Commentary III

III.1 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The account(s) of Agni's birth (vss. 3–14) are very difficult to sort out and are riddled with paradoxes and unclear referents.

III.1.1: The JPB tr. of the 1st hemistich is quite different from any of the other standard tr., but seems to me more satisfactory than the others, although it is quite tricky. It assumes that Agni is the speaker of the hemistich – all others assume that it is the ritual officiant – but that Agni's speech includes an embedded quotation addressed to Agni (hence the voc. *agne*) by the officiant. It also takes *vákṣi* as the *-si* impv. to √*vah* (with Gr and Re, but contra Old, Ge, and WG), rather than the 2nd sg. root pres. to √*vaś*.

By this interpr., Agni says to the priest "you have made me your draught-horse [=oblation-conveyor]" (*... mā ... váhniṃ cakartha*). This is regularly Agni's role; see, e.g., nearby III.11.4 *agním ... váhniṃ devā̃ akṛṇvata*. The standard tr. require the priest to say the same thing to Agni, with *váhni-* then identifying the priest, but this is far less likely (though for *váhni-* referring to a priest, see III.20.1). The standard tr. also require *tavásam* either to modify the priest (Old, Re, WG) or a different substantive to be supplied (so Ge). But, as Ge points out (n. 1a), *tavás-* only otherwise modifies gods, and further, as Ge does not point out, it is used of Agni twice more in this hymn, including the immediately flg. vs. (2d, 13d). All of this reinforces JPB's interpr. of *sómasya mā tavásam ... váhnim* as referring to Agni, not a priest or poet.

The standard tr. also encounter the problem of the accented *vákṣi* (whichever morphological analysis they impose on it), generally explaining it as expressing unsignaled subordination. But by JPB's interpr., the parenthetical impv. clause consists only of *vákṣy agne*, and the accent falls out from its clause-init. position. Taking *vákṣi* as an impv. to √*vah* also connects it both etymologically and thematically with *váhni-*. For a similar connection see nearby III.5.1, 9–10 and comm. ad 9–10.

As for the 2nd hemistich, it constitutes the priest-poet's reply to Agni's speech in ab. All the standard tr. also take the priest-poet to be the speaker here, but then another interpr. difficulty arises: the participial phrase that begins c, *devā̃m̐ áchā dī́dyat*, most naturally modifies Agni (see almost identical III.15.5 with the middle part. and Agni as subj.), but the first ps. verbs *yuñjé* and *śamāyé* must have the poet as subj. Old struggles mightily with this, and Re simply reassigns the phrase to the poet. But then, once again, the accentuation of the verb makes trouble – why *yuñjé*? Ge proposes (this was also one of Old's thoughts) that the middle part of the hemistich – *yuñjé ádrim, śamāyé agne* – is parenthetical, and the opening participial phrase is to be construed with *tanvàṃ juṣasva* at the end of the next pāda. This works quite well and accounts for the accented *yuñjé*. And this solution actually reinforces JPB's embedded imperative clause in the first hemistich – both occupy the last four syllables of the odd pāda (and in the case of cd, the beginning of the even) and end with voc. *agne*. The structures are parallel.

Thus, by this interpr. the first vs. matches two individuals: Agni and the poet, each of whom appears both in 1st and 2nd ps.: Agni as 1st ps., addressing the poet in 2nd ps., in ab – but also quoting the poet as addressing Agni in the 2nd ps. The 2nd hemistich is simpler: the poet in 1st ps. addressing Agni in 2nd ps.

III.1.2: The next vs. introduces new sets of actors, now in the plural. The first pāda contains 1st pl. *cakṛma* (recalling *cakartha* in 1); this 1st pl. most likely has as subj. the ritual officiants as a group. Pādas b, c, and d all contain *3rd* plural verbs: b: *duvasyan*, c: *śaśāsuḥ*, d: *īṣuḥ*. The question is – who are the subjects of these verbs, and are they all the same? Because of the ritual content of b, human priests seem the most likely, and JPB's interpr. of the 1st pl. of pāda a as a quotation of these priests (hence his quotation marks) allows a way of reconciling the clashing grammatical persons and also fits the tricky interplay of quotations in vs. 1. Re, however, considers the subj. of *duvasyan* to be "les premiers sacrificateurs," continuing as subjects of the 2nd hemistich – hence distinct from the 1st pl. of pāda a; in a similar way WG (flg. KH Inj. 128) take it as a timeless general statement. And a further wrinkle is introduced by the fact that *duvasyan* reappears at the end of vs. 13, there clearly with the gods as subject. Of these choices I would favor the JPB solution, though it is far from certain.

Who we supply as subjects in cd depends in part on what we do with *diváḥ*. If, with the standard tr., we take it as an abl. loosely construed with the verb ("from heaven they directed ...") (or, with Ge and Th [Unters. 44], as a gen. with the unnamed subjects of *śaśāsuḥ* "they of heaven"), then the subjects cannot be the humans of pāda a (and maybe b); if, with Old (SBE), we take it as dependent on *kavīn̐ām*, no such inference has to be drawn. I do not have strong feelings about this, but given the prominent initial position of *diváḥ*, I think it is more likely connected to the verb or its subj. than to the gen. that ends the pāda, and that therefore the subjects are gods vel sim. The fact that the gods are prominent in the next two vss. about Agni's birth gives some support to this interpr. However, the interpr. is made more difficult because the construction of the verb is somewhat anomalous: √*śās* without preverb generally takes a personal obj.: "instruct someone," but here *vidáthā* is the available acc. If the verb can be construed like some occurrences of *ā́* √*śās* (see comm. ad IX.99.5) in the sense 'direct' (as is implicitly accepted by the standard tr. of our passage), the pāda may mean that the gods (or similarly heaven-based entities) direct how the goodies should be parceled out to the various human kavis. Pl. *vidátha-* reappears in 18b, though without clear thematic ties to our passage – although it's worth pointing out that it's immediately preceded by pf. *sasāda*, which is something of a phonological match to *śaśāsuḥ*, which precedes it here.

In short, the vs. is a bit of an interpretational mess, though the grammar isn't particularly challenging.

III.1.3: For reasons given ad vs. 5, *pūtádakṣa-* here should be tr. "of purified skill."

Despite its accent, the loc. *apási* in the phrase *apási svásṝṇām* (also 11d) must mean 'labor' and belong with the other anomalously accented forms of a neut. *apás-* 'labor'; see comm. ad I.64.1. Here it flirts with its sometime twin *áp-* 'water(s)', which appears in the loc. pl. in the parallel phrase in pāda c. Since, as disc. in the publ. intro., the "sisters" may be not only the fingers that operate the kindling apparatus, but also the rivers or waters that also give birth to Agni mythologically, a secondary sense of "in the water of the sisters" is not excluded here.

III.1.4: I would prefer to take *áśvāḥ* as part of the simile, despite its position: "They came to him newly born like mares to a new-born colt." That *áśvāḥ* is at some distance from

the beginning of this two-part simile is not a problem: there is often disjunction in multipart similes.

III.1.5: Note the etymological figure between the words opening the two hemistichs: *#śukrébhiḥ* (a) / *#śocíḥ* (c).

The phrase *krátum punānáḥ* "purifying his resolve" echoes the cmpd *pūtá-dakṣaḥ* in 3b, esp. since *krátu-* and *dákṣa-* are frequently found together (as in the next hymn III.2.3 *krátvā dákṣasya ...*). To register the repetition of the root √*pū*, the tr. in 3b of *pūtá-dakṣaḥ* as "of refined skill" should be changed to "of purified skill." (Or the participial phrase here should be changed to "refining his resolve.")

Rather than taking *ā́yur apā́m* as a nom. appositive to Agni (with JPB and, apparently, Old SBE), I would follow the other standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) in taking it as an acc. parallel to *śocíḥ* and another obj. to *vásānāḥ*: "clothing himself all around in flame (and) in the life of the waters."

III.1.6: The tr. of *ánadatīḥ* as "not speaking falsely" rests on an old article of mine, "A Vedic-Avestan Correspondence: RV *ánadant-*: Gathic *nadəṇt-*" (JAOS 101 [1981] 351–54), in which I argue that this vs. is structured by paired oppositional phrases: *ávasānā ánagnāḥ* "not clothed (yet) not naked"; *sánāḥ ... yuvatáyaḥ* "old (yet) young"; *sáyonīḥ ... saptá vā́nīḥ* "having one womb (yet constituting) seven voices." Only the first pair, *ánadatīr ádabdhāḥ*, at least as it is ordinarily interpreted, does not fit this pattern: "not eating (yet) undeceivable" cannot conceivably form an oppositional unity. I further point out that "not eating" is not an appropriate description of rivers, who in fact are sometimes explicitly characterized as eating. I therefore suggest a different segmentation of the negated participle, as *á-nadant-*, not *án-adant-*, and connected *nad* with Old Aves. *nadəṇt-* in Y. 33.4, which on contextual grounds I interpr. as 'speaking falsely'. This interpr. yields a more satisfactory oppositional pair "not speaking falsely (yet) undeceivable," which fits the pattern of the vs. much better.

The *divó yahvī́ḥ* "exuberant young women of heaven" are the rivers. See also vs. 9.

III.1.7: The hapax stem *saṃhát-* is problematic, in that it looks like an anomalously formed root noun cmpd to √*han*, with the empty *-t* characteristic of roots ending in short resonants, save for nasals. It is variously interpr.; besides the standard tr., see also Scar's detailed (but inconclusive) disc. (696). I find JPB's interpr. persuasive: that it is an oppositional partner to *stīrṇā́ḥ*, referring to Agni's flames, which both spread out and bunch together. It would also be possible to take *saṃhátaḥ* as a gen. with *asya*, contrasting the compacted Agni with his spread-out flames, with an alt. tr. "Of him, the compact mass, (the flames) of all colors are spread (out)."

The publ. tr. of d is a bit anticlimactic. I also think that the dual entities indicated there are, with the standard tr., Heaven and Earth, rather than (or rather than only) the two fire-churning sticks, as identified in the publ. tr. Both *mahī́* and *samīcī́* are regularly used of H+E – the latter, for ex., in III.30.11 – and the statement "the two mothers [/parents] of the wondrous one are the two great, conjoined (H+E)" would pick up and further specify 3b *diváḥ subándhur janúṣā pṛthivyā́ḥ* "who through his birth is the close kin of heaven and of earth."

III.1.8: This vs. and 10a have the only forms of the pf. (*babhar-* /) *babhr-* in the RV (versus *jabhar-* / *-bhr-*), both medial. See Kü 342. Note also the nominal *babhrí-* in 12a.

The ghee and honey of 7b recur here in c.

III.1.9: "The udder of his father" is a paradox of the type beloved by Vedic poets, esp. in the context of Agni's birth. As to what it refers to, various suggestions have been advanced – see the publ. intro. and the standard tr. I prefer to stay out of it.

The instr. phrases in c and d, *sákhibhiḥ śivébhiḥ ... yahvîbhiḥ*, are instrs. of separation, as Old suggests.

The *divó yahvîḥ* "exuberant young women of heaven" are the rivers. See also vs. 6.

III.1.9–10: The abrupt anacoluthon between 9c and d, with Agni represented by the acc. in c (*cárantam*) but as the nom. subj. of *babhūva* in d, is best accounted for by JPB's interpr., whereby Agni is also the acc. referent of *gárbham* in 10a, as well as the nom. subj. of *babhre*, which governs *gárbham*. This allows 9d to be a parenthetical remark, as it is represented in the publ. tr. Other interpr. leave 9c hanging.

III.1.10: However it is interpr., pāda a presents another paradox on the subject of Agni's birth. That Agni is the embryo in question is supported by his suckling in pāda b.

See comm. ad vs. 8 on the *babhr-* forms, also ad 12.

With Ge, Re, and WG, but contra JPB, I would take c as an independent clause, with *ní pāhi* confined to d. The term *sapátnī* 'cowives' is used nearby (III.6.4) clearly of Heaven and Earth. Note also that Agni was *sabándhuḥ* of H+E in 3b; the term is a reciprocal one, and so they now receive this same designation. The cosmic pair H+E are then contrasted with the *manuṣyè* pair in d – the two "belonging to / stemming from men," which here are likely the kindling sticks, as identified in the publ. tr. If pāda c refers to H+E, it might seem presumptuous to command someone (whoever is the subj. of *ní pāhi*) to protect these cosmic entities, whereas the kindling sticks belong to the human realm and are more vulnerable. I would substitute the tr. "The two close kin (of his) [=Heaven and Earth] are cowives for the blazing bull; protect the two belonging to men [= fire-churning sticks] for him." By identifying H+E both as kin of Agni by birth and his cowives, a new factor – incest – is introduced in this ever-shifting series of paradoxical relationships.

III.1.11: On JPB's colloquial rendering of *yaśásaḥ sáṃ hí pūrvîḥ* "for glory gets the girls," see comm. ad X.46.10, where I use his tr. for the same phrase there. A more literal rendering would be "for many (females) (assemble) for one who has glory." Re takes *yaśásaḥ* as nom. pl., modifying the fem. subj. "waters," but the repetition in X.46.10 makes this unlikely.

The re-marked impf. *aśayat* (for expected *t*-less medial **aśaya*, next to pres. *śáye*) appears directly before an initial *d-*: *aśayad dámūnāḥ*, as Re points out. But the ending *-d* is metrically guaranteed.

On *apási svásṝṇām* see comm. ad vs. 3.

III.1.12: On the unclear word *ákra-* see comm. ad I.189.7. If 'foal' is the correct interpr. of this word, note that it responds to 4c *śíśuṃ ná jātám abhí ārur áśvāḥ* "They came to him newly born like mares to a new-born colt."

The redupl. nominal *babhrí-* has the same *b-* redupl. as the isolated pf. forms *babhrāṇáḥ* (8a) and *babhre* (10a); unlike the pf., the nominal is found once elsewhere, however (VI.23.4), where it takes an acc. obj. I think it likely that it participates here in the dominant paradox of this part of the hymn, that Agni is both an embryo / new-born and the father / begetter of the same – as is (fairly) clearly expressed in the second hemistich. Since in IV.6.3 *ákra-* is described as "new-born" (*navajāḥ*), with Agni as referent, and since in our 4c we have a new-born colt (*śíśum ... jātám*, see immed. above), I think we can fill in this expression as "like a (new-born) foal, bearing (himself as embryo)," with reference esp. to 10a *gárbham ... babhre* "he carried (himself as) embryo."

The missing contrastive "father" in this hemistich is, I think, implied by pāda b, where the dat. *sūnáve* invites us to supply *pitéva* (as in I.1.9, 26.3; VIII.48.4; X.25.3; see also *mātā́ sūnáve* II.38.5). I would emend the tr. to "desirable for a son to see (like a father)."

As just indicated, the 2nd hemistich expresses, somewhat more clearly, Agni's role as both begetter and begotten, with the former role heavily emphasized in c (*jánitā́ yó jajāna*), though he begets the dawns there, not himself, and the latter in d (*apā́ṃ gárbhaḥ ... yahváḥ*). The vs. ends with *agníḥ*, tying all his roles together.

The fem. pl. *yahvī́ḥ* has figured prominently in this set of vss. (4a, 6b, 9d); this is the only time in the hymn that the corresponding masc. *yahváḥ* is used.

III.1.13: This vs., which is the penultimate one of the birth sequence, reassembles a number of the terms used earlier in the hymn: *apā́ṃ gárbhaṃ* picks up the same phrase in the nom. from 12d, as well as *gárbham* in 6d, 10a; *darśatám* = the same in 3c; *jajāna* = *jajā́na* 12c, as well as the numerous other forms of √*jan* ; *subhágā* recalls *subhágam* 4a; *vírūpam* resembles *viśvarūpāḥ* 7a; *devā́saḥ* also in 3d; *jātám* also 4c; *tavásam* also 1a, 2d; *duvasyan* also 2b. The effect is almost claustrophobic.

Given these repetitions, the tr. of *tavásam* should be corrected to 'mighty' to match vss. 1 and 2.

The subj. of *jajāna* is *vánā ... subhágā*. This is universally taken to be a nonce feminization of neut. *vána-* 'wood', on the tacit assumption that a female is the appropriate gender to give birth (though note the immediately preceding masc. *yó jajā́na* 12c) and/or that it is a stick of wood assimilated in gender to the *aráṇī-* 'kindling stick' (so Re explicitly) (cf. V.9.3 *jániṣṭāráṇī*). However, MLW suggested to me the appealing alternative that the phrase can be a neut. pl., construed with a singular verb – a fairly rare but nonetheless attested syntactic possibility in the RV, and particularly appropriate for a substance that even in Sanskrit shifts between a mass noun and a count noun. I would slightly change the tr. to "(the pieces of) wood, possessed of good fortune, gave birth ..."

In c I would change "even" to "also."

III.1.14: The standard tr. (save for Old SBE, but incl. JSK, DGRV I.185) separate the two hemistichs into two distinct sentences, having therefore to supply a verb in cd (mostly *sacanta* from b; see Ge n. 14). I prefer the publ. tr., in which the radiant beams

themselves produce radiant Agni as milk, a process that conforms to the closed loop of birth, whereby the son is the father who gives birth to himself, depicted earlier in this section. The beams are both produced by Agni and produce him in their turn.

The "unbounded container" (*apārá ūrvé*) echoes the "broad and unrestricted (place)" (*uraú ... anibādhé*) in which Agni grew (*vavardha*) in 11a; here the same verb is used (*vṛddhám*).

III.1.15–23: As Ge indicates (in his intro. and by inserting a line space after 14), the hymn takes a decisive turn in vs. 15, reintroducing the poet and focusing on the ritual and Agni's relation to the ritualists — though the theme of Agni's birth does not disappear (see vss. 20–21). The text also gets considerably easier to interpr., and there are more repeated pādas (and portions thereof) – see Bl. RR and passim below.

III.1.15: The ritualistic turn is signaled by the very first word, *ī́ḷe* (repeated at the beginning of b). Rather than introducing the vs. with 'and', from the *ca* in pāda a, as the standard tr. do, better to take the *ca* as conjoining the two occurrences of *ī́ḷe* in an X *ca* Y constr., as JPB does (see JSK DGRV I.185–86).

On the likely reading **mimihi* for transmitted *mimīhi* see Gunkel 2018 (Fs. Vine).

On the repetition of ... *no dámyebhir ánīkaiḥ* in III.54.1, see comm. ad loc.

III.1.17–18: The even pādas of these two vss. match each other almost too exactly: 17d and 18b end with *sā́dhan*, and 17b and 18d are almost identical: x x *víśvāni kā́v*^{i}*yani vidvā́n*. In addition, *vy àdyaut* returns from 8a. It almost seems that the poet exhausted his ingenuity in the birth section of the hymn and hasn't much energy left for the ritualistic finale.

III.1.19: The post-caesura portion of pāda a, *sakh*^{i}*yébhiḥ śivébhiḥ*, is a variant on 9c *sákhibhiḥ śivébhiḥ*, which fills the same slot (though after an opening of 5, not 4), with the abstract *sakh*^{i}*yá-* substituted for the personal *sákhi-*. The whole first hemistich is identical to III.31.18cd.

Note polarized #*asmé ... naḥ*# in the 2nd hemistich.

III.1.20: All the standard tr. (but JPB's) render *jánmañ-janman* as "in every generation, in generation after generation." But though this is a possible sense of *jánman-*, in a hymn so fixated on Agni's births and on the root √*jan*, and in a vs. containing the parallel alternative stem *jániman-* 'birth', a minor morphological variant of *jánman-*, it seems tone-deaf to isolate this āmreḍita semantically. After proclaiming Agni's older and current births in ab, the poet reprises the pl. *jánimā* with the āmreḍita, which is equivalent to a serial plural. (Note that an āmreḍita to the first stem would be metrically unwieldy: **jánimañ-janiman*, with 6 syllables that would not fit in the opening and whose metrical shape would not work in the cadence.) The point is that every time the ritual fire is kindled ("born"), it is then installed on the ritual ground. I would slightly alter the tr. to reflect that point more clearly: "at his every birth Jātavedas has been installed."

Most of pāda c, ... *vṛ́ṣṇe sávanā kṛtémā́*, is also found in III.30.2, an Indra hymn. I therefore think that the referent of *vṛ́ṣṇe* here is also Indra (with Ge, n. 20c; contra Re),

esp. since soma-pressings are not offered to Agni. I would slightly alter the tr. to "these great soma-pressings have been made for the bull [=Indra]."

III.1.21: Pāda a repeats 20d; see comm. above.

The second hemistich is found verbatim in a number of places, incl. III.59.4. See Bl. ad loc. To match the other occurrences of the tr. should be altered to "in the favor of him ... and also in his propitious benevolence."

III.1.22: Pāda d is also found in X.80.7.

III.1.23: This vs. is something of a Viśvāmitra refrain vs. for (most of the) Triṣṭubh Agni hymns in III (III.5.11, etc. – see Bl. for full listing).

Gr, fld. by Re, takes *śaśvattamám* as modifying *saním*. However, III.62.2 *śaśvattamám ávase johavīti* (see also X.70.3) supports construing it with *hávamānāya*, with JPB (Ge, WG).

III.2 Agni Vaiśvānara [SJ on JPB]

III.2.1: Each of the hemistichs in this vs. contains a semantically challenging simile among other problems. In ab, assuming that *dhiṣáṇā-* here refers to the ritual ground as Holy Place (see comm. ad I.160.1), that we "give birth" to it (*janāmasi*) and that it's compared to ghee are both surprising – and no doubt responsible for the various alternative translations of *dhiṣáṇām* in this vs.: Ge "Werk" (which he then specifies as Loblied), Re "une offrande-poétique," WG "ein Fest." But the usual sense can be maintained here: we generate / give birth to the ritual ground by demarcating it at each ritual. As is well known, Vedic ritual does not have permanent or stable places of worship, but requires a new one to be measured out and sanctified for each performance. The *dvitā́* 'once more, yet again' opening c may reinforce this begetting anew of the ritual ground, in addition to its application to the 2nd hemistich.

As for the ghee comparison, *ghṛtáṃ ná pūtám* is a fixed simile (also IV.10.6, V.86.6, VIII.12.4) to which very unghee-like entities are compared (the body of Agni, IV.10.6; the praise hymn, VIII.12.4). The point of comparison in all cases is "purified," not "ghee": here we purify [/sanctify] the ritual ground in the course of creating it, just as we do the melted-butter oblation. I would therefore slightly alter the tr. to "For Vaiśvānara strong through truth, for Agni, we give birth to the Holy Place [=ritual ground], which is purified like ghee."

The second hemistich presents a number of problems – among them, what, if anything, is the *ca* conjoining, and how should we construe *mánuṣaḥ ... vāghátaḥ*? how can one "bring together" a chariot with an axe? how is the axe/chariot simile related to the Hotar?

I will tackle the last two questions together. Although both parts – the simile and the frame – translate easily into the foreign languages in question (German, French, English), this ease is deceptive: neither part really makes sense, though the lack of sense has elicited no real comment. First of all, the simile: although axes are of course part of the equipment of a carpenter who would construct a chariot, the axe is not used to "put together" (*sám √ṛ*) the chariot, but to hew the wood that will then be used for this

construction. Rather than the preverb *sám*, we might expect its opposite, *ví*, which is in fact found with the only other occurrence of *kúliśa-* in the RV, I.32.5 *skándhāṃsīva kúliśenā ví**v**ṛkṇā* "like branches hewn **apart** by an axe." At best we can see the simile here as telescoping two distinct steps in the making of a chariot: the obtaining and shaping of the separate pieces of wood (which involves a *kúliśa-*) and their putting together, which in the course of things would not. Interpreting the simile takes some mental effort on the part of the audience.

Then, what does it mean to "put together / assemble" the Hotar? A priest should not be subject to assembly from separate parts like a chariot. The expression here, *hótāram ... dhiyā́ ... sám ṛṇvati*, plays off a more easily interpretable one in the same Agni cycle, III.11.2 *agnír dhiyā́ sám ṛṇvati* "Agni through insight assembles (the sacrifice)," though it has to be admitted that the obj. is supplied there. And, as with the simile just disc., I think the poet is challenging us both to recognize that the expression here doesn't make sense and to dig deeper to find a way to make it do so. As with the simile, this is possible. The referent of *hótāram* is of course Agni, and as the ritual fire, he/it is indeed put together / assembled out of separate pieces of (fire)wood, just as the chariot is. So the simile and the frame have a close conceptual connection, but both have to be interrogated in order to find it.

The whole thing is put even further off balance by the case disharmony between simile and frame: *kúliśa-* should really be in the instr., parallel to *dhiyā́*; it is not the axe that does the actual construction, but a carpenter using an axe.

This leaves us with the problematic *ca* in c. The standard tr. (incl. JPB) assume that *mánuṣaḥ* is a gen. sg., dependent on *hótāram* and that *mánuṣaś ca* implicitly conjoins the current Hotar [=ritual fire] with the Hotar/ritual fire of the primal sacrifice; this is most explicit in the publ. tr. "the chanters (bring together) with their insight the Hotar [=Agni], (who was) also (the Hotar) of Manu." This interpr. is supported by the *dvitā́*, which (as was just noted) indicates that the current ritual action is a repetition of one or more in the past. By this interpr. the phrase is quite condensed, from something like **hótāram asmā́kaṃ* (*/no*) *mánuṣaś ca* (or **hótāraṃ nū́tanam mánuṣaś ca*). Also by this interpr. *vāghátaḥ* is a nom. pl. and the subj. of *sám ṛṇvati*; this verb is sg. because it agrees with the simile subj. *kúliśaḥ*, which immed. precedes it. This is likely the correct, or at least the most probable, interpr. However, there are several alternatives, given in order of decreasing likelihood. As Old points out, *mánuṣaḥ* could also be nom. pl. (as in, e.g., I.36.7 and II.2.5); in this case it could be conjoined with *vāghátaḥ* in an X *ca* Y construction: "the sons of Manu and the chanters assemble the Hotar ..." Moreover, *vāghátaḥ* could be gen. sg. and conjoined with *mánuṣaḥ*, again in an X *ca* Y construction ("the Hotar of Manu and of the chanter"). There is also the fact that *mánuṣaś ca* occurs twice elsewhere in III, once in the next hymn III.3.6 *devébhir mánuṣaś ca jantúbhiḥ*, once in III.60.6 *vratā́ devā́nām mánuṣaś ca dhármabhiḥ*. In both instances it is a subpart of a (properly) conjoined phrase involving gods as the other member of the pair. It is possible that our *ca* was improperly borrowed from these phrases (esp. III.3.6, a hymn that has many ties to this one) and has no function here, or that we should supply "gods," in a phrase "the Hotar (of gods) and of Manu." (Note also that in that same hymn [III.3.4b] *ca* precedes a form of *vāghát-* in this same metrical position.) Or, if we make *mánuṣaḥ* a gen. dependent on nom. pl. *vāghátaḥ* and supply nom. 'gods', "(the gods) and the

chanters of Manu assemble" (see the involvement of the gods in 3b). But I consider these interpr. less likely.

III.2.2–4: These vss. show some lexical chaining: 2a *rocayat* / 3c *rurucānám* // 3d *vā́jaṃ saniṣyán* / 4ab *saniṣyántaḥ ... vā́jam*.

III.2.2: With Ge and Re, JPB takes *mātróḥ* as the agent of *ī́ḍyaḥ* "to be invoked by his two parents." I would prefer not to have a gen.-loc. agent (otherwise the agent is instr. with this stem), and I also wonder about the action: would Heaven and Earth "invoke" Agni? Better, with Old (SBE) and WG, to construe this du. as a gen. with *putráḥ*: "the son of the two mothers [=kindling sticks and/or H+E], or perhaps as a loc.: "to be praised in the two parents [=H+E]." The loc. of place/occasion is often used with *ī́ḍya-*, though usually with reference to a ritual. So I would emend the tr. to "He, the son of the two mothers, became one to be invoked" or "He, the son, became the one to be invoked in the two mothers [=H+E]." The gdv. *ī́ḍya-* is frequently used without agent.

Here, in vs. 7, and in III.11.2, JPB tr. *cánohita-* as 'placed for delight', with a full lexical sense of *-hita-* (sim. but more elaborately Re "mis (en place) pour la satisfaction (des hommes)"). But it is surely simply the passivization (or pseudo-passivization; see below) of the phrasal verb *cánas √dhā* 'take delight, enjoy'. All 12 of the occurrences of *cánas-* in the RV form a VP with a finite form of *√dhā*. In 10 of these occurrences *cánas* immed. precedes *√dhā* and takes an acc.; in the other two *cánas* follows *√dhā* and takes a loc. For the predominant construction, see, e.g., VIII.19.11 *stómaṃ cáno dadhīta* "he [=Agni] should take delight in the praise song." Given this construction type, we should expect the entity modified by the past participle cmpd *cánohita-* to be the source of delight (praise song vel sim.)(so, it seems, Ge: "beliebt"). However, in its five occurrences (the three in III and two in IX.75.1, 4), it seems rather to target the one who takes delight, i.e., the subject of the finite phrasal verb: Agni in III, Soma in IX. See esp. IX.75.4 *matíbhiś cánohitaḥ* "delighted by our thoughts." For Agni as subj. of *cánas √dhā*, see VIII.19.11 just quoted, also VI.4.2, 10.6. Although I am puzzled by how the passivization works (or doesn't), I would therefore emend the tr. to "delighted." (So, more or less, WG "(uns) geneigt gemacht").

III.2.3: Different tr. distribute the nominals in pāda a differently from the publ. tr., with *dákṣasya* dependent on *krátvā*. Although *krátu-* and *dákṣa-* are standard formulaic partners, usually appearing in the same case (e.g., IV.37.2 *krátve dákṣāya*), and although the sequence *krátvā dákṣasya* is found also in V.10.2 and IX.16.2, it is not nec. for *dákṣasya* to depend on *krátvā*. See comm. ad IX.16.2, where I keep them separate.

In order to keep 3b *cíttibhiḥ* separate from 1d *dhiyā́* in translation, "insights" should here be changed to "thoughts," as in III.3.3.

The fut. stem *saniṣyán-* has a strongly desiderative cast, as is recognized by most tr. and Gr.

III.2.4: I would alter the tr. of *áhrayam* from 'audacious' to 'immoderate'; the adj. modifies *rā́dhas-* 'bounty, largesse' 5x, also once *dhána-* 'stakes', and must express not a personal quality of daring or immodesty, but rather an excessive amount – a sense more appropriate for a prize than audacity. See comm. ad X.93.9.

On *uśíjam kavíkratum* see comm. ad III.3.7. I would here slightly change the tr. to "with a poet's purpose."

As noted in the publ. intro., *rā́jantam* can mean both 'ruling' and 'shining' and both should be registered here: I'd change to "who rules/shines with his heavenly flame."

III.2.5: This vs. reprises some of the words that participated in the lexical chaining of vss. 2–4 (see above): *vā́ja-* (b) and *surúcam*.

Note the phonetic fig. *(yatá)srucah surúcam*.

The cmpd. *sā́dhad-iṣṭi-* is problematic. The dominant interpr. is what is found in Gr: a verbal governing cmpd with the 2nd member *íṣṭi-* 'sacrifice' (√*yaj*), hence 'making the sacrifice succeed' – identical in sense to *yajña-sā́dh(ana)-*. This analysis is fld. by Old (SBE) – though decisively rejected by him in the Noten – Ge, JPB, and Lowe (Part. 273). One of the issues is the identity of the 2nd member: Old (Noten) suggests it is instead the much better attested *iṣṭí-* 'desire, quest', and Re's interpr. chooses this alternative, while keeping the same cmpd structure ("menant-droit-au-but la quête ..."; sim. Bl RR p. 182). But Old raises a more serious issue than the root affiliation of the 2nd member, namely the accent. Governing cmpds with this shape accent the *-át-*, no matter where the accent would have fallen in the presumably associated verb stem: type *bharád-vāja-* v. *bhárati*, but this one is accented on the root syllable (a problem also disc. by Lowe). Old, flg. Wh., suggests that it is instead a possessive cmpd. (of a more standard bahuvr. type) – though cannily neither of them translates it. The WG rendering, "dessen Labung ... erfolgreich wird," rests on this analysis (see their n.). (Unfortunately AiG doesn't treat it.) Although I find the accent disturbing, with Lowe (173) I am inclined to accept it as "an anomalous alternative strategy" and keep the transitive governing sense found in the publ. tr. (and generally elsewhere). However, I would recognize an alt. interpr., "whose sacrifice succeeds (i.e., having a successful sacrifice) for the (ritual) workers."

III.2.6: Chaining of *vṛktábarhiṣaḥ* in b with the same in 5b.

The standard tr. (incl. Old SBE), save for JPB and WG, take the whole of the vs., up to *drávi̯iṇam* in d, as a single clause, with *úpāsate* as the main verb. However, Old in the Noten raises the question whether the verb should be accented (**upā́sate*, i.e., *upa-ā́sate*) because of the *hí* in pāda a. He decides not, on the dubious grounds that by the time we get to the verb, the sentence has gone off the rails ("aus dem ursprünglichen Geleise geraten ist"). Better with JPB (and WG) to supply another verb with *kṣáyam pári* in ab and take *úpāsate* (i.e., *úpa*+*āsate*) as a main clause verb. On the basis of the expression in the very next hymn, III.3.2 *kṣáyam ... pári bhūṣati*, I would suggest supplying **bhūṣanti* and tr. "the men ... (attend) upon your dwelling" (rather than the publ. tr. "are all around your dwelling" or WG's "(sitzen)").

I would substitute the more ritually focused "they reverently approach him" for "they are drawing near," for the semi-technical lexeme *úpa √ās*.

Rather than "company" for *dúvaḥ*, I would substitute "service." On *dúvas-* see comm. ad IX.65.3, where I suggest that *dúvas-* is offered by men to gods. Here it seems that the men both wish to do service to Agni and to receive his friendship. See already Old's tr. in SBE: "seeking (how to do) honour (to thee) and (desiring) thy friendship." I would therefore emend pāda c to "a," to express the two sides of the exchange. The use of *dúvas-* in this vs. should be harmonized with the denom. *duvasyá-* in 8b.

III.2.7: There are two ways to interpr. pāda a, both somewhat problematic. Ge and JPB take "the great sun" (*svàr mahát*) as a ref. to Agni and the nom. subj. of *ā́ pr̥ṇat*. In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the standard formula is only "fill the two world-halves" (see the passages cited by Ge in n. 7a), that Agni is often identified with the sun, and that it is hard to see what "fill the great sun (with light)" would mean, given that the sun is already full of light. Against this interpr. is the repetition of the preverb *ā́*, which strongly invites an interpr. with *svàr* as a parallel obj. to *ródasī*. So Old (SBE), Re, and WG. I find this interpr. not only possible, but, given the rhetorical structure, preferable, and suggest the alt. "He filled the two world-halves, filled the great sun (with light)." What this somewhat puzzling expression might mean is that, in keeping with the Vedic view of the ritual as generative of natural phenomena, the kindling of the ritual fire provides the rising sun with light.

As Ge (n. 7c) points out, pāda c seems to refer to the Paryagnikaraṇa, the carrying of a firebrand around an object on the ritual ground.

Note that the caesura falls within the cmpd. *vā́ja-/-sātaye*.

On *cánohita-* see comm. ad vs. 2 above; the tr. should be emended to "delighted."

III.2.8: In 16 of its 17 occurrences *havyá-dāti-* conforms to its grammatical expectations, as an abstract noun meaning 'the giving of oblations', but here it seems to be agentive: 'giving the oblations' by all standard renderings. Better to consider it an unsignaled bahuvrīhi (since the accent was already on the 1st member) meaning 'having/controlling the giving of oblations'. On the compd see Scar 219.

"Who makes the rite good" for *svadhvará-* might impose somewhat too much structure; better perhaps "of good ceremony."

In b *duvasyáta* harks back to *dúvaḥ* in 6c. I would alter the tr. here to "do friendly service to."

I would alter the tr. of the final pāda in two ways: "has become" ➔ "became," since the impf. doesn't ordinarily have this sense; "placed in front of the gods" ➔ "for the gods." The publ. tr. makes it sound as if the gods are located behind Agni physically, whereas it must mean that Agni became the ritual fire that is placed in front / to the east, which serves as the fire that receives the offerings made to the gods (what is later [AV+] called the Āhavanīya).

III.2.9: The priestly term *uśíj-* returns from 4c, but here not of Agni but in the pl. of immortal priests of some sort.

Since *mártye* is loc. (the only loc. sg. to this well-attested stem), not dat., I'd tr. "in the mortal (realm)," not "for the mortal"; this tr. fits better with the locational expression in the next pāda.

The two non-earthly kindling sticks are supposed to be the sun and lightning; see Old's n. in SBE, etc.

I would also tr. *ádadhuḥ* as "placed," not "have placed." As recognized in all the standard tr., the accent on this verb marks the clause as implicitly subordinated to the next.

III.2.10: Again I'd render the impf. *akr̥ṇvan* as "perfected," not "have perfected."

Although the phrase *viśā́m kavíṃ viśpátim* is found also in V.4.3, VI.1.8, I think the constituency is *viśā́m ... viśpátim* in the archaic figure type "clanlord of clans," with *viśā́m* fronted to initial position around *kavím* (so WG "den Seher, den Lagerherrn der Lagerstätten"); see III.13.5, VII.7.4, IX.108.10, X.92.1; also *viśā́m ... páti-* I.127.8, VI.15.1, VIII.95.3. I would therefore tr. "clanlord of clans, poet ..."

Given the travel to distant parts in pāda c, I would tr. *eṣú bhúvaneṣu* "in these worlds" (with Old SBE), not "in these creatures" (with the other tr.) – although 11a might be a counterindication.

III.2.11: The med. 3rd sg. *jinvate* is the only middle form to this well-attested stem (on *jinvé* see comm. ad IV.21.8). Act. forms of *jínva-* are transitive ('quicken X'); JPB's "enlivens himself" correctly reflects the medial form, but sounds awk. to me. I'd prefer intrans. 'quickens'; the modern English use of this verb for the first perceptible movements of a fetus in the uterus matches the usage here almost uncannily. For this reason I'd also delete "his" with "bellies."

The pf. part. *prajajñivā́n* is taken by Old (SBE), Ge, Re, Lub as belonging to *prá* √*jan* 'propagate'. However, Gr, WG, and JPB assign it to *prá* √*jñā*, an analysis strenuously argued for by Kü (203). He rightly points out that all weak forms of the perfects of √*jan* and √*jñā* fall together, *except for* the strong stem of the active part., where properly speaking √*jan* should have **jajāvā́ṃs-* or **jajanvā́ṃs-*. Our form, again properly speaking, can therefore only belong to √*jñā*. His point is well taken but overly rigid. The primary reading of this form may well be to √*jñā*, but it's hard to deny the possibility that in this birth context √*jan* may also be meant, a conflation encouraged by the homophony of all other weak forms of their perfects. That both roots can occur with *prá* further ties them together. I would allow both senses here.

Putting this all together, I'd tr. the first hemistich "He quickens in the bright bellies, forethoughtful / proliferating further, the bull roaring like a lion.

III.2.12: Chaining of *vaiśvānaráḥ*, 11c, 12a.

I would tr. the aor. *ā́ruhat* in conjunction with the adv. *pratnáthā* as "as of old he has mounted ..."

The post-caesura phrase *bhándamānaḥ sumánmabhiḥ* is a phonological figure of sorts.

Verbal forms of the root √*bhand* are almost confined to this little clutch of hymns at the beg. of III: III.2.12, 3.4, 4.6; the only form outside this group is dual part. *bhándamāne* in an Āprī hymn I.142.7 (see comm. there), clearly based on III.4.6, also an Āprī hymn. Nominal forms are more widely distributed.

JPB takes *sumánmabhiḥ* as a noun "with our good thoughts," contra Gr and all the standard tr. (also Gotō, 1st cl., 223), who take it as a bahuvrīhi "possessing good thoughts." This latter interpr. must be correct: it is found as a nom. sg. masculine in VII.68.9, and *mánman-* is of course neut. See comm. ad VIII.101.9. The tr. should be changed to "being delighted by those possessing good thoughts."

It would be nice to capture the etymological figure *janáyan jantáve*, but I can't think of a non-awk. way. In any case we should interpr. *jantú-* here in light of *mánuṣaḥ ... jantúbhiḥ* "the kin(smen) of Manu" in the next hymn (III.3.6), represented here by JPB's "for the (human) race."

III.2.13: Much fuss has been made over *diví kṣáyam*. I think some version of Old's explan. in SBE (which he more or less disavows in the Noten), that it is actually to be read **divi-kṣayám* 'dwelling in heaven' (a form found in V.46.5) or of Ge's (n. 13b) "unfertiges" bahuvrīhi ('having a dwelling in heaven') must be correct. The introduction of a word boundary might have been encouraged by 6a ... *hí kṣáyam*. See also *kṣáyam bṛhántam* in the next hymn (III.3.2), which must refer to the same heavenly place as the phrase here. Although I admire JPB's principled interpr. that takes the text as transmitted and equates Agni with "the dwelling in heaven," the text alteration required to get a more satisfactory sense is slight enough that I'm willing to make it.

The verb in that rel. cl., *ā́ ... dadhé*, is variously rendered: e.g., JPB "placed," Ge "an sich nahm," WG "verschafft hat," all of which are possible. But I wonder if some version of the later ritual idiom *ā́ √dhā* "establish (the ritual) fire" is meant here: Mātariśvan not only stole fire from heaven but brought it to earth for the purpose of ritual. I would tr. this pāda as "... the one dwelling in heaven whom M. established here."

III.2.14: The opening of the vs., *śúciṃ ná yā́man* seems like a paraphrase of 13c *citráyāmam*, though of course it is not, morphologically or syntactically.

īmahe in d repeats from 13c.

Ge (n. 14d) suggests that *bṛhát* stands for (/is truncated from) **bṛhátā* characterizing *námasā*, but there's no reason why it can't be an adverb, as most take it.

III.2.15: This final vs. reunites lexical items from various parts of the hymn: *mandrá-* (4a), *hótar-* (1c, 6b), *śúci-* (14a), *ukthyà-* (13a), *citrá-* (11b, 13c), *īmahe* (13c, 14d). Other words are variants of ones found earlier: *dámūnas-* recalls *dámya-* (8b), *viśvácarṣaṇi-* recalls *vícarṣaṇi-* (8c), *rátha- rathī́-* (8c), *darśatá- -dṛ́ś-* (14b), *mánurhita-* the phrase *ā́ ... dadhe mātaríśvā* (13b). Perhaps most strikingly, *ádvayāvinam* is etymologically akin to *dvitā́* (1c), forming a sketchy ring.

III.3 Agni Vaiśvānara [SJ on JPB]

This hymn has many resonances with the immediately preceding one, III.2. Re in fact remarks "Suite de préc." Some of the echoes will be noted below.

III.3.1: Echoes of III.2: the opening *vaiśvānarā́ya pṛthupā́jase* is found in the nom. in III.2.11, which vs. also contains *rátnā*; *duvasyá-* is found also in III.2.8, with the noun *dúvas-* in III.2.6.

The form *vípaḥ* is multiply ambig.: it can be nom. or acc. pl. or perhaps gen. (/abl.) sg.; though we might expect ending accent esp. in the gen. sg. and perhaps the acc. pl., the accentuation of root nouns of unstable function can't be entirely counted upon. Alone of the standard tr. (but in agreement with Sāy. [see Ge's n. 1ab] and Gr), JPB takes it as nom. pl. and the subj. of *vidhanta*. For Old [SBE], Ge, and Re it is an acc. pl., either parallel to *rátnā* or (acdg. to Ge) forming an "unfertiges" compound with it. WG take it as a gen. sg. dependent on *rátnā* ("die Schätze der begeisterten (Rede)"). I would favor either the acc. pl. or the gen. sg. (though I am somewhat concerned about the accent of the gen. sg.) and tr. "they [=poets/priests] dedicate inspired words (and/as) treasures (//

dedicate treasures of inspiration).” Note that forms of this word return in vss. 3 (*víprāsaḥ*), 4 (*vipaścítām*), and 7 (*vipā́m*).

I think Ge is quite correct (n. 1b; see passages cited there) that the point here is that ritual poetry provides the underlying surface (the “Teppich” – carpet) for those moving through the ritual.

On *dúvas-* / *duvasyá-* see comm. ad IX.65.3 and their appearances in the preceding hymn, III.2.6, 8. I would here alter the tr. to “Agni does friendly service to the gods.”

III.3.2: For *kṣáyam ... pári bhūṣati* see III.2.6.

III.3.3: *ketú-* also in III.2.14.

The “tasks and songs” (*ápāṃsi ... gíraḥ*) refer to the physical and verbal portions of the ritual.

The mid. part. *yájamāna-* seems to be used in its developed technical sense of ‘sacrificer’.

Here and in vs. 10 for *ā́ cake* I’d prefer “delights in” to “desires (to find).” JPB so tr. *cakānáḥ* in nearby III.5.2. This necessitate changing “in him” to “by him” (in the sense of bei / chez).

III.3.4: An alliterative first hemistich: *... vipāścítāṃ, vimā́nam ... vayúnam ... vāghátām*.

In c the two worlds (*ródasī*) return from 2a.

√*bhand* + INSTR. is also found in the preceding hymn, III.2.12, but the instr. there refers to persons, and so the two passages are not fully parallel. Here the interpr. is complicated by the semantic multiplicity of *dhā́man-* and the fact that it is not specified whose *dhā́man-* are at issue. It is tempting to assume that it picks up the *bhū́rivarpasā* of the preceding pāda and refers to the *dhā́man-* of H+E – in this case I would tr. “he is delighted by their domains (i.e., the ones he just entered)” The standard tr. (incl. JPB) take the *dhā́man-* to be Agni’s, hence the publ. tr. “through his manifestations,” Ge “um seiner Eigenschaften,” etc. On the whole, this interpr. -- that the *dhā́man-* are Agni’s, not the two worlds – is more likely, esp. because of *táva dhā́māni* in vs. 10. But this does not settle the matter, given *dhā́man*’s semantic slipperiness. I would suggest a few additional tr. “by his foundations/emplacements [=hearths]” or “by his ordinances” (sim. WG “an den Satzungen”). I do not see a principled way to decide: the end of the next vs. (4d *devā́sa ihá ... dadhuḥ* “The gods placed him here”) might slightly favor “foundations” but *táva dhā́māni* in vs. 10 suggests something less concrete.

III.3.5: The cmpd. *candráratham* reminds of the simile *ráthaṃ ná citrám* in III.2.15. In fact JPB tr. both *citrá-* and *candrá-* in these expressions as ‘shimmering’. In order to keep them separate, I would change the tr. of *candrá-* to ‘gleaming’. And in fact I don’t particularly like ‘shimmering’ for *citrá-* and prefer the more generic ‘bright, brilliant’ for this very common stem.

su^{u}var-vídam recalls *s^{u}var-dṛ́śam* in III.2.14, though they are of course semantically distant. The former is repeated in this hymn in vs. 10.

The hapax *vigāha-* ‘plunging’ (JPB’s ‘sinking deep’) must pick up the implication of *apsuṣád-* ‘sitting in the waters’ in the previous pāda.

I would now render *tū́rṇim* as ‘advancing’ rather than “as he moves swiftly”; see comm. ad nearby III.11.5.

Note the rhyme forms *tū́rṇim* (c), *bhū́rṇim* (d); a singsong effect is avoided by placing them in different metrical positions.

III.3.6: Ge (n. 6a, fld. by WG) wants to supply the ppl. *iṣitáḥ* from 2d to construe with the instr.s, but this seems unnec.: an instr. of accomp. suffices.

Agni’s journey between the two worlds returns here from 2a, with the same idiom *antár īyate*.

Several echoes of III.2: *jantú-* (III.2.12 q.v.), *rathī́ḥ* (III.2.8), *dámūnas-* (III.2.15), and most notably *sā́dhad-iṣṭi-*. On this difficult cmpd, see comm. ad III.2.5.

III.3.7: The syntagm *jarasva* + LOC here receives a variety of rather awk. tr., incl. the publ. “be awake to a lifetime ...,” which goes easily into Engl. (more easily as “awaken to ...”), but misleadingly. I think it should be interpr. in light of constructions of the pf. impv. *jāgṛhi* (etc.) with loc., which I render “be watchful over,” as in IX.61.24 *sóma vratéṣu jāgṛhi* “O Soma, be watchful over the commandments” (sim. IX.82.4, I.21.6). I would therefore emend the tr. to “be watchful over our lifetime of good descendants.”

Act. trans. *jinva* here contrasts with med. *jinvate* in III.2.1; see comm. there.

The apparent syntagm *váyāṃsi ... bṛhatáś ca* is difficult to interpr. Its structure must be X Y *ca* (Y′), with the head noun of the 2nd constituent gapped. See JSK (DGRV I.127). But the question is what is the identity of Y′? Ge (n. 7c) suggests a notional repetition of X, namely *váyāṃsi* (a possibility also floated secondarily by Old, Noten and fld. by WG), simply dismissing the gender mismatch (not to mention the unlikelihood of conjoining identical nouns with each other). His tr., “Errege Kräfte und zwar grosse,” is not compelling. Old suggests *vā́jān*, which is accepted by JSK; JPB ‘gods’; Re supplies “pouvoirs,” without specifying the Skt. word. All of these are possible, but none has strong support. The best that can be mustered is a passage in this Agni cycle where *vā́jān* is the obj. of *jinva* (III.15.6). But √*jinv* does not have a standard masc. object; *bṛhánt-* does not have a standard masc. pl. noun that it modifies; and *váyas-* is not regularly conjoined with a masc. pl. noun. We must also reckon with the possibility that *bṛhátaḥ* is not masc. acc. pl. but, as often, gen. sg. (though Old considers this “schwerlich”), and the second constituent is “the Y(s) of the lofty one.” On the whole it seems safer and more honest to leave the possibilities open, as in Old’s (SBE) tr. “Stir up vigour and the great ones” – so, in modern terms, “quicken our vital powers and the lofty ones.”

The priestly term *uśíj-* here and in the flg. vs. (8b) is also found in III.2.4 and (in pl.) III.2.9. In fact, our pāda *uśíg devā́nām ási sukrátur vipā́m* seems a partial scrambling of III.2.4c *uśíjaṃ kavíkratum*, with *sukrátur vipā́m* an analytic version with partial relexification of *kavíkratu-*. I would slightly change the tr. to “you have the good purpose of inspired words.”

All the standard tr. (but JPB) tr. the last pāda as a unity, but then why is *ási* accented? This problem has attracted no comment. JPB’s tr. solves the problem by starting a new cl. with *ási*, which is probably correct, although the association between *uśíj-* and *krátu-* just noted makes it less appealing. It might be possible to argue that the phrases before and after the *ási* are contrastive and therefore condition accent on the verb, but this seems artificial.

III.3.8: Note that this vs. is framed as a Praśasti (*prá śaṃsanti*).

A number of terms from the preceding hymn are repeated here: *víśpati-* III.2.10, *yahvá-* III.2.9, *átithi-* III.2.2, *uśíj-* III.2.4, 9, as well as vs. 7 here; *vāghát-* III.2.1, as well as vs. 4 here.

The standard tr. supply *yajñám* as obj. to the infinitival *vṛdhé*, on the basis of parallels, esp. nearby III.6.6 *yajñám-yajñam ... vṛdhé*, so an alt. tr. might be "(for him) to strengthen (the sacrifice)." In the publ. intro. JPB suggests rather that the obj. is intentionally left ambig.

The abstract *jūtí-* ordinarily means 'speed' or 'alacrity', but in several passages (here, nearby III.12.3, III.34.2, and I.116.2) it has a transitive sense 'spur', presumably based on the numerous transitive forms of *junā́ti*.

III.3.9: Since *suráṇa-* is ordinarily an adj., the tr. "the great delight" should be changed to "very delightful" or "bringing delight." It is once used as a noun (III.53.6), but is a neuter there.

In c *bhūripoṣíṇaḥ* is universally taken (starting with Gr) as a gen. sg. modifying *tásya*, but it could also be nom. pl. modifying *vayám*, to which it is in fact adjacent. I favor reading it with both: "We, prospering abundantly, would attend to the commandments of him, who prospers abundantly." Obviously our prosperity derives from Agni's.

III.3.10: The verb *ā́ cake* from vs. 3 and pl. *dhā́man-* from vs. 4 come together here. As in vs. 3 I'd prefer "delight in" rather than "desire" for *ā́ cake*. As in vs. 4 the exact referents of *dhā́māni* are unclear, but here they enable him to "find the sun." JPB's "manifestations" may make the most sense in this context.

svarvíd- returns from vs. 5.

III.3.11: The publ. tr. takes *daṃsánābhyaḥ* and *svapasyáyā* as parallel and implicitly instr.: "By the wondrous powers of Vaiśvānara and by his good work ...," but the first form is dative or ablative and should not be syntactically assimilated to the latter. I take the former as ablative: the wondrous powers are what enables the "good work." I would tr. "Because of /from the wondrous powers of V., by his good work ..."

JPB follows Ge (n. 11ab) in what seems to me a very shaky and implausible interpr. of the first hemistich, suppling *rétas-* 'semen' as the obj. of *áriṇāt*, and somehow connecting this semen with Agni's birth. The grounds for such a daring image do not seem to me to have been prepared earlier in the hymn, and there is no formulaic support: *rétas-* is not elsewhere construed with √*ri* 'flow' (despite their likely etymological connection) or modified by *bṛhánt-*. Moreover, the two other occurrences of *bhū́ri-retasā* (VI.70.1, X.92.11) also both modify H+E as here, but have nothing to do with Agni or his birth. Better, with Old (Noten; fld. it seems by Re, and as an alt. by WG), to supply as the object *bhā́s-* 'light', which is regularly modified by *bṛhánt-*; *bhā́s-* is usually used of Agni's light, which he "spreads" or "lets loose" (which could be poetically rephrased as "let flow") and is sometimes compared to the light of the sun. I would also render *ékaḥ ... kavíḥ* as "the poet alone." Putting this all together: "Because of /from the wondrous powers of V., the poet [=Agni] alone, by his good work, lets flow (his light) aloft."

By this interpr., what happens in cd is that Agni, once born [=kindled], spreads his light through the two worlds, thus magnifying/exalting them.

The verb *maháya-* returns from vs. 3.

III.4 Āprī [SJ on JPB]

On the allusion to key words by indirection in some vss., see publ. intro.

III.4.1: The stem *sumánas-* is found in pādas a and d, with related *sumatí-* in b.

The dat. *yajáthāya*, the only case form to the stem, is always used in (quasi-)infinitival usage; see comm. ad II.28.1. I would substitute "to sacrifice (to them)."

III.4.2: The publ. tr. renders *yáṃ devā́sah ... āyájante* as "to whom [=Agni] the gods offer sacrifice ..." But *ā́ √yaj* means not 'sacrifice to', but 'attract/win by sacrifice'; see comm. ad X.63.7. Ordinarily the obj. is a desirable *thing*; see, e.g., nearby III.1.22 *ágne máhi drāviṇam ā́ yajasva* " O Agni, win great wealth by sacrifice." The situation is more complex here, since the object is an animate being, Tanūnapāt – indeed one usually identified as an aspect of Agni, who also figures as part of the subject of the verb. And so the action depicted is an internal loop, a closed circle: the gods bringing one of their own (/one who is a multiform of one of them) by sacrifice to the sacrifice, which he in turn will make successful. The tr. should be changed to "(You) whom the gods – Varuṇa, Mitra, (and) Agni – attract here by sacrifice, three times a day, day after day." It's a surprisingly complex and convoluted thought for an Āprī hymn.

III.4.3: I would now substitute "visionary power" for "insight" for *dī́dhitiḥ*. See comm. ad VII.1.1.

The publ. tr. takes *yájadhyai* as absolute, with Agni the Hotar implied as subj.; the other tr. take *hótāram* as obj. of *yájadhyai*, as *vṛṣabhám* is of *vandádhyai* in c. I think this latter interpr. is better, as it continues the closed circle of the previous vs., with Agni both sacrificer and sacrificed to. I would change to "goes forth to sacrifice first to the Hotar ..."

III.4.4: The identity of the two indicated by *vām* is uncertain. Sāy. (fld. by Re and in part by Ge and WG) suggests Agni and the barhis, but this seems a remarkably ill-assorted pair, and the notion that the barhis, meant to be spread on the ground and the product of a ground-growing grass, would have a path for it created "high above" is somewhat absurd. See Old (Noten) for other possible pairs, none of which he endorses. I am somewhat attracted by Max Müller's suggestion, rejected by Old, that *vāṃ* stands for *vā*.

On *vā* as a sort of semantic reframing (not his term) of what went before, see JSK, DGRV II.184–85.

For apparent nom. sg. masc. *devávyacā(ḥ)* modifying a neut. sg., see comm. ad II.31.5.

III.4.5: Although not explicitly mentioned in the vs., the subject of ab and also, most likely, cd is the gods, who come to the sacrifice through the "divine doors" (also not mentioned here explicitly; see publ. intro.). Although Old (SBE) takes the doors as subj. in cd, the movement they would be making is out of character for doors (even divine

ones). Instead the gods come "through" (*ví*) them "to" (*abhí*) the sacrifice. I would slightly change the publ. tr. from "wander" to simply "come" or "proceed"; though √*car* does often mean 'wander, roam', it has a number of nuances, esp. with preverbs, and "wander" is a less purposeful, more unceremonious kind of movement than I would expect of gods arriving at the sacrifice.

In b "return" (*práti yan*) refers to the gods' regular attendance (punctuated by departure from) the sacrifice.

I do not know what "having men as their adornment(s)" means. It surely doesn't refer to figurative art.

The two-word sequence *prá jātā́* is surprising; we would expect univerbated *prájātā* when the preverb is adjacent to the participle. Old considers it an archaism, from a time when the connection between preverb and participle "noch loser war"; he explicitly doesn't think that there's a functional difference (much less that *prá* is to be construed elsewhere in the clause). I reluctantly concur.

III.4.6: On *bhándate* see comm. ad III.2.12. As noted there, the only form of this stem outside this group of hymns in III is *bhándamāne* in I.142.7, in an Āprī hymn and a verse dependent on this one; see comm. ad loc.

I would prefer "close together" rather than "close by": the point is the close proximity of Dawn and Night to each other, not to us / the ritual ground. I also don't think it's the predicate of the clause (publ. tr. "are close by"). Rather, we should supply *sīdete* vel sim. (cf. I.142.7, 188.6; VII.2.6; X.70.6, 110.6). So I would substitute "... Dawn and Night (sit) close together."

I do not understand why there's a purpose cl. in cd (*yáthā ... jujoṣat* "so that X will rejoice ..."); it should have as its grounds the presence of Dawn and Night announced in the first hemistich, but I don't see the logical connection.

The position of *utá vā* in d is quite anomalous; it should really precede *índraḥ*, or, if it is taking a post-positive position, just after *índraḥ*. See JSK, DGRV II.153, who merely calls attention to the anomaly.

III.4.7: For the possible identity of the seven in b, see Ge's long n.

III.4.8–11: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss. are identical to their counterparts in the Āprī hymn VII.2.8–11.

III.4.10: On *satyátara-* see comm. ad I.76.5. I would substitute the tr. "more truly present" for "more real," though the intention is almost the same. Re's "plus réel (que l'oblateur humain)," based on Ge's view (fld also by WG) about paired divine and human Hotars, is, I think, somewhat off-base: the point is rather that the god embodied in the physically present fire is more real / more present than the notional gods who have been brought to the ritual ground.

Another postposed *yáthā* clause whose connection to what precedes is murky (see vs. 6), though this one is not a purpose clause, since its verb is the pf. indic. *véda*.

III.5 Agni [SJ on JPB]

This hymn has an omphalos structure, with vss. 5–6 paired, containing repeated phraseology and enigmas at the center; they are surrounded with framing ring in 3c / 7a // 2ab / 8ab+9 // and possibly 1d / 9d+10d. Since the final vs., 11, is a repeated vs. (=III.1.23, 6.11, 7.11, 23.5, all in this Agni cycle), vss. 5–6 are in the exact center of the hymn.

III.5.1–3: A notable run of augmented aorists: 1b *ábodhi*, 1d *āvaḥ*, 2d *adyaut*, 3a *ádhāyi,* 3c *asthāt*, 3d *ábhūt*, interrupted only by the pf. *vāvṛdhe* in 2a.

III.5.1: Note the presence of both *viprá-* and *kaví-* in pāda b.

III.5.2: It is difficult to know how to distribute the various instr. pl.s between *vāvṛdhe* and *namasyàḥ*, but it might be worth noting that *namasyà-* doesn't seem otherwise to be construed with an instr. whereas the med. pf. of √*vṛdh* regularly is. So perhaps all the instr. go with *vāvṛdhe*: "through the praises, songs, and recitations ..."

III.5.5–6: On these vss. as the omphalos see intro. above.

III.5.5: Note that *padáṃ véḥ* echoes 1b *padavîḥ*, though they are completely different morphologically and syntactically, only sharing *padá-* 'track'.

On the mysterious expression *ripó ágram* see the similar expression in IV.5.7 *ágre rupáḥ*, a passage that has other connections with ours, *rupó ágram* in the flg. vs. IV.5.8, in a pāda otherwise identical to ours, and X.79.3 *ripá upásthe*, along with the comm. on these passages. For reasons given there I tentatively take *ríp-*/*rúp-* to mean 'mount' (sim. JPB's 'summit') and tr. the phrase in IV.5.7 as "on the tip of the mount," suggesting that this refers to the ritual ground. Perhaps here it reprises 3c *sā́nv asthāt* "he has mounted the back (of the altar)." Beyond that I can't go.

JPB's 'summit' might better be changed to my 'mount', since he also uses 'summit' for *várṣman-* in 9b. Although I think it quite possible that the phrase in 9b is meant to "repair" the enigmatic one here, they do not use the same words.

Given *nā́bhā pṛthivyā́ḥ* in 9b, perhaps better "in the navel (of the earth)" rather than "(of the sacrifice)."

III.5.6: This vs. forms a pair with vs. 5, signaled by the repetition of *padáṃ véḥ* (5a, 6c) and the presence of the verb *rakṣati* 'guards' in the final pāda of 6, which is a near-synonym of the insistent *pā́ti* 'protects', which opens every pāda in 5. Moreover, like vs. 5 this vs. also has connections with IV.5.7: in particular, the phrase *sasásya cárma* is found in IV.5.7c, where I follow Gr in taking it as a reference to the ritual grass strew (see comm. ad loc.).

I would be inclined to take pāda b with cd, rather than what precedes, in that knowledge of the ritual patterns would seem more needed for the esoteric phraseology of c than the fairly straightforward name in a. Thus, "The Ṛbhu ... to be invoked. As the god knowing all the ritual patterns -- the ghee-covered hide of the grain and the track of the bird – just that does Agni guard ..."

The publ. tr. takes *ghṛtávat* as modifying both *cárma* and *padám*, which is not only possible, but perhaps favored by its position between the two NPs. However, since

"the track of the bird" appears without that qualifier in the previous vs. and elsewhere (I.164.7, III.7.7, X.5.1), it is perhaps safer to limit it to *cárma*: "the ghee-covered hide of the grain (and) the track of the bird."

III.5.7: The first pāda, *ā́ yónim ... asthāt*, reprises 3c *ā́ ... sā́nu asthāt*, forming a loose ring around the paired vss. 5–6.

III.5.8: The first hemistich conceptually echoes 2ab, though with the strengthening of the fire effected by physical fuel (plants, ghee), not verbal means (praises, songs, hymns), producing an outer ring around 5–6, in addition to the inner ring in 3+7. Here the two finite verbs, *vavakṣe* and *várdhanti*, both relate to the single verb in 2ab, pf. *vāvṛdhe*, with *vavakṣe* matching the perfect in form and *várdhanti* matching the root. I might be inclined to match the tr. of *vavakṣe* to the temporal function of *vāvṛdhe* in 2, though *vavakṣ-* can have strictly presential value as the publ. tr. has it. Perhaps rather "Just born, he has grown strong ..., when the fruitful ones strengthen him."

The opening of b, *yádī*, must be *yád ī* – i.e., 'when him' not 'if', as not infrequently elsewhere, incl. 10c. (See my "RVic sīm and īm," Fs. Cardona, 2002.)

III.5.9: This vs. in part participates in the outer ring with 8ab: *adyaut* in pāda a and *dūtáḥ* in d reprise *dūtó adyaut* in 2d. But it also has resonances with other parts of the hymn: *yahváḥ* in pāda a = 5b; *nā́bhā* in b = 5c; *mitráḥ* in c recalls the numerous occurrences earlier (3b, 4bcd); *tṛ́ḍya-* in c = 6a.

It is also possible that *várṣman diváḥ* "upon the summit of heaven" is meant as a repair or explanatory gloss of *ripó ágram* in 5a (q.v.). This may be suggested by the presence of *nā́bhā pṛthivyā́ḥ* in this pāda, echoing *nā́bhā* in 5c.

On *yajáthāya* as always infinitival, see comm. ad III.4.1. Here also I would substitute "to sacrifice (to them)."

III.5.9–10: It's possible to identify one last outer ring: *váhniḥ* 'draught-horse' (referring to Agni) in 1d may find its counterparts in the more explicit *vakṣat* 'he will convey' (9d) and *havya-vā́ham* 'oblation-conveyor' (10d).

III.5.10: I'd replace "has propped up" with "propped up": this is surely an event in the distant mythological past, given the Mātariśvan clause in c.

As in 8b, *yádī* should be read *yád ī* "when him."

Best to tr., with the standard tr., "as oblation-conveyor."

There is a difference of opinion on how to interpr. and construe *bhṛ́gubhyaḥ pári*. Ge, fld. by the publ. tr. and WG, take *bhṛ́gubhyaḥ* as an abl., with *pári* the postposition 'from', and the whole phrase construed with *gúhā sántam* ("hiding from the Bs"). Others (Old [SBE], Re, HPS [B+I 69–70]) take *bhṛ́gubhyaḥ* as a dative construed with *samidhé* and *pári* as an adv. ("tout autour"): "kindled him, being in hiding, as the oblation-conveyor for the Bh's." On the issues, see Ge's detailed n. 10c. Re argues that Ge's interpr. cannot be correct, because otherwise we would expect close sandhi *bhṛ́gubhyas pári*, but this is a false argument. As Mark Hale has shown, close sandhi is blocked by the caesura, which in this case falls between these two words. I am of two minds about the interpr. On the one hand, Ge's interpr. best accounts for the position and use of *pári*. As

he says, otherwise *pári* is left "in der Luft hängen." On the other, Ge himself points to I.60.1 *bharad bhṛ́gave mātaríśvā* "M. brought [Agni] to Bhṛgu," which would favor a dative interpr. here. In the end the *pári* argument sways me to the Ge side – esp. since √*idh* is not construed with that preverb – but I still think the dativa l interpr. given above is worth considering.

III.6 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.6.1: As is convincingly argued in the publ. intro., the unidentified fem. referent in this vs. is probably an unsignaled pun on *juhū́-*, which can mean both sacrificial ladle and tongue, the latter standing in for the poet's power of eloquent speech. The final pāda esp. favors the former identification as ladle: she bears the oblation and is covered with ghee. But the opening of the vs. invites the verbal reading. The other two occurrences of the part. *vacyámāna-* (√*vañc*, on whose sense see the various reff. in the lexical list) have such referents: *matíḥ* in III.39.1 (in this same maṇḍala) and *stómāḥ* in X.47.7. In both instances the part. depicts an intimate movement of the thought/praise hymn curling itself out of the poet's heart (III.39.1) or intertwining with his mind (X.47.7). (See comm. ad locc.) Note esp. X.47.7 *mánasā vacyámānāḥ*, which is very similar to our *mananā́ vacyámānāḥ*. (*mananā́* is a hapax.) And of course, though it belongs to a very different root, the root syl. *vac-* evokes √*vac* 'speak', an association supported by the voc. *kāravaḥ* "o praise-poets." The transfer of the action of the participle from the praise-song (in its other two occurrences) to the praise-poet is bold; I think it refers to an almost physical sense of mental spinning or twirling as one tries out different wordings in search of the best formulation (as I've just been doing). The physical counterpart of this mental motion is expressed in the next vs., 2d, which helps pin down the sense here.

On *dakṣiṇāvā́ṭ* see Scar (474–75).

III.6.2: Pāda b is notable for a pile-up of items that might be in competition for first position and without such competition would have claimed it: the conjunction *utá* (the winner), the preverb *prá*, and the adverbial conjunction *ádha*, which adjoins the caesura and is immediately followed by *nú*, which normally claims 2nd position. With all these little words vying for first place, there's hardly any space left for content in the pāda, which enjambs with the following pāda c.

Given that Heaven and Earth reappear as agents in the next vs., and are therefore capitalized as animates, I would be inclined to cap them here as well. I assume that JPB left them lower case here because their role here is to be spaces, but I think the distinction is not clear cut in the Vedic worldview. See also vs. 4, where they are capped in the publ. tr.

The draught horses with their tongues are clearly Agni's flames, and the movement depicted by this form of √*vañc* is surely the twisting, curling motion of flames – which helps define the sense of the verb in 1a.

III.6.3: Once again (see the preceding hymn III.5.8, 10), *yádī* should be read *yád ī* "when it," with the acc. enclitic *ī* anticipating the NP *śukrám arcíḥ*.

Some reminiscences of vs. 1: *devayántīḥ* (cf. 1b) and *práyasvatīḥ* 'bearing/having pleasing oblations', which is functionally similar to *havír bhárantī* (1d).

I would substitute "reverently invoke" for "summon" (which sounds peremptory rather than worshipful) to tr. *īḷate*.

III.6.4: I prefer 'seat' for *sadhástha-* to JPB's 'abode, dwelling'; on the connection with √*sad* (despite the aspirated *dh*) see EWA s.v.

The Pp. reads nom. *dhruváḥ*, which is so tr. by Ge (/WG). However, Gr lists it as *dhruvé*, and the loc. interpr. is favored by Old, Re, and JPB. Either is possible, and both have support. See Ge's n. 4a and comm. ad VI.9.4. An alt. would be "... is set down steadfast here in his abode [/seat] ...," which I weakly favor.

III.6.6: The *vā* in pāda a seems essentially functionless. JSK (DGRV II.189) calls it "a loose interstanzaic concatenator"; Re "explétif (hortatif?)" – though hortatory "or" is not a standard function of this particle. There could be an implicit contrast between 5d and 6ab: you either lead the people *or* you hitch up your horses and bring the gods here. But the contrast is very faint.

The gen. *ṛtásya* is variously construed: JPB (and Old SBE) take it as dependent on *keśínā*; Re and Lü (454) on *yogyā́bhiḥ*; Ge and WG on *dhurí*. (Scar [662] tr. the hemistich but fails to render *ṛtásya.*) Since only Ge cites passages in support of his configuration (n. 6a), I am inclined to follow his interpr. and substitute "place your two long-maned (horses) ... on the yoke-pole of truth." Acdg. to Ge, this expression refers to the Opfer. The other interpr. are not excluded, however; for *ṛtásya* dependent on horses, see, e.g., IV.2.3 *róhitā ghṛtásnū, ṛtásya*, a passage very like ours.

ghṛtasnúvā is problematic. See esp. the disc. by Scar (662–63). Although generally listed as *ghṛtasnú-*, the two forms with this accent more likely belong to a stem in *-snū́-*, as Scar points out. This *ghṛta-snū́-* exists beside *ghṛtá-snu-* (10x) with first-member accent (save for a single unaccented voc. *ghṛtasno*), generally considered to be a bahuvrīhi with the 2nd member a weak form of *sā́nu-* 'back', hence 'having a back with ghee, having ghee on its back', a *vájra-hasta-* type compound (cf. *ghṛtá-pṛṣṭha-* 'id'). However, the 2nd-member accented *ghṛta-snū́-* is also parallel with *ghṛta-snā́-* 'bathed/bathing in ghee' (2x), and *ghṛta-snū́-* is generally rendered (incl. in the publ. tr. of our passage) like the *-snā́-* cmpd: 'bathing/bathed in ghee'. Scar suggests that *ghṛta-snū́-* represents a contamination of *ghṛtá-snu-* and *ghṛta-snā́-*, which seems reasonable. There cannot have been a strict semantic separation between *ghṛtá-snu-* and *ghṛta-snū́-* because the same referent, du. *keśínā* is modified by *ghṛta-snū́-* here and *ghṛtá-snu-* in III.41.9 (see also another dual referring to horses, *átyā* in IV.2.3, modified by *ghṛtá-snu-*). I think both meanings are likely in play here, and would substitute "bathed in ghee [/ghee-backed]."

III.6.7: The *ā́* in pāda a must be a postposition, not a preverb in tmesis: √*ruc* does not appear with *ā́*, and the *ā́* here does not adjoin a metrical boundary, as preverbs in tmesis generally do. Rather it is to be construed with preceding abl. *diváḥ*, with emphatic *cid* 'even' intervening. It also must have the meaning "(all the way) to" (so Ge, WG, Scar [197], JPB; contra Old [SBE], Re), even though *ā́* with preceding abl. generally means 'from ... to' (Gr "von ... her"), and it is *ā́* with following abl. that means 'to' (Gr 169). However, see Gr's 8) "zu ... hin," as well as comm. ad I.92.17. Since I think the *ā́* is a

postposition, I would delete JPB's "here" in "shine here" and substitute "shine all the way even to heaven."

The publ. tr. rendering of pāda b, "you become radiant along with the many far-radiant dawns," misrepresents both the case of "dawns" (acc., not instr.) and the function of *ánu*. It should be emended to "you become radiant following the ... dawns," indicating that the ritual fire is kindled just after first light.

The cmpd *uśádhak* is quite problematic, although on first glance it looks straightforward enough. It occurs three times, here, III.34.3, and VII.7.2, always in conjunction with *vána-* wood: *uśádhag váneṣu* (here and III.34.3), *uśádhag vánāni* (VII.7.2), always at pāda end. It looks as if it should be a root-noun cmpd. consisting of a zero-grade form derived from √*vaś* 'desire, want' and √*dah* 'burn'. However, the accent is wrong for a regular root-noun cmpd. Moreover, in this passage the form must be an acc., in the object phrase with *panáyanta*. This brings us to the problem of *apáḥ*, which must also be part of the object phrase. By accent, this form should be the adjectival 'industrious', but the standard interpr. (Old [SBE], Ge, Re, WG) simply take it as if it were the neut. noun *ápas-* 'work' and finesse the accent somehow. (That *apási* in III.1.3 seems to be the noun, not the adj. [see comm. ad loc.], lends some support to this tack.) They then do one of two things with *uśádhak*: either take it as a neut. adj. modifying *apáḥ* 'work' (Ge: "deiner gierig in den Holzern brennenden (?) Tätigkeit") or as a modifier of Agni (Old [SBE], Re, WG), despite the fact that it is neither a vocative (note 2nd syl. accent) nor a gen. (Old [SBE n.] cavalierly says it stands for a gen. metri causa – though he alternatively suggests the first solution, as an adj. modifying *apáḥ*. He gives the same two solutions in the Noten, but in opposite order.) The solution found in the publ. tr., as well as in Scar., flips the values of *apáḥ ... uśádhak*, taking the latter as a neut. noun and *apás-* in its usual adjectival value: "industrious burning-at-will in the wood." The substantivization of an old root-noun (adj.) cmpd. **uśa-dáh-* 'burning in the wood' can account for its accent shift, while the accent of *apáḥ* is correct for its function. Although this interpr. is complex and cumbersome, it seems the best way to account for the various anomalies in this phrase. One consequence, however, is that in the other two occurrences a standard adjectival interpr. of the cmpd., as nom. sg. masc. modifying Agni, which is possible in both, has to be set aside if the form is to be harmonized with its usage here. This is Scar's solution (see esp. disc. p. 192). However, having attempted to follow Scar on this austere formal path, I find I cannot, and I now think that in those passages the troublesome accent just has to be accepted. I think it possible that the reinterpr. of the stem as a neut. noun that is evident here as simply reversed, but the accent remained where it had shifted. See comm. ad locc.

III.6.8: The first three pādas begin X *vā yé*; these relative clauses are picked up by *ebhiḥ* near the beginning of the next vs. The question is what to do with pāda d, which lacks the structural signature of the first 3 pādas. JPB takes d as a parenthetical independent clause, but this is impossible because *āyemiré* has an accented verb (flg. a preverb, so it can't owe its accent to pāda-initial position) and therefore must be subordinated. Is it a fourth, unsignaled rel. clause ("(which) horses ..." or "(whose) horses") – so Old (SBE and Noten), Ge, JSK (DGRV II.164). Or does the rel. clause beginning in c extend through d? Re takes it so, but by making *rathyàḥ ... áśvāḥ* a bahuvrīhi "defait" with the subject another set of divinities. I would follow WG, flg. Kü (397), in taking the horses

themselves as subject: "or the helpers, easy to call, deserving the sacrifice, the chariot horses who were guided here." My only reservation is that *ū́ma-* 'helper' is ordinarily a descriptor of gods – even though 'helper' seems a reasonable role for their horses. This longer third clause would show a Behaghel progression.

III.6.9: Although the presence of the gods just delivered to the sacrifice invites a transitive interpr. of *mādáyasva*, as in the publ. tr. "make then [*sic*: them] rejoice," the other occurrences of *mādáya* are reflexive: "invigorate yourself! rejoice!"

III.6.10: On pāda c, see Ge's n. 6c. I think he is correct that dual *adhvarā́* is by attraction in the simile; see *prā́ñcam ... adhvarám* in I.18.8.

Note the presence of both *ṛtá-* and *satyá-* in the final pāda. I might substitute for the somewhat awk. publ. tr. "the truth-possessing (parents) of truth-begotten (Agni), who are really present."

III.7 Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the difficulties of the hymn, see publ. intro. I will mostly stay away from deeper interpr. of the contents.

III.7.1: Given the obscurity of the content of this vs., there is some question as to how to deploy the fem. pl. *saptá vā́ṇīḥ* "seven voices." Old (SBE n., Noten) is tempted to make this phrase the subj. of both a and b, but is (rightly) deterred by the masc. rel. prn. *yé* (*yá* in sandhi). Therefore, the standard tr., incl. JPB, take it as acc., parallel to *mātárā*, as obj. / goal of *vivišúḥ*. Kü (101), fld. by WG, instead takes it as nom., but as an appositive to the (masc.) subject: "als die sieben Stimme." Since I have no strong views on the sense of the vs. or the referent of the fem. pl. phrase, I will take no stand, beyond suggesting that the alt. tr. "have entered ..., as the seven voices" could be considered.

The parallel in X.65.8 *parikṣítā pitárā ... dyā́vāpṛthivî* most likely identifies the dual *pitárā* here as Heaven and Earth; the du. *mātárā* in the preceding pāda may also have the same referents, though as JPB points out in the publ. intro. they could also/instead be the fire churning sticks. On *parikṣít-* see comm. ad X.65.8.

Ge and WG take the intens. *prá sarsrāte* as trans., with *dīrghám ā́yuḥ* as obj. ("extend their lifetime long"), but medial forms of √*sṛ* are intrans./reflex. "stretch (oneself) out." See Narten ("Ai. *sṛ*," MSS 26 [1969] = KlSch 125–43) and, for the intens., Schaef. (198–99); on this passage specifically, Narten 88–89 = 134–35; Schaef. 199.

On *prayákṣe* see comm. ad III.31.3.

III.7.2: On the derivation and morphology of *divákṣasaḥ* see comm. ad X.65.7, III.30.21 and detailed disc. by Scar (92–93). It is here most likely a gen. sg. modifying *vṛ́ṣṇaḥ*, as most take it, though Sāy. (see Ge n. 2), Gr, and Old (SBE) instead interpr. it as nom. pl. (as it is in X.65.7).

The pl. *áśvā(ḥ)* is universally interpr. as to the fem. stem *áśvā-* 'mare', presumably on the basis of its identification with *dhenávaḥ* and association with *devî́ḥ*, and this is probably correct. But the form could also be masculine pl., and the gender bending characteristic of passages like this could be in play. On the other hand, see the females "playing the bull" in 9a. In any case, the pāda is surely a nominal sentence, as in

almost all interpr.; Re and WG, however, apparently take pāda a as an acc. phrase and construe it with *ā́ tasthau*. This interpr. seems excluded by *dhenávaḥ*; we would expect *dhenúḥ*.

On the basis of the similar phraseology in X.65.6, Ge takes the single cow in d as the offering ladle. I find this plausible, though it must be said that X.65.6 isn't all that clear.

III.7.3: The first hemistich seems to paraphrase 2b: in that pāda an unidentified single being took (his) stand (*ā́ tasthau*) on a set of plural females; here the same happens, but the being is discursively identified in b as a male, and the verb *ā́ ... arohat* substitutes for *ā́ √sthā*.

The tr. "lord" might be expanded to "lord / husband," given that he "mounts" females here, and also given the simile in 4d.

The 2nd hemistich takes up 1a, with compd. COLOR-*pṛṣṭhá-* and *dhā́seḥ*. Here Agni is presumably destroying the firewood that (notionally) held the flames; the sense would be clearer if "made them depart from the wellspring of the brushwood" were substituted for "made them dwell apart." The lexeme *prá √vas* means 'go / dwell abroad / away from home'.

III.7.4: The subj. of the first hemistich is universally (save for JPB) understood to be "rivers, streams," but this relies entirely (as far as I can see) on Sāy.'s gloss of *vahátaḥ* as *nadyaḥ*. But *vahát-* (on which see AiG II.2.159) is a hapax, and the point here surely is that it participates in an etymological figure with the flg. verb *vahanti*. And the larger point then is the paradox created by the conveyors conveying (*vaháto vahanti*) a stationary (*stabhūyámānam*) entity. I do think that "conveyors ... convey" would be better than the "carriers ... carry" of the publ. tr., but otherwise think this etymological rendering is much superior to the introduction of ill-supported rivers.

On Agni as the son of Tvaṣṭar, see I.95.2 adduced by Ge.

As noted ad III.6.4, I'd prefer 'seat' for 'abode'.

Strictly speaking, "woman" in d should be in parens.

III.7.6: Ge (n. 6) remarks "Besonders dunkel," which is saying something in a hymn of such general obscurity. The nub of the problem is how to construe *ánu*. Ge asks whether it goes with *ghóṣam* or *anayanta*. If the latter, it would allow *ghóṣam* to form a phrase with *śūṣám* at the end of the next pāda. Unfortunately, acdg. to our current understanding of tmesis, it cannot be in tmesis with *anayanta*, because it doesn't appear in any of the standard landing sites for a preverb in tmesis. I was tempted to construe *ánu* with *pravídā*, as Old (Noten, contra his interpr. in SBE) almost breezily suggests: "Warum nicht *pravídā ánu* verstehen ...?" (fld. by Scar, though see his n. 682). Unfortunately the answer is "because *ánu* is never construed with an instr. and is also almost always a preposition, not a postposition." Which means that we're stuck with *ánu ghóṣam* and two different noises in a single clause. The publ. tr. does what it can under the circumstances.

Note that *ánu sváṃ dhā́ma* in d recalls the adverb *anuṣvadhám* in the previous hymn (III.6.9). Also, *dhā́ma* echoes *dhā́nam* in the previous pāda, and both resonate with *(praví)dā́nu* in pāda a.

III.7.7: Pāda b recalls III.5.5–6.

III.7.8 = III.4.7, in an Āprī hymn.

III.7.9: The interplay of females and bulls is found also in 2a, while *suyāmāḥ* qualifies females in 3a. However, the immediate referents can't be the same, because *raśmí-* here is masc.

The opening of c, *déva hotar*, echoes the dual *daívyā hótārā* that begins the borrowed vs. 8; for this reason I'd tr. "o god Hotar," or even "o divine Hotar."

Strictly speaking, *mandrátaraḥ* should be "more delighting" or "very delighting"; *cikitvā́n* recurs from 3b.

III.7.10: In d "the fault ... we have committed" is somewhat misleading, in that the poet admits neither individual not collective guilt: it should simply be "even the fault that has been committed."

III.7.11 = III.1.23, etc.

III.8 Sacrificial Posts

On the structure of this hymn, see the publ. intro. As was also noted there, though the hymn is an intrusion in the Agni cycle, it is found (/was inserted) at a seam in the cycle: at the end of the 11-verse (III.3–7) trimeter Agni hymns. The next set of hymns have 9 verses and are in varying meters, with mostly 8-syllable pādas (III.9 Bṛhatī, III.10 Uṣṇih, III.11–12 Gāyatrī).

III.8.1: Note the future impv. *dhattāt*, which has the standard (later) function of enjoining an action that will follow another one.

III.8.4: Kane (HDŚ II.1.269) suggests that the image in this vs. is that of a young boy, well dressed and encircled with his sacred thread (*yúvā suvā́sāḥ párivītaḥ*), at his Upanayana, whom they "lead up" (*ún nayanti*), in an idiom close to the *úpa √nī* of the Upanayana. Acdg. to Kane, several gṛhya sūtras in fact employ this mantra in the Upanayana.

III.8.5–6: Note the minimal difference between the two semantically distinct forms, the root noun cmpd *deva-yā(ḥ)* 'beseeching the gods' (5d) and denom. part. *devayántaḥ* 'seeking the gods' (6a).

III.8.6: There is number disharmony between the 2nd plural enclitic *vaḥ* (a) and the voc. singular *vánaspate* (b). The simplest way to account for this is to assume that the voc. has simply been repeated from the 1st vs. of the hymn (1b) in this 1st vs. of the 2nd (half of the) hymn, which switches its subject from a singular post to plural posts. Or Lord of the Forest may refer to the forest itself or a single tree that produces multiple posts.

III.8.8: The rarer dual dvandva *dyā̆vā-kṣā̆mā* substitutes for the more common *dyā̆vā-pṛthivî*, with *pṛthivî*, perhaps in its lit. meaning 'broad one', pleonastically following the dvandva.

III.8.10: Contrary to the standard tr., I think there is a change of subject in the 2nd half-verse. Rather than calling on the posts to help us, we turn again to the gods, who are the likely subject of *avantu*, just as they were in 8c. The types of help we ask them for are distinct but complementary: help for our sacrifice in 8c, help in battle and competition in 10d, a theme introduced by the *vihavá-* 'competing invocation' in 10c. The *vā* of 10c signals this disjunction and the return of the gods as subject. Although Klein (DGRV II.203) suggests reading *vā* here as if for *vaí*, given that the hymn contains several loosely construed *vā*-s (1d, 6b), this does not seem like a good idea.

[III.9-29 JPB – comm. by SJ]

III.9 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.9.1: Every pāda in this vs. has close parallels elsewhere. Most of pāda a, X X X *tvā vavṛmahe*, is found also in I.187.2 and VIII.19.3. (On metrically bad *vavṛmahe* and the likely restoration **vuvūrmahe*, see Kü [459] and comm. ad VI.4.7.) Pāda b = V.22.3, VIII.11.6, and, extended to a Jagatī, I.144.5. Pāda c = VIII.19.4, with substitution of *ūrjó* for *apā̆m*. Pāda d = I.40.4.

Since Agni's entry into "his mothers, the waters" is depicted in 2b, calling him Apām Napāt here is esp. apt.

On the basis of my reeval. of the usage of *anehás-* (see comm. ad X.61.12), I would substitute "flawless" for "faultless." The tr. of *subhágaṃ sudī̆ditim* in pāda c might be harmonized with that of VIII.19.4 "providing good fortune and good light," though this is not strictly necessary – the renditions are close enough.

III.9.2: The first pāda presents interpretational difficulties that have mostly been glossed over. The form *vanā̆* is generally taken to be a neut. pl. of *vána-* 'wood', but it is wrongly accented (expect **vánā*), and given the near ubiquity of that stem, and indeed this very morphological form, this anomaly should not be dismissed so easily as it usually is (see a particularly strong statement by Kulikov [*ya*-presents, 329 n. 820]). Old (SBE and, more explicitly, Noten) and Schindler (Root nouns p. 43) instead take it as an instr. to the root noun *ván-*, which better reflects its accent, but appears to cause syntactic difficulty, since the verb with which it's construed supposedly only takes accusatives. However, that verb, the mid. part. *kā̆yamāna-*, is a hapax; the stem is found nowhere else in Sanskrit. I therefore think that comparing the case frame of stems that are ultimately related to it but superficially quite distinct, esp. the pf. *(ā̆) cake* (see esp. Kulikov 319–20), is of limited utility, and that an instr. is possible with this very distinct stem: "finding pleasure with the wood"; it is even possible that *kā̆yamāna-* is a pseudo-passive and the phrase should be tr. "(Fire) being enjoyed by the wood," which might provide a reason for Agni's entry into the waters in pāda b – a means of escape.

There are several different ways to interpr. pāda c, depending on who we take as the implicit agent of the infinitive *pramṕṣe*. The publ. tr. (also Old SBE) seems to assume

that agent to be the ritualists, who should pay sufficient attention to the return of Agni. But most tr. assume instead that Agni is the agent, and he should not forget (with a slightly different, but quite possible sense of *prá √mṛṣ*) to return – with pāda d reminding him that he had made the same cycle before (with "earlier" generally supplied: e.g., Kü 158 "dass du (früher), obwohl du in der Ferne warst, hier erscheinen bist"). I think each interpr. is possible and would allow both alternatives; I would, however, delete JPB's "therefore," which seems too emphatic for a *tád* not even in 1st position, and substitute "you came to be here" for "you have come to be here," since the latter is not usually the sense of the impf.

III.9.3: I would be inclined to add a "just" (reflecting *evá*) in pāda b: "and now you are just benevolent" – the point being that before he escaped the smoke, there were both positive and negative aspects of Agni, but now it is only positive.

The standard view of the referents of *anyé ... anyé* is that they are the various priests, and this is supported by *sakhyé* in c, which responds to *sákhāyaḥ* referring to us ritualists in 1a. But I agree with JPB that another possible referent is the flames, some of which dart out and others stay close to the point of ignition.

The accent on *yánti* presumably results from the contrast of the two short clauses.

III.9.4: The stem *saścát-* (here, I.42.7, and VII.97.4) is generally given an abstract sense (e.g., Old [SBE] hindrance, Ge Mangel, Re déficience), even though both Ge and Re accept a connection with *√sac* 'dry up' (Ge n. 4b, Re n.), contra Gr, who takes it to the other *√sac* 'follow, accompany'. The connection with *asaścát-* 'never drying up, inexhaustible' provides strong evidence both for the root etymology and for the literal sense. Given the Vedic horror of aridity (as exemplified, e.g., by the Vṛtra myth and the welcome release of the waters), "parched places" seems a reasonable interpr. Moreover, "parched places" provides a nice contrast with the waters in which Agni hides himself (pāda d and 2b). WG take *saścátaḥ* instead as an adj. ("folgende") modifying *srídhaḥ*, which doesn't have much to recommend it and doesn't work for the other passages. In fact WG tr. the same form in I.42.7 as "die trockenstehenden (Orte)" and Gotō (in Dōyama/Gotō) as "die Versiegungen," so the rejection of 'dry up' seems to have been temporary.

The simile in d is somewhat jarring: "resting in the waters like a lion," since lions don't generally lie around in water. A different loc. needs to be supplied or assumed (so Ge, Re, WG): "like a lion (in his lair / hiding place)" vel sim.

III.9.5: As JPB indicates in the publ. intro. *mathitá-* here can mean either (or rather both) 'stolen' and 'churned' (used of fire produced by friction). Most tr. choose just one (though often with a nod to the other): 'churned' (et sim.) Old SBE, Ge; 'stolen' Re, WG, Narten (Ved *math*, 133 = KlSch. 23), Elizarenkova (Lg. and Style 193).

WG and Elizarenkova (both flg. Kuiper) take *devébhyaḥ* as dat.: "stolen for the gods": This is appealing in that it was the gods who pursued him and wanted him back. But this makes *pári* somewhat harder to construe, since *pári* is found with *√math* only when an abl. is in play (I.93.6, IX.97.2). To save both the abl. and the narrative, we can assume that *mathitám* refers to the original disappearance of Agni: "who (had been) stolen from the gods" and was subsequently recovered by Mātariśvan. As for the

"churned" alternative, in this secondary reading I take *devébhyaḥ* as a dative: "churned for the gods," referring to the kindling of the fire.

III.9.6: I do not think that *táṃ tvā* is esp. emphatic; the *tám* merely provides a prop for the enclitic. This pāda opening is quite common, found 69x in the RV; see disc. in my 1992 "sa figé," esp. pp. 228–30. I'd therefore rephrase "You are he whom ..." to simply "the mortals seized you."

On the basis of persuasive parallels cited by Old and Ge, *devébhyaḥ* belongs with the immed. flg. voc. *havyavāhana*, rather than with the preceding cl.

Most tr. take cd as a purpose clause, "so that you will guard," against JPB's "since you guard ..." Either is possible, esp. since the verb in c, *abhipā́si*, can be either pres. indicative or subjunctive. The purpose cl. interpr. is a viable alternative.

III.9.7: With most interpr., I'd take *tád bhadrám* and *daṃsánā* as parallel subjects of *chadayati*, rather than, with the publ. tr., taking *táva ... chadayati* as a parenthetical insertion. Hence, "this auspicious thing of yours, your wondrous skill, appears good even to a simple man." The verb *chadayati* is singular, either because *daṃsánā* is an appositive to *tád bhadrám* (as punctuated above) or because a series of singular nouns as subject can take a sing. verg.

I would also prefer "livestock" or "cattle" to "herd" for *paśávaḥ* in c.

III.9.8: On *śī́rá-* see comm. ad VIII.43.31.

Contrary to all the standard interpr., incl. the publ. tr., I'd be inclined to take c with ab, as a continuation of the long acc. phrase begun in pāda a, with d a snappy summary: "serve the god with obedience." The instr. *śruṣṭî* that begins d seems to me to signal a new beginning.

III.9.9: This vs. is identical to X.52.6, the final vs. of one of the three hymns there (X.51–53) concerning the flight and recovery of Agni, which is also largely treated in our hymn.

III.10 Agni [SJ on JPB]

A hymn made up almost entirely of clichés; in this it is reminiscent of the elementary I.1. The first seven vss. each contain a form of *agní-*, mostly voc. (1a, 2b, 3c, 7a), a feature also reminiscent of I.1.

III.10.3: The publ. tr. mistakenly tr. dat. *jātávedase* as a voc. It should be corrected to "who will do ritual service for you, the Jātavedas ..."

III.10.5: The part. *bíbhrate* appears to belong in the simile, since it immediately precedes the simile marker *ná*. It is so tr. by Old (SBE), Ge, and JPB. However, the sense would be somewhat better if the part. modified Agni, with the simile confined to *vedháse*: "bringing the lights of inspirations like a ritual master"; it is so tr. by Re and WG. This is in fact syntactically possible, since, as disc. ad VIII.76.1 (etc.) and in my 2024 ECIEC presentation "Penultimate *ná* 'like' in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism," simile-marking *ná* is blocked from pāda-final position, it does not follow its target when it would end up there. I would therefore favor the alt. tr. just given.

Note that pāda-final *vedháse* matches likewise positioned near-rhyme *jātávedase* in 3b; that one ends a dimeter pāda and one a Jagatī line may mitigate the potential sing-song rhyme effect.

III.10.6: The ablatival subordinator *yátaḥ* is tr. as if it were a plural with fem. *gíraḥ* as antecedent ("the songs ... those from which he was born"). But *yátaḥ √jan* is a rare idiom meaning "as soon as" (see Gr *yátas* def. 6), presumably from a temporal ablatival sense "from (the time) when." See the passages assembled by Ge (n. 6b): I.128.4 *yátaḥ ... ájāyata*, I.141.1 *yáto jáni*, VII.4.2 *yátaḥ ... ájaniṣṭa*, VII.7.3 *yátaḥ ... jajñiṣé,* and semantically sim. I.25.17 *yátaḥ ... ā̃bhṛtam*. So substitute "... strengthen Agni, as soon as he is born, worthy to be hymned."

III.10.7: The verb *ví rājasi* recalls the noun *samrā̃jam* in 1b, but it is also presumably a pun: not only "you rule" but "you shine," as pointed out in the publ. intro.

The phrase *áti srídhaḥ* is found also in the previous hymn, III.9.4.

III.10.8: Note the pronominal doubling, with *naḥ* (a) anticipating *asmé* (b).

Echoes from earlier in the hymn: *dīdihi* (3a), *suvī́ryam* (3c).

III.10.9: The verb *sám indhate* forms a trivial ring with 1c *indhate sám*, but this seems less the artful deployment of a poetic device and more the result of poverty of imagination.

III.11 Agni [SJ on JPB]

This is scarcely less banal than the immediately preceding hymn, save for a complex figure in vss. 3 and 5.

III.11.2: On *cánohita-* see comm. ad III.2.2. The tr. should be corrected here to "delighted."

"Sacrifice" is almost universally supplied as the obj. of *sám ṛṇvati* (save for Old [SBE], who takes it as intrans./reflex. "sets himself in motion"). Supplying "sacrifice" seems reasonable, though there are no clear parallels, and the other occurrence of *sám ṛṇvati*, in nearby III.2.1, is troublesome (see comm. ad loc.).

III.11.3: The vs. begins like 2c, *agnír dhiyā̃*, and then seems to make a new start with *sá cetati*. This is generally not registered in the standard tr., though it is, properly, in the publ. tr.

Ge (/WG) takes *cetati* as transitive ("understands" vel sim.) with pāda c as its obj.: approx. "knows how to reach his goal." But *cetati*, even when in the (semi-)transitive value 'perceives', does not, I think, have the "know how" construction, and, even more important, the *hí* in c marks this pāda as an independent clause. For detailed disc. of this passage and the problems associated with the object interpr. of c, see Keydana (Inf. 193–94). Far better to take *cetati* in its common sense 'appears', reinforced by the cognate *ketú-* 'visible beacon' in b, and keep pāda c as a syntactically separate nominal cl., as done by Re (also see his n.), Keydana, and JPB.

The phrase *ártham hy àsya taráṇi* is difficult, esp. if we accept that it must be an independent cl. on the grounds given just above. Interpr. it requires us to assess the meaning and function of *taráṇi-* and to re-assess the same for *tū́rṇi-*, found in 5c. I should first justify why I think the latter has any bearing on the former. First, I find it striking that these two fairly rare *-ni-* forms (22x [incl. deriv.] and 8x [incl. compd.] respectively), built to very similar bases, are found within two vss. of each other. This seems to call out for their comparison. Further, *taráṇi-* here must be construed with *ártham*, one way or the other, and *tū́rṇi-* appears in the cmpd *tū́rṇy-artha-* (2x). The poet seems to be swapping out related adjectival forms with *ártha-*. However, *tū́rṇi-* is usually given a different meaning ('swift') from *taráṇi-*, with a different etymology (√*tvar*, not √*tṝ*). I will reexamine *tū́rṇi-* ad vs. 5, but will here concentrate on *taráṇi-*. This adj. is generally, and I think quite correctly, derived from √*tṝ* 'cross over', etc. etc. (see, e.g., EWA I.630). It occurs 20 times in the RV (in addition to 2 occurrences of *taráṇitva-*). In what I consider to be its original, literal sense, it means 'transiting, crossing', of the sun (I.50.4, VII.63.4, X.88.16). In these passages the referent has a definite trajectory (across the sky) and a definite goal (the other side of the sky), a fact to which we will return. The form then can be used of forward motion without a necessary trajectory or goal: 'advancing', used of fire and its flames (e.g., I.128.6, IV.4.12) or Soma (I.121.6), priests (IV.45.5, 7), etc. And ultimately the sense of forward *movement*, which may involve 'overtaking' smtg. else (maybe III.49.4), can be attenuated simply to its conceptual equivalent, 'surpassing' (e.g., Indra VIII.45.28, a successful man VII.32.9, 20, etc.). The influence of comparable forms of the multivalent verb could always have been felt. The occurrence here is the only neut. form; the question is -- what is its relationship to *ártham*? Here a return to the 'transiting' passages will help. In VII.63.4 the sun is described as *dūréarthas taráṇiḥ* "whose goal is in the far distance as he crosses over (to it)," where a cmpd. with *artha-* is associated with *taráṇi-*. This suggest that *ártham* here is conceptually the obj./goal of *taráṇi-*, rather than being directly modified by it. In other words, a rendering like the publ. tr., which represents simple modification, "for his goal is surpassing," is probably wrong. However, this complicates the syntax: what neut. could *taráṇi* modify if not *ártham*? And is it just a simple adjective? Here I follow Keydana (194), with the same reluctance he seems to show, in taking *taráṇi* here as a predicated infinitive (or its functional equivalent): "for his goal is (to be) advanced towards" or, perhaps better "for it is for him to advance to his goal." In the following vs. Agni is made the conveyor of oblations, and in the verse after that he is a chariot: the purposeful forward motion of Agni is well established.

III.11.5: To return to the relationship between *taráṇi-* and *tū́rṇi-* discussed ad vs. 3, here concentrating on *tū́rṇi*. As I said there, this stem is usually glossed as 'swift' (e.g., Gr 'rasch, eilend, rasch im Werke') and derived from √*tvar* 'hasten' (e.g., EWA I.689, though an alternative connection with √*tṝ* is admitted there). But none of its occurrences requires, or even encourages, a meaning 'swift', while several instead favor 'crossing, advancing'. Two of the six non-compounded forms occur alongside the root-noun cmpd *ap-túr-* 'crossing the waters' (I.3.8, III.51.2); this association seems significant, and they share the same *u*-root vocalism. In X.88.6 *tū́rṇi-* is used of the sun transiting (like *taráṇi-*; see ad vs. 3 above). A sense 'advancing' works for the other non-cmpded forms, in all cases better than 'swift' (see comm. ad locc.). Then there are the two occurrences of the cmpd *tū́rṇy-artha-* (III.52.5, V.43.2). In the publ. tr. I rendered this cmpd as 'swift to

his/their task', flg. Gr "schnell zum Ziele dringend, zum Ziele eilend," but how a bahuvrīhi would allow such a sense is now not clear to me. (AiG does not treat the cmpd.) Taking into account the fact that *taráṇi-* is construed with *ártha-* in our vs. 3c, as an obj./goal (see above), I think we can take *tū́rṇy-artha-* in a similar sense, with a pseudo-infinitival 1st member: 'having a goal to advance to'. In short, *tū́rṇi-* is essentially a synonym of *taráṇi-*, and both are derived from √*tṝ* and meaning 'transiting, advancing' (etc.). It should be noted that this analysis seems to be reflected in both Ge's and Re's tr. of the two forms in this Agni cycle (III.3.5, 11.5), "zielerreichenden" and "franchissant (les obstacles)," though without comment, as opposed to WG "schnell, rasch" in both places.

As for the root vocalism, and esp. the contrast between ppl. *tīrṇá-* and our stem *tū́rṇi-*, it's striking that *tīrṇá-* is actually not found in the RV, save in a single occurrence of negated *átīrṇa-*. In any case, the *tī́r* and *tū́r* root syllables of √*tṝ* are thoroughly confused; though I would like to confine the latter originally to √*tvar* 'hasten', synchronically we must reckon with numerous *tū́r* forms to √*tṝ*.

I would alter the tr. to "the advancing chariot, ever new."

III.11.7: The instr. *vā́hasā* is variously interpr. and construed; e.g., Ge considers the gen. *pāvakáśociṣaḥ* at the end of the last pāda to be dependent on it; Old (SBE) and WG take *vā́hasā* as (somehow, loosely) governing *práyāṃsi*. It's important to consider the usual employment of the stem, incl. in its many cmpds. (see disc. ad X.29.3); the *vā́has-* is ordinarily conceptualized as a verbal product (hymn, vel sim.) that serves as the vehicle to bring / attract the gods to the sacrifice. Here the pious mortal by bringing the gods here with such a vehicle attains to desirable things. Although *práyāṃsi* are ordinarily pleasurable offerings *to* the gods, here I think they must be pleasurable things that the mortal himself wishes to attain; this is supported by the formula that seems to be split across this vs. and the next one (see comm. ad 8a). It also seems to be parallel to *kṣáyam* 'dwelling place' in the last pāda, given *sadhásthāni práyāṃsi ca* "abodes and pleasurable offerings" in the immediately flg. hymn, III.12.8, which also supports the syntactic interpr. reflected in the publ. tr.

III.11.8: Various suggestions have been made for what to supply with *súdhitā*, but Re's, *práyāṃsi*, must be correct, since *práyāṃsi* is found in the immed. preceding vs. (7a) and *práyāṃsi súdhitā(ni)* is a fixed phrase: I.135.4, VI15.15, VIII.60.4, X.53.2. (*práyāṃsi* also regularly serves as obj. of √*dhā* [I.169.3, III.30.1, X.91.9].) Here the same verb, *aśyāma*, is found as in vs. 7 (*aśnoti*), also with mortal worshipers as subject. The two vss. seem to be making the point that mortals, too, can attain to *práyāṃsi*. I would add a parenthetic "(pleasing offerings)" to replace "things": "all the well-placed (pleasing offerings)."

III.11.9: Strictly speaking, *érire* should not be 'placed' but 'set in motion', and the tr. should be altered accordingly.

III.12 Indra and Agni [SJ on JPB]

A fairly elementary hymn. Every vs. except 3 contains the dual dvandva *índrāgnī́*, generally in the voc. (1a, 2a, 5c, 6, 7a, 8a, 9a), always pāda initial. Vs. 4c has the acc. *índrāgnī́*, and vs. 3a the independent accs. *índram agním*.

III.12.3: As just noted, this is the only vs. in which the two gods are not compounded. I don't know why; it can't be because they're in the acc., because *índrāgnī́* is acc. in the next vs., 4c. We fall back on the unsatisfactory explanation of metrical necessity (extra syllable needed).

The meaning of the hapax *kavi-chád-* is uncertain, in part because the root affiliation of *-chád-* cannot be determined. See disc. in Scar (130). The standard view is that the root is √*chand* 'seem, appear, please', giving the cmpd the sense "appearing as poets" (publ. tr. "who appear as sages"), perhaps more idiomatically "in the guise of poets." However, as Scar points out, the root could instead be √*chad* 'cover, protect', with the cmpd meaning "protecting poets." Perhaps best to go with the former analysis, with all the standard tr., since this root is more common. While accepting this root affiliation, Gr gives it a transitive sense "taking pleasure in poets" (somewhat similar Sāy.), which is not excluded – nor is the analysis with √*chad* 'cover'.

Although not so analyzed by the Pp., the sequence *jutyā́ vṛṇe* may conceal the preverb *ā́*; see *ā́ vṛṇe* in 5c.

III.12.4: On *tośá-* and the root √*tuś* in general, see comm. ad VIII.38.2, where I defend the old gloss 'drip' against Gotō's anodyne replacement, 'hasten'.

III.12.5: On *nīthāvíd-* see Scar (485). As he points out, in IV.3.16 *nīthā́ni* are associated with other verbal tricks of skilled poets.

III.12.8: The neut. pl. *taviṣā́ṇi* can be taken in two different ways, either as an adj. modifying the neut. pl.s *sadhásthāni práyāṃsi ca* in the flg. pāda (so Old SBE [modifying only *sadhásthāni*], Re, publ. tr.) or as substantivized 'powers' (as in I.166.1, 9) (so Gr, Ge, WG). I weakly favor the latter, because neither abodes nor pleasurable offerings are naturally "mighty," and the nominals usually modified by adjectival *taviṣá-* are quite different from these benign objects. I would therefore propose an alt. "Yours are the powers, and the seats and pleasing offerings."

As noted ad III.6.4, I prefer "seats" to "abodes."

III.13 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The content is fairly straightforward, but there are syncopations and disturbances in syntax and word order, esp. in the earlier vss.

III.13.1: The content of the vs. is entirely banal, but the construction of pāda c seems a bit disordered, with the material we expect to begin pāda / clause, *ā́ sá naḥ*, instead ending the pāda, preceded by the VP *gámad devébhiḥ*. (I.5.3 is almost identical, with *vā́jebhiḥ* instead of *devébhiḥ*.) The easiest way to account of this is to assume the whole VP was fronted.

III.13.2: The first hemistich of this vs. is troubled both syntactically and conceptually. To begin with the syntactic: in the vs.-opening configuration *ṛtā́vā yásya* the ordinary interpr. would be that, as is incredibly common, despite its second position *yásya* marks the whole as a rel. clause, which would contain nom. *ṛtā́vā* as its subject (i.e., "of whom/whose [X] the truthful one [does something]"). But this doesn't work; instead nom. *ṛtā́vā* is, as it were, a single-word nominal clause, with *yásya* coreferential with and dependent on it (i.e., "[he is] the truthful one, of whom/whose ..."). This nom. has no further function; when the referent (Agni) returns in cd, he is in the acc. (*tám ... tám*). Given the ubiquity of relatives clauses with *yá-* in 2nd position, the reading forced on the configuration here, with *ṛtā́vā* and *yásya* in separate clauses, counts as a deliberately misleading trick. However, within this Agni cycle there is a similar syntactic construction that escapes the problem we have here, but provides a model for interpr. our almost identical problematic pāda-opening. III.6.10 begins *sá hótā yásya ródasī ...* "He is the Hotar of whom the two world-halves ..." The difference is the inclusion of *sá*, which suggests that *sá hótā* is a full nominal clause and also pushes *yásya* into third position. This pāda is surely the model for ours, with trisyllabic *ṛtā́vā* substituting for disyllabic *hótā* and thereby knocking out the clarifying *sá*.

In the rest of the hemistich the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take *ródasī* and *ūtáyaḥ* as joint subjects of *sácanta:* "whose skill the two world-halves and the helps follow." Needless to say, this is a wildly ill-assorted pairing. This seems to be what the syntax points to: among other things since *sácanta* is accented, it must be in a dependent clause. But what it means doesn't bear considering. It's also important to note that pāda b, *dákṣaṃ sácanta ūtáyaḥ*, is found independently elsewhere, in I.134.2e (a Vāyu hymn), where it makes reasonable sense (and is subordinated to a *yád* in the preceding pāda). The fact that b is found independently, along with the nonsense that results from cobbling a and b together, is, I think, a good clue that we should de-couple the two pādas. Bloomfield (RReps, ad I.134.2) finds our hemistich disturbing as it is usually interpr. and devotes considerable space to discussing it. His solution is to take pādas a and b as separate *yásya* clauses (both hanging off *ṛtā́vā*): "The righteous (Agni) whose are the two worlds ... (whose) helps attach themselves to solid pious work—him ..." I think this must be the correct way to interpr. the structures and would substitute (with some relexicalization): "(He is) the truthful one, whose are the two world-halves, (whose) skill (his) forms of help accompany." That it is Agni's *ūtáyaḥ* is suggested by *devásya ... ūtáyaḥ* in the next hymn (III.14.6).

III.13.3: The vs. contains one suffix-accented *tár*-stem governing the gen. (*yantā́ ... eṣām ... yajñā́nām*) and two root-accented ones governing the acc. (*dā́tā ... vánitā maghám*). It is not clear to me whether the morphological and syntactic difference is meant to signal a functional difference. Although Tichy cites the passage for its use of both stem types (*tar-stems*, 299–300), her attempt to differentiate them functionally (302) seems weak. Of *yantā́* + GEN in this passage she says it expresses the god's "Wirkungen ... zugunsten der Lebewesen," while *dā́tā ... vánitā* + ACC describes "bleibende Eigenschaften" of the god. But she does not explain why his role as "controller of sacrifices" is not a permanent characteristic of the god, or, conversely, why his roles as "giver and gainer of bounty" are not actions beneficial to living beings. For her the morphology seems to be the sole driver

of interpr., imposing distinctions that don't seem to be reflected in the actual content of the phrases.

The standard tr. fold *áthā hí sáḥ* into the rest of pāda b (*sá yajñā́nām*), despite the apparent new beginning and the doubling of *sá(ḥ)* (e.g., JSK [DGRV II.82] "for he is also (the leader) of the worships," reproducing Ge). But *áthā hí sáḥ* has all the hallmarks of a clause-initial sequence, and with the publ. tr. (as well as Tichy [300] and WG) it should be taken as a separate nominal cl. As elsewhere in the hymn, the syntax is syncopated.

As it also is in the next pāda, *agníṃ tám vo duvasyata*, where the pāda/clause would ordinarily begin with *táṃ vaḥ*.

III.13.6: The involvement of the Maruts in strengthening Agni is a bit odd: these gods are not usually associated. But see III.16.2 adduced by Ge: *imáṃ naro marutaḥ saścata vṛ́dham* "Follow this one to strengthen him, o superior men, o Maruts," as well as the Maruts' presence in the next hymn, along with Mitra and Varuṇa (III.14.4). I almost wonder if the Maruts as winds (as in later Sanskrit) are what's at issue in the strengthening: fanning the flames.

III.14 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The verbal hero of this hymn seems to be *sáhas-* 'strength', with *sáhasas putráḥ* found in 1c, 4c, 6a (latter two as voc.) and voc. *sahasvaḥ* in 2b and 4a.

III.14.1: On *vidáthāni* here, see Th (Unters. 46 n. 1), who tr. "[Stätten der] Verteilungen" and identifies them as the hearths/fireplaces on the ritual ground.

Because of the appearance of the chariot in pāda c, as well as in the final vs., 7c, I'd be inclined to tr. *ā́ ... asthāt* as "he has mounted," as usual.

I'd be inclined to tr. *satyáḥ* as "really present" and *kavítamaḥ* as "best poet."

The phrase *pṛthivyā́m pā́jo aśret* is found identically in VII.3.4 (except with accented *áśret*), where JPB tr. very differently; see also III.61.5 *diví pā́jo aśret* and VII.10.1 *pṛthú pā́jo aśret*. These passages should be harmonized; I'd here emend the tr. to "has fixed his leading edge on the earth." This refers to the spread of the fire. However, on the basis of *pā́jasā pṛthúnā* in the next hymn (III.15.1), perhaps 'countenance' should be retained here.

III.14.3: Strictly speaking "(and Night)" should be in parens.

On *vājáya-* (so accented), see my *-áya*-Formations, pp. 51 and 88. The form here is probably the intrans. "race," but it is possible that it belongs with the transitive "incite" forms, with gapped obj.: "Dawn (and Night) inciting (you)."

On the grammatical form underlying *vandhúreva*, see Old (SBE and Noten) and Re. Since it is likely either du. or pl., the tr. should be altered to "chariot-boxes."

III.14.4: I do not understand the phrase *sumnám arcan* nor the publ. tr. "chant to you your favor"; *sumná-* is ordinarily something attained, or desired to be attained; it is not the object of a verb of speaking. Perhaps what is meant is that the gods chant *their own* favor / benevolent thoughts for Agni, which allows him to rise up in pāda c.

In d I am inclined to go against the clear morphology of *pratháyan* and take *kṣitī́ḥ* not as obj. of a trans. participle (as in the publ. tr. "spreading out the settlements"), but as

goal of *abhí* "spreading *to* the settlements," depicting the light of the fire spreading across the earth (sim. WG). The phrase *sū́ryo nṛ́n* is then (in my view) an unmarked simile "(like) the sun (spreading) to men," where *nṛ́n* is the acc. pl. it appears to be (not gen. "the sun of men," as in other tr.), but not a direct object as in the publ. tr. ("spreading out men"). The phrase *sū́ryo nṛ́n* is also found in I.146.4 (q.v.).

III.14.6: The first syllables of *sahasríṇam* echo the insistent *sahas-* earlier in the hymn (see comm. in intro. above).

The opening of d, *adroghéna vácasā*, is conceptually reminiscent of the opening of 5d *ásredhatā mánmanā*.

III.14.6–7: Each hemistich begins with a form of the 2nd sg. prn.: *tᵘvám* (6c, 7c), *tᵘvád* (6a), *túbhyam* (7a).

III.14.7: This vs. is notionally in a weak ring with vs. 1, with *kavikrato* matching *kavítamaḥ* (1b), *adhvaré* corresponding to *vidáthāni* (1a), and *suráthasya* to *vidyúd-ratha-* (1c). Remember also that *ā́ ... asthāt* anticipates the chariot of pāda c. Possible further support for the ring is found in the phonologically scrambled matches at the ends of the first hemistich of vs. 1 and the second of vs. 7: *sá vedhā́ḥ* and *svadehá*.

The first hemistich consists of an unresolved rel. cl., or, probably better, one with the rel. prn. and its antecedent flipped. If instead of *yā́ni imā́* at the end of pāda a we had **imā́ yā́ni*, an interpr. "these things (are) for you, which we have done" would be possible. This is in fact the way Ge, WG, and JPB take it (also, more or less, Re), and is probably the best way to do it – although I don't know of a rule that flips these pronouns. Otherwise we must read it as a rel. cl. without a main cl.: "which these things we have done ..." (with the further ungrammaticality in Engl. of "which these").

III.15 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.15.1: Curiously, Re does not try to impose a trifunctional interpr. on b, though it's actually quite easy to construct one.

III.15.2: It would be possible to take *tanvā́* with the verb, as the standard tr. do, rather than with the voc.: "take pleasure by yourself / take pleasure with your own body"; I would slightly favor this alt. though it is not nec.

III.15.3: The construction of d is uncertain. Ge, Re, and WG take *naḥ ... uśíjaḥ* as a double acc. with *kṛdhí*, with *rāyé* a dat. of purpose – e.g., WG "mach uns zu Uśij, (dass wir) Reichtum (gewinnen)." JPB, like Old (SBE), takes *uśíjaḥ* as an appositive to *naḥ*: "us, the fire-tending priests." In his n. 3d Ge describes the Uśij, an inherited priestly title with a cognate in Old Avestan, as ancient singers who recaptured the cows and found Agni, and it is certainly the case that in several passages (e.g., IV.1.15=16.6=X.45.11, VII.90.4) the pl. *uśíjaḥ* are identified as or act parallel to the Aṅgirases in the Vala myth and also take part in the finding of the fugitive Agni (X.46.2). Although by the appositive reading, "we" could just count as modern-day Uśij, the double acc. reading of Ge et al. makes somewhat better sense and also makes better sense of the syntax ("make ACC.

DAT.”). I would therefore alter to “make us Uśij/fire-tending priests, for (us to acquire) wealth.”

III.15.4: The gen. (/abl.) *pāyóḥ* in c is somewhat troublesome, but I think it has troubled interpr. more than it should. In the publ. intro. JPB wants to see the phraseology here as showing an indirect identification of Agni with Indra, which seems to me a hypothesis more elaborate than the evidence merits or requires. Old (SBE, but still tentatively held in Noten) wants to emend *pāyóḥ* to voc. *pāyo* or nom. *pāyúḥ*. since Agni is regularly called *pāyú-* (e.g., I.31.13, II.1.7). In the pl. the word often refers to Agni’s flames (e.g., I.95.9, IV.4.12–13) as his helpers in providing protection. A singular form not referring to Agni is somewhat surprising, but it should be noted that this is the only form of the stem in Maṇḍala III, and an innovative use of it is quite conceivable. My inclination is to think that “the/your foremost protector” might be a reference to the first or foremost flame of the ritual fire; alternatively, but less likely in my view, it refers to the sacrifice (so Re). It should also be noted that *bṛhataḥ* in the next pāda does not have to modify *pāyóḥ* but can be independently construed (so Ge, WG), though it can be part of the *pāyóḥ* phrase (so Old, Re, JPB). My suggestion for the 2nd hemistich is “... as the leader of the sacrifice and of your foremost protector [=flame], (leader) of the lofty one, o Jātavedas of good guidance.”

III.15.5: This vs. is a bit disjointed, leading the various interpr. to supply various verbs and combine various NPs. It seems better to follow the fairly barebones interpr. of JPB’s publ. tr. I would make only one very slight adjustment: delete “up” in b.

Note that *dīdyānaḥ* (b) picks up *didīhi* in 4a, despite difference in voice and quantity of the redupl. and root syllables.

III.15.6: In c Ge (/WG) supplies ‘come’, which I’d be inclined to follow, since *devébhiḥ* is otherwise left with nothing to do. So, a period at the end of the first hemistich, with c to be rendered as “being aflame with good flame, o god, (come) with the gods.”

III.15.7 = III.1.23 (etc.).

III.16 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.16.1: The last term over which Agni exercises control in this vs. is *vṛtraháthānām*, which is surprising both because this term is in Indra’s domain, not Agni’s, and because the plural number of the form seems rather to pertain to the first cmpd member (“of obstacles”) than to the second (“smashing”) – strictly speaking, this should be tr. “the smashings of obstacle(s).”

III.16.2: On the Maruts strengthening Agni, see comm. ad III.13.6. I would prefer “accompany” to “follow,” for *saścata* without preverb.

On *śévṛdha-* see comm. ad V.87.4. Here I would prefer “kind attention” to “kindness.”

The pl. referent of the *yé* that is the subject of the second hemistich is not certain: it can be either the riches (*rā́yaḥ*) of the immed. preceding pāda or the Maruts of pāda a,

since both are masc. pl. The Maruts are favored by Sāy., Old (SBE), Re; the riches by Ge and JPB (with WG unclear). I think it quite likely that both are meant. However, though the contents of cd fit the Maruts better, it would require a switch from 2nd ps. in ab to 3rd. Although this is hardly uncommon, since a 3rd ps. referent is already to hand, it may be better to stick with "riches."

The VP *śátrum ādabhúḥ* is also found in VI.46.10, where I tr. the verb as 'outwit', which might be better here, since the subjects are positively viewed entities and "swindle" is not ordinarily a positively viewed action.

III.16.3: Exactly how the long gen. phrase beginning with *rāyáḥ* works with *naḥ ... śiśīhi* "sharpen us" is not clear to me. With the publ. tr., it may be best to assume a mediating (gapped) dative "share, portion" with *rāyáḥ ... śūṣmíṇaḥ* a partitive gen ("sharpen us for [a share] of wealth ..."). In the publ. tr. "a share" should be in parens. For the dat. in this construction see VII.18.2 *śiśīhi rāyé asmā́n* "sharpen us for wealth."

In any case since *suvī́rya-* is a neut. noun (see comm. ad VII.4.6), this tr. should be emended to "wealth (and) an abundance of good heroes."

III.16.4: As Ge (n. 4a) remarks and as is reflected in the publ. tr., *víśvā bhúvanā* should be construed both with *cákriḥ* and with *abhí sāsahíḥ*, between which it is placed.

In b I might prefer "does friendly service to the gods"; on *dúvaḥ* see comm. ad IX.65.3.

III.16.5: The publ. tr. of *ámati-* 'lack of thought' fits well with the two following privative cmpds., *avī́ratā-* and *agótā-*; however, it is not very specific. In general, *ámati-* means 'inattention, neglect'; see comm. ad X.42.10.

III.17 Agni [SJ on JPB]

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is dominated by forms of √*yaj* 'sacrifice'; the insistent repetition is somewhat offset by the fact that the four finite verb forms, all act. 2nd singulars, *áyajaḥ* (2a), *yakṣi* (2c, 3c), and *prá yaja* (5c), are all used somewhat differently. See below.

III.17.2: Though tightly bound in apparently parallel constructions, the 2nd sg. forms of √*yaj*, *áyajaḥ* (a) and *yakṣi* (c), each with an acc. complement, are used differently: the acc. with the latter has its standard function with √*yaj*, marking the gods as target/goal of the sacrifice, but the object of *áyajaḥ*, namely *hotrám* 'office/role of Hotar', seems to refer to the manner or capacity in which Agni performed sacrifice. This off-balance construction is made harder to interpr. by the contrastive *pṛthivyáḥ ... diváḥ*. Do they express different types of Hotarship (so JPB, as well as Ge, Re, WG) or are they genitives in datival function ("for the earth ... for heaven"; so Old SBE). I am inclined towards the latter, because I don't understand what "the Hotarship of the earth / of heaven" could mean, whereas the datival genitive could be an oblique object (functionally parallel to *devā́n* in c), displaced from the acc. slot by the phrasal verb *hotrám* √*yaj*. I would therefore alter the tr. to "Just as you performed the sacrificial role of Hotar for the Earth ... and just as you observantly (performed it) for Heaven ..." (Of course they could also be ablatives, but that case would be even harder to construe.)

III.17.3: There is no agreement on the sense of the hapax fem. pl. *ājā́nīḥ*; in particular if it is agent ('birth-givers', e.g., Ge / WG "Mütter"; essentially also Re) or an abstract 'births' (so Gr, Old SBE). Determining the sense of *ājā́nīḥ* is essential for the analysis of *uṣásaḥ*: if the former is an agent, then *uṣásaḥ* must be a fem. nom. pl. (with substitution of the weak stem for the strong *uṣā́saḥ*, as frequently elsewhere) in an equational nominal clause: "three dawns are your mothers" (or "the dawns are your three mothers"). If *ājā́nīḥ* is an abstract, then *uṣásaḥ* should be a sg. oblique (though JPB mixes the two in the publ. tr.: "three dawns are your births"). Both Old (SBE and Noten) and Gr take *uṣásaḥ* as ablative. I am inclined to follow this latter interpr. – in part because an abstract reading "three births" makes pāda b more parallel to pāda a with its "three lifetimes." Moreover, though *ā́ √jan* is a fairly rare idiom, it generally appears with an ablative or ablatival adverb in the sense "born from X"; see, e.g., IV.43.3 *divá ājātā* "born from heaven"; V.31.3 *sáhasa ājaniṣṭa* "he was born from might" (as well as I.179.4, IV.18.1, X.129.6, maybe I.83.5; cf. also VII.3.9 with the oblique gen./loc. du. *mātróḥ*). I would therefore substitute the tr.: "three are your births from Dawn" (most likely the kindling of the three ritual fires at dawn). The fem. *tā́bhiḥ* that opens the next hemistich would then refer to the births (+/- the lifetimes in the neut. in pāda a).

The third 2nd sg. act. form to *√yaj*, *yakṣi* in c, is construed with an acc. in yet another sense. The *s*-stem obj. *ávaḥ* 'help', is what we want Agni to acquire for us by sacrifice; the usual idiom is *ā́ √yaj* '(bring) here by sacrifice, win by sacrifice', but the expected preverb is lacking here.

III.17.5: It is surely shocking to end a hymn to Agni by addressing him in order to state that there was a previous Hotar who was better at sacrificing than he, the god currently being addressed, is. The more predictable sentiment is found in V.3.5a, which is identical to our pāda a, save for having *ná* in place of *yáḥ* ("no previous Hotar was a better sacrificer than you"). On these near twin pādas see Bl RR ad III.17.5: "Evidently the poet of the latter stanza [=III.17.5 sj] builds his strange statement upon familiar ideas, and cannot resist the temptation to go the poet of 5.3.5 'one better' by introducing the fable of a yet more primordial and superior sacrificer than Agni himself." As Old (SBE) suggests, the "better sacrificer" is most likely a previous instantiation of the ritual fire, so there is at least a genealogical relationship between them.

The relative prn. *yáḥ* of pāda a is clearly picked up by *tásya* in pāda c; all the standard tr. (also JSK DGRV I.143–44) take pāda b as part of the relative clause describing the previous Hotar, and, given the *yáḥ ... tásya* dyad, this would be the default interpr. However, I think pāda b actually anticipates the main cl. of c and refers to the current Agni. The lack of temporal or person reference in b allows it to lean either way, and *dvitā́* 'once more, yet again' nudges it towards the current Agni, not the previous one. Although JPB's tr. essentially follows the standard ones, he clearly recognizes the force of *dvitā́* and orients the pāda towards the future, even apparently interpr. the agent noun *sáttā* as a periphrastic future ("once again will take his seat"), which seems a bit incoherent, since it predicts that the previous, better sacrificer will fulfill that same role again, even though the current Agni is ordered in the next pāda to perform the sacrifice. The other tr. take b as purely descriptive or else as having past-time reference.

In keeping with my sense that b belongs with c, I would emend the tr. of abc to "He who as previous Hotar was a better sacrificer than you, o Agni – (you), once again taking (his) seat [/place] and being luck itself by your own power -- carry forward the sacrifice according to *his* foundation(s)." Pāda c is in a ring-compositional relationship with 1a: *prathamā́nu dhármā* "according to the first foundations." The depiction in our vs. of a better sacrificer than the current Agni is more pointed, but both the 1st vs. and the last point to an original foundation that provided the template for the current sacrifice and sacrificer.

I would also slightly alter the tr. of d to "Then set the rite in place at our pursuit of the gods."

Vs. 5 also has close connections with vs. 2: *hótā* (5a) picks up *hotrám* (2a), *cikitvaḥ* (5c) *cikitvā́n* (2b), *prá yajā* (5c) *prá tira* (*yajñám*) (2d). Note also that *(prá) yajā*, the fourth finite form of √*yaj*, is used absolutely, with no acc. complement, unlike the other three (2a, 2c, 3c).

III.18 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.18.1: I don't understand why the so-called future impv. *dahatāt* is used in d. Though the future sense of the *-tāt-* formation is less pronounced in the RV than in Vedic prose acdg. to Wh (Gr. §571), it still is a marked form in contrast to the present impv. *daha*, and one expects the *-tāt* impv. to follow logically upon a previously enjoined action. This vs. does contain a preceding impv., *bhávā* (pāda a), but its action is not closely tied thematically with *dahatāt*. The future impv. is used in conventional fashion in III.8.1 and III.23.2.

III.18.2: The two *tápo* forms (a, c) should be analyzed as *tápă* + *u*, though JSK (Ptcl. *u*, 176) is uncertain about the second and suggests that the poet or redactor could have changed *-ā* to *-o* to match the flg. two words, which end in *-o*. Given the undoubted occurrence of one form coalescing with *u* in this passage, it seems more economical to use the same explanation for the 2nd.

The standard tr. all interpr. *cikitānáḥ* as transitive 'perceive', with *acíttān* as obj. This is of course very tempting because of the etymological relationship. But medial forms of the pf. *cikité* are intrans. (see Kü 176) in the sense 'be perceived, appear, be conspicuous', as are the med. forms of the closely related intens. *cékite* – so JPB's intrans. rendering is more faithful to the morphology.

On the surprising root accent of *acítta-* see AiG II.1.226 (which merely notes it without explanation, though listing a handful of similar anomalies).

III.18.3: As Ge (n. 3c) points out, *bráhmaṇā* can be read either with *ī́še* or with *vándamānaḥ*, between which it is strategically placed; he provides parallels for both. This double reading is reflected in the publ. tr. (though curiously not in Ge's own).

In d the acc. phrase *imā́ṃ dhíyam ... devī́m* requires a verb to govern it; already Old (Noten, contra SBE) suggests *juhómi* in b, and this is endorsed explicitly by Ge (n. 3d) and WG. A putative phrase **juhómi dhíyam* would express the common trope of "pouring prayers" – but neither Ge nor WG seems to have the courage to so tr. it: Ge / WG "(bringe ich)." By contrast, JPB's tr. does.

III.18.4: Since *śáṃ yóḥ* appears in the immediately preceding hymn (III.17.3) in the same metrical position, it should be rendered in the same way here if possible. I would substitute "as luck and life, (set) rich (vigor) upon the Vs," to match III.17.3 "become luck and life."

III.18.4: For *sṛprā́ karásnā* see the cmpd. *sṛprá-karasna-* in VIII.32.10. On *karásna-* 'forearm' vel sim., see EWA s.v. *kará-*. "Glossy forearms" are a more likely possession of Agni's – ghee-drenched flames – than of Indra in VIII.32.10.

III.19 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The hymn has a particular interest in the ritual participation (or at least witnessing) of the gods as a whole: see *devátātā* (1c), *devátātim* (2c, 4c), *śárdhaḥ ... divyám* "divine troop" (JPB publ. tr. "multitude of gods").

III.19.1: In nearby III.17.5 a "better sacrificer" (*yájīyān*) than (the current) Agni was announced, but here he is back in his customary role as *yájīyān*.

III.19.2: On the formation of (*pra)dakṣiṇíd* see comm. ad V.36.4.

All the standard tr. take *urāṇáḥ* as trans., with *devátātim* as object – also in the identical pāda IV.6.3b. However, all other occurrences of this participle are passive (save possibly for VII.73.3), and in this hymn a passive "(Agni) being chosen" complements the opening of the hymn *agníṃ hótāraṃ prá vṛṇe* "I choose Agni as Hotar," in the immediately preceding vs. In a ritual context "choosing" is regularly about the choice of Hotar. For further disc. see comm. ad IV.6.3.

Contra the standard tr. (incl. JPB's), I think *vásubhiḥ* refers to material goods, not to "good" gods, and would emend to "with gifts and goods." My interpr. is supported by sg. *vásvaḥ* in the next vs., which certainly doesn't refer to a divinity.

III.19.3: The grammatical subject changes in this vs., from Agni in 2cd (in my view, against Ge's opinion that it is the human Hotar) to a human ritual officiant. This change of subject should be signaled in some way in the publ. tr., perhaps by "He [=human priest]." Interpreting 3a is made more difficult by the fact that there is no overt verb or clear way to construe the instr. phrase *téjīyasā mánasā*, and tr. vary widely. I think JPB is correct to supply a verb based on *sám ... aśret* in 2d, which is also construed with instrumentals. Here the "sharper thought/mind" is the human priest's contribution to the sacrifice, while Agni in 2d provided gifts and goods.

The fungibility of Agni as priest and human as priest is made clear in pāda b, where the impv *śikṣa* is addressed to Agni, while the human priest is referred to as *śikṣú-* (*pace* BR's emendation of *śikṣóḥ* to voc. *śikṣo*, accepted by Old but rejected by Ge, Re, WG, JPB). The ritual contributions of the god and the human are essentially equated.

The *utá* introducing pāda b has non-coordinate value, as JSK (DGRV I.453) notes. He renders it by "therefore" (JPB's "and so"). Perhaps it's meant to match immediately preceding *-ūta* 'helped' (in sandhi) in the cmpd *t^{u}vóta-*.

The standard tr. take *suṣṭutáyaḥ* as "good praise-singers," but as JSK (DGRV I.55) points out, the well-attested stem *suṣṭutí-* otherwise only means 'praise-song' (a fact

acknowledged by Re, but not reflected in his tr.). JSK plausibly suggests that "(we) and our praise-songs" form a zeugma, an interpr. represented in the publ. tr.

The publ. tr. fails to tr. *te*: emend to "our praises of you."

The gen. *vásvaḥ* is to be construed with *prábhūtau*, along with *rāyó nṛ́tamasya*. See, e.g., *vásvo rāyáḥ* in II.2.12; I would therefore change "of the good" to "of goods," since I think this is a material, not moral desire.

III.19.5: As noted in the publ. intro., 5a forms a ring with 1a *agníṃ hótāram ... miyédhe* / 5a *yát tvā hótāram ... miyédhe*, with the ring signaled by the fairly rare word *miyédha-* 'ritual meal'.

Note *yajáthāya devā́ḥ* as a variant of *yajáthāya devā́n* in nearby III.17.1, where the acc. served as obj. to the infinitival *yajáthāya*.

III.20 Agni and the All Gods [SJ on JPB]

III.20.1: JPB's rendering of *vāvaśānā́ḥ* as "bellowing" follows Kü's reinterpr. (477–80, 486–88) of all forms of this stem as belonging to √*vāś* 'bellow', rather than assigning some of them to √*vaś* 'want, long for' (so, e.g., Gr). This wholesale reanalysis seems extreme to me. Certainly in this vs., where the gods are asked to "hear us," noisy bellowing of their own might interfere. I prefer to follow the standard tr.: "the gods, ardently longing for the rite ..." This sense is supported by *devávāta-* in the next vs., at least if it means 'sought by the gods' (my preference) rather than 'won by the gods' (JPB).

Note the phonological echoes of the openings of c and d: *sujyótiṣo ... sajóṣaso*.

III.20.2: The whole vs. concerns the three ritual fires.

The neut. *vā́jina-* is a vṛddhi deriv. of *vājín-* 'prizewinner, competitor, racehorse' (AiG II.2.350). It is found 5x in the RV, with the other four in Maṇḍala X (X.56.3; 71.5, 10; 103.10). In two of the five passages it is closely linked with *vājín-* (X.56.3 *vājy àsi vā́jinenā*, X.103.10 *vājínāṃ vā́jināni*). As a vṛddhi deriv., it can bear various semantic relationships to its base *vājín-*. In X.56.3 and 103.10 I tr. it as "competitive spirit," but in X.71.5, 10 it seems more concrete, as "competition." Neither of these meanings particularly suits the form here, which is isolated from the forms clustered in X; nor do I find JPB's 'victorious charges' (or any of other suggested tr.; see Ge's n. 2a, Re's n.) persuasive. I wonder if it refers to a locale, like parallel *sadhástha-*, namely 'place of competition, arena', indicating the hearths. I would change the tr. to "three are your arenas of competition ..."

As noted ad III.6.4, I prefer 'seats' to 'abodes'.

In b the contrast between "three" and "many" is striking, but I think JPB's tr. is correct: the "tongues" are flames (as often), and these are first numbered as three, associated with the three fires, but of course each fire has numerous flames.

As noted ad vs. 1, I'd change "won by the gods" to "sought by the gods."

III.20.3: The cmpd. *pṛṣṭa-bandhu-* 'whose kinship is asked about' has a contrastive match in *bandhu-pṛ́ch-*, used of the Aśvins, in this same maṇḍala, III.54.16 (see disc. ad loc.).

The theme of names is also found there. Presumably names are the clues to the web of relationships (/kinship) in which the god has his place.

III.21 Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the use of this hymn in the animal sacrifice in śrauta ritual, see publ. intro. In addition to the presence of *médas-* 'fat' in every vs. but 3, which was noted in the publ. intro., the word *stoká-* 'drop' is found in every vs. and a form of the root √*ścut* 'drip' in every vs. but 1. The hymn is also notable for using three of the most resonant words for 'poet, seer' in short compass: *vípra-* and *ṕśi-* in vs. 3, both of Agni, and *kaví-* in the cmpd *kaviśastá-* in 4.

III.21.3: On KH's deriv. of *santya* (always voc., no accent) from **saṃ-tya-* in the meaning 'companion', see EWA s.v.

III.21.4: I would correct "independent" to "never poor" for *adhrigo*. See comm. ad I.61.1, VIII.22.11.

As JPB points out in the publ. intro., *medhira* 'o wise one' is a pun on the ubiquitous *médas-* 'fat'.

III.21.5: On the lexeme *práti* √*vī* see comm. ad VIII.39.5, where I gloss it as "accept," as the reciprocal action to *(prá)* √*vī* 'pursue'. Here *práti ... devaśó vihi* plays off *devávītaye* in 2c (and flirts with etymologically unrelated *prā́vitā* in 3d).

III.22 Purīṣya Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the later ritual use of this hymn, see the publ. intro.

III.22.1: The syntax of this vs., esp. its 2nd hemistich, is clotted; see Old's long disc. in Noten, also Ge (n. 1cd).

The first issue is the double loc. *yásmin ... jaṭháre* in ab – in particular how to interpr. *yásmin*, which must refer to Agni, a necessity that does not fit easily with the rest of the rel. cl., which depicts the common scene of Indra taking soma into his belly. What is Agni's role in this? Unlike other oblations, esp. ghee, soma is not poured into the ritual fire – such a liquid would extinguish the fire or at least subdue it – so Agni is not the mediating mouth through which Indra acquires the soma, as he is with ghee and the like. Old (SBE) tr. "with whom," Ge "durch den," both more appropriate for an instr. *yéna*; WG "worin," JPB "in whom," which correctly reflect the loc. but leave the purport unexplained. Re's "chez qui" seems to me the best solution (Ge could have used "bei"): Indra acquires the soma on the ritual ground in the vicinity of the ritual fire. I would slightly emend the tr. to "at which," which is inelegant but closer to the "chez," "bei" that English unfortunately lacks -- or maybe "nearby."

On *vāvaśānáḥ*, see comm. ad nearby III.20.1. Against all the standard tr., but with Kü's reanalysis of the stem, JPB renders it as "bellowing," rather than "longing for." Although Indra is more likely to bellow than the listening gods of III.20.1, I'm still inclined to tr. "ardently longing for it," or at least allow this as a second reading.

The problems in the 2nd hemistich start with pāda c, which contains two semantically separate acc. NPs, *sahasríṇam vā́jam* "thousandfold prize" and *átyaṃ ná*

sáptim "like a teamed steed," which beg to be connected – the horse should win the prize – but without syntactic means to make the connection. One or both of these accusative phrases could belong with the only other acc. in the vs. *sómam ... sutám* in ab, but an interpr. "received the pressed soma in his belly as a thousandfold prize / like a teamed steed" is not compelling, esp. the horse simile. Whereas Agni is regularly compared to horses. But Agni in this hemistich (as in the first pāda) is in the nominative, as subj. of the passive *stūyase* "you are praised." The best alternativen of the many disc. by Old and Ge seems to be the one adopted by Ge et al., that the syntax changes horses in midstream as it were – that is, what started out as a construction with an acc. object to a transitive form of √*stu* 'praise' ("[we praise Agni] like a steed ...") switched to the passive ("you [Agni] are praised") at the last minute.

But this doesn't solve the problem of the ungoverned "prize," nor account for *sasavā́n sán* opening d. The nom. part. *sasavā́n* can modify nom. Agni, of course: "you are praised as one winning, like (one praises) a steed ...," but what we'd really like to do with this verb form is to make it the link between the acc. steed and the acc. prize in c. A way into a solution is provided by a reexamination of *sán*, whose presence is puzzling (though it has attracted no comment in the standard tr.; only JPB reflects it, presumably in his "since you are"). Nom. forms of the pres. part. to √*as* 'be' are almost always concessive, but "*although* winning, you are praised" makes no sense here. My solution is to slightly emend *sasavā́n sán* to the acc. sg. of the same participle, **sasavā́ṃsaṃ* (see *sasavā́ṃsam* in nearby III.34.8). This requires only converting the *n*'s to anusvāras and erasing the accent on *sán*. It is not difficult to imagine the redactors, confronted with immed. flg. *stūyase*, making a nominative phrase with two participles out of the single acc. part. in an effort to provide the verb with a subject. With my emendation, the steed is now modified by an acc. participle, which then can govern the other acc. phrase, the prize. The mixture of constructions -- acc. in the simile, nom. in the frame – remains, but it is now the only syntactic issue, the troublesome *sán* is gone, and the break between the two constructions is clean. I would now change the tr. to "You are praised (as one praises) a teamed steed *that has won a thousandfold prize."

III.22.2: As disc. ad III.53.9, *nṛ́cákas-* can mean either 'having one's gaze on men' or 'having/drawing the gaze of men'; along with most standard tr. JPB opts for the former, but I think the latter is better in this context, since it modifies "radiance" in an NP that depicts a visual spectacle – how could men fail to look?

III.22.3: I consider JPB's rendering of *áchā* as "(to) there" somewhat misleading; I think *áchā* is just a directional particle 'to', and I very much doubt that it can be used as a straight locative adverb "there," as the publ. tr. of pāda b "there you have spoken ..." seems to take it.

Pāda b is intrusive, in that the rel. clauses of cd *yā́ḥ ... yā́ḥ ... ā́paḥ* ("which .... which waters") must further specify the *árṇam* of pāda a, to which Agni goes.

The pf. *ūciṣe* in b is persuasively taken by Kü (442) as reflexive, belonging to the relatively rare middle of this pf. stem: "hin zu dir hast du die Götter gerufen." This makes better sense than simply depicting Agni as chatting with the gods, and it also allows a directional reading of *áchā* ("to [yourself / the ritual ground]"). I think it also encourages a more specific interpr. of *dhíṣṇyāḥ* in the nominal rel. tag *dhíṣṇyā yé* that is more

appropriate to the context. Agni calls to himself the gods "who belong to the holy place," i.e., the ones that should come to the ritual ground. On *dhiṣáṇā-* as 'holy place = ritual ground' see comm. ad III.2.1.

As just noted, the rel. clauses of cd are loosely linked with pāda a; most tr. parenthetically resupply *áchā jigāsi*. Given the double rel. prn. *yā́ḥ ... yā́ḥ*, the *ca* connecting them, and, especially, the contrastive *parástāt* (c) / *avástāt* (d), I think we are dealing with two bodies of waters, only one of which is the sea of heaven (*divó árṇam*) of pāda a. This is not clearly brought out in the publ. tr. (and may in fact not be meant), but most of the standard tr. (also JSK, DGRV I.112) do reflect this view.

Putting this vs. all together, I'd substitute "O Agni, you go to the undulating sea of heaven—you have called to yourself the gods who are associated with the holy place—(you go) to the waters that are in the realm of light beyond the sun and to those that stand nearby beneath (it [=sun])."

III.22.4: On the basis of I.163.1, where I tr. *púrīṣa-* as 'fertile soil (see comm. ad loc.), contrasting there with *samudrá-* 'sea', I think *purīṣyà-* here also has this more specific sense (rather than the abstract 'relating to fullness, overflowing'), esp. because it is contrasted with *prāvaṇá-* 'belonging to *pravaṇá-* 'cascades, torrents'. I would therefore tr. the NP of the first hemistich as "the fires belonging to fertile soil along with those belonging to falling torrents"; what exactly these two sets of fires are escapes me.

With Re, JPB takes *adrúho 'namīvā́ íṣo mahī́ḥ* as nom. pl., characterizing the fires, but some or all of these words could in fact be acc. pl., either as further object(s) of *juṣántām* (so Old) or objects of a verb to be supplied (like "grant"; so Ge, WG). Since *adrúh-* generally modifies gods, I'd take it as nom. pl. here, but would make *anamīvā́ íṣo mahī́ḥ* an acc. obj. (note that *anamīvá-* several times modifies *íṣ-*, as Ge [n. 4d] points out). Simplest is to make this phrase an obj. of *juṣántām*: "Let (the fires), free of deception, enjoy the sacrifice (and) great refreshments free of disease" – though I recognize that the refreshments might better be things that Agni gives rather than enjoys.

III.22.5 = III.1.23, etc.

III.23 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.23.1: As noted ad III.6.4, I prefer 'seat' to 'dwelling'.

The first pāda plays with aspirated dentals: *nírma**th**itaḥ sú**dh**ita ā́ sa**dh**a**th**e*, with the first two words a syncopated rhyme.

For *dadhe*, 'has acquired' might be slightly better than 'has received'.

Old (SBE) suggests (as an alternative) that *amṛ́tam* might here refer to "the drink of immortality," namely the ghee offered into the fire, and this suggestion is fld by Ge (/WG). This interpr. cannot be excluded (see Gr's definition 7: "n., der *Unsterblichkeitstrank* ... häufig auf die ins Feuer gegossene Opferbutter ..."), and Ge's invocation of nearby III.26.7 is apt, but I think that a double reading (/pun), rather than simply a strict ritual reading, is likely: Agni's acquisition of "immortality" squares with his "unaging" (*ajáraḥ*) nature in c. So I'd suggest "has acquired immortality [/ the immortal (ghee-offering)]."

III.23.2: The future impv. *bhavatāt* is used in conventional fashion here to enjoin an action that should follow a previous one, as also in III.8.1; see comm. ad III.18.1 for a more puzzling occurrence.

III.23.3: The VP *pūrvyám ... ajījanan* "have begotten the primordial one" is an implicit paradox – one beloved of RVic poets -- that Agni is both ancient and reborn every day, like Dawn.

The phrase *vára ā́ pṛthivyā́ḥ* is found in this maṇḍala at III.53.11, where it also refers to a place of sacrifice.

III.23.4: The verb of pāda a, (*nú*) ... *dadhe*, is multiply ambiguous: it can be the 3rd sg. pf., identical to *dadhe* in 1d (so JPB), or the 1st sg. perfect (so apparently Old SBE, Re), or 1st sg. pres. (so apparently Ge, WG). Any of these interpr. (immed. past "he has /I have installed," pres. "I install") is compatible with the impv. in d. I weakly favor a 1st ps., though whether pf. or pres. is indifferent to me.

The sandhi form *mā́nuṣa* is taken as *mā́nuṣe* by the Pp., and a loc. interpr. is reflected in the tr. of Ge, Re, and WG. Gr lists the form as *mā́nuṣas* without registering the Pp. reading, and this nom. interpr. is found in Old SBE and the publ. tr. – though Old in the Noten admits that either form is possible. I weakly favor the Pp. loc. and would substitute "among the descendants of Manu" for "As (the Agni) of Manu."

III.23.5: Though this vs. is simply the Viśvāmitra Agni refrain (see III.1.23, etc.), in this case it has some connection with what precedes: its first word *íḷām* picks up *íḷāyās padé* "in the track of the milk-libation" in 4b.

III.24 Agni [SJ on JPB]

As noted in the publ. intro., every vs. begins with the voc. *ágne*, and every vs. has at least one impv. or the equivalent.

III.24.1: The publ. tr. "overwhelm in battles" (see also Old SBE, Re, WG) indirectly reflects the fact that √*sah* generally occurs with the loc. of the stem, *pṛ́tanāsu* (I.102.9, VI.68.7, etc.). Only Ge tries to represent the acc. by dint of reinterpr. *pṛ́tanā-* as "enemy," not "battle": "überwaltige die feindlichen Heere" (so also Gr, meaning 2: "feindliches Heer"). On the ubiquity of the loc. *pṛ́tanāsu* / *pṛtsú* with √*sah*, see Scar (604–5), who struggles with the interpr. of the root noun cmpd *pṛtanā-ṣā́h-*, which he glosses "in den Kämpfen siegreich; die Kämpfen gewinnend (?)" (with both loc. and acc. senses). He suggests that the compd. represents a contamination of two constructions: *pṛ́tanāsu* (*pṛtsú*) √*sah* and *pṛ́tanās* √*ji* (for which see, e.g., II.40.5). Although the latter construction may have played a role, I think the inherent functional ambiguity of 1st cmpd members in root noun cmpds was the instigating factor. Although probably the majority of 1st members in such cmpds serve as direct objects to the root noun final (type *vṛtra-hán-*), a variety of other syntactic relationships are possible. The cmpd *pṛtanā-ṣā́h-* occurs 9x in the RV, well distributed through the Saṃhitā (see also *pṛtanā-ṣā́hya-* 1x). I think it quite likely that *pṛtanā-* originally had a locatival relationship with *ṣā́h-* in this cmpd, but with the case ending suppressed the direct object reading arose, facilitated by the apparent parallel *pṛ́tanās* √*ji*. This root-noun cmpd *pṛtanā-ṣā́h-* occurs in a nearby

Agni hymn (III.29.9), and *pṛtanā-ṣāhya-* is also found in Maṇḍala III (III.37.1). Our nonce phrase *sáhasva pṛ́tanāḥ* is, I suggest, based on (a misunderstanding of) the nearby root noun cmpd. How to render it is a puzzle – perhaps the sleight-of-hand "overwhelm (in) battles."

III.24.2: Since JPB tr. *íḷā-* in the Viśvāmitra Agni refrain (found most recently in III.23.5) and in vs. 4 of the preceding hymn III.23 as "milk-libation," the rendering here of the instr. to the corresponding root noun *íḍ-* as "ghee-libation" is somewhat jarring – though I realize that it's easier to kindle a fire by ghee than by milk. It should be changed here to "milk-libation" or to my preference simply 'refreshment' or 'libation'.

The tr. of the notorious compd *vītí-hotra-* should be changed to "whose oblations are worth pursuing." See comm. ad II.28.1 and my 2024 "Vedic Evidence for the Verbal-Governing *dā́ti-vāra-* Compound 'Type'" (IEL).

III.24.3: The first two pādas consist entirely of vocatives, save for instr. *dyumnéna*. Old (SBE) and (it seems) Re construe the instr. with pāda c, but Ge, WG, and JPB with the voc. *jāgṛve* 'wakeful'. I would ordinarily be inclined to follow Old and Re, save for two factors: 1) both b and c are repeated elsewhere, which suggests, but doesn't require, that they are self-contained; 2) although *jā́gṛvi-* is not found with a loc. elsewhere, cf. III.37.8 (same maṇḍala, in a hymn with ties to this one [see comm. ad vs. 1]) *dyumnínam ... jā́gṛvim*, with an *-ín*-stem possessive built to our *dyumná-*.

III.24.4: I think that JPB is correct that *víśvebhiḥ* should be read both with *agníbhiḥ* and with *devébhiḥ*.

The stem *cāyú-* is a hapax and has received a range of interpr.: Gr "Ehrfurcht bezeugend," Old (SBE) "who are respectful," Ge "die sich ... geehrt fühlen (?)," Re "qui ... sont à l'honneur," WG "die ... Ehrbietung bezeugen," JPB "who are the respected (priests)," JSK (DGRV II.23) "who show respect." Besides an affiliation to √*ci* 'perceive' (etc.; see EWA s.v. *cI*[1], where MM tr. the stem "Respekt bezeugend"), there is little to narrow down the possible senses – particularly whether it is active (referents are subjects of √*ci*) or passive (referents are objects of √*ci*). However, it should be noted that a gerund with the same root syllable, *nicā́yyā*, is found two hymns later (III.26.1), with the likely active sense 'having noticed, paid attention' (see the other occurrence of the same form in I.105.18). That our hapax appears so close to that gerund gives us leave (in the absence of other evidence) to interpr. it in that general realm. I therefore think it has "active" sense and means something like "attentive," which works well in a ritual context. The rel. *yá u* clause would then be best connected with the voc. *ágne*, as further subjects of *mahayā*. I would tr. "and those who are attentive at the sacrifices."

III.25 Agni [SJ on JPB]

Note the ring compositional elements in vss. 1 and 5, identified by JPB in the publ. intro.

III.25.1: The vs. contains two forms of √*cit* characterizing Agni: *prácetāḥ* (a) and *cikitvaḥ* (c). It might be good to tr. them so that the root etymology is captured, but I cannot come up with a non-awkward way to do that.

Pace Gr (s.v. *tánā*) and all the standard tr. (except Re), as well as JSK (DGRV I.345, 348), it is highly unlikely that *tánā* is a nom. sg. fem. ('Spross', 'seed') appositive to Agni, but rather, with JPB (see also alt. interpr. in Ge n. 1b), an instr. to the root noun *tán-* as elsewhere.

On *ṛ́dhak* with √*yaj* see comm. ad X.105.8, also VI.49.10. My interpr. of the adverb is slightly diff. from JPB's, though his "one by one" may be a development of my "separately."

III.25.2: The pf. part. *vidvā́n* in pāda a picks up *cikitvaḥ* in in 1c.

The rendering "wins heroic deeds" (*sanoti vīryà̀ṇi*) is a bit jarring. Though *vīryà-* does ordinarily refer to deeds (as in the famous opening to I.32), here "heroic powers" would fit better.

The phrase *amṛ́tāya bhū́ṣan* occurs nearby in III.34.2, an Indra hymn, where I think *amṛ́tāya* refers specifically to Indra, rather than to the abstract "immortality" as is likely here.

III.25.4: Strictly speaking *sutā́vataḥ* should be "who has pressed soma," rather than an apparent pres. part. "pressing soma."

I'd prefer "not negligent" for *ámardhant-*, rather than "never disdaining." The point is that they exert themselves to come to the sacrifice, rather than that they don't turn it down. I would take *somapéyāya* as a purpose dative with *yātam* (cf. VII.24.3, X.112.2), rather than construing it directly with *ámardhantā*. So: "... drive here to the sacrifice / to drink the soma, you non-negligent ones."

III.25.5: As disc. in the publ. tr., Ge (n. 5a) suggests that the gen. pl. *apā́m* should be construed with a supplied *nápāt* ("[descendant] of the waters"), on the reasonable grounds that *duroṇá-* in an Agni context always refers to a human dwelling. He could also have pointed to the phrase in the immed. preceding vs. *dāśúṣo duroṇé*, which encourages supplying "of the pious man" here. Re and WG follow Ge, while Old (SBE) and JPB follow Sāy. in construing *apā́m* with *duroṇé*, the most natural way to construe what's actually in the pāda (rather than supplying two extra words). Though I see the justice of Ge's arg., I would still go along with the publ. tr., for a reason so far adduced by no one (as far as I know): *sadhásthāni* 'abodes, seats' in c. This word is semantically close to *duroṇá-*, and it also is found three times with *apā́m* (I.149.4, II.4.2, VI.52.15), the former two in clear Agni context. See esp. I.149.4 *hótā yájiṣṭho apā́ṃ sadhásthe*. I suggest that we should understand *apā́m* with *sadhásthāni* in c as well, with that phrase expanding on *apā́m ... duroṇé*: "you are kindled in the house of the waters ... magnifying the seats (of the waters) with your help," whatever may be meant by these locations.

III.26 Agni Vaiśvānara [SJ on JPB]

On the structure of the hymn and the scholarly disagreement about it, see publ. intro. I think it is possible to reconcile the two views. On the one hand, Old's observation that the placement of the hymn in the collection suggests that it consists of three separate hymns is hard to counter; on the other, it seems possible that the three hymns were associated from the beginning as constituting a primitive Āgnimāruta śastra and were therefore placed consecutively here.

III.26.1–3: In this tṛca to Agni Vaiśvānara, the epithet *vaiśvānará-* is found in all three vss. (1a, 2b. 3b) and in fact is the first word of the hymn.

III.26.1: *agním* was omitted from the publ. tr., which should read "having discerned with our mind Agni Vaiśvānara."

The cmpd *anuṣatyá-* is found only here and is variously rendered; Re's "qui se conforme au réel" is the basis for the publ. tr. It can be interpr. in light of *mánasā ... nicā́yya* "having discerned with our mind ..." As Ge points out (n. 1a), this probably means that we see Agni in our mind before the new fire is actually visible; *anuṣatyá-* would then assert that our mental image is in conformity with the reality of the physical fire when it appears.

III.26.2: Although in most cases *devátāt(i)-* seems to be a collective meaning 'divine assemblage' (as in JPB's tr. here), in several passages, esp. in the phrase *mánuṣo devátāt(i)-* (V.29.1, VI.4.1, and here), 'attendance on the gods' seems more apposite. I'd therefore change the tr. to "who is Bṛhaspati for Manu's attendance on the gods."

Agni is Bṛhaspati here insofar as he controls or is associated with the ritual formulations; see (approx.) Ge (n. 2c) and HPS, B+I 70–71, who points out that we can match Bṛhaspati with *viprá-* in the flg. pāda (and Mātariśvan with *śrótar-* and Vaiśvānara with *átithi-* in the same pāda).

III.26.4: With Ge, WG, and JPB (and contra Old [SBE, but see his n. 2 on this vs.], Re, and Scar [62]), *táviṣībhiḥ* should be construed with *sámmiślāḥ* in b, on the basis of I.64.10 *sámmiślāsas táviṣībhiḥ* and a similar expression in VII.56.6, both also of the Maruts.

On *bṛhad-úkṣ-* see Scar (61–62).

III.26.5: Root-noun cmpds with *-śrī́-* as 2nd member are difficult to pin down semantically. See the extensive, and ultimately (legitimately) indecisive, disc. of this group by Scar (545–54). The problem is that the extremely well-attested uncompounded root noun *śrī́-* has become semantically independent of the verbal root √*śrī* (pres. *śrīṇā́ti*). The latter means (acdg. to Narten, KZ 100 [1987]) 'perfect, make complete', while the latter has come to mean 'excellence, splendor, glory, beauty' (and of course goes on to a glorious career in later Skt). The problem with the root-noun cmpds with this word is to determine whether the 2nd member maintains its original verbal semantics or shows the developed semantics of the uncmpded root noun. In most such cmpds I have opted for the latter interpr. (perhaps wrongly), but here, given the larger context, I'm inclined to see it as having verbal semantics, governing the object *agni-*, hence 'perfecting the fire' vel sim.. If this tṛca concerns the Maruts, as gods of the storm/wind, fanning the flames of the ritual fire (see publ. intro.), such a transitive interpr. fits the context better than simply "with Agni's splendor," and I would change the tr. to "bringing Agni / the fire to perfection." (Oddly, in this particular passage there is almost universal agreement among translators that the cmpd is intrans./passive, despite the larger context.) Other *-śrī́-*cmpds with ritual items as first members have profitably been reconsidered as well: *adhvara-śrī́-*, *ghṛta-śrī́-*, and *yajña-śrī́-*; see comm. on the relevant passages.

On *heṣá-* see EWA s.v. *HEṢ*[1].

III.26.6: The second hemistich is presented somewhat misleadingly in the publ. tr.: it is not a gen. phrase hanging off *marútām* in b, but a nominal clause in the nominative and should form its own sentence: "With their dappled horses, with their unreceding generosity, they (habitually) go to the sacrifice, (as ones) wise at the ritual distributions." Pāda c is identical to II.34.4c in a Marut hymn.

III.26.7: Though JPB identifies the *amṛ́ta-* as soma, on practical grounds it is more likely to be ghee, which is regularly offered in the fire, whereas soma would put the fire out or at least damp it down. See III.23.1.

III.26.8: There are two possibilities for construing the first phrase in b, *hṛdā́ matím* – either as a second object NP with *ápūpot* or as first object NP with *ánu prajānán*. JPB follows Re in the second alt.; I somewhat prefer the first, in part because the instr. would be parallel to the instr. phrase in pāda a. Old (SBE) clearly so interpr. it, likewise probably Ge and WG. As an alt. I would then suggest "He purified the chant with the three purifying filters, the thought with his heart, discovering the light."

III.26.9: This vs. would be more easily parsed if the long (three-pāda) acc. phrase came first and was resumed by the *tám* beginning d, fld. by the impv. and the voc., rather than fronting the impv. and postponing its voc. subj. to the end. So, "The inexhaustible well-spring ... in the lap of his parents – o you two world-halves, carry him across, as the one who speaks what is real.

I would render pāda c as "the crackling, the one becoming exhilarating in the lap of his parents," with *mádant-* in its full participial value, not just as adj. 'joyful'.

III.27 Agni [SJ on JPB]

Another hymn in tṛcas; on the structure of the hymn see publ. intro. The language is simple, straightforward, and stereotyped for the most part, though there are some puzzles.

III.27.1: Various suggestions for the subj. of *jigāti* : the sacrificer (Sāy., Old [SBE]), the sacrifice or the sacrificial ladle (Ge n. 1a), Agni (Re). It scarcely matters, but it is the case that *sumnā́yá-* / *-yú-* often has humans as subject, which would favor the first alt.

III.27.2: On *dhitā́van-* see comm. ad III.40.3.

III.27.9: Old (SBE) takes *ā́ dadhe* as 1st sg. with Agni as the obj., whereas all subsequent tr. (incl. JPB) take it as 3rd sg. with Agni as subj. (in both cases implicitly). Old's interpr. makes more immediate sense, esp. as *ní tvā dadhe* begins the next vs. and the verb must be 1st sg. with Agni = object "you." The reason for the otherwise universal interpr. as 3rd sg. is based on a repeated passage in the AVŚ: V.25.2=VI.17.1 *yátheyáṃ pṛthivī́ mahī́ bhūtā́nāṃ gárbham ādadhé*, with the Earth as overt subject. But those are pregnancy charms, with a feminine subject, and that is not the context here. Moreover, Agni is himself called *bhúvanasya gárbha-* (X.45.6)(as Ge points out, n. 9b), which is the object

here. I am therefore inclined to follow Old and substitute "I have established (him) as the embryo ..." There is then chaining with *ní tvā dadhe* in the flg. vs. The AV passage will have adapted the phrase to a different context.

III.27.11: The morphologically anomalous *yantúram* is (in my view) a textbook case of a form generated solely by context. Its *-túram* playfully anticipates the following word *aptúram*, a reasonably well-attested root-noun cmpd *ap-túr-* (√*tṝ*) 'crossing the waters' — but *yantúr-* is not a cmpd. but rather a byform (/deformation) of the agent noun *yantár-* 'controller, guider' (√*yam*), possibly influenced by the gen. *yantúr* (though Wack. is skeptical). See Old (SBE and Noten), AiG III.203–4. From this passage it was adapted to VIII.19.2, where it provides a better cadence than the proper acc. sg. *yantā́ram*. It must be noted, however, that there are alternative interpr. of the form, particularly Th's analysis (*Studien zur idg. Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte*. 8) as a haplology of **yantu-túr-* "der die Zügelung überholt," which Th further glosses as "so schnell, dass man ihn nicht zügeln kann." I find this semantic interpr. forced in the extreme and know of no other such uses of √*tṝ* ; certainly the other cmpds with 2nd-member *-túr-* are quite different in meaning. Moreover, the supposed 1st member *yántu-*, supposedly meaning "Zügelung," is barely attested and not in that sense: once as a dat. inf. *yántave* ('to hold / extend', VIII.15.3), once in the cmpd. *suyántu-* 'easy to control' (V.44.4). Nonetheless, no doubt due to Th's prestige and to a linguistic disinclination towards irregular surface analogy (which, though also being a linguist, I do not share), it is the favored explan. in EWA (s.v. *yantúr-*), is weakly favored by Scar (186–87), and has been adopted by WG. (There is also an even less likely analysis owing to Pinault; see EWA, Scar, and WG n. for details.) I firmly hold to the older explan. However, in our passage I would be inclined to tr. "controller," rather than supplying "horses" with "guiding" – though the "yoking" of truth in the next pāda does introduce an equine theme.

vanúṣaḥ is universally taken as a nom. pl. modifying *víprāḥ* in the next pāda, rather than a gen. with *ṛtásya*. This is no doubt correct: *vanús-* almost always qualifies animate beings. However, I would prefer to tr. it within its own pāda: "eager at (/for) the harnessing of truth." Cf. IV.44.3 *ṛtásya ... vanúṣe* "for (the one?) eager/striving for truth."

III.27.13–15: This tṛca is unified by a focus on *vṛ́ṣan-* 'bull', which is the last word of vs. 13, the first of vs. 14, and occurs 3x in the last vs. Note also that 13c and 14a are mere scrambling of each other: the only added element is the particle *u*, assuming that the correct analysis of 14a *vṛ́ṣo* is *vṛ́ṣā u* (see JSK [Part. u, 175] for disc.).

III.28 Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the ritual application of the hymn see publ. intro. Also correct a small lapse in that intro.: in "tied to a specific parts of the liturgy," "a" should be deleted.

The impv. *juṣásva* 'enjoy!' is found in four of the six vss. (1a, 2c, 4b, 6c).

III.28.5: The *iṣ*-aor. subjunctive *kāniṣaḥ* has extended grade in its root syllable, like the indic. *akāniṣam* (IV.24.9), rather than expected full-grade **kaniṣaḥ*. See Narten (Sig.Aor. 94), who explains it (not surprisingly) as directly founded on the indic.

III.29 Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the ritual technicalities in this hymn, see publ. intro. The language is fairly simple and straightforward.

III.29.2: Despite the pl. *garbhínīṣu* lit. '[those (fem.)] having embryos', I do not think this expression refers to multiple pregnant women (JPB's "within women with child"). Rather, on the basis of very similar X.27.16 (also adduced by Ge) *gárbham ... súdhitaṃ vakṣánāsu* "the embryo well placed in (her) belly," I think *garbhínīṣu* modifies a gapped *vakṣánāsu* 'belly'; the stem *vakṣánā-* is ordinarily a pl. tantum (see comm. ad X.27.16). I would emend the tr. to "well placed within a pregnant (belly)."

III.29.3: In a very similar context in II.10.3 I tr. *uttānā́yām* as "in her with (legs) agape," which I would substitute here. See comm. ad loc.

On *áva √bhṛ* see comm. ad VIII.93.23.

Although "on this day" is a reasonable, though not entirely accurate, representation of its etymology (better 'on one day'; see EWA s.v.), *sadyás* generally means 'immediately', and that is, I think, the sense here: the fire catches right away. I'd emend to "impregnated immediately."

The parenthetical *rúśad asya pā́jaḥ* is almost a textbook gloss of a bahuvrīhi **rúśad-pājas-* (cf. *rúśad-vatsa-* 'having a bright calf', etc.), and a nom. sg. m. bahuvrīhi would work well here. Re calls it a "composé « défait »." We might expect to find a standard bahuvrīhi here, since *pā́jas-* also forms bahuvrīhis (e.g., *pṛthu-pājas-*). The same phrase is found, in the same metrical position, in I.115.5, where, however, the syntagm is justified: *pā́jas* is the grammatical subject with another quality predicated of it. Here, however, the decomposition serves rhetorical purposes. As I have discussed elsewhere (Ged. Gary Holland, forthcoming; see also comm. ad V.62.7), decomposing a bahuvrīhi and explicitly specifying its possessive sense through a pleonastic *asya*, is a poetic strategy to introduce syntactic variation.

As often, the interpr. of *vayúna-* is difficult (see comm. ad II.34.5, etc.). Here the loc. *vayúne*, rendered in the publ. tr. as "within the ritual pattern," means, I think, that the fire was engendered at the appropriate time and place in the sacrifice, that is acdg. to its standard pattern. Or perhaps, since the dawn is associated with *vayúna-* (e.g., I.92.2, 6; IV.51.1), this is a shorthand way of saying "at dawn."

III.29.6: As often, *yádī* should be read *yád ī*, with the enclitic prn. *ī* – hence "when him ...," not "if ..." See my 2002 "RVic sīm and īm" (Fs. Cardona).

With the majority of tr. (starting with Sāy.) I think "chariot" should be supplied with *citráḥ* in the simile *citró ná yā́man aśvínor ánivṛtaḥ*. Old (SBE) suggests the sun; though I think the sun is the ultimate target of the full simile, it is mediated by the chariot image. The adj. *citrá-* modifies *rátha-* in I.34.10 and III.2.15, with the former referring specifically to the Aśvins' bright chariot.

III.29.8: Note the paired imperatives opening the first two pādas, simplex *sī́da*, caus. *sādáya*.

As indicated by Gr (s.vv.) and endorsed by Wack (AiG II.1.20, etc.), *súkṛta-* is adjectival 'well-done' with accent on the prefix as with other such cmpds. (*súdhita-*

'well-placed', *súpūta-* 'well-purified', etc.), whereas the suffix-accented *sukṛtá-* has been substantivized to 'good work' (generally referring to the sacrifice). The tr. should therefore be emended to "in the womb of good work" (see the same phrase in X.61.6).

III.29.9: Since *dhūmá-* is a masc. noun, the sense of the NP *dhūmắṃ vṛ́ṣaṇam* should be flipped to "bullish smoke."

On *pṛtanā-ṣắṭ* see comm. ad III.24.1.

III.29.10: I now find 'seasonal, at its season' a somewhat misleading tr. for *ṛtvíya-* in a ritual context and would substitute 'at its proper time' here; see comm. ad X.28.5.

III.29.11: Note the pun between the epithet *mātaríśvan-* and the loc. *mātári*. On the name Mātariśvan and its etymology see Insler and Brereton, forthcoming in JASPA. śThe connection between Agni's epithets and his stage of birth is not so clear in the other pādas.

III.29.13: On √*srev* 'miscarry, abort' and our form *asremá-* < **-srev-mán-* see EWA s.v. *srev*, Narten, SigAor. 282–83, and AiG I Nachtr. to 91, 37.

On *taráṇi-* see comm. ad III.11.3; I would here change 'overwhelming' to 'advancing'.

III.29.14: I would prefer to tr. all three augmented imperfects, *arocata* (a), *áśocat* (b), and *ájāyata* (d) as straight preterites, "he shone ... he blazed ... he was born" -- not as "has shone," etc., more characteristic of aor. or pf. This creates some problem with the last pāda, if it is taken in conjunction with pāda c with its pres. *ní miṣati*, since "he doesn't blink ... when/after he has been born" is more natural then "when/after he was born." I suggest that the *yád* clause in d is entirely parallel to the one in b and that c is parenthetical: "From of old he shone forth, when he blazed in the lap of his mother, in her udder – day after day the delightful one does not blink — when he was born from the belly of the lord."

I would substitute "in her udder" for "upon her udder."

The identity of the *ásura-* from whose belly Agni was born is unclear. Old (SBE) tentatively suggests Heaven; this is also Lüders's opinion (*Varuṇa* 390), which is favored by W. E. Hale (*Ásura-*, 45–46). Ge (n. 14d, fld. by WG) suggests Vṛtra, on the basis of X.124.3–4, where, however, I identify the Asura as Dyauṣ Pitar, not Vṛtra (see the publ. tr., as well as my treatment of this hymn in my 2016 "The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124"). Alternatively, if *āsurá-* in vs. 11 refers to the upper churning stick as JPB suggests, the same referent could be found here as well – neatly contrasted with the "mother" in b, the other churning stick.

Note the play of *suráṇaḥ* (c) and *ásura-* (d), though they are etymologically unrelated.

III.29.15: The presence of two root noun cmpds to roots in long *ā*, ending in *-ās* — *prayắḥ* and *prathamajắḥ* -- complicates the interpr. of the first hemistich, because both forms could be either nom. sg. or nom. pl. They are flanked by clear plural forms: nom. pl. *amitrāyúdhaḥ* and 3rd pl. pf. *viduḥ*, but neither of these is as diagnostic as it might be

– the first because it's in a simile that might involve a constructio ad sensum, the latter because it may belong to a new cl. Nonetheless almost all tr. (incl. JPB) take both forms as pl. The exceptions are Scar (413, 440), who allows both possibilities for the former ("der/die"), though taking the latter as pl., and Old (SBE and Noten), who takes the former as pl. but the latter as sg. and belonging to a separate cl. I am agnostic about *prayā̆ḥ*, though a plural is somewhat easier. But I'm in agreement with Old about *prathamajā̆ḥ* on formulaic grounds. By the pl. interpr., the referent has to be the Kuśikas, the priestly family that is named in the next pāda (c). But it is odd to call them "the first-born of the formulation" or, if *bráhmaṇaḥ* is to be construed with *víśvam*, simply "the first-born." But Agni is called *prathamajā̆ ṛtásya* "the first-born of truth" in X.57 and probably I.164.37 and X.61.19, an epithet very like *prathamajā̆ bráhmaṇaḥ*. Old suggests that *prathamajā̆ bráhmaṇaḥ* is an independent nominal clause, referring to Agni, with a new clause beginning with *víśvam íd*. This not only makes better sense of the hemistich but accounts better for the position of *íd*. This also allows the first pāda to refer to Agni's advances, not the Kuśikas' (see *ayāḥ* [if to √*yā*] and *yāhi* with Agni as subj. in 16c and d). And in b *víśvam íd viduḥ* need not involve the grandiose claim "they know everything," but rather, with Old, "they know every (fire)." The interpr. of this small clause then connects with pāda d where each Kuśika kindles his own fire. I would emend the tr. of ab to "Battling the enemy, the advances / advance troops (of Agni) are like (those) of the Maruts. (He is) the first born of the formulation. (The Kuśikas) know every (fire)."

I would be inclined to tr. the two verbs in cd as "they have raised" and "they have kindled."

III.29.16: The here-and-now of the ritual situation is emphasized in the first hemistich of this final vs., by *adyá* and *ihá* – and also by *asmín*. I would slightly alter the tr. to "while this sacrifice was proceeding."

The standard view of *ayā(ḥ)* in c is that it is a 2nd sg. *s*-aor. to √*yaj*. See already Gr., and all the standard tr. and interpr. (save for JPB), incl. Old (both SBE and Noten), Narten (Sig.Aor. 200), Lub (1123). I am dubious. In favor of this view is the fact that √*śam* (here represented by *aśamiṣṭhāḥ*) is often concatenated with forms of √*yaj* (e.g., VI.1.9 *īje śaśamé ca*). But, as is regularly acknowledged, *ayās* is not the expected outcome of 2nd sg. **ayāź-s-s* (better **ayāṭ* like the 3rd sg.) and has to have been wholly remade, to a form that appears to belong to a different root, √*yā*. Moreover, the (inappropriate) *yāhi* in the next pāda suggests that the poet considered *ayā(ḥ)* a form of √*yā* that licensed *yāhi* ; see also *prayā̆ḥ* in 15a.

The final pāda is identical to III.35.4, an Indra hymn, where it is more appropriately addressed to Indra.

III.30 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is characterized by hapaxes and very rare words, often with affective suffixes, and unusual phonology. These words include *dhā̆yuḥ* (7a), *gehyà-* (7b), *kúṇāru-* (8b), *píyāru-* (8c), *alātṛṇá-* (10a), *yāmakośá-* (15a), *salalū̆ka-* (17c).

III.30.1: The desid. *títikṣante* used to be assigned to √*tij* 'sharpen' (e.g., Wh Rts, Gr), but has for quite awhile been taken to √*tyaj* 'abandon' instead. See EWA s.v. *TEJ* and *TYAJ*, Gotō (1st cl., 165–66 n. 268), and in some detail Heenen (Desid. 59–60 and 147–48). Curiously WG render it here as (if) an intensive to √*tij* : "Sie schärfen (sich) immer wieder (gegen) ...," despite Gotō's own published views to the contrary. (In the WG tr., acdg. to the title pg., Maṇḍala III is Witzel's responsibility, however, which may account for the discrepancy. It is rendered correctly as ".... hält ... aus" in II.13.3.) The desiderative stem has the idiomatic sense 'endure, support', and the semantic channel from (putatively) 'desire to abandon' to this idiom is not entirely clear. I am not convinced by the suggestions of either Gotō or Heenen (59–60). Instead, I think the middle voice is the key: if we assume a reflexive 'abandon oneself to', 'give oneself over to', it is not difficult to imagine this development.

The sense of the final pāda depends on the meaning of *praketáḥ*, and like many derivatives of √*cit* this word is slippery. In my view, it means both 'sign' and 'insight' (that is, it reflects both the 'appear' and 'perceive' values of √*cit*). In this particular passage I take it in the former value; the point is that Indra is showing no sign of his presence or imminent arrival, and so we are subject to abuse from our rivals. For a similar usage cf. II.17.7, where the poet beseeches Indra for good fortune, and then demands *kṛdhí praketám* "make a visible sign," further asking for him to bring the good fortune here. In X.104.6 Indra is himself called the *adhvarásya praketáḥ* "the visible sign of the ceremony." Ge interpr. the word as "Losung" ('motto, watchword, password'), which is, I suppose, possible, but I don't understand what it would mean here; Re as "le signe-pré(monitoire)," which is somewhat opaque to me, but seems closer to my interpr than Ge's; Old as "Helle" (light, brightness). WG take it as an agent noun: "Wahrnehmer."

III.30.2–3: The next two vss. develop the theme sounded in pāda d of vs. 1.: Indra's absence. In vs. 2 we point out that for Indra nothing is very far away, so he could, and should, easily come here, where the sacrifice is invitingly set out for him. In vs. 3 we provide a flattering description of Indra's great powers and then plaintively ask where these powers are now.

III.30.3: The 2nd member of *tuvikūrmí-*, an epithet of Indra, is generally now derived from the seṭ root √*car*^{j}, a derivation already found in AiG I.24, 141, 152 -- hence my 'powerfully ranging'. See EWA s.v. *tuvikūrmí-*. The older deriv. from √*kṛ* (e.g., Gr., Wh Rts; explicitly rejected by AiG II.2.776) is nonetheless still reflected in the standard tr.: Ge "der Tatenreiche," Re (with hesitation) "aux actes (?) puissants," WG "der mächtig Wirkende" -- even though AiG I (1896) predates all of them by a good margin, well over a century in the case of WG!

There is number incongruence between the neut. sg. *yád* of the rel. clause and neut. pl. *tyā́ ... vīryā́ṇi*. The *yád* is, as it were, an anticipatory collective: "what(ever) you did ... where are those deeds?"

III.30.4: As has often been pointed out, the redupl. pres. to √*han*, *jíghnate*, almost always takes plural objects, and so, at least in this formation, reduplication seems correlated with repetitive action. This semantic nuance is strengthened here by the syntactic construction, with the redupl. pres. in the participle (*jíghnamānaḥ*) construed with a quasi-auxiliary

cárasi. (Cf. 14b below.) Although *cárasi* does have lexical meaning ('you range/roam/wander') in my opinion, the lexical value is weak enough here that the verb can seem to be a marker of the progressive present: "you go about / keep / are (constantly) smashing" -- an interpretation that goes back at least to Delbrück (*Altind. Syntax* 388). On the other hand, it is possible that √*car* in its lexical value may be resonating with *tuvikūrmí-* 'powerfully ranging' in 3b (see comm. there). However, it is hard to know whether that root connection would still be perceived by the contemporary audience -- it certainly has escaped most of the modern audience -- given the phonological distance between the two words and the fact that *tuvikūrmí-* is simply an epithet of Indra and its own lexical value may have become attenuated.

There is a faint phonological echo between *vṛtrā́* in b and *vratā́(ya)* in d, which occupy the same metrical position.

III.30.5: I am not certain how to construe *śrávobhiḥ*. The publ. tr. takes it with the voc. *puruhūta*: "much invoked with acclamations." But I am not entirely happy about construing a full noun with a voc. that ordinarily stands alone (as in, e.g., 7d, 8a). Ge tr. "rühmlich," which seems designed to be as untethered to the sentence as possible. Re takes it with the speaking of pāda b: "... seul avec tes renoms tu as parlé (un langage) ferme," but I don't understand what that means; WG like Re, except tr. "mit Ruhmes(taten)," which again I don't follow.

I have given the idiom *dṛḷhám* √*vad* a mildly slangy turn (similarly in X.48.6); the collocation of a verb of speaking and an adverb referring to a physical quality seems to invite it. "Speak firmly" would be a more neutral rendering than "talk tough," but pāda d, which describes heaven and earth as a mere "handful" for Indra, also seems to belong to a vivid and informal register.

The participial phrase *vṛtrahā́ sán* contains, unusually, a non-concessive nominative of the pres. part. of √*as* 'be'. It seems here to be definitional and to pick up and summarize 4b *éko vṛtrā́ cárasi jíghnamānaḥ* "you alone range about [/keep] smashing obstacles." As discussed immed. above, the redupl. pres. part. combined with a quasi-auxiliary depicts this as repetitive, indeed habitual, action -- and the *ékaḥ* indicates that only Indra engages in it. Our phrase here, *vṛtrahā́ sán*, comes to the appropriate conclusion: since you and you alone keep smashing obstacles, you are The Obstacle-Smasher, par excellence.

III.30.6: Sāy. supplies 'chariot' as the subj. of pāda a, and in this he is followed by the standard tr. as well as Old. Although this is perfectly harmless and certainly possible, I do not understand why supplying a subject not found in the context is desirable, much less necessary. I admit that it would allow us to use the *etu* of *prá ... etu* in b as the gapped verb with the *prá* of a, but Rigvedic poetic syntax is flexible enough to allow a 2nd ps. substitution in such a gapped phrase (*prá ... *ihi*, anticipating *prá ... etu*). The fact that 2b has a similar phrase with Indra as the 2nd sg. supplied subject -- *ā́ tú prá yāhi ... háribhyām* -- also supports my assumption that the default subject is Indra.

Unfortunately the voc. *indra* in 6a was omitted in the publ. tr. The pāda should read "(Come) forth along an easy slope with your two fallow bays, o Indra."

III.30.7: *dhā́yuḥ* is a hapax. The stem is generally listed as *dhā́yu-* (so Gr) and would therefore have to be a masc. nom. sg. here, but the standard tr. render it as obj. of *ádadhāḥ*. This interpr. requires it to be a neut. *-us*-stem, which is easily possible (see, e.g., Old). Old suggests that it belongs to √*dhā* and that *dhā́yur ádadhāḥ* is an etymological figure like *ábhaktam ... bhajate* in b. I prefer the analysis suggested in AiG II.2.470 linking it to √*dhā(y)* 'suckle, nourish', thus a neut. *-us*-stem exactly parallel to neut. *dhā́yas-* 'nourishment'. This analysis seems to be reflected in Re's "tu as accordé la satisfaction-nourricière," though Re's (in)famous hyphenated portmanteaus are capacious enough to include many possibilities.

I am not entirely sure what pāda b is about: is this a legal issue, having to do with what is held in common? or with what hasn't (yet) been divided by inheritance? Or is it simply that nobody has distributed the goods yet? X.112.10d, adduced by Ge, is similar: *ábhakte cid ā́ bhajā rāyé asmā́n*, but that pāda follows one in which Indra is urged to do battle and so the most likely interpr. there is that we are asking for a share in the as-yet-undivided spoils of war. Here, however, the goods are specifically identified as *gehyà-* 'belonging to the household'. This is the only occurrence of this stem in the RV; it is found in AVP (VI.14.8, VII.11.3; see Arlo Griffiths ed. and tr.) and later, and *gehá-* 'house', from which it is derived, first occurs in VS. The etymology of *gehá-* is somewhat unclear (cf. EWA s.v.), as is its relationship to synonymous *gṛhá-*. The former is quite widespread in MIA, beginning already in Aśoka, but it cannot be simply a Middle Indic form of *gṛhá-* at least acdg. to the standard sound laws (*pace* older accounts such as AiG I.39). However, it is quite possible that it has guṇa in an adj. derived from MIA *gihi(n)* 'householder' (<**gṛhin-*), whose *i*-reflex of the syllabic **ṛ* is probably due vowel assimilation to the *-i-* of the suffix *-in-*. In any event it seems likely that the word was imported into Vedic from MIA and that the use of this unusual stem here signals a particular social or legal institution for which we have no other evidence.

III.30.8: This vs. contains two difficult words, *kúṇāru-* (b) and *píyāru-* (c). It is surely no accident that they appear pāda-final in successive pādas and are rhyme forms. The former is a hapax (though the vs. is repeated in the VS [Mā XVIII.69, Kā XX.5.2]). It has been glossed 'lame in the arm' on the basis of a supposed connection with Ep, Cl *kuṇi-* 'id.' (cf., e.g., AiG II.2.288, KEWA s.v. *kuṇiḥ*, EWA s.v. *kuṇāru-*). But the chronological and morphological distance between the two words speaks against this connection, as does the fact that *kuṇi-* is likely a Dravidian borrowing (see KEWA). Moreover, since Vṛtra is a snake and is specifically called 'handless' here, it is unlikely that he would have an arm to be lame in. Wiser heads generally take it as a PN (so the standard tr., as well as Mayrhofer PN [though with ?]). However, this cautious course is not very satisfactory either. The enemy is most definitely Vṛtra: his name appears in c, his mother's (Dānu) in a. Why would he be called by a different name, esp. one that never appears elsewhere? Unfortunately I do not have a strong alternative. However, I would point to *kúṇapa-*, which means something like 'carrion, corpse' (AVŚ XI.9.10, 10.10.4, 8; MS IV.9.19; ≅ *kuṇapá-* TS XI.2.10.2, where human and equine *kuṇapá-*s are distinguished) on which various nasty critters are invited to feed, and to various later forms of *(-t)kuṇa-* referring to various bugs (cf. Kuiper [Aryans passim], Turner [CDIAL s.vv. *kúṇapa-, kuṇa-*], and Pāli *mankuna-*). On the basis of these shaky parallels I suggest that *kúṇāru-* means something like 'vermin' or perhaps even 'corpse'. It owes its pejorative *-āru*-suffix to

píyāru-; cf. also *śarā́ru-* in X.86.9, which I tr. 'noxious creature'. Of course, *ku-* is a common pejorative prefix as well. Perhaps the word is simply constructed of pejorative affixes with a hiatus-breaking *ṇ*! Or -- a better possibility -- it may represent **ku-nara-āru-* 'ill-manly', with haplology and MIA retroflexion of the nasal. My point here is not to claim any of these suggestions as definitive, but to show that this completely opaque word resonates with other words in several different directions and therefore assuming a lexical meaning rather than taking it as a PN is the better course. However, in the publ. tr. 'vermin' should be followed by a question mark.

The 2nd difficult word, *píyāru-*, is by comparison much simpler. It must be derived from √*pī* 'sneer, taunt', whose pres. *pī́yati* is attested 3x already in the RV. It contains the same pejorative *-āru-*suffix as *kúṇāru-*, *śarā́ru-* -- though it should be noted that not all *-āru-*suffixed words are pejorative: *vandā́ru-* is quite positive, and the mysterious hapax *jábāru-* (IV.5.7) is at worst neutral but probably positive.

III.30.9: The pf. of √*sad* is generally intrans.(/reflex.) 'sat (oneself) down', but in several instances must be trans. 'set down', as it is here. See Kü 542–43.

There is no agreement on the meaning of the adj. *sāmaná-*, found in the RV only here and in the wedding hymn (X.85.11). Gr 'gemeinschaftlich' (fld. by WG), Ge 'gütige (?)', Re 'abondante' (but in EVP XVI, ad X.85.11, he suggests that in our passage it means 'attelée-avec' with which 'heaven' should be supplied), AiG II.2.136 'reich'. I suggest that it's a vṛddhi deriv. of *sámana-* 'gathering', meaning 'related to the gathering/aggregate', hence 'whole'. This does not work so well in X.85.11, but there there is a pun on *-sā́man-* 'tune', and the word seems simply to mean 'together' vel sim.

III.30.10: On *alātṛṇá-* see comm. ad I.166.7. In this passage though 'unquiet' does not seem a normal feature of Vala, it can be applied proleptically, characterizing its opening up in fear of Indra's blow.

Note the phonetic figure in ab: ***alā***.. ***vala*** ... ***vr***a*jo* ... ***v***y ***ā****ra*, with *-ṭṛṇ-* ... *-ndr-* nestled in the 1st pāda; the d pāda also has phonetic rep.: ***prā́van vā́ṇīḥ***.

The standard tr. all supply the Maruts with *vā́ṇīḥ* 'choir'. But as Schmidt (B+I 141) points out, the Maruts do not ordinarily participate in the Vala myth; it is the Aṅgirases who are Indra's back-up band. See III.31.4ff.

III.30.11: Pāda a begins with an elementary numerical figure: *éko dvé* "the one the two," subject and object of *ā́ paprau* respectively, both of which are identified in the 2nd pāda. The juxtaposition of the two numbers is responsible for my tr. *éka-* as 'the one', rather than 'alone' as elsewhere in the hymn (vss. 4, 5).

Because of the voc. *śū́ra*, at least pāda d (and probably also c) shows a switch to 2nd ps. from the 3rd ps. of ab. Since there are no verbs in cd, at least one needs to be supplied. Most tr. (Ge [/WG], Klein [DGRV I.442], Scar [431]) take c and d as separate clauses, supplying impvs. "come" and "bring" respectively. This is possible, but I follow Re in taking cd as a single clause -- though do not follow his interpr. of *iṣáḥ* as a verb ('envoie', presumably to √*iṣ* 'send').

All tr., incl. Re, take *samī́ké* as "in battle" (or, closer to the root sense in my opinion, Scar "Treffen"). Although this noun generally has the meaning 'encounter', it is a straightforward derivative of *samyác-* 'united, conjoined', and here I take it to refer to

the "join" of Heaven and Earth, which would define the midspace. Note that pāda-final *samīké* matches pāda-final du. *samīcî* in a, referring to Heaven and Earth.

I supply 'bring' as the verb of cd, with *sayújaḥ ... vā́jān* as obj. There are several possible interpr of *iṣáḥ*. As just noted, Re takes it as a verb. Assuming (with everyone else) that it belongs to the root noun *íṣ-*, there are two possible analyses, as gen. (/abl.) sg. or nom./acc. pl., although in the latter case we would prefer it to be accented *íṣaḥ* (cf. the acc. pl. *íṣaḥ* in 18b). Both Klein and Scar take it as acc. pl.; I agree with Ge (/WG) in construing it as gen. sg. with *rathî́ḥ*.

III.30.12: The grammar of ab is so straightforward that it is easy to overlook how odd the statement is. It is not surprising that the sun does not confound the quarters or directions (*díśaḥ*); after all, the layout of the cosmos is not likely to be altered by the sun as it passes through. But what does it mean that these same *díśaḥ* are *prasūtā́ḥ* every day by Indra? The ppl. can only belong either to √*sū* 'propel' or √*sū* 'give birth', far more likely the former (*pace* WG, who seem to take it to the latter): only the former is found with *prá* and in fact 9d contains an exactly parallel expression, *tváyā ... prásūtāḥ* "propelled by you." Ge tr. "vom Falbenlenker bestimmten," but 'determined, fixed, set' seems the exactly opposite of what *prá* √*sū* ordinarily means, including in nearby 9d. Such a meaning makes more sense of this vs. but at the expense of arbitrarily assigning a unique meaning to this rather common lexeme. If we take the idiom seriously, the hemistich seems to be saying that while the sun respects the placement of the parts of the cosmos, Indra pushes them around in some fashion, remaking or reconfiguring the cosmos daily. I simply do not understand this; I must be missing something. Perhaps Indra arranges the *díśaḥ* every day in a slightly new way for the sun's road?

The sun is presumably the subj. of *ā́naṭ*; so the standard tr.

The cmpd *háryaśvaprasūta-* technically has three members -- that is a 2nd member ppl. (*prásūta-*) whose 1st member is itself a cmpd. This would be somewhat unusual for the RV, where cmpd size is quite limited. But the bv. *háry-aśva-* is so frozen as an epithet of Indra that it was probably not fully perceived as a cmpd. Cf. the exactly equivalent *índra-prasūta-* (1x).

Ge (/WG) seems to interpr. *ádhvanaḥ* as acc. pl. ("Wenn sie ihre Wege vollendet hat"). Because I am not at all certain that √*naś* can be used that way with an acc., I take *ádhvanaḥ* as gen. sg., with a supplied 'end'; cf. V.54.10 *ádhvanaḥ pārám aśnutha* with the same root. So apparently also Re.

áśvaiḥ is an instr. of separation with *vimócanam*.

On the position of *ā́d íd* see comm. ad V.85.4.

III.30.14: On *vakṣáṇā-* 'belly' (here tr. 'udder' perhaps misleadingly) as a pl. tantum, see comm. ad X.27.16.

carati bíbhratī is another instance of quasi-auxiliary √*car* + pres. part. (also to a redupl. pres.); cf. 4b. Here, *carati* seems to have more lexical value than in vs. 4.

III.30.15: The sense of the hapax *yāmakośá-* is unclear. Ge takes it as traveling trunks: "Die Reisetruhen sind bereit"; sim. Old. But the image of Indra standing by overseeing the loading of his luggage verges on the absurd. Old suggests rather that it is *we* who have come with empty suitcases, hoping Indra will fill them. Re takes *yāma-* to √*yā*

'beseech' rather than √*yā* 'drive, travel', yielding "les vases de la prière." Since there is no comm. in EVP XVII, we will never know what he meant by that; it is certainly not transparent. My tr. "journey-bucket" is meant as a slangy term for chariot ('bucket' can be so used in English for an old or badly maintained car); certainly the use of *kóśa-* 'bucket, cask' to refer to (a part of) a chariot is clear from VIII.20.8, 22.9. WG's "Wagenkörbe" is similar.

I also think that the chariots in question belong to the enemies mentioned in cd; this might account for the slangy designation of their vehicles -- rather like referring to a rival's car as a jalopy. In any case it would seem odd to command Indra to stand fast and then immediately get on a chariot and go traveling.

III.30.16: The standard tr. all take the *ghóṣa-* to be emanating from the foes, but the instr. *amítraiḥ* with *śṛṇve* should make it an agent of the hearing ("is heard by ...") not a source of the sound. Ge's (/WG's) "von" and Re's supplied "(faite) d'ennemis" show their need to overrule the syntax. I see no reason why it should not be Indra's battle-cry, striking fear in all who hear it.

III.30.17: *salalūka-* is yet another peculiar word that brings our interpr. to a standstill. The current standard interpr. is "indulgence, patience" vel sim. (Ge [/WG] "Nachsicht"). I do not understand where such a meaning would come from. Mayrhofer (KEWA s.v.) suggests √*sṛ* in the meaning 'sich erstrecken', but the semantic channel from one to the other seems blocked to me. Although a deriv. from √*sṛ* seems likely, a more literal sense of that root, 'run, flow', provides better sense. (The older interpr. of the word was 'zerflossen' or 'umherschweifend' [Gr, etc.].) Both the *l*'s and the affective *-ūka*-suffix suggest a slangy or low-register word -- hence my "send scooting." Gr suggests a preform **salsalūka-*, presumably because *-ūka-* is often added to intensively reduplicated stems (see AiG II.2.498) (cf. *jāgarūka-* III.54.7). This seems possible (though not, of course, necessary), and "send scooting" is also meant to reflect an intensive/iterative sense. Note that *salalūkam* phonologically resembles *sahámūlam* in pāda a (in almost the same metrical position), which may help account for the presence of *salalūkam* in the vs. and could also have facilitated a dissimilation from **salsalūkam*.

III.30.18: It is difficult to know how to construe the first pāda of this vs. I take it as a nominal main clause expressing the purpose of the subordinate clause in b. Ge (/WG) as a parallel subordinate clause with pāda b, for which a verb (ausziehst 'set out for') must be supplied -- all dependent on pāda c. Re as part of a single subord. cl. introduced by *yád* in b, also all dependent on c. Each of these solutions has drawbacks. Mine requires nothing to be supplied (Re's supplies less than Ge's), and it also avoids two problems produced by Re's interpr: a worrisomely late position of *yád* and an untethered *ca* in the middle of pāda a. But mine comes with a certain awkwardness of expression and an ill-assorted conjoined pair ("for well-being and with horses").

However the various interpr. of ab differ, they all agree in taking *āsátsi* as the verb in the subor. cl. introduced by *yád*, thus showing the older non-imperatival (that is, subjunctive) value of the so-called "*-si* imperative."

III.30.19: Gr analyses *dhīmahi* as passive, but this is rightly rejected by all standard tr.: the numerous other examples of this form are all transitive. What then should we supply as object? I take the line of least resistance, importing *bhágam* from the preceding pāda. I take the b pāda to mean that we hope to take the portion Indra brings us now and put it together with the superfluity of his previous gifts (and those to come) (*deṣṇásya ... prareké*). Ge (sim. WG) does not construe these two nouns together, but takes *deṣṇásya* as a partitive genitive, supplying the obj. of *dhīmahi* ("Wir möchten von deiner Gabe etwas auf Vorrat zurücklegen"), while Re takes the verb as reflexive: "puissions nous nous placer ..."

The Pp. and all standard analyses take *ūrvá* as underlying nom. *ūrváḥ*; I, however, take it as loc. *ūrvé*. Though Ge and Re tr. the word as 'sea', it really refers to the container, in this case the sea-basin, and so logically what stretches out is not the container itself but the liquid in the container. (WG tr. Behälter, but keep it as nom.)

III.30.20: The conjoined verbs in ab, *mandayā ... papráthaś ca*, are in different moods, imperative and subjunctive respectively. Or so it seems: in the sandhi context *mandayā góbhiḥ* the apparent impv. *mandayā* could represent subjunctive **mandayās*. However, I don't think this is necessary; impv. and subj. are both future-oriented moods, and in fact in this passage the pairing functions as a sort of covert conditional: "(if) you invigorate it, it will spread." Kü (321), fld by WG, construes *candrávatā rā́dhasā* with the 2nd verb, but both the accent on *papráthaḥ* and the position of the *ca* make it clear that *papráthaḥ* must begin a new clause.

III.30.21: Schaeffer (136) sees no particular repetitive function in the well-attested intensive *dárdar-*; she considers it simply lexicalized. Therefore my "keep breaking open" may impose a semantic nuance that does not belong to this stem. However, at the very least it takes pl. objects here (*gotrā́, gā́ḥ*), so it could be considered "objektsdistributiv" (for which term see Schaeffer 86–87).

On *divákṣāḥ* (per Pp.), which raises both semantic and formal problems, see comm. ad X.65.7. As disc. there, the 2nd member most likely belongs to the root √*kṣā* 'rule', not √*kṣi* 'dwell', and, further, is quite likely not a root noun, but an *-as*-stem built to the zero-grade of the root (see Scar 92–93). The Pp. reading for our nom. sg., *divákṣāḥ*, is compatible with both a root-noun and an *-as*-stem 2nd member. However, it makes metrical trouble: the Saṃhitā hiatus, *divákṣā asi*, is correct for an underlying final *-ās* in sandhi, but the line then has an extra syllable. A contracted reading **divákṣāsi* would fix the problem, but makes trouble for both root noun and *-as*-stem interpr. Scar floats the possibility of an *-n*-stem (for this occurrence; it won't work for the other two, which have the form *divákṣasaḥ*). This multiplication of stems is not appealing. A simpler and not-unprecedented explan. is given by HvN in their metrical commentary: "recursive application of sandhi rules."

III.31 Indra

As indicated in the publ. intro., the hymn presents multiple difficulties, esp. in its first three vss. I will not attempt to represent the many conflicting interpr. of these vss., but simply lay out some parts of my own and point to some of the many puzzles that remain. As also noted in the publ. intro., I think the cosmic incest theme imposed on

these vss. by others is faint at best, and also think that the ritual occasion depicted is not the original generation of the ritual fire but the removal of the Āhavanīya fire from the Gārhapatya.

In the publ. intro. I say that Indra is not named in the narrative of the Vala myth until vs. 11, but this is false: the last word of the 1st verse of the Vala treatment, 4d, is *índraḥ*. He is also named in the last vs. of the Vala section, 11b -- thus producing a satisfying ring.

Vss. 3 to the end are tr. and discussed by H.-P. Schmidt in *Bṛhaspati und Indra* (pp. 166-75).

III.31.1: The female line of descent implied in the 1st pāda, *duhitúr naptyàm* "the (grand)daughter of the daughter," is striking. As noted already, I believe that this kinship succession refers to the production of the offering fire (Āhavanīya) from the householder's fire (Gārhapatya) and the removal to the east of the former. Obviously, however, this can't refer directly to the fires, because *agní-* is masc.; it is rather, I think, a reference to the hearths, which word (*dhiṣánā-* in some uses) is fem. The conveyor (*váhniḥ*) who has come (*gāt*) is the fire itself (often called *váhni-*), which has made the journey from the Gārhapatya hearth to the Āhavanīya hearth. The offering is being made there by the father (*pitā́*), whom I take as the priest. I do not see allusion to the cosmic incest of Heaven and his daughter, in part because it is difficult to identify who the granddaughter would be. (See Old.) The ritual identifications of *váhni-* = Agni and *pitā́* = priest are pretty standard; it is the identity of the females that causes dispute.

On *ṛtásya dī́dhiti-* see comm. ad VII.1.1.

On the vs. as possible evidence for the institution of the *putrikā* 'appointed daughter', see H-P Schmidt's (*Women's Rites and Rights*: 33–37) somewhat skeptical discussion of Yāska's interpr. of the vs. Schmidt also points out that Vasiṣṭha DS XVII.16 interprets the vs. in the same way, as referring to the *putrikā*.

III.31.2: I do not see sufficient evidence in this vs. for the legalistic interpr. having to do with inheritance rights advanced by Old and Ge (fld. by WG); see also Schmidt (37–38) on Yāska's interpr. Again, my interpr. involving the two fireplaces is at least thinkable, though there are a number of loose ends (in everyone's interpr). In the first pāda in my interpr. the fire that has been taken out of the Gārhapatya leaves nothing behind. The two other occurrence of *āraik* have womb as obj. + a dative (as if it were our pāda b): I.113.1 *evā́ rā́try uṣáse yónim āraik* "so night has left behind the womb for dawn" and I.124.8, which even has a sister: *svásā svásre jyā́yasyai yónim āraik* "The (one) sister has left the natal place to her older sister." In both the idea seems to be that one has vacated the space for the other -- not left as legacy, as the legalistic inheritance interpr. requires. Problematic for my interpr. is the fact that *rikthám* should be the equivalent of the womb itself (the fireplace), not the detritus that the fire might leave in it. Moreover, the two hearths that had been daughter and granddaughter now become sisters -- but a certain fluidity in modeling kinship relations would not be surprising.

In b the site of the new fire, the Āhavanīya, is the womb of this new fire and "the repository of the winner" (the winner being the fire itself).

Contra Gr, I take *sanitúḥ* as the gen. of the agent noun, rather than an adv.

The second half-verse is fairly clear (for this hymn) in its description of the churning of the fire: the mothers are the fingers, the two good workers are the two kindling sticks. See the fire-churning passage with kindling sticks in nearby III.29.1.

The *yádī* opening the second half-verse is better taken as *yád ī*, with the enclitic pronoun. See 6a below.

III.31.3: In the first pāda the instr. *juhvā̆* can be read simultaneously as "with his tongue," construed with *réjamānaḥ* and referring to the flame(s) of the fire, and as "by the offering-spoon," construed with *jajñe* and indicating that the ghee poured from the spoon "begets" the fire by making it flame up.

The second pāda is likewise ambiguous and initiates the transition to the Indra-Aṅgiras-Vala myth portion of the hymn. The "sons of the great ruddy one" (*mahás putrā̆m̐ aruṣásya*) can be the flames of the fire, that is, of Agni himself -- and the infinitival *prayákṣe* 'to display' is esp. appropriate to this interpr. But they can also be, as they are identified by most commentators, the Aṅgirases, the sons of Heaven, who will figure in the Vala myth about to be related, but who are also associated with Agni, who is sometimes called *áṅgirastama-* (e.g., I.75.2; see Macd, *Vedic Myth.* 143). The "birth of these" (*jātám eṣām*) in c can likewise refer to both the flames and the Aṅgirases. Indra's appearance in d strengthens the Aṅgiras reading and provides a transition to the next portion of the hymn.

The lexeme *prá √yakṣ* has been variously interpreted. For 'display' see Gotō (1st class, 153 and n. 572), EWA s.v. Curiously WG tr. it as if to *√yaj* 'sacrifice', despite Gotō's own disc. just cited -- though the other possibility is suggested in the n. For further disc. of *√yakṣ* see comm. ad VII.61.5.

III.31.4: Pādas a and c contain feminine plural nom./acc. forms: *jaítrīḥ* and *jānatī̂ḥ ... uṣā̆saḥ* respectively. Although the default assumption would be that they are coreferential and both refer to the Dawns, the familiar plot line of the Vala myth suggests rather that they identify two different subjects: the (unexpressed) Aṅgirases in ab, the (expressed) Dawns in c. (So Ge, Re, Schmidt [B+I, 167]; Old agrees that the Aṅgirases should be supplied as subj. in a, but takes *jaítrīḥ* as obj. [presumably alongside clear acc. *spṛdhānám*], while WG take the Dawns as subj. of a, but supply the Aṅgirases as subj. of b.) The Aṅgirases are Indra's back-up band in the Vala myth, as noted above ad III.30.10, and would be expected to accompany him, as pāda a depicts, while the Dawns are still confined within the Vala cave and only in c recognize Indra's song and come out of the cave. The problem for an Aṅgiras reading of pāda a is of course the fem. gender of *jaítrīḥ*. Here it is probably best to follow Sāy. in supply *víśaḥ* 'clans' (so Ge, etc.); cf. I.121.3 *viśā̆m áṅgirasām*. However, note that the Aṅgirases are referred to by the fem. pl. *vā̆ṇīḥ* 'choir' in the preceding hymn, III.30.10, and that noun could be supplied here.

The cows of d are surely the dawns, as often; Indra becomes their *páti-*, a word meaning both 'lord' and 'husband'. On the naming of Indra here, see the intro. remarks above.

III.31.5: The Aṅgirases, now presumably in the masc. (though both *dhī̂rāḥ* [a] and *víprāḥ* [b] are technically ambiguous), remain the implicit subjects of abc, with Indra, also unnamed, taking this role in d. The cows, also not identified, are represented in pāda a by

the fem. pl. part. *satī́ḥ*. In fact, though these identifications are fairly easy to make for those familiar with the story, they remain covert, and, further, both b and d have unidentified objects as well. In b Ge (/WG) tr. *áhinvan* without object; I have supplied the cows (so apparently also Lü [Varuṇa 510–11], Schmidt [B+I 167]), while Re's parenthetic "(l')" in "(l')incitèrent" presumably refers to Indra.

In d there is an expressed object, but it is merely a 3rd ps. pronoun, which is, furthermore, ambiguous in sandhi: *tā́* in *tā́ námasā* can represent either neut. pl. *tā́* (or instr. sg. *tā́*) or fem. pl. *tā́ḥ*. The Pp. opts for the former, a decision endorsed by Old. The issue is further complicated by the fact that the form could be construed with either (or both) of two verbal forms, part. *prajānán* or pf. *ā́ viveśa*. Old takes *tā́* to refer vaguely to things that Indra knows and construes it with *prajānán*; sim. Re: "sachant ces choses." Ge [/WG], contra Pp., restores *tā́ḥ*, which he takes to refer to pl. *pathyā̆ḥ*, generated from *pathyā̆m* in c. My tr. is closer to Schmidt and to Lü, in restoring *tā́ḥ* (like Ge), but assuming its referent to be the cows, into whose company Indra enters. With Lü and Schmidt, I also take *prajānán* as having an implicit object inspired by *pathyā̆m* in c, but *prajānán* is generally used absolutely to mean "knowing (the way)" and so a form of *pathyā̆-* need not be supplied. The publ. tr. should have parentheses: "knowing (the way)."

III.31.6: Ge (/WG) interpret ab as a direct quotation from the gods, for reasons that are unclear to me. Although an immediate past reading might help account for the injunctive aorists *vidát* (a) and *kaḥ* (b), in fact the second hemistich also contains two injunctives, *nayat* (c) and *gāt* (d), the latter of which is also an aorist. So there is no clear grammatical distinction between the two half-verses, and the subject (Saramā) also remains the same throughout (by most interpr.), with all four pādas focusing on the same narrative. Other interpreters (Re, Lü, Schmidt) ignore this odd decision of Ge's.

In pāda a *yádī* should be read *yád ī* ; see 2c above.

In b *pā́thaḥ* ordinarily means 'fold, pen', but here refers to the herd confined in the fold: the shift from container to contained is a common one in semantic change.

ákṣarāṇām in c most likely has double reference, both to the cows that are being released from the Vala cave and the syllables of the Aṅgirases' song that effects that release.

Ge makes the point (n. 6d) that *ráva-* in this context otherwise only refers to the Aṅgirases' song; this leads him to switch the subject to Uṣas, as the first out of the cave, coming in response to the sound of the Aṅgirases. This seems, on the one hand, over-finicky -- why introduce another female character in the middle of a vs. without signaling it? -- and, on the other, rather deaf to the possibility of multiple meanings that always lurks in RVic discourse. One of the points of the Vala myth in general seems to me the mirroring of sounds: the song that releases the cows and their joyous counter-mooing in response -- an obvious place for a poet to allow a single word to do double duty. This same double reference is found in the preceding pāda in *ákṣarāṇām*. Schmidt (B+I 167) also takes the *ráva-* to be that of Indra and the Aṅgirases and in fact makes Uṣas the subject of the whole 2nd hemistich. I do not see the need for this.

III.31.7: Note that all pādas begin with 3rd sg. preterite verbs: a *ágachat,* b *ásūdayat*, c *sasā́na*, d (modified initial pos.) *áthābhavat* (which most likely represents *átha abhavat*,

though *áthā bhavat* is possible). All but the perfect in c are augmented imperfects; this contrasts markedly with vs. 6, which, as was just noted, contains four 3rd sg. injunctives, three of them aorists. Three of the four pādas of vs. 7 also end with nom. sg. masc. pres. participles: a *sakhīyán*, c *makhasyán*, d *árcan*.

Pāda b configures the release of the cows from the Vala cave as a birth, but a birth overlaid with metaphor ("brought to sweetness").

In c the standard tr. (save for Re and Klein, DGRV II.67) take *makhasyá-* as 'being generous' vel sim. But in all three occurrences of this verb stem (here and IX.61.27, 101.5) the 'do battle' sense is primary. Since it co-occurs with *sasa̍na* 'won' in this pāda, the 'battle' sense seems esp. appropriate. So Re "comportant-en-combattant." For further on *makhá-* see comm. ad I.18.9.

My tr. of d, *áthābhavad áṅgirasāḥ sadyó árcan*, differs in an important way from the standard. In my opinion it states that Indra became an Aṅgiras as soon as he sang; the others that the Aṅgiras [=Indra] right away became a singer (e.g., Ge "Da ward sogleich der Aṅgiras zum Lobsänger"). On the one hand, I'm not certain that √*bhū* + pres. part. can yield this sort of predication, esp. with the pres. part. standing in, in effect, for an agent noun. So -- a syntactic argument, though I have not examined the evidence in detail. Another syntactic/lexical argument: *sadyáḥ* + participle is frequently used to indicate the circumstances under which the action of the main verb takes place. This is esp. common with *sadyó jātáḥ* "just born" / *sadyó jajñānáḥ* "having just been born" -- e.g., the next hymn, III.32.9 *sadyó yáj jātó ápibo ha sómam* (≅10) "Just born, you drank the soma" (and cf. III.29.3). But the prevailing interpr. here requires the *sadyáḥ* to go with the main verb, despite its position directly before the participle -- e.g., Klein "And then did the Aṅgiras straightway become a singer." And finally a semantic objection: the proposed tr. seems to me thematically backwards. Indra joins the category of the Aṅgirases because he joins them in song, which is their principal function in this myth; he is not an Aṅgiras by nature who happens to start singing. (This point is made, more or less, by Schmidt [173], despite his contrary tr.)

III.31.7–8: Given the thematic weight the part. *árcan* carries (see comm. immed. above) and given that it occupies pāda-final position in 7d and 8c, it should have been tr. the same way in these two vss. I would emend the publ. tr. to 'chanting' in 7d, or else 8c to 'singing' and *arkaíḥ* in 9b, 11b to 'songs'. The instr. *arkaíḥ* reappears in pāda-final position in 11b.

III.31.8: Ge (/WG) take this vs. as a quotation of the Aṅgirases' praise-song of Indra. I do not see why. The vs. seems to follow easily from the preceding one, and in fact at the end of vs. 7 it's Indra who's singing (/chanting), not the Aṅgirases. We might expect such a quotation to be signposted in some way. I do not consider the 1st pl. enclitic *naḥ* in c to be a sufficient signal.

The presence of Śuṣṇa in b is a bit puzzling, since the smiting of Śuṣṇa is not part of the Vala myth. Perhaps, with Schmidt (173), he is mentioned because Indra is uncontestably Śuṣṇa's killer, and this extra-mythic (or extra-Vala myth) association makes it clear that the unnamed subject of this vs. must indeed be Indra.

The standard tr. take c as a separate clause from d and supply a verb of motion with *prá* (e.g., Ge "[ging] ... voran"). This is certainly possible, but cd can also be read as

a single clause (so Schmidt, 168), since *prá* is frequent with √*muc*. This interpr. allows, but does not enforce, a coreferential interpr. of *naḥ* (c) and *sákhīn* (d), as in my tr. (flg. Schmidt).

What calumny? Ge (n. 8d) suggests the dishonor because of the loss of the herd.

III.31.9: Ge's suggestion that this vs. concerns the Aṅgirases' Sattra, a months-long ritual, seems completely convincing. Note the verb *sedur* 'they sat' in pāda a and the nominal *sádanam* 'sitting' in c. I am less convinced by his interpr. of c (fld. by Re, WG), that this Sattra is frequently *(bhū́ri*) repeated now, though I admit that both the hic-et-nunc prn. *idám* and the particle *nú* might support his view. I prefer Lü's interpr. (Varuṇa, 511, fld. by Schmidt 168), who takes *bhū́ri* as 'long' and the hemistich as a further description of the Aṅgirases' Sattra in the Vala myth.

My interpr. of d (based on Lü and Schmidt) deviates further from Ge (Re, WG). All of the latter take *yéna ... ṛténa* as coreferential and the equivalent of ... **ṛtáṃ, yéna* -- that is, **ṛtám* in the main cl. as antecedent to *yéna*. The main cl. **ṛtám* would be an appositive to *sádanam* "the Session, (that is,) the *ṛtá* by which they ..." However, I separate the two instr. in d and take the antecedent of *yéna* to be *sádanam* ("the Session by which ..."), leaving *ṛténa* to mean 'by/through truth' as so often. They also take *māsā́n* as the obj. of *ásiṣāsan* ("they sought to win the months"), but this acc. pl. can easily be an acc. of extent of time (again, as so often), and the true object of their desire to win can be supplied as the cows.

III.31.10: What "the milk of the age-old semen" means is unclear to me. Ge suggests that they're milking their old cows, but the rhetoric seems rather overblown just to express that. Lü (620–21, fld. by Schmidt 168) identifies the semen as *ṛtá-* and the milk as the Kultlied of the Aṅgirases. This may well be, but nothing imposes this explanation, and Schmidt in fact worries briefly (173) that logically the Aṅgirases should already have their Kultlied since they should have used it to free these very cows.

On *niṣṭhā́-* 'outstanding' see Old, Scar (648–49). The word must be derived from *nís* √*sthā*, not *ní* √*sthā* and in fact goes literally into English as 'stand out', with the same idiomatic meaning. In addition to two occurrences of the simplex (this and IX.110.9), it is found in several compounds: *karma-niṣṭhā́-* X.80.1 of a hero who stands out through his work, *puruniṣṭhā́-* 'standing out among many' V.1.6 (of Agni), VIII.2.9 of soma. Ge (unaccountably) takes it as 'Verteilung' (fld. by Re, Lü 528–29, Schmidt 168), an interpr. about which Old comments rather acidly. Old's own interpr. is essentially reproduced here and was also adopted by WG. On these exx. in the context of the limitations on root noun cmpding, see my 2024 "Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian [Fs. Kellens]: 142 and n. 15.

Note the partial responsion between *ghóṣa* in c and *góṣu* in d, in the same metrical position.

III.31.11: My interpr. of the first hemistich differs from the standard; I take it as consisting of two separate clauses, each identifying Indra in one of his most important mythic roles -- in the Vṛtra-slaying and in the freeing of the Vala cows -- along with his associates in those enterprises, the Maruts and the Aṅgirases respectively. It is important to note that this naming of Indra, in conjunction with the first appearance of his name in

4b (see comm. there and in the intro. remarks), frames the treatment of the Vala myth, and, by mentioning Vṛtra, it also sets the stage for the opening out of this hymn to treat other exploits of Indra.

Others take *vṛtrahā́* in pāda a simply as an auxiliary epithet of Indra in this account of the Vala myth, but I do not think that Vṛtrahan would be so promiment in a treatment of the Vala myth, and I also cannot otherwise account for the *séd u* in the middle of pāda a without assuming that a new clause begins there. (Lü [517] gets out of this difficulty by accepting Ludwig's emendation to a bahuvrīhi *svéduhavyaiḥ* 'having sweating oblations' [=Aṅgirases], but though this is ingenious, esp. as sweat figures in the same myth in X.67.6–7 as Ge points out, it requires too much alteration for a sequence that can make sense on its own.) In the first brief clause, *vṛtrahā́* is the predicate, and *jātébhiḥ* refers to the Maruts, who are well known for being 'born (together)' (e.g., V.55.3 *sākáṃ jātā́ḥ*). Ge suggests, but rejects, an emendation here to *sajātébhiḥ* (for transmitted *sá jātébhiḥ*), an idea also of Alsdorf's (see Schmidt 169); I would modify that by proposing haplology from *sá *sajātébhiḥ*. The rest of ab concerns the Vala myth, which has been the subject of the past seven vss. The myth is readily identifiable by the VP *úd usríyā asṛjat* "sent the ruddy (cows) surging up" and by the *arkaíḥ*, repeated from 9a. Since the chants in 9a clearly belonged to the Aṅgirases, there need not be any even oblique reference to the Aṅgirases here: the bare *arkaíḥ* will be enough.

III.31.12: The first pāda contains two datives, *pitré* and the prn. *asmai*. Because of its lack of accent, *asmai* cannot be a demonst. adj. with *pitré*. Ge gets out of the difficulty by interpr. *pitré* as a simile, which allows *asmai* to be independently construed, but this depends on his frequent assumption that *cid* can be a simile marker, a role I do not think it can have. Instead I give the VP *cakruḥ sádanam* a double reading: acdg. to the first the Aṅgirases perform a Sattra for their father (see 9c), but in the second they also prepare for him a literal seat. Because *cakruḥ sádanam* participates in two clauses, each can have an independent dative, though in my opinion the datives are coreferential.

It is unclear what the referent of the neut. object in b is, described as *máhi tvíṣīmat* "great and turbulent." Ge, flg. Sāy, takes it as a further reference to the seat, Re the all-purpose "quelque chose," Schmidt the eye of the sun, WG sim. the sun-god. My own candidate is the *pā́thaḥ* of 6b, also described as *máhi* there. In vs. 6 the word is used to indicate the herd, which is contained in the fold (see comm. there); here I think it is the container, the fold or pen, itself -- representing the cosmic space and also the ritual ground. When they survey it they see that this space needs organizing, which they proceed to do -- by propping apart Heaven and Earth (a deed usually ascribed to Indra) and preparing and propping up a seat for Indra. They thus make the whole cosmos into Indra's ritual ground, and in the next vs. (13ab) Earth herself serves as the emplacement allowing Indra to pierce Vṛtra.

The position of the *hí* is somewhat anomalous: since the whole b pāda forms a single clause, we would expect the *hí* in Wackernagel's position. However, there is a general tendency when a preverb precedes its verb late in the clause for *hí* to intervene between them, as here: ... *ví hí khyan* #. More specifically, 1) when there's a *hí* in a clause containing a verbal form of √*khyā,* it always immediately precedes the verb -- sometimes in normal Wack. pos. (e.g., I.81.9), sometimes not (as here and, e.g.,

VI.15.15). 2) With one exception, all injunc. forms of √*khyā* are preceded either by *hí* or by a preverb ending in *-i*, which prob. led to a sense that √*khyā* should be so preceded. Note also in this passage the phonetic echoes #*máhi* ... *ví hí khyan* #, which also resonates with pāda d ... *ví minvan* #. It is perhaps worth noting in this connection how many pādas in this hymn begin with *máhi* or *mahî*: 3d, 4b, 6b, 12b, 13a, 14a, 14c, 15a (esp. clustered here); cf. also *mahás* 3b, *mahắn* 3c, 18d. I assume that a pāda opening **máhi hí* would be avoided; in any case there are none in the RV.

In d most tr. take the sun as the referent of the object. I instead supply the seat. The root √*mi* often takes 'seat' as obj.: not our *sádanam* admittedly, but *sádman-* II.15.3 (with *ví*), X.20.5, I.173.3, IX.97.1, *sắdana-* X.18.13. This is a fairly large percentage of the attested forms of the verb, and since 'seat' is already present in this vs., it is easily supplied here.

III.31.13: I take *yádi* here as a shortened form of *yád* **ī* with enclitic pronoun (as in 2c and 6a), though it unfortunately appears before a word beginning with a single consonant. An "if" makes no sense here, and it is also desirable to have an acc. pron. in this pāda to serve as obj. of *dhắt* and subj. of the infinitival *śiśnáthe*. This putative **ī* may anticipate and double the heavy acc. phrase of b, assuming that the latter refers to Indra.

As noted just above, Earth herself serves as the foundation from which Indra can launch his attack. Our passage is very similar to I.102.7 ... *tvā dhiṣáṇā titviṣe mahy, ádhā vṛtrắṇi jighnase* ... "The great (Earth), the Holy Place has sparked you .... So you keep smashing obstacles ...," with the same *mahî ... dhiṣáṇā* as here and even a form of √*tviṣ*, like *tvíṣīmat* in 12b; cf. also VI.19.2 *índram evá dhiṣáṇā sātáye dhāt* "The Holy Place positioned just Indra for winning," with √*dhā* + inf. as here. The same √*dhā* + inf. construction is found in 19d below: *svàś ca naḥ ... sātáye dhāḥ* "and set us up to win the sun."

Although Gr assigns the hapax *śíśnathe* to a them. stem *śiśnátha-*, as Old clearly states we expect a datival infinitive here, and so it more likely belongs to an athem. stem *śiśnáth-*; cf. *abhiśnáth-*.

Re takes b as describing Vṛtra, Schmidt Indra; Ge's tr. is not clear, though Schmidt (169 n.) claims it's to Vṛtra. I follow Schmidt in assigning the phrase to Indra, though the poet may have intended its referent to be ambiguous, indicating that the opponents are almost evenly balanced.

I follow the current standard view (represented already by Ge and Re) that *ánutta-* is the ppl. to the lexeme *ánu* √*dā* 'concede'; Schmidt and WG follow the older deriv. from √*nud* 'push', hence 'unpushable' vel sim.

III.31.14: Because *vaśmi* is unaccented, the first pāda would be more accurately tr. "I long for your companionship ...." since *vaśmi* cannot begin a clause. I tr. as I did to capture the parallelism of pādas a #*máhi ... sakhyám* and c #*máhi stótram*, as well as 15a *máhi kṣétram*.

III.31.15: Ge takes *nṛ́bhiḥ* as the agent with the part. *dīdyānaḥ* ("von den Männern entflammt (?)"), but this participle never elsewhere takes an agent. Better an instr. of accompaniment, with most other tr. That Indra is described as shining may be connected to the fact that three of the four things he generates shine too: the sun, the dawn, and fire.

There is some disagreement about who the men are: the Aṅgirases or the Maruts. Given the general prominence of the Vala myth earlier in the hymn, but the more recent concentration on the Vṛtra myth, I imagine the ambiguity is intentional and both sets of Indra's helpers are to be thought of.

III.31.16: My interpr. of this vs. differs significantly from the standard, beginning with the disposition of the pādas. Most take abc together, with d as a separate clause, while I divide the vs. into two hemistichs, which express parallel notions. In ab, in mythological time, Indra sends the waters surging; this is the standard happy denouement of the Vṛtra myth. In cd priests (even perhaps the Aṅgirases) impel another collection of liquid, the streams of soma -- the ritual equivalent of Indra's cosmogonic release of the waters. Although the standard interpr. tacks pāda c onto ab, as describing the waters, it contains vocabulary that is strongly associated with soma: *mádhu-* 'honey, sweet', √*pū* 'purify', and *pavítra-* 'filter', and I cannot offhand think of another instance in which *waters* are said to be purified — though they are often purifying.

In ab note the return of several lexical items: *vibhű-* (13b) and *sadhryàñc-* (6b). The *cid* 'also' also links this vs. with a previous part of the hymn, namely 11b where Indra sends surging another group of fem. entities (ruddy [cows]): *úd usríyā asṛjad índro arkaíḥ*.

I do not understand why Indra is called *dámūnāḥ* 'master of the house'. The word is generally an epithet of Agni (understandably), and there is nothing in this passage that seems to me to link Indra to the domestic sphere.

In c *mádhvaḥ* is taken by most as fem. acc. pl. (by Schmidt as masc. nom. pl.). Several exx. of this form are analyzed by Gr as either masc. nom. pl. or fem. nom./acc. pl. However, none of these supposed examples is convincing, and it is best to take it here as the gen. sg. it usually is. It then needs a head noun. Old adduces nearby III.36.7 *mádhvaḥ punanti dhărayā pavítraiḥ* "they purify it in a stream of honey with purifying filters," which is very similar to our pāda c. I therefore supply, with Old, a form of *dhărā-* 'stream' upon which gen. *mádhvaḥ* depends. The precise form I supply is acc. pl. *dhărāḥ*, modified by the (fem. acc.) part. *punānăḥ* and coreferential with *dhánutrīḥ* 'runners' at the end of the vs. The conceit in the phrase *hinvanti ... dhánutrīḥ* is that the priests are spurring on the streams of soma (like) horses. As for the subj. of *hinvanti*, I take it as (the current) priests (as in the sim. passage III.36.7 just quoted; also III.46.5, where Adhvaryus are the subj. of *hinvanti*). It could also be, with Re, the Aṅgirases, who have been operating as priests in the Sattra depicted earlier.

Ge (/WG) take *kavíbhiḥ* as an adjective with *pavítraiḥ* (Ge: "mit geistigen Filtern"), but in my opinion there are no adjectival uses of *kaví-*. Instead it is used as a defining appositive (poets as filters), as I take it, sim. Re, or it is a separate agent with *punānăḥ* ("being purified by poets with filters"), with Schmidt (170). For the same phrase see III.1.5.

III.31.17: As Ge points out, pāda a is very similar to IV.48.3 *ánu kr̥ṣṇé vásudhitī, yemăte viśvápeśasā* "The two black treasure chambers [=Night and Dawn], with all their ornaments, have directed themselves after each other in turn." Bloomfield (RR ad III.31.17) cleverly comments, "The words kr̥ṣṇé and vásudhitī are both dvandva ekaçeṣa:

'black (Night) and (Uṣas)' is a way of saying náktoṣ́ā́sā; conversely 'treasure-giving (Morn) and black (Night)' is uṣ́ā́sānáktā."

"The magnanimity of the sun" is a slightly surprising expression. Is it that the sun makes the succession of Night and Dawn possible by his transit across the sky, and this is considered generous on his part? Or is it an indirect reference to the distribution of the dakṣiṇā at dawn. A related, but opposite, sentiment is found in VII.81.4 *uchántī yā́ kr̥ṇóṣi maṃhánā mahi, prakhyaí devi svàr dr̥ś́é* "You who in dawning make through your magnanimity the sun to be visible for seeing," with the magnanimity credited to Dawn.

The only other occurrence of pl. *r̥jipyá-* (II.34.4) is at least indirectly used of the Maruts; the standard tr. all assume they are the referents of cd, which seems correct. Here they seem to be functioning as priests, attempting to bring Indra to a sacrifice.

III.31.18: Note the alliteration in b (*... viśvā́yur vr̥ṣabhó vayodhā́ḥ*) and the rather elementary etymological figure in d (*mahā́n mahī́bhiḥ*); although *sakhyébhiḥ śivébhiḥ* is neither the one nor the other, it seems to function as a bridge between the two.

III.31.19: Pāda b, *návyaṃ kr̥ṇomi ... purājā́m* "I make new (the hymn) born of old," is about as succinct a summary of the RVic poetic enterprise as we can find in the text: the poets' focus on ever new expressions based on traditional techniques and themes. In this particular case, Ge suggests that *purājá-* refers to the Preislied of the Aṅgirases, about which we heard in vss. 7–8.

On the √*dhā* + inf. construction, see vs. 13 above.

III.31.19–20: Note the echo of 19d #*s*^{u}*vaś ca naḥ* in 20b *s*^{u}*vastí naḥ*.

III.31.20: The mists are probably in part metaphorical -- menacing threats and mental darkness -- but may also refer physically to morning mists, which are clearing as the dawn sacrifice begins. Note also that pāda-initial *míhaḥ* is a mirror image of *máhi*, which opens so many pādas in this hymn (see comm. ad 12b).

III.31.21: I follow Schaeffer (Intens., 133–34) in taking the medial intens. *dédiṣṭe* in the meaning 'display (one's own X)' -- hence my different tr. of *ádediṣṭa* (a) 'has put on display' and *diśámānaḥ* 'allotting'.

I interpr. b as having a more complex construction than the standard interpr. The trouble is the *antár* phrase: when *antár* governs the acc., it is only used with dual (or plurals conceived as duals -- *jātā́n ubháyān* [IV.2.2], e.g.), but *kr̥ṣṇā́n* has no overt partner here. I suggest that it is an elliptical plural-for-dual: "black (nights) and (bright days)"; cf. VIII.41.10 *śvetā́n ... kr̥ṣṇā́n* used for days and nights. The elliptical *kr̥ṣṇé* used of Night and Dawn in 17a would support this, and in 20a the clearing of the mists at daybreak (if I'm right) might provide the other half of this elliptical duality. If this is correct, Indra *comes between* (*antáḥ ... gāt*) the nights and days *with* the entities appearing in the instr. (*aruṣaíḥ dhā́mabhiḥ*). *aruṣá-* 'ruddy' can of course be used of Dawn and her various associates, esp. her "cows"; *dhā́man-* is a frustratingly multivalent word, but here I think it means 'manifestation' vel sim, and the phrase refers to the dawns, who of course come temporally between night and full day.

The positioning of *ca* in d is somewhat disturbing, but I see no other way to explain it than Klein's (DGRV I.225, II.102 n. 28): it conjoins the first and second half-verses, but takes Wackernagel's position in the 2nd pāda of the 2nd half-verse "following an intervening participial phrase."

svā́ḥ 'his own' is in a very prominent position, as the last word in the last real vs. of the hymn (before the refrain, vs. 22). Why it should be emphasized that the doors that Indra opens are his own I do not know, beyond the fact that anything belonging to Indra is highly noteworthy. But I would point out that *svā́ḥ* may be a pun on *sʷ́vaś* (*sʷ́vaḥ* in pause) 'sun' initial in 19d (though unfortunately *svā́ḥ* is not distracted here as it so often is). This pāda is identical to X.120.8d, where it also participates in word play.

III.32 Indra

III.32.1: The impv. *píba* is accented, though it is located mid-clause. There is no obvious reason for this. Old suggests weakly (ZDMG 60: 736) that it is an emphatic accent, but this is of course a circular argument: any verb bearing an unexpected accent can be called emphatic. I find the accent esp. disturbing because the identical phrase, minus the initial voc. *índra*, is found without accented impv. elsewhere: #*sómam somapate piba*# (V.40.1=VIII.21.3) versus our #*índra sómaṃ somapate píbemám*#. There are several possible contributing factors. First, three pādas at the beginning of this hymn begin with accented *píbā* (2b, 3d, 5b), and our form may have had its accent added redactionally. However, I think that *píba* has special status and can be accented in positions that strict syntactic rules would not allow. (This is rather like Old's "emphatic" argument, except that I limit the effect to a single verb form.) See esp. I.15.1, II.37.1–3 and comm. there. The unsanctioned accent may arise partly because *píba* 'drink!' is a particularly rousing verb in RVic discourse. It also often occurs in non-initial position when it nonetheless legitimately has accent -- after init. vocatives (e.g. *índra píba* III.36.2, etc.) or at the beginning of a clause after another short clause (or clauses) (e.g., VIII.4.8 *tū́yam éhi drávā píba* "Come here swiftly! Run! Drink!"), and this may have led to the sense that it can be accented in non-initial position in general. I also note in Lub's conspectus that unaccented *piba* generally occupies either final position in its pāda or second position, while accented *píba*, besides being common and expected in initial position, tends to avoid both those positions except when 2nd position follows an initial voc. (as in III.36.2, etc.) or final position opens a new clause (as in VIII.4.8). Note that if this distribution holds, the "identical" phrases I cite at the beginning of this comment are not the same after all, because unaccented *piba* is pāda-final and our accented *píba* is followed by another element. However, there are a few counterexamples with pāda-final *pī́ba* not beginning a new clause (e.g., VIII.4.3, 65.5). One can speculate on why 2nd and final position would favor the unaccented verb while full medial favors the accented form: namely, that 2nd position is of course Wackernagel's position, where enclitics typically migrate, and, assuming a basic SOV underlying order, absolute final position is the default position for unaccented main-clause verbs. Still, the full medial position where we find accented main-clause *píba* does not otherwise favor or impose accent on other verbs that appear there, so if this hypothesis holds, it is only for this special verb.

Ge rather charmingly suggests that *praprúthya* represents "brr machend" to stop the horses. Although "whoa" would be the equivalent English word/vocal gesture, given

the object 'lips' (*śípre*), I wonder if it's the "horse training voice command" (gleaned on the internet) called "smooching" -- defined as "kissing sound with lips used to ask a horse to move on or up a gait." I rather like the idea of Indra smooching to his fallow bays.

III.32.4: Ge (and in part Re) take *mádhumat* as referring to speech ("... wurden beredt in süssen (Worten)"), but though *mádhumant-* occurs several times with *vácas-* and the noun *vípra-* 'inspired poet' demonstrates that √*vip* 'become inspired' can have a strong verbal component, still the focus of this hymn is soma -- and the default referent of *mádhumant-* 'honeyed' is soma. Here the underlying word must be neut. (which *sóma-* of course is not), but the neut. *sávana-* 'pressing' is found elsewhere with this adj. (cf. X.112.7 *mádhumattamāni ... sávanā*), and *sávana-* is found three times in the first five vss. of this hymn (1b, 3c, 5a).

Note the insistent repetition of the syllable *ma* in pāda d (*a**ma**r**má**ṇo **má**nya**mā**nasya **márma**), anticipated by ***má**dhu**ma**d* in a and ***ma**rútaḥ* in b, and continued by the first word in 5a ***ma**nuṣvád*. This phonetic figure may be signaling the **Ma**ruts' name. See also vs. 7.

III.32.5: The rendering of *vavṛtsva* in the publ. tr. ("let yourself be turned hither"), a sort of passive reflexive, now seems over-elaborate to me; I would substitute "be turned." The other examples of this mid. pf. impv. seem more straightforwardly simply "turn" or "turn yourself," but if *yajñaíḥ* has true instrumental force, a passive rendering is more natural. Possible, however, is Re's "grâce à (nos) sacrifices."

The referent of *saraṇyúbhiḥ* is not totally clear. Sāy. (fld. by Re) suggests the Maruts, while Ge adds horses or waves as possibilities. The other ex. of a plural to this stem (also instr.) in I.62.4 is in a clear Vala context, with the Navagvas and Daśagvas in the same vs., which would suggest the Aṅgirases -- but, although the Vala myth and the Aṅgirases were prominent in the preceding hymn III.31, they are not found in this hymn, which is dominated by the Maruts and which mentions only the Vṛtra myth (here and in the following vs.). I therefore think it likely that Sāy. was correct. Note that *saraṇyú- ... sisarṣi* is an etym. figure, continued by *sártavaí* in the next vs. (6b).

The rendering of the phrase *apó árṇā* as "the flooding waters" in the publ tr. assumes an emendation to fem. pl. *árṇāḥ*, with Gr and numerous others (see Old), contra the Pp and not reflecting the expected sandhi of such a form, which should be *árṇāḥ*. As Old points out, the emendation is not nec.: *árṇā* could easily be a neut. pl. to the thematic stem *árṇa-*. In this case the tr. would better read "the waters, the floods."

III.32.6: This vs. appears to have no main clause. I take it as loosely attached to the preceding vs., while Ge attaches it to the next one. Old (fld. by WG) disputes the Nebensatz analysis, pointing first to the odd doubly accented Pp. analysis of *prā́sṛjaḥ* as *prá ásṛjaḥ*: if the verb is accented, we would expect univerbation with the preverb and loss of the preverb accent. He instead suggests that *yád* is to be construed with the participial phrase *vṛtráṃ jaghanvā́n*, as if it contained the finite verb *jagántha* -- a mixed construction. I am in general reluctant to allow a subordinating conjunction to have domain over a participle, and in this particular case this assumption would further require bits of the main clause and the subordinate clause to be interwoven in a fashion unprecedented (as far as I know) even in RVic syntax: the major part of the subordinate

clause would be plunked down between the object of the main verb, *apáḥ*, and that verb *(prā́sṛjat*), and the 2nd half verse would consist of NPs modifying the object of the subordinate clause but following the end of the main clause. I do admit that the position of *yád dha* in pāda a suggests a close relation with the participial phrase, but I do not consider that position sufficient to override the arguments against that analysis.

As is well known, *-tavaí* infinitives almost always are followed by the particle *u* in the configuration *-tavā́ u* at pāda end (see JSK, Part. *u*, 164–67). This is one of the 6 counterexx. (listed p. 166 n. 10); I wonder if the final of *ājaú* in the combined *sā́rtavājaú* mimics the standard phraseology. See comm. ad X.108.6 for another counterex. and possible twist on the standard configuration.

The vs. contains several nice oppositions: *śáyānam ... cáratā* "(him) lying (still) with (your) moving (weapon)" and the etymological *devī́r ádevam* "the goddesses, godless ..." In addition note the etymological pun: *vṛtrám ... vavrivā́ṃsam*.

III.32.7: The *ma-* phonetic figure that dominated 4d returns in this vs.: cd ... ***mamá****tur ...,* ... ***ma****hi****mā́****nam*** ***mamā́****te*. This figure is reinforced by the first words of pāda a, *yájā****ma*** *ín* *ná****ma****sā*, and the uninterrupted sequence of *-am* acc. singulars in ab: ... *vṛddh****ám*** *índr****am****, bṛhánt****am*** *ṛ́ṣv****ám*** *ajár****am*** *yúvān****am.*** Although the latter is a side-effect of the grammar, it is my impression that a skilled RVic poet would break the monotony of such a string -- *unless* it served some other poetic purpose, here to provide the mirror-image *-am* to *ma-* and perhaps to evoke the Maruts.

The two forms of the perfect to √*mā* 'measure' in the 2nd hemistich, act. *mamátuḥ* and med. *mamā́te*, share the same subj. and obj., with the 1st clause positive and the second negated. Clearly the poet is playing with two different senses of √*mā*. Gr, Ge, and Old neatly convert the word play to "messen" ('measure') versus "ermessen" ('gauge, grasp, realize') (or so I understand them). My "measure" / "measure up to" is a similar attempt whose purport is close to Kü (378) and WG: "sich messen."

III.32.8: On the clash of gender and deixis in *pṛthivī́ṃ dyā́m utémā́m*, see comm. ad VIII.40.8.

III.32.9: The juxtaposition of *adroghá-* 'undeceptive' and *satyá-* 'real, true' is also found in III.14.6 *adroghéṇa vácasā satyám*.

The standard tr. take pādas a and b together, with cd separate. I think it makes more sense to take b with cd, as supplying the reason (Indra's early soma drinking) that he couldn't be obstructed.

The standard tr. also take *dyā́vaḥ* as 'days', whereas the publ. tr. agrees with Hoffmann (Injunk. 242) in tr. 'heavens'. The problem, as I saw it then, was its co-occurrence with *áhā* likewise 'days', which led to awkward duplication. However, I have now rethought this; the series of temporal expressions in this hemistich (*áhā, mā́sāḥ śaradaḥ*) invites a temporal reading of *dyā́vaḥ* as well and makes "heavens" seem out of place. In X.7.4. and 12.4 the two stems also co-occur and I tr. "days and daytimes." I would now substitute that tr. here as well.

varanta here and in 16b is formally ambiguous; it can be either an injunctive or a subjunctive to the root aor. (see Hoffmann 239–40); Hoffmann takes it as a subjunctive. It does not work terribly well as either one; in both passages I tr. it as a preterital modal

("could obstruct"), but this interpr. is not firmly based in the morphology. I sense that in this vs. and the next the poet is struggling to express a verbal category that isn't found in the Skt. verbal system, namely anteriority: modal anteriority here, temporal anteriority in 10cd.

III.32.10: As just noted, this vs. contains an apparent attempt to express anteriority: the pluperfect *ā́viveśīḥ* seems to function like an English pluperfect (rather than the standard Vedic plupf., a past tense to a presential perfect), to express an action that happened before the action of the main verb, an interpr. more or less endorsed by Kü (500).

III.32.11: The standard tr. (save for Hoffmann, Injunk. 100, sim. to my interpr.) take ... *sphigyā̀ kṣā́m ávasthāḥ* as "you covered / clothed the earth with your hip," but the medial root pres. to √*vas* means 'wear' and takes an acc. of the garment rather than an acc. of the entity being clothed (the construction found with *vāsáya-*). See the similar ex. at VIII.4.8 and the comm. there, as well as the similar sentiment found in I.173.6, where Indra wears Heaven and Earth as various accessories. The point of course is to emphasize Indra's vast size by making Earth (and Heaven) seem puny in comparison. A similar point was made in vs. 7d, as well as in the immediately preceding pāda 11c.

III.32.12: *yajñá-* is the focus of this vs., with 5 occurrences of it or a transparent deriv.

I take *várdhanaḥ* as the predicate of pāda b as well as pāda a ("the meal is also your strengthener"); the standard tr. take b as an independent nominal clause with *priyáḥ* as its predicate ("the meal is dear to you"). There is no way to tell for certain; the absence of *te* in b gives some support to my interpr., but that support is undeniably weak. The difference between the two tr. is also not large and has no effects on the interpr. of the rest of the vs.

The second hemistich expresses the reciprocity of the sacrificial enterprise, neatly shown by the balanced verb forms to the same root √*av* 'aid, help': impv. *ava* (c), impf. *āvat* (d). But the reciprocity is curiously indirect: Indra is asked to aid the sacrifice (rather than the sacrificer[s]), and the sacrifice aided Indra's mace (not Indra himself). In both clauses the direct object is an inanimate entity standing in for an animate one, and in the second clause the subject is inanimate as well. Only Indra is animate and capable of acting.

The nom. sg. pres. part. *sán* 'being' is not used concessively ("although being ...") as it normally is. I think it may have the same force as it does in III.30.5, a "definitional" one: Indra is by definition the one deserving of / derivationally associated with the sacrifice, and therefore he is the one who should aid it.

III.32.13: The reciprocity expressed by complementary verbal forms to √*av* found in the 2nd half of the last vs. is here wrapped up in one word, the instr. *ávasā*, which I tr. twice: I use the aid provided by the sacrifice (cf. 12d) to bring Indra here with his aid (cf. 12c). In Ge's tr. it is only Indra's aid, but he allows for the other possibility in n. 13a. Re and WG also associate it only with Indra. Given the balanced expression of 12cd, I think it is *meant* to have a double reading.

III.32.14: The standard tr. (see also Kü 186) take the two verbs *vivéṣa* and *jajā̆na* as parallel in the *yád* clause, with *mā* obj. of the first and possibly of the 2nd. I prefer to take *vivéṣa* as the main clause verb, followed by the *yád* clause, whose (sole) verb is *jajā̆na*. *vivéṣa* then owes its accent to its initial position in the pāda. This interpr. allows *mā* to take a more natural place, and it also saves us from positing a personal object to *vivéṣa*, which otherwise is not so construed. (Note that Kü's second tr. of this passage [p. 502] is entirely different from his first: he distributes the clauses as I do, but takes *vivéṣa* as *first* sg.) And what does it all mean? In my view the *dhiṣáṇā* 'holy place' (on which see comm. ad I.160.1) is here the ritual ground, and she is credited with the "birth" of the poet qua poet. After this birth, the poet can produce the praise of Indra that he is credited with in pāda b, and this in turn leads to the good results in pāda c.

Pāda c contains two different subordinators, *yátra* 'where, when' and *yáthā* 'so that', with a single verb, subjunctive *pīpárat*. Ge's explan., that we simply have a doubling of relatives, seems to me the best account; this is reflected, more or less, by Old's "wo (und) wie ...," though Old goes on to suggest a complex crossing of two different constructions, which seems over-elaborate. In the publ. tr. I have rendered *yátra* as a temporal adv. ("at that time") with no subordinating force, since I think *yáthā* expresses purpose and controls the subjunctive.

Rather than taking *áṃhasaḥ* as an ablative, with most others, I supply *pārám* 'far shore', a word related to *pā̆rya-* in pāda b and to the verb *pīpárat* itself, and found in this context elsewhere; cf. II.33.3 *párṣi ṇaḥ pārám áṃhasaḥ*. Here as well *áṃhasaḥ* is then a gen. dependent on **pārám*. Although it unfortunately involves a breach of the pāda boundary, I also take *nāvéva* with the preceding pāda, because this simile is almost entirely limited to passages containing verbal forms to √*pṛ* (I.46.7, 97.7, 99.1, V.4.9, 25.9, VIII.16.11, 18.17, IX.70.10). I also find it hard to imagine Indra traveling by boat, even metaphorically.

III.32.15: The agent noun *séktar-*, which forms an etymological figure with *sisice*, presumably refers to a habitual or practiced 'pourer'. So Tichy (*-tar*-stems, 159, fld. by Kü 570). I have taken *kóśam* as the obj. in the simile rather than the frame, contra the standard tr., though it could certainly go in the frame or in both without appreciably affecting the sense.

The pf. form lacks retroflexion on its root initial, as does one of the other two forms of this pf. in the RV (*sisicuḥ* II.24.4), as opposed to expected *siṣicatuḥ* in VIII.33.13. I have no explanation for the lack of retroflexion.

III.32.16: On *varanta* see comm. ad vs. 9.

Ge (fld. by WG) takes *sákhibhyaḥ* as a dat. of benefit, but I think it more likely that it's an ablative with agentival force. See Re, who simply tr. it as an agent. The mythological episode is surely the Aṅgirases' energetic help to Indra in the breaking of Vala.

III.33 Viśvāmitra and the Rivers

In addition to the usual treatments, see Schnaus, *Dialoglieder*, 81–107.

III.33.2: *índreṣite* echoes *víṣite* in 1b, though they belong to two different roots: √*iṣ* 'impel' and √*sā* 'tie' respectively. The basis for calling the rivers *índreṣite* is given in 6ab.

I might now render *prasavám* slightly differently here, with the participial phrase meaning "begging (for the signal) for the forward thrust" (in the mode of Ge and Re), with *prasavá-* here a technical racing term. The situation is muddied by the fact that the stem *prasavá-* occurs 4x in this hymn (here, 4c [≅ 11c], and 6d) with three somewhat different senses.

In c *ūrmíbhiḥ* can be construed with both participles, *samārāṇé* 'clashing together' and *pínvamāne* 'swelling', between which it is positioned.

Although by my rule ("Vedic anyá- 'another, the other' ..."; Fs. Beekes 1997, 111-18), forms of *anyá-* found initial in the pāda should be indefinite ('another') not definite as here, the *anyó 'nyam* ("the one ... the other") construction works differently. This might also be an example of prosodic flip: since enclitic *vām* cannot begin a pāda, a putative order **vām anyā́nyā́m* might have flipped *anyā́* to initial position.

III.33.4: The reference of the rivers switches from dual to plural here and remains so (save for two singulars in 10cd). There is no obvious reason for this change, though it may reflect the fact that when the two rivers merge into each other they form a third.

The first hemistich may contain two predicated present participles, *pínvamānāḥ ... cárantīḥ* "we (are) swelling ... proceeding," but it is more likely that the predicate is the instr. adv. *enā́* "So we are ...": the rivers are affirming the truth of what Viśvāmitra and the poet of the hymn have said about them.

III.33.5: It is not clear to me why Viśvāmitra's speech is somian (*vácase somyā́ya*). I doubt that it is because it is accompanied by soma (Gr), since Viśvāmitra is probably not performing a soma sacrifice on a river bank. Somewhat more likely, perhaps, is Ge's "soma-like," but probably by a transitive phrasal transformation: 'speech' (*vácas-*) is occasionally called 'honied" (*mádhumat-*), e.g., I.78.5, VIII.8.11); honey (*mádhu-*) is frequently qualified as *somyá-*. Hence, *somyá-* can be transferred to speech by way of the middle term 'honey'.

Ge renders voc. *ṛ́tāvarīḥ* as 'ihr Immerfliessenden' without comment. But this is simply the fem. stem to the possessive *ṛtā́van-* 'possessing *ṛtá-*', which he elsewhere tr. "gesetzestreuen" (e.g., I.160.1, III.54.4) et sim. Interestingly, this fem. is used of river(s)(Sarasvatī in the sg.) or watery females in several other passages (II.41.18, III.56.5, IV.18.6, VI.61.9); in one of these Ge also inserts the notion of wandering in his tr. (III.56.5 "die rechtwandelnden ...''), though otherwise he conforms to the 'truthful' sense. Rivers/waters are probably so-called in part because they are famously noisy. I do not understand the source of Schnaus's tr "Naturgemäss."

In 5c *avasyú-* 'seeking help' answers the question posed by the rivers in 4c *kiṃyú-* 'seeking what?' and in the same position in the vs.

III.33.6: In this vs. the rivers indirectly respond to Viśvāmitra's command "Stop!" (*rámadhvam*) in the previous vs. (5a), by asserting that they flow because of the efforts of and at the pleasure of the gods: Indra dug their channels and, by smashing Vṛtra, removed the barrier to their movement; Savitar led them and they flow at his impulsion. Without

explicitly refusing Viśvāmitra's request, they make it plain that they won't comply by stopping.

The stem *prasavá-* 'forward thrust, impulsion' occurs here for the third time in this hymn (2a, 4c, 6d; see also 11c) and is here associated with its etymological divinity Savitar, the Impeller. Although I tr. all 3 occurrences with 'forward thrust', I now render this example in keeping with its usual sense when associated with Savitar: "at his impulsion." See also comm. ad 2a above.

III.33.7: This is the central vs. of the hymn; in it Viśvāmitra practices the kind of praise poetry that the rivers will ask him to reproduce in perpetuity in vs. 8, couched in high formal style. In fact it can be seen as a variant of the opening of the great Indra hymn I.32.1: *índrasya nú vīryā̆ṇi prá vocaṃ, yā̆ni cakā̆ra* ... Here we have the gerundive *pravā̆cyam* for *prá vocam*, *vīryàm* matching *vīryā̆ṇi*, *índrasya* as in I.32, and the nominalization *kárma* for the pf. *cakā̆ra*. The serpent, the mace, and the signature verb √*han* are then found in the rest of b and in c, as they are in I.32.1 (and note also anticipatory *ápāhan vṛtrám* in 6b). As Watkins points out (Dragon, 309), here the verb √*han* has been displaced from its standard formulaic role, with *áhim* as object, to an adjacent part of the myth that there is "a veritable constellation of inherited words and roots relating to poetry in this passage" (apropos vss. 7–8).

I render *yád* in b as 'when'; it could also be a neut. loosely construed with *kárma* ("... deed that he hewed apart the serpent").

Note the etymological and phonetic figure *ā̆yan ... áyanam* in d.

III.33.8: I think it quite likely that *yád* expresses purpose here (substituting for standard *yáthā*), given the subjunctive *ghóṣān*, not to mention the clear desire on the part of the rivers to have their praise remembered in later times. I would therefore slightly emend the publ. tr. to "so that ..."

Though med. *juṣáte* overwhelmingly means 'enjoy', the addition of the preverb *práti* sometimes yields a transitive 'favor in return, in response' with personal obj. See disc. ad IX.92.1.

The ubiquitous modern greeting *námas te* is found twice in the RV, here and VIII.75.10 (cf. also II.28.8 *námaḥ purā̆ te* ...). Here it anticipates the literal action of bowing, demanded in 9c and performed in 10c.

III.33.9: The dat. *kāráve* with *ā̆* √*śru* is highly unusual; see comm. ad VII.68.8. This passage here seems to be the only one in the RV with a personal dat. with the verb √*śru*.

ánasā ráthena – probably, as most translators take it, a reference to both baggage/supply wagon and war chariot.

III.33.10: Although the two rivers refer to themselves collectively in the 1st pl. in ab, the second hemistich consists of two contrasting statements in the 1st sg., each presumably made by one of the rivers. This balanced contrast accounts for the accent on the 2nd verb *śaśvacaí*.

The simile involving the *pīpyānā̆ ... yóṣā*, the young woman with breasts "swelling" with milk, has been prepared for by the earlier two occurrences of *páyas-* 'milk' referring to the water of the rivers (1d, 4a).

III.33.11: As in the immediately preceding hymn III.32.9–10, the poet here seems to be trying to express verbal nuances that are not coded systematically in the Vedic verbal system, in particular another variety of anteriority. Here the sequence of moods is unusual: pres. optative in the subord. cl. (*saṃtáreyuḥ*), pres. subjunctive in the main cl. (*árṣāt*). With the optative he seems to be aiming at a future perfect ("will/would have crossed") whose prospective action precedes that of the main verb, namely the subjunctive referring to future time. Although I have not examined the entire RV with this in mind, these experiments in anteriority seem confined to -- or at least especially pronounced in -- the work of this poet. Note also that the poet makes no attempt to generate an opt. to the pf. *tatāra* or to use the already existing pf. opt. *tuturyā́-* (RV 5x). This provides further evidence, if more were needed, against Dahl's claim that the pf. opt. denotes "epistemic possibility and anterior aspect" (*Time, Tense and Aspect*, p. 402 and in general pp. 392-402). If this were a stable function of the pf. opt., surely Viśvāmitra would have availed himself of that formation.

The vs. reprises much of the vocabulary from earlier in the hymn: *iṣitá índrajūtaḥ* is an elaboration on *índreṣita-* in 2a; the oft-repeated *prasavá-* returns again in the expression *prasaváḥ sárgataktaḥ* repeated from 4c.

III.33.12: The prospective action expressed by the opt. *saṃtáreyuḥ* in 11a is announced as completed by the aor. *átāriṣuḥ ... sám* 'they have crossed', and the poet urges the rivers to flow again with a sequence of imperatives, elaborating on the subj. *árṣāt* in 11c.

III.33.13: Hoffmann (Injunk, 93 n. 184) thinks the first impv. is concessive: "Mag eure Welle an die śamyās schlagen, die Geschirre lasst frei" -- this may well be, but a little hard to tell given our lack of teamster texts.

III.34 Indra

III.34.1: Gotō (1st class, 173–74) posits a separate root √*di* 'destroy' to account for 5 occurrences of *dáyate* ordinarily taken to mean 'divide' with the other occurrences of *dáyate*. (The forms in question are found in III.34.1, IV.7.10, VI.6.5, 22.9, and X.80.2.) He is followed by Lub and (at least in this passage and IV.7.10) WG. I see no reason to split the present into two and posit a second root; *ví dayate* 'divide into pieces, fragment' is simply another of the vivid images of destruction that RVic poets gloried in.

III.34.2: The sense of *jūtí-* as 'spur' here (on which see comm. ad III.3.8) is reinforced by *bráhmajūta-* 'spurred on by the sacred formulation' in the preceding vs., c.

I have tr. the nominal phrase *asi ... pūrvayā́vā*, which comes out rather stiffly in English ("you are the fore-traveler"), into a smoother verbal expression.

III.34.3: The first two pādas of this vs. are rhetorically parallel, consisting of an etymological figure of augmented verb plus some part of the object (*vṛtrám avṛṇot* a, *māyínām amināt* b), ending with a bv. formed with *-nīti-* 'leading, control'.

This interpr. of *vyàṃsa-* follows Schmidt (KZ 78 [1963]); see EWA s.v. *áṃsa-*.

In the second half-verse the subject takes an odd turn: after mention of Indra's iconic deed (besides the explicit mention of Vṛtra in a, see the echoes of the great Indra hymn I.32 in b *māyínām amināt* [I.32.4 *māyínām ámināḥ prótá māyā́ḥ*] and c *áhan vyàṃsam* [I.32.5 *áhan ... vyàṃsam*]), there is an abrupt switch to Agni phraseology. The same phrase *uśádhag váneṣu* "burning at will in the woods" (?) is found in the Agni hymn III.6.7; cf. also *uśádhag vánāni* also of Agni in the Agni hymn VII.7.2. The final pāda concerns the appearance of visible entities from the night, which also better fits an Agni context. For this reason I see a syntactic break in the middle of pāda c and take *uśádhag váneṣu* with d, contra the standard tr. On the curious and problematic word *uśádhak* see comm. ad III.6.7 as well as Scar (197–99) at length. Both discussions conclude that *uśádhak* in III.6.7 should be a neut. noun, '(the) burning-in-the-wood', rather than a straight root-noun adj. modifying Agni – though the adj. interpr. would work better here and in VII.7.2 – and in both places is, I think, simply a way of referring to Agni. As disc. ad III.6.7, I think the new neut. noun 'burning-at-will' found in III.6.7 simply reverted to an adjectival root noun compd, though keeping the shifted accent. Although this is not a morphologically agreeable solution, altering the tr. here to "The burning-at-will in the woods [=Agni] brought to light ..." is ultimately too artificial.

On *dhénā-* 'milk-stream' see comm. ad I.2.3 and Schmidt (Gs. Nyberg). Schmidt there suggests that the referent in this pāda is the dawns emerging out of the dark of the night. This occurs of course at the same time as the kindling of the ritual fire and would account for the shift in diction to Agni phraseology. This image can then be secondarily applied to Indra bringing the dawn cows out of the nocturnal darkness of the Vala cave.

III.34.4: The phonetic echo of *uśádhag* (3c) in *uśígbhiḥ* (4b) reinforces both the thematic connection between these two vss. -- Indra's production of light -- and the superimposition of Agni traits on Indra. As Schmidt (B+I 59) points out, the Uśij-priests, ordinarily associated with Agni, sometimes substitute for the Aṅgirases in the Vala myth, but we should also note that it is esp. in Maṇḍala III that Agni is himself identified as an Uśij (III.2.4; 3.7,8; 11.2, 27.10); note also the Uśij-priests attending on him in III.2.9, 15.3.

III.34.5: The metaphorical use of *viveśa* 'entered' + an action ('thrusts') reminds me of the somewhat slangy English "get into" for "become enthusiastic about / energetically do (some action)."

The stem *barháṇā-* otherwise only appears as an adverbial instr. 'mightily', and I am tempted to take it so here (as WG seem to do), rather than as the acc. pl. assumed in the publ. tr. However, the sandhi context is against this interpr.; note Old's tart "Gewiss nicht *barháṇā* Adverb (Hiatus!)."

As Ge points out, the referent of fem. gen. pl. *āsām* must be *dhíyaḥ* 'insights'. For insights having bright color or hue, see the passages adduced by him (n. 5d): I.143.7 *śukrávarṇām dhíyam* and III.39.2, where *dhī-* wears silver garments. The *várṇam* here plays off *áryam várṇam* in 9d.

III.34.6: Another etymological figure appears in c: *vṛjánena vṛjinā́n* "... the bent ones [i.e., morally twisted or corrupt] with his band [i.e., his circle of helpers bent around

him]," both derived from √*vṛj* 'twist', though the semantic connection is somewhat less obvious than in the etymological figures in 3ab.

There is another, thematic connection between vss. 3 and 6. As there, Indra here achieves his victory first with his comrades (*śárdha-* 3a), then with his tricks (that is, by "out-tricking" [*aminā́t*] with his shape-shifting abilities, *várpa-* 3b). In such cases his overwhelming strength might be almost superfluous -- hence my parenthetical "(though)." Note that *abhíbhūti-* (*abhí* √*bhū*) is a different lexical realization of *abhiṣṭí-* in 4b (if to *abhí* √*as*, as is the common opinion; cf. EWA s.v.).

III.34.8: The intense concentration on the root √*san* 'win' noted in the publ. intro. and the concomitant *s*-alliteration begin here.

On the clash of gender and deixis in *pṛthivī́ṃ dyā́m utémā́m*, see comm. ad VIII.40.8.

III.34.9: The slightly awkward tr. "of many benefits" for *purubhójasam*, modifying the cow in d, is meant to capture its etymological relationship with *bhógam* in c.

The contrastive pairing of *dásyu-* and *ā́rya-* is striking here.

III.34.10: I do not see any semantic/functional difference between the imperfect *asanot* in a and b and the insistent pf. *sasā́na* of vss. 8–9, though we might assume that the poet made the choice apurpose. Both Ge and Re render the forms in the same way (as do I); WG tr. *sasā́na* as 'er hat erlangt' and *asanot* as 'gewann'. Although I find the idea of rendering the two different grammatical forms differently appealing, I'm not sure that losing the root connection is worth it.

III.35 Indra

III.35.1: The first pāda is somewhat oddly expressed, at least as it is rendered in the publ. tr.: Indra is urged to mount the horses yoked to the chariot, but not only is horseback riding very rare in the RV, but no one is likely to mount a horse being used to pull a vehicle. This must be an awkwardly expanded version of the usual "mount the chariot" (see 4c below). There is an alternative interpr., which can rescue the expression. Patrick Stiles (as relayed to me by MLW) suggests that *tíṣṭhā* is a one-word clause, and the rest of pāda a is a nominal clause with *hárī* as nom. subject. Hence "Mount! the two fallow bays (are) being yoked to the chariot." This avoids the horse-back-riding scenario and requires no change in the text. I might like the *ā́* to be in a different place, but that seems a relatively minor problem.

The *niyút-* 'team' is generally associated with, indeed belongs to, Vāyu, who is regularly called *niyútvant-* 'possessing *niyút*s'. However, the word is sometimes used in a reciprocal value: just as Vāyu and Indra drive to us with their *niyút*s, so do our *niyút*s, the 'teams' of poetic thoughts, drive in return to the gods, in passages where *niyút-* is parallel to words for 'thought, hymn', etc. Cf., e.g., I.134.2, 135.2, VI.35.3, 47.14, VII.23.4, 90.1, X.26.1. It is therefore not nec., with Bloomfield (RVReps ad loc.) to assume that "niyúto is for niyúdbhiḥ."

III.35.2: The most natural reading of *yáthā* in c is as a subordinator in a purpose clause ('so that') with the subjunctive *ā́ vahātaḥ* in d, and this is how the standard tr. take it. But there is a major stumbling block: the verb is unaccented. Old seems willing to emend to an accented verb; Ge suggests that if the unaccented verb is bothersome, assume an ellipsis in c. I have, in somewhat ad hoc fashion, taken *yáthā* as a sort of simile marker with *dravát*. I am not entirely satisfied with this solution, but it does more or less fit category 4) in Gr's lemma *yáthā*, and I am quite reluctant to put an unaccented verb into a subordinate clause. A similar phrase in the next hymn, where *yáthā* marks a localized comparison, gives support to the interpr. here; see III.36.6 *prasaváṇ yáthā* "like a shot" (tr. similarly by all standard tr.).

III.35.3: Medial *nayasva* is one of the relatively few middle forms to this pres. stem. It is presumably used here because Indra is leading his own horses.

The crux in this vs. is the hapax cmpd. *tapuṣpā́-*. Gr glosses it 'warmes trinkend', perhaps referring to the gharma drink; in this he is tentatively fld by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *tápuṣ-*). But this *-us*-stem, *tápus-*, refers only to heat, generally menacing scorching heat, and in any case the horses shouldn't be drinking the gharma drink (or probably any hot drink at all). The word is discussed by Scar (305–6), who offers several possible interpr. The interpr. is made more difficult by the uncertain grammatical identity of the form. It appears in sandhi as *tapuṣpā́tém*, is taken by the Pp. as *tapuḥ'pā́*, and is generally analyzed as a dual, modifying the bullish (horses) -- so Ge, Re, Scar, WG. However, Ge suggests in n. 3a that the form could represent irregular sandhi for *tapuṣpā(ḥ) utá* (that is, a double application of sandhi, first losing the final *-s* before vowel and then coalescing the vowels) and therefore be a nom. sg., modifying Indra. I have adopted this solution; it doesn't make much sense for the horses themselves to be doing the protecting, but Indra's protective role would fit with the impv. *ava* 'help' in the next pāda.

In the last pāda Indra is urged to eat the roasted grains (*addhi dhānā́ḥ*). The same grains are prepared for the horses to eat in vs. 7: it seems somewhat surprising that Indra and his horses receive the same fodder, as it were -- though calling the horses Indra's "comrades in joint revelry" in the next vs. (4b) suggests that they consume the offered meal together. I also don't understand why the grains should be "of the same appearance every day." This phrase is essentially repeated in III.52.8, which also contains 5 occurrences of *dhānā-* (or deriv.). Perhaps the point is that we unfailingly make the same offering to Indra daily; he needn't worry that we will substitute inferior food.

III.35.4: The double etymological figure in pāda a is almost awkwardly heavy: *bráhmaṇā te brahmayújā yunajmi*, an awkwardness necessarily reflected in the tr.

III.35.7: All the clauses in this vs. are nominal sentences with past participle as predicate (*stīrṇám, sutáḥ* a, *kṛtā́ḥ* b, *rātā́ḥ* d). It is therefore misleading to tr. the last as "are given" (versus "has been strewn," etc.) as in the publ. tr. I would change to "have been given."

III.35.8: *prajānán vidvā́n* repeats 4d. The particular relevance of this phrase in either vs. isn't clear to me.

III.35.9: Kü (477–80) discusses the stem *vāvaś-* at length, rejecting the usual connection with √*vaś* 'desire, want' and assigning it instead to √*vāś* 'bellow'. (WG follow this interpr. in our passage; Lub still assigns this form to √*vaś*.) Kü's morphological arguments -- lack of *u*-redupl. and of root ablaut -- are strong. However, although I would concede that the form was derivationally original only to √*vāś*, I would argue that once a stem *vāvaś-*, built to √*vāś* 'bellow', became established, it was available to "migrate" to √*vaś* 'desire', especially because the shortening of the root syllable in this metrically driven formation makes the form look more like √*vaś* than √*vāś*. Although the meanings of the two roots might seem so far apart that it would be hard to confuse one for the other, in fact the usual context of √*vāś* forms narrows the semantic gap considerably: cattle bellow because they want something. Kü allows for the possibility of semantic overlap as well.

III.35.10: The occurrence of 2nd sg. act. pres. impv. *píba* and aor. impv. *pāhi*, both to √*pā* 'drink', in a disjunctive *vā* construction should give us a good opportunity to discern the functional distinction between the imperatives to these two tense-aspect stems, esp. since, as far as I can see, both imperatives would fit either of the metrical slots occupied. I have in fact tr. as if there is a functional difference: 'drink' versus 'take a drink', but I am not at all convinced that this is correct. Cf. the disc. of the positional tendencies of *píba* ad III.32.1 and note that the same pāda opening *índra píba* is found in the next hymn, III.36.2d. However, the same sequence of pres. and aor. to √*pā* is found in III.36.3, so it may well be meaningful. (The standard tr. render *píba* and *pāhi* identically here.)

I take *práyatam* in c with *yajñám* in d, contra the standard tr.

III.36 Indra

On the reciprocal ring compositional structure of this hymn, see comments ad vss. 9–10.

III.36.1: I confess to being somewhat puzzled by the first half vs., beginning with the identity of the 2nd ps. subject. My assumption is that it is the priest setting out the offering for Indra, not Indra himself, who is the 3rd ps. subject in cd. Pāda b ("being united with help") would then express the priest's receiving of Indra's help, though the expression seems a little odd. The only similar passage I can find is V.42.8 *távotíbhiḥ sácamānāḥ* ... "being accompanied by your help," of the ritual patrons. It might instead be possible to take b with cd, modifying Indra "being at one with his (own) help." The dvandva *śáśvac-chaśvat* in b matching *suté-sute* in c might weakly support such an interpr. (contra the standard tr. as well as my publ. tr.). Unfortunately the pres. *yā́date* is not well enough attested to allow us to determine its usual subjects; of its 5 occurrences, 3 involve rivers uniting with the sea (as in 7a in this hymn). In a so-far unpubl. treatment of the root and its possible cognates, A. Nikolaev suggests that it means 'clasp, press'; I'm afraid I find this far-fetched. Taking the priest as the subj. of *dhāḥ* also fits the reciprocal ring formed by vss. 9–10; see disc. below.

The other question in this half-verse is how exactly to construe *sātáye dhāḥ*. The standard tr. take *prábhṛtim* as the subj. of an active infinitive *sātáye* -- perhaps most clearly in Keydana (Infinitive, 317 n. 132) "Mach, dass diese Darbringung siege," taking Indra as the subject of *dhāḥ* (contra my identification of the priest as subj.). But I doubt

that the *prábhṛti-* itself is the agent of winning. My publ. tr. takes *sātáye* as a passive, with (perhaps) Indra the implied agent: the offering is to be won by him. This interpr. may be supported by 2c *prayamyámānān práti ṣū́ gṛbhāya* "Grasp at (the drinks) being offered," with *prá √yam* expressing the same notion as *prá √bhṛ* in 1a and Indra's gaining control of them in both passages. It might also be possible that *sātáye* is not being used as a real infinitive, and the phrase should be tr. "set this offering here for (our) gain" -- that is, when Indra takes the offering set out by the priest, there will be general gain for all of us but neither the offering nor Indra is the agent of an infinitival use of this dative. (This seems to be close to the WG interpr.)

III.36.2: *vídānāḥ* is another -- very clear -- example of a tense-stem participle serving as predicate. *Pace* Gr (fld. by Re) it most likely belongs to 'know' rather than 'find'.

III.36.3: Both the pres. and the aor. stems of *√pā* 'drink' occur here, as in III.35.10. The situation is in fact even a bit more complex: as in III.35.10 both stems deploy imperatives here, *píba* opening pāda a, *pāhi* in d, but the latter is also in a complex diptych with the impf. *ápibaḥ* ("just as you drank [*ápibaḥ*] ..., so [take a] drink [*pāhi*] today ..."). As in III.35.10 I have translated as if there is still an aspectual difference between the two stems, but I am not certain this is the case.

III.36.4: Indra in pāda a is identified with a large drinking vessel, in this vs. that emphasizes his size and capacity.

The b pāda begins and ends with etymologically related words: *ugrám* (adj.) and *ójaḥ* (noun), though each is part of a different NP.

As Kü demonstrates (503–6), the pf. of *√vyac* is always presential.

III.36.5: The vs. begins with the two words that began the first two pādas of the last vs.: 4ab *mahā́ṁ* ..., *ugráṃ*; 5a *mahā́ṁ ugró*.

Ge (/WG, Scar [209]) take *samā́cakre* in b as transitive and supply 'cows' as object, from c. Although it is true that the middle pf. of *√kṛ* is generally transitive, in this context, parallel to intrans. *vāvṛdhe* in pāda a, a nonce passive value can be imagined. In fact see (in this same maṇḍala) III.1.8 *vṛ́ṣā yátra vāvṛdhé kā́vyena* "where the bull has grown strong through our poetic craft," of which this pāda seems to be a variant, with the *vāvṛdhe* there anticipated in our previous pāda. Cf. Re "il s'est empli ... de pourvoir-poétique," also intransitive. (Ge suggests this possibility in his n. 5b.)

Scar (209–10) makes heavier weather of *vājadā́(ḥ)* then seems necessary. He points out that the cows shouldn't be giving prizes, which is logically true enough, but surely the point is that Indra is so generous that even the prizes he gives, the cows, give prizes of their own (the trickle-down gift economy). Their gifts are presumably, on the one hand, milk products and, on the other, new calves to augment the herd.

III.36.6–8: The next three vss. ring changes on the theme of large bodies of water and large containers of soma.

III.36.6: On *prasaváṃ yáthā* see disc. of *dravád yáthā* ad III.35.2.

In b the problem is the simile *rathyèva* -- more precisely what the nominal in that sequence represents. The Pp. resolves it, not surprisingly, as *rathyă*. Gr takes this as an instr. to *rathî-* 'charioteer'; Ge also takes it as an instr. but to a stem *rathyă-* 'Fahrstrasse' (see Old, ZDMG 61 [1907] 831–32 = Kl.Sch.262-63). Old himself (so apparently also Re) favors a nom. pl. *rathyàḥ* with double application of sandhi. This is possible (see similar possible situation in III.35.3), but I wonder if it does not reflect the du. *rathyă* it appears to be. This hemistich reads like a brief reprise of Viśvāmitra and the rivers (III.33). For one thing, the past tenses (impf. *áyan* a, pf. *jagmuḥ* b) don't make much sense if the point of the half-vs. is simply to serve as the standard of comparison for Indra's width (pāda c), whereas the past tense does work in a brief re-narration of the situation in III.33. The word *prasavá-* here also echoes III.33, which contains 4 occurrences of that stem. And III.33.2 contains an undoubted example of the dual *rathyă* also marked as a simile in a similar context: *áchā samudráṃ rathyèva yāthaḥ* "you two drive like two charioteers to the sea," referring to the two rivers, the Vipāś and the Śutudrī. The mixture of numbers, with pl. rivers in the frame and du. charioteers in the simile, is not surprising; even in III.33 the dual reference to these rivers soon gives way to plural. This mythic snatch having been told, the sea, so filled, is available to be compared, unfavorably, to Indra. Kü (77, 156, fld. by WG) also takes it as du, but as referring to two chariot horses. If the form is accepted as a dual here, it will have to be detached from *rathyèva* in VII.95.1, which see comm. ad loc.

III.36.7: The standard tr. take pāda a as a simile, with the rivers *compared* to the priests of cd. I instead take the rivers as referring to the soma-purifying waters and consider b the predicate to a, with the pres. part. *bhárantaḥ* substituting for the main verb. At least in the transmitted text their simile would be unmarked, though most interpreters manipulate the text to produce a marker. Bl (RRs ad loc., referring to an earlier art. of his) suggests emending to *samudré ná* as in the otherwise identical pāda VI.19.5, a suggestion seemingly endorsed by Old and fld. by WG. However, the instr. *ūtíbhiḥ* with *yắdamānaḥ* in 1b supports the instr. reading of *samudréṇa* here, and in 4 of its 5 occurrences *yắdamāna-* is construed with an instr. This suggests that VI.19.5 has altered the formula, rather than vice versa. Ge follows a different path to a simile marker, haplology of *samudréṇa *ná.* Since the text makes sense as is, I see no reason to change it.

The verse contains two parallel morphological word-plays: *bhárantaḥ ... bharítraiḥ* and *punanti ... pavítraiḥ*, each containing a neuter *-tra-* instrument noun. The latter, *pavítra-* lit. 'instrument for purifying', is of course very well attested in the RV, referring to the soma-purifying filters, but *bharítra-* is a hapax, obviously generated to match *pavítra-*, including the *-i-*liaison vowel appropriate only to the seṭ root √*pū*, not to aniṭ √*bhṛ*. It is tr. 'arm' by all (going back to the Naigh.), but milking with the arms doesn't make sense in either life or metaphor. I think it means rather 'hand' and participates in a different word-play within its pāda: an 'instrument for carrying' can easily be a hand, and so it is synonymous with *hásta-* 'hand' found in the immediately preceding word *hastín-* 'hand-ed'. There is a further implied verbal twist, at least with my interpr. of ab: the rivers don't have hands but carry anyway, while the priests do have hands but use their carrying appendages for something else. I'm afraid the publ. tr. needed to be quite heavy-handed to convey the deftness of this little play.

III.36.8: On *kukṣí-* as ‘cheek’, not ‘belly’, see Jamison 1987 (Ged. Cowgill).

As Ge also comments, the chronological sequence of pāda d seems reversed, assuming (as I generally do) that the perfect participle regularly expresses anteriority: Indra drank the soma before smashing Vṛtra. The primary VP here, *avṛṇīta sómam* is found in the great Indra hymn I.32.3, but with a different opening (*vṛṣāyámāṇaḥ*).

III.36.9: Most tr. take Indra as the implied obj. of *mā́kiḥ ... pári ṣṭhāt*, thus displacing *etát* into an adverbial role (Ge/WG ‘dabei’). This is possible, but I take it as anticipating *dátram* in c.

On the form of *dátra-* see comm. ad IV.17.6.

III.36.9–10: Note that the vocabulary of the beginning of the hymn is being turned around reciprocally at the end: *ā́ ... bhara* (9a) and *prá yandhi* (9d, 10a) are imperatives addressed to Indra, urging him to bring/offer things to us, whereas in 1a *prábhṛtim* (at least in my interpr.) and 2c *prayamyámānān* the same lexical expressions refer to things we offer to Indra. The lexemes *prá* (*/ ā́*) *bhṛ* and *prá* √*yam* delineate the complementary responsibilities of the human ritualist and the god, with the former serving as their agent in vss. 1–2, providing sacrificial offerings, and Indra serving as their agent in vss. 9–10, providing wealth in turn to us, the ritualists. Other ring compositional echoes are the *dhāḥ* + dative infinitive (1a *sātáye dhāḥ* and 10c *jīváse dhāḥ*), also expressing reciprocal actions, and the stem *śáśvat-* (1b, 10d).

III.37 Indra

I have endeavored to preserve in tr. the consistent position of *índra-* in each vs., for which see the publ. intro. Other elements have had to be juggled; as is often the case, it is harder to honor the half-verse division in Gāyatrī than in trimeter.

III.37.1: On the retroflex in *pṛtanāṣā́hya-* see comm. ad IX.88.7. As for the semanto-syntactic structure of the form, see comm. ad III.24.1.

III.37.3–4: As Ge also suggests, Indra’s names (*nā́māni*) in vs. 3 form a complementary pair with his hundred *dhā́man-* ‘forms, embodiments’ in 4.

III.37.5: Given *vā́jeṣu* beginning vs. 6, *vā́jasātaye* would have better been tr. “to win prizes.”

III.37.6: And here a plural “when the prizes (are set)” would be more accurate.

III.37.7: The vs. contains 5 locatives, 4 of them plural, and so the issue -- though not a particularly pressing one -- is to sort out what goes with what. I have taken them pāda by pāda. Different tr. distribute them slightly differently.

III.37.9: On the *indriyā́ṇi* dispersed among the five peoples, see Proferes 2007: 65.

III.37.10: Note the alliteration in pāda b: *dyumnáṃ dadhiṣva duṣṭáram*.

The root √*tṝ* contributes two forms here: *duṣṭáram* (b) and *úd ... tirāmasi*. It is difficult to convey their root connection in Engl.

III.38 Indra

In addition to the usual tr., it is worth consulting Re's alternative tr. in his *Hymnes spéculatifs* (29–31 + nn.), in addition to his later one in EVP XVII.

My interpr. both in detail and in overall outline differs significantly from others, but it is internally consistent and attempts to fit the many puzzling details into an overall schema. That this sometimes requires making interpretive leaps is a price I'm willing to pay. I lay out and support my choices in the comments on individual vss., though I do not chart every deviation from the various other tr. and defend them against those tr.

III.38.1: The 1st sg. pf. *dīdhayā* is taken by all as a straight indicative; the Pp. reads *dīdhaya* with short final vowel. My tr. "I ponder" reflects this analysis (Kü [257–60] having demonstrated that the indic. pf. of this root is always presential). However, I now wonder if this form could be a subjunctive with the unextended 1st sg. subj. ending *-ā*. Although lengthened forms of the indic. pf. ending *-a* do exist (e.g., *védā* 9x), they are relatively uncommon. And a subjunctive "I shall ponder ..." would open this speculative hymn nicely.

The standard tr. take *priyā́ṇi ... párāṇi* as coreferential (e.g., Old "die fernsten, lieben (Dinge, Ereignisse)"). I prefer to take the two as contrastive, the nearby familiar things dear to the poet and far-away matters almost beyond his ken -- with the intensive (i.e., frequentative) part. *mármṛśat* conveying the restless activity of his mind. Realizing that he needs the steadying hand of poetic tradition to help control his racing but fertile thoughts, in d he expresses his desire for poets belonging to that tradition to give a full account of what he is seeing -- though he does not deny that he himself has wisdom.

III.38.2: As I see the movement of the verse, in pāda a the poet sets himself to question the older generations of poets about their creative activity. Pāda b concerns this activity in the past and identifies *mánas-* 'mind' as the foundation (√*dhṛ*) for the creative act. (I might now alter the tr. to make this clearer, to "making their minds the foundation.") In cd we turn to the present time and to the poet (*te*) (who addressed himself in a); the *praṇī́-* in c (on which see further below) are the products or models derived from the creative activity in b. In d it is made clear that these precedents, actively sought by the current poet's mind, rest on the *dhárman-* 'foundation' not only of the mental activity of the former poets but also of his own mind.

The first technical issue in this vs. is whether *pṛcha* + ACC. here means "ask X" or "ask about X" (in German terms "fragen" vs. "fragen nach"); both uses of the accusative are possible with √*pṛch*. Related to this question is what *jánimā* means in this context: 'births', 'generations', 'races'? With Ge and Klein (DGRV I.453–54), I take *jánimā kavīnā́m* to be the personages addressed, not (with Old, Re, Hoffmann [Inj. 225], Scar [276, 288], WG) the topic of the question. The poet is widening his range of interlocutors from the current poets (1d) to the long series of generations, back to the poets who themselves participated in the creation (2b).

With all modern tr./comm, I take *takṣata* as a med. 3rd pl. middle to the athematic present to √*takṣ*, rather than a 2nd pl. act. of the thematic stem, as Gr classifies it. I have

added the self-beneficial "for themselves" to the tr. because, though the root √*takṣ* is abundantly attested, this appears to be the only middle form in the RV. In keeping with my larger interpr. of the hymn as concerning two creations, the second of which was the product of poets conjuring up the differentiated cosmos by their verbal powers, I think the medial *takṣata* here signals the intimate engagement of the poets in the act of creation and the interpenetration of the things created and the creators themselves. Note also that our current poet lays some claim to this primal act by calling himself in 1a a *táṣṭar-* 'craftsman, fashioner', the agent noun to the root √*takṣ*, which supplies the verb of creation in 2b.

The root-noun cmpd. *praṇī-* is found only here in the RV, but the lexeme *prá* √*nī*, lit. 'lead forth', is very common as a verb form and in other cmpds. The word here has received a not particularly instructive variety of renderings, which I will not repeat. I think it means 'precedent' -- that is, the work of creation engaged in by the kavis of old provides the model for the current poet. This seems a reasonable semantic extension of 'leading forth'. The precedents keep "growing stronger / increasing" both because the elements of creation keep proliferating and because the current poet becomes more familiar with them and adept at employing them.

In the last pāda these precedents that the poet has sought with his mind take up their position in his mind, ready to serve for his own creative endeavors. The older generations of poets were called "firm in mind, holding their minds firm" (or, see above, "making their minds the foundation") (*manodhṛ́t-*) in b; it is fitting that their models, which he "sought with his mind" (*mánovāta-*), should now in turn take up their position on his own mind's support (*dhármaṇi*). On the basis of the cmpd. *manodhṛ́t-* in b I supply 'mind' as the possessor of *dhárman-*. Most tr. (Ge, Re [twice], Hoffmann [Inj. 225], Klein DGRV I.453-54) interpr. the loc. *dhármaṇi* as a rather vague adverbial (Ge, Hoff "in rechter Weise," sim. Klein). I think it needs to be interpr. in full locatival sense; Scar (276) and WG in separate ways do give it a locatival interpr. but their tr. do not reflect its connection with *manodhṛ́t-* in b.

III.38.3: Before addressing the question of what pādas a and b have to do with each other thematically, we must first consider the small technical issue of the placement of *utá* at the beginning of pāda b. Since pāda a contains a participle (*dádhānāḥ*) and pāda b a main verb (*sám añjan*), it is unlikely that *utá* is conjoining the two pādas. Instead, with Klein (DGRV I.396–97), I think it is probably conjoining this hemistich with the preceding vs., with *utá* displaced to the beginning of pāda b after the participial phrase in a. This is very reminiscent of III.31.21, in this same Indra series, where the same explanation accounts for a rightward displacment of *ca* into the beginning of the second pāda of the clause.

As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this vs. describes the role of the poets in the second creation. It fleshes out the laconic *takṣata dyā́m* "They crafted heaven" in 2b. But what are they depositing in pāda a, and why? The first question can be restated as -- what should be supplied with *gúhyā*? The most common nouns appearing with that adjective are *nā́man-* 'name' and *padá-* 'traces, track'; either of these could work here because both can be used of the esoteric verbal production of the poets. "Secret names" would refer to the act of creation that involves dividing and naming the inchoate mass of material pre-creation; "secret traces" would refer to the esoteric poetry more generally. Here they seem to have pooled and deployed these secret elements, to use in their poetic

ornamentation -- that is, in their detailed elaboration -- of the originally undifferentiated matter of the two worlds. Note that the participle is middle: it is their own names/traces that are in play.

In both Hymnes spéc. (1956) and EVP XVII (1969) Re tr. *sám añjan* as "ont consacré," as an allusion to royal unction. The dat. *kṣatrā́ya* 'for dominion' makes this a tempting idea, though *sám* √*añj* is not a standard technical term in the royal consecration. I certainly think this is a secondary meaning of this pāda, but in keeping with the rest of the hymn, I think the primary meaning must be creation through poetic elaboration. Since royal consecration does in fact make the person in question a new entity, the king, it can be conceptualized as a creation as well.

The 2nd half-verse is more clearly concerned with creation. The root √*mā* 'measure' is of course regularly used in this connection, and as I said in the publ. intro., the separation of the two worlds in d is a standard cosmogonic image. Ge's interpr. of c is rather aberrant and in part dependent on a passage in the PB, and his interpr. has not become the standard. Because of the accent on *mamiré*, I have supplied 'when' with the first half of pāda c, though the accent may simply result from the adjacency of the two verbs *mamiré* and *yemúḥ*.

The verb in d, *antáḥ ... dhuḥ*, is not a standard expression for 'separate' and in fact might be expected to mean 'place between'. WG tr. in that way, supplying "Luftraum" (*antárikṣa-*): "Zwischen die beiden ... (Welten) setzten sie (den Luftraum) ..." This is a clever solution and it may be the original sense of the lexeme, which, however, I believe has evolved to mean, without an object, 'place apart', that is, separate by putting something in between.

I take *dhā́yase* as belonging to √*dhā* 'suckle, nourish', like the rest of the occurrences of this *-as*-stem. Re (EVP), Kü (395), and WG all follow this root assignment, but Ge and Re (Hymnes spéc.) take it to √*dhā* 'place': "damit sie (die Herrschaft) ausüben" and "pour qu'ils se tiennent stables," respectively. The separation of the two worlds is often presented as a boon for humans, so the 'nourish' interpr. seems more fitting, and the usual analysis of *dhā́yas-* supports it.

III.38.4: As noted in the publ. intro., I believe that this vs. turns to the first creation, before the poets' intervention that was presented in vss. 2–3. It is appropriate that the entities described here are unidentified, for this is the time before the poets brought their verbal skills to bear. The central figure in this vs. is introduced merely by an acc. participle (*ātíṣṭhantam* 'mounting'). The form makes it clear that the referent is masculine and singular, but no other information is given; there is not even a pronoun. Likewise the subj. of the verb *pári ... abhūṣan* 'they tended' is given only as *víśve* 'all'. Again we know the gender (masc.) and the number (pl.), but not the identity: poets (from vs. 2)? gods (the frequent default referent of *víśve*)? Rather than suggesting referents for these two entities as the standard tr. do, I think we should accept that the lack of referential clues is deliberate.

Certainly it continues through the verse, though some details accumulate. In b the 'mounting' entity of pāda a is now presumably the subject. He wears beauties (*śríyo vásānaḥ*) and is self-luminous (*svárociḥ*); these descriptions begin to narrow the field, but not enough. (The only other occurrence of *svároci-* modifies the Maruts, who are not likely to be in question here. And a number of different gods acquire *śrī́-*.) In c he is

identified as both a bull (or bullish one, *vṛ́ṣan-*) and a lord (*ásura-*), neither particularly diagnostic, and the pāda claims to provide us with his "great name" (*mahát ... nā́ma*). Indeed d seems at first to give us that name: *viśvárūpaḥ*. But the joke is on us, for not only is *viśvárūpa-* not a name but an epithet, but its literal meaning tells us that the lack of a single identifiable referent in this verse is the point. The word means "having all forms," and so the entity we've been chasing through the vs. is in fact protean and cannot be pinned down to a single identity. He/it is creation before differentiation. (For a similar figure in a similarly mystical hymn in this maṇḍala, see III.56.3, where the androgynous figure is also called both a bull and *viśvárūpa*.)

The final pāda forms a tight ring with the first, in that the verb *ā́* √*sthā* returns, and this time we get some indication of what he is mounting. But even this further specification falls short: it is simply *amṛ́tāni*, a neut. pl. adjective with multiple possible referents. This repetition makes the unfolding creation seem somewhat circular, but also incremental, in that new details accumulate, if slowly. But what seems to me an important clue has generally been ignored in the standard interpr. I find it impossible to believe that the repetition of *ā́* √*sthā* was not deliberate, but all the standard tr. (save in part for Re, Hymnes spéc, though he fell in line in EVP) render the two occurrences quite differently: the first literally ('mount'), but the second with the idiomatic meaning 'assume', with Ge and WG supplying 'names' with the adj. 'immortal' (Ge "... hat er unsterbliche (Namen) angenommen"). There are two obvious things wrong with this interpr: 1) the lexeme *ā́* √*sthā* is extremely common and I know of no passage where it means 'assume'; 2) translating it thus completely ignores the intra-vs. repetition, which at least to me is extraordinarily salient: the first word of the vs. is *ā́tiṣṭhantam*, the last *tasthau*. I therefore assume that the pf. in d also means 'mount' and that the referent of the pl. 'immortal' is deliberately unspecified, but is something one could stand on -- in this case probably 'worlds' or some kind of solid 'things'. Cf. VIII.52.7 (Vālakh.) *ā́ tasthāv amṛ́taṃ diví* "[it] has mounted to the immortal (world?) in heaven" and (with *adhí* √*sthā*) I.35.6 *amṛ́tā́dhi tasthuḥ* "they have taken their place on his immortal (foundations?)." The specification of a place to stand on enlarges the cosmic picture. Consider also 9c below with *tasthúṣo vírūpā* "of him surmounting the various forms," with √*sthā* and *-rūpa-*.

III.38.5: The unidentified creature in vs. 4, finally identified as a bull or as bullish (*vṛ́ṣan-* 4c), returns in this vs., with a slightly different 'bull' designation (*vṛṣabhá-*). Here it is depicted as androgynous: though masc. in gender and called a bull, it gives birth (*ásūta*). Androgyny is a powerful signal of the lack of differentiation I have been discussing, since perhaps the fundamental, universal binary contrast is male : female.

The bull's act of birth results in the desired differentiation that characterizes creation. This is expressed both by 'many' (*pūrvī́ḥ*) in b and, indirectly, by the address to the two sons of heaven (*dívo napātā*) in cd. These two then seem to establish control over what has been created in the earliest time (*pradívaḥ* 'from olden days') and therefore implicitly preside over time.

I would now be inclined to interpr. pāda b as an expression of possession, "His are these many proliferating riches." Cf. VI.3.3, also IV.23.8. However, the context is not definitive.

I interpr. and construe *vidáthasya* in c differently from most, who take it with *dhībhíḥ*, with the interpr. further complicated by variant renderings of *vidátha-* (Ge "im Geiste der Weisheit"; Re [EVP] "grâce aux visions-poétiques de la cérémonie"; WG "mit den Einsichten der (Beute-)Verteilung"). None of these makes a lot of sense to me, and therefore, despite the adjacency of *vidáthasya* and *dhībhíḥ*, I construe the former instead with *kṣatrám* "dominion of/over the (cosmic) division." On this sense of *vidátha-* see comm. ad VIII.39.1: though the word generally refers to the ceremonial distribution of wealth and then to the ceremony where this happens, it can also refer to other types of division, including the parts of the cosmos. It may be somewhat more daring to assume that *kṣatrá-* can take a genitive of what is ruled over -- I do not now have parallels -- but keep in mind that the root √*kṣā* from which *kṣatrá-* is derived regularly takes such a genitive. If my interpr. is correct, the *vidátha-* refers to the cosmic divisions produced by the 1st creation.

As noted in the publ. intro., a number of referents have been suggested for the two sons of heaven, and as I also said there, I think this is missing the point. We remain in the realm of the 1st creation where entities may begin to proliferate but they are still not named. I suggested there that the two may be the two world halves (note that *kṣatrá-* was associated with them in vs. 3b and see 8c below), but it is also quite possible that the focus should be on the "two," not on who exactly the two are: the first splitting of the primal unity.

III.38.6: The first half of vs. 6 simply expands on vs. 5. The same two kings have as their sphere of activity an increasing number ("three, many, all" *tríṇi ... purúṇi ... víśvāni*) of "seats," that is (in my opinion), separated places, in the cosmic division (*vidáthe*) also repeated from vs. 5. Note that the same verb *pári* √*bhūṣ* 'tend to' returns from 4a, where 'all' was the subject, not the object as here.

In the 2nd hemistich the poet, who has been absent since vs. 2, returns, with his mind (*mánasā*), and sees the whole of creation in detail (or so I surmise), down to the wind-haired Gandharvas -- all subject to the commandment of the two kings.

III.38.7: This vs. summarizes both creations. The first is dealt with glancingly in the first pāda. I take the neut. prn. *tád* 'this' as a reference to the not-yet-differentiated proto-creation, which belonged to and arose from the androgynous bovine of 5a, here explicitly identified first as masculine (*asya* : since this pronoun is unaccented, it does not modify what follows but functions as an autonomous pronoun), then as both bull (*vṛṣabhásya*, as in 5a) and milk-cow (*dhenóḥ*). This is the first appearance of any explicit feminine principle in this hymn.

The rest of the vs. concerns the second creation, with the original unitary *tád* divided and fitted out with names and forms. Note the return of the creation verb √*mā* 'measure', with *ā́ ... mamire* (b) and *ní ... mamire* (d) echoing *sám ... mamire* in 3c. The curious phrase *sákmyaṃ góḥ* has caused some puzzlement among interpr. Although by formation the hapax *sákmya-* appears to be a neut. abstract derived from √*sac* 'accompany', the standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) take the phrase as the equivalent of an animate creature, remarking that the companion of the cow must be the bull. But this not only ignores the abstract nature of *sákmya-* but also assumes that *góḥ* here refers narrowly to a female bovine, though the stem is regularly used as a cover term for

bovines of both sexes. I take the phrase as meaning "the fellowship of the cow" (or better, though more awkwardly, "the fellowship of the bovine") as a poetic description of what was depicted in pāda a, the joint activity of the bull-and-cow and its product. This undifferentiated creation is then measured out into individual parts and equipped with names. The subject of *ā́ ... mamire* in b is not identified, but I assume it is the same *māyínaḥ* as the subject of *ní ... mamire* in d, whom I take to be the age-old poets we met in vss. 2–3.

Just as pāda b refers to the individual names, so does d refer to forms: the classical pairing of name-and-form (*nāmarūpa*) is thus distributed across the vs., as Ge already pointed out (n. 7b). I take *asmin* here as referring to the creation (it), rather than to a putative 'him' (as most tr. do). In the course of their creative activity the poets assume various powers (pāda c) to enable their individualizing work.

III.38.8: As was indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. is in certain ways a rephrasing of vs. 7, but updated, as it were, to the present day. The vs. begins exactly as vs. 7 did: *tád ín nv àsya*, followed by a genitive specifying the identity of the *asya* (*vṛṣábhasya* 7a, *savitúḥ* 8a), a signal that vs. 8 is a second version of the immediately preceding vs. Hence, by my interpr., *savitár-* is the equivalent of the original creator, the bull-cow of 5a and 7a. I therefore do not think that this refers to the god Savitar, but is rather to be taken in its literal sense as "the impeller." Or rather, since b = VII.38.1b (a Savitar vs.), the poet is identifying Savitar in his most generic sense with the Ur-creator, the one who "set in motion / impelled" the creation.

The poet disclaims any part in that original creation (*nákir me*), and the firmly fixed golden emblem of b seems to me to represent the static, undifferentiated result of the first creation. It reminds us of the *hiraṇyagarbha* of X.121, another image of undifferentiated creation.

But in cd (at least in my view -- the interpretations vary quite a lot) the poet identifies himself with the poets of old (of 7bcd). In c most tr. supply a verb, with the *ródasī* phrase as its object: Ge "(bringe ich)"; Re "(Savitar) a suc(cité)"; while Kü (457) takes cd as a single clause, with #*ā́* (c) and #*ápi* (d) both preverbs with *vavre*. I think, by contrast, that this is a nominal sentence with *ródasī* as subject. The two world-halves are credited with a role in the second creation, the same role they may play in 5cd (see comm. there): they set everything in motion. *But* they do so through the stimulus of a *suṣṭutí-*, a 'good praise-hymn', and I take this praise-hymn to be the product of the 1st ps. poet, who disavowed a role in the first creation in 8a, but takes credit for contributing to the second creation in 8c. If my interpr. with *ā́* as an adverb 'here', seems too radical, it would be possible to supply a verb, as others have done – but I suggest √*prā*: a quick glance through Lub shows that the most common verb with *rodasī* and *ā́* is *prā* (see in this maṇḍala III.2.7, 3.10, 6.2, 34.1, 54.15 as well as numerous exx. in other maṇḍalas). This would yield an alt. tr. "he has [/ I have] filled the two world-halves ..."

The puzzling pāda to me is d, and my publ. tr. is opaque even to me. I have now rethought it and will propose here a modified tr. and interpr. First, I suggest returning to Gr's grammatical analysis of *vavre* as a 1st sg., not a 3rd sg. (as all subsequent tr. have taken it, incl. my publ. tr.). I take the pāda now as the current poet's boast, asserting his place in the poetic lineage. The lexeme *ápi* √*vṛ* means 'swaddle, cover over', as the simile of the woman and her children (one reading of *jánimāni* here) makes clear. But

such a meaning can both be protective and somewhat arrogant or threatening. To understand the sense of the frame here, we need to go back to 2a, where the tremulous poet asked the previous generations (*jánimā*) of poets about their creative acts. I think these same poetic generations are what's referred to here, but here our newly confident poet "covers" them -- on the one hand, in a protective sense, like the young woman swaddling her children. He protects their legacy by continuing it. But 'cover over' can also mean 'conceal', and in this sense the poet boasts that he will (or has?) become more skilled than they and cover up their achievements with his own. I would therefore retranslate the pāda as "I have covered over / swaddled the (poetic) generations like a young woman her children."

III.38.9: As discussed in the publ. intro., I take this vs. as showing both contributors to the second creation -- the two (world-halves) from 8c and the masters of artifice (*mayínaḥ*) from 7d -- bearing witness to our poet's new skill. In the first half of the verse the two (world-halves) begin by bringing to success the first creation of "the age-old great one" (*pratnásya ... maháḥ*). I supply the equivalent of *tád* in pāda a, picked up by *yád* at the end of the pāda and further specified by *daívī svastíḥ* beginning b. The standard tr. instead take a and b as separate clauses, with *daívī svastíḥ* somewhat loosely construed with b.

In c the sequence *gopājihvasya* is variously interpr. Ge (/WG), Re (Hymnes spéc.), and, at least partially, Old read it as two words, the first nom. *gopā*, the 2nd emended to *jīvásya* (Ge, WG) or *jagatas* (Re; he gives no accent, but it should be *jágatas*) -- attaching pāda c to b and taking d as a separate clause. I see no reason in this case to go against the Pp, which considers the form a cmpd, much less to emend the text so severely. Instead I take the two apparent genitives in c (*gopājihvasya tasthúṣaḥ*) as referring to the current poet: he boasts that his tongue is a herdsman -- that is, it marshals words -- and that he surmounts the various forms (*vírūpā*) -- that is, he has (verbal) control over the differentiated forms of the second creation. The poet has achieved his vocation. For the tongue, see vs. 3 of the following hymn (III.39.3b), where the poem, the hymnic vision, "mounts the tip of (the poet's) tongue." A form of the root √*sthā* is also found in the same pāda.

III.39 Indra

Though nowhere near as obscure as the previous hymn, the first three vss. of this one also portray poetic craft and, especially, poetic inspiration.

Morphological parallelism and lexical repetitions dominate the rest of the hymn.

III.39.1: √*vañc* means 'move crookedly, meander', but encompasses a number of different types of such motion, including circular or wave-like motion. Here I think it refers, rather charmingly, to a bending, curling movement made in order to come out of a small opening. (English 'scrunch' might be accurate, but is also inelegant.) The poet's heart is thus configured as a smallish container from which his thought must gracefully exit -- a characteristically female gesture perhaps. I very much doubt that she is galloping, à la WG.

The publ. tr. should be altered to "when being recited" to reflect the present participle and to match the identical phrase in 2b.

III.39.2: Ge (/WG), Scar (142) take *diváḥ* as temporal ("noch vor Tag geboren"). This is possible and would fit with the *jā́gṛviḥ* 'wakeful' and, perhaps, with the silvery garments of c (if they refer to dawn). Nonetheless, with Re (see also Ge's n. 2a, where he suggests that the spatial interpr. is better), I take it as spatial "from heaven." The vs. contrasts the immediate presence of the *dhī́* (*séyám asmé* "this one right here in us") with her origin as a product of age-old divine and ancestral inspiration (*sanajā́ pítryā*), and *diváś cid ... pūrvyā́* seems to me to participate in this balanced contrast.

III.39.3: The first pāda of this vs. is a definitional truism: the cmpd. serving as subject, *yama-sū́ḥ* 'twin-bearing', is split into its component parts in the VP, *yamā́ ... asūta* 'bore twins'. The question is who are the twins. Given the context, I find Old's suggestion (fld. by Re) that this is a metaphor for speech production and that the twins are, perhaps, the verse (*ṛ́c-*) and sāman more plausible than Ge's interpr. (flg. Sāy.) that the twins are the Aśvins and the birth-giver is Uṣas. I take the mother to be the *dhī́-* who was the subject of the previous vs.; note that *dhī́ḥ* is the last word of vs. 2.

Since I take the same noun to be subject of b, *pátat* emerges as a problem, since it is presumably a neut. nom./acc. act. participle but qualifies the action of the proposed fem. subj. Given the tendency for neut. NA forms to be used adverbially, I so interpr. it here (as Re also seems to: "en volant"), rather than (with Ge [/WG]) introducing neut. *mánaḥ* 'mind' here for it to modify.

This hemistich echoes some of the vocabulary and themes found in the previous hymn. *asūta* in pāda a matches *ásūta* in III.38.5a, and note that the apparent product of this birth is also a dual in III.38.5c. As noted ad III.38.9c, both the tongue and the mounting in that pāda are found in our 3b. I do not think the same events and entities are referred to in these passages, but they do seem to have a similar view of the relation between poetic speech and creation.

The standard tr. interpr. c as meaning that the pair just born associate with some kind of generic beauty (Ge "Schönheit," Re "les formes-de-la-beauté"), but *vápūṃṣi* are esp. associated with Agni in Maṇḍala III, where he assumes or bears these wondrous forms (cf., e.g., III.1.8, 18.5, 55.9, 57.3; though admittedly he is not the only entity that has such forms). I think the *vápūṃṣi* of Agni are at issue here, and the pair -- verse and sāman -- accompany them as the ritual speech being recited when the ritual fire is blazing.

Unfortunately the verse-and-sāman interpr. does not fit as well in pāda d, where we might wish the dual "smashers of darkness" to be endowed with light one way or another. The only other occurrence of this stem modifies Agni, and Agni is several times subj. of the phrase *támaḥ √han* (V.14.4, VIII.43.34). This phrase once has a dual subj. (VI.72.1 *víśvā támāṃsy ahatam*), but the subj. there is Indra and Soma, whom we surely do not want to introduce here. It is worth noting that the Aśvins, the subjects here acdg. to Ge et al., are not found as subj. of this expression. Since I think there is good support for the verse-and-sāman interpr. in the rest of the vs., I would argue that these forms of ritual speech are called smashers of darkness because of their role in the dawn sacrifice.

III.39.4: The next part of the hymn seems driven by the rhetoric of morphology, both parallelisms and contrasts. In this vs. note the heavy *-i/anā-vant-* forms *mā́hināvān* and

daṃsánāvān stationed at the end of successive pādas (c, d), which are followed by *dákṣiṇāvān* at the end of 6d and the neut. *barháṇāvat* at the end of 8d.

Pādas a and c contain what appear to be matching sequences that conceal morphological differences:

#(*nákir) eṣāṃ* ***ninditā́*** ...
#(*índra) eṣāṃ* ***dṛṃhitā́*** ...

The two *-itā́* forms are respectively an agent noun (*ninditā́*) and a neut. pl. ppl. (*dṛṃhitā́*), though the two *eṣām* have the same grammatical identity and referent and the first word in each pāda is the subject.

III.39.5: The interweaving of lexicon and morphology continues in this vs. Pāda a contains two forms of the same stem: *sákhā ... sákhibhiḥ*, and the instr. pl. is found four more times in the vs. (adjacent *návagvaiḥ*, b *sátvabhiḥ*, c *daśábhir dáśagvaiḥ* the last pair with their own etymological play). Pāda-final *dáśagvaiḥ* also parallels *návagvaiḥ* ending pāda a, and *sátvabhiḥ* of b is more subtly connected with *satyám* beginning c.

On *abhijñú-* see Scar (344–45).

III.39.6: The 2nd hemistich has intensely alliterative (partially) etymological figures: *gúhā hitáṃ gúhyaṃ gūḷhám apsú*, *háste dadhe dákṣiṇe dákṣiṇāvān*. The first half is more restrained but note the morphological pair *padvát ... śaphávat* and the repetition of *viveda* from 5d.

The phrase *náme goḥ* is puzzling, and the hapax represented by *náme* has not standard interpr. Gr (s.v. *náma-*, thus a loc. of an *-a*-stem) glosses 'Weide, Weideplatz (?)'. Ge refuses to tr. *náme*. Old suggests 'Sichneigen', which is essentially literal (if to √*nam* 'bow, bend' and not very helpful. Re 'domaine', which makes sense but is not clearly related to its supposed etymon; WG "beim Zuteilen der Kuh," also without accounting for the semantic development. Most likely both Re and WG are assuming a derivation from the probably separate PIE root **nem*, as in Greek νέμω 'distribute', though with different semantic devs. Like Old I also take it literally, as the loc. sg. of a thematic noun to √*nam* 'bend, bow', but suggest that "the bend of the cow" is some sort of homely spatial metaphor drawn from knowledge of cow anatomy indicating a hidden or protected place. English 'oxbow' for a U-shaped configuration of a river is a similar application of pasturage terminology to physical space. Cf. also *ukṣṇó rándhram* (VIII.7.26) "the loins of the ox," which I also think is a way of referring to the Vala cave. See comm. ad loc. This tentative interpr. of *náme* assumes it is not the equivalent of the equally puzzling OAv *nəmōi* twice in Y 46.1, a form that appears to be a dative, possibly in infinitival use (which would make it a root noun, not an *a*-stem).

Pāda c is found identically in II.11.5 and X.148.2. In the former its referent is Vṛtra; in the latter I also take it as Vṛtra, though others opt for Soma. The referent here is unclear, but with HPS (B+I 142–43) I think the most likely candidate is the *mádhu* of pāda a, and that *mádhu* is the sun/light: "the concentrated honey" of the dawns. Lending support to this interpr. as the sun, see X.72.7 *átrā samudrá ā́ gūḷhám, ā́ sū́ryam ajabhartana* "then you brought here the sun, which was hidden in the sea."

III.39.7: The IXth class *vṛṇīta* in pāda a is ambiguous: it can be either injunctive or optative; the standard tr. take it as the former, expressing straight past time. I instead

interpr. it as optative, primarily because of the parallelism with 8a, where the light chosen in 7a, "should suffuse the two world-halves" with opt. *ánu ṣyāt* (note also *syāma* in 7b, 8b). However, the ambiguity of *vṛṇīta* allows it serve as pivot between the past-time narration of vss. 4–6 and the expressed wishes of 7–8.

The rendering of *purutámasya* in the publ. tr. makes it seem to qualify the hymns, not the bard. The tr. could be slightly emended to "... of the bard, who is the latest of many."

III.39.8: Pāda b seems to pose an almost deliberate syntactic challenge. The adverbial *āré* 'at a distance' is normally construed with an ablative, as in 7b *āré syāma duritā́t*, but in 8b we have the same phrase but with the noun in the genitive: *āré syāma duritásya bhū́reḥ*. Or so it is taken by everyone, including me. But I now wonder if the ambiguous form *bhū́reḥ*, which could be genitive or ablative, is in fact the latter and is not modifying *duritásya* but rather governing it: "May we be at a distance from an abundance of difficulty."

III.40 Indra

III.40.1–2: The difference, if any, between *pāhi* (1c) and *píba* (2c) is as usual not clear. See disc. ad III.35.10. If we are looking for ways to distinguish them, *ā́ vṛṣasva* "drench yourself in it," immediately following *píba* in 2c, might support a more durative interpr. of the pres. impv., as perhaps would the adj. *tā́tṛpi-* if it has intensive semantics 'ever satisfying'.

III.40.2: Since *ā́* √*vṛṣ* takes genitive objects almost exclusively (see X.116.4), *tā́tṛpim* is best construed with *píba*.

III.40.3: The adj. *dhitā́van-* is not entirely clear. It is a possessive *-van*-stem to the ppl. *dhitá-* (√*dhā*); as Debrunner points out (AiG II.2.560), it unusually preserves the *dh-* that is found in this ppl. only as 2nd member of a cmpd or under certain sandhi conditions. The final has been lengthened as is normal in these stems: in the RV only *maghávan-* has a short final vowel before the *-van*-suffix. Cf. also the numerous *-ā-vant*-formations in the previous hymn (III.39.4, 6, 8). But what does it mean? The form occurs only here and in III.27.2, modifying Agni. Gr (flg. BR) glosses it as 'gabenreich', Ge "der das Erwartete (?) bringt," whose connection to √*dhā* I don't understand. Both Re's "pourvu (d'offrandes) présentées" and WG's "das Vorrat habend" may be closer to the mark; see also Old's tr. [SBE) of III.27.2 "in whom (manifold wealth) has been laid down." But what is most characteristically *hitá-* at the sacrifice is the ritual fire, *ā́* √*dhā* being the technical term of establishing that fire, and I therefore suggest that the sacrifice with its fires established is at issue here. Some support for this interpr. may come from the last phrase *stavāna viśpate* "o you who are praised as clan-lord." The epithet *viśpáti-* is ordinarily used of Agni, so Indra is here being praised as Agni, and it is Agni who both is and oversees the ritual fires.

III.40.5: This is the first vs. that doesn't begin with voc. *índra*; the voc. surfaces only in the middle of b, an unprominent position. But its place is somewhat taken by phonologically similar *índavaḥ* at the end of the vs., and initial *índra* reappears in 6c.

III.40.7: Contra Old and WG, I agree with Ge and Re that *vanínaḥ* is the 'wooden' word and is not a derivative of √*van* 'win'. The focus in this hymn is very narrowly on the ritual situation.

III.40.8: This is the only vs. in the hymn without a form of *índra-* (7 of the 8 of those forms being vocatives, the lone exception *índram* in 7b). Here voc. *vṛtrahan* is substituted.

III.40.8–9: On the "magic square" of these vss., see publ. intro. Vs. 9 actually seems to be covering the logical possibility that Indra might not be either far or near but somewhere in between, and in that case the exhortation in vs. 8 to come from nearby or far away might not work.

III.41 Indra

III.41.1: The 1st persons *naḥ* and *madryàk* are somewhat awkwardly doubled. With Ge I take *naḥ*, found in (modified) Wackernagel's Position in pāda a, with *sómapītaye* in b, and *madryàk* 'in my direction' with the verb of motion in c.

III.41.2: I now find 'seasonal, at its season' a somewhat misleading tr. for *ṛtvíya-* in a ritual context and would substitute 'at the proper time' here; see comm. ad III.29.10, X.28.5.

III.41.6: It is curious that the impv. *mandasvā* is not accented in this clause, despite the *hí*, nor is it in the identical vs. VI.45.27 or in VI.23.8 also with *sá mandasvā hí* ... I have no explantation; Old notes the lack of accent and gives a ref. to his treatment in ZDMG 60, but in fact there he does nothing more there than note the passages.

III.41.7: The 1st pl. them. *jarāmahe* is perfectly ambiguous between '(be) awake' and 'sing', and all other tr. assign it to 'awake' -- incl. WG, though Gotō (1st class, 154) assigns it with certainty to 'sing'. I have also tr. as 'sing', though nothing is at stake between the two renderings.

III.41.8: Most take *hári-priya-* as 'loving the *hári*' (e.g., Re "qui aimes les alezans"); I have reversed the direction of affection: "dear to the fallow bays," primarily because better attested *puru-priyá-* means 'dear to many' not 'loving many', though the accent difference between them may signal a difference in meaning. (However, the special accentual behavior of compounded *puru-* muddies the waters.)

III.42 Indra

III.42.1: The relative clause in c is somewhat tricky. The standard tr. (though Ge hesitates in his n. 1c) take the subject to be soma and take *háribhyām* with ab, starting the rel. cl. with *yáḥ* in 2nd position (type "come with your fallow bays to our soma, which is for you and seeking us"). I am reluctant to break the pāda in that way -- though given *ukthébhiḥ* at the beginning of 4c, which must go with the preceding pāda, with a new clause beginning *kuvíd*, this is not much of an argument. More importantly, since *tvám asmayúḥ* in the immediately preceding hymn (III.41.7) has Indra as the referent, I am reluctant to have identical *asmayúḥ* modify soma here. (Old cites some passages in IX where this adj. does modify soma, but those cases describe the preparation of soma and his/its journey towards us, the priests, whereas here the soma is stationary and Indra is journeying towards it and, as its preparers, us.) My interpr. leaves *te* as the problem -- where to construe it and whether it can be coreferential with *yáḥ*. The 2nd question can be answered affirmatively; nothing forbids *yáḥ* from 2nd ps. reference here. As for the first, I take it with *háribhyāṃ*, a solution I find somewhat unsatisfying, since possessive genitives are not usually necessary in these situations. But cf. *máma* in 3a below, also in a situation where the possessor doesn't need to be overt.

III.42.3: Note the alliteration framing the first two pādas: #*índram itthā́ ... iṣitā́ itáḥ*#.

III.43 Indra

The publ. tr. attempts to convey the density and distribution of the many words for 'here', 'nearby', 'close'.

III.43.1: The standard tr. take *úpa barhíḥ* with the next pāda ("call you to the ritual grass"); Sāy. agrees with my version (see Ge's n. 1c). There is no principled way to decide, and very little depends on it.

It is not easily possible to register the pun of *havya*(*vā́haḥ*) 'oblation' (to √*hu* 'pour') and *havante* (to √*hvā* 'call').

III.43.4: The reference to Indra changes from 2nd ps. in ab to 3rd in cd. It would be possible to attach ab to the preceding vs., which also has Indra in 2nd ps., and take cd as a new sentence. But the fact that both ab and cd have subjunctives (*váhātaḥ* and *śṛ́ṇavat*) suggests that the two clauses go together.

Because of the accent on *váhātaḥ*, the *ca* is likely subordinating, as in fact the standard tr. (and I) take it. However, the sequence *ā́ ca* (...) √*vah* shows unexpected accent on the verb form elsewhere (I.74.6, X.110.1), so it is possible that ab is a main clause with the verbal accent produced by this curious formulaic usage; see comm. ad I.74.6.

III.43.5: 2nd ps. reference to Indra returns here, in *kuvíd* clauses otherwise parallel to the one in 4cd with 3rd ps. ref.

Ge (fld. by WG and by me) takes the pf. part. *papivā́ṃsam* as expressing the cause of Indra's action.

The transmitted Saṃhitā text *ma ṛ́ṣim* must be read contracted, as *márṣim* (so HvN) to achieve a Triṣṭubh line; the Pp. correctly analyzes this sandhi sequence as *mā ṛ́ṣim*.

III.43.6: The final word of this vs., *mūrā́ḥ*, is generally taken as distinct from *mūrá-* 'stupid, foolish' and as an acc. pl. fem. with *ā́tāḥ* (e.g., Ge "die verschlossenen (?) Töre"). I follow Old's final suggestion that it belongs to the normal stem *mūrá-* and refers to the horses; English "dumb beast" is a reasonable analogue.

III.44 Indra

On the extended pun in this hymn, see publ. intro.

III.44.2: The two pāda-final *-áya*-causatives, *arcayaḥ* (a) and *arocayaḥ* (b), are also near phonological matches.

III.44.3: This is the middle vs. of the hymn and (comparatively) more complex than the rest. As in 2ab, the first two pādas end with morphologically parallel formations, the accusatives *hári-dhāyasam* (a) and *hári-varpasam*, both with *-s*-stems as 2nd member and *hári-* as 1st. The standard tr. obscure this parallelism by giving them quite different interpr., with *hári-* in the first cmpd serving as apparent obj. to *dhāyas-* (Ge "der den Goldigen nährt," sim. Re and WG; also Gr), while the second cmpd is rendered as a straight bahuvrīhi. By this interpr., in the first cmpd. *hári-* refers to soma (so Gr, Re) or soma or the sun (Ge [/WG]), while the *hári-* in the 2nd is simply a term of color or material. Given the structure of this vs. and the parallel structure in vs. 2, I think the two cmpds should be interpr. in a similar manner and that the "golden nourishment" of heaven would be the sunlight. However, I do concede that in some other X-*dhāyas-* cmpds the 1st member may be the recipient of the nourishment (e.g., *arí-dhāyas-* 'having nourishment for the stranger', *kārú-dhāyas-* 'having nourishment for the bard' – though cf. *viśvá-dhāyas-* 'affording/deriving all nouishment'), and so I would consider a tr. 'having nourishment for the golden', though I think this is the less likely possibility.

In c I assume a clause break after *ádhārayat* and take the rest of cd as a nominal cl. with *bhójanam* as subj. For a similar constr. with *bhójanam* cf. VII.68.5 *citráṃ ha yád vām bhójanaṃ nv ásti*.

The poet has cleverly managed to gather the root √*dhṛ* into the pervasive verbal play of the hymn, by stationing the dual form *háritoḥ* in a sandhi position where its initial surfaces as *dh*, hence *ádhārayad dháritor*. This *dh* repetition resonates with (*hári-*)***dh***ā*yas-* in pāda a. Meanwhile in c the double *dh*-alliteration of the first two words is matched by double *bh*-alliteration in *bhū́ri bhójanam*.

III.44.4: Pāda-final *rócanam* (b) echoes pāda-final *arocayaḥ* (2b) symmetrically around the central vs., as well as rhyming with pāda-final *bhójanam* in 3c.

III.44.5: As noted in the publ. intro., the insistently golden vajra of vs. 4 (*háritam ... ā́yudham ... vájram ... hárim*) is transformed into a silvery one (*árjunaṃ, vájram*), but keeps the *har* phonology in the participle *haryántam* 'gladdening', also modifying the vajra. A different color-type term, *śukrá-* 'gleaming, bright' is also used of the accoutrements of the weapon; the instr. pl. *śukraíḥ* is again a surprise: we would expect *háribhiḥ*.

And in fact we get two forms of the latter in the last hemistich. In one of them the poet uses the sandhi trick he employed in 3c to produce an initial *dh*: (*ápāvṛṇod) dháribhiḥ*, which allows the sequence *dháribhiḥ ádribhiḥ* to read as a virtual anagram.

This last half-verse introduces Vala-myth phraseology (*ápāvṛṇot*, *úd gā̆ḥ ... ājata*) in a hymn that otherwise lacks any mythic references. This Vala theme seems particularly out of place because the soma and the vajra play little or no role in the Vala myth but are strongly associated with the Vṛtra myth. I am uncertain of the identity of the *háribhiḥ* who participate in the driving up of the cows in d. Ge and Re confidently supply 'horses', and that is of course the default interpr. of this form in an Indra context. But Indra's horses are not actors in the Vala myth elsewhere, as far as I can remember. His helpers in the Vala myth are the Aṅgirases, so perhaps they qualify as golden here. Or perhaps it refers to the golden lights of the dawns and is an instr. of accompaniment with *gā̆ḥ* ("drove up the cows along with the golden [dawn lights]").

III.45 Indra

III.45.1: Although I use the Engl. word 'gladdening' here as in the last hymn, the repetition is misleading. The Skt. word here tr. is *mandrá-*, whereas in the last hymn it was *haryatá-*.

The simile concerning the bird and the snare is reminiscent of the much more obscure image in I.125.2, in which an animal of some kind seems to be bound up and captured.

The reading *nā̆* found in both Aufr. and HvN is an error for transmitted *ná*.

III.45.2: In the string of agentive phrases that entirely make up this vs. the poet manages a certain variety of syntactic patterns: standard tatpuruṣa with 1st member obj. (*vṛtrakhā̆dá-*), tatpuruṣa with accusative 1st member (*valaṃrujá-* [note that without the acc. marker it would be a metrically unfavorable four light syllables]), agent noun with genitive (pāda bc, 4x with 3 separate agent noun types: *purā̆ṃ darmá-*, *apā̆m ajá-, sthā̆tar- ráthasya, háryor abhisvará-*), agent noun with acc. (*dṛḷhā̆ ... ārujá-*). The relentless repetition of nom. sg. agent phrases makes it quite certain that the Pp. loc. sg. reading *abhisvaré* should instead be taken as nom. sg. *-aḥ*, with Old. All standard tr. agree. The only argument against this that I can see is that *háryor abhisvaráḥ* would be the second GEN + simple *-á*-stem agent phrase (after *apā̆m ajáḥ* in b), and if the poet was serious about producing the phraseological variety I have just catalogued he might have avoided a repetition by couching this phrase in the loc. ("at the calling of the two fallow bays"). The only other occurrence of *abhisvará-* is in the loc. (*-e* in sandhi, also pāda-final) and means 'call', not 'caller' (X.117.8). Still, I do not think this arg. is strong enough to counter-balance the pressure of the nom. sg. sequence.

III.45.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this is the middle vs. of the hymn, and it contains four similes, which are interlocked in interesting ways. In the first half-verse both similes target *krátum* 'resolve, will'. In the first the term held in common (*gambhirā̆n* 'deep') has been attracted in number to the upamāna (*udadhī́n* 'pools'), though the position of the *iva* probably shows that 'deep' lies outside the simile proper (*gambhirā̆ṃ̊ udadhī́ṃ̊ iva, krátum ...*). This simile is not dependent on the verb, while the second one (*krátum*

puṣyasi gā́ iva "you foster it like cows") requires the fosterage of the verb *puṣyasi* for the comparison to make sense. That is, Indra's will is like cows only in that he cultivates it and helps it prosper, whereas it is "deep" regardless of any verb that might govern it.

The second hemistich contains two parallel similes, both bipartite, with a nom. pl. referring to entities that reach an acc. goal: cows / pasturage, brooks / lake. The first, the bovine one, seems generated from the cow simile of pāda b, esp. as the adj. *sugopá-* (c) contains the same *gó-* as *gā́ḥ* in b. The interesting thing about this half-verse is that the frame, the upameya, is not expressed at all. There is neither an overt nom. of the entity(/-ies) in motion nor an acc. goal -- simply the simile marker *iva.* The comparison is wide open. Sāy. suggests that soma drinks are the subj. to be supplied, and he is followed by the standard tr. (and Old). Old suggests that the goal is either "you" (=Indra) or his *krátu-*; Re shares his uncertainty, while Ge (/WG) supply "dich." Although it is true that *āśata* takes soma drinks as subject in other passages (see Ge's n. 3cd), this hymn does not otherwise mention soma, and I am wary of supplying it out of nowhere. I prefer to take *krátu-* as subj., either in the pl. ('resolves' as in the publ. tr.) or, as Ge. suggests in n. 3cd, as a sg., with the verb attracted to the number of the subjects of the two similes. And I take *āśata* in a different sense in the frame than in the similes -- without expressed goal as "reach fulfillment, achieved (their goal)," although I recognize that the overwhelming number of occurrences of this verb do have expressed goal.

III.45.4: The simile in b is not clear, in great part because *práti √jñā* appears to be employed in some technical sense that we have no handle on. The lexeme is not common in Vedic and seems to mean 'greet, welcome' (or perhaps just 'recognize, acknowledge') in the Vāstoṣpati hymn, VII.54.1, and in other texts 'acknowledge, respond' vel sim. In post-Vedic Skt. it means 'promise' or the like. Since *áṃśa-* 'portion' may also have a technical or legal sense, this phrase may belong to a stratum of language that we have no access to at this period. My feeling is that it has to do with the acceptance or rejection of something offered, as *prati √grah* signals acceptance of a properly given gift (see Sac. Wife 199–201). But I cannot get further than that.

The simile in cd is notable for its structure: it contains three different syntactic constituents – a nom. subj. and two acc. phrases serving as the double obj. of *√dhū* "shake X for Y" (i.e., shake a tree for its fruit), with the simile-marker *iva* following the last of the four words of the simile: *vṛkṣám pakvám phálam aṅkī́va dhūnuhi*.

III.45.5: The first hemistich contains three forms with *sva-* 'self': *svayúḥ ... svarā́ṭ ... sváyaśastaraḥ*, and the second hemistich opens *sá v-*, with a scrambling of the phonetic elements. Other patterning is seen in the comparative *sváyaśastaraḥ* ending the first hemistich and the superlative *suśrávastamaḥ* ending the 2nd, both built to *-as*-stems and compounded with the phonological variants *sva-* and *su-*.

smáddiṣṭi- occurs 4x in the RV. It is a cmpd. of *smád-* 'altogether, together with' and the *-ti*-abstract of *√diś* 'direct, assign, allot', and as Ge says (n. 5b), it appears to be a technical term in dānastutis. In its other three occurrences (VI.63.9, VII.18.23, X.62.10) it modifies the gift, while here it qualifies the giver, Indra. As Old points out, medial *√diś* is used of the allotting of gifts in V.36.6, and such a sense seems to fit here as well. For further see Old's detailed disc.

The splv. *suśrávastamaḥ* is rendered by the standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) as 'best listener'. Since it is built to the noun *śrávas-* 'fame' rather than directly to the root √*śru*, I find this meaning unlikely. In some other passages the word simply means 'most famous, having the best good fame' (e.g., VIII.13.2). Here because of the involvement of 'us' (*naḥ*), I take it as 'receiving the best good fame', i.e., with 'fame' being the praises we offer him. In only one passage does 'best hearer' seem a likely interpr., and there that meaning is induced by the presence of the verb *śṛṇuṣvá*: I.131.7 *śṛṇuṣvá suśrávastamaḥ* "listen (to us) as the one who listens best (lit. 'having the best hearing'?)."

III.46 Indra

III.46.1: This vs. is cunningly constructed, in that until the very last word of the third pāda it consists entirely of genitives with nothing to depend on; neut. pl. *vīryā̃ṇi* at the end of c breaks this string and provides the necessary grammatical support -- joined by the matching adj. *mahā̃ni* at the very end of the vs.

III.46.3: All four pādas begin with *prá*; the verb of a, *ririce*, should be supplied with the other three pādas.

Note the phonological plays in a: *prá (mā)trā(bhī)* and *ririce roca(mānaḥ*).

III.46.4: The string of untethered accusatives in the first 3 pādas reminds us of the string of genitives in vs. 1. Here the syntactic tension is resolved only by the verb *ā́ viśanti* that ends the verse and allows the accusatives to serve as its goal.

I do not entirely understand the function of *abhí* in pāda a. It matches nearby III.48.4c ... *janúṣābhibhū́ya#*, where *abhí* is part of gerund. It may also recall *abhíbhūtim ugrám* (I.118.9, IV.38.1, sim. VI.19.6), which in turn is a variant of *abhibhūty-ójas-* (cf. nearby III.48.4a, the vs. just cited for the gerund). In any case the *abhí* seems pretty functionless in this passage; my "over(whelmingly)" is an attempt to give it some function.

III.47 Indra

III.47.3: The aor. impv. *pāhi* here implicitly contrasts with the pres. impv. *píba* in 1b, 2b, 4d. As usual, it is difficult to know how much semantic or functional difference to read into this contrast. See disc. ad III.35.10. In this particular case the root noun cmpd. *ṛtupāḥ* may have triggered the immediately following *pā(hi).*

Re tr. *ṛtupāḥ* as 'guardien des temps-rituels', with √*pā* 'protect' rather than √*pā* 'drink'. I think it unlikely in a dull little hymn like this that there would be a pun of that sort, and the sequence *ṛtúbhir ṛtupāḥ pāhi*, with the two elements of the cmpd. extracted from it and flanking it, seems to impose etymological identity.

The second hemistich refers to Indra's allowing the Maruts a share in the soma because of their support in the Vṛtra battle. For a dramatization of this ritual situation, see I.165 and associated hymns.

III.47.5: The first word of this final vs., *marútvantam* echoes the first word of the hymn, *marútvān.*

III.48 Indra

III.48.1: Though Gr classifies *prábhartum* as an infinitive, and Old's and WG's tr. seem (indirectly) to reflect this analysis ("dass man ihm darbrachte ..."), the form seems to be simply a *-tu*-abstract (somewhat concretized) (so tr. Ge and Re). As is well known, the *-tum* form that serves as the only infinitive in Classical Sanskrit is hardly found in early Vedic. Macd. (VG §586b) registers only five examples in the RV (not including this one) and an equal number in the AV. *prábhartu-* here seems more or less equivalent to *prábhṛti-* or *prábharman-*, though the *-u*-stem datives *bhártave* (IX.97.50) and *ápabhartavaí* (X.14.2) are infinitival.

Notice the near rhyming openings to the two half-verses, a: #*sadyó h(a)*, c: #*sādhóḥ*.

III.48.2: It is appropriate that the "beestings" (*pīyū́ṣa-*), that is, the colostrum or first milk, should be given to the new-born Indra.

The preverb *pári* in pāda a is presumably to be construed with *ā́siñcat* in b, a verb with which it is frequently found. I do not understand the position of this *pári*, in the middle of the pāda, right after the caesura but breaking up the NP *mātā́ ... yóṣā jánitrī*.

III.48.3: The 3rd sg. impf. *aiṭṭa* of course belongs to √*īḍ*; it is missing from Gr (as MLW pointed out to me), but registered in Lub.

It is not clear who the "others" (*anyā́n*) are whom he keeps away, but the medial pf. in the next pāda (*cakre*) implicitly claims that he did the great things (*mahā́ni*; cf. *vīryā̀ṇi ... mahā́ni* in III.36.1cd) by himself, that is, without the help of others.

III.48.3–4: I assume that *purudhá-pratīka-* in 3d refers to Indra's shape-shifting powers; the cmpd seems to be "unpacked" in 4b "he made this body as he wished" (*yathāvaśáṃ tanvàṃ cakra eṣáḥ*).

These two vss. are noteworthy for containing 3 gerunds, *upasthā́ya, abhibhū́ya*, and *āmúṣyā*. The quest of the poet(s) of the Indra hymns in III to find a way to express anteriority (see disc. ad III.32.9–10, 33.11) is successful at least in this passage.

III.49 Indra

III.49.1: The first word *śáṃsā* is read *śáṃsa* by the Pp., i.e., as a 2nd sg. impv. This is quite possible, of course, and is the interpr. of Ge (/WG) and Old. With Re I take it as a 1st sg. subjunctive because this is more in keeping with the 1st ps. diction in annunciatory initial praise vss. like I.32.1 *índrasya nú vīryā̀ṇi prá vocam*. But nothing depends on the analysis either way.

III.49.2: The 2nd hemistich is universally tr. (save for Scar, 656) as a single rel. clause, but *amināt* is unaccented and so d must be a separate clause.

In c the standard tr. (incl. also Scar) construe the instr. pl. *śū́ṣaiḥ* with instr. pl. *sátvabhiḥ* (e.g., Ge "mit seinen mutigen Streitern"). This of course would be the default assumption. However, in almost every occurrence of the stem *śū́ṣá-*, including all the

other examples of the instr. pl., it refers to hymns or praises, whether with a limiting noun or not. I therefore separate it from the other instr. in the pāda and take it as having its usual referent. The poet claims that Indra's strength is at least partially dependent on our strengthening praises.

III.49.4: The ppl. *pṛṣṭá-* 'asked (about)' is a little odd. Ge tr. 'gesucht', which would make it less odd, but I don't think √*prach* means that. It may be referring to the fact that Indra's existence and whereabouts are often questioned in the RV.

In b Ge and WG take the simile to be *rátho ná vāyúḥ*. This of course conforms well to the structure of the pāda and of similes in general, but it has the undesirable consequence of requiring *rátha-*, a word whose meaning is about as well known as any in the RV, to stand not for 'chariot' but for 'chariot-warrior' (vel sim.; cf. Ge's Wagenheld). I therefore, somewhat reluctantly, follow Re. in taking the simile to be *ūrdhvó, rátho ná* "erect like a chariot." Re then takes *vāyúḥ* as a (pseudo-)genitive: "(se tenant) droit comme le char (de) Vāyu," which is unacceptable for this clear nominative. I instead take *vāyúḥ* as the beginning of another, unmarked simile. Cf. IX.88.3 *vāyúr ná yó niyútvān*, with simile marker.

III.50 Indra

III.50.2: On *dheyuḥ* and related forms, see my "... *dheyām* revisited" (Ged. Schindler, 1999).

III.50.3: The first hemistich poses some difficulties: the subject is not expressed, and it is not clear what it should be; there is an abundance of acc. sg. masculines, not all of which are coreferential; the root affiliation of *dhā́yase* is disputed; the value of *gṛṇānā́ḥ* is unclear.

To begin with the last, which has implication for some of the other questions: the standard tr. take *gṛṇānā́ḥ* as transitive, with Indra as object. But of the over 50 examples of this middle participle, only one other occurrence is transitive, I.181.9, where this value was induced by contextual pressure (see comm. ad loc.). I therefore take it as passive here as well.

If it is passive, then the missing subject must be something capable of being praised. Gr takes the subject to be the horses of vs. 2; since they were the overt subject of a form of √*dhā* in 2c (*dheyuḥ*) and would be the subj. of another one here (*dadhire*), this makes implicit sense. And it is possible that they might be praised or sung. However, the question is whether the horses can be thought to establish or deposit soma, as 2a requires. Priests would make more sense for this action (so Re), but priests would not ordinarily be praised -- hence the anomalous transitive interpr. of *gṛṇānā́ḥ* by most tr. In the end I would opt for the horses, but not very happily -- the contextual arguments pull in opposite directions.

Now, as for the accusatives: *mimikṣúm ... supārám, índram*, I agree with the standard tr. that the first refers to soma, seeking to be mixed with milk, and of course that the last, *índram*, is separate from it. The question is where *supārám* belongs. The standard tr., in different ways, take it with soma. Since in all its singular occurrences the word refers to Indra, I take it with *índram* here as well.

The final question is the root affiliation and value of *dhā́yase*. The standard tr. all take it to √*dhā* 'place', construed with *jyaíṣṭhyāya* and with Indra as implicit subj. (e.g., Ge "dass er [=Indra] die Oberhoheit ausübe"). However, all clear cases of *dhā́yas-*, which mostly appears in the dat., belong to √*dhā* 'suckle, nourish' (incl. at nearby III.38.3 [though see the minority opinion discussed in comm. ad loc.]). I take it as such here, with *índram* as its object (thereby avoiding the necessity to construe this acc. with either *dadhire* or *gṛṇānā́ḥ*). The procuring of soma to nourish Indra is a logical progression -- though I'm still concerned that the horses might be the agents.

III.50.4–5: On the sequence of two repeated vss. see publ. intro.

III.51 Indra

III.51.1–2: These two vss. have the same structure: pādas acd are just accusatives qualifying the acc. *índram* in b, and the b pādas are essentially the same, with nom. pl. *gíraḥ* + a verb that governs the accusatives. Though vs. 3 breaks the syntax, Indra still appears first by name in pāda b.

III.51.2: The standard tr. take *arṇavám* as an unmarked simile, serving as goal to the verb in b: "my songs go to Indra, *as if* to the sea [Ge "(wie) zu dem Meere," Re "(tel) un océan," WG more accurately but less persuasively "(wie) zu wallender Flut"]. The word is therefore only indirectly associated with Indra: they are both goals but need have nothing else in common. But given the parallelism in structure of vss. 1 and 2, I am reluctant to break the pattern of accusatives characterizing Indra by introducing this syntactic disjunction, and further the supposed simile only makes good sense if *arṇavá-* really is a sea or the like, not an undulating flood. I think instead that Indra is directly described as a flood, the flood itself being characterized as *śā́kín-* 'possessing powers'.

Note the phrase *tū́rṇim aptúram*, which I would now render 'advancing, crossing the waters', in line with my reassessment of the meaning and root affiliation of *tū́rṇi-* (see comm. ad III.11.5). The connection of the adj. and the root-noun cmpd. is also found in I.3.8.

The water-crossing mentioned here may simply be a reference to Indra's general leadership in crossing rivers and gaining new territory, but it may more specifically point to the famous crossing of King Sudās dramatized in III.33 and referred to again in III.53.9, even though the poet Viśvāmitra, not Indra, is the major actor there. The crossing is mentioned again in 9a.

III.51.3: Although *panasyate* might make more sense if tr. "expresses admiration," the other occurrences of this denom. stem and the related adj. *panasyú-* all mean 'attract/invite admiration'. Here the poet is hoping for a good reception from the recipient of his hymns, which he indeed receives in pādas b and c. I have tr. the loc. phrase *ākaré vásoḥ* as if ablative, to make the sense clearer. It could have been rendered "... seeks admiration at (the hands of) him ..."

I would now change "faultless rhythms" to "flawless rhythms"; see comm. ad X.61.12.

III.51.4: Though this vs. begins a new tṛca in a different meter, it partially restores the syntactic structure of vss. 1–2: the first pāda presents Indra in the acc., the second one directs praises to him. Note also that *nṛṇā́m ... nṛ́tamam* picks up *náram* of 2a. The structure is somewhat complicated by the fact that both (unnamed) Indra in pāda a and the (unnamed) subjects of the impv. *arcatā* in b are addressed in the 2nd ps. This leads both Ge and Re to separate the two pādas: Ge pronounces pāda a an anacoluthon or ellipsis, while Re supplies "(je te chante)." This fastidiouness seems unnecessary to me: the two referents of the 2nd persons are in different grammatical numbers and unlikely to be confused with each other for other reasons, and in a ritual situation both should be present ("at the seat of Vivasvant," 3c) and could both be directly addressed. The two instrumentals in pāda a (*gīrbhír ukthaíḥ*) also go better with the verb in b; cf., e.g., VI.22.1 *índraṃ táṃ gīrbhír abhy àrca ābhíḥ*.

Pāda d consists of two clauses, the nominal *námo asya* and the short verbèd clause *pradíva éka īśe*, and so, contra Gr's suggestion (s.v. *īś*, col. 236, #8), the verb doesn't take an acc. here. For supposed exx. of √*īś* with the acc., see comm. ad VII.32.18.

III.51.5: The stem *niṣṣídh-* and related forms are difficult (see, inter alia, Scar 596–97). As Scar points out, there is no obvious direct way to connect it with either √*sādh* 'succeed' or √*sidh* 'repel', and neither of these roots appears with *níḥ* in the RV (though the latter does in post-RVic texts, but without relevant meaning; see Gotō, 1st Kl., 328). On the other hand, the semantic range of the word itself in context is relatively clear. It usually refers to something offered by inferiors to superiors. Ge's Tribut (see his brief disc. in n. 5b) works pretty well. If we want to connect it to the root √*sādh* 'succeed, realize, reach the goal', it may be seen as the material representation of the fulfillment (this is the √*sādh* part) of an obligation, and the *níḥ* 'forth' may reflect the proffering of these material goods.

I supply 'streams' with *jīráyaḥ* on the basis of the other occurrence of this pl. in II.17.3 *prá jīráyaḥ sisrate* ... as well as the well-attested *jīrá-dānu-* 'possessing lively drops'. There is general agreement in the standard tr. that *jīrí-* refers to flowing water.

III.51.6: Note the chiasmic structure *túbhyam bráhmāṇi gíraḥ ... túbhyam*.

As MLW points out to me, c contains one of the few examples of initial *bodhí*, which, as I've discussed ("Syntactic Constraints on Morphological Change," 1997, esp. 69–75) is ordinarily found pāda-internal, as opposed to *bháva*.

Ge persuasively identifies *ávaso nū́tanasya* as a genitive of quality.

III.51.7: This vs. contains yet another implicit contrast between the aor. and pres. of √*pā* 'drink': *pāhi ... yáthā ... ápibaḥ*. See comm. ad III.35.10, 36.3, 40.1–2, and 47.3. It is not clear whether a contrast is also meant between the acc. *sómam* with *pāhi* (also 8a) and the (potentially partitive) genitive *sutásya* with *ápibaḥ* and, if so, whether it is signaling some sort of aspectual distinction.

The verb *ā́ vivāsanti* lacks an object here, though it usually is construed with one. Ge (/WG) interpret it as 'invite' (presumably supplying 'you'), while Re supplies the gods as object. I think the object slot has been intentionally left blank: with Indra's guidance and in his shelter they hope to win whatever they fancy, hence my somewhat

awk. tr. “seek their win.” Oberlies (Rel.RV I.403) suggests that this is a poetic contest, but I don’t see any evidence of this beyond the plural.

Given the usual rendering of *kaví-* elsewhere in the publ. tr., I would change the tr. here to ‘sage poets’ or just ‘poets’.

III.51.8: The connection between the two hemistichs in this vs. is not clear. The first unambiguously presents the here-and-now of the sacrifice, with an impv. and the adv. *ihá* ‘here’, while the second harks back to Indra’s primordial birth and the gods’ attendance on it, expressed by an augmented imperf. (*ábhūṣan*). There is no way to reconcile the temporal disjunction directly, so I have adopted Ge’s makeshift: supplying “(wie damals),” though there is no overt representation of my “as” (or his “wie damals”). There does not seem to be much semantic connection between the two halves either, unless we, the pressers and offerers, are being identified with the gods who served Indra at his birth.

III.51.9: The abrupt temporal shifts continue in this vs., exacerbated by shifts in person. The poet first addresses the Maruts in the 2nd ps. and asserts something about Indra in the present time (or so I [and the other standard tr.] take the nominal sentence without overt copula). In pāda b the Maruts are then referred to in the 3rd ps. -- though they are not named in this pāda, the other two occurrences of *dā́ti-vara-* refer to them, and *ánu √mad* is a signature verb of theirs -- and in the past, in the augmented impf. *ámandan*. (Though the Saṃhitā text transmits ’*mandan*, the augment is metrically guaranteed.) This pāda seems an aside, reminding the audience of the Maruts’ previous involvement with Indra. The vs. then shifts to the present time again, with the Maruts remaining in the 3rd ps., as potential drinking companions for Indra.

On *dā́ti-vāra-* see my 2024 IEL article on it and, supposedly, related compounds.

In 6c Indra was urged to become “a friend of present help”; what that present help was/should be is spelled out here, a friend “at the water-crossing.” For water-crossing see comm. ad vs. 2 above. It is presumably *not* directly related to the Maruts’ applause in pāda b, for they provide material and moral support at the Vṛtra-smashing, not in crossing waters.

As MLW points out, *své* in the phrase *své sadhásthe* does not refer to the subject, but rather to the immed. preceding gen. *dāśúṣaḥ*.

III.51.9–10. Note that *pibatu* takes an acc. in 9cd, but a gen. in 10c, as with *ápibaḥ* in 7b.

III.51.10: The first two pādas of this vs. are variously translated. The problems are 1) the referent of *idám* and 2) the absence of a verb. My interpr. is closest to Ge’s. If the referent of *idám* is the soma, we need only find a synonym for soma that is neuter; *sávanam* fits the bill and is elsewhere modified by *sutá-*, as it can be here. As for the verb, I assume a form of √*as*: the idiom *ánu √as* means ‘be at hand’.

III.51.12: The three body parts to which the soma should reach are in different cases: pāda a contains loc. (or possibly gen., though this seems unlikely) *kukṣyóḥ*, while b and c have acc. *śíraḥ* and *bā́hū* respectively. The verb -- *prá aśnotu* -- is presumably held constant, though represented only by the preverb in b and c. Since the loc. can express

goal just as well as the acc., this is allowable syntactic variation. Thanks to MLW for drawing my attention to the case disagreement.

III.52 Indra

III.52.2: *pacatyà-* occurs only here; it does not seem to have any gerundival sense, nor does its base *pacatá-*, though *-ata-*adjectives often do (*darśatá-* 'sightly', not just 'seen'); see AiG II.2.168. I assume *pacatyà-* is a nonce creation to provide an extra syllable here in the versified recipe. And perhaps *pacatá-* was fashioned as a clearer alternative past participle to *pakvá-*, which can of course also mean 'ripe', though it's quite commonly applied to cooked food.

III.52.3: The accent of *ghásaḥ* is unexpected, but it presumably results from its juxtaposition with immed. following *joṣáyāse*, which can owe its accent to its pāda-initial position. Although *ca* can be subordinating ('if') and induce verbal accent, that doesn't seem to be its function here; instead it coordinates with the *ca* in b to produce a "both ... and" construction. That the *ca* in b is not in 2nd position but follows the obj. *gíraḥ* supports this interpr., since the first *ca* follows the obj. *puroḷā́śam*.

III.52.5: I would now render *tū́rṇy-artha-* as 'having a goal to advance to'; see comm. ad III.11.5.

III.52.6: On the acc. complement and sense of the lexeme *úpa śikṣa-* see comm. ad I.112.19, I.173.10

III.52.8: The phrase *vīrátama- nṛṇā́m* 'most virile of men' is a variant of the fairly common formula *nṛṇā́ṃ nṛ́tama-* 'most manly of men', an occurrence of which is found in the preceding hymn, III.51.4. This vs. is repeated at IV.32.16.

III.53 Indra, etc.

III.53.1: The curious dual dvandva *indrā-parvatā* 'o Indra and Mountain', only in the vocative and therefore unaccented, occurs 3x: I.122.3, 132.6, and here. As discussed ad I.122.3 and 132.6, I believe that the 'mountain' is Indra's *vájra-*.

III.53.2: The verb in pāda b, *yakṣi*, is simply an injunctive 1st sg. *s*-aor. to √*yaj*, but it is rendered as a future/modal in all the standard tr. (including this one). This value seems also found in the identical form in X.52.5, though not in X.4.1. (Gr's ex. in VI.16.8 is better taken as a 2nd-sg. act. *-si* impv.) I don't know why this particular form should have this value, save for the general functional flexibility of the injunctive. But perhaps the fact that the formally identical 2nd sg. act. *-si* impv. is so common and (as an old *s*-aor. subjunctive) is used in both imperatival and subjunctive-future value may have allowed that value to spill over onto its formal twin. KH (Inj. 253) suggests that 1st sg. injunctives express the immediate future.

III.53.3: The 1st dual subjunctive (*śáṃsāva*) coupled with a sg. voc. (*adhvaryo*) is a rough and ready way to express a 1st ps. inclusive. This type of construction contrasts with the 1st ps. exclusive found in phrases like VII.88.3 *ā́ yád ruhā́va váruṇaś ca nā́vam* "When we two, Varuṇa and I, mounted the boat ..." with a nominative explicitly conjoined with *ca* to an implicit *ahám*.

The injunctive *bhūt* in d must also, like *yakṣi* in 2b, be modal/prospective or even imperatival, since the *áthā ca* indicates that it temporally and/or logically follows the impv. *sīda* in c.

III.53.4: The dismissal of Indra and the sending him off home comes rather early in this hymnlet; he just got here (vs. 1) and at that point we urged him to stay put (vs. 2). Vs. 3 seems to depict the sacrifice proper, and the remaining 3 vss. of this portion of the hymn (vss. 4–6) are an extended farewell. In this vs. the poet seems to be reassuring Indra that if he goes home, he still won't miss out on anything here: we'll send Agni to fetch him whenever we press soma.

III.53.5: *párā yāhi* "drive away" comes awfully soon after 2a *mā́ párā gāḥ* "don't go away."

The genitive phrase *vājíno rā́sabhasya* is ambiguous: does it refer to two animals or one? Re opts for the former: "... du (cheval) gagnant-du-prix (et) de l'âne." But the same phrase in I.34.9 makes it likely that the two words belong together as the designation of a single animal. So Ge (/WG).

III.53.6–7: See the publ. intro. for the thematic and lexical connections between these two vss., despite their belonging to different sections of the hymn. See there also for the connection of vs. 7 with III.31, via the identification of the current poet with the Aṅgirases, ur-sacrificers and givers of dakṣiṇās (on which see Ge's n. 7a).

III.53.8: As Schaefer points out (p. 162), the intens. *bobhavīti* construed with an āmreḍita *rūpáṃ-rūpam* must signal repetitive function ("Gestalt um Gestalt").

The use of *māyā́ḥ* here approaches its later sense of "illusion": the various forms that Indra assumes in pāda a conceal the "real" Indra.

In c I read *diváḥ* twice: once as 'day' with *tríḥ* in the meaning "three times a day" (cf. nearby III.56.5, 6 *trír ā́ diváḥ*, also X.95.5 *tríḥ ... áhnaḥ*), once as 'heaven' with following *pári* "from heaven." The latter reading, adopted by Sāy., is rejected by Old and Ge (n. 8c) because we should expect the close sandhi *divás pári.* This argument is subject to criticism on two grounds. First, I think the double reading of *diváḥ* would preclude close sandhi for one of the readings. Moreover, none of the other cited exx. of *divás pári* is broken over the caesura as here. As Mark Hale has discussed at length, close sandhi of NOUN + POSTPOSITION is blocked at the caesura. See "Preliminaries to the Study of the Relationship between Syntax and Sandhi in Rigvedic Sanskrit," *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 51, pp. 77-96, 1990; this view is cited here after the 1995 draft, *Wackernagel's Law in the Language of the RV*, pp. 38-50.

The ritual situation in the 2nd hemistich is puzzling for several reasons. First, Indra's appearance at the sacrifice "three times a day" is what we expect, since there are three soma pressings. Then why is he characterized as *ánṛtupāḥ* 'drinking out of season'?

Ge (/WG) gets out of this bind by supplying a parenthetical "(oder)": he either comes three times a day *or* drinks unseasonably. This works, but the "or" is of course a complete invention. More problematic is the fact that Indra is drinking unseasonably at all. In this same Indra cycle he has been apostrophized as *ṛtupāḥ* (voc., III.47.3). The apparent breaking of the ritual rules here is esp. striking because he is called *ṛtā́van-* 'possessing the truth, truthful' at the same time, made more striking because this is the only place in the RV where *ṛtā́van-* qualifies Indra. Lüders (*Varuṇa* II, 547–48) suggests that *ṛtā́van-* is used here only as word play with *ánṛtupā-*, since Indra has essentially no connection with *ṛtá-* ("dass er zum Ṛta so gut wie keine Beziehung hat," p. 548). But this seems unlikely, esp. given that the unnegated expression *ṛtupā́ ṛtā́vā* in the same metrical position is used of Agni in this same maṇḍala (III.20.4). Some point is being made, that Indra can be *ṛtā́van-* despite his un-rule-governed behavior.

I think the clues to a solution are found in the first half of the verse, where Indra is depicted as constantly shape-shifting and enveloping himself in *māyā́ḥ*. Perhaps Indra is impersonating other gods through the various *rūpa*-s he assumes, and his unseasonable drinking involves his taking their places in the rota (*ṛtú-*) of soma-recipients (the Ṛtugraha treated in I.15 and II.36–37). What then are "his own mantras" (*svaír mántraiḥ*), which accompany the unseasonable drinking? Lüders (p. 548) suggests that when he drinks outside of the three pressings he has to recite his own mantras. Though this is clever, I do not think it is correct, nor do I follow my own published tr. "by (the power of) his own (magic) spells" -- though I do think the mantras may be semantically linked to *māyā́ḥ* here. But my current thinking is that the phrase should be tr. "with *their* own mantras," referring to the mantras appropriate to the gods whose forms he has appropriated and whose turns he takes in the drinking. As to how he can be called *ṛtā́van-* when his behavior seems not to be precisely aboveboard, perhaps he has gained the epithet from the gods whose identities he's stealing: Agni, Tvaṣṭar, and Mitra and Varuṇa, all called *ṛtā́van-* elsewhere in the RV, all occur in the Ṛtugraha sequence (I.15; II.36–37). Or perhaps the epithet alludes to Indra's most enduring adoption of another identity, that of Bṛhaspati. Though Bṛhaspati is called *ṛtā́van-* only once in the RV as far as I am aware (VI.73.1), the role of *ṛtá-* in association with Bṛhaspati in the Vala myth is very significant; see, e.g., Lüders p. 549. Or perhaps we can simply say that Indra's "truth" -- his inherent nature -- is his ability to assume other forms and act out of turn and impose his will without following rules.

III.53.9-10: The use of somewhat inappropriate epithets continues in these vss. The subject of 9ab, the "great seer" (*mahā́m̐ ṛ́ṣiḥ*) is Viśvāmitra, mentioned by name in c. A mortal, he is described as 'god-begotten' (*devajā́-*) and 'god-sped' (*devájūta-*) but 'possessing a man's sight' (*nṛcákṣas-*); the last is also used of the Kuśikas, Viśvāmitra's family, in the next vs. Curiously it is the epithet with *nṛ-* 'man' that appears to be misapplied, not those with *devá-* 'god': the stem *nṛ-cákṣas-* is found approximately 40 times in the RV, and in all other occurrences (with the exception of III.22.2, where it qualifies a divine quality, the radiance of Agni, and the possible exception of the next hymn, III.54.6) it qualifies a god, who either has his (divine) gaze on men or attracts the gaze of men. Thus, the status of Viśvāmitra and his kin is implicitly raised by receiving a descriptor usually used of gods. That the Kuśikas drink soma with the gods in 10cd is a sign of this enhanced status. What the adj. means here is unclear to me: is it that they too

attract the gaze (and thus admiration) of other men, or that they, despite possessing only a man's sight, still manage feats sufficient to match the gods, esp. Viśvāmitra's stopping the rivers in full flood?

III.53.10: The publ. tr. does not recognize or render the idiom *ví √pā*, found generally in the middle, for which see also comm. ad VII.22.3. As is indicated there, in later Vedic and already in late RV, the idiom is specialized for the separation of surā from another liquid in the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, but earlier can refer more generally to the extraction ("drinking out") of a liquid from another source, e.g., by the pressing stones in IV.16.3 and VII.22.3. What the idiom is doing here is less clear to me. Ge (n. 10d / WG) thinks this is a reference to the (much later) notion that *haṃsa*s can separate liquids and so it belongs with the Sautrāmaṇī passages -- the *haṃsa* being found in pāda a, though only in a simile unrelated to drinking. I think this unlikely. It may simply be that the pressing stones are involved: the Kuśikas may be "drinking out" the soma by means of the pressing stones found in pāda a (*ádribhiḥ*). However, it is also possible that the *ví* represents the cross-species aspect of the drinking party: the mortal Kuśikas are urged to drink along with the gods, but the gathering may be segregated. So perhaps a tr. "drink apart, along with the gods"; such a notion seems to underlie Re's "Buvez séparément avec les dieux." It would contrast with a true symposium expressed by *sám √pā* also in the middle (see IV.35.7, 9) and in fact might allude to that idiom, given the well-known polarization of *ví* and *sám.* Another possibility is Sāy's *parasparavyatihāreṇa* 'by mutual interchange, alternately'. I am weakly inclined towards the pressing stone interpretation, though also somewhat drawn to the cross-species one. And I would also point out the resonance of the preverb *ví* with ***vi**śvāmitraḥ* (9c) and ***vi**prāḥ* (10c).

III.53.11: This vs. is supposed to depict the Aśvamedha of King Sudās, and the releasing of the horse in b and the smiting of obstacles in all directions in c, followed by a sacrifice in d, certainly support this interpr.

cetáyadhvam is variously rendered, but most generally as 'pay attention' vel sim. I instead take this middle full-grade *-áya*-formation as a reflexive transitive "make yourselves known" based on the 'make perceive' sense of *cetáya-*. Re's alternative "faites vous remarquer" is closest to mine.

As Watkins points out (Dragon, p. 208), although this form of the intens. of *√han* has a singular object (somewhat unusually), it is "serially plural," in that the *vṛtrám* is located in one cardinal direction after another; see also Schaeffer 204–5.

III.53.12: The first hemistich, couched in the 1st ps., consists only of a rel. clause, which breaks off. The "I" is clearly Viśvāmitra, whose name opens the hemistich and whose protective *bráhman-* is mentioned there -- making it very likely that pādas ab constitute this *bráhman-*, though it's not quite clear what is protective about this truncated utterance.

The plupf. *átuṣṭavam* should not exist, at least in my opinion, since the two forms of the indicative pf. *tuṣṭuvúḥ* (VIII.6.12, 18) also appear to have preterital value. However, the contexts in VIII.6 do not guarantee that value -- it is possible that they are presential "they praise" (see comm. ad VIII.6.12). The existence of a pf. subj. *tuṣṭávat* at VIII.98.16 also suggests that the indicative pf. is, or originally was, presential. The only

other pf. forms in the RV, the act. part. *tuṣṭuváṃs-* (3x) and mid. part. *tuṣṭuvāná-* (1x) are generally tr. as preterital, but again context does not dictate this rendering.

III.53.13: The tr. of the last pāda might better begin "Just he will make ..." to reflect the *íd*.

III.53.15–16: As indicated in the publ. intro., the subject of these two vss. is the mysterious feminine *sasarparî-*, which has been interpr. as differently as "Kriegstrompete" (BR, fld. by Gr), "Sangesgeweise" of the Viśvāmitras (Ge), and Vāc (Anukramaṇī, Sāy.). The interpr. of these vss. has been further complicated by the later tradition that sees them as concerning the supposed rivalry between Viśvāmitra and Vasiṣṭha, for which I see no evidence at all in the RV.

Although I do not think all the puzzles are ultimately solvable, some clues can get us some distance. First, *sasarparî-* is a *vṛkī*-type fem., and as Debrunner points out (AiG II.2.369), the major use of this inflectional type is for female beings (human and animal). This lends some credence to the opinion that the *sasarparî-* is a cow of some sort (e.g., Re "La (vache) Sasarparī"). That vs. 14 concerns the ritually worthless cows of the Kīkaṭas would also support a contrast with an eminently worthy cow found among us. Second, these two vss. sound rather like a dānastuti (see *jamádagnidatta-* in 15b and *yắm me palastijamadagnáyo dadúḥ* in 16d), and since the next part of the hymn goes off in a completely different direction, this could serve as a hymn-capping dānastuti for what precedes. Cf. I.126.2, a dānastuti hymn, where, after Kakṣīvant is given cows, he stretches the king's unaging fame to heaven: *diví śrávo 'járam ā́ tatāna*, highly reminiscent of our 2nd hemistich ... *tatāna, śrávo devéṣv amṛ́tam ajuryám*.

Even if this sketch of the function of the vss. and of Sasarparī is accepted (a big if), it remains to analyze the word. I consider it a portmanteau pun. On the one hand it is a kind of anagram for the intensive of √*sṛp* 'creep', found in the RV only as the hapax adj. *sarīsṛpá-* (X.162.3), which I tr. 'squirming'. On the other hand, it is also phonologically reminiscent of *sabar-dúgha-*, *-duh-* 'sap-yielding', of milk cows -- two occurrences of which are found in nearby III.55 (vss. 12, 16) qualifying Night and Dawn, one of whom bellows (*mimāya* as here) in vs. 13. (Acdg. to Griffith, Gr associates Sasarparī with Sabardughā, though this is not registered in the dictionary.) Just as the Sasarparī brings fame in 16, so does a *sabardúh-* in VI.48.12-13 "milk out immortal fame" (*śrávò 'mṛtyu dhúkṣata*). Another possible association is *sarpís-* 'melted butter', adduced by Mayrhofer as a possible relative of *sasarparî-* (EWA s.v. *sarpís-*). My tr. "squirming, sappy (cow called) Sasarparī" reflects my sense that all of these words have contributed to the designation *sasarparî-* and these contributions are positive: *sabardúgha-* and *sarpís-* reflect the fecundity and richness associated with juice and fat, *sarīsṛpa-* the uncontainable vitality of a squirming young animal. Needless to say, this is highly speculative and does not rest on properly chaste etymological principles, but it is difficult to see what could with regard to this maddening but phonologically delectable word.

The next question to ask is why Sasarparī "banishes neglect" (*ámatim bā́dhamānā*). Again this phrase supports the notion that the referent of *sasarparî-* is a cow. In I.53.4 and X.42.10 *ámati-* is overcome by cows; the word is paired with hunger (*kṣúdh-*) in VIII.66.14, X.42.10, and X.43.3. Hunger and neglect can be combatted with cows and their nourishing products, and one of the combatants is Sasarparī.

III.53.16: Besides the continuing problem of *sasarparî-*, the other difficulty is the hapax *pakṣyā̆* in c. Gr takes it as 'aus Monatshälften bestehend' (flg. BR), Ge (/WG) 'auf meiner Seite stehend', Re as 'ailée' or 'prenant parti (pour moi)'. The publ. tr. strikes out on its own (though closest to Re's first alternative). It involves reading *sā̆pakṣyā̆* against the Pp (but involving no change in the Saṃhitā text), to be divided *sā̆ apakṣyā̆*. The latter would be the instr. of a nominal abstract in -^{i}*yā-* (see AiG II.2.840), a rare but attested type built primarily to *-a*-stems. Here potentially to *apakṣá-* 'wingless' (cf. AV XI.5.21), hence 'winglessness'. What might this bizarre confection have to do with the passage? The rather flimsy connection is via the daughter of the Sun (*sū̆ryasya duhitā̆* in 15c) and a possible reference to Dawn in 16c: the same phrase *návyam āyur dádhānā* is used of Dawn in VII.80.2). (Like) the former, Sasarparī has stretched the Kuśikas' fame to the gods; (like) the latter, she has brought fame to all the five peoples. These feats might be expected to require special forms of transport, such as wings, if the agent is not a supernatural traveler like Dawn or the Sun's Daughter. But Sasarparī is a cow, hence wingless.

I realize how fragile -- and potentially ludicrous -- this suggestion is, however, and it might be better to play it safe with something like 'on my side'.

III.53.17: As noted in the publ. intro., this verse and the rest of this little section are reminiscent of the final vs. of III.33.13, against disaster on a journey, specifically there a river crossing.

The hapax *pātalyè* is entirely unclear, besides being a dual referring to some part of the chariot.

On the thematic medial stem *dáda-* in the sense 'hold, keep safe', see Gotō (1st Class, 171–72, flg. Wackernagel).

III.53.19: On *abhí vyayasva* see comm. ad VII.33.4. I assume 'engird' refers to the ends of the axle being embedded in the wheel hub.

The loc. *spandané* is generally taken as a third type of wood (besides *khadirá-* and *śiṃśápā-*), but while the other two words are standard designations of trees, *spandaná-* is ordinarily not, but rather refers to a type of motion -- jerking or kicking. I take it to refer here to the elasticity or flexibility of Dalbergia sissoo (*śiṃsapā-*), a quality it has (at least acdg. to the internet).

III.53.20: On the problematic *ā̆vasā ā̆* (Saṃhitā) */ ā̆ ava'saí ā̆* (Pp.), see detailed disc. by Scar (576–77), who lays out the various phonological and morphological possibilities. As he points out, the reading of Holland van Nooten, *ā̆ ávasā ā̆*, with accent on the first *a* (possible on the basis of the Saṃhitā text) and deaccentuation of the final *ā* of the noun (contra both Saṃhitā and Pp), makes no sense (and does not conform to the transmitted text). The nominal form between the two *ā̆*'s is by most accounts a root noun cmpd of √*sā* + *áva*. The question is what the case form is. I follow Whitney (§971a) and Old in reading *-ās*, contra the Pp., interpreting it (with Whitney and Old) as an irregular abl. sg. to this root noun cmpd. (expect **avasás*) in infinitival usage. The parallelism in the hemistich supports this interpr., but see the other possibilities offered by Scar.

III.53.21–24: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss. are traditionally taken as depicting the rivalry between Viśvāmitra and Vasiṣṭha, but I see no sign of this here; certainly Vasiṣṭha is not mentioned. The verbal link is supposed to be VII.104.16 *adhamás padīṣṭa* "let him fall lowest," a curse uttered in a Vasiṣṭha hymn that echoes our 21c *ádharaḥ sás padīṣṭa*. But in neither case is the opponent named, and there is no reason to assume that Vasiṣṭha directs this at Viśvāmitra or vice versa.

The first vs. of this sequence (21) is quite straightforward; vs. 22 is more complex, but I feel fairly confident in its interpr. But vss. 23–24 are very difficult, and my interpr. is correspondingly quite provisional.

III.53.22: With Old, I reject the interpr. of *cid* in abc as a simile particle (contra Sāy and Ge); in all three cases the *cid* can be interpreted in its usual 'even, even though, just' sense. However, I differ from Old on the purport of the vs. He thinks it describes concrete events, possibly as a "Beschreibung von Zauberhandlungen," while I think it contains two figurative descriptions of the impotence of the enemy -- in this I am closer to Ge's notion of similes than to Old. I also find myself in the odd position of being in general agreement with Griffith's interpr. (based on Ludwig's). Each hemistich describes an action involving great effort and drama that produces trivial and insubstantial results. In ab an ax is thoroughly heated, but this formidable weapon only cuts off the blossom of a silk cotton tree. (That silk cotton tree flowers are a vivid red might remind the audience of the real blood that might have been shed by a blazing hot ax.) In cd a pot, also heated, is boiling (*yéṣantī*), indeed has boiled over (*práyastā*), but all it produces is foam.

III.53.23: In my opinion, at least the first half of this vs. continues the sentiment of vs. 22: the enemy is powerless, despite bluff and bluster. In pāda a older translations supply an unidentified subject ("he") for *cikite*, but the medial perfect of √*cit* is always pass.-intrans. and with Kü (176) I take the verb as an impersonal passive with an oblique subj. in the genitive; cf. I.51.7 *táva vájraś cikite* with the subject in the more normal nom. The point here is that the opponent's missile (*sa͂yaka-*) is so inconsequential as not to attract or deserve notice.

In b the first problem is the hapax *lodhá-*, which is universally taken as a red animal of some sort, a horse (Ge, Re), fox (Gr), or goat (Old, tentatively EWA), as an *l*-form related to *rudhirá-*, etc. My quite different tr. 'clod' assumes (again, very tentatively) an association with a loose set of words for lump, clod, etc.: *loṭṭha* (Pkt., etc. = Vedic *loṣṭá-*, perhaps by hypersanskritization) (Turner 11157), **lottha* / **lodda* / **loddha* (Tu. 11137), **luṭṭa* (Tu 11077). The point would then be that "they" (whoever they are) lead (to sacrifice?) a lump of earth or the like, thinking that it's an actual (sacrificial?) beast. This situation reminds us of the chariot race of Mudgala and Mudgalānī (X.102) in which a block of wood is yoked with a bull, and the oddly assorted pair still wins the race (X.102.8–9). It might also remind us of X.28.9 in which an earth clod (*logá-*, not too distant phonologically) splits a stone. The other morphological fact of note in this pāda is that *páśu* is neut. and initially accented (versus the ubiquitous masc. *paśú-*). This may be a deep archaism, matching Lat. *pecu*, Goth. *faihu* (cf. AiG II.1.20, II.2.474), or it may be a nonce attempt to de-animatize the word in this peculiar context.

Like vs. 22 and 23a, 23b describes an undesirable situation exactly contrary to what was aimed at: having mistaken a lump for a sacrificial animal, the actors will surely

not get the results they wanted -- although X.102.8–9 and X.28.9 may point to success in unlikely circumstances. But the second hemistich depicts situations in which, though a mistake was possible, it was not made: they don't set a bad horse (*ávājin-*) to race with a good one; they don't put a donkey before the horses. The question is whether the subjects of the three 3rd pl. verbs (*nayanti* b, *hāsayanti* c, *nayanti* again d) are the same, or are the deluded weaklings of ab being contrasted with more clear-headed and successful actors in cd? Common sense suggests the latter, but the morphologically identical sequence of verbs with no overt subject or change of subject the former (as Old points out). I cannot make up my mind, esp. because the following vs. muddies the waters even further.

Given the interpretational difficulties, the grammatical identity of *áśvān* is a minor problem. In the publ. tr. I take it as acc. pl. *áśvān*, but the Pp. interprets it as abl. *áśvāt*, with the final *-n* in sandhi before the nasal of *nayanti*. Either is possible ("lead before the horses" / "lead before the horse"), and given the uncertainty of meaning, there is no obvious way to choose. The abl. is supposed to be construed with *puráḥ*, but in fact ABL. + *puráḥ* is not a robust construction.

III.53.24: The good sense / bad sense problem continues, or returns, here. The sons of Bharata are ceremonially presented to us, with the here-and-now deictic *imé*. And we know from vs. 12 that the Bharata people (*bhā́rata- jána-*) are our people. But here they (or the subjects of the three 3rd pl. verbs: *cikituḥ* b, *hinvánti* c, *pári ṇayanti* d) seem to make the same bad choices that were visible in vss. 22-23, esp. 23b. The continuation of the 3rd pl. verbs invites us to make the Bharatas subjects also in vs. 22. Is this a jokey anti-dānastuti? Are the "bad choices" I just mentioned meant to show that even if they do stupid things, they will still beat the incompetents depicted in vs. 22? Or that bad choices can still sometimes unaccountably lead to good? I am baffled.

The mealtime *prapitvá-* is well attested in the RV, but *apapitvá-* is found only here. Both Ge and Re take the words in some kind of figurative sense (e.g., Re *apapitvá-* 'la retraite', *prapitvá-* 'l'élan-en-avant'), but since the *-pitvá-* compounds are otherwise only used of meals and the times of day associated with them, it seems best to maintain that sense here; so WG 'die Nachessenzeit', 'die Voressenzeit'. In its contrast with *pra* here, I take *apa* as meaning 'leaving the meal, post-prandial' and therefore 'non-meal'. My interpr. is influenced by my sense that the lesser choice is the one being made in each case in this vs.

In c the standard tr. take *ná* as a simile marker: "they incite their own horse like an alien one." But given the paired negative clauses in 23cd and the undoubted negative (or at least undoubted by the standard tr.) in the immediately preceding pāda (24b), where the *ná* takes the same position as in c, the pattern seems to impose another negative here. Under either interpr. the action is not a very smart one: spurring your own horse like an alien one should presumably mean that you don't spur it at all.

The accentuation of *jyā́-* in the bahuvrīhi *jyā́-vāja-*, against simplex *jyā́-*, is attributed to the shift to initial accent in some other bahuvrīhis: AiG II.1.293 with Nachtr. 81. The standard tr. avoid the problem of the sense of this cmpd by attributing to *-vāja-* a sense it doesn't otherwise have: Ge (WG; cf. Gr) Schnelligkeit, Re la force. But *vā́ja-* means 'prize' and bahuvrīhis with it as 2nd member 'having X as prize'. I here assume that winning only a bowstring (minus the bow) would not be a glorious outcome.

III.54 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn falls into two parts, vss. 1–10, esp. 2–9, devoted to Heaven and Earth, contains rhetorically ambitious cosmic speculation; the rest of the hymn is a conventional All Gods hymn in list form. The first section might be termed an "embryonic" or "unfulfilled" omphalos hymn. The first and last verses (1 / 10) establish a clear demarcative ring, and the middle verse (5) has all the earmarks of an omphalos verse, expressing the focal enigma. But the ring defining the boundaries is the only one; the concentric rings we expect in an omphalos verse are lacking.

III.54.1: All four pādas contain a distracted -*^{i}ya*- form immediately after an early caesura.

The expression "listen with his ... faces" is somewhat comic, though clearly domestic and heavenly "faces" refer to Agni's aspects in those two places. As Bl points out (RR ad III.1.15, which also contains the phrase ... *no dámyebhir ánīkaiḥ*), "with his faces belonging to the house" is unexceptionable in III.1.15, where it is construed with the verb *rákṣā*, but "a bolder poet" has adopted it to this less congenial (and therefore more interesting) environment.

III.54.2: With Ge (/WG) I supply "to those two" in b, to provide both a goal for *icháñ carati* and an antecedent for *yáyoḥ* in c.

III.54.3-4: The co-occurrence of *ṛtá*- and *satyá*- in these two vss. (3a, 4b) is striking. In keeping with my estimation of the difference in meaning between the two, I tr. the first as 'truth' and the latter as 'real(ity)'. In both cases here the sense of *satyá*- is close to the English idiom "come true," that is, "become real." In 3a the poet is asking that the cosmic truth(s) associated with Heaven and Earth be realized in our own sphere, that H+E put themselves out, as it were, for our benefit. 4ab also concerns the truth(s) associated with H+E -- hence the adj. *ṛ́tāvarī* 'truthful' -- and the older poets, in finding these two entities that possess their own truth(s), spoke words (presumably about and in praise of H+E) that both reflected the reality of those truths and that also came true (*satyavā́caḥ*). This vs. esp. emphasizes the poets' process of discovery of the truths about H+E.

As Re points out, the vs. contrasts the priests or poets in ab with the warriors in cd.

III.54.5: The first pāda is also found in the famous cosmogonic (or anti-cosmogonic) hymn X.129, as 6a. The final pāda of that hymn, X.129.7d, ends with an incomplete sentence "or if he does not know ...?" (*yádi vā ná véda*). Though all the standard tr. of this vs. here find a way to incorporate our 5d into the syntax of the verse, I by contrast think the same trailing off into uncertainty is found here as in X.129.7. The lower seats of the gods in heaven can be seen, but not the ones in the higher realms. We can only discover so much. As for grammar, I take the *yā́* of d as a neut. pl. referring to *sádāṃsi* in c (so also Re, though with a slightly different interpr. of the rest). Ge (/WG) instead take it as a fem. nom. sg. referring to the *pathyā́* in b, with c as parenthetical. I do not entirely understand the *vratéṣu* in d. The hidden commandments may be the laws that govern the further reaches of the cosmos.

I would slightly change the translation of d from "(... those) which ..." to "(... those) that ..."

III.54.6: On the somewhat anomalous use of *nṛcákṣas-* here see comm. ad III.53.9.

The first pāda of this vs. seems to imply that, though the higher seats of the gods are not generally visible (5d), a *kaví-*, despite having only a man's sight, has been able to see (*abhí ... acaṣṭa*) Heaven and Earth whole, and that he is cognizant of the crucial paradox about them --- that they are joined but still distinct -- a paradox treated in the rest of the vs. and the following one (7).

The interpr. of b is hampered by the hapax *víghṛte*. On the surface it appears to belong to the root √*ghṛ* 'sprinkle', but it is difficult to make this yield immediate sense. It appears to serve the same function as *víyute* 'separated' in the next vs. (7a), and it has therefore been suggested that *-ghṛta-* actually belong to the root √*hṛ* 'take' or is a byform thereof (see, e.g., KEWA III.578). My publ. tr. reflects a tacit acceptance of such a view (or at least a willingness not to probe it too deeply), but I now wonder (without full conviction) whether in the context of *mádantī* 'becoming exhilarated' a sense that connects *víghṛte* to √*ghṛ* 'sprinkle' might be possible: "sprinkled separately but becoming exhilarated (together)." In any event I take it as a dual fem. acc. (with Ge [/WG]), not, with Re, a loc. sg. with *yónā*.

My tr. also depends on assuming that the exhilarating is happening jointly, in contrast to whatever type of separation is indicated by the *ví-*prefixed ppl. -- the same contrast between unity and separation found in cd. The place where this is happening in b, "the womb of truth" (*ṛtásya yónā*), may refer to two different places, the ritual ground (as so often) and, perhaps, the distant invisible seats referred to in 5d.

The publ. tr. takes *véḥ* as a nom. sg., parallel to H+E as subject of 'make' – referring to the bird's nest-building activity. But it could be the more usual genitive: "have made a seat like (that) of a bird."

III.54.7: The *-ūka-*stem *jāgarūka-* in b is found only here in Vedic. I wonder if it owes its *-ka-*suffix to the femininized context of c, where H+E are identified as "sisters and young women" (*svásārā yuvatī*) despite their oppositely gendered names. On *-ka-* in women's language, see my "Women's Language in the Rig Veda?" (Gd. Elizarenkova, 2008) and "Sociolinguistic Remarks on the Indo-Iranian *-ka-Suffix: A Marker of Colloquial Register" (IIJ 53 [2009]).

Note the virtual mirror image of *víyute* (a) and *yuvatī* (c).

I do not understand the use of *ā́d u* here. Ordinarily this old ablative has a fairly strong temporal ("just after that") or logical ("just because of that") sense, but since c has a concessive force ("although being ..."), it is difficult to get *ā́d* to have logical force, and the fact of being sisters but called different names does not seem to have a temporal dimension. It reminds of the *ca ... ā́d* in 11cd, but there *ā́d* easily expresses a standard temporal sense. It is possible, but extremely speculative, that the *ā́d* does reflect some sort of cosmic temporality: H+E, originally joined together, had a single identity and gender, but after the cosmogonic separation they received different, and genderedly oppositional, names. The monism of the next vs. (8cd) might (barely) support such an idea; note that "the One" there is neut. (*ékam*).

The standard interpr. (see Ge, etc.) of *mithunā́ni nā́ma* is that their names are of different genders when they are given separate names, with *dyaúḥ* generally masc. and *pṛthivī́* fem. But they are also paired sisters, with the fem. du. designation *ródasī*. This

seems correct, and the publ. tr. should probably have reflected this sense of *mithuná-* better. I am somewhat puzzled by why the names are in the plural, however.

III.54.8: The notion of the pair of H+E, separate but unified, is, in the 2nd hemistich, replaced by an even starker contrast, the One (*ékam*, neut. as noted in comm. to previous vs.), which controls the Many, with the Many first configured as oppositional pairs in the neuter: the moving and the fixed (*éjad dhruvám*), the walking/roaming and the flying (*cárad patatrí*). *ékam* is found at the end of its pāda, just as it is in the refrain to the next hymn (III.55).

III.54.9: On the meaning of this vs. see publ. intro. It is the final vs. of the hymn-within-the hymn, vss. 2–9 dedicated to Heaven and Earth. The 1st ps. poet reappears here; he is first found in vs. 2, the beginning of this self-contained portion, and has been absent since, though he may be related to the 3rd ps. *kaví-* in vs. 6.

As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this vs. has a double meaning, aided by the double readings of two items in it: *ádhi √i*, which means both 'go upon' (literally) and 'study' ('go over', figuratively), and the unnamed *dyaúḥ*, present both as the divinity Heaven alluded to in the phrase in b "great father, begetter" (gen. *maháḥ pitúr janitúḥ*; for this as a designation of *dyaúḥ* cf., e.g., I.164.33 *dyaúr me pitā́ janitā́*) and as heaven the place, suggested by the locational adv. *yátra* 'where' in c, introducing the place where the gods take their stand. The poet is both studying the ancient cosmic mysteries he has been attempting to understand in the previous vss. (esp. 5–6) and is embarking on the path that leads to the place where the gods are established, beyond the ken of mortals. Recall the question in 5b "What is the pathway that leads to the gods?" (*devā́m̐ áchā pathyā́ kā́ sám eti*), a question followed by the statement that only the lower seats of the gods are visible. Here *purāṇám* in pāda a can qualify 'path' -- not the fem. *pathyā́* in 5b but the more familiar masc. *pánthā-*, qualified as *purāṇá-* in IV.18.1 (cf. also *purāṇám ókaḥ* 'ancient home' in nearby III.58.6, referring to the Aśvins' dwelling, presumably also heaven). The gods are themselves on a separate path (*pathí vyùte* d) in the same place, at least by my interpr. Despite their different representations in the (written) Saṃhitā text and in the Pp., *vyùta-* here and *víyuta-* in 7a must be the same form, ppl. to *ví √yu*; in recitation they would be identical. The verb *unoti* to the supposed root *√u* to which *vyùta-* is sometimes referred (see, e.g., Ge n. 9d) is actually also a form of *√yu*, in the sequence *vyùnoti* in V.31.1, also meaning 'separates'. Cf. EWA II.503.

III.54.10: This vs. forms a sort of ring with vs. 1, enclosing the Heaven and Earth hymnlet of vss. 2–9. Like vs. 1 it begins with *imám* followed by a word for hymn (1a *imám ... śūṣám*, 10a *imáṃ stómam*), and with 1cd it contains a verb form of *√śru* 'hear' with god(s) as subject (10b).

On *ṛdūdára-* see EWA s.v. *ARD*, though he is somewhat cagey about its formation. I assume the 2nd member is *udára-* 'belly', with the literal sense 'moist-bellied' being equivalent to our 'tender-hearted'. This assumes a bahuvrīhi with an adjectival first member of the form *ṛdu-*, a shape (disyllabic adj. ending in *-i-* or *-u-*) that often triggers (or is at least associated with) 2nd member accent in bahuvrīhis (see AiG II.1.296ff.).

III.54.11: The first hemistich is either a syntactic fragment -- a long NP in the nominative establishing the topic -- or *pátyamānaḥ* is a predicated pres. part. (The publ. tr. takes it as the former.)

In c *ca* appears to be subordinating, given the accent on the verb *áśreḥ*. I would now be inclined to delete the "and" in the publ. tr. and remove the parens. from "when."

III.54.14: I am not entirely certain why "victorious Bhaga" is brought in here in a simile in this Viṣṇu vs. I suppose that our praises are making a triumphal procession to Viṣṇu, and the mention of Bhaga may suggest our hope that these praises will be met with a satisfactory portion of goods in return. See 21c below.

In cd it is tempting (see, e.g., Old) to make *mardhanti* the verb of the rel. cl. beginning with *yásya*, which otherwise lacks a verb and appears truncated. But *mardhanti* is stubbornly unaccented. Construing *yásya pūrvīḥ* as a relativized expression of possession, we can assume that it asserts that Viṣṇu has a large female entourage; these females are further characterized in the independent clause in d as "genetrices" (*jánitrīḥ*), for which "mothers-to-be" seemed a more acceptable English rendering, who attend on him and do not neglect him. What this is all about escapes me, though Viṣṇu is associated with the wives of the gods in I.156.2.

III.54.15: The standard tr. construe the instr. *víśvair vīryaiḥ* as the object of *pátyamānaḥ* ("being master of all *vīryá-*), but when *pátya-* takes an object, it is in the acc., including once in this hymn: 8c *patyate víśvam*. In the only other passage in which Gr identifies the verb stem as taking an instr., VI.13.4, I take the instr. as here, as expressing the means by which the subject displays his mastery.

III.54.16: The first half-vs. treats the kinship we share with the Aśvins, a theme occasionally touched on elsewhere (e.g., VIII.73.12 adduced by Ge). The grammatical problem in the hemistich is the (pseudo-)root noun cmpd. *bandhupṛ́ch-*, which has been interpr. both actively ("asking about [their] kinship": Gr, Ge [/WG], Lü 526, Scar 328–29) and passively ("asked about [their] kinship": Re). I have followed the Re path, on the assumption that it is more likely that humans are asking the Aśvins about it than that the Aśvins are wondering about it themselves. But in general I prefer root noun compounds to have active meaning, and it is possible that the majority position is the correct one. It does not seem to have too much effect on the interpr. of the rest. Another hapax cmpd, with the same elements in opposite order, is found in this maṇḍala: III.20.3 *pṛṣṭa-bandhu-* (voc., not accented) 'whose kinship is asked about'. Names are also at issue in that passage.

III.54.17: There is phraseological connection between the first pāda of this vs. and the previous vs.: *cā́ru nā́ma* "dear name" repeats verbatim the end of 16b, and though they are etymologically unrelated, *kavayaḥ* in 17a echoes *ákavaiḥ* in 16d.

The first half of the verse most likely refers to the Ṛbhus, though they are not named until c. The "dear name" of these unnamed subjects is probably "gods," the predicative voc. *devā(ḥ)* in b. The Ṛbhus were not originally divine, but achieved the status of gods because of their wondrous acts in the sacrifice. So to be addressed as "gods" by Indra is precious to them indeed.

The second half-vs. consists of a pāda (c) with a sg. nom. (*sákhā*) referring to Indra, accompanied by a pl. instr. (*ṛbhúbhiḥ*) and no verb, followed by one (d) with a 2nd pl. impv. (*takṣatā*). It is tempting to construe the two pādas together, with a mixture of constructions: the sg. nom. + instr. serving as the equivalent of a pl. subj. to the verb in d, but I have kept strictly to the grammar, as do the standard tr.

III.54.18: Ge (/WG) takes pl. *yajñíyāsaḥ* as predicated of *aryamā́ ... áditiḥ* with pāda a simply a nominal clause; this is strictly impossible, since the predicate adj. should be dual. Ge explains the plural on the grounds that the poet is thinking of the other Ādityas. Similarly, Th (M+A 13) reads *aryamāṇaḥ* (for Pp. *aryamā́ naḥ*), with a plural referring to "Aryaman and the other Ādityas." Some version of this is possible, but I prefer to take *yajñíyāsaḥ* as a third term referring to an unspecified set of other gods (quite possibly the rest of the Ādityas), and all three terms as the subj. of pl. *yuyóta* in c. (So also Re.) The *naḥ* in pāda a then simply anticipates the same form in c, and b is parenthetical.

III.54.19–20: The call to the gods to hear us, found first in vs. 1, returns here at almost the end of the hymn (19c, 20a, 20c). Note that in 19c the verb is sg. (*śṛṇótu*) with a series of sg. subjects (and one pl., *ā́paḥ*, in the middle), while in 20a it is pl. (*śṛṇvantu*) with a grammatically pl. subj. In 20c a sg. nom. with an instr. pl. of accompaniment (rather like the construction I suggested in 17c) takes a sg. verb, which suggests that my suggestion for 17c is incorrect.

III.54.19: On the secondary thematic stem *ánāga-* beside derivationally correct *ánāgas-* see comm. ad VII.60.1.

III.54.21: The standard tr. take *bhágaḥ* as the subj. of *mṛdhyā(ḥ)* in c; e.g., Ge "Bhaga [das Glück] möge in meiner Freundschaft nicht fehlen, o Agni." With such a 3rd ps. subj., this requires *mṛdhyāḥ* to be a precative (Re calls it a "pseudo-précatif" for some reason) rather than a straight 2nd sg. opt. This is, of course, not impossible. But the desire expressed here, that Agni make sure that Bhaga does the right thing, does not seem the usual type of prayer addressed to gods in the RV. I take pāda c as consisting of two clauses, the first nominal, the 2nd, addressed to Agni, consisting only of a negative and a verb (cf. for this construction with this verb, *ná mardhanti* in 14d above), with Agni the subj. I take *bhágaḥ* as a common noun in the publ. tr.; alternatively it might mean "(May) Bhaga (be) in partnership with me."

The final word of the vs., the gen. *purukṣóḥ* 'consisting in much livestock', is a bahuvrīhi variant of the phrase *bhū́ri paśváḥ* 'abundance of livestock', likewise ending its vs. in 15d.

III.54.22: Old is disturbed by *tā́m̐* in c and suggests emending *pṛtsú tā́m̐* to *pṛtsutā́*, loc. sg. of *pṛtsutí-*. Because of the peculiar mid-pāda position of *tā́n*, I favor this suggestion though it requires erasing one accent.

III.55 All Gods

As noted in the published introduction, this hymn is notable for its refrain, "great is the one and only lordship of the gods" (*mahád devā́nām asuratvám ékam*), with its juxtaposition of *devá-* and *ásura-*. For a riff on this refrain, see X.55.4.

III.55.1: The perfect in b, *ví jajñe*, is entirely ambiguous between √*jan* and √*jñā*, and I think it likely that both are meant. In this context there is not too much difference between a syllable being born and being discerned. The "track of the cow" is presumably here the ritual ground, and the reference is to the ritual speech of the dawn sacrifice.

Re astutely notes the juxtaposition of *akṣára-* and *padá-*, reinforcing the speech theme, even though *padá-* has the sense of 'track, footprint' here. See *padá-* in the next vs. (2b) for a possible reference to speech.

The standard tr. all supply a first-person subject in c, with a verb like "I proclaim." No one but Old attempts to justify this addition, and his attempt is half-hearted. I instead take c as continuing b and take the underlying form of *prabhū́ṣan* to be *prabhū́ṣat*, neut. nom./acc. sg., before a following nasal, against the Pp. The participle modifies *akṣáram* in b. In my interpr. the "syllable" (that is, the essence of speech) attends to the gods' commandments, perhaps by giving them imperishable verbal form. I also suggest that the "great syllable" is actually the refrain found in d; note that *mahát* in b takes the same position as it does in the refrain. The refrain may also be the most important of the gods' vratas; see also 6c.

I now have some reservations about the interpretation of *akṣára-* as 'syllable' here. As is well known, in the RV this stem does not always denote the syllable; the clearest such usages are the four occurrences of the stem in the late Riddle Hymn I.164. Although it *can* mean that here as well (and much has been built on this interpretation by those who backproject later Vedic preoccupations with mystical syllables into the RV), in this passage it could merely be "an imperishable [entity]," perhaps referring to Agni, whose birth is treated in the next verses (2–7). In fact, under this interpretation the ambiguity of the gender of *prabhū́ṣan* in 1c might be deliberate -- either a neut. *in -at* modifying *akṣáram* directly or a masc. in *-an* reflecting an unsignaled transition to the divine gendered from of Agni. I would now slightly alter the tr. of the first hemistich to "a great imperishable (syllable / entity)."

III.55.2: For *juhuranta* see comm. ad I.43.8; I take the form to √*hvṛ* 'go crookedly', not √*hṛ* 'anger, be angry'. The point here is that the gods and the ancestors, who themselves know the path/word, should not keep us from following this same ritual cursus. There is no question of anger that I can see.

The standard interpr., that c refers to the beacon of the kindled ritual fire visible between heaven and earth, is surely correct. This kindled fire is referred to more straightforwardly in the next vs., 3c *sámiddhe agnaú*.

III.55.3: The flying, scattered desires of the poet here and his (re)turn, in a ritual context, to the old ways of doing things reminds us of the opening of III.38, a hymn about the development of a poetic vocation within the age-old tradition, esp. III.38.1cd. In this connection it's worth noting that our refrain, *mahád devā́nām asuratvám ékam*, finds an echo in III.38.4c *mahát tád vṛ́ṣṇo ásurasya nā́ma* "Great is that name of the bull, the lord." Ge also appositely adduces VI.9.6, also about a poet's training and his self-

conscious assumption of the mantle of tradition, with his inspiration deriving from the ritual fire.

The *ṛtá-* that we wish to speak may again be the refrain that follows immediately.

III.55.4: The *ví ... purutrā́* of the preceding vs. (3a) returns here, though with the preverb bound to a ppl. (*víbhṛtaḥ*); the phrase is contrasted with *samāná-* to express the theme of unity and diversity in balance. The "common king" is of course Agni, and the image is both of this single god being found on many different ritual grounds and of the ritual fire on any particular ritual ground being divided into three.

With Ge, I assume that the pair in c is the kindling sticks. Cf. III.31.2d and X.27.14b, esp. *tasthaú mātā́* "the mother stands still," comparable to our *kṣéti mātā́* "the mother rests peacefully." The epithet 'having two mothers' (*dvimātár-*) used of Agni in 6a and 7a is a reference to the paired kindling sticks.

III.55.5: As is generally acknowledged, the feminine plurals in the first hemistich refer to plants; the idea is the common paradox that fire is covertly present in all plants because overt fire is produced from wood. Here the three types of plants must be 1) 'older' (*pū́rvā-*) = woody and easily burned, 2) 'later' (*áparā-*) = still green and obviously growing and fire grows up with them, 3) tender (*táruṇī-*) = sprouting ones, which are hard to burn, but he's in them already anyway. Most tr. take *sadyáḥ* with Agni, not the new-born plants -- e.g., Re "est d'un coup au dedans des (plantes) nouvelle(-ment) nées" -- but *sadyáḥ* is strongly associated with forms of √*jan*, esp. in III (e.g., III.5.8 *sadyó jātáḥ*; sim. III.32.9, 10; 48.1), in the sense of "just born."

The covert presence of fire is the topic of the paradox in c: he is always within the plants (*antárvatīḥ*), which are therefore pregnant in some sense, even though they have not been impregnated (*ápravītāḥ*) sexually. See X.91.6 for a similar passage, though it lacks the paradox found here.

III.55.6: There seems to be a consensus that the phrase *śayúḥ parástāt* in pāda a refers to a form of Agni in the other world, that is, to the sun in some manifestation (see esp. Ge n. 6ab). This seems to me entirely unnecessary and a cosmic intrusion in a sustained description that is otherwise entirely focused on the ritual fire (vss. 1–9). Instead the hemistich seems to contrast the fire that was immanent and motionless (*śayúḥ*) in the plants, as described in vs. 5, released after birth and roaming restlessly, as a newly kindled fire does. The depiction of his resting place as 'far away' (*parástāt*) may seem exaggerated if only plants are involved, but conceptually, and to a certain extent physically (since the kindling wood has to have been gathered from somewhere), it seems to me appropriate.

We should also factor in the possible interpr. of *śayú-* as 'fatherless'; see disc. ad IV.18.12. I consider the word a pun here; on the one hand the fire resting in the plants (as above), on the other, the fatherless fire who yet has two mothers. I would now alter the tr. to "He who was lying down far away / fatherless -- now he who has two mothers ..." For a similarly phrased passage see I.31.2.

III.55.7: Pāda b is an elaboration on and corrective of 6b. It is not the whole fire that wanders untethered, only the top of it (*ágram*), while the base stays put on the hearth.

Most tr. take *ágram* as an acc. with *ánu* ; I follow Re (who in turn follows Bergaigne) in taking it as the neut. nom. subj.

The accent on *cárati* is contrastive with the immediately following *kṣéti*, which opens a new clause.

III.55.8: This verse contains quite oblique phraseology. The first half-verse appears to describe the increasingly aggressive ritual fire after it has been kindled. I take *āyát* as the neut. pres. part. to √*i* + *ā́* 'come', substantivized to mean 'approach, advent', and I supply a gen. 'of him', which is parallel to the gen. simile in pāda a. The growing fire is compared to a fighter involved in close combat. I have rendered *pratīcī́nam*, lit. 'turned outward, opposite, face to face', as the slangy 'right in your face' to convey the belligerent nearness of the fire's approach.

The c pāda is likewise hard to interpret. As Ge notes, the lexeme *antár* √*car* is generally used for the journey between earth and heaven undertaken by Agni, the messenger or "go-between" for the earthly and heavenly realms. This usage is found in fact in the very next vs., 9b, where Agni is clearly the subject and is journeying through the space between heaven and earth -- as well as in numerous other passages (see esp. X.4.2, as well as nearby III.58.1). As Ge also points out, in I.173.3 it is 'Speech' (*vā́k*) who plays this role. Similarly, in our passage 'thought' (*matí-*) -- i.e., as often, thought that has taken shape as ritual speech -- is the subject and undertakes the role of messenger. As for the tribute of the cow (*niṣṣídhaṃ góḥ*), with Ge I take this as referring to the bovine product that serves as oblation, namely ghee. Thus, ritual speech makes the swift journey to the gods in heaven from the ritual ground, bringing the news of the oblation or serving as its envoy. On *niṣṣídh-* see comm. ad III.51.5.

III.55.9: In pāda a the "gray messenger" is Agni, gray because of his ash; I take the fem. pl. *āsu* as referring to the plants (see vs. 5) that provide the fuel that feeds Agni's flames. The fire "bears down on them" (/ "keeps pursuing them"; *ní veveti*) as it spreads over the firewood. (A reference to his hearths is also possible, but I think less likely.)

In contrast to the earthly spread of the fire depicted in pāda a, b shows it rising towards heaven in its messenger role. I take *rocanéna* as an instr. of extent of space, rather than referring to Agni's own luminosity with the standard tr. However, taking it in the latter way would not appreciably alter the sense of the pāda.

The publ. tr. is somewhat misleading, in having 'bearing' for both *ní veveti* in a and *bíbhrat* in c, though of course English 'bear' has entirely different senses in the two idioms.

III.55.10: This verse continues the theme of vss. 8–9, Agni's role as go-between. Its point is to show us that Agni as messenger reaches to the highest places in heaven, those defined by the endpoint of Viṣṇu's famous striding. But the introduction of Viṣṇu also initiates the transition from the exclusive focus on Agni and his kindling.

Note the alliteration: *(go)pā́ḥ paramaṃ pāti pā́thaḥ, priyā́ ...*

III.55.11–15: These five verses are devoted to the pair Night and Dawn, and the section is demarcated by a formulaic syntactic ring: 11b/15b *táyor anyát ... anyát* "of these two, the one ..., the other," with appropriately oppositional terms filled in.

III.55.11: The *yád* in pāda c has no obvious function. JSK (I.136) interprets the pāda as containing an "X and which Y" construction ("the dusky one and [the one] who is ruddy"), with *yád* instead of *yā́* by attraction to the *anyád* of b. Although this is a tempting way to account for the *yád*, in addition to the wrong gender the rel. is wrongly positioned: we should expect **yád /yā́ ca áruṣī*. Ge's suggestion, that this contains the izafe-like [not Ge's term] *yád* that attaches appositives in Vedic prose, is attractive, but not only would this be a reverse example (the *yád* clause always follows in prose), but it would be entirely isolated in the Saṃhitā language. See my 2022 "Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto-izafe."

It's also worth noting that the structure of c is identical to 12a *mātā́ ca yátra duhitā́ ca dhenú́*, with two nom. singulars conjoined by double *ca*, a *yá*-subordinator between them, and a dual nom. at the end of the pāda referring jointly to the two singulars. So it is possible that the *yád* of 11c comes from the model of 12a, where *yátra* has function.

III.55.12: With Ge I interpret this fem. pairing to be Night and Dawn, who in the previous vs. were identified as sisters. They jointly nurse the infant fire at the early morning sacrifice; the reference is probably to twilight, the transition between Night and Dawn. Re prefers to identify them as Heaven and Earth, but this requires him to interpret Heaven as a female (which of course is not unheard of), and it also makes less ritual sense. On the other hand, the same fem. dual *samīcī́* is used in vs. 20 of Heaven and Earth.

III.55.13: The pāda-initial position of *anyásyā(ḥ)* strongly suggests that it is indefinite ('another', not 'the other'), contra the standard tr. Since definite *anyá- ... anyá-* ("the one ... the other") is correctly positioned in 11b, 15b, and 17ab, I think we should take the contrastive positioning seriously and connect this phraseology with 4c, which also contains initial *anyá-* (*anyā́ vatsám bhárati kṣéti mātā́* "Another bears the calf; the mother rests peacefully."). In that passage the "mother" of the fire, the lower kindling stick, rested, while the upper kindling stick, identified as "another," carried the infant fire. Here the situation is reversed: the *anyā́-* form refers to the mother of the calf/fire, which is now being licked by a different feminine entity -- in this case, in my opinion, the ghee oblation. A second pairing also imposes itself, however: in vs. 12 we had a different feminine duo: Night and Dawn. Their proximity in 12 invites an alternative reading of 13a, underscoring the temporal transition, with Night functioning as the mother of the fire, but Dawn taking over, tending it and bellowing over it. This latter interpr. seems to be continued in the next vs. (14ab).

I confess that I do not entirely understand the purport of pāda b (nor, as far as I can see, does anyone else). The hemistich is found identically also in X.27.14cd, though given the virtual impenetrability of that hymn, this doesn't help much. Contra Ge (/Gr, etc.), I do not think *bhū́-* here is 'world', nor that the instr. expression *káyā bhuvā́* means "in welcher Welt" (see Old for objection to this tr.). Instead I take *bhū́-* as 'form' or (with Old, etc.) 'existence-form', with the phrase meaning "in what shape or guise." I suspect that the pāda asks how the surrogate mother/cow, who took over from the fire's mother in pāda a, will deliver nourishment (symbolized by her udder) to the infant fire. The answer

may be given in pāda c: it is "the milk of truth" (*ṛtásya ... páyas*-), which we might further translate into "the milk of correct ritual speech."

III.55.14: Ge (/WG) takes *pádyā* as merely a locational 'unten', contrasting with *ūrdhvā́* at the beginning of the next pāda. It seems unlikely that a formation with so much lexical content would be used in so colorless a manner, esp. given the deployment of *padá*-forms elsewhere in the hymn (*padé iva níhite* beginning the next vs. [15a], *padé góḥ* 1b, *padajñā́ḥ* 2b). The "feet" of Dawn are presumably, in naturalistic terms, the light of dawn nearest to the horizon; shining through morning mists it will take on various shapes and colors. (Lü [617 n. 3] suggests that the various shapes and forms are vegetation on the earth, which is also worth considering.) But in mytho-ritual terms, if Dawn is the cow nurturing the young fire in 13b (as well as pāda b in this vs.), the "wondrous forms" (*vápūṃṣi*) she clothes herself in and the "many shapes" she possesses (*pururū́pā*) are the forms and colors of the fire over which she stands. That the scene is set on the ritual ground is suggested by pāda c, where "I" roam across "the seat of truth" (*ṛtásya sádma*), which I take as a reference to seat of the ritual. Ge (/WG), however, interpret the pāda as simply meaning "I wander 'im Geiste'" -- I *think* because of the *vidvā́n* 'knowing', though that word usually refers to knowledge of the ritual or to cosmic knowledge related to the religio-ritual system.

With Ge (/WG) I take *pururū́pā* as fem. nom. sg.; however, it can equally be neut. acc. pl. (with Gr and Re) modifying *vápūṃṣi*. The choice actually has almost no effect on the sense of the pāda.

III.55.14–15: The publ. tr. is somewhat misleading, in that *vápūṃṣi* in 14a is tr. as "wondrous forms" and *dasmé* in 15a as "the wondrous one." I might substitute "marvelous forms" for the first, to avoid the impression of an etymological connection.

III.55.15: This vs. seems to continue the theme of Night and Dawn. The *anyád ... anyád* construction of pāda b echoes that in 11b, where Night and Dawn were first introduced, and in fact our pāda b, with one hidden and one visible, paraphrases 11b, with one shining and the other black, and forms a small ring demarcating the Night+Dawn section.

Moreover, the two "set down within the wondrous one" echoes 12c *ṛtásya té sádasy īḷe antáḥ* "I reverently invoke the two within the seat of truth." I take *dasmá*- to refer to the ritual fire/ritual ground, and one of the marvels is that two such large entities (Night and Dawn) can fit into something so small.

The vs. also recycles various thematically significant lexical items: *padá*- (see comm. ad 14); *nihité* echoing *ní dadhe* (13b); *antár* (12c and passim: 2c, 5b, 5c, 8c, 9b, 12c; *antár* is in a sense the signature word of this hymn); *anyád ... anyád* 11b. The 'pathway' (*pathyā́*) takes us back to III.54.5 where a question about "the pathway leading to the gods" (*devā́m̐ áchā pathyā́*) initiated the mysteries that have dogged us ever since.

III.55.16: The miraculous milkers in this vs. are taken by all standard tr. as rain clouds, flg. one of Sāy.'s suggestions (the other being the heavenly regions). In context this interpr. seems perverse. The verse forms part of a tight little section (beginning with vs. 11) concerning Night and Dawn and their nourishing of the infant ritual fire. Our vs. esp. echoes vs. 12: *dhenávaḥ ... sabardúghāḥ ... ápradugdhāḥ* "milk-cows, sap-yielding, not

milked out" is the equivalent in the plural of 12ab *dhenū́*, *sabardúghe dhāpayete* "the two milk-cows, sap-yielding, give suck" in the dual. I find it highly unlikely that the vocabulary here repeated from 12 would refer to entirely different entities (clouds), which, moreover, have no connection with the dawn ritual depicted here. Instead, in the course of this section the joint nurturing activity of Night and Dawn (11–12) has given way to the dominance of Dawn over Night (13ab, 14ab), and though both Night and Dawn are present in vs. 15, one of them (Night) is hidden (15b). This trend accords with the natural phenomenon: at dawn, light dissipates darkness. In our vs. 16 the plural cows either represent the Dawns in general -- the plural of Dawn being often interchangeable with the singular -- or the beams of light, the "dawn cows," of a single Dawn. The expression "becoming new ever again" (pāda c *návyā-navyā yuvatáyo bhávantīḥ*) might favor the former possibility, since it reminds us of the daily parade of ever-new youthful Dawns. My identification of the cows with the dawns here admittedly leaves the noisiness ("let them be noisy," *ā́ ... dhunayantām*) unexplained. I would suggest either that there is also a reference to the crackling of the fire wood as the ritual fire is kindled at dawn, or that it refers to the general noise attendant on dawn as the various creatures awake, including real cows mooing to be milked. Note that already in vs. 13a Dawn (in my interpr.) "lows" (*mimāya*) over the infant fire. I think we can safely banish the putative rain clouds.

III.55.17: As indicated in the publ. intro. I consider this vs. to be transitional between the fire-kindling vss. and the arrival of Indra at the sacrifice. I therefore think that the reference is ambiguous. In the publ. intro. I suggested a trio of possible referents: Agni, Soma, and Indra. I now think it is only Agni and Indra and that Agni is the sole referent in ab, with transition from Agni to Indra in c.

This opinion is very different from the standard, which takes Parjanya as the subject here (flg. on the supposed rain cloud vs.). The issue is further complicated by the fact that in the next hymn (III.56.3) yet another being, possibly Tvaṣṭar or Tvaṣṭar's son, is described as *retodhā́ vṛṣabháḥ* "a bull, depositor of semen," which matches our *vṛṣabháḥ ... ní dadhāti rétaḥ*. Although I must concede that Parjanya is described with the same phrase as III.56.3 in VII.101.6 and is said to deposit semen also in V.83.1, such designations are not exclusive to Parjanya. In I.128.3 it is Agni who is ... *réto vṛṣabháḥ kánikradad, dádhad rétaḥ kánikradat* "a bull ever-roaring, depositing his semen' (with √*krand*, rather than √*ru*, 'roar'), and I think Agni is the referent here as well. I do not entirely understand the two herds of cows, but suggest that it may have to do with the embryonic doctrine of the cycle of waters that is later developed in the Upaniṣads, whereby rain falls from heaven and causes plants to grow; the plants, as fuel, produce/give birth to the fire, whose smoke goes to heaven and becomes clouds from which the rain falls, and the cycle begins again. Our passage may have an abbreviated form of this: the bull Agni is roaring (that is, crackling as fire) among one set of cows (plants as firewood); the smoke goes to heaven and the rain (his semen) falls to earth and produces plants (the other herd). Note vs. 5 much earlier in the hymn, where it is said of the plants "Having (him) within, (though) unimpregnated they give birth to (him)."

The transition from Agni to Indra occurs in pāda c, in my interpr. Both Agni and Indra can be called *kṣápāvant-* (/*kṣapā́vant-*) 'earth-protector', indeed simultaneously. (See X.29.1 and my "Śleṣa in the Rig Veda?" [Fs. Gerow], 163–64.) Indeed this epithet is

even more flexible: as I discussed in the Gerow Fs., the first element may be either *kṣá(m)* 'earth' or *kṣáp-* 'night'. (For the possible morphological analyses, see the loc. cit.) Under the latter analysis, the epithet would be appropriate only for Agni, but under the former to both Agni and Indra, so the first word in c may slip from clear reference to Agni to double reference. The following two words, *bhága-* and *rājan-*, are also used in the RV of both Agni and Indra, though 'king' is more common for Indra than Agni. The transition is complete.

III.55.18: In my interpr. this vs. announces the arrival of Indra with a splendid team of horses. This new topic is signaled by *prá nú vocāma* beginning pāda b. The exact arrangement of the six and five isn't clear to me. Re suggests that the double *nú* indicates that there are two separate clauses here. He may be right ("now there is an abundance of horses of the hero; we will proclaim (it) now"), though the difference in sense is slight.

III.55.19–21: I'm not sure why Tvaṣṭar appears here. The previous vs., with the arrival of Indra at the sacrifice, may mark the end of the ritualistic vss. that dominated the hymn up till now. The few remaining vss. then celebrate the prosperity and abundance that our good relationship with the gods, via the sacrifice, will produce: teeming life provided by Tvaṣṭar (19), goods filling the two worlds provided by Indra (20), peace provided by Agni (21), and the inanimate earthly supports for all this prosperity, which provide their gifts to Indra (22).

III.55.19: It is striking that pāda a is reused in the famous Yama-Yamī dialogue hymn (X.10.5b), where Yamī claims that Tvaṣṭar made them a married couple in the womb. I do not think there is an echo of that story here; the point of intersection is simply the association of Tvaṣṭar with conception, pregnancy, and birth (cf., e.g., X.184).

Acdg. to the standard interpr. (Ge [/WG], Re; cf. Klein DGRV I.218, Kü 314), *prajā́ḥ* is to be construed with *pupóṣa*, on the basis of X.170.1 *prajā́ḥ pupoṣa purudhā́ ...* This is not impossible, but it seems unnecessary, esp. as the latter hymn is quite late. It also implies that *purudhā́* should also be construed with *pupóṣa*, but this is impossible because *jajāna* is unaccented. It is also unlikely that *prajā́ḥ* and *purudhā́* should be separated, given *purudhā́ prajā́vān* in the next hymn (III.56.3b). At best we can take *prajā́ḥ purudhā́* with both verbs: "thrives with regard to offspring in great quantity and has begotten them [=offspring in great quantity]" or perhaps "thrives with regard to offspring and has begotten them [=offspring] in great quantity." Such an interpr., with an acc. of respect and a fundamentally intransitive verb, follows that of Kü (314). I do not believe that *pupóṣa* here can have the transitive/causative sense that the other tr. ascribe to it (e.g., Re "a fait fleurir les créatures").

III.55.20: I assume that the subject of this vs. is Indra. One of his standard cosmogonic deeds involves the creation and separation of the two worlds ("the two great bowls" here), the separation here implied by the material crammed between them. Indra is of course commonly identified as a *vīrá-*; he also "finds goods" (e.g., II.13.11, VIII.61.5), though so do other gods as well as mortals.

III.55.21: The first three pādas here are almost identical to I.73.3abc, where Agni is definitely the referent. For disc. of some of the detail, see comm. there.

III.56 All Gods

I will not attempt to further identify the referents in these enigmatic vss. beyond the sketchy suggestions given in the publ. intr. Ample disc. can be found in the standard tr. As in many such mystical hymns, the grammar is mostly quite straightforward; it's the purport that remains cloaked in obscurity.

III.56.1: The standard tr. take b as obj. of *minanti* in a, which is certainly possible, while I take it as a separate nominal clause. The choice has no real implications.

In c I take *ródasī* as subj. of the infin. *ninámе* in d, along with *párvatā(ḥ)*, but the standard tr. (also Thieme, ZDMG 95: 90) supply a different infinitive in c, generated from *minanti* in a. So, e.g., Ge "Weder die Zauberkundigen noch die Weisen schmälern ... / Nicht sind Himmel und Erde ... (zu schmälern) ..." I do not see the need for supplying additional material. The only possible semantic arguments might be 1) that the two worlds would not be subject to being bowed down (but I don't see why), or 2) that *vedyā́-* wouldn't be capable of performing something physical (like bowing down) but only mental/moral (like transgressing), but such an action seems well within normal limits for the Vedic conceptual universe. Another possible way to construe pāda c is to take *ródasī* as another subject of *minanti*: "nor do the two worlds transgress the commandments." This has the merit of not supplying anything, but makes *vedyā́bhiḥ* harder to incorporate. Old suggests this possibility as well as supplying *ninámе*; he does not suggest supplying a different infinitive in c.

The word *vedyā́-* can be either positive or negative depending on context. Here it must be the latter; cf. also VII.21.5.

III.56.2: WG suggest that *átyā(ḥ)* is a hapax related to *ánta-* 'border, edge', *ántya-*, tr. 'Begrenzungen'. Since no other forms show such a putative zero-grade, since *ántya-* is not found in the RV, since the stem *átya-* is well attested, and since there is no metrical advantage to reducing an **antyā(ḥ)* here to *átyā(ḥ)*, this suggestion doesn't merit adopting. In a hymn of this nature, the females might as well be steeds as boundaries. For other attempts to reinterp. *átyā(ḥ)* see those rejected by Old and another given by Ge (n. 2c).

III.56.3: On the basis of *tváṣṭā ... viśvárūpaḥ* in the preceding hymn (III.55.19) I take the subj. here to be Tvaṣṭar. Since Tvaṣṭar has a large role in the shaping and begetting of offspring, the identification makes sense in this context.

As Ge (et al.) points out, the deriv. *pājasyà-* at the beginning of the Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Up. (ŚBM X.6.4.1) in the list of the body parts of the sacrificial horse seems to refer to the underbelly: *dyaúṣ pr̥ṣṭhám antárikṣam udáraṃ pr̥thivī́ pājasyàm díśaḥ pārśvé ...* "heaven its back, midspace its belly, earth the underbelly, directions its flanks ...," which accounts for the standard tr. here 'having three bellies'. However, here in this passage with polarized gender and a sexual tone, I think it should also contrast explicitly with *tryudhā́* (better **tryūdhā*; see Old, who explains the shortening on the basis of following *purudhá*) 'having three udders'. On a four-legged animal the underbelly would

be the part that sags behind the ribcage, where on a female paśu the udder would be. The corresponding male body part located there would be the groin, hence my tr. The image is the common one of the ur-creator as androgynous. See III.38.4–7, a deeply enigmatic hymn in this same maṇḍala, where the creator is also both a bull and *viśvárūpa-*.

In c I suggest that *patyate* may be ambiguous between 'be master' and 'be husband' (on the basis of *páti-*, which of course means both) because of the sexual activity in d.

III.56.4: I have no suggestions for the identity of the singular referent of pādas a, cd (though the waters call to mind Indra), nor for the reason of what seems the intrusive pāda b.

Here and sometimes elsewhere the loc. *abhīke* seems to have a temporal sense ("in an instant, in a flash") rather than a locational one ("in close quarters" vel sim.). See for this passage Ge's "im entscheidenden Augenblick", Re's "tout d'un coup." The semantic dev. isn't too hard to see: as quick as a collision.

III.56.5: On this vs. see Thieme, Untersuchung 43–44 and 47–48. He is responsible for the second interpr. of *vidátheṣu* in b. See also *vidátha-* in III.38.5–6, a passage already adduced above ad vs. 3, and comm. thereon: 'cosmic division' seems the most likely interpr. of the stem there.

The three watery maidens in c may be evaluated in conjunction with II.5.5, also with the three (apparently watery) women who nourish Apām Napāt in II.35.5, and perhaps with the three goddesses of the Āprī hymns (Sarasvatī, Idā, and Bharatī). Who they are here and what they are doing are unclear to me.

In d *pátyamānāḥ* 'acting the master' may be a sly joke, since it has females as its subj. and it was just used (3c) for the hyper-virile inseminator.

III.56.6: The emphasis on the day here is striking. Two different 'day' words get used: #*trír ā́ divaḥ ..., divé-dive ... trír no áhnaḥ*#, with the two parallel expressions polarized at the beg. and end of the hemistich. For another poss. passage with both words, cf. IX.86.19 and comm. thereon, where the possible semantic difference between the two words is explored.

III.56.7: Schaefer (196–97) nicely points out that the "intensive" (i.e., frequentative) *soṣavīti* is the verbal equivalent of the āmreḍitas in 6cd (see comm. above) with the simple verb *suva*.

I am not certain what to do with pāda b. The standard tr. take Mitra-Varuṇa as parallel subjects with those in c, with the main verb in d. This is certainly possible, but conceptually it seems a bit odd. Do Mitra and Varuṇa want things from other gods? would they beg for such a gift? Also Savitar is regularly *híraṇyapāṇi-* (as in III.54.11), so the *-pāṇi-* adj. here (*supāṇī́*) would associate M+V with him.

III.57 All Gods

III.57.1: The plural agent noun *panitā́raḥ* predicated of just two gods, Indra and Agni, assumes other gods are covertly present; cf. III.54.9 in the same VD series, with *devā́saḥ ... panitā́raḥ*, after which the expression here may be modeled.

III.57.2: The standard tr. all take Indra and Pūṣan in pāda a as the subj. of *duduhre* in b and as modified by *prītā́ḥ* in that pāda. There are several difficulties with this interpr. First, pāda a has entirely dual reference: the two divine names *índraḥ* and *pūṣā́*, followed by two dual descriptors, *vṛ́ṣaṇā suhástā*, but both the adj. *prītā́ḥ* and the pf. *duduhre* in b are plural. Although Old suggests that this dual/plural disharmony is similar to (and therefore presumably no more problematic than) the pl. *panitā́raḥ* in 1d, I think the cases are different: Indra and Agni have no dual descriptors in 1d and there is a plausible source nearby for the pl. *panitā́raḥ*.

Moreover, in 2ab Old and Ge (/WG) take Indra and Pūṣan as agentive milk*ers*, supplying what produces the milk (namely in this case the udder) as the object of *duduhre*. But medial forms of √*duh* ordinarily take the milk-producer (cow or, by synecdoche here, the supplied udder) as subject; if there is an object it is the milk, either actual or metaphorical. This is exactly the use of the med. 3rd sg. pf. *duduhe* (that is, the identical form to *duduhre* save for number) in 1c. It seems highly unlikely that these two nearly superimposable forms would be used with entirely different syntax/semantics in near adjacency. The construction that would be reflected by the tr. of Old et al. is generally found in the active; cf., e.g., I.64.5 *duhánti ū́dhaḥ* "(The Maruts) milk the udder." (Re bypasses the syntacto-semantic difficult by taking Indra and Pūṣan as the milk-producers -- "Indra donc, Pūṣan ... ont donné un lait inépuisable" -- but the number disagreement remains.)

To avoid these two problems, I propose taking 2a as a variant pairing continuing 1d -- Indra and Pūṣan are often found together, as are Indra and Agni, and could equally admire the cow. In fact, if 2a continues 1d, the pl. *panitā́raḥ* could be accounted for by the addition of Pūṣan in 2a. (Alternatively 2a can be a nominal clause with *suhástā* as predicate: "Indra and Pūṣan, the two bulls, have dexterous hands" or sim.) I then take 2b as a separate clause, with *prītā́ḥ* a fem. nom. pl. referring to cows, who are "pleased" because they are well-treated and produce milk accordingly; they are the subj. of *duduhre*, and *śaśayám* refers to the milk they produce. In this interpr. the unnamed cows in b stand for the inspired thoughts, the poems, of "me" -- the poet who called his *maniṣā́-* a milk-cow (*dhenú-*) in 1ab. The productive result of these poems in the sacrificial exchange, their "milk," is compared to the "(milk) of heaven," namely, rain. This theme is further developed in cd: when/if the gods take pleasure in her, i.e., the poet's inspired thought offered at the sacrifice, he hopes to get the reciprocal benefit of the gods' benevolence. (Note the echo of *asyām* in c and *aśyām* in d, though unfortunately they are in different metrical positions.)

It might be objected that the cow in vss. 1–2 is otherwise singular (*dhenúm* 1b, *yā́ duduhe* 1c, *asyā́ḥ* 1d, *asyām* 2c), but the feminine plural dominates vs. 3 (*jāmáyaḥ* 3a, *dhenávaḥ* 3c), and this may simply anticipate the number shift.

III.57.3: Ge takes *śaktím* as an infinitive, governing a dat. *vṛ́ṣṇe* (flg. the Pp.): "... dem Bullen einen Dienst zu leisten wünschen." This somewhat wayward interpr. is not followed by the other standard tr., where *śaktí-* receives its usual abstract sense -- though

WG do preserve the dativa l interpr. of the ambig. Saṃhitā *vṛ́ṣna* (“die dem Stier das Kraftvermögen wünschen”). The more natural interpr. is Re’s, with underlying gen. *vṛ́ṣṇaḥ*: “qui recherchent la force-active du taureau,” and my tr. reflects that.

As Ge suggests, the “sisters” in ab are the fingers of the officiant that produced the ritual fire with the kindling sticks; the cows in cd may be the ghee-oblations or (supported by vss. 1–2) the hymns accompanying the production of the fire, or both.

III.57.4: The first hemistich faintly echoes 1a, with *manīṣā́* (4b) corresponding to *manīṣā́m* and *vivakmi* (4a) reminiscent of *vivikvā́n*, though they belong to two different roots (√*vac* and √*vic* respectively).

Various referents have been proposed for the feminine pl. in cd: dawns (Old), tongues, flames (Ge), flame-tongues (WG). Though Re favors flames in his tr., his comment in his notes is more illuminating: “Type d’ellipse d’un nom fém. pl., notamment dans le cycle d’Agni; plusieurs possibilités concurrentes.” This remark seems esp. apt to this hymn, with its focus on feminine entities. Note also that *ūrdhvā́ bhavanti* is found in the next hymn, III.58.2, where the subjects are either ritual offerings or wise thoughts (or both).

III.57.5: The two descriptors of Agni’s tongue, *mádhumatī* ‘possessing honey’ and *sumedhā́(ḥ)* ‘very wise’, seem almost to clash in their juxtaposition, but they were probably chosen to reflect two different aspects of the tongue. On the one hand, Agni’s tongues of flame flare up when the libations are poured upon them; ‘honey’ presumably here refers to these libations (rather than to soma, despite the common identification of soma with honey; soma would put the flames out if poured on them). But *real* tongues, the kind that produce speech, can be qualified as ‘very wise’ because of that speech, and the crackling of the ritual fire often stands for ritual speech.

[III.58–60 JPB]

III.58 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

III.58.1: Although *pratná-* has a variety of referents in the RV including, often, Agni, supplying “semen” with it here is supported by a very similar phrase in this same maṇḍala: III.31.10 *páyaḥ pratnásya rétaso dúghānāḥ* “milking out the milk of the age-old semen”, as well as VIII.6.30 *ā́d ít pratnásya rétaso jyótiṣ paśyanti vāsarám* “just after that they see the dawning light of the age-old semen”; in addition, I.100.3 *rétaso dúghānāḥ* “milking out (the milk) of their semen” (see comm. ad locc.). For the possible referents of both the milk and the semen, see publ. intro.

One way or the other, the first three pādas with their unclear referents and actions, apparently all connected with the early morning, are setting the stage for the quite straightforward statement in pāda d.

III.58.2: The vs. is very difficult and lends itself to a range of unsatisfactory syntactic analyses. I’m afraid that I find quite unlikely the publ. tr.’s interpr. of ab, with a parenthetic *ūrdhvā́ bhavanti* breaking up a single clause that occupies the rest of the hemistich. (Even though this is one of the possibilities that Old entertains.) Although I’m

not, in principle or practice, against explanations via parenthetic interjections – I use this tactic from time to time – this one doesn't reward us with better sense. The interrupted clause especially – "... carry you two like parents back here" – contains a puzzling simile: why would the parents need carrying back? I am also disturbed by the position of *práti vām*, which by rights should begin a clause – putting it after the verb with which the words are supposedly construed, with the rest of the clause dribbling in towards the end of the next pāda, seem uncharacteristic of RVic syntax. Such an analysis should only be considered if it yields superior sense (which it does not). Ge's interpr. is slightly better, in that he takes a and b as separate clauses, and his deployment of the simile with the parents makes more sense. But he still takes *práti vām* with the preceding verb. I prefer to take *suyúg vahanti* as the minimalist 1st clause with unspecified subject (which may, in the end, be the *medhā́ḥ* at the end of the hemistich, but does not have to be) and unspecified object (but surely the Aśvins): "In good harness they convey (you two)." A new clause begins (as it should) with *práti vām*: "by truth the *medhā́ḥ* stand erect in response to you two, as if (in response to) their parents." The image is of dutiful children standing up to show respect. I don't quite know what to do with *ṛténa*, but it doesn't work very well in anyone's interpr. Here perhaps it indicates that the gesture of respect is made according to proper procedure, or else it could be a reference to the Kultlied (as Lü often interpr. *ṛtá-*, though in this case [p. 453] he thinks *ṛténa* should be construed with *suyúk-*.) In any event I think my new interpr. better accounts both for the syntax and the sense.

As for *médhāḥ*, see Old on whether this is the proper reading (to m. *médha-* 'ritual offering') or whether, per BR, it should be emended to **medhā́ḥ* (to f. *medhā́-* 'wisdom, wise thoughts' (as in I.88.3, which also has *ūrdhvá-*). In fact either (or both) will do: the ritual offerings become erect by being raised up by the flames and smoke after having been offered; the wise thoughts of the poet-ritualists respond to the presence of the Aśvins by standing at attention, as it were. For *ūrdhvā́ bhavanti* in a sacrificial context, see the immed. preceding hymn, III.57.4; note also that Agni's tongue [=flame] is described in that hymn as *sumedhā́* 'very wise' (III.57.5).

Pace Ge and JPB, I very much doubt that *asmát* should be construed with *járethām* as a pseudo-agent: "awaken because of us"; "von uns sollt ihr wachgerufen werden." Nor, with Old, do I think that *manīṣā́m* is the obj. of *járethām ... ví* in a construction meaning "wake away X" (i.e., cause X to go away by waking). What then to do with *manīṣā́m*? Perhaps JPB's interpr. will work – with *manīṣā́m* the first object of *cakṛma*, here construed with *ví*, meaning 'put aside, make go away'. In that case I would only alter his tr. by incorporating *asmát*: "Awake! We have put the inspired thought of the miser away from (*cakṛma* + *ví*) us; we have brought here (*cakṛma* + *ā́*) your help." However, the Ge (/WG) solution of supplying a verb with *ví* – "drive" or sim. – is also possible, though to my eyes less neat.

I am somewhat disturbed that a *manīṣā́-* would be credited to a *paṇí-*, since *manīṣā́-* is ordinarily a very positively presented thought, but I don't see any way out of that.

III.58.3: The stem *ávarti-* is found 4x in the RV, 3 of them in this same syntagm, I.118.3=III.58.3 *práty ávartiṃ gámiṣṭhā*, V.76.2 *ā́gamiṣṭhā práty ávartim*, always of the Aśvins. The fourth is found in the famous hymn about Indra's birth, IV.18, in its final vs. 13, where Indra says of himself *ávartyā śúna āṇṭrā́ṇi pece* "because of need I cooked the

entrails of a dog." This brief expression of *āpad* dharma supports the usual interpr. of *ávarti-* as 'need, want, distress' rather than JPB's 'trouble'. I would slightly emend the tr. to "you are the first to come in response to need."

III.58.4: The parenthetical remark in b is an implicit explanation of the impvs. in pāda a, with their insistent *ā́* 'here': everyone everywhere is summoning the Aśvins, but they should think about and come only to us.

It's not clear to me why the priests giving honey are compared to allies (*mitrā́so ná*). Note that the next hymn, III.59, is dedicated to Mitra.

III.58.5: This vs., esp. abc, is very like V.74.8 (q.v.).

III.58.6: "Your home is old" sounds more like criticism than praise; I would slightly emend the tr. of pāda a to "Ancient is your home, benevolent your companionship."

III.58.7: The caesura most likely breaks at the compound seam of *tiró-ahn^{i}yam*.

III.58.8: The root-noun compd *madhu-ṣút-* (3x, one a rep.) has the expected act. sense 'honey-pressing' and modifies the pressing stone, but this splv. *madhu-ṣút-tama-*, modifying soma, appears to have passive value, "best of the honeyed pressings," per JPB. See Scar 615.

Note the fairly unusual syncopated syntax, with pāda a continuing through the first word of b, *sómaḥ*, followed by an abrupt clause break and initial *tám* picking up *sómaḥ* in a different case. The clause break does not coincide with a metrical break.

On *kárikrat* with sg. obj. that is modified by implicitly pl. *bhū́ri* see Schaef 105.

III.59 Mitra [SJ on JPB]

As indicated in the publ. intro., this is the only hymn in the RV dedicated solely to Mitra. The hymn is divided into two by meter: vss. 1–5 Triṣṭubh, 6–9 Gāyatrī. The ring composition between vss. 1 and 5 (see below) also supports the view that these were originally separate hymns.

III.59.2–3: Note the presence of *vratá-* in these two vss., despite the standing association of *vratá-* with the absent Varuṇa, usually Mitra's constant and overshadowing companion. It seems likely that *vratá-* in these vss. is meant to evoke him. In fact, since *ādityá-* is found in both the pādas that contain *vratá-*, in the second (3c) construed with it (*ādityásya vratám*), it is possible that Varuṇa is indeed there, since singular *ādityá-* usually refers to Varuṇa (see Gr 1) s.v. *ādityá-*).

III.59.2: The juxtaposition of *mitrá márto* is surely meant as phonetic play; see comm. in 3b immed. below. The beginning and ending of the pāda, *prá ... práyasvān*, reinforces the figure.

Apropos of *vratá-* mentioned just above, it is not clear whose *vratá-* is meant: Thieme (1957: 44) takes it as the subject's ('by [keeping his] vow"), with *te* a dat. of benefit with *śikṣati* ("exerts himself for thee"), while JPB takes it as Mitra's ("strives

according to your commandment"). The word order is not decisive, since *te* can just be in Wackernagel's position.

III.59.3: The 1st member of *mitá-jñu-* of course echoes *mitrá-*. What stance this cmpd refers to is disputed, though it is unlikely to refer to prayer; see, e.g., Th (M+A 48), who adduces the English expression "weak-kneed." I think it likely that it refers to a warrior's steadfast posture. AS points out that in Homer when warriors die their knees loosen; on the knee as "the joint of bravery," see H. Monsacré, "The Tears of Achilles," III.5 https://chs.harvard.edu/chapter/iii-5-the-weeping-body-of-achilles/ "Similarities in methods of intervention."

III.59.4: Thieme (M+A 49–50) argues that in this vs. Mitra is identified with the ritual fire, signaled in part by the initial *ayám*. Whether or not this identification is correct, the annunciatory *ayám* should be rendered. I'd slightly emend to "This Mitra here, worthy of reverence ... has been born ..."

The second half of this vs. seems like a not-very-skillful recasting of 3d:

3d *vayám mitrásya sumataú syāma*
4cd *tásya vayáṃ sumataú ... saumanasé syāma*

Since 4cd is also a repeated hemistich (III.1.21, VI.47,13, X.131.7), it should also be harmonized with them.

III.59.5: There's a lot of 4 in 5 as well:

4a *namasyàḥ suśévaḥ*
5a *námasopasádyaḥ ... suśévaḥ*

This vs. ends the Triṣṭubh portion of the hymn and shows ring comp. with vs. 1:

1a *jánān yātayati* 5b *yātayáj-janaḥ*
1d: *mitrā́ya havyáṃ ghṛtávaj juhota* / 5d *agnaú mitrā́ya havír ā́ juhota*.

III.59.6: *carṣaṇī-dhṛ́t-*: *carṣaṇí-*, like *kṛ́ṣṭi-*, is derived from √*kṛṣ* 'plough' (on which see Th, KZ 81 [1967] [= KlSch 247–58]). A kind of slant rhyme of the cmpd here is found in vs. 1bc, where the etymological and semantic sibling of *carṣaṇí-*, *kṛṣṭī́ḥ*, is found in 1c as obj. of *abhí caṣṭe* and a form of the root √*dhṛ*, *dādhāra*, is found in 1b with a different object.

On *sānasí-* as a metathesis of a redupl. *i*-stem **sāsani-* see EWA s.v. (= I.723), like *sāsahí-*.

III.59.7–8: The verb *abhí ... babhū́va*, which is the scaffold of vs. 7, returns as the nominalized first cmpd member *abhíṣṭi-*, though built to *abhí* √*as*, not √*bhū*. This connection should have been signaled: I'd alter vs. 7 to "who dominates heaven ..."

III.59.8: The intransitive phrase (*pañca*) *yemire jánāḥ* recalls trans. *jánān yātayati* (1a) and *yātayáj-jana-* (5b), with the pf. *yemire* reminiscent of *yetire*.

III.59.9: Note that *vratá-* is once again associated with Mitra.

III.60 Ṛbhus [SJ on JPB]

On the various deeds of the Ṛbhus, detailed esp. in vs. 2, see Brereton "Gods' Work: The Ṛbhus in the *Ṛgveda*." In *Indologica: T. Ya. Elizarenkova Memorial Volume*, Book II, ed. L. Kulikov (2012). Pp. 111–34.

III.60.1: The publ. tr. fails to tr. *vaḥ* in pāda a, and its absence makes the tr. harder to interpr. As the publ. intro. says of this hemistich, "the present priests [= *uśíjaḥ* sj] have recovered the skills of the Ṛbhus ...," but a too hasty reading of the publ. tr. gives the impression that the Ṛbhus are being identified with the Uśij-priests. To make it clearer, I would alter the tr. to "these things of yours."

The neut. pl. *tā́ni* is a neutralized placeholder for the various skills, expressed in relative clauses with abstract nouns of different genders and numbers, set out in the next verse and a half: 1c *yā́bhir māyā́bhiḥ*, 2a *yā́bhiḥ śácībhiḥ*, 2b *yáyā dhiyā́*, 2c *yéna ... mánasā* -- all summed up by *téna* beginning 2d.

Maṇḍala III contains a surprisingly large proportion of the occurrences of *uśíj-*: about a third, 9 of the 29 (not counting two repeated pādas); no other maṇḍala comes close. Most of the occurrences are sg. and refer to Agni, though some refer to legendary priests of one sort or another, as here.

The instr. *védasā* must mean 'through knowledge' here, against the standard sense of the homonymous *s*-stem 'property, possessions'; this is the only passage in the RV that imposes 'knowledge'. (On VIII.87.2, so interpr. by Gr. and Ge., see comm. ad loc.) Given its isolation, it is likely that an *s*-stem *védas-* 'knowledge' was created here to match *mánasā* in the 1st pāda. Although it is generally thought that the cmpds *viśvá-vedas-* and *jātá-vedas-* provide support for a simplex *védas-* 'knowledge', it is likely that the 2nd cmpd member in both forms actually belongs with 'possession, property'. See comm. ad I.44.7.

The bahuvrīhi *prátijūtivarpas-* is opaque; it is not even clear whether its internal structure is *prátijūti-varpas-* or *práti-jūtivarpas-*. The former is the view of those who make their analysis explicit (Gr, Scar 177), but the lack of a noun **prátijūti-* or of a lexeme *práti √jū* as well as the existence of a bahuvrīhi *práti-rūpa-* 'having a form corresponding (to every form)' (VI.47.18), with *-rūpa-* a semantic match to *-varpas-*, at least complicates the matter. Before going further, we should consider whether the *-varpas-* attributed to the Ṛbhus is inherently singular or plural (either being possible in the bv). The publ. tr. opts for singular: "... a (different) form," suggesting in the publ. intro. that this refers to their new divine form. The other standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) instead interpr. it as inherently plural: a new form for every occasion (signaled by the *práti*). Because of the *práti*, which JPB's tr. "rapidly adopting a (different) form" fails to render, I think the shape-shifting, inherently plural, interpr. has to be correct, despite the appeal of taking it to refer to the change from human to divine form. Whatever piece of Ṛbhu mythology this refers to, I would render the compd as "having/acquiring a (different) form in response to (every) spur," essentially identical to the standard tr. cited above—e.g., Re's very full "(assumant) une forme-changée à chaque incitation (nouvelle)." As for the structure of the cmpd, the first analysis, *prátijūti-varpas-*, is the correct one – however, with *práti-* not as a preverb with *√jū*, but in the function it has in *práti-rūpa-* cited above.

The pl. *māyā́bhiḥ* is misleadingly rendered as sg. 'craft' in the publ. tr. I also think that this instr. has a closer relationship to the cmpd. just discussed than is conveyed by

the publ. tr. In some of its usages in the RV *māyā́-* comes close to its later sense 'illusion'; see, e.g., nearby III.53.8, concerning the various forms Indra assumes, and comm. thereon; sim. VI.47.18. Here the apparent shape-shifting of the Ṛbhus may be enabled by their *māyā́*-s, which I would render here by 'powers of illusion' – reconfiguring the 2nd hemistich as "with which powers of illusion, acquiring a (different) form at (every) spur, you attained ..."

I would tr. both verbs in this vs., *jagmur abhí* and *ānaśá*, as simple preterites: "they arrived at," "you attained," since they both, esp. *ānaśá*, refer to the mythological past. In particular, after the recital of the Ṛbhu's deeds in vs. 2, the summary ends with *sám ānaśa*, the same verb that ends vs. 1 (and see *sám ānaśur* in 3a) – but rendered differently in the publ. tr.

III.60.2: Since *śácībhiḥ* is pl., it would be better rendered by 'abilities', and I'd prefer "with" to "by" (also in pādas b and c).

As disc. ad I.161.7, I do not think that flowing milk is involved here. I would substitute "... you brought a cow "flowing" out from a hide."

III.60.3: I would supply *índrasya sakhyám* of pāda a also as the goal of *dadhanvire* in b: "they raced (for it)."

III.60.5: Although Ge and WG supply "your" [=Indra] with *gábhastyoḥ*, in fact in the passages cited by Ge (n. 5b) where *gábhastyoḥ* is associated with soma preparation, the hands belong to the priests. With Re (implicitly) and the publ. tr. I would, however, slightly rearrange the tr. to "sprinkled soma, pressed in the hands (of the priests)."

III.60.6: The instr. *śácyā* is somewhat puzzling, if, as in the publ. tr., it means "along with your [=Indra's] ability," which presents "ability" almost as a fellow drinker. Even if it is an instr. of means (simply "with/by your ability"), not accompaniment, it's odd: no one doubts Indra's ability to drink soma, an action that requires no special skill (save for the prodigious amounts he can consume). A possible solution is provided by the association of the instrumentals of this stem with the Ṛbhus. In this very hymn, in 2a, they carved the cups "by their ability (/ies)": *śácībhiḥ*, and in the Ṛbhu hymn IV.35, the first three pādas of verse 5, each one detailing a different feat of the Ṛbhus, all begin with *śácyā* "by (your=Ṛbhus') ability/skill." Although *śácī-* is of course more often associated with Indra, in this localized context the association with the Ṛbhus would come to the fore, and I suggest that this instr. refers to them: either as a functional equivalent of the *-m/vánt-* stems in pāda a: *ṛbhumā́n vā́javān* "along with the Ṛbhus bringing the Prize of Victory [=Vāja]" and therefore an instr. of accompaniment "along with their ability / skill," or as the means by which the Ṛbhus accomplished the pressing, "by their ability/ skill."

The VP *yemire* + DAT is found in the immed. preceding hymn, III.59.8, where the five peoples "submit" to Mitra; cf. also VIII.12.28–30, IX.86.30, etc. I would prefer "submit" or "submit themselves" here as well. Since the idiom is generally *víśvā bhúvanāni yemire* "all the worlds submitted (to X)" (VIII.3.6, 12.28-30; IX.86.30; cf. X.56.5), I suggest that "pastures" is a metaphor for "worlds," rather than referring to the

soma rites, per JPB, sim. Ge, Re, HPS (*Vrata*, 91). The "five peoples" (*páñca ... jánāḥ*) in III.59.8 is a similar totalizing expression for the whole population of the world.

There are several different ways of construing pāda d, which has been much discussed. (In addition to the standard tr. and comm., see HPS *Vrata*, 91, JSK DGRV I.96–97.) Either *vratā́* is instr. sg. and parallel to *dhármabhiḥ* or it is nom. pl. The former view is represented in Ge's tr. (though in n. 6d he acknowledges the possibility of a nom. pl.), as well as by WG and JSK, while Old championed the latter view and is fld. by Re and HPS. However we interpr. *vratā́*, there is the independent question of the disposition of the genitives, *devā́nām mánuṣaś ca*. The two genitive can be dependent on different nouns: *devā́nām* on *vratā́*, *mánuṣaḥ* on *dhármabhiḥ*; the *ca* then conjoins those two complex NPs, appearing, appropriately, after the first word of the 2nd NP—but only if both head nouns are in the same case. Hence, with the publ. tr. "according to the commandment of the gods and the (ritual) foundations of Manu." Or the *ca* can conjoin only the two genitives ("of gods and Manu") and the resulting phrase can depend either on *vratā́* or on *dhā́rmabhiḥ*. For the former see Re, for the latter HPS. Thus there are several possible deployments:

[*vratā́* (instr. sg.) *devā́nām*] AND [*dhármabhir* (instr.) *mánuṣaḥ*]

[*vratā́* (instr. sg. or nom. pl.) *devā́nām* AND *mánuṣaḥ*] [*dhármabhiḥ* (instr.)]

[*vratā́* (instr. sg. or nom. pl.)] [*dhármabhiḥ devā́nām* AND *mánuṣaḥ*]

And one impossible one (though favored by Old):

[*vratā́* (nom. pl.) *devā́nām*] AND [*dhármabhir* (instr.) *mánuṣaḥ*]

Impossible because *ca* should not conjoin two head nouns in separate cases with different syntactic functions in the clause. (Old notes the problem but is undisturbed.)

A nom. pl. interpr. of *vratā́* is tempting: the phrase *vratā́ devā́nām* with NA pl. *vratā́* is found twice in nearby hymns (III.55.1, 56.1; cf. also III.7.7), and in V.63.7 acc. pl. *vratā́* is found in a syntagm containing instr. *dhármaṇā*, the syntactic configuration we would have here. My concerns are twofold: on the one hand, as was just charted, *devā́nāṃ* cannot depends on nom. pl. *vratā́* if *mánuśaḥ* depends on instr. pl. *dhármabhiḥ* ; yet the phrase *vratá- devā́nām*, with only the first gen., is the nearby phrase we are comparing. In addition, the structure that the nom. pl. phrase would fit into is uncertain. If it is taken with the pl. verb in pāda c, *yemire*, it should mean "the commandments of gods and men submit to you (=Indra)." This is not impossible, given Indra's hegemony even in the divine world, but it is a bit startling in context – with *dhármabhiḥ* still to be added: "the commandments of G+M submit to you according to the ordinances/principles" (?). Or, less likely, "the commandments submit to you (=Indra) according to the ordinances/principles of gods and men." If the verb is not to be borrowed from c, another one has to be supplied (/invented): Re "(ont lieu)," HPS "(werden) ... (erfüllt)." For these reasons, the instr. interpr. of *vratā́* seems the better choice, with the submission of the "pastures" to Indra in harmony both with divine vratas and human dharmans, per the publ. tr.

III.60.7: As noted ad VIII.63.4, *hóman-* can mean either 'pouring, offering' (to √*hu*) or 'invocation' (to *hū*, though **háviman-* would be better; cf. *hávīman-*). Here, *pace* JPB, I think "at the offering/pouring of the rite" would be slightly better (so WG and seemingly Ge and Re).

III.61 Dawn

III.61.1: In the publ. tr. "with a rich prize" is slightly misleading, since it represents only *vā́jena*, but "prize-giver with a prize" sounded flat.

"Young woman from of old" (*purāṇī́ ... yuvatíḥ*) reflects the usual paradox that Dawn is both new every day and the same every day from the beginning of time. She is "Plenitude" (*púraṃdhiḥ*) because she distributes the priestly gifts at the dawn sacrifice.

III.61.3: The hapax *caranīyámāna-* seems an elaborate way to express what might as easily have been simply *cárant-*. Re tr. 'traçant la marche' and comments that it has "valeur durative-technique par rapport au simple *cárantī*." My 'making progress' also attempts to differentiate it from the simple pres. to √*car* and to indicate its denominative origins.

III.61.4: The puzzle in this vs. is the image in pāda a, *áva syū́meva cinvatī́*. Some factors that contribute to this puzzle: 1) *áva* √*ci* is not otherwise found in Vedic. (In epic/classical Skt. it means 'gather'.) 2) *áva* need not be construed with *cinvatī́*, but could go with *yāti* in the next pāda, esp. since tmesis in participles is considerably rarer than in finite verbs. 3) There are several roots √*ci*. 4) The referent of *syū́man-* isn't clear.

To begin with the last, most interpr. locate *syū́man-* in the realm of sewing and garments. Ge tr. "die die Naht auszieht" ("who undoes/rips out a seam"), sim. Old "... die Naht auftrennend," Re "défaisant le fil." Old suggest that it is the seam that holds the darkness(es) together. Sāy. goes further, in suggesting that it refers to a garment (*vastram*), which Dawn takes off. WG's "Wie eine (Frau) den Gurt ablegend" may also reflect this image, though their n. vacillates between sewing and equestrian interpr. The problem with all of these attempts is that, in its few occurrences, *syū́man-* is otherwise used of horse tackle, esp. of reins; cf. the PN *syū́ma-raśmi-* ("*Band-Bridle" Mayrhofer, PersNam s.v.) and the cmpds *syū́ma-gabhasti-* (I.122.15 'with hands as its guiding rope'), *syūma-gṛ́bh-* (VI.36.2 'pulling at the reins'), as well as instr. *syū́manā* (I.113.17), all in horse/chariot contexts. Despite its derivation from √*sīv* 'sew', it therefore seems unlikely that only here in the RV would it refer to garment construction. And, although Dawn as a female might in principle be connected with sewing (if that was Vedic women's work), in fact she is usually not, whereas her travels are a standard theme; note, e.g., her chariot in 2b, her horses in 2c, and her driving (*yāti*) in this vs.

We must then turn to the verb. If we use the later 'gather' sense for *áva* √*ci*, the simile might mean "gathering up the reins (preparatory to setting out on a journey)." A similar idea, though not related to horses, seems to be reflected in Ge's alternative given in n. 4a: "Wie (die Hausfrau), die das Halfterband (den Tieren) abnimmt (um sie auf die Weide zu treiben)," relating it thematically to *svásarasya pátnī* "mistress of good pasture" in the next pāda. I prefer to compare the lexeme *áva* √*tan* 'unstring, slacken' of bowstrings (e.g., AV VI.42.1 *áva jyā́m iva dhánvano manyúṃ tanomi te hṛdáḥ* "Like a bowstring from a bow, I make slack the fury from your heart"; RVic exx. similar but without an explicit bowstring). The image is of Dawn letting the reins go slack to give the horses their head. Curiously, Griffith's tr. is similar, "letting her reins drop downward," though he thinks it refers to her sending down rays of light. If this interpr. is correct, I

assume that it belongs to the root √*ci* 'pile', with a highly developed idiomatic sense. In fact, combinations of √*ci* + PREVERB tend to show fairly extreme idiomaticity.

Arnold (Ved. Met., 300) suggests reading *uṣā́ ā́ yāti* for simple *uṣā́ yāti*, which would yield an 11-syl. line. Old is tempted but seems to favor the transmitted reading; Re, however, is convinced. HvN reject it without explan. ("a rest at the 5th place seems preferable"). I would follow Arnold and Re, and therefore the publ. tr. should be emended to "drives here."

Pāda d is taken by Ge and Re (and me) as containing one of the relatively rare RVic occurrences of *ā́* + following abl. in the meaning 'all the way to'. The source of this counterintuitive use of the abl. can be seen in passages like this, where 'all the way to' and 'all the way from' are essentially identical in sense: the light of dawn stretches throughout the midspace, and the directionality (from/to heaven/earth) is irrelevant.

III.61.5: The standard tr. supply a form of √*vac* (Ge specifically *vivakmi*, invoking *áchā vivakmi* in nearby III.57.4a) in pāda a, which is then taken as a separate clause: "I (call) to Dawn for you ..." Although I resisted this in the publ. tr., I now see its merits, in accounting for the preverb *áchā*, the double *vaḥ* (pādas a and b), and the acc. case of Dawn. I would therefore emend the tr. to "(I invite) for you the goddess Dawn, radiating widely; proffer your well-twisted (hymn) (to her) with reverence."

The phrase *pā́jo aśret* is found in a number of passages; see III.14.1 for details.

The standard tr. (also Lü 73, Kü 430) take *rocanā́* as a fem. nom. sg., in order, as Ge says (n. 5d), to allow *prá ... ruruce* to have its expected intrans. sense. But well-attested *rocaná-* is otherwise only neut. (X.189.2 adduced by Ge, etc., as another ex. of a fem. is also a neut. pl.), and in the pl. it regularly refers to the luminous realms. I would prefer not to create a separate stem to apply to a single example, esp. because the default interpr. of the form would be neut. pl. There is a simple solution that allows the neut. pl. analysis to be preserved without imperiling the intransitivity of *ruruce* -- to interpr. the neut. pl. as an acc. of extent, as often. The publ. tr. reflects this.

III.61.6: The phrase *arkaír abodhi* has double sense, since *arká-* can mean both 'chant' and 'ray' and *abodhi* both 'has (been) awakened' and 'has been perceived'. The ambiguity nicely captures the ritual situation: we ritualists (wish to) believe that the natural world is set in motion and controlled by our ritual activity (in this case chanting that makes Dawn awaken and dawn), but the ritual is itself set in motion by phenomena in the natural world, in this case the appearance of the first light of dawn.

III.61.7: This vs. offers a surprising number of small puzzles. The first is how to construe *uṣásām iṣaṇyán*. Most take gen. pl. *uṣásām* as the obj. of the participle, despite its unexpected case. (Others, like Pischel and Lü [for details see Lü 596–97], simply label *uṣásām* an acc. -- convenient but unconvincing.) I supply 'cows' (*gā́s*) as obj. on the basis of III.50.3 (in this maṇḍala) *sám ... gā́ iṣaṇya* and IX.96.8. That the bull (*vṛ́ṣā*) in the next pāda is the subject of 'drive' invites a bovine object. The cows, as often, can be the rays of the Dawn (the "dawn cows"). They are driven "on the foundation of truth" (*ṛtásya budhné*), that is, the earth and more specifically the ritual ground.

The bull doing the driving is, in my view, the sun, which follows dawn and could therefore be conceived as driving the rays of dawn before him. His "entering the two world halves" is, of course, his rising above the horizon.

The tr. of *māyā́-* is always fraught; I would suggest here 'uncanny power' or 'supernatural power'. See comm. ad V.63.3–4.

The standard tr. take *candréva* in d to mean "like gold," but if the reference is to the precious metal, it should be *candrám iva*, as they all acknowledge. With Gr and Old I instead take it as the fem. nom. sg. it appears to be, referring to Dawn. But who/what is the subj. of the frame? Most tr. take it to be the sun, who spreads his radiance (*bhānúm*) far and wide. This is certainly possible, but it leaves the *māyā́* of Mitra and Varuṇa announced in c rather orphaned. I therefore prefer to take *māyā́* as the subject of *ví dadhe*, in intransitive usage ("the uncanny power spreads/is spread"); the syntax of this frame is contrasted with the transitive but self-involved *ví dadhe* in the simile: "as shimmering (Dawn) has spread her own radiance," with *bhānúm* belonging to the simile. This kind of syntactic disharmony is commonly exploited in similes, as I have discussed at length elsewhere ("Case disharmony in RVic similes", *IIJ* 24 [1982] 251-71; for several exx. in a Dawn humn, see I.92).

III.62 Various gods

III.62.1: For the sense of this complex vs. and its relation to the rest of the hymn, see publ. intro. The point of the verse appears be that our hymns, however frenetic (a), are no longer effective (b), and therefore the activity of Indra and Varuṇa on behalf of their partners [=us] is in abeyance (cd).

With the standard tr. I supply 'hymns' with the opening *imā́(ḥ)*: the NP *imā́ gíraḥ* is pretty common.

The praise hymns to Indra and Varuṇa appear to be whirlwinds (*bhṛmáyaḥ*) to us, but they cannot be 'thrust/brandished' (*ná túj yā(ḥ)*) by the devotees of the gods -- that is, they have lost their oomph, their energy, and therefore their effectiveness. For the connection between *bhṛmí-* and √*tuj*, cf. IV.32.2 *bhṛ́miś cid ghāsi tū́tujiḥ* "You are a whirlwind, constantly lunging" of Indra. For the connection of hymns with √*tuj,* cf. V.17.3 *tujā́ girā́*. Despite its position, *ná* in b should be the negative, not the simile marker. See Old.

MLW suggests an alternative interpr.: These hymns have become not to be pushed (away) for the one who has you two? I.e., they can't be rejected because they are so insistent. So why aren't you fulfilling them?

On *sína-* see comm. ad II.30.2.

I take *sma* as indicating habitual action.

III.62.2: In ab the combination of an intensive (*johavīti*) and two superlatives (*purutámaḥ* and *śaśvattamám*) gets its point across!

III.62.3: The "Shielding Goddesses" (pl.) appear here and in VII.34.22. In both cases they are associated with *śaraṇá-* 'shelter'. A singular *várūtrī-* also occurs 4x, once (I.22.10) in association with *hótrā bhā́ratī* as here. Beyond their/her protective role, the *várūtrī*

appear(s) to be featureless. The corresponding masc. stem *varūtár-* appears 5x as a common noun 'defender, guardian'.

III.62.5: Ge (/WG) take *ā́ cake* as 3rd sg. (Ge: "Er liebt unbeugsame Kraft"). This is certainly possible, but Schmidt (B+I, 131) makes good arguments for flg. Sāy and Gr in taking it as 1st sg.; see also Re (EVP XVI, ad loc.).

III.62.5–6: Vs. 6 is entirely couched in the acc. and picks up from 5ab, where the acc. phrase is obj. of *namasyata*; 5c is a parenthetical intrusion.

III.62.7: Ge suggests in his notes that this vs. could be a single clause, essentially "This praise-hymn is recited to you by us," with *te* (a) and *túbhyam* (c) tautological. This is possible, but it seems rhetorically unlikely.

On the expressed instr. agent with the finite passive, see my 1979 "Expression of Agency with the Passive ..." and "Case of Agent ..."

III.62.8: This vs. is more complex than it first appears, at least in my interpr. The dominant reading is the one given by Ge: the simile in c matches the frame in a, with b parenthetic. Nearby III.52.3bc [=IV.32.16bc] is nearly identical with minor morphological variation in the frame: *joṣáyāse gíraś ca naḥ / vadhūyúr iva yóṣaṇām*. This interpr. is undeniable. However, I think the intervening b pāda can also be seen as a target of the simile, but in a syntactically twisted way. The object of the verb *avā* 'help' is the NOUN + PARTICIPLE phrase (in reverse order) *vāyayántam ... dhíyam* "the insight seeking the prize," which, extracted from its role as object and presented as a simple clause, would represent "the insight (nom.) seeks the prize (acc.)," with subject/object syntactic relations. Thus reconfigured, the phrase in b would match the simile in c: "our insight seeks the prize, as a bride-seeking man (seeks) a maiden." The syntactic transformation of one of the parts of the structural pair from clause into acc. participial phrase does not disrupt their functional and semantic matching -- it rather shows again the pleasure that RVic poets get from off-kilter correspondences. (See, e.g., the simile/frame pair at the end of the previous hymn, III.61.7d with comm. above.)

This secondary reading presents another twist. In the dominant reading the subj. of the impv. *juṣasva* is a (male) god, the obj. a hymn (*gír-*), a word feminine in gender. These genders match those of the simile: the subj. a bride-seeking male, the obj. a maiden. But when we consider the underlying clause in b, the genders are reversed: the insight (*dhī́-*) is feminine; she is the seeker, not the sought, while the prize (*vā́ja-*) she seeks is a masc. noun.

III.62.9: The usual sharp polarity between the preverbs *ví* and *sám* is emphasized by keeping the verb constant (*páśyati*) and explicitly conjoining the two verb complexes with *ca*. My "looks at all creatures separately and sees them whole" is meant to capture the contrast of the two preverbs in idiomatic Engl.

III.62.10–12: All three vss. in this ṭṛca contain *déva-* (...) *savitár-* (or vice versa).

III.62.10: And here, buried in this not particularly noteworthy hymn, is the Gāyatrī mantra, which is itself not particularly noteworthy on its own terms.

Note the play on *dhīmahi* / *dhíyaḥ* juxtaposed across the hemistich boundary, belonging to different roots.

III.62.11: I take *púraṃdhyā* as an instr. of accompaniment, not (with Ge [/WG]) an instr. of means.

III.62.17: The sense of the splv. instr. pl. *drā́ghiṣṭhābhiḥ* is unclear. This is the only occurrence of the superlative in the RV, and neither *dīrghá-* nor the cmpv. *drāghīyas-* occurs in the instr. pl. The standard interpr., that the splv. here is temporal (Gr 'in längster Dauer'), seems reasonable, but not assured.