunctive in the dep. clause, *sánitā* looks to me like a good prospect for a periphrastic future use of the agent noun (so, it seems, Ge; in contrast cf. Tichy, 229: “Wo sich ... beeilen wird, *gewinnt* ...” [my italics]).

The subject in cd is, in my opinion, Indra. The adj. *nṛmānas-* ‘manly minded’ is used most often of him, and of course it is Indra for whom the soma is destined. *vīrá-pastya-* is a hapax, but it seems a bahuvrīhi of the type *vájra-bāhu-* ‘having an arm with a mace in it’, hence ‘having a house with heroes in it’, presumably referring to both divine and mortal warriors that Indra can muster in battle -- his household.

The first two words in the last pāda, *árṇā dh̥treva*, are problematic, the 2<sup>nd</sup> more than the first. For *árṇā* we must assume a neuter substantivization (‘flood[s]’) of the adj. *árṇa-* ‘flooding, undulating’, here in the pl. Given its sandhi position it could in principle instead represent *árṇās*, a feminine substantivization; since *árṇa-* several times modifies fem. *áp-* ‘waters’, this might work better -- but it makes it harder to explain the difficult *dh̥tīrā*, which is most easily taken also as a neut. pl. These floods are surely the floods of soma that are racing in the first half-verse.

As just noted, the simile *dh̥treva* [= *dh̥tīrā / iva*] is problematic. It is tempting to take it as *dh̥tīraḥ* with irregular sandhi (so Roth; see Old), but this is of course not a legitimate interpretational technique. It is also tempting to leave it untranslated, as Ge

does. Sāy. takes it as a fem. nom. sg., but who would this wise woman be? Ge considers the possibility of an instr. sg., but not seriously enough to tr. it so. Reluctantly, with a similarly reluctant Old, I take it as a neut. pl., meaning ‘wise (thoughts)’. This is unsatisfying because the adj. *dhîra-* otherwise only refers to animates. There are partial parallels for  $\sqrt{san}$  with thoughts/wisdom as obj., e.g., IX.9.9 *sānā medhām*, X.143.3 *sīṣāsataṃ dhīyah*, but not with *dhîra-*. A possibly more promising interpr. is suggested by Re, who points out that the only other neut. form of *dhîra-* is found with *janūṃṣi* ‘races’ in VII.86.1; this also seems to underlie Tichy’s “wie verständige (Wesen).” I would now emend the publ. tr. to “... like the wise (races).” This isn’t a great deal better, but it at least deals with the problem of animate/inanimate.

V.50.5: As all comm. remark, the meter in pāda b is flawed. Curiously enough, the other two occurrences of *rāthaspātiḥ* (in the closely related X.64.10, 93.7) are also found in metrically wanting pādas—each missing a syllable—as Old notes. The metrical problem may (or may not) be connected with the morphological anomaly in this compd.: the 1<sup>st</sup> member *rāthas-* to the extremely well-attested thematic stem *rātha-*. We would of course expect *\*rātha-pāti-*, but the problem with this form emerges immediately on constructing it: 4 light syllables. On this form and similarly anomalous hapax *rtas-pati-* (VIII.26.21; voc., so unaccented) see Wackernagel’s rather elliptical treatment (AiG II.1.241, 246–67), where he classifies the two forms with gen. *pāti-* compds, without explaining how he analyzes the *-as* forms morphologically. I would suggest that the putative, metrically difficult form with stem as first member was “fixed” by analogy to the common genitival *-pāti-* compds to athematic noun stems (or opaque ones), most esp. *bṛhaspāti-*, which is very common and phonologically similar. However, this does not address the metrical problem. Arnold (101) suggests reading *\*rāthasas*, which fixes the meter but at the high cost of inventing an *s*-stem to *rātha-*, which makes no sense derivationally (rightly rejected by Old). Old attributes the metrical disturbance to “laxe metrische Praxis,” which is, at best, a description, not an explanation. I do *not* think *rāthas-* represents an archaic gen. form—all the less so since it’s not clear that the form was correctly transmitted. In any case, Old considers the *rāthaspāti-* a divine being of some sort; the “Lord of the Chariot” here joins another very marginal figure, God Leader. *rāthaspāti-* is found with Bhaga elsewhere (X.64.10, 93.7), and such an association would fit the emphasis on ‘wealth’ (*rayí-*) in b and c.

The forms *iṣastútaḥ* and *devastútaḥ* in d and e can either be nom. pl. root noun agentive compds or acc. pl. tatpuruṣa action nouns (both with 2<sup>nd</sup> member *-stú-t-*); see Scar 636–7. Although most interpr. (Ge, Re, WG) opt for the former, I have chosen the latter, on the basis of a number of passages in V where a praise song (vel sim.) is the obj. of *manāmahe*: V.13.2 *agné stómam manāmahe*, V.35.8 *diví stómam manāmahe*, V.66.3 ... *susūtúm ... stómair manāmahe*; also VII.82.10 *devásya ślókaṃ savitúr manāmahe*.

## V.51 All Gods

On the structure of this composite hymn, see publ. intro. It is bland and featureless throughout, reminding us that there must have been a lot of mediocre Rigvedic poets and/or ritual occasions that did not require (or pay for) the best of what the poets had to offer.

V.51.1: The eponymous phrase *viśvaiḥ ... devaiḥ* opens successive pādas here (b, c), but the adj. is in fact more narrowly construed with immediately following *ūmebhiḥ*. This is rather like (or, rather, opposite to) the manipulation of the phrase in vs. 1 of the preceding hymn (50.1).

V.51.3: On the basis of VIII.38.7 *prātaryāvabhiḥ ... devébhiḥ* I construe those two instr. most closely together.

V.51.4: On the loc. *camū* see AiG III.188. It belongs to the category of endingless locatives discussed by TY; see comm. ad VII.102.3.

V.51.5-10: These next 6 vss. are in Uṣṇih, divided into 3 (vss. 5–7) and 3 (vss. 8–10) by their refrains: *abhí práyaḥ#* of 5–7 and the full-pāda *ā yāhy agne atrivát suté raṇa* of 8–10. In fact vss. 8–10 are rigidly -- and boringly -- structured, with each of the first two pādas containing a form of *sajūḥ* ‘jointly’ and as many god-name instrumentals as can be fitted in.

V.51.5: This vs. begins the second hymn in this conglomeration. Note that it repeats pāda-final *havyádātaye* from 1c, and the infinitive at the end of its first pāda, *vītāye*, rhymes with *pītāye* at the end of 1a.

V.51.11–15: Considered by Old to be an Anhang even to this set of appended hymns. Its lexical hero is *svastí-*, a form of which appears in every pāda between 11a and 15a. The poet seems to be trying to show how many different syntactic constructions he can plug *svastí-* into. Unfortunately this is not sufficient to hold our attention.

V.51.11: The transmitted impv. *mimūtām* would be better read *\*mimitām*; see Gunkel 2018 (Fs. Vine).

*anarvánaḥ* receives far more attention than I think it deserves. See esp. Old. However, now see the abundant references to my own comments on the various *anarvá(n)(a)-* stems in the lexical commentary index. JPB (Ādityas 218–19) has a convincingly scenario for this form as a backformation from *anarváṇam*, which he sees as the proper acc. sg. of a fem. *n*-stem.

V.51.12: My tr. of ab differs from the standard, which take *bhúvanasya yás pátiḥ* as a rel. cl. limiting *sómam*. Since the acc. of the god name seems to correlate with “call upon for well-being (*svastáye*),” and the rel. cl. is preceded by *svastí*, which is found as acc. in the “establish/mete out well-being,” I supply “mete out” here and take the rel. cl. as the subject without overt antecedent.

V.51.12: Bṛhaspati’s “whole flock” (bv. *sárva-gaṇa-*) may refer to the Āngirases. In any case note *sárva-* rather than the older *viśva-*, esp. notable in a Viśve Devāḥ hymn (though *viśve devāḥ* opens the next vs.).

## V.52–61 Maruts

This Marut cycle, attributed to Śyāvāśva Ātreya, is one of the glories of the RV, with a distinctive and exuberant poetic voice. Other hymns are attributed to him: V.81–82 (Savitar), VIII.35–38 (Aśvins, Indra [2x], Indra and Agni), and IX.32.

### V.52 Maruts

The pattern of the mention of the Maruts' name in this hymn is worth noting: it might be called a “versified paradigm” (à la I.1) with a hole in it. The various oblique forms of the plural stem *marút-* are densely clustered at the beginning of the hymn: instr. *marúdbhiḥ* (1b), gen. *marútām* (3c), loc. *marútsu* (4a), dat. *marúdbhyaḥ* (5d), and acc. *marútaḥ* (6d) -- each oblique case represented (if abl. is lumped with dat.), each once only. In addition there are three forms of the vṛddhied *mārutam* in the neut. acc. sg. later in the hymn (8a, 13c, 14a). However, though these gods are frequently referred to in the nom. pl. in the hymn, beginning with *yé* in 1c, and once in the voc. (*dhr̥ṣṇavaḥ* 14c), there are no forms of the nom. *marútaḥ* or the voc. *mārutaḥ* / *marutaḥ*, although these are the most common forms of this stem in the RV. After the paradigm has been established in the early part of the hymn (1–6), there are no further occurrences of the simple stem in the 11 remaining vss. (7–17), only the three vṛddhi forms. I don't know what, if anything, to make of this, but it does not seem by chance.

On the responsions and ring-compositional structure of vss. 1–5, see the publ. intro. and my “Poetic ‘Repair’ in the Rig Veda” (2006: 133–36), as well as *The Rigveda between Two Worlds* (2007: 112–13). The responsions and the versified paradigm are most likely related; as I argue in “Poetic ‘Repair’” the instr. in the phrase *ārcā marúdbhiḥ* ... in vs. 1 is somewhat anomalous, but it is “repaired” by the substitution of the expected dat. in 5d ... *ārcā marúdbhyaḥ*. To summarize those discussions briefly, in a hymn devoted to the Maruts, beginning with the self-exhortation of the poet “chant forth,” we might expect the Maruts to be the recipients (dat.) of the chant, not, as it seems, fellow-chanters (instr.) with the human poet. But putting them in the instr. emphasizes an important part of their profile, that they are also known to chant, a feature that is alluded to by the hemistich-final adj. *īkvabhiḥ* ‘possessing the chant’. Thus the beginning of the hymn seems concerned with the Maruts' contrastive and mediating functional roles as expressed by the oblique cases of the paradigm.

V.52.1: On the somewhat anomalous expression in the first hemistich, see reff. given just above.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is also syntactically somewhat compromised. Forms of uncompounded  $\sqrt{mad}$  that mean ‘take pleasure in / enjoy’ seldom if ever (possibly VII.49.4) take the acc. (as also noted by Re), in preference to instr., gen., or loc.; yet *mādanti* here seems to take acc. *śrávaḥ* as obj. It might be possible to extract *ānu* from the compd *anuṣvadhám* ‘according to their own nature’ and construe it with *mādanti*, since *ānu*  $\sqrt{mad}$  ‘cheer on’ does take an acc. -- but a personal acc., not the neut. inanimate ‘fame’ that it would govern here. So an unresolvable syntactic tension has been set up. I think the tension reflects the double role of the Maruts already encountered in pāda b. As recipients of Śyāvāśva's praise chant, they would “take pleasure in their fame,” but as participants in the chanting they would “cheer on” the fame of other(s).

Ge and Re seem to take *adroghám* as an adv., a possibility also mentioned by WG. However, the other apparent adv. form has initial accent (*ádrogham* VIII.60.4), and

furthermore the existence of a bahuvrīhi *ádrogha-vāc-* (2x) and the syntagm *adroghá-vācas-* (III.14.6) support a collocation with semantically similar *śrávas-*.

V.52.2: It is not clear why the rel. cl. of ab contains *sánti*, as the clause seems a simple equational one (“since they are comrades”), and such clauses generally lack an overt copula. Ge takes *dhṛṣṇuyā* as a predication with *sánti*, as, it seems, do WG. This is in principle appealing, but given that we get untethered adv. *dhṛṣṇuyā* in the previous and following vss. (1a, 4b) and a similar equational (rel.) cl. in 13ab (*yé ... kaváyaḥ sánti* “who are poets,” it does not seem compelling.

Ge takes *dhṛṣadvínaḥ* as acc. pl. with *śásvataḥ*, but he seems isolated in this interpr., starting from Sāy., who takes it as the nom. pl. that otherwise universally prevails.

V.52.3: As Ge points out, the verb *áti √skand* ‘spring across/beyond’ is reminiscent of *ádhi √skand*, which refers to sexual mounting. He supplies a parenthetical “(auf die Kühe)” in the simile (so also Re), and I would now also do so: “they spring across the nights, as streaming bulls spring (upon cows).”

The meaning ‘night’ for the rare and etymologically unclear (see EWA s.v.; also WG n., with more confidence in the etym.) *śárvarī-* seems established by later Vedic and MIA evidence, but I do not know why the word appears in this passage. A fem. word for night is necessary to make the implicit sexual pun work, but the better attested *rātrī-* is of course also fem. It somewhat responds phonologically to likewise pāda-final *śásvataḥ* in 3b, and it therefore might form a web, along with *syand(rāsaḥ) ... ṣkand(anti)* earlier in the hemistich -- but the phonological connections seem too slight. Maybe Śyāvāśva just likes words that begin with his initial.

I am not certain what image is being conveyed. Ge suggests that the Maruts’ storms calm down at night and then take on renewed energy in the morning, but the two passages he adduces don’t seem to support that interpr. Moreover, ‘spring across/beyond’ seems to me the opposite of what Ge envisions: it’s a vigorous action not a relaxation into tranquility. I tentatively suggest that it refers to the fact that thunderstorms (or, rather, the associated lightning flashes) are especially visible at night and appear to streak across the dark sky.

V.52.5: This is the vs. in which the problematic instr. of 1b is resolved -- “repaired” -- but, as discussed in my 2006 paper, the poet produces a new conundrum, though this one can be, as it were, pre-repaired. The obj. *yajñám* ‘sacrifice’ is unexpected with the verb *prá ... arcā* ‘chant forth’; we expect a verbal product as object. But the *yajñám* here is picking up the conjoined phrase *stómaṃ yajñám ca* of 4b, whose *stómaṃ* would be an appropriate obj. of *prá ... arcā*.

V.52.6: This vs. is in Pañkti; that is, it contains five 8-syllable pādas rather than the four of Anuṣṭubh, otherwise the meter of the hymn until the end, where the final two vss. are also in Pañkti. Here the slight shift in meter seems to mark a boundary: on the one hand it brings the versified paradigm to a close, with the acc. *marútaḥ* in d; on the other it announces the advent of the gods with their storms and inaugurates the descriptive passages that dominate the remainder of the hymn.

The first pāda lacks a verb; Ge makes a valiant effort to construe *asṛkṣata* of b with pāda a as well, in two different senses (see his n. 6; ‘... sind ... herangesprengt’ for a, ‘haben ... geschleudert’ for b), but the former would be a unique sense for *ā √sṛj*. Gr also invents a unique sense ‘decorate X with Y’ to allow the two pādas to be construed as a single construction. To avoid such ad hoc contrivances it seems best to follow Old in supplying a verb of motion with the insistent *ā* in pāda a.

The adj. that begins pāda b, *ṛṣvā(h)*, can be either acc. pl. fem. modifying *ṛṣṭīh* ‘spears’ (so Gr, apparently also WG) or nom. pl. masc. modifying *nāra(h)* ‘men’. The pāda break preceding it might favor the former interpr., but 13a, where the Maruts are definitely called *ṛṣvā(h)*, favors the latter, esp. since the Maruts are also *ṛṣvā-* elsewhere (e.g., I.64.2). Note that in 13a the adj. is also followed by ‘spear’, but safely bound in a cmpd: *ṛṣvā ṛṣṭīvidyutaḥ*; this bahuvrīhi ‘whose spears are lightning flashes’ combines the independent words *ṛṣṭīh* and *vidyútaḥ* of our vs. (pādas b and c respectively) and enforces their identity. This resolution in 13a of the ambiguity of 6ab can be seen as another example of “repair.” Partly because the poet seems to be drawing attention to the phrase by resolving it in 13a I am now inclined to take *ṛṣvā(h)* in 6b with both of its possible referents and emend the tr. to “the lofty men have launched their spears aloft.” It would be one of the reasonably many examples where a grammatically ambiguous descriptor is positioned exactly between its two possible referents.

The hapax fem. part. *jájjhatīh* ‘giggling’ is, of course, phonologically quite striking. As discussed by Hoffmann (Aufs. 306 and n. 3 = KZ 83 [1969]), the form is based on the redupl. pres. to *√has* ‘laugh’ with a Middle Indic (“dialectal”) development of the cluster *\*gh-s* (rather than the expected *-kṣ-* found in the masc. part. to the same redupl. pres. *jáḥsat-* in I.33.7). The use of such a phonologically exotic word is reminiscent of the equally exotic *akhkhalī-* in the frog hymn (VII.103.3). The latter, as Thieme has convincingly argued, is an importation from pedagogical discourse, conducted for young boys in a preform of Middle Indic. Our form here seems adopted from vernacular “women’s language” and brings a whiff of family life: little girls running after their brothers or parents with little-girl giggles -- a life that would, of course, be conducted in a vernacular (pre-) Middle Indic.

Pāda e has several parallels, given by Ge in his n. 6e. The question in our passage is whether *divāḥ* is gen., as I’ve taken it (so also Ge and somewhat differently Re), or abl. (“The radiance arose ... from heaven”; so WG). The parallels cut both ways: V.25.8 *svānó arta tmánā divaḥ* and VII.34.7 *úd asya śúṣmād bhānúr nārta* seem to favor an abl. interpr., but IV.1.17 *úd devyā uṣāso bhānúr arta* a genitive. In the end, I don’t think the choice materially affects the sense of the passage: whether the radiance is ‘of heaven’ or ‘from heaven’ the result is pretty much the same.

V.52.7: This vs. consists of a single rel. cl. (*yé ... yé*) with no main cl. It is most probably proposed to vs. 8 with its correlative the neut. sg. *sárdho mārutam* “the Marut troop,” despite the mismatch in number and gender. The end of vs. 6 has no reference to the Maruts, and, as I noted above, it serves as a boundary vs. The same structure with number disharmony envisaged here across pāda boundary (7a *yé ...*, b *yé ...* // 8a *sárdho mārutam ...*) is found, more clearly, within a vs. in 13: 13a *yé ...* / 13c *tám ... mārutam gaṇám ...*, perhaps another example of repair.

The usual tripartite division of the cosmos (earth, midspace, heaven) is here complicated by the intrusion of a fourth, “the precinct of the rivers” (*vrjána- nadñnām*). Re also notes this, but suggests that c does nothing but “enjoliver” (embellish) a -- that is, that the rivers are a variant of the earth. In a basic sense he is correct, but I would add that what we have here may be the clash of two formulaic expressions of contrastive geographic totality -- the standard tripartite model and one, barely attested, in which a nearer or lower *vrjána-* is contrasted with something more distant. Cf. esp. I.101.8 (with mention of the Maruts) *yád vā marutvaḥ paramé sadhásthe, yád vāvamé vrjáne mādayasva*, a bipartite phrase where a seat (*sadhástha-* as here) that is *paramá-* ‘high/distant’ is contrasted with *avamé vrjáne* ‘lowest/nearest enclosure’; a *vrjána-* is similarly *ávare* in II.24.11. Thus, though pāda c may refer to the same general geographical location as a, namely earth, it also evokes a paired, rather than tripartite, contrast like that in I.101.8 just cited.

The pf. injunc. 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. *vāvṛdhánta* (see Kü 471) is attested several times elsewhere and manifestly belongs to a redupl. stem. It is worth noting, however, that the poet seems to be playing with its long reduplication. The *vā* is positioned exactly where we would expect *vā* ‘or’ to be (Wackernagel’s position: #*yé vāvṛdhánta ...*), anticipating the two *vā*’s in pādas c and d, also in Wackernagel’s position. I am not suggesting a re-segmentation as *vā vṛdhánta*, simply pointing to Śyāvāśva’s penchant for verbal play and for making single forms do double duty. To extend this analysis, note the beginning of pāda b, *ya urāv ...*, with *āv* that could be taken as a metathesis of *vā*.

V.52.8–9: I don’t understand the force of *utá sma*, which opens 8c and 9a, with *utá* opening 9c. Klein (DGRV I.416–17) says that they introduce parallel statements about the Maruts and represent “concatenation across the stanza-boundary,” halfway between intrastanzaic and interstanzaic usage. But the role of *sma*, whatever it may be, seems downplayed in this description.

V.52.8: Ge takes *syandrā(ḥ)* as acc. pl. fem. and supplies antelopes as the obj. of *yujata*. This is not impossible, but *syandrā(ḥ)* was already used of the Maruts in 3a (cf. also V.87.3).

V.52.9: The phrase *páruṣṇyām ūrñā vasata* is similar to IV.22.2 *páruṣṇīm uśámāṇa ūrñām*, but while in the latter *páruṣṇīm* modifies ‘wool’, here it must be a loc. sg. The ‘wool’ in both passages is best understood as a metaphor for ‘foam’. The stem *páruṣṇī-* is the fem. corresponding to *paruśá-* ‘gray’. It is also a river name, presumably so called because it is covered with grayish foam. For disc. see Old, Hoffmann (Aufs. 333–35 [=Die Sprache 1974]). The mediating image in this picture is provided by *sundhyávaḥ*; I follow Thieme (KZ 79 [1965] = Kl Sch. 219ff.) in interpr. this form as ‘preening [waterbird]’ (to *śudh* ‘clean’); for another passage where the adj. clearly refers to a (metaphorical) bird, see VII.97.7, also VIII.24.24. As pointed out in the publ. intro., the density of imagery is remarkable: the Maruts swathed in clouds (not explicitly mentioned) are compared to birds in a river covered with foam, with the foam (again not explicit) characterized as wool.

The instr. sg. *pavyā* to the masc. stem *paví-* shows the older *-ā* ending, which becomes limited to fem. *-i-*stems when the masc./ neut. adopt *-inā*.

V.52.10: The first half-vs. consists of fanciful names of the individual Maruts (never otherwise named), summed up with the instr. phrase *etébhīḥ ... nāmabhiḥ* “with these names” in c. The rest of the second hemistich is unclear, however, primarily because the formal identity and meaning of *ohate* are disputed. The former issue is the easier to solve: though Gr identifies the verb as a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. and Re hesitates, it must be a 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. to the root pres. (of  $\sqrt{oh/uh}$ ) (see EWA s.v. *OH* and esp. Narten [Kl Sch. 98–100 =1969]). The basis for considering it a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. is the Pp’s interpr. of *viṣṭārā* as nom. sg. *viṣṭārāḥ*, but a loc. sg. in *-é* is equally possible. It is highly unlikely that *ohate* would be 3<sup>rd</sup> singular in 10d but 3<sup>rd</sup> plural in 11a, b, as Gr, for ex., takes them. The questions then are who is the subj. and how does the verb fit with the rest of the material in the half-verse. Most interpr. take *yajñām* as the obj. and tr. “praise the sacrifice,” with either the Maruts or unidentified priests/poets as subj. This is not impossible, but given the two *ohate* in the next vs., which lack objects (unless *yajñām* is supplied, so, e.g., Gr), I prefer to seek a consistent interpr. of the verb forms. The root is used on a number of occasions as a passive ‘be lauded’ / reflexive ‘vaunt oneself’ (cf., e.g., V.30.6, VIII.5.39). Here I take the Maruts as subject and the names in ab to be the verbal content of the Maruts’ vaunt. (Note that the threefold repetition of *ohate* here is matched by the three occurrences of *vocanta* in vs. 16, also with the Maruts as subj.) Under this interpr. the dat. *máhyam*, which is problematic in most interpr., expresses the verbal recipient of the boast. This leaves *yajñām viṣṭāré*. For most interpr. the latter word characterizes the Maruts as they come to the sacrifice -- e.g., Ge ‘in breiter Schar’. Again, not impossible. However, the root  $\sqrt{str}$  ‘strew’ is almost always closely associated with the ritual, esp. with the strewing of the barhis, and I suggest that *viṣṭāré* is an infinitival locative that takes verbal rection, hence “at the bestrewing of the sacrifice.” However, I realize that this interpr. has some problems: *-stāré* is an unlikely infinitival form, and  $\sqrt{str}$  doesn’t elsewhere take *yajñām* as object. Moreover, one nominal form of  $\sqrt{str}$ , namely *viṣṭārah* in II.13.10, does seem to have spatial force (JPB ‘far-flung’). I don’t have a good solution.

V.52.11: My interpr. of this vs. follows from that of 10 and diverges from those of others. By my interpr. the nom. plurals are further names the Maruts call themselves, shown most clearly by the *īti* ending pāda c. Most interpr. take c with d, syntactically and semantically divorced from ab -- e.g., Klein (DGRV II.102–3, closely flg. Ge) “(And) the men proclaim it (as worthy) and (their) teams proclaim (it so), and wondrous (are their) forms, worthy of being seen, (of whom they say,) “(They are) from the distance.” But the *ādihā*’s that open pādas a, b, and c impose, or at least beg for, a parallel interpr. of the three pādas, esp. with the *īti* closing the last, and the parenthetical “(of whom they say)” is ad hoc, generated only from the *īti* of c.

One of the problems not mentioned by the standard interpr. is the intrusive *ní* in pāda a. The verb  $\sqrt{uh}$  does not otherwise occur with this preverb, and since *ohate* is surrounded by identical forms without preverb (10d, 11b) it seems unlikely that only the middle one would have the preverb. It might be loosely inspired by the *ni* in *nīyúta(ḥ)* in b, but Śyāvāśva does not seem the type of poet to throw in verbal fragments without function. I suggest rather that it continues but varies the naming pattern of 10ab with PREV-*pathi-*, here with the *ní* a very minimalist predication of *nārah* “men down.”

V.52.12: This vs. bristles with difficulties. The first to present itself is the least of them: the root noun cmpd *chandastúbh-*. Thus the transmitted form, but it is analyzed by the Pp and all subsequent treatments as *chandaḥ-stubh*, with the *s*-stem *chándas-* ‘rhythmic chant’. This makes sense and the phonology is impeccable. However, this *s*-stem has decidedly late distribution (X, 1x Vālah., with the deriv. *chandasyà-* once in late IX), and I now wonder if it contains a thematic stem instead.

The next word, the hapax *kubhanyú-*, is more troublesome. There are several competing interpr. of this word, though Ge refuses to tr. it at all. Re tr. “voués à un rite communiel,” which he derives from Benveniste (BSL 52 [1956] 11–12 [not yet seen by me]), who connected it with Ossetic material: see KEWA III.676; the Ossetic connection was disputed by Szemerényi; see KEWA ref. and EWA s.v., and seems in principle farfetched. Another, going back to Neisser (see EWA s.v.) and followed by Scar (640) and WG, is ‘yelling, shouting’, from  $\sqrt{bhan}$  ‘speak’, with the pejorative prefix *ku-*. (Remmer [Frauennamen, p. 48] also follows this basic analysis, but takes the *ku-* in positive sense: “welche Redner!” hence “wortgewaltig.”) More likely is an analysis stemming ultimately from Sāy.’s *udakecchavaḥ* (see Ge’s n. 12a “Wasser wünschend”). Ge cites similarly formed *udanyávaḥ* ‘water seeking’ in nearby V.54.2, 57.1 (latter also has an *útsa-* ‘wellspring’ as here). The Kubhā river also figures in this Marut cycle, in the next hymn V.53.9 in a list of river names. A derived adj. *\*kubhā-yú-* ‘seeking the Kubhā’ can easily have been formed. Given the common interchange of *-ā-yá/ú-* and *-an-yá/ú-* derivatives (type *vṛṣāyá-*, *vṛṣanyá-*), *\*kubhāyú-* could have been reformed as *kubhanyú-*, esp. under the influence of *udanyú-*; see also *iṣanyata* in 14d. Here it can mean either ‘seeking the Kubhā River’ or ‘seeking water’ more generally. Since their goal in the following pāda is a wellspring (*útsam*), seeking some sort of water source makes good sense in the passage.

The meaning of the word *kīrī(n)-* is disputed, with the two leading contenders ‘bard’ and ‘weak, poor’. The former, the only sense given by Gr, seems to be currently in the ascendancy after eclipse -- e.g., KEWA glosses it only as ‘gering, niedrig, arm’, but EWA as ‘Dichter, Lobsänger’, with ‘weak’ banished to the small print -- perhaps because it is easier to etymologize ( $\sqrt{kṛ}$  ‘celebrate’). But the contexts, esp. the fact that it is regularly followed by *cid* ‘even’ and often refers to a person receiving divine aid despite his condition, favor the latter. See also my brief disc. in Hyenas (251-52). The sense ‘weak, poor’ fits our context less well, since the Maruts are powerful and outfitted with enough bling to make them rich. But if ‘weak’ can be interpreted as ‘lightweight, light on their feet’, it can work: the Maruts are *dancing* to the wellspring. Another issue is the status of the stem *kīrín-* to which this form is assigned. The only other forms possibly belonging to this stem are 3 instr. sg. *kīrínā* (I.100.9, V.4.10, 40.8), but they can also of course belong to the reasonably well-attested simple *i*-stem *kīrī-*. Mehendale (“Two Vedic Notes: (1) *kīrín?*” BSOAS 1974: 670–71) attempts to eliminate the *-ín-* stem entirely by analyzing our form as instr. sg. *kīrínā + u*, with *u* replacing the usual *cid*, and this interpr. is tentatively followed by WG. But *u* is hardly equivalent to *cid* and it is highly unlikely to be placed here, in the middle of a pāda and a clause. Our understanding of Rigvedic particle usage has advanced considerably since 1974. If we want to eliminate, or limit, *kīrín-*, it should first be noted that of the three instr. sgs., two are in Maṇḍala V (V.4.10, 40.8), and so it is possible that the poets of V reinterpr. *kīrínā* as belonging to an *-ín-* stem; there are no unambig. exx. of the plain *i*-stem *kīrī-* in V.

Certainly there is no possessive sense associated with the putative *kīrīn-* forms as far as I can see.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich also presents difficulties: how to construe the indefinite expression *ké cid*, why the Maruts are compared to/identified with thieves, and whether c and d form a single expression or two. These questions have been addressed in various ways in the standard transl.; I will treat only my own. My rendering assumes that c and d are separate clauses (contra the standard view) depicting a two-step process. For c I start with the fact that what thieves mostly do in the RV is hide. I assume that the Maruts are likened to thieves because on their first approach, enveloped in clouds perhaps, they are indistinct and unidentifiable; this is also conveyed by the indefinite *ké cin ná* “like who knows who.” (I do not take *ké cid* directly with *tāyāvah*, but interpr. them as two different ways of referring to the stealthy Maruts, again against most interpr.)

In d the Maruts suddenly flash out (*āsan drśí tviṣé* “came to glitter in my sight”) as the storm, or specifically the lightning. As they become visible in this way, it also becomes clear that they are ‘helpers’ (*ūmāḥ*); as usual, the assumption behind this is that the storm, though violent, brings fructifying rain -- rain which is previewed in the first hemistich, where the Maruts seek water and prance to the wellspring, while chanting in rhythm, presumably a reference to thunder.

V.52.13: On the phrase *ṛṣvā ṛṣtīvidyutaḥ* see disc. ad vs. 6; for the number disharmony in *yé ... tām* see disc. ad vs. 7; for the seemingly unnecessary copula *sánti* see disc. ad vs. 2 as well as immediately below.

This vs. serves as another boundary. The Maruts of the thunderstorm, dominating the middle of this hymn, are reconfigured as ritualists, appropriate guests and participants at our sacrifice. The ritual context now takes over for the rest of the hymn. This thematic transition may help explain the *sánti*. In pāda a the Maruts are still lofty ones with spears of lightning -- untamed forces of nature -- but in b they are asserted to be poets and ritual adepts (*kavāyaḥ ... vedhāsaḥ*). Perhaps the *sánti* marks the two forms in b as predicate nouns in an equational sentence (X IS Y), where X and Y belong to very different domains.

The address or, as seems likely, self-address to the seer (*rṣe*) returns us to the very beginning of the hymn, with Śyāvāśva’s clear self-address in 1ab.

V.52.14: The self-address of 13c seems important enough to repeat here in pāda with minimal variation, though the syntactic function of the acc. *mārutam gaṇām* is different and the rest of the vs. much less clear.

The first hemistich lacks a verb; the parameters of what to supply are set by the nominal arguments in a -- the seer is commanded (/commands himself) to [DO SOMETHING] to(ward) (*ācha*) the Marut flock -- and further limited by the simile in b, with the nom. maiden (*yoṣāṇā*) roughly corresponding to the seer and the acc. friend/ally (*mitrām*) to the Maruts. I have supplied ‘approach’, others ‘invite, address, turn’, etc., all more or less acceptable.

The question then is what the simile in b is conveying. Most of the renderings attribute bolder action to the maiden than I think gently bred Vedic girls would ordinarily undertake (see esp. Klein, DGRV II.183–84: “... like a maiden entices a friend”). My solution is to read *dānā* twice in two different morphological interpr. First, with the

standard interpr., as the instr. sg. of ‘gift’ (on the possible stems, see EWA s.v. *dāná-*). But also as a root aor. mid. participle in the nom. sg. fem. with passive value. Although such a participle is not recognized by the standard grammars, it is exactly the form we would expect and fits the gift-marriage model perfectly. The *mitrá-* to whom she is given is presumably her spouse; on *mitrá-* in a wedding context see X.27.12 and my “The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara” (Fs. Parpola 2001), 309–13.

The final word of b, *yoṣáṇā*, is anomalously accented (vs. standard *yóṣaṇā*). See below comm. ad 15b for a possible explanation.

The second hemistich seems to be presented as a disjunctive alternative to the first, introduced by *vā*. The “or” does not make much sense; it is tempting to follow Re’s judgment: “*vā* irrationnel.” But Klein (II.184) may have rightly divined the rationale: “the poet first beseeches the Rishi to entice the Maruts to the worship, but then, as an alternative, appeals directly to the Maruts themselves to come.” I would tweak this slightly by suggesting that the action to which 14cd is presented as an alternative is not 14ab, but rather 13cd, of which 14a(b) is a variant. The ṛṣi orders himself to stop the Maruts with a song (13cd) but then suggests to them that they initiate the journey themselves (14cd).

The voc. *dhṛṣṇavaḥ* addressed to the Maruts again reminds us of the beginning of the hymn, with *dhṛṣṇuyā* (1a, 2b, 4b) and *dhṛṣadvínaḥ* (2c).

V.52.15: This vs. is a variant of 14, with the parts somewhat differently distributed. The phrase *devāṃ áchā* in b resembles *ácha ... mārutam gaṇám* in 14a, and it therefore seems prudent and economical to supply the same verb as in 14a.

Although in 14ab *dāná* belonged to the same syntagm as *ácha ... mārutam gaṇám*, here it is construed with a different part of the sentence, with the opt. *saceta* ‘would/might/could keep company’. In 14 the poet was offering a gift to the Maruts; here he “keeps company with a gift” -- that is, receives it -- bestowed by the Maruts. The situation is the standard reciprocal exchange of praise and worship for the gods for material benefits from the gods. The givers are first identified as *sūrī-*s ‘patrons’ (c), and one could think of the human patrons often so called, but pāda d makes it clear that the Maruts are meant, and the identification of the *sūrāyaḥ* with the Maruts is even clearer in 16b.

The two instr. in d are off balance: *yāmaśrutebhiḥ* ‘famed on/by their course/journey’ modifies the Maruts, but, *pace* Gr, Ge, and WG, *añjībhiḥ* should not, because *añjī-* is only a noun ‘unguent, adornment’ (see in the next hymn V.53.4), not the adj. their tr. require. Re recognizes the problem and suggests that it is an “instrumental of identification”: “en tant que (porteurs d’) ornements.” I think rather that *yāma-* and *añjībhiḥ* are functionally parallel, both to be construed with *śrutá-*, but one in a cmpd and one in an independent syntagm. For similar interplay between cmpd member and independent word, see comm. ad VIII.1.2.

The real problem in this vs. is *vakṣáṇā*. In the publ. tr. I follow Ge and Re in taking it as an acc. pl. of *vakṣáṇā* ‘udder’, but of course this stem is fem. and the acc. pl. form here should be *vakṣáṇāḥ*. Ge (n. 15b) casually suggests that it is exceptionally neuter or else a mistake for *vakṣáṇāḥ*, Re that it’s a “nt. insolite.” Others provide different morphological analyses: Gr sets up a special stem *vakṣáṇā* ‘Darbringung’ and must take it as a nom. sg.; Old suggests emending the accent to *\*vákṣaṇā*, allowing it to belong to

the stem *vákṣaṇa-* ‘strengthening’ and takes it as a neut. nom. pl. (“wie zu den Göttern die Stärkungen”); WG maintain the ‘udder’ analysis but take it as a nom. sg.: “Der ... (wendet) sich den göttlichen (Maruts) zu wie ein Schlauch (der gefüllt sein will).” This last is the most ingenious and does the least violence to the morphology / repertoire of stems, but the image is an odd one, to say the least.

My explanation, admittedly rather weak, starts from the similar patterning of vss. 14 and 15: 1) the *ácha* + acc. gods noted above (though *ácha* differently positioned), in each case requiring a verb to be supplied; 2) *dānā* (beg. of 14b/15c); 3) the parallel endings of the b pādas: 14b ... *ná yoṣánā* / 15c ... *ná vakṣánā*. The final word of each of these pādas is problematic: *yoṣánā* has the wrong accent, *vakṣánā* has the wrong ending. I suggest that the words were mutually adjusted to each other, either in composition or redactionally. Oldenberg already suggested (in his n. 2) that *yoṣánā* might owe its accent to *vakṣánā*, but the suggestion was half-hearted since he really wanted to emend the accent of *vakṣánā* to *\*vákṣaṇā*, as I just noted. However, this seems the best explanation of the accent of *yoṣánā*, and conversely this allows us also to assume that acc. pl. *\*vakṣánāḥ* lost its *-ḥ* to match *yoṣánā*. Although this may seem no different from Ge’s and Re’s arbitrary conferral of neut. gender, my explanation is contextually tied and has some possibility of being correct.

V.52.16: This Pañkti vs. is the last real vs. of the hymn, since 17 (also Pañkti) is a *dānastuti*. It begins with *prá*, just as vs. 1 did, and continues with the insistent repetition of the verb of speech *vocanta* (pādas b, c, e). The vs. is also reminiscent of repeated *ohate* ‘vaunt themselves’ in 10–11; as there, the recipient of the Maruts’ speech here is “me.” The structure of the vs. would be clearer if the tr. read “Those who proclaimed ... they proclaimed P. their mother, then they proclaimed their father ...”

On *-eṣá-* in *bandhv-eṣé* see comm. ad V.66.5.

On *iṣmín-* see comm. ad I.87.6.

V.52.17: By all standard interpr. the Maruts are the subjects of this *dānastuti*, but it is worth noting that they are not named -- and so it is possible that a set of human patrons, assimilated to the Maruts and thus endowed with their prestige, are the actual donors praised.

Note the etymological chaining between the subj. of 16e *śíkvasaḥ* and 17a *śākínaḥ*, both deriv. from *śak*. This could be evidence of the identity of the subjects (Maruts both), or it could be another way of conferring Marut qualities on the human patrons.

The unbalanced *āmreḍita ékam-ekā* is curiously formed. AiG III.395 (fld. by Klein, *Āmreḍitas*,” p. 791 [JAOS 123 (2003)]) suggests that the pl. *ekā* has been attracted to the following *śatā*, whose attribute it is. It also seems an attempt, utilizing both sg. *ékam* and pl. *ekā*, to express the awkward distributive, of *one* hundred per each of seven Maruts, producing a total of plural hundreds.

### V.53 Maruts

For the complex metrical structure of the hymn, see publ. intro. Despite the numerous different names for the meters, with few meters repeated in adjacent vss., they

are all combinations of 8- and 12-syllable pādas, and so the hymns is metrically more harmonious than the long list of meters implies.

V.53.1: Like V.52.14 in the immediately preceding hymn, this vs. contains a *vā* ‘or’ whose disjunctive alternatives do not seem parallel. While it is true that both alternatives are questions beginning with *kāh* ‘who’, the questions seem ill-matched. Re’s assessment here is “illogisme de *vā* [*sic* -- he prints it with accent].” Perhaps the point is that if no one knows as far back as the Maruts’ birth, there may still be someone who has had long association with them and their habits.

V.53.2: In b *kathā yayuḥ* could be resolved as *kathā ā yayuḥ* “how did they drive here?” This interpr. might be favored by *āyayūḥ* in 3a, although it is disfavored by *prā yayuḥ* in 12b.

The sandhi form *āpāya* at the end of c is universally interpr. as the nom. pl. *āpāyah*, referring to the Maruts; it could, however, be just as easily dat. sg. *āpāye* and refer to the good giver (*sudāse*) immediately preceding. In fact, I think it should be read as both, as reflected in the publ. tr. This double reading is favored by the way the vs. is structured, a striking pattern discovered by Natalie Operstein (in class, early 2000s). In general in this verse syntactic constituency is alternating and interlocked -- that is, constituents have the pattern X Y X’ Y’, etc. So, pāda a:

<i>ā</i>	<i>rātheṣu</i>			
<i>etān</i>		<i>tasthúṣaḥ</i>		

with the acc. pl. *etān* ... *tasthúṣaḥ* interrupted by the loc. pl. *rātheṣu*, which is governed by *ā* preceding the acc. pl. The pattern is similar in cd:

<i>kāsmāi</i>	<i>sudāse</i>	<i>ídābhir</i>	<i>sahá</i>
<i>sasruḥ</i>	<i>ānu</i>		<i>vṛṣṭáyah</i>
		<i>āpāya</i>	

The datives *kāsmāi* ... *sudāse* form a constituent, interrupted by the 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. verb *sasruḥ*, whose preverb *ānu* follows the dat. *sudāse* and whose overt subj., nom. pl. *vṛṣṭáyah* itself interrupts the postpositional phrase *ídābhir* ... *sahá*. In this configuration *āpāya* is not definitively paired: it could go with dat. *sudāse*, separated from it by the prev. *ānu*, or with the nom. pl. *vṛṣṭáyah*, likewise separated from it by a single word, instr. *ídābhir*. Note also that it is the final word of a 12-syllable pāda, in a verse whose other pādas are 8-syllables, so it is metrically almost isolated and could almost (not quite -- it’s only 3 syllables) attach itself to d rather than c. Since *āpí-* ‘friend’ is an inherently reciprocal word, its double application is especially appropriate.

V.53.3: The referent of *té* in the opening phrase *té ma āhuḥ* “They say to me” is not entirely clear. It is universally taken as the Maruts, and that is probably correct. Among other things it is reminiscent of the Maruts’ proclamations “to me” in the previous hymn: 52.10 ... *máhyam* ... *ohate* and 52.16 ... *me* ... *vócanta*. However, it is possible that the subj. is instead unidentified human associates of the poet. This would avoid the awkwardness of having the Maruts refer to themselves in the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps.: “They say to me, ‘When you see them [expect “us”], praise.’”

In pāda a note the figure *āhur yá āyayúr*.

As Re points out, *yá āyayuh* ... *māde* is the implicit answer to *kathā yayuh* in 1b. The two instr. in b *dyúbhir víbhiḥ* have provoked more commentary than they probably deserve. Ge (fld by WG) takes the former as referring to daybreak and the birds are then the birds that start stirring at that time. This is not impossible, but *dyúbhiḥ* (incl. *úpa dyúbhiḥ* VIII.40.8) generally means ‘through the days, day after day’, and that is fine here. The Maruts would then fly “with the birds” because they come through the midspace, where birds are at home.

V.53.4: The vs. consists entirely of a nominal rel. cl. without verb, presumably hanging off vs. 3.

The problematic form is the hapax *śrāyā* (Pp. *śrāyāḥ*). It is generally taken as a nom. pl. thematic deriv. of  $\sqrt{\text{śri}}$ , so ‘resting in’, attenuated by some to ‘provided with’ (with loc.). I cannot find particular fault with this analysis, save for its banality and the unclear source of the root-syllable *ā*. I am inclined instead to take it as an instr. sg. (*śrāyā*, equally possible in this sandhi situation) to a derivative of  $\sqrt{\text{śri}}$ , parallel to *śriyā*, which is regularly used of the Maruts. But I confess I do not know why *śriyā* wouldn’t have been used instead or exactly what the derivational mechanism would be, incl. again the source of the  $\text{ṛddhi}$ .

V.53.5: The construction of this vs. is very problematic and has been much discussed (see, e.g., Old’s long consideration). In the end my interpr. is closest, but not identical, to Re’s, though perhaps not arrived at by the same means.

To deal with the easiest issue first, *pace* Gr and Ge I do not construe *ānu* ... *dadhe* together. For one thing *ānu*  $\sqrt{\text{dhā}}$  barely exists; moreover a preverb in tmesis is unlikely to move to the end of the preceding pāda (so also Re). Rather, it surely governs preceding immediately *rāthān*, like similarly pāda-final *ródasī ānu* in 6c. It can be further noted that *ānu* is a signature word of this hymn, occurring 6x: 2c, 5a, 6c, 10c, 11c, 16c. With *ānu* otherwise assigned, the simplex verb *dadhe* ‘I take my place’ is then easily construed with the purpose dat. *mudé*.

The real problem in the verse is what to do with pāda c. The easy sense that Ge extracts from it (“die wie die Himmel (Tage) mit Regen kommen”) makes a hash of the grammar. Assuming that he means *dyāvah* to be compared with the chariots, with the point of comparison found in the part. ‘coming’ (*yatīḥ*),

- 1) *dyāvah* must be taken as an acc., which is simply impossible; or
- 2) the alternative to 1) is to assume the whole simile has reverted to the nominative, something that doesn’t happen in RV, as I long ago demonstrated (“Case disharmony...”) though Ge asserts it here (his n. 5c referring to his n. to I.180.3d);
- 3) the fem. part. *yatīḥ* should modify masc. *rāthān* or else, by attraction, *dyāvah*, which latter is only fem. in the meaning ‘heaven’, not ‘day’.

A way to a solution (or partial solution) comes from recognizing that the fem. pl. part. *yatīḥ* regularly modifies ‘waters’; cf. *āpaḥ ná pravātā yatīḥ* VIII.6.34 = 13.8 = IX.24.2, *āpo ādrśram āyatīḥ* X.30.13, *apām ārtham yatīnām*. It is therefore quite likely, esp. in this rainy context, that ‘waters’ is gapped here, solving the gender problem -- and also the case problem, because, adding another nominal element to the syntagm allows *dyāvah* to take its expected nominative role and respond to the acc. represented by (*apó*) *yatīḥ*. Re’s tr. reflects this: “comme les cieux (agréent les eaux), qui vont avec la pluie.”

The question is then what is the mediating verb? Re's 'agréent' makes sense, but he doesn't explain where he got it. I think it is possible to generate it from the dative *mudé* of b, either by simply switching emphasis from the finite verb *dadhe* to its infinitival complement or, in a trickier move, reading *mudé* a 2<sup>nd</sup> time, but this time as a 1<sup>st</sup> sg. mid. to a root present:  $\sqrt{mud}$  has a hapax med. root opt. *mudīmahī*, and though it is generally classified as a root aor., a root pres. is certainly not excluded. It is worth noting that this opt. is construed with the preverb *ānu* (VIII.1.14 *ānu stómam mudhīmahī*). Assuming this lexeme in our c would simplify the rendering of the simile. I therefore suggest a slight alteration to the published translation, to "(I delighting/delight) like the heavens (in the waters) when they come with their rain."

See also disc. ad 10c, which in some ways repairs this problematic passage.

V.53.6: As noted by most comm., masc. acc. sg. *yám*, presumably modifying *kósam*, has no referent in the main cl. Such "improper" relativization is not rare in the RV.

*ānu* at the end of c can also, secondarily, be read with d: *ānu, dhānvanā*.

V.53.7: In c I construe *ádhvanaḥ* as an abl. with *syannā(h)* rather than a gen. with *vimócane*. The effective difference is trivial, but the image seems more dynamic if the horses, unhitched, rush off into the roadside pastures (perhaps in pursuit of the "dappled females," though if the latter are antelopes, this would lead to species crossbreeding).

V.53.8: The abl. *parāvataḥ* is somewhat odd with *māva sthāta* "don't stay away"; we would expect loc. *parāvāti*, which is quite well-attested. It may be that *parāvataḥ* has simply been harmonized with the ablatives in ab: *divá(h) ... antárikṣād amāt*. However, it's also possible to take *māva sthāta* in c as a parenthetical exclamation and *parāvataḥ* as a continuation of the abl. phrase of ab: "Drive hither, Maruts, from heaven, from the midspace, from nearby -- don't stay away! -- and from a distance." This might also explain the unusual pāda-final *utá* of b. I therefore offer this as an alternative to the publ. tr.

There is also the question of what the lexeme *áva*  $\sqrt{sthā}$  means here. Generally it means 'descend', often into a river or the like (see Re ad loc.). But that doesn't make sense here: if the Maruts are to come here from heaven or the midspace, as they are invited to in ab, they will *have to* descend. If we take the *áva* seriously, perhaps the idea is that the Maruts shouldn't perform their descent somewhere else than here-- at a distance -- perhaps into the rivers named in the next vs. But this seems overly complex.

V.53.8–9: Note the phonological modulation of #*ā* ... (8a) to #*māva*...(8c) to #*mā vo* (9a) / *mā vaḥ* (9bc). The *vaḥ* then migrates to the end of 9d.

V.53.10: In some ways this vs. is both a variant and a repair of vs. 5. Like that vs. it begins with an acc. phrase referring to the Maruts' chariots. Following (*ānu*) they come the rains: *ānu prá yanti vṛṣṭáyah*, a variant of 5c *vṛṣṭī ... yatīr iva* "(fem. pl.) coming with their rain," where I supplied 'waters' as the referent of the participle. The syntax is somewhat different, but the elements are there. In this passage the relationship between the metaphor and the natural world is drawn more clearly: the chariots and the flock of Maruts represent thunder and lightning (see below), which are regularly followed by rain.

While a, c may function as repair, the phrase in b, ... *gaṇám mārutam návyasīnām*, introduces a new poetic complication. It is found identically in V.58.1, where it is even more troublesome. The problem is what to supply with gen. pl. fem. *návyasīnām*. Ge and Re, rather bizarrely, choose to supply Maruts -- e.g., Ge “der ... marutische Schar der neuesten (Marut).” This not only contravenes the unmistakable gender of *návyasīnām*, but it produces an awkward and clunky pleonastic expression. It is also unclear to me who the “newer” or “newest” (latter both Ge and Re) Maruts would be: it is generally emphasized that the Maruts are indistinguishable and “there is no last one” (V.58.5). Nonetheless the view that *návyasīnām* refers to the Maruts is well entrenched. There is no masc. gen. pl. comparative attested in Vedic, and both Lanman (Noun Inflec. 515) and Macd (VG 234) state that the fem. form is used instead in these two passages “in agreement with *marútām*” (Macd, as if gen. pl. *marútām* were actually in the passage), due to “metrical exigencies” (again Macd, but same view expressed by Lanman). The metrical argument is strikingly weak: although neither a putative masc. gen. pl. *\*návyasām* nor *\*návíyasām* built to the alternative comparative stem would fit this exact metrical slot even with distraction of the gen. pl. ending (as here), neither form would have any trouble fitting into other parts of a Vedic metrical line (including the cadence), and it’s difficult to believe that a poet like Śyāvāśva would set his heart on putting a comparative *just here* and then seriously distort the grammar to shove it in. (Sāy., it should be noted, does not supply Maruts, but still ignores the gender of *návyasīnām* by glossing it with the grammatically ambiguous *nūtanānām* and then connecting that gen. pl. with *ráthānām* in pāda a.)

WG have the merit of supplying a fem., namely ‘rains’, borrowed from the *vṛṣṭáyaḥ* of c. But this again seems pleonastic: why would the rains follow the rains, and indeed why would the (temporally unmarked) rains follow the newer rains? I start by considering what is regularly called ‘newer’. To this there is a ready answer: hymns, songs, formulations, thoughts, etc. -- the standard verbal products celebrated in RVic discourse, several of which are fem. In fact, note that in the next vs. (53.11) two such words are prominently positioned at the ends of pādas: *suśastībhiḥ* (11b) ‘good chants’ and *dhūtībhiḥ* (11c) ‘poetic thoughts’, both of which are elsewhere modified by *návyasī-*: VIII.5.25 *návyasībhiḥ suśastībhiḥ*; I.143.1 ... *návyasīm dhūtīm*. I therefore propose that we should supply such a word with *návyasīnām* in 10b. (In the publ. tr. it is ‘hymns’.) But this produces an odd locution, “the Marut flock of newer (hymns),” with semantically ill-assorted elements joined -- or so it seems at first glance. But remember that the poet is depicting a metaphorical thunderstorm: the rains, undisguised, come last, but I think we have both thunder and lightning earlier in the vs.: the flock is *tveśám* ‘glittering’ (though, I must admit, the word sometimes just means ‘turbulent’: see *vāta-tviṣ-* ‘turbulent as the wind’ in the next hymn, V.54.3), which can represent the lightning. And the flock also consists of “hymns,” which in this context can be the regular booming of thunder claps.

V.53.11: The Maruts’ thunder-hymns are then met with our reciprocal offered praise hymns.

In pāda a *va eṣām* is taken by all standard tr. as a doubled gen. pl., essentially “of these you,” though not so tr. I think rather that *eṣām* refers to the chariots, and *vaḥ* is the

gen. dependent on the whole NP *śárdham-śárdham ... eṣām*, which simply reprises 10a *tám vaḥ śárdham ráthānām*, with gen. pl. of the chariots.

V.53.12: The question *kásmai ... prá yayuḥ* “to whom have they driven” returns us to the questions in vs. 2: *kathā yayuḥ / kásmai sasruḥ* “How have they driven? To whom have they flowed?” The referent of *kásmai* in 2, the “good giver” (*sudāse*), is further specified here as “one who has given an oblation” (*rātáhavyāya*), though with different roots ‘give’. This ring-compositional reprise brings to a close the descriptive portion of the hymn, and the poet turns to requests.

V.53.13: With the standard tr. I take *yéna* in pāda as referring to *enā yāmena* in the previous vs. (12c).

I tr. *dhānyà-* lit., ‘related to grain (*dhānā*), as ‘granular’, because I think it refers both to the raindrops, shaped like grain, and the actual grain that results from the rain.

I.57.1 *rādho víśvāyu* suggests that *víśvāyu* belongs to what precedes, rather than to *saúbhagam* as Ge and Re take it.

V.53.14: The standard tr. take *usrí* as having temporal domain over the whole of pāda c: “when it rains, the waters at dawn are luck, lifetime, and medicine.” I don’t see any way to tell, and in fact I don’t see why dawn should limit any of these predicates.

V.53.16: Unaccented *asya* should not modify *stuvatáh* as WG take it. Better the solutions of Ge and Re, esp. the latter, who separate these two genitives, with Re supplying “Marut troop” with *asya*.

## V.54 Maruts

V.54.1: The first word of the hymn is *prá*, as it was in V.52, the first of Śyāvāśva’s Marut hymns. It would at first appear to be in tmesis with *anajā* in b (so Gr and see Re’s bizarre tr. “je veux lancer-avec-onction”), but *√añj* does not otherwise appear with *prá*. I think it rather belongs with the last word of the vs., *arcata*. The syntagm *prá √arc* is quite common and, more to the point, began the first hymn in this cycle: V.52.1ab *prá ..., árcā*. The rest of our vs., from *śárdhāya* to *dyumnásravase*, is set into this celebratory frame.

*anajā* is the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. act. nasal infix pres. subjunctive, as all the standard tr. take it, *pace* its assignment to the pf. by Gr, Wh, Macd.

My tr. of *gharmastúbh-* ‘with the rhythm of the gharma-pot’ sounds like a *bahuvrīhi*, which it is not. Better would be ‘chanting rhythmically (like) the gharma-pot’ (cf. *chandastúbh-* in nearby V.52.12). The point of comparison, as is noted by most comm., is the regular bubbling of the gharma-pot.

My “sacrificing on the back of heaven” agrees with Ge and Re in taking *diváh* as limiting the first member of *prṣṭhayájvane*. Old allows both this and a syntagm *divá ā* “from heaven,” while WG follow Old’s 2<sup>nd</sup> alternative and suggest that the Maruts are sacrificing on the back of the earth (to be supplied). It is difficult to make a judgment here.

V.54.2: Like the 1<sup>st</sup> vs. this one begins with *prá*. Also like the first vs. the first hemistich of this one is dense with cmpds, here describing the Maruts' chariots.

The repetition of *párijrayaḥ* at the end of both hemistichs seems a bit clunky and perhaps especially so because, if the forms are nom. plurals (as generally taken), the supposed stem *pári-jri-* is ill-formed: we expect an empty final *-t-* on what looks like a root noun in short resonant. This supposed stem *párijri-* occurs once outside of this hymn, also pāda-final, also as apparent nom. pl. of the Maruts (I.64.5), and the root noun *-jri-* is also supposed to be found in *urujrí-* twice, again as nom./voc. pl. *urujráyāḥ* (accented VIII.70.4, unaccented voc. VII.39.3, the only form not pāda-final). Thus all attested forms of the supposed *-jri-* stem are in the shape *-jrayaḥ* (accented or not). The 2<sup>nd</sup> cmpd exists beside an *s*-stem bahuvrīhi *urujráyas-* (twice in acc. sg. *-asam*), and a simplex neut. *s*-stem *jráyas-* is well attested (approx. 15x), with Aves. and OP cognates *zraiiāh-* and *drayah-* respectively. All of this makes the stem *-jri-* seem very fishy. Debrunner (AiG II.2.44) explains the forms, which, as we saw, all end in *-ayas*, as haplologies from *\*-ayasas*, making ref. to Wackernagel's AiG III.80, which presents other possible haplologies to *-s*-stem *\*-asas* forms. Though I am leery of systematic haplologies, I think this has a reasonable chance of being right, esp. in this pāda-final position. However, in our passage I think there is another contributing factor. Ge (n. 2ab) adduces two passages containing *jráyas-*: X.92.5 *pariyánn úru jráyāḥ* (IX.68.2, not cited by Ge, is identical) and I.95.9 *urú te jráyas páry eti*, with *pári* (+ VERB OF MOTION) collocated with the *-s*-stem *jráyas-*. In V.54.2 *párijrayaḥ* seems almost like a univerbation of a prepositional/adverbial phrase *pári \*jráyāḥ* "around the (broad) expanse." It is even possible that one of the forms in this vs. is meant to represent the adverbial phrase -- so, possibly, ab "forth (go your chariots) around the expanse," referring to the Maruts' circling the earth or the midspace -- while the other is a nom. pl. (by old haplology), to be rendered as in the publ. tr.: "the waters swirling in their stream bed." This would alleviate the clunkiness of the repetition, which would then be only apparent.

As Ge. remarks (n. 2c), "Trita's Beziehung zu den Marut ist dunkel." Trita is associated with the Maruts also in II.34.10, 14. In vs. 10 of that hymn Trita seems to be associated with making noise, as here; that is as far as I can get.

V.54.3: Pāda-final *parvatacyút-* returns here (from 1b) but in a different form: nom. pl. *-aḥ* rather than dat. sg. *-e*.

V.54.4: The vs. sets up pairs of antitheses: nights/days (a), midspace/dusky realms (b), with the third only indirectly implied: fields [=dry land]/ \*water [via boats] (c).

The *īm* that interrupts the simile *nāvāḥ ... yathā* in c is superficially puzzling, but I think it is related to the implication just noted: it stands for the acc. 'waters' in the full realization of the phrase "like boats (through waters)." It is also worthy of note that the cadences of pādas c and d are phonologically similar, esp. at beginning and end, though they achieve this through very different grammatical means: ... *nāva īm yathā # ... nāha riṣyatha #*.

V.54.5: Note the phonetic echoes: (*mahi*)(*v*)*aná*(*m*) ... (*ta*)*tāna* ... (*é*)*tā ná* ... (*áyā*)*tanā*.

I take “greatness” (or “heroism [and] greatness”) to be the unexpressed subj. of *tatāna* in b, rather than *yójanam* with Ge. The latter is an acc. of extent of space, and the phrase #*dīrghám ... yójanam*# is iconically positioned to express the distance traversed.

In the second hemistich contra Ge and Re I take c as a separate nominal main clause, with d a temporal dependent cl. This allows the *yád* to be properly positioned, rather than occurring deep in the dependent cl. (The WG treatment is similar to mine.) The shared characteristic in the simile in c, ‘having ungraspable brilliance’ (*ágrbhītasocis-*), presumably refers to the combination of speed and timidity that characterizes antelopes, deer, and their ilk and makes them hard to catch. If we were to speculate more narrowly, the ‘brilliance’ might refer either to the conspicuous white spots on the coat of the chital deer or the white sides, underbelly, interior legs, and hindquarters of the blackbuck -- both species that seem native to the right location.

The puzzle in d is the phrase *ánaśvadām ... girím* “the non-horse-giving mountain.” In order to approach it, we might first tackle the verb that governs it, *ny áyātanā*. The lexeme *ní √yā* is generally hostile; cf. nearby V.42.10 (also of the Maruts) *yá óhate rakṣáso devāvītāv / acakrēbhis tám maruto ní yāta* “Who(ever) will laud the demons at the invitation to the gods, run him over/down, Maruts, with your wheel-less (chariots).” In our passage the sense seems to be that the Maruts trample down or overrun a mountain whose behavior deserves it. But what is a non-horse-giving mountain? On the one hand, it may simply refer to a stingy mountain, comparable to a stingy patron, contrasted to *aśvadā-* ‘horse-giving’ used of generous patrons elsewhere. But still, why horses? Mountains can be the source of nourishment and wealth; cf. I.65.5 *gírir ná bhújma* “a source of benefit like a mountain” (also VIII.50.2 and comm. ad I.55.3). But mountainous terrain is not particularly friendly to horses, which are most at home in open, relatively flat grasslands. I therefore wonder if the operable segmentation of the compd is *anaśva-dā-* ‘giving non-horses’ (rather than *an-aśvadā-* ‘not giving horses’). This might then be an oblique reference to the Vala myth and the mountain that yields up cows (that is, non-horses). However, since the Maruts are not generally associated with the Vala myth, this may be farfetched. The safest interpr. is Old’s deflection, that the phrase is “auf unbekannte Erzählung anspielend.”

V.54.6: My interpr. follows that of Narten (Sig.Aor. 195–96), with the first pāda consisting of the *yád* clause, the 2<sup>nd</sup> the main cl. Both Ge and Re take the first part of pāda a as the main cl., with the dependent clause starting with *yád*. Although *yád* is better positioned in their interpr. than in Narten’s, they must make *arṇasám* an obj. of *móṣathā* (in unconvincing fashion) and the sequence of tense/mood is badly off: aug. aor. *ábhrāji ... aor. subjunctive móṣathā*, lit., “it has flashed when you will steal ...” Ge simply renders the subjunctive as a preterite, while Re’s parenthesis in “vous déroba(i)ez” is masterfully evasive even for him.

As I just said, I am not happy with the position of *yád* in Narten’s/my interpr., since it follows both the verb and part of the subject (plus a voc., but that doesn’t count). There is another possibility, that *yád* functions here as a sort of *izafe*, connecting *sárdhah* and *arṇasám*: “the troop, which is a flood.” In this case *ábhrāji* would be a main-cl. verb, and the two pādas, a and b, would be syntactically unconnected: “The troop that is a flood has flashed; you will plunder ...” *arṇasá-* is a hapax. Narten takes it as an adjectival deriv. of *árṇas-* ‘flood’, but it could have been (re-)substantivized as ‘flood’.

The point of comparison in b between the Maruts and the caterpillar is that violent storms also strip the leaves off trees.

The sequence *vrkṣám kap(anéva)* is oddly reminiscent of *Vṛṣākapi*, the randy monkey in X.86, but this must be accidental.

In the publ. tr. the voc. *sajośasaḥ* is not rendered as a voc., since the Engl. would be awkward.

The *s*-aor. subj. *neṣathā* ‘you will lead’ is particularly appropriate to the obj. *arámati-*, the personified feminine Proper Thinking, since the verb  $\sqrt{ni}$ , esp. in sigmatic forms, becomes specialized for leading females in ritual settings; cf. the priestly title *Neṣtar*. Although *neṣtar-* probably owes its *-ṣ-* to crossing of the agent noun *nétar-* with *Tvaṣtar* (*tváṣtar-*), who is also associated with ritual females (see EWA s.v. *neṣtar-*), its apparent coincidence with the *neṣ* of the *s*-aor. could spread the semantics.

V.54.7: In d the sequence *ṛṣim vā* must have been fronted around the rel. *yám*, since the phrase as a whole *ṛṣim vā yám rájānaṃ vā* does not mean “either the seer or which king” but “which seer or king” -- or even better “which one, whether seer or king.”

I take the thematic stem *súṣūda-* as ultimately deriving from a pf. subjunctive, despite accent. In this particular form, the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. indic. pf. *\*súṣūda*, with the rarely occurring 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. act. pf. ending *-a*, would have simply been extended by the prim. ending.

V.54.8: In the cmpd. *grāmajít-* the 1<sup>st</sup> member could have either an acc. or an instr. relationship with the root noun. Both would be possible: ‘conquering roving band’ (so Gr, Ge, Re, Thieme [M+A 81]) or ‘conquering with/in roving bands’. Although in such root noun cmpds an acc. relationship is more common, indeed also among cmpds in *-jít-*, I follow Scarlatta’s preferred interpr. (156) found also in his tr. (=WG), although the acc. interpr. is hardly excluded. The parallel I.100.10 *grāmebhiḥ sánitā*, cited by Re, is suggestive.

My interpr. of b follows Thieme (M+A 81), esp. of *aryamānaḥ*, which he takes as “hospitable ones (hospitable householders who refresh the stranger).” Others take it as a pregnant pl. referring to “(Mitra, Varuṇa, and) Aryaman.”

The dep. cl. in c, *yád ināso ásvaran*, can be construed either with what precedes or what follows, but sits uneasily with either because of its augmented *ásvaran*, which doesn’t match the pres. indic. *pínvanti* (c) or *undanti* (d). I chose to connect it with d, as thunder before rain.

V.54.9: *dyaúḥ* is clearly fem. here, given the adj. *pravátvatī*, but this gender choice must be conditioned by its standard formulaic partner, fem. *pṛthivī*, in the preceding pāda, modified by the same adj. in the same position.

The nom. pl. *jīrádānavaḥ* ‘having lively drops’ in d must modify the mountains (*párvatāḥ*), but in the immed. preceding hymn it is found in the voc. of the Maruts (V.53.6, in the same metrical pos.; cf. also I.34.4 a nom. pl. of the Maruts in the same position). There are no grounds for emending the text by deleting the accent and making it into a voc. (which would also entail a switch from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. ref.); how would it have acquired the accent here? Rather it must be word play: mountains produce torrents of water when it rains.

V.54.10: The *s*-stem adj. *sá-bharas-* (so accented in X.101.3, though it is an accentless voc. here), tr. here ‘of equal gravity’, is a bahuvrīhi with the lit. sense ‘having the same burden / weight’, with the same *-bharas-* as in *viśvá-bharas-* ‘bringing all’, i.e., lit. ‘having/bringing all burdens’ in IV.1.19.

*s<sup>u</sup>varṇaraḥ* at the end of pāda a picks up *náraḥ* at the end of 8a and 10b and *asvaran* at the end of 8c.

On *śrathayá-* see comm. ad V.85.4.

V.54.12: Note the repetition of *ágrbhūta-śociṣ-* from 5c; this cmpd is found only once elsewhere in the RV (VIII.23.1, of Agni).

The first hemistich is discussed in some detail by Thieme (Fremd. 68–70), whose interpr. I basically follow. I would add that the (heavenly) brilliance that cannot be grasped by the Ārya on earth is shaken down as rain by the Maruts.

There are two basic interpr. of c, depending on what the subject of *sám acyanta* is taken to be. For Ge the subj. is the Maruts, with *vṛjánā* the grammatical obj. referring to their girthbands: they are girding themselves for battle. WG’s interpr. also takes the reference to be to the Maruts, but with *vṛjánā* as the subj. referring to the closing of the ranks (Reihe) of the Maruts, again before some warlike manoeuvre on their part. In both these interpr. the referent of the subj. of *sám acyanta* and *átitviṣanta* is the same: the Maruts. With Re I instead consider the verbs to have different subjects: the subj. of *sám acyanta*, *vṛjánā*, refers to the circles or communities of the Ārya, while the Maruts are the subj. of *átitviṣanta*. I think the two hemistichs contrast the Maruts’ effects on the Ārya communities: in ab the Maruts bring them the welcome rain they cannot get themselves, but in cd they cling together during the violence of the Maruts’ storm. (I cannot decide which strain Kü’s tr. (224) follows, though WG’s paraphrase of it in their n. leans towards the Re/JB side.)

V.54.13: The verb in d, *rāraṅta*, presents difficulties both morphologically and semantically. Formally it has received a variety of analyses: Gr classifies it (impossibly) with *√radh* ‘subdue’; as Old notes, in context it would best belong to *√rā* ‘give’, but it is hard to make this work formally. Given the long redupl. characteristic of the pf. to *√ran* ‘enjoy’, the form most likely belongs there. Lub. classifies it as a med. (3<sup>rd</sup> sg.) injunc. to that root, but there are no other med. forms to this stem or indeed to the root (*raṅáyanta* being an *-anta* replacement). I think we are therefore stuck with the formally most likely analysis, given by Kü, as 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. pf. impv., with (as often) irregular full grade (see also Ge n. 13d). This poses problems semantically. It should mean ‘enjoy’, with the Maruts as subject. The gapped obj. is qualified by *sahasrín-* ‘possessing/in thousands’; as Re points out, this is a stable epithet of *rayí-* ‘wealth’. And this is the problem: the Maruts have just given us wealth; we should be the ones enjoying it. Gods never enjoy wealth -- they distribute it. Ge suggests in his n. that the thousandfold wealth they enjoy is “in Gestalt von Opfern,” which is certainly a good try (probably the best available). Old tries to make the verb into what looks like a reflexive causative: “macht [den Reichtum] bei uns sich erfreuen” -- that is, the Maruts should make the wealth be happy to stay by us. WG go one step further in the causativization process: “(An diesem Reichtum) ... macht, dass man sich hier bei uns daran freue ... am tausendfachen.” But these last two attempts to separate the Maruts from the enjoyment are unconvincing, because no other forms to this

stem show this causative tendency. I think we probably should stick with the meaning imposed by parallel forms (so also Re) and deal, perhaps as Ge does, with the Maruts enjoying riches. The possible transitivization of *rārandhi*, built to the same stem, in X.59.5 (q.v.), via reinterpr. as a redupl. aor., is not really available here because *asmé* is not acc. and so the phrase cannot straightforwardly mean “make us enjoy wealth.” However, it might be possible to interpr. it as “make wealth enjoyable to us.”

V.54.14: The problematic wealth of 13d reappears in 14a as the obj. of a gapped verb whose subj. is the Maruts, but in this case we can borrow the verb from the next pāda, *avatha* ‘you aid’. Ge unaccountably supplies a verb (“gewähret”) that matches neither what precedes nor what follows.

The pāda-final words in the first hemistich, ... *spārhāvīram#* and ... *sāmavipram#* are phonologically similar. This partial match may help explain the odd hapax *sāmavipra-*. Although my tr. ‘inspired in his melody’ is structurally similar to the other standard renderings (e.g., Re ‘inspiré par la mélodie-sacréé’), the cmpd should not mean that. For one thing the 2<sup>nd</sup> member *vīpra-* is almost never used adjectivally (*pace* Gr), but almost always as a noun referring to a type of poet. Moreover, the accent strongly suggests a bahuvrīhi. A literal rendering of such a bahuvrīhi would be something like ‘whose inspired poet is the melody’ or ‘whose inspired poet has the melody’ (latter like *vājra-bāhu-* ‘having an arm that has a mace (in it)’), which do not work as descriptors of a seer. I wonder if the phonological play just noted didn’t flip the order of the cmpd members, and the underlying form would be *\*vīpra-sāman-* ‘having the melody of an inspired poet’. Exact parallels are *vīpra-manman-* ‘having the thought of an inspired poet / having inspired thought’ in VI.39.1, where it modifies *kavī-*, and *vīpra-vacas-* ‘having the speech of an inspired poet / having inspired speech’ in VIII.61.8.

### V.55 Maruts

V.55.1: The question about *práyajyu-* is how technically it is meant; I here follow Re.

The first hemistich recalls vs. 11 in the previous hymn, esp. in the bahuvrīhi *rukṃá-vakṣas-* ‘with brilliants on their breasts’ (lit. ‘having breasts with brilliants on them’, of the *vājra-bāhu-* type), which matches the nominal phrase V.54.11b *vákṣassu rukṃá*, but also in *bhrājad-ṛṣṭi-* ‘having glinting spears’, whose members are distributed differently in 54.11a *ámseṣu ... ṛṣṭáyaḥ* and b *agníbhājasah*.

The idiom *śúbham √yā* is used of the Maruts elsewhere, in nearby V.57.2 as well as I.23.11; cf. also the cmpds *śubham-yā(van)-*. My “drove in beauty” is of course a conscious echo of Byron’s “She walks in beauty, like the night.” A different kind of English resonance would be offered by “gone to glory.”

V.55.2: The verb *ví rājatha* can mean either ‘shine forth’ or ‘reign over’; both fit the context and the subject, though given pāda a “you assumed your power,” perhaps ‘rule’ has the edge. The root noun cmpd *virāj-* seems confined to the ‘rule’ sense, when it does not refer to the meter by that name.

V.55.4: I take *ābhūṣénya-* as a quasi-desiderative gerundive, parallel to *didrkṣénya-* ‘desirable to be seen’ -- hence ‘desirable to become’ → ‘to be emulated’. However it may simply mean ‘to be attended upon’.

The *utá* introducing the impv. in c is awkwardly rendered as ‘and’. Klein (DGRV I.454) says it means rather ‘therefore’, which works better in English. However, ‘therefore’ for *utá* does not have much support (3 passages cited by Klein out of over 750) or a clear path of development, and a closer look at the context does not yield a causal “X, therefore Y” interpr. It is possible that the morphologically ambiguous *dadhātana* is not an imperative but an injunctive, which would yield a more acceptable pendant “and you establish us in immortality.” And it is also possible that the *utá* here loosely matches the other 3<sup>rd</sup>-pāda *utá*-s in 2c, 7c, while anticipating 5a #ú*d*.

### V.56 Maruts

V.56.1: Ge (/WG) supply “bring,” an impv. addressed to Agni, in the first hemistich. There seems no particular reason to do so, since the acc. phrase of ab can be construed with *áva hvaye* in c. Perhaps it’s on the basis of the *ā* in pāda a, but this is in the wrong position to be a gapped preverb. I don’t actually know what *ā* is doing, but note that in the ring-compositional expressions in vss. 8–9, the ‘call’ verb is construed with *ā*.

V.56.2: The question in this vs. is who is the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. referent of *mányase* (a), *te* (c), and *vardha* (d). Acdg. to Sāy. it is still Agni, but Ge suggests alternatively that it could be the self-address of the poet, a view shared by Re. (WG think Agni, but with a very peculiar tr. of pāda a). I think poetic self-address is excluded because of the *me* in b: the poet is unlikely to refer to himself as “you (sg.)” and “me” in successive pādas (and then back to “you”), so Agni is the more likely. The point must be that both Agni and the poet want the same thing -- for the Maruts to come to the sacrifice. The identification of you as Agni requires that he possess/produce *hávana-* ‘calls’ in c. This can refer to the crackling of the fire. Alternatively, flg. Gr, *hávana-* could belong to *√hu* and mean ‘oblations’, but *pace* Gr none of the occurrences he adduces need to have that meaning.

V.56.3: The gender politics of this vs. would not bear modern scrutiny: the idea seems to be that the Earth enjoys rough sex because she gets nice presents. But it is a powerful image.

The poss. adj. *mīlhúṣmant-* occurs twice in the RV; the other form is found in VI.50.12, where it is masc. and seems barely distinct from *mīlhvās-* ‘giving rewards, generous’. Here in this fem. form the possessive value of *-mant-* does have force, assuming the correctness of Ge’s and Re’s interpr. as ‘possessing a generous (man/lord/spouse)’. WG take it rather as ‘Soldatenbraut’, interpr. *mīlhvās-* as ‘one who has *mīlhá-*’ (booty, etc) and further suggesting that the woman in question was part of the spoils of war. This is appealing in some ways, but it does not fit well with the last word of the hymn, *mīlhuṣī*.

As Ge points out (n. 3a), *pārāhatā* may have two senses -- simply ‘beaten aside’ by the onslaught of the Maruts and ‘(sexually) penetrated’, for which sense he cites ŚB XI.5.1.1 *vaitaséna daṇḍéna hatāt* [*sic*, not Ge’s *hatā*], the ŚB paraphrase of Urvaśī’s ... *mā ... śnathayo vaitaséna* (X.95.5) “you pierced me with your rod.”

V.56.4: *ní √ri* means ‘make flow’, hence ‘liquefy, dissolve’. In I.127.4 the very similar *sthīrā cid ānnā ní riṇāti ójasā* has ‘sturdy foods’ as obj., but since Agni is the subject, the food is presumably wood of some sort. In nearby V.58.6 a middle intrans. of *√ri* (though without preverb) takes trees as subj.: *riṇaté vānāni* “the trees dissolve.” I therefore supply them as obj. here.

What then does the simile in b have to do with this? Even unruly oxen are unlikely to dissolve trees. Because the images don’t easily harmonize, I now think that the simile in b should go with the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich: unruly oxen *can* cause the ground to shake. This is somewhat difficult to convey in tr. -- I might rearrange it to “like oxen averse to the yoke / they shake ...”

The phrase *gāvah ... durdhúrah* echoes *dudhró gauḥ* of 3d phonologically, even though the adjectives are entirely unrelated.

As often Ge takes *cid* in c as a simile marker, a function for which there is no good evidence.

V.56.5: Ge takes the impv. *út tiṣṭha* as another self-address of the poet; again the presence of a 1<sup>st</sup> ps. sg. in the vs. (*hvaye* in d) makes that unlikely. I think it is directed rather at Agni, like the direct addresses in vss. 1 and 2. For the same impv. cf. IV.4.4 *úd agne tiṣṭha* (sim. VIII.23.5): the ritual fire is blazing up while the Maruts are called to the sacrifice. In this case Agni may be commanded to rise up with praises (*stómaiḥ*) -- praises like his calls in 2c. Alternatively, there may be a clause break after the impv., with a new clause beginning with *nūnám* and continuing to the end of the vs. (This division was suggested by Natalie Operstein in class in the early 2000s.) The praises will then be those produced by the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. poet who is the subj. of *hvaye* at the end of the vs.

In b *sámuṣṭita-* can hardly be separated from nearby V.55.3 *sākám ukṣitāḥ*, and V.57.8 *byḥád ukṣámānāḥ* also supports the root etym. to *√vakṣ/ukṣ* ‘be(come) strong’, against Gr’s connection with *√ukṣ* ‘sprinkle’.

V.56.6: As Bl (RVReps) and Ge point out, this vs. appears to have been constructed from textual blocks found in I.14.12 and I.134.3. Our pāda *yuṅdhvám hy áruṣī ráthe* is identical to I.14.12a except for the sg. impv. *yukṣvā hí* rather than our pl. *yuṅdhvám hí*. If our pāda is modeled on I.14.12 (or a similar source) it could explain both the *hí* with no obvious function and the sg. chariot *ráthe* for the plural Maruts; this mismatch in number is repaired in the next pāda *yuṅdhvám rátheṣu rohítaḥ*. This latter pāda has no close parallels in the RV, though I.14.12b ends with *rohítaḥ*, which is a further obj. to *yukṣvā* in pāda a (I.14.12b *haríto deva rohítaḥ*) and so may be a distant source. Our 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich *yuṅdhvám hārī ajirā dhurí vólhave, váhiṣṭhā dhurí vólhave* closely follows I.134.3bc *vāyū ráthe ajirā dhurí vólhave, váhiṣṭhā dhurí vólhave* (whose pāda a contains the ‘yoke’ verb: *vāyúr yunkte* ...). What I don’t understand is why Śyāvāśva has made these clumsy adaptations just to produce a vs. that in context is just treading water -- there’s no need for a yoking vs. here.

Note that *váhiṣṭhā vólhave* “the two best pullers to pull” is an etymological figure, with both words built to *√vah*, though it is not at all transparent. Perhaps this is what attracted Śyāvāśva.

V.56.7: Whatever the reason for the previous vs., *syá vājy àruṣaḥ* “this reddish race horse here” contrasts with the *áruṣī(h)* ‘reddish (mares)’ in 6a. Although in the publ. tr. I identified the referent as Agni (and I still think he is a possible secondary referent), I now accept the view of Sāy., Ge, and Re that it is the Beipferd of the Maruts (see the parallels adduced by Ge in n. 7a); otherwise the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the vs. makes little sense.

The *mā* prohibitive in c contains what looks like a root aor. subjunctive *karat*. Flg. Wackernagel (Fs. Jacobi), Hoffmann (Injunk. 55–56; see also 92) explains this potentially embarrassing form as the injunctive to a thematized root aor., which thematization began from the ambiguous 1<sup>st</sup> sg. *ākaram*. He (somewhat disingenuously) notes that outside of *mā* clauses the *kara-* forms are otherwise only subjunctives, and he further suggests that his two exx. are found in idiomatic expressions that belong to the Volkssprache, which could explain the earlier thematization (cf. also Aufs. II.344 n. 2). (His other ex. of *mā ... karat* in VIII.2.20 I explain differently, as not belonging to the *mā* clause at all. See comm. ad loc.) Hoffmann’s thematic aor. explan. has been apparently accepted by Lub, who classifies the two forms identified thus by Hoffmann under “A-AOR.inj.” I am generally dubious, because the root aor. of  $\sqrt{kr}$  is so well entrenched in the RV and the *-a*-forms are otherwise found in clear subjunctive usage. However, I am somewhat sympathetic to the “idiomatic” explanation, esp. combined with a metrical observation: the injunc. *kaḥ* expected here is found almost entirely at the end of Triṣṭubh pādas, but would not work here at the end of a Jagatī pāda. Nonce thematization, esp. perhaps in a low-register expression, would be a quick fix.

WG produce a curious hybrid of prohibitive and subjunctive: “Nicht *soll und wird* er ... (euch) langsam *machen*” (my italics). I do not understand the explanation given in the n., or at least do not understand what sort of grammatical category is envisioned: “Uns scheint ein expektativer oder voluntativer Konjunktiv deutlich mitzuschwingen: >(Auf keinen Fall erwarten wir), dass er euch langsam mache< bzw. >Dass er euch ja nicht langsame mache!< This clearly builds on Tichy’s analysis of the function of the subjunctive as “expectation,” but I do not understand how the subjunctive would interact with the *mā*.

V.56.8–9: These two vss. essentially duplicate each other The main verbs of the two vss., *ā huvāmahe* (8b) and *ā huve* (9b) resonate with the verb in the 1<sup>st</sup> vs. (*ā...*) *áva hvaye*.

The battered-woman Earth who received presents (*mīlhuṣmatī*) in 3ab is balanced here by the glorious Rodasī, standing in apparently equality with the Maruts, dispensing presents herself (8c *surānāni bibhratī*, 9d *mīlhuṣṭī*). I see no merit on flg. Ge’s acceptance of Sāy.’s interpr. of *mīlhuṣṭī* as the name of the wife of Rudra.

### V.57–58 Maruts

As Old (Proleg. 204–5) points out these two hymns are parallel and share a final vs. He attributes their position at the beginning of the four 8-vs. Marut hymns to this twinning. Otherwise V.58, in Triṣṭubh, should follow V.59, in Jagatī.

### V.57 Maruts

V.57.3: After *dyām* in pāda a we expect *\*pṛthivīm*, but get phonologically similar *párvatān* instead. This disappointed expectation is “repaired” in pāda c, where *pṛthivīm* appears as the obj. of a different but semantically similar verb.

V.57.6: The pf. that ends the vs., *pipiše*, produces a bad cadence that would be fixed by a heavy redupl. syllable. The metrical problem is not mentioned by Old or Kü; HvN note it but do not suggest a solution. I wonder if it is for intens. *\*pepiše*; the act. intens. is found once in the late RV, while the middle begins to be attested in the AV, with a sense not appreciably different from non-intens. forms. Of course, the *t*-less ending *-e* would have to be accounted for, but several 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. med. intensives have such an ending; see Schaefer 44. Of course, this might all be more trouble than it’s worth for a metrical violation.

V.57.7: The sentiment in pāda c is somewhat puzzling, though the grammar is straightforward: *prásastim naḥ kṛṇuta rudriyāsaḥ*. This should mean “make a eulogy for us, o Rudras,” with the VP *prásastim*  $\sqrt{kr}$ . Though the three other occurrences of this VP, in I.113.19, 181.1, and II.41.16, do conform to expectations, taking it that way here would reverse the sacrificial bargain. As detailed in the first hemistich, the Maruts have given us bountiful riches of all sorts; in return we should be producing a *prásasti-* for them -- not they for us. In fact, of course, it is never the gods’ job to produce praise for humans. In order to make sense of the phrase, I have pushed the sense of  $\sqrt{kr}$  from ‘make’ to ‘make good’ -- that is, act such that the praise we are giving you is true. (You have given us many things; do it again.) Re’s “faites nous (aujourd’hui une récompense digne du) panégyrique” is similar, despite the overstuffed parenthesis. There is another, less likely, alternative. As I have argued elsewhere (RV between Two Worlds, pp. 146–48), even in the RV the *prásasti-* was probably a genre of praise appropriate to kings and only secondarily applied to gods. It might be that the poet is asking the Maruts to render his patron and king deserving of his [=poet’s] *prásasti-*, either by redistributing the wealth that they showered on the king or by the king’s performing some worthy feat. But this seems overly complex and far less likely, and since *prásasti-*s in the RV are often directed at gods, it is unnecessary.

V.57.8: The vs. consists almost entirely of accented vocatives. Only the last phrase *bṛhád ukṣámānāḥ* escapes the voc. and that probably because accent conversion would be tricky.

The juxtaposition (across hemistich boundary) of *ṛta-jñāḥ* and *sátya-śrutaḥ* is striking -- and in my opinion telling with regard to the difference between *ṛtá-* and *sátya-*, both often tr. ‘truth’. Here *ṛtá-* is something one knows, but *sátya-* is something one hears. In my view *ṛtá-* is the immanent truth -- the principles and relations that lie underpin the world as we know it -- while *sátya-* is the realized truth. In some contexts this can be simply palpable reality, but here I think it refers to how *ṛtá-* is realized verbally, in the formulations of poets, available to be heard.

## V.58 Maruts

V.58.1: On the phrase ... *gaṇám mārutam návyasīnām* with its problematic fem. gen. pl. *návyasīnām*, see the extensive disc. ad V.53.10.

There is complete fungibility between the collective sg. *gaṇám mārutam* “Marutian flock” and the plural *yé* in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich referring to the individual Maruts, which picks up *gaṇám mārutam* by sense though not strictly by grammar. The *eṣām* at the end of pāda a seems clumsily pleonastic, however. It must refer also to the pl. Maruts and depend on the acc. *gaṇám* (“the flock of them”), doubling the vṛddhi deriv. *mārutam*. It should *not* be construed with the fem. *nāvyaśīnām*.

*āśvāśva-* shows phonological play, as well as being a buried etymological pun, if the old connection between *āśú-* and *áśva-* holds. It is also a kind of anagram for the poet’s name *śyāvāśva-*. Note that both words must be distracted to 4 syllables (*āśú-aśva* and *śyāvā-aśva* respectively).

The sequence *utésire* is entirely ambiguous between *utá īsire* and *utá īsire*. The Pp. reads the unaccented verb, but the *utá* suggests that the verb is conjoined with *váhante* and belongs to the rel. cl. and should therefore be accented.

V.58.2: In my opinion the same switch in number happens in this vs. as in the preceding one, exactly in the same way -- with *yé* in c picking up *gaṇám* in the first hemistich. The standard tr. take the rel. cl. of c with d: the pl. *yé* matches the number of its putative antecedent *nṛṇ* in d exactly. Although connecting with c thus appears to be the easier syntactic course, the exact parallelism between 1abc and 2abc makes that structure more appealing, and in addition the pāda-init. impv. *vāndasva* in d seems to be marking a syntactic break.

The first hemistich, which consists entirely of an acc. phrase, obviously simply continues vs. 1, skipping back over the rel. cl. in 1cd to the *gaṇám* phrase in 1ab.

The bv *dhúni-vrata-* ‘possessing a turbulent commandment’ has, at first glance, a curious sense, but the point is that, as the thunderstorm, the Maruts’ job -- their *vratá* -- is to be noisy, boisterous, and tumultuous.

I would substitute “possessing uncanny power” for “masters of artifice.”

The orig. *s-*stem *máyas-* has become a frozen, synchronically uninflected form in the RV. Therefore, the accent shift that makes possessive adjectives out of many neut. *s-*stems (type *yásas-* ‘glory’ → *yaśás-* ‘glorious’) was probably not an available derivational strategy -- hence the somewhat clumsy cmpd with *bhū-*.

The phrase *mayo(-bhúvaḥ) ... ámitāḥ* appears to be an etymological play but of course is not. Note also *māyínam ... mayo-*.

It’s worthy of note that the vs. contains four nominal forms with 1<sup>st</sup> member ending in *-i*, with three different explanations: *khādi-hasta-*, *dhúni-vrata-* (both bahuvrīhis with regular *-i-*stem 1<sup>st</sup> members; for the latter see AiG II.2.296), the somewhat mysteriously formed (see below) *dāti-vāra-*, and *tuvi-rādhas-* (Caland compounding *-i-*). To which we might add *mayínām*, as well as *mahitvā* and the immediately preceding *ámitā(h)* with mirror-image phonology.

The cmpd. *dāti-vāra-* occurs 3x in the RV (and nowhere else): here, I.167.8, and III.58.2, but its repetitions in the Indo-Europeanist literature must number in the thousands. It is there generally taken as a representative of an archaic cmpd type with a verbal governing first member, found also in Greek forms like βωπι-άνειρα ‘nourishing men’. The proposals for the identity of the first member vary wildly, though probably the current favorite, due to the prestige of J. Schindler, who championed it, is a *-ti-*stem nominal. This is not the place to explore the history of this cmpd., but two things are

worth noting: 1) the evidence for the other Vedic cmpds that are supposed to belong with it is very weak; see esp. the remarks on *rīty-āp-* and *vṛṣṭi-dyu-* ad IX.106.9; 2) the three occurrences of the cmpd. have to be assessed in the context of apparent syntagms closely connected to it formulaically. The cmpd. always occurs as the final in a Triṣṭubh line; the VP *dāti vār'yam* is found at the end of Jagatī/dimeter lines at VII.15.12, 42.4, with accented *dāti* at V.48.5, with impv. *dātu* at VII.15.11; with semantically similar obj., *dāti vājam* (Triṣṭubh) at VI.24.2, and non-adjacent with semantically similar obj. *dāti ... vāsu* at IV.8.3. It is hard to know what to make of this assemblage. The *dāti* forms are clearly finite verbs (note the lack of accent on several, as well as the impv. form *dātu*) in the independent syntagm, but they are not standard forms of  $\sqrt{dā}$ ; at best the *dāti* forms are aorist subjunctives. But their appearance in the syntagm, with adjacent VO order, is obviously not independent of the cmpd. It is quite possible that *dāti* was extracted from the cmpd. and reinterpreted as a finite verb, but at the very least this means that the *dāti*- in the cmpd was not synchronically interpr. as a *-tī*-stem nominal. In any case, I am dubious about the antiquity of *dāti-vāra-* itself and even more so about the existence of a “type *dātivāra*,” as I have discussed elsewhere. On *vīti-hotra-* see comm. ad II.38.1, on *rītyāp-* and *vṛṣṭi-dyu-* comm. ad IX.106.9. For further disc. of these issues, see my forthcoming art. “Vedic Evidence for the Verbal-Governing *dāti-vāra-* Compound ‘Type’: A Critical Reassessment.”

V.58.3: The enclitic 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. *vaḥ* in pāda a must refer to the assemblage of ritual celebrants and its referent is not the same as the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. ref. to the Maruts in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich (voc. *marutaḥ*, impv. *juṣadhvam*, vocc. *kavayo yuvānaḥ*).

As JL observed, pāda d has only one accented syllable (the first word *etám*). The voc. phrase that ends it, *kavayo yuvānaḥ*, recurs in the final vs., 8c [=V.57.8c], but with voc. accent because it is in a string of such vocc.: *kávayo yúvānaḥ*. As noted ad V.57.8, that verse consists almost entirely of accented vocc., so the poet seems to be playing with extremes of syntactically driven accent here.

V.58.4: The wrong sandhi in d *yuṣmád sádaśvo* is found in both Aufr. and HvN, but the Max Müller ed. has the correct *yuṣmát*. So, a copying error going back to Aufr., presumably generated from the *yuṣmád* beginning c, as well as immediately following *sád-*.

The two cmpds in c are a little aberrant in their semantic/morphology “interface.” Given the sense of the phrase, it’s possible that we’re dealing with a lower linguistic register with somewhat looser cmpding practices. *muṣṭi-hán-* (3x RV): as a root noun cmpd we might expect the 1st member to have object relationship with 2nd – and mean ‘smiting fist(s)’ like, e.g., *vṛtra-hán-* ‘smiting Vṛtra’. Scarlatta (690) suggests some (not very convincing) ways around this. In *bāhú-jūta-* we might expect agent+passive semantics: ‘sped by the arms’, like *índra-prasūta-* ‘impelled by Indra’ (etc. etc.).

Like 3d, 4b has only one accented syllable: *vibhvataṣṭám janayathā yajatrāḥ* -- though the lack may be less noticeable since the accented syllable comes closer to the middle of the line.

The sense of *írya-* is disputed, and it has no secure etym. (see EWA s.v. *írin-*). Schlerath (Königtum) suggests that it’s a deriv. of *írā-* ‘refreshing drink’, meaning ‘Nass spendend’, and this suggestion has been adopted by Oberlies (RdR II.178). However, this

does not work in all passages, nor with *irin-* (V.87.3) if that is related. It seems best to follow the old standard gloss ‘regsam, rüdrig’, etc., and the posited connection to  $\sqrt{r}$  ‘arise’, etc. (see EWA loc. cit.).

There are two approaches to the interpr. of *vibhva-taṣṭá-*. One assumes that the first member is a PN, the name of one of the Ṛbhū (so Re, WG). One of the occurrences of the cmpd is in a Ṛbhū hymn, IV.36.5, in a vs. with both a form of the word *ṛbhú-* and the name of another Ṛbhū, *vāja-*. There the PN interpr. seems correct or at least a pun. However, in the other passages, III.49.1, V.42.12, and this one, all lacking a strong Ṛbhū presence, it seems best to see a more general meaning. Ge seems to follow this course (here and III.49.1, though not V.42.12) but his “vollendeteten” doesn’t give much hint as to how he interprets the first member.

The hapax *sád-aśva-* appears to be the only RVic cmpd with the first member *sa(n)t-* -- assuming, with most, that *sát-pati-* contains a reduced form of *sádas-* ‘seat’ (see EWA s.v.). I take it as semantically related to the derived adj. *sátvan-*, of warriors ‘the real thing’. So ‘(having) true horses’ in the sense of “good men and true”; English “trusty” works well. We might have expected *s(u)vásva-* ‘having good horses’ parallel to *suvīra-* at the end of the pāda, but perhaps the poet wanted to vary the expression – though the pun on his name in 1c *āśvaśva-* would suggest differently.

V.58.5–7: Sustained phonetic play, esp. with *p* and *r/r*, in *prá-pra* (5b), *pṛśneḥ putrā(h)* (5c), *prāyāsiṣṭa pṛṣatībhīḥ* (6a), *práthiṣṭa ... pṛthivī* (7a).

V.58.5: Note the phonetic play on initial *a* and final *ā*: *arā ... ácaramā áheva ... ákavā*.

The syntactic break in the middle of pāda a, after *ivéd*, and the enjambment across the pāda boundary, with *áheva* in pāda a the subj. of the verb *prá-pra jāyante* in b, give the sense of unstoppable motion that the similes also provide.

Flg. Hoffmann (Aufs. II.413 [=MSS 10 (1957) 61–62]), WG and Re (though Re rather mutedly) take *ákavā(h)* as meaning that the Maruts do not become reduced in power, and Ge’s rather vague ‘vollkommen’ is in the same realm, though obviously without the benefit of Hoffmann’s disc. I prefer to take the adj. as outer-directed -- ‘not stinging, unstinting’ rather than inner-directed ‘not retracting’.

The VP *sváyā matyā ... sám mimikṣuḥ* “They have equipped themselves with their own poetic thought” seems implicitly to contrast with the opening of the previous hymn, V.57.1 *iyám vo asmát ... matīḥ* “This poetic thought from us for you.” This should remind us that the Maruts are both recipients and producers of praise poetry. See the disc. of the opening of this Marut cycle, V.52, where much is made of this dual role. A number of tr. take *matī-* as the equivalent of ‘will’ or ‘intention’ (van Bradke [Fs. Roth (1893) 119] Will, Ge, Kü [386] Absicht, WG Antrieb), but this stretches the meaning of this word unacceptably. In any case the locution must harmonize with the very similar one in I.165.1 adduced also by Ge: *káyā śubhā ... marútaḥ sám mimikṣuḥ / káyā matī*.

V.58.6: Although the adjacency of *pṛṣatībhīr ásvaiḥ* might seem to lend credence to the supposed shifting gender of *áśva-* ‘horse’ due to the clear fem. form of the preceding adj., it is better to follow the standard tr. in taking the two words as separate, with the fem. referring to dappled antelopes or simply dappled mares that serve as the horses for the

Maruts' chariot. Note that this type of double ref. to their draught animals is found in the next vs., 7c, where the Maruts yoke "the winds as their horses" to the chariot pole.

Pāda c is cleverly constructed: *āpaḥ* 'waters' would be a perfectly acceptable subject of the following verb *riṇaté* 'flow, dissolve', but it is "bound" to *kṣódante* with the accent on *riṇaté* making the syntactic break clear. But the *real* subject of *riṇaté*, *vánāni* 'trees', is a much less appropriate subj. than what preceded.

VIII.7.26 (also a Marut hymn), *dyaúr ná cakradad bhiyā*, adduced by Ge, makes it clear that Heaven is roaring with fear, but the roaring must also represent thunder.

V.58.6–7: The final word of vs. 6 is *dyaúḥ*, while *pṛthivī* appears in the 1st pāda of 7, implicitly linking this standard pair, although they are contextually separate. However, the verb *práthiṣṭa*, which opens the pāda, forms an etymological figure with *pṛthivī* and therefore can substitute for it.

V.58.7: The first hemistich has distinct sexual overtones, with the Earth spreading herself to receive the Maruts' "embryo" -- though it is more decorously phrased than V.56.3.

It is difficult to get a causal reading from *hí* in c. It cannot be connected with the preceding pāda, and the action of c seems irrelevant to d, so connection with the following pāda seems unlikely. I have settled for the craven 'certainly'.

Note that *dhurí* here was anticipated by injunc. *dhuḥ* at the end of b. Moreover, verse-final *dyaúḥ* in 6d resonates with hemistich-final *dhuḥ* of 7b. One could almost wonder if the primal incest of Heaven and Earth is being subtly alluded to.

V.58.8: See comm. above on the identical vs., V.57.8. Although it is a repeated vs., it fits nicely into this hymn: 1) *ámṛtā řtajñāḥ* has ring-compositional relationship with 1d *amṛtasya svarājah*; note the twisted phonetic relationship between *svārājah* and *řtajñāḥ*. 2) *túvīmaghāso* echoes *tuvirādhaso* of 2d; 3) Pāda c: the accented voc. *kávayo yúvānaḥ* repairs the unaccented identical phrase in 3d. Perhaps this internal quotation is responsible for the metrical problem, 10 syls. with rest after caesura.

## V.59 Maruts

V.59.1: As was indicated in the publ. intro., the referent of the 'spy' (*spát*) is unclear. Ge suggests a number of possibilities, none compelling; WG take it as the singer. Most bizarrely, Old interprets the word as an interjection. I think it possible that it is the sun. One clue is the repetition of the phrase *suvitāya dāvāne* "to give good faring," which is used of the Maruts in 4d. I therefore think the 'spy' must be a being that can function in the same way as the Maruts and provide the same type of benefit. The sun is elsewhere called a spy (X.35.8), provides light for creatures to move about, and appears before and, more importantly, after a storm.

Part of the solution to the foregoing question depends on another problem in the first pāda, the interpr. of the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. verb (*prá ...*) *akran*. It is regularly assigned to  $\sqrt{kran}$  'roar' (so, e.g., Gr, Lub), and the standard tr. all interpr. it so. But this interpr. is by no means universal: both Wh (Rts) and Macdonell instead assign it to  $\sqrt{kram}$  'stride'. (Old, again bizarrely, takes it to  $\sqrt{kr}$ .) Narten sides with the  $\sqrt{kran}$  contingent (Sig. Aor. 99 n. 254), though without argument, simply asserting "... kann nicht ... zum Wz.-Aor. von

*kram* gestellt werden.” On the one hand, of course, the argument against  $\sqrt{kram}$  is obvious: it is a *seṭ* root -- its 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. root aor. should be, and in fact is, *ákramīt*. But there are countervailing arguments.  $\sqrt{kram}$  is found with the preverb *prá* in the RV only in IX.77.1 and, at least acdg. to MonWms., nowhere else in Skt., whereas *prá*  $\sqrt{kram}$  is common. Vs. 4d, containing the other occurrence of *suvitāya dāvāne*, also contains a verb of movement (at least acdg. to me and Ge), *prá bharadhve* ‘press forward’; moreover, *suvitāya* elsewhere in the RV regularly appears with verbs of motion (cf., e.g., nearby V.57.1 *suvitāya gantana*), whereas it does not fit easily with verbs of proclaiming (though cf. VIII.27.10 *prá ṇaḥ pūrvasmāi suvitāya vocata*). As for the morphological problem, from the fairly common (9x) 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. root aor. (*á*)*kramuḥ*, an aniṭ-type *kran* could easily be backformed. If the verb does belong with  $\sqrt{kram}$  and the spy therefore *strides* forth, rather than *roars* forth, an entity like the sun makes good sense.

The pāda-initial *árcā* exactly matches pāda-init. *árcā* in the opening vs. of the opening hymn in the Marut cycle, V.52.1. As there, so here, we can read the preverb *prá* with that verb, borrowing it either from the vs. initial form or from the third word in the 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda. In fact this 2<sup>nd</sup> *prá* can be read as a preverb in tmesis either with *árcā* or with final *bhare* (or both), and in the former case, it could be interpr. as having moved to the end of its clause *árcā divé prá* right before the caesura with an opening of 5, rather than being the first word of the 2<sup>nd</sup> clause *prá pṛthivyā ṛtām bhare* right after the caesura with an opening of 4. In other words, *prá* is ambiguously positioned both syntactically and metrically.

Another ambiguous form is *táruṣanta* (in sandhi) in c, which can be resolved either as finite 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. med. *táruṣante* (so Pp, Gr, etc.) or an act. pres. part. masc. pl. *táruṣantaḥ*. In the first instance it owes its accent to its clause-init. position; in the latter, because it’s a participle. Since this stem has exactly 3 forms in all of Skt. -- this one, an active *taruṣema*, and a med. 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. (*-anta* replacement?) *taruṣanta*, there is no way to tell, though, since *taruṣanta* could also belong to an underlyingly active stem, I’m somewhat inclined towards the act. part.

The reflexive-type medial *śrathayante* might be better tr. “they let loose their own radiance” (as in the *-áya*-book, p. 104) than “they let their own radiance slacken.” The Maruts’ storm is not abating but gathering fury. On *śratháya*- see comm. ad V.85.4.

V.59.2: The publ. interpr. of d follows Thieme (Untersuchungen, p. 39). WG draw attention to Th’s revised interpr., in Kl. Sch. II.998–99 (and 834), in which he takes *mahé* as a dual and *vidathé* as a final dative: “sie halten inne, um den Regen zu verteilen,” closely followed by WG “... haben zwischen den zwei Grossen (Himmel und Erde) zur Verteilung (des Regens).” Some of this seems worth adopting. Because of the *antár* a dual interpr. of *mahé* is attractive, but rather than separating *vidáthe* from *mahé* syntactically (the interposition of the caesura, invoked by Thieme and WG, does not seem sufficient reason) and making it a dative (though the stem is otherwise only thematic and a dat. should be excluded), it seems best to return to Old’s suggestion that *mahé vidáthe* is a dual acc. phrase, as it is in VIII.39.1. I would then emend the tr. to “the men have taken their places between the two great divisions [=Heaven and Earth].” This is in fact where the Maruts as thunderstorm are positioned -- in the midspace.

V.59.3: The various tr. configure these four similes somewhat differently; I won't comment in detail on these versions. The most puzzling one is the first, in great part because it is not clear what the Maruts' horn would be -- perhaps the superstructure of their helmets? or their lightning bolts? (Sāy. takes it as their turban.) Ge suggests that it has a double meaning, horn and Selbstgefühl, but we still need some physical aspect of the Maruts that could be compared to cowhorns, so the second abstract sense doesn't help much.

Most interpr. take *sūryo ná cákṣuḥ* either as a mistake for gen. *sūraḥ* (so Gr, e.g.) or as a decomposed bahuvrīhi, both yielding "like the eye of the sun." I see no reason to adopt either interpr. The suggested phrase, with a proper gen., is found in 5d *sūryasya cákṣuḥ* (and, of course, elsewhere) in the same metrical position. If Śyāvāśva had wanted to say that here, he would have. Instead he must be comparing the Maruts' eye to the sun, with both in the nom. Since *sūryasya cákṣuḥ* is a fairly common expression, its appearance in vs. 5 can be seen as poetic repair of the double nom. in our vs. In my view the quality held in common by sun and eye is the light emitted in the journey through space, but this depends on one's interpr. of *visárjane*. Ge gives it a later sense not otherwise found in the RV (Aufhören 'stopping', sim. WG Schwinden); Re takes it as 'expansion'. I see it as a variant of *ví √sr* 'stream/run/spread through'. Cf. *rájaso visāré* I.79.1, used of Agni compared to the sun. In fact, we might consider the two phrases to be variants of each other; both are pāda final, with I.79.1 in a dimeter (hence iambic) cadence, while ours provides a Jagatī cadence.

V.59.4: Pāda b succinctly summarizes the special skills of the Maruts, which lie in their ability both to produce praise poetry and to perform hypermasculine feats.

The sandhi of *kás kāvyā* is irregular, but connected to similar irregular sandhis before *kaví*- elsewhere. See comm. ad VII.18.2.

V.59.5: The simile in pāda a requires a hidden term of comparison. The "reddish horses" (*áśvāḥ ... aruṣāsaḥ*) must be, covertly, the flames of a fire; that is why they have the same lineage, because they all flare up from the same source. I doubt that the poet was telling us that all red horses have the same bloodlines.

The two middle similes (b, c) seem redundantly phrased, in that in each case one of the terms applied to the subject also provides the verb: *prayúdhaḥ prá ... yuyudhuḥ* (b), *suvṛdho vāvṛdhuḥ* (c). I do not understand the stylistic point of this redundancy, but since it's repeated in adjacent pādas it must be deliberate.

I also don't understand the *utá* in b, placed between preverb and verb (*prótá yuyudhuḥ*) and with nothing obvious to conjoin. Klein (DGRV I.373–74) takes it as conjoining b with a, but gives no explanation for its position, whose extreme rarity he notes. For another ex. of *utá* between preverb and verb, see X.53.7.

Another anomaly in b is the metrical shape of the verb, in pāda-final position: *yuyudhuḥ* would be far better read *\*yūyudhuḥ*, as also the identical forms in IV.30.3 and VII.83.7. See Kü 409. Although no forms of this poorly attested perfect are transmitted with long reduplication, it's worth noting the hapax redupl. *i*-stem *yūyudhi*- (X.149.4), a variant of *yūyudhi*- (2x).

V.59.7: This vs. contains several syntactic ambiguities of not much moment. The rel. prn. *yé* in the 1<sup>st</sup> hemistich can in principle be picked up by either *ásvāsaḥ* ‘horses’ or *eṣām* ‘of them [=Maruts]’, and in fact either the horses or the Maruts could easily be compared to birds. I don’t see any way to decide, though it’s true that the default ref. of any masc. pl. in a Marut hymn is the Maruts.

In b *brhatáḥ* can in principle be acc. pl., gen. sg., or abl. sg., so that it could technically modify any of the three nouns in that pāda: acc. pl. *ántān*, gen. sg. *diváḥ*, or abl. sg. *sānunaḥ*, and it is found with both *diváḥ* and *snóḥ* (alt. form of *sānunaḥ*) elsewhere. With the standard tr., I take it with ‘back’. Flg. Ge and Re, I assume that the ‘back’ is heaven’s -- and in fact the gen. *diváḥ* could be read both with *ántān* and with *sānunaḥ*, between which it is positioned. WG suggest rather that it’s the back of the earth, namely the mountains, and this is worth considering. If they’re coming from the mountain, it may explain why/how they have stirred the *nabhanú-* of the mountain. Still, the clear phrase *diváḥ ... sānu* in the next hymn (V.60.3b) favors ‘heaven’.

On *nabhanú-* see comm. ad IV.19.7.

V.59.8: The second clause of pāda a, *áditir vītáye naḥ*, is underspecified and has been variously interpr. Since *vītáye* is frequently used in stereotyped passages of gods ‘pursuing’ the oblation, often with a verb of motion, I supply this context here. For parallels, cf., e.g., VIII.20.10 *havyā no vītáye gata*.

The nom. pl. demon. *eté* is pāda-final, which seems an odd position for such a pronoun. But a glance at Lub’s Concordance shows that *eté* is found in just that place fairly commonly -- e.g., in the next hymn, V.60.5a.

## V.60 Maruts

V.60.1: The opening of the hymn, *īle agnīm*, is a flipping of the opening of the first hymn in the RV, I.1.1 *agnīm īle*, but since this phrase, in both orders, is found a number of times in the RV, we should perhaps not make too much of it. However, it’s worth noting that this is the only other place where it opens a hymn.

This is the only occurrence of the ppl. *prasattá-* ‘seated to the fore/in front’, and it here seems a substitute for the standard *puróhita-* ‘placed in front’, of Agni as the offering fire on the ritual ground. If *īle agnīm* is a conscious evocation of RV I.1.1 (or a templatic Agni hymn), then *prasattáḥ* could be evoking the third word of I.1.1 (*agnīm īle*) *puróhitam*.

However, the gambling phrase that follows goes off in a very different direction; as is recognized by all standard tr., the phrase *ví cayat kṛtám* is dicing vocabulary. For the VP see I.132.1 and Falk (1986, *Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel*, pp. 126–28).

V.60.2: The parallelism between the two loc. phrases *preṣatīṣu śrutāsu* (a) and *sukhēṣu ... rátheṣu* (b) seems clear, but this entails that the Maruts are mounted both on their horses and on their chariots. This is a price that most tr. are willing to pay, but Re avoids it at the price of the parallelism, by attaching the dappled females to the chariots: “... qui sont montés sur les chars aisés conduit par les (antilopes) tachetées.” Since the Maruts are clearly astride horses in the next hymn, V.61.3, I think we can have them there here as well.

The person changes between hemistichs from 3<sup>rd</sup> (ab: *yé tasthúh*) in the rel. cl. to 2<sup>nd</sup> (cd: voc. *ugrāh ... vah*) in the main cl. This is hardly unusual in the RV. The standard tr. register this anacoluthon in various ways, WG most sharply, by supplying a main cl. for ab: “(Sie sind es), die ...” and separating the two hemistichs into two sentences. This seems unnec.

V.60.2–3: Note the concatenation: 2d ... *párvataś cit # // 3a # párvataś cit ...* The two vss. also hold the verb *rejate /rejata* steady (2d, 3b, though in slightly different metrical position, both post-caesura, with one pres. and the other injunc.), but in the first instance it’s earth (*pr̥thivī*) that trembles and in the 2<sup>nd</sup> (the back of) heaven (*divāh*, initial in its pāda like *pr̥thivī*). So the standard pair heaven/earth are contrasted and identically positioned, but they are grammatically non-parallel. There is also a repetition of ‘fear’, though again in different forms -- nominal *bhiyā* in 2c, pf. *bibhāya* in 3c, both pāda-final. This kind of patterned and varied repetition may not reach the heights of poetic art, but it is a pleasing demonstration of the way a RVic poet infuses freshness into the clichés that are his bread-and-butter.

V.60.4: The “marks of greatness” of the publ. tr. follows Re’s “signes-de-grandeur”; *māhāmsi* must refer to something that can be visible on their bodies.

On the wooing context of this vs. see comm. ad X.94.10.

V.60.5: The standard tr. (all ultimately deriving from Sāy.) take Rudra and Pṛṣni as the joint subj. of a verb to be supplied (“prepared,” vel sim.), with *sudínā* as obj. (e.g., Ge “Ihr ... Vater ... (und) ... Pṛṣni (haben) den Marut schöne Tage (bereitet)”). This seems unnec. The first part of this hemistich (through *pṛśniḥ*) seems simply to define the Maruts’ parentage: *pitā ... rudrāḥ* is answered by *pṛśniḥ*; no ‘mother’ is necessary, because her role as their mother is virtually her only function in the RV and because the bahuvr. *pṛśni-mātar-* ‘having P. as their mother’, modifying the Maruts, is used three times by Śyāvāśva in this cycle (V.57.2, 3; 59.6). As for *sudínā*, it is used several times in the kind of nominal cl. envisioned in the publ. tr.; cf. IV.4.7 *vīśvéd asmai sudínā ...* “All (days) (will be) day-bright for him”; VII.11.2 *áhāny asmai sudínā bhavanti* “for him the days become bright shining,” both with dat. as here.

The epithet *sudúghā* used of Pṛṣni may be somewhat ironically meant. At least in VI.66 it is said that Pṛṣni only once produced milk (vs. 1), that is, she milked out her sons the Maruts, but that she did not give milk to them (vs. 5).

V.60.6: The second hemistich has a few complications. We can start with the *utá vā*: what is it conjoining? Ge and Re seem to take it as conjoining the vocc. *rudrāḥ* and *ágne*, and Klein (DGRV II.170) explicitly follows this interpr., though giving no other exx. of conjoined vocatives. But esp. given the various choices of place given in ab, conjoined by *vā*, the more natural reading is to assume it offers another alternative to *átah* ‘from there’ in c; the most natural of those choices would be “or (from) here.” WG, by contrast, recognize that a choice of locations is what is probably meant, but have to supply the 2<sup>nd</sup> alternative complete: “von da aus ... oder (von wo ihr euch) auch nun (befindet).” My solution may be too tricky to be acceptable, but I think the ‘here’ is implicit in the *asya /asyá*. First, note that the cross-pāda sandhi ... *asyāgne ...* is compatible with either an

unaccented or an accented gen. sg. pronoun. The Pp. takes it as the former, but if it is to be construed with *haviṣaḥ* in the next pāda, as the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take it, as an adjective it should be accented (*asyá*). I do think it has an adjectival role with *haviṣaḥ*, but I also think this near-deictic is a substitute for an adverb of place like *ihá* or *itás*, and the possibility of non-accentuation is an indirect indication that it can also be taken independently of *haviṣaḥ* to express the potential location of the Rudras here and now on the ritual ground with Agni. I would slightly adjust the tr. to “from there, o Rudras, or (here and) now, o Agni, be cognizant ...” The awkwardness of folding Agni into the Maruts’ actions is also on view in the next vs.

I do not understand the presence of the future impv. *vittāt*. Perhaps with Sāy. (... *āgacchateti śeṣaḥ*), we should supply a verb of motion that implicitly precedes the action of *vittāt*: “from there (come here and) take cognizance ...” The following hymn, V.61, gives some support to this scenario. In V.61.17 Night is ordered to carry off the speaker’s hymns to his patron, with an ordinary impv. *pārā vaha*, while the flg. vs. contains a future impv. *vocatāt* (V.61.18) ordering her to speak for him once she gets there. It may also be that the future impv. was used here for convenience because the future impv. neutralizes number (also person, but that’s irrelevant here) and thus can be applicable both to the plural Rudras and the singular Agni. It’s accented because it follows an extrasentential voc. and therefore counts as being pāda-initial.

The standard tr. take *yád* as the neut. rel. prn. with *haviṣ-* as antecedent (“... the oblation that we sacrifice”), but *√yaj* never takes the offering as object, but rather the god who is the recipient. I therefore prefer to take *yád* as the subordinating conj.

V.60.7: The first pāda, *agnís ca yán maruto viśvavedasaḥ*, is a particularly complex ex. of a reverse *vāyav índraś ca* construction, with the subordinator *yád* placed, in modified Wackernagel’s Position, after the first term and a voc. adj. attached to the second. This sequence of three vss. (6–8) contains three different versions of the awkward pairing of singular and plural entities in a voc. phrase: vs. 6 with its independent non-adjacent vocc. *rudrāḥ ... ágne*, this *vāyav índraś ca* construction, and 8a *ágne marúdbhiḥ* with an instr. of accompaniment. Note that the adj. *viśvavedasaḥ*, which, since it’s voc., should technically only modify the Maruts, is more commonly applied to Agni in the RV, and so he should probably be included in its domain.

The problematic epithet *riśādas-* has already been discussed; see comm. ad I.2.7. As indicated there, the publ. tr. weakly favors Th’s ‘caring for the stranger’ over Hoffmann’s ‘fastidious’. The original meaning is difficult to get to, because by either etymology (or any other one) the word would by this time be entirely opaque and, with no synchronic lexical anchoring, it would have been free to float semantically and get attached to other words secondarily. It is often used of the Ādityas, both collectively and individually, for whom ‘caring for the stranger’ is a quite congenial reading. But it is also, as here, often used of the Maruts, where it is not so good a fit. But generally when it is applied to the Maruts, it is either with reference to their benevolent and generous aspect (as here, where they are *viśvavedasaḥ* ‘affording all possessions’ and are urged *vāmám dhatta* “establish a thing of value”) or is found nearby occurrences with the Ādityas (so here and V.61.16, with Mitra and/or Varuṇa V.64.1, 66.1, 67.2; cf. also I.186.8 *riśādaso mitrayújah*) or both (cf. Agni, the Ādityas, and the Maruts all as both *viśvavedasaḥ* and *riśādasah* in VIII.27.4).

V.60.8: The publ. tr. takes *āyúbhiḥ* in c as a PN (as often), thus identifying a separate group of co-soma-drinkers. The standard tr. take the instr. phrase in c as a further characterization of the Maruts, with *āyú-* as ‘langlebig’ (Ge, WG), ‘vigilants’ (Re). I now think this is the better course and would emend the tr. to “along with the pure, lively ones who set all in motion.”

### V.61 Maruts

For the structure of this hymn and its place in the series, see publ. intro. Although there is an *itihāsa* in the Brhaddevatā (V.50) that supposedly recounts the circumstances of Śyāvāśva’s composition, it was clearly constructed secondarily and fancifully on the basis of the Rigvedic text (see both Old and Ge).

V.61.1: Note the doubly marked superlative *śréṣṭhatama-* (also I.113.12), which therefore ought to be rendered as “the most fairest.” It must be nom., not voc., because of its accent, since in a standard voc. phrase it would be unaccented flg. unaccented *naraḥ*.

It is somewhat notable that the Maruts are referred to *éka-ekah* “one by one,” since they are usually not differentiated at all.

V.61.1–2: These two vss. contain a fairly high percentage of the total number of RVic 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. active pfs., with the poorly characterized ending *-a* on the weak stem: *āyayá* (1b), *śeka*, *yaya* (2b). Macd. (VG p. 358) lists only twelve forms in all of Vedic (some of which have more than one token) of the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. act. pf., and one of these (*anāha*) is better interpr. otherwise (see comm. ad VIII.48.5).

V.61.2: *kathā* can be read thus or as *kathā ā*, with the same preverb as in the unverbated *āyayá* in the rel. cl. of 1b. The Pp. does not read the preverb. It is possible that the variation between *kathám* in the first question of the pāda and *kathā* is meant to enable the preverb reading, and the publ. tr. reflects that.

With Ge and Re I assume a gapped *kvā* in c and in 3a. WG simply take them as questions without an explicit interrogative (“Ist ein Sattel auf einem Rücken ...?” etc.). The difference is unimportant rhetorically.

V.61.3: For this vs. see publ. intro.; as pointed out there, the simile in c can either refer to sex or to childbirth.

It is interesting that *sakthāni* is plural. Although there are plural ‘men’ (*naraḥ*) and therefore twice as many thighs as men, in Classical Sanskrit it is my impression that the dual would ordinarily be used in such a situation, where a number of men each spread their two thighs. RV seems more flexible.

V.61.3–4: The final word of vs. 3 is *jānayaḥ*, while the final word of the 1<sup>st</sup> hemistich of 4 is (*bhadra-*)*jānayaḥ*, showing the standard distribution of the ‘wife’ word, with simplex *jāni-* and *jāni-* as 2<sup>nd</sup> cmpd. member. The distrib. here is complicated by the fact that 3c ... *nā jānayaḥ* produces an unusual cadence of four shorts, which *\*jānayaḥ* would easily repair. But since the long-vowel variant never shows up as a simplex, we should presumably resist the temptation to emend.

V.61.4: The 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. impv. *etana* shows an unexpected full-grade root syllable in the Saṃhitā text, but is read with metrically problematic but morphologically “correct” zero-grade in the Pp (*itana*). Of course, such full-grade 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. impvs. are found elsewhere, but in this case I wonder if it’s a secondary extraction from forms cmpded with the preverb *ā*, as in V.87.8, also a Marut hymn, with pāda-final *étana*. See also disc. ad VI.42.2.

V.61.5: As noted in the publ. intro., the standard tr. (now incl. WG) take *sánat* as meaning ‘gave’ (Ge schenkte, Re a donné, WG geschenkt hat), not ‘gained’; Indeed Re claims that the stem *sána-* means ‘give’ in dānastutis, but provides no parallels. I have found none in any of the occurrences of this stem, but by contrast quite a number of exx. of *sána-* in dānastutis with the expected meaning ‘gain’ (I.126.3, V.30.14; VIII.25.22, 24; 46.22, 29; 68.17; X.62.11). Note, however, the honorable exception of Klein (DGRV I.431) “That one *has obtained* [my italics] a herd consisting of horses ...”; Grassmann likewise gives the verb in this passage its standard meaning ‘erlangen’. The only possible reason I can imagine that this array of skilled philologists resolutely turned their backs on the very clear evidence of the semantics of this root is that they couldn’t imagine that a female could have won or gained these prizes -- though, as noted in the publ. intro., it would be just as anomalous for a female to *give* them. If I am right that the woman in question is a favored concubine, or even the Favorite Wife (*Vāvātā*) of later Vedic ritual, of Śyāvāśva’s royal patron, then he may have indulged her with a little gift at the time of the general distribution of bounty. She does, after all, perform services for him, as pāda d shows.

*śatāvayam* is almost universally interpr. as ‘consisting of a hundred (/hundreds of) sheep’, with the 2<sup>nd</sup> member derived from *ávi-* (so Gr, Ge, Re, Klein; also AiG II.2.140 and II.1 Nachtr. 34), and certainly sheep fit nicely into a sequence with horses and cows. WG demur, suggesting that such a cmpd should rather be *\*śatāvya-* and proposing an alternate analysis on the model of *cātur-vaya-* ‘fourfold’ (2x) -- hence “livestock in horses and cows a hundredfold.” However, the *-vaya-* of *cātur-vaya-* is not otherwise found in such cmpds and has no obvious source (see AiG II.2.906), and the long final vowel of the first member *śatā-* would not be quite as easily explained (though stems like *śatāmagha-* and *śatāvant-* also show unetymological long vowels). I do think WG’s point is well-taken that *\*avaya-* is an unlikely deriv. to *ávi-*, esp. since that stem shows “closed” inflection, but *-vaya-* ‘-fold’ has its own problems. I suggest rather that the cmpd orig. contained the well-attested deriv. *avyāya-* ‘sheep-y, ovine’ (hence *\*śatāvvyaya-*), which has undergone haplology of the first *y*. Note that there’s a lot of phonological play in these vss. (sibilants and *v*’s, with *a*’s), inspired by the poet’s name Śyāva-aśva: 5a *sā ásv’yam* ... b *śatāvayam* ... c *śyāvā-aśva* [or HvN’s *śyāvāśva*] ... 6a *śáśtyasī* ... b ... *vásyasī*, which could have contributed to the deformation of the underlying cmpd. I would therefore keep the older meaning, but with a different analysis of the 2<sup>nd</sup> member.

Note also that the end of c, (*-stut*)*āya yā*, is nearly identical to the ends of 1b *āyayā* and 2b (*kath*)*ā yaya*.

V.61.6–8: As indicated in the publ. tr., I consider these vss. a digression reflecting on the character of women in general, motivated by the introduction of the winning woman in vs. 5.

V.61.6: The comparative *śáśīyas-* is attested only twice in the RV, here and in IV.32.3. Though they have different senses in the two passages (‘more reliable’ here, ‘more numerous’ there, at least by my interpr.), the semantic dev. from the positive *śáśvant-* ‘regularly recurring, in unbroken sequence, each and every’ to the two senses of the comp. is fairly straightforward. Here, regularly recurring > constant > reliable. In VIII.1.34 this development takes a sexual turn, with a *śáśvatī nārī* being one who is “ever ready” for sex (in my interpr.), and a sexual nuance is not ruled out in our passage either - - though here the emphasis is on her dependable qualities compared to the unsatisfactory man.

V.61.7: The relativization is loose, at least in the Eng. rendering. Literally it should be “More reliable than a man is a woman who discerns the thirsting one ...,” etc.

The lexeme *ví √jñā* means ‘discern, recognize’, and a full rendering of the implication of these VPs would be something like “who recognizes (that a particular man) is famished ...” -- the idea presumably being that, having recognized their plights, she then sees to them, each in his own need. I have folded this two-step process into ‘pay attention to’. If she does see to the needs of each, the third in the series *kāmīnam* ‘the desirous / lusting one’ again introduces the sexual: she feeds, clothes, and has sex with the three in turn, at least by my interpr. The standard tr. have a tendency to attenuate the third term -- e.g., Klein (DGRV I.432) “the one desiring (aid)” -- but in this saucy hymn I think sex is never far from the surface. I do have to admit, however, that *kāmīn-* is not otherwise used of sexual desire, but has a more general application, incl. to the Maruts in this same cycle (V.53.16).

V.61.8: On *vairadeya-*, lit. ‘what is to be given for a man/hero’, as Wergeld or blood money, see Roth (ZDMG 41: 672–76) and Macdonell-Keith Vedic Index s.v. *vaira*. Another indirect ref. to the same phenomenon is found in II.32.4 *vīrām śatādāyam* “a hero (for whom) a hundred (cows) are to be given.” In our case the person in question is hardly worth the name ‘man’ and would be better off dead than alive, since his relatives would still receive the standard recompense for a *vīrá*, whatever his personal failings had been. It is telling that he is called a *pañí-* ‘niggard’, a reminder to Śyāvāśva’s patron that stinginess is a grave flaw.

V.61.9: On this vs. see publ. intro. As detailed there, I take the vs. as an elaborate pun. On the one hand a young woman (*yuvatīh*) is narrating the course of a race (or perhaps the progress of the horses that are to be given to the poet as his prize) to the poet -- thus the word *vartanī-* ‘course, track’ in b and the two chestnut (horses) (*róhitā*) in c. (Note also that *śyāvá-* is not only the short form of the poet’s name but also, more usually, a horse color term.) But a more intimate scene is signaled by her low voice (*√rap* is ordinarily used of murmuring or muttering; see the esp. telling passage in the Yama/Yamī hymn X.10.4, where it is contrasted with *√vad*), her use of a nickname “Dusky” (*śyāvá-*), and esp. the pf. part. *mamandúṣī* ‘having intoxicated, beguiled, seduced’ (I follow Kü

[366–67] in taking the pf. as transitive and supplying ‘me’ as its obj.). And the whole vs. can be read as a description of sexual intercourse. The ‘course’ would be the course of the sex act, and the two ruddy ones in c can be any paired female body parts; given the use of the same verb *ví √yam* here as in 3b, where men spread their thighs, they may be thighs, but the labia and breasts are also possible. Both Ge and Re take the dat.

*purumīlhāya* in c as a PN and therefore not coreferential with *śyāvāya* in b. But it makes more sense to interpr. *purumīlhā-* in its full lexical sense ‘having many rewards’ (so also WG), describing the poet (*vīprāya* in d) who has received his dakṣiṇā from his patron and who is in fact Śyāvāśva -- and implying that part of this dakṣiṇā is the seductive woman in this very vs. On Purumīḍha in later Vedic see comm. on the next vs.

As a number of others have noted (e.g., Hoffmann, Injunk. 150), though the Pp. reads *arapat*, the actual form may be the injunctive *rapat*; the Pp’s augment is not realized metrically or in the transmitted text. This doesn’t affect the interpr. one way or the other. Though Gr lists *prāti* as a preverb with *rapat*, this lexeme is not otherwise found (in all of Skt., if Mon-Wms is to be believed), and given the distance between the two words and what would be an unusual position for a preverb in tmesis (pāda-initial but in the pāda *after* the verb), I think it unlikely that they are to be construed together. I take *prāti* as adverbial, reinforcing the intimacy of the scene, hence my ‘face to face’.

V.61.10: My interpr. of the dānastuti vs. proper differs from the standard, which has in my opinion been unduly affected by the later Vedic rationalization of the passage. Both JB (I.151) and PB (XIII.7.12) briefly narrate a tale in which Purumīḍha and Taranta figure as the two sons of Vaidadaśvi, but as we just saw, *purumīlhā-* is better taken in its literal sense. I also take *tarantā-* not as a PN but in lexical value. In either case it is likely a thematization of the pres. participle *tárant-* (cf. AiG II.2.211), showing the same accent shift as AV *jīvantā-* from *jīvant-*, and it should mean ‘overcoming, victorious’ → ‘victor’. By contrast I do think *vaidadaśvi-* is a PN, but a speaking name, as the vṛddhi deriv. of \**vidád-aśva-* ‘finding / acquiring horses’ (cf. *vidád-vasu-*), an appropriate name for a patron. It is worth noting that both names Śyāvāśva and Vaidadaśvi have Iranian counterparts; see Mayrhofer Personennamen s.vv.

How to distribute *yáḥ* and *yáthā* and whether to interpr. the latter as a subordinator or a simile marker are the syntactic problems in this vs., and diff. tr. have diff. solutions. I take *yáḥ* as marking a generalizing rel. cl. (‘whoever ...’) and *yáthā* as a simile marker, with c a nominal cl. functioning as the main clause to ab. The verb in b, *dádat* is a short-vowel subjunctive (‘‘whoever will give ...’’) but can also be interpr. as a thematized injunc., which in turn can be read with Vaiśvadaśvi (‘‘as V. did’’). If I had had the courage of my convictions, ‘‘did’’ would not be in parens. in the publ. tr.

V.61.11: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. marks the beginning of the second, more conventional hymn in this composite, at least in my analysis.

Technically speaking ‘horses’ should be in parens.

It is not clear if *īm* has its usual acc. function: it could anticipate *mádhu* in b, though that seems somewhat distant and that participial phrase is otherwise fully contained in b; it could function as a reflexive marker (‘‘drive *themselves*’’); or it may be one of the rare instances of functionless *īm*.

I have silently depluralized *śrāvāmsi*, since ‘fames’ is not English. Perhaps the point here is that each Marut has his own *śrāvas*, though, since they are seldom distinguished, this may be overthinking it.

V.61.12: This vs. has produced more consternation than it deserves, because of the reluctance of many interpr. to allow *yéṣām* to be coreferential with the subj. of *vibhrājante*. In these interpr., if the subj. of that verb is the Maruts, then another referent for *yéṣām* must be found; if *yéṣām* refers to the Maruts, then another subj. of the verb must be found. See Old’s lengthy disc., which includes the differing suggestions of numerous scholars (incl. also interpr. *yéṣām* as *\*yé eṣām*) but doesn’t reach firm conclusions. Of modern interpr., Re takes *yéṣām* as the Maruts and makes *ródasī* the subj. of the verb: “les Deux Mondes brillent au loin”; in a fractured sense this goes back to Max Müller’s tr. in SBE 32, but Müller emended the verb to *\*bhrājate* and took *ródasī* as sg., whereas Re mentions no such emendation and seems to be taking *ródasī* as dual, which will certainly not work grammatically with a pl. verb. WG seem to have accepted the *\*yé eṣām* interpr. Ge, surprisingly, is more relaxed and allows coreference under the rubric of “der reflexive Gebrauch des Relativs,” which seems perfectly plausible to me: they flash with their own splendour.

The “bright ornament” of c is the sun: *rukma-* is so used elsewhere in clearer context (VI.51.1, VII.63.4).

V.61.13: I have taken the two negated adjectives at the end of b and c, *ánedyah* and *ápratiṣkutaḥ*, as predicated, in contrast to all the standard tr. There is, of course, no way to tell.

V.61.15: Whose *dhî-* is it? Ge, Re, and WG all assume it is the mortal’s (e.g., Ge “Ihr ... führet den Sterblichen recht nach seinem Sinn”), but the placement of the phrase *itthā dhiyā* right after *prañetāraḥ* and at some distance from *mártam* at least weakly suggests that it is the Maruts’s. Since, as I have had occasion to remark many times, the Maruts sometimes have the role of verbal praisers and sometimes are the recipients of the same, I think both readings are possible and the poet may have wanted it to remain ambiguous. Tichy’s tr. (-tar-stems, 300–301) seems to attribute the *dhî-* to the Maruts or at least remains neutral: “Ihr bringt den Menschen vorwärts ... recht mit Bedacht.”

Note that in the cmpd *yāma-hūti-* it is the Maruts’ journeys (*yāma-*, 1<sup>st</sup> member) but the mortal’s invocations (*-hūti-*, 2<sup>nd</sup> member).

V.61.17–19: As noted in the publ. intro., the patron’s name Rathavīti (‘pursuit of the chariot’?) in 18, 19 is punned upon. In 17 (before he is explicitly mentioned, though the patronymic Dārbhya would presumably evoke him) Night is asked to carry the hymns “like a charioteer” (*rathīr iva*); in 18 the 2<sup>nd</sup> cmpd. member *-vīti-* is derived from the same root  $\sqrt{vī}$  ‘pursue’ that supplies the verb *āpa veti* ‘goes off track’.

V.61.17: I do not understand why the goddess Night acts as the intermediary between the poet and his patron; see Ge’s n. 17–19, which doesn’t seem to me entirely satisfactory.

V.61.18: The Rathavīti phrase is in the loc.; the publ. tr. renders it as if the addressee, which is technically incorrect. It is either a loc. absol. without participle or a “chez/bei” expression: “speak for me thus when R. (is present) / at R’s.” Since the net result is the same, I have kept the easier-to-parse addressee tr.

V.61.19: Ge and Re take *gómatīh* as a ref. to the Gomatī river; WG to “cow-rich lands.” I think it’s likely a pun, and I supply *vīśaḥ* ‘clans’ for one half of the pun.

#### [V.62-78 JPB]

This collection of hymns has many small and large puzzles.

#### V.62 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

The Anukr. assigns this hymn to Śrutavid, a poet found only here. The compd. *śruta-víd-* is found once in the RV, in the difficult All God hymn, V.44.12. Although it is generally taken as a PN there, I consider it instead an epithet of Indra: ‘finding [/knowing] what is heard (=praise)’. Curiously that same vs. also furnishes the name of another Anukramaṇī poet, Sadāpṛṇa, supposedly the composer of the immediately following hymn V.45. See also V.71–72.

V.62.3: The voc. expression *mītrarājānā varuṇā* is a curiously convoluted one, as long as *mītra-rājānā* is taken as a compd. I would follow Old in dividing it: *mītra rājānā varuṇā*, which requires only a change in the Pp. Although we might expect \**mītrā*, Old is untroubled. The opening of 5d, *mītrāsāthe varuṇā*, with both vocatives present and the first combined in sandhi with the verb, might have enabled the (redactional?) short-vowel vocative here, since *mītrāsāthe* could be resolved as either *mītrā* or *mītra* there.

The 2nd du. verbs in the 2nd hemistich, *vardhāyatam ... pīnvatam ... sṛjatam*, are universally all taken as imperatives (“make grow,” etc.), and this is of course not only grammatically but contextually possible. But given the augmented 2nd du. *ādihārayatam* that begins the vs., it is also possible that they are injunctives with preterital readings continuing that of *ādihārayatam*: “you made grow ... you swelled ... you released.” That *ādihārayatam* describes a cosmogonic action and the other three more quotidian and regularly repeated ones might be an argument against this interpr., but I don’t consider it a strong one.

V.62.5: The interpr. of the 1st hemistich is very difficult; it is noteworthy that this is the middle vs. and therefore structurally prone to mystery. The phraseology is very similar to the nearby M-V hymn V.69.1 (as the standard tr. and comm. note), but this may hurt more than it helps – though my reading of the latter brings these two passages into closer alignment; see comm. ad loc. In any case, the hemistich is much discussed – see, e.g., Old, who provides at least two alternative translations.

The most pressing grammatical problem is *vārdhat*. This must be a neut. NA sg. active participle to the 1st class pres. to *√vṛdh*. (The only other grammatical possibility, an accented 3rd sg. injunctive to the same stem, would be fatally difficult to fit in syntactically.) Because there are no overt neut. sg. nominals for this participle to modify, desperate alternatives must be considered. One is to supply such a neuter, with its modifying participle then governing fem. *amātīm* as object. So the publ. tr., which more

or less follows Ge's (though with different supplied neuters: Ge favors *ṛtám* [n. 5a], JPB *vratám* [from V.69.1; see also Old]). Hence the publ. tr. "Guarding (the commandment) that increases your famed, broad banner ..." However, plucking a neut. noun out of nowhere and displacing the obvious acc. obj. to *rákṣamāṇā*, namely *amátim*, seems a desperate step too far. Moreover, (the rare) neut. sg. participle has a unique functional profile; see comm. ad X.127.7, citing Craig Melchert's claim that there are no transitive neut. participles in the RV. I therefore think *várdhat* has the intrans. sense 'increasing, growing' otherwise at odds with its diathesis, and further, with Re, that it's adverbial here. (This seems superior to supplying a neut. noun, parallel to and identified with *amátim*, as WG do.) I suggest altering the tr. to "Guarding your famed emblem, wide in its growing, ..." (Note also the substitute tr. for *amáti-* to match V.69.1; on *amáti-* see comm. ad I.73.2.) On the untethered *ánu* see comm. ad V.69.1.

I do not understand the simile.

The verb *āsāthe* is accented either because it follows the extrasentential voc. and is therefore the first real word in the pāda or because of the influence of the rhyming verb *trāsāthe* in the next vs. (6b), which is accented because it's in a rel. cl. It could also in principle contain the preverb *ā*, as *ā-āsāthe*, but *ā* is not otherwise found with *√ās* and the Pp. doesn't so analyze it thus.

V.62.5–6: The b pādas of these two vss. are essentially identical. Cleverly, they differ phonologically only in the first syllable: *mí* versus *yám*, since the sandhi coalescence of *mítrā* [Pp. *míttra*] + *āsāthe* (*√ās*) in 5b yields (*mí*)*trāsāthe*, identical to *trāsāthe* (s-aor. subj. *√trā*) in 6b. On the irregularity of the latter form, see disc. by Narten (citing Wack.) in SigAor. 131. Because the form is a subjunctive, the publ. tr. should be corrected to "will safeguard."

The phrase "a thousand-pillared rule" (*kṣatrám ... sahásrasthūṇam*) is, on the surface, incongruous; it has to be interpr. in the context of the other "pillars" in this sequence of vss. (7a, 8b). The actual, material possessor of the pillars is only revealed at the end of the sequences, as the throne (*gártam*) onto which M+V mount (vs. 8bc *áyasthūṇām ... ā rohathaḥ ... gártam*). Just as, in English, the physical object "throne" can stand for the conceptual "rule," here in opposite fashion "rule" stands in for "throne." We might also try pushing the incongruity in the other direction – that is, reinterpreting "pillar" in a conceptual, not material way. In that case, it could be temporal ("thousand-year rule," e.g.) or refer to non-material means of support.

V.62.5–8: In fact this little section concentrates on the throne. The two occurrences in vss. 5 and 8 define a ring, with lexical variation in the verb (and in the case-syntax): 5cd *ádhi gárte ... āsāthe* / 8c *ā rohathaḥ ... gártam*. The first phrase *ádhi gárte* is unverbated as *ádhi gartya-* in 7d, but the independent word *gárta-* does not appear overtly in the intermediate vss.

V.62.6: This group of M+V hymns contains several occurrences of the word *kṣatrā-*: here, 66.2, 67.1, 68.3, as well as the cmpds *devá-kṣatra-* 64.7, *máhi-kṣatra-* 68.1. The publ. tr. gives several different renderings for them, which should be harmonized. I would substitute 'dominion' for 'rule' here. The VP *kṣatrám bibhrtháḥ* is also found in

V.64.6. Again, the two should match; I'd substitute 'maintain' or, perhaps better, 'sustain' here.

V.62.7: *híraṇya-nirṇig* picks up *ghṛtásya nirṇig* in 4c, though with a different referent.

As is well known, *áyas-* refers generally to base metal, not to a specific type of metal at this period (see EWA s.v.). However, copper is a possible referent. It is the appearance of the pillar that is the focus here (7a and 8b) – contrasted with gold (*híraṇya-nirṇig* 7a, *híraṇya-rūpam* 8a) and seen at sunrise -- and a rendering 'copper' would better capture the hue and luster of the pillar than 'metal', and I will substitute that in the translations below.

The phrase *áyo asya sthūṇā* is, in Re's terms ("Observations sur les composés nominaux du Ṛgveda," *Language* 29 [1953]: 235), a "pré-bahuvrīhi," and in fact the corresponding bahuvrīhi *áyasthūṇa-* occurs in the next vs. (8b). As I have discussed elsewhere (Ged. Gary Holland, forthcoming), the decomposition of the underlying bahuvrīhi – I would take issue with Re's "pré" – was necessary because three-member compounds are systematically excluded, or at least discouraged, in the RV. Of course, in this case the third word *asya* is itself unnecessary, since the possessive "its" is inherent in the underlying bahuvrīhi. In these cases the decomposition seems to be a poetic strategy to introduce variation in paired possessive phrases, alternating bahuvrīhis with nominal equational clauses. For other such exx. see I.163.9, III.29.3, VI.75.11, 15 and comm. ad locc. To better convey the rhetorical effect I would alter the tr. to "having a cloak of gold, its [=throne's] pillar [is] copper ...," with the referent ultimately being the throne – rather than taking (with most, incl. the publ. tr.) *hírānyanirṇig* as modifying *sthūṇā* directly (though see below); that *híraṇya-rūpam* is in the same verse-initial position in 8 and modifies the throne gives some support to this view.

The simile, "like a horse-whip" (*aśvājanīva*), doesn't seem particularly well suited to either the pillar of the standard interpr. or the throne. I'm assuming that the pāda depicts the sudden, momentary glint when the sun hits the throne; the property shared with the horse-whip would not be its shape but the fact that the whip is deployed so suddenly and rapidly that it's only glimpsed at intervals.

Although I believe that the referent of *áyo asya sthūṇā* is the throne, as indicated above, the pillar from that nominal clause remains grammatically the subject in pāda c, as shown by *nímitā*.

In c *kṣétre* echoes *kṣatrám* in 6c.

Pāda d presents its own syntactic challenge: the well-attested root  $\sqrt{san}$  'win, gain' always takes the acc. In the many passages given in Gr, he lists only one, this one, as having a partitive genitive. Nonetheless, that must be the correct analysis. As was noted above, *ádhi gartya-* harkens back to *ádhi gárte* in 5c. To make the sense of this pāda clearer, I would recast as "Might we win (a share) of the honey found on your throne."

V.62.8: Since the throne has been the focus of the last few verses but without being so identified in vss. 6–7, this little section presents as a sort of riddle – with the answer withheld until the end of pāda c. I think the tr. should reflect this postponement and would therefore substitute for abc "(The one) having golden color at the break of dawn, having copper pillars at the rising of the sun – the throne do you mount, o M+V."

Note the simplification of the geminate *s* before C in *áyasthūṇam* < \**ayassthūṇam*).

### V.63–64

The Anukr. attributes both these hymns to Arcanānas Ātreya, whose name is found in the last vs. of V.64. Arcanānas is also one of the alternative poets for VIII.42.

### V.63 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

On the sonic aspects of this hymn, see publ. intro.

I find JPB's rendering of *citra-* as 'shimmering' somewhat too insistent, esp. since the word is repeated so often in the hymn (3c, 4b, 5c, 6b, 7d); I would substitute the less attention-attracting 'bright'.

V.63.1: I would prefer to tr. *sátya-dharman-* "whose ordinances are real / come true," as in V.51.2 in this maṇḍala. Note that both *ṛtá-* and *satyá-* are found in the first hemistich of the hymn, each in a prominent position in the vs. Moreover, *ṛtá-* and *dhárman-* both appear in the final vs. in parallel function, forming a ring with this vs.

I would substitute "mount" for "stand on."

Gr configures *mádhumat* as the obj. of *pinvate*, and in this he is followed by Ge and (a bit skeptically) Re. I resist this interpr. for two reasons: 1) I don't think that *mádhumat* is a simple synonym for *mádhu*; 2) though med. *pínvate* can sometimes take an obj., it is usually intrans. (For a split construction between simile and frame see II.34.8 and comm. ad loc.) I therefore take *mádhumat* adverbially, perhaps with the same developed sense as neut. *X-vat* 'like X', and would tr. "the rain swells like honey" (or, if this seems too radical, "the rain swells in the fashion of something containing honey"). Alternatively, with WG, it could be a second subject of *pinvate*: "... der Regen, das honigsüsse (Nass) des Himmels." The phrase *drapsā mádhumantaḥ* "honeyed drops [=rain]" in 4d might favor this last solution, as well as the appositives to *vṛṣṭím* in 2c.. I'm not sure what the publ. tr.'s "the rain swells rich in honey" is meant to convey grammatically, perhaps just to avoid committing to one interpr.

V.63.2: The *vām* was omitted from the tr. of c, which should be changed to "We beg you two for ..."

V.63.3–4: The tr. 'cunning' for *māyā-* seems incongruous here: surely M+V don't produce cosmic effects through low trickery, but through some greater than normal ability to manipulate natural events. I'm afraid 'magic power' or 'magical art' works better, much as I'd like to avoid 'magic'. I'd now instead try out 'uncanny power' or 'supernatural power' – though 'trick' or 'magic trick' still serves for the negative uses of the term. And 'wile(s)' for the instantiations of the power can be used either negatively or positively – that is, Indra can have wiles just as his opponents can.

V.63.3: See above on *māyā-*. Here I would substitute "you make heaven rain by means of the uncanny power of a lord."

V.63.4: And here “your uncanny power is fixed in heaven,” with a slightly different rendering of *śritā-* too. Re suggests that here M+V’s *māyā-* is the sun found in the next pāda. This is an intriguing idea, but seems contradicted by the fact that the two gods hide the sun in pāda c. I think the idea is more that they control all the natural phenomena in heaven (sun, clouds, rain) by their *māyā*, their supernatural power.

V.63.5: The Maruts are not usually at home in a M-V context, but since they are gods of the thunderstorm, their introduction is appropriate here.

It is a bit noteworthy that the simile in b, sg. *śūro ná*, does not match its correspondent in the frame in number, the pl. Maruts in pāda a. Although Vedic similes are far less strictly regulated for grammatical agreement (save for case) than those in Classical Skt., agreement here would have been easy and would not affect the meter (\**śūrā ná*).

Though in c the Pp (fld. by Gr, Old, Th., WG, and the publ. tr) read *citrā*, a neut. pl. modifying *rājāṃsi*, both Ge and Re prefer *citrāḥ* (equally possible in this sandhi context), modifying *tanyávaḥ* -- an interpr. with a long history (see Old’s comm.). All things being equal (as they seem to be), I will stick with the Pp. But I would substitute “across the bright [or shimmering, per JPB] spaces,” to convey the plural and the sense of dimension. The second half of the pāda is identical to 2d, which might be an argument against construing *citrā(h)* with *tanyávaḥ*, since it’s part of a fixed phrase.

In d the verb *ukṣatam* is universally interpr. as an impv., but it could as easily be an injunc. ‘you sprinkle(d)’. See 6d below.

V.63.6: Given the metrical structure of the 2nd hemistich, *māyāyā* belong with the rest of c, and so it is universally rendered. However, it’s worth noting that the cross-pāda phrase ... *māyāyā, dyām varṣayatam* ... mostly replicates, though in different order, 3d *dyām varṣayathaḥ* ... *māyāyā*, and *māyāyā* could be read with that VP as well.

Like *ukṣatam* in 5d, *varṣayatam* is always interpr. as an impv. but could be an injunc., matching *vasata* in the previous pāda (6c). There are no other impvs. in this hymn except for putative *ukṣatam* in 5d. Putting all this together, I’d tr. cd as “The Maruts clothe themselves in clouds by (your/their) uncanny power (and by your uncanny power) make / you make/made heaven rain ...”

Because of *aruṣām*, *dyām* must be fem. here, as occasionally elsewhere.

V.63.7: This vs. forms a ring with vs. 1, using particularly resonant vocabulary. The first word of the hymn, *ṛtasya* (with voc. accent), is echoed by the 1st word of the last hemistich, *ṛténa*; the first word of this last vs., *dhármaṇā*, echoes *sátyadharmāṇā* opening 1b. These two words, so closely associated with M+V, are now found in parallel function, though in vs. 1 they were each embedded in different syntagms, and as instrumentals they express the tools M+V wield to keep the universe functioning. The chariot of 1a is found again as the last word of the hymn, where its identity with the sun is made clear. The reappearance of the sun-chariot is esp. important because it had been hidden by rain and clouds in the interior of the hymn (see esp. 4c).

I would prefer to render *dhármaṇā* as ‘by your ordinance’ and *māyāyā* as ‘by the uncanny power’. It’s esp. important to render the instrumentals *dhármaṇā* and *ṛténa* in the same fashion, since they express parallel forces.

### V.64 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

V.64.1: On the image conveyed by the dual *vrajā* see WG comm. ad V.6.7. The case form of simile and frame is slightly skewed – we might expect the two arms to correspond more closely to *vrajā*; see Re’s comm., also KH, Aufs. 572, n. 22.

The preverb *pāri* is in tmesis with the pf. part. *jaganvāṃsā*; tmesis with participles is fairly rare.

V.64.2: The intens. *joguve* is also found in I.127.10 in this same phrase, *viśvāsu kṣāsu joguve*. In that passage the verb is fairly clearly 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. despite its pseudo-perfect *t*-less form. Here it could be 1<sup>st</sup> sg., as JPB takes it (flg. Gr). The 1<sup>st</sup> sg. optatives in the next two vss. (3a *aśyām*, 3b *yāyām*, 4b *dheyām*) support this interpr.; However, the identity of the two phrases (I.127.10 and this one) might speak for a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. interpr. (so Ge, WG – both supply “man” as subj.; sim. Schaefer. 114 and n. 304). In I.127.10 the subj. is *haviṣmān* ‘one possessing the oblation’; here a similar ritual participant, *\*ārcan* ‘one chanting’, could be extracted from the dat. *asmai ārcate* “to him who chants” in pāda b, as sugg. by Old. A third tack is taken by Bl (RR ad I.127.10) and Re, who interpr. *joguve* as passive, with *śevam* as subj.: Bl “your praiseworthy kindness has been praised in all places.” This passive interpr. is unnecessary and hard to defend: the identity of the phrases in the two hymns should impose a near-identical functional interpr. unless there are strong indications to the contrary, and the third attested form to this stem, the mid. part. *jóguvānah* in I.61.14, also means ‘calling on’, not ‘being called on’. Difference in person (1st v. 3rd) is, however, trivial, and I would favor the 1st sg. of Gr/the publ. tr. against Ge/WG/Schaefer’s 3rd.

V.64.3–4: On the three 1st sg. act. aorists in these vss., *aśyām* (3a), *yāyām* (3b), and, especially, the famous form *dheyām* (4b), see my 1999 “Once more, yet again, the Vedic type *dheyām* revisited: Metrical marginalia to a persistent problem” (Ged. Schindler): 165-181, esp. 167–68 – with copious ref. to the over-abundant previous lit. All three of these forms must be read distracted. I argue there that despite the difference in their transmitted forms, the two that are built to roots in *-ā* (*yāyām* [root pres.] and *dheyām* [root aor.]) represent the same underlying shape: *yā’yām* and *dhā’yān* respectively, but were redacted differently. This in turn calls into question the KH doctrine that the root aor. optative has a special inflection.

V.64.3: The med. pf. *saścire* has received numerous often incompatible interpr.: Gr (def. 13) “bei einer Sache oder Person oder an einem Orte [L.] bleiben, verharren”; Ge “... suchen sie Zuflucht” (with *śármani* as obj.); Re “... sont allés-de-tout-temps-en-son-sillage”; WG “... sind (alle) beisammen”; Th (Fremd. 118) “... ist man [sicher] geleitet”; HPS (Vrata 75) “sie stehen unter seinem ... Schutz”; Kü (539) “Mit seinem ... Schutz sind sie zusammen”; publ. tr. “They go together with the protection ...” I find all of these problematic for various reasons. For one thing, the loc. *śármani* should be taken seriously and not made into an honorary instr., with Kü and JPB, or an obj., with Ge. For another, given the emphasis on journeying in the first half of the vs. (*gátim*, *yāyām pathā*), it seems likely that the sense of motion in most uses of *√sac* (‘follow, accompany, escort,

conduct’, etc.) would be tapped here, and ‘bleiben, stehen, sind ... beisammen’ and so forth do not represent that. A passage in a nearby M+V hymn containing the same *saścire* is also surely relevant: V.67.3 *vratā padéva saścire* “They follow their commandments like tracks” (or possibly, “as if by foot”; see comm. ad loc.), with an acc. to be construed with the verb. I therefore think *saścire* here has the sense ‘follow’ or ‘proceed along’ and should have an acc.; I would supply *gatím*, the “(right) way” that the speaker desires to attain in pāda a. In order to do so, he wants to go “by Mitra’s path” (b) – for he observes (cd) that others (the unspecified “they” who are subject of *saścire*) follow this way under Mitra’s protection. I would emend the tr. of cd to “Under the protection of this one [=Mitra], dear and never injuring, they follow (the right way).”

V.64.4: On the notorious root aorist opt. *dhēyām* see the ref. given above (3–4).

V.64.4–5: The second hemistichs of these two vss. are entirely parallel and partly identical:

4cd X X *kṣáye maghónām, stotṛñāṃ ca spūrdhāse*

5cd X X *kṣáye maghónām, sákhinām ca vṛdhāse*

At first glance, each consists of a chiasmic construction:

NOUN(-e) GEN. PL. / GEN. PL. ca NOUN(-e)

Although the nouns on either end superficially match (with their -e endings), they are in different cases: the first is a thematic loc., the 2nd the dat. to -as-stems, and the s-stem datives have an infinitival nuance, as so often. So the apparent parallelism of the two halves of the chiasmic construction is partly illusory, but the fact that the construction itself is repeated indicates that the complication was meant. What the *ca* is coordinating is ambiguous (see Old): it can either conjoin the two two-word phrases or simply the two gen. pls. -- in which case the two gen. pls would depend on one of the adjacent nouns, most likely preceding *kṣáye*. The position of the pāda boundary and the nice balance of the two chiasmic NPs speak strongly, to me, for the former interpr. (so Ge [at least in 4], JSK [DGRV I.94–95], JPB), but both Re and WG opt for the latter, with the conjoined genitives mostly dependent on *kṣáye*.

V.64.6: The first hemistich presents us with two syntactic problems, which may (or may not) be connected: 1) Who are the referents of the rel. *yéṣu* – does it only include the immediately preceding *naḥ* (“... us among whom ...”) or is there another disjunct set of referents (“... us [and those] among whom ...”)? 2) What is the *ca* doing? As for the 1st question, Ge (fld. by JSK [DGRV I.128]) opts for two referents; both favor the *maghávans* of vss. 4–5 (though Ge [n. 6a] suggests alternatively that it might be the gods). JSK further explicitly suggests that the *ca* is conjoining a gapped dat.

\**maghávadbhyaś ca* with *naḥ* -- but the result would be syntactically incoherent, since it places this dative in the middle of the clause with the loc. *yéṣu* referring to the same group. (Ge simply waves his hands, saying that *ca* is “an falscher Stelle,” but this doesn’t really help.) Given this syntactic muddle, it therefore seems best to limit the reference of *yéṣu* to *naḥ*, with Re, WG, and the publ. tr. I would further suggest that the *naḥ* is actually internal to the *yéṣu* clause, but has taken Wackernagel’s position before the rel. because the first position is occupied by the pronoun *yuvám*. This suggestion assumes that *naḥ* is notionally loc.; although technically this enclitic should be only acc., dat., or

gen., in my RVic experience personal-pronoun enclitics are flexible enough to fulfill most oblique functions. A literal English rendering of my understanding of the syntax – “among which us-es” – is unfortunately unparsable and ungrammatical.

Limiting *yéṣu* to *naḥ* leaves the dangling *ca*. The publ. tr. supplies a parenthetical “here” before *bṛhát ca*: “(here) and aloft,” and this makes a certain amount of sense. WG simply take *bṛhát* as a nominalized neut. abstract “Hoheit” conjoined with *ḡṣatrám* – a clever strategem, but I know of no other examples of nominalized *bṛhát*. I find Re’s solution the closest to my own, though not in every detail: he supplies another noun, to be modified by *bṛhát* (i.e., *bṛhát ca* [\*X])—yielding a coordinated NP “(votre) pouvoir-temporel et (votre) puissant (pouvoir-spirituel).” The noun he supplies is *bráḡman-*. Although this is possible, I would prefer to supply a noun found regularly with *bṛhát* in a phrase associated with M+V. I suggest *ṛtám*. A phrase with *bṛhát + ṛtám* is found twice in this little group of M+V hymns, at V.66.5 and V.68.1. The latter passage is esp. telling, since the phrase is adjacent to *máhi-ḡṣatrau* referring to M+V: “having great dominion, lofty is (your?) truth” – with *ḡṣatra-* adjacent to *bṛhát* as here. I would therefore emend the tr. of the 1st hemistich to “Us, among whom you two sustain your dominion and your lofty (truth).”

As was noted above, V.62.6 also contains the VP *ḡṣatrám bibṛṡthaḡ*. I might substitute ‘sustain’ here, though ‘maintain’ works well enough.

In the publ. tr. “space” should technically be in parens, since only *urú* is present. The phrase is a variant on *ulokám √ḡṛ*. The expression *urú √ḡṛ* + purpose dative is found elsewhere: e.g., I.36.8 *urú ḡṣáyāya cakṛire* “They made themselves a wide (place) for peaceful dwelling” – and see the variant (without *√ḡṛ*) in the next hymn, V.65.4 ... *urú ḡṣáyāya ... vanate* “he wins a wide (place) for peaceful dwelling.”

I would take *vājasātaye* as parallel to the other two datives, unlike the publ. tr.: “for the winning of prizes, for wealth, for well-being.”

V.64.7: The first hemistich presents problems that are usually solved by a quick trick: the locatives in pāda b, *deváḡṣatre rúśadḡavi*, are generally taken as PNs (or rather a single PN) Deváḡṣatra Rúśadḡu. This is of course a time-honored way of dealing with problematic forms, and in a final vs., esp. one that ends with the certain (or at least likely) PN Arcanānas, it is not implausible. However, the second of the two words, *rúśadḡu-* ‘having gleaming cows’, is highly reminiscent of two epithets of Uṣas, *rúśad-paśu-* ‘having gleaming livestock’ (V.75.9, in this same maṇḡala) and *rúśad-vatsa-* ‘having a gleaming calf’ (I.113.2). Since the hemistich begins with the loc. sg. fem. part. *uchántyām* modifying a gapped ‘Dawn’ in a loc. absol., it seems perverse to separate this loc. bahuvr., which can be fem., from the referent with which it belongs semantically and formulatically. Hence the publ. tr.’s “While (Dawn) with her shining cattle is breaking ...,” which I think is correct. What then to do with *deváḡṣatre*? It cannot modify Dawn, because it is emphatically not fem. The publ. tr. supplies ‘sacrifice’: “at the (sacrifice) under divine dominion.” This is an ingenious way to avoid inventing a PN, but I know of no formulatic support. This tr. is in fact based on a stray suggestion of Old’s (n. 1, p. 358 in Noten), which, however, he then dismisses with “Doch das ist freie Phantasie.” Because of the tight association between M+V and *ḡṣatrá-* in this group of hymns (see comm. ad V.62.6), it would be desirable for the cmpd to qualify them, esp. given the phrase in V.68.3 *máhi vām ḡṣatrám devéṣu* “Great is the dominion of you two

among/over the gods,” with both *devá-* and *kṣatrá-*. This is Old’s solution: he simply pronounces it a masc. dual nom. \**devákṣatrā*, which has been corrupted by the adjacent loc. *rúśadgavi*. This is a high-handed move, esp. since the word is immediately preceded (admittedly across a pāda break) by an undoubted du. nom. *yajatā*, with the ending *-ā*, which should have anchored \**devákṣatrā*. It is difficult to see how the corruption could have happened. In the end, I go with the publ. tr. as the least unlikely interpr.

Both Ge and WG take ab as a separate nominal cl., whose crucial components are *me yajatā*, as in Ge’s “Die beiden Opferwürdigen (sollen) uns (beistehen)” (sim. WG). I am tempted by this alternative because *me yajatā* is isolated from the busy rest of the vs. unfolding in cde – in contrast to the publ. tr., which integrates *me yajatā* into cde.

Ge in fact has an ulterior motive for separating ab and cde, because he thinks the dual subjects of the latter part of the hymn are not M+V, but the two Adhvaryus engaged in ritual preparation (see n. 7cd). One of his arguments is that it would be inappropriate to ask the gods to run with their feet. He is correct that *paḍbhíḥ* is never used of gods in the RV but appears twice of priests at ritual activity (IV.2.14, X.79.2, both times associated with hands, as here). However, this argument is undercut by the fact that feet are attributed to gods elsewhere – e.g., I.51.6, where Indra tramples an enemy *padā* ‘with your foot’ – and divine feet are prominent in a ritual context in later śrauta ritual, where the *pan-nejanī* ‘foot-washing’ waters are designated for washing the feet of the visiting gods. Although Ge’s interpr. has some points in its favor in interpr. cd, it is problematic for e, *bíbhṛatāv arcanānasam* “supporting/maintaining Arcanāsas.” Ge supposes that the two Adhvaryus are supporting the poet/Hotar (by Ge’s interpr.) Arcanāsas by their ritual labor. But I find it hard to believe that the du. redupl. pres. that has been resonantly associated with M+V in this hymn (6b) and elsewhere in this group (V.62.6) would be switched – in the very last pāda of the hymn – to describing the role of support staff, as it were, rather than including the poet in the exalted range of objects that M+V support. At best, we can see M+V partially conflated with priests in this vs., but rhetorically they must be the focus of this final vs.

On the elaborate pun in cd, see publ. intro.

On the form *paḍbhíḥ* see comm. ad IV.2.12.

## V.65–66

The next two hymns are ascribed to Rātaḥavya Ātreya by the Anukr. A gen. *rātāhavyasya* is found in V.66.3, but it need not be a PN, since *rātā-havya-* is a relatively common bahuvr. with the transparent sense ‘who has bestowed the oblation’ [=human ritualist, e.g., I.118.11] / (less commonly) ‘on whom the oblation is bestowed’ [=divine recipient, e.g., VII.35.1].

## V.65 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

V.65.1: In d *vánate* is universally tr. as ‘desires, wants, likes’; this makes good sense, and the obj. here, *gírah*, is found a number of other times with this stem in the same sense (I.3.2, 93.9, VII.94.2), the usual sense of this medial thematic present. The problem is that in this hymn *vanate* is also found in vs. 4, where it clearly means ‘gain, win’. See disc. ad 4b.

V.65.2: The vs. contains no verbs.

The compds *śreṣṭha-varcas-* and *dīrgha-śrúttama-* form a nice little morphologically contrastive pairing: both contain splvs., but one as 1st member, one as 2nd, and they are different types of splvs. (primary *śreṣṭha-*, secondary *śrúttama-*), in different types of cmpds (bahuvrīhi versus root-noun governing).

On my increasing skepticism about ‘lord of settlements’ for *sátpati-* see comm. ad VIII.69.4, I.173.5.

V.65.3: The du. pronominal *tā* is there only to provide support for the enclitic *vām*; the phrase functions like more common *tām tvā* (VI.1.6, etc.). It does not require a separate tr. (pace Re’s “tels étant”; WG’s “als solche”). See my 1992 “*sá figé*” article (HS 105). Such acc. phrases were based on / adapted from the *sá (tvám)* nominative construction.

The rendering of cd in the publ. tr. is grammatically erroneous, since the implied subj. is dual M+V, which the nom. plural *svásvāsaḥ* cannot modify. The plural subj. is most likely humans (so Ge, Re) – Ge (n. 3d) identifies them as the Opferherren. I would favor a first plural subj. (“we”) and a modal verb, as opposed to, say, Re’s “Les hommes) ... (vont) ...”

With Old I read *\*sucetúnā* for *sú cetúnā*; see *sucetúnā* in the immed. preceding hymn, V.64.2.

I take *dāvāne* as a purpose infinitive to be construed with *vājān* : “to the prizes for giving” = “to the prizes to be given.” On *vājāṃ abhí prá*, see IX.99.2 *vājāṃ abhí prá gāhate* (sim. IX.110.2), with a verb of motion; also (without *prá*) X.75.2 *vājāṃ abhy ádravaḥ*.

Putting this all together, for cd I’d substitute “(May we), having good horses, with good attention (race) forth to the prizes for giving.”

V.65.4: Another grammatical solecism in the publ. tr.: *urú* can’t modify *gātúm*, because the latter is masc.

As noted above, *vanate* here is identical to *vánate* in 1d, but the two forms appear to mean different things and to belong to the homonymous roots  $\sqrt{van}$  ‘desire’ and ‘win’ respectively. As was also noted there, the medial thematic pres. *vánate* ordinarily belongs to the former root. Rather than trying to push one or the other of the occurrences in this hymn into a semantic slot it doesn’t easily fit, I think it better to interpr. *vanate* in this vs. as a subjunctive to the (otherwise marginally attested) root aor. that does belong to  $\sqrt{van}$  ‘win’ (see Gotō [1st Kl, 283–86] for the messy overlapping averbos of these roots).

For ab I would then substitute “Mitra [/an ally] will win wide (space), a way, for peaceful dwelling, even out of narrow straits.”

Technically speaking, gen. sg. *pratūrvataḥ* could modify either *mitrásya* or *vidhataḥ*. Ge opts for the latter: “... dem Verehrer, der vorausstrebt” (sim. WG with elaborate justification in notes, though not Gotō [1st Kl. 163 n. 259]). However, it seems best to assign it to Mitra, with Gr, Re, and the publ. tr. Word order weakly supports this interpr.; more importantly, this stem always has gods as subjects.

V.65.5: The publ. tr. of this vs., uncharacteristically, mingles the two hemistichs – in order, I think, to facilitate JPB’s rendering of the difficult *váruṇaśeṣasaḥ*. I would first

reconfigure the tr., so that the two hemistichs are separated, as is usual in our tr. The first would then be “Might we be within the most extensive help of Mitra.”

As for *anehásas*, I have thoroughly revised my understanding of the meaning of this stem, removing it from the moral sphere (‘blameless’) to the material/physical one (‘lacking nothing’); see comm. ad X.61.12. Here the point would be that having Mitra’s help we need nothing else.

Now the difficult hapax *váruṇa-śéṣasaḥ*. The first question is what is its case and number: nom. pl. or gen. sg.? Gr, Old, Re, and WG opt for the former, Ge, Th (M+A 67), and the publ. tr. for the latter. Word order certainly favors the nom. pl.; in fact the awkward mixing of the two hemistichs in the publ. tr. was occasioned by the attempt to take it as gen. sg. with a noun in pāda a. But our troubles have barely begun. Given the accent, the cmpd is a clear bahuvrīhi – so that the WG tr. as an apparent tatpuruṣa, “Wir möchten ... Erben des Varuṇa (sein),” though tempting, cannot be accepted. But what is the structure of the b.v.? Does it mean ‘having Varuṇa as *śéṣas-*’ or ‘having the *śéṣas-* of V’? Both have been tried. And finally, what does *śéṣas-* mean in the cmpd.? These last two questions are connected. JPB’s “whose complement is Varuṇa” is essentially based on Th’s “whose supplement is True Speech,” flavored by Re’s “ayant Varuṇa pour (aide) complémentaire” – even though Th/JPB take it as a gen. modifying *mitrásya* and Re as a nom. pl. modifying *vayám*. (Cf. also Old’s “V. als Anhang, Gefolge habend” as nom. pl.) All of these assume the structure of the b.v. to be ‘having V. as *śéṣas-*’, and in each the meaning of *śéṣas-* has been radically extended/attenuated (though less so by Old than the others). The independent *s*-stem is attested 8x in the RV (cf. also the b.v. *aśéṣas-* 1x). In all occurrences it literally means ‘what remains’, ‘legacy’ and generally refers to someone’s ‘posterity’, his living ‘remains’ – i.e., descendants; see disc. ad X.16.5. (Th cheerfully admits to the usual meaning of *śéṣas-* but apodictically announces “Nothing of this kind can possibly be meant here.”) Pace Thieme, I think that, all things being equal, we should try to interpret the *-śéṣas-* in this cmpd in a manner as close as possible to the other uses of the stem. Ge does so, while maintaining the ‘having Varuṇa as *śéṣas-*’ structure – unfortunately the result is not happy. His literal tr. (n. 5d) is ‘Varuṇa zur Nachkommenschaft habend’, which he takes as a reference to Aditi. He interprets the cmpd as a gen. sg. dependent, like *mitrásya*, on *ávasi* and tr. “(im Schutze) der Mutter des Varuṇa.” This is quite ingenious, but I see no reason to bring in Aditi, esp. in such an oblique fashion. My own inclination is to use the other structure, ‘having the *śéṣas-* of V’, as the interpretive model, hence ‘having the legacy of Varuṇa’, This still requires a bit of semantic stretching of *śéṣas-*, but far less than we saw above: “legacy” would here refer not to living progeny but to the principles that V. represents and the dominion (*kṣatrám*) he has over the world – or perhaps more specifically to V’s *vratás* or his *ṛtá*. All three figure in the beginning of the next hymn, attributed to the same poet, with its focus on Varuṇa.

I would now tr. the whole vs., with the revised tr. of the second hemistich folded in: “Might we be within the most extensive help of Mitra, (we) lacking nothing (when) having your help (and) having the legacy of Varuṇa in every way.”

#### V.66 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

Ge suggests that this hymn is incomplete and probably not correctly transmitted, though without giving his reasons. Its difficulties don’t seem to me the result of

truncation or bad transmission, but the usual RVic techniques of “indeterminate ellipsis ... and obscure reference,” as suggested in the publ. intro.

V.66.1: The voc. part. *cikitāna* is universally tr. “o perceptive one” vel sim. and interpr. as the self-address of the poet (see, e.g., Ge n. 1), and it’s a bit difficult to see what else to do with it. However, the mid. pf. of  $\sqrt{cit}$  is intrans., with the meaning ‘be perceived’ (etc.), contrasting with the act. pf., which means ‘perceive’ (as in *cikéta* opening the previous hymn, V.65.1); on this med. pf. see Kü 176. The only other occurrence of this part., in III.18.2, has the same intrans. meaning as the finite mid. forms (contra most tr.; see comm. ad loc.). The better attested med. intens. part. *cékitāna-* also has the same intrans. value; see comm. ad II.34.10. I am torn between context, which favors ‘o perceptive one’, and grammatical system, which favors an interpr. like the rest of the medial redupl. forms to this root. If I opt for system, the developed meaning of the medial pf. that Kü identifies, ‘bekannt sein’, is a possibility. As an alternate tr. I would therefore suggest “o conspicuous / well-known / famous mortal,” referring to a particularly skilled poet. However, ‘o perceptive one’ may be the correct interpr., because it was influenced by the middle pf. form *cikéthe* to the parallel root  $\sqrt{ci}$  found in 4d. Though that form is morphologically anomalous and the vs. rather opaque, the verb nonetheless fairly clearly means ‘perceive’, despite its middle voice.

The first hemistich lacks a verb. The publ. tr. takes the duals as nom., minimally construed with an annunciatory *ā*: “here are the two gods ...” Others supply a verb: “call” (Ge, WG) or “bring” (Re), with the duals as acc. It’s a matter of taste and makes little difference.

I would render *-peśas-* as ‘ornament’, not ‘garment’.

There is no overt subject of *dadhūtá*, assuming it is passive; Old plausibly suggests *dhīh* on the basis of V.41.5 *dadhūta dhīh*. If it is transitive, it has neither overt subject (though the referent of *cikitāna* would be the obvious choice) nor object.

V.66.2: Since *asuryà-* is regularly used as a neut. substantive meaning ‘lordship, lordly power’, with most tr. (but not the publ. tr.) I would separate it from *kṣatrām* here and tr. the 1st hemistich “Because these two together have achieved dominion that is not overturned and lordly power ...”

There are multiple suggestions for the referent of *mānuṣam*; see Old and the various standard tr., also incl. JPB Ādityas 99 (superseded by the publ. tr.) and JSK (DGRV II.99, based on the former). The publ. tr. makes good sense to me, with *mānuṣam* picking up the *kṣatrām* of pāda a, but I don’t have a strong feeling about it.

On “placing the sun” as a trope, see my 2010 “Súre Duhitár’s Brother, the ‘Placer of the Sun’” (Fs. Melchert).

V.66.3: On *tā vām* see comm. ad V.65.3.

The first hemistich is challenging to interpr., but much aided by the fact that pāda a is identical to V.86.4a (where the 2<sup>nd</sup> du. refers to Indra and Agni, not M+V). On that passage see comm. ad loc. The verb in V.86.4b with which pāda a is construed is *havāmahe* ‘we call upon’, which would work here as well. The tricky part is how to fit in our pāda b. The acc. phrase *urvīm gavyūtim eṣām* “broad pastureland for them [=chariots]” appears to be the content of what we are asking M+V for, but  $\sqrt{hū}$  doesn’t

ordinarily take a double acc. of the type “ask X (for) Y”; however, we do get occasional exx. of “ask (for) Y [ACC],” with the provider in the gen., as in I.10.10 *vṛṣantamasya hūmaha, ūtīm* ... “we call for the help of the best of bulls.” I suggest that we have a conflation of these two structures and would substitute for ab the tr. “In our quest for chariots (we call upon) you two for broad pasture-land for them [=chariots].”

The 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is much more straightforward, though not entirely. Pāda c contains the gen. *rātāhavyasya*, which, as disc. above ad V.65–66, is identified by the Anukr. as the name of the poet, though it need not be a PN. In fact, as indicated there, the compd is multivalent: it can refer to the mortal ritualist who has given the oblation or the god to whom it has been given. The ambiguity is not resolved here, for *suṣṭutí-* ‘good praise’ can take a genitive of the poet producing the praise or of the god who receives it, though more commonly the former; cf. the contrastive phrases VIII.34.1 *éndra yāhi háribhir, úpa káṇvasya suṣṭutím* “O Indra, drive with your fallow bays up to the good praise of Kaṇva” and I.7.7 *ná vindhe asya suṣṭutím* “I cannot get enough of good praise of him [=Indra].” Thus, although the publ. tr.’s “the good praise of him by whom the oblation is given,” referring to the poet, is the more likely reading, an alternative “the good praise of the one on whom the oblation is bestowed” (=Varuṇa) is also possible.

The adverbial *dadhṛk* (3x) almost surely belongs to the root  $\sqrt{dhṛṣ}$  ‘dare’ (contra Gr’s “*dṛñh*”), beside other redupl. forms *dadhṛṣá-* and *dadhṛṣváṇi-*, all based on the pf. See Old ad loc., AiG I.137 (unsure) and II.2.2, 85, as well as EWA s.v. *dadhṛk*. As a probable nom. sg. to a pseudo-root noun, it adds to the complex dossier of double sibilant clusters (here *-ṣ-s* #); though we might expect *\*dadhṛt* (like *-dvít* to  $\sqrt{dviṣ}$ ), it’s possible that the numerous compounds containing *-dṛṣ-* with nom. sg. in *-dṛk* influenced this near-rhyming form. (It could also be a neut. sg. simply ending in *\*-ṣ*, but this would be even more puzzling.)

V.66.4: An opaque vs.

The phrase *dákṣasya pūrbhíh* “by the fortresses/bulwarks of your skill” is a bold metaphor and difficult to interpr. in context. See, e.g., Old. The motive for its creation may be sought in the voc. that ends the vs., *pūta-dakṣasā* ‘possessing refined skill’, an epithet found elsewhere. The *pū* of *pūta-* may have suggested a phonological play on *pūrbhíh*, despite their semantic and etymological distance. Old (p. 359 n. 2) similarly suggests that the Anklang of *pūr-* and *pūt-* is perhaps intentional. Ge finds the image too jarring and supplies a separate verb for ab: “ihr (berget),” but it seems best to embrace the metaphor. After all, metaphorical fortresses are well known to anyone with a passing acquaintance with the Christian hymnal.

Acdg. to my understanding of *ábhuta-* I’d change “undeceivable” to “unerring.” See also V.70.4.

JPB (publ. intro.) suggests that the “beacon of the peoples” is Agni; WG’s suggestion that it’s the sun is also possible, esp. given the association between M+V and the sun. In I.191.4 *ketávo jánānām* seems to refer to the light(s) of day, dimming in the evening.

On the anomalously formed *cikethe*, see esp. Kü (170). Although Ge’s (n. 4) suggestion that it’s haplogogized from *\*ciketethe* to  $\sqrt{cit}$  (which figures fairly prominently in this group of hymns, incl. *ketúnā* in the previous pāda) is appealing, Ge himself points

out that  $\sqrt{cit}$  is not found with *ní*, whereas  $\sqrt{ci}$  is. The use of the thematic dual ending -*ethe*, instead of -*āthe*, is of course an irregularity whatever root the form is assigned to.

V.66.5: Another opaque vs. The first question is why is Earth invoked; she has not figured in this hymn or the group to which it belongs. Re's suggestion that Pṛthivī = Aditi is contextually opportunistic and unconvincing. I do not have a good answer beyond the fact that the wide spreading in pāda c may have suggested the eponymous Wide One. It would perhaps be better to tr. the voc. "O Wide (Earth)." Related to this question is whether the mention of Earth automatically involves Heaven. The publ. tr. seems to think so, and takes the dual *jrayasānaú* in c as referring to H+E, contrary to the M+V of the standard tr. I would follow the standard view here; though I am still puzzled by the intrusion of Earth, I find it hard to believe that in this hymn (and hymn group) a dual without an explicitly different referent could be meant for any pair but M+V.

Against the publ. tr., I consider the "lofty truth" to be M+V's, not the seers'. See disc. ad V.64.6. I would also attach b to cd, rather than to a, as most tr. (incl. the publ. tr., but not Re) do. I think the action in cd (whatever it may be) is undertaken by the seers in their quest for fame.

The phrase *śrava-eṣá ṛṣṇām* "in the seers' quest for fame" is structurally almost equivalent to *éṣe ráthānām* "in (our) quest for chariots" in 3a, though with objective genitive in 3a and subjective gen. with the cmpd in 5b. On the accent shift of independent *éṣa-* to *-eṣá-* in the cmpd, see AiG II.2.99 and .96; see also the similar compd. *bandhv-eṣá-* in V.52.16.

As pointed out by Old, Ge, Re, WG, *jrayasānaú ... pṛthú* is a decompositional variant of the bahuvr. *pṛthu-jráya(s)-* (4x). On \**jrí-*, *jráya(s)-* see comm. ad V.54.2.

I take the subj. of *áti kṣaranti* to be the seers, with Old (and implicitly Re and WG), rather than the chariots=hymns with Ge (n. 5cd) and the publ. tr. None of these possible subject is a natural fit for "stream, flow," so it seems more economical to stick with the plural that's already in the discourse (*ṛṣṇām* in b). I'm not sure what the image is meant to convey – perhaps that the seers are so eager for fame that they "stream over," that is, overwhelm, M+V with their poetic effusions. The instr. *yāmaḥiḥ* should probably be read with both senses of *yāman-*: 'request' and 'journey'; see Old's portmanteau "mit ihren (Bitt-)gängen."

Putting this all together, I provide a new tr. for the whole vs.: "O Wide (Earth), this is the lofty truth. In the seers' quest for fame, with their entreaties / on their journeys they stream over the two [=M+V] who are rightly spreading widely."

V.66.6: This vs. is universally interpr. as a purpose cl., with the whole vs. subordinated to *yád* in pāda a, with the verb *yátemahi* postponed until d. This is probably the most natural way to read the vs., esp. as the vs. opens with the preverb *ā*, which is regularly found with  $\sqrt{yat}$  in the idiom 'take/put in one's place' (tmesis therefore over three pādas). However, it's worth trying out a two-clause interpr., with ab a nominal cl. introduced by *yád* and cd the main cl. In that case *yátemahi* would owe its accent to its first position in the pāda. This alt. tr. might be "Since we and our patrons are yours here ..., might we take our places ..."

The cmpd *īya-caḥsas-* is curiously formed. The standard view seems to be that the 1st member was adapted from the stem of the verb *īyate*, an unusual derivational pathway. As for tr., I would suggest the alternate ‘with darting eyes’.

*vayāṃ ca sūrāyaḥ* is an inverse *ca* construction.

### V.67-68

These two hymns are ascribed to Yajata Ātreya. The well-attested adj. *yajatā-* ‘worthy of the sacrifice’ is found in the first vs. of V.67, but not in a context where it could be interpr. as a PN. Nonetheless, that is probably the source for the Anukr.’s ascription.

### V.67 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

This hymn is over-stuffed with vocc. and names in general and does not present any of the difficulties of the preceding hymn.

V.67.1: It would be possible, with Ge etc., to take *niṣkṛtām ... yajatām brhāt* as a separate obj. of *āśāthe* in d.

Another instance of the word *ḥsatrām* in this hymn group, echoing esp. *ḥsatrām ... āśāthe* with the same verb in the immed. preceding hymn, V.66.2. See disc. ad V.62.6. For consistency I would change the publ. tr. “lordship” to “dominion.”

As was just noted, there are a lot of vocc. in this hymn. In this vs. there is a sg. or du. in pāda a (*deva*, Pp *devā*), a du. or pl. in b (Pp *ādityā*, possible *ādityās*), and a string of three sg.s in c (*vāruṇa mītrāryaman*). Though there are two possible duals in ab (though I have my doubts about both), there is only the set of three singulars in c that could serve as subj. for the dual verb *āśāthe* in d. I assume that the verb reverts to the Mitra-Varuṇa configuration in a hymn dedicated to those two, possibly reaching back to ab. Th (M+A 12–13) argues for this passage that Aryaman is in apposition to Mitra, and there is therefore an actual dual subj. here. This seems overclever; it also ignores the variant numbers of the vocc. in the first hemistich and the use of a pl. verb (*saścire*) with the same triple subject in vs. 3 (though there, it is true, the init. *vīśve* may open the phrase to the larger group of All Gods).

V.67.3: On *vīśve* here see immed. preceding comm.

Although I often find ‘affording all possessions’ a better interpr. of *viśvá-vedas-* than ‘having all knowledge’ (see comm. ad IV.8.1), in this passage the latter seems a better fit.

The VP *vratā padéva saścire* is universally rendered as “they follow their *vratas* like tracks (vel sim.),” with *padā* the neut. pl. to thematic *padá-*. This is probably correct. However, it’s thinkable that *padā* here is the instr. sg. to the root noun *pád-* and it means “as if by foot”; see comm. ad V.64.3.

V.67.5: The *mitra ... vāruṇo vā* phrase appears to me to be a variant on the Vāyav Indraś ca construction, with conjoined voc. and nom. – hence “o Mitra or Varuṇa” (so, more or less, JSK DGRV II.145). Therefore the elaborate “or (is it) Varuṇa?” of the publ. tr. is unnecessary.

The gen. pl. *tanūnām* is variously interpr. – does it refer to the forms/bodies of M+V (plus possibly other gods) or to the selves of the praisers (so, though in different ways, Re and WG)? I follow Ge (n. 5ab) in taking it as referring to the plural gods in vss. 3–4. I would emend the tr. of ab to “Which of you two, o Mitra and Varuṇa, is unpraised – (which) of the forms/bodies (of all the gods)?”

#### V.68 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

V.68.1: I would slightly emend the tr. of c to “lofty is your truth” or “lofty is the truth.” As disc. above ad V.64.6, I think “lofty truth” is a hallmark of M+V in this small group of hymns. In fact I am almost tempted here to see *ṛtām bṛhát* (\**vām*) as a decomposed bahuvrīhi, standing for \**bṛhádṛtau*. See the parallel phrase *máhi vām kṣátrám* in 3c, which decomposes *máhikṣatrau* in our vs. On such decomposed bvs see my forthcoming “Limits on Indo-Iranian Compounding” to appear in Ged. Gary Holland. (It is perhaps also noteworthy that there are no bvs with *-ṛta-* as 2nd member.) Ge supplies “hear” to govern *ṛtām bṛhát*, and I acknowledge that in the parallels he cites (n. 1c: I.151.4 = VIII.25.4) M+V do hear (*ā ghoṣathah*) “lofty truth,” which suggests that that truth emanates from the poet. However, the formulaic consistency in this hymn group supports my interpr. Re supplies “chantez,” presumably borrowed from *prá ... gāyata* in the first hemistich. WG take the phrase as a nominal cl., as do I and the publ. tr.

V.68.3: As noted ad vs. 1, *máhi vām kṣátrám* decomposes the b.v. *máhikṣatrau* in 1c.

V.68.5: The two cmpds in the first pāda belong to the (in)famous *dāti-vāra-* type and are in fact identical, save for number, to the same phrase in IX.106.9. I have demolished the evidence for the verbal-governing readings of these cmpds in my 2024 article, “Vedic Evidence for the Verbal-Governing *dāti-vāra-* ‘type’” (IEL 2024: 1–18). For disc. of the type in general see also comm. above at V.58.2 and on this phrase in particular comm. ad IX.106.9. I would here substitute the tr. “having the heaven with its rain and the waters with their flowing” for the publ. tr. “Bringing the heavens to rain and the waters to streaming.”

The publ. tr. does not make it sufficiently clear that *dānumatyāḥ* modifies *iṣáh*, not M+V. Moreover, *iṣáh* is gen. sg. not the pl. implied by the publ. tr. I would emend the tr. to “the two lords of refreshment that brings gifts/drops.”

#### V.69–70

These two hymns are attributed to Urucakri Ātreya, a poet found only here. The adj. *urucákri-* ‘making wide (space)’ is found 3x in the RV, including in nearby V.67.4 in the pl. in the phrase *aṃhòś cid urucákrayaḥ* “making a wide space even from narrow straits,” of Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman (possibly also incl. the All Gods). That phrase must be the Anukr’s immediate source.

#### V.69 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

V.69.1: The 2nd hemistich resembles the more difficult nearby passage V.62.5ab; see the comm. there. By my reading it is in fact closer to that passage than the publ. tr. (and most

others). The publ. tr. (as well as Ge and WG) take *amátim* as obj. of *vāvr̥dhānau* and *vratám* as obj. of *ánu ... rákṣamāṇau*. But the middle of *√vr̥dh* is overwhelmingly intrans. ‘be(come) strong / strengthened’, incl. in *vardhete* in the preceding hymn (V.68.4). Kü (471–72) identifies only 3 transitive mid. pf. passages, incl. this one. I suggest taking the part. here in its usual intrans. value and making *amátim* the obj. of *rákṣamāṇau*, as it is in V.62.5 (by my interpr.). As for *vratám*, I construe it with *ánu*, which is then not a preverb in tmesis with the participle *rákṣamāṇau*, but a preposition: the phrase *ánu vratám* (“according to commandment”) is extremely common. Putting all this together yields an emended tr. of cd “(you two), growing strong, protecting the emblem of your dominion, following your unaging commandment.” Re’s rendering is very similar. This interpr. has the merit also of not positing a preverb in tmesis with the participle, a construction that is possible but rare, and not assuming a lexeme *ánu √rakṣ*, which otherwise seems not to exist. The only thing that gives me pause is that V.62.5 contains an *ánu* at loose ends, that *might* be construed with *rákṣamāṇā* there. But that passage is so contorted and opaque that it cannot be allowed to outweigh the clarity of the *ánu vratám* phrase here.

### V.70 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

V.70.4: I am in complete agreement with JPB that we should read *mā akásya* rather than the *mā kásya* of the Pp. See my detailed disc. ad IV.3.13. I would, however, then seriously part ways with JPB: I do not think that the poet is expressing a fear that he will become a nobody, but, as with most passages with *bhujema* (on which see KH, Inj. 95), that he not himself pay for offenses committed by someone else (see, e.g., VI.51.7 *mā no éno anyákṛtam bhujema* “Don’t let us pay for the offense done to you by another”). Although our vs. shares crucial lexicon with IV.3.13, incl. *yakṣám* and, later in the vs., *bhujema*, *mākásya yakṣám* is not in the same clause as *bhujema* in that vs. as it is here, and the publ. tr.’s twisting of *bhujema* to “endure (becoming)” cannot be justified, given the formulaic nature of the rest of the *bhujema* passages. Instead I think the point is that, not only do we not want to pay for an actual offense done by someone else, we certainly don’t want to pay for an illusory offense of a non-person. I would alter the tr. to “Let us not pay for the phantasm [=illusory deed] of a nonentity with our own persons”; this is a polite (or at least obscure) way to ask the gods not to punish us for offenses that the gods have invented.

Given my understanding of *ádbhuta-*, I’d change “o you of undeceived will” to “... of unerring will” – another, if flattering, appeal to the gods to be sure they’re right about what they exert their will upon.

As for the third pāda, I would slightly alter to “nor with our posterity, nor with our lineage.” The point is that we don’t want our descendents to pay for this illusory misdeed any more than we should. On *śéṣas-* see comm. ad V.65.5 and X.16.5. The last para. of the publ. intro. seems to me itself to venture into illusory territory, esp. with regard to the new body in heaven.

### V.71–72

These last two short hymns of the M+V collection are attributed to Bāhuvṛkta Ātreya, whose given name should mean ‘twisted by arm(s)’. The compd *bāhuvṛktá-* is found in V.44.12, though not (in my view, *pace* most interpr.) as a PN. The Anukr. seems

to have mined the difficult hymn V.44 for potential names of poets; see also the intro.s above to V.45 and V.62.

The two hymns are quite simple, esp. in comparison with the complexities of most of the other hymns in this collection.

### V.71 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

V.71.1, 3: It's noteworthy that both alternate forms of the 2nd du. act. impv. to the root aor. of  $\sqrt{gam}$  are found so close together here: the full-grade  $\tilde{a}$  *gantam* in 1a and the (more common) zero-grade  $\tilde{a}$  *gatam* in 3a. This is obviously not a matter of dialect or of replacement.

### V.72 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

As Old notes, the third-pāda refrain varies minimally, with 2nd du. impv. *sadatam* in vss. 1 and 2, and 3rd du. impv. *sadatām* in 3, each appropriate to its context.

V.72.2: I would prefer “by your principle” to “... foundation.”

V.72.3: It seems better contextually to interpr. *juṣetām* as an impv. (with Ge, Re, WG; also Baum, Impv. 113) than as a presential injunc., as the publ. tr. seems to. Hence “let them take pleasure ...”

As usual, the dat. *iṣṭáye* is assigned to several different roots. I take it to  $\sqrt{iṣ}$  ‘desire’. On this same expression see nearby V.78.3, there with the Aśvins as subj.

### V.73–74 Aśvins

The poet is Paura Ātreya. The stem *paurá-* appears 3x in V.74.4, at least once probably as a PN. V.73 begins with a vs. with several forms of *purú-* (1c 2x; 2a; 2b).

### V.73 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

The hymn is composed in pragāthas.

V.73.1: The accent-less verb *gatam* shows that  $\tilde{a}$  *gatam* is the main clause for the four *yád* clauses, and it starts in the middle of the pāda.

V.73.2: On *varasyā-* as ‘longing for space’ see comm. ad VI.49.11.

V.73.3: On *īrmā* see comm. ad VIII.22.4.

There is disagreement over the morphological identity of *anyā*. The publ. tr. takes it as an instr. sg. (neut.) modifying a non-overt *cakréna*, but Gr identifies it as neut. pl.; Old prefers this analysis, with the form modifying immed. flg. *nāhuṣā yugā*. So also Ge, though he adds a parenthetic “(mit dem anderen)” [i.e., the other wheel] and suggests (n. 3c) that what is really needed is *\*anyéna anyā*, a suggestion embraced also by Re (in his n.; there are no tr. of Aśvin hymns in ÉVP). There are several problems with this quite fussy solution. For one thing, who are *the other* Nāhuṣa generations? The stem *anyá-* is explicitly contrastive, but there is no other body of *nāhuṣā yugā* to be compared. Instead the comparison here is clearly between the one wheel and the other – hence the sneaking

in of \**anyéna* and its subsequent elimination in the solutions just presented. Rhetorical grammar requires that the second *anyá-* refer to something close enough conceptually to the referent of the first *anyá-* for them to form a contrastive pair. In contrast to Old, Ge, and Re, WG attempt to salvage the “wheel” reference for *anyā* but at too high a cost. Pointing out (in the n.) that the chariot of the Aśvins is elsewhere described as having three wheels (*trīcakrá-*, e.g., I.157.3), they suggest that *anyā* here is dual and refers to the other two wheels that aren’t the one at rest in the first hemistich. Since this dual would have to be masc., it requires that the usually neut. *cakrá-* is masc. here (though it must be admitted there are a couple of du. masc. *cakrá* forms [see VIII.5.29 and X.10.7]). Moreover, since, by their account, *anyā* is acc., it needs to be construed with something, ideally a verb, but *pári ... dīyathaḥ* ‘fly around’ doesn’t take an acc. of the vehicle (or its parts). They therefore supply another verb: “... (fahrt ihr) die andere Räder,” without indicating which Skt. verb for ‘fahren’ is at issue – probably  $\sqrt{vah}$ . But intruding a verb into *pāda c* breaks up the *pári √dī* lexeme that frames the hemistich (#*pári ...*, ... *dīyathaḥ* #) and that elsewhere is used of the Aśvins’ journey (e.g., VIII.5.8, 26.6). The instr. sg. analysis of *anyā* assumed by the publ. tr. avoids these problems and fulfills the rhetorical expectations of the *anyá- ... anyá-* construction.

On Nahus (etc.) see the various references to the comm. given in the lexical index.

V.73.4: The publ. tr., flg. Ge, supplies ‘chariot’ with *enā*, while Pirart prefers ‘wheel’. Both of these seem too restrictive and somewhat skewed: what is being celebrated is surely something done by the Aśvins, not by their vehicle or one of its pieces. It can refer generally to the action(s) of the previous vs., esp. their great journey, or even more globally to any remarkable act of those gods – of which there are a good many. I would replace the tr. of ab with “That (deed) of yours was done in this way, which (deed) of yours is praised through all (the generations).”

WG take *kṛtām* as the technical gambling term: “euer gewinnender Wurf.” There is nothing in the context to support this, and I do not associate gambling imagery with the Aśvins.

I would remove *arepás-* from the realm of the moral and substitute ‘flawless’ for ‘faultless’ – esp. since the word is used in 6c of the gharma drink, which has no moral dimension.

I think that Ge is correct in construing *ánu* with preceding *vísuvā*, particularly since *ánu √stu* is a very marginal lexeme; see his parallels for postpositional *ánu* in n. 4a. If *ánu* were a preverb, it should have been unverbated with accented *stáve* in this dependent cl. The distance between *vísuvā* and *ánu* might give one pause, but it is consistent with RVic word order practices: given an underlying # *yád vām vísuvā ánu štáve*, with the enclitic in standard 2nd pos., an emphatic *vísuvā* would have to be fronted around the whole complex of subord. *yád* + enclitic *vām*.

I wonder if the *bándhu-* the Aśvins join in in d is really “with us” (*asmé*) or, at least, primarily with us. Among other things *asmé* can be dat. or loc. but not instr. More telling, to me, is the contrast between *nānā jātaú* “separately born” and *sám ... bándhum éyathuḥ* “you two have come together to kinship,” where the original separation of the Aśvins yields to their unity. Once again, rhetorical contrast suggests a different interpr.

from the standard one. Perhaps replace with "you have come together to kinship among us" (loc.), with the character of the kinship left vaguer.

V.73.5: With Gr, Old, Ge, and the publ. tr., best to read fem. acc. pl. *ghṛṇāḥ* rather than, with the Pp., *ghṛṇā* – though Ge (n. 5cd) suggests an alternative interpr. with the instr., which WG prefers.

V.73.6: Substitute ‘flawless’ for ‘faultless’ for *arepás-* as in vs. 4.

Note the reverse phonetic figure *nāsatyāsnā*.

I think ‘scurries’ for *bhuranyāti* conveys the wrong tone; elsewhere I’ve tr. ‘bustles’—or the more neutral ‘hastens’ could work as well.

V.73.7: Since there is no representative of the horse in cd, but there is an enclitic *vām* that can be an acc., I would follow the standard tr. (contra the publ. tr.) with “... will turn you two here ...”

The ownership of the *dāṃsas-* is disputed: the Aśvins (so publ. tr., Re, Pirart) or Atri (Ge, WG). The usage of the stem elsewhere seems decisively in favor of the former: the Aśvins’ *dāṃsas-* is celebrated regularly – e.g., I.116.12, 25, VIII.9.3 – including in this very hymn (2b), and in general the stem seems to belong to gods, not mortals.

V.73.8: On the possible referents of the fem. subj. of ab, see publ. intro.

KH (Injunk. 129) takes the *yád* + SUBJUNCTIVE as a purpose clause: “so that you will/can cross ...” This is an appealing alternative; the cooked nourishments provided to them in d would sustain them on their journey.

V.73.9: Although the standard tr. incorporate the first pāda into the *āhuḥ* clause, the interpr. of the publ. tr. -- taking pāda a as an announced fact, which is then specified in pāda b -- seems better. For similar annunciatory initial *satyám* phrases, see III.39.5, VIII.33.10.

I see no reason to switch to the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. in cd, after the clear 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. address to the Aśvins in ab, as the publ. tr. does. (The standard tr. do not make the switch.) I think it quite possible that cd continues the content of *āhuḥ* “they say, ‘you two are ...’,” and even if cd are independent clauses, the pronoun *tā* does not preclude 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. ref.

The triple representation of *yāman-* in cd, esp. in c *yāman yāmahūtāmā*, comes across as clunky and uninspired in the publ. tr.’s “On their journey these two are the most often summoned on the journey.” Although the lack of inspiration may well be due to the Vedic poet, it might be good to introduce a bit more zing in the repetition – something like Ge’s “...auf der Fahrt die Fahrtgerufensten” (which works better in German). Perhaps “you two are on your journey the most on-the-journey summoned.”

V.73.10: A typical summary vs., with *imā bráhmāṇi* referring to vss. 1–9.

**V.74 Aśvins** [SJ on JPB]

V.74.1: With Old, I would take *kū śṭhaḥ* as separate words showing close sandhi, rather than as a compd, with the Pp. The disyllable reading of *kū* is much discussed; I would favor assuming a complex with the particle *u* as 2nd element.

Contra the publ. tr. (and Pirart), but with Ge (n. 1a; sim. Re) I would take *diváh* as elliptical for *divó (napātā)* “(o sons) of heaven.” The problem with this interpr. is that, if it is a voc. phrase (as all other reff. to the Aśvins in this vs. are), we should properly expect accent shift in the gen. in a voc. phrase to *\*dívo napātā* (as in I.117.12, IV.44.2, both initial in their pādas) or, more likely, erasure of accent to *\*divo napātā*, since *diváh* here is pāda-internal. I must assume that the normal accent of the gen. is found (or restored) here because the voc. on which it depends was gapped. The alternative interpr., found in the publ. tr. and Pirart and floated by Ge in the same n., is that it is to be construed with *kū* “where of heaven?” = “where in heaven?” Pirart finds an Avestan parallel in the phrase *kuua ... aṣhā zəmō* “where of this earth ...?” in a few passages in the Videvdāt. This is suggestive, but the lack of Vedic parallels and the fact that a well-formed question of this type with expected loc., *kūha ... diví* “where in heaven,” may be found in the next vs. (2ab) give me pause. (Of course the latter could be explained as poetic repair.) Nonetheless, the robust number of parallels with elliptical gen. assembled by Ge in his n. weighs more heavily for me. WG’s tr. “während des Tages” presents a third possibility – a genitive of extent of time. They provide no parallels however, and I don’t recall such a usage elsewhere. I would substitute for ab “Where are you today, Aśvins, you gods, (you sons) of heaven ...?”

V.74.2: There are a surprising number of ways to construe what appears to be the simple syntax of ab – see the various tr. As noted above ad vs. 1, it is possible to take *kūha ... diví* as “where in heaven ...?” (so Ge). But other tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) separate *diví* from the question particle. The issue in part is whether we’re trying to identify a particular part of heaven, and this is intertwined with the question of whether *śrutā* is predicative or simply attributive – that is, “where are those two *famed?*” versus “where are the two famous ones?” Since it would be odd and belittling even to imply that the Aśvins might be famous only in one part of heaven, I think a Ge-type tr. “where in heaven are the two famed?” with a predicated *śrutā* is pragmatically excluded. Avoiding this implication may account for the various other construals of *diví* in the various tr. However, with an attributive function it works much better: “Where now in heaven are the two famous ones, the gods, Nāsatyas?” – which I would substitute for the publ. tr. It is simply a narrowing of the scope of the first question, found in vs. 1 “where are you?” (or else a rephrasing of the “where of/in heaven are you?” acdg. to JPB and Pirart). For a somewhat similar narrowing of focus in a series of questions opening an Aśvin hymn, see IV.43.1–2 with the publ. intro. and comm. thereon.

The focus shifts from heaven to earth in the next hemistich, also with a further narrowing of the locational scope.

Pāda d has been subjected to a variety of interpr., esp. as to the identity of the *kó*. The one adopted by JPB (and Pirart), in which the constituent is *kó vām* “which of you two,” seems quite unlikely to me, in that it must assume a splitting up of the two Aśvins, with only one of them located in that particular place. But a split between the Aśvins, physical or conceptual, is rare (though not non-existent) in the RV, and is not found in this hymn (unless in 4b, q.v.). (Note that in the identical *kó vām* in 7a, *vām* is not

construed with *kó* either.) By contrast, both Ge and WG assume that the interrogative refers to someone or some part of the earthly world – perhaps simply the *jána-* of pāda c (“which (people) ...”). This is conceptually fine, but requires supplying a lot of machinery to make it work. I find Old’s suggestion the best: he interpr. *kó* as *kā + u*, with a fem. sg. interrog., referring to the river(s) found in the gen. pl. *nadīnām*. This solves another problem in the pāda: *sácā* is not ordinarily construed with the gen. (*pace* Ge, who cites a number of not very good supposed examples in his n. 2d; contra, Pirart). I would now, flg. Old’s analysis of *kó*, tr. the pāda “Which of the rivers is in company with you two.”

V.74.3: For pāda d Ge (n. 3d) appositely adduces I.30.12 *yáthā ta uśmāsīṣṭāye* as parallel. But just as there, Ge’s “wir wünschen, dass ihr gern kommet” (sim. Keydana, Inf. 277–78) presupposes a sense for *iṣṭāye* that matches none of the roots  $\sqrt{iṣ}$ . See comm. ad loc. Pirart opts for  $\sqrt{yaj}$  in both passages (I.30.12 only treated ad V.74.3), which is possible. But the dative inf. *iṣṭāye* usually belongs to  $\sqrt{iṣ}$  ‘seek’, and, with this sense, pāda d follows logically after the questions of abc, with *vām* as subj. of the infinitive. (So also WG, though not in I.30.12 [different translator(s)], as well as Re.)

V.74.4: On the puzzles in this mythological vs., see disc. in publ. intro. as well as Ge’s detailed n. 4. This vs. is probably responsible for the Anukr’s ascription of V.73–74 to a poet Paura Ātreya.

Let us begin with the voc. *paúra* opening pāda b. This form is also read with final short vowel in the Pp., and so looks like a singular voc. However, starting at least with Sāy., it is taken as a dual with shortened final (< \**paúrá*), referring to the Aśvins (see the standard tr. and comm., as well as Lanman, Noun Infl. 342). Despite its surface appearance it shouldn’t be a singular picking out only one Aśvin (see above ad 2d), since the verb *jīnvathuh* is 2nd dual. Ge (n. 3 at bottom of pg.) floats the possibility that it is the self-address of the poet, but this is not the standard context for such address (see my 2005 [2009] “Poetic Self-Reference in the *Rig Veda* and the Persona of Zarathustra” [Fs. Skjaervø]). When poets address themselves, they exhort themselves (+/- other ritual officiants), with an imperative, to praise or otherwise serve the god(s). It is not clear in the publ. tr. whether JPB takes the voc. as sg. or du., thanks to the number ambiguity of English, but it must be the latter – despite the awkwardness of interpr. the form this way.

As indicated in the publ. intro. (and all other disc.), the story of Paura is not a part of the Aśvins’ usual repertoire, and we cannot get far with it. However, it must belong with the other stories of the Aśvins’ rescues – a view supported by the fact that the next vs. concerns the well-known episode of Cyavāna. Therefore, it is unlikely that it concerns soma, *pace* Pirart (and a suggestion of Ge’s in his n.), even though *uda-prút-* is used of soma drops elsewhere (IX.106.8) — because the style of the vs. conforms to the standard catalogue style of the recounting of the Aśvins’ good deeds.

The 2nd hemistich is syntactically truncated, and the verbal element (such as it is) is the complex confection *grbhūtātāyē*, with the extended abstract suffix *-tāt-i-* on a past participle (see AiG II.2.621). Although I don’t know exactly how to construe the syntax, it seems clear that the two datives, *paurāya* (b) and *grbhūtātāyē* (c) are contrastive possibilities of Paura’s fate: he seemed doomed to captivity, but with the Aśvins’ intervention he was instead set on the way to *paurá-*. I’m not sure how to deal with the *yád* of c, which interferes with the parallelism of the two datives and of the accusatives

referring to the victim (*paurám* a, *īm* c). I am reluctant to supply material to govern the acc. + infinitival dative of c in a subordinate cl. introduced by *yád* (i.e., something like “when [SUBJ. VERB] him for capture ...”), so my rather loose alternative tr. ignores the *yád*: “You two enliven even/also Paura, swimming in water, for ‘muchness’, him (who was instead meant) for capturing, like a lion, in the track of deceit.” Unlike the publ. tr., I think that *druhás padé* is part of the frame, not the simile, hence my comma after “lion.”

Beyond this I can’t get.

V.74.5: The syntax of this vs. is much better regulated than that of vs. 4; still, there are some disturbance in c. The nom. *yúvā* beginning the pāda cannot belong to the subord. cl. marked by *yádī* – even though at first glance it just looks like a part of the clause that has been fronted around the subordinator -- because it refers to Cyavāna and should be the obj. of du. *kr̥thaḥ*. Best with the publ. tr. to take the *yádī* cl. as parenthetical (so also KH [Injunk. 166]).

As often I would interpr. *yádī* not as ‘if’ but as *yád ī* ‘when/since him’. Note *yád īm* in the preceding vs. 4c.

The verb of this cl., *kr̥thaḥ*, is a root aor. with primary ending. On this set of morphologically anomalous forms see KH (Injunk. 111, 166) and comm. ad X.39.8. He attributes these forms to the attempt to distinguish the injunctive from the imperative, since 2nd du. and pl. root aor. forms with sec. endings are generally imperatives. In our passage I would note in addition the pres. forms *jīnvathaḥ* (4b) and *muñcathaḥ* (5b), which reinforce the primary *-thaḥ* ending.

V.74.6: The construction of pāda b is unclear, and the fact that b might either be a continuation of the *hí* clause in pāda a or its main clause makes interpr. even more difficult. The two passages cited by Ge (n. 6b) as parallels to b, V.52.12, 87.6, are both suggestive and similarly difficult of interpr. Like our passage, they contain a form of the verb ‘to be’ (V.52.12 *āsan*, 87.6 *sthána*, here *smási*), the loc. root noun to  $\sqrt{dr̥s}$  (V.52.12 *dr̥sí*, *saṃd̥r̥sí* 87.6 and here), and in V.52.12 and our passage a dat. root noun (52.12 *tviṣé*, here *śriyé*). As I interpr. the other two passages (see comm. ad locc.), the nom. subjects are the ones being seen, with the seer supplied as gen. dependent on the *dr̥s*-form. Thus

V.52.12 *ūmā āsan dr̥sí tviṣé*

“but the helpers (then) came to glitter in my sight” (with “my” from *me* in the preceding pāda)

V.87.6 *sthātāro hí prásitau saṃd̥r̥sí sthána*

“for in the sight (of all) you are firm-mounted (charioteers) in the onslaught.”

In both cases the gods, specifically the Maruts, are the subject, the ones viewed, and the viewer(s) are mortals of some type. If we impose the same structure on our passage, we mortals must be the subject, the ones viewed, and the gods, the Aśvins, the viewers – here represented by the enclitic *vām*, which I take as a genitive dependent on *saṃd̥r̥sí*.

Although this flip is somewhat disconcerting, syntax should outweigh our notions of contextual appropriateness. I would now tr. the pāda “we are in the sights of you two for (your) splendour.” What could this mean in context? I think the first hemistich announces to the Aśvins that we are in a privileged position to provide them with praise – I take a and b as parallel clauses under the domain of *hí*. The Aśvins are aware of this – we are “in their sight(s)” -- and therefore, in cd, they should listen to the praise and come here. I

take the fronted *ásti* of pāda a as an existential, rather than simply indicating the location of the praiser as in most tr. Putting ab together with cd: “Because there exists a praiser for you here and we are in your sights for your splendour [i.e., to celebrate it – *śrī-* is almost always a characteristic of gods], now hear me and come here with help, you whose goods are prize mares.” The insistence in ab on *our* role and skill as praisers is explained by the next two vss., where the poet worriedly asks who (else) has attracted them today (7) and again urges them to come to him (8).

V.74.6–7: I would slightly emend the tr. to “whose goods are prize mares.”

V.74.7: The standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) plausibly take the gen. pl.s *purūṇām* and *mártyānām* as dependent on *káh* ; Kü (451) somewhat puzzling tr. instead “Wer hat euch beide heute *von den vielen* für sich gewonnen ...” (my italics); if this is really what it means we might expect an abl.

The bahuvr. *vīpra-vāhas-* falls a bit outside the usual pattern for *-vāhas-* compds, which ordinarily have a ritual element as 1st member, with the sense that it is the vehicle that brings the god to the ritual ground (e.g., *ukthá-vāhas-* ‘having hymns as conveyance’). (See, e.g., comm. ad I.6.2, X.29.3.) Here it is either the inspired poet himself or the abstract inspiration that inspires him that serves as vehicle. I would slightly modify the tr. to showcase the bahuvr. nature of the compd: ‘o you who have inspiration/the inspired poet as conveyance’. See further on vs. 8 below as well as V.75.2.

The last two pādas are conceptually contrastive of the standard pairing of ritual speech and ritual action, though with somewhat non-parallel syntax. Pāda c refers to ritual speech, while d refers to ritual action -- by way of nom. *vīpraḥ* ‘inspired poet’, the animate agent of speech, in c, and instr. *yajñaiḥ*, the instr. inanimate result of action, in d.

V.74.8: I would slightly prefer “quickest driving ... drive here.”

In c the *purū* picks up the *purūṇām* of 7a, but it’s neut. and cannot refer to people. Still, the point is the same: choose us over the many other possibilities. The publ. tr. supplies “regions” with *purū*, and this is possible and has formulaic support in other Aśvin hymns (e.g., III.58.5, with *tiráḥ purū cid ... rájāṃsi*), but on the basis of toher parallels I suggest instead “pressings.” See esp. IV.29.1 *tiráś cid aryáḥ sávanā purūṇy, āṅgūṣébhīr grṇānāḥ* ... “Drive even across the many pressings of the stranger, being hymned by songs ...,” which also contains the relatively rare stem *āṅgūṣá-* as here. (See also the other passages collected in Ge’s n. 7c to V.75.7 [i.e., the next hymn] with *tiráḥ ... sávanā(ni)*.) “Pressings” would be more in keeping with the ritual focus here. See further ad V.75.7.

The publ. tr. somewhat misrepresents the sense of pāda d, which, in my opinion, was correctly seen by Old. It is not that the chariot is the object of praise (so Ge n. 8cd: “Gegenstand des Preises”) or the occasion for it (so WG: “(Anlass für) ein Preislied”), but that our praise song is the chariot that brings the Aśvins here. In other words, we’re dealing with what I might fancifully call a decomposed and relexicalized bahuvrīhi of the type *ukthá-vāhas-* ‘having hymns as conveyance’, the exact type of compd. we met in *vīpra-vāhas-* in the immediately preceding vs. (and see *síndhu-vāhas-* in V.75.2). Here the putative compd would be *\*āṅgūṣá-ratha-* ‘having the praise song as chariot’, ‘whose chariot is the praise song’, combining *ráthaḥ* from pāda a and *āṅgūṣáḥ* from d. To make

this clearer I would slightly alter the tr. of d to “(your chariot, which is our) praise song among mortals here.”

V.74.9: I very much doubt that the *śám* is meant to be ours, *pace* the publ. tr. I would substitute “Let our acclaim be weal for you ...”

### V.75 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

The poet of this hymn is named as Avasyu Ātreya (see also V.31), transparently derived from vs. 8, where *avasyú-* modifies ‘singer’.

The meter is Pañkti, beloved of Maṇḍala V, but here the fifth pāda in each vs. is a fixed refrain. The hymn shares themes and phraseology with the immediately preceding V.74. It contains some lexical puzzles and a few knotty problems.

V.75.1: On the lexical ring with vs. 8 and its reciprocal thematics, see comm. there.

Because of the repeated preverb *prāti*, opening the verse and appearing right before the verb in d, I think the lexeme *prāti* (...) *bhūṣati* has two objects, not one as in the publ. tr., with *vām* in c as the second. I would retr. “Upon the most loved chariot ... / upon you two does the praise-singer, the seer, attend with his praise.”

V.75.2: On *ahám sánā* see esp. Old., which the publ. tr. in general follows. It seems likely that this is a poorly transmitted version of the voc. *áhaṃsana* in VIII.61.9, a univertation of the phrase *\*ahám sanā* “I shall win!” The details are unfortunately somewhat sketchy, but I would reluctantly follow the publ. tr. in construing it as a pl. with *vísṽā(h)* and referring to rival groups (‘clans’ = *vís-* to account for fem. *vísṽā(h)*?) all asserting their competitive edge. (One would of course like *\*-sanāḥ*.) Ge, Re, and WG recognize it as an independent purpose clause *ahám sánā* (e.g., Ge “(auf dass) ich gewinne”; but why accent on verb?). Pirart by contrast analyses it as a cmpd ‘winning the day’, which is semantically appealing but doesn’t account for the compositional form *ahám* -- the usual compounding form of ‘day’ is *áhar-*. It does give me pause that two hymns later (V.77.3d) we get the clause ... *atīyāthó duritāni vísṽā* “You drive beyond all difficulties,” which is very like our *atyāyātam ... tiró vísṽā* with a reasonable nominal modified by *vísṽā*. Accordingly I would certainly entertain an alt, “Drive here, o Aśvins, beyond and across all (difficulties) – (and then) “I shall win!”

Another *-vāhas-* cmpd; see comm. ad V.74.7, 8 just above. On the Sindhu as the Aśvins’ conveyance, see VIII.26.18, adduced by Ge (n. 2d): *vāhiṣṭhā vāṃ nadīnām / síndhur híraṇyavartaniḥ* “best of rivers at conveying you, the Sindhu with her golden track.” Note the presence of *híraṇya-vartani-* also in our passage, though here modifying the Aśvins.

V.75.3: As above (V.74.6–7) I’d substitute “whose goods are prize mares,” and for “since you are pleased” simply “taking delight”: I’m not at all sure the participle is causal.

V.75.4: The sense of the hapax *vāñcī* is unclear; it must be derived from *vāñ-* ‘voice, music’ with an *-(a)ñc-* suffix, but what the suffix is conveying is hard to determine. The deriv. should have been originally adjectival, but could have been substantivized. So, in the first instance ‘vocal, musical’ vel sim.; in the latter either pleonastically ‘voice’ (so

apparently Re’s suggestion), ‘song’, or ‘musical instrument’. The larger sense of the passage can be interpr. in the context of the trope of hymns as chariots (see esp. V.74.8 and comm. above). Here, though, the item in question is set upon, or perhaps attached to, the chariot, rather than serving as chariot. The phrase is somewhat reminiscent of I.119.5 (also an Aśvin hymn) *rátham vāñī yemathuḥ* “two voices guide (your) chariot,” adduced by Ge (n. 4ab). WG suggest the fem. subj. serves as Lotse (pilot, guide) of the chariot. Somewhat following that tr., I would substitute “the musical (song) of the one with good rhythm is set on your chariot, o you with bullish goods,” though not with particular enthusiasm.

Pādas cd are quite similar to IV.44.2 (also an Aśvin hymn) *yuvór vāpur abhī pṛkṣaḥ sacante, vāhanti yát kakuhāso ráthe vām* “Nourishments escort your wondrous form when the humped horses (?) convey you on the chariot” – with *kakuhá-* and *pṛkṣaḥ*, as well as *vāpus-* corresponding to our *vāpuṣá-* and the chariot implicit. I would slightly alter the tr. here to “Your hump-backed wild beast of wondrous form makes nourishments for you” (whatever this is supposed to mean). Ge (n. 1 bottom of page) plausibly suggests that the *kakuhó mṛgáḥ* is a zebu, which has a prominent hump.

V.75.5: On *bodhín-manas-* see comm. ad VIII.93.18.

The root-noun cmpd *havana-śrút-* is based on the final phrase of the refrain *śrutam hávam*.

Since Cyavāna is one of the clients of the Aśvins, incl. in the immed. preceding hymn V.74.5, the publ. tr. “you run down Cyavāna” should not stand, given the hostile sense of the English idiom “run down.” Although the lexeme *ní √yā* generally does have that hostile sense (e.g., V.35.2), here it must be merely additive with Cyavāna as goal: “drive down to Cyavāna, the unduplicitous—the “down” referring to the Aśvins’ journey from heaven or the midspace to Cyavāna’s location on earth.

V.75.6: On *pruṣitá-psu-* see comm. ad IV.38.1 and EWA s.v. *psu-*.

V.75.7: The *mā* injunctive phrase *mā ví venaḥ / venatam* is found five times, all but one in this maṇḍala (V.31.2, 36.4, 75.7=78.1, VI.44.10); see also the likewise negated absolutive (?) *ávivenam (/n?)* in IV.24.6, 25.3 (on which form(s) see comm. ad IV.24.6). Based on the older understanding of the meaning of the root *√ven* as ‘see’, Ge tr. the prohibitive here as “wendet euren Blick nicht auf” (and similarly elsewhere; see also Th, Fremd. 85). KH (Injunk. 86) also relies on this understanding of the root meaning but with a different sense of *ví*: “hin und her schauen, zögern.” With the revised interpr. of the root as ‘track’, I take the meaning of the idiom to be ‘lose the track’, that is, ‘go off/apart from (*ví*) the track’. WG’s “sucht nicht länger links und rechts” incorporates the ‘track’ sense but with the back-and-forth motion of Hoffmann’s gloss. See also Gotō (1st class, 298 and n. 710). This zigzag interpr. is motivated by KH’s general view that *mā* with pres. injunc. is “inhibitive” (“don’t keep doing ...”) rather than prohibitive (“don’t do ...”) as it is with the aor. But the necessity for this distinction has been robustly disproved by IH 2020 (JAOS 140.4), and its irrelevance is esp. clear for this root, which has no aor. forms (or indeed any other verbal forms beyond the pres. stem). This is the only way to make a *mā* prohibitive to this root.

As noted in the publ. intro., pāda c poses considerable difficulties, particularly what to construe with *tiráś cid* and what to do with the hapax *aryayā*. The latter point is esp. widely discussed: see the detailed treatment by Old, as well as Ge’s n. 7c, Th Fremd. 85–86, Pir. ad loc. Let me first say that I do not think the publ. tr.’s solution of the first conundrum is correct – that is, supplying the problematic *ahám sánā* – “(all those ‘I shall win’s)” – from vs. 2, even if that is the correct analysis of the phrase in vs. 2 (which is doubtful). Instead I would invoke vs. 8 from the immed. preceding, and thematically and phraseologically related, hymn: V.74.8 *purū cid ... tiráḥ*. There I suggest supplying “pressings” with *purū*; see comm. ad loc. I would do the same here; this suggestion is, at least indirectly, supported by the problematic *aryayā* that follows. Ge wants to see a haplology here, with acc. pl. *aryáḥ* omitted before *aryayā* (hence “across (the Āryas)”), but this seems artificial. Better (though not great) to follow the older view (see Old esp., fld. by Re and WG) that *aryayā* represents *\*aryá ā* with *-y-* a hiatus breaker. This would allow comparison with passages like IV.29.1 *tiráś cid aryáḥ sávanā purūni* “even across the many pressings of the stranger”; VIII.66.12 *tiráś cid aryáḥ sávanā ...* (both adduced by Ge in n. 7c, though in support of his haplology suggestion), with a gen. sg. *aryáḥ* dependent on the gapped “pressings.” I would therefore substitute “Even across (the pressings) \*of the stranger.” We are not out of the woods yet, though: what to do with the resulting *\*ā pári* at the end of the pāda? If they are twin preverbs, they’re in the wrong order (usually *páry ā*). As parallel Re adduces VIII.34.10 *ā yāhy aryá ā pári*, which is strikingly similar, but there the *ā* governs preceding *aryáḥ*, which is an abl.: “drive here away from the stranger” (see comm. ad loc.). My somewhat ad hoc solution is to take *ā* as adverbial ‘here’ and *pári* with the VP in the next pāda: *vartír yātam*. For *pári* with *vartíḥ √yā*, see, e.g., VI.63.2, VII.69.5, VIII.26.14, X.122.6. Or, perhaps better, with *ā* construed independently with *yātam* and *pári* more closely connected to *vartíḥ*. My full tr. of cd is then “Even across (the pressings) \*of the stranger drive here around your circuit.”

V.75.8: In d *úpa bhūṣathaḥ* forms a ring with *práti bhūṣati* in the 1st vs. (1d), essentially bringing the hymn to a close. The final vs. (9) announces the immediate commencement of the sacrifice and serves as a sort of summary vs. Although the lexical ring is limited to a single word, the reciprocal thematics give this lexeme more weight than one might expect. In vs. 1 it is the human praiser (*stotā ... řṣiḥ*) who attends upon the Aśvins with his praise (*stómena*). But here the roles have been reversed: it is the Aśvins who attend upon “the singer as he sings” (*jaritāram ... grṇántam*). The human ritualist has been relexicalized (*√stu* → *√gṛ*), though kept as a *-tar*-stem agent noun, but the sacrificial compact has been fulfilled with exact reciprocity – as the repeated verb *√bhūṣ*, with first human and then divine subjects, indicates.

V.75.9: As just noted, this vs. announces that the sacrifice has just been undertaken, with three augmented aorists: *ābhūt* (a), *ā ... adhāyi* (b), *áyoji* (cd). The rest of the hymn contains only imperatives and present indicatives. Note that the two verbs in a and c are pāda-initial, but the one in b has been postponed with its preverb opening the pāda in tmesis. This might be because *#\*ādhāyi* would not be unambiguously augmented. The presence of two other gods, Uṣas and Agni, also breaks with the rest of the hymn, where the only divine presence is the Aśvins.

For *rúṣat-paśu-* I might prefer ‘having gleaming livestock’.

### V.76–77 Aśvins

These two hymns are assigned by the Anukr. not to an Atrid, but to Atri Bhauma himself.

### V.76 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

V.76.1: This vs., esp. its first pāda, almost reads as if it’s taking off from the last vs. of the preceding hymn, V.75.9, where Uṣas and Agni were prominently introduced.

V.76.2: This vs. contains three splvs., two built to the root  $\sqrt{gam}$  (*gāmiṣṭha-* a, *āgamiṣṭha-* c). JPB’s “the best who come” for these two I find misleading: the splv. sense should apply to the action expressed by the root – hence “the best at coming.”

The VP *saṃskṛtām prā mimītaḥ* is variously interpr. Ge and WG take *saṃskṛtām* as referring to the place (Ort) or goal (Ziel) to which the Aśvins come – explaining that the Aśvins don’t get the address wrong, as it were; that is, they don’t go to another sacrifice. Although I think this is the general idea, I think *saṃskṛtā-* is too loosely interpr. The lexeme *sám*  $\sqrt{(s)kr}$  (which is quite rare in the RV) doesn’t refer to a determined place, but rather to a well-prepared offering vel sim. See the very clear passage VI.41.3 *indrāya vṛṣṇe sám akāri sómah* “The soma has been brought to perfection for bullish Indra.” With Re we might assume that the adj. here qualifies the *ghármam* of the previous vs. Thieme (KlSch 11–12) also takes it as referring to a prepared meal, with *prā*  $\sqrt{mī}$  indicating that the Aśvins don’t (ex)change it for another – i.e., they don’t go to another sacrifice. Ge’s and WG’s “verfehlen” (‘miss’) attenuates the sense of the difficult lexeme *prā*  $\sqrt{mī}$ , but not too badly; Kü’s (369) “schädigen [durch Missachtung]” goes too far afield. The publ. tr. “they do not compromise the (offering) prepared (for them)” is somewhat puzzling—I would substitute “they do not mistake (the offering) brought to perfection,” which may not be much better. It’s meant to convey that they recognize our offering, don’t mix it up with someone else’s, and come to it, not elsewhere. The splv. “best at coming” might indicate their skill at coming to the right place.

With Ge and WG, I am inclined to take *ánti* (or *ánti nūnám*) as the predicate, not *úpastutā* with the pub. tr. The adv. *ánti* is frequently predicated, with or without contrastive *dūré* ‘in the distance’. Cf., e.g., I.94.9 *dūré vā yé ánti vā ké cid atrīnah* “whatever rapacious ones are in the distance or nearby.” Pāda b further develops pāda a: the Aśvins, best at coming, have come to the right sacrifice -- they are now right here. I would substitute “Nearby are the Aśvins now, the ones approached with praise here.”

HvN’s *dívābhipitve* should be corrected to *dívābhipitvé* with 2nd accent; this is not a compd. The Saṃhitā text reads *dívābhipitvé* ‘*vasāgamiṣṭhā*’.

On the sense of *ávarti-* see comm. ad III.58.3. As pointed out there, in three of its four occurrences it’s found in the same phrase: a splv. to  $\sqrt{gam}$  and the preverb/prep. *prāti*. Therefore we should read that phrase across the pāda boundary (... *āgamiṣṭhā*, *prāty ávartim* ...). I would substitute ‘need’ for ‘trouble’ here.

Putting all these suggested changes together, I would tr. the whole vs. as

They do not mistake (the offering) brought to perfection, the two best at coming.  
Nearby are the Aśvins now, the ones approached with praise here --

the two best at coming with help in response to need, by day and at the evening mealtime, and the best luck for the pious man.

V.76.3: The phrase *ávasā śám̐tamena* is a recasting and combining of two separate elements in the previous vs. 2cd: *ávasā ... śám̐bhaviṣṭhā*.

With Ge (sim. WG), I take *ā tatāna* as an example of the slangy idiom found also in I.92.23 ‘hold out on’, that is, ‘refuse to provide’; see also nearby V.79.9, where I interpr. *tanuthāḥ* (without preverb) as ‘drag out’. I would substitute “right now the drink does not hold out on the Aśvins.” The use of the emphatic and, in the RV, relatively rare *idānīm* ‘right now, at this very time’ contrasts with, or perhaps sums up, the various times of day listed in the rest of the vs. Whenever they come the drink is ready – it’s ready right now.

V.76.4: As Ge points out (n. 4a) *pradīvi* is the opposite of *idānīm* in 3d. But, I’d add, the insistent annunciatory near-deictics *idām ... imé ... idām* in ab continue the here-and-now focus of *idānīm*. To bring this out, I’d slightly recast the tr. to “For here is your place, your home from of old, here your house, here your dwelling, o Aśvins.”

The adj. *br̥hatāḥ* can be construed both with *divāḥ* and *párvatāt* and is stationed exactly between them.

V.76.5: This generic final vs., repeated as V.77.5, is identical to V.42.18, an All God hymn, also attributed to Atri Bhauma.

A third occurrence of *ávasā* (see 2c and 3c); the phrase here, *ávasā nūtanena*, is a near rhyme to 3c *ávasā śám̐tamena*.

### V.77 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

In contrast to the last hymn, where the Aśvins are urged to come at any time of day (see esp. V.76.2–3), this hymn emphasizes that the Aśvins’ proper time is the early morning (*prātár*) and other times are less desirable. (See esp. vss. 1–2.)

V.77.1: The signature word *prātár* (a, c) is reinforced by *prathamā* (a), *purā* (b), and *prá ... pūrva-* (d).

I would slightly alter the tr. of pāda a to “sacrifice to the early-coming ones first.”

I don’t think the “ungenerous vulture/greedy one” is the rival sacrificer, as identified in the publ. tr. This is Ge’s idea (n. 1b), but on the assumption of a very compressed expression: they will drink (here) before a rival sacrificer invites them elsewhere. I find this hard to get out of the text, esp. since the identification “vulture” = rival sacrificer doesn’t exactly impose itself. The most obvious way to read the *purā* ABL expression is that they will drink before the “vulture” drinks; it should therefore refer to a god (or the like) competing with the Aśvins for the first drink. Could this be a dig at Vāyu, who ordinarily gets the first drink, from an Aśvin devotee less enamoured of the Indra-Vāyu cult?

In d the English conceals a Sanskrit grammatical problem: *pūrvabhājah* is not dual, so “the poets proclaim them [=Aśvins] as those who receive the first portion” cannot be correct. If *pūrvabhājah* is the acc. obj. of *prá śamsanti*, as the publ. tr. takes it, it’s plural; it could also be nom. pl., modifying *kaváyaḥ*, or (unlikely) gen./abl. sg. If

nom. pl. it would need to mean ‘providing the first portions’, which is possible but not appealing: the poets should be providing praise, not oblations. Better to take it as acc. pl., with the referents being the collection of gods who receive oblations then – incl. Vāyu and Indra, as well as the Aśvins. This is essentially the solution of Ge, Scar (352), WG, though without specifying the particular recipients. If those do include Vāyu and Indra, my speculation about the identity of the “vulture” might receive support.

To accommodate the pl. of *pūrvabhājah* I would reconfigure cd, with c dependent on b, and d independent: “They will drink before the ungenerous vulture, for the Aśvins receive the sacrifice in the early morning. The poets proclaim (all) those who receive the first portion.”

V.77.2: The second pāda is syntactically ungainly and has given rise to some awkward interpr. The expected (gapped) subject is ‘sacrifice’, but this is then apparently modified by the adj. *devayā(h)* and *ājuṣtam*. The latter is definitely neut., the former better masc. or fem., though modern grammarians are reluctantly willing to allow neut. usages of nom. sg. *-ās* to *-ā*-root nouns (see Lanman, Noun Inflection 443, 445; Macdonell Vedic Gr. 251). But even if we opt for two neuters, what neut. substantive are they modifying? We would expect the subj. to be *yajñá-*, generated from *yajadhvam* in pāda a, but *yajñá-* of course is masc. Sāy. supplies *havís-* (see Ge n. 2b), which is neut. but has no contextual support. Nonetheless, Old and Ge seem to accept this makeshift (see also Scar 412 n. 580). WG somewhat rescue the gender problem, by making *ājuṣtam* a separate semi-impersonal clause, thus allowing *devayā(h)* to modify a non-neut.: “Nicht findet (das Opfer) spät statt, das zu den Göttern gelangen soll: (Spät) ist unpassend.” This is certainly better than the Old/Ge/Scar interpr. However, I find a suggestion of Benfey’s, summarily dismissed by Old (“[s]ehr unwahrscheinlich”) and mentioned by Scar (412 n. 580), far more appealing – that it is an infinitival dative *devayāi* ‘to go to the gods’. Although the standard doctrine is that root nouns in *-ā-* have datives in *-e*, one need only cite the clear infinitival dat. *prayāi* ‘to go forth’ (2x, with undeniable *-ai* in the Saṃhitā text; see Scar 413), likely to the same root – whether because the dat. ending *-ai* of derived *-ā-* and *-ī-* stems has been adopted or because the non-ablauting root *(-)yā* + ending *-e* yields *-ai*. This inf. can be construed with the impersonally used *ājuṣtam* as in the publ. tr.: “it is displeasing (for it) to travel to the gods.” As for the tr. “travel to the gods,” it is also possible that the root in question is  $\sqrt{yā}$  ‘beseech’. This would work semantically just as well (“(when it is) displeasing to beseech the gods”), and the same derivation from a full-grade *yā* would apply.

The publ. tr. renders *anyāḥ* as definite (“the other one, not us”), but by my rules *anyāḥ* here should be indefinite, since it is in actual first position in the clause – the conjunction *utá* doesn’t count for these purposes. I would therefore (with the other standard tr.) tr. it as indefinite: “another than us ...”; “someone else than us ...”

In the clause *vī cāvah*, the *ca* is subordinating, as the accent on the verb shows. In agreement with the publ. tr., I think the unidentified sacrificer has started too late: when it has already dawned (hence the aorist). The insistent *prātár* used here of the Aśvins and of our sacrifice actually refers to predawn. See my Sacrificed Wife (p. 188) on the Prātaranuvāka, a litany that is to be recited even before the birds are stirring. In contrast Ge seems to think that the sacrificer in c is performing around the same time as we are,

and WG that he starts before us. However, it's best to take pāda d as congratulating us on our having the jump on our rivals.

V.77.3: On a possible parallel to pāda d, see comm. ad V.75.2.

V.77.4: It is worthy of note that the rel. cl. of the first hemistich contains an indic. pf. *vivéṣa* and a subjunctive *rárate* that are implicitly parallel – but despite their modal difference both work fine in the passage. As for *rárate*, its accent marks it as a redupl. present; this accent is shared with the well-attested part. *rārāṇa-*, and there are other apparent redupl. pres. forms (e.g., impv. *rirīhi*, 2nd du. *rārāthām*). However, I think it likely that this redupl. pres. is a reconfigured perfect. Although Kü (420–22) finds a sharp functional difference between the present forms and, esp., the pf. mid. part. *saṃraraṇá-*, see comm. ad X.15.8, where I explain the functionally aberrant forms of this part. by haplology from *\*saṃraraṇāná-* to *√ran* ‘enjoy’.

WG (see also Gr) construe *pítváḥ* with *cániṣṭham* rather than (or perhaps in addition to) *vibhāgé*, contra Ge and the publ. tr. Though this is appealing (“the most pleasing of food”), *vibhāgá-* is regularly (though not universally) construed with a gen., and *cániṣṭha-* is not. I do not, however, think “offering” needs to be supplied with *cániṣṭha-* as in the publ. tr., since this collocation is not found elsewhere.

#### V.78 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

On the structure of this last hymn of the Aśvin cycle, see publ. intro. It is attributed to Saptavadhri Ātreya, whose name is derived from the saga briefly presented in vss. 5–6.

V.78.1–3: Pāda c in these vss. constitutes a refrain.

V.78.1: On b see comm. on the identical pāda ad V.75.7.

V.78.3: As usual, I would substitute “whose goods are prize mares.”

Pāda b is almost identical to nearby V.72.3 [*√juṣ*] *yajñám iṣṭáye*. As usual, *iṣṭáye* is variously interpr. here. Ge “um gern zu kommen” (also V.72; root?); Re *√iṣ* ‘desire’; WG “zu (eurer und unsrer) Erquickung” (but 72.3 “aufsuchen”; root?); Pirart *√yaj* (with complex tr.). Although the last would be a figura etymologica, a point in its favor, in fact the *-ti-*abstract to *√yaj* is ordinarily accented on the root (*iṣṭi-*). I prefer to take it to ‘desire’, with the rendering ‘to our liking’.

V.78.4–6: The fragmentary saga(s) of Atri’s and/or Saptavadhri’s release from a constricted space present serious difficulties of interpr. For brief remarks see my Hyenas, 228–31 with nn., esp. n. 150.

V.78.4: As Ge points out (n. 4b), the simile in b of the woman in need, presumably during childbirth, sets the stage for the childbirth charm in vss. 7–9.

On the phrase in c see comm. ad I.118.11. I would alter the tr. here to conform with the one substituted there: “with the urgent speed even of a falcon.”

The instr. *śámtamena* recalls *ávasā śámtamena* in nearby V.76.3, justifying the publ. tr.'s parenthetical "(help)," instead of grouping it with the *jávasā* phrase in the preceding pāda.

V.78.5: The immediacy of the demands in this vs. would suggest that the speaker is not the poet, but perhaps Saptavadhri himself (referring to himself in the 3rd ps. in d) or a witness of the ordeal.

Old calls attention to the unexpected accent of the future participle *sūśyantyā(h)* (for \**sūśyántī-*). It seems possible that this fem. part. had been reinterp. as a technical term for a woman in labor (or late stages of labor) and its morphological structure is no longer prominent.

V.78.6: I would substitute "with your uncanny powers" for "by your cunning."

WG cleverly suggest in the n. that the movements in d resemble the contractions of a woman in labor.

### V.79–80 Dawn

The poet is Satyaśravas Ātreya. The name is found in 79.1–3, though with the patronymic Vāyya, and is probably the patron, not the poet. See comm. ad V.79.1–3.

### V.79 Dawn

The meter of this hymn is Pañkti, with five 8-syllable pādas. The fifth in all vss. is the refrain, a voc. phrase *sújāte aśvasūnrte* "o well-born lady, liberal with horses," which is essentially detachable. So the hymn comes across as standard Anuṣṭubh, with an appended and superfluous refrain. On Pañkti final vss. in Anuṣṭubh hymns in this maṇḍala, see the beginning of the comm. on V.

As indicated in the publ. tr., the contents of this hymn are for the most part uninspired, contrary to most Dawn hymns, though closer inspection reveals more intricate patterns than a superficial reading turned up.

V.79.1–3: These three vss. follow the same pattern: Dawn is urged to repeat for us now a previous action she performed in the presence of and for the benefit of a previous patron. The name Satyaśravas Vāyya appears in all three vss. (The Anukr. attributes the hymn to Satyaśravas Ātreya, but as Ge points out [n. 1d] he is surely the patron, not the poet.) Curiously in vss. 1 and 3 Satyaśravas Vāyya is identified as the previous patron, while in vs. 2 he is the current patron and the previous patron has a different name. This chronological slippage is somewhat confusing -- and is emphasized by having identical clauses differing only in the tense/mood of the verb and the demonstrative vs. relative pronoun:

2cd *sā vy ùcha sáhīyasi, satyaśravasi vāyyé*

3cd *yó vyaúchah sáhīyasi, satyaśravasi vāyyé*

The insistence on this generous patron of the past has a purpose: there is a parallel insistence on the patrons of today in the rest of the hymn. Although only Dawn is addressed, the poet is clearly sending a message to the patrons, to generously redistribute the wealth that Dawn will bestow on them, on the model of Satyaśravas.

V.79.1: The phrase *mahé ... rāyé divítmatī* is very reminiscent of IV.31.11 *mahó rāyé divítmate*, with an adverbial *maháh* but a dat. *divítmate* modifying *rāyé*. See comm. ad loc. It seems likely that our fem. *divítmatī* is a nonce adaptation to the fem. context. As for *divítmant-*, I now tentatively accept the analysis of *divít-* as containing the root noun -*i-t-* and would alter the tr. to “as one coming from heaven” or “as heaven-sent one.”

V.79.2–3: Is the comparative ‘mightier’ (*sáhīyas-*) used to assert that Satyaśravas Vāyva is mightier than Sunītha Śaucadratha?

The Pp. reads accented *ví* even directly before accented *aúchaḥ* (2b, 3c), where we might expect univibration and loss of accent on the preverb. The Samhitā text (*vyaúcho*) is of course ambiguous. I would read the sequence with unaccented and univibrated *vi*; the verb *aúchaḥ* owes its accent to its presence in a rel. cl. The Pp. may have accented *ví* on the model of the impv. *ví ucha* (2c, 3b; *vy ùcha* in the Samhitā text).

*sā* with the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. impv. *ucha* simply shows the common use of the *sáltám* prn. with 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. impvs.; see my 1992 “Vedic ‘sá figé’: An inherited sentence connective?” Elaborate semantic/functional interpr., like Re’s “de la même manière, dans les mêmes conditions (heureuses)” (EVP 3, ad loc.) or WG’s *yā ... sā ...* “welche du ... als solche du” are unnec.

V.79.3: *yó* beginning pāda c represents *yā + u* (note Pp. *yó íti*), but the apparent masc. form causes a momentary stir.

V.79.4: With the standard tr. I take cd as the main cl. corresponding to the rel. cl. in ab, despite the lack of a resumptive pronoun and of a verb. The pattern established in the first 3 vss. of alternating rel. and main clauses makes this interpr. likely, even though the subjects have changed.

Contra Ge, who takes ab as referring to the singers and cd to the patrons, I think both hemistichs refer to the singers. So also Re and WG, an interpr. that goes back to Sāy. (see Ge’s n. 4). Here the circulation of wealth appears to be a two-way transaction: the poets praise Dawn and receive bounties. How that happens is laid out in the next few vss., which complicate the two-way model.

V.79.5: The two-party sketch in vs. 4 gives way to a three-party model: when Dawn gives them the go-ahead, as it were, the patrons, who have not yet been mentioned in the hymn as a class, bestow bounties on the poets.

This vs. presents some difficulties, not least the referent(s) of the various plurals and their grammatical identity. With most, I take the *ganāḥ* to be the priest/poets who were also the subj. of the preceding vs. and who greeted Dawn with praise in 4ab. The first hemistich of this vs. expresses the potential reciprocity for this praise: Dawn considers its producers worthy to be given bounties, the same bounties referred to in 5c.

I part company with the standard tr. in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich. Most take the subj. here to be the patrons, who either physically surround the priest/poets (so I read Old) while giving to them or have succeeded (using a sense of *pāri √dhā* [‘conclude’ not found till later]) in giving, finished giving to them (Ge, Re, WG). By contrast I consider the subject still to be the priest/poets. They surround the patrons, who are giving to them. *dādataḥ* is of course grammatically ambiguous: I take it as acc. pl., while the rest interpr. it as nom.

pl. The use of the word *gaṇá-* ‘throng’ to refer to the poets in ab helps explain the surprisingly physical verb ‘surround’ in cd: the picture is of the over-eager (*váṣṭi-*) ritual recipients almost ganging up on the patrons.

V.79.6–7: Here the patrons, who have properly compensated the priest/poets, receive their own reward from Dawn. Interestingly it is not material, but rather *yáśas-* ‘glory’ -- though glory consisting of heroes (*vīrávat*), meaning, narrowly, sons, but also men belonging to our side who will perform well in warfare and acquire battle glory. The emphasis on non-material rewards for the patrons continues in vs. 7 with “lofty brilliance and glory” (*dyumnám brhád yáśaḥ*), while the poets receive material gifts, *rādhāṃsi áśvyā gavyā* “benefits consisting of horses and cows.” For a similar split between material rewards for the singers and non-material ones for the patrons see V.86.6, where the patrons get “lofty fame” (*śrávo brhát*) and the singers get wealth and refreshment (*rayám ... íṣam*).

V.79.8: The two-party model returns here, with Dawn bringing the gifts directly to the priest/poets.

V.79.9: The last vs. before the summary vs., this one brings the hymn ring-compositionally back to its beginning with its opening impv. *vy ùcha* ‘dawn forth’, a lexeme found 4x in vss. 2–3 (2b, 2c, 3b, 3c).

As noted in the publ. intro., this prohibition and its striking simile are the most notable features of this hymn. The *mā* clause contains a present injunctive, not an aorist. Hoffmann (79) explains it as an inhibitive, not a prohibitive -- his standard explanation for the use of present injunctives in such contexts. Although IH has demonstrated that this explanation of the use of pres. injunctives with *mā* doesn’t hold -- they are generally used when an aor. injunc. is not available -- in this case, Hoffmann’s analysis may be correct. There is a perfectly fine root aor. to  $\sqrt{tan}$  and it in fact occurs once with *mā* (I.91.23), so we may need to seek a functional explanation somewhat in the manner of Hoffmann’s. On the other hand and after further thought, I wonder if the pres. stem is used in this context in order to express a *durative* prohibitive, rather than an inhibitive. That is, *starting now*, when you dawn, don’t dawdle at your work. She’s just been ordered to dawn, which makes the start time now, not in the past, but the poet fears that once she starts she’s going to draw it out longer than she should. It shouldn’t be inhibitive in KH’s sense, because that would mean she’s already started the work. On still another hand, however, since this is functionally the final vs., which refers back to the beginning of the hymn, perhaps the poet *is* saying that Dawn has been at work since that beginning and should finish it up.

It is difficult not to take *sūrah* as a nom. sg. to a thematic stem (so, e.g., Ge and Re), although many occurrences of *sūrah* are better interpr. as gen. sg. to *svâr-* -- incl. in this same sequence *sūro arcíṣā* in VIII.7.36. WG take it as a gen., but then must identify a different subj. for *tápāti*, leading them to introduce Varuṇa and a superstructure of explanation that seems over-elaborate. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think the point of contact is the assumption that thieves work at night and if the sun rises on them, they will be caught out.

V.79.10: *pram̐yase* is variously rendered, but ‘diminish’ or the like fits both the root and the context. Thieme’s principled insistence on ‘tauschen, täuschen’ (ZDMG 41 [1941] 107–8 = KISch 32–33) produces an unconvincing interpr., requiring further shoring up: “... die du ... nicht getäuscht wirst (= du, deren Absicht zu schenken nicht vereitelt wird).” That Dawn does not diminish in cd harmonizes with the increase in gifts that the poet urges in ab.

The dat. *stotṛbhyah* may be construed with *uchántī* rather than *pram̐yase*, thus “dawning for the praisers, you do not diminish” (so Re, Th), but this would have no appreciable effect.

### V.80 Dawn

As noted in the publ. intro., every vs. but the first begins with *eṣā* ‘she, this one here’.

V.80.1: In contrast to the relentless nominative representation of Dawn in the rest of the hymn, this 1<sup>st</sup> vs. begins with 3 full pādas of accusative describing her.

V.80.3: I previously accepted the standard view that *áprāyu-* is a root noun compound derived from *prá √yu* (*√yu* 2 ‘keep away’) and is essentially a variant of *áprayuchant-* (cf., e.g., EWA s.v. *YAV*<sup>2</sup>, p. 404 with lit.). There are, of course, two formal problems with this analysis: the long *ā* of the preverb, which, notably, is not found in *áprayuchant-*, and the lack of the empty *-t-* suffixed to root nouns ending in short resonants (cf. *dveṣo-yú-t-* to this same root; though see *amho-yú/ū-* in V.15.3 and comm. thereon). It should also be noted that the Pp. analyzes *áprāyu* as *ápra-āyu* (also in I.89.1); although the Pp. is not always a reliable guide, its evidence should be considered. The issue has recently been discussed in detail by Scar (439–40), who in the end rejects the *prá √yu* interpr. in favor of a bahuvr̐hi with *āyu-* ‘youth, lifespan’, a neut. noun that is less well-attested than both the neut. *āyus-* ‘id.’ and the derived adj. *āyú-* ‘lively’. The semantics of this cmpd. are a little tricky: Vedic people always pray to have their lifetimes lengthened, using the preverb *prá* (generally with *√tī*), so *\*prāyu-* should mean ‘having a lengthened lifetime’, a good thing, and *áprāyu-* the reverse, hence a bad thing. However, Scar suggests ‘nicht alternd, ewig jung’, thus a good thing. Although it’s somewhat disturbing that the usually positive collocation of *prá* and *āyu(s)-* remains positive when negated, Scar’s reconstruction of the semantic development seems plausible. A further development from ‘ever young’ → ‘lively’ → ‘not slacking, unremitting’ can be envisioned -- esp. if, as I think likely, the word ceased to be transparent and got partially captured by *prá √yu* and its negated adj. *áprayuchant-* (a scenario also sketched by Scar). Note *áprayuchan* nearby in V.82.8. Though I do not feel that the publ. translations of *áprāyu-* need to be altered, my analysis of the form now starts in a very different place. A somewhat different value is proposed for *áprāyuṣ-* in I.127.5, but starting with the same basic elements; see comm. ad loc.

### V.81–82 Savitar

Though attributed to Śyāvāśva, the poet of the Marut cycle (V.52–61), these two hymns lack the exuberance of those hymns.

## V.81 Savitar

The hymn falls into three symmetrical sections (vss. 1–2, 3, 4–5) based generally on their verse/pāda-initial elements, but these sections do not correspond to thematic divisions. The first section, vss. 1–2, is marked by *ví*. Though the first pāda of vs. 1 lacks *ví*, the repetition is insistent starting with pāda b *víprā víprasya ... vipāścítaḥ*, followed by hemistich-initial *ví* in 1c *ví*, 2a *víśvā*, 2c *ví* along with other, internal *ví*'s: 1c *vayunāvíd*, 2a *kavīḥ*# / 2b *prāsāvīd ... dvipáde* / 2d *ví rājati*#. The *ví* may play on the middle syllable of the god's name *savitár-*, and it also ties him to the *vípra-* he is identified with in 1b. Given that the next hymn (V.82) plays on the first syllable of his name (*su/sav*) and the root from which it's derived, it may not be farfetched to suggest that this section focuses on the 2<sup>nd</sup> syllable.

Both hemistichs of the next vs. begin with the rel. prn. (3a *yásya*, 3c *yáḥ*), a relatively low-energy repetition between the *ví*'s of vss. 1–2 and the *utá*'s of 4–5. In these last two vss. the repetition of *utá* explodes: every pāda save for the last (5d) begins with *utá*, seven occurrences in all. Beside these patterns of repetitions, it is striking that the first and last pādas of the hymn do not participate; the last pāda serves as an extra-hymnic summary pāda.

The name Savitar is found once in each vs.

V.81.1: With Ge I take *vipāścítaḥ* as nom. pl. qualifying the (human) *vípra-*s, who attend to the inspiration of “the lofty inspired poet,” namely Savitar (sim., but not ident., WG). By contrast, Gr, Re, Th (Unters. 21) take *vipāścítaḥ* as gen. sg., modifying Savitar. The latter interpr. requires that the gen. phrase *víprasya brható vipāścítaḥ* is dependent on *mána utá ... dhíyaḥ* in the previous pāda. In other words, the poets hitch up the mind and insights of Savitar, not their own. This would not be impossible but is less likely in the context of Vedic poetic composition, and the middle voice of *yuñjate* suggests that the objects of the verb are the poets' own.

The word *párisṭutiḥ* is a hapax, and the lexeme *pari √stu* is otherwise only late and rare. I do not know exactly what it refers to, but it is likely a technical ritual term.

V.81.2–3: Just as Savitar follows the lead (*prayānam*) of Dawn in 2d, the other gods follow his lead (also *prayānam*) in 3a. The masc. rel. prn. *yásya* beginning 3 makes it clear that the referent has changed -- which is not clear from the English.

V.81.3: The publ. tr. takes instr. *ójasā* as belonging to the gods, whereas the standard interpr. assign this *ójas-* to Savitar. Although there is no way to tell from the Skt., I think “with/through his power” is the better choice, esp. given the parallel instr. *mahitvanā* in d, which is definitely Savitar's. I would so emend the tr.

The second hemistich at first appears quite straightforward syntactically, but the syntax clashes with what we expect the sense to be -- and on further inspection the syntax turns out to be skewed, too. I'm afraid that in my publ. tr. this has produced regrettable incoherence. Looking at the syntax first, we seem to find a textbook case of a relative / correlative construction: *yáḥ ... sá ...*, with an accented verb in the rel. cl. *vimamé*, hence “who measured out the earthly (ones), he ...” But there is a problem, because the direct object of the rel. cl., *pārthivāni*, should be completed by *rājāmsi*, which is technically in the main clause beginning with *sá*. This does not bother Ge or Re, who tr. the two acc.

pls. together in the rel. cl. (e.g., Ge “der die irdischen Räume durchmessen hat ...”). WG by contrast do notice the problem and tr. *pārthivāni* in the rel. cl. and *rājāṃsi* in the main cl. and supply all the missing parts in each cl.: “(er), der die irdischen (Räume) durchmessen hat, er ist Etaśa, der ... die (irdischen) Räume (durchmessen hat) ...,” which is similar to my publ. tr. -- though a bit more coherent -- but also a bit clumsier. The publ. tr. assumes that the 2<sup>nd</sup> set of spaces are ‘heavenly’; cf. IV.53.3 *āprā rājāṃsi divyāni pārthivā* “(Savitar) has filled the heavenly and earthly spaces.” The semantic problem is posed by the phrase *sá étaśaḥ* smack in the middle and apparently starting the main clause, coreferential with the *yāh* in the rel. cl., which we all had good reason to think was referring to Savitar. One solution has been to take *étaśa-* as an adj., ‘dappled’ vel sim (so Sāy.: *etavarṇaḥ śubhraḥ śobhamānaḥ*) or ‘hastening’ (so Gr, though not for this passage). But most take it as the PN Etaśa, the famous, if often enigmatic, horse of the sun. Following that tactic, as far as I can see we must take it as an identification or a simile, with Savitar equivalent to Etaśa -- not as a complete change of subject. There are two ways I can see to do this -- 1) take *sá étaśaḥ* as a parenthetical interjection within the relative clause, which otherwise occupies all of cd: “Who measured out the earthly spaces -- he is Etaśa! -- with his greatness -- god Savitar ...” or 2) to keep the rel./corr. structure but fold *étaśaḥ* in as unmarked identification / simile: “Who measured out the earthly (spaces), he, (like/as) Etaśa, measured out the (heavenly) spaces with his greatness: god Savitar.” I prefer the latter, because it allows us to supply ‘heavenly’ in the main clause, and surely the point of contact between Savitar and Etaśa in this context is that Etaśa crosses the heaven daily, “measuring it out,” as he pulls the sun’s chariot. Etaśa as a measurer of earthly spaces makes little sense. I would therefore emend the publ. tr. to the 2<sup>nd</sup> alternative. That Savitar is identified with Etaśa in one of his aspects may be supported by the explicit identifications with other figures in the next two vss.: *mitró bhavasi* (4d), *pūṣā bhavasi* (5b).

V.81.4–5: 4b and 5d are entirely parallel in structure:

4b *utá mitró bhavasi deva dhármabhiḥ*

5d *utá pūṣā bhavasi deva yāmabhiḥ*

This strict parallelism should extend to the two final instr. pls. -- that is, Savitar should become the god in question by virtue of a quality/entity held in common and expressed in the instr. I therefore think it unlikely that *dhármabhiḥ* is the vague “nach deinen Eigenschaften” of Ge or “par (tes) dispositions-naturelles” of Re; it needs to refer to an actual thing, like Pūṣan’s journeys. In the publ. tr. I render it as ‘supports’ (sim. WG “durch deine Unterstützungen”), keeping in mind that Savitar often holds up his arms, which may function as literal supports. But it may rather be something like ‘institutes, ordinances’, referring to the regulation of time and activity that Savitar performs.

## V.82 Savitar

As noted in the publ. intro. as well as just above ad V.81, this hymn contains numerous verbal and nominal forms of the root  $\sqrt{sū}$  ‘impel’, whose agent noun ‘Impeller’ Savitar is grammatically. Every vs. in the hymn contains a form of the name *savitár-*, but play on the root doesn’t start till vs. 3. There are eight such forms, with a concentration on the impv. in the middle: pres. subj. *suvāti* (3b), aor. injunc. *sāvīḥ* (4b), pres. impv. *suva* (4c, 5b, 5c), them. loc. *savé* (6b), them. acc. (*satyá*)*savam* (7c), with a return to the

original pres. subj. *suvāti* (9c). Starting with vs. 3, only vs. 8 lacks such a form -- but *s<sup>u</sup>vā(dhīr)* with distracted *suvā* fits phonologically, though not etymologically. We might also note that the first two vss., which lack the punning root forms, do contain forms that might be considered phonological precursors: 1c *sarva(-dhātāmam)*, 2a *svāyaśastaram*, 2c *svarāj'yam*. With so much concentration on form in this hymn, we should not be surprised that the content is not particularly stimulating.

V.82.1: As Re points out, this vs. is reminiscent of the Gāyatrī mantra, III.62.10. Putting them side-by-side, it is difficult not to assume that one of them (presumably this one) is a deliberately fractured version of the other:

III.62.10 *tāt savitūr vāreṇyam, bhārgo devāsya dhīmahi*  
*dhīyo yó naḥ pracodáyāt*

V.82.1 *tāt savitūr vṛṇīmahe, vayāṃ devāsya bhójanam*  
*śréṣṭham sarvadhātāmam, túram bhágasya dhīmahi*

Note esp. the first pādas, whose 1<sup>st</sup> 2 words are identical and whose last words both belong to  $\sqrt{vṛ}$  ‘choose’. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda *devāsya* is identically positioned, and the phrase *bhārgaḥ ... dhīmahi* is echoed by our pāda *bhágasya dhīmahi*, but with a diff. noun (*bhāga-*, not *bhārgas-*). The remainders of the vss. diverge, but the tone is certainly set by pāda a and the similarities of b/d. It is difficult to know what to make of this -- whether the Gāyatrī mantra had already achieved some sort of local fame that lent itself to parodic imitation or whether the similarities are just the result of the usual formulaic underlayer (though there are no other vss. that begin *tāt savitūr*). It’s also somewhat striking (and could be used as an argument either way) that the vs. in our hymn is not a Gāyatrī but an Anuṣṭubh -- and it is the only Anuṣṭubh in a Gāyatrī hymn. If III.62.10 was already known as the (or a) Gāyatrī mantra, our poet could be slyly tweaking that reputation. Or this can all be my post-hoc invention.

V.82.4: Ge interpr. *sāvīḥ* as modal (“mögest du ... zuweisen”), and KH (Injunk. 264) explicitly takes this injunctive as the substitute for the unattested *iṣ*-aors. impv. to this root. But given the pres. impv. to the same root in the flg. pāda (*pārā ... suva*), as well as in the next vs. (5b, 5c), I think it more likely to be a contrastive expression of recent past – though I take the other two occurrences of *sāvīḥ* (II.28.9, VI.71.6) as imperatival, for slightly different reasons.

V.82.8: With regard to *áprayuchan* see disc. of *áprāyu-* ad V.80.3.

V.82.8–9: There are no overt main clauses in these last two vss., whose vs.-init. rel. prns. *yáḥ* hang off the accs. in vs. 7, but it is possible that the vs.-final *savitā* (or in 8 *deváh savitā*) in both cases constitutes a de facto main cl.

V.82.9: A further question concerns the last clause of 9c, *prá ca suvāti savitā*. Ge (fld. by Klein [DGRV I.248 n. 93, 251]) takes *ca* as subordinating, tr. ‘wenn’, thus producing a dependent clause dependent on another dependent clause “who ..., when he ...” (Re has a fussy interpr. involving an ellipse that I find puzzling.) I see no reason for Ge’s interpr., but take the *ca* as conjoining the two clauses ab and c (or their verbs). The accent on *suvāti* is already accounted for by its presence in a rel. cl., and I think it more likely that

the poet would end the hymn with a ringing announcement of what Savitar is going to do rather than a conditional uncertainty about whether he's going to do it.

The phrase *āśrāvāyati ślókena* is technically an etymological figure, somewhat obscured by the *l*-form of *ślóka*- and its highly lexicalized state.

### V.83-86

The generic poet Atri Bhauma (see V.37–43) returns for these almost final hymns.

### V.83 Parjanya

V.83.1: The verb *dadhāti* can be read with both *rétaḥ* and *gárbham*, the latter in the idiom *gárbham*  $\sqrt{dhā}$  'impregnate', found again in 7a.

V.83.2: This vs. quickly modulates from the physical to the moral, with Parjanya the scourge not only of the trees but of demons and evil-doers.

V.83.3: We might expect *\*rathīr iva* here, to the *vrkī*-stem *rathī-*, but the ending *-ī* must belong instead to the *-ín*-stem *rathín-*, which does have an independent existence. See Old ad loc.

I take the whip in the simile to be lightning; both a whip and a lightning flash are slender, fast, unpredictable, and have a non-straight trajectory. The flash of lightning would also do the revealing in pāda b. Note also that thunder is covered in pāda c and rain in b and d, so lightning is what's otherwise absent.

"Rain-bearing cloud" (*varṣyāṃ nábhaḥ*) in d seems like a quick and a bit half-hearted poetic repair of "rain-bearing messengers" (*dūtān ... varṣyān*) in b. The two pādas hold the verb *kṛṇute* constant.

V.83.5: Note the unusual geminate in *nánnamīti*, dissimilated from *\*námnamīti*.

In pāda b the question is whether the scene is set during the thunderstorm, with frightened quivering livestock, or afterwards, as they gambol in new growth. Pāda a speaks for the former, c for the latter. Ge (and, it seems, WG) opt for the latter, while I favor the former, though without strong grounds.

The first three pādas of this vs. begin with *yásya*; the fourth does not, but ends with a close phonological match, *yacha*.

V.83.6: The default referent of *ásuraḥ pitā naḥ* "the lord, our father" here is of course Parjanya, since this is a Parjanya hymn and the subject is urged to pour out water (cf., e.g., Hale, *Asura*, 46–47). However, I wonder if this is not rather a reference to Dyaus Pitar, or at least an identification of Parjanya with Dyaus Pitar. For Heaven as *pitár-ásura-*, see X.124.3 as well as disc. and other related passages in my "The Divine Revolution of RV X.124" (Ged. Staal, 2016), 294, and of course Zeus famously 'rains' in Greek.

V.83.7–8: These two vss. ring changes in the oppositional pair *úd* 'up' and *ní* 'down': 7c *n'āñcam*, 7d *udváto nipādāḥ*, 8a *úd acā ní ṣiñca*. Note that 7b *udanvátā* might seem to belong with this sequence, but *udan-* there is the 'water' word.

V.83.8: Hoffmann’s positing (Aufs. I.164 = KZ 79 [1965]) of a separate root  $\sqrt{añc}$  ‘scoop, draw (water)’ seems unnec., at least for this passage.

### V.84 Earth

For a discussion of this hymn as an implicit riddle, see my “A Sanskrit Riddle in Three Movements: Rig Veda V.84,” in *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, ed. Billie Jean Collins and Piotr Michalowski, 2013, pp. 155-58. Its placement immediately after the Parjanya hymn, to which it is attached as a kind of pendant, is important. Note also that all three standard words for ‘earth’ are found in the hymn: *ṛṥthivī* (1b), *bhūmi*- (1c), and *kṣám*- (3b), though in different cases and usages. The riddling middle vs. lacks such a word.

V.84.1: The exclamation with which the hymn opens, *bád*, has a very un-Indo-Aryan shape, with a plain *b* and an unmotivated retroflex *ḍ*. This *ḍ* becomes *ḷ* before words beginning with a vowel, showing the standard Ṛgvedic intervocalic change -- which, interestingly, operates across word boundary here and in the 7 other passages in which *bád* is followed by a vowel; in VIII.101.11 it becomes *ṇ* before a nasal, in VIII.101.12 a *t* before *s*. In 4 of its occurrences, incl. this one, it is immediately followed by *itthā*; the combined sense of the two particles escapes me. The non-Sanskritic phonology of *bád* suggests that there is a colloquial flavor to the word, but it is hard to capture exactly what that is -- esp. as the rest of the vs. doesn’t show markedly low register features.

Note the phonetic figures *párvatānām*# ... *ṛṥthivi*# (ab), *#prá* ... *pravatvati*# (c), and *#mahná* ... *mahini*# (d), all positioned at pāda boundaries and all involving a fem. voc. as the 2<sup>nd</sup> word. The first two pairs of course also play off each other.

This first verse presents an unsurprising picture of the earth, weighed down by mountains whose slopes define her and providing support for the life that flourishes upon her. This vs. serves as scene-setter and contrast to vs. 2.

V.84.2: *vicāriṇi* is generally taken as ‘far-wandering’ vel sim. (e.g., Ge ‘du Wandelbare’), but cf. X.173.2, where the mountain to which the newly installed king is compared is *ávicācaliḥ* ‘unwavering’; remember also that earth is said to ‘bob up and down’ (*nánnamīti*) during the thunderstorm in the preceding hymn (V.83.5).

This is the riddle vs.: the puzzle involves positing a number of qualities of the earth that don’t appear to be characteristic of her -- quite unlike the first vs. -- and implicitly asking under what circumstances these unlikely attributes would be true of the earth, who is not explicitly named. In this vs. she is addressed as a ‘wobbler’ (*vicāriṇi*), she is associated with nights (*aktúbhiḥ*), she is said to “fling moisture forward” (*perúm ásyasi*), and she is silvery (*arjuni*). Neither the unsteady actions nor the silver color and association with night are earth-like.

As Thieme already suggested (Gedichte, 58), the nights can represent the darkness of monsoon clouds and her wobbling results from the thunderstorm. She is also ‘silvery’ with rain, which she ‘flings’ in the forms of streams and rivulets down her slopes, the slopes mentioned in verse 1.

V.84.3: The first half of this verse restores to us the familiar steady, sturdy Earth

of vs. 1, while the second half identifies the special circumstances that held in vs. 2. Because it is made up of two subordinate clauses, it must be attached to the previous verse and the 2nd person referent must be the same. This verse, with its straightforward diction and balanced construction, provides the answer to those dullards in the audience who failed to solve the implicit challenge of vs. 2.

The standard tr. all supply a verb for *vidyútaḥ* -- e.g., WG “wenn ... die Blitze (blitzen) ...” -- but I don’t see why the lightning bolts can’t ‘rain’ -- in particularly violent thunderstorms lightning flashes can seem to come as thick and fast as raindrops.

Note that ‘earth’ is reunited with her usual formulaic companion ‘heaven’ in the final pāda of the hymn. It should be kept in mind that this is the only hymn dedicated only to Earth in the RV, instead of to Heaven and Earth.

### V.85 Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

On the structure of this hymn see the publ. intro. In addition to the standard treatments, Th tr. and comm. in *Gedichte*.

In the publ. intro. I would substitute “uncanny power” for “cunning.”

V.85.1: The verb *arcā* is completely ambiguous between 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. impv. (Gr, Ge, publ. tr.) and 1st sg. subjunctive (Re, Th, WG). Since there are no further references to the singer in this part of the hymn, there is no basis on which to determine which is meant -- though see 5b *prá vocam* “I proclaim,” which might favor the 1st ps. An alt. tr. would be “I will chant forth ...” In any case, there are no implications either way.

V.85.2: The verb *ví ... tatāna* is only appropriate for the complements in the first pāda (and barely even there). Starting with pāda b the verb must be *adadhāt*, which is postponed until after the caesura in the last pāda. So Ge and Re; contra Th, WG, and the publ. tr., which group pāda b with pāda a. The syntactic transition is cleverly done: all four pādas contain at least one ACC + LOC pair (one in a, two each in bcd). The expectation as the verse unfolds would be that all these pairs should be construed with *ví ... tatāna*. But though “stretched out the midspace upon the trees” works as a striking image — perhaps the trees as the pegs of a loom across which a piece of weaving is stretched —, the audience should be increasingly uncomfortable with “(stretched out) the victory prize in/on/upon (?) the steeds, the milk in/on/upon the ruddy cows ...” This discomfort is finally resolved by *adadhāt* in d. In an attempt to represent the withholding of the verb I would emend the tr. to

He stretched out the midspace upon the trees; the prize of victory in the steeds, the milk in the ruddy (cows),

resolve in hearts, fire in the waters, the sun in heaven, and soma on the mountain / stone did Varuṇa place.

In the phrase *sómam ádrau* the 2nd word is ambiguous: it can refer to the mountain on which the soma-plant grows or the stone on which it is pressed.

V.85.3: The acc. phrase *nīcīnabāram ... kāvandham* “the cask with opening below” seems a low-register item; the *-bāra-* of the adj. is most likely a MIA version of *pārā-* (see comm. ad VIII.40.5 and X.106.1) and the rare word *kāvandha-* has no clear etymology or morphological structure (see AiG II.2.725) and fairly robust representation in MIA,

though with the meaning ‘headless trunk’. The use of this homely phrase in the otherwise high rhetorical style of this hymn is somewhat jarring.

To reflect the hymn’s signature word (see publ. intro.) it would be good to explicitly render *ví* in d – perhaps “soaks the land widely” or “soaks the earth across.” It is also good to distinguish *vy ùnatti* here from *unátti* without preverb that begins the next vs.

V.85.4: In addition to the preverb-less *unátti* just noticed, the first pāda varies 3d *bhūma* with *bhūmim*. It seems unlikely that a semantic distinction is meant here, though I can’t be sure.

It is only the publ. tr. among the standard ones that recognizes that *ād ít* must constitute a very truncated main cl. to the *yadā* clause that precedes. Almost universally *ād (ít)* “(just) after that” opens its pāda and clause. It surely would not be postposed here and still form part of the *yadā* cl. (contra WG’s tr.). Instead it expresses the immediate result (or the immediately following action) of the *yadā* clause. A near parallel is III.30.12 *sám yád ānaḥ ádhvana ād ít ásvair, vimócanam kṛṇute ...* “When he has fully reached (the end) of the road, only after that does he perform his unyoking of the horses.” That example has a VP that continues in the next pāda; here the next pāda is independent – though Ge, Re, and Th implicitly push *ād ít* into c, breaching the hemistich boundary. Instead, in my view (and that of the publ. tr.) the whole clause must be simply *ād ít*. However, I do not think the *ād ít* is well rendered in the publ. tr.’s “then surely it does.” Neither the syntactic truncation nor the immediacy of the following action is captured. The abrupt breaking off is rhetorically powerful: the message is “when Varuṇa wants something, right after that (it happens).” The action is instantaneous and automatic and so does not have to be spelled out. If this were a slangy hymn, I would render *ād ít* by “right after that – bam!” Given the hymn’s high style I’ll content myself with “right after that (it’s there)!” In the publ. tr. I would also delete the colon at the end of the 1st hemistich and cap the 1st word of the next: “The mountains ...”

The publ. tr. “wishes milk to flow” for *dugdhám ... váṣṭi* also needs some adjustment. I agree that the verbal aspect of the past part. should be brought out – it doesn’t simply mean ‘milk’ (/Milch, the substance, contra Th) – but the English of the publ. tr. doesn’t match the Skt. very well. I would tr. the whole of b as “When V. wants (it [=rain/water?]) milked out, right after that (it’s there)!” Ge’s tr. of the *yadā* cl., “Wenn Varuṇa gemolken haben will ...,” is close to mine in spirit.

Although c is straightforward, d poses some problems: who are the *vīrāḥ* and is *śrathayanta* a real middle intrans., a reflexive (vel sim.), or just an *-anta* replacement with active-type meaning? With regard to the first question, both Ge and Re suggest the Maruts. This seems eminently reasonable, since they are elsewhere called *vīrāḥ* (e.g., I.85.1), they are always linked with the storm, and the two other forms of *śratháya-* in Maṇḍala V have as subject the Maruts (V.59.1) or their horses (V.54.10). WG instead suggest that the *vīrāḥ* are human workers who have been laboring hard and now, with the rains come, can take a well-deserved break. This seems unlikely, among other things because *vīrā-* would be an odd designation for such a group. Th’s view that these are humans showing symptoms of terror at the advent of the thunderstorm seems even more farfetched. As for the function of *śrathayanta*, four of the five forms belonging to the stem *śratháya-* are medial (and 3rd pl.). Two are intrans. in the meaning ‘slacken, go

slack’: V.54.10, VIII.99.6; one reflexive/internal obj. V.59.1 – as opposed to the lone act. form, the part. *śrathāyan-* at IX.68.2, with direct object. Although the fact that all the medial forms are 3rd pl. makes an *-anta* replacement explanation attractive, in fact all the clear exx. have real medial function. This is most likely the case here as well. Though Ge (n. 4d) suggests that they are loosening the clouds from the mountains – the clouds the mountains took as clothing in pāda c – a reflexive sense like Re’s “se donnent libre-cours” or the publ. tr. “let themselves loose” fits the usage of the stem better. On this stem and its averbo, see my *-āya-* p. 104. The med. form here contrasts functionally with the act. redupl. aor. *śiśrāthaḥ* in 7d.

V.85.5–6: As usual, I would substitute for “cunning” “uncanny power”—or perhaps better, since in both cases the *māyā-* seems to refer to particular phenomenon – “magic trick.”

V.85.5: The gen. phrase *āsurāsya śrutāsya ... vāruṇasya* recalls vs. 1b *vāruṇāya śrutāya*. It may not be an accident that the two times Varuṇa is called ‘famed’ in this hymn are in the vss. in which the poet’s public verbal celebration of V. is explicit: 1a *prā ... arcā* and 5b *prā vocam*.

V.85.6: I don’t think “defy” is the right nuance for *ā dadharṣa*. It is not that anyone would try to make the sea to overflow in defiance of V’s uncanny ability to keep it from doing so – rather that the power that Varuṇa has over the natural world, esp. the waters, cannot be challenged. So I would substitute “no one challenges ...”

V.85.7: On *sādam id* see Ge’s n. 7b and comm. ad I.185.8. As Ge points out, this phrase seems to qualify *sākhāyam* here, in I.185.8, and X.7.3. I would add here “comrade in perpetuity” for “partner.”

I would prefer “whatever offense ...”

The injunc. *śiśrathaḥ* elsewhere is generally used in imperatival function, appearing parallel to negative imperatives (i.e., *mā* prohibitives; II.28.7) or positive ones (IV.12.4); it is also itself found in a prohibitive in IV.32.22. (However, see I.128.6 for a non-imperatival use.) Although there are no parallel imperatives here, an imperatival value fits the context well, and this is how it is generally taken (incl. by the publ. tr.), though see WG, who take it as preterital (“hast du (nun) aufgelöst”).

V.85.8: The structure of the simile in pāda a is somewhat anomalous. For one thing, the frame should contain a 1st ps. (“we”), as is universally recognized. We should then expect the verb to be 1st pl. as well (*\*riripma*), not 3rd pl. *riripuh*, since the frame determines the verbal material, with the simile just matching nominals to nominals. Th (Ged. 51), Kü (428), and WG handle this problem by supplying a different, generic verb for the 1st pl. frame: Kü ≅ Th “Wenn [wir gehandelt haben, wie wenn] Spieler beim Spiel betrogen haben ...” But this is more disruptive than a mismatch of person because the verbal elements between frame and simile should match. Better to follow Ge, Re, and JSK (DGRV II.175), who keep the “cheat” for both simile and frame. We must then attribute the 3rd pl. verb to much-maligned “attraction.”

The simile itself is # *kitavāsaḥ ... ná dīví* # “like gamblers in a dice game.” Although usually in discontinuous similes the simile marker follows the first word (expect \**kitavāso ná ... dīví* #), the configuration found here is not unknown. The position of *ná* before the second word in the simile right before the pāda break is also by rule. See my recent “Penultimate *ná* in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism” (ECIEC 2024).

Pāda b is found also in X.139.5. There are several different ways to read the (semi-)disjunctive construction here (on which see JSK DGRV II.174–75) – on the one hand, with *yád vā ghā satyám* as one clause and *yán ná vidmá* as the other. This is the interpr. of the publ. tr., as well as Re, Th, and Kü (428). The other is to take *vidmá* as the verb of both alternatives: “whether we know it for sure or not” (i.e., consciously or not). This is the interpr. of Ge and (slightly differently) WG and the one I prefer, in part because it seems to work better in X.139.5 (though that hymn is far from clear).

With the publ. tr. (see also Re), I take *śithiréva* [= *śithirā iva*] as essentially proleptic: expressing the state of “these things” after the action of loosening takes place. This is the 3rd occurrence of the √*srath* ‘loosen’ in this hymn: 4d *śrathayanta*, 7d *śiśráthaḥ* -- but here in the Middle Indic form *śithirá-* < \**śrth(i)rá-* (see EWA s.v.). The \**r* > *i* MIA development is also seen in the word for ‘gambler’ (*kitavá-*; see also EWA s.v.) in pāda a. The adj. *sárva-* (rather than *vísva-*) is another sign of comparative lateness. All of these popular features are striking in the final vs. of an otherwise old-fashioned high-style hymn (though see also 3a).

### V.86 Indra and Agni

The hymn begins with the voc. dual dvandva *índrāgnī*, and a form of that cmpd is found in 2d, 4b, 6a; vss. 3 and 5, which lack the cmpd., begin with dual pronouns (*táyoḥ* and *tā* respectively), while dual forms of both the demonst. and the rel. pronoun are also common elsewhere in the hymn.

V.86.1: The 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is a little tricky. As noted in the publ. intro. it seems to concern the Vala myth, though with Trita as hero -- an odd substitution in a hymn at least half dedicated to Indra. Moreover, there’s a functional slippage in the accusatives with the verb *prá* √*bhid* ‘split (forth)’. The first acc., neut. pl. *dr̥ḷhā*, is of course very common, used of fastnesses or strongholds (which usually get split or otherwise breached). The standard interpr. (Gr, Old, Ge, Re) take it with *dyumnā* (e.g., Old “feste Herrlichkeiten”), but this is an uneasy collocation. The *dyumnā* should be the brilliant things desired to be obtained; they are more likely to be held within strongholds than to be strongholds themselves, and the consistent use of *dr̥ḷhá-* as ‘fastness, stronghold’ makes it unlikely that it can here refer to the thing held rather than what holds it within. I assume that *prá* √*bhid* can take a double acc.: ‘split X (to release) forth Y’, with X the container and Y the contained. Old is quite dismissive of a variant on this explanation, but I do not see the objection -- particularly as whatever *vāñīḥ* refers to, it is more likely to be the contained than the container. As for *vāñī-*, this stem usually refers to music or voices. Ge’s tentative suggestion, that these are the voices of the cows released from the Vala cave, makes the most contextual sense -- even though, as Ge points out, the word is not otherwise used of animal noises. On the other hand, as he also points out, it *is* used of rivers, so that application to non-human sounds that are comparable to a choir of human voices is possible. That *vāñī-* is also sometimes used of the choir that encourages Indra in a Vala

context (e.g., III.30.10) might add an additional resonance to the usage here, but I do not think it is the primary reading.

V.86.2: The publ. tr. starts the vs. in the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. (“you two who”) and ends in the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. (“these two”). This does not represent the text entirely fairly, because the grammatical person is entirely unclear until the last pāda, which contains an acc. dual dvandva and a 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. dual acc. prn. (*tā*) and a 1<sup>st</sup> ps. pl. verb. Until pāda d Indra and Agni are represented only by the insistent rel. du. *yā* (a, b, c). The vs. could therefore be couched entirely in the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. (“the two who ...”), as the standard tr. do. I stand by my modulatory tr. because, based on vs. 1 with its voc. dual dvandva and 2<sup>nd</sup> du. verb *āvathaḥ*, we start vs. 2 assuming the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. context carries over, and nothing disturbs that assumption until the very end of the vs.

V.86.2–4: Vs. 3 is the middle vs. of the hymn, since vs. 6 is in a different meter and is an extra-hymnic summary vs. It has the marks of an omphalos, esp. semantic and syntactic obscurity. The real difficulties lie in the central 3cd along with 4a, which is verbally related to 3cd by the problematic *eṣ*-forms (see below). The omphalos is framed, in classic omphalos fashion, by *indrāgnī (tā) havāmahe* in 2d and 4b.

V.86.3: 3cd has elicited much disc.; see esp. the lengthy treatment of it by Old, with several different possible tr. supplied, Ge’s n. 3cd, and a fairly detailed disc. in WG’s n. (now supplemented by an even lengthier and somewhat ill-tempered treatment by Slaje [Vájra, 92–94]). Among the problems are 1) what is the referent of the ‘wood(en)’ in instr. *drúnā*; 2) who is the subj. of the verb and is it his hands (*gābhastyoḥ*) that are in question; 3) what is *gávām* construed with; 4) what case is *vṛtragná*, that is, what is its pausal form?

I will begin with 3): flg. Ge (n. 3cd), I supply a loc. *\*éṣe* to govern *gávām* “(in the quest) for cattle.” This is supported by *éṣate* in this pāda, *éṣe ráthānām* “in the quest for chariots” in the next pāda (4a) likewise with gen., and X.48.9 *gávām éṣe*. As Ge suggests, *\*éṣe éṣate* may have been simplified by a sort of word-haplology. However, this interpr. is slightly complicated by the fact that I, at least, take *éṣe* and *éṣate* to different roots: *éṣe* as a loc. sg. to a thematic deriv. to *√iṣ* ‘seek’ and *éṣate* (with most) as the stem *īṣa-* + *ā*, which I take to be the orig. desid. to *√i* ‘go’ (see Gotō 1st Cl. p. 77, citing Hoffmann; Heenen Desid. 96ff.). The publ. tr. “goes questing (in his quest) for cattle” seems, however, to connect the two etymologically. I meant rather that the ‘seek’ sense of nominal *éṣa-* “bled” into the desid. sense ‘desire to go’, on the basis of their shared phonology and the fact that ‘seek to go’ is very close to ‘quest’. The verb form *éṣa-* must, of course, have a preverb, because it should not otherwise be accented.

As for 4), the underlying form of *vṛtragná* — contra the Pp and most interpr., who take it as dat. *vṛtragné* — I think it is a genitive (*vṛtragnáh*), dependent on *gābhastyoḥ* -- a possibility floated but ultimately rejected by Old. A parallel passage with a weapon (in fact, a *didyút*; see our 3b) being wielded in the arms of a man is found in VII.25.1 *pátāti didyún náryasya bāhóḥ*. A dat. does not make much sense here because *ā* *√iṣ* doesn’t ordinarily take a dative, nor does *prāti*, so we are left with no way to fit a dat. *\*vṛtragné* into the existing syntax of the sentence, save as a free-floating dat. of benefit. (Re, curiously, seems to take it as a loc. “chez Vṛtraḥaṇ” [*sic* the retroflex *ṇ*]). This seems

to go back to an idea of Hillebrandt's that it belongs to an otherwise unattested thematic stem; see Old. This has nothing to recommend it.) In answer to 2), if I am thus correct that the hands are those of Indra, it seems likely that he is also the subject of *éṣate*. Otherwise the subject is an unidentified other party or (so most interpr.) is the missile (*didyút*) of pāda b. What then to do with *drúnā*? This is the most problematic of the problems. Most interpr. take it as the handle of the *didyút* (which, acdg. to WG, might be a sort of Vedic boomerang). In VIII.96.11 and IX.98.2, the same instr. seems to refer to a wooden paddle or the like. A similar wooden implement, usable as a weapon, may be meant here -- though it seems a come-down for vajra-wielding Indra. More likely it is equipment esp. suitable for cattle herding -- a prod or goad, and this would account for Indra's trading in his usual weapon for something more appropriate to a quest for cows. Of course, since soma is usually poured into wooden cups, this may also depict Indra with a wooden soma cup in his hands, preparing to drink before he goes out on his quest. I might emend the publ. tr. to "With the wooden (goad / soma-cup) in the hands ..."

I am not at all certain of the correctness of any of these answers to the questions posed above. Nor do I have any explanation for *práti*, beyond pointing out that 4c begins with rhyming *pátī*. And, most especially, I don't understand why this cramped and obscure half-verse is found in this otherwise rather anodyne hymn.

V.86.4: As noted above, the *éṣe* + GEN. here helps explain 3cd. It is also integrated into the omphalos-framing (semi)repeated pāda *indragnī havāmahe*. Most standard tr., however, render *éṣe* here not as 'in quest of, in pursuit of', but as 'rush, run, course' (e.g., Ge "im Rennen der Wagen," Re "pour la course de chars", WG "anlässlich eines Wagenrennens"), implicitly accepting Gr's separation of *éṣa-* into two stems 'das Hineilen, Eilen' and 'Aufsuchen, Begehren'. *éṣe* + GEN is found three times elsewhere in V -- V.41.5, 8 (both *rāyá éṣe* "in quest of wealth") and this very pāda in V.66.3 -- and it seems uneconomical to give these similar syntagms in the same maṇḍala two entirely different meanings. Old (ZDMG 62: 477–78 [=KlSch 286–87]) makes similar points, arguments accepted by Bl (RReps ad V.66.3).

With the phrase *turásya rādhasaḥ* compare the compd. *tuvi-rādhās-* (3x, incl. V.58.2). This pair, compd. and free phrase with *tuvi-* and *turá-* respectively, confirms at least a synchronic connection between the Caland compding form *tuvi-* and the *-rá-* adjective, even though from  $\sqrt{tū}$  we should expect long-vowel *\*tūrá-*. Contamination with *turá-* 'swift, impetuous' surely contributed to the vowel shortening, as is generally supposed: the two adjectives would be hard to sort out in many contexts where vague and general flattery was being conveyed. For *turá-* and  $\sqrt{tū}$ , see also *tavāse turāya* (3x) with a different derivative of  $\sqrt{tū}$ .

V.86.5: On *vṛdhánt-* see comm. ad I.158.1.

The verb *puró dadhe* gives a more Agni-esque cast to the vs. than the more Indraic vss. that have preceded.

The standard tr. separate c and d into two clauses, but I think the two expressions are meant to be balanced against each other. The idea seems to be that although (*cid*) the two gods deserve portions (*árhantā*), I have set them out as if they themselves were portions (*ámśā-iva*), prizes for a prize-winning steed. What it means to "set them out" I

don't know. It's worth noting that *√arh* regularly takes *pītám* 'drink(ing), share of drink' as object (e.g., V.51.6), so the reciprocal notion would be familiar to the audience.

V.86.6: *havyá*, so accented, is generally 'oblation', as opposed to *hávya-* 'invocation'. However, in this case it is difficult not to see a pun, with the hymn just completed counting both as an oblation ("like ghee ...," pāda c) and an invocation, accompanying the physical oblation. The pun is further enabled by the adj. *śūṣyà-* 'forceful', which in its other two occurrences (I.54.3, VII.66.1) modifies types of speech (*vācas-* and *stóma-* respectively).

This pun may help explain the curious expression "like ghee purified by stones" (*ghṛtām ná pūtām ádribhiḥ*). The problem of course is that it is soma, not ghee, that is purified by stones. It is very doubtful that stones could play a role in preparing melted butter (pity the poor cow), and although the root *√pū* is occasionally used of *ghṛtá-* (VI.10.2 and esp. the fixed simile *ghṛtām ná pūtām* in III.2.1, IV.10.6, and esp. the very similar VIII.12.4 *ghṛtām ná pūtām adriṣah*) -- and consider the English term for ghee, "clarified butter" -- it is overwhelming characteristic of soma. The standard tr. deal with the disharmony in this simile by separating it into two -- e.g., Ge "durch die Presssteine (gepresst), wie Schmalz geklärt." By contrast, I think the ill-assorted technology in the simile was deliberately introduced, to match the same punning lack of fit in the frame, where the forceful/noisy *havyá-* has been poured (*áhāvi*): the jarring "ghee pressed by stones" calls attention to the more subtle mismatch in the frame. We might almost call this ritual synaesthesia.

### V.87 Maruts

The final hymn of the maṇḍala, a Marut hymn separated from the cycle earlier in the maṇḍala (52–61), is attributed to Evayāmarut Ātreya, with the name transparently derived from the somewhat puzzling interjection *evayāmarut* that ends the second pāda of every vs.

Re nicely characterizes this hymn (in his comm. on vs. 5) "l'hymne est fait de débris empruntés au cycle ancien des M." Certainly there is a sense that the vss. are constructed of loosely connected phrases, which may well be connected with the unusual meter.

As disc. in the publ. intro., the final word of the 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda of each vs., *evayāmarut*, appears to be an exclamatory internal refrain without syntactic connection to the rest of the vs. Ge by contrast takes it in each case as forming a nominal sentence with unexpressed Viṣṇu (usually, but see below): "(Viṣṇu is der) mit dem die Marut gern kommen." But though Viṣṇu is surprisingly prominent in this hymn, I don't think he outranks the Maruts, and the formation of *evayāmarut* is too peculiar to be folded into a conventional (if invisible) nominal clause. Though sg., I think it must refer to the Maruts, who, after all, appear in the collective sg. in the rest of the vs. (pādas cde) as a troop (*śárdha-*). For the phrase on which this is built, see V.41.16 *evayā marutaḥ*.

V.87.1: The grammatical identity of *giriḥ* (in sandhi) 'mountain-born' is problematic (see Old's disc.). The Pp. takes it as *giriḥ*, which could be nom. pl. fem. (so Gr and Re) and modify 'thoughts', but this makes little sense: the thoughts in question are surely home-grown, as it were, not outsourced from a mountain. (Though Old's offhand

suggestion that the cmpd might mean “in der Rede geboren,” with otherwise unattested loc. sg. of *gír-* ‘hymn’, is worth considering as a second punning reading, suitable for ‘thoughts’. See *girā* in 3a.) *giriḥ* could likewise be nom. sg. masc. and refer to Viṣṇu. This is the basis for Ge’s first Satzparenthese “-- er ist der Berggeborene, mit dem die Marut gern kommen --” and he is followed by Scar (136). But switching the ref. to Viṣṇu from dative (... *mahé ... viṣṇave, marútvate*) to nominative in the middle of a pāda right at the end of the dative phrase is highly unlikely. Although the morphology doesn’t entirely work, I think it must be a dative. The problem of course is that the dat. to this *-ā-* root noun should be underlying \**giriḥ*, which should appear in sandhi as *giriḥā*, not *-jā*, as here. It should be noted, however, that datives in *-é* to root nouns in *-ā-* are exceedingly rare (see Macd., Vedic Gr. p. 252; AiG III.125), and beside them exist infinitives in *-ái* to roots in *-ā-* (Macd. loc cit.; AiG III.129) like *pratikhyái, vayo-dhaí*. Esp. in this sandhi situation, I see no reason why this extended dat. sg. would not have been available even to a non-infinitive. In favor of a dat. referring to Viṣṇu is the very similar passage I.154.3 *prá viṣṇave sūśám etu mánma, giriḥṣíta urugāyāya vṣṇe*, with the semantically corresponding dat. root-noun cmpd. *giriḥṣíte* ‘mountain-dwelling’ in a lengthy dat. phrase referring to Viṣṇu and *prá ... etu mánma* matching our *matáyo yantu* almost exactly. (Curiously WG tr. *giriḥ* as if a dat. parallel to *marútvate* “... zum grossen Viṣṇu, der in Begleitung der Maruts ist, der in den Bergen geboren ist,” but Scar, who was responsible for this vol. of WG, seems to hold onto the nom. sg. interpr. in his n. -- though the n. is a bit incoherent.)

The hapax cmpd *bhandád-iṣṭi-* is variously rendered. Both Ge and WG (latter flg. Gotō, 1<sup>st</sup> pres. cl., 224) interpr. *-iṣṭi-* as “sacrifice” (hence Ge’s ‘opferliebend’, WG ‘deren Opferungen erfreuen’). But *-iṣṭi-* is far more often ‘desire, quest, seeking’ than ‘sacrifice’ in the RV, and notice the concentration of such forms of *√iṣ* in the previous hymn (V.86.3, 4, at least by my interpr.). As Lowe points out (*Participles*, 270–71), *bhandát-* and its ilk result from reanalysis of governing cmpds, producing pseudo-act. participles to roots without an active paradigm (like *√bhand*, which is otherwise only middle). The cmpd is exactly parallel to rhyming *krandád-iṣṭi-* (X.100.2), whose interpr. also varies. Although both cmpds have the look of governing cmpds, neither *√bhand* nor *√krand* is transitive; I therefore think we have more or less standard bahuvrīhi semantics ‘having a fortunate quest’ and ‘having a roaring quest’ respectively, whose English I have adjusted to something more palatable.

The adjectivally accented *távase* beginning d points up the nominally accented rhyming *śávase* at the end of e. With Re I think the Maruts are being equated with *śavas-* itself, but it would be possible to take *śávase* as a separate purpose dative ‘for strength’ (with or without *távase*).

On *dhúni-vrata-* see comm. ad V.58.2.

V.87.2: This vs. is quite loosely constructed. To begin with, the rel. cl. of ab has no obvious main clause, though the two *yé*’s do, of course, refer to the Maruts, who show up in the voc. in c. The rel. cl. could also hang off vs. 1, with pl. *yé* picking up the collective sg. *śárdha-* in 1cde.

The next question is what belongs with each *yé*. The easiest solution and the one taken by the standard tr. (as well as Klein DGRV I.118) is to take the first as a nominal cl. *yé jātā mahinā* and the 2<sup>nd</sup> as containing the accented verb *prá ... bruváte*. But there

are several factors against this. For one thing the *prá* that begins the 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda is actually a repeat of the one that begins the vs. (#*prá yé jātāḥ ... yé ca ... , prá ... bruváte ...*); that is, the first *prá* seems to have been extracted from the second *yé* clause and fronted around the first, which may well be a violation of RVic clause structure and at best is highly unusual. If we take *prá ... , prá ... bruváte ...* as the verb for both *yé* clauses, as I do, it is considerably less problematic. Moreover, the *yé ... yé ca* construction is far more at home in expressing complementary pairs (see Klein I.115–16) than in conjoining coreferential entities with semantically unconnected predicates, as the standard tr. requires (e.g., Klein 118: “Who were born with greatness and who now themselves proclaim (their might) with knowledge.”). In my interpr. the *yé ... yé ca* construction expresses two types of Marut birth, “born/produced by might” and “self(-produced/born),” with the *svayám* signalling the 2<sup>nd</sup> type. The Maruts are called *svajāḥ* in I.168.2; cf. also I.64.4 *sākām jajñire svadháyā ...* “They [=Maruts] were born all at once by their own power.” I see only two arguments against my interpr.: 1) the *nú* in the second *yé* clause, which might mark a chronological progression (as in Klein’s tr. [also WG]; Ge and Re both ignore the *nú*, and it’s certainly true that *nú* need not be temporal); 2) the apparently required underlying assumption that there are two groups of Maruts. As to that, I don’t think the complementary pairing needs to indicate that there are two distinct groups of Maruts sorted by their means of birth, but rather that we can view their births in different ways.

The next question is how to construe *prá ... bruváte*. Ge and WG both take it as reflexive “announce themselves,” but *prá √brū* is not elsewhere reflex./pass., even in the middle. Re supplies as object “leur naissance,” which can be justified, but I prefer Klein’s “their might.” The resonant word *sávas-* is found on either side of this phrase, at the ends of 1e and 2c and is the focus of 2cde, and *prá √brū* elsewhere takes such objects (*indriyám* I.55.4, *bālāni* X.54.2).

The rest of the vs. consists, in my opinion (flg. Re), of two parallel clauses, each beginning with instr. of respect, followed by *tád* and a gen. referring to the Maruts (2<sup>nd</sup> ps. in c, 3<sup>rd</sup> in d), and, as predicate, a negated form of *√dhṛṣ* ‘dare (against), assail’. The *tád* is specified as *sávas-* in the first clause, which identification carries over into the second:

*krátvā            tád vo (maruto) nādhṛṣe sávaḥ*  
*dānā mahnā    tád eṣām            ádhṛṣtāso (nādrayaḥ)*

This striking parallelism makes the interpr. of Ge and WG unlikely: they take *krátvā* as the weapon that someone might try to use, unsuccessfully, against the Maruts’ *sávas-*, whereas *dānā mahnā* they take as instr. of respect. Actually, Ge’s treatment is more complicated: his tr. reflects the interpr. I just paraphrased (“Diese eure Macht ist nicht durch Einsicht zu erzwingen”), but in his n. 2c–e he describes the three instr. as parallel: “Der Sinn ist jedenfalls, dass keiner wagt, es ihnen an Umsicht, Freigebigkeit und Grösse gleichzutun.”

As Ge points out (n. 2e), masc. pl. *ádhṛṣtāsaḥ* has been attracted to the number and gender of the simile (*ádrayaḥ*); it is still specifying *sávaḥ* in the frame.

It’s also worth noting that pādas c and d both contain *ná* in sandhi with a following vowel in quite similar phonological sequences: *nādhṛṣe ... nādrayaḥ*. The first *ná* is the negative (matched by *a-* in *ádhṛṣtāsaḥ* in the next pāda); the 2<sup>nd</sup> is the simile marker.

V.87.3: Like vs. 2 this vs. begins with several relative clauses (*yé pāda a, yéṣām c*), with no clear main clause.

The first pāda of this vs. is syntactically straightforward, but we might wonder why the Maruts are heard “through a/their hymn.” In answer, there is the fact, often referred to above, that the Maruts are singers as well as sung-to. Further, in this context their “hymn” may be a metaphorical reference to thunder. It is also possible that it is a pun, as indicated in the publ. tr. and also implicitly by Scar (537), with the *-ā* variant form of the *i*-stem loc. sg. of *girí-*. (Interestingly Scar’s alternative “mit einem Lied (/im Gebirge)” in the root noun book is not reflected in his tr. in WG, which limits itself to “mit ihrem Lied.”) Of course, such a loc. sg. would be wrongly positioned: it is the *-au* loc. sg. form that is overwhelmingly found at pāda end (see, e.g., Lanman, Noun Infl., p. 385), but as a secondary punning reading the “wrong” form could be acceptable, esp. as it precedes a consonant, as most forms of loc. sg. *-ā* do. Thus the Maruts would be heard “on a mountain” -- as their storm often is.

The hapax nom. sg. *írī* is problematic formally and semantically. In this sandhi sit. the long *ī* final can only belong to a devī-type *-ī* stem or an *-in*-stem. It is usually cited as the latter (e.g., Gr, EWA), but this analysis seems excluded formally because *-in*-stems are always suffix-accented. An underlying *-in*-stem is emphatically denied by AiG II.2.328 (“Die Barytona v. *írī* ... gehören nicht hierher”; see also Old’s serious doubts). Debrunner (AiG II.2.407–8) seems to favor (if “favoring” means sticking it in that section but then calling it “ganz unklar”) a masc. devī-type *-ī*-stem, but of course such stems are rare and problematic in all their occurrences. Nothing in the passage actually excludes an analysis as a *feminine -ī*-stem, but who would such a feminine be? The other question of course is what is it derived from and what does it mean. I follow the line of least resistance that has been fld. by a number of others and connect it with *írya-*, which is better attested though not much clearer, and is found in another Marut hymn in V, V.58.4; see comm. ad loc. If the basic sense is something like ‘energetic’, the form of *írya-* in V.58.4 is positive in sense, while *írī* is negative.

I do not understand the pāda-final *ā*. Assuming that *īṣte* belongs to  $\sqrt{īṣ}$ , that root does not otherwise appear with *ā* (or any other preverb). It’s worth noting that *īṣte* here is the only *t*-full 3<sup>rd</sup> sg.; the usual and very well-attested 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. is, of course, *īṣe*. We might try to connect the form with  $\sqrt{īṣ}$  or  $\sqrt{iṣ}$ , but neither is promising formally or semantically.

The last pāda, *prá syandrāso dhúnīnām*, confronts us with a lexical conundrum: it contains two plurals, one nom., one gen., both of which are good Marut words. For the Maruts as *syandrā-* see V.52.3, 8; for *dhúni-* see *dhúni-vrata-* in this hymn (1e) and V.58.2, as well as the simplex adj. in numerous passages (e.g., V.60.7). So which one modifies the (unexpressed) Maruts, and what should we do with the other? The poet seems to be messing with our minds: we encounter the first, *syandrāsaḥ*, and understandably assume it refers to the Maruts, then come to the second, *dhúni-*, which is an even more characteristic Marut word, and have to readjust. Ge supplies ‘chariots’ (Wagen, sim. WG Fahrzeuge) with the nominative, and the publ. tr. tentatively follows that. Re manages to make both words refer to the Maruts, “(dieux) bruyants qui rapides (vont) de l’avant,” breezily remarking “il n’est pas indispensable de sous-entendre « les chars ».” But, though I’m sympathetic to his intuition that both words should refer to the Maruts, the grammatical difference is unambiguous. In Max Müller’s tr. of this hymn (SBE 32), he tr. “the rushing chariots of these roaring Maruts come forth” and notes that

“chariot” was Oldenberg’s suggestion (presumably in their consultation on the SBE translations; the suggestion is not registered in the *Noten*). One of the problems with supplying “chariots” is the preceding pāda (d), also in the nom. pl., which seems clearly to describe the Maruts. If *syandrāsaḥ* does not refer to the Maruts but to their chariots, we must either assume that the flashing entities in d are also chariots or put an unsignalled break between the two pādas. The publ. tr. essentially does the latter, but it is unsatisfactory. Ge does the former, which isn’t satisfactory either, and WG stir the pot even further by supplying ‘weapons’ as the comparandum in d.

V.87.4: The “common seat” (*samānāsmāt sādasaḥ*) is presumably one shared by Viṣṇu and the Maruts and is also presumably the same as the *sadhāstha-* in the previous vs. (3c) -- perhaps the midspace? The standard interpr. (incl. mine) also assume the same seat (or a similar place) is the referent of *svāt* ‘from his own’ in pāda c. For other exx. of the idiom  $\sqrt{yuj}$  + ABL. ‘yoke from’ with ‘seat’ in the abl., see Old.

Similar to *āyukta tmānā* is V.52.8 *prā ... yujata tmānā*; in the latter passage the verb is used absolutely, without expressed obj. That is possible here too, though it is also possible, and indeed more likely, to take *viṣpardhaso vīmahasaḥ* in d as the obj. (so also Re and WG), referring to horses, an interpr. that saves supplying a verb to govern that phrase, as Ge does (“lenkt”). (See Max Müller’s solution below.) It should be noted, however, that neither of these adjectives is otherwise used of horses: *viṣpardhas-* is found twice elsewhere, once of human contenders (I.173.10), once of, apparently, flames (VIII.23.2); *vīmahas-* is only attested once elsewhere, in I.86.1 of the Maruts. Max Müller in the SBE 32 tr. takes the two adj. as a voc. phrase addressed to the Maruts. This seems unlikely in the middle of a sentence devoted to Viṣṇu and only turning to the Maruts in its last word, *nṛbhiḥ*, and so a ‘horse’ interpr. seems the best course.

The publ. tr. renders *ādhi ṣṇūbhiḥ* as “upon the (mountains’) backs,” but in accord with the standard sense of this phrase (e.g., V.60.7) and in harmony with the standard tr. I would now alter this to “along the (mountains’) backs.” This complicates the rendering of the rest of the clause, because there is no verb of motion, just ‘yoke’. Both Re and WG supply an expression to provide this motion: Re “(pour courir) à travers les hauteurs” and WG “(zur Ausfahrt) über die (Berg-)Rücken.” Reluctantly I would join them and supply something like “(to travel) along ...”

The standard explanation of *śevṛdha-* as a haplology of *\*śéva-vṛdha-* (already Gr, endorsed by AiG I.279, tentatively also by EWA s.v. *śéva-*) seems correct, but this does not settle its sense. Cmpds in *-vṛdha-* have a range of senses, both transitive and intransitive, and of relationships to their 1<sup>st</sup> member, and none of the quite varied contexts in which *śevṛdha-* appears is sufficiently diagnostic. Several of them apply to Agni as the ritual fire just kindled (X.46.3, X.61.20 [the latter accented *śevavṛdhá-*]); once (I.54.11) it is used of ‘brilliance’ (*dyumná-*) and once (III.16.2) of ‘riches’ (*rāyaḥ*). The preponderance of the evidence, esp. the two “fire just born” passages, seems to point to an intransitive/passive reading of *-vṛdha-* and an instr. reading of *śé(va)-*, hence ‘growing strong through kindness/benevolence’ or, perhaps better in English, ‘through kind attention’ (to which I would now change this tr.). Although an intrans. reading of the publ. tr.’s “strengthening with kindness” is possible, this English expression is more likely to be read as transitive, and I would therefore alter the tr. to the clearer ‘growing

strong ...’ What this descriptor means in our passage is entirely unclear to me -- that the Maruts are treating Viṣṇu well and he thrives?

V.87.5: Note the chiasmic phonetic figure that begins the vs.: *svanó ná vo*.

The caus. injunc. *rejayat* needs an obj. I supply ‘earth’ on the basis of intrans. *rejate* passages with *bhūmi-*, *pṛthivī*, et sim. as subj., but any standard cosmic feature will do (Re ‘I’univers’, WG ‘alles’).

*Pace* Gr, *ṛñjāta* is better analyzed as a 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. mid. athem. form than a 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. act. them. All the standard tr. follow the 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. mid. interpr.

The source of *sthāraśman-* is disputed. First note that this peculiar form can be partially motivated contextually: 6c begins *sthātāro*, so there was some incentive to begin our pāda with a word of similar shape. We can begin by dismissing the odd Pp analysis of this cmpd, *sthāḥ’raśman-*. It is difficult to know what this is meant to represent. AiG II.1.316 and II.2.9 take *sthā-* simply as the cmpded root or root noun, and Wackernagel (II.1.316) classifies it with verb-first verbal governing cmpds, an analysis that has been taken up by others (see e.g. Tribulato, *Ancient Greek Verb-Initial Compounds*, 164 and passim), though there are no transitive forms to  $\sqrt{sthā}$  except the *p*-causative. Bloomfield (RVReps ad loc.) suggests that it’s “a kind of haplogy” from *sth(ir)āraśmānaḥ*, with *sthirā-* ‘firm’ as 1<sup>st</sup> member (note Sāy.’s gloss *sthiraraśmayo*), and this is accepted by Ge (n. 5d). It is not clear where the long *ā-* of his posited *sth(ir)ā-* would come from, however; is he thinking of a nom. pl. syntagm *\*sthirā raśmānaḥ*, with univerbation and loss of the noun’s accent? Moreover, in the Nachtr. to AiG II.1.316 [=Nachtr. 87] Debrunner points out that haplogy of Bl’s posited form should produce *\*sthirāśman-* (undoubtedly why Bl calls it “a kind of haplogy”). Re proposes a 1<sup>st</sup> member adj. *\*sthāmán-* ‘bien en place’ or ‘solide’, internally derived from the noun *sthāman-* ‘station, standing place’, but this requires several more steps derivationally and semantically, and the haplogy (if that’s what he sees it as) would involve loss over an intermediate syllable and loss of a heavy consonant-final syllable, both of which are problematic: *sthāmán-raśman-*. Certainly *sthirā-* makes the most sense semantically, but, as noted above, Bl’s haplogy runs into formal difficulties. However, if we begin with my observation that 6c #*sthātāro* makes a *sthā* opening desirable, an irregular reduction of *\*sthirā-raśman-* may be the best option. In fact if we operate with a slightly different form of the 1<sup>st</sup> member, the development may be easier to explain. I suggest positing a reduced form of *sthirā-*, namely *\*sthrá-*, showing the same *-irV-* ~ *-rV-* alternation as *índra-* ~ *\*índira-* (metrically guaranteed, but not transmitted in the Saṃhitā; cf. AiG I.55) and the 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. med. pf. endings *-ire* and *-re* (AiG I.23). *\*sthrá-* would thus show the loss of an apparent svarabhakti vowel, rather than the insertion of one. The posited cmpd *\*sthrá-raśman-* would then undergo liquid dissimilation, not haplogy. This still doesn’t explain the long *ā-*, but the parallel *sthātāraḥ* might help there.

V.87.6: Note #*sthātāraḥ ... sthanaḥ*.

This vs. reprises some of what came before. The focus on *śávas-* earlier in the hymn (1e, 2cde) is emphatically revived with ab ... *vṛddhaśavasah ... śávaḥ*; the hapax epithet *suśukvan-* in the nom. pl.. *suśúkvānaḥ* in 3b is cleverly echoed by the pf. part. *śuśukvāmsah*, where the redupl. *śu-* matches the prefix *su-*; and the simile in 3d *agnáyo ná svávidyutaḥ* appears in reverse order (and a different shared quality) in *śuśukvāmsa*

*ná-agnáyah*. There is also a local repetition of *tveṣá-* in 6b, echoing the same stem in the same position in 5b.

V.87.7: This vs., too, reprises earlier material: there is a 3<sup>rd</sup> “fires” simile, this time marked with *yathā*, not *ná*, and extended over the pāda boundary (*agnáyo yathā, tuvidyumnāḥ*); *avantu* in b echoes *avatu* in 6b in the same metrical position; the ‘seat’ returns for the third time (pāda c), with yet a different word: *sádman-* versus 3c *sadhástha-* and 4b *sádas-*.

The last two pādas present several problems. One is how to reconcile *yéṣām* and *sárdhāmsi*, which are presumably coreferential and refer to the Maruts. Simplest is to accept Ge’s “der reflexive Gebrauch des Relativs” (n. 7d); cf., e.g., V.61.12 and comm. thereon. The publ. tr. does not render *yéṣām* literally, but as “when ... of them,” for the sake of English, since “at whose drives” is awkward in context.

The causal connection between the journey of the Maruts (d) and the spreading out of the earth (c) is clear in V.58.7, also adduced by Ge: *prátiṣṭha yāman pṛthivī cid eṣām* “Even the Earth has spread herself at their journey,” but pāda c cannot be brought into the domain of the relative in d (though Old tries) because of the lack of accent on the verb *paprathe* in c. Instead d and e must together make a circumstantial clause dependent on c. With Ge and Re I supply a verb of motion ‘ap(proach)’; this can be partly generated from the *ā* in c, though that *ā* is primarily a postposition with the loc. and is not in the right place for a preverb in tmesis. The *étana* in the next vs. (8a) may support the supplying of a verb of motion here.

The next question in de is the grammatical analysis and reference of *maháh*, which presents us with entirely too many possibilities: abl./gen. sg or nom./acc. pl. of *máh-*, nom. sg. of *mahá-*, adv. *mahás*. On the basis of the gen. phrase in the next vs., 8c *vīṣṇor maháh* (cf. also 1a *mahé ... vīṣṇave*), I take it as gen. sg. and supply Viṣṇu: the Marut troops are here said to be Viṣṇu’s. This more or less follows Ge; Re takes *maháh* as adv., WG as nom. sg. See also Old’s disc.

The final problem is the bahuvrīhi *ádbhuta-enas-*, which is found once elsewhere (VIII.67.7). The problem is to find some plausible overlap between the senses of the two members and a plausible reason why whatever is so constructed should apply to the Maruts. The standard sense of *énas-* is ‘offense, transgression, outrage’; *ádbhuta-* is famously problematic, but probably the most widely accepted analysis currently is as a negated form of *√dabh* ‘deceive, trick, harm’ (see EWA s.v.), hence ‘infallible, unerring’, shading (probably because of loss of transparency) into ‘wonderful, astonishing, ineffable’. Put these together and you get the highly unconvincing ‘having infallible offenses’ or the like -- not a good epithet for a favored group of gods. Clearly something has to give, and in most interpr. it’s the semantic integrity of the parts; e.g., Re decides that *énas-* here preserves an earlier sense, derived from its relationship to *inóti* and means ‘élan’, yielding a cmpd “à l’élan extraordinaire,” which fits smoothly into the context by virtue of suppressing the semantics of both cmpd members. In the other occurrence of the cmpd in VIII.67.7 I take it as applying to the Ādityas (most others see it as a gen. sg.) and meaning ‘whom (others’) offenses cannot mislead’. That is, the stripped-down sense is ‘possessing unmisleading/misleadable offenses’, but the offenses are committed by others and the Ādityas are not misled by them. This may provide more tricky structure than a bahuvrīhi can quite manage, but it does preserve the lexical senses of both members. It

may mean this here as well -- the Maruts are no more trickable than the Ādityas -- and I propose that as an alternate tr. But the publ. tr. takes a different route, with the sense ‘harm’ for  $\sqrt{dabh}$ , hence ‘whose offenses are beyond harm’ -- meaning, perhaps, that the violence and turmoil attendant on the Maruts’ stormy passage on the one hand leave no lasting damage and on the other cannot be held against the Maruts. They are not moral lapses.

Note the figure in c: *pr̥thú paprathe ... pārthivam*, which is both phonological and etymological.

V.87.8: The first word in the vs. *adveṣāḥ* must be adverbial; it of course resonates with the 2<sup>nd</sup> to last word in the vs., *dvéṣāṃsi*.

The construction of the gen. (or possibly, in principle, abl.) phrase *viṣṇor mahāḥ* isn’t entirely clear. Old is insistent that it belongs with the voc. *samanyavaḥ*, hence “of equal fervor with Viṣṇu,” but this adj. is not otherwise construed with a third party but rather indicates that those so described are equally fervent with each other. Moreover, the genitive is not the most likely case for the proposed meaning, and we might also expect the gen. phrase to lose its accent or take vocative accent if it were part of the vocative phrase. The standard tr. take the gen. as simply identifying the Maruts as “Viṣṇu’s,” and this may well be the best way to do it. The publ. tr. construes it with *smát* ‘together with’ at the beginning of d, as Gr also indicates. The genitive case is problematic, however: *smát* takes the instr. Further, as Ge points out, rather than *smát* we should expect *\*asmát*, the 1<sup>st</sup> pl. abl. prn. to be construed with *yuyotana ... ápa dvéṣāṃsi* “keep hatreds away from us”; see parallels cited by Ge in n. 8d. Unfortunately *asmát* does not work metrically. WG cleverly suggest that the end of c and the beg. of d, underlyingly *\*yuyotanā \*asmát*, were combined in sandhi as *\*yuyotanāsmát* and then decoupled first into *\*yuyotanā, smát* and then, with shortening of the variable final vowel of the impv., to the transmitted *yuyotana, smát*.

The instr. *daṃsánā* must belong with the simile: cf. VIII.101.2 *tā bāhūtā ná daṃsánā ratharyataḥ* “With their wondrous skill as if with their arms they drive their chariot,” also adduced by Ge.

V.87.9: The first two pādas of this vs. are essentially variants on the first two pādas of the previous vs., with 8a *gātum étana* corresponding to 9a *gántā* and *śrótā hávam* identically opening both b pādas. The adverbial *adveṣāḥ* ‘without hatred’ in 8a is matched by *arākṣāḥ* ‘undemonically’ in 9b, though the adv. has been moved to the second cl. (With Re I take it as an adv.; Gr takes it as an adj. with *hávam*, which requires him to identify only this occurrence of *háva-* as a neut.; WG see it as a nominative in a stand-alone nominal sentence. The patterning of vss. 8–9 just laid out makes the adverbial interpr. the strongest one.)

The final word of pāda, *susámi*, makes both metrical and morphological trouble. The pāda is short a syllable (11, not 12) and the cadence is bad even for a Triṣṭubh, with a light penultimate syllable. Gr proposes to fix the first of these problems by reading *susámiyā*, but though this gets us 12 syllables, it makes the cadence worse -- not to mention that there’s no reason why the textual change would have occurred. Old proposes to read *susámī*, matching the other two instr. occurrences of this stem; the same phenomenon is found with the simplex, where an instr. *sámi* with short final occurs at the

end of the pāda, while *śámī* is found pāda-internal. Since in our passage the next pāda begins with a cons. cluster, the original length of the final vowel would be obscured anyway. However, this suggestion does nothing to fix the cadence or the deficient syllable. See also the disc. in WG; in the WG tr. they take it as a neut. acc., but the disc. in the n. is more equivocal. I have no solution. Of course, those who wish to see laryngeal effects preserved at this stage would argue that the problematic short penultimate could be explained by the fact that  $\sqrt{sam}$  is a set root and the root syllable would originally have been heavy (*\*śamH* in a bastardized notation).

The rest of the vs. is more opaque, or rather it is difficult to reconcile the simile in c with the directive to the Maruts in de. The problem is similar to the one posed by *ádbhuta-enas-* -- that the two parts of the expression are semantically disharmonious. The wish expressed to the Maruts is that they should be *durdhártu-*, which should mean ‘difficult to maintain or uphold’ or, extending the sense of  $\sqrt{dhr}$  a bit, ‘difficult to restrain’. This works pretty well in the directive: the Maruts should not hold back from punishing someone who insults one of us. The gen./abl. *nidáh* is not the ideal case, but it may well refer back to the same form in 6d *té na uruṣyatā nidáh* “deliver us from insult,” with a highly condensed expression. In the publ. tr. I have tr. the form in 9e as “at an insult” rather than “from an insult,” because “difficult to restrain from an insult” sounds as if the Maruts are itching to insult *us*. The question is -- why are they like ancient mountains (*jyēṣṭhāso ná párvatāsaḥ*) when they are acting thus? As a class of objects, mountains are among the least likely to need restraining: they are fixed and stable. Ge gets out of this problem by supplying, out of whole cloth, a different quality that the Maruts and the mountains have in common, the parenthetical “(ragend),” but there is no basis for this. WG take *jyēṣṭha-* itself as the point of comparison and push its sense: “sehr mächtig wie die Berge.” I think the clue to the solution is the location of these mountains, *vyòman* ‘in distant heaven’. There are of course no mountains in heaven, at least in the usual Vedic cosmological picture -- but there *used* to be: the winged mountains that flew around until Indra clipped their wings. The splv. *jyēṣṭhāsaḥ* ‘most ancient’ may refer to this primal, unclipped state. Although this interpr. may seem farfetched, I think it best accounts for the odd expression -- and this may be Re’s view too, based on his tr. “comme de très puissantes montagnes (qui circuleraient) dans l’espace” (he has no disc.). Note in any case that the mountains here recall the mountain(s) in vs. 1 (*giriḡā-*) and possibly vs. 3; the agreement in sense with vs. 1 provides another example of non-lexical ring composition.