

## Commentary VII.56–104

### VII.56 Maruts

VII.56.1: Ge takes cd to be the answer to the question in ab, but since vs. 2 seems more directly responsive to the question, I take cd here as simply further specification of the subject of the question.

Unusually, *īm* has no acc. function; there is no possible accusative role it could fill.

I consider *vyàktā(s)* to be at least an implied pun. The first reading is as the nom. pl. m. of the ppl. of *ví √añj* ‘anoint, ornament’, referring presumably to the Maruts’ characteristic adornments and their glistening appearance as (wet) bearers of rain. This interpr. is reflected in all the standard tr. However, I think it also is meant to contrast with *sānīlāḥ* ‘of the same nest’, as an indication that the Maruts are also separate individuals, and employing the common *ví / sá(m)* polarization. The problem is to identify a morphological form that could be represented by *vyàktā(s)* and express the sense ‘separate, individual’ vel sim. I hesitantly suggest that we start with the *-añc-* stem, *vy-āñc-*, found only in the cmpd. *uru-vyāñc-* ‘wide-spreading’. (The rarity of this stem may be accounted for by competition with the well-attested stem *viṣvañc-* of almost the same meaning [‘facing in opposite directions, divergent’], which looks like a more substantial version of *vyāñc-* and is built to the extended form *viṣu* of the same preverb *ví*.) If *vyāñc-* made a collective abstract in *-tā-*, *\*vyàktā-* ‘individuality, separateness’, the form in our passage could be its instr. sg. in adverbial usage. There are obviously weaknesses in every link in this chain of reasoning. First, the stem *vyāñc-* is very rare and limited in distribution; second, I know of no other such abstracts to *-añc-* stems and in fact *-tā-* stems are relatively rare in early Vedic (AiG II.2.617); third, it should be accented *\*vyāñc-* (AiG II.2.619). However, a poet intent on packing a pun into *vyàktā(s)* might not scruple to use unusual forms to achieve it, and elsewhere in the RV puns sometimes ignore accentuation for their 2<sup>nd</sup> reading. In slight support of the suggestion, we might note that this set of hymns has one other ex. of the instr. of such a stem in adverbial usage: VII.57.4 *puruṣátā* ‘in human fashion’, as well as an instr. to a *-tāt-* abstract in the same usage: VII.57.7 *sarvátātā* ‘in your totality’, referring to the Maruts -- the exact opposite of my suggested *vyàktā* ‘in their individuality, separately’, also of the Maruts. If my suggestion is correct (by no means certain!), it would also be a pun facilitated by sandhi, since the first reading as ppl. should have underlying *-ās* and the other one as instr. simply *-ā*, but both would show up as *-ā* in this sandhi position.

Because this vs. is in Dvīpadā Virāj (which, despite its name, consists of *four* pādas of five syllables apiece), *ádha* opens the d pāda and is therefore less oddly placed than might appear. Klein (DGRV II.128) characterizes the *ádha* as “conjoining the second [term] with the first” and tr. “the young men of Rudra and the ones having good horses.” But since the two terms are coreferential, the *ádha* (I Engl. ‘and’) seems unrec. or even misleading.

VII.56.2: This vs. seems a response, if an indirect one, to the question posed in vs. 1. The *hí*, as often, has a higher discourse function: it gives the reason for asking the question in

the first place. We could tr. “(I ask) because ...” I also consider this vs. a further expression of the “individual/collective” theme I tentatively identified in vs. 1, here conveyed by the pl. *janūṃṣi* ‘births’ in the first clause, contrasted with the sg. *janútram* ‘means of begetting’ in the 2<sup>nd</sup>. If 1ab asks “who are they *individually*?” 2ab states that the question needs to be asked because no one knows their *individual* births, even though (cd) *they* [=Maruts] know “mutually” (*mitháh*) their own (individual) means of begetting. In other words, they share the knowledge of their separate births -- something we don’t know. Note the middle *vidre*: they know facts about *themselves*, contrasting with the 3<sup>rd</sup>-party lack of knowledge in ab *nákiḥ ... véda*.

VII.56.3: This vs. continues the theme of mutuality in vs. 2, but now concerns the Maruts’ adult behavior as gods of the storm. The mutuality is expressed both by the adv. *mitháh* repeated from vs. 2 and by the reciprocal 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. verb *aspr̥dhran* “they contended with each other.”

The hapax *svapū-* has been variously, and surprisingly, interpr. See Old ad loc. (also KEWA s.v., etc.) for the numerous suggestions, incl. BR ‘broom’, Lanman ‘wings’. However, the most obvious analysis also is most likely the correct one, as a root noun cmpd. to root  $\sqrt{pū}$  ‘purify’, hence ‘self-purifying’. This is Old’s conclusion, reflected also in Ge’s and Re’s tr. and in Scar (323). Perhaps the resistance to this obvious interpr. resulted from the fact that it is a hapax -- astonishing given the centrality of Soma Pavamāna “self-purifying Soma” in RVic ritual as the subject of the entire IXth Maṇḍala -- and in this passage it has no connection with soma. Here it quite likely refers to the rain drops accompanying the Maruts’ storm, as Ge suggests.

Old acutely notes that the verb in this pāda *vapanta* resembles *pavanta* ‘they purify(/ied) themselves’. Rather than considering *vapanta* a corruption of *pavanta* (which seems extremely unlikely to me), I would instead suggest that it’s a metathetic word play (*vap*  $\approx$  *pav*), aided by preceding (s)*vap(ūbhiḥ)*.

VII.56.4: Whenever the birth of the Maruts, and esp. the udder of Pr̥ṣni, are found in the RV, bewilderment ensues, and this passage is no exception. At least it is here identified as a secret that only the insightful can perceive -- a characterization that the modern interpreter fully concurs with. For other problematic passages on this topic see II.34.2, VI.48.22, and VI.66.1, 3 with comm. ad locc. Our passage would be fairly easy to interpr. if we could take *ūdhaḥ* (that is, *ūdhar*) as a loc. sg. Such is Ge’s solution (“im Euter,” explicitly identified as a loc. in n. 4b) and also Re’s, though the latter has the grace to bury the loc. in a parenthesis: “(en sa) mamelle.” But a loc. *-ar* to *r/n* stems “ist nicht nachgewiesen” (AiG III.311), and it is safer to take it as an acc. sg. as elsewhere. In my interpr. *yád* is a neut. pronoun (rather than a subord. conj.) and refers collectively to the Maruts and ‘udder’ is a species of appositive to it though with a bit of a twist: ‘udder’ refers to the contents of the udder, and that content is the collective Marut embryo(s). This seems to me better than taking *yád* as ‘that’ or the like, as in Kü’s (175) “Diese Geheimnisse kennt der Weise, dass die grosse Pr̥ṣni ein Euter getragen hat.” (On p. 339 Kü simply reproduces Ge’s tr., with *ūdhaḥ* as loc. and a pronominal obj. [“sie”], referring to the Maruts, supplied; he doesn’t comment on these two incompatible interpr.)

VII.56.5: The good heroes that the clan possesses are in fact the Maruts themselves, specified in the instr. Re calls this an “instrumental of identification.” Whatever term is used, it is not, in my experience, a common usage of the instr., but it is nonetheless not hard to interpret. A similar usage is found two vss. later, in 7cd.

VII.56.6: A very cleverly constructed vs., nicely fitted to Dvipadā Virāj meter. Each 5-syl. pāda consists of two words, phonologically and etymologically (or pseudo-etymologically) related. There are both repetition of morphological figures and variation on them. All four pādas end with a nom. pl. masc. adj.; the first two pādas end with superlative *-iṣṭhāḥ*, the third with the phonologically similar, but morphologically distinct *-iślā(h)*, the last with something phonologically distinct (*ugrāḥ*).

Three (a, b, d) of the four pādas contain etymological pairs; in the first two the etymological relation is reinforced by phonological repetition (*yāmaṃ yā(y)iṣṭhāḥ*, *śubhā śóbhiṣṭhāḥ*. (As for the first, the Saṃh. has *yéṣṭhāḥ*, but the first vowel must be distracted. HvN restore *yáyīṣṭhāḥ* with short root vowel, but I think *yā* is more likely. In neither of the other two occurrences of this stem [V.41.3, 74.8] does the meter establish the quantity of the root syllable.) In the third ex. (pāda d) the etymological relationship is not transparent, but would be available to the audience steeped in derivational morphology: *ójobhir ugrāḥ*. Although c, *śriyā sámīślā(h)*, lacks the etymological connection, it mimics it through alliteration, though it is notable that we have *miśLa*, not the also attested *miśRa*, which would match *śriyā* better. Another set of three versus one: in three pādas (b, c, d) the first noun is in the instr., but in pāda a it is not. The 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda is the only one that doesn't deviate from the various patterns in any regard: it's an etymological figure, ends with a superlative, begins with an instrumental.

One can also note the reversal of vowels in the root syllables of the word pairs of b and d: *u ... o* versus *o ... u*.

VII.56.7: The first pāda of this vs., *ugrām va ójaḥ*, restates the last pāda of the preceding vs. (6d *ójobhir ugrāḥ*) as an equational nominal clause. Because of its connection with vs. 6 it also sets up the expectation that what follows will also be an etymological figure, but b *sthirā śávāmsi* is not, though it has the same syntactic configuration as pāda a.

The loose construction of the instr. *marúdbhīḥ* is similar to that in 5a.

VII.56.8: The nominal equations of 7ab continue in the first half of this vs., and *śubhrāḥ* picks up *śubhā śóbhiṣṭhāḥ* of 6b. Although *śúṣmaḥ* is not etymologically related to *śubhrāḥ*, they are alliterative.

Pāda c contains a rhyming simile: *dhúnir múnir*. Such full rhyme is quite rare in the RV and seems to provide the crescendo of this highly wrought little passage. Note also that the final word of d, *dhṛṣṇóḥ*, is a slight flip of the initial word of c, *dhúniḥ*.

In order to get a proper Dvipadā Virāj line, the *iva* of c has to be read 'va, as it sometimes is elsewhere. See Old. If the particle is disyllabic, however, it makes cd a Triṣṭubh pāda. Since the Dvipadā Virāj section of the hymn is drawing to a close (fully Triṣṭubh starting with vs. 12), the possible double metrical reading here may be gesturing towards the upcoming Triṣṭubh takeover. Indeed the Dvipadā Virāj begins to break up beginning in vs. 10, despite the Anukr. identification of 1–11 as DV.

In the simile of *c*, *iva* (*/va*) is out of place; we expect *\*dhúnir iva múniḥ*. This displacement was doubtless made to draw attention to the rhyme noted above. But it also interacts somewhat with the question of whether *cd* contains two DV *pādas* or one *Triṣṭubh*, because a quick glance at *Lub* shows that *iva* is fairly rare immediately after the caesura, which would be its position here if we are dealing with a *Triṣṭubh pāda*. I imagine that this rarity has less to do with *iva*'s accentless status (though that might contribute) than with its usual tendency to take 2<sup>nd</sup> position, which would generally put it earlier in the line. There certainly do exist trimeter lines with *iva* post-caesura, e.g., IV.18.6 *ṛtāvarīr iva saṃkróśamānāḥ* (cf. also V.1.1, 11.5, etc.); they are just less common than I had expected.

VII.56.10: The metrical decay noted for 8cd continues here. Although the first half of the vs. has the expected 10 syllables with a word boundary after 5 -- thus allowing a division into two DV *pādas* -- the opening of *b* is *huve*, an unaccented verb. In the immediately preceding vs. (9), *pāda b* opens with accented *yuyóta*, which must owe its accent to its *pāda*-initial position, as there are no syntactic features favoring it. The DV here is far less sensitive to the *pāda* boundary. Even more clearly, the second half of the vs. is an undoubted *Triṣṭubh*, since it has 11 syllables and a caesura after the first 4, with the unaccented voc. *maruto* spanning syllables 5–7.

Both *Ge* and *Re* (also *Lub*) take *vāvaśānāḥ* to *√vaś* ‘want, desire’ with the supposed object being *soma*, but I think it makes more sense, and requires less machinery, to assign it to *√vās* ‘bellow’. Otherwise too much has been gapped and needs to be supplied; cf. *Re*'s expansive parenthesis: “... pour qu'à satiété ... (vous vous gorgiez de *soma*, le) désirant-avec-force.” See the same disagreement about the affiliation of the same participle in VII.36.6, with comm. ad loc.

VII.56.11: This vs. is unambiguously *Triṣṭubh*, consisting of two *pādas* of 11 syllables. The first has an opening of 5, which could be a self-contained *pāda* of DV, but what follows it is 6 syllables, marking the whole as a single *Triṣṭubh pāda*. The second part is even less ambiguous, as it has an opening of 4, so a DV division is impossible. The only feature that matches that of DV is that there are only two *Triṣṭubh pādas* in the vs., not four.

On *iṣmín*- see comm. ad I.87.6.

VII.56.12: The metrical boundary, however fuzzy, between the DV and *Triṣṭubh* sections separates the first part of the hymn from the more ritually focused one beginning here. The expression *hinomy adhvarām* “I set the ceremony in motion” announces the inauguration of the sacrifice.

This vs. harps, rather tediously, on the adj. *súci*- ‘gleaming’, which occurs 6x, twice each in *pādas a*, *b*, and *d*.

*Pāda c* contrasts *ṛtá*- in *ṛténa ... ṛta-sāpaḥ* with *satyá*-, the latter as goal of *√i* ‘go, come’. In my view, *satyám ... āyan* refers to the truth-serving Maruts’ epiphany on the ritual ground: they “came to reality” for the sacrificers, that is, they became really present. This epiphany is effected “by truth”: the operation of the properly performed ritual mechanism.

VII.56.13: This vs. has no finite verbs, but three predicated tense-stem participles: pf. *upaśiśriyāṇāḥ* (b), aor. *rucānāḥ* (c), pres. *yāchamānāḥ* (d), in a hymn already well provided with such (see 10d, 11d).

As for *upaśiśriyāṇāḥ*, although pf. participles regularly have preterital value, the middle pf. of *√śri* is presential (Kü 527–28) and stative, and this form contrasts with the far more common ppl. *śrita-* ‘set’ -- hence my “being set,” though this rendering somewhat undercuts the stative value.

In cd it is possible that only one of the participles is predicated, and in fact the publ. tr. renders pāda c as wholly a simile. However, this hemistich could contain two independent predications: “(you are) shining like ...; (you are) holding yourselves ...” In any case there is an un signaled change of subject between the hemistichs: in ab the ornaments (nom. *khādāyah*, *ruk māḥ*) are the grammatical subjects, while in d the Maruts must be supplied because the participle *yāchamānāḥ* seems to assume an animate subject. Pāda c is ambiguous: either the brilliants (*ruk māḥ*) or the Maruts can be shining. The etymological relationship between *ruk māḥ* in b and the part. *rucānāḥ* in c might suggest that c goes with b. However, in my publ. tr. I have privileged the hemistich boundary and supplied the Maruts as subj. of c (as do Ge and Re), but the other interpr. is certainly possible. One argument for the standard interpr. might be that the subjects of medial participles to *√ruc* (well-attested *rōcamāna-*, as well as *rucāná-*, *rurucāná-*, *rōrucāna-*) are generally gods.

VII.56.14: Ge suggests (n. 14a) that the *budhnyā ... m āhāmsi* “deep-grounded powers” are the “verborgenen Herrlichkeiten” (*ninyā*) concealed in Ṛṣni’s udder in vs. 4. Even leaving aside the fact that, as was discussed above, *ūdhaḥ* in vs. 4 should not be a loc., this interpr. seems both un nec. and too specific, esp. since ten vss. intervene. *budhnyā*-here may refer to the powers that the Maruts, gods associated with the midspace, derive from the earth below, or it may simply mean something like ‘fundamental’, by a semantic development parallel to that of the Engl. word.

The preverb *prā* is showcased in the first hemistich: *prā ... īrate ... , prā ... prayajyavas tiradhvam*. I am not certain what *prā √tī nāmāni* in b is meant to convey, but I interpr. it in the context of the importance of the Maruts’ individual identities (vss. 1–4) and of calling their names (10a) earlier in the hymn. Perhaps the Maruts need to “put their names forward” and make themselves individually known before they can enjoy the Gṛhamedha offering.

As noted in the publ. intro., the ritual references in pādas b-d are quite specific, alluding to the Maruts’ role in the Sākamedha, the last of the Cāturmāsyaṇi (“Four-monthly”) rituals. See the publ. intro. for further details.

VII.56.15: The phonological figure of the two words *adhīthā*, *ithā* straddling the pāda boundary of ab provide a nice little study in syllable weight. (The echo is of course obscured by the application of sandhi in the Saṃhitā text: *adhīthéthā*). If we add in the opening of the vs., *yādi*, the echo is even more pronounced: *yādi ... adhīthā*, *ithā*, with (y)*ādi* doubling *adhī*.

Exactly what *ithā* is doing here is unclear to me, but this adverb several times appears in context with *vīpra-* and some verb of invoking (see Ge ad VII.94.5), as here (with the invoking represented by the nominal *hāvīman*). Cf. VII.94.5 ... *īlata*, *ithā*

*vīprāsaḥ*, IV.29.4 = VIII.7.30 *itthā vīpraṃ hávamānam*. I suggest that *itthā* refers to the precise manner in which a *vīpra-* makes the invocation.

The Maruts are asked to “give study to / be mindful of” what is *stutásya*. *stutá-* is of course a very common past *passive* participle meaning ‘(what/who is) praised’. In this context we might rather expect the abstract noun ‘praise’, and indeed Ge simply so tr.: “... des Lobpreises eingedenk seid,” with no explicit comment, but a crossref. (n. 15a) to several passages with a similar idiom but with *stotrásya* ‘praise song’ instead of *stutásya* (e.g., V.55.9 *ádhi stótrasya ... gātana*). But the poet could easily have used *stotrásya* here in the same metrical slot if he had wanted to, and so I think we must take the ppl. seriously. Re in fact does so -- “prêtez-attention à la chose-louée” -- though in his n. he simply notes its similarity to the *stotrá-* passages. I think the point is a cleverer one: the poet suggests that if the Maruts pay attention to what we poets praise -- what *gifts* we poets praise -- they will know what to bestow on us. The “if” clause is immediately followed by its corollary: “right away give (us) wealth ...” -- the poet implying that the Maruts are a quick study! Although I must admit that *stutá-* ‘praised’ seems always to refer to gods, not to material objects, the semantic extension seems an easy one, and we can invoke the term *dāna-stuti-* ‘praise of the gift’ -- though it’s notable that, although this term is ubiquitous in secondary lit. on the RV, it is not actually attested in Vedic.

Since *suv̄rya-* is a neut. noun (see comm. ad VII.4.6), this tr. should be emended to “wealth (and) an abundance of good heroes.”

By my rules, we might expect that *anyáḥ* in d should be definite (‘the other’) rather than the indefinite ‘another’ that better fits the passage (unless we assume that the *anyáḥ* is a rival poet). However, I suggest that *nū cid ... anyáḥ* is a composite negative indefinite expression like *ná kás cid anyáḥ*. Cf. VIII.24.11 *nū anyátrā cid ...*

The cadence of d is bad. It is tempting to emend injunc. *ādábhat* to subj. *ādábhāt*, which would fix the meter and fit the sense (in fact, the publ. tr. renders the verb as if a subj.: ‘will ... swindle’), though no doubt the temptation should be resisted.

VII.56.16: Each pāda in this vs. contains a simile marked by *ná* comparing the Maruts to domestic animals (a, d), spirits (b), and children (c). Except in c, the simile begins the pāda. The vs. contains only one finite verb, *śubháyanta*, in b; the functional role of the finite verb is filled instead by the adjectives that are the point of contact between the simile and the frame. In the publ. tr. I deliberately failed to render ab as the rel. cl. it technically is because the “which Maruts ... they ...” structure would have intruded upon the succession of similes.

In b opinion is divided on the sense of *yakṣa-dṛś-*. Ge takes *-dṛś-* as active, with the first member in an acc. relationship with it (“Geisterseher”), flg. Sāy. in his analysis of the syntax of the compd., though not of the meaning of the first member. So also Re. However, Ge considers the possibility of a pass. sense in his n. (16b), and Old opts for the pass. interpr. For disc. of this compd. see Scar (232); of his choices I opt for the *bahuvrīhi*. On *yakṣá-* + *√dṛś* see comm. ad VII.61.5.

Another oblation to the Maruts at the Sākamedha, besides the Gṛhamedha mentioned above (vs. 14), is made to the *kṛīḍin-* (‘playful’) Maruts on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of the sacrifice (see, e.g., ŚB II: 20 and Eggeling, SBE XII.408). The characterization of them in d as *prakṛīḷnaḥ* obviously makes ref. to this oblation.

VII.56.17: This vs. has the feel of a final vs. Though there is no overt sign of a break with what follows, the next vs. turns its attention to the Hotar, Agni, and this might be taken as a change of subject.

In the cadence of pāda a *mṛlantu* should be read with a light root syllable, contrary to normal practice. Old doubts that the form should be read with this exceptional light syllable and ascribes the irregularity to “die metrische Unebenheit” of this hymn, while HvN do accept the light reading and adduce one other occurrence that requires this scansion (IV.3.3, though that passage looks more equivocal to me).

Ge and Re take *varivasyá-*, lit. ‘make wide space’, in a general ‘help, protect’ sense (e.g., “qui protègent les Deux Mondes bien fixés”). But surely the beneficiaries are us (not the two worlds), and the idea is to make the worlds spacious for us.

VII.56.18–19: As was just noted, vs. 17 “feels” like a final (or pseudo-final) vs. If vs. 18 marks a new beginning, we can note both that in vs. 18 the Hotar invokes the gods as he would at the beginning of a sacrifice and that in vs. 19 (and 20a) the Maruts are referred to four times (19a, b, c, 20a) with the near-deictic pronoun *imé* “these right here,” which might indicate their epiphany on the ritual ground.

VII.56.18: The first hemistich of this vs. presents us with a common problem: the most obvious way to interpr. it meets a syntactic stumbling block that should not allow that interpr., and the standard interpr. ignore that obstruction. In this case the issue is the middle participle *gṛṇānáḥ*. This part. is attested over 50x; the vast majority of these attestations are clearly passive in value. In fact, Gr interpr. only 2 forms as “medial” (that is, transitive, not passive): this passage and I.181.9. Nonetheless, both Ge and Re take it as transitive here (though with different objects) without comment. But I think we ignore the use of the overwhelming majority of forms at our peril. In fact, since Agni as Hotar is the implicit subject of the sentence, a passive value of *gṛṇānáḥ* is easily possible: as both Hotar and god, Agni performs a ritual invocation (as priest) while himself being hymned (as god). (The other occurrence flagged by Gr as non-passive, I.181.9, is indeed transitive, but owes its anomalous usage to special circumstances. See comm. ad loc.)

If we eliminate *gṛṇānáḥ* as a potential governor of an object, the acc. *satrācīm rātīm* must be construed with *ā ... jōhavīti*. Although the acc. with (*ā*) *√hvā* is more usually a god or other animate being, abstract entities (like ‘giving’ here) are also possible. The *vaḥ* in 2<sup>nd</sup> position in pāda a, which might have served as acc. to *ā ... jōhavīti* must then be a gen. dependent on the acc. NP. The more usual configuration is restored in pāda d *havate vaḥ* “he calls upon you,” a minor ex. of poetic repair.

In c both Ge and Re supply ‘sacrificer’ with gen. *īvataḥ* ‘such’, while I supply ‘wealth’. There is in fact no good support for either position that I can find. I prefer mine because ‘wealth’ would pick up ‘giving’ from the previous pāda, whereas there is no mention of a sacrificer anywhere. But I do not strongly favor my solution. *gopā-* ‘herdsman’ is regularly construed with *ṛtāsya* ‘truth’ (e.g., I.163.5, III.10.2), so perhaps that phrase is meant, anticipating *ādvayāvī* ‘without duplicity’ in d. Note that the *gopā-* is also *ādabdha-/ādabhya-* ‘undeceivable’ (e.g., II.9.6, X.25.7).

VII.56.19: As was noted above, this vs. contains three examples of the near-deictic *imé*, opening the first three pādas. The publ. tr. only fully renders the first one, as three

examples of “these here” seemed too heavy. It is also worth noting that, though the *imé* forms might suggest the presence of the Maruts right here at the sacrifice (as was suggested above), the clauses in which they are found describe general activities of those gods, which would almost necessarily be performed away from the ritual ground.

Both Ge and Re follow the Pp. reading *sáhasaḥ*. Re interpr. it rather loosely as an abl., whereas Ge takes it as a gen. and as if it were the differently accented poss. adj. \**sahásaḥ* (“die Gewalt des Gewaltigen”), without comment. Old suggests that the better reading is dat. *sáhase* and cites passages containing *ā √nam* with the dat. I follow this interpr.

VII.56.20: Ge and Re both take b as a self-contained clause. I think it better (with MMüller in SBE) to take *bhṛmiṅ cid* beginning b as obj. to *junanti* in pāda a, parallel to *radhráṅ cid* -- beginning a new clause with *yáthā* in the middle of b. The point would be that the Maruts are so vigorous that they can energize both an entity that has no energy at all (“the feeble”) and one that has energy in excess (a whirlwind).

VII.56.21: The adj. *sujātá-* ‘well-born’ generally refers to gods, or at least to mortals; it is only here used of material goods (implicitly *vasavyà-* in the preceding pāda, hence my ‘of good quality’. Of course, it is possible that *vasavyà-* here refers, at least partly, to human capital (sons), as apparently in II.9.5 *ubháyam te ná kṣīyate vasavyàm ... kṛdhi pátiṃ svapatyásya rāyáḥ*, where the second category of “goods of both types” (*ubháyam ... vasavyàm*) is “wealth in good descendents” (*svapatyásya rāyáḥ*). But I don’t think this is a necessary interpr.: “well-born/produced” is likely available to semantic extension.

VII.56.22: As most interpr. point out, the three locc. in b are especially contested objects for the Ārya. See esp. Proferes (98): “Because of their economic value, rivers, plants and clans were subject to competing claims, and constituted flashpoints for conflict between various groups for whom control over resources meant increased power” -- as well as his elucidation of the three terms. See also Thieme (Fremdling 55), Oberlies (I.350).

Fem. *yahvī-* ‘exuberant’ is in the pl. typed for rivers/waters. For this whole locative phrase see VII.70.3.

VII.56.23: Despite the use of *√kr* ‘make’ (2<sup>nd</sup> pl. pf. *cakra*), it is not likely that the Maruts created the *ukthāni* themselves, though they are singers on other occasions; rather they provided the occasion and the subject for the poets of earlier eras to celebrate them. Though Re’s ‘provoke’ is a bit strong, it’s the right idea. My ‘have given rise to’ is a bit weak.

VII.56.24: The sense of pāda d is somewhat unclear and the various tr. incompatible. Ge’s “wir möchten euch mehr gelten als das eigene Heim” seems esp. difficult to wring out of the Skt., though the other possibilities he suggests in the n. (24d) are somewhat more likely. I start with the *abhí √as* lexeme, which generally means ‘surmount, dominate, be superior’, which doesn’t seem to be reflected in the Ge suggestions. However, in my interpr. the enclitic *vah* has only the vaguest syntactic connection to the clause. I do not have a better solution.

## VII.57 Maruts

VII.57.1: My interpr. differs considerably from the standard—Old, Ge, Re—all of whom take ab as a single clause, with the sg. *nāma mārutam* the subject of 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. *madanti* and *mādhvaḥ* the oblique obj. of that verb. So, e.g., Old “Am Honigtrank erfreut sich ... euer Marutname (=Marutgeschlecht).” The number disagreement between subj. and verb is taken as a *constructio ad sensum* (so explicitly Ge n. 1ab, sim. Old), and the clash between 2<sup>nd</sup> person encl. *vaḥ* / voc. *yajatrāḥ* and the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. verb is glossed over. I find these disharmonies disturbing and prefer to separate the two pādas. By my interpr., as noted in the publ. intro., pāda a has an idiomatic construction very similar to Engl. “has X’s name on it,” meaning “is destined for / belongs to X.” (“That cookie has your name on it” means “you should take it; I’ll cede it.”) Then in b the person switches from 2<sup>nd</sup> (*vaḥ ... yajatrāḥ*) to 3<sup>rd</sup> (*madanti* with gapped subj. = Maruts), but the number is unchanged. This situation lasts through the first hemistich of vs. 2. As for the sense, I take the ‘honey’ to refer to the soma to be offered to the Maruts at the sacrifices mentioned in b: the soma oblation at the sacrifice in question is intended just for them. Alternatively, but less likely in my view, it could refer to the rain that the Maruts produce. In that case it would have the Maruts’ name because it is their product. The rain is metaphorically referred to in d *pīnvanti útsam* “they swell the wellspring.”

The relationship among the clauses in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich isn’t certain, although there are no real implications whichever interpr. is chosen. With the standard tr. I take *pīnvanti útsam*, which opens d, as the main clause on which both the preceding rel. (c: *yé rejáyanti*) and the following temporal clause (*yád áyāsuḥ*) depend. In this case *pīnvanti* would be accented because it opens its pāda. However, that verb could be part of the rel. cl. starting in c (*yé ...*), with all of cd dependent on b: “... they become exhilarated -- they who set ... to trembling (and) swell the wellspring, when ...”

VII.57.2: The two suffix-accented *-tár-* agent nouns in the first hemistich take accusative objects, rather than the expected gen. (*nicetāraḥ ... grṇāntam, praṇetāraḥ ... mánma*). See Tichy (363–64). Although Tichy suggests some possible reasons for this unexpected (but not vanishingly rare) construction (pp. 367ff.), they don’t seem to be particularly applicable here.

I see no easy way to get a causal sense from *hí*, hence my “surely.”

Object-less *vītáye* is clarified by 6b *vyantu ... hávīṃṣi*.

The pf. part. *pipriyāñāḥ* is interpr. by Ge/Re as implicitly prospective: the Maruts will become pleased/gratified as a result of their *vītí-*. I take it rather as having preterital value: they have first been gratified by the initial guest-reception ritual and are now awaiting their meal. A passage like I.73.1 *átithir ná prīñānāḥ* “being gratified like a guest” supports this interpr.

VII.57.3: Ge takes *anyé* with *marútaḥ*: “Nicht glänzen andere Marut so sehr wie diese ...” But both the position of *yáthā*, which in its simile-marking role should follow the first term of the simile, and common sense (who would the other Maruts be?) strongly suggest that *anyé* refers to a group separate from the Maruts. By my rules *anyé* should be definite, and I think Re is correct in supplying ‘gods’. This would make sense in a ritual context:

the other divine visitors at the ritual (save for Indra) are pretty drab compared with the Maruts.

Since the other occurrence of *viśva-píś-* modifies Dawn’s cart (VII.75.6), as Old points out a passive sense ‘all-adorned’ is more likely than ‘all-adorning’. So Scar (319) ‘allgeschmückt’.

The middle part. *piśāná-* is an isolated form: the only apparent attestation of a root aor. to this root, beside the thematized nasal pres. *piṃśá-* and the pf. *pipeśa*, etc. (However, *piśā* in VII.18.2 is taken by most as an impv. to a thematic aorist [see comm. ad loc.], which could easily have replaced the opaque root aor. impv. \**pīdhí*, so the root does have a fragmentary aor. system.) That it is a participle at all has been called into question by John Lowe, who suggests it may be a Caland adj. instead (“Caland adjectives ...” 2012: 92–93; see also *Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit* 2015: 133). Although I don’t see any advantage in assigning it to a category of dubious existence (Caland adj. in -*āná-*), its isolation does make it difficult to interpr. As a medial form, it might be expected to match the medial perfect usage and be pass. (e.g., VI.49.3) or reflexive (V.60.4) vel sim. However, it is generally taken as transitive, as in the publ. tr., with the transitive value ascribed to the preverb *ā* (see Gr) opening c. Lowe (*Part.* 133) disputes this interpr., declaring the supposed tmesis between preverb and participle here “a unique type of discontinuity.” He prefers to construe *ā* with the finite verb *añjate* in d and take *piśānáḥ* as an intransitive adj.; *ródasī* is then an obj. of *añjate* along with *samānám añjí* and not construed with *piśānáḥ*: “All adorned and decorated, they anoint / the two worlds (with) the same anointing for beauty.” As far as I can find, however, there are no occurrences of  $\sqrt{añj}$  with double acc. When the object anointed is in the acc., the ointment is in the instr., so his suggested interpr. would be syntactically unique in a different way. I therefore prefer to construe both *ā* and *ródasī* with *piśānáḥ*. However, the construction need not be transitive “adorning the two-world halves,” as is the standard interpr. and publ. tr. Old suggests several other possible relations (see also Re’s n.), including that *ródasī* might be an internal / Inhalts-type of acc., expressing the ornament, hence “wearing the two world-halves as adornment.” Old ultimately rejects this interpr., as does the publ. tr., but it remains a possibility, one that would better reflect the medial form.

VII.57.4: Unlike Ge/Re I attach b to c, not to a. Nothing rests on this, but the cause and the (hoped-for non-)effect are more closely allied that way.

I did not tr. *vah* in c, which would have necessitated the awk. rendering “... into the way of it of yours.” This vs. is over-supplied with *vah*-s, with one in each pāda.

VII.57.5: Ge and Re tr. *raṇanta* as a modal (“sollen sich ... erfreuen”; “Que les Maruts se réjouissent ...”), as does Hoffmann (259), who explicitly identifies it as a subjunctive, not an injunctive, flg. Re (BSL 33.1: 6–7), who claims that *-anta* is a regular RVic subjunctive ending. I think a modal value, whether the form is identified as injunctive or subjunctive, is unnecessary and in fact fits the context less well than a preterital reading. Previous vss. refer to the performance of the sacrifice at which the Maruts are present (esp. 1ab and 2). They are now asked to provide benefits in return, and so we might assume that the sacrifice is now over (though 6ab gives me pause), an assumption supported by *kṛté* with its past reference: ‘what has been/was done’.

In the publ. tr. *cid* is not tr. I think it is a simple emphatic here “in just what has been done here,” which is somewhat stilted in Eng., or else (perhaps more likely) it actually emphasizes the following word *átra*: “in what has been done *here*” -- at our sacrifice, not at someone else’s. So Sāy. It could, of course, mean “also” or “even,” but neither of those makes sense in context -- nor does Ge’s (/Hoffmann’s) “wenigstens” or Re’s “(un peu) même.”

VII.57.6: With Ge, I take *viśvebhir nāmabhiḥ* with *stutāsaḥ*, despite the displacement of word order. In fact, there’s nowhere else to put that unwieldy instr. phrase but at the beginning of a new pāda. Re tr. it as an independent phrase, whose referent and relation to the rest of the sentence aren’t clear to me: “Alors, (une fois) loués, que les seigneurs Marut agréent, de tous (leurs) noms, les offrandes!”

VII.57.7: The contrast of *viśve ... sarvātātā* “all (of you) ... in (your) totality” highlights a constant theme of Marut hymns, that they are both individuals (emphasized by “all your names” in 6b) and a collectivity. See the treatment of this at the beginning of the previous hymn (VII.56) and comm. thereon.

The position of the patrons (*sūrī-*) as middle men in the circulation of goods and services is nicely expressed here: you help the patrons; they help us.

## VII.58 Maruts

VII.58.1: The gen. phrase *daívyasya dhāmnah* does not have a clear syntactic relationship to the rest of its clause. The standard interpr. (Ge, Re, Scar [62]) resupplies the word *gaṇá-* in the rel. clause and seems to take the phrase as gen. of material, as it were: e.g., Ge “die starke (Truppe) der göttlichen Rasse.” By contrast I treat the possessive adj. *túviṣmant-* as a real possessive with the gen. phrase implicitly dependent on the underlying nominal *tuví(s)-/\*távis-*, hence “having the power of its divine nature.”

The *utá* beginning the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is relatively functionless. Klein (DGRV I.375–78) says it signals weak nexus between distichs with non-parallel structure. It might also be possible to claim that it is a sort of inverse *utá*, which should connect c with d, which *are* syntactically and thematically parallel. I also think it possible that it expresses a covert conceptual connection between the heaven indirectly referred to in b (*daívya-*) and the midspace defined by the two world-halves in c, a space also indirectly measured by the distance from ‘chaos, disorder’ (*nírṛti-*) and the heavenly vault (*nāka-*) in d.

VII.58.2: Like the gen. phrase in 1b, the instr. *tveṣyèṇa* has insufficient syntactic grounding in its clause. Like Ge “(geschieht)” and Re “(s’est produite),” I see no choice but to supply a verb to link the subject *janūḥ* and the instr.

I have no opinion on the morphology of *janūḥ*. Gr calls it a masculine nom. sg. to the *-us-*stem *janús-*, an interpr. bolstered by the acc. form *janúṣam* (3x). AiG II.2.490 posits a paradigm of alternating gender, with m. or f. in the (nom./acc.) singular, but neuter in the dual and plural, which accords with the distribution of forms in the RV (du. *janúṣī*, pl. *janūṃṣi*) but fails to account for the gender switch. In the same vol. (II.2.496–97) Debrunner suggests that our *janūḥ* belongs to a *-ū-*stem (though acc. *janúṣam* would

still need to be a masc. [or fem.] form to an *-us-*stem). The problem is that non-neut. forms of *-is-* and *-us-*stems don't lengthen the suffixal vowel in the nom. sg., unlike *-as-*stems. However, it seems possible that our *janūḥ* contains a nonce lengthening on the model of the vastly more common masc. *-as-*stems, as AiG III.292 indirectly allows. It should also be noted that because of following *cid*, the suffixal syllable of the preceding noun would be heavy, whether it originally read *janūs cid*, as in the transmitted text, or *\*janūs cid*, as grammar would have us expect.

The relationship between the first hemistich and the rel. cl. in c displays the RV's customary willingness to switch person reference in midstream and without warning. The first hemistich refers to the Maruts in the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps., with the enclitic *vah* in a and the b pāda consisting only of vocatives. Because there is nothing to lean on, all three vocatives are accented, but in all three cases the initial accent contrasts with the inherent accent of the stem: *bhīmāsaḥ* (*bhīmā-*); *túvimanyavaḥ* (*tuvi-* cmpds. are accented either on the 2<sup>nd</sup> member [e.g., *tuvi-rādhās-*] or on the 2<sup>nd</sup> syllable of the first member [e.g., *tuví-brahman-*]); *áyāsaḥ* (*ayās-*). There could therefore be no doubt that the reference is 2<sup>nd</sup> person; yet the rel. cl. that picks up the referents with the nom. pl. prn. *yé* is unequivocally in the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps.: (*prá ...*) *sánti*. The following pāda returns to 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. ref. with *vah*.

On the “X Y *utá*” construction (rather than expected X *utá* Y) see Klein DGRV I. 344ff.

VII.58.3: In pāda a I take *maghávadbhyaḥ* as referring to our human patrons, because I take the Maruts as subj. of the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. impv.: *dadhāta*. However, given the connections between 3ab and 6ab (for which see below), where *maghónām* refers to the Maruts, it is quite possible that the subj. of the impv. is the poet's fellow priests and the Maruts are the referent of *maghávadbhyaḥ*.

The simile in c causes some interpretational problems. Both Old (ad VI.50.10) and Re suggest interpr. that violate the structure of the RVic simile, and I think both treatments are wrong; Ge's treatment is more possible, though it differs from my own. All three take *jantúm* as part of the simile with *gató nādhvā* (= *ná ádhvā*), roughly for both “as a travelled road leads (the) people on,” while I take *jantúm* in the frame.

The RVic simile is only nominal; when a verb is involved it is shared by simile and frame. Both Old and Re take c as entirely simile, with its own independent verb (*ví tirāti*), and d as a loosely (Old) or more tightly (Re) connected frame, with its own verb (*prá ... tireta*). Old explicitly argues (ad VI.50.10) that *ná* can sometimes be a quasi-clausal simile marker, and he tr. “Der gegangene Weg vergleichsweise mag einen Menschen vorwärts bringen: so bringt auch uns verwärts.” After examining all the similes in the RV (see my “Case disharmony in RVic similes.” *IJJ* 24 [1982] 251-71), I would vigorously contest his characterization of *ná*. Re's tr. has a more conventional simile/frame relationship, but still violates the shared verb rule: “Comme le chemin parcouru fait passer l'homme outre, qu'elle nous pousse (plus) avant ...” (The subject of d, “elle,” seems to refer to the *susṭutí-* in b.) Although the structural violation in Re's tr. would be mitigated by the fact that the two verbs belong to the same verb stem, *tirá-*, they have different preverbs (*ví* and *prá*), and therefore different senses, and are also in different moods (subj. and opt.).

Ge's rendering, "Wie ein zurückgelegter Weg der Leute, so möge es (uns) zum Ziele führen," respects the simile structure, with the subject in the frame ("es") presumably referring to the good praise in b (see Re also), but the sense seems off. If the praise is to bring anyone or -thing across, it should be the Maruts (brought to our sacrifice), not us. Still I would be willing to consider a variation of Ge's interpr., with the praise as subj. in the frame, but the Maruts as obj.: "As a road when it's travelled (does) people, (the good praise) will bring the (Maruts) across."

However, I think it likely that the focus in this 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich has shifted to the help that the Maruts will give us when they have enjoyed our praise (see the thrice repeated *yusmótaḥ* 'aided by you' in the next vs., 4abc). In particular, pāda d *prá ṇá spārhābhir ūtībhis tireta* is almost identical to VII.84.3 *prá ṇá spārhābhir ūtībhis tīretam*, addressed to Indra and Varuṇa. In the latter passage, *tīretam* must be a 2<sup>nd</sup> du. active opt. with Indra and Varuṇa as subj. In other words, in that passage gods are the subject. In our passage *tireta* is ambiguous: it can be a 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. act. opt. or a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. mid. opt., and different factors pull in different directions. The parallel in VII.84.3 suggests we have gods, namely the Maruts, as subject here too, and the easiest way to do that is take it as a 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. A passage in the preceding hymn, VII.57.5 *prá vājebhis tirata puṣyāse naḥ* "Further us with prizes for our thriving," with 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. act. impv. to the same stem, also supports this interpr. This is the analysis of Gr, and it is also responsible for Old's "So bringt ..." On the other hand, the clear 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. *tirāti* in c invites a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. interpr. also of *tireta*, and the following hymn contains the idioms we have here, *prá √tī* and *vī √tī*, there with a single instance of the verb stem in the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. middle positioned between the preverbs: VII.59.2 *prá sá kṣáyam tīrate vī mahīr iṣaḥ* "He furthers his dwelling place, ex(tends) his great refreshments." Re and Ge both opt for the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. middle interpr., but the subject they each (seem to) provide is the good praise of b, a far cry from the gods we expect as subject of the expression found in d. My interpr. of cd solves both problems, though, admittedly, not in the most elegant fashion. I supply 'flock' (*gaṇá-*; see 1a) as the subj. of both *vī tirāti* and *prá ... tireta*. We thus have a singular subject that will allow *tireta* to harmonize with *tirāti* and the divine subject that will allow d to harmonize with VII.84.3. Nonetheless, on the basis of i.3 I would consider an alt. tr. with *tireta* as 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. act.: "might you [=Maruts] further us ..."

VII.58.4: As noted just above, this vs. is structured by three (abc) pāda-init. *yusmótaḥ* 'aided by you'. The three separate clauses containing this opening build on each other in an interesting way, and the first two are also linked by a morphophonological relationship.

To begin with the latter, both a and b end with a predicated *-ín-*stem qualifying the successful poet and the successful steed respectively with semantically parallel descriptors: ... *śatasvī*, ... *sahasrī* "possessing hundreds ... possessing thousands." The two words are also phonologically similar; to put it schematically, *SaCasRī*, where the *-s-*Resonant-*ī* final is esp. salient. The second one is correctly formed (to *sahásra-*) and well attested. The first is a hapax and aberrantly formed: the expected *-ín-*stem to *śatá-* is *śatín-*, which is in fact reasonably well attested. *śatasvín-* is obviously modeled on *sahasrín-* (already implied by AiG II.2.917 and Re ad loc.), aided by the fact that *-vín-* is regularly added to *-as-*stems (AiG II.2.917). So with *śatá-* temporarily re-configured as an *-as-*stem, the suffix *-vín-* can be affixed, allowing the stem to parallel *sahasrín-* in

metrical and phonological shape. In b *sahasrī* is immediately preceded by *sáhuriḥ*, which reinforces the phonological pattern: *sahVri(h)*.

Now as to the relations among the three *yusmótaḥ* clauses. I suggest that they can be seen as an instance of Behagel’s Law (the law of “increasing members”) involving syntactic blocks, not merely NPs. Pāda a contains a noun and a predicated adj. (*vípraḥ ... śatasvī*); pāda b a noun and two predicated adjectives (*árvā sáhuriḥ sahasrī*). And pāda c has two clauses, a nominal one consisting of a noun (*samrāṭ*) predicated of an unexpressed subject (=Indra), and a full clause, with finite verb and object (*hanti vṛtrám*). My view of the increasing complication of syntactic structure in these three clauses produces interpr. of two of the clauses that differ from the standard. In b both Ge and Re (also Klein, DGRV I.436) take *sáhuriḥ* as an attributive adj. and only *sahasrī* as predicated (e.g., “... does the winning steed become a possessor of thousand(-fold) booty”). This is of course possible, but both the structural argument already adduced and the pragmatic fact that the horse has to become victorious before he wins prizes speak for my interpr.

In c the difference between interpr. is greater. I take *samrāṭ* as one clause, with the noun predicated of unmentioned Indra : “(Indra) is sovereign king.” This clause is linked to the next (*hanti vṛtrám*) by *utá*: “and (he) smites Vṛtra.” Ge, Re, and Klein all take *samrāṭ* simply as the subj. of *hanti* (e.g., “and with your aid does the great king smash the obstacle”). But this interpr. must ignore or explain away the position of *utá*. Klein is the only one who is explicit about the function of *utá*. He groups it with passages that contain “a repeated term within one of a set of parallel clauses,” conjoined by *utá*. But in the other exx. he gives (pp. 436–37) the *utá* is adjacent to the repeated element and in Wackernagel’s position. In our passage this should yield *\*yusmóta utá samrāṭ*. Klein does not comment on *utá*’s position here. Although one could argue (though Klein does not) that *utá* was displaced to the right to avoid the clash ...-óta *utá*, in fact that is the kind of clash that RVic poets like! (Indeed the presence of *utá* in this pāda may be partly to call attention to the compositionally suppressed -*ūtá*-.) My interpr. takes the *utá* as properly positioned to conjoin two clauses, and no special pleading (much less ignoring of the problem) is required.

Although Indra’s name is not mentioned, *hanti vṛtrám* is of course a definitional predicate for Indra, who is also regularly identified as a *samrāj*-. The Maruts’ role in helping Indra in the Vṛtra conflict is of course one of the contended issues in the RV (see the Agastya hymn I.165 for example).

Re takes abc as expressing the three functions, which I find hard to see. Does he assume pāda b is the third function and c the second? Surely he doesn’t see the smashing of Vṛtra in c as third function!

VII.58.5: On *jijīliré* as a presential stative, see Kü (610–11).

VII.58.6: The first hemistich, which contains both *susṭutí*- ‘good praise’ and a form of *√juṣ* ‘enjoy’ with the Maruts as subject, but in separate clauses is an expansion of 3b *jújoṣann ín marútaḥ susṭutím naḥ*. As was noted above, the first pāda of 3 also contains a pl. form of *maghávan(t)*-, which I take there as referring to our human patrons, because I take the Maruts as subject of the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. impv., but the presence of *maghónām* here,

clearly referring to the Maruts, may instead suggest that the *maghāvant*-s in 3a are also the Maruts.

*idám* in b (*idám sūktám*) is yet another example of the frequent use of a form of *ayám* in the last vs. of a hymn to refer to the whole preceding hymn.

## VII.59 Maruts

VII.59.1: The āmreḍita *idám-idam* in pāda a must go with the clause in b. The *ca* that connects the two clauses is slightly displaced: we might expect it to occur after the first element of its clause, namely *idám-idam*. But the pāda boundary and the intrusion of a pāda-initial voc. *dévāsaḥ* have clearly interfered with the placement, and the sequence *yám ... yám ca* makes the syntax perspicuous.

The sequence of vocc. in cd is puzzling because the first is unaccented, while the rest are accented, including those that follow the first in the same pāda: *tásmā agne váruṇa mītrāryaman, mārutaḥ* ... We would, I think, expect either all accented (*\*agne váruṇa mītrāryaman*) or all unaccented (*agne \*varuṇa mītrāryaman*). Old suggests that a new “Ansatz” begins after *tásmā agne*, and it is of course true that the caesura follows *agne* -- but also of course true that vocatives are not ordinarily accented in that position. He also points out that the three vocc. in the 2<sup>nd</sup> part of the pāda are the names of the three principal Ādityas, which occur together and as accented vocc. elsewhere (V.67.1, VIII.19.35). In the latter passage the three vocc. are found pāda-internal post-caesura as here (see comm. ad loc.) Both of the factors adduced by Old no doubt contributed to the accentual behavior of this pāda, but it is a fine reminder that the rules of voc. accent, which we think of as fairly mechanical, are in part rhetorically driven.

VII.59.2: *yuṣmākam* ... *ávasā* is a variant of the compd. *yuṣmóta-* (i.e., *yuṣmā-ūta-*) found three times in the preceding hymn in VII.58.4.

The vs. contains two, or implicitly three, 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. act. present forms of the root  $\sqrt{tṛ}$ , *tarati* in b, *prá / ví tirati* in c. For the same pairing of preverbs, see comm. ad VII.58.3 in the previous hymn.

VII.59.3: This vs. plays on the common contrast, also found earlier in this Marut cycle, between the Maruts as individuals -- here “the last” (*caramá-*) of them -- and as a collective (*vísve*).

On *sácā* as loc. absol. marker, see comm. ad IV.31.5.

I have rendered the nom. pl. *kāmínaḥ* as an adverb (avidly) to avoid the somewhat heavy ‘having desire (for it)’.

VII.59.3–4: Both of these vss. begin *nahí vaḥ*; in neither one is it easy to produce a causal value for *-hí*, hence my ‘certainly’. The opening of 4c *abhí vaḥ* plays on the *nahí vaḥ* of 3a, 4a.

VII.59.5: Both Ge and Re take c as a single clause (e.g., “Car je vous ai donné ces offrandes”), but the position of *hí* suggests that a new clause begins with preceding *raré*, and *imā vo havyā* is a fine nominal clause announcing the oblations present right here on the ritual ground.

VII.59.6: The sequence *sádatāvitā* is analyzed by the Pp. as *sádata avitá*, with the latter form generally taken as a 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. impv. to  $\sqrt{av}$  ‘help’. But this interpr. is problematic on grounds of both form and meaning. There is no stem *avi-* to  $\sqrt{av}$ ; the best that can be done is to classify it with the *-iṣ-* aor. *ávī*, etc., but, in addition to *-i-* rather than *-iṣ-*, the accent is wrong, since the *-iṣ-* aorist has root accent. Moreover, a form of ‘help’ fits badly in the passage, where the main verb should provide syntactic support for the infinitive phrase *spārhāṇi dātave vāsu* “to give coveted goods.” These difficulties are treated in detail by Narten (Sig. aor. 87–88), who suggests an appealing and convincing solution, to read *sádatā vitā*, with the latter the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. impv. to the root pres. of  $\sqrt{vī}$  ‘pursue’, a solution that does not require emending the Saṃhitā text. As Narten points out, this pres. appears elsewhere with an infinitive. Although we ideally would expect a long root vowel (\**vīā*), she adduces the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. impv. *vihí* (3x), beside more common *vīhí*, as a model. This solution is accepted by Lub, though it is rejected by Baum (Impv. in RV p. 93, although he hesitates p. 167); Klein (DGRV I.166, 167; II.39) implicitly accepts the Pp. reading, but he does not cite the following pāda containing the infinitive phrase.

The accent on the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. impv. *sádatā* presumably results from its juxtaposition and contrast with adjacent *vitā*.

*ásredhantaḥ* at the beg. of c can be either a voc. or a nom. pl.; nothing hangs on the exact identification.

VII.59.7: I take pāda a as a nominal clause separate from b, with predicated pres. part. *śúmbhamānāḥ*. The hemistich cannot form a single clause because *apaptan* in b is unaccented despite the *hí* in pāda a. I take the sense of the first pāda to be that storms come out of nowhere, fully beautified as it were, so the beautification must have been done “in secret” (*sasvār*). The dark-backed geese of b are the storm clouds. The next hymn, dedicated to Mitra and Varuṇa, has a similarly structured vs., VII.60.10 *sasvās cid dhí sámṛtis tveṣy eṣām apīcyèna sáhasā sáhante* “Because their attack is violent even in secret and they overpower with hidden power ...” (JPB tr.). In that vs. the finite verb in b, *sáhante*, is accented and therefore falls under the domain of *hí* in pāda a. Although in 60.10 a causal interpr. of *hí* is possible, it is difficult to impose one here, despite the identical pāda opening *sasvās cid dhí*.

VII.59.8: *tiráś cittāni* is a striking expression, without obvious parallels. In interpreting it, we can begin by noting that *tiráś cid* is a reasonably frequent pāda opening (IV.29.1, V.75.7, VIII.33.14, 51.9, 66.12), including in the next hymn, VII.60.6. Although I toyed with the possibility of reading *tiráś cit tāni* here, with the neut. pl. prn., this does not seem to be productive. However, the fact that *tiráś cid* is a formulaic expression may help account for the fact that our *tiráś cittāni* seems to be only loosely connected syntactically to the rest of the clause. Ge takes the expression as meaning “against/contrary to expectation” (wider Erwartung), but I’m not at all sure that *tiráḥ* can mean ‘against’ (though see X.171.4 *devānām cit tiró vāsam* “even athwart the will of the gods”). And in any case we would surely want to punish someone who tried to kill us, whether we expected him to or not. Re’s “en croisant (nos) pensées” is better; I have adapted an English idiom “cross-purposes,” which is practically a calque on the Skt. phrase. Here it reflects the hostility between the would-be attacker and “us.”

VII.59.8–9: Although, as noted in the publ. intro., the last four vss. of the hymn (9–12) must be late additions, there is a verbal link between vs. 8 and vs. 9: *tápiṣṭhena* “with the most scorching ...” opening 8d is echoed by the Maruts’ ritual epithet *sāmtapanāḥ* opening 9a. This link may help account for why these Sākamedha vss. were attached just here.

VII.59.9–12: For the Sākamedha rites reflected in these vss., see publ. intro. and, e.g., ŚB II.5.3, esp. 3ff.; ĀpŚS VIII.9; sec. lit. including Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, 117–19; Keith, *Religion and Philosophy*, 322–23, etc.

VII.59.9: With the standard tr., I supply “come” in c, anticipating *ā gata* in 10a.

VII.59.11: The *āmreḍita ihéha* echoes that in vs. 1, *idám-idam*, forming a superficial ring. Given the apparent composite nature of the hymn, this apparent ring is presumably not a sign of a hymn conceived originally as a unity, but perhaps a hasty adjustment to try to integrate the separate pieces.

Pāda c appears to mean “I choose the/your sacrifice” (*yajñám ... ā vṛṇe*), as in Re’s “je choisís votre sacrifice.” But this doesn’t make a lot of sense in its baldest form. Although *ā vṛ* normally just means ‘choose’, in this passage the *ā* appears to be used as it is with *√yaj*: *ā √yaj* means ‘attract through sacrifice’ (sim. *ā √pū* ‘attract through purification’), hence my “I will you (to come) here to (my) sacrifice,” that is, I attract you to it by the force of my will.

#### [VII.60–74 JPB]

##### VII.60 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

The composition of this hymn is somewhat ragged, with phrases from elsewhere incompletely adapted to context as well as grammatical and syntactic solecisms. See, e.g., vss. 1, 8, 9, 10, 12.

VII.60 Intro.: I would substitute “mares” for “antelopes”; see comm. ad vs. 3 below.

VII.60.1: Like *énaś-* (see comm. ad V.3.7), *āgas-* is something that is done (e.g., *yát sīm āgaś cakṛmá* I.179.3=V.85.7=VII.93.7), an ‘offense’. The negated bahuvr. *ánāgas-* therefore means lit. ‘without offense’, a sense that can shade into ‘blameless’, enabling the (in my view false) interpr. of the noun itself as ‘blame’.

In formal terms this bahuvr. should be an adjectival *-s*-stem, *ánāgas-*; however, there are several unambiguous occurrences of a truncated thematic stem: m. acc. pl. *ánāgān* (III.54.19, IV.12.4, X.12.8), f. acc. sg. *ánāgām* (VIII.101.15). In addition, several forms of *ánāgāḥ*, which should be, and regularly is, nom. sg. m., in context must be nom. plural m. (e.g., VII.87.7) and must also belong to the thematic stem; see the forms listed by Gr under *án-āga-*. Our form here has elicited a great deal of discussion (which I will not treat in detail) because neither the *-s*-stem nor the thematic stem allows the morphological interpr. that most commentators want – namely acc. pl., agreeing with an unexpressed “us” or “men” in indirect speech; see, e.g., Re “... tu déclarais (les hommes)

exempts de faute.” For this, we should expect either \**ánāgasah* or \**ánāgān*. Old simply declares *ánāgāḥ* an acc. pl., but other comm. are not so bold. The publ. tr. follows the correct course, in my opinion, in taking *ánāgāḥ* as the nom. sg. it appears to be (so also WG among the standard tr.) with its usual meaning. The sun is of course perfect and therefore without offense / blameless; on this basis it has the charter to pronounce on this state with regard to others, esp. since it serves as the eye for Mitra and Varuṇa, observing the activities of men (see vs. 2). Though I agree with the publ. tr. and WG, I think there is a further wrinkle in this passage, however: not only is *ánāgāḥ* nom. singular (to the *s*-stem), modifying the sun, but it is also to be read as nom. plural (to the *-a*-stem) and constitutes the direct speech of the sun: “(they are) free of offense.” I would therefore emend the tr. of the first hemistich to “When today as you rise, o Sun, you who are free of offense will say ‘(they are) free of offense’ as truth to Mitra and Varuṇa.” The sun’s statement is, in effect, a sort of satyakriyā.

With regard to the problematic phrasing of pāda a, note that nearby VII.62.2 has the syntactically and morphologically correct *prá no ... vocó, ’nāgasah* “you will proclaim us to be without offense,” with acc. pl. of the *s*-stem *ánāgas-* agreeing with *naḥ*. This is the first, but not the only, passage in this hymn that presents a fractured version of a phase found correctly elsewhere.

Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. supply “without offense” in pāda c to modify *vayám*, thus smuggling in nom. pl. *ánāgāḥ* by other means. See, e.g., Ge “Wir möchten vor den Göttern (schuldlos) ... sein.” This is certainly possible, but the text can be interpr. without supplying anything: “may we be among the gods, o Aditi, dear to you as we sing, o Aryaman.”

The referent of *táva* is undetermined, since it is preceded (in c) by voc. *adite* and fld. by voc. *aryaman*. Aditi might be slightly more likely, given her esp. benign maternal character.

VII.60.2: The bahuvr. *nṛcákṣas-* is extremely common in the RV, almost exclusively (see, however, comm. ad III.53.9–10) of gods. It can mean, inter alia, ‘having (his/its) eye/gaze on men’ or ‘drawing the eye/gaze of men’, with objective and subjective genitive respectively. In our passage I think the publ. tr. chose wrong (“who draws the gaze of men”). The strongly expressed point of vss. 1 and 2 is that the sun sees everything men do and can testify to their offenses or lack thereof. I would emend to “the Sun, who has his eye on men ...”

The *ubhé* ‘both’ (neut. or fem.) of b is undefined, but Old’s suggestion that the referent is the still and the moving of c is plausible and essentially fld. by all. See IV.53.6, adduced by Old: *jágata sthātúr ubháyasya*. I would slightly emend the tr. of *sthātuḥ* to “still” or “stationary” instead of “standing.”

VII.60.3: I do not know of any evidence that Sūrya’s draught animals were antelopes. Macd. (Ved. Myth. 30) thinks they’re mares, and *harít-* obviously belongs to the word family containing very well-attested *hári-*, the designation of Indra’s fallow bay horses. See EWA s.v. *hári-*, with fem. *harít-* rendered ‘gelbliche Stute’. Note also the overt ‘horse’ in I.115.3 *áśvā harítaḥ sūryasya* “the tawny mares of the Sun” (sim. IX.107.8 *áśvayeva haritā*). The fact that Sūrya is once called *saptāśva-* ‘having seven horses’ (V.45.9) strongly supports the opinion that the seven *harít-* here (also IV.13.3) are

equines. I would therefore emend the tr. of pāda a to “... his seven tawny mares.” On *etaśá-* (*létaśa-*) see comm. ad VII.62.2.

If the second hemistich is taken as a single rel. cl., as in the publ. tr., the rel. prn. *yáḥ*, in 2nd pos. in d, comes too late, since half of the direct object (*dhāmāni ... jānimāni*) and an adj. modifying the subj. (*yuvākuḥ*) occupy pāda c. Old, Ge, and Re, in different ways, attempt to construe *dhāmāni ... yuvākuḥ* together (e.g., Re [in n.] “voué à vos institutions”), but these efforts seem artificial, and it’s probably best to accept the late rel. prn.

I would slightly change “like your herds” to “like herds.” M+V do not have herds of livestock of their own; Sūrya is being compared to a (human) herdsman.

VII.60.5–7: These vss. are marked by hemistich-initial *imé* ‘these here’ (5a, 5c, 6a, 7a).

VII.60.5–6: *ádabdhāḥ* ending vs. 5 is picked up by *dūlābhāsaḥ* at the end of 6a.

VII.60.6: Although only M+V are explicitly listed as subjects, the rest of the vs. is couched in the plural, and clearly Aryaman is assumed here (see 4d, 5b).

The verbal stems *citáya-* and *cetáya-* are hopelessly entangled functionally and their meanings are difficult to sort out. See disc. in my *-áya-Formations* pp. 57–58, 74, 161–63. The zero-grade stem *citáya-* should be (and usually is) intransitive ‘appears’ or I/T ‘perceives’, but here it must have the double I/T sense ‘makes perceive’, originally only appropriate to full-grade *cetáya-*. (As Ge [n. 6b] points out, a semantic parallel for our passage is VII.86.7 *áchetayad acítaḥ*, with full-grade *cetáya-*.) For disc. of our passage see esp. *áya-Form.* p. 162. The phonological and etymological play in *acetásam cic citayanti* (... / c: ... *sucétasam*), reinforced by 7b *cikitvāṃso acetásam*, favored the confusion of root syllables. It is also the case that the late break *cita* with two lights is metrically better than \**ceta* H L, though the latter is by no means excluded.

Pāda c is almost identical to VII.3.10, with part. *vátantaḥ* in place of the opt. *vatema* there. See comm. ad loc. I would here substitute “Being familiar with the resolve based on good perception.”

VII.60.7: Ge, Re, and WG all construe *cikitvāṃsaḥ* with *diváḥ ... pṛthivyāḥ* (e.g., Re “qui ont compris le ciel (et) la terre” / WG “auf Himmel und Erde achtend”). However, as Re (n.) points out, this pf. part. is usually used absolutely; moreover, transitive forms of  $\sqrt{cit}$  ordinarily (though not invariably) take the acc. It also seems rhetorically stronger for the gods to be generally “perceptive,” rather than limiting their perceptions to certain objects, esp. when contrasted with the generally unperceptive mortal. Therefore, the publ. tr., with absolute *cikitvāṃsaḥ* and H+E loosely construed with *imé*, seems preferable, even though the gods don’t really belong to the earth. However, to bring out the contrast between the adjacent *cikitvāṃso acetásam* I would slightly rearrange the tr. to “These unwinking ones, of heaven and earth, lead the unperceptive man – they being perceptive.”

On *viṣpitá-* see comm. ad VIII.83.3.

VII.60.8: Several alternatives to the standardly agreed-upon tr. present themselves in this vs.

To begin with, though the publ. tr. takes *yád* as a subord. conjunc. “since,” the other standard tr. take it as a neut. rel. prn. agreeing with *śárma*. By this interpr. *tásmín* in c is its correlative: “which shelter ..., in that ...” In the end, I prefer the publ. tr. (see below), but a neut. rel. prn. is certainly possible.

However, there are other possibilities for the overall structure of the vs. All the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take cd as a single main clause, with *dádhānā(h)* in c modifying the 1st pl. subj. of *karma* in d. However, it is not impossible that c is a continuation of the subordinate cl. in ab, with d an independent main cl. (In any case, this is how it would unfold to the hearer.) The part. *dádhānā(h)* would then modify the gods who are the subject of ab, and the *tásmín* beginning c could either refer to the shelter (*śárma*) or to Sudās. This alternative structure could be rendered as “Since Aditi, Mitra, and Varuṇa offer shelter to Sudās (/the good giver), placing (his) progeny and posterity in it/him, let us not ...” The major argument against this interpr. is the middle voice of the participle, which favors some version of the publ. tr. “... we, securing our (own) progeny and posterity in it.” However, in its slight favor is the fact that d is a self-contained *mā* prohibitive, and it might be desirable not to have a preposed participial clause.

Another possible alternative is (as already indicated in the alternative tr. just given) to take *sudāse* not as the PN of the famous king (esp. of VII.18, the Ten Kings Battle), but as a general descriptor “good giver” (or both).

And a final possibility: *gopāvat* in pāda a is taken by all as a neut. possessive modifying *śárma*: “shelter/protection possessing a herdsman (/herdsmen)” (e.g., WG “... mit Hirten versehene Schutzdach”). This strikes me as a little odd – as if the shelter came with its own dedicated attendant. I wonder if instead *gopāvat* is an adverbial neut. in the sense “like X” (of the type *jamadagnivát* ‘like Jamadagni’), characterizing the divine subjects (“Aditi, Mitra, Varuṇa, like herdsmen, offer shelter ...”). The problem is, of course, the accent: we expect \**gopāvát*. Note, though, that the Ādityas are elsewhere called *gopā-*, including in nearby VII.51.2, 52.2 (also II.27.4, VIII.31.13). VII.52.2 is phraseologically quite close to our passage: *mitrás tán no váruṇo māmahanta, śárma tokāya tánayāya gopāḥ* “This will Mitra and Varuṇa (and the others) grant to us as (our) herdsmen: shelter for our progeny and posterity.” Save for WG, the other standard tr. seem to downplay the literal possessive sense of *gopā-vant-*, and indeed JPB’s “... herdsmanlike protection” seems to assume the “like” sense, though rendering it as a neut. modifying *śárma* – an uncomfortable mash-up. Despite the accentual problem, I favor the adverbial interpr. For another instance in which this hymn may maladroitly adopt phraseology from elsewhere in the maṇḍala, see disc. of the next vs.; for another accentual problem, see vs. 12.

Putting all this together, I suggest an alt. tr. for the whole vs.: “Since Aditi, Mitra, and Varuṇa, like herdsmen, offer shelter to Sudās (/the good giver), placing progeny and posterity in it/him, let us not do (anything) that angers the gods.”

VII.60.9: The switch in tone to the hostile and ominous seems to have been occasioned by *devahélanam* in 8d.

The first hemistich of this vs. is oddly constructed. The feature that most strikes me – and seems to have occasioned no concern in anyone else – is the hemistich-final *sáh*, which, despite its unusual position, doesn’t even have a clear referent (“he” = priest, probably, though WG [n.] suggest rather Sudās). Pāda-final nom. sg. *sá(h) / sã* is quite

rare (I count 20 exx. out of 1126, per Lub) and is generally functionally marked. (For reference the passages in question are I.54.3, 79.11, 117.18; II.35.1; III.13.3, 30.7; V.2.4, 7, 41.12; VI.47.4, 51.14, 66.3; VII.60.9, 86.6; VIII.13.1, 27.18; IX.71.8, 79.3 [2x]; X.108.4.) In 12 of the 20 passages the pronoun is the subject of a short, usually nominal clause that begins in the middle of the pāda (as in VI.51.14=IX.79.3 *vṛko hí śáḥ* “for he is a wolf”), though occasionally with a finite verb (as in V.2.4 ... *ájaniṣṭa hí śáḥ* “for he has been born”). The independence of these short clauses from what precedes in the pāda is generally emphasized by a particle, often *hí* (as in the quoted exx.), after the first word of the clause. In a few other passages, the pronoun is the referent of a preposed rel., with the rel. and prn. stationed at opposite ends of their clauses, as in I.79.11 *yó naḥ ... abhidāsati, ánti dūrē paḍiṣṭá śáḥ* “Whoever will assail us, close by or in the distance, let him fall.” (Note also that *paḍiṣṭá śáḥ* is also a self-contained brief cl.) Other rhetorical factors drive the position of the pronoun in the few remaining passages. In none of the other 19 passages does the pronoun lack a clear referent, which is often emphatically called attention to. Our passage fits none of these criteria: the *śáḥ* is not in a brief clause by itself; it is not the referent of a preposed rel. cl.; and it in fact has no obvious referent. We need another explanation, and there is one to hand. The first and most famous of the remarkable Vasiṣṭha–Varuṇa hymns (VII.86–89) is VII.86. In vs. 6 the embattled poet tries to excuse his misdeeds by deflecting blame: *ná sá svó dáḁṣo varuṇa dhrútiḥ sá* “it was not (my) own devising, o Varuṇa – it was delusion.” (On the emended tr. of this passage, see comm. ad loc.) Note that the post-caesura sequence in that vs., *varuṇa dhrútiḥ sá*, is almost identical to our *varuṇadhṛútaḥ śáḥ*. I suggest that our passage is clumsily based on VII.86.6, and the pāda-final *śáḥ* is a pleonastic adaptation of the *sá* in VII.86.6, once *varuṇa dhrútiḥ* was converted into a hapax root-noun cmpd *varuṇa-dhrút-*, most likely an acc. pl. to modify *rípaḥ*. (It would also be possible to detach *varuṇa* from the cmpd and take it as a voc., as in the source passage VII.86.6.) Although Scar (279) cites VII.86.6 in discussing the root-noun cmpd, he does not seem to see its real relevance. For another ex. in this hymn of an awkward reuse of a phrase from another Varuṇa hymn, see vs. 8.

The lexeme *áva √yaj* is rare in the RV (and elsewhere), occurring in the RV only in I.133.7, IV.1.5, and here. The occurrence in IV.1.5 is influenced by one of *áva √yā* in the preceding vs. (IV.1.4). In I.133.7 it means ‘dash down / banish X by sacrifice, sacrifice X away’ and takes *dvíṣaḥ* ‘hatreds’ as obj. The lexeme seems the functional opposite of *ā √yaj* ‘bring/attract through sacrifice’, a form of which is found in our vs. 11 and is an example of what Thiago Mendes-Venturott treated as “unselected object constructions” at the 2025 UCLA IE conf. Here the verb seems to take a double acc. *védim* and *rípaḥ*. The publ. tr. “ritually cleanse the altar of any double-dealing” accommodates the double acc. (more or less) but may introduce a notion (“ritually cleanse”) that seems extraneous. I might substitute ‘rid by sacrifice / ritually rid’, with the whole hemistich tr. “With his libations he should ritually rid the altar of any defilements whatsoever that delude Varuṇa” – or, if we take *varuṇa* as an independent voc. (see above) “of any deluding defilements whatsoever, o V.” Or, if (*varuṇa-*)*dhrútaḥ* is taken as a gen., “... defilements of the delusive one / one deluding V.” I assume that the subj. here is a priest, although it is barely possible that it is a god, probably Varuṇa – matching Aryaman’s action in cd.

In d *sudāse* can alternatively or in addition be “for the good giver”; see vs. 8.

VII.60.10: Another rather rough-hewn vs.

On *sasváś cid dhí* see comm. ad VII.59.7.

The first hemistich must be entirely in the domain of the *hí*, since *sáhante* in b is accented; it presumably provides the basis for cd. The question in this hemistich is who are the referents of gen. *eṣām*, who are presumably also the subj. of the pl. verb *sáhante*. Re supplies ‘gods’, which is probably correct – or, rather, more narrowly the Ādityas, but it could perhaps be the opponents of Sudās in the Ten Kings battle. No other tr. ventures an identification, save for Th (M&A 53), who takes Aditi, Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman as subj. of *sáhante*.

I would slightly change the emphasis and slightly relexify this hemistich to “Because their attack is violent even in secret and they overpower with hidden power ...”

Pāda c contains a nom. pl. pres. part. *réjamānā(h)*, which on contextual grounds cannot have the same referent as 3rd pl. *sáhante* in b, though that would be the first reading (see disc. ad 8c above). Nor can it have the same referent as the 2nd pl. impv. *mṛlátā* in d, esp. because the 2nd pl. is represented by the abl. *yuṣmát* in c. The syntactic rupture is harsh, and there is no obvious referent in the near vicinity. Old adduces another occurrence of *réjamāna-* with similar phraseology: I.171.4 ... *ahám ... índrād bhīyā ... réjamānaḥ* “I ... trembling with fear of Indra,” and on this basis and taking into account *naḥ* at the end of the hemistich, the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) supply a 1st pl. subj. “(we are) trembling from fear of you.” This makes sense – indeed it’s about the only thing that could make sense – but it should be noted how little actual support there is in the passage itself and how much it fractures the syntax.

This is all the more the case since pāda d cannot be directly construed with pāda c: as was just pointed out, the *second* plural subj. of the impv. *mṛlátā* is incompatible with the referent of the nom. pl. part. *réjamānāḥ*, now identified as *first* plural. The standard tr. generally identify d (or part thereof; see below) as the direct speech of the trembling “we” of c – explicitly in Ge’s parenthetical “(sagen wir:)” – addressed to the Ādityas or the gods in general.

The last issue is the accent on *mṛlátā*, which by most interpr. is in the middle of a clause. Old weakly suggests three possible explanations, none of which he commits to (for good reason). It is possible that the accent has been introduced (redactionally) on the model of other mid-pāda accented forms of *mṛlátā*, when it begins a new clause (e.g., I.171.4, which is – NB – the passage that provides us with the model for the interp. of *réjamānā(h)* in c) or after a string of vocc. (e.g., VI.51.5). For another mid-pāda accented *mṛlátā* without clear explanation, see comm. ad VI.50.11. However, the accent may be justified, if with WG, we take *dákṣasya cin mahinā* with pāda c; in that case *mṛlátā* would begin a new cl. An alt. rendering reflecting this syntactic division might be “(we are) trembling in fear before you, bulls, despite the greatness of our skill: ‘have mercy upon us.’” My reservation about this fix is that *dákṣa-* is ordinarily a property of gods; on the other hand, this interpr. gives *cid* something to do. WG take *dákṣa-* as the name of one of the minor Ādityas (“eben durch die Grösse des Dakṣa”; see also the n.); under this interpr. we are trembling despite having Dakṣa on our side. This is possible. And of course, given the other disturbance in this hymn, incl. accentual ones, the accent may simply be wrong.

VII.60.11: The ragtag syntax continues. Here a perfectly well-formed generalizing rel. cl. in ab (“who(ever) ...”) finds no overt referent in the main clause of c: a gen. *\*tásya*, dependent on *maghāvānah* -- “(\*his) patrons” – seems to have been suppressed. See Old’s disc.

I think it possible that pāda b should be construed with c, not a, as in the publ. tr. (and most others). Pāda a describes the activity of a ritualist who obtains favor for his sacred formulation by sacrificial means, but “the winning of victory’s prize and of the highest wealth” is more appropriate to his patrons, who will parlay their priest’s ritual success into battlefield victory. An alt. tr. could be “Whoever by sacrifice wins favor for his formulation, at the winning of victory’s prize and of the highest wealth / (his) patrons strive to overpower the battle fury of the stranger.”

VII.60.12: The apparent short-vowel dual voc. *deva* in the Saṃhitā text is read as *devā* in the Pp. Although such dual forms obviously do exist (e.g., *deva* in VIII.9.6; for an expansive list see Lanman, Noun Inflection 342–43), I think there are fewer than are usually identified. In this particular case I am inclined to follow the publ. tr., with its (unsignaled) compound *\*deva-puróhiti-* “the placing in front of the god,” which requires no alteration of the Saṃhitā text. Although Ge (n. 12a) wants to see *puróhiti-* as referring to the Purohita-ship of Vasiṣṭha, I see no reference to that here – and in fact Purohita as a priestly title is only just coming into the RV (or may not have done so yet): see comm. ad I.44.10, 12. Ordinarily the adj. *puróhita-* means literally ‘placed in front’, referring to the placement of the offering fire to the east at the beginning of the sacrifice, its installation. Here in the last vs. of the hymn this act, as the commencement of the dawn ritual (signaled first by the rising of the sun in the first vs.), inaugurates the sacrifice. The near deictic *iyám* draws attention to the immediacy of the act. The only problem with positing this cmpd is the accent: we should expect *\*devá-purohiti-* with 1st member accent, even though it’s a tatpuruṣa (see, e.g., *devá-hiti-*, *devá-hūti-*). Given the many disturbances in this hymn, I do not find this unduly concerning. However, I would be remiss if I didn’t note that the syllable before an early caesura is generally heavy, which would favor *\*devā*.

The publ. tr. omits *yajñésu*. I would also slightly alter the wording: “This installation of the god [=Agni] here in front has been performed for you two at the sacrifices, o M+V.

### VII.61–63

Note that each of these hymns begins with the preverb *úd*, setting the scene for the rising of the sun that opens each hymn.

#### VII.61 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

VII.61.1: The Pp reads *varuṇā*, a pregnant dual voc. (“o Varuṇa [and Mitra]”) for Saṃhitā *varuṇa*, as it read *devā* in the preceding hymn (VII.60.12) for Saṃhitā *deva*. Once again I don’t think this is necessary; calling on one of the pair would not be unusual. However, it is the case that a heavy final syllable would make for a more standard L L H break. Most tr. follow the Pp reading; the publ. tr. does not.

I am in agreement with the publ. tr. that we do not need to supply an object (“light,” “rays,” etc.) with the part. *tatanvān*, as the standard tr. do. However, “who has extended himself” sounds too reflexive (/middle) for an active pf. part., and I would substitute simply “stretching out” vel sim.

Although “mark” for *ā ciketa* works fine, this English verb may be a bit ambiguous; I would substitute “takes note of,” to make it clearer.

Although the other standard tr. (but not the publ. tr.) consider *manyú-* as essentially neutral here (Ge Absicht, Re pensée-intentionelle, WG Eifer; see also Re’s n. “ici *manyú-* est la pensée-passionnelle (non nécessairement la pensée-mauvaise)”), the stem elsewhere explicitly expresses the mental energy that is harnessed for violence. When *manyú-* is deployed by a positively viewed figure (like Indra), the result is good, but the violence is there nonetheless. Since *manyú-* was used in the immediately preceding, closely related hymn (VII.60.11) of the battle fury of our enemy (see also nearby VII.56.22), it seems unlikely that it here refers blandly to zeal or intention. Rather, as we see later in the hymn and elsewhere, the sun and Varuṇa’s other spies are esp. looking out for the misdeeds and wrong attitudes of humans; here the sun is taking note of a potential explosive situation.

VII.61.2: Re considers *dīrghaśrút* a neut. pl., modifying *mánmāni*, an analysis Old also toys with, but nom. sg. masc. seems more likely. See the other standard tr. and Scar (555).

On *krátvā ná* see Ge’s n. 2d.

VII.61.3: In the first hemistich all the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) supply the verb *√ric*: the idiom *prá √ric* + ABL is so recognizable that even in the absence of a form of the verbal root, it would come to mind. In tr. I would substitute “project beyond” or “extend beyond” for “reach past” of the publ. tr., and in fact I’d be inclined to supply it as a participle, not a finite verb: “(Projecting) beyond the wide (mid-space) ...”

On supplying “mid-space” with *uróḥ*, see Old and III.46.3.

Re plausibly suggests that the apparently ill-assorted pair “among the plants and among the clans” (*ośadhīṣu vikṣú*) refers to the countryside and the settled places respectively (*āraṇyá / grāmyá* in somewhat later parlance; see X.90.8).

JPB takes *ṛdhag yatáḥ* as an abl. sg., referring to an enemy: “guarding ... against him who goes his own way.” The other standard tr. (see also Gr) take *yatáḥ* as acc. pl., referring to the spies of pāda c. This seems the more likely interpr.; the root *√rakṣ* almost always governs an acc., and although Re’s claim that the root is “toujours favorable” may be a bit overblown, it is generally accurate. The tr. should be changed to “unwinkingly guarding (them) as they go each separately.”

VII.61.4: The verb *śámsā* is universally taken as a 1st sg. subjunctive; it could of course be a 2nd sg. impv. Nothing rides on the decision.

The other standard tr. take *dhāma* as a singular, while the publ. tr. interprets it as a short-vowel neut. pl. Either is possible and again nothing rides on it – though I prefer the pl. of the publ. tr.

On the intens. pf. *badbadhe* see Schaef (156–57), Kü (331).

Pāda d presents a clever twist. The most common use of the lexeme *prá √tṝ*, esp. in the middle, is in the idiom “lengthen (one’s) lifetime (*āyus-*).” Because the passage of time is the focus of pāda c: *áyan māsāḥ* “the months will pass,” we expect the lifetime idiom here as well. But instead of extending his life, the good sacrificer extends his “settlement” (per publ. tr.), that is, his (personal) circle, his band, his community. (I would prefer “circle” here to “settlement,” which seems to represent the physical location rather than the people in it.) Pāda d is thus directly contrastive with *avīrāḥ* “without heroes,” not with the temporal idiom. That is, it contrasts adding to the population (d) with not doing so (c).

VII.61.5: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. is difficult to interpret, not least because the most straightforward reading attributes “deceits” (*drúhaḥ*) to Mitra and Varuṇa – a difficult concept doctrinally, since these two gods are generally the moral arbiters of the RVic world. There is also some uncertainty about the morphological identity of some of the words – in particular, the Pp analyzes the Samhitā *ámūrā* and *vísṡvā* as such (that is, as ending in *-ā* in pausa), though *ámūrāḥ* and *vísṡvāḥ* are equally possible in sandhi, and would match *imāḥ* (so Pp.) as fem. nom. pl. Acdg. to Sāy., *ámūrā ... vísṡvā* are voc. m. duals; this interpr. is more or less followed by Ge, though he considers *vísṡvā* a nom. du. (n. 5a) – a distinction without a difference, given his tr. “alle beide unfehlbar.” Since both stems have initial accent by nature, it is impossible to determine whether they are nom. or voc. Despite the Pp., Sāy., and Ge, it seems better to take all three forms as fem. nom. pl. As Old points out, separating *vísṡvā(h)* from *imā(h)* seems artificial.

As for the apparently problematic content of this vs., I think the way to reconcile “deceits” with Mitra and Varuṇa is much as JPB indicates in the publ. intro., but I think this explanation can be further refined. The clue is in pāda b, where it is said that neither *citrám* nor *yakṡám* is seen in/among the fem. entities introduced in the first pāda. The two words *citrá-* and *yakṡá-* are, in my view, contrastive terms in the visual realm; both refer to something that is conspicuously bright and visible, but of two different sorts. The first, very well-attested *citrá-*, usually an adjective, describes bright objects that are real (or so we hope) – the sun, various gods, light, wealth, and so forth. As a visual sign it can be relied upon. By contrast, the much rarer noun *yakṡá-* refers to objects that are conspicuously visible but *unreal*: apparitions, phantasms, illusions. It is obviously derived from *√yakṡ* ‘be conspicuous, display’, but has shaded off into a specialized visual domain. Pāda b is saying that neither a real visual sign nor a delusive one is seen among the entities in question; in other words those entities are inconspicuous, indeed invisible. I would emend the tr. (somewhat overheavily) to try to bring out the visual aspect of *yakṡá-* (and also to reflect the presential use of the middle pf. of *√drś*, on which see Kü 233): “... among whom/which is seen neither a (true) bright sign nor an (illusory) apparition.”

Because they show neither true nor false visible signs, the entities that follow the untruths of men (pāda c) are invisible and on this basis are *drúhaḥ* “deceptions, delusions,” since their targets are unaware of them.

There are several different ways to interpr. pāda d, depending on the analysis of *acíte*. Easiest to dismiss is WG’s claim (n.) that it is loc. to an (otherwise unattested) thematic *acíta-*. The interpr. generated by this analysis (“Nicht sind eure Geheimnisse in Unkenntnis geraten”) does not improve the sense. Better to interpr. as a dat. to the

existing root-noun compd. *acít-*, but this still allows several radically different paths for interpr. Ge, Re, and JPB take *acíte* as an infinitive, “(not) not to be perceived,” but even here they diverge. Re and JPB construe *vām* as the agent of *acíte* (e.g., JPB: “There have not been secrets that cannot be perceived by you two”), whereas Ge takes *vām* as gen. with *ninyānī* with the agent of the infin. left unexpressed: “Nicht sind euch beiden Geheimnisse unbekannt geblieben.” By contrast, Scar (120) interpr. *acít-* as an agent noun ‘unperceiving (one)’ and tr. “Nicht wurden eure Geheimnisse dem Unverständige zuteil.” I favor the Scar interpr., because the other four occurrences of *acít-*, incl. two in VII (VII.86.7, 104.1), have this function. True, none of them is dative (all are acc. pl.) and root-noun datives are often infinitival; still it seems best to interpr. the form in conjunction with other occurrences of the same stem. I would therefore substitute “your secrets have not been for the unperceptive.” Or perhaps better to accept both interpr., i.e., those of Scar and JPB, since both can fit the context. On the one hand, the spies of M+V - their “deceptions” -- cannot be perceived, as the rest of the vs. indicates. On the other, these spies see everything and relay it all to M+V, and therefore there are no secrets that M+V do not know.

VII.61.6: Since the last vs. (7) is shared with VII.60 (vs. 12), this is the real final vs. of the hymn and has a summary tone.

The infinitival *ṛcāse* is something of a tease. It appears after two pādas with 1st sg. verbs in ritual context: *yajñám mahayam* “I magnify the sacrifice” (a) and *huvé vām* “I call upon you two” (b), and it has the look of a 1st sg. *-se* form, the famous cluster of 1st sg. verbs that express praise and other ritual actions (*stuṣé*, etc.). In fact, this root does make such a form, the hapax *abhy àrcase*, with full-grade root in a late hymn (X.64.3). However, because of its accent our *ṛcāse* cannot be a finite verb (though the pāda has no other verb) and breaks the 1st-sg. pattern; another occurrence of this infinitive is found in VI.39.5.

Ge and Re take *bráhma ... imāni* as the subject of *jujuṣan*, which for them has the I/T sense ‘please’. But all forms of the redupl. stem *jujuṣ-* / *jujoṣ-* mean ‘enjoy’ and take an acc. obj., and the publ. tr. “they will enjoy” must be correct (so also Gr, WG). It is somewhat disconcerting to have a plural subject after the intense concentration on the dual M+V (incl. three forms of *vām* in the first three pāda of this vs.), but it is common for hymns to open out to a larger group of recipients at their end – and of course the other Ādityas always lurk in the background in M+V hymns and could be the subject here. For the zero-grade root syllable of this apparent subjunctive, see Kü (201).

VII.61.7=60.12 (q.v.).

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

VII.62 Intro.: I would change “antelopes” to “steeds”; on the non-evidence for antelopes as the Sun’s draught animals, see comm. ad VII.60.3.

VII.62.1: Pāda b is syntactically orphaned. Both Ge and Re supply verbs to govern the (likely) acc. phrase with the sun as subj.: “awakens” (Ge), “contemplate” (Re). Re’s suggestion is better supported, in that forms of *√cakṣ* are found in similar configurations

in the two preceding hymns, VII.60.3, 61.1. However, it is also possible simply to fold b into the clause found in pāda a, as WG and JPB do. The latter seems to supply a *prāti* “(facing)”, presumably borrowed from vs. 2 and also common in similar contexts in the opening of Dawn hymns. It might also be possible that the NP in b is in the nominative, though this doesn’t get us anywhere.

In d I would substitute “was” for “has been” – and perhaps “made” and “makers” for “created” and “creators.” In any case, as Re points out, *krātu-* has a pseudo-etymological relationship with  $\sqrt{kr}$  here.

VII.62.2: The stem *etaśá-* in the singular designates the Sun’s horse and seems to be used as a name; in the far-less-common pl. it refers to steeds in general. It was originally a color term (‘dappled’ vel sim.; see EWA s.v.), derived from *éta-*, also a color term applied to animals (see EWA s.v.). The latter refers to antelopes in later texts and seems already to have made this switch at least partly in the RV, at least in Marut contexts. See I.165.5, 166.9, 169.6, 7, V.54.5, etc.

VII.62.3: On *śurúdh-* see comm. ad IX.70.5. I would prefer “rich spoils” to “ritual gifts.”

VII.62.4: Pāda a is found identically in IV.55.1b; see comm. there. The du. + sg. vocc. (*dyāvābhūmī adite*) co-occur with a du. verb (*trāsīthām*, on the form of which see comm. ad VII.70.2); *adite* therefore seems to be an adjunct or afterthought, esp. since the 2nd ps. dual continues in the next pāda (*vām ... ṛṣve*). (On other interpr. of *adite* see Old ad loc.) Although in the three other occurrences of *trāsīthām*, all accented, all pāda-internal, the verb has to be taken as the beginning of a new clause or as an interjection, here it follows a voc. phrase that opens the pāda and therefore is the first “real” word in the pāda.

Pāda b has no overt syntactic relation either with the preceding pāda or with the following hemistich (and is quite different from the context of the repeated pāda in IV.55.1). The solution found in the publ. tr. (as well as in Ge, Re, and WG) is to take it with pāda a, as an unsignaled “X (and) which Y” construction, with the referent of the *yé* being “die Urgötter” (Ge n. 4b). Ge appositely adduces I.159.3, where the gods, who are the sons of Heaven and Earth, also give birth to them, in a beloved paradox. Bl (RVRep 240) instead takes b as dependent on the flg. hemistich with *yé* referring to Varuṇa, Vāyu, and Mitra. This seems less satisfactory, though it avoids the necessity of supplying *\*ca* after *yé* in b.

### VII.63 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

The hymn is knitted together by the occurrences of the lexeme *úd √i*. The finite form *úd (...)* *eti* is found in the first three vss. The first two begin *úd v eti*; the verb is postponed till pāda b in vs. 3, lacks the particle, and is not initial; in 4 it ends pāda a. The pattern is broken in vs. 5, where *ánv eti* appears instead, after the caesura in b. But the all-important preverb is restored in the loc. part. *údite* in 5c. Only the final vs., which is repeated from VII.62.6, lacks this idiom.

VII.63.1–2: The Saṃhitā text of both vss. begins *úd v eti*; the Pp. reads *ū* in both. It is not clear to me why HvN restore *ū* in 1a but *u* in 2a in the same phonological context.

VII.63.2: On the desid. *-vívṛtsan* see Heenen (229–30), who makes rather heavier weather of it than necessary.

VII.63.3: On the pf. *cachanda* see Kü (181–84) at length. Both Old and Kü (182 n. 204) counsel against reading short redupl. *cāchanda* here (or in the other occurrence of the pf., *cachadyāt* X.73.9), given the orig. root-initial cluster *\*sk-* – even though in both cases a light redupl. syllable would convert a bad cadence into a good one. I would myself be tempted to read a secondarily shortened redupl. here.

VII.63.4: On *tarāṇi-*, its relationship to *ártha-*, and this pāda in general, see disc. ad III.11.3; the post-caesura phrase *tarāṇir bhrājamānaḥ* is also found in X.88.16.

The *árthāni* in d echoes the cmpd. *dūrēārtha-* in b: both the sun and the people whom he impels have their own goals.

VII.63.5: As the publ. intro. says, the image in b is somewhat puzzling: what does it mean to “go along / follow the/a *pāthaḥ*”? The stem *pāthas-* means ‘fold’ (as in sheepfold), pen, shelter’ and (in my view, only secondarily) ‘troop, herd’ (as in the publ. tr.). There is one other place in the RV that contains this exact expression, I.113.8, where Dawn follows “the troop of those who go away” (*parāyatīnām ānv eti pāthaḥ*), referring to the Dawns who have preceded her. So the expression is intelligible, though, as the publ. intro. points out, it’s hard to identify what the *pāthaḥ* consists of. However, in our case I think there are several different kinds of interference also happening in this pāda, which may explain this odd expression. First, remember that *ānv eti* breaks the pattern of *úd eti* that prevailed in the first four vss. (see comm. above), so it is, in a sense, calling attention to itself. Second, our acc. sg. *pāthaḥ* closely resembles the acc. pl. to the ‘path’ word, namely *pathāḥ*. As it happens *ānu ví* is a regular idiom with the singular of this stem, namely *pānthām* (e.g., I.24.8, 124.3 [=V.80.4], VII.44.5, X.66.13), which is also regularly found with *ānu* alone or in combination with other roots. I think it likely that *ānv eti pāthaḥ* was meant to evoke this idiom: “go along the path,” as was also suggested by Re. Moreover, there is another idiom that involves *ví* and *pāthaḥ*, namely *āpi ví pāthaḥ* “enter the fold/pen,” used of slaughtered animal victims going to heaven (“the pen of the gods”), e.g., I.162.2 (Horse sacrifice), II.3.9 (Āprī hymn), but also of gods merging into the fold of the gods (e.g., III.8.9, VII.47.3). The preverbs *ānu* and *āpi* are minimally distinct, and here the Sun could be entering the fold of the gods after his journey across the sky. I think these echoes are the background of the expression in b, but we are still constrained to tr. what is there. However, I would prefer “troop” to “herd,” as a more appropriate collective noun for gods.

It is only in the 2nd half of this, the last real vs. of the hymn, that Mitra and Varuṇa appear as dedicands of the hymn and of ritual activity; their only other appearance was in 1c, dependent on the Sun.

I would prefer “do honor to” to “worship” for *prāti ... vidhema*.

VII.63.6= 62.6

**VII.64 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]**

VII.64.1: The opt. *prá ... dadīran* is functionally ambiguous. Gr identifies it as a passive; Old denies it is passive, adducing III.21.5 and nearby VII.48.4, both with transitive middle forms of  $\sqrt{dā}$  (with III.21.5 also containing *prá*). But Ge (n. 1b) allows either transitive or passive value (though tr. it as the former), citing VII.90.1 (also in this maṇḍala) with passive *prá ... dadrire*. I am happy to go along with the publ. tr. and all the other standard tr. in taking it as transitive with supplied subject, presumably the ritual participants, but the case is not as clear as Old suggests: “cloaks of ghee should be given to you” is a possibility.

VII.64.2: This vs. is esp. marked by vocatives, particularly the long unaccented voc. phrase in pāda a, *rājānā maha ṛtasya gopā*, anchored to the preverb *ā*, the only non-extra-sentential part of this opening pāda, with the unaccented gen. phrase *maha ṛtasya* dependent on *gopā*. Pāda b opens with a voc. phrase, and c and d each contribute another voc. There’s hardly room left for content. Of all these vocc., only *sīndhupati* opening pāda b is accented.

VII.64.3: I would prefer “along the straightest paths” or “... paths leading straightest to the goal.”

The Pp. reads dat. *sudāse*; JPB’s acc. pl. (*sudāsas*) is based on Th’s interpr. (Fremdl. 80). Although *sudās-* is ordinarily sg. and, esp. in VII, refers to King Sudās, I find the acc. pl. interpr. here appealing, though an alt. would be “will speak for us to Sudās,” as found in most other tr.

The adv. *ād* is displaced from its usual initial location, no doubt because of the pile up of other elements in that position.

The publ. tr. omits *sahá*; I would tr. “may we together ...”

VII.64.4 (and publ. intro.): I do not think that *gárta-* necessarily refers to a *chariot* seat (*pace* Ge n. 4a; Macd.-Keith, *Vedic Index*, based on Zimmer), just a lofty seat or throne, which *may* be on a chariot.

The obj. “him” in c should be in parentheses, since there is no pronoun here coreferential with the rel. prn. *yáḥ* of pāda a.

In d *tā* (the Pp. reading, endorsed by Old) is simply the dual equivalent of *sá* with 2nd ps. impvs. See my “*sá* figé.” There is no reason (with Ge n. 4d) to read *tāḥ*, fem. pl. with *sukṣitīḥ*.

VII.64.5: The dat. sg. *túbhyam* cooccurring with vocc. *varuṇa mitra* is somewhat surprising; “each of you” represents it well. The separation of the two gods in this pāda is no doubt represented by the order of the vocatives and their failure to form a dvandva, in contrast to *mitrāvaruṇā* in 2c and 4c.

## VII.65 Mitra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

VII.65.1: For an abbreviated version of ab, see VII.66.7 and comm. thereon.

I would rearrange the tr. of the first hemistich, to showcase the likely ring composition of the opening *práti vām* with 4c (q.v.): “I call upon you two with hymns, when the sun has risen ...”

I would prefer to render the syntax of pāda c more literally: “(you two,) in [/of] whom there is imperishable and preeminent lordship.”

With Gr and all the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.; see also Scar 120, citing Kuiper) I take verse-final *jigatnú* as dual with shortened final (<\**jigatnū*). By contrast, Old takes it as a neut. sg., modifying *asuryàm*. Although this would be grammatically impeccable and avoid having to assume shortening, the notion of their lordship “einhereilend” seems odd. Old’s interpr. also has the merit of avoiding an embedded rel. cl. in c, but since it is a nominal cl., this is not problematic. (See my 2022 “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses ...,” Fs. M. Hale.) Acdg. to the standard trs., the acc. dual *vām* returns as referent in d.

VII.65.2: The first hemistich contains two clauses – a nominal *hí* clause and an imperative clause – both marked by *tā(u)* subject pronouns. The cooccurrence of apparent 3rd ps. pronouns with the subj. of a 2nd ps. imperative (*karatam* pāda b) is not problematic, as I long ago (“sa figé” [1992] HS 105) showed that forms of the *sá / tām* pronoun regularly serve as subjects with 2nd ps. imperatives. The nominal *hí* clause(s) in pāda a (*tā hí ... taú ...*) pose a bit of a problem. They cannot be an anticipatory part of the impv. clause, because *karatam* is unaccented. It is tempting, with the publ. tr., to take these pronouns as having 2nd ps. reference, since 2a is sandwiched between vs. 1 and the rest of 2, all with 2nd du. reference. However, it should be noted that 3ab is also a nominal cl., opening with *tā*, which the publ. tr. renders with a 3rd ps. (“These two ...”). The other standard tr. take both 2a and 3ab as 3rd ps. (e.g., Ge 2a “Denn sie sind ...”; sim. Re, WG), and this best reflects the syntactic rules for *sá / tām* reference. I would therefore emend the tr. of 2a to “For those two are lords of the gods and those two are civilizing. Make ...” (the modulation from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. also requires taking pāda a as syntactically separate from b).

VII.65.3: See disc. of the *tā* clause immediately above.

VII.65.4: Although the publ. tr. combines cd in a single clause, I follow Old and the standard tr. in separating them. Among other things, *prāti* does not occur with *pṝ* ‘fill’, but the pāda-initial *prāti vām* repeats the opening of the hymn (1a), providing a bit of ring composition (since vs. 5 is a repeated vs.). I would tr. c as “(I call) upon you two here according to (my) wish for the people.”

As for d, although I would like to eliminate all potential exx. of gen. with  $\sqrt{pṝ}$  (see comm. ad X.104.2 and VI.69.7), this does not seem possible here. I would tr. “give your fill of the beloved heavenly water.” The publ. tr. “from the ... water” is appealing, but the clear gen. *divyásya* precludes an abl.

VII.65.5 = VII.64.5

#### VII.66 Mitra and Varuṇa (etc.) [SJ on JPB]

The last of the Mitra-Varuṇa series, whose length and metrical variety are suitable for this accessory position.

VII.66.1: I would substitute ‘fortifying’ for ‘thunderous’.

On the double fully inflected dual dvandva *mitráyora váruṇayoḥ*, see comm. ad VI.51.1, containing its only other occurrence.

VII.66.2: The first pāda is only 7 syllables. Old suggests distracting the last syllable of *devāh*; perhaps alternatively \**devāsaḥ*, though the cadence would not be good.

On the phrase *asuryāya prámahasā* see comm. ad VIII.25.3, where it also appears. As noted there, the repetition of the phrase requires us to interpret the two words together, contrary to most tr. (though with the publ. tr.).

VII.66.3: The *tā* that opens the vs. is at home with the impv. *sādháyatam* in c; on a more complex situation with the *sá / tám* pronoun, see comm. ad VII.65.2 above.

It is unclear whether gen. *jaritṛṇām* depends on *stipā tanūpā* in pāda a (so Ge, Re, Scar 308) or *dhíyaḥ* in c (JPB, WG). I rather favor the former, since in Gāyatrī the syntactic and conceptual break between b and c is generally stronger than between a and b. I would suggest the alternate “protectors of the dependents and the bodies of us singers ... bring (our) insights to success.” Under this analysis the independent gen. *jaritṛṇām* is dependent on *sti-* and *tanū-* and would thus avoid a three-member cmpd. (See my forthcoming “Limits on Indo-Iranian Compounding” [Ged. Gary Holland].)

*sādháyatam* is accented because it immediately follows the extra-sentential voc. *mítra*.

VII.66.4–6: This trīca is rather clumsily constructed.

VII.66.4: I do not understand why JPB tr. the loc. absol. *sūra údite* here and in vss. 7 and 12 as “at the rising of the sun,” but the same phrase in nearby VII.63.5, 65.1 more literally as “when the sun has risen.” I would emend all three occurrences in this hymn to “when the sun has risen.”

I would also change “if” to “when.”

The word *ánāgā(h)* is found in the same type of context and produces the same interpretational difficulties as in VII.60.1, the first hymn in this series. (The return of the problematic *ánāgā(h)* may in fact signal a type of ring composition across the series.) On the morphological issues, see comm. ad VII.60.1. As discussed there, the form can properly be either a nom. sg. m. to the *s*-stem *ánāgas-* or a nom. pl. to the secondary thematic stem *ánāga-*; what it cannot be is an acc. pl. to either one, despite Ge, Re, and apparently Old (ad VII.60.1). In our passage it may be nom. sg. referring to the Sun, as apparently in VII.60.1 (so publ. tr.), or nom. pl. referring to all the gods listed. I prefer the former solution. An alt. interpr. of it as nom. sg. could have it refer to Varuṇa, who is absent in this vs.

There is also the problem of *suvāti* ‘will impel’, which lacks an overt object. Since Ge takes *ánāgāḥ* as acc. pl., he construes it with *suvāti* but attributes an unlikely sense to the verb: “bestimmen werden” (will determine [those who are] *ánāgāḥ*). I prefer, with the publ. tr., to supply ‘us’ as obj., with the phrase referring to the impulsion given to all beings when they awaken at dawn.

VII.66.5: This vs. seems somewhat ramshackle. The first pāda, which should be the main cl. corresponding to the *yád* clause of vs. 4, requires some manipulation to fit this role,

and the next two pādas, which should belong together (*pace* HO), have disharmonious elements.

As for pāda a, I take *kṣāyaḥ* ‘dwelling place’ to refer here to the inhabitants thereof, the “household.” Once the gods impel us at daybreak, (we) the household should perform the morning ritual that attracts the gods. This sense might be better conveyed by eliminating “be one that” in favor simply of “let this dwelling (/household) pursue (its ritual duties) well.” English “house” can serve a similar function: the “House of Atreus” does not refer to a bricks-and-mortar building but to the (tangled) family.

The two pādas b–c present us with two conundrums: pāda b lacks a verb, and the pl. (2nd ps.) voc. of b seems to be resumed in c by a rel. cl. in the 3rd ps. The first can be fairly easily solved: the preverb *prá* ‘forth’ and the loc. *yāman* ‘on the journey’ invite us to supply a verb of motion. The question is only whether it should be 2nd pl. (to match the voc.) or 3rd pl. (to match the rel. cl. in c), a choice that the poet avoids by gapping the verb. Although I think (with most) that the voc. *sudānavaḥ* is coreferential with the subj. of the gapped verb and with the *yé* of the rel. cl., a 3rd ps. tr. in b, with all the standard tr., goes better in English.

VII.66.6: Most tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) supply *\*īśate* in the rel. cl. of b, based on *īśate* in c. The repetition is rather clunky, and it also turns b into an embedded rel. with at least a notional verb. I prefer to take the gen. *ádabdhasya vratásya* as a gen. of description: “who are of undeceivable commandment,” which allows the rel. cl. of b to be nominal and therefore easily embedded.

VII.66.7: See remarks on *sūra údite* ad vs. 4. Here also the tr. should be changed to “when the sun has risen.”

This Gāyatī hemistich, *prāti vāṃ sūra údite, mitráṃ grṇīṣe váruṇam*, is an abbreviated version of the Triṣṭubh hemistich in VII.65.1 *prāti vāṃ sūra údite sūktáir, mitráṃ huve váruṇam pūtádaḥsam*, with one additional word at the end of each pāda to fill out the Triṣṭubh line (distracting *suuktaīḥ*). (Otherwise only the verbs in the 2nd pāda differ.) Although it is not possible to be certain whether our phrase has been “abbreviated” (as I describe it above) or the one in 65.1 has been amplified, I would in fact favor the latter interpr.

As disc. ad VII.65.1 I’d prefer to rearrange the elements in the tr, to “I will sing to you when the sun has risen ...”

VII.66.8: As Old points out, both forms of *iyám* in this vs. should be read as monosyllables (see also Arnold; AiG III.514).

The opening phrase *rāyā hiranyayā* is somewhat problematic. The first word is, at least on the surface, simply the standard instr. sg. of *rayí- / rāy-* ‘wealth’, while the second differs from the fem. instr. sg. of *hiranyá-* ‘gold’ by its final accent (*hiranyayā*, versus *hiranyáyā* [=VIII.1.32, 78.2]) and is generally (Gr, Ge, etc.) taken as the instr. of a fem. stem *hiranyayā-* ‘desire for gold’. Taking the two forms at face value results in a functional mismatch: “with wealth, with desire for gold.” Ge finds this troubling and suggests (n. 8a) that *rāyā* simply substitutes for *\*rāyyā*, which could not be formed (why not?). He therefore tr. them as functionally parallel: “with desire for wealth, with desire for gold,” and is followed by JPB and, rather timidly, by Re, though not by WG. Since I

believe that morphology should outweigh translational convenience, I think we must accept the off-balance phrase. Despite its initial positioning, I take it as an instr. of accompaniment with the purpose dative in b and would tr. “This thought here is for power that keeps the wolf away, along with wealth and desire for gold.” The expression is rather clumsy, but so is much in this hymn.

VII.66.9: Another syntactically awkward vs. The expression *té syāma* is not uncommon in the RV, but it almost always has a dependent rel. cl. with *yé* picking up the *té*: “may we be those who ...” See, e.g., IV.8.5, V.6.8, X.148.3. Here there is no such rel. cl. or even a clause-internal predicate that might modify the *té*-s, and so the pronouns are at best pleonastic and don’t conform to the use of *sá / tám* with non-3rd persons, as outlined in my *sá figé* article. WG tr. “Dein möchten wir sein, Gott Varuṇa, dein, Mitra ...,” which would be appealing if it were grammatical – but *pāda*-initial accented *té* cannot stand for enclitic 2nd sg. *te*!

VII.66.10: The referents here must be the gods, or a subset of them – quite possibly the Ādityas, who are the topic of the paired vs. 11 – though Ge (flg. Ludwig) expressly denies the identity, instead holding that the multiple gods of 10 contract with the Ādityas of 11. Or, with Ge and WG, it is possible to take the rel. cl. of cd as parallel to the rel. cl. in 11ab, with the Ādityas as subj., leaving 10ab independent with the larger group of gods as subj.

VII.66.11: The obj. phrases of a and b, *śarādam māsam ād āhar* and *yajñám aktúm ca-ād ḥcam*, are structurally entirely parallel, but the first group of three forms a natural class, against the ill-assorted trio of b: “the sacrifice, night, and the verse.” On the basis of the phrase in *pāda* a, we would expect *aktúm* to be some division of the sacrifice intermediate between the ritual as a whole and the verse, the smallest verbal unit – but it is hard to make *aktú-* into such a word.

VII.66.12: As disc. ad vs. 4 I would emend the tr. of the loc. absol. to “when the sun has risen.”

I think that the purport of this vs. has been misunderstood by all the standard tr. because all of them take *ohate* as having act. meaning: “solemnly declare” (JPB), “löblich finden” (Ge), etc. But *ohate* can also be passive in value (see comm. ad V.52.10), and taking it so makes M, V, and A the subject of praise, and *pāda* d a direct quote of that praise. I would therefore retr. the whole vs. as “Thus we will contemplate you with our hymns today when the sun has arisen, when Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman are lauded: “You are charioteers of truth!” I take *vaḥ* in *pāda* a as referring to the Ādityas, also directly addressed in *pāda* d. Alternatively it could refer to the poet’s priestly colleagues and be rendered “for you.”

However the vs. is interpr., *rathyaḥ* in d is probably a predicate voc. However, since the praise of these gods continues in the next vs. (13), it is possible that the voc. phrase *ṛtāsya rathyaḥ* can be sequestered and the predication with *yūyám* limited to 13ab: “you, o charioteers of truth, // are possessing the truth, born of the truth ...”

VII.66.13: See immed. above for possible construal with the end of vs. 12.

At the beginning of *c téṣām* doubles and is coreferential with *vaḥ* and serves to indicate the case of that functionally protean enclitic.

VII.66.14: With Ge and Re (but not WG), the publ. tr. takes pāda d as an infinitive phrase: “right for everyone to gaze upon.” But *áram* isn’t ordinarily (*lever?*) construed with an infinitive. Moreover, *-cakṣas-* is found in vs. 10 in the cmpd *sūra-cakṣas-* clearly in the meaning ‘eye’ (‘whose eye is the sun’). I would change the tr. to “fit for every eye,” or, if it seems better to keep *cákṣas-* as a reference to the sun, “fit for the eye for everyone.” On *áram* see comm. ad VIII.92.24–27, X.9.3.

VII.66.15: In pāda a, with Ge, I would take the *āmreḍita śīrṣṇāḥ-śīrṣṇaḥ* as a qualifier of *jágataḥ* -- not, with the publ. tr., as a third term beside *jágataḥ tasthúṣaḥ*, nor, with WG, as the head noun on which *jágataḥ* depends. (Re in his n. seems to follow Ge, but his tr. is somewhat incoherent.) I would emend the tr. to “the lord of the moving – each and every head – and the still.” The phrase *jágataḥ tasthúṣaḥ*, generally in the gen. as here, is of course a merism for the animate and inanimate world. See this same phrase, without *śīrṣṇāḥ-śīrṣṇaḥ*, in I.89.5.

On *samáyā* see comm. ad I.113.10.

As discussed ad VII.60.3, I would dispute the assumption that Sūrya’s draught animals were antelopes and would change the tr. to “the tawny mares on his chariot.” As pointed out ad VII.60.3, the fact that Sūrya is once called *saptāśva-* ‘having seven horses’ (V.45.9) supports the identification of these animals as equine: see *saptá svásārah* “the seven sisters” in pāda a.

VII.66.16: The publ. tr. renders *śarádaḥ* (2x) literally as “autumns,” but *śarádam* in 11a as “year,” for which it often stands. This seems the correct choice: in 11 smaller and smaller units of the year are at issue and “autumn” would be discordant, whereas here “autumn” is the more poetic choice.

VII.66.17–18: 17bc contains a *vāyav índraś ca* construction, split across the hemistich boundary and with a word interposed, while 18ab has the same *vāyav índraś ca* construction, but split only across a hemistich-internal pāda boundary and with no intervening word. Otherwise the vss. are almost identical in content, though partly relexicalized and syntactically varied. They share *ā yātam* (17b, 18b); *adābhyā* ‘undeceivable’ (17a) corresponds to *adrúhā* ‘without deception’ (18b); *sómapīṭaye* (17c) to *pībatam sómam* (18c). The only real differences are *kāvyebhiḥ* (17a) versus *divó dhāmabhiḥ* (18a), though they share the instr. pl., and *ātuḥ* in 18c, which has no correspondent in 17.

VII.66.19: This vs. is a slightly freer adaptation of 17–18, with *ā yātam* again; a dual dvandva voc. *mitrāvaruṇā* instead of the *vāyav índraś ca* construction; an aor. impv. phrase *pātām sómam* instead of the pres. impv. *pībatam sómam* of 17. The rest is more varied.

#### VII.67 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

VII.67.1: The interpr. of this opening vs. is made difficult by several puzzles: 1) the hapax infinitive *jarádhyai* in pāda a. Assuming it belongs to  $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$  ‘awaken’, is it transitive (so Ge) or intransitive (so publ. tr., WG)? 2) what is the referent of *yáh* in c and how does it fit with d (or the rest of the vs.).

I opt for the intransitive interpr. of *jarádhyai* for several reasons. For one thing, it seems unlikely that anyone is going to transitively awaken the Aśvins’ chariot. But more to the point, *práti* with a verb of awakening is regularly intrans. with the sense ‘awaken in response to’, generally in the context of the dawn ritual. See, with this root in an Aśvin hymn, IV.45.5 ... *agnáyaḥ ... jarante práti ... áśvínā* “The fires awaken in response to the Aśvins” (possibly also VII.73.4 in this Aśvin cycle, q.v); also with  $\sqrt{budh}$ , as in nearby VII.80.1.

How to construe this infin.? The publ. tr. seems to take it as a purpose infin. loosely associated with *vivakmi* in d (“[In order] to become awake ... I recite ...”). But given its prominent position in the first pāda of the hymn and its distance from that verb, it seems more likely to be a predicated infin. Who/what then is the unexpressed subject of this infinitive? Ge supplies “I,” WG “man.” I would follow the impersonal tack of WG, but going even further – supplying “(it is time) to awaken in response ...” vel sim. Contra the publ. tr., I would take ab as a single clause and start anew with cd.

The problem of the rel. cl. in c is discussed at length by Old, as well as by Ge (n. 1c) at somewhat lesser length. Old suggests several alternatives, but seems to favor supplying \**stómam* as obj. to *vivakmi* in d, with *yáh* in c dependent on this unexpressed obj. in the postposed main cl. Ge basically follows this interpr., as, more or less, does the publ. tr., switching the order of the tr. of c and d in the process: “I recite (to you) here ... that which ... has awakened you two.” JPB’s “that which” does not appear on the surface but must stand for Old’s unexpressed \**stómam*. I am dubious about this solution, with a preposed rel. cl. having no overt head in the main cl. and with nothing in the immediate context to support supplying it there. This suggested object also does not fit well with the simile in JPB’s interpr.: “I recite (a praise) like a son to his parents ...” (?). I do recognize that vs. 3ab of this hymn, ... *vām ... stómaiḥ siṣakti ... vivakvān*, gives some support to Old’s supplied *stóma-*, but I do not consider it sufficient.

I find one of Old’s other suggestions more likely – that the referent of *yáh* is the “I” who is subj. of *vivakmi* in d. This has the drawback that the verb of c, *ájīgar*, is (2nd or) 3rd ps. Old suggests that the verb might have been attracted into the 3rd ps. by the simile *dūtó ná*. I wonder if it just started out as a generalizing rel. cl. (“who[ever] has awakened you ...”), which took a sharp turn to identifying the generic subject as the 1st ps. in the main cl. I find that WG also follow this option of Old’s and also more or less fold a generalizing rel. into their tr. “Als einer, der euch ... geweckt hat, rede ich ...” I would change the tr. of cd to “As one who, like a messenger, has awakened you two, o holy ones, I address (you) like a son his parents.”

Note the appearance of two quite distinct forms of  $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$  ‘awake’ in this vs., with intransitive *jarádhyai* (presumably based on the middle thematic pres. *járate*) in pāda a and the transitive redupl. aor. *ájīgar* in c.

VII.67.2: The first three pādas each open with an augmented passive aor. (or the 3rd pl. equivalent): a: *áreti*, b: *úpo adṛśran*, c: *áreti*.

I would suggest two alternative tr. in this vs. In b perhaps “the borders even of darkness” (instead of “the very borders of darkness”). This accounts better for the placement of *cid*, and the meaning is somewhat more pointed: in the light of morning even darkness, or its edge, becomes visible. In d “for beauty” rather than “for glory.”

VII.67.3: The final word of the 1<sup>st</sup> hemistich, *vivakvān*, is a hybrid: a perf. part. built to the redupl. pres. stem – an explan. that goes back to Bartholomae (see Old). It was obviously based on likewise hemistich-final *vivakmi* in 1d, and Old points out that the author of this set of hymns has a particular penchant for this redupl. pres. (also 68.4, 72.3). The instability of the redupl. of this pf. (*vavāc*- v. *uvāc*-; see Kü 441) in this period and the absence of any act. pf. part. to this very common pf. until ŚB *ūcivāms*- (as far as I can tell) may have prepared the ground for this blend. Moreover, a (more or less) properly formed present act. part. to this redupl. pres. in the masc. nom. sg. would be *\*vīvacat* (*!vīvakat?*) (on the assumption that a real zero-grade root syllable [*\*\*vyūcat*] would be blocked), which would produce a bad cadence and also bear little resemblance to the strong stem *vīvak*-C, which is all that is attested to this stem. On the whole, the pseudo-pf. part. was a wise confection.

VII.67.4: On *avóh* see comm. ad VI.67.11 and X.132.5; in its three occurrences (VI.67.11, here, and X.132.5 [where it should be restored from transmitted *vā*]) it doubles the enclitic *vām* and serves to anchor the case (gen.-loc.) of that enclitic.

I am puzzled by JPB’s over-complex interpr. of pāda a, supplying “chariot” as the subject from the previous vs. According to his publ. intro., “In vs. 4 there is no explicit mention of the chariot, but there is a complex ellipsis in 4a, which lacks both subject and verb.” But I do not see why pāda a cannot be part of the *yād* clause found in pāda b – hence no ellipsis. Although the *yād* comes later than I would like, I see no reason why all of pāda a cannot be construed with the “I” who is subject of the *huvé* that opens b. I would take the opening pronominal *avór vām* as a gen. expansion of *yuvā-* in *yuvākūḥ*: “(I,) seeking these very two of you ...” vel sim. (stilted and heavy in English, I realize), and would tr. the whole hemistich as “Now, o honey-bearing Aśvins, when, seeking these very two of you, seeking good things, I call upon you when (the soma) is pressed.” The whole of ab is a dependent cl., with cd serving as main cl. (contra the publ. tr., which takes pāda a as a main clause on which b is dependent, with c starting a new sentence.

VII.67.5: As an alt. in b, I would substitute “to win” or “for winning” for “to win gain,” which appears to have an overt object.

Again as an alt. in c, I’d substitute “(when) the prize (is set),” since “in the competition for the prize” implies more expressed material than there is. For another likely unmarked loc. absol see pāda c in the next vs. (6).

VII.67.6: The tr. of the negated adj. *áhraya-* as ‘abundant’ fails to render its negated morphological structure and is also quite pallid. As an alt. I would substitute ‘immoderate’ or ‘unrestrained’. After all, the adj. belongs to *√hrī* ‘be ashamed’, and negated derivatives of this root often mean ‘unashamed, immodest, unabashed’. Such an undertone is appropriate to the sexual context provided by *rétas-* ‘semen, seed’. In fact,

both Ge and WG directly reflect the ‘shame’ sense in their tr.: Ge “dessen man sich nicht schämt”; WG “ohne Schande.”

I also think the sexual aspect of propagation may be seen in pāda c. The root  $\sqrt{tuj}$  means literally ‘thrust’, and its cooccurrence here with *toké tánaye* seems telling, esp. after the semen in b. I am tempted to take those two locc. in the same way as *vāje* in 5c, as an unsigned loc. absol.: “thrusting (when) progeny and posterity (are at stake),” with *tūtujānāḥ* alluding to movement in sexual intercourse. For the almost identical pāda in VII.84.5, fld. by a pāda identical to our d, see comm. ad loc.

The all-important lineage having been secured in pādas b and c, we now proceed to our ritual duties – in this case the pursuit of and service to the gods (*devāvīti*). Although I agree that *vām* in c belongs with this phase, the expression in the publ. tr. seems somewhat compressed. As in 4a, where *avór vām* expanded on *yuvā-* in *yuvākūḥ*, here *vām* seems to further specify *devá-* in *devāvīti*. I would substitute “we would proceed to the pursuit of you two gods.” Once again English makes it impossible to reflect what I think the structure is.

VII.67.7: JPB’s “promissory portion” as a tr. of the hapax *pūrvagátvan-* seems excessively specific and legalistic, and is justified neither by the literal sense of this cmpd (‘going before’) nor the context, though I can, I think, see how he came to it. However, though it may have the kind of technical meaning inherent in “promissory portion,” if so we have no access to this or evidence for it. Starting with the literal meaning, the referent may be someone / -thing that comes in advance of the main event. My own conjecture is that it refers in the first instance to someone who goes out as an advance greeter for an arriving comrade, and in this particular context quite possibly refers to the praise hymn that we send out to greet the gods as they are arriving at the sacrifice. For *eṣá syá* with such a referent, see, e.g., *eṣá stómaḥ* in nearby VII.64.5; see also in the next hymn VII.68.9 *eṣá syá kārúḥ* “this very praise-poet,” with a personal referent associated with the praise hymn. This hymn is signaled by *eṣá syá* that opens the vs. I would re-tr. the whole of ab as “This very (praise hymn?) like an advance (greeter) for a comrade has been sent forth / established as a treasure given for you, honey-bearing ones, among us.” Alternatively *nidhí-* may refer to the soma, as it does in nearby VII.69.3 ... *nidhúm mádhumantam pibāthaḥ* “you will drink the honeyed treasure.”

As Ge (n. 7b) points out, *hitáḥ* can belong to both  $\sqrt{hi}$  ‘send’ and  $\sqrt{dhā}$  ‘place, establish’. As the first, it is appropriate for *pūrvagátvā* (as I interpr. it), as the latter it matches *nidhí-*.

I consider “Manu’s sons” somewhat too specific and would change to “among the clans of the descendents of Manu.”

VII.67.8: On *tarāṇi-* see comm. ad III.11.3; I would here substitute ‘advancing’ or ‘transiting’ for ‘surpassing’ and reorganize the tr. of ab to “They do not become exhausted—your (horses) of good quality (*subhvāḥ*), which, yoked by the gods to their yoke-poles, transiting, convey you.”

VII.67.9: The function of *hí* in pāda is unclear to me.

I would prefer the tr. “lineage” to “relationships” for *bándhum* in c. The patrons are not networking but ensuring their family line.

VII.67.10: As noted in the publ. intro., *járatam* probably forms a ring with *jarádhyai* in the 1st pāda of the hymn (note also *ájīgar* in 1c), though Ge, Narten (s-aor. 121), Gotō (151), WG, and others instead assign *járatam* to ‘make age’ (but see Old, who favors ‘awaken’). They attribute a positive value to ‘make age’ – i.e., cause to live long – but this is not the ordinary use of ‘age’ in a dawn hymn context – but rather “another day older, closer to death.” The argument for ‘age’ is that the stem *jára-* ‘sing’ is otherwise medial, but the act. form here can result from a superficial match with the paired verb *dhattám* in this conjoined VP. Note that med. *jarate* is found in the final vs. of the next hymn, VII.68.9, which at least to my mind supports interpr. *járatam* here as belonging to the same stem. *járatam* would thus combine the thematic stem of the infinitive *jarádhyai* in vs. 1 but with oppositional function (transitive versus intransitive), but with the function of another form to the same root also found in verse 1 and forming part of the ring. There is also reciprocity: humans (we ritualists / I the singer) awaken the Aśvins in 1c, while the Aśvins awaken our human patrons in 10c.

### VII.68 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

VII.68.1: As is generally recognized, incl. in the publ. tr., the accent on *vītám* requires it to start a new clause. The brief finale *vītám naḥ* is a sort of tag, and its independence is supported by similarly positioned and structured *śrutám naḥ* in 2c. To convey the economy of this little clause, I would be inclined to reduce the expression to “pursue ours”; in any case I would not supply an object (“(offerings)”) different from what immediately precedes (“oblations”), esp. given *haviṣo vītáye* in 2b, with a noun *haviṣ-* closely related to *havyá-* in our pāda c.

VII.68.2: On the lexeme *áram*  $\sqrt{gam}$  see comm. ad X.9.3, where I suggest altering the tr. of pāda b here to to “Come fit for the pursuit of my oblation.” (Note also that I would substitute “oblation” for the “offering” in the publ. tr.: I see no substantial semantic difference between *havyá-* and *hávīs-*.)

On the brief independent tag *śrutám naḥ*, see disc. ad vs. 1c. Here I would abbreviate the tr. to “hear ours.” The message is more pointed here than in 1c because our calls are contrasted with those of a stranger (*aryó hávanāni*), whereas in 1c the oblations mentioned in the earlier part of the pāda are already ours.

VII.68.3: The active redupl. stem *íyar-*, plus or minus preverb, is overwhelmingly transitive, though it is hard to eliminate all intransitive exx. (e.g., I.165.4). If a transitive sense is sought here, *vām* could be the obj. – so an alt. tr. would be “Your chariot rouses you forth ...”

Re and WG take *iyāná-* as belonging to  $\sqrt{yā}$  ‘beg, implore’, but given the journey context, ‘speeding’ (with Ge and the publ. tr.) seems more appropriate, even though  $\sqrt{yā}$  ‘beg’ is probably found in the next vs. (*deva-yā-*); see below.

VII.68.4: I would slightly reconfigure the elements in the first hemistich. For one thing, there are two forms of the 2nd du. prn. (*vām* a, *yuvábhyām* b), and I would prefer to represent them both. Given the position of *yuvábhyām* I construe it with immediately

preceding *somasút*. The enclitic *vām* is then, for me, the addressee of *vívakti*. Further, *ūrdhvá-* is used several times of the position of the pressing stone at work, independent of the noise it makes (see I.28.1, X.70.7, 100.9), and I would therefore decouple it from *vívakti* here. Moreover, the root noun cmpd *deva-yā-* is either ‘beseeching the gods’ or ‘traveling to the gods’, not ‘seeking the gods’ (which is instead *devayá-*). Putting this all together, I would retr. ab as “When this stone here, upright, beseeching the gods, addresses you two, as it presses the soma for you two ...”

In c the publ. tr.’s ‘enchanting’ for *valgú-* is rather too specific and dramatic, and I don’t know on what evidence it rests. (The RVic occurrences of the stem do not favor it.) Better ‘agreeable’ vel sim.

I do not understand the function and/or position of *u* in pāda a – nor does JSK, who (*Particle u*, 163–64) simply notes that there are several instances in the Vasiṣṭha maṇḍala of *u* following *-ā*.

VII.68.5: This vs. concerning the Aśvins’ aid to Atri has a number of fairly impenetrable difficulties. See esp. the detailed disc. of Old, as well as the treatments of Ge and others.

By general agreement, the *citrām ... bhójanam* “brilliant sustenance” in pāda a refers to nourishment that the Aśvins provide to Atri (e.g., I.116.8, with a different expression), but it’s worth noting that the same phrase is used in nearby VII.74.2 of food that the Aśvins give to mortals in general.

Pāda b is the most problematic part of the verse. On the one hand, the formation and referent of the hapax *máhiṣvant-* are puzzling; see Old’s disc., with citation of previous interpr. In the end Old’s preference, to take it as a *-vant-* deriv. of *máhi-* with an irregularly enlarged stem (like the hapax *índrasvant-* in IV.37.5), may be the least risky, and he is followed by Ge, WG, and the publ. tr. This explanation is hardly compelling, however; among other things, what is a possessive suffix (*-vant-*) doing attached to an adj./adv. (*máhi-*)? I wonder if Old was too hasty in rejecting a potential connection with Aves. *spānta-* ‘holy’ (< \*‘swollen’); cf. RV *śvānta-* ‘swollen’ (?). The phonology is obviously a problem, but esp. in a ruki context (after *i*), without etymological support, the sequence \**śv* might be prone to become *ṣv*. And ‘greatly swollen’ / ‘having great swelling’, again without etymological support, could easily revert to simply ‘great, intense’. But what to supply with it? the “heat” (Glut) of Ge and the publ. tr.? (Note that it cannot directly pick up *bhójanam* in pāda, because that noun is neut.) Since a heated place of confinement is part of the myth of Atri, this solution seems at first as plausible as any other, but it should be noted that there’s no positive evidence for it – and in fact it is difficult to endorse it without considering the verb to which it is the object.

And in fact the other problem in b is the verb *ní ... yuyotam*. Here the stem formation points in one direction and the preverb and complement case point in another, as disc. by Old (see also Ge n. 5b, WG): the redupl. pres. belongs exclusively to  $\sqrt{yu}$  ‘keep away’, which is otherwise never found with *ní* -- which, however, is regularly found with  $\sqrt{yu}$  ‘join’, whose pres. is the 6th cl. *yuváti*. This latter also often takes a dative, whereas  $\sqrt{yu}$  ‘keep away’ more often takes an ablative. Although Ge, JPB, and WG opt for  $\sqrt{yu}$  ‘keep away’, with Old (and Re) I tentatively prefer  $\sqrt{yu}$  ‘yoke, unite’, rating the preverb and the dative complement more highly than the verb stem (though with reservations remaining). In this case whatever *máhiṣvantam* means, it should refer to something positive, and one lies ready to hand: the masc. *omānam* in c.

I would also add here that I find the imperative interpr. of *yuyotam* by Ge and WG attractive (against the presential injunc. of the publ. tr.), since the immediately flg. rel. cl. has a subjunctive and the preceding cl. a present

I will now attempt a very shaky tr. of the whole vs., in which I have little confidence: “The brilliant sustenance that is now yours, (with that?) harness the very powerful (thing) for Atri, who will receive (that [as]) relief from you, being dear to you.”

One final puzzle in the vs.: the last phrase, *priyāḥ sán*. Nom. forms of the pres. part. of  $\sqrt{as}$  are almost always concessive, so this should mean “although being dear.” But in none of the various available interpr. of this vs. is a concessive reading likely. The same phrase in X.123.5, adduced by Old, also appears to be non-concessive, though the one in nearby VII.88.6, also mentioned by Old, does have concessive value.

VII.68.6: As Re points out, *pratītya-* here requires a diff. interpr. from the other RVic occurrence of the stem in IV.5.14, where I tr. it ‘easy to attack’ (perhaps better ‘easy to counter’).

On *itāūti-* see comm. ad VIII.99.7.

VII.68.7: On this version of the Bhujyu story see Old, Ge (n. 7c), and publ. intro. Pace Ge and JPB, I am not certain that Tugra (Bhujyu’s father) is the referent of *árāvā*. I would also render that word as “a hostile/ungenerous one” rather than “his enemy” as in the publ. tr. Substitute “a hostile/ungenerous one, (yet) devoted to you two, will rescue him.” WG suggest, over-cleverly, that *yó yuvākūḥ* actually refers to Bhujyu, present as the acc. *īm* in this pāda. This would make for easier sense, but it is hard to see how an audience would not construe the rel. *yāḥ* in this nominal cl. with the immediately preceding *árāvā*.

VII.68.8: I am disturbed by dat. *śayāve* construed with *śrutam*. Acdg. to Gr, this is the only form of simplex  $\sqrt{śru}$  (of the untold many) found with a dat. Re cites three [really only two; see below], but all with preverb *ā*: in his I.39.6 the dat. is an inanimate that the subjects of the verb are listening *for*; this seems like a different construction from “listen to [+DAT.]” However, III.33.9 does have a personal dative and cannot be explained away (*ā ... kāráve śṛṇota* “Listen to the bard”). (Re’s 3rd ex., supposedly found in the next vs., III.33.10, does not contain a dat., but instead an acc. obj. to *ā ... śṛṇavāmā*.) In any case, given the non-occurrence of datives with simplex  $\sqrt{śru}$ , in our passage I prefer to distance the dative from *śrutam* and tr. “give heed when you are being summoned for Śayu.”

As for the cow(s) in cd, a passage cited by Ge, I.116.22, makes clear that the cow in question in Śayu’s, and she is barren. There are not two cows, one fertile and one barren, as implied by the publ. tr. The tr. should be emended to “you who make his prize cow swell, like waters, even though she was barren.”

The simile *apó ná* is unusually positioned, in that this is one of the vanishingly rare examples of pāda-final *ná*, either as simile marker or as negative. See comm. ad X.111.7 and my recent “Penultimate *ná* ‘like’ in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism” (ECIEC 2024). Here its anomalous position is mitigated by the fact that it is in the middle of a hemistich, not at the end, and, even more, by its placement within the NP that constitutes the frame to which the comparison is being made (*aghnyām ... staryāṃ cid*).

VII.68.9: As was just pointed out (ad 8a), *aghnyā-* is not a fertile cow per se, since in vs. 8 she is barren. I would emend the tr. to “The prize cow ...”

### VII.69 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

VII.69.1: I would change to “with its wheel-rims” to reflect the instr.

VII.69.3: On  $\sqrt{yād}$  see comm. ad III.36.1, 7. Since the participle (the only form attested) is always construed with the instr., I would like a tr. here that better reflects instr. *vadhvā*, perhaps “embracing with the bride.”

The “bride” is surely Sūryā, who is the subject of the first hemistich of the next vs. For the chariot as a stand-in for the bridegroom in the Sūryā svayaṃvara, see my 2001 “The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara? Formulaic Evidence” (Fs. Parpola).

Notice that in  $\sqrt{bādh}$  and *vartanī-* return from vs. 1, where, however, they were not construed together.

VII.69.4: There is a sharp difference of opinion about the interpr. of pāda d – specifically is *vāyaḥ* the neut. sg. of the *s*-stem abstract ‘vitality’ or does it belong somehow to *vī-* ‘bird’? Old, Re, and WG favor the latter solution, Ge and the publ. tr. the former. In favor of ‘bird’ is the telling passage Old adduces, also in an Aśvin hymn in a Sūryā context: IV.43.6b *ghṛṇā vāyo ’ruśāsaḥ pári gman* “your ruddy birds avoid the glowing heat,” with *pári*  $\sqrt{gam}$  like *pári*  $\sqrt{gā}$  here, and a different but etymologically related word for ‘heat’ (*ghṛṇā-* versus *ghraṃsá-*). (Sūryā appears in pāda d: *yéna páti bhāvathaḥ sūryāyāḥ* “by which you two become the masters/husbands of Sūryā.”) In IV.43.6 *vāyaḥ* is unproblematically plural, but in our passage the verb (*pári ... gāt*) is sg., so *vāyaḥ*, if belonging to ‘bird’, must be a sg. as well. Although a neut. collective *vāyas-* is found beginning in the AV, its existence is doubtful for the RV – possibly I.141.8, I.104.1 (see Re). In addition to this morphological difficulty, there are other issues that weigh against the “bird” interpretation. For one thing, as Ge (n. 4d) points out, the word *omán-* in this same pāda is found in Aśvin context only in the Atri saga, incl. in the immediately preceding hymn (VII.68.5). Moreover, the recipient of the Aśvins’ help in the subord. cl. of c, to which d is the main cl., is masculine (*devayántam*), but there is no masc. sg. in the Sūryā context. WG (n.) suggest *devayántam* refers to the bird in the next pāda; for this to work they must assume a thematic masc. stem *vāya-* there, not the neut. collective offered by Re, but this is nowhere stated. No such stem is attested elsewhere, and wholesale proliferation of stems for the sake of convenience should be avoided. On balance, the Ge–JPB solution with *vāyas-* ‘vitality’ seems preferable, despite the striking similarity of the birds in IV.43.6. That the Sūryā tale occupies only the first hemistich, with decisive change of subject in the second, is not particularly surprising, since 4ab continues the theme of the previous vs., and Aśvin catalogue hymns often move abruptly from one episode to the next.

A small change: I would substitute “seeking the gods” for “serving the gods” for *devayántam*, since the same stem is found in 6d, where JPB tr. “seeking ...”

VII.69.5: On the phrase *vásta usrā(h)* and its morphological features, see comm. ad VI.3.6. It almost seems as if this fairly rare (otherwise, in various guises, IV.25.2, VI.3.6,

VIII.46.26, and, deformed, II.39.2) and anomalously formed phrase is “repaired” in the main clause by the quite common and easily interpretable synonymous phrase *uṣáso vyùṣṭau* in the same position in the hemistich.

VII.69.6: With regard to the striking simile in pāda a, both Old and Ge (n. 6a) suggest that buffaloes seeking water hasten towards lightning because it betokens rain. Old voices understandable skepticism about the reality of this behavior, but accepts it as a folk belief – as would I.

A slight alternation: I would attach c to d, not to b, as JPB does, nor treat it as an independent sentence as Ge and WG do: ‘Since in many places they call ..., let not the others ...’

VII.69.7 [= 67.10, 1.v.]: In the earlier occurrence *járatām* forms a ring with the first vs., but not here.

### VII.70 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

VII.70.1: After the Aśvins’ journey to the ritual ground in pāda a, pādas bcd play with the notions of standing and sitting (b *sthānam*, c *asthāt*, d *ā ... sedáthuḥ*) once there (see a reprise in vs. 3). Assessing what the subject of c is (see speculations in publ. intro. and most of the standard comm.), this verbal play should be kept in mind. As for what that subject is, I think JPB is correct – it’s the ritual fire – against the various suggestions proffered by Old, Ge, Re, and WG. Agni is regularly the subject of *asthāt* (e.g., V.1.2 *ūrdhvó agnīḥ ... asthāt*; sim. II.3.1, III.5.7, etc. etc.) and the dynamic root aor. “has stood up” captures the dramatic ignition of the ritual fire when the gods arrive at the early morning sacrifice. The comparison of Agni to a prizewinning horse is also common: for this same simile, *áśvo ná vājī*, see III.29.6. Moreover, although *śunáprṣṭha-* ‘having prosperity on its/his back’ is a hapax, Agni is regularly modified by the similarly formed *ghṛtá-prṣṭha-* ‘having ghee on his back’ (9x).

In my view the simile in d consists only of *ná yónim* “as if on a womb.” The unusual order of simile marker and its target results from the fact that *ná* ‘like’ never takes 2nd position in a simile if it would be pāda-final. See my recent “Penultimate *ná* ‘like’ in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism” (ECIEC 2024). Although *dhruváse* could be part of the simile (and is generally so taken), which would produce a more conventional simile construction, I think that this purpose dative is appropriate to the Aśvins’ direct action, and that the womb has nothing to do with it.

I would retr. the hemistich (also representing the aor. *asthāt* and pf. *sedáthuḥ* as the immed. past) as “Like a prize-winning horse, with prosperity on its back, (the fire) has stood up, when you two have sat down here to be firmly fixed, as if on a womb.”

VII.70.2: I find JPB’s “cling” for *síṣakti* too distant from the usual senses of  $\sqrt{sac}$  and also out of synch with the “journey” motif of pāda c. I would substitute “accompanies you two.”

Note that *sumatís cániṣṭhā* is repeated in 5d, and see also *cániṣṭám* in 4a.

The publ. tr. of d (“... you, having been harnessed like a pair of well-harnessed swift steeds”) is misleading, in that it seems as if the participle “having been harnessed”

modifies the dual acc. *vām* with the simile agreeing with the referent of the participle. But that participle is nom. sg. *yujānāḥ* and must modify the rel. prn. *yāḥ* of c that refers to the *gharmāḥ* in b, while the simile *étagvā cin ná* is dual and should target the acc. du. *vām*. Figuring out how to put this together is made more complex by the syntactic ambiguity of *yujāná-*, which can be either passive (“having been yoked”) or transitive (“having yoked”). That a passive form is found in the immediately preceding hymn (VII.69.5) favors a passive interpr. here, but a transitive value would simplify the construal of the simile, which could simply serve as obj. of *yujānāḥ*. Under this interpr., a full tr. of the hemistich would yield “which [=gharmā] carries you across the seas and streams, (it) having yoked (you two) like the well-yoked sun’s horses [ / having yoked (you two) with good yoking like the sun’s horses].” Despite the awkward difference in function between *yujāná-* in these two adjacent hymns, I favor this alternative, because the simile works better.

As the two tr. just given shows, *suyújā* is ambiguous: it can either be an acc. du. modifying *étagvā* or an instr. sg. in an etymological figure with *yujānāḥ* (“yoke with good yoking”). See Scar 433 and WG (n.); on the latter type of constr. see KH, Fs. Risch (1986) = Aufs. III, esp. 834. Because *suyúj-* elsewhere appears in the acc. sg., nom. + acc. pl., and instr. pl. modifying horses (vel sim.) (see, e.g., acc. pl. V.31.10 *yuktān suyujás cid áśvān*), I favor the dual interpr. here.

I do not understand the function of *cid*, but it should be noted that the other occurrence of du. *étagvā* (VIII.70.7) is also immediately fld. by an apparently functionless *cid*.

VII.70.3: Both *sthāna-* and *ní √sad* are repeated from vs. 1: *sthānāni* (3a) and *ní ... sádantā* (3c), although both the places and the sitting are in cosmic spaces, not on the ritual ground. The configuration of vs. 1 is also reversed: in vs. 1 the Aśvins travel in *pāda* a and in bcd take their seats on the ritual ground. In vs. 3 they occupy their distant seats in abc and travel from there in d. Because of the balanced variation of vss. 1 and 3 I do not follow the publ. tr. in taking vs. 3 as hanging off vs. 2, with *yāni sthānāni* construed with *pīparti* in 2c, functioning parallel to *samudrān sarītaḥ*. Instead, with Ge and WG I take abc as a single rel. cl., with d the main cl., though it lacks an overt finite verb. Ge supplies “kommt von da” with the verb supplied on the basis of VII.71.2 (the next hymn) and V.76.4, where a phrase with the part. *vāhantā* is found in a clause with the impv. (*upā*)*yātam* (fld. by WG; see n.). This makes sense, but it might also be possible simply to take *vāhantā* as a predicated pres. part.: “(from those places) bringing ...”

The “exuberant young women of heaven” (*divó yahvīṣu*) are rivers, as elsewhere (e.g., III.1.6, 9). As Ge points out (n. 3b), *yahvīṣv óṣadhīṣu vikṣú* appears to be formulaic; see VII.56.22 (a Marut hymn).

The relative phrase has no overt resumption in the main cl.; “from those places” (shorthand: “from there”) needs to be supplied.

I would retr. the whole vs. as “The places you have established for yourselves, among the exuberant (rivers) of heaven, among the plants, and among the clan, (you two) sitting down on the peak of the mountain, (from those places come,) bringing refreshment for the pious man.”

VII.70.4–7: The crucial term *bráhmaṇ-* is found in each of these four vss.

VII.70.4: The impv. *caniṣṭám* neatly echoes the splv. adj. *cániṣṭhā* in 2a and 5d. Although it is, formally, a proper 2nd du. act. to an *-iṣ-*aor., it is clearly artificially based on this splv., like its even more dependent sister form *cániṣṭhat* (VIII.74.11, q.v). See Narten (s-aor. 111, flg. KH).

The stem *yogyā-* (3x) appears to mean lit. ‘yoking string / harness cord’ at least in III.6.6 and possibly X.53.2 (see disc. there). However, “when you will take on the harness cords ... of our seers” of the publ. tr. is, to say the least, opaque, and the word must show a developed sense here. The best clue is furnished by the parallel phraseology in 5b ... *bráhmāṇi* 2ND DU VERB *ṛṣṭhām*, which is almost identical to our ... *yogyā(h)* 2ND DU VERB *ṛṣṭhām* save for the identity of the acc. pl. obj. I suggest that it refers here to what is to be yoked to oneself – (ritual) duties or undertakings. I would retr. “when you will reach the undertakings of the seers,” in other words, when you get to the ritual. The use of this unusual term here may result from the pattern of lexical repetition in this hymn: *yogyā(h)* appears in the same vs. as *yugāni* (d), also with an idiomatic sense, and after the etym. figure *suyujā yujānāḥ* in 2d.

VII.70.5: I base “the (pious) man” on *jánāya dāsúṣe* in 3d. I would prefer not to jump from a particular man to JPB’s “our people” in two vss. Moreover, since  $\sqrt{yā}$  +/- preverb(s) generally takes an acc. of goal, the dat. *jánāya* needs a different function.

VII.70.5–6: The pādas 5c and 6c are almost identical; the major difference is the case of the final noun:

5c *práti prá yātám váram ā jánāya*

6c *úpa prá yātám váram ā vásiṣṭham*

On this basis I think the tr. of the two should be as close as possible. In 5 the publ. tr. reads *váram ā* twice “at your wish ... according to our wish,” but not in 6, and in 6 “according to his [=Vasiṣṭha’s] wish,” not ours. It might be better to leave the ownership of the *váram* unspecified. I would tr. the two pādas as

“drive forth at will for the sake of the (pious) man”

and “(to it = sacrifice) drive forth at will, to Vasiṣṭha.”

VII.70.6: As indicated in the tr. just given, the rel. cl. in ab has no overt resumption in the 2nd hemistich; “to it” vel sim. needs to be supplied with the verb of motion in c.

The phrase *imā bráhmāṇi* in d initiates the emphasis on the here-and-now of the ritual moment and its verbal accompaniments that dominates the next vs. The same phrase is the last of the near deictic NPs in 7.

VII.70.7: Note the repeated near deictic: *iyám ... iyám ... imān ... imā* and see comm. on previous vs.

### VII.71 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

VII.71.1: As the publ. intro. cleverly suggests, the bahuvrīhis *ásvāmaghā gómaghā* are so positioned in sandhi that they can represent either masc. acc. du. *-ā*, modifying *vām*, or

masc. nom. pl. *-ās*, modifying the non-overt subject of *huvema*. This ambiguity nicely captures the reciprocal relationship between the gods and their worshipers: the Aśvins have livestock to give, the humans have livestock received as gifts. The primary reading should be the dual (with the Pp and the standard tr.), but the other should not be dismissed.

VII.71.1–2: Note ... *asmád yuyotam* # ending 1d and # *yuyutam asmád* ... beginning 2c, with two different root grades in the otherwise identical impv.

VII.71.2: As with VII.70.5 just above, I would not construe the dat. *dāśúṣe mártvyāya* directly with *upāyātam* as goal (as in the publ. tr. and the other standard tr.), but here take it as the beneficiary in the part. phrase in b: “with your chariot conveying a desirable thing for the pious mortal.”

On *ánirā-*, see comm. ad VIII.48.11. Here “famine and disease” might make a better pairing than “thirst and affliction” for *ánirām amīvām*.

On the ill-formed presumed opt. *trāsīthām*, see esp. Narten (s-aor. 131–32), with previous lit. Narten suggests that the Sprachgefühl for 2nd and 3rd du. middle optatives may have been weak, so that the formally proper *\*trāsīyāthām* eluded the poet – an eminently sensible suggestion that might bring comfort to my 1st year Sanskrit students. Though it is likely to be an opt., note that the transmitted long *-ī-* would be better read short in all four of its occurrence, as noted already by Gr. Since the verb is accented, it must start a new little clause.

VII.71.3: JPB’s suggestion in the publ. intro. that the “hands” of *syūma-gabhastī-* are the hands of the priests who control the ritual is certainly possible and more plausible than other suggestions that have been made.

The 2nd du. verb *vahethām* looks as if it should pair with *trāsīthām* in the previous vs., but it is a well-formed middle impv.; the opt. should be *\*vaseyāthām*.

VII.71.4: “The chariot that is your conveyance” might be a little less flat-footed than “The chariot which is the conveyer for you.”

On *viśvápsnya-* see comm. ad VIII.97.15.

VII.71.5: I would prefer “for Pedu” to “to Pedu” as well as “narrowness” to “difficulty” for *ámhas-* in the Atri myth.

VII.71.6=VII.70.7

**VII.72 Aśvins** [SJ on JPB]

VII.72.2: The *utá* in d conjoins two two-word phrases and is not only found after the 2nd constituent but after both parts of it. See JSK (DGRV I.344–45) for this type.

VII.72.3: I would prefer “addresses” to “summons.”

**VII.73 Aśvins** [SJ on JPB]

VII.73.3: The expression *pathām urāñā(h)* is a curious one, for several reasons. With Old, the best way to interpr. the gen. pl. *pathām* is as a partitive gen.: “choosing among the paths,” though this gen. construction with  $\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$  does not otherwise seem to exist. The participle is also problematic, in that, as Re points out, *urāñá-* is ordinarily passive, as opposed to the pres. part. *vṛñāná-*. In fact, even those forms of *urāñá-* interpr. as transitive by Gr and the standard tr. are in fact better taken as passive; see comm. ad III.19.2, IV.6.3, IX.109.9. However, I do not see any way to take it as passive here or to construe *pathām* with anything else in the clause, so I’m afraid we’re stuck with this unusual construction.

VII.73.5=72.5

#### VII.74 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

VII.74.1: The morphological identity and syntactic function of *usrā* are disputed. The Pp. takes it as *usrā* (so also Lub), and Sāy. interpr. it as a dual modifying the Aśvins (so also Old, Ge, WG). Gr reads *usrās* out of sandhi, identifying it as a fem. nom. pl., presumably modifying *díviṣṭaya(h)*. Re would read the same form but as gen. sg., supplying *vástoḥ* or *vyúṣi* for it to depend on. This solution is adopted in the publ. tr. and seems the most attractive of the not so great options.

VII.74.3: For “whose goods are worth winning” I would substitute “having noble goods”; see comm. ad I.128.7.

The d pāda is identical to 4d in the immediately preceding hymn (VII.73), though without the final *sívéna*.

VII.74.5: I would change “follow” to “keep company with”; see comm. ad V.17.5. I think the point is that the patrons stay close to the ritual ground and the offerings made to the Aśvins in order to receive their benefit.

VII.74.6: The other occurrence of *nṛ-pātár-* is in an etymological figure in I.174.10, *narām nṛpātā*; here an unrelated synonym is substituted for *narām*, namely *jánānām*, but the etymological figure is gestured to, by *náraḥ* in the following pāda (c). See also the etym. figures *sávasā sūśuvuḥ* (c) and *kṣiyanti sukṣitím* (d). I find the publ. tr. “dwell upon a good dwelling” awkward and unidiomatic, but I’m not quite sure what to substitute – “inhabit a good habitation”?

#### VII.75 Dawn

VII.75.1: Although the Saṃhitā form *āvo* in pāda a (Pp. *āvaḥ*) is assigned to  $\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$  ‘cover’ by Gr, it clearly belongs to  $\sqrt{vas}$  ‘shine, dawn’. See, e.g., AiG I.335. It is rightly glossed by Sāy. with *vyaucchat*. Both roots occur regularly with the preverb *ví* as here (‘dawn widely’ / ‘uncover’) and both are regularly found in dawn contexts. Here *ví ... āvas* explicitly contrasts with *ápa ... āvar* ( $\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$ ) ‘uncovered’ in c.

The latter form makes a bad Triṣṭubh cadence: ... *āvar ājuṣtam*#, where we would expect *-var* to be a heavy syllable. Old (Prol. 424 n. 1) persuasively suggests that this apparent light syllable may actually represent \**āvarr* (from original 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. \**āvart*), with the same doubling of final resonant before initial vowel that we find in *-nn* from older \**-nt*. He suggests the same for *kar* (IX.92.5) and *abibhar* (X.69.10), both of which would be metrically better as \**-arr*.

*āv-* is something of a signature of this vs.: *āvo ... , āviṣ(kṛṇvānā) ... / āvar*, reinforced by numerous other *a-lā*-initial words: *āgāt / āpa ... ājuṣtam, āngirastamā ... ajīgaḥ*.

The “truth” (*rténa*) of Dawn must refer to her conforming to the standard patterns of the cosmos by dawning every day and indeed her embodiment of these patterns, since the regular alternation of night and day is the most salient sign of cosmic laws. The word here contrasts with *drúhaḥ* ‘deceits’ in c.

Corey Barnes (class, 12/15) pointed out the repeating pattern (*drúh*)*as táma ... (ājuṣ)tam, á(ṅgir)astamā*, which showcases ‘darkness’.

In d I take *pathyā* as standing for acc. pl. *pathyāḥ* in harmony with the Pp. and the standard views. Scar (137 and n. 191) tentatively suggests taking it rather as an instr. *pathyā* (“gegen den Text”), modelled on *pathyā (jánānām)* in nearby VII.79.1, where either instr. sg. *-ā* or acc. pl. *-āḥ* is possible. Although “awaken the paths” with the acc. pl. is not an entirely straightforward expression, his instr. interpr. not only goes against the text but also requires supplying an obj. for “awaken” (“der Menschen”), and in addition “awaken (the men) along the path” doesn’t appreciably improve the sense. (Were they sleeping by the roadside?) I assume that “awaken the paths” is shorthand for “filling the paths with (newly awakened) people moving hither and thither and thereby making the paths lively.” An instr. in VII.79.1 fits the context better.

VII.75.2: Like the *āvaḥ* forms (see vs. 1), *bodhi* is ambiguous, and either interpr. could be made to fit the context. Gr takes it to  $\sqrt{budh}$  ‘be aware, be awake’, but most later interpr. assign it to  $\sqrt{bhū}$  (Old, Ge, Re, Lub). However, I opt for  $\sqrt{budh}$  for several reasons. For one thing, as I have shown elsewhere (1997 “Syntactic Constraints on Morphological Change,” 69–74), *bodhi* to  $\sqrt{bhū}$  is in virtual complementary distribution with the parallel impv. *bháva*, with *bodhi* confined to pāda-medial position, against *bháva*, which occurs initially and finally. A pāda-final *bodhi* here would violate this distributional rule. Moreover, the last word of the preceding vs. is *ajīgaḥ*, belonging to  $\sqrt{gr}$  ‘awaken’, and I think the poet is playing off these two ‘awaken’ roots. Although Old gives numerous supposed parallels with  $\sqrt{bhū}$  and the syntactic construction in our pāda, most of these involve dat. infinitives. However, two give me pause — III.54.3 *mahé sú naḥ suvitāya prá bhūtam*, VII.85.4 *ásad ít sá suvitāya ...* — both of which contain the dat. *suvitāya* and a form of ‘be(come)’. On the basis of these passages, I admit the possibility that *bodhi* here belongs to  $\sqrt{bhū}$ , but still think it likely that the poet is slyly playing with the ‘awaken’ roots. If it does belong to  $\sqrt{bhū}$ , I would explain its wrong positioning on the basis of strict parallelism between the semantically and syntactically parallel clauses of a and b, with the latter ending with the impf. (*prá*) *yandhi*.

Ge and Re construe *márteṣu* with *śravasyúm* (“... Reichtum, der unter den Sterblichen nach Ruhm strebt”; “... la richesse ... qui crée le renom parmi les mortels,” with Re adding a “creative” dimension to *śravasyú-* that does not seem to me to be

justified, though it makes the tr. make more sense). I think rather that the sequence *dēvi mārteṣu mānuṣi* is meant to draw attention to two different relationships that Dawn, a goddess, has with the human world: on the one hand, she comes among mortals (*mārteṣu*) every day, awakening the whole human world; on the other, she has a special relationship with the descendents of Manu, that is, the Ārya sacrificial community, a much more restricted set of humans to whom she is more tightly bound by ritual activity.

VII.75.3: The focus shifts from the sg. Dawn of vss. 1–2 to her pl. beams (*bhānāvah*), but with lexical repetition linking them: *āguḥ* at the end of b echoes *āgāt* similarly positioned in 1b, *citrāḥ* repeats *citrām* (qualifying ‘wealth’) in 2c. And the nom. pl. beams and gen. sg. goddess are syntactically intertwined: *eté tyé bhānāvo* [nom. pl. m.] *darśatāyās* [gen. sg. fem.] *citrā* [nom. pl. m.] *uśāso* [gen. sg. fem.] *amṛtāsaḥ* [nom. pl. m.].

The phrase *janáyanto daívyāni vratāni* ‘generating the heavenly commandments’ seems to expand on the *ṛténa* of vs. 1: by her dawning, Dawn every day recreates in visible form the rules that govern the cosmos.

VII.75.4: The initial *eṣā syā* ‘this very one’ (fem.) matches *eté tyé* ‘these very ones’ (masc.) opening the previous vs., referring to her beams.

As Old points out, pāda a lacks a syllable (even reading, as expected, *s<sup>i</sup>yā*). He tentatively suggests *\*yuyujānā*. It is certainly the case that *yujānā-*, which is fairly common, never appears in this post-caesura position, while the four occurrences of *yuyujānā-* are all post-caesura. But it is difficult to explain why the corruption would have occurred -- perhaps haplology in the sequence (*s<sup>i</sup>*)*yā* *\*yuyu(jānā)*?

The ‘patterns of the peoples’ (*vayúnāni jánānām*) seem almost to be the human equivalent of the *daívyāni vratāni* of 3c.

The pāda-final pres. *jigāti* picks up the aor. forms to the same root, also pāda-final, *āgāt* (1b), *āguḥ* (3b), but it also plays against the likewise redupl. *ajīgaḥ* at the end of 1d, belonging to the separate root  $\sqrt{gr}$  ‘awaken’.

VII.75.5: *citrā-* reappears in b (cf. 2c and 3b).

The polarized position of the phrases *ṛṣiṣṭutā* (beg. of c) and *vāhñibhir grṇānā* (end of d) helps anchor the application of *vāhñi-* ‘conveyor’ to ‘conveyor of ritual offerings’, since ‘praised by seers’ is unambiguous. Cf. also I.48.11 *yé tvā grṇānti vāhñayaḥ*.

VII.75.6: And *citrā-* again, for the third time opening a b pāda.

The metaphorical use of *vāhñi-* found in the previous vs. contrasts with the literal use (well, as literal as the RV gets) of the participle *vāhantaḥ* ‘conveying’ referring to Dawn’s horses (*ásvāḥ*).

VII.75.7: The first hemistich consists of four consecutive etymological figures, all nom. sg. fem. + instr. pl. masc. — simple but effective.

On cd see Hoffmann (Injunk. 134).

VII.75.8: Since it directly follows *vāvaśanta* ‘(the cows) keep bellowing (7d)’, *nū no* opening the vs. is surely meant to evoke the root  $\sqrt{nu}$  ‘bellow, roar’, also used of bovines,

with its (pseudo?) intensive (*á*)*nūnot* (also *nónuv-*), though of course it really consists of particle followed by enclitic pronoun.

### VII.76 Dawn

On the intricate structure of this hymn and its relationship to verb tense, see publ. intro. As noted there, vss. 1–2 have augmented aorists referring to the immediate past (*ásret* 1b, *ajaniṣṭa* 1c, *akar* 1d, *adṛśran* 2a, *ábhūt* 2c, *āgāt* 2d); vss. 3–4 have augmented imperfects and one perfect referring to the more distant past (*āsan* 3a, 4a, *dadrkṣé* 3d, *avindan* 4c, *ajanayan* 4d); and vss. 5–7 have present indicatives and imperatives stating general truths and urging action (*sám jānate ... yatante* 5b, *minanti* 5c, *ṛlate* 6a, *ucha* 6c, *jarasva* 6d, *ribhyate* 7b).

VII.76.1: Unlike the previous hymn, which contains no other divinities, this vs. introduces two (though one without name) before mentioning Uṣas, who enters only as the very last word of the vs. The two other gods are Savitar (b) and Sūrya in his role as “eye of the gods” (*devānām ... cákṣuh*, c).

The two virtually synonymous adj. *viśvájanya-* ‘belonging to all people’ and *viśvānara-* ‘belonging to all men’ are juxtaposed across the pāda boundary (a/b); they refer to two different entities: the immortal light (*jyótir amṛtam*), presumably the sun, and god Savitar (*savitā devāh*). As such they may also subtly allude to the well-known group, the All Gods, with their first member(s) *viśvá-* and the ‘men’ words implicitly summoning up the opposite, *devá-*. The pl. gods then show up in c, with another occurrence of *viśva-* in d.

In c it is not possible to determine whose *krātu-* is being referred to. Ge takes it as the gods’, and certainly the adjacency of the two words (*krátvā devānām*) is suggestive. Re seems to favor Uṣas. However, given that it is Savitar’s action in ab that raised the light, I think it likely that the *krātu-* is his.

VII.76.2: On the relation of this vs. to its paired frame vs. 5, see publ. intro. Their relationship is signalled in the first instance by patterned repetition, with 2b and 5b almost identical: *ámardhanto vásubhiḥ* x x x x. This patterned repetition also involves poetic repair. The qualifier *ámardhantaḥ* ‘not negligent’, used unusually of paths in vs. 2b, returns in 5d with a far more appropriate referent, the Fathers or their modern-day representatives, the Vasiṣṭhas. The standard tr. either ignore the identity of the two words, found in the same metrical position, and tr. each in a way that fits the context as the tr. sees it (so Ge “unfehlbar” 2b versus “nicht zurückstehend” 2d) or choose an anodyne tr. that doesn’t reflect the act. transitive morphology of the form (Re “impeccable” in both places). But forms of the root  $\sqrt{mrdh}$  generally take an acc. obj. (or an enclitic prn. that is likely acc.) in the sense ‘neglect X’, and we would expect the participle, even negated, to reflect the same usage. As usual, I think it is incumbent on us to follow the morphology, even when it leads us to interpretations that seem, at first, awkward. Here I would first point out that Dawn “awakened” the paths in the previous hymn (VII.75.1d *pathyā ajīgaḥ*), so paths in this group of hymns appear to have more animacy than might be expected. The paths in our vs. are the ones that lead to the gods (*devayānāh*), and in this context “non-negligent paths” could be ones that don’t fail to lead us there, perhaps because they stay in good order, as is implied by the qualifier *iṣkrta-*. As often with such

semantic mismatches, the sense that comes from apparently incompatible words construed together is hard won, but it also leads to a deeper understanding of what the poet intended.

In the ppl. *īṣkrta-* here and in a number of other locutions involving *īṣ + √kr* (*īṣkartár-*, *īṣkr̥ti-*, etc.), *īṣ-* behaves like a pseudo-preverb. The most likely default source for this *īṣ-* is the root noun of the same shape meaning ‘refreshment, nourishing drink’ (so EWA s.v. *īṣ-*), although the semantics makes difficulties: the additive meaning we might expect (‘prepare nourishment’ vel sim.) is not found. Instead it seems to mean something like ‘set in order, set to rights, restore’. Although some interpr. the idiom as ‘heal’ (see EWA loc. cit.), I see no good evidence for this in the RV; certainly “healed paths” here would be even more aberrant than “non-negligent” ones. The form here is the only occurrence of the lexeme *īṣ √kr* in the Family Books; otherwise it is limited to the late RV: the finite verbs *īṣkaram* X.48.8, *īṣkr̥nudhvam* X.53.7, the past participle here and in the compd. *īṣkr̥tāhāva-* X.101.6, as well as negated *āniṣkr̥ta-* VIII.99.8 and IX.39.2, agent nouns *īṣkartar-* VIII.1.12 and *īṣkartár-* VIII.99.8, X.140.5, and the fem. abstract *īṣkr̥ti-* X.97.9. Besides its possible etymological connection with *īṣ-* ‘refreshment’ (textually hinted at only in IX.39.2, X.48.8, 140.5), it also seems to form an antonymic pair with *nīṣ √kr* ‘expel’; see the hymn to healing herbs, X.97, where *īṣkr̥ti-* is contrasted with *nīṣkr̥ti-*, *nīṣ kr̥tha*. This rhyming contrast may account for the ‘restore’ sense, antonymic to ‘expel’. Our passage also contains interaction with a different pseudo-preverb: *īṣ-kr̥ta-* can be seen as picking up (*āv*)*ír akar* in 1c. Though the augment induces *-r* sandhi, the underlying idiom is *āvīṣ √kr* (e.g., IV.4.5 *āvīṣ kr̥nuṣva*) with *-īṣ* matching *īṣkr̥ta-* here.

*purástāt / pr̥aticī* “from the east, facing west” is another example of a paired contrast across a pāda boundary.

VII.76.3–4: As noted in the publ. intro., these two vss. are defined as an omphalos, and this relationship is signaled by the patterned repetition of their first pādas: 3a *tānīd ... āsan* / 4a *tá id ... āsan* “just those were ...”

VII.76.3: Despite the straightforward, indeed ballad-like opening (“those were the days ...”), the syntax of the rest of this vs. is difficult to entangle. The problem is that there appear to be two subordinating expressions (*yā* in b, *yátaḥ pári* in c), though it is difficult to identify more than one subordinate clause; if there are two subordinate clauses, one of them would have very sketchy clausal structure. Nonetheless, Ge and Re opt for the latter solution, supplying a verb in b, both taking *yā* as neut. pl. nom. and the subject of this clause (e.g., “Nombreux furent ces jours en vérité qui (surgirent) autrefois ...”); for them cd is then a new subordinate cl. marked by *yátaḥ pári* referring to these same days (e.g., “à la suite desquels ...”). Something like this is possible, and in my many fiddlings with this vs. over the years I have more than once hovered over something like it. But the stumbling block is *pr̥acīnam* in b, which both Ge and Re must take as an adverbial temporal expression (“vorher” and “autrefois” respectively), even though this stem is otherwise only locational ‘forwards / towards the east’, often in a ritual context. I can see no way to integrate the standard use of this stem into a nominal clause consisting only of pāda b. I therefore take bcd as a single subordinate clause with two markers of subordination, *yā* (b) a neut. pl. acc. extent of time (“through which ...) and *yátaḥ pári* (c) referring to the place from which Dawn comes, picking up *purástāt* in 2c. The *yā* is more

narrowly construed with the finite verb *dadrkṣé* in d (“... the days through which you became visible” -- that is, dawned over and over), the *yátaḥ pári* with the participle *ācárantī* “faring forth thence [= from the east].”

I further take *prācīnam* as the goal of that participle (“faring forth ... towards the east-facing [sacrifice]”). As I just noted, *prācīna-* is often found in a ritual context, modifying *yajñá-* (VII.7.3) or *barhís-* (I.188.4, IV.5.4, X.110.4). Either would be possible here, and the point would be that Dawn is hastening from the east towards the sacrifice that, like an expectant lover, is facing towards her. Assuming with most comm., beginning with Sāy. (see esp. Old’s argumentation) that we should read loc. *jāré*, contra Pp. *jārah*, the acc. *prācīnam* in the frame would be the functional equivalent of *jāré* in the simile -- GOAL -- despite the mismatch of cases, a nice example of case disharmony in a simile (as discussed in my 1982 IJJ article).

Although I realize that this is a very fussy solution, I cannot see any other way to deal with the troublesome *prācīnam*. And it is, after all, an omphalos vs., where perturbations are common. Strictly speaking, my tr. fails to render both subordinators as such: “thence” should be “whence.” But the tr. is hard enough to parse as it is.

The contrastively paired similes, “like (a maiden) faring forth to her lover, not like one going (home) again” (*jārá ivācárantī ... ná púnar yatīva*), are well understood by the standard comm. and nicely indicate that Dawn dawns with as much speed as she can muster, eager for reunion with her lover, rather than lingering like one reluctantly leaving a tryst. For the first cf. I.123.9 ... *yóṣā ná ... niṣkṛtām ācárantī* “going to the appointed place like a maiden to a rendezvous,” also of Dawn (see also VI.75.4 in the weapon hymn). The *iva* is wrongly placed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> simile, but the poet had too many elements to fit in as it was.

VII.76.4: Although this vs. begins in the same way as vs. 3, the syntax is quite straightforward, with no dependent clauses and the Fathers as subject throughout. Once again we might consider this an example of poetic repair, given the syntactic difficulties the previous vs. posed.

VII.76.5: As noted above, this vs. marks the transition to present-tense verbs and imperatives from the distant past of vss. 3–4. Who the subject of these verbs is in vs. 5 is not entirely clear. Until the very last syllable of the first hemistich, it is impossible to know even the gender, but the oddly positioned *té* at the end of pāda b identifies the subject as masc.; up until then, since *sámgatāsaḥ* could be either masc. or fem., the fem. Dawns are a possibility. The second hemistich repeats the *té* immediately (c), and adds an unambig. masc. adj. *ámardhantaḥ* (as well as potentially ambig. *yādamānāḥ*). Once *té* restricts the subject to masc., our immediate thought would be the Fathers, who are the subject of vs. 4. This is the solution of both Ge and Re. However, the temporal switch between 4 and 5 might speak against that. In vs. 6 the Vasiṣṭhas are explicitly identified as the subject (6a). My own view is that the subject of vs. 5 is deliberately left unspecified, to allow a transition between, and identification of, the Fathers and their latter-day representatives the Vasiṣṭhas. That the Fathers are at least arguably present is suggested by *samāná ūrvé* “in a common pen,” since *ūrvá-* frequently refers to the Vala cave where the cows/dawns are confined and therefore could set the action of the vs. in mythological time when, as the preceding vs. notes, the Fathers “found the hidden light”

and “generated the dawns,” as in the Vala myth. As for a contemporary reference, “common pen” could refer to the sacrificial ground, where the Vasiṣṭhas would be acting in concert.

In addition to specifying the gender of the subject of *ab*, the final *té* also repeats the final syllables of the two verbs that precede it in the *pāda*, *jānate ... yatante*.

### VII.77 Dawn

On the structure of this hymn, as signaled by its verb forms and personal reference, see publ. intro. The first three vss. contain a series of sg. augmented aorists (started with a perfect), all but *ábhūt* with Dawn as 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. subj.: *úpa ruruce*, *ábhūt*, *ákar*, *úd asthāt*, *ásvait*, *aroci* (which last almost forms a ring with the opening pf.), *adarśi*, into which fem. sg. pres. participles have been interspersed: *prasuvántī*, *bādhmānā*, *bībhratī*, *vāhantī*, *náyantī*. Following that we get in vss. 4–5a an equally insistent series of imperatives: *ucha*, *kṛdhi*, *yāvaya*, *ā bhara*, *codāya*, *vī bhāhi*, with Dawn as 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. subject. In 5b the fem. pres. parts return: *pratirántī*, *dádhatī*. In the last vs. the pattern is broken again: a pl. present *vardháyanti* with the Vasiṣṭhas as subject, found in the only subordinate cl. in the hymn, and in the last *pāda* before the clan refrain an aor. injunctive in imperival usage, *dhāh*.

VII.77.1:  $\sqrt{ruc}$  appears with the preverb *úpa* only here. I connect it with the simile *yuvatīr ná yósā* “like a young maiden”: *úpa* generally connotes ‘up close, intimate’, and *úpa*  $\sqrt{ruc}$  may suggest the beguiling radiance of a beloved young girl close by.

As Re points out,  $\sqrt{bhū}$  + dat. inf. is rare. Here *ábhūt ... samídhe* seems to be the intrans./pass. equivalent of a periphrastic causative  $\sqrt{kṛ}$  *samídhe*, as in I.113.9 *úṣo yád agnīm samídhe cakārtha* “O Dawn, since you have caused the fire to be kindled ....,” adduced by both Ge and Re. For a periphrastic caus. nearby, see VII.75.8 *mā ... nidé kar* “Don’t put to scorn ...”

I do not know why we have pf. *ruruce* in a vs. containing two augmented aorists, *ábhūt* and *ákar*, with two more in the next hemistich (2a *asthāt*, 2b *ásvait*); the passive aor. (*a*)*roci* would have been possible, and is in fact found in 2d.

VII.77.2: Whatever the reason for the pf. *ruruce* in vs. 1, its semi-repetition in the aor. *aroci* in 2d inaugurates a pattern of lexical chaining in the first part of this hymn.

*víśvam* opening the vs. may pick up *víśvaṃ jīvám* “every living thing” of the previous vs. or anticipate *víśvam* in 3d, where I supply ‘world’.

In c the bahuvrīhi *sudṛśīka-saṃdṛś-* ‘having an appearance lovely to see’ is an internal etymological figure, ... *dṛśīka-* ... *dṛś-*. Since the final segment of the cmpd, underlying *-ś* (or rather the product of nom sg. *-ś+s*), appears as *-g* in sandhi, it echoes the *-k-* of the prior member: *sudṛśīka-saṃdṛg*.

VII.77.3: More chaining: the compound etym. figure with *dṛś* in 2c is echoed not only by a repetition of the entire first member of the cmpd. *sudṛśīka-* (3b) but also in the pass. aor. *adarśi* (3c), while the fem. agent noun *netrī* of 2d returns as a participle *náyantī* (3b), likewise fem., and the aor *ásvait* of 2b matches the adj. *śvetá-* in 3b.

VII.77.4: On the abrupt change of tense/mood and of person here see above and publ. intro. Notably, the lexical chaining stops here as well.

In pāda a *ánti*- ‘nearby’ contrasts with *dūré* ‘in the distance’, though the first is in a cmpd. and the latter is not. The ‘away’ / ‘here’ contrast is also found in c, though *yāvāya* means ‘keep away’ without benefit of preverb or adverb, while *ā* serves for ‘here’. The objects of the antithetical pairs are similar in the two pādas: “(bring) nearby” takes *-vāma-* ‘valuable things’ (a), *vásuni* ‘goods’ (c); “keep/send away” *amíttram* ‘foe’ (a), *dvéṣaḥ* ‘hatred’ (c). Re comments similarly. *ánti*- may also implicitly refer back to the semantically similar *úpa* opening the first vs. and mark the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> section of the hymn. For the complementary opposition *ánti* / *dūrā*- in a similar passage, cf. IX.78.5 *jahí sátrum antiké dūraké ca yáḥ* “Smash the rival nearby and the one who is in the distance.”

The VP *dūré amíttram ucha* “dawn the foe into the distance” displays an apparent transitive sense of *√vas* ‘dawn’. This transitive sense is otherwise limited to *ápa √vas* ‘dawn (X) away’, as in nearby VII.81.6 *uṣā uchad ápa srídhaḥ* “Dawn dawns away failures” (= I.48.8; cf. VII.104.23, VIII.47.18). In our passage the locational adverb *dūré* ‘in the distance’ fills the role of the preverb *ápa* ‘away’, a point also made by Re. Baum’s interpr. (Impv. in RV, 164) of *amíttram* as an acc. of goal, in the sense “‘illuminate the enemy (when he is) far away,’ i.e. prevent him from hiding,” is unlikely, and he does not mention the *ápa √vas* passages.

VII.77.5: I take the two *ca*’s in cd as marking a “both ... and” construction: *íṣaṃ ca ... gómad áśvāvad ráthavac ca rádhaḥ* “both refreshment and largesse in cattle, horses, (and) chariots.” Though ordinarily we might expect the 2<sup>nd</sup> *ca* to be placed after the first term in the second constituent (hence\* *gómac ca ...*), I explain its late position as resulting from treating the three parallel *-vat* adjectives as a unitary qualifier; it also allows the complementary placements of *ca* in cd: #X *ca* ..., ... *ca* Y#. Klein interprets the passage very differently, taking the two *ca*’s as independent: the first as conjoining the two participial clauses in bc (... *pratírāntī* ... / ... *ca* ... *dádhatī* ...)(DGRV I.104–5) and the second as an XYZ *ca* construction, conjoining the *-vat* adjectives (86 and passim).

### VII.78 Dawn

On the lexical marks of this hymn, see publ. intro. The signature word *práti* opens the hymn and is repeated at the beginning of the first two pādas of vs. 2 and in the middle of 3a; it returns at the beginning of the last vs. (5), thus sketching a ring. The other signature word, fem. pres. part. *vibhātī*- ‘radiating widely’ is concentrated in the latter part of the hymn, ending the pādas 3b, 4b, and 5c.

VII.78.2: The lexeme *ápa √bādh* appears, as often, in tmesis. This tmesis appears to be regular even when the lexeme appears, as here, in the participle (univerbated as *apabādhmāna-* only in the late X.103.4; in tmesis I.35.3, 90.3, V.80.5, IX.97.43 as well as here). But in our passage *ápa* is oddly positioned for a preverb in tmesis (which may account for Gr’s failure to register the preverb, as also in V.80.5): immediately following the object and not adjacent to a metrical boundary, ... *bādhmānā, víśvā támāṃsi durityāpa devī*. Although this aberrant position might suggest that *ápa* is not a preverb here but a postposition or adverb, this would require separating the expression from the

well-attested verbal lexeme, which I prefer not to do. I should however note that in vs. 1b *bādhmānā tāmāṃsi* is found without *āpa*.

VII.78.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. departs from the practice of the rest of the hymn by referring to plural Dawns.

*prāty adṛśran* in the middle of pāda a repeats the opening of the hymn (1a), with polarized #*prāti ... adṛśran*#. The plural subject in vs. 1 are Dawn's "beacons" (*ketávaḥ*).

VII.78.5: As noted in the publ. intro., the hapax denom. *tilvilāyādhvam* is the most notable feature of this hymn. This verb is clearly built to the adj. *tīlvila-*, found in V.62.7, where it appears to mean something like 'fertile': *bhadré kṣétre nímitā tīlvile vā* "(the pillar) fixed in the good or \_\_\_ field/land." Note not only the *l*-s, but the rhyming *til-vil-*, a word-formation tactic not otherwise found in standard Vedic; the standard assumption is that it is a non-Indo-Aryan word (see, e.g., Kuiper, Aryans 14). The standard interpr. take it as a (presumably more specific) synonym to *bhadrá-*, though of course the *vā* 'or' construction could identify it as a contrast or even opposite to *bhadrá-*. If the word belongs to the agricultural sphere (as *kṣétra-* 'field' suggests), a non-IAr origin makes sense. It is sometimes connected (see EWA s.v.) with *tilá-* (AV+) 'sesame', which also lacks an IAr etym. The word *tīlvila-* is found in later Vedic; most of the occurrences are in similar passages in the gṛhya sūtras for the erection of a housepost and are clearly dependent on RV V.62.7 (e.g., ĀśGS 2.8.16, ŚāṅkhGS 3.3.1), but a ŚB passage seems to place it in the 'fruitful, fertile, rich' sphere. The passage concerns a cow let out to wander; whichever direction she goes will predict what will happen to the sacrificer. ŚB IV.5.8.11 *yádi praṭcīyād íbhyatilvila iva dhānyatilvilo bhaviṣyatīti vidyāt* (Eggeling) "If she goes westwards, let him know that he will be rich in dependants and crops."

### VII.79 Dawn

As noted in the publ. intro., *ví* is the signature word of this hymn. The first and last hemistichs of the hymn (1a, 5c) begin with *ví* and a form (indeed two, in the etymological figure in 1a) of  $\sqrt{vas}$ : 1a *vy uṣā āvaḥ* and 5c *vyuchántī*, forming a ring, and *ví* opens 1d, 2a, 3c, 4d as well. This preverb also gets played with in various ways: 2b opens with *víso* 'clans', whose 1<sup>st</sup> syllable falsely promises the preverb. The regular oppositional counterpart of *ví*, namely *sám*, opens 2c and provides the 2<sup>nd</sup> syllable of 1c (*susamḍṛgbhiḥ*). The alliteration of 3c is also set in motion by its opening *ví* (see below).

VII.79.1: This vs. echoes the 1<sup>st</sup> vs. of VII.75 in several ways, and VII.75.1 is helpful in resolving the verbal ambiguities in this one. Our vs. contains two occurrences (pādas a, d) of *ví ... āvaḥ* in exactly that sandhi form. The 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. augmented root aor. form *āvaḥ* is entirely ambiguous between  $\sqrt{vas}$  'dawn' and  $\sqrt{vr}$  'obstruct, cover', and the preverb *ví* does not help, since *ví*  $\sqrt{vas}$  regularly means 'dawn widely' and *ví*  $\sqrt{vr}$  'uncover, open'. VII.75.1 also contains two such forms, but both of them are in sandhi forms that allow their root affiliation to be unambiguously identified. VII.75.1 opens exactly like our vs., *vy uṣā āvaḥ*, but in VII.75 the sandhi form of the verb is *āvo*, which must belong to  $\sqrt{vas}$ . Pāda c of VII.75.1 contains *āvar* (though in tmesis with *āpa* rather than *ví*); again, the sandhi form *-ar* makes it clear that this verb must belong to  $\sqrt{vr}$ . Given the parallelism of the two vss., it seems almost as if VII.75.1 is providing a guide to the ambiguities of our

vs. In any case the standard interpr. all distribute the *āvaḥ* forms in this vs. as just laid out.

There is another echo between the two vss.: pāda a here contains *pathyā*, which could represent either instr. sg. *pathyā* (so Pp.) or acc. pl. *pathyāḥ* out of sandhi, recalling *pathyā* in VII.75.1d, which must represent acc. pl. *-āḥ* before a vowel. In this passage I favor the instr. sg. Note also that *pāñca ksitīḥ* opening our b pāda opens VII.75.4b.

VII.79.2: Whatever the etymology of *aktú-* ‘night’ -- I favor the connection with PIE *\*nokʷt-* ‘night’, *pace* EWA s.v.; see most recently LIN 505 and n. 20 -- it is here at least secondarily associated with *√añj* ‘anoint’ (which for some, e.g., EWA, is its etymon), since *aktūn* serves as obj. of *vy añjate*. My “glossy nights” is an attempt to capture the pun. For those who consider *aktú-* a derivative of *√añj*, *aktūn* here would be an internal obj. / cognate acc.; cf. Oberlies (Relig. v. II.111): “Die [rotglühenden] Morgenröten verstreichen ihre Farbe ...”

In any case, *aktūn* participates in two phonetic figures: *añjate ... ánteṣu aktūn* and the near-mirror-image *aktū(n) ... yuktā(h)*.

As in the previous hymn (VII.78), Dawn is sg. in this hymn, except in one vs., in this case this one; in VII.78, vs. 3.

VII.79.3: *#ábhūd uṣā(h)* is reminiscent of *#ábhūd agníḥ* in VII.77.2, though there the construction involved a predicated infinitive. See also VII.76.2 *#ábhūd u ketúr uṣásaḥ*.

Dawn is *índratamā* because she is *maghónī* ‘bounteous’ as he is *maghávan(t)-*. The splv. suffix *-tamā* echoes *tamaḥ* ‘darkness’ in the previous vs., 2c.

As Re points out, *suvitāya* in b recalls *duritā* in VII.78.2.

Pāda c displays heavy alliteration: *ví divó devī duhitā dadhāti*. The pattern is set in motion by the preverb *ví*, which, as was noted above, is the hymn’s signature word. The first three words in c have *ví* itself, its inverse (*d*)*iv(ó)*, and a long-vowel variant (*de*)*vī*, but in the meantime the *d* pattern has asserted itself and carries through to the end of the pāda. The elements of this sequence are found nearby each other in other hymns in this cycle, though not with the same intense concentration. Cf. esp. VII.77.5–6: 5b *devi*, 5c *dádhatī*, 6a *divó duhitā*.

VII.79.4: As slowly becomes clear, this vs. concerns the Vala myth, as the last pāda, describing the opening of “the doors of the firm-fixed stone,” illustrates. This slipping into the Vala story accounts for the otherwise puzzling *āṅgirastamā* ‘best / most like the Aṅgirasas’ in the previous vs. (3d; found also in nearby VII.75.1, also in a potential Vala context). The Aṅgirasas, of course, were responsible, along with Indra, for opening the Vala cave and releasing the imprisoned cows; they did so by singing. As Ge points out, the praisers who benefit from Dawn’s largesse in 4b are most likely the Aṅgirasas, and they would also then be the subjects of c.

Note the phonetic echo between *rādho* (a) and (*á*)*rado* (b), which is then found scrambled in d (*dú*)*ro ádr(eḥ)*. Pāda d also contains internal phonetic play with *d*’s and *r*’s, as well as *a*, *u*, and *o*: ... *dṛḥ(asya) dúro, adr(e)r āūr(ṇ)o(h)*. This is the only trisyllabic reading of the augmented stem *aurṇo-* and the vowel hiatus *a-ū* (or *a<sup>v</sup>ū*?) emphasizes the phonetic figures.

The verb in c, the pf. *jajñúh*, is perfectly ambiguous between  $\sqrt{jan}$  ‘beget’ and  $\sqrt{jñā}$  ‘recognize’. It is now standardly taken to the former, though Ge previously (Ved. St.) assigned it to the latter, a stance criticized by Old and silently given up by Ge in his tr.

VII.79.5: As noted in the intro. above, *vyuchántī*, which opens the last pāda of the hymn (save for the clan refrain), forms a ring with the opening phrase (1a) *vy ùṣā āvaḥ*. This reinforces the affiliation of *āvaḥ* in 1a with  $\sqrt{vas}$ , not  $\sqrt{vr}$ .

### VII.80 Dawn

VII.80.1: This vs. reprises various parts of the other dawn hymns in this cycle. The first hemistich *prāti ... uṣásam ... abudhran* echoes VII.78.5a *prāti tvā ... budhanta*, with each having the mortal worshipers as subject. (Note augmented *abudhran* versus injunctive *budhanta*.) In c Dawn is “unrolling” the two world halves (*vivartáyantīm*), while in VII.79.2c her cows “roll up” the darkness (*sám ... táma ā vartayanti*) with the preverb *sám* complementary to *ví*. In our vs. *sám* is found in the same pāda in the adjective describing the two world-halves, *sámante* ‘adjoining’. Finally, Dawn’s role in “revealing all beings” (*āviṣkṛṇvatīm bhúvanāni víśvā*) reminds us of her revealing her own greatness (*āviṣkṛṇvānā mahimānam*) in the first vs. of this cycle (VII.75.1b). The act. part. in our vs. is externally focused, while the middle part. in VII.75.1 properly captures the internal focus of that expression. The act. expression is also found in VII.76.1 *āvír kar bhúvanam víśvam uṣāh*.

Ge takes du. *rājasī* as referring to the Dark (and Light), i.e., Night and Day. But du. *rājasī* ordinarily refers to the two world-halves and is often used in conjunction with *ródasī* (e.g., I.160.4, IV.42.3), and I see no reason to seek a different referent here. Dawn’s action of ‘unrolling’ the two world-halves would refer to the visual effect of the gradual revealing of their features as the dawn’s light strengthens. For a similar notion, though with *ví*  $\sqrt{vr}$  ‘uncover’, see the previous hymn VII.79.1 *ví sūryo ródasī cákṣasāvaḥ* “The Sun has uncovered the two world-halves with his eye.”

VII.80.2: Because of the middle voice of the part., I interpr. *návyam āyur dádhanā* as referring to Dawn’s new life, which she would then assume every day. The middle voice contrasts with VII.77.5 *pratirántī na āyuh* “(she,) lengthening our lifetime.” Both Ge and Re seem to imply that in our passage the new life is established for others.

The sg. *abodhi* at the end of the first hemistich matches the pl. *abudhran* in the same position in vs. 1.

Pāda d *prācikitat sūryam yajñám agním* is exactly parallel to VII.78.3 *ájījanat sūryam yajñám agním*, which suggests that *ácikitat* is felt as a redupl. aor. to the caus. *cetáyati*, despite the obvious drawbacks of form (we would expect *\*acikitat*).

VII.80.3: This vs. is identical to VII.41.7, though it may fit better here.

The three *-vmatī-* adj., *ásvāvatīr gómatīh ... vīrávatīh*, modifying the pl. ‘dawns’ reprise the sequence at the end of the first hymn in this cycle, VII.75.8 *gómad vīrávat ... ásvāvat*, where they qualified *rátanam*.

## VII.81 Dawn

VII.81.1: Note the adjacency of *támaḥ* and *jyótiḥ*, though here across the pāda break.

VII.81.3: The stem *vánanvant-*, in my opinion, must be separated into two separate words on semantic grounds, neither of which is entirely clear morphologically. In VIII.102.19 and X.92.15, where it is associated with an axe (*svádhitī-*) in the identical phrase *svádhitir vánanvati*, it appears to belong with *vána-* ‘wood’. Cf. for the association IX.96.3 ... *svádhitir vánānām*, X.89.7 *svádhitir váneva*. But in VIII.6.34 it modifies *matīḥ* ‘thought’ in a context in which ‘wood(en)’ seems effectively excluded. In both VIII.1.31 and our passage I also find it difficult to make ‘wooden’ work, though Ge, for example, thinks our voc. addressed to Dawn (may -- he tags it with ? --) mean “Wagenbesitzende,” on the assumption that the wagon is wooden and the material has come to refer to the object made of it. In VIII.1.31, where it modifies ‘horses’ (*áśvān*), he takes it as referring to their wooden yokes. (He refuses to tr. the form in VIII.6.34.) Mayrhofer (both KEWA s.v. *vānam* and EWA s.v. *ván-*) favors the ‘wood’ connection as well, and in EWA suggests that *vánan-* is the *-n*-form of a heteroclitite, whose *-r-* is found in the locative 1<sup>st</sup> cmpd member *vanar-* (though one would of course not expect the *-r-* in the oblique). Re, having written in favor of the ‘wood’ connection (BSL 37: 19), disavows it in his n. to this passage in EVP III, in favor of “gracieuse,” on what seem firm grounds. Old discusses the problem with his customary acuity and decides for a derivation from  $\sqrt{van}$  ‘win, hold dear’, with a pun on ‘wood’ in VIII.102.19 and X.92.15. Although I generally favor seeing audacious metaphors in the RV, in this particular case I find that putting all the forms of *vánanvant-* under one rubric unduly stretches the metaphorical fabric -- though I might be open to Old’s suggestion that in VIII.102.19 and X.92.15 there is a pun on ‘wood’, but the form belongs with  $\sqrt{van}$ . This does not, however, help with the morphology. I tentatively suggest that the form derived from  $\sqrt{van}$  is the result of the further derivation or contamination of originally participial forms. The 8<sup>th</sup> class present to  $\sqrt{van}$ , *vanóti*, has an act. part. *vanvánt-*; if this acquired a *-vant-* suffix, the result would be in the first instance *\*vanv-án(t)-vant-*, which by dissimilation of the middle *-v-* could develop into our form (though with accent shift). Or the pf. part. *vavan-váms-* could have dissimilated to *\*vanan-váms-* (again accent is a problem). Or, starting with the pres. part. *vanv-ánt-*, we could imagine a perseverative form *\*vanv-an(t)-ant-*, with migration of the 2<sup>nd</sup> *-v-*. Or we can concoct an intens. stem *\*vanvan-* with participle *\*vanvan-a(n)t-*, again with flip of the *v*. But all of these scenarios are pure fantasy, I’m afraid. As for the form putatively derived from ‘wood’, I have even less idea, though I suppose it’s worth pointing out that all attested forms from both stems *vanánvant-* actually have the weak form of the suffix *-vat-* and *\*vana-vatV*, built directly to *vána-*, would be metrically unfavorable.

VII.81.4: This vs. presents several minor syntactic problems. Pāda b contains two apparent dative infinitives, the almost synonymous *prakhyai* and *drśé*, most likely to be construed with *kṛṇóṣi* in pāda a. The standard interpr. take the two infinitives as separate parallel constructions, though the details of these constructions differ acdg. to tr. (cf., besides Ge and Re, Scar [353] and Keydana [Inf., 167, 203]). As a typical ex., see Scar’s “... die du ... machst, dass man sieht und man das Licht schaut.” Although as far as I

know there is no way to tell, I prefer to take both the datives with *svàr*; the standard expression *svàr dṛśé* indicates that the sun is visible, available for seeing, while *prakhyat* is used in a similar fashion to *cákṣase* in 1c.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is more problematic. The first question is the grammatical identity of *ratnabhājah*, which could be gen. sg. and modify immediately preceding fem. gen. *tásyās te*, or nom. pl. and modify the implied pl. subj. ‘we’ of immediately following 1<sup>st</sup> pl. *īmahe*. Ge opts for the former (“... die du Belohnungen austeilst”), but Old, Re, and Scar favor the nom. pl., as do I. For one thing other *-bhāj-* cmpds have similar syntacto-semantic value (“having a share of X”), rather than the transitive sense (“sharing out X”) required by the gen. interpr. It is of course possible that the positioning between the gen. sg. and the 1<sup>st</sup> pl. was deliberate, and the form is meant to be ambiguous.

The other problem lies in the interpr. of the two verbs *īmahe* (c) and *syāma* (d). The standard interpr. take the pāda break as a clause break (“as sharers of your treasure we beseech you; may we be like sons ...”). I find this mildly problematic, in that *ratnabhājah* would be better construed with *syāma* (“might we be sharers ...”) than with *īmahe*, and I have therefore taken it that way, with *īmahe* parenthetical and the simile in d an adjunct. This interpr. is supported by VI.71.6 *vāmbhājah syāma* “May we be partakers of the valuables” (sim. III.55.22 *sákhāyas te vāmbhājah syāma*). However, my interpr. not only complicates the syntax slightly, but the lack of accent on parenthetical *īmahe* might be troublesome -- though I don’t have strong intuitions on how verbal accent works with parentheticals. (The one example I can come up with, however, does accent the verb that interrupts the clause: X.95.1 *mānasā tīṣṭha ghore vácāmsi miśrā kṛṇavāvahai nau* “Thoughtfully -- stand still, fearsome woman! -- let us two now exchange words.”) In any case it might be better to follow the standard interpr. and tr. something like “we beseech you ([for us] to be) sharers in your treasure; may we be like sons to a mother” -- though as this tr. shows, taking *īmahe* with *ratnabhājah* requires more semantic machinery.

In c *tásyās te* is a fairly unusual ex. of the double *sá tvám* construction. As is sometimes the case with oblique forms of this construction, I think it likely that the *tásyāḥ* is there to indicate the gender of the personal pronoun -- though, given the Dawn context, the fem. gender of *te* could hardly be a secret.

VII.81.6: *codayitrī maghónaḥ* is perfectly ambiguous, since *maghónaḥ* could be either gen. sg. or acc. pl. In the former case it would refer to Indra, the archetypal *maghávan-*, in the latter to the pl. patrons (the *sūrī-* referred to in pāda a). According to the standard distribution of cases, suffix-accented *-tár-* agent nouns should take the gen.; indeed our stem does just that in I.3.11 *codayitrī sūñtānām*. However, this distribution is not absolute, and given the recent mention of the pl. patrons and the absence of Indra from this hymn (and mostly from this hymn cycle), a pl. reading is quite possible as well.

*sūñtātvatī* at the end of c forms a faint ring with *sūnārī* at the end of vs. 1. Note that it also recalls I.3.11 just cited.

[VII.82–89 JPB]

VII.82 Indra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

The dual dvandva *īndrāvāruṇā* (as nom. or, usually, voc.) appears in every vs. but 6 – and the final vs., where the names are disjoined and accompanied by other gods. It is not clear to me why vs. 6 is the exception, since both gods are represented there and Varuṇa is named.

VII.82 Intro.: As discussed ad V.63.3–4, I do not favor JPB’s tr. of *māyā-* as ‘cunning’, and here in the intro. and in vs. 3 I would substitute ‘uncanny power’.

VII.82.1: The second hemistich presents several problems. The most obvious is that the rel. cl. of c (whatever its configuration: see below) has a singular subject (*yāḥ*), which seems to be resumed by a plural object in the main clause of d (*dūḍhyàḥ* “those of vile intent” [JPB]). However, such number mismatch is not rare between rel. cl. and main cl., esp. with this type of maximalizing rel. cl. (“who(ever) ..., they ...”). (It should be noted that *dūḍhyàḥ* could be a gen. sg.; this would match the sg. rel. prn., but would assume a gen. obj. with  $\sqrt{ji}$ , which is more unlikely than a number mismatch.)

More problematic is how to construe pāda c, and here I’m afraid the interpr. of the publ. tr. is syntactically impossible. Avoiding the numerical disharmony just noted, JPB takes the acc. sg. *dīrgháprayajyum* as the obj. of the main cl verb *jayema* “may we conquer” in d (with the pl. *dūḍhyàḥ* being loosely parallel). The rel. cl. that constitutes the rest of pāda c (*āti yó vanuṣyāti*) then depends on the preceding *dīrgháprayajyum* and is therefore embedded in the main clause – but embedded relative clauses with finite verbs are not licit, and violations are very rare. The more natural interpr. is that of the other standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG), which take the whole of c as a rel. cl. and construe the acc. *dīrgháprayajyum* with *āti ... vanuṣyāti*. See, e.g., Ge’s “Wer den im Opfer Anhaltenden zu überbieten sucht ...” The somewhat late position of the rel. prn. is not problematic: the acc. obj. occupies the entire opening, and the rel. prn. takes notional 2nd position after the preverb *āti* in tmesis.

I am tolerably certain that this is the correct syntactic interpr., but that doesn’t remove all difficulties, since both the hapax *dīrgháprayajyu-* and the verb *āti vanuṣya-* are hard to interpr. To start with the verb, the denom. *vanuṣyá-* means something like ‘be rapacious’, and it never elsewhere governs an acc. It also does not otherwise appear with preverbs, and so *āti* is likely the trigger for the acc. here. I assume a literal sense for the lexeme like “be rapacious beyond X.,” hence (like the standard tr.) “be eager/avid to exceed, surpass X.” But what is X? This compd. has received a wide variety of glosses, most of which pay little attention to the members that make it up, particularly *práyajyu-*. Gr “weit hinausstrebend”; AiG II.1.220 “unermüdlich fromm”; Ge “den im Opfer Anhaltenden”; Re “(l’homme) qui se distingue au loin” (commenting that *prayajyu-* has nothing to do with *prá √yaj*, but belongs to a [phantom] root *yaj* ‘be distinguished’, which [acdg. to him] is a variant of *yaś*); JPB “one whose fore-offerings are long”; WG “den sich lange im Opfern Bemühenden”; EWA II.393 “opferfreudig” (for *práyajyu-* alone). This stem *práyajyu-*, the apparent second member of the compd., doesn’t fit any of these renderings well: reasonably well attested in the RV (12x), it always modifies gods and means something like ‘receiving the first of the sacrifice’. It is hard to square this with the bahuvrīhi *dīrgháprayajyu-*, which should modify a human ritualist. The rare lexeme *prá √yaj* means ‘set the sacrifice in motion’ (e.g., VI.15.13) and the late and rare *prayājá-* (X.51.8, 9; X.108.2) has the technical meaning ‘fore-offering’ (presumably the

source of JPB’s renderings, but note the difference in root-vowel length). None of this is very promising. It might be better to start with the simplex *yájyu-*, which almost always modifies human ritualists “eager to sacrifice,” but constructing a *bahuvrīhi* with that as 2nd member is challenging. For the context we would want a word designating a person whom the over-zealous subject of the rel. cl. would want to outdo; this at least suggests that the 1st member *dīrghá-* should refer not to the (over-)length of the ritual observance (per JPB), but to the knowledge of it “au loin” (per Re). I can cobble together a sense “whose sacrifices (are known) far and wide” (with *pra* semantically echoing *dīrghá-* rather than being immediately compounded with *-yaj-*), but I can’t get the morphology to work – maybe *-yu-* added to the whole complex?

In any case, in the absence of anything better I’d tr. cd as “Whoever is avid to surpass the one whose sacrifices (are known) far and wide – those of evil intent might we conquer in battles.”

VII.82.2: The first pāda is metrically disturbed. Old’s (over?)tentative suggestions fix it rather nicely: distract *s<sup>u</sup>varāḷ* and zap pāda-final *vām*.

VII.82.3: I would prefer “apertures” for “holes” in pāda a.

In pāda b I would take *prabhúm* as proleptic: “you raised the sun (to be) preeminent in heaven.”

As noted above ad publ. intro., I do not favor ‘cunning’ as a gloss for *māyā-*. Moreover in this vs. the form in question is the possessive deriv. *māyín-* ‘possessing *māyā*’, which should have an external referent, represented by *asya*. So the tr. “in the exhilaration of cunning” is grammatically wrong. The most likely referent of *māyín-* is *soma* (so Ge, Re). Although, as WG (n.) point out, the referent of an unaccented oblique form like *asya* should already be in the discourse -- and *sóma-* is not – the context, esp. the dependence of this gen. on the loc. *máde* ‘in exhilaration’, which is so often completed by *sómasya*, essentially assumes it. I would substitute the tr. “in the exhilaration of this (soma) possessing uncanny power.”

On the hapax *ápit-*, see Scar (318–19). It obviously owes its formation and presence here to the word play *ápinvatam ápitaḥ pínvatam ...*

Note the return of *dh̄t-*, now viewed in a positive light, in contrast to the *dū-dh̄t-*, our opponents, in 1d.

VII.82.4: The verse remains in suspension until the last word, the 1st pl. verb *havāmahe*; subjects, objects, and adjuncts are found, independently, in all three pādas, abc, but cannot be put together until the end. This is not an easy effect to reproduce in English, and no tr. attempts to do so entirely. Nonetheless it would be better to make both the 1st pl. subject and the verb parenthetical in the early parts of the vs.: “Just on you two (do we call) as chariot-drivers in conflicts and battles, on you two (do we,) with knees fixed, at your instigation of peace; / on the two masters of the good belonging to both (war and peace), (you two) easy to call, do we bards call, o M+V.”

Pāda a recalls 1d, both with *p̄tanāsu*.

In all of its occurrences I prefer ‘peace’ for *kṣéma-* to JPB’s ‘peaceful settlement’, despite its derivation from *√kṣi* ‘dwell (peacefully)’. It is regularly paired contrastively with ‘war’ as here (also, e.g., V.37.5, X.89.10).

On *mitá-jñu-* see comm. ad VI.32.3.

The phrase *vásva ubháyasya* appears in the next hymn (VII.83.5) in very similar context, governed by the verb *rājathaḥ* “you rule over” rather than the *īśānā* “being masters of” here. The question is what “both” refers to. JPB thinks war and peace (so also Re n., sim. WG); Sāy. (see Ge’s n. 4c) heavenly and earthly (Re in 83.5). However, Ge’s suggestion that the reference is to the enemies’ goods and one’s own seems the most sensible in context. Since the gods have control of the goods belonging to both sides, they can award them all to their choice of winner. I would emend the tr. to “of the goods of both (sides).”

VII.82.5: Substitute ‘peace’ for ‘peaceful settlement’; see comm. ad vs. 4 immed. above.

*duvasyāti* is presumably accented because of the implicit contrast between pādas c and d.

VII.82.6: As noted above, this is the only vs. that does not contain the dual dvandva *īndrāvāruṇā* or the two names adjacent *īndro vāruṇaḥ* (10a). Only Varuṇa is mentioned (pāda a), even though an *anyāḥ ... anyāḥ* (“the one ..., the other”) construction controls the 2nd hemistich, contrasting the two gods. For a speculative reason why see below.

As I interpr. pāda b, the two gods are competitively showing the measure of their individual *ójas-*, not jointly displaying it. Although this feature may be implicit in the publ. tr., it gets somewhat lost; it’s clearer in WG’s “messen die beiden ihrer Körperkraft gegenseitig.” The competing displays of this power are found in the *anyá- ... anyá-* clauses in cd. Such a rivalrous sense of the middle of *√mā* is not standard even with the dual; cf. IV.41.4 with a pres. middle du. impv. with the same subjects (I+V) and the same object (*ójas*), where the two gods seem to be acting jointly: *tásmin mimāthām abhíbhūty ójaḥ* “Against him do you two [=I+V] show the measure of your overwhelming power.” In our passage the somewhat awk. *asya yát svám* “(the power) of him, which (is) (his) own” seems designed to signal and enforce the separation of the two subjects. I would retr. the pāda as “each of the two shows the measure of his enduring power, (the power) that is his own,” though this loses the dual verb. Alternatively “the two each show the measure of his enduring power ...,” but this is awkward in English. The *ójas-* in question was jointly established in the two gods in vs. 2 by all the gods.

I don’t know quite what to do with the NPs in pāda a. I am not convinced by JPB’s “for the sake of (displaying) ...” I think they express purpose more directly. But the other interpr. are no better, and I will not deal with them further here. It does not help that *śulká-* is found only once elsewhere in the RV (VIII.1.5, also in the dative phrase *mahé (...)* *śulkāya*). The word has no etymology and seems to have undergone some semantic shift through time. In the RV passages it obviously does not have its later sense of ‘brideprice’, which prevails in the dharma lit. (see my Sac. Wife 213–25 and 297 n. 13). A perhaps transitional semantic phase is found in a late Brāhmaṇa passage, Jaiminīya Br. I.145, where Heaven and Earth exchange mutual and complementary gifts at their marriage (passage quoted and tr. in Sac. Wife 213), called *śulka-* for both sides.

Otherwise the stem is found in Vedic primarily, but rarely, in the AV, esp. AVP: Ś III.29.3; P II.65.4, IV.27.6, X.2.6, XIX.52.6. (Note that the last two are omitted from Kim’s Index verb.; several more occurrences are listed in VB, but are to be read *śukla-*: Ś V.19.3, P IX.18.9). The Ś example is tr. by Wh as “tax”; three of the examples in P are in

close proximity to *bali-* ‘tribute’ and are rendered as “Zoll” (P II.65.4 [Zehnder 1999]) and “levy” (P IV.27.6, X.2.6 [both Zehnder, Leach, and Hellwig online, also for II.65.4]). The association with *bali-* ‘tribute’, which is what the people offer to their king (or “chieftain” in the Zürich AVP lexicon), and the fact that all three of those AVP passages are in hymns “to preserve and strengthen the power of a chieftain” (AVP X.2) et sim. suggest a power imbalance between the provider of the *śulka-* and its recipient. This is supported by the single AVŚ occurrence, in a hymn (III.29) called by Wh “With the offering of a white-footed sheep”; in vs. 3 the man who gives said sheep “ascends unto the firmament, where a tax is not paid (*kr*) by a weak man for a stronger” (Wh): *sá nākam abhyārohati, yātra śulkó ná kriyate, abaléna bālīyase*. This suggests that ordinarily it is precisely a weak man who provides the *śulká-* to a stronger one and only the offering of the sheep exempts him here. The reciprocity found in the JB passage is not in evidence in the AV passages, nor is there any connection with brideprice – unless we think of the would-be groom as someone in a weak position vis-à-vis the bride’s father and his *śulka* a kind of “tribute.”

None of this gets us very far with the two RVic passages, beyond making it clear that my “exchange-gift” does not work well, resting on the later JB and dharma passages (though see comm. ad VIII.1.5). If we look for the kind of power imbalance found in the AV passages, that may afford a different angle from which to consider our passage. If a *śulká-* is what the weak give to the strong, can it be that Indra and Varuṇa are showing their respective powers in order to be offered this *śulká-*? Who then is the giver and what does the *śulká-* consist of? Perhaps the poet and his poem – and the English word “tribute” would be fortuitously (and fortunately) apt, referring both to the verbal homage and the economic circumstances of its payment.

I am rather taken with this solution, but it runs into two difficulties: what to do with the apparently parallel dative phrase *vāruṇasya nú tviṣé* (if dative it is; out of sandhi *tviṣá* could equally well be *tviṣás*), and how to make this interpr. work for the other occurrence of *mahé* (...) *śulkāya* in VIII.1.5. The best I can do with the former problem is to suggest that, though both phrases are (probably) dative, they are not meant to be entirely parallel, as possibly signaled by the *nú* that introduces the second phrase. Since *ójas-* is ordinarily associated with Indra but in pāda b both gods are displaying it, it may be that “for the flaring might of Varuṇa” is drawing attention to this unusual facet of Varuṇa, that the competitive display in pāda b is meant to showcase V’s *tviṣ-* and his *ójas-*. This may be why this verse and it alone lacks an overt mention of Indra, in order to focus attention on Varuṇa. I would now (tentatively) retr. this pāda as “For a great “tribute” [=poem as fee] and now for the flaring might of Varuṇa ...”

As for VIII.1.5, it is harder to see power imbalance in that passage: the 1st-ps. speaker (presumably the poet, though in a somewhat combative mood) swears he will not hand over Indra “even for a great *śulka*” (then spelled out in numerical terms, “not for a thousand, not for ten thousand ...”). Who might be the weaker party who would provide this extravagant *śulka*? a competing poet/ritualist with lesser powers? Or is the *śulka* here more a ransom, which incorporates the notion of exchange that the word shows later? See comm. ad loc.

The RV *śulká-* passages might motivate us to reexamine the “Zoll, levy, tax” interpr. of the word in the AV. It seems likely to me that it is less a fixed and obligatory sum like a tax or customs fee collected under defined circumstances than a quasi-

voluntary contribution like tribute offered to a more powerful figure than the giver (however obligatory that was in practice).

In the *anyáḥ ... anyáḥ* construction, pāda d, devoted to Varuṇa, depicts him in an uncharacteristically militant posture (whether defensive, per the publ. intro., or not), as opposed to the “Indra in war and Varuṇa in peace” of vss. 4–5. This is presumably to remind us that Varuṇa too has *ójas-*, though that quality is more often attributed to Indra. As indicated above, I think this may be what lies behind the second dative phrase in pāda a.

VII.82.7: The first hemistich is a variant of II.23.5 and X.126.1, each of which has a finite verb (“have overcome” [*titiruh*] and “reach” [*aṣṭa*] respectively). The publ. tr. follows Ge and Re in supplying “come.” (WG take pāda c as an embedded cl. and use *naśate* in d as the verb for ab as well.) I would prefer to take the parallel passages into consideration, and here would supply ‘reach’ as in X.126.1, given the *naśate* in d, a pāda whose structure parallels ab – though it seems a bit odd to say that “narrow straits” either come to or reach anyone/-thing. Although I supply a verb from the same root as *naśate* in d, I do not follow WG in taking ab, d as a discontinuous main cl., with c embedded within it.

Pāda d is structured almost, but not exactly, like a(b): *ná tám ... mártiyam* (a) / *ná tám mártasya* (d). The question of how to take the gen. *mártasya* leans two different ways. On the one hand, the default would be to assume that it has the same referent as the acc. *mártiyam* in pāda a – the good ritualist whose ceremony the gods attend in pāda c. Flg. this interpretation the *tám* needs a different referent; the one ready to hand is *adhvará-*, which ends the preceding pāda. This would yield a tr. “nor does deviance (/crookedness) reach the (rite) of (that) mortal.” Although this seems like an obvious reading, none of the standard tr. adopts, or even mentions, it. Instead, they take *tám* as still referring to the ritualist of pāda a (and his rel. cl. avatar *yásya* in c) and take gen. *mártasya* as referring to a *different* and hostile mortal (e.g., publ. tr. “nor does a mortal’s crookedness reach him”). This must rest on the other occurrence of the abstr. *párihvṛti-* in IX.79.2 ... *mártasya kásya cit párihvṛtim*, where the genitive is indeed dependent on *párihvṛti-* and the mortal is definitely hostile. Although I recognize the relevance of this parallel, I think the other alternative should at least be considered.

In any case I would change JPB’s “crookedness” to “deviance.” I do not accept WG’s “Nachstellung” (by which I think they mean here ‘stalking’ [rather than ‘reenactment’ and available sim. tr.]), who follow KH (Aufs. III.753 = 1980 Fs. Thieme) in this (to me) counterintuitive interpr. of *pári √hvṛ*. An additive ‘swerve around’ leads easily to ‘deviate’.

VII.82.8: The publ. tr. takes the structure of the 2nd hemistich quite differently from the other standard tr., which all (Ge, Re, WG, also JSK DGRV II.170–71) take cd as a single clause with c containing further objects of *ní yachatam* in d, along with *mārḍikám* in d. But this should be syntactically impossible, since in that case the whole clause should be under the domain of *hí* in c but the verb *yachatam* is not accented. (That the verb is in a different pāda is irrelevant: the accent rule covers the whole clause, regardless of metrical boundaries; see, e.g., II.5.4 ... *hí* (a) ... *ájani* (b).) Better JPB’s interpr. of pāda c as a nominal cl. that gives the grounds for the action in d: “because there is friendship ...,

extend compassion ...” Curiously, the passages that Ge cites as parallels (n. 8c), namely VIII.10.3, 27.10, both show nominal clauses with overt existential *ásti* ; moreover, JSK (DGRV II.170 n. 23) observes that the nouns in pāda c are semantically closer to each other than either is to *mārḍīkām*.

I part company with JPB on the interpr. of *yád* in c. He takes it as a causal subordinator, a sort of doubling of *hí* : “Because there is ... or since there is ...” I think instead that we’re dealing with an interesting variant of the “X and which Y” construction. (For the construction in general, see JSK DGRV I.105ff.) The standard form of that syntagm is X *yá-* ca Y, with *ca* occurring after the rel. in the second nominal phrase (e.g., I.51.8 *áryān yé ca dásyavaḥ* lit. “... Āryas and (those) who are Dasyus,” but amounting to “Āryas and Dasyus”). Here since the complex conjunction *utá vā* ‘or’ is not postpositive, the whole nominal rel. phrase follows it (*utá vā yád āpyam*). The literal sense of the pāda is the “Because with you two there is companionship or what is friendship,” which reduces to “because with you two there is companionship or friendship, ...”

VII.82.9: More literal would be “in the winning of offspring and descendants”; the publ. tr. presents the loc. absol. as if it were an expression of purpose. This may be implied but it is not syntactically overt.

VII.82.10: Old’s view that c belongs with ab, a view fld. by Ge, WG, and the publ. tr., is preferable to that of Re, who splits pāda c down the middle.

For *manāmahe* in d “ponder” might be better than “keep in mind.”

### VII.83 Indra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

VII.83.1: The middle part. *pásyamāna-* is also found with the obj. *āpyam* ‘friendship’ in IX.110.6. Medial forms to this well-attested pres. stem are quite rare, and in this phrase the intimate link between the subjects and the friendship they are contemplating must have evoked the middle voice. See comm. ad IX.110.6.

In the view of JPB (see publ. intro.), this vs. depicts a present-day marching forth, which is likened to the martial advance in the Ten Kings Battle – hence “they have gone forward.” This is certainly possible, but I am more inclined to see this vs. as a narrative (so Re in his n.: *itihāsa*) of the original battle, and I would alter the tr. of the verb to “they went forth.” The verbs in the second hemistich (c *hatam* c, d *avatam* [per Pp.]) are universally taken by the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) as imperatives. For JPB these are rallying cries in the present moment, and the directive to “help Sudās” is a replication of the cry from long ago. For Ge and Re (n.) they are quoted speech embedded in the historical narrative. It should be noted, however, that these duals are completely ambiguous between imperatives and injunctives; if the latter, they could have preterital value. Moreover, given the sandhi situation, the second verb, phonologically combined with what precedes (*ávasāvatam*), could in fact be an augmented imperfect *āvatam*, contra Pp. (See *āvatam* in the same position in 4b [though *avatam* in 5b]). Both injunctive and imperfect could yield “you two struck down the obstacles ... you helped Sudās with your help.” I suggest that the two verbs should be read as both: preterital injunctive advancing the narrative, and imperative in quoted speech enlivening said

narrative. Against this double interpr. one must at least note Hoffmann’s observation that the pres. stem *áva-* has no unambiguous injunctive forms; see comm. ad VI.26.4. However, there is no obvious reason why it shouldn’t, and I would not reject an injunc. interpr. here on that basis. In any case, as I just pointed out it could be an augmented imperfect.

A revised tr. of the relevant parts of the vs. would be  
 “... , the broad-chested went forward in their quest for cattle. /  
 Strike down the obstacles, ...! Help Sudās with your help  
 You two struck down ...      You helped ...

VII.83.2: Ge takes this vs. as a continuation of the quoted speech of 1cd.

The verb of pāda a, *sámayante*, is properly speaking a subjunctive, though on the way to thematization and indicative status. See Gotō (1st class), 95–96, also comm. ad VI.26.1. Here the parallel verbs *bhávati* (b) and *bháyante* (c) are straightforwardly present indicative and might support a thematized indicative interpr. for *ayante* as well. However, a rendering “will clash together” for pāda a, with b and c expressing the general conditions that will prevail when the action of pāda a occurs, is more than possible (and for me preferable). I would also alter “gather together” to “clash together” in this adversarial context.

Pāda c contains a grammatical mismatch: neut. pl. *bhúvanā* and anim. pl. *svardṛśaḥ*. Some (like Re) take these as an implicitly conjoined double NP: “les mondes (et) ceux qui voient la lumière-du-soleil.” But with most (Ge, WG, publ. tr.), it seems best to assume the same referent for both nominals, either with the 2nd term an appositive to the 1st, or simply as a single NP with gender clash. Old plausibly suggests that since *-dṛś-* cannot form a neut. pl., the animate pl. was pressed into service. Although a gen./abl. sg. interpr. of *svardṛśaḥ* is technically possible, VII.58.2 *bhayate swardṛk* with nom. sg. as subject of *bháya-*, adduced by Old, makes that solution unlikely. I might substitute “... living beings, those who see the sun ...”

VII.83.3: With Ge, I consider this vs. a continuation of the quoted speech of the narrative, rather than, with JPB (publ. intro.), the poet “reenter[ing] the earlier battle.”

VII.83.4–6: See disc. of the larger structures in these vss. ad 6cd.

VII.83.4: The publ. tr., along with Re and WG, interpr. *śṛṇutam* in c as an impv., against Ge’s preterite (“Ihr erhörtet ...”). Since it is sandwiched between augmented imperfects, *āvatam* (b) and *abhavat* (d), Ge’s interpr. is at least thinkable – and I now think preferable, given the larger structure of vss. 4–6.

The publ. tr. omitted *eṣām*. It also renders *hávīmani* as a loc. infinitive (“to summon you”); I might favor instead a simple loc. Putting this all together I would suggest an alt. rendering of c as “you heard the formulations at their [=Trtsus’?] invocation.” Despite its position, *eṣām* more likely goes with *hávīmani* than with *bráhmāṇi*, given ... *eṣām ... deváhūtiṣu* in 7d. In both cases *eṣām* takes Wackernagel’s Position, despite being construed with the loc. at the end of the pāda.

In d the interpr. of the abstract *puróhitih* is difficult. The publ. tr. takes it in the literal sense “placement in front,” presumably referring to their location on the battlefield

(though this is not clear). The stem is found only once elsewhere in the RV, in VII.60.12, where JPB again takes it literally, but with regard to the placement / installation of the ritual fire, which is often qualified as *puróhita*- ‘set in front’. In our passage Ge takes it as “Purohitaamt” (sim. WG); Re as “le rôle du chapelain.” Since the technical priestly usage of *puróhita*- is only just developing (or may not have yet developed) in the RV and since the *Ṛtsus* are otherwise found on the battlefield in the Ten Kings Battle (VII.18.7, 13, 15, 19 [there in conjunction with the defeat of Bheda, as in our ab]; VII.33.5–6, and most strikingly in our own hymn, vs. 6), a martial interpr. (like that of the publ. tr.) seems more likely than a priestly one – though if they are the referents of *eṣām* in the preceding *pāda*, this introduces a ritual context.

The expression *satyā ... abhavat puróhitiḥ* must be interpr. in tandem with *satyā ... úpastutiḥ* (... *abhavan*) in 7c(d). In the latter case JPB tr. “came true,” as so often with forms of *satyá*- in the RV, but such a tr. doesn’t fit our 4d very well: JPB instead in 4d “came to be their true (place).” To accommodate both passages I suggest ‘trusty’ → ‘reliable’ for *satyā*. In 4d this means that the forward battle line of the *Ṛtsus* could be relied upon: it held fast. While in 7c the invitory praise (*úpastutiḥ*) had its usual, reliable effect in bringing the gods. I would here alter the tr. to “trusty was the forward placement of the *Ṛtsus*.”

VII.83.5: As noted below (ad vs. 6), Ge takes vss. 5 and 6ab as quoted speech embedded in the narrative. This may be the best solution; see below ad 6cd.

It’s mildly worthy of note that *aghá*- and *árāti*- appear together in conjunction with *aryáḥ* in VI.59.8 (also with *√tap*) and VI.48.16, but in both passages *aghā(h)* is fem. nom. pl. and modifies *árātayaḥ*, whereas here *aghāni* is an independent neut. pl.

On *vásva ubháyasya* see comm. ad VII.82.4 and emend the tr. here to “of the goods of both (sides).” The presence in the next vs. of the two parts of the phrase disjoined: *ubháyāsaḥ* “both (sides)” (6a) and *vásvaḥ ... sātáye* “to win goods” (6b) reinforces my interpr. of the phrase here.

VII.83.6: See immed. above for the disjoining of the phrase found in 5c.

There is a sequence-of-tense problem in this vs. The first hemistich is in the present (*havante*), but the subord. clause in *yátra* that hangs off it in cd has an impf. *āvatam*. The publ. tr. sidesteps this issue by making the *yátra* cl. illustrative: “(as) when.” Ge makes vss. 5 and 6ab quoted speech in the narrative, with the narrative proper returning in 6cd. Although I’m sympathetic to Ge’s ploy, the fact that the narrative picks up with an untethered dependent clause needs to be explained – and in fact can be. It may be that the *yátra* clause depends directly on vs. 4, and this relationship is signaled by the ring-compositional phrasal repetition found in 4b ... *prá sudāsam āvatam* # and 6d # *prá sudāsam āvatam* ... This interpr. entails that 1) 4c is preterital, as Ge takes it; 2) 5–6ab contains quoted speech. Leaving the latter out this gives us a narrative skeleton:

(4) Indra and Varuṇa, conquering Bheda without opposition with your deadly weapons, you helped Sudās.

You heard the sacred formulations at their invocation. Trusty was the forward placement of the *Ṛtsus*,

...

(6cd) when you helped Sudās together with the Tṛtsus, when he was hard pressed by the ten kings.

VII.83.7: I would dispute “without a zeal to sacrifice” for *áyajyu-*. The publ. tr. “Gathered together but without a zeal to sacrifice” makes it sound as if the ten kings just didn’t feel like sacrificing at the moment (it’s tough on the battlefield). But instead the stem refers to “non-sacrificing, a-sacrificial” people, contrasted with those who do perform (Vedic) sacrifice. It is a permanent alienation from sacrificial culture, not a temporary lack of interest. And surely the failure of the ten kings in battle results from their non-sacrificing state.

On *yuyudhuḥ*, metrically better as *\*yūyudhuḥ*, see comm. ad V.59.5.

The pf. act. forms to *√yudh* also seem to have a particular semantic profile. Of the four (*yuyódha* 1x, *yuyudhuḥ* 3x), three are negated (*yuyódha* VI.25.5, *yuyudhuḥ* IV.30.3, and our passage). In all three passages the point seems not to be that the subject(s) of the verb did not fight, but rather that they did not succeed in their fight (so also Re in his n.). I would therefore in all three passages add the parenthetical “(successfully).” In our passage this modified sense is particularly necessary, since otherwise the vs. contradicts the preceding and flg. vss., where Sudās is said to be “hard pressed by the ten kings” (6c) and “surrounded on every side in the battle with the ten kings” (8a). If our intervening vs. means, with the publ. tr., “the ten kings gave no fight to Sudās,” it sounds as if his enemies, formidable in 6 and 8, didn’t even bother to fight in 7 – better “did not succeed in fighting Sudās,” thus highlighting how stunning his victory actually was.

I would retr. the first hemistich as “The ten kings, non-sacrificers, (though) united, did not succeed in fighting Sudās.”

On *satyā ... úpastutiḥ* see comm. ad 4d. Because of the parallelism I would tr. the phrase here as “trusty was the invitory praise ...,” though I would otherwise be inclined to “the invitory praise (came) true,” as in VI.65.5 *satyā nṛṇām abhavad deváhūtiḥ* “The men’s invocation of the gods has come true.”

VII.83.8: As pointed out by Ge (inter alia), the descriptors in pāda c are used of the Vasiṣṭhas in VII.33.1. The question is whether we want to entirely identify the Vasiṣṭhas with the Tṛtsus in d; the separation of the two groups in the publ. tr. seems prudent.

VII.83.9: The contrastive *anyá-* ... *anyá-* construction is nicely emphasized by the anagramistic openings: #*vṛtrāṇy anyáḥ* ... # *vratāny anyáḥ* ...

VII.83.10 = VII.82.10

#### VII.84 Indra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

VII.84.1: Pāda d along with the last word of c (... *dádhānā, pári tmánā vísurūpā jigāti*) is essentially identical to V.15.4 (... *dádhānaḥ, pári tmánā vísurūpo jigāsi*), save for the gender of the subject and the person of the verb. The phrase qualifies Agni in V.51.4 and pāda d is rendered in the publ. tr. as “you go all around with varying form in your single person,” a reasonable description of Agni with his flames. It is less apt for an offering ladle (though see Ge n. 1d; Bl, RRP, ad V.15.4 for speculations), and JPB may be right

(see publ. intro.) that the “ghee-rich one” might also refer to a hymn, though I’m not sure that *tmánā víṣurūpā* fits that referent any better.

VII.84.2: The statement “Heaven speeds the lofty rule of you two” (*yuvó rāṣṭrám brhád invati dyaúḥ*) is somewhat discordant: where is Heaven speeding it to and how? how does a rule get sped? However, the literal sense of *invati* can’t be brushed aside. Re’s “promeut” provides an attractive compromise, with the literal sense attenuated to lexical metaphor. I’d substitute here “promotes” or “advances” your rule.

The parallel clauses in cd serves as a cautionary reminder that parallel rhetorical constructions don’t necessarily require parallel grammatical forms: pāda c has a clear precative (3rd sg. *pári ... vṛjyāḥ*), while d has an equally clear subjunctive (*kṛṇavat*).

VII.84.3: This is a lesson that should have been applied to the final pāda of vs. 3: its verb *tiretam* is an unequivocal 2<sup>nd</sup> du. act. optative, but is rendered by Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. as an imperative, presumably because the first three pādas in the vs. have imperatives (2<sup>nd</sup> du. *kṛtám* a, b; *etu* c). Only the WG tr. reflects the opt. (“Vorwärts mögt ihr ...”). I would substitute “might you further us ...”

This pāda is almost identical to VII.58.3d, which differs only in the verb: *tireta* v. our *tiretam*. The parallel gives further support (if support it needed) to the opt. interp. of our *tiretam*. In the parallel the only question is whether the opt. *tireta* is 2nd pl. act. or 3rd sg. mid. Our passage favors the former, but there are countervailing features that favor the latter, and in the end the question cannot be decided. See disc. ad loc.

VII.84.4: The syntax of the 2nd hemistich seems at odds with its sense. Syntactically it appears to have a preposed rel. cl. (... *yá ādityāḥ* ...) in c picked up by a main clause in d, whose sg. subject would, ordinarily, be coreferential with the sg. *yá ādityāḥ* in c. But in content it seems like the equivalent of an *anyá-* ... *anyá-* construction, with contrastive functions of Varuṇa (c) and Indra (d) expressed in different clauses, like the *anyá-* ... *anyá-* construction in the immed. preceding and immed. flg. hymns, VII.83.9 and 85.3. The publ. tr. renders the sense, taking *yāḥ* as “if”; see disc. in the publ. intro. Both Ge and WG follow a similar tack. Re’s interpr. is more complex: “L’Āditya qui abolit les dés-Ordres (est aussi) le héros (qui) répartit des biens incommensurables,” citing IV.42.3 *ahám índro váruṇaḥ* in his n. and suggesting that “Vr. est en même temps I. ... En contrepartie: I. est Vr., les deux n’en font qu’un du point de vue de notre hommage, en dépit de leurs fonctions distinctes.” I am drawn to some version of Re’s interpr., because RVic poets, incl. this very poet (see 83.9, 85.3), know how to construct balanced contrastive statements and certainly understand how relative clauses ordinarily work – so we can hardly pronounce 4cd a failed *anyá-* ... *anyá-* construction due to poetic incompetence. I would put forth an alternative tr. based on Re’s: “The one who as Āditya confounds untruths [=Varuṇa] (also) as warrior [=Indra] apportions immeasurable goods.” The functions of the two gods are neatly kept apart – as Re notes, *dayate vāsūni* is used of Indra in VI.30.1 – but their identity as focus of joint worship in this Indra-Varuṇa hymn is also highlighted. And the word play of *ánṛtā mínāti*, *ámitā* across the pāda boundary that separates the two gods also emphasizes their superimposability.

VII.84.5: Pādas b and c are almost identical to VII.67.6cd, though there 6c begins *ā vām*, in contrast to our *prāvāt*, and the pf. part. is nom. pl. m. *tūtujānāḥ*, agreeing with the subj. of *gamema* in the flg. pāda, as opposed to our fem. sg. *tūtujānā*, agreeing with *iyām ... gīḥ* in the previous pāda. This difference in subject requires some interpretational adjustment. In VII.67.6 (q.v.) I suggest that the participle, literally ‘thrusting’, has sexual overtones, which are encouraged by the context and appropriate to the subj. “we.” I take the loc. phrase *toké tánaye* as an un signaled loc. absol. This interpr. can also work here, though with the paradoxical feature that the feminine “hymn” is credited with male sexual behavior, esp. piquant since (besides VII.67.6 with “we” as subj.) the participle always modifies the hyper-masculine Indra (7x). I would emend the tr. to “It [=hymn] helped (us) forward, thrusting (when) progeny and posterity (are at stake).” On the part. *tūtujāna-* see comm. ad VI.29.5, where I argue that it has full lexical value, contra Kü inter alia. However, I do not think that it ever takes an obj., as JPB’s tr. here, “multiplying us ...,” requires.

### VII.85 Indra and Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

VII.85.1: The vs. begins with direct 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. reference to the gods, in the enclitic *vām* (a), but modulates to 3<sup>rd</sup> ps., via *indrāya varuṇāya* (b), most clearly in the 3<sup>rd</sup> du. impv. *uruṣyatām* (d), which, however, is introduced by the du. form of the *sá / tám* prn., *tā*, often found also with 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. imperatives.

JPB supplies “our” with *yāman* : “on our journey.” But, with Ge, Re, and WG, it is far more likely to be the gods’ journey: they are coming to us; we’re staying put. I’d emend the tr. to “on their journey.” It is possible that *yāman* instead means “at our entreaty,” as Re suggests only to dismiss.

VII.85.2: As Ge (inter alia) points out, *yéṣu* is loc. pl. by “attraction” to *dhvajéṣu*, substituting for the \**yátra* that should correspond to the immed. preceding *átra*, perhaps to avoid a singsong effect.

The morphologically and phonologically parallel acc. pl. adjs in d, *pārācah ... víṣūcaḥ*, are proleptic.

VII.85.3: The ppl. *právikta-*, found also in VI.50.5, is assigned to the root  $\sqrt{vij}$  ‘be agitated’ by Gr (likewise Wh Roots); this interpr. is vigorously and persuasively defended by Old.; see also Th, KISchr. p. 254 and n. 2, positing a somewhat different sense of  $\sqrt{vij}$ . But the majority of modern tr. (Ge, Re, WG) take it to  $\sqrt{vic}$  ‘separate’, with the sense ‘chosen’ (though in this passage Re flirts with  $\sqrt{vyac}$  ‘encompass’ [glossing the ppl. “étendues au loin”], but ultimately opts for “choisi”). I do not see the advantage of  $\sqrt{vic}$ : the sense doesn’t work very well, and though *prá* probably occurs with a form of  $\sqrt{vic}$  in III.57.1 (*prá ... vivikvān*), it definitely appears with  $\sqrt{vij}$  in X.111.9 (*prá vivijre*). I therefore stick with the publ. tr. of JPB.

The accent on *dhāráyati* is presumably due to its occurring in a contrastive *anyá-* ... *anyá-* construction.

VII.85.4: The last three pādas of this vss. end with the same morphological form: a nom. sg. m. *-vant-/mant-* stem built to an *s*-stem: b: ... *nāmasvān* #, c: ... *haviṣmān* #, d ... *prāyasvān* #. The b and c pādas also station the enclitic *vām* right before the final word.

The publ. tr. has a minor syntactic error: pāda c must still be under the domain of the rel. prn. *yāḥ* beginning b, since the verb is accented (*ā-vavārtat*); if pāda c began a new sentence/main clause, as in the publ. tr., the preverb should have been accented (*\*ā-vavartat*). Since the two pādas belong to a single cl., there is no need to supply a verb in b, and I would construe the doubled *vām* in those two pādas with the *-vant-/mant-* stems that follow (as is already suggested by the non-Wackernagel's Law position of the enclitics). I would emend the tr. to “the one who, bringing homage to you two (here), o Āditya, by his power, / bringing oblations to you two, will turn you two here to help.”

The rel. cl. of bc is generally attached to pāda a by the standard tr., but it could as easily be preposed to d. That both bc and d have subjunctives, against the impv. of pāda a could be an arg. in favor of this alt. configuration, though not a particularly strong one.

Given the ritual focus of the other two parallel *-vant-/mant-* stems in this vs., I would change the tr. of *prāyasvān* from “bringing pleasure” to “bringing pleasurable offerings.”

VII.85.5 = VII.84.5: See comm. there.

#### [VII.86–89 Varuṇa JPB]

For a detailed examination of these hymns see my disc. in *The RV between Two Worlds* (2007: 92–108), some of which is reproduced or paraphrased here.

#### VII.86 Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

For my disc. of this hymn in Jamison 2007, see esp. pp. 96–101, where I argue that this is an omphalos hymn, structured esp. by the manipulation of the grammatical category of person between Vasiṣṭha and Varuṇa. The desired 1<sup>st</sup> person (Vasiṣṭha) / 2<sup>nd</sup> person (Varuṇa) pairing is achieved only in vs. 4, while the other vss. lead up to and away from this encounter. Two diagrams chart this structure.

First, the symmetrical shape, leading up to and away from the omphalos vs. 4:

- 1 anonymous praise of anonymous god
- 2 Vasiṣṭha asks himself about Varuṇa
- 3 Vasiṣṭha addresses Varuṇa briefly and asks others about Varuṇa's attitudes
- 4 Omphalos: poet has sustained and reciprocal contact with Varuṇa
- 5 Distancing from god, through changes in number and person
- 6 Further distancing; impersonal list
- 7 Both poet and god are represented generically.

[8 extra-hymnic]

The referential relationships between the two figures in this poem can be charted as follows:

	Vasiṣṭha	Varuṇa
vs. 1	---	3 <sup>rd</sup> [nameless]

vs. 2		1 <sup>st</sup>		3 <sup>rd</sup>
vs. 3a		1 <sup>st</sup>		2 <sup>nd</sup>
bcd		1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup>		3 <sup>rd</sup>
<b>vs. 4 (omph.)</b>		1 <sup>st</sup>		2 <sup>nd</sup>
vs. 5ab		1 <sup>st</sup> pl.		2 <sup>nd</sup>
cd	3 <sup>rd</sup>		2 <sup>nd</sup>	
vs. 6		3 <sup>rd</sup>		2 <sup>nd</sup>
vs. 7ab		1 <sup>st</sup>		3 <sup>rd</sup>
cd	3 <sup>rd</sup>		3 <sup>rd</sup>	

For the resonances between the two hymn VII.86 and VII.87, see Jamison 2007, Chap. 3, esp. pp. 94–103, and comm. ad VII.87 below, in addition to my remarks on VII.86.

VII.86.1: This vs. is in some ways a typical praise-hymn opening, though it is noteworthy that the poet is absent: there is no introductory “I will proclaim” or the like. The god Varuṇa himself is barely present, in the unemphatic unaccented oblique pronoun *asya* in the first pāda, and as the unnamed subject of the cosmogonic deeds in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich.

The form *paprāthat* and its fellows (10x; *-at* [6x], *-as* [1x], *-an* [2x], and *-anta* [1x]) are morphologically and functionally problematic. Although they used to be interpr. as if to a redupl. aor. stem *\*pípratha-* (Gr, Wh Roots, etc.), both the *a*-redupl. and the radical accentuation point to the well-attested perfect; see Th Plusq. 47–48, my *-áya-* Formations 129, and Kü 321–22. The problem then is the thematic vowel; the easiest way to explain it is to take the forms as subjunctives, and indeed several of the occurrences clearly or most likely fill that role (II.25.2, III.30.20=III.50.4, VII.42.6), all passages so identified by Kü. However, several others seem to have clear preterital function and occur in preterital context, including this one, as well as I.103.2=II.15.2, II.11.8, VIII.94.9, and X.88.1. Kü suggests interpr. them all as subjunctives anyway, though he recognizes that they appear “in mythisch-präteritalem Kontext.” But his reevaluations are not convincing: it seems best not to force the contexts and instead to accept this group as distinct from the set of homonymous subjunctives. A possible, though somewhat daring, solution to the preterital occurrences may be suggested by the surprising distribution of forms to this perfect noted by Kü (319): the active pf. has no indicative forms but just the thematic forms under discussion, while the medial pf. (with intrans. value) is well attested as both indicative and participle. I suggest that in the active pf., an original *\*paprātha* was the lautgesetzlich outcome of *\*peplotHe*, with Brugmann’s Law blocked by the root-final laryngeal. But the light root syllable was disturbing once biconsonantal *\*tH* had become monoconsonantal *-th*. Simply lengthening it would have put the 3rd sg. into competition with the well-attested 2nd sg. pf. of *√prā* ‘fill’, *paprātha*. So, much like the remarking of the *t*-less 3rd sg. middle *\*áduha* ‘milked’ as pseudo-act. *áduhat*, *\*paprātha* added a clarifying *-t* to its 3rd sg., and this apparent thematic stem spread. The short root-vowel of the parallel subjunctive stem *paprāth-a-* caused no such disquiet because subjunctives to perfects are built to the originally *\*e*-grade guṇa.

VII.86.2: The poet now appears, in the 1<sup>st</sup> person and citing his own direct speech in pādas b–d. He begins the vs. with the dialogue verb: *sám √vad* ‘speak with’, but the

desired partner in the dialogue, Varuṇa, is not present. Instead the instr. with *sám vade*, which should identify his interlocutor, is *sváyā tanvā* “with my own self,” i.e., Vasiṣṭha himself: the wished-for dialogue is instead a closed-circuit monologue. He asks himself about Varuṇa’s attitudes and reactions, but he has no direct access to the god.

On the curious phrase *antár varuṇe* “within Varuṇa,” which tends to be watered down in translation, see my disc. (2007: 103), where I argue that the last vs. of VII.87 (7b) contains the complementary phrase, which brings closure to the question posed here, “when shall I be within Varuṇa?” Thus a type of ring composition that extends over two hymns. See comm. ad 87.7.

VII.86.3: The poet briefly moves closer to contact with the god, by addressing Varuṇa in the vocative in pāda a, but soon pivots away to inquire of other men.

As usual, in the tr. of *énaś-* I would substitute “transgression” for the publ. tr.’s “guilt.” Like *āgas-* in the next vs., *énaś-* is something one does/commits. See comm. ad V.3.7.

On the final word of pāda a, *didṛkṣu*, see Old’s detailed disc. With him (and Lanman, Noun Infl. 405–6), I take it as neut. in adverbial usage of the desiderative adj. whose expected suffixal accent (*\*didṛkṣú-*) has been retracted in this adverb. (AiG II.2.468 [Debrunner] notes the unusual accent, but rejects Old’s adverbial interpr. as “unwahrscheinlich” for no stated or obvious reason, while the earlier AiG III.144–45 [Wackernagel] accepts the adverbial interpr.) I would slightly alter the publ. tr. to “with a desire to see,” to reflect the adverbial value.

In pāda c I don’t know what *cid* is doing, but I doubt that the “even” of the publ. tr. captures its sense here. I think it more likely that it’s somehow reinforcing the *íd* flg. *samānām*, indicating that however many poets Vasiṣṭha inquires of, they all say the very same thing. I would slightly emend the tr. by eliminating the “even.”

In the kavis’ response, the near deictic *ayám* modifying Varuṇa may promise Vasiṣṭha an epiphany – indeed, the epiphany that comes in the very next vs. For this reason I would substitute “this Varuṇa here” for “Varuṇa now” of the publ. tr. Note also the juxtaposition of the 2nd sg. tonic pronoun *túbhyam* referring to Vasiṣṭha and the god’s name, another way of bringing the two closer.

Notice another little touch of virtuosity: the verse contains two explicit 2<sup>nd</sup> singular references, one in pāda a to the god (the voc.), and one in pāda d to the poet (pronoun), who appeared in pāda a in the 1<sup>st</sup> person.

VII.86.4: Verse 4 is the omphalos, where direct contact between poet and divinity is achieved and sustained. The poet asks Varuṇa the crucial question about his own offense (“What was the greatest/[oldest] offense, for which you wish to smite a praiser and partner?”), claims that Varuṇa will give the answer to him (“you (will) declare this to me ...”), and offers to humble himself to the god (“I would swiftly bend down to you with reverence (to be) free of transgression.”). Both pādas in the second half verse contain both parties: *prá ... me vocaḥ* “you (will) declare to me” and *áva tvā ... iyām* “I would bow down before you” in more or less reciprocal positions in the verse line. Interestingly the first half verse, in which the poet asks about the offense and its punishment, avoids the 1<sup>st</sup> person: the poet doesn’t explicitly claim the offense (even with an enclitic *me* or the like), and the target of Varuṇa’s potential violence is not “me” but *stotāram ...*

*sákhāyam* “a praiser and partner.” The reference is clearly to himself, but he shrinks from the 1<sup>st</sup> person pronoun, perhaps to avoid owning the misdeed or attracting the punishment. The 2<sup>nd</sup> person reference to Varuṇa is found in both pādas, however, in the vocative *varuṇa* (a) and the verb ‘you wish to smite’ (*jíghāmsasi*, b).

Rather than being a neut. sg. interrog. modifying *āgaḥ* and correlative with *yád* in b., *kím* could be the question particle, as in the publ. tr. “Was the offense so very great ... that you wish ...” The problem with this is that the splv. *jyéṣṭham* is forced into the meaning “so very great,” a sort of equative, with *yád* then a subordinating conj. (“so very great ... that ...”). I am a bit reluctant to assign such a value to the splv. Admittedly my own interpr. of *yád* requires it to be a loosely construed acc. of respect, “about / for which (offense),” expressing the precise reason Varuṇa wishes to smite him.

There is another issue about *jyéṣṭham* that needs to be addressed. Although this splv. regularly means ‘most important, most distinguished,’ it can also be a measure of age: “oldest.” Although in vs. 4 Vasiṣṭha seems to be asking about the *worst* thing he has done – “most important” in that sense – we should keep in mind that the corresponding comparative *jyāyas-* is found two vss. later (6c) and in a context in which “older” is clearly favored. Combine this with the fact that “ancestral deceits” *drugdhāni pútryā* are mentioned in the intermediate vs. (5a), and 4ab can be reinterpr. as Vasiṣṭha’s complaint that he is being punished for an offense committed in a previous generation: “What was (that) most ancient offense for which you wish to smite your praiser and partner.” In other words, even here Vasiṣṭha is reluctant to admit culpability. Such an interpr. in fact makes the best sense of the distinction in tense between pf. *āsa* in 4a and desid. pres. *jíghāmsasi* in b – although, since the offense would have been committed before the smiting in any case, the tense difference isn’t too much of a problem in the other interpr. Nonetheless I favor the interpr. of 4ab with “most ancient/oldest” and *kím* as a neut. sg.

In d I would substitute “without transgression” for the publ. tr.’s “freed of guilt” for *an-enás-*. See comm. ad vs. 3 about *énas-*.

VII.86.5: After the climactic encounter of vs. 4 the poet moves slowly away from intimate contact with the god. Vs 5 achieves this in several ways. Though Varuṇa continues to be addressed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person, with the reiterated imperative *áva ... sṛjā* [*/sṛjā*] ‘release’, as well as the vocative *rājan* ‘o king’, in neither case is the object of the impv. the expected *mā* ‘me’. The first half verse substitutes the 1st plural: the *naḥ* ‘us’ of pāda a and in pāda b a heavy relative clause containing both 1<sup>st</sup> plural nom. pronoun *vayám* and a 1<sup>st</sup> plural verb *caḅṛmā*. In the second half the object is *vásiṣṭham*, with the poet naming himself in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person. The 1<sup>st</sup> plural in the first half verse maintains the 1<sup>st</sup> person/2<sup>nd</sup> person dialogue but dilutes the intimacy through the change of singular to plural; in the second half the *vásiṣṭham* keeps the focus on the one-to-one contact of poet and god, but by indirection, through the change from 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> person. It is also the only time that the name appears in the poem. The verse also contains a pair of similes, as we have already seen, the first in the poem. As I have discussed elsewhere (*RV between Two Worlds*, Chap. 1), similes can also produce a sense of distancing.

As noted just above, the “ancestral deceits” *drugdhāni pútryā* may refer to the *āgaḥ ... jyéṣṭham* “most ancient offense” in 4a, though here Vasiṣṭha directly admits his own contribution (or, given the 1st plural, the contribution of his own generation or affinity group) to the wrongdoing against Varuṇa.

VII.86.6: The process of separation continues in vs. 6. Varuṇa is again addressed in the vocative in pāda a, but the rest of the verse is an impersonal listing of contributory causes to misdeeds. The poet himself doesn't appear, except in the adjective *sváḥ* 'own' in pāda a, a possessive adjective not marked for person -- where in fact he disclaims ownership.

In fact verse 6 continues to distance the poet not merely from the god, but also from the poet's own responsibility for whatever has caused the god's anger. The causes Vasiṣṭha mentions are either external factors, like drink, or the legacy of ancestral misbehavior. Such is, I think, the meaning of pāda c, with its fronted existential *ásti* (which cannot simply be functioning as a copula): when the 'younger' (*kányas-*) does wrong, he is simply carrying out what was passed on to him from his predecessors – the elders (*jyāyas-*) -- who still "exist" within him. Thus, 6a essentially follows from and elaborates on 5a, concerning the *drugdhāni píttryā* "ancestral deceits" and most probably 4a, with the splv. *jyēṣṭha-* corresponding to the cmpv. *jyāyas-* here. (See comm. ad loc.)

The phrase *dhṛútiḥ sáḥ* ending pāda a is usually just folded into the list of exculpatory external factors in the first hemistich, as in the publ tr. "This was not one's own devising nor was it deception, ... (but rather) liquor, frenzy, dice, thoughtlessness" – or else equated with his *dákṣa-* (e.g., Ge "Nicht ist der Verfehlung eigener Wille"). Instead the unusual pāda-final position of *sáḥ* marks this as a short self-contained clause (on this syntactic type, see disc. ad VII.60.9). The phrase *dhṛútiḥ sáḥ* directly counters *ná sà svó dákṣaḥ*: "It was not one's own devising – it was delusion," with the various types of delusion listed in the next pāda. In other words, conscious and deliberate actions would be ascribed to his own *dákṣa*, but the various types of *dhṛúti* – drink and the like – lead his consciousness astray. I would emend the tr. accordingly. Of the standard tr., WG comes closest to reflecting this interpr.

I do not quite understand how pāda d fits into the vs. I am inclined to think that it continues the train of thought in ab and is not directly connected thematically to c. That is, "sleep" is another form of delusion that can lead to bad behavior; being apparently unconscious is no excuse.

The *sváḥ* here has another formal role, in addition to marking the movement away from the intimacy of the omphalos verse. Recall the phrase *sváyā tanvā* in 2a, the striking first appearance of the poet in this hymn. This phrase is separately echoed by *tanūbhiḥ* in 5b and *sváḥ* here in 6a, providing thus a set of concentric rings framing the omphalos vs. 4.

VII.86.7: The final verse (before the extra-hymnic one) reverses the values of the previous one. In the first half verse the poet returns emphatically in the 1<sup>st</sup> sg., with the subjunctive *karāṇi* and nom. pronoun *ahám*, while the god with whom he's paired is now in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person.

And in the second half verse both have returned to the 3<sup>rd</sup> person, identified by function rather than personal identity: the instructing god (*deváḥ*) and (better) poet (*kavítaraḥ*). It is not as anonymous as the first verse, but the moment of intimacy has long passed. And yet, the relationships defined in this verse, of servant to master and poet to patron, are intensely personal ones, though presented generically here, so that intimacy is re-established in another fashion.

On the likelihood that the unspecified *gṛtsa-* refers to Varuṇa, see my comments introducing the next hymn, pointing to the clear identification in VII.87.5c *gṛtso rājā vāruṇaḥ*. It should be noted that most interpr. of pāda d reverse the identifications that I have made and that appear in the publ. tr.; that is, by these interpr. the “better poet” (*kavītarah*) is Varuṇa and the “clever one” (*gṛtsam*) is Vasiṣṭha. In addition to the argument just made, which I consider to be clinching, see also my disc. in 2007 (99 n. 9), where I point out that *gṛtsa-* is almost always used of gods [in fact, erase the “almost” – it always modifies gods elsewhere] and also that since Vasiṣṭha has been progressing towards understanding during the poem, it makes sense that his improvement would be reflected in a comparative, “better poet.”

JPB’s tr. of *āram* √*kr* as ‘give satisfaction’ is somewhat distant from other syntagms involving *āram*, where it generally means ‘fitting(ly), proper(ly)’. In conjunction with √*kr* (found at least in I.170.4, II.5.8, III.35.5, IV.33.2, V.44.8, X.63.6, 101.2) it means ‘prepare X properly’ or, without obj. ‘get it right’ (slangily). I would here substitute ‘behave fittingly’: “Like a servant, I will behave fittingly to the generous (master); freed from offense, I (will behave fittingly) to the ardent god.” (Note that the publ. tr. omitted *devāya* here; it should be restored.)

VII.86.8: The final verse is, by my analysis, extra hymnic. Its last pāda contains the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain. The preceding pāda, beginning *sām naḥ* ... “Luck to us...,” is scarcely less conventional, especially for the Vasiṣṭhids, though there is no exact match in the Rig Veda for the whole pāda. It has the appearance of a sort of joke here. One Vasiṣṭha hymn, VII.35 to the Viśve Devāḥ, consists entirely (save for the last two verses, 14–15) of pādas beginning *sām naḥ*, usually followed by the name of a divinity in the nominative. Our poet here seems to be alluding to this tiresomely monochrome hymn of his own family circle, an example of a list structure of little or no artistic merit (as far as I can see). More important, this final verse announces itself as a sort of meta-verse, by referring to the rest of the hymn that precedes it as *ayām ... stómaḥ* “this praise song here,” which is then dedicated to Varuṇa: “This praise song is for you, o Varuṇa of independent will: let it be set within your heart.”

I would substitute “peace” for the publ. tr.’s “peaceful settlement.” See comm. ad VII.82.4.

### VII.87 Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

I also discuss this hymn at length in the 2007 Paris lectures (esp. 100–3). I argue that VII.87 “is a parallel and mirror image of VII.86, and they must have been composed to be considered with and against each other” (p. 100). Like VII.86, VII.87 is an omphalos hymn, with the central vs. (4) containing the enigmatic speech of Varuṇa to the poet (“me” *me*). Keep in mind that in VII.86 Varuṇa never speaks – the poet simply predicts he will speak (VII.86.4c “you (will) declare this to me ...” *prá tán me vocaḥ*), so direct speech from the god is esp. striking. But aside from the intimacy of this direct contact between the god and the poet in this omphalos vs. (or its first pāda, 4a), in VII.87 there is none of the tricky and structural reference shifting we found in VII.86. A form of *vāruṇa-* appears in every vs., but save for a voc. *varuṇa* (2d, reinforced by *te* in 2a, d), Varuṇa is always in the 3rd ps., and, until the final vs. (7), the praise is fairly

conventional and cosmogonic, with the poet barely in evidence – and certainly not obsessing about his personal relationship with the god (until the last vs.).

However, as I note (2007: 102), despite its comparative lack of personal drama the hymn is tightly structured, with paired responsions in the vss. surrounding the omphalos (1/7, 2/6, 3/5): e.g., *rájas-* (2a, 6c), *paśúḥ ... bhūrṇiḥ* (2b) “ardent (domestic) beast” semantically answered by *mṛgás túviṣmān* “powerful (wild) beast” (6b). “Both worlds” (*ubhé ... ródasī*) in 3b proliferate into multiple heavens and earths in 5ab. Even the first and last words of the hymn form a ring, though through phonology, not semantics or etymology: 1a *rádat* ‘(he) dug’ is echoed by the last word before the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain, 7c *rdhántaḥ* ‘fulfilling’.

There are also lexical matches between VII.87 and VII.86, showing the tight connection between the two hymns: the unidentified ‘clever’ one (*gṛtsa-*) in VII.86.7d (see comm. there) is specified as Varuṇa in VII.87.5 (*gṛtso rájā varuṇaḥ*); Varuṇa is *bhūrṇi-* in 86.7b and compared to a *paśúḥ ... bhūrṇiḥ* (in 87.2b); the *kaváyah* who were qualified as *cikivān-* in 86.3bc return as *kaváyah ... práchetasaḥ* in 87.3cd. Each poem also contains both the ‘offense’ (*āgas-*) and its absence (*ánāga[s]-*) exactly once: the former in 86.4a, 87.7a, the latter in 86.7b and 87.7b. See comm. below ad 87.4 for *vocat* and ad 87.7 for a crucial resposion that resolves a puzzle in VII.86.

VII.87.1: The interpr. of pādas b and c runs into syntactic difficulties. See the detailed disc. by Old. Pāda b has no finite verb, just the preverb *prá*; Ge and Re supply a transitive form of  $\sqrt{srj}$  (suggested by the simile *sárgo ná srṣṭáḥ* in c, with parallels elsewhere; see Ge’s n. 1b), which then would take neut. *árṇāṃsi samudriyā* as acc. object. However, if pāda c is to be construed with b (as both Ge and Re do), the simile *sárgo ná srṣṭáḥ* is firmly nominative, but it should match *árṇāṃsi* in case – though both Ge and Re find (implausible) ways to avoid this clash. (The pl. *árvatīḥ* could of course be either nom. or acc.) The publ. tr. instead supplies a form of ‘go’ in b (commonly gapped with *prá*), which allows *árṇāṃsi* to be nom. and conform to the case of the simile in c, a tack fld. by Old and Lüders (Varuṇa I.296). Re objects that such an interpr. “laisserait à l’ombre l’initiative de Vr. [=Varuṇa],” but I hardly think that in this hymn celebrating Varuṇa’s many cosmogonic deeds we need worry that he won’t get enough credit. Alternatively but flg. the syntax of the publ. tr., rather than an anodyne “went” we could supply a intransitive/passive form of  $\sqrt{srj}$ , which would better match the simile in c, e.g., *asṛgran* or *asṛkṣata*, both of which are quite common; cf., e.g., IX.64.7 *prá te sárgā asṛkṣata* “your surges have surged forth.” So I suggest an alt. tr. here, “Forward (surged) the floods of rivers to the sea.” I favor this solution.

We are not free of syntactic difficulties yet, however, for pāda c has a confused combination of sg. and pl. nominatives. The pl. *árvatīḥ* in the middle of the pāda can match the pl. *árṇāṃsi* of pāda b and function as a quasi-simile – as in the publ. tr. “... the floods of rivers to the sea, (those) mares ...” In my interpr. (and that of the publ. tr., though not that of Ge and Re., who take *árvatīḥ* as acc.), *árvatīḥ* is nom. pl. That the simile that precedes it (*sárgo ná srṣṭáḥ*) is sg. is not a problem, since similes are self-contained. But what to do about the sg. participle *rtāyán* that immed. follows pl. *árvatīḥ*? On first glance it appears to skip back over the pl. *árvatīḥ* to qualify the simile (so the publ. tr., with rearrangement of word order), but such an interpr. would be quite odd (see Old, who considers this possibility but is not happy with it). I see two other possibilities

here – both of which are considered and rejected by Old, it should be noted. The one I favor is to take *ṛtāyán* with the following pāda, modifying the subject of *cakāra*, Varuṇa. The semantics works well, though this interpr. violates the pāda boundary, which is the deal-breaker for Old. I suggest an alt. tr. of bcd “Forward (surged) the floods of rivers to the sea, / like a surge sent surging, the mares [=floods]. Following the truth, he made ...” The other possibility, which I find distinctly less appealing, is to take *ṛtāyán* as a 3rd pl. injunctive. This would require erasing the accent – or somehow configuring it as belonging to a subord. clause.

VII.87.2: On *sasavān*, which here and twice elsewhere should be read with heavy root syllable, see comm. ad X.29.2 with ref. to KH.

The publ. tr. of *yāvase sasavān* “victorious in its pasture” sounds a bit off. Either we should interpr. *yāvase* as “field (of battle/contest vel sim.),” with Ge: “der auf der Weide (den Kampf) gewonnen hat,” or construe *yāvase* with what precedes: “like an ardent animal in its pasture, having won” (so Re). I slightly favor the latter, since *yāvasa-* does not seem to be used metaphorically of places of battle or contest, but only for pastures full of forage for livestock. Perhaps the idea is that the animal is celebrating its victory by letting off steam in the pasture.

VII.87.3: This verse, too, presents interpretational difficulties. The largest, but probably the one most easily solved, is what is the relationship between the two hemistichs: ab with its subject “the spies of Varuṇa” and cd with its subject “the poets.” The publ. tr., along with most interpr., takes the two groups as parallel, and in fact the publ. tr. supplies the same verb *paśyanti* from the first hemistich in the second as well (though neither Re nor WG do). Ge, by contrast, takes cd as an indirect question, i.e., a rel. cl. dependent on *paśyanti* in the first hemistich, “they observe which poets ...”). Although this is syntactically possible – the *yé*, though deep in this supposed clause, simply follows a very long nominative NP, and we can, if nec., assume a gapped *\*tān* in the main cl. as antecedent – I find the alternative, where the god’s spies and the accomplished (human) poets perform similar or even identical tasks, more persuasive. That *kavis* observe accurately and clearly like Varuṇa’s spies makes sense; recall the instructive *kavis* in 86.3.

A more intractable problem is the hapax *smādiṣṭa-*. I find it difficult to follow the publ. tr. in “with united desire” (which seems to rest at least partly on Ge’s “vom gleichen Wunsch beseelt”), whatever that might mean, because *smād* in compounds means “(provided) with X” and, when uncompounded, usually “along with” with instr. It is true that in some passages it means something more like “altogether,” as in VII.3.8 ... *naḥ ... ní pāhi, smát sūrīn jaritṛn ...* “protect us altogether, both patrons and singers” – but in that passage the double acc. seems a variant / shorthand for “patrons along with singers” (or vice versa). Gr’s “mit einem Auftrag versehen” is supposed to contain the ppl. to *√iṣ* ‘desire, wish’ acdg. to his notation, but I don’t see how we get from Wunsch to Auftrag. WG use the same tr., though they claim it’s based on AiG II.1.287 – which in fact simply provides this gloss cribbed presumably from Gr. Re’s tr. fits the presumed etymology better – “munis des (objets) désirables” – but doesn’t make much sense in context. Varuṇa’s spies don’t go around distributing desirable things, nor do they seem motivated by hoped-for remuneration from Varuṇa. I am tempted to interpret *smādiṣṭā*

(Pp. -āḥ) not as masc. nom. pl. modifying the nominative spies but rather the accusative object of *paśyanti*: “they look upon the two world-halves \*along with their desirable things ...,” but I can’t make this work without re-inventing the sandhi rules (we should expect dual fem. \**smādiṣṭe*). Despite this serious problem, I weakly favor this interpr. though it would require textual emendation.

In d both Ge and Re interpr. *iśáyanta mánma* as belonging to *iśáyati* ‘prosper, derives benefit’, but with the publ. tr. I take it as belonging to *√iṣ* ‘send’ with *-anta* replacement. See the same phrase in I.77.4, with comm. ad loc. and ref. to my *-áya-* formations, p. 100 n. 55. As in I.77.4 I would take *mánma* as pl. here: “who send their thoughts,” against the publ. tr.’s sg.

VII.87.4: This is the omphalos vs., containing the direct speech of Varuṇa to the poet. That the speech is a god’s does not make it any easier to interpr.; for some of the difficulties and ambiguities in the vs., see publ. intro.

The first question to address is a structural one. Pāda a sets up the speech situation, with Varuṇa the speaker (*uvāca ... vāruṇaḥ*) and the poet, presenting himself in the 1st ps., as the addressee (*me ... médhirāya*). Pāda b surely contains Varuṇa’s direct speech, but is the 2nd hemistich a continuation of his speech, in which he speaks of another poet speaking (*vocat ... vípraḥ*), or have we returned to the narrative frame with Varuṇa himself the subject of *vocat*? On the question, see my 2007: 93 n. 3, and for my answer, 2007: 102. My answer depends in part on the matches between the paired hymns VII.86 and VII.87. In VII.86 in the crucial omphalos vs. (4), Vasiṣṭha addresses Varuṇa, saying *prá ... me vocaḥ* “you (will) declare to me ...”; the same verb, though in 3rd ps., is found in our 4c: *vocat* “he (will) speak ...” As I say (2007: 102), “Because *vocat* answers structurally to (*prá ...*) *vocaḥ* in 86.4, I think it likely that this verb plays the same role in 87.4 ... and has the same subject, namely Varuṇa.”

We will return to this hemistich, but first let us consider the speech situation in pāda a and the function of the adj. *médhira-*. The publ. tr. renders this pāda “Varuṇa said to me who am wise,” and the standard tr. are similar (e.g., Ge “Mir, dem Weisen”). This interpr. assumes that Vasiṣṭha is already wise and therefore deserving of Varuṇa’s privileged communication; Re’s tr., “à moi initié,” captures this well. But the Vasiṣṭha depicted in the companion hymn VII.86 is far from wise, at least until the final vs. (7a), where Varuṇa instructs the uninstructed (VII.86.7c *áchetayad ácirah*). I am inclined to take *médhira-* in our vs. as proleptic: Varuṇa spoke to me (to make me) wise.” This interpr. is awkward to convey in English – the least clumsy might be what I just suggested. But though awkward, I think it needs to be considered, since it makes better sense to me in the context of this suite of hymns.

The content of the god’s speech, pāda b, though enigmatic, is straightforward grammatically and syntactically and is an instantiation of the common trope of the many, hidden names of the cow=speech. What Vasiṣṭha is supposed to make of this statement is another matter, but the expression itself is not challenging.

This is not true of the next pāda, however – which, as I said above, I take as a return to the narrative frame from direct speech, and with Varuṇa as subj. The crucial ambiguity in c is the function of *ná*. Although *ná* ‘not’ and *ná* ‘like’ can ordinarily be disambiguated by their position in the verse line, there is one place where their functions overlap: syllable 5 in dimeter vs. and, as here, syllable 9 in trimeter, i.e., right before the

last word of the line. (On the metrical position of *ná* see Brent Vine, “On the Metrics and Origin of Rig-Vedic *ná* ‘like, as’” [IJ 20 (1978): 171–93, esp. 178–81], and my “Penultimate *ná* ‘like’ in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism,” ECIEC 2024.) In our case the *ná* is particularly ambiguous because it follows something that could be a simile and it precedes the finite verb, one of the standard positions for the sentential negative. Scholarly opinion is split: Old takes it as the negative; Ge, Re, WG, and the publ. tr. as the simile marker. (Note that in 2007: 201, I state that Brereton agrees with Old on the negative; by the time of the publ. tr. he (who was responsible for the tr. of this hymn) had switched to favoring the simile marker. In 2007: 201–2, I suggest that the ambiguity is deliberate, that pāda c can mean either “he will speak (its names) *like* secrets” or “he will *not* speak (its) secret (names).” In other words, is Varuṇa about to reveal the names whose number he gave in the previous pāda, or is he leaving to the poet to figure them out? I do not think this ambiguity is meant to be resolved. “Though Vasiṣṭha has experienced the verbal epiphany described in 4ab, he leaves us uncertain about the extent of the revelation” (2007: 202). In order to reflect this ambiguity, I would emend the publ. tr. to “he will speak (its names) like secrets / he will not speak (its) secret (names).”

VII.87.5: On the numerology in the first hemistich, see publ. intro. The issue is whether *śáḍvidhānāḥ* refers to the total of the three heavens and three earths, with  $3 + 3 = 6$ . Or the adj. qualifies only the three earths, which would suggest a total of 18 ( $3 \times 6$ ) earth divisions, which, along with the three heavens, would add up to 21, the number of names of the cow in the preceding vs. Although with such cosmological numerology it’s impossible to tell, I favor the former solution (eighteen is a lot of earth parts!), in contrast to the publ. tr., and would emend to “Three heavens are deposited within him, and below are three earths, making up six divisions.”

It is not clear what it means for the three heavens (and the three earths?) to be “within” Varuṇa (*antár asmin*), but the “within” theme is found earlier in the poem (2c) and will come to a climax in the final vs. 7 (see comm. ad loc.). Here it may just refer to Varuṇa’s capaciousness: with a nod to Walt Whitman, “I am large. I contain multitudes.”

On fem. *tisró dyāvah* see comm. ad I.35.6.

VII.87.6: The enigmas continue, although once again the difficulties do not lie in the grammar or syntax. I take this as a companion verse to the immediately preceding one (5), in suggesting Varuṇa’s vast dimensions. Here, however, it is not the cosmic spaces that are contained within him, but he who extends to their limits and fills them. This is clearer in the 2nd hemistich than in the first (though “clear” is a relative term). The depth of the space he inhabits is expressed by *gambhīrá-* in the compd. *gambhīrá-śamsa-*, whatever that means as a whole (see below); the width in the phrase *rájaso vimānaḥ* “measurer of the airy realm,” and – this is the boldest of my suggestions – its generous boundaries in the compd. *supārá-kṣatra-* ‘whose sovereignty has good further shores’.

By this I think is meant that his rule extends to the edges of the world. I would link this to the statement in pāda a *áva síndhum váruṇa dyaúr iva sthāt* “Varuṇa has descended to the river like the sky/heaven.” On the surface this statement is puzzling, and interpr. differ widely. In fact, Ge and Re take *dyaúḥ* here as ‘day’, although this doesn’t improve the sense – and as far as I know nom. sg. *dyaúḥ* never has temporal value and would be esp. unlikely to when *dyāvah* in the previous vs. (5a) clearly has spatial

reference. However, if we follow Thieme in taking *síndhu-* as a boundary river, which here forms the border of the world (Thieme, “Sanskrit *síndhu-/Sindhu-* and Old Iranian *hindu-/Hindu-* [Henning Ged.] 1970: 447–50; see JPB, *Ādityas*, 119), the image is of the sky descending to the horizon, enclosing the whole world within that boundary. The final part of the vs., *sató asyád rājā* “(he is) king of (all) this that exists,” sums up this domination.

I do not quite know how to fit pāda b into this schema, but I think that it provides two similes (one unmarked) for the scene depicted in pāda a, each slightly distorting what pāda a seems to be expressing. The second one, “the powerful wild animal” (*mṛgás túviṣmān*), without simile marker, focuses on one everyday image of descending to a/the river: one of the things that wild animals regularly do in the RV is come to a water source to drink (so also Ge n. 6b). See, e.g., VIII.4.10 *ṛśyo ná ṛśyann avapānam ā gahi* “Like a thirsting antelope, come to the drinking hole.”

The “white/bright drop” (*drapsó ná śvetāḥ*) is both harder and easier. There are too many possible referents for this phrase: Ge (n. 6b) suggests Sun, Moon, or soma, and all are in principle plausible, and each could connect with the frame VP in pāda a, *áva síndhum ... sthāt*, in a different way. Of the parallels Ge adduces, the one that I find most apposite is VIII.96.13 *áva drapsó amśumatīm atiṣṭhat* “The droplet descended (in)to the Amśumatī (River).” Unfortunately this passage is extremely obscure (see comm. ad loc.), but probably refers to soma entering the water as it is being prepared.

These two images are somewhat different: the drop enters the river (and is submerged); the animal comes to the edge of the river. And neither of them quite matches the frame, where (if my interpr. is correct), the edges of the boundary river and the sky are lined up. But a kaleidoscope of shifting images, riffs on the initial statement, is just one more tool in Vasiṣṭha’s arsenal.

I think, in fact, that this is also what is at stake in the cmpd. *gambhīrā-śamsa-*. As I said above, on the one hand *gambhīrā-* expresses the vertical dimension – the depth – of Varuṇa’s physical vastness. However, *gambhīrā-* can also express mental depth, profundity of thought – the physical and mental senses are also found in English ‘deep’ and ‘profound’. See esp. the two hapax cmpds *gambhīra-cetas-* (voc.) modifying *kavī* “o you two poets of deep perception” (VIII.8.2) and *gambhīrā-vepas-* “of deep inspiration” (X.62.5). The cmpd here uses *gambhīrā-* in the mental sense, but this first member is also available to express physical depth.

Putting this all together, I would retr. the verse as

“Varuṇa, like heaven, has descended to the boundary river— like the bright drop [=sun/moon/soma?] (into the river), (like) a powerful wild animal (to the river [to drink]); he of deep recitation, who takes the measure of the airy space, whose sovereignty has good further shores -- (he is) king of (all) this that exists.”

VII.87.7: As I indicated ad VIII.86.2, the loc. *váruṇe* in this vs. echoes and brings closure to the anguished and somewhat puzzling question in that vs., “When will I be within Varuṇa?” As I said in the Collège de France lectures (p. 103 with n. 11): “Recall the first appearance of the poet in VII.86.2, after the impersonal introductory verse, and his first question: *kadā nv àntár váruṇe bhuvāni* ‘When will I be(come) within Varuṇa?’ The locative phrase *antár váruṇe* is striking, and when not simply rendered literally (as, e.g., Renou does: “dedans Varuṇa”), has given rise both to watered-down interpretations (e.g.,

Geldner “... dem Varuṇa nahe kommen”) and imaginative ones (e.g., G. Thompson, who sees this as evidence for ritual shamanistic role-playing). Whatever it is meant to convey, the question hangs fire for the entire two-hymn sequence, until the very last verse, 87.7, where a satisfactory answer is envisioned: ‘we’ (now plural, note), forgiven for and freed from our offense, may be again ‘in Varuṇa’: 87.7b *vayám syāma váruṇe ánāgāḥ* ‘Without offense, may we be in Varuṇa.’ The only two occurrences of the loc. *váruṇe* in the VIIth Maṇḍala open and close these two hymns, in the same syntactic construction (1<sup>st</sup> ps. subject -- [modal ‘be’] -- Varuṇa [loc.]).”

An intermediate expression *antár asmīn* “within him” is also found in our hymn, VII.87.5a, with clear reference to Varuṇa. There the reference is to the vast spaces of heaven and earth contained within him; here the idea must be that Varuṇa encompasses us as well.

### VII.88 Vasiṣṭha [SJ on JPB]

I also treat this hymn in detail in Jamison 2007 (103–8). Like VII.86–87 it is an omphalos hymn, and like VII.86 much of it is organized by the shifting personal reference of the poet (Vasiṣṭha) and the god (Varuṇa); for a chart see p. 108.

VII.88.1: The hymn begins with Vasiṣṭha’s address to himself, complete with a voc. *vasiṣṭha*. On this type of poetic self-address, see my “Poetic Self-Reference in the *Rig Veda* and the Persona of Zarathustra” (BAI 19 [2009]; Fs. P. O. Skjaervø). The middle impv. *bharasva* is one of only two such exx. in the RV, against over a hundred occurrences of its active counterpart; the other one (I.79.10) is found in the same type of context, with a poet addressing himself by name.

On the lit. meaning of *śundhyú-* as ‘preening’, see comm. ad V.52.9. Since the adj. does not have passive value, I would substitute ‘glossy’ or ‘sleek’ here for the publ. tr. ‘well-preened’.

The question in the 2nd hemistich is who/what is the referent of *yáḥ*. The publ. tr. (partially flg. Old as well as Lanman, Reader) takes it as referring to Vasiṣṭha. This seems to me to be correct, and it allows the acc. phrase beg. with *īm* to refer to Varuṇa, which is the most natural way to read it. The problem is that this requires an abrupt reference shift from 2nd ps. poet (ab) to 3rd ps. poet (c *yáḥ ... kárate*), but such shifts are not uncommon, esp. in hymns like this that are so preoccupied with reference. Other solutions that don’t require this shift encounter more pressing problems. If *yáḥ* refers to Varuṇa (implicitly Ge, WG, explicitly Lü [315–16], Do), then we need a diff. referent for the acc. phrase; for most of those just mentioned, this is the sun (already Sāy.), though for Lü the/a chariot (which was Ge’s earlier solution in his Komm.). But like the other hymns in this group, the focus is relentlessly, claustrophobically on the dyad of Vasiṣṭha and Varuṇa; introducing another actor is contrary to the uneasy balance between V+V that prevails throughout the hymn(s). By contrast, Re takes the referent *yáḥ* to be the hymn (already one of Old’s suggestions), but this runs into a different grammatical problem: the word for thought/hymn in the first hemistich is fem. *matíḥ*, and a masc. synonym must be silently substituted to account for masc. *yáḥ*. I will stick with the publ. tr.

VII.88.2: Once again there are numerous interpr. of this vs. Starting with the first hemistich, the first question is the referent of *asya* in pāda a, followed by how to construe the two genitives in b, *agnéḥ* and *vāruṇasya*. For Ge and WG, who supplied the sun as obj. in 1cd (see above), *asya* also refers to the sun here; Ge then considers the two genitives in b to be parallel, with the sun mistaken by the poet for the face of both Agni and Varuṇa (“so halte ich ihn für das Anlitz des Agni, des Varuṇa”). However, as disc. above, I think the introduction of the sun is unlikely, and therefore the *asya* in our vs. must refer to Varuṇa; the second pāda then describes the poet’s confusion of Varuṇa and Agni (so, essentially, Lü 317–18, Re, WG, Scar 299) – when, as disc. in the publ. intro., the poet confronts the ritual fire at night and sees Varuṇa in it.

The second hemistich is syntactically ambiguous, which makes its interpr. all the harder. The syntactic question concerns the domain of *yád* in c and its function. The publ. tr. takes *yád* as the temporal subord. ‘when’ and its domain the whole c clause (“when the sun is in the rock and darkness is master,” with both *svàr* and *ándhaḥ* neut. nominatives), flg. JSK DGRV II.29 (also Part. *u*, p. 162); see also WG. However, it is also possible to assign *yád* a more limited role, as *izafe* in a nominal expression: “the sun that (is) in the rock.” As I have shown (“Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto *Izafe*,” Fs. M. Hale, 2022), although full, verb-ed relative clauses cannot be embedded in the RV, there is no such prohibition on nominal relative expressions. By that interpr., *svár yád áśman* is a self-contained acc. phrase, parallel to *ándhaḥ* (also acc.), both serving as goal to *ninīyāt* in d. This allows the nom. *adhipā(h)* to be extracted from c and serve as subj. of *ninīyāt*, with cd a single clause: “the overlord should lead me to the sun that is in the rock and to the darkness.” This is essentially the standard view; see Ge, Re (more or less), Lü (more or less), Don, Scar 299. (Re and Lü prefer to take *ándhaḥ* as a reference to the soma plant, rather than darkness, which seems to me to introduce yet more extraneous matter.) This interpr. has the advantage of allowing *adhipāḥ* to refer to Varuṇa. But it has the disadvantage of failing to explain the *u* that follows *adhipā* (*adhipā u andhaḥ*), whereas taking that phrase as a parallel nominal clause to *svàr ... áśman* would place the *u* in 2nd position in this little nominal clause. Although I prefer the Klein–JPB interpr. found in the publ. tr., which neatly identifies the time period of the confusion of Varuṇa and Agni in the first hemistich, I consider the other a possible alt.: “The Overlord [=Varuṇa] should lead me to the sun that is in the rock and to the darkness, to see the wonder.”

VII.88.3: The image of the boat and the swing is lovely and a bit mysterious – but grammatically and lexically without problems. For the swing and the phrase *śubhé kám* see the previous hymn, VII.87.5. Note that the elaborate etymological figure *prá preṅkhá īṅkhayāvahai*, which includes a 5-syllable finite verb, disturbs the meter by making the usual caesura after 4 or 5 impossible.

As I noted in the Collège de France lectures (2007: 105), *ā yád ruhāva varuṇas ca* “when (I) and Varuṇa boarded ...” makes use of an extremely rare 1st ps. variant of the 2nd ps. *vāyav indraś ca* construction, with gapping of the 1st ps. prn. implied by the 1st dual verb. It both brings Vasiṣṭha and Varuṇa into intimacy and divides them, since Vasiṣṭha has been, essentially, erased grammatically.

VII.88.4: This, the omphalos vs., is also the thematic climax, when Vasiṣṭha is initiated into his poetic role by Varuṇa. See my 2007: 105–6. As I point out there, this vs. depicting the most intimate contact between Vasiṣṭha and Varuṇa keeps them both in the 3rd ps., though all the other vss. have them in various combinations of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd.

VII.88.5: The highpoint of Vasiṣṭha’s life in vs. 4 is followed by a great crash in vs. 5, where Vasiṣṭha asks sadly what has happened to their erstwhile companionship.

VII.88.6: This vs. is characterized by structural disharmony: the first hemistich is a rel. cl. in the 3rd sg. (*yāḥ ... kṛṇávat*), but its main cl. in c is in the 1st pl. (*bhujema*). This switch of person has a purpose: the first hemistich describes someone who, though a dear friend and comrade of Varuṇa, will do offense against the god. As I disc. elsewhere (2007: 106), “There is a good reason for Vasiṣṭha’s retreat into the 3<sup>rd</sup> person, for here he is obliquely admitting to offense against Varuṇa. We noticed before, in VII.86.6, the poet’s evasion of responsibility in such circumstances, expressed grammatically by avoidance of the 1<sup>st</sup> person and of his own name. In VII.88.6 this evasion is signalled by a slightly awkward combination of the impersonal 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular (pādas ab and d) and the generalizing 1<sup>st</sup> plural (pāda c), with the latter apparently serving as an improper main-clause correlative to the former.

On the apparent grammatical solecism of opt. *bhujema* with *mā*, see comm. ad IV.3.13, referring to KH’s explanation (Injunk. 95–97) taking the apparent opt. as originating as a misinterpr. of expressions containing the dat. inf. *bhujé*.

In keeping with my usual interp. of *énaś-* (see comm. ad V.3.7, 87.7), I would subst. “may we, (though) possessing transgressions, not pay ...”

The voc. *yakṣin* is difficult to interpr. It is a RVic hapax, though the base noun *yákṣa-* is better attested. As disc. ad VII.61.5, I think *yakṣá-* refers to false appearances, apparitions, phantasms – both wondrous and foul. Varuṇa would then be addressed as ‘possessor/controller of apparitions’. Curiously, and tellingly, *yakṣá-* is found several times with *mā ... bhujema*. In V.70.4 (addressed to Mitra and Varuṇa) *yakṣám* is the direct object of *bhujema*; by my interpr. (contra the publ. tr.; see comm. ad loc.), the passage means “Let us not pay for the phantasm [=illusory deed] of a nonentity (*akáśya*) with our own persons (*tanūbhīḥ*)” – in other words, let us not be blamed and punished for something we didn’t do. In IV.3.13 (q.v., incl. comm. ad loc.) *yakṣám* is at some remove in the vs. from *mā ... bhujema*, but the general point is the same: Agni should not pursue and punish us for deeds for which we’re not responsible. I think something like this is behind the wish expressed in pāda c, though Vasiṣṭha isn’t bold enough to say so directly. He addresses Varuṇa as having/controlling/recognizing(?) *yakṣá-*, and, though acknowledging that we have some transgressions (*énaśvantah*), asks that we not be punished for the offenses that the unidentified friend in the first hemistich committed, which are illusory deeds with regard to us. It is hard to get this into English (or even get it out of the Skt.), but I think that’s because Vasiṣṭha is tying himself into rhetorical knots to avoid acknowledging any wrongdoing.

I would substitute the (quite unsatisfactory) tr. for the first three pādas: “Varuṇa, whoever, though being your very own dear friend and your companion, will commit offenses against you ..., / may we, (though) possessing transgressions (of our own), not pay for (his) (*yakṣá-s* [illusory deeds]), o you who control/recognize *yakṣá-s*.”

VII.88.7: Vasiṣṭha’s syntax further deteriorates in the last vs. of the hymn. To quote at length from 2007: 107:

The final verse, vs. 7, rings a final set of changes on the theme of reference. Pāda b picks up the generalizing 1<sup>st</sup> plural of 6c, predicting that a 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. Varuṇa will set us free: *vy àsmát pāśam vāruṇo mumocat* “Varuṇa will release the fetter from us (abl. *asmát*).” But this oblique 1<sup>st</sup> pl. is surrounded by two pādas (a, c) in which the 1<sup>st</sup> plural is probably also covertly represented, in the nom. pl. participles *kṣiyántaḥ* ‘dwelling’ and *vanvānāḥ* ‘winning’. But in contrast to the syntactic clarity of pāda b, the syntax and thought remain radically incomplete in these framing pādas: there is no finite verb form to establish the grammatical person of the subject, and the acc. *tvā* ‘you’, the last 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. appearance of Varuṇa in the poem, is syntactically orphaned, since there is nothing in the verse to construe it with. Though translators and interpreters regularly (and understandably) supply a 1<sup>st</sup> pl. finite verb to remedy both these problems at one blow, Vasiṣṭha has the courage to take his experiments with reference to the extreme. He cleverly uses the participle, which specifies number but not person, to create what we might call a “zero-person” plural in a and c, and draws attention to this lack by stationing an accusative pronoun that does mark person but that requires a (non-appearing) verb to give it a syntactic role -- and, for good measure, the acc. pronoun of pāda a is in a different person (2<sup>nd</sup>) from its clear referent in pāda b (3<sup>rd</sup>).

*dhruvāsu tvāsú kṣitīṣu kṣiyánto, vy àsmát pāśam vāruṇo mumocat /  
ávo vanvānā áditer upásthāt*

To be true to Vasiṣṭha’s final ploy we would need to render these three pādas (pāda d is the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain) “Dwelling [pl.] in these firm dwelling places ... (to) you -- Varuṇa will release the fetter from us -- winning [pl.] help from the lap of Aditi.” It is no wonder that translators must betray Vasiṣṭha’s experiments here. An attempt to produce parsable English yields “(We) who dwell in these firm dwelling places (will win?) you -- Varuṇa will release the fetter from us -- (we) (who are) winning help from the lap of Aditi.”

### VII.89 Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

As noted by all comm., this hymn is very different in tone from the tight group of Vasiṣṭha–Varuṇa hymns that precede it, and though it is couched in the 1<sup>st</sup> ps., Vasiṣṭha does not appear in it by name. A feature of the hymn that has attracted less notice is its strategy of associating Varuṇa with other gods, via standard epithets, esp. *adrivaḥ* ‘possessor of the stone’ in 2b, a voc. otherwise addressed to Indra, and the voc. *śuce* (3b) to the stem *śúci-* ‘bright, blazing’, most commonly of Agni.

VII.89.1–5: The rendering of the voc. *sukṣatra* as “o you whose lordship is great” is somewhat misleading, since *su-* does not mean ‘great’. The phrase is also rather heavier than I would like, but it’s hard to cut it down without distorting the grammar. I propose the only slightly shorter “o you of good dominion.”

VII.89.2: I see no reason to take *yád* here as ‘if’ and would substitute ‘when’.

The voc. *adrivaḥ* surprises in this context: this well-attested form (voc. only) is otherwise addressed to Indra (47x), save for once to Soma (IX.53.1) in addition to this passage. There is no reason to assume Indra has infiltrated our passage, but it is also puzzling why Varuṇa would be called ‘possessor of the stone’. A sidenote: although *ádrī-* often does specify the pressing stone, it is used of other types of stones, incl. the Vala cave. There is therefore no reason to tr. it as “o master of the pressing stones” here, though that would be appropriate for the voc. addressed to Soma in IX.53.1. I would change the tr. to ‘o possessor of the stone’, though I still don’t know why he is so called. But see remarks above.

VII.89.3: I prefer ‘scantiness’ or ‘skimpiness’ to ‘weakness’ for *dīnātā*.

The other four exx. of voc. *śuce* are addressed to Agni, and most masc. sg. forms of this stem modify that god. I do not know of any other passages where *śúci-* qualifies Varuṇa.

VII.89.5: Once again I would substitute ‘transgression’ for ‘guilt’ as tr. of *énaś-*.

---

Re treats VII.90–92 in EVP XV.105–9.

### VII.90 Vāyu / Indra and Vāyu

VII.90.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn plays on the two senses of *niyút-* in Vāyu context: his teams of wind-horses and our teams of poetic thoughts. This ambiguity is fully on display in pāda c *váha vāyo niyúto yāhy áchā*, where acc. pl. *niyútaḥ* is stationed between the two imperatives. *váha* and *yāhy*. The latter is interpr. by the Pp. as accentless *yāhi*, but in this sandhi situation, followed by initially accented *áchā*, it could also represent *yāhí*. If this impv. is unaccented, *niyútaḥ* should be construed with it, with a clause boundary after preceding voc. *vāyo*. If it is accented, it should begin a new clause and *niyútaḥ* should be construed with *váha*. The situation is complicated by the semi-parallel passage I.135.2 *váha vāyo niyúto yāhy asmayúḥ*, where unaccented *yāhi* is the only choice because the following word does not begin with an accented vowel. If *niyútaḥ* is to be construed with *yāhy*, it is an acc. of goal and refers to our teams (poetic thoughts); if with *váha*, it should refer to Vāyu’s teams. Curiously, both Ge and Re in both passages choose to construe *niyútaḥ* with *váha* (e.g., “Fahre, Vāyu, die Niyut-Rosse, komm here!”), even though in I.135.2 this interpr. should be excluded. Old (ad I.135.2) opts for the other construction and tr. “fahre, Vāyu; zu (unsern) *n.[iyút-]* komm.” This interpr., the only one strictly possible in I.135.2, is further supported by III.35.1=VII.23.4

*yāhí vāyúr ná niyúto no áchā* “Travel like Vāyu to our teams” where *niyútaḥ* is clearly construed with *yāhí*. However, just because *niyútaḥ* needs to be construed with *yāhy* in our passage and in I.135.2, construing it also with *vāha* isn’t excluded -- so an alt. tr. of this passage and of I.135.2 could be “Drive (your teams), Vāyu; travel to our teams.” See also 3c.

VII.90.2: The rel. *yāh* in pāda a may be somewhat deeper in the clause than we would like, following both the indirect obj. *īśānāya* and the direct obj. *práhutim*.

VII.90.3: I take *dhāti* as a root aor. subjunctive (as apparently also Kü, judging from his tr. “... soll ... führen ...,” p. 186); unfortunately it does not have a distracted root vowel, but see disc. ad IV.8.3 as well as my 2024 article on *dāti-vāra*.

Note the extreme alliteration of b: ... *devī dhiṣāṇā dhāti devám*, with mirror-image plain and aspirated voiced stops, as well as the etym. figure *devī ... devám* enclosing the whole.

The *niyút-* in this vs. are explicitly identified as Vāyu’s ‘own’ (*svāḥ*), which supports the view that the *niyút-* in 1c are not Vāyu’s but ours.

The question in d is the referent of *vásudhiti-* ‘treasure-chamber’. Both Gr and Ge identify it as Vāyu himself, though this seems pretty much excluded by the fact that acc. *vásudhitim* is conjoined with the other acc. *vāyúm* (c) by *utá* (see Klein DGRV I.323–24, though he also suggests Vāyu could be the referent). Old suggests Indra (flg. Pischel), and Re so renders it in tr. To me Agni seems more likely than either Indra or Vāyu, since Agni is actually called a *vásudhiti-* in I.128.8, and *śvetá-* ‘gleaming’ is more appropriate to Agni than to either of those gods. (For Agni as *śvetá-* see, e.g., V.1.4.) However, to my mind the most likely referent is Dawn, a possibility also floated by Re. Dual *vásudhiti-* occurs twice (III.31.17, IV.48.3), both times of Night and Dawn. In both cases the noun is modified by dual *kṛṣṇé* ‘black’, which of course characterizes only one of the pair and evokes the opposite, suppressed quality, ‘bright’ (see comm. ad IV.48.3). In IV.48.3 the two treasure-chambers are intimately associated with Vāyu and his journey to the sacrifice. Note also that the dawns show up in the very next pāda in our hymn (4a). The one obstacle to identifying *vásudhitim* here as Dawn is that the accompanying adj. *śvetám* is masc., but this would be problematic in any case, if it modifies *vásudhiti-*, because the noun itself is fem. (see du. fem. *kṛṣṇé* just cited)—though it can have a masc. referent (e.g., I.128.8 *agním hótāram ṛlate vásudhitim* “They invoke Agni, the Hotar, [as] treasure-chamber”). I assume that \**śvetām* has been redactionally shortened (without metrical consequences, since it precedes a consonant-initial word) on the basis of such equational passages, or perhaps on the basis of such passages *vásudhiti-* was simply interpr. as masc. here.

VII.90.4: In the publ. tr. the injunc. *uchán* is rendered as a preterite; I’d now be inclined towards a pres. “the dawns dawn,” if the vs. depicts the ritual scene unfolding. If, however, it is an account of the Vala myth, a preterital *uchán* would be better. Since there is probably split temporal reference here, describing the actions both of the mythical Aṅgirasas originally opening the Vala cave and of the priests reenacting this mythic model, the injunctive *uchán* can fit both scenarios—likewise the perfects that follow (*vividuḥ* b, *ví vavruḥ* c, *sasruḥ* d), since that tense can be used both for both distant and

immediate past. Unfortunately English does not have a temporally un- (or under-)marked tense like the injunctive, and so a choice between present and preterital translations has to be made.

On the basis of the next hymn, VII.91.4 *náraḥ ... dīdhyanāḥ* (and see also our 5a), the subject of b should be ‘men’ or the Uśij-priests in the next pāda, though the ‘dawns’ of the previous pāda would technically be available.

I did not render *cid* in c in the publ. tr. Cf. V.29.12, where the same phrase opens the pāda and *cid* likewise appears to be functionless. It could perhaps mean ‘also’ here, as a second action after finding the light.

On *ānu pradīvaḥ* see Old’s extensive disc.

VII.90.5: If the previous vs. had two temporal reference points, this one seems completely focused on the ritual here and now. As noted in the publ. intro., the priests have become the draught animals that draw Indra and Vāyu’s chariot -- alluding to the trope of sacrifice as chariot.

VII.90.6: As noted in the publ. intro., the use of *īśānā-* ‘having dominion’ here cleverly assimilates the patrons modified by this participle with Vāyu (2a) and Indra-Vāyu (5d), who receive the same modifier.

Ge (n. 6a) persuasively suggests that the striking phrase “confer the sun on us,” with the patrons as subject, refers to “the great light of the Dakṣiṇā” (priestly gift). This is reminiscent of the biblical quotation “Let your light so shine before men ...” that always preceded the taking up of the collection in the Episcopal church of my youth.

### VII.91 Vāyu / Indra and Vāyu

VII.91.1: For my interpr. of the context of this vs. see the publ. intro., where I suggest that the vs. depicts the primal situation before the ritual was first instituted, with the gods existing without a sacrificial compact. I take *purā ... āsan* as existential, “existed previously,” as I do almost the same construction (but with pf., not impf.) in IV.51.7 *purāsuḥ* -- but not *purā-āsitha* in VI.45.11, where the *purā* is contrasted with *nūnām* in disjunctive *vā* clauses. The existential reading seems to me preferable to a predicative one, whether *vr̥dhāsaḥ* or *anavadyāsaḥ* were to be predicated.

The construction of *kuvíd* is unusual, in that it appears on the surface that the *kuvíd* construction here consists of a rel. clause introduced by *yé* without a main clause. Old’s first suggested rendering is of this type (“Bewiesen sich wohl einst die Götter als tadellos?”); similarly Hettrich (Hypotaxe, 145). But Old alternatively suggests supplying a main verb with *kuvíd* with the relative clause subordinate to that clause (“Wie denn (verhielten sich) die Götter, welche ... waren?”), a syntactic solution silently adapted by Re. In either case *āsan* would unproblematically be accented because it belongs to the rel. cl. Although my interpr. differs somewhat from Ge’s, we both take *āsan* as the verb of the main clause with *kuvíd* (“Ganz gewiss waren es schon früher die untadeligen Götter ...”), with the rel. clause either requiring a verb to be supplied (Ge) or simply being a nominal rel. cl. (me). By this interpr. the accentuation of *āsan* would contradict Gr’s rule (s.v. *kuvíd*) that the verb introduced by *kuvíd* is accented only when it is in the same pāda -- but see comm. ad II.35.1 for further violations of this “rule.” The construction I

envisage runs into another problem, that the rel. cl. (*námasā yé vṛdhāsah*) would seem to be embedded in the main clause *kuvíd ... āsan*). But we have seen elsewhere (e.g., VI.21.2, 22.5, 64.5, 6) that *nominal* relative clauses can function as pseudo/proto-izafe constructions and be embedded in the matrix clause. See my 2022 “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto Izafe” (Fs. Hale). Here the rel. cl. would, further, precede the main clause proper, beginning with *purā*, and be preceded only by the rhetorical introductory *kuvíd aṅgá*, so its “embedding” is slight. This example would differ from the norm in being proposed to its referent, *devāḥ* in the next pāda.

For “hard-pressed Manu” see VI.49.13.

VII.91.2: Ge (n. 2a) suggests that *ná* in pāda a stands for haplologized *\*ná ná*, with both the simile particle (“Willig wie Boten”) and the negative (“... nicht zu hintergehen”). Certainly it must represent the negative with infinitival dat., since *ná dábhāya* occurs twice elsewhere (V.44.3, IX.73.8) with *gopá-*, but it is less clear that we need the simile marker. Though Indra and Vāyu are probably not technically messengers in the way that Agni is, I see no real problem in identifying them thus when they come to the sacrifice from the heavenly world, rather than simply comparing them to messengers.

I do not entirely understand why *pātháḥ* is accented, and, unusually, Old makes no comment in the Noten. I assume that it falls roughly in the category of expressions with a single verb and “zwei Subjekten, Objekten u. s. w.” (specifically here the u. s. w.) treated in Old’s lengthy article on Verbalenklisis in the Rig Veda (ZDMG 60 [1906]:707–41 = KISch 182–216; cited phrase p. 708=183), though in a rather cursory scan of the article I did not find this passage. The triggering phrase here would be *māsás ca ... śarádaś ca pūrvīḥ* “though the months and many autumns,” with the accented verb in the middle, even though the conjoined NPs are not contrastive.

Ge tr. the just cited phrase with “viele Monaten und Herbst,” though technically speaking fem. *pūrvīḥ* can only modify *śarádaḥ*, to which it is also adjacent. Klein (DGRV I.134) echoes Ge’s interpr. forcefully (“... *must* be taken with both conjoined nouns” [my ital.]), and no doubt this is the ultimate intent, though I find preferable the rendering that matches the grammar (so also Re without comment).

VII.91.3: As discussed in the publ. intro., I differ from the standard tr. (which consider Vāyu the subject of ab and the referent of the acc. pl. in pāda a to be the sacrificers) in considering this first hemistich a disguised reference to the soma offered to Vāyu. Although the Vāyu identification might seem the default -- and it indeed may be correct -- both the vocabulary and the ritual situation seem to point in another direction. The descriptor *sumedhás-* is never otherwise used of Vāyu, but it is applied 3x to Soma or his drop (IX.92.3, 93.3, 97.23); the only figure who receives this epithet more often is Agni. Similarly *śvetá-* is not used of Vāyu (for the supposed application in the immed. preceding hymn, VII.90.3, where I think it refers to Dawn, see comm. ad loc.), but does apply to a drop (*drapsá-*) in nearby VII.87.6, while Soma makes himself a *śvetá- rūpá-* in IX.74.7. The adj. is also used of horses (VII.77.3), and perhaps, in conjunction with *niyútām abhiśrīḥ* “the full glory of the teams,” Soma is configured here as the lead horse of the “teams” of offerings we will make to Vāyu. The beings (acc.) that the subject accompanies (*siṣakti*) are called *pīvoanna-* ‘whose food is fat’, a hapax. It seems an

unlikely epithet of human sacrificers, as the standard interpr. requires. It might describe the ritual fires, but it is most clearly reminiscent of X.100.10 *úrjam gāvo yāvase pīvo attana, rtásya yāh sádane kóse aṅgdhvé* “O cows, eat nourishment in the pasture, eat fat, you who are anointed in the cup, at the seat of truth,” addressed to the milk to be ritually mixed into the soma. The masc. gender of *pīvo-annān* is something of a stumbling block to this interpr., but it might result from the variable gender of the underlying referent *gó-* ‘cow’ or reference a masc. term for milk or liquid in general. The other acc. pl. in this pāda, *rayivṛdhaḥ*, is a hapax, though reminiscent of *nāmasā ... vṛdhāsaḥ* in 1a. Like the numerous other cmpds in *-vṛdh-* the root noun 2<sup>nd</sup> member could have either intransitive/passive value with the 1<sup>st</sup> member in an instr. relationship (‘strong/increased by wealth’) or transitive value with an acc. 1<sup>st</sup> member (‘increasing wealth’) -- though most *-vṛdh-* cmpds conform to the former type. Ge interpr. it as transitive (“die ... ihre Reichtümer mehrend”), Gr as intrans.; Old fails to comment, and Re takes refuge in vagueness (“ayant ... une richesse abondante”), which seems to lean towards the intrans. Scar (521) allows both possibilities in his gloss, though his tr. of the passage follows the transitive path, “die ihren Reichtum mehren,” echoing Ge. For my larger interpr. of the passage, either would more or less work, but neither adds much or seems particularly apt.

To sum up, though I don’t reject the Vāyu / human ritualist interpr. of the nom. / acc. in ab out of hand, I think an identification of the nom. as Soma and the acc. as the cows(’ milk) with which soma is mixed works better in the passage. (I do have to admit that Indra and Vāyu drink *clear*, unmixed soma in the very next vs.) Alternatively we might consider the ritual fire (specifically the one that receives the offerings, later called the *Āhavanīya*) the subject and the libations themselves the acc. And, on the basis of VII.92.3 in the next hymn I also now wonder if the acc. referents in ab might be the teams of wealth we meet in that vs. Basically, no single interpr. of this vs. can account for all the elements of it.

My interpr. of c follows from that of ab. I take the pl. subj. to be the drops of soma, extending themselves as offering to Vāyu -- not the priestly sacrificers. Only in d do these sacrificers make their appearance (*nāraḥ*).

On the very similar pāda IV.34.9, see comm. ad loc.; it is possible that “riches/treasures” should be supplied here as the referent of *svapatyāni*, not “ritual actions.”

VII.91.4: Both Ge and Re take ab as a series of subordinate clauses truncated without a main cl. By contrast, as I indicated in the publ. intro., I think that the *yāvat* ‘as long as’ clauses in ab project the future temporal limit to the institution of sacrifice, with cd inviting the gods to participate as long as it will last.

*dīdhyānāḥ* in b matches the same word in the same position in the immed. preceding hymn VII.90.4b, though the contexts are different.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> du. act. aor. impv. *pātam* in c echoes the 2<sup>nd</sup> du. act. pres. *pāthāḥ* in 2b, but these two root forms belong of course to two different roots  $\sqrt{pā}$ , ‘drink’ and ‘protect’ respectively. Both of them are anchored to their roots by root-noun cmpds closely preceding them, *go-pā* ‘cow-protectors’ (2a) and *śuci-pā* ‘drinkers of the clear (soma)’ (4a), both dual and both subject of the following verb. In fact *śuci-pā* looks both left and right, with elementary etymological figures on both sides: *śuciṃ (sóman) śucipā pātam*

....

## VII.92 Vāyu / Indra and Vāyu

VII.92.2: For *sómam* as obj. of *prá √sthā*, see parallels cited at VI.41.2.

VII.92.3: I assume that the object of Vāyu’s quest in our house is soma. Other interpr. take *iṣṭāye* differently: Ge “um gern in sein Haus zu kommen,” which seems quite loose; Re “pour (aller le) chercher en (sa) demeure,” with the referent of “le” apparently *dāśvāmsam* of pāda a, which I suppose is possible.

As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. makes clear the equation between the teams (*niyút-*) in ab that Vāyu drives to the sacrifice, his wind-horses, and the teams of wealth he hitches up (*ní ... yuvasva*) for us in cd. In cd we would expect an accusative resumptive prn. *tās* or the like, picking up the rel. phrase *yābhiḥ ... niyúdbhiḥ* of ab and serving as obj. of *ní ... yuvasva*. The absence of this prn. is presumably what led Ge to pronounce the *yābhiḥ* of a as “die freie Verwendung des Relatives” (n. 3) and to tr. the subordinator with “Wenn.” But I think rather that the objects in cd stand for the missing *\*niyútaḥ*. Though the noun *niyút-* doesn’t appear explicitly in cd, elsewhere that noun can be obj. of its etymologically twin verb; cf., e.g., I.180.6 *ní yád yuvéthe niyútaḥ ...* and, in the immediately hymn, the passive phrase *niyuvānā niyútaḥ ...* (VII.91.5). Therefore the accusatives in cd expressing wealth and its material realizations are implicitly equated with *niyút-*. The important complementarity of the two forms of *ní √yu* in the two hemistichs is disguised by Ge’s bland translation of the verb in c: “gib uns”; similarly Klein (DGRV I.26) “grant to us.”

In the phrase in d *vīrām gavyam ásvyam ca rādhaḥ* “(a) hero and bovine and equine bounty,” the sg. *vīrām* is superficially unsettling and disharmonious: surely we want more than a single hero! But *vīrām* most likely is meant to characterize *rādhaḥ*, along with the common adjectival collocation *gavyam ásvyam*. However, an adjectival *vīryá-* \*‘consisting of heroes’ is blocked, because that stem has been frozen as a neut. substantive meaning ‘heroism, heroic deed’. I would now be inclined to reflect what I consider the substitution of *vīrā-* for the non-functional adjectival stem and tr. the acc. phrase as “(teams that are) well-nourishing wealth for us, *bounty in heroes*, in cows and horses.”

VII.92.4: The standard interpr. (Old, Ge, Re) take the nom. pl. rel. *yé* of ab to be coreferential with the instr. *sūrībhiḥ* ‘with the patrons’ in c. This is certainly possible, but I follow Thieme (Fremd. 20) in taking it rather with the 1<sup>st</sup> pl. subj. of *syāma* in c, hence “(we) who ...” There is no morphosyntactic way to tell, as the rel. cl. of ab has no finite verb, so the person of *yé* is unspecified. I favor “we” because cd seems to set up a contrastive pair of the two instr. pl. in c / d (*sūrībhiḥ / nṛbhiḥ*), with which we accomplish complementary feats: smashing obstacles along with the patrons (c), conquering in battle with the superior men (=warriors) (d). If the first hemistich refers exclusively to one of these instrumentals the rhetorical balance is disturbed.

I do not follow Thieme (Fremd. 20 n. 1) in accepting the old suggestion (conjectured by Gr; see Old for further lit.) that the Samhitā *vāyāva* should be taken as a nom. pl. *vāyāvaḥ*, against Pp. dat. sg. *vāyāve*, as an adj. ‘serving Vāyu’ vel sim. As Old points out, the dat. is supported by *té vāyāve* found twice in the preceding hymn

(VII.91.1, 3), like our *yé vāyáve*, and in any case the posited adjectival form would be morphologically dubious (see, e.g., Re’s remarks *inter alia*). Most supply another nom. pl. adj. to construe with dat. *vāyáve*; cf. Ge’s “die dem Vāyu (opfern),” Re’s “(étant) au (service de) Vāyu.” But I think this is unnecessary: I take the phrase *vāyáva indramādanāsaḥ* as an example of the fungibility of compounds and free syntagms with the same structure. In other words, I would extract the  $\sqrt{mad}$  form from the cmpd and construe it also with dat. *vāyáve*. This is a particularly nice ex. of the makeshifts employed to avoid three-member cmpds – here even splitting up a dual dvandva. Although transitive forms of  $\sqrt{mad}$  generally take the acc., cf. for the dative IX.25.1 *marúdbhyo vāyáve mádaḥ* “exhilarating (drink) for the Maruts and for Vāyu” and, with the same nominal form as here, VII.31.1 *prá va índrāya mādanaṃ, háryaśvāya gāyata* “Sing forth your exhilarating (song) to Indra of the fallow bays,” though the dat. there is more likely controlled by the verb *prá*  $\sqrt{gā}$ . The connection between Vāyu and  $\sqrt{mad}$  is reinforced in the next vs.: 5c *vāyo ... mādayasva*.

With Old, Re, Thieme (loc. cit.), I take *aryáḥ* as gen. sg. of *arí-*, construed with *nitósānāsaḥ*, not as nom. pl. with Gr, Ge.

In cd the opt. *syāma* seems to serve as a modal-establishing auxiliary to the participles *ghnántaḥ* (c) and *sāsahvāmsaḥ* (d), perhaps a more economical and less clumsy alternative to two separate optatives (*hanyāma* and *sāsahyāma*) or else a makeshift attempt to express repeated modal action (expressed by my parenthetical “be (always) X-ing”).

In d *amíttra-* seems deliberately positioned verse-final to contrast with *aryáḥ*, which ends the previous hemistich, and therefore most likely has its full etymological sense -- ‘(one) without alliance (to us)’ -- in opposition to *arí-*, which identifies members of our larger sociopolitical community, even if unknown to us personally.

## VII.93–94

Re treats VII.93–94 in EVP XIV, starting p. 55.

### VII.93 Indra and Agni

Both Ge and Re remark on the prominence of the word *vāja-* in the hymn (“Das Schlagwort ist *vāja*”; “Thème du *vāja*”). Although I would certainly not deny that, the word does not seem to call attention to its dominance in the way that other signature words often do: not only is it absent from three of the eight vss. (4, 5, 7), but especially at the beginning (vss. 1–3) it is not prominently positioned (not at a pāda boundary or after the caesura) nor positioned in the same place in the vs. line -- both being ways in which a word can assert itself -- nor does it repeat the same case and number. In vss. 6 and 8 it is hemistich-final (6d, 8b) and so becomes slightly more salient. In other words, it’s certainly a theme, but a somewhat muted one.

VII.93.2: The first hemistich is hyper-alliterative, with sibilants *s* and *ś* and, esp. in the 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda, *v* and *u*, all tied together by alternations of short and long *a*: *tā sānasī śavasānā hí bhūtām, sākamvrdhā śavasā śūśuvāmsā*. This phonological effect is reinforced by the etymological figure of *śavasānā ... śavasā śūśuvāmsā*, all belonging to the root  $\sqrt{śū}$ , *śvā* ‘swell’. To capture the etymological relationship I would be inclined to adjust the publ. tr. to “o swelling ones .. swollen with swelling (strength).”

It is difficult to say which of the qualifiers is/are being predicated of Indra and Agni with the *bhūtám*, but Ge, Re, and I seem all to have settled on *sānasī*.

*vāja-* is modified by *ghṛṣvi-* in IV.32.6, 9 and by *sthávira-* in VI.1.11, 37.5. The two adjectives seem, if not contradictory, at least slightly incompatible, but note that Indra is qualified by the same two adjectives in the same order, case, and metrical location as here in III.46.1, VI.18.12. In keeping with the Indraic slant to this hymn (on which see publ. intro.), it seems as if a phrase more appropriate to Indra has been transferred to the prize.

VII.93.3–4: There is no main clause in vs. 3: the three co-referential participial phrases (... *ichámānāḥ* b, ... *nákṣamānāḥ* c, ... *jóhuvataḥ* ...d) all simply expanding on the dependent cl. of pāda a, *úpo ha yád ... gúḥ* “When they have come”). However, the first pāda of vs. 4 echoes 3b exactly, save for number: 3b ... *víprāḥ prámatim ichámānāḥ* (pl.) versus 4a ... *vípraḥ prámatim ichámānāḥ* (sg.), vs. 4 seems to continue vs. 3. Interestingly enough, it is not possible to determine whether his new start in 4 is a main clause or continues the dependent cl. in vs. 3 -- though Ge, Re, and I all take it as an independent cl. The problem is that the finite verb *ṛtte* opens the second pāda; its accent then can be owing to its metrical position and it can be a main-cl. verb (as we all interpret it). However, the accent could also signal that it’s the verb of a dependent cl., and the whole complex of vss. 34 could be interpr. “When the prize seekers have come ..., (when) the inspired poet ... invokes ..., (then,) o Indra and Agni, further us ...” -- in other words 4cd would supply the main cl. for all of 3–4ab.

VII.93.7: In d the verb is pl. (*śís Rathantu*), but only two gods, Aryaman and Aditi, are mentioned in the pāda; the subjects must therefore include the gods found in b.

### VII.94 Indra and Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is made up of four *ṛcas*, which were probably originally independent, since four 3-vs. hymns would fit the standard pattern of hymn arrangement, but a single 12-vs. hymn following one with 8 vss. would not. There is little sign of unity within the separate *ṛcas*, but the content of the hymn as a whole is so generic that it would be hard to identify features that would either unify or distinguish the various parts. Also, there may be a faint, probably secondary, ring between the 1<sup>st</sup> vs. (1c) and the last (12d) (see comm. ad vs. 12), which may suggest that the four *ṛcas* were combined into a single hymn even before the redaction of the Saṃhitā text. The first *ṛca* (vss. 1–3) also has a faint sign of internal unity: the dual *dvandva* voc. *índrāgnī* beginning the b-pāda in each vs. However, the 3<sup>rd</sup> *ṛca* (vss. 7–9) also contains the same form in every vs. (7a, 8c, 9c), and 10b also begins with this *cmpd.*, though there it is not a voc. but an acc., and it requires a distracted reading (*índrā-agnī-*).

VII.94.1: Both Ge and Re take *ajani* ‘has been born’ in c as the main verb for ab, while I take ab as a separate nominal cl. Either is possible. I would be more inclined towards the Ge/Re solution if *mánmanah* were an ablative, parallel to *abhrāt* in the simile (“has been born \*from this conception, like rain from a cloud”). But though *mánmanah* itself could be abl., it is anchored as a gen. by *asyá*, which must be adjectival (and hence go with *mánmanah*) because of its accent. In fact, at least in tr. “this ... praise hymn of this

conception” is a clumsy expression, though both Ge and Re make it slightly less so by adding ‘mine’ (“of this conception of mine”). Though the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. ref. is not found in the text, it does ameliorate the tr. The point is the usual one, that the verbal product, the hymn, arises from the poet’s mental functions.

VII.94.2: This vs. traces the genesis of the praise hymn further back: the poet’s insight (*dhī-*) / conception (*mánman-*) that produces is the hymn is itself the product of the gods’ stimulation, here expressed by *pipyataṃ dhíyaḥ* “swell his insights.”

VII.94.4: The loc. phrase *índre agnā* beginning this *ṛca* echoes the repetitive voc. dvandva *índrāgnī* of the 1<sup>st</sup> *ṛca*.

VII.94.5–6: Both vss. begin with the dual pronoun *tā*, but the first is 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. (“these two”) and object of a 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. verb (*īlate ... víprāsaḥ* “the inspired poets invoke those two”), while the 2<sup>nd</sup>, followed by 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. enclitic *vām*, has switched reference to 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. and is object of a 1<sup>st</sup> ps. verb (*havāmahe* “we call upon you two”) -- thus effecting a relationship of considerably more intimacy.

VII.94.7: On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

VII.94.8: On my reading *\*akāsya* for *kāsya* after *mā*, see comm. ad IV.3.13.

VII.94.10: This vs. is a fragment, a *yád* clause without a main cl. It also contains an augmented intensive *ájohavuh*; this preterital form seems out of place in a hymn that lives almost entirely in the ritual present (our actions for Indra and Agni) and immediate future (via the imperatives we address to those same gods). (Only *ajani* in vs. 1 is preterital, but this aorist refers to the immediate ritual past.) The verse is also one of the few in this hymn that lacks parallel *pādas* or near repetitions elsewhere. (See Ge’s nn and Bloomfield, RReps for some of the details, though Bloomfield does not list partial repetitions.)

VII.94.11: This vs. is likewise a fragment, a nom. dual dvandva (*vrtrahántamā*), which supports a rel. clause characterizing Indra and Agni, but no main clause. By my interpr. (and those of Ge and Re), this rel. cl. is nominal, with a predicated part. *mandānā*. Old takes the ambig. *āvivasataḥ* as a dual finite verb (but cannily doesn’t tr.); this interpr. requires an anomalous meaning for the form, whereas the interpr. as a gen. sg. participle, shared by Ge, Re, and me, allows the form to have its usual sense (“seek to win [the gods]”).

VII.94.12: The 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. ref. of the nom. du. in vs. 11 is transformed into 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. ref. by the 2<sup>nd</sup> du. impv. *hatam* in 12b, mediated by the dual prn. *tāú*, which in this context, with a flg. impv., can have either 3<sup>rd</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. ref. (see my “*sá figé*”).

Ge and Re take *ābhogá-* and *udadhí-* as PNs, which seems odd since both words are easily interpretable. The latter is in fact attested in other passages as a common noun meaning ‘water-holder, reservoir’ and its components are clear. I assume that the reason for assuming a PN is that a ‘water-holder’ is considered to be a positive entity, and since

it is to be smashed, it must be negatively viewed here. But “holding” water can shade into “withholding” water, a negative action, and *udadhí-* here may refer to the Vala cave (see comm. ad X.67.5, 111.4, and also HPS Vedisch *Vrata* 47 n. 84) or to Vṛtra, who is surely the victim in the preceding pāda (see below). We might here also invoke the first vs., where the hymn is produced “like rain from a cloud.” A cloud can be considered a ‘water-holder’, and the positive and negative aspects of water-holding may be contrasted in the 1<sup>st</sup> and last vss. As indicated above, although I do think the ṛcas in this hymn were originally independent, some sense of ring composition might have gone into their combining.

As for *ābhogá*, Old seriously doubts the gloss ‘snake’ found, e.g., in Gr. But I’m somewhat puzzled as to why. There is certainly a root *√bhuj* ‘bend, coil’ distinct from *√bhuj* ‘enjoy, benefit’, and *bhogá-* definitely means ‘(snake’s) coil’ in reference to Vṛtra in V.29.6 ... *bhogān sākāṃ vājreṇa maghāvā vivṛścát* “the bounteous one hews apart his [=Vṛtra’s] ... coils at one blow with his mace.”

## VII.95 Sarasvatī

VII.95.1: The problem in this vs. is *rathyèva* in c. Contextually the most obvious interpr. is as a nom. sg. fem., subject of *yāti*, but assuming the correctness of the Pp. reading, *rathyā iva* (and there is no other viable alternative), it is difficult to find a way to get there morphologically. If it belongs to the vṛkī-inflected *rathī-* ‘charioteer’, the nom. sg. should of course be *rathīs*. Gr assigns it to this stem, but as an instr. sg., but who would this other charioteer in the instr. be? Ge/Re also interpr. as an instr., but to a stem *rathyā-* ‘Fahrstrasse’ / ‘une route-carrosable’. See Ge’s somewhat opaque comm. in the 4<sup>th</sup> vol. of his tr. (p. 252, col. 3, ad II.4.6b) and Old’s more illuminating one, interpreting a previous, but similar formulation of Ge’s (ZDMG 61 [1907] 831–32 = Kl.Sch.262-63). Old himself prefers an interpr. as an acc. pl. *rathyāḥ* with double application of sandhi (to nom./acc. pl. \**rathyās iva*). Here the acc. pl. would presumably be parallel to “all the other waters” that Sarasvatī pushes ahead of her, but the simile would ill fit the passage. (Old does not transl.) The sequence *rathyèva* occurs several times elsewhere: II.39.2, 3, III.33.2, 36.6, VII.39.1. In all but III.36.6, *rathyā* is clearly the correct dual nom./acc. to the vṛkī-stem, and in III.36.6 I interpret it also as a dual (contra most interpr.), for reasons given in the comm. ad loc. But here that solution, wedding morphology and sense, will not work. My ad hoc and admittedly entirely unsatisfactory “solution” here is to take it as a nonce fem. nom. sg. in *-ā*, perhaps based on *asuryā* (also nom. sg. fem.) in the 1<sup>st</sup> vs. of the next hymn (VII.96.1), also of Sarasvatī. The hymns are twinned and can be read against each other.

VII.95.2: By my interpr. (as well as the standard ones), this vs. contains two forms of the act. pres. stem *céta-*, 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. *cetat* (or *acetat*: see immed. below) in pāda a and part. *cétantī* in c. The first is found in the sequence *ékācetat*, analyzed by the Pp. as *ékā acetat*. This is perfectly possible, but an injunctive form is equally possible on textual grounds and in my opinion would fit the presential/resultative context better. See Gotō (1<sup>st</sup> cl., 138 and n. 181), who so interprets it. In any case, I take it as intransitive ‘shows / appears’, with *śúciḥ* as the predicate adjective. In c the participle *cétantī* has the sense ‘perceives, takes note’ and governs the gen. *rāyāḥ*. Given the semantic multivalence of the root *√cit* and

the pleasure poets take in manipulating and juxtaposing its forms, this functional shift within a verse is not surprising. (Gotō [p. 138] also assigns different functions to the two forms.) The intrans. use of *cetat* is supported by *cetati* in the same usage in the next hymn (VII.96.3).

VII.95.3: The male subject of this vs. is not identified, but the Anukramaṇī identifies him as Sarasvant. This seems correct (despite doubts raised, e.g., by Old), given that half of the following hymn, the 2<sup>nd</sup> ṛca (VII.96.4–6), is devoted to him and he is mentioned by name in all three vss. The two hymns VII.95 and 96, despite being in different meter, should be read against each other. See comm. ad vs. 1 above.

I take med. *māmṛjīta* as reflexive, with Sarasvant both subj. and obj. (so also, apparently, Kü 373), though Ge thinks that the obj. is the racehorse and Re that both subj. and obj. are the racehorse.

VII.95.4: On *mitá-jñu-* see comm. ad VI.32.3.

The *sákhībhyah* of the final pāda must be Sarasvatī's sister rivers. As Old points out, the stem *sákhī-* can be used of females as well as males; fem. *sákhī-* is absent from the older language. See also Re ad loc. For the glorification of Sarasvatī over the other rivers, see vs. 1 and implicitly vs. 2, as well as the 1<sup>st</sup> vs. of the next hymn (VII.96.1) and VI.61.9, 10, 13. The formulation “higher than ABL” is identical to the boast of the victorious co-wife in X.145.3 *úttarāhám ... úttaréd úttarābhyah* “I am higher, higher even than the higher ones (fem.).”

VII.95.5: My interpr. of the syntax and the reference in this vs. differs considerably from the standard. Most (Ge, Re; see also Old) take b as parenthetical, with pāda a parallel to c, both containing nom. pl. m. med. participles with 1<sup>st</sup> ps. subjects, *júhvānā(h)* and *dádhanā(h)* respectively. The first part. is transitive with *imā* as object. Hence, “Offering these (oblations, vel. sim.) ... , setting ourselves in your shelter, we ...” Under this interpr. according to Re, the *yusmát* in pāda a refers to the patrons, already found in vs. 3 -- rather loosely construed (“de votre part”). Ge fails to identify the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. referent, while Old considers both the patrons and the rivers possible and makes no decision.

Although the Ge/Re(/Old) interpr. is certainly possible -- and has the parallelism of the two participles in its favor -- I am reluctant to bring in patrons, who figured only in the Sarasvant vs. 3, and I also prefer to avoid parenthetical clauses if at all possible. I therefore go against the Pp. in taking the first participle as *júhvānā* and neut. pl., rather than *júhvānāḥ* and masc. pl. As a nom. pl. neut., the part. is passive and forms a nominal clause with *imā*, with the participle predicated (as is not rare). The part. stem *júhvāna-* is found with both transitive and passive interpr. (Note that Gr takes this form as passive, but as a nom. pl. fem. in *-āḥ* modifying his supplied *gírah* ‘hymns’, represented by *imāḥ* [requiring him to go against the Pp reading *imā*].)

By my interpr. of pāda a, the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. refers to the (other) rivers just featured in 4d, and in the expression *yusmád ā, ā* means ‘all the way to’, though it must be admitted that *ā* in that usage usually precedes (see Gr col. 169). Old himself suggests as one of his possibilities “bis zu euch hin” of the rivers or waters. The ambiguous position of *ā* in the expression in 2b *giríbhya ā samudrāt* “from the mountains all the way to the sea” also has *ā* directly before an abl. expressing goal.

VII.95.6: Ge and Re seem to take *vājān* as the obj. of *vārdha* as well as *rāsi*, while I supply Vasiṣṭha, the subject of the preceding hemistich.

### VII.96 Sarasvatī (1–3), Sarasvant (4–6)

VII.96.1: With Gr, Ge (etc.) I take *gāyīṣe* as a 1<sup>st</sup> sg. *-se* form of the *stuṣé* type; Old, fld by Re, takes it as a 3d sg. passive. Besides separating the form from the standard usage of *stuṣé* and the like, this leaves *bṛhāt ... vácaḥ* syntactically untethered. Old takes it in instr. sense, but it's hard to get the neut. acc. to function that way.

Re also takes *mahayā* in c as a 1<sup>st</sup> sg. subjunctive, but an impv. works better with the voc. *vasiṣṭha* (d), an example of poetic self-address (treated in my 2005 Fs. Skjæevø article).

VII.96.2: On the interpretational problem posed by du. *ubhé ... ándhasī* “both stalks,” see publ. intro. As indicated there, I do not subscribe to the interpretation that takes this as a metaphorical expression of political geography. Rather I assume that the usual sense of *ándhas-* ‘soma stalk’ → ‘soma’ allows the dual to refer to two liquids. Ge (n. 2a) points out that in ŚB V.1.2.10 this dual is used for soma and surā (the profane intoxicating drink), and since in the Sautrāmaṇī ritual surā is mixed with milk, the second liquid could also be the more benign milk. Old makes a good case for the connection of soma and surā with Sarasvatī and also suggests that the formulation is meant to indicate that the Pūrus make use of profane drinks as well as soma. Re favors soma and surā without disc. Two textual passages nearer to hand suggest other possible solutions. As was noted ad VII.95.1, 3, these two adjacent hymns to Sarasvatī, VII.95 and 96, show twinning tendencies. In VII.95.2 (that is, the vs. corresponding to this one in position) Sarasvatī milks out “ghee and milk” (*ghṛtām páyaḥ*) for Nāhuṣa, probably the designation of a human family group or lineage (see Mayrhofer, Personennamen s.v. *nāhuṣ-*); here the Pūrus (another such designation) preside over two liquids, which could be those very two. Alternatively, in this same hymn, VII.96.5, Sarasvant’s waves are characterized by honey and ghee (*mādhumanto ghṛtaścútaḥ*), and this pair is another possibility, esp. if ‘honey’ stands for soma, as often. These two vss. (2, 5) match each other in another way; see ad vs. 5 below. In the end, Ge’s interpr (at the end of his n.) that the Pūrus, living beside the Sarasvatī, inhabit a land rich in soma and milk seems to suggest the most likely image: whatever the two liquids are, they are indications of a place rich in nourishment -- in biblical terms, a land of milk and honey.

I do not know why the Maruts would be the particular companions of Sarasvatī, unless their storms swell her waters.

VII.96.3: The subjunctive *kṛṇavat* seems to have a more strictly modal sense than most subjunctives; I am tempted to tr. “should do good” or “may she do good.”

VII.96.4: Why Sarasvant should receive the pleas of bachelors seeking wives and sons is utterly unclear to me, and the standard tr./comm. don’t address this issue.

VII.96.5: The third pāda of this vs., which is the 2<sup>nd</sup> vs. in the ṛca addressed to Sarasvant, the masc. equivalent of the far more prominent Sarasvatī, parallels that of the 2<sup>nd</sup> vs. in the ṛca addressed to Sarasvatī that opens this hymn:

2c *sā no bodhi avitrī marútsakhā*

5c *tébhīr no avitā bhava*

Re suggests that this parallelism attests to the secondary character of Sarasvant. The difference between the two impvs. *bodhi* and *bhava*, both to  $\sqrt{bhū}$ , conforms to the positional distribution of these two forms discussed in my 1997 “Syntactic constraints on morphological change: The Vedic imperatives *bodhi*, *dehi*, and *dhehi*” (*Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes*, ed. E. Pirart).

VII.96.6: The acc. phrase in ab *pīpivāṃsam ... stānam* is the object, or one of the objects of *bhakṣīmāhi* in c, which makes the rel. clause *yó viśvadarśataḥ*, referring to the *stāna-*, technically an embedded rel. But as we have often seen, *nominal* rel. cl. -- pseudo-izafes -- are regularly found embedded.

The expression “share in the breast” seems somewhat odd, but this “swelling breast” is presumably swelling with the honey and ghee in vs. 5. As noted in the publ. intro., it is also odd to attribute this breast to the male figure Sarasvant. The more appropriate association between the breast and Sarasvatī is found in I.164.49, a passage adduced by Ge (n. 6ab).

### VII.97 Indra and Bṛhaspati

Re treats this hymn in EVP XV.66–69. For the structure of the hymn and the covert identification of Bṛhaspati (/Indra) with Agni, see publ. intro. This identification is argued for extensively by Schmidt (B+I, 62–67, which also contains a complete tr. and philological comm.).

VII.97.1: This vs. plays on the ambiguity of reference of the noun *nṛ-*, which can refer both to superior (mortal) men and to gods. It also cleverly but uninsistently identifies the sacrifice as the meeting place of men and gods, the *nṛśádana-* ‘seat of men’ or (in my current understanding) ‘(ritual) session of men’, who come from / belong to both heaven and earth (*divāḥ ... pṛthivyāḥ*) -- though see Ge’s n. 1a for other, in my opinion less likely, possibilities. (On *nṛśádana-* see comm. ad V.7.2.) The *náraḥ* in pāda b, however, seem only to be men proper, that is mortals, who seek the gods at the sacrificial common ground.

In c *sunvé* is one of the rare exx. of a singular verb with neut. pl. subj. (here *sávanāni*), a construction that is of course supported by comparative evidence and surely inherited. Gr interprets the verb rather as a 1<sup>st</sup> sg. transitive. This is not impossible -- and note the 1<sup>st</sup> pl. verb in 2a -- but *sunve* is otherwise passive, with 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. *sunviré* likewise passive.

In d the verb *gáman* (in sandhi) could represent either 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. *gáman* or 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. *gámat*, but both the context, with Indra mentioned in the preceding pāda, and the parallel I.178.2d *gáman na índraḥ sakhyā váyaś ca* support the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg.

The pāda is also marked by case disharmony: dat. *mádāya* and acc. *váyaś ca* appear to be joint complements of *gámat*, conjoined by *ca*. Such case disharmony is rare in *ca* collocations (see Klein DGRV I.56–57), but at least in this example poses no

obstacle to understanding: the dat. expresses purpose, the acc. goal. Although neither Klein nor I find the construction problematic, Re supplies a second verb to govern *váyaḥ* (“obtenir”), and HPS interprets the acc. as an Inhaltsakk.

A more problematic issue, at least for me, is the position of *ca*, unmentioned by anyone, incl. Klein. The standard tr./interpr. take the 2<sup>nd</sup> term of the conjoined NP to be *prathamám váyaḥ* “first vitality/youth,” but we should then expect the *ca* to follow *prathamám*, the first word of the second member. Although such positioning is not an unbreakable rule, it is remarkably regular. To avoid the problem I take *prathamám* as an adverb here, as I do in the parallel I.83.4 (*prathamám ... váyaḥ* without a *ca*), cited by Old and Re, for which see comm. ad loc.

VII.97.2: The problem in this vs. is *maha* (sandhi form) in *b bḥhaspatir no maha ā sakhāyaḥ*. The Pp reads this as *mahe*, as do most subsequent interpr. -- though *mahaḥ* is possible and is in fact the interpr. of at least one tr.: HPS takes it as the voc. pl. of *māh-*, construed with *sakhāyaḥ*, hence “ihr grossen Freunde.” But this seems unlikely: there are no voc. forms to this stem in the RV (though the derived fem. *mahī-* does have some), and the intrusion of *ā* in the middle of the voc. phrase seems unlikely. Others accept the Pp *mahe* and generally take it as a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. verb, but opinions differ on its root affiliation and meaning. I will not detail these disagreements; see the disc. in Old, Ge’s n. 2b, Re ad loc., and Gotō 243–44. My interpr. is closest to Gotō’s: he assigns this to a root  $\sqrt{mah}$  ‘bring about’, separate from  $\sqrt{mah}$  ‘magnify’, with a *t*-less 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. of the *śáye* type (see also comm. ad I.94.1) and tr. “Bḥhaspati ist für uns imstande.” I differ from him in the interpr. of the rest of the pāda: he takes *ā* as the trigger of an unexpressed verb of motion, “[kommet] o Genossen herbei.” This seems to assume that the friends addressed are not coreferential with *naḥ* earlier in the pāda, or the referents of the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. verbs in pādas a and c. I do not entirely understand the position of *ā*, but it may show the occasional positioning of a preverb immediately after its verb or simply be an adverbial ‘here’, as in my tr.

As Re points out, the optative (*bhávema*) is quite unusual in a *yáthā* purpose cl., where the subjunctive is standard. See Gr s.v. *yáthā*, cols. 1083–84, nos. 6–8.

VII.97.3: Both Ge and Re take great pains to avoid identifying Indra in c with *bráhmaṇas pátim* in b and the elaboration on this phrase in d, but as discussed in the publ. intro. and extensively by HPS, the identification is the point.

VII.97.4: The second pāda contains an equational rel. cl. with expressed copula *ásti*; main cl. equational expressions almost always lack copula (when *asti* is found, it is generally existential), but overt copulas are not uncommon in dependent clauses. It is of course optional; see the nominal rel. cl. in the preceding vs., 3d, which lacks copula.

Pāda c contains a phrase in the nominative, *kāmo rāyáḥ suvṛyasya* “desire for wealth in good heroes,” which is picked up abruptly by the acc. prn. *tám*, object of the immediately following verb *dāt*. There seems no other way to interpret it -- and it goes perhaps too easily into English -- but both the syntax and sense are slightly off. The fronted expression seems like a topicalized phrase, but in Vedic topics would not default to the nominative but remain in the appropriate case for the larger syntactic frame; see in the next vs. the acc. phrase that occupies the whole of pāda a, which is the obj. of the

verb in b. Moreover, one doesn't *give* wishes/desires but rather the contents of those desires, so that the referent of *tám* may be *rayí-*, not *kāma-*. Both concerns suggest that the relationship between the *kāma-* phrase and the abbreviated *tám dāt* clause is less close than it appears. Re supplies some structure to the first phrase -- "(En nous est) le désir ..." -- and something like that might produce the necessary distance.

As for *rāyāḥ suvīryasya*, since *suvīrya-* is a neut. noun (see comm. ad VII.4.6), this tr. should be emended to "wealth (and) an abundance of good heroes."

VII.97.5: On *pastyā-* see comm. ad I.40.7. As noted ad I.40.7 HPS in that passage renders the stem as 'stream' but here as 'house', the interpr. I prefer. Note that in our passage HvN should be corrected from *pastiyānām* to *pastīyānām* (that is, *pastyānām*).

VII.79.6: The construction of the vs. is uncertain in several regards, which center on the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich. The first is whether neut. *sāhaḥ* belongs in the rel. cl. or not; the position of rel. *yāsya* is compatible with either answer. I take it as an independent qualifier of acc. *bṛhaspátim* in b, hence an acc.: Bṛhaspati is identified with the abstract noun 'strength / force' itself. I therefore assume that the rel. cl. begins with *yāsya*. This also seems to be the Ge solution. The sense of Re's tr. is similar, but he puts *sāhaḥ* in the, or a, rel. cl. as a nominative -- taking c as containing two nominal rel. clauses: "lui dont la force-dominante (est réelle, dont) le séjour-commun (est) noir." HPS makes *sāhaḥ* the subject of an equational rel. cl.: "dessen Gewalt eine schwarze Stätte ist." Since I think it more likely that Bṛhaspati is identified as strength itself than that his seat is, I find Schmidt's interpr. less likely, though it does have the merit of not inserting a syntactic break in the middle of a pāda. If Bṛhaspati is identified with *sāhaḥ* here (as I think), Schmidt's claim that Bṛhaspati is identified with Agni in this hymn -- an identification esp. clear in this vs. (see publ. intro.) -- is strengthened, since Agni is so often called "son of strength" (*sūnú-sāhasaḥ*, e.g., in this maṇḍala VII.1.21, 22, 3.8, etc.).

A more interesting question is what to do with d. The pl. *vāsānāḥ* is universally, and plausibly, taken as referring to the horses of ab: in pāda they are called 'ruddy' (*aruṣāsah*); in d they "clothe themselves in ruddy form" (*rūpām aruṣām*). The question then is whether d is simply a continuation of the main cl. in ab, the part. *vāsānāḥ* modifying *ásvāḥ* in pāda a, with the rel. cl. of c embedded in it. This is perfectly possible and seems to be the standard interpr. Although we prefer to avoid interpr. with embedded relatives, once again the rel. cl. in this instance is nominal (whichever finer grained interpr. we follow), and nominal relatives are systematic exceptions to this rule. However, I prefer to take d as a continuation of the rel. cl. introduced by *yāsya*, with oppositional nominal expressions, contrasting Bṛhaspati's dark seat with his horses which take on "ruddy form." This interpr. allows the 'ruddy' in d to be more than a pleonastic repetition of the same word in pāda a and gives more punch to the *nīlavat sadhástham* of c by making it part of a contrastive pair. If this interpr. is correct, the part. *vāsānāḥ* would be predicated.

Ge (n. 6bc) notes the word play between semantically and etymologically distinct *saha-* (b) and *sāhaḥ* (c). In fact the play is more tightly constructed than he indicates, with the chiasmic figure *saha-vāho vahanti / sāhaḥ*, with the hemistich boundary isolating the semantically non-conforming word.

VII.97.7: It is difficult to wring a causal sense out of *hí* here. The vs. continues the depiction of Bṛhaspati as Agni: the hundred feathers of the preening bird are the flames dipping and rising much like the action of preening; the golden axe or axes are likewise flames; while the descriptions in cd are focused on the role of Agni in the ritual.

On *śundhyú-* see comm. ad V.52.9. As there, the adj. clearly refers to a (metaphorical) bird here; see also VIII.24.24.

I would now be inclined to tr. the bahuvrīhi *híraṇya-vāśīḥ* (for the inflection see AiG II.2.408) as implicitly pl. (‘having golden axes’, rather than the publ. ‘having a golden axe’ flg. Ge/Re) because it seems to refer to Agni’s flames. HPS tr. “mit hundert goldenen Äxten bewaffnete” without comment; he seems to have silently transferred the *śatá-* from *śatá-patraḥ* in pāda a, presumably an oversight.

*svāveśá-* is somewhat difficult and disputed. HPS specifically rejects Velankar’s “easy of approach” and Re’s “d’accueil favorable”; Schmidt’s “mit seinem gute Eintritt” is closer to Ge’s “bringt Glück mit seinem Eingang.” HPS (p. 66) suggests that *svāveśá ṛṣvāḥ* simply evokes the image of a fire flaring up, but I don’t see what ‘entrance’ has to do with that. I take it as ‘providing good/easy entrance’; here this would refer to the entry of the libations into the offering fire, an interpretation that is in harmony with d, which concerns the subject’s superior ability to provide *āsutí-*, the ‘pressed drink’, to his comrades, presumably the gods who consume the oblations through Agni as their mouth.

VII.97.8: I take the ‘comrades’ addressed by the voc. *sakhāyaḥ* to be different from those mentioned in the dative in the preceding vs. There the comrades of the god were the (other) gods who receive the oblation from Agni; here they are the comrades of the poet, who urges them to tend to the god. The identity of comrades obviously depends on who they are comrades *to*.

Pāda d implicitly echoes 4d.

VII.97.10: On *kīrī-* see comm. ad V.52.10.

## VII.98 Indra

VII.98.1: Verbal forms of the root  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘drink’ do not appear with the preverb *áva* in the RV or, indeed, elsewhere in Skt. But this noun stem *avapāna-* is found 5x in the RV (I.136.4, VII.98.1, VIII.4.10, X.43.2, 106.2); in 3 of these passages (all but I.136.4, X.43.2) it is used of a wild beast come to drink; cf. (besides our passage) VIII.4.10  $\acute{r}\ddot{y}yo n\acute{a} \acute{t}\acute{r}\ddot{y}yann avapānam \acute{a} gahi$  “like a thirsting antelope, come to the drinking (hole).” These specialized contexts suggest that rather than meaning simply “das Trinken, der Trunk” (Gr), the stem refers to a drinking hole frequented by wild animals (so already MonWms). The preverb *áva* ‘down’ would refer to the physical stance of animals lowering their heads to drink. The image of Indra beating buffalos to a watering hole is rather charming.

VII.98.2: With Ge I take *yád* as a neut. rel. prn. rather than as the subordinating conj. *yád*, though this poses some minor syntactic difficulties. If the referent is ultimately soma, we would expect a masc. form (*yám*); the neut. can be explained as “attraction” to the predicated “food” (neut. *ánnam*) in the same cl. (“what you made your food ...”). As a

resumptive pronoun in the main cl. we might also prefer \**tásya* to *asya*, though this is a small problem.

VII.98.3: I might now slightly alter the tr. of the pf. part. *jajñānáḥ* to ‘having (just) been born’ to put emphasis on Indra’s prodigious actions immediately after his birth.

VII.98.4: On the *s*-aor. of  $\sqrt{\text{śah}}$  see Narten (Sig.Aor. 264–67) and on the lengthened grade of some forms of this aor., as well as elsewhere in the root, see Narten (op. cit.) Gotō (1<sup>st</sup> Kl. 325–26), EWA s.v. *śAH*.

On the root noun  $\sqrt{\text{vṛt-}}$ , see Schindler (Rt.Nouns s.v.); it belongs with  $\sqrt{\text{vṛ}}$  ‘obstruct’ (etc.), not, with Gr,  $\sqrt{\text{vṛt}}$  ‘turn’. In this passage a derivation from ‘obstruct’ makes sense for the defensive forces that provide an obstacle to the attacking army.

VII.98.5: The first hemistich *préndrasya vocam prathamā kṛtāni, prá nūtanā maghāvā yā cakāra* is a variant on the famous opening of I.32: I.32.1ab *índrasya nú vīryāni prá vocam, yāni cakāra prathamāni vajrī*. The two contain almost all of the same elements (*prá vocam, índrasya, prathamā(ni), yā(ni) cakāra, nú / nūtanā*), with variation only with *vīryāni*  $\cong$  *kṛtāni* and different epithets of Indra, *maghāvā / vajrī*. Nonetheless the distribution of elements between clauses and the word order in each clause are significantly different. This variation is typical of RVic formulae, which generally do not follow a fixed template and are not sensitive to meter alone (both vss. in question are Triṣṭubhs).

I would now substitute “wiles” for “magic powers.”

Re comments on VII.99–102 in ÉVP XV: 99–100 pp. 39–43, 101–2 pp. 113–14.

### VII.99 Viṣṇu, Viṣṇu and Indra

VII.99.1: Re supplies “other gods” as the subj. of *ánv aśnūvanti* in b. This seems perfectly acceptable, though not strictly necessary. And since in vs. 2 it is, presumably, mortals (since they are ‘born’) who fail to reach the limit of Viṣṇu’s greatness, mortals could also be the subject here. See remarks below on the formulaic connection between the two vss.

As Re points out, both the case of the complement (acc. versus gen.) and the voice (act. versus mid.) differ between 1<sup>st</sup> pl. *vidma* in c and 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. *vitse* in d. The middle voice of *vitse* makes sense, since Viṣṇu knows *his own* farthest realm; the variation in case is harder to account for. Perhaps the two earthly realms are subjects of direct knowledge, while the farthest realm is something even Viṣṇu only knows *of*.

VII.99.1–2: The b-pādas of these two vss. are variants of each other, using two different roots for ‘attain’ ( $\sqrt{\text{naś}}$ ,  $\sqrt{\text{āp}}$ ) and two different formulations of ‘greatness’, the 2<sup>nd</sup> an elaboration on the first:

1b *ná te mahitvám ánv aśnūvanti*

2ab *ná te ... mahimnáḥ páram ántam āpa*

Another example of the freedom of RVic formulaics; see comm. ad VII.98.5 in the previous hymn for further on this.

VII.99.2: Ordinarily the pres. part. should express ‘being Xed’, in contrast to the past part. ‘Xed’. But in this context *jāyamāna-* must refer not to someone in the process of being born, but more likely someone who is still alive, against *jātá-*, someone born in the past and presumably now dead.

VII.99.3: With Ge I take the first hemistich as Viṣṇu’s quoted speech. This, however, does not solve the puzzle posed by *hí bhūtám*. Is *bhūtám* an impv., as Ge takes it -- or an injunctive, with Re? If an imperative, how does it square with *hí*? This particle is not rare with imperatives, but it always seems somewhat problematic. Often it appears with the first impv. in a series, and the *hí* clause can command the action on which all subsequent actions depend, with the following impvs. often introduced by *áthā* -- see comm. ad I.10.3, 14.12, etc. -- but here there is no following imperative. In the publ. tr. I manage a syntactic sleight-of-hand, reading *bhūtám* twice, once as an injunctive in a causal *hí* clause, to be construed with the two adj. in pāda a, *írāvatī dhenumátī*, and once as an impv. in a main cl., to be construed with the adj. in b, *sūyavasínī* (schematically “because you are X Y, become Z”). Although this works, it seems somewhat artificial and requires separating the three apparently parallel adjectives into two clauses. This interpr. was based in part on I.93.7, which contains a clause ADJ ADJ *hí bhūtám* followed by an *áthā* cl. with an impv. to a different verb. In the publ. tr. of I.93.7 I take *bhūtám* as an injunc (with Ge, Re). “Since you are X Y ..., therefore ...” But in the comm. I cast doubt on that interpr. and prefer an impv. interpr. “Become X Y, then ...” Therefore, I.93.7 is not necessarily a support for my publ. interpr. here; I still weakly prefer it because of the absence of a following impv., but now consider the alternative possible: “Become full of refreshment, rich in milk-cows, affording good pasture ...” The following impv. may be missing because Viṣṇu’s direct speech is truncated. (Despite their distance in the text, comparing I.93.7 to our passage is justified by the fact that the first pāda in the very next vs. in our hymn, 4a, is identical to I.93.6d, adjacent to the vs. under comparison.)

VII.99.4: As was just noted, the first pāda of this vs. is identical to I.93.6d, where Agni and Soma are the dual subjects. Indeed, the identity of the dual subjects in this vs. is left hanging throughout the vs., and the poet may have left a false trail: the last du. 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. referents were the two world halves (*ródasī*), addressed by Viṣṇu in 3ab. Assuming that the hymn as we have it is a unity (rather than consisting of two separate *ṛcas*, plus summary vs., as is possible), *ródasī* would remain a live possibility for the subj. of this vs. until the final pāda (d), where the 2<sup>nd</sup> du. subjects are addressed as *nārā* ‘superior men’, suppling a gender that clashes with fem. *ródasī*. But since *nṛ-* has a wide range of reference, this still does not definitively identify them. Even the dual number leaves the identity open: *nārā* is used of the Aśvins (mostly), Indra-Vāyu, Indra-Agni, Indra-Varuṇa, Mitra-Varuṇa -- and only once (here) of this pair. It is only with the first word of the following vs. (5a), the voc. *índrāviṣṇū*, that the question is settled.

All of the deeds recounted in this vs. can be attributed to Indra alone (see publ. intro.), although Viṣṇu’s role in enlarging and defining cosmic space may be alluded to in pāda a, with the creation of space for the sacrifice. Re’s claim that ab belong more to Viṣṇu, cd more to Indra is overstated: the cosmogony in b has little to do with what we know of Viṣṇu but is associated elsewhere with Indra.

As Old points out, the name of the Dāsa in c, Vṛṣaśipra, seems akin to Viśiśipra in V.45.6, whom Manu defeats (note that Manu figures in our vs. 3b) -- a connection not registered in Mayr.'s *Personennamen*. However, as noted in the comm. ad V.45.6, this gets us nowhere, since we know nothing further of either of these figures. More interesting is the potential relationship between these names and Śipiviṣṭa, the epithet of Viṣṇu found in the RV only in this hymn (vs. 7) and the next (VII.100.5, 6). The first member of this epithet, *śipi-*, looks like a Caland form of the 2<sup>nd</sup> member of the two names, *śipra-*, while the 2<sup>nd</sup> member, *viṣṭá-*, is esp. close to the 1<sup>st</sup> member of the name found in V.45.6, *viśi-*; *vṛṣa-* in our passage is a plausible re-Sansritization cum folk etymology of a possible MIA form *\*visi-*, underlying *viśi*.

VII.99.5: Both Śambara and Varcin are Indra's targets elsewhere, with no involvement of Viṣṇu. They are conjoined objects (*varcínaṃ śambarāṃ ca*) of Indra's smiting (*áhan*) in VI.47.21.

There is numerical play between the two hemistichs: in c the numbers are raised both by a digit (9 → 10) and by a factor of 10 (9 [10] → 100; 90 [100] → 1000). The connection is emphasized by the parallel structure of the numerical expression: b: *#náva X navatím ca* / c: *#śatám X sahásraṃ ca*. Varcin is credited elsewhere with the same number of forces: II.14.6, IV.30.15.

I do not know why the verb is in the present in the second hemistich (*hatháh*) but aorist in the first (*śnathiṣtam*). In the passages containing the other three occurrences of Varcin (II.14.6, IV.30.15, VI.47.21) the verbs are all preterital.

VII.99.6: The adj. *urukramá-* 'wide-striding' is otherwise used only of Viṣṇu (5x), but here encompasses Indra as well, in the dual.

The dual dvandva voc. *indrāviṣṇū* that opened vs. 5 is here divided into two pāda-final vocc. in c (*viṣṇo*), d (*indra*). Presumably because they belong to separate clauses, the dvandva doesn't decompose into a vāyav *indraś ca* construction, but it does follow such constructions in placing the 2<sup>nd</sup> member of the dvandva first (see my 1988 "Vāyav *indraś ca* revisited," *MSS* 49: 13–59).

VII.99.7: On *śipiviṣṭa* see comm. ad vs. 4.

## VII.100 Viṣṇu

VII.100.1: The meter of the first pāda is badly off and is not easily fixable. See Old. He suggests a distracted reading of *nū* and records the suggestion that *márto* should be emended to *márt'yo*, which HvN print as their text. If both are adopted (distracted *nū* and *márt'yo*; so Arnold p. 310), the line achieves 11 syllables, but the price may be too high, esp. as the light fourth syllable would be unusual.

Although *dáyate* generally means 'distribute (goods to someone else)', e.g., I.68.6 *tásmāi ... rayīm dayasva*, in a few passages it seems to have adopted the more "middle" meaning 'receive/take a share', perhaps adjusted to the model of other words of sharing, esp. *bhájate* 'receive a share' versus act. *bhájati* 'share out, distribute shares'. See Gotō (1<sup>st</sup> Kl., 172–73), whose tr. of this passage is close to mine. As noted ad II.33.10, I do not subscribe to Gotō's separation of forms of *dáyate* into two separate roots.

The three subsequent pādas (bcd) state the conditions under which the mortal in pāda a will receive the longed-for share. They are marked by the rel. prn. *yáḥ* in b and c; adopting Re’s strategy I have rendered them as conditionals (“if”) for clarity, rather than as straight rel. clauses (“who”). Unfortunately I don’t think my tr. makes it clear that cd are parallel to b, rather than being part of a resumed main clause, and I would now slightly emend the tr. to “..., if he will set ... and will seek ...”). The apparent non-parallelism is exacerbated by the fact that the verbs of c and d (*yájāte* and *āvívāsāt* respectively) are subjunctives, whereas *dāśat* in b should be the injunctive to the thematic pres. *dāśati*, which elsewhere attests a real subjunctive (*dāśāt*). KH discusses just this passage (Inj. 238), suggesting that in such contexts the indicative present, injunctive, and subjunctive overlap in usage.

VII.100.3: Flg. a suggestion by Ge (n. 3a, though not reflected in his tr.), I take *eṣá-* in pāda a (also 4a) as belonging to the stem *eṣá-* ‘quick’, which is used several times of Viṣṇu in the gen. expression *vīṣṇor eṣásya* (II.34.11, VII.40.5, VIII.20.3), in which confusion with the nom. pronominal *eṣá(ḥ)* (possible here) is excluded.

The hapax *śatārcas-* is problematic. The Pp analyses the 2<sup>nd</sup> member as *arcasam*, but Wackernagel (AiG I.318) points out that the sandhi between the cmpd members would require rather *-rcasam*. However, Old disputes this, claiming that it would then have to be written (“... geschrieben werden müssen”) *\*śatārcasam*, though it’s not clear to me why. Interpr. differ significantly: Sāy. glosses with *arcis-*. Old posits a masc. *s-* stem *\*arcás-* ‘singer’, comparing VI.34.3 *yádi stotārah śatām yát sahásraṃ grṇānti* “When a hundred, when a thousand praisers sing to him ...,” an interpr. followed by Ge -- though the connection between the two passages seems tenuous to me. By contrast, Re tr. “au cent éclats,” perhaps flg. Sāy.’s *arcis-*. Since an infinitival dat. *rcáse* ‘to praise, for chanting (praise)’ is found in VI.39.5 and VII.61.6, it seems reasonable to take the underlying stem *rcas-* as the base here, as Gr does, glossing ‘hundertfach zu preisen’. My ‘worth a hundred verses’ is close to that, though perhaps ‘praises, chants’ would be better.

Because of the lack of accent on *asya*, it should be pronominal, not adjectival; I would adjust the tr. to “of him, the stalwart.”

VII.100.3–4: As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 3 and 4 are responsive. The first pāda of 4 concentrates the essence of the 1<sup>st</sup> two pādas of 3, substituting *ví cakrame* (of 3b) for *trír deváḥ* (in 3a) at the beginning of the pāda. This phrase, *trír deváḥ*, is short a syllable; Old suggests reading *trír*, but this seems unlikely: I don’t know of any other disyllabic readings of this extremely common numeral (either as 1<sup>st</sup> cmpd member *tri-* or adverbial *trís*). I suggest rather that the metrically disturbed opening draws attention to the beginning of this set of paired vss. by being flawed and is “repaired” by 4a. See similar remarks about 3c and 5c ad vs. 5.

VII.100.4: By concentrating Viṣṇu’s strides in the first pāda of 4, the poet is free to express the aim of Viṣṇu’s action -- creating space and dwelling places for the people -- in the rest of the vs.

As Ge points out (n. 4c), *asya* can refer either to Viṣṇu or to Manu, although in actuality this may not matter. It may be an instance of “trickle-down” ownership: Viṣṇu

makes a dwelling place for Manu, and in turn Manu's people also get firmly planted. Or, Manu *and* the people may both be under Viṣṇu's auspices.

VII.100.5: On the name Śīpiviṣṭa, see comm. ad VII.99.4. Note that Viṣṇu's name was already celebrated in 3d, though the actual name is not mentioned there.

The syntactic affiliation of *aryāḥ* is disputed: the question is whether it depends on *vayúnāni* or simply picks up *te* in the previous pāda. With Ge and Re I follow the latter course; Re argues cogently that *vayúna-*  $\sqrt{vid}$  does not normally have a “régime extérieur” (though I.72.7, II.19.3 appear to be exceptions). I would further add that since Śīpiviṣṭa seems a type of “secret name,” referring to Viṣṇu as a stranger (*arí-*) might fit with that. By contrast Thieme construes *aryāḥ* with *vayúnāni*, in two somewhat different ways: Fremdling (1938, p. 41) “... kennend die Ordnungen, die für den Fremdling gelten,” later corrected in Unters. (1949, 22 n. 1) to “... kennend die Geheimnisse des Fremden.”

The end of pāda *c tavásam átavyān#*, with the *s*-stem adj. followed by a (negated) comparative to the same root, nicely echoes the end of 3c with the same configuration but the comparative not negated: *tavásas távīyāni*. The employment of longer and shorter forms of the comparative (i.e., with or without the linking vowel *-ī-*) allows the phrases to make an almost exact metrical match -- except that the cadence of 5c is faulty (... *-sam átavyān*), with a light syllable at the beginning (and in fact 5 light syllables in a row (... *-i tavásam a-*), starting right before the caesura and continuing through the break and into the cadence. As in the paired vs. 3–4 the metrical disturbance may call attention to the formulaic match. *átavyān* also picks up *kīráyah* ‘(even) the weak’ in 4c semantically.

In d the pres. part. *kṣáyantam* is rendered by both Re and Th (Fremdl.) as if it belongs to  $\sqrt{kṣi}$  ‘dwell’ (“qui réside” and “... [dich,] der da wohnt”), but the part. to the root pres. of that root is *kṣiyánt-*; the part. here must belong to  $\sqrt{kṣā}$  ‘rule over’ (them. pres. *kṣáyati*). Ge may be trying to have it both ways with his “der ... thront,” if my German dictionaries are correct in glossing thronen as “sit enthroned.”

VII.100.6: Exactly what this vs. is trying to tell us is unclear. Most tr. and comm. take *paricákṣya-* as referring to something blameworthy (tadelnswert); so, e.g., Ge (“Was war an dir zu tadeln ...?”), Old, KH (Injunc. 78–79). But the other example of this gerundive in VI.52.14 modifies *vácas-* specifically and seems to mean ‘to be disregarded, overlooked’: *mā vo vácāṃsi paricákṣyāṇi vocam* “let me not speak words to you that can be disregarded.” Esp. because the verb in the dependent cl. belongs to  $\sqrt{vac}$ , pf. *vavakṣé*, it seems reasonable to supply ‘speech’ here as well. The point seems to be that we should have paid attention when he called himself Śīpiviṣṭa, and that even when he appears in other form(s), he should not keep the *form* of Śīpiviṣṭa concealed from us, any more than we should not notice the name. But what these statements are in service of, I have no idea -- and the hymn ends here (save for the repeated vs. 7, which, however, makes a point of addressing Viṣṇu as Śīpiviṣṭa).

### VII.101 Parjanya

VII.101.1: As was noted in the publ. intro., this hymn has a penchant for triplets, but it is not always clear which three entities are referred to -- as in this vs., at least for me, with

“the three speeches.” As Ge points out (n. 1a), the identities of the speeches depends on the identity of the addressee of the impv. “speak forth” (*prá vada*). If it is Parjanya, the dedicand of the hymn, they probably refer to thunder(claps) (so, e.g., Lü, Va 392 -- three because they sound in the three heavenly domains) or thunder, lightning, and rain (so, e.g., Doniger 174). I am inclined to follow Lü but for reasons differing from his. I suggest that this could be an early version of the triple utterance “*da da da*” of Thunder in BĀU V.2, made famous in the West by T. S. Eliot in the section of *The Wasteland* entitled “What the Thunder Said.” Note that in BĀU V.2.3 Thunder or the thundering one (*stanayitnuḥ*) is identified as *daivī vāk* (like the three *vāc*- here).

If the impv. is the self-address of the poet, it would refer probably to the three types of ritual speech (*ṛc*-, *sāman*-, *yájus*-), or, on the basis of VII.33.14 (which contains *prá vadāty ágre*, similar to our *prá vada [jyótir]agrā*), solemn speech (*ukthá*-), melody (*sāman*-), and the sound of the pressing stone -- or, less likely in my view, with Ge three dynamic levels of sound, soft, medium, loud. Needless to say, both sets of referents may be meant. In the natural world interpr., the “light at the front” would of course be lightning; in the ritual interpr. it would be the ritual fire.

The three speeches milk the udder of pāda b. Again the identities of the referents of the udder and the liquid it produces depend on the referents in pāda a. In the natural world interpr., the udder would be heaven or the clouds therein, the liquid the rain; in the ritual the udder would probably be the soma plant and the liquid the soma -- though the udder could possibly be the sacrifice as a whole and the good things that result from its performance.

On *vād*- *prá* *√vad* see comm. ad VII.103.1.

In the publ. tr. of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich it was not made clear which nouns go together -- since Engl. lacks the convenient tool of case. The calf (*vatsám*) is the same as the embryo of the plants (*gárbham óṣadhīnām*); both are objects of the participle ‘creating’ (*kr̥nván*), whose subject is the bull (*vṛṣabháh*), which is also the referent in the phrase “as soon as he is born” (*sadyó jātáh*) and the subj. of “sets to bellowing” (*roravīti*). The calf, embryo of the plants, is most likely Agni, who is so called elsewhere (see Ge n. 1c). Ge suggests that it is Agni as lightning, which is possible, but I assume that lightning and the ritual fire are here assimilated, via a trope whereby the sound of thunder, likened to ritual speech, kindles the ritual fire. The bull is surely Parjanya, as is confirmed by the identical phraseology of vs. 2 of the next, related hymn (VII.102.2): *yó gárbham óṣadhīnām ... kr̥nóti ... / parjányah*.

VII.101.2: Multiple candidates have been suggested for the three lights of d, but it should be pointed out that there is actually only *one* light (*jyótiḥ*), which has three *vartu*-s (*trivártu*). Unfortunately this adj. is a hapax, but it is most likely related to the better attested *trivṛt*-. For the relationship between these two and the uncertainty of the root affiliation (*√vṛt* [which I favor] or *√vr̥*), see Scar (511). If the form does belong with *√vṛt* we should properly expect *\*trivarttu*, but of course *rTT* and *rT* clusters can generally only be distinguished on etymological grounds (see AiG I.112–14). As for our form, AiG II.2.663 (with lit.) suggests that *trivár(t)u* in this passage is a nonce creation modeled on well-attested *tridhātu* found in the preceding pāda (c).

In any case the triply layered shelter and triply turned light conform to the triadic focus of this hymn; I’m not sure they need to be more specifically identified.

VII.101.3: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. is full of gender ambiguity and gender switching, in service of the Vedic love of paradox. Although the subject of the first hemistich is surely Parjanya, he is not identified by name, and a masc. gender pronoun only appears as the very last word of the half-vs. (... *eṣāḥ*) -- while the state and activity ascribed to the subject of pāda a are quintessentially female.

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich the referents probably align well with the implied genders, unlike pāda a: by most interpr. the mother is Earth, the father is Heaven, as usual. But the action, at least in pāda c, is paradoxical, since it is the “milk” (*páyah*) of the *father* that the mother accepts. This milk is of course a metaphor for rain. In d it is said that both the father and son grow strong on it, another apparent paradox. Assuming that the father is Heaven, this is probably an early ref. to the water cycle: rain produces plants, which ultimately produce the offerings sent to heaven via the smoke of sacrifice, swelling the clouds that then again produce rain. By most accounts the “son” who is also strengthened in d refers to mankind, the offspring of the earth.

VII.101.4: This extravagant claim of Parjanya’s cosmic centrality -- all creatures, the three heavens, and the waters all take him as their basis -- must derive from his control of the rain, as the second hemistich suggests and 5cd further develops. The vs. is also made up of pādas with either exact (a, d) or near repetitions (b, c) elsewhere in the RV (see Ge’s nn. 4a, 4c, 4d and for pāda b partial reps. in I.35.6, VII.87.5; VII.90.4, X.111.8), which may account for the generic impression it gives.

Note the fem. *tisráḥ* modifying ‘heavens’, which is ordinarily masc. The same phrase is found in I.35.6 and VII.87.5.

VII.101.5: The subjunctive *jujoṣat* in b would fit the context better with a modal reading (“let him enjoy it / may he enjoy it”), surrounded as it is by impvs. (*astu* b, *santu* c) -- though the standard rendering of the subjunctive, as given in the publ. tr., is certainly not excluded.

VII.101.6: With Lü (506), I take the first hemistich as a truth-formulation, summarily referred to by *tád ṛtaṃ* “this truth” beginning c.

### VII.102 Parjanya

Although the Anukr. identifies the meter of vs. 2 as Pādanicṛṭ (7 7 / 7), it is clearly a Gāyatrī like the other two vss., with distraction of the gen. pl. ending *-nām* at the end of pādas a, c.

VII.102.2: This vs. consists only of a rel. cl; it could be attached either to vs. 1 or to vs. 3, both of which have pronouns in pādas adjacent to vs. 2 that could serve as referent (*sá* 1c, *tásmāi* 3a). I prefer attaching it to vs. 3, since this configuration would fit the standard model of definitional relative clause / ritually based main clause.

On *gārbham oṣadhīnām* see VII.101.1c and comm. thereon.

### VII.103 Frogs

My interpr. of this hymn relies on the treatment of it in my 1993 article “Natural

History Notes on the Rigvedic 'Frog' Hymn," *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 72-73 (1991-92 [1993]) [=Amṛtamahotsava Volume, for 75th anniversary of the BORI], pp. 137–44. Since this article is not universally accessible, I will reproduce much of the commentary here (without particular ref. to pg. nos. or to the sec. lit. that is excerpted there). The hymn is one of the most popular in the RV and has been constantly tr. -- e.g., besides the usual, Macdonell (VRS and *Hymns* ...), Renou (*Hymnes spéculatifs*), Thieme (*Gedichte*), Maurer, Doniger.

VII.103.1: This first vs. is in Anuṣṭubh, as opposed to the rest of the hymn, which is Triṣṭubh, and it reads like a scene-setting introduction. Old suggests that it's an addition.

The natural history phenomenon corresponding to the "year-long vow" (*saṃvatsarām ... vrata-[cārīṇaḥ]*) undertaken by the frogs is surely estivation, as was already suggested by H. H. Bender in 1917 ("On the Naturalistic Background of the 'Frog-Hymn,' RV VII. 103," *JAOS* 37: 186–91). The rains (here embodied in Parjanya) trigger the emergence of the frogs, in a frenzy to mate—what is known as "explosive breeding." A loud chorus of male vocalizations attends the mating, calling females to the breeding place.

The pf. of √*sī* 'lie' is represented in Vedic only by the med. part. *śasayāná-*, found twice in the RV (also V.78.9). It has full-grade for expected zero-grade in the root syllable, matching the full-grade forms of the archaic root pres. *śáye*, part. *śáyāna-*. See the matching pres. part. form at the end of 2b, *śáyānam*.

The presence of the stem *brāhmaṇá-* is of course a sign of the lateness of this hymn, since it is restricted to only the latest layer of the RV.

I now think the phrase *brāhmaṇā vṛatacārīṇaḥ* "(like) brahmins following their commandment" may be a sly reference to *brahmacārya-* (first found in the AV, but cf. *brahmacārín-* in late RV X.109.5), which refers not only to the studentship phase of life stages, but also, specifically, to celibacy. The frogs, by virtue of their estivating state of suspended animation, have perforce been celibate, but they now go about energetically remedying the situation.

The phrase *vācam ... prá √vad* is reminiscent of nearby VII.101.1 *tisró vācaḥ prá vada* in a hymn to Parjanya, who is the instigator of the frogs' speech here.

The presence of *parjánya-* in c links this hymn to the two preceding ones (VII.101, 102) dedicated to Parjanya.

VII.103.2: The comparison of the estivating frog to a "dried-out leather bag" (*dṛtiṃ ná śúṣkam*) may reflect a natural phenomenon: a 1932 "Notes on Indian Batrachians" by one C. McCann in the *Bombay Journal of Natural History* recounts an experiment undertaken by him that involved depriving frogs of water until they became shrunken and dried out like pieces of wood and then rehydrating them, at which point they began behaving normally.

It is difficult to interpr. *sarasī* as anything but a loc., but its morphology is a bit problematic. To the well-attested *-s*-stem *sáras-* 'pond', the loc. sg. is the expected *sárasī* (IX.97.52), but our form not only shows an unusual ending with a long *ī*, but it also bears the accent. No other forms to a putative stem *sarasī-* (so Gr, etc.) are found.

Wackernagel-Debrunner (AiG II.1.306; II.2.384) also posit a *sarasī-* stem, a *vṛkī-* type fem. with collective meaning, with loc. sg. in *-ī* (AiG III.170; see also Lanman, *Noun*

*Inflection*, 389), by way of a contraction of \**sarasî*’-*i*. Though *vrkî*-loc. sgs. are rare, see *nadî* (I.135.9) and *gaurî* (IX.12.3) to better established *vrkî*-stems. Rather than following the Lanman analysis of such forms as contractions of the stem vowel -î- with a loc. sg. ending -*i*, I consider these forms possible exx. of endingless locatives – on the basis of TY’s discussion of this category. His exx. of loc. *camû* and *tanû* to -û-stems provide a nice parallel to our -î locatives (though of course in the latter case a contraction with -*i* cannot be ruled out). On balance, it seems best to posit a stem *sarasî*- with Gr, Lanman, Old, Wackernagel-Debrunner, etc. I am somewhat reluctant to do so because of its extreme isolation and the widespread attestation of the -*as*-stem *sáras-*, which in fact is found in vs. 7b, but the need for a heavy final syllable may have led to the creation of this nonce stem, but my reluctance is considerably tempered by TY’s discussion of the category. The use of the nonce *sarasî* here may have been encouraged by the need for a heavy final syllable.

VII.103.3: This vs. contains the famous hapax *akhkhalīkṛtya* with the otherwise non-occurring (in Skt.) cluster -*khkh-*. The word was brilliantly explained by Thieme (KZ [1951] 109 = KISch 138). He sees it as the first attested *cvi* formation in Sanskrit (but see comm. ad X.28.12 and my 2023 “Another, Unrecognized, *cvi* Construction in the Rigveda,” Fs. Minkowski). The base noun is *akṣára-* ‘syllable’, and the sense would be ‘making syllables’ -- a reference to the Indian pedagogical technique, still in use today in traditional instruction, of students repeating the text after the teacher, syllable by syllable, word by word. Here the teacher would be the father, as was most likely the original situation -- hence *pitáram ná putráḥ* “like a son to his father.” Since even in RVic times the language used in instructing young boys would surely have been an early form of Middle Indo-Aryan, it would not be surprising that this technical pedagogical term should appear in MIA garb: *akṣára* should yield \**akkhara-* in early MIA -- and in fact does; cf. Pāli *akkhara-*. This has simply been transformed into the more “froggy” sounding \**akhkhara-* → *akhkharī-* in the *cvi* formation. This onomatopoeic rendering of a frog call is worthy to take its place beside the better-known imitation in Aristophanes’s brekekekex koax koax. In fact, because the word does double duty in this passage -- imitating frog vocalizations directly, while implicitly comparing the frog chorus to the call-and-response style of childhood instruction -- our word seems even more ingenious and well chosen than the Greek. And it is quite striking that both the Greek and the Sanskrit immediately convince as froggy, though they are phonologically very distant from each other.

VII.103.4: The verb in the first pāda, *ánu gr̥bhṇāti*, is generally rendered with an anodyne ‘greet’ (Macdonell, Maurer, Doniger; sim. Re ‘salve’), ‘support’ (unterstützt, Ge), or is given a specifically ritual interpr. (Thieme, *Gedichte*). But the lexeme has a straightforward literal sense ‘grasp in following, grasp from behind’, and this literal meaning exactly describes the posture of frog mating (“amplexus”), with the male grasping the female around her middle with his forefeet (sometimes facilitated by so-called “nuptial pads” developed during the mating season). Since once achieved, this posture is held for long periods—hours, days, even weeks or months—it would be visually salient to any Vedic bard outdoors during the rainy season, which is also the frog mating season. The only potential problem with my interpr. is that the obj. of the verb is masc.

*anyám*. However, the expression here *anyó anyám* “the one ... the other” is already stereotypical in the RV for any mutual activity and will soon be frozen as the adverb *anyonyam* ‘mutually’. Moreover it is not impossible that the original text had a fem. \**anyām* (*anyó \*anyām ánu gr̥bhñāti enoḥ*): four-syllable openings almost always have a heavy fourth syllable (see Arnold, 188), whereas the transmitted text has a light one. Thus \**anyām* could have been changed redactionally to *anyám* on the basis of the later adverb.

Note the phonetic echo ... *ámandiṣātām / maṇḍūkāḥ*.

The intens. *kániṣkan* in c, ‘hopped and hopped, continually hopped’, is a nice description of the apparently random and chaotic “scramble competition” of male frogs seeking partners.

VII.103.5: The pedagogical model seen in vs. 3 is made more explicit here: the repetition of one frog’s call by another is likened to that of a pupil and his teacher (*śáktásyeva ... śíkṣamāṇaḥ*). Both of these terms are used here in a specialized pedagogical sense, already seen in the Aves. desid. *sixša-* ‘teach’ as well as post-RV, but not found elsewhere in the RV, where extremely common *śíkṣati* means ‘do one’s best’. For reff. for this Ir. usage see Heenen (233). In contrast to this widespread development of the desid. to  $\sqrt{śak}$ , the use of  $\check{v}rddhi$  *śáktá-* for ‘teacher’ seems to be only here – it’s derived from *śákti-* ‘ability’; see AIG II.2.111, 127.

With Maurer, I take *sárvam ... párva* as referring to a group of frogs, not to the section of a lesson with most others. The “speaks” in this pāda should be in parens.

VII.103.6: This vs. reflects the natural fact that different frogs have different cries, which allow the females to differentiate conspecific males from those unsuitable for their mating.

VII.103.7–9: With the behavioral model of the frogs established in the first 6 vss., the next three treat the ritual application of this model.

VII.103.7: The first ritual application is that of the Atirātra or “Overnight” soma ritual. Frogs are generally nocturnal; they are active during the day only if the weather is rainy or very humid. So, the first signal to humans of the frogs’ emergence from estivation would be the *sound* of the nocturnal frog chorus when the rain supplied them with the impetus to emerge. Hence they are compared to brahmins at an Overnight ritual speaking around a soma vessel configured as a pond. The similes are complexly intertwined: the frogs are compared to brahmins, but those hypothetical brahmins are then implicitly compared to frogs around a pond – in other words to the original target of comparison.

VII.103.8: But as the day dawns, the frogs become visible, with their drive to mate overriding any instinct to flee or conceal themselves. This visibility is insistently conveyed by “[they] become visible; none are hidden” (*āvír bhavanti gúhyā ná ké cit*). The frogs are compared to two different kinds of priests: brahmins (7a, 8a), who are here responsible for ritual speech, and Adhvaryus (8c), the priests who do the physical labor in Vedic ritual. They are “sweating” (*siṣvidānāḥ*): sweat is a sign of hard ritual labor in Indo-Iranian religious terminology (see my 2011 [2015] “Avestan *xšuuīd*: A Relic of

Indo-Iranian Ritual Vocabulary,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 25: 19–29). Here, once again the image does double duty -- the frogs would be covered with water drops from the rains, but they are also compared to the hard-working priests officiating at the Pravargya ritual. The Pravargya is an especially sweat-inducing ritual, since it involves a hot milk drink (*gharmá-*), which must be tended as it is heated over the fire. Other features of the Pravargya conform to aspects of the hymn: there is a year-long *dīkṣā* (period of consecration for the sacrificer), reflected in both 1a (*saṃvatsarāṃ śaśayānāḥ* “lying for a year”) and 8b (*bráhma kṛṇvántaḥ parivatsarīṇam* “creating their yearly sacred formulation”); this *dīkṣā* involves a taboo on water or moisture of any kind. But the most crucial intersection between the Pravargya and frog behavior is found in the next vs.

Note in passing the non-etym. figure *vācam akrata bráhma kṛṇvántaḥ* with two forms of  $\sqrt{kr}$  governing two words for speech, with the subject, *brāhmaṇāsaḥ* in a derivational relationship to the 2nd form of speech.

VII.103.9: The year-long preparation for the Pravargya rite is again emphasized here in the first three pādas.

In b the *ná* is potentially ambiguous. The first reading is no doubt the negative: the ritualists/frogs do not fail to observe the proper ritual calendar. The VP *ná (...)* (*prá minanti*) is quite common (e.g., II.24.12, III.28.4, X.10.5). But *ná* could also be a simile marker in the phrase *náro ná*, for, after all, the subjects are frogs, *compared* to men. Since *ná* occupies the fifth syllable of the pāda, either reading is compatible with its position: an early caesura, followed by *ná*, for the negative reading; a late caesura, preceded by *ná*, for the simile.

The final pāda of the vs. is the ritual climax: the *gharmá*-drinks, heated on the fire, bubble up and overflow their vessel, as milk does when it’s been left too long on the stove. The “obtain their own release” (*aśnuvate visargám*, note the middle verb), a phrase rendered rather generically by many tr. (e.g., Doniger “the hot fires come to an end”; Maurer “the heated receptacles get emptied out”), is in my view a rendering of the dramatic moment when the bubbling mass boils over. I further suggest that its analogue in the natural world is the female frog’s release of her masses of eggs (up to 2000+ in some species), which are fertilized by the male as they are released – which must be a visually striking event. It may also refer to the practice of some frogs of making a “foam nest” in which to deposit the eggs, liquid albumen whipped up by the frog’s hind legs into a “dense light foam” -- a process that also might appear like milk boiling over.

VII.103.10: This final vs. is a mock-dānastuti.

The frogs’ release and fertilization of masses of eggs in the preceding vs. serves as a model for the fertility and increase of the ritualists that are major aims in Vedic rituals. This is surely the sense conveyed by the final vs. of the hymn, describing various types of frogs as “giving” goods and hundreds of cows to us, as well as lengthening both their and our lifetimes. They do so “at a pressing of thousands,” which can literally refer to the release of the frogs’ eggs. The prodigious fertility of frogs (no matter what happens subsequent to the thousands of eggs produced) is an encouragement to our own.

The publ. tr. renders *prá tiranta áyuh* as “they lengthened (their / our) life.” But the verb is of course *tirante*, a present indic., out of sandhi and the tr. should be corrected to “lengthen.”

#### VII.104 Multiple divinities, to destroy demons and ward off evil

See the publ. intro. for an intro. to this complex composite hymn and its parts. Complete translations are given by Norman Brown (“The Rigvedic Equivalent for Hell,” JAOS 61 [1941]: 76–80) and Herman Lommel (“Vasiṣṭha und Viśvāmitra,” Oriens 18-19 [1965/66]: 200–27), as well as Doniger.

VII.104.1: The verse contains a remarkable eight verbs of violence, with three in the last pāda alone -- all quite different.

VII.104.2: The syntactic function of *aghám* in pāda a is ambig. It could be an acc. sg. masc. parallel to *aghásamsam*, the object of *yayastu*. So Wh (tr. of AV VIII.4.2) “against the evil plotter, the evil ...” The pāda break following it might support this reading. However, it can also be a neut. sg., modifying *tápuḥ* and therefore the subject of *yayastu*, as in the publ. tr., flg. Ge, followed also by most subsequent tr. Ge’s cited parallel, VI.62.8, where *tápur aghám* belong together, seems decisive here. See also V.3.7, where *aghám* is used as a weapon against an *aghásamsa-*: *ádhîd aghám aghásamse dadhāta* “set evil upon him, the speaker of evil.”

The simile particle *iva* in the simile *carúr agnivāṁ iva* is postposed, but such late placement of simile markers is not uncommon in the RV.

The hapax *anavāyá-* is unclear. Old approvingly cites Bergaigne’s gloss ‘qui ne peut détourner par des supplications’, and this interpr. seems to inform most subsequent tr., including mine. But this interpr. should rest on the lexeme now understood to be *áva √yā* ‘appease’, and I do not see how the morphology would work. *√yā* has a zero-grade *ī*, but no *ay-* forms -- but (*an-*)*avāya-* can only be broken down into *ava+ay-a*, containing no elements of *√yā/ī*. AiG fails to treat this form. Re (EVP XVI.114) tries briefly to get it from *áva √ī*, but decides that *áva √ī* is “simpler.” This is certainly the case morphologically, but the semantics are harder: *áva* is not a particularly common preverb with *√ī* and when it appears, the lexeme generally means ‘go down’ (with ‘down’ the physical direction), occasionally more generally ‘go away’. Re cites V.49.5 *ávaitu ábhvam*, claiming that the verb there means ‘céder’, thus allowing our form to mean ‘qui ne cède pas’. But I do not see a ‘cede’ sense in that passage, just ‘go away’. This is, in fact, the interpr. found in RIVELEX (I.181), which glosses the stem *anavāyá-* as ‘nicht weggehend’ -- ‘not going away’ (metaphorically ‘nicht vergehend, verbleibend’, 181 n. 1) and analyses as a “Verbales Rektionskompositum/Dete<r>minativkompositum” *an-* + *avāya-* ‘weggehend’ (< *áva* + *√ay<sup>1</sup>-*). This must be the correct analysis, though I am sorry to abandon the richer semantics of a derivation from *áva √yā*. My publ. tr. ‘unrelenting’ can still probably stand, as a strengthened expression of ‘not going away’. (Note in passing that RIVELEX I.394 [s.v. *ay<sup>1</sup>-*] glosses verbal forms of *áva* + this root as ‘herabsteigen; Abbitte leisten — descend; apologize’; the second terms of the German and English glosses must result from confusion with *áva √yā / ī* and should be stricken.)

The rendering ‘worm-eater’ for *kimīdín-* here and in the following vs., as well as in X.87.24, is based on a suggestion of Schindler and Werba recorded in EWA s.v. and

also entertained by Scar (41). Note that in X.87.24 it is associated with *yātudhāna-* ‘sorcerer’, which stem figures prominently later in our hymn as well as in other parts of X.87.

VII.104.3: The first hemistich of this vs. contains 2 locative phrases, *vavré antár* (a) and *anārambhaṇé tāmāsi* (b). Essentially all tr. are agreed that the two phrases are parallel and refer to the same place -- and this is reasonable and probably would be the default reading. This interpr. in turn leads some (see esp. Norman Brown and Oberlies I.473) to take this as a description of Hell, or the RV equivalent thereof. My interpr. is syntactically bolder, and perhaps less well supported, but it arises from my discomfort with equating the enclosed space denoted by *vavrá-* (which is several times used of the Vala cave, e.g., IV.1.13, V.31.3) with “ungraspable darkness.” Because these locales seem incompatible, I take *vavré antár* as referring to the place where the evil-doers are hiding / taking refuge, and the action enjoined on Indra and Soma in b is to roust them from this hole and thrust them into a dark void with no handhold, the very opposite of an enclosure. A similar use of *vavré antár* as a place from which creatures are ejected is found in the account of the Vala myth in V.31.3 *prācodayat sudúghā vavré antár* “(Indra) impelled forth the good milkers (who were) within the cave.” The action there is of course benign, but the loc. phrase also refers to the original location of the cows, not their destination. I must confess, however, that vs. 17 in our hymn, with the phrase *vavrāṁ anantān* “holes without end” into which the villainess is to fall, does give me pause. (On the other hand, vs. 17 is in a portion that was probably a late addition to the hymn; see publ. intro.)

VII.104.4: The lexeme *úd √takṣ* (lit. ‘fashion up’) that opens the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich occurs only here in the RV, and at least acdg. to Monier Wms nowhere else in Skt.; it was clearly artificially generated to contrast with the verb *nijūrvathaḥ* (‘grind down’) at the end of the hemistich, to highlight the *úd* ‘up’ / *ní* ‘down’ contrast.

VII.104.5: Both *ásmahanman-* and *tápurvadha-* have bahuvrīhi accent, and though it’s tempting to render them as tatpuruṣas, the accent should be respected. See Old’s disc. and Ge’s wavering in the n. [he is definitely tempted], though the tr. in the text is bahuvrīhi-like.

*pársāna-* occurs only 3x in the RV (and nowhere else in Skt.), here and in VIII.7.34, VIII.45.41. It has no good etymology (see EWA s.v.). The sense of ‘deep place, chasm’ is thus entirely dependent on context. Such a meaning is compatible with all three passages; the strongest support for it is VIII.7.34 *giráyaś cin ní jihate pársānāso mányamānāḥ* “Even the peaks bend down, thinking themselves depths.” Parallel locatives in VIII.45.41 make it likely that it refers to a place, but not what sort of place it might be: *yád vīlāv indra yát sthire, yát pársāne párabhṛtam* “What is in a firm place, what in a solid place, Indra, what has been borne away (in)to a *pársāna* ....” In our passage the *ní* ‘down’ does suggest that the destination is a depth, but I also think that this interpr. has been somewhat uncritically embraced by those with preconceptions about the Vedic hell/underworld.

*nisvarám* ‘in silence, to silence’ contrasts with *svaryà-* ‘reverberant’, used of the weapon in 4c.

VII.104.6: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. closes the first section of the hymn, at least as I understand the structure.

The preverb *pári* appears with  $\sqrt{hi}$  ‘impel’ only here in the RV (and, acdg. to Mon Wms., all of Skt.). It seems to have been suggested by the *pári* in pāda a, construed with  $\sqrt{bhū}$ , in the meaning ‘encircle’. The idiom *pari*  $\sqrt{hi}$  ‘impel around’ does not make much sense, unless the image is of *hótrā-* compared to horses made to circle a race track. Re thinks rather that it reprises *pári bhūtu* in a: “l’offrande que (je ceins) autour (de vous en la) poussant” -- but this seems more trouble than it’s worth: he is forced to supply the crucial verb (je ceins: ‘gird, buckle on’) while relegating the actual verb stem *hinomi* to a participial adjunct (“en ... poussant”).

*hótrā-* is of course completely -- and not very interestingly -- ambiguous between ‘libation’ and ‘invocation’.

In the last pāda Indra and Soma are compared to *nṛpātī*. Some interpr. (Brown, Doniger) take this as a ref. to the Aśvins, and it is true that the other three occurrences of this dual refer to the Aśvins (VII.67.1, 71.4, X.106.4), as duals often do. However, I think it’s more interesting to assume that the poet is comparing these two great gods to *human* ‘lords of men = kings’, a sly switching of the hierarchy of roles. (Of course he just compared the gods to horses, so being compared to humans may be a step up.) I think Ge is correct in his interpr. of this simile: the gods should encourage our poetic formulations in the way that human kings do, by providing us with material goods. If *nṛpātī* = Aśvins, the simile doesn’t work.

VII.104.7: See publ. intro. for the init. *prāti* here echoed by that beginning 11c and forming a ring defining vss. 7–11 as a subsection. Since *prāti* ‘against’ is not otherwise found with  $\sqrt{smṛ}$  (or with  $\sqrt{śus}$ , see vs. 11), I think the preverb has been stationed at both ends of this section to focus attention on the targeted victim. See disc. in publ. intro.

The NP *rakṣāso bhaṅgurāvataḥ* is entirely ambiguous between gen./abl. sg. and acc. pl. It is almost universally taken as acc. pl. here, as parallel obj. to *druhāḥ* ‘deceits’, but I prefer gen. sg. for several reasons. For one thing “deceits (and) demons” is a somewhat off-balance coordination (though certainly not impossible in RVic discourse). More important, the second hemistich defines a single enemy who shows hostility “with his deceit” (*druhā*); it makes sense to identify this single foe as the singular demon of pāda b, who owns the deceits mentioned there. In favor of the acc. pl. interpr., in X.76.4 (cited by Ge, n. 7b; cf. also X.87.23) the same phrase must be acc. pl. obj. of a form of  $\sqrt{han}$ , as here: X.76.4a *āpa hata rakṣāso bhaṅgurāvataḥ*. On the other hand, in IX.71.1 (also cited by Ge) in the two-word sequence *druhó rakṣāsaḥ*, which we also find here, *druhāḥ* is an acc. pl. (as here), obj. of the verb *véti*, but *rakṣāsaḥ* belongs to a different syntagm and is abl. sg., construed with *pāti* “protects from the demon.” The point of citing all these parallel passages is to demonstrate that even identical word sequences can function differently syntactically in different contexts: the poets were not locked into a morphological template.

The poss. adj. *bhaṅgurā-vant-* (to *bhaṅgurá-* [AiG II.2.487], to  $\sqrt{bhañj}$  ‘break’; see EWA s.v. *BHAÑJ*) modifies *rakṣās-* 3x and *hantár-* once. I choose to render its possessive morphology by tr. ‘with his wreckage’ (lit. ‘having breakage, wreckage’), referring to the damage that a demon brings in his train -- in contrast to looser and more

colorful tr. like Brown's (reproduced almost verbatim by Doniger): "Slay those who employ demons, who hate us, who would break us to bits," where he manages to turn both the root noun *druh-* and the poss. adj. *bhaṅgurāvanta-* into verbs qualifying *rakṣásaḥ*. Others attenuate the meaning of *bhaṅgurāvanta-* to 'crooked', and then by easy metaphorical extension 'tricky, malicious' (see Gr's 'tückisch, trügerisch', also EWA's 'trügerisch, mit krummen Wegen'; Ge, Lommel, Lü 419 'hinterlistig'). This interpr. is based on the second of BR's glosses of the base adj. *bhaṅgura-* 1) zerbrechlich, vergänglich, 2) krumm, kraus, gerunzelt; see Gr's reproduction of the 1<sup>st</sup> word of each in his gloss of (*bhaṅgurá*). This base word is not found in Vedic -- and *bhaṅgurāvanta-* is found outside the RV only in passages based on RVic passages -- though *bhaṅgura* is fairly widespread in Classical Skt., where it generally means 'breakable', but occasionally 'curved' esp. in connection with eyebrows (cf. AiG III.195 in addition to BR s.v.). Since the 'curved, crooked' sense seems to be a late and specialized development, I see no reason to impose it on this RVic word, esp. since I see no clear line from 'break' to 'be crooked' except in such a specialized application.

VII.104.8: The lexeme *abhí √cakṣ* here seems almost a substitute for *abhí √car* 'conjure against', and note that the object ("me") is qualified by the part. *cárantam*. Re notes that this is the only RVic pejorative ex. of well-attested *abhí √cakṣ*, which generally means 'look upon, look towards, oversee' in neutral or positive sense. It is notable that in our passage the action of this *visual* idiom is accomplished by *verbal* means ("untruthful words" *ánṛtebhir vácobhiḥ*). Re remarks that it coincides "avec le passage de «voir» à «dire»" -- without specifying what he means.

VII.104.9: The hapax *pāka-śamsá-* is taken by some as a bahuvrīhi (implicitly, Gr 'arglos redend'; cf. Whitney [AV VIII.4.9] "him of simple intent," Brown "him of pure and single heart," Doniger "the man of pure heart" [with *śamsa-* = 'heart'?!]), but by accent it should be a determinative compd, contrasting explicitly with the bahuvrīhi *aghá-śamsa-* 'having evil speech' with 1<sup>st</sup> member accent, found in vss. 2 and 4. It is surely *my* guileless speech that is in question, since I was "acting with guileless mind" (*mā pākena mánasā cárantam*) in the immediately preceding vs (8a). As Re points out, *ví √hṛ* probably refers to distortion of ritual speech.

Since *pāka-śamsá-* is a thing, not a person, the parallel *bhadráṃ* in b should also likewise be a thing (so Ge, Whitney, Lommel, Brown), not, as the publ. tr. ("an auspicious one") has it, a person. I would thus take the form as a neut. acc. sg., not a masc. and slightly emend the publ. tr. to "something auspicious." This something is probably also connected with ritual performance.

VII.104.10: I take *ní ... hīyatām* as belonging to *√hā* 'change position'; in most passages *ní √hā* means 'bend down' (e.g., VIII.27.2), but here and in VI.52.1, also a curse, I take the passive as 'be bent double'. Most tr. are unsatisfyingly generic ('perish' and the like).

VII.104.11: See disc. in publ. intro. and ad vs. 7 on the use of *práti* to define this section of the hymn and call attention to the victim. As noted ad vs. 7, *práti √suṣ* is found only here.

VII.104.12: The prim. comp. *ṛjīyas-* here (=AVŚ VIII.4.12; also in AVŚ V.14.12), to *ṛjú-* ‘straight’, should of course have a full-grade root syllable *\*rājīyas-*, like the superlative *rājiṣṭha* (RV 7x, = Aves. *razišta-*). Re plausibly suggests that it has adopted the root syllable of the base adjective -- though why other primary comparatives and superlatives tolerate root ablaut is not addressed. It’s worth noting that if we were to restore the expected form, it would fix a problematic cadence (*yatarád \*rājīyaḥ* ← *ṛjīyaḥ*), by producing a heavy syllable four syllables from the end. As it is, the cadence is  $\sim \sim - \times$ , rather than expected  $- \sim - \times$ . I am reluctant to emend, however, since it is not clear how the erroneous zero-grade would have been introduced.

VII.104.13: Most interpr. (Ge, Oberlies [Rel. RV I.441], Re, Doniger, Wh [AV]), take *kṣatríyam* here as masc. personal ‘ruler’, modified by the part. *dhāráyantam*, while I take it as neut. ‘rule’ (as it sometimes is; cf. IV.20.3, V.69.1) and the obj. of the participle. The problem with the standard interpr. is that the part. has nothing to govern, and in fact a number of interpr. supply a second *kṣatríyam* (or *kṣatrám*; see Re) to occupy that role. Cf., e.g., Ge “... den Herrscher, der fälschlich (die Herrschaft) führt.” However, Lü (419), Lommel, and Brown interpr. as I do.

VII.104.14: The disjunctive “if” clauses that occupy the first hemistich are more complicated than they first appear. In the publ. tr. I took the first half, *yádi vāhám ánṛtadeva āsa*, as a contrary-to-fact expression “if I were ...” The general context speaks in favor of this interpr.: in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich the speaker asks indignantly why Agni is angry at him, so the implication is that the speaker has *not* done what would occasion such anger. This assumption presumably accounts for Ge’s tr. “als ob ...” (fld. by Lommel), which is strenuously disputed by Old. But the grammar makes problems: the indicative perfect *āsa* should not express contrary-to-fact modality, but a fact in the past (that may or may not have present relevance). For contrary-to-facts of this sort, the pres. opt. usually serves; cf. VII.44.23 *yád agne syām ahám tvám, tvám vā ghā syā ahám* “If I were you, Agni, or you were me ...” Note also that the AV version has an indicative present, *ásmi* (Wh “If I am one of false gods ...”). So we must reckon with the real possibility that “I” did have false gods, at least in the past, and I would slightly alter the tr. to “If I was (previously) a man with false gods ...”

The parallel verb in b is the perfect *apy ūhé*. In the publ. tr. I take this as presential -- and this is quite possible, since the other forms of this pf. are so used (see Kü 489–90) -- but Kü takes it as preterital, and, given my slight reinterpr. of pāda a, this might be best: “if I called upon ...” Kü accepts Insler’s 1996 positing of a root  $\sqrt{vāh}$  ‘respect’ separate both from  $\sqrt{vah}$  ‘convey’ and from  $\sqrt{uh / ūh}$  ‘laud’ (which latter has a full-gr. root med. pres. → them. pres. *óh(a)-*). I am not convinced of the need for this separate root and would simply group the pf. *ūhé* with the pres. of  $\sqrt{ūh}$ , despite Kü’s argument that unless the pf. is clearly distinguished from the pres. by meaning or function, they should not belong to the same root. For further on the lexeme see comm. ad X.52.3.

What exactly this pāda is conveying is not clear. Did the speaker call upon the true gods but in a false (that is, ritually faulty or with false intent or a false heart?) way? Such is the interpr. of most comm. -- e.g., Ge “nur zum Schein” -- but Lü (420) suggests equating *mógham* and *devān* (“oder wenn ich das Falsche als Götter ... auffasste ...”),

though he also gives the alternate “in falscher Weise.” And Re is more radical in his interpr. of the verb: “si j’ ai une compréhension (fausse des) dieux.” Given the appearance of the same adverb *mógham* in 15d, with the sense of false speech, the standard interpr. of the occurrence in this vs. seems the correct one, esp. as it contrasts nicely with the false or untrue gods in *pāda a*.

The question in d is where to construe *te*. Ge (fld. by Scar 469, but with ?) takes it as a quasi-agent: “Die Falschredenden sollen dem Tode *durch dich* verfallen.” Given that *te* is an enclitic and that the verb is not passive, this seems a stronger statement than the text would seem to support. I take *te* with the *drogha-* of the cmpd *drogha-vāc-* “deceitful to you,” but I admit that it might rather go with *nirṛthām* “your dissolution” (so Brown, Doniger “your destruction”; sim. Lü) -- that is, dissolution stemming from you. Not all tr. render the *te*: it is absent from Lommel’s rendering.

VII.104.15: I use the standard English rendering of *yātudhāna-* (with cognates well attested also in Old and Middle Iranian) as ‘sorcerer’ (German Zauberer), without any implications about what practices this figure might engage in. Since in the RV the word is found only in “popular” discourse, he presumably doesn’t work his ill through orthodox ritual means.

VII.104.17: The standard rendering of *khargālā-* is ‘owl’; see, inter alia, Gr, EWA, and the various tr. of this vs. But I find this unlikely for several reasons. The ‘owl’ is found as *úlūka-* in 22a, so it is already represented in this sequence of vss. But, though one could argue that there are numerous types of owls, which could have different designations, there are other arguments against this identification. For one thing, if the word is onomatopoeic, as EWA suggests, *kharg(a)* is not a particularly owl-ish sound. I tentatively suggest the nightjar. A number of species of nightjars are found in the proper geographical area. As for behavior and appearance, judging from information aggregated from the internet, nightjars are nocturnal (“goes forth by night” *prá ... jīgāti ... náktam*), feeding esp. at the twilights; the sexes are similar, and the birds are small and therefore could be considered typically female (hence the fem. *khargālā-*). They stay hidden on the ground by day (“concealing her own body by deceit” *āpa druhā tanvāṃ gūhamānā*): images on the internet show them visually almost indistinguishable from the ground and one YouTube video is entitled “Indian Nightjar -- Master of Camouflage”; acdg. to Wikipedia “During the day, the Indian nightjar lies still on the ground, concealed by its plumage; it is then difficult to detect, blending in with the soil.” Moreover, their cries are much easier to connect with *kharg(a)* than an owl’s, being described as “a continuous churring” (the internet provides numerous recordings of various types of nightjars). Note that etymologically the “-jar” of nightjar is derived from its churring song -- and *jar* and *kharg* are reasonably close phonetically. Moreover, their genus name is *Caprimulgus* “goat-sucker,” based on the old belief that the birds suck milk from goats; if a similar belief was also found in India, it might seem to be the habit of a sinister or at least uncanny creature -- accounting for its inclusion here among the sorcerers in animal form.

The ability of the soma-pressing stones to smash demons, referred to in d, is also found in the pressing stone hymn X.76.4 *āpa hata rakśāso bhaṅgurāvataḥ* “Smash away the demons with their wreckage,” which incidentally contains one of the three other occurrences of *bhaṅgurāvant-* in the RV, besides the one in vs. 7 above. The demon-

destroying ability of ritual implements, especially the noise made by their clashing, also reminds me of “Manu’s Cups,” whose clattering destroys Asuras. See the various Vedic prose versions of this in my *Sacrificed Wife*, pp. 21–26.

VII.104.18: I am not entirely certain why it is the Maruts who are tasked with the destruction of these creatures, though it is probably because the demons in question have taken the form of birds and therefore are moving in the midspace, which is the Maruts’ domain. Re also cites the well-known relationship between the Maruts and the *vís-* (see *vikṣú* here), and these animal demons may be associated with the “folk.”

The root noun *ríp-* is otherwise used of cheats and swindles (cf. also *ripú-* ‘cheating, swindler’), and I am reluctant to allow a sense ‘defilements’ only here -- though it is the almost universal solution of other tr. (Wh, Brown, Klein [DGRV II.149: “impurities”], Lommel “Unsauberes,” but cf. Ge’s “Unredlichkeit” [dishonesty], which has a moral nuance). Deception and cheating are also characteristic of the animal-demons in this section: see the *khargálā* who conceals her own body “with deceit” (*druhā*) in 17b, the flying dog-sorcerers that want to deceive Indra in 20b, and the oblation-stealers in 21b -- so the standard sense of *ríp-* fits the larger context. However, I do have to acknowledge that the root  $\sqrt{rip}$  does mean ‘smear’, and so ‘defilement’ is not out of the question.

It is difficult to avoid taking *devé* here as an adjective ‘divine’, modifying *adhvaré* ‘ceremony’, a temptation that all tr. (including me) have succumbed to and that is endorsed by Old.

VII.104.19: The “mountain” with which Indra smites the demons must be Indra’s *vájra-* ‘mace’, identified with a mountain elsewhere, as Re points out: in VII.22.6, as well as in the curious dvandva *indrā-parvatā* (3x, only in voc.: I.122.3, 132.6, III.53.1). See comm. ad locc.

VII.104.21: I have rendered the impf. *abhavat* in pāda a as an immediate past (‘has become’), though this is not ordinarily a usage of the impf. But this sense fits the context -- with the parallel pres. *śísīte* (20c) and *eti* (d) and the imminently threatening meances -- better than a simple past.

Note the echo of *parāśaró* in *paraśúr* in c.

As Re remarks, this is the only negative use of the desid. *vívāsa-* ( $\sqrt{van}$  ‘win’), usually ‘seek to win, covet, coax’. The negative sense must be attributable to the confrontational preverb *abhí*.

How to distribute and construe the two similes in cd is the question. I take both similes, *paraśúr yáthā vānam* “like an axe a tree” (c) and *pātreva* “like pots” (d), with the pres. part. *bhindán* (d) in two slightly different senses, ‘splitting’ and ‘breaking’ respectively (sim. Brown, Doniger). This pres. part. is anticipated by the preverb complex *abhíd* that opens the hemistich, looking like an aberrant form of  $\sqrt{bhid}$  -- a low-level ex. of poetic repair. Others (notably Ge, Wh, Lommel) take *bhindán* only with the 2<sup>nd</sup> simile, with the first controlled by *eti* in d (e.g., Ge “Śakra fährt auf die Dunkelmänner los wie die Axt in den Baum”). But axes are more likely to “split” than to “advance,” and I take *eti* only with the acc. pl. (*satáḥ* ...) *rakṣāsaḥ* as goal. It would also be possible to take *bhindán* + *eti* as a verb phrase with auxiliary, ‘keeps splitting’ or the like.

The function, and indeed the morphological identity, of *satáh* is unclear. With Gr, I take it as a pres. part. to *√as* in the acc. pl., modifying *rakṣásaḥ*. In my interpr. it means ‘real, really being X’, though that could extend to ‘really present’. Re by contrast suggests that it’s an adverb, meaning here ‘tout à fait’, also probably found as 1<sup>st</sup> cmpd. member in *sató-mahant-* (‘entirely great’ VIII.30.1) and *sató-vīra-* (‘entirely heroic’ VI.75.9). Although Re does not pronounce on the morphological analysis, AiG II.1.237 implies that it contains the adverbial ablatival suffix *-tas / -tás* and thus does not belong to the pres. part. of *√as*. See also EWA s.v. *satás*. Old (ad VII.32.24) allows several possibilities, incl. the adverb, which he considers assured in the cmpds. cited above. Although, with Old, etc., I think that an adverbial *satáh* is found in those cmpds., I do not find that interpr. *satáh* as adverbial here improves the sense, though I grant that the acc. pl. pres. part. doesn’t really either.

VII.104.22: The *śúśulūka-*, occurring beside *úlūka-*, must be some species of owl, and it is tempting to take it as a deformation of *\*śíśu-ulūka-* ‘baby owl, little owl’, hence presumably the diminutives found in many tr. (incl. mine).

Sāy. takes *kóka-* as the cakravāka bird (see Ge n. 22b), Gr, Wh, Lommel, Brown, Doniger as the cuckoo, presumably on onomatopoeic grounds. The reinterpret. ‘wolf’ is owing to Lü (see Re and EWA s.v.) and has MIA support. Despite the dominance of birds in pādas a and c, ‘dog’ and ‘wolf’ make a natural pair in b.

VII.104.23: Acdg. to Re, Mehendale interpr. the curious formation *yātumāvant-* in pāda a (also I.36.20, VII.1.5, VIII.60.20) not as a metrical variant of *yātumánt-* (so AiG II.2.775) but as a haplogy for *\*yātu-māyyāvant-*. I assume (I have not seen the art.) that his posited form contains *-māyā-* in one form or another and anticipates the next vs. where the female sorcerer is “exulting in her magic power” (*māyāyā śāśadānām*), though I don’t know why the form posited is not just *\*yātu-māyāvant-*, containing attested *māyāvant-* ‘possessing māyā’ (IV.16.9). If we accept this suggestion, or modified suggestion, the tr. could be slightly altered to “the demonic power of those possessing the magic power of sorcerers.”

The *kimīdín-* was singular in vs. 2, but a dual matched pair (*mīthunā yā kimīdīnā*) here. Why the dual is not entirely clear, but the next vs. specifies both male and female sorcerers as Indra’s target, and the *mīthunā-* here suggests a sexual pairing.

VII.104.24: *vīgrīva-* ‘with no / broken neck’ is ambiguous: is it descriptive of a pre-existing condition and thus a species, ethnic, or personal slur (in English “no-neck” is an insult, referring to a burly and stupid thug or goon)? or is it used proleptically here, to indicate what will happen to those who “shake to pieces” (*rdantu*). I’ve taken it as the former, but opinion is divided and either would work in the passage.

*mūra-deva-* is also contested. Acdg. to EWA (s.v. *mūla-*), flg. Wack., it is an *r-* form of *\*mūla-deva-* ‘whose gods are roots’ (Wurzelnbeter)(see also Brown). This excursion into exotic anthropology seems unlikely to me -- not the sort of divinity that Vedic people would posit even of their worst and most primitive enemies. Most tr. take it as ‘idol-worshiper’ (e.g., Ge Götzenbeter), without, however, indicating what the ‘idol’ rests on: ‘root’ → ‘root as representation of god’ → ‘idol’ (not a semantic chain that seems reasonable to me)? Or, more likely to me, based on *mūrā-* ‘stupid, foolish, dumb

(i.e., non-speaking)'. My own 'with feckless gods' is rests on this association, but is closer to the sense of the original adjective. The problem of course is the accent, since *mūrā-* 'dumb, foolish' has suffixal accent, and *mūla-* 'root' has initial-syllable accent like the first member of this compound. However, accent shift in cmpds isn't unknown; cf., in the opposite direction, the famous case of simplex *viśva-* but cmpded *viśvá-*. And the semantics works better with 'foolish, feckless'.