

Commentary V.1–40

As noted in the publ. intro. to this maṇḍala (p. 659), most of the hymns in V are not attributed to Atri himself, but to various of his descendants (Ātreya), with a number of different given names. As it happens, many of these names have been derived directly from the hymn(s) ascribed to them, as will be noted passim below.

It should be noted that the translator of WG Maṇḍala V is actually Scarlatta [see the title page], so though I continue to refer to WG, neither W nor G is responsible; there are noticeable differences in approach, generally for the better.

The Agni hymns of this maṇḍala have a particular penchant in the Anuṣṭubh hymns for the hymn-final verse to be Pañkti (i.e., to have an extra pāda at the end). See V.7, 9–10, 16–18, 20–23; V.6 is also entirely in Pañkti and there are few hymn-internal Pañkti vss. in the Anuṣṭubh hymns. This is also common in Anuṣṭubh hymns elsewhere in V (V.35, 39, 49–50, 52, 64–65), though it is less consistent; in addition, V.75 and 79 are entirely in Pañkti.

V.1–28 Agni JPB; comm. SJ

V.1 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The first two vss. begin *ābodhi* ‘has awakened’. This opening may have been suggested by the name of one of the poets to whom the hymn is attributed, Budha Ātreya, or, more likely, that name was extracted from the opening verbs, since the Anukramaṇī names this poet only for this hymn. The Anukramaṇī’s other poet for this hymn, Gaviṣṭhira Ātreya, is found in the last vs., 12c.

V.1.1: There is some awkward phrasing in the publ. tr. First, “(he) has awakened *by* the kindling wood of the peoples” (my italics) is hard to parse. I would either substitute “(along) with” for “by” or, by preference, tr. *samīdhā* as the action noun ‘kindling’, rather than the material substance ‘kindling wood’. For this double sense, see Scar (52–53). I would substitute “Agni has awakened through the kindling of the peoples.” I do not think the instr. is an agent/instr. in the usual sense (“has been awakened by ...”), because *ābodhi* does not seem to appear in true passive constructions.

Then, in b it is not clear from the tr. that the participial phrase modifies Dawn and not Agni. I would slightly rephrase to “... Dawn, who is approaching ...”

I would also somewhat modify the tr. of the 2nd hemistich for several reasons. For one thing, I would dispute the tr. “leap forth” for *prá ... sisrate*. The redupl. pres. to $\sqrt{sr}$ general means to ‘flow, run’, with *prá* ‘flow/run forth’; for this passage Narten (MSS 26 [1969]: 85 = KISch. 131) argues for a secondary ‘stretch towards’. The substitution of ‘leap’ seems unjustified by the usage of the root elsewhere and is not contextually required. Moreover, like most tr. (Old [SBE], Ge, Re, Narten [op. cit.] – but *not* WG) the publ. tr. treats the pres. part. *ujjīhānāḥ* as the operative verb in the simile, with *prá ... sisrate* applicable only to the frame: “Like young (birds) rising ..., his radiant beams leap forth ...” But this is contrary to the structure of the RVic simile, which always holds the verbal notion in common with the frame, and it also leaves the detached *prá* in the simile in the middle of pāda c functionless. Instead, I think that the *prá* of c anticipates *prá ... sisrate* of d and indicates that that’s the verb of the simile, with the participle *ujjīhānāḥ* only an adjunct – and the *vayām* of c is entirely parallel to *nākam* in d, as goal of *prá \sqrt{sr}*. So explicitly Old (Noten) and, esp., WG. Putting this all together, I’d emend to “his radiant beams

flow forth to the vault, like young (birds) to a branch as they rear up.” I prefer ‘flow’ to ‘stretch’ because of the birds; although flowing may not seem to be particularly characteristic of birds, stretching is even less so – and a flock of little birds moving together could be perceived as flowing. I have tr. the simile after the frame because it’s easier to signal what the verb is.

V.1.2: I’d substitute ‘erect’ for ‘tall’ to tr. *ūrdhvā-*, to match 3d.

V.1.3: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. has several unusual images, esp. the one in pāda a, where Agni “awakens the bridle of the troop.” There is much disc. among tr. about what precisely this can mean, with attempts to identify some part of the ritual that could be metaphorically likened to the physical bridle. I think perhaps this has been overthought. First, it’s clear that after two vss. that announce with their first word (*ābodhi*) that Agni has awakened, there is a pleasant reversal in having Agni awaken something else. Now in general the kindling of the ritual fire sets the rest of the ritual in motion, and so I think “awakened” is simply a vivid metaphor for “set in motion, started.” As for the bridle of the troop, assuming (with the publ. tr.) that the “troop” (*gaṇā-*) is the priests, I’d see their bridle as the controlling through-line of the ritual, standing for the ritual itself (cf. *ṛtasya raśmī-* “rein of truth” in nearby V.7.3, a phrase invoked by Re in his disc. of our phrase). I do not think it needs to be something so precise as “hymn” (so the publ. tr., but not the publ intro.).

The juxtaposition of fem. *uttānā-* ‘stretched out’ (better ‘stretching upwards, with (legs) agape’; see comm. ad II.10.3) with masc. *ūrdhvā-* ‘erect, upright’ evokes an erotic image at odds with the mother-infant suckling depicted, a dissonance that is surely meant. Contra most tr. (incl. the publ. tr.), I do not think the *uttānā-* female is the offering ladle vel sim., but rather the kindling-stick(s), as in II.10.3, III.29.3 (a connection explicitly disavowed by Re). Although the kindling of the fire that would be thus depicted should precede the other actions in this vs., the distribution of tenses in fact supports my interpr.: pāda d contains the imperfect *adhayat*, which should express a generalized past, whereas pāda a has an aorist (*ajīgar*) expressing the recent past, and c and d have presents (*aṅkte*, *yujyate*). The action of d can precede and provide the grounds for the subsequent actions of abc, the progress of the sacrifice after the kindling. I would change the tr. of d to “Erect, he suckled upon her with (legs) agape [=kindling stick(s)] with his tongues.” This depicts the rising of the flame after kindling.

V.1.4: The first hemistich contains a trivial example of case disharmony in a simile, with acc. *agnīm* in the frame (a) and loc. *sūrye* in the simile (b).

V.1.4–6: These three vss. show particularly close concatenation between the end of the previous vs. and the beginning of the next. See disc. in the publ. intro., which also points to more attenuated examples. Here 4d ... *jāyate āgre āhnām* is repeated in 5a as *jāniṣṭa ... āgre āhnām* and 5d and 6a are identical save for the verb: *nī ṣasāda* (5d), *ny āsīdat* (6a).

V.1.5: WG take *hitāḥ* to $\sqrt{hi}$ ‘impel’, so a play on words with immed. flg. *hitēṣu* -- WG “im vollen Galopp [= *hitāḥ*] ... auf die hingelegten [= *hitēṣu*] Hölzer.” Although this is clever, it seems unlikely, esp. since *hitó hitēṣu* presents itself like an *āmreḍita*, as in *dāme-dame* in the flg. pāda.

Pāda c is identical to VI.74.1, save for the number of the participle *dádhāna-* (sg. here, dual there). Since VI.74 is dedicated to Soma and Rudra, there is nothing particularly Agni-esque about these treasures, whatever they may consist of.

V.1.6: As Old points out (see also Scar 648–49), the apparent thematic stem *puruniṣṭhá-* found here (in sandhi before vowel, *puruniṣṭhá r...*) would be metrically better as the root noun *puruniṣṭhā-* (nom. sg. **-ās > *ā r*), matching the nom. sg. in VIII.2.9 as well as the uncmpted root noun *niṣṭhā-* III.31.10, IX.110.9). As for its sense, the publ. tr. “outstanding among many” is quite likely (or the variant “... in many places” [Old SBE, etc.], but see the disc. in my 2024 “Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian” (Fs. Kellens), where I suggest it could alternatively be a bahuvrīhi meaning “having many standouts [=flames].”

WG’s rendering of the last pāda, *dhartā kṛṣṭīnām utá mādhyā iddhāḥ*, “ein Erhalter (des Landes bis zu den) Grenzen, auch wenn im Zentrum entzündet” sets up a more satisfactory contrastive pair of *kṛṣṭī-* and *mādhye*, which makes more sense of their explicit coordination with *utá*, than the standard tr. – though it may push the tr. of *kṛṣṭī-* further than is warranted.

V.1.7–8: Another ex. of concatenation: 6d *mṛjanti* / 7a *mārjālyò mṛjyate*. Though *mārjālyà-* is a hapax, with somewhat exotic morphology, its sense is not difficult to discern.

V.1.8: The phrase *své dāme* “in his own house” is common (I.1.8, etc.), and the gapped noun would easily be supplied, esp. since *své* is fld. by *dām(ūnāḥ)*.

For *prāsi*, “surpass all others” might be better than “are ahead ...”

V.1.8–9: Another concatenation: 8d (*vísṽān ...*) *prāśīy anyān* / 9a *átīy eṣīy anyān* : “you surpass all the others” / “you go forth beyond the others.” The question is – who are “the others” and are they the same in both cases? JPB supplies “fires” in the first instance and “sacrificers” in the second, but I do not know on what grounds. Old (SBE) supplies “beings” in both cases; Ge does not specify the identity in 8d but supplies “Göttern” in 9a; Re supplies “dieux” in 8d, but “gens” in 9a; WG leaves *anyān* unspecified in both cases in the tr., but in the n. to 9 suggest they are “konkurrierende Clans oder Feinde” in that vs. No one provides any argument or textual support for their identifications. I do not have strong feelings about this, but I think 1) rhetorically it’s likely that both *anyān* have the same referent, since this is the way concatenation works elsewhere in the hymn; 2) “other” is implicitly contrastive, so we should try to identify the contrastive element. In paired *anyá-* ... *anyá-* (“the one ... the other”) constructions, they contrast with each other and refer to different entities. But with single *anyá-*s there should be an X in the passage that contrasts with the other X(s). Here the most likely X is Agni with the other Xs also fires, and this inference is supported by a passage like VII.1.14 *séd agnír agnīṁr áty astu anyān* “Let just this Agni be superior to the other fires” (cf. also I.59.1 *vayā íd agne agnáyās te anyé* “The other fires are just twigs of you, Agni”). I would therefore emend the tr. of these two pādas to “o Agni, you surpass all the other (fires) by your strength. / In an instant you go forth beyond the other (fires).” The “other fires” are the ones used at other sacrifices, and our ritual fire is superior.

V.1.10: The configuration *ántita ótá dūrāt* at first appears a bit odd, with *ā* inserted between the two explicitly conjoined ablativals. The *ā* must be functioning, as often, as a postpos. with the ablatival adv. *ántitaḥ*, with parallel *utá dūrāt* appended and *ā* gapped in the second term.

There is some dissension about the referents in pāda c. Old (SBE, not mentioned in Noten) thinks the persons have switched and the 2nd sg. impv. *cikiddhi* is addressed to the human worshiper, even though the 2nd sg. referent in ab is Agni. For him *bhāndiṣṭha-* refers to Agni; so also for Ge, though he takes Agni as subj. of *cikiddhi*, in a tricky closed-loop construction: “Denk (uns) dein, des Besten, Wohlwollen zu!” (sim. WG). Re’s interpr. is sim., though he takes the *sumatī-* to be that of the human ritualist but with *bhāndiṣṭha-* referring to Agni (like Old, Ge, WG). I confess myself puzzled by their contortions. The only other occurrence of this splv. (I.97.3) most likely refers to a human ritualist (see comm. ad loc.). As for *sumatī-*, although it often, indeed predominantly, originates from a god (“the good favor of god X”), it can also reciprocally be a human product, a “good thought” offered to a god. See comm. ad IV.4.8. In this case it would be one more form of tribute brought to Agni. I would therefore follow the publ. tr., contra the other standard tr.

V.1.12: A typical summary vs. beginning with the immed.-past aorist *avocāma* ‘we have spoken’.

The alternative poet to whom the Anukr. ascribes this hymn, Gaviṣṭhira, appears in c. That this is indeed a poet’s name is clear from X.150.5, where it appears in a list of other poets.

V.2 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The Anukramaṇī ascribes the hymn first to Kumāra Ātreya, whose first name must be adopted from the first word of the hymn *kumārām*. This is the only hymn associated with him.

On the various backstories conjectured for this enigmatic hymn, see publ. intro. I will not myself attempt yet another comprehensive interpr. The first seven vss. seem to be a thematic unity; see comm. ad vs. 7 below.

V.2.1: On this vs., see also Th (Unters. 29), who identifies the young mother as Night and the infant as the sun; he does not identify the father. It is not necessary to follow him in this interpr., but his construal of pāda c should be noted.

The syntax – and hence the sense – of cd is hard to figure out. The problem starts with *ná* in c: although this is almost universally taken as the negation of *paśyanti* in d (Old [SBE], Ge, Re, WG -- though not Th., JPB), this is the wrong position for a verbal or sentential negation. It is found in the middle of an apparent NP (*ánīkam asya ... minát*), and, though it immediately follows the caesura, this minor metrical boundary in a different pāda doesn’t seem to me enough to allow *ná* to have more than local force. Instead I think it has to negate *minát* one way or the other. This interpr. is made more likely by the fact that *√mī* ‘diminish, confound’ and its 9th cl. pres. *mināti* are regularly negated, with the negation often immediately preceding it in a post-caesura position – see, e.g., VII.31.11 *tásya vratāni ná minanti dhīrāḥ*.

But construing the negative with *minát* brings problems of its own. The first is that this pres. part. actually has a negated form, in composition with the privative: *áminant-* (5x). We might therefore have expected **áminat* here, esp. if it is functioning as attributive adj. (as Th takes it: “Sein ... nicht täuschendes Gesicht”). I can see three possible reasons why we’d have *ná minát* instead: 1) The *ná* breaks the potential hiatus **asya áminat*. 2) The original form was subjunctive *minat* (3x elsewhere), which either acquired an accent once it was no longer understood or because it’s contrastive with the following clause. In this case we should tr. “his face will not diminish/confound [X].” 3) The neut. part. is predicated and therefore more likely to be negated by the clausal negation *ná*. This is the solution of the publ. tr. In this case we

should tr. “His face is not one that diminishes/confounds ...” or “His face is one that doesn’t diminish/confound ...” However we choose to account for the lack of the cmpd privative form, I think the independent negative must be construed with *minát*. Note that we likely have the same construction in 4b ... *ná ... śóbhamānam*; see comm. there.

What then does *minát* mean? JPB takes it as intrans./reflex., as far as I can understand the tr. “not one that changes (its face).” But act. forms of $\sqrt{mī}$ are generally transitive, though often with gapped object, and one of the standard objects is (*daívyāni*) *vratāni* “(divine) commandments” (as in the passage just cited), often referring to immutable cosmic laws. I would supply that object here (so also Th): “not confounding the (divine) commandments.” Whether the face (*ánika-*) is that of Agni or of the sun (and the word is used for both), this means that they are following the regular patterns of the ritual day: the sun rises / the ritual fire is kindled, both at the appropriate time.

Putting this all together, I would tr. this hemistich “His face, not confounding (the divine commandments), do the people see deposited in front in the spoked wheel.” I favor Agni as the referent, since he is so often identified as the *aratī-*. Although the events of the first hemistich – his mother swaddling him and not handing him over to his father – might seem to favor the standard interpr. *ná ... paśyanti* “do not see,” there is in fact no sense in the 1st hemistich that he is hidden or invisible. And my interpr. works better with the questions and statements in vs. 2, where an unidentified speaker or speakers address the same young woman who carries the child in 1ab, which would indicate that at least someone is seeing it. Note the emphasis on seeing in the next vss.: *ápaśyam* (2d), *apaśyam* (3b, 4a).

V.2.2: *péṣī* is a RVic hapax (though see much later *haviḥ-peṣī-* BauŚS). The publ. tr. “wet nurse” reflects what I consider the most appealing etym., that it is a reduction of **páyis-ī* derived from *páyas-* ‘milk’. See KEWA and EWA, both s.v., as well as Gr “Pflegerin” (from BR, though without suggested etym.). This would be exactly the sort of word to show Middle Indic phonological developments, though unfortunately there is no such Pāli word. However, Mayr (EWA) seems to favor Mahlerin (“miller,” from $\sqrt{piṣ}$ ‘crush’), as suggested by Caland (JB in a quotation of the RV passage), weakly favored also by Old (Noten). This would refer to the second kindling stick, with *máhiṣī* referring to the first. The reference to the two kindling sticks would still be possible with the ‘wet nurse’ sense, which fits the maternal context much better than ‘miller’. Ge’s “Stieffmutter” and Re’s “servante-épouse” seem to rest on nothing but context. Old (SBE) and WG refuse to tr.

In b “has given birth” for *jajāna* would be better as “gave birth,” given *vavárdha* “grew strong” in the next pāda.

V.2.3: Despite its middle voice, *dadānāḥ* must mean ‘giving’, not ‘taking’; the middle signals that the soma was the speaker’s own, as in the publ. tr.

V.2.4: Pāda b presents problems: 1) what to do with *sumád yūthám*? 2) is *ná* negative or simile-marking? Old (SBE, still favored in Noten) reads, flg. B-R, a cmpd *sumád-yūtham* and *ná* as simile-marking: “like (a bull [=Agni]) with his herd.” This is tidy and contextually satisfactory, but requires emendation. The publ. tr. essentially follows this tack, but without the emendation, which makes the sense less tidy and contextually satisfactory. Ge, Re, WG all implicitly reject the emendation and read *ná* as negative. They take *yūthám* as a second object of *apaśyam* (“[and I saw] the herd ...”). Because of the separation of Agni from the cows in the next vs. (5ab), I

think this latter tack is the correct one, with the herd, being apart from Agni, no longer beautifully shining. Fitting in *sumád* and *purú* is a little tricky, but I suggest emending the tr. to “I saw him [=Agni] moving ...; (I saw) the herd, all together, not shining much in beauty.” Note that if *ná* is negative, it is negating a pres. participle, as is likely also in 1c – though here with an intervening word.

There are numerous competing interpr. of cd, with uncertainty about the identity of the female plural subjects of c and d and about which of the nominals in d is predicated of the other (“the gray ones became young” [Ge, WG] or “the young ones became gray” [Old, Re]). Without rehearsing the various versions, I will simply present my own. I think the fem. pl.s refer to the firewood. What is depicted is the first catching of the fire immediately followed by its rising up from the wood, no longer confined to the logs on the ground – the fire escapes to wander, as is depicted in vss. 3–5. And as it burns they become gray with ash. I find the use of the root aor. *agr̥bhran* telling for several reasons. Most striking is the fact that it is a phonological scrambling of *gár̥bham* ‘embryo’; the birth context already clear from *ájaniṣṭa* is reinforced by this buried pun. And the immediate past use of the aorist works both with the aor. that immed. follows (*ájaniṣṭa*) and the present in the next pāda (*bhavanti*): the publ. tr. does not quite capture the sequence of events, and I would emend to “They [=the fire logs] have not taken hold of him, for he has been born. The young women [=logs] become gray.” The play on youth and the gray of age is obvious.

V.2.5: This vs. is in some ways a companion piece to vs. 4 with the theme of separation of a male animal, presumably a bull, from its cows, and esp. the echo in pāda c *yá īm jagr̥bhuh* ... of 4c *ná tā agr̥bhran*. However, the subjects of 5c are crucially masc. (*yé* ... *té*) and quite likely identical to the *ké* of pāda a), while those in 4c are feminine. Although I’m tolerably convinced that the feminines in 4cd are the fire logs, I have no idea who the corresponding masculines are in vs. 5 – and the poet may not know either, given that the vs. begins with a question.

Older tr. (Old, Ge, Re) of (*vī*) *yavanta* take the verb as a preterite, but it is now generally identified as a subjunctive (see KH [Injunc. 258 n. 295], my *-áya-* [174 n. 148], Kü [399–400]), hence the publ. tr. “will keep ... separate.”

The masc. rel. prn. *yéṣām* is plausibly explained by Old (SBE and Noten) as referring to both the cows (*góbhiḥ*) and the masc. animal (*maryakám*) in the main cl. The point is not that the cows will be separated from their herdsman, the *maryaká-*, but that the herd, comprising *maryaká-* and cows, has never had a herdsman (*gopā-*). The gender of *yéṣām*, the *cid*, and the general sense just sketched speak against the publ. tr. “which have never had a stranger as their herdsman” (sim. Kü 163). Better some version of the standard tr. (Old, Ge, Re, WG) “which have no herdsman, not even [probably better, much less] an alien one.”

The adj. *áraṇa-* ‘alien, strange’ may be meant to evoke *arānī-* ‘kindling stick’.

As noted above, the first clause of c is matched to 4c, but with crucial differences – not only the gender of the subj., but the tense of the verb. The pf. *jagr̥bhúḥ* here has a stative-like value ‘hold onto / have hold of’ (see Kü 163), against the aor. *agr̥bhran* ‘have taken hold’ in 4c. I would slightly emend the tr. to “those who have hold of him, let them release him.”

In d, once the *maryaká-* has been released, he assumes charge of the rest of the herd and drives it home.

V.2.6: The last part of pāda c, *áva tám sr̥jantu*, is a close echo of 5c, *áva té sr̥jantu*.

The tr. of *vasāṃ rājānam* might be a little less jarring as “the king over the dwellings.” Similarly, “hostile forces” instead of “hostilities.” However, the content of this hemistich is still disconcerting, because *ní dadhuḥ* must be a negative action in context, but *ní √dhā* is a standard, positively viewed, lexeme for installing Agni in his ritual role (see, in fact, *nīhitam* in 1d). The poet seems to signal that his use of *ní √dhā* is unusual by then deploying phonologically similar negative terms: *nīnditāro nīndyāsaḥ* “scorners to be scorned” (6d) and *nīditam* ‘bound down’ (7a). The disturbing *ní dadhuḥ* is then “repaired” at the end of 7d by the gerund *niṣádya* ‘having taken your seat’: *ní √sad* being the intrans. equivalent of transitive *ní √dhā* in the ritual.

I find the publ. tr. almost uninterpretable because of its use of the neutral “have set down” with the subject “hostilities”; I would slightly alter it to “Hostile forces have held down ...” The force of *ní √dhā* here may be ‘hide’, as the standard tr. take it, but I don’t think this is necessary.

V.2.7: This vs. reads like a hymn-final vs., with the *evā* of c, as so often in final vss., introducing an economically expressed demand of the god, based on his mythical actions in the past. Certainly the first 7 vss. have a thematic and phraseological unity that is lacking in the rest of the hymn, and note also that the first appearance of the name Agni in the hymn is in 7c, whereas it is fairly common in what follows. But I would not venture to suggest that we have two distinct hymns here.

The abl. *sahāsrāt* has been interpr. in several different ways. Sāy., as well as Old (SBE) and Re, take it as qualifying the sg. *yūpāt*, in plural sense: “from the thousand sacrificial posts” (Old). But the number disharmony seems too extreme, and the pragmatics are off too: a single sacrificial victim can be tied to only one post. Certainly this is true in the Śunaḥśepa story. The publ. tr. supplies pl. “bonds,” which makes more sense, and can be supplied from *pāsān* in c -- in which case they should be tr. the same, either “(fetters)” / “fetters” or “(bonds)” / “bonds”). This works well, but it’s worth considering the alternative interpr. of Ge and WG, that “thousand” specifies the price for which Śunaḥśepa was sold to become a substitute sacrificial victim: “bound because of a thousand (cows).” Although price is usually expressed in the instr., a case could be made for the abl. here.

The tag in b, *ásamiṣṭa hí śāḥ*, is almost identical to 4c *ájaniṣṭa hí śāḥ*, both with close sandhi retroflexion.

cikitvaḥ picks up *cikitvān* in 5d.

V.2.8: Although this vs. seems situationally quite specific, in fact the last three pādas are identical to X.32.6. In the latter hymn the first pāda clearly refers to Agni’s flight and concealment in the waters, and so the first pāda of our vs. seems likely to have the same reference though targeting an early part of the story (the flight itself, before the concealment in water).

The verb of pāda a, *aíyeḥ*, is the sole plupf. to *√i* in the RV; see Kü (99) and already Old (SBE and Noten).

On the possible referent of *vratapā-* see comm. ad X.32.6.

V.2.9: I’m not sure why JPB takes the accusatives in c as belonging to two different entities: “ungodly craft and those of evil ways,” esp. because “those of evil ways” would have to be feminine beings. Better to take all three fem. pl.s as one NP: “godless wiles of evil ways.”

V.2.10: *bhāma*- is a perfect (and therefore not very interesting) pun – meaning both ‘radiance, beam’ and ‘wrath, rage’; see EWA II.261 and, e.g., Ge’s “Zornesgluten.” Since *bhāmā(h)* is pl. here I’d substitute “his raging beams.”

V.2.11–12: Vs. 11. presents itself as a hymn-summary vs. in the mouth of the poet, while 12 ventriloquizes the gods as speakers. I am not sure what vs. 12 is doing here.

V.2.12: This vs. has an extra (fifth) Triṣṭubh pāda, a variant known as Śakvarī. The extra pāda (e) is a minor variant of d.

The two other sg. occurrences of *tuviṅrīva*- (VIII.17.8, 64.7) qualify Indra, and the content of ab is more Indraic than Agnic. Tr. are split as to whether the powerfully necked bull is in fact Indra (Ge, WG) or Agni-assimilated-to Indra (Old, Re). The tacked-on nature of the vs. would allow either interpr.

In b most interpr. *aśatrú* as a neut. adverbial (so publ. tr.: “unchallenged”), but it could modify *vēdaḥ*, as Gr takes it and Th (Fremdl. 62) favors. I’m inclined to the former but could imagine the latter.

V.3–6 Agni

The poet of these hymns, Vasuśruta Ātreya, has four hymns attributed to him, rather than the singletons encountered so far. Nonetheless his name may also be derived from context: the opening pāda of V.4 contains the phrase *vásupatiṃ vásūnām*.

V.3 Agni [SJ on JPB]

V.3.1–3: The identification of Agni with a series of gods is a fairly common trope; see esp. II.1, esp. vss. 3–7.

V.3.2: The relation between pādas a and b is somewhat disputed. Old (SBE, defended vociferously in Noten) thinks b is part of a subordinate cl. introduced by *yád* in pāda a. This requires him to emend *bibharṣi* to accented **bíbharṣi* and produces the puzzling tr. “when thou bearest the secret name of the maidens” – with no sense of what that name would be or why maidens would have a secret name. The other standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG, JPB; see also Th, M+A 85) take *yát kanīnām* as a self-contained nominal cl.: “when you belong to maidens,” “when (it’s a matter of) maidens,” vel sim. This is surely correct, and also surely correct is the assumption in the publ. tr. that the linkage between Aryaman and maidens is marriage (against Th’s suggestion that this has to do with maidens preparing meals for guests on the Gārhapatya fire). The association between Aryaman and marriage is well known (see esp. JPB, *Ṛgvedic Ādityas*, 175–77), and the context of this vs. is marriage: the 2nd hemistich clearly depicts a wedding ceremony (on which see my 2001 “Rigvedic svayamvara” [Fs. Parpola], 312–13).

The question is what is the secret name in b and does it have anything to do with the marital context that surrounds it. Re suggests that b is a “retour à Varuṇa,” while by contrast both Ge and WG suggest that the secret name is Aryaman – because that is what maidens secretly call him (Ge n. 2ab) or because he is invoked with regard to Liebesdingen (WG). The Ge/WG tack seems more promising than Re’s, but the pāda should not be interpr. without making reference to the same phrase in the next vs., though with the familiar addition of cows: V.3.3d *téna pāsi gúhyaṃ nāma gónām* “with that [=track of Viṣṇu in c?] you protect the secret name of the cows,”

though I don't quite know what to do with this. It may well be that we are not supposed to learn Agni's secret name; the phrase in the next vs. suggests that it may be in highest heaven. Nonetheless, I might suggest another possibility: that the secret name is found in pāda b itself – the voc. *svadhāvan* (note that the almost identical voc. *svadhāvaḥ* is found in 5b).

In c the publ. tr. reads *mitrām* twice, once as the god with whom Agni is identified and once as the common noun 'ally', to be construed with *súdhitam*. A double reading both better fits the structure of these vss. (identification of Agni with various gods) and the placement of the simile marker *ná*, which follows *súdhitam*, not preceding *mitrām*.

V.3.3: The med. 3rd pl. injunc. *marjayanta* is universally interpr. (incl. in my *-áya-* monograph, 157 n. 108) as reflexive "groomed themselves." I now think this is incorrect, and the form is a standard *-anta* replacement with active transitive value, with the gapped object being "you [=Agni]." As I noted in the *-áya-* treatment (loc. cit.), seven of the nine med. forms to *marjáya-* are transitive, incl. five *marjayanta*. It doesn't make a lot of sense for the Maruts to spiff themselves up for Agni; their attention to the fire as it is kindled makes more sense. For a passage with the Maruts as subj. and Agni as obj., see X.122.5 *tvām marjayan marúto dāśúṣo grhé* "The Maruts groomed you [=Agni] in the house of the pious man." (I also think the injunc. *marjayanta* here should have presential, not preterital value, with most of the standard tr.) I would therefore emend the tr. to "For your splendor the Maruts groom (you), when your dear bright birth (takes place)."

For the relationship between 3a *táva śriyé* and 4a *táva śriyā*, see comm. on next vs.

Ge (n. 3cd) makes a valiant effort to explain why Viṣṇu's highest track/footprint allows Agni to protect the secret name of the cows, but it remains somewhat mysterious. I agree with him that since *padá-* can mean 'word' as well as 'footprint' (etc.), a linkage can be established between it and the name -- but the mechanism that allows protection of one by the other is unclear.

V.3.4: The first hemistich is multiply ambiguous. To begin with, *sudṛśaḥ* can be either gen. sg. with *táva* or nom. pl. with *devāḥ* -- or both, which is my preference and which is reflected in the publ. tr. (though with unnecessary parens around the gen. sg. occurrence). This interpr. fits well with the opening phrase. That opening, *táva śriyā*, responds to 3a *táva śriyé* and seems to express the reciprocal benefits for Agni and the Maruts/gods in general. After the Maruts have groomed Agni for his splendor, the gods appear beautiful through Agni's splendor, i.e., the lovely light he produces after being kindled that illuminates their bodies. Ge and Re take *sudṛśaḥ* only as gen. sg., WG only as nom. pl., losing the sense of reciprocity in both cases.

In b the participial phrase *purū dádhanāḥ* can be (and has been) interpr. in a number of different ways, given the vague reference of *purū* ("many Xes") and the multivalence of the root *√dhā* and of its middle voice. Old (SBE) and JPB take the part. in the sense of "assuming, acquiring" (JPB's "receiving"); Ge's idiomatic "mehren" seems to fall into the same category ("acquire many things" → "increase"?). Re ("place") and WG ("perform") in different ways opt for a more active-type sense. It is essentially impossible to tell what this underdetermined phrase is supposed to mean, but Old's "assuming many (powers or goods)" – or rather the former ("powers") – seems to me the safest interpr., on the basis of passages like III.34.5 *dádhanā naryā purūṇi* "(Indra) assuming his many manly powers" (cf. I.72.1=VII.45.1). This interpr. would be consistent with the benefit the gods receive from the newly kindled fire and then feed into the service they provide it.

The 2nd hemistich is almost identical to IV.6.11, except with *daśasyántaḥ* for *namasyántaḥ*. On the “Laud of Āyu” see comm. ad IV.6.11. Here I would substitute “showing favor to him as the ‘Laud of Āyu’,” rather than “giving homage,” which is more appropriate to *namasyántaḥ*.

V.3.5: With regard to pāda a, see III.17.5 and comm. thereon for a surprising twist on this assertion.

The publ. tr.’s cumbersome “one belonging to the clan of which you will become a guest” is an attempt to deal with the gender mismatch (anacoluthon) between the rel. phrase *viśāḥ* ... *yāsyāḥ* ‘of which clan [fem.]’ and the resumptive prn. masc. *sá* ‘he’.

V.3.6: This vs. takes the last VP of vs. 5, *vanavad (deva) mártān*, and radically splits it up, with the verb *vanuyāma* in pāda a and *mártān* the final word of d, while interposing circumstantial participles and oblique complements, eking out the sentence structure. This effect is not captured by the publ. tr., which puts the entire VP up front, though the tr. is certainly accurate. In an attempt to represent the Skt. better, I would substitute “O Agni, helped by you, might we vanquish -- striving after goods and awakening with our offering – (might) we at the competition and at the ritual distribution of the days, (might) we with our wealth, o son of strength, (vanquish) mortals.”

V.3.7: Although JPB generally tr. *énaś-* as ‘blame’ or ‘guilt’ (e.g., I.24.9, 14; VII.52.2, 86.3), *énaś-* is ordinarily something that is done ($\sqrt{kr}$, e.g., II.28.7 *énaḥ kṛṇvántam* “committing an offense”), just like *āgas-*, so both these nouns need to be acts, not mental states. I favor ‘offense, transgression, outrage’. The two appear together here, and I would alter the tr. to “an offense (or) transgression against us.”

The impv. *dadhāta* in pāda b is pl., presumably referring to the gods, with an immediate switch in c to the sg. and Agni.

The same type of anacoluthon found in 5 appears here in cd, where the fem. *abhíśastim etām* in c is the apparent antecedent of masc. *yāḥ* in d; a linking gen. has to be supplied.

V.3.8: The temporal situation in this vs. is disturbingly incoherent. The moment in time is identified as “at the dawning of *this* (dawn),” with the near-deictic *asyāḥ*, which should indicate the moment of the current speech. But the subj. is “the ancients” (*pūrve*) or at least “previous, earlier ones” and the verb is an augmented impf. *ayajanta*, which should be a general, not immediate-past, preterite (“they sacrificed,” not “they have [just] sacrificed” [*pace* Old SBE]). Worse, the vs. continues in c with a subord. cl. (*yád*) whose verb is the present *īyase*, reinforced by a pres. part. *idhyámānaḥ*. As Ge points out (n. 8ab; see also Bl RR), the first hemistich is almost identical to X.122.7 (with *asyā uśáso vyūṣṭisu* and subj. *mānuṣaḥ* instead of *pūrve*), but the 2nd hemistich there continues with a general preterite, the pf. *vāvr̥dhuḥ*, rather than the present we have here. I considered taking *pūrve* as an unmarked simile (“[like] the ancients”), but this still leaves the problematic *ayajanta* ... *īyase* sequence. As far as I can see, there are two possible ways to deal with this: 1) to sever cd from ab, and have the 2nd hemistich anticipate 9a, whose impvs. would work temporally with the pres. of 8c (so, basically, Re); 2) to interpr. *īyase* as a generalizing habitual: “they sacrificed to you, since you are (always) speeding / (regularly) speed.” I prefer the latter, because it maintains the unity of the vs. and because the impvs. of 9a do not work thematically with 8cd. As for *asyā vyūṣi*, I’m afraid I have to live with the fact that

this and similar phrases with the near-deictic referring to dawn do not have to refer to the present moment; see not only X.122.7 just cited, but also V.45.8 with our *asyā vyūṣi* in mythological narrative (though with injunctives).

V.3.9: As Old suggests (SBE), *yódhi vidvān* is a parenthetical interjection, separating *áva sprdhi pitáram* from the rel. cl. in b that hangs off *pitáram*. The publ. tr. flips the order of the two imperative clauses, which makes the main cl. / rel. cl. structure more transparent, but loses the exclamatory immediacy of *yódhi*. I would flip the order back: “Rescue (your) father [=priest] – as the knowing one, fight! – (the father) who is (also) known as your son ...” Alternatively, flg. Kü (489), “Rescue (your) father [=priest]; as knowing one, fight (for him) who is (also) known as your son ...,” with the rel. cl. hanging off a supplied main cl. prn. As Ge remarks (n. 9ab), the priest is Agni’s father, as his kindler, and Agni’s son, as one who needs the protection of the god; this kinship paradox is of course a common RVic trope.

The full construction of the lexeme *áva √sprdh* ‘rescue, save from’ is with a personal acc. and an abl. of the threat to be averted. See, e.g., VIII.66.14 *tvām no asyā ámater utá kṣudhó, abhísaster áva sprdhi* “rescue us from this neglect and hunger, from their curse.” Here the ablative, and hence the specification of the threat, is absent, but a variety of possibilities have been offered in an earlier vs.: evil-speaking (7b), curse (7c, *abhísasti-* as in VIII.66.14), duplicity (7d) (see also vvs. 11–12). Since both 7 and 12 mention *abhísasti-* as a particular menace and it appears with *áva √sprdh* in VIII.66.14, we could provide a fuller tr. “save your father (from the curse) ...,” though in fact it may be a more powerful statement if the threats are unnamed and potentially legion.

The hapax impv. *yódhi* is a problematic and much discussed form. Even its root affiliation has been called into question: although most (incl. among older lit., Wh, Gr, and Macd VGS, as well as most modern tr.) assign it to *√yudh* ‘fight’, Old (SBE, less emphatically Noten; so also Re) follows Delbrück in taking it to *√yu* ‘keep away’. This would save us from having to assume the (fairly uncomplicated) reduction of *-ddh-* to *-dh-* (i.e., **yódh + dhi* to **yód-dhi* to *yódhi*), but the major anomalies remain – namely the full-grade root vocalism and the root accent. If we assume a root-aorist impv. to either *√yu* or *√yudh*, we would expect **yu(d)dhí*, with zero-grade root and accented ending. The form has been much fought over in recent decades as a token in the PIE verbal system wars. I personally have no settled view on the history of *yódhi* and its possible deep archaism or shallow nonce status, and refer readers to the brief disc. of the recent lit. in Baum’s *The Imperative in the Rigveda* (2006): 26–27.

On *ūhé* as possibly belonging to a root *√vāh* ‘anerkennen’, see Kü 488–90, though I am dubious that it needs to be reassigned.

To capture the etymological relationship between *cikitvaḥ* and *(ṛta-)cid* I would substitute ‘perceptive one’ for ‘watchful one’, and I would render *abhí √cakṣ* as ‘watch over’, which would continue the protective role of Agni in ab.

V.3.10: The publ. tr. “sets many names (on you)” is perhaps too literal; the lexeme *nāma √dhā* is of course just the standard idiom for name-giving. I would substitute “gives many names to you” or “confers many names on you.” This is an early example of what develops into devotional name litanies like the Śatarudriya. Closer to home, the statement recalls the identification of Agni with a series of gods at the beginning of the hymn (vss. 1–4).

Despite the change in person between the two hemistichs (Agni = 2nd ps. in ab, 3rd in cd), *cakānāḥ* ‘enjoying, taking pleasure’ seems to take up *joṣáyase* at the end of d. The

uncertainty expressed there (“if [yádi] you will find pleasure”) is continued by the question particle *kuvíd*, which generally introduces a statement about which there is some uncertainty (“is it the case that ...?”). The uncertainty here is perhaps whether or not Agni will enjoy the praise and name-giving in ab and on that basis reward us by gaining favor for us, rather than simply whether he will gain that favor. I’m not sure how to render this in tr., however; it may require, in English, promoting the part. *cakānāḥ* to a main verb: “he will enjoy this, will he not? (and) gain ...”

If *kuvíd* is targeting *cakānāḥ* here, this may help explain the lack of accent on the main verb *vanate*. Though *kuvíd* usually triggers verbal accent, it sometimes does not. Acdg. to Gr., the verb is unaccented when it occurs in a different pāda from *kuvíd*, but there seem to be more exceptions than examples that conform to the rule. See disc. ad II.35.1. We cannot here simply claim that pāda c is a separate nominal clause, to which *vanate* in d does not belong because it is highly likely that the instr. phrase *devásya sáhasā* should be construed with *vanate* in d, as the publ. tr. has it. By contrast, many tr. (Old, Re [though only *sáhasā*, not *devásya*], WG – but not Ge or Kü 142) construe the phrase with *cakānāḥ* (e.g., Old [SBE] “delighting in his divine power”), but this loses the connection between *joṣáyāse* and *cakānāḥ*.

V.3.12: Given that *āgas-* in 7a indicates an act of aggression by someone else against us, we should be careful not to read *āgo avāci* “this offense has been spoken” as a confession of his own misdeed on the part of the poet. Instead he is summing up his presentation of the threats and menacing people that beset him from outside, mentioned here and there earlier in the hymn. “Announced” might be better than “spoken”: Agni is on notice to protect his client.

The final phrase “to him doing harm” is somewhat hard to place. I would change to “to one who does harm.”

V.4 Agni [SJ on JPB]

V.4.1: The publ. tr. renders *tvām ... abhí prá mande* as “In you I find exhilaration.” This interpr. conforms to those of Re, Gotō (1st Cl, 236 n. 520), Kü (358–59); on Ge’s somewhat bizarre interpr. of this idiom (apparently fld. here by WG), see comm. ad VII.18.21. The lexeme *abhí prá √ma(n)d* is surprisingly well represented in the RV, with both act. and middle forms. In my opinion the act. forms are transitive in the sense ‘exhilarate, stimulate’ (see comm. ad VII.18.21, 33.1, VI.18.9); the middle form *abhí prá mandase* (VIII.93.19; see also *abhí ... mandase* X.50.2) is intr. in the sense ‘become exhilarated’. However, contra the standard view (incl. that of the publ. tr.) I consider *abhí prá mande* in this passage to be transitive (so also Old SBE) and would emend the tr. to “I stimulate you at the rites.” Although the form is middle, 1st sg. middles often have a special status, in that the particularly self-involving quality of the 1st sg. can override usual voice distinctions and allow an active sense to be realized by a middle form. (For another likely ex., see comm. ad X.49.11.) As for the form itself, as pointed out by several (Gotō, Kü, both loc. cit.), it can belong either to the perfect to *√mad* (<*ma-md-e) or to the thematic pres. to the secondary root *√mand* – in fact the 1st sg. middle may be the pivot that allowed the sec. root to be extracted. In context the interpr. as a present fits better.

Since in my opinion *vājayá-* means ‘seeking the prize’ with no added sense of ‘racing’, I would substitute “seeking the prize, might we win the prize” in b.

On *pr̥tsutí-* and its analysis as a possible haplogy, see comm. ad I.110.7.

V.4.3: On *viśāṃ kavīm viśpátim* see disc. ad III.2.10; as indicated there, I think we must read the formulaic NP *viśāṃ ... viśpátim* together, with *kavīm* an intrusion. The fem. gen. pl. *mānuṣīṇām* at the end of the pāda also belongs in the phrase. I would therefore correct the tr. to “clan lord of the clans stemming from Manu, poet ...” Note that this formula echoes *vásupatiṃ vásūnām* “goods-lord of goods” in 1a.

V.4.5: On the not entirely predictable semantics of *abhiyúj-* see Scar (422–23).

V.4.6: The standard tr. simply ignore the *hí* in the first pāda. However, JPB has argued (2012, Fs. Bronkhorst) that *hí* in an imperative cl. provides the grounds for the action of a following impv. (see comm. ad I.10.4, 14.12, etc.). In this case the two imperatives, *prá ... cātāyasva* and *pāhi*, are separated by two intervening pādas, a complex participial phrase (b) and a *yád* subordinate clause (c). Nonetheless, the same causal relationship holds: by chasing away the Dasyu, while gaining vigor for himself, Agni becomes capable of protecting us. The relationship between the two imperatives is made clearer by the reversal of c and d in the publ. tr.

The loc. *vāje* functions as a single-word loc. absol., the loc. of the stake.

V.4.7: On the metrical problem in pāda a, localized in *ukthaiḥ*, see Old (Noten). There does not seem to be an easy or obvious solution for the three forms (also II.11.2, X.24.2) of this extremely common instr. pl. that would be better read trisyllabic.

V.4.7–8: These two vss. showcase the 1st pl. prn., with 6 forms in pāda-initial position: *vayám* (7a, b), *asmé* (7c, d), *asmākam* (8a), *vayám* (8c).

V.4.10: The publ. tr. of this vs. seems somewhat jumbled, in great part because the Skt. itself is. I think it would read more smoothly and convey the sense better if pāda c is treated as a parenthetical interjection, so that the 1st ps. subject of the rel. cl. in ab can also be the subject of what I consider the main cl. in d -- and what is desired in d has a direct connection to the circumstances of b. Substitute the tr. “I who, thinking (on you) with a simple heart, as a mortal repeatedly invoke you, the immortal – set glory on us, o Jātavedas – might I attain immortality through offspring, o Agni.”

V.4.11: The *sukṛte* responds to *sukṛtaḥ* in 8c. It could perhaps be folded more neatly into the relative expression: “for whichever right-acting one you will make ...”

V.5 Āprī [SJ on JPB]

V.5.4: As indicated in the publ. tr., this vs. lacks the overt key word that would be expected here, namely *barhís-* ‘ritual grass’. Assuming that this neut. noun is to be supplied in this vs. as subj. of *ví prathasva* – as is entirely justified (see, e.g., X.110.4 *barhīḥ ... vy ù prathate*) – there is an apparent grammatical problem: the adj. *ūrṇamradā(h)* appears to be masc./fem., not neut. (In its only other occurrence [X.18.10], *ūrṇamradāḥ* modifies fem. *prthivī-*.) Gr (s.v. *ūrṇamradas-*) suggests that the underlying *barhis* is being conceived of as a deity and therefore gendered, but this does not seem to be the case in other Āprī hymns. Although evidence is scanty, in that in most Āprī hymns *barhīḥ* appears in the acc. and most adjectives modifying it are thematic and therefore neut. and masc. can’t be distinguished, at least in VII.2.4 the *barhis* is modified by a

clear neut. adj. *pṛṣadvat* ‘dappled’. Even clearer, in X.70.4 *barhīḥ* is the subject and is modified by a series of neut. adjs. *devājuṣṭam ... dīrghám ... surabhí*, even though it is addressed in the voc. as a god: *deva barhīḥ*. The only other place in the Āprī hymns where *barhīḥ* is modified by an apparently gendered adj. is III.4.4 *devávyacā(ḥ) ... barhīḥ* “the barhis providing an expanse for the gods.” This is the clue: both problematic adjectives (*devávyacāḥ* in III.4 and *úrnamradāḥ* here) are -as-stems in bahuvrīhis, with an -ās ending apparently modifying a neut. noun. This apparent gender mismatch is actually fairly common; see esp. comm. ad II.31.5.

V.6 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The hymn is in Pañkti (5 x 8), with the final pāda of each vs. a refrain that is semi-detached syntactically from the rest of the vs. In particular, it contains the 2nd sg. impv. *ā bhara* “bring here,” which must be addressed to Agni — but the first three vss. have Agni in the 3rd ps. sg., not the 2nd person. Vss. 4 and 5 switch to 2nd sg., so the refrain is better integrated, but vss. 6–7 have fires/flames in the 3rd pl. Vss. 8–9 return to 2nd sg. Agni, and in fact the first two pādas of vs. 8 contain the refrain verbatim, though scrambled and expanded. Vs. 10, the summary vs., is again in the 3rd ps. The effect is to keep the hearers slightly off balance.

The hymn also starts off with a series of repeated rhetorical patterns; see comm. on the 1st three vss.

V.6.1: To capture the somewhat unusual word order in pāda a (*agnīm tām manye yó vásuḥ*), I would be tempted to slightly recast the beginning of the vs. as “Agni – I contemplate him, who is the good one ...”

As Ge points out (n. 1b), all this home-going suggests that the evening fire is at issue.

V.6.2: Pāda a is a variant on 1a, with Agni transposed from acc. to nom. in both main and rel. clauses and the order of his name and the demon. flipped: *só agnir yó vásur grṇé*. The rest of the vs. is structured exactly like 1b–d, with a pāda-init. repeated element (*sám*, corresponding to *astám* in 1), followed in b by the acc. rel. *yám* and the 3rd pl. pres. to *√i* (1b *yám yánti*, 2b *yám āyánti*) with the subj. *dhénavaḥ* in both. Pādas c and d gap the rel. prn. and the verb, which are clearly to be supplied in both from b, with variable subjects – loosening up as the vs. progresses: c has *árvantaḥ* like 1c, but with a different adj.; d has an entirely new subject, and the first human one.

Note the *t*-less passive *grṇé*, built to the 9th class pres. stem.

On *t*-less *raghu-drú-*, see comm. ad X.61.16.

V.6.3: Although this vs. gives up the rigid structural repetitions of vss. 1–2, it keeps the pattern of initial repeated word with gapped verb, with pāda a beginning *agnīḥ*, with obj. and verb distributed across ab, and pāda c, also beginning with *agnīḥ*, followed by an adj. modifying the original object, and the verb to be supplied from b.

Old (both SBE and Noten) rightly rejects BR’s emendation of *rāyé* to *rayím*, which is reproduced approvingly by Gr.

The subject of d could be either the *vājín-* or Agni. Old favors the former, on the basis of the association of *√prī* and *prītá-* with that stem (see also the passages adduced in Ge’s n. 3c). I would follow this interpr.; it is not clear how the other tr. take it: the “he” of the publ. tr. suggests that the god is assumed to be the subj., and at least Re’s tr. suggests the same. Of course, if the

publ. intro. is correct that the *vājín-* that Agni gives is Agni himself, the question is less important. Still, I would change “he journeys” to “it.”

The VP *yāti vār'yam* strikes me as a sly twist on the formula *dāti vār'yam* (e.g., V.48.5 *dāti vār'yam*) that figures in the disc. of the problematic compound “type” *dāti-vāra-*, but perhaps I’m simply too close to it. See my 2024 IEL article “Vedic Evidence for the Verbal-Governing *dāti-vāra-* Compound ‘Type’: A Critical Reassessment.”

V.6.4: This vs. gives up any structural connection with the preceding ones; however, it does open in the same way as 5: *ā te agne*, and it is also highly alliterative: ... *idhīmahi*, *dyumāntam deva* ... / *yād dha* ..., *samīd dīdāyati dyāvi*.

We would really expect **tvā* for *te* in pāda a, as Old points out: both the verb (*idhīmahi*) and the adjectives qualifying its object (*dyumāntam* ... *ajāram*) presuppose “fire.” However, a supplied “flame” is a good substitute. Though as Re remarks, the *te* anticipates the one in 5a (see remarks immed. above), this pattern is not enough to induce a poet arbitrarily to substitute one case for another – esp. since the *te* in 5 is pleonastic.

Old suggests that the “kindling stick in heaven” is actually the sun, a view accepted by Ge (n. 4cd).

For the rather awkward “admired more,” I would substitute “ever more admirable.”

V.6.5: This vs. represents a different structural experiment: the actual sentence consists of pāda a and the last part of pāda d, with everything in between – b, c, and the 1st word of d – an elaborate voc. phrase. Both b and c end with a (-) *pate* voc. The discontinuous clause consists of # *ā te* ... *ṛcā háviḥ* ... / ... *túbhyam hūyate* #, with *túbhyam* doubling *te* in pāda a, which is perhaps there to give the audience some hope that there will be a clause after the vocatives end. I will attempt here a tr. that reflects the word order, but it will be close to unparsable: “For you, o Agni, the oblation along with our verse – o lord of the blazing flame, o much-gleaming wondrous lord of the clans, o conveyor of oblations – for you (it) is poured.” The first pāda is also found in VI.16.47, where it is easily construed with the immediately following pāda.

V.6.6: Although Gr takes *prá* ... *puṣyanti* as a lexeme, and Old (SBE) tr. pādas ab as a single cl. (so also Bl RR, ad I.81.9), both the fact that this would be the only occurrence of *prá* *√puṣ* in the RV and the fact that pāda b is found independently elsewhere (= I.81.9, ≅ X.133.2) suggest that pāda a is a separate cl. and another verb (most likely *√as*) should be supplied in it. So already Ge (see n. 6ab), fld. by Re and WG, as well as the publ. tr.

Pāda c *té hinvire tá invire* makes a nice figure. The question is what is the valency of these verbs. Old, fld. by the publ. tr., takes them both as transitive, supplying *vísvam* ... *vāryam* from b as their objects. Ge, Re, and WG take them both as intrans. Although the medial form of the verbs favors the intrans. interpr., parallel usage favors the trans. one. All but one (X.50.3) of the occurrences of *hinviré* are overtly transitive, as well as many of the occurrences of the med. part. *hinvāná-*. As for *invire*, this is the only middle form to *inóti* / *ínvati* (both stems always transitive) and clearly context-generated, so it offers no evidence. However, the parallel verb in the next pāda, *iṣanyanti*, also belongs to a consistently transitive stem. I see no alternative to following the Old interpr., and though this requires supplying an object for all three verbs, one is readily to hand.

V.6.7: The med. 3rd pl. injunc. *vrādhanta* is the sole finite form to this supposed stem and has been plausibly explained by Hoffmann (Inj. 122 n. 32; see also Gotō [1st cl. 302]) as a back-formation to the (pseudo?) participle *vrādhant-*. For further on *vrādhant-* see comm. ad X.49.8. The 3rd pl. *bhuránta* in d may have aided the creation of the finite form here.

On the dual *vrajā* see WG n., which plausibly explains the image.

V.6.8: As noted above, the first two pādas here repeat the refrain in scrambled and extended fashion; instead of the compact 8-syl. refrain *īṣaṃ stotṛbhya ā bhara*, we have ... *ā bhara*, *stotṛbhyaḥ* ... *īṣaḥ*, with pl. instead of sg. *īṣaṃ* and further terms to fill out the 16 syllables. I'm not sure what effect was intended by this elaborated repetition, esp. since it is not the final vs. of the hymn.

Fem. acc. pl. *nāvā(h)* presumably modifies both *sukṣitīḥ* and *īṣaḥ*, though most tr. apply it to only one or the other.

V.6.10: The reading *ajuryamur* is difficult. Old (flg. Sāy.) believes there are two 3rd pl. verbs *ajur yamur* “they have driven, they have led.” But the assumption of a 3rd pl. *-ur* ending in what otherwise looks like an injunc. pres. (*ajur* to *ājati*) or unredupl. pf. (so Gr) is problematic, as is the lack of accent on the 2nd verb. Considerably better is Bl's suggestion (RR 245), that it represents a haplology of **ajuryām yamur* “(him) unaging they guided.” Agni is *ajuryá-* elsewhere (e.g., I.146.4) and the synonymous *ajāra-* qualifies his flame in our vs. 4. Bl's suggestion has been adopted by Ge (see n. 10a), Re, WG, and the publ. tr.

The cmpd *āśv-āśvīyam* ring-compositionally recalls *ārvanta āśávaḥ* in 1c (and cf. *ārvanto raghudrīvaḥ* in 2c). It also introduces an etymological figure (or pseudo-etymological figure, if the etymological connection between *āśú-* and *āśva-* is no longer perceived) in this cmpd.

V.7 Agni [SJ on JPB]

This hymn and the next (V.8) are attributed to one Iṣa Ātreya, who, like the other poets so far in Maṇḍala V, is found nowhere else. He may in fact appear in the poem itself, as nom. sg. *īṣaḥ* in the final pāda of vs. 10 (so the publ. tr. inter alia, though I prefer to see this as the acc. pl. of *īṣ-* — see below). Even if this is a masc. name, it has clearly been reinterpr. from one of the first words in the hymn, the acc. sg. of the fem. root noun *īṣ-*: *īṣaṃ* opening 1b; see also acc. pl. *īṣaḥ* in 3a.

As the publ. intro. points out, this hymn is dominated by the preverb *sám* and phonological variants of it. In this it is reminiscent of the last hymn of the RV, X.191, in which *sám* and derivatives are the signature words. (See comm. ad loc.) In X.191 this focus on *sám* ‘together’ has a thematic purpose: to emphasize the message of unity, but a similar rationale for its use here is harder to identify. I think it's possible that it refers to the ritual compact and cooperation of gods and men; see esp. vs. 2.

The usual self-contained nature of RVic vss. is challenged in this hymn, where dependent clauses may hang off main clauses in adjacent vss. and be detached from the rest of their own clause. See details below. However, I would dispute the analysis proposed in the publ. intro. of a construction supposedly extending across three vss. (6–8), for which I see a different configuration; see disc. ad loc.

The hymn is also full of remarkably knotty little problems, which are treated at length below.

V.7.1: The reinterpr. of *īṣam* as a masc. (see above) may have been encouraged by the fact that the sg. adj. *samyāñcam* is masc., agreeing (presumably) with masc. *stómam* in the conjoined NP *īṣam stómam ca*, rather than with the nearer term *īṣam*.

Note also that (*ī*)*ṣam* participates in the *sám* figure.

V.7.1–2: These two vss. together form a single sentence, with the main cl. occupying all of vs. 1, while vs. 2 consists of two rel. clauses (ab / cd). In fact, by my interpr. the first half of vs. 3 also belongs here. See below. Neither the main clause (vs. 1) nor the first of the rel. clauses (2ab) contains a finite verb or even a participle, while the 2nd rel. cl. (2cd) contains two finite verb. (And 3ab has yet another one.)

V.7.2: Unfortunately I find the English in the publ. tr. almost impossible to parse. This is primarily the fault of the Skt., and I’m not sure my alternative will be any easier to interpret:

At any encounter with whom, whenever it is, men (become) high-spirited at the
session of men [=sattra] /
at the seat of men [=ritual ground],
whom the worthy ones kindle and the people bring to birth.

Contrary to the standard tr., incl. the publ. tr., I take *kútrā cid* as temporal (“whenever”) rather than locational, since, one way or another, *nṛṣádane* provides the locus.

As for the term *nṛṣádane*-, I think it has two senses, both of which can be operative in any one passage. In addition to the obvious ‘seat of men’ [=ritual ground], I think it can also mean ‘session of men’; that is, it refers to the multiday ritual latter called a Sattra. Against most other tr., Ge champions the latter interpr. in most of its occurrences (e.g., here “in der Männersitzung” footnoted as “Dem Opfer”). Particularly clear is VII.97.1 where *nṛṣádane* is parallel to *yajñé*.

The next question is – who are all these beings? Here there is considerable ambiguity. The word *nṛ*-, though tr. ‘man’ or ‘superior man’, does not in fact have to refer to a human (though it can); it is regularly used of gods, as is well known. The participial stem *árhant*- ‘worthy, deserving’ is less ambiguous: it is always elsewhere in the RV used of gods, and, although it has not become the religious title it later becomes in Buddhism, the erstwhile participle has become essentially lexicalized (see Lowe, Part. in RV, 146 etc.). The final term, *jantú*-, leans more to the human; see, e.g., the contrast in III.3.6 *devébhīr mānuṣāś ca jantúbhiḥ* “by the gods and the kindred of Manu”). However, there are certainly passages in which gods are included under the term; see, e.g., VII.9.1 *ubháyasya jantóḥ* “of both races,” where the context makes it clear that these are gods and humans. In our passage I would follow JPB in seeing the *árhantaḥ* in c as gods (hence the *cid* ‘even’) and the *jantávaḥ* in d as humans, cooperating on the production of the ritual fire; I would not, however, confine *náraḥ* in b to priests, as JPB does. I think it possible that both gods and humans are referred to by *náraḥ*. As is also clear from my alternative tr. just given, I take *raṇvāḥ* in b as predicated of *náraḥ*, not attributed, and would not supply the verb “unite,” as JPB does.

V.7.3: The syntax of this vs. is incoherent, at least if we read the vs. as self-contained. Not only is there an *utá* apparently “conjoining” a subord. clause introduced by *yád* (ab) with a main cl.

(cd), but the present indicative (or subjunctive) *vānāmahe* (pāda a) is followed by a preterital pf. *ā dade* (d), a sequence of tense/mood difficult to construe. Note the handwaving language of JSK grasping for an explanation of non-coordinating *utá* here (DGRV I.448): “the focus of *utá* seems to be on the sememe of person inherent in *ā dade*, and the particle possesses a contrasting or perhaps reciprocal value (‘he for his part’).” This has nothing to do with any standard usage of *utá*; moreover in his tr. (p. 447) he renders the pf. *ā dade* as a present (‘he ... grasps’), flg. Ge (‘ergreift’), a solecism gleefully pounced on by Kü (241 n. 339): “GELDNER präsentisch!” Re’s interpr. makes better sense of the sequence of tense/mood: he makes ab a purpose cl. logically flg. on cd: “Afin que nous gagnions ..., ... (Agni) a saisi la rène ...” But this doesn’t solve the *utá* problem, which Re veils with the all-purpose French “alors”; moreover, purpose clauses generally follow the main cl. (and are introduced by *yáthā*). A simpler solution is to detach the subord. clause of ab from the main cl. of cd, with *utá* in c signaling a new beginning. The first hemistich can then simply continue the string of subord. clauses in vs. 2 that hang off vs. 1. The kindling of the ritual fire in 2cd is enabled by the gathering of refreshments and, esp., oblations in 3ab. As is already noted in the publ. intro., in this hymn syntactic units do not strictly coincide with metrical and vs. boundaries in the standard fashion. I would therefore reconfigure the tr. by replacing the period at the end of vs. 2 with a comma and continuing on to 3ab: “... birth, // When we (will) bring together the refreshments, together the oblations of the sons of Manu.” The pres. indic./subj. *vānāmahe* works perfectly with the pres. indic.s in 2cd. The comma at the end of 3ab should be replaced by a period, and a new sentence begun: “... of Manu. And he has taken ...”

This new sentence expresses what happens immediately after the begetting of the fire in 2cd. On the “rein of truth,” see *gaṇásya raśanām* in nearby V.1.3 and comm. there. I take this to refer to the through-line of the sacrifice. Once Agni has been kindled, he can take up the reins of ritual performance.

V.7.4–5, 7–8: Contra the publ. intro., I do not think that *smā* means ‘again’; better the alt. given there, “as always” or just “always.” Ad X.102.2 I suggest that *sma* + present in that hymn has the force of a past iterative/durative. In this hymn I don’t think there is a preterital sense, but a habitual reading works well. All five clauses concern regularly repeated actions (real or metaphorical).

V.7.4: I would substitute “He always makes a beacon ...” for “Again he makes ...”; similarly, “he always diminishes ...” for “Again he diminishes ...”

I do not understand the *ā* at the end of pāda a; ACC *ā* generally marks a goal (see Gr 169 “Praep. mit vorgehendem Acc.”), which *ketúm* is not. And it should not be in tmesis with *kṛṇoti*, because *ā* $\sqrt{kṛ}$ has the specialized meaning ‘bring here’.

Re plausibly suggests that the dat. part. *saté* (like nom. sg. *sán*) has concessive value: “even for one being far away.” I think it possible that the *cid*, as sometimes elsewhere, has been displaced to Wackernagel’s position and does not limit *náktam* (as the publ. tr. takes it), but the dat. phrase. I would substitute “makes a beacon here during the night, even for one who is far away.”

V.7.5: Both the logical connection and the syntactic connection between the two hemistichs are hard to discern, and the publ. tr. makes little attempt to discern them. To begin with the syntactic one: there is no resumptive element in cd (in the publ. tr.) corresponding to *yásya* in pāda a,

unless it is buried in *svá-* (as the publ. tr. seems to indicate). As for the logical connection, Ge (nn. 5ab and 5cd) overliterally suggests that the priests go to the hills to get firewood (cd), and it's sweaty work lugging it back (ab). But "sweat" in an Indo-Iranian ritual context refers to the sweat produced by the priests' labor at the ritual itself, viewed as an oblation (see my "Avestan *xšuuīd*: A Relic of Indo-Iranian Ritual Vocabulary." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 25 (2011 [2015]): 19–29). And "paths" refers here to the ritual cursus. Re seems to recognize the disconnect between the two hemistichs via his punctuation, a comma followed by a dash, but it's not entirely clear what he means by this. WG take the step of separating them definitively, supplying "(er ist es)" as the minimal main cl. on which the rel. cl. of ab depends, and starting over with cd. For my solution, which finds a referent in the main cl. for *yásya*, see below.

As in vs. 4, I would substitute "they always pour down" or "they are always pouring down" for "they again pour down."

I would also substitute "the" for "his," qualifying "paths."

This leaves us with a new beginning in cd. I confess I find this hemistich almost completely baffling. The situation is not helped by the fact that the lexeme *abhí √ruh* is found only here in the RV and barely elsewhere in early Vedic (the AVP citations in VB don't actually exist). The standard tr. (incl. Old [SBE], Re, Kü [p. 434], WG, and the publ. tr.) differ wildly from each other. Among the (undiscussed) issues are – does *abhí √ruh* mean 'mount on' or 'mount to' (vel sim.) and/or does it belong to *√ru(d)h* 'grow'? does *svájenyam* modify *bhūmā* or are they independent? what is the grammatical identity of *bhūmā* – N/A sg. or N/A pl. of *bhūman-* or loc. sg. of *bhūmi*? Not to mention the meaning of the hapax *svájenya-* (on my views of its base *jén-* see comm. ad I.128.7). With absolutely no confidence in the correctness of my choices (and in fact a fair certainty that some or most of them are probably wrong), I'll essay a new tr., different from the others available: "They have mounted/grown to him, who is noble by nature [=Agni], on the earth as if to the backs (of heaven)." The subj. is either the priests, or perhaps more likely the flames. They mount or grow to the rising fire (of which they are a part); for the ambiguity of the verb form, see in this same maṇḍala *rúhat* in V.36.2, which is a pun meaning both 'mount' and 'grow' (see comm. ad loc.). Since *jén-* regularly modifies Agni (see, e.g., I.128.7), I take *svájenyam* as having the same referent. I interp. *bhūmā* as loc. sg. of *bhūmi-* (as I also do in VI.62.8). As for *prṣṭhā*, rather than taking it to refer to the backs of horses as most do (Ge, Re, Kü), I think we should supply *diváh* as in the common phrase *divás prṣṭhá-* (see III.2.12, IX.36.6, etc.). The flames are rising as if to heaven itself. It might be objected that here we have plural 'backs', whereas the standard phrase is in the singular. But since there are multiple heavens, they must have multiple backs; see, e.g., IX.86.27 *trītye prṣṭhé ádhi rocané diváh* "on the third back, in the luminous realm of heaven." My suggested tr. is closest to Old's in SBE of all the standard ones, though with significant differences.

V.7.6–8: The publ. intro. claims that these three vss. contain "a highly unusual construction" that extends across them. I think the syntactic configuration is much more fluid than that; we have already seen that dependent clauses earlier in the hymn can be attached to an adjacent vs. In the case of vs. 6 I see no reason for the claim that it belongs with the flg. vs. (7) rather than continuing from vs. 5. I do think vs. 7 is a semi-detached comment on the end of vs. 6, however; see below. As for 8, I think it belongs with 9, with parallel rel. clauses (8ab, 9ab), both completed by a main cl. (9cd).

V.7.6: As just noted, I'd take the rel. cl. in vs. 6 with Agni in the acc. throughout as dependent on 5cd. Obviously one reason that JPB doesn't so construe it (I surmise) is that he does not see a direct reference to Agni in 5cd, since he takes *svájenyam* as a modifier of *bhūmā* ("this land of his own noble birth"; sim. Ge, Re, Kü), while I take *svájenyam* as referring to Agni (like Old, WG). I would therefore emend the transition of 5 to 6 to "... him, who is noble by nature ..., // whom, much coveted ..."

I would also reduce the somewhat bloated "in order that he suckle everyone [=both gods and mortals]" to "for the suckling of all." For the *dhāyase* in 9b, see comm. there.

Since *-ana*-nominals are generally transitive and agentive, I'd change the tr. of *svādanam* from 'sweetening' to 'sweetener'.

I do not understand what *prá* is doing at the beginning of c. Though I rather like Re's characterization for its rhetorical punchiness -- "débris d'une proposition principale" -- I think he's wrong, in that the accusatives here follow naturally from ab, and a main clause, however reduced to debris, would be intrusive.

V.7.7–8: Both these vss. display intractable metrical problems: both 7c and 8c lack a syllable. Although various suggestions have been made to eke out another (see Old [Noten] and Arnold), none of these is very strong, and the fact that the pattern is repeated suggests that it's a pattern and we shouldn't try to erase it. By contrast 7d has an extra syllable; although the lack in c and the excess in d seem to dovetail, there's no way to transfer the extra from d to c or to elide one of the syllables in d. The metrical irregularities seem deliberate. However, it's worth noting that pāda c, which lacks a syllable, ends with *śúcīdan*; the only other occurrence of this stem is in VII.4.2c, a Triṣṭubh pāda that is also a syllable short and ends with *śúcīdan*, which also gives a bad cadence.

V.7.7: As indicated above, I think this vs. is a comment on the end of vs. 6, specifically the last pāda: "... (Agni,) the homeland/homestead for Āyu." I would argue that he is called this because fire clears the ground for habitation and for agriculture. The *hī* cl. of 7ab expresses this directly, though with some clever twists. (Much of the comment on this hemistich is based on discussions with IH, though his ideas are somewhat different on several points. The interpr. is also close to that of WG; see also the n. on the passage there.) The statement, "for he, like a mower, is always mowing ..." (as I would tr. it), describes this clearing of the land as Agni's job: the *sma* 'always, constantly' and the "habitual" feature of the agent noun *dātar-* reinforce each other.

As for what he mows, the sandhi of the acc. NP *dhānvākṣitam* of the Saṃhitā text can be analyzed in two different ways – and I suggest that both are operative and that one of them can itself then be interpr. in two additional ways. The Pp. takes the 2nd word to be *ākṣitam*, generally interpr. to mean 'inhabited' (from *ā* √*kṣi* 'dwell'). Re (n.) takes this as a thematic deriv. of the root noun cmpd. *ākṣīt-* on the grounds that it cannot be what it appears to be – a ppl. -- since a ppl. is not attested to this root, having been "evicted" by the common (*á-*)*kṣita-* 'imperishable' to homonymous √*kṣi* 'destroy'. But this is circular: it can't exist because it doesn't exist. I see no reason why a ppl. to 'dwell' in clear context could not exist, at least marginally – just as the agent noun *dātar-* here is clearly to be interpr. 'mower' (to √*dā* 'mow') in context, against more common and mainstream *dātar-* 'giver' (for further on this see below). Moreover, the other possible sandhi division, yielding *ākṣitam*, is not only possible, but can also belong to 'dwell' rather than 'destroy', despite the well-attested homonym 'imperishable' (where Gr puts it) – in the meaning 'uninhabited'. This is the interpr. of the publ. tr. ("uninhabitable wasteland"). I do

think this is one of the operative readings here, but I would claim that there are two others, each starting with the Pp. *ākṣitam*. In one this is a proleptic adjective: “he mows the wasteland (such that it becomes) inhabitable”; in another, *dhánva* and *ākṣitam* are a merism: “he mows the wasteland (and) the inhabited (land)” (in the latter case, we would be dealing with the use of fire to burn crop residue in cultivated fields, which seems to be well attested for antiquity and is also a common, and environmentally problematic, practice in modern India).

To summarize, there are three simultaneous readings of the phrase ... *dhánvākṣitam* ...
dāti ...

<i>dhánva ākṣitam</i> ... <i>dāti</i>	“he mows the uninhabited wasteland”
<i>dhánva ākṣitam</i> ... <i>dāti</i>	“he mows the wasteland (to become) inhabited”
<i>dhánva ākṣitam</i> ... <i>dāti</i>	“he mows the wasteland (and) the inhabited (land)”

The “mower” image then gives way, with scarcely any signal (an enigmatic use of *ā*? whose function here I don’t understand), to another one: the *paśú*-, with a transitive (in the technical logical sense) metamorphosis of the image: Agni is like a mower; a mower is like a pasture animal, because it also clears the land of vegetation, but by cropping it with its teeth. Hence Agni is (like) a *paśú*-; this same image is found in slightly different guise in nearby V.9.4, a hymn that shares a number of features with this one.

The *paśú*- is found at the very end of the hemistich, but in my view the image is continued in the next pāda (c): “with golden beard and blazing teeth.” In context these bahuvr̥his depict Agni as a goat, albeit a fiery goat: goat’s teeth, found only in the lower jaw, are quite prominent and visually salient [see the images of goat’s teeth on the web] and a goat’s beard hangs off the lower jaw just below.

The final pāda returns to more conventional imagery, unconnected to the agricultural diversion in the first three pādas.

To put this all together, I’d render the end of 6 and vs. 7 this way:

6d: ... (Agni,) also the homeland/homestead for Āyu.

7ab: For like a mower he mows the uninhabited wasteland
the wasteland (to become) inhabited
the wasteland (and) the inhabited (land)

(like) a grazing animal [=goat],

7cd: which has a golden beard and blazing teeth – (and) a craftsman whose might cannot be blunted.

The root $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘mow’ is of course barely attested, particularly in comparison with its dominating homonym $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘give’. Although ‘give’ does not have a root present, as ‘mow’ does, the root aor. subjunctive *dāti* ‘will give’ is marginally attested, so even the present form *dāti* here does not guarantee the root affiliation – it is only context that does. And the agent noun *dātar*- could belong to either. The poet is obviously aware of the possible interference of ‘give’ here, and in fact plays on it in the final vs. (10b), where two forms of ‘give’ (*tvādātam* and *dade*) are construed with the same *paśú*- that appears here. This should not surprise us, given the range of this poet’s tricks.

V.7.8: The difficulties do not let up. The major question in this vs. is the referent of *yásmai* in pāda a. The default choice would be Agni, and this is in fact the choice of most tr. However, this

creates considerable difficulties: the masc. nom. adj. *śúciḥ* immed. preceding *yásmai* would naturally modify Agni (see *śúcidan* in 7c), and it is Agni to whom the axe should be compared: see VII.3.9 *pūtēva svádhitīḥ śúciḥ* “(Agni), gleaming like a (heat-)purified axe”; V.48.4 (in this same maṇḍala) *tām asya rūtīm paraśóḥ iva* “this stream(ing) of his [=Agni’s], like (that) of an ax.” There are ways around this clash of cases: *śúciḥ* can be made to refer to something else, either a part of Agni, like “flame” (so Ge), or an offering. The latter is Old’s tack (fld. by Re); he suggests ghee, and in fact considers emending *śúciḥ* to neut. *śúci* to match the gender of *ghṛtām*. By contrast, WG simply take *śúciḥ* as a one-word nominal cl., on which the *yásmai* cl. is dependent (“Flammend (ist Agni), für den ...”), but this seems artificial and contrary to the way rel. cl. generally work in the RV (though I admit I’ve resorted to such an explanation elsewhere), where a 2nd-position rel. within its clause is extremely common. The other approach is to allow Agni to be the subject, given the rhetorical support for this identification just detailed, and find another referent for *yásmai*. This is the solution of the publ. tr., which takes it to be the sacrificer. Since the rel. prn. *yáḥ* in the flg. vs. (9a) does have such a referent, there is good support for this identification – and in fact this interpr. goes back to Bergaigne (see Old, Noten). But the intro. of this figure without preparation seems abrupt, esp. because the main clause of the 2nd hemistich has nothing to do with the sacrificer, though we should expect the rel. prn. to have a correspondent in the main cl. JPB clearly recognizes the awkwardness of this and in the publ. tr. reverses the order of the hemistichs, translating cd before ab (which is contrary to our agreed-upon practice). But the need for such a reversal is almost never felt in the RV, and so this disturbance in the publ. tr. signals that this solution, at least in this particular form, is questionable. I am inclined to follow the publ. tr. (and Bergaigne) in their identification of the referent of *yásmai*, and to make this rel. cl. parallel to 9a *ā yáḥ* ... As for 8cd, I would take it as a parenthetical intrusion. I realize that this is an ad hoc stratagem, but I think trying to interpr. cd as the main cl. to 8ab makes for thematic incoherence.

The simile *svádhitīva* either shows irregular sandhi or is based on a long-*ī*-stem fem. *svádhitī-* not otherwise attested — except possibly in *svádhitī-vant-* in I.88.2, though that form is probably the result of metrical lengthening before *-vant-* (see comm. ad loc.). The Pp. here reads *svádhitīḥ iva*. See Old and AiG III.144–45, who see an irregular loss of the final consonant and contraction of the two *i*-vowels.

We now must tackle the 2nd hemistich. As I said, it seems to have little to do with the first. Although the standard assumption (which I consider correct) is that Agni is the gapped object in c, this description of Agni’s birth is unusual in that usually two parents [=the pair of kindling sticks] are mentioned – though see nearby V.9.3, where a single stick (*arāṇī*) gives birth (*jāniṣṭa*). The relevance of pāda d is also unclear. Acdg, to Old (SBE) and Ge, the mother gives birth “after she had enjoyed love” (Old; Ge “Liebesglück”); the other tr. take *bhāga-* rather more generally. But all of the standard treatments (here incl. Scar 624) assume that the mother is the subj. of d as well as c. But I think more sense can be wrung out of it if we take *Agni* as the subj. of d: his mother easily gave birth to him and in consequence he obtained his *bhāga-*. This parenthetical aside explains how, in the first hemistich, Agni can “stream like an axe” – he is amply provisioned. I would further suggest that his *bhāga-* is specified in the next vs., with the voc. *sarpirāsute* ‘whose portion is melted butter’; the offering of *sarpís-* into the fire sets off a shower of sparks.

Putting this all together, I would suggest a revised tr. of this vs.:

For whom [=the sacrificer], as for Atri, blazing (Agni) always streams like an axe,

— his easily bearing mother bore (him [=Agni]), such that he successfully obtained his portion (of fuel) –

As for what “streaming like an axe” means with regard to fire, see comm. ad V.48.4: I think it refers to the arc of sparks coming from a well-kindled fire, and conflates the movement of an axe being wielded with the material product of the fire, the sparks, following the same type of trajectory.

Once again, by my interpr., the vs. is not self-contained. The rel. cl. of ab is parallel to the rel. cl. in 9ab, and both find their main cl. in 9cd.

V.7.9: As noted just above, I think that the referent of the rel. *yáh* in pāda a is the same as that of *yásmāi* in 8a, and both refer to the sacrificer. In the case of 9a, all tr. agree on this identification.

The dat. *dhāyase* returns from 6b, and JPB interprets it in essentially the same way: “so that you suckle (everyone).” But I actually think they are used in different ways. In 6b Agni is the dispenser of nourishment, the suckler of all, both gods and men. This is made clear not only by the *vīśvasya* construed with *dhāyase*, but by the next pāda (c), where he is called “the sweetener of foods.” But here I think Agni is the recipient of suckling, with the dispenser being the sacrificer, who, as it were, stands in for the mother of 8c. In 8d Agni (in my interpr.) obtains his portion after his mother bears him; the “portion” is, in my view, the melted butter embedded in the voc. addressed to Agni ‘you whose portion is melted butter’ (*sarpirāsute*). The subject, i.e., the sacrificer, is “luck” (*śám*) for Agni because he provides Agni with this butter. I would therefore emend the tr. of ab to “Who [=sacrificer] is luck for you, o Agni, for your suckling, o you whose portion is melted butter.”

With two parallel rel. clauses referring to the sacrificer (*yásmāi* 8a, *yáh* 9a), we would expect the main cl. to begin with a resounding sg. *tám*. But our poet continues to keep his audience off-balance – here by switching the number from sg. to pl. and evading the conventionally expected pronominal referent. Instead of **tám* (or *tásmin*) we get *eṣu*, which is further specified by *mártyeṣu* later in the hemistich. The rest of the hemistich is straightforward and stereotyped, but the poet could obviously not resist complicating the relative/correlative structure. I would emend the tr. to “on these, on these mortals, confer brilliance and fame ...” Pace WG, I do not think that *dyumnám utá śrávaḥ* belong with *eṣu* and *cittám* with *mártyeṣu*.

V.7.10: The hymn remains intractable to the end – though no worse than what precedes. The opening *íti cid* “in just these words” is appropriate for a summary vs. citing the hymn that precedes. (For other citational uses of this phrase, see V.41.17 and X.120.4, both adduced by Re.) However, what follows in vs. 10 would imply that the hymn being cited is a battle hymn – though the contents of vss. 1–9 are not aggressive or hostile, and in fact the concentration on the word *sám* and its variants (see publ. intro. and hymn intro. above) suggest a theme of unity and cooperation rather than conflict.

Opinions differ on what to do with the first pāda, i.e., with the phrase *manyúm adríjaḥ*. Old, Re, and the publ. tr. take it as one of the objects of *ā ... dade*, and I think this is correct. WG simply leave the phrase hanging separately. Ge supplies a separate verb, from *√mī* ‘diminish’, based on the root noun cmpd. *manyu-mī-* and such VPs in other passages. Although this is possible, it seems unnecessary: syntactically parallel but conceptually non-parallel phrases are not rare in the RV, and “battle-fury (and) a sacrificial animal” is hardly the most jarring example.

In fact, it is easy to imagine that the assumption of someone else's battle-fury would be accomplished both verbally (*īti cid*) and ritually, by an animal sacrifice – hence, *ā paśúm dade*.

The interpr. of the hapax *adhríjaḥ* is disputed, starting with the stem: Gr lists it as thematic *adhríja-*, hence a nom. sg., but in context it is more likely the gen. (or abl.) of an *adhríj-* and is now mostly so taken. The easiest thing to do with it is make it a PN – so the publ. tr., as well as Old and WG. However, it is hard not to try to connect it with the much-discussed (see, e.g., ad I.61.1) word *ádhrigu-*, despite the difference in accent and final cons.—esp. since the voc. *adhrigo* is found in nearby V.10.1. In which case ‘rich (man)’ would be an appropriate rendering (so Ge [hesitantly] and Re). Given the appearance of non-givers in pāda c, this fits well: rich but stingy. Taking the *manyú-* of such a person means, in the first instance, taking it away from him, and consequently deploying it oneself.

As noted above, the two forms of $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘give’ in pāda b play off $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘mow’ in 7b.

The hoped-for result of the actions in ab, esp. the ritual actions, is given in cde, introduced by *ād* ‘after that’ (i.e., after the “taking” in ab) – Atri's victory over his enemies. As noted in the hymn intro. above, it is from here that the supposed poet's name is extracted: *iṣáḥ* in pāda e. Though Old, Ge, WG, and the publ. tr. all reckon with this form as a name in the nom. sg., I consider the introduction of an otherwise unknown character to be quite unlikely – esp. since this Iṣa would upstage Atri, who should be the focus of the benefit the hymn will provide. Instead I think the poet is parceling out pieces of the final clause, across the short pādas. By my interpr. *iṣáḥ* is the acc. pl. of *iṣ-* ‘refreshment’, which is found in 3a, and as the acc. sg. *iṣam* in 1b (which would form a ring with the occurrence here in the final pāda of the hymn). I take *iṣáḥ* here as the delayed obj. of *áprñataḥ* in c, which would itself modify both *dāsyūn* and *nṛn*. I would emend the tr. of the last three pādas to “after that, o Agni, Atri should overpower the Dasyus who do not give (refreshments), should overpower the men (who do not give) refreshments.” Re also takes *iṣáḥ* as acc. pl. of *iṣ-*, though as directly governed by *sāsaḥyāt*.

V.8 Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the supposed poet Iṣa, see hymn intro. to V.7 and comm. on V.7.10.

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is structured by a simple device: each vs. begins *t"vām agne*, save for vs. 5, which has instead *t"vām agne*. All of the acc. pronouns must be read distracted, even though this distraction is only proper to the nom. found in vs. 5.

This is a conventional Agni hymn with few knots, made up in great part of accusative phrases describing Agni's ritual roles and appearance -- a relief after the elusive trickery of V.7, but much less interesting.

V.8.1: The bahuvr. *viśvādhāyasam* recalls *viśvasya dhāyase* in the immed. preceding hymn, V.7.6.

V.8.2: The root-noun cmpd *jaradvīṣ-* is disputed. Gr analyzes as *jara-dvīṣ-* ‘hating old age’, but starting with the Pp, the preferred segmentation has been *jarad-vīṣ-*, and this is reflected in most tr. For the meaning Old (SBE) suggests “busy among the decayed (wood)” (sim. Ge, Re), but Scar (248–49, under $\sqrt{dvīṣ-}$) suggests rather that the first CM is *jarát-* ‘old age’ and that we a cmpd complementary to *jarád-aṣṭi-* ‘having the attainment of old age’ (a positive state in this case), meaning ‘effecting / bringing about old age’, an interpr. found also in WG (whose tr. of Maṇḍala V is of course actually by Scar). The publ. tr. also follows this interpr., though more elaborately than necessary, with the consequent effacement of the root $\sqrt{viṣ}$: for “striving to bring

(mortals) to old age” I would substitute “effecting old age.” Given the generally positive tone of this vs., the chief reading of the adj. is probably as the publ. tr. has it: Agni makes it possible for his worshipers to live long lives. But there may be some whiff of an Oldenberg-type interpr., referring to the “age” the fire brings to its fuel, since in some passages the gray ash of the coals is depicted as the result of aging – see, e.g., V.2.4 *pāliknīr īd yuvatāyo bhavanti* “the young women become gray” and comm. thereon.

V.8.3: The root-noun cmpd *ghṛta-śrī-* is difficult to interpr; see comm. ad X.65.2, I.128.4, and (generally on *-śrī-*cmpds) III.26.5. Here in an Agni context I would now prefer “bringing the ghee to perfection.”

V.8.4: The 2nd hemistich is the first place in the hymn that Agni appears outside of the acc.; it prepares for the nom. formula *t'vām agne* opening the next vs.

I do not see any reason to supply a head noun with *naḥ* and would just (with most tr.) render *sá no juṣasva* “find pleasure in us.”

The instr.s in d are a little harder to construe, since *√juṣ* doesn’t take an instr. – but generally the acc. Here again I do not think that “songs” needs to be supplied as the head noun for *mārtasya*, which should either depend on *yaśásā* (“with the glorious X of a/the mortal”) or be gen.-for-dat. recipient “with your *yaśásā* and *sudītībhiḥ* for the mortal”). It is difficult to know what to supply with the adj. *yaśásā*, though I quite agree with Old that (*pace* BR, Gr, etc.) it should not be emended to the noun **yáśasā*. Old (SBE) supplies “offering,” Ge “Gabe,” WG “Ehren(-Gabe).” (Re goes completely off the rails.) If I were to go this route, I would suggest “homage” (**námasā*), since it is found in pāda b. But the trouble with all these otherwise sensible interpr. is the case-frame issue I raised above: these instrumental can only be construed with *juṣasva* in the loosest possible way. I therefore am taken by JPB’s ascription of both instr. to Agni, though I would tinker with his interpr. of *yaśásā*: “with a glorious (fire?).” I have two alternatives to float. The most constant referent of *yaśás-* is ‘wealth’ (*rayīm* in the acc. sg.), and Agni is the regular dispenser of it – see, esp., VI.8.5 ... *grṇádbhyó, 'gne rayīm yaśásam dhehi* ... “O Agni, establish glorious wealth for the singers” (note the same singers, *grṇántaḥ*, in our pāda b). I would suggest tr. “... the god, with glorious (wealth) for the mortal (gen. for dat.), with your bright lights.” Alternatively, and more radically, sg. *yaśásā* might stand in for the pl. and modify *sudītībhiḥ*, avoiding the singsong and metrically awkward **yaśóbhiḥ sudītībhiḥ* -- and meaning “with your glorious bright lights for the mortal.” This alt. requires assuming that such a number swap is possible, but see, with the swap in the other direction, I.129.8 *sváyaśobhir ūtī*, ordinarily interpr. as “with his self-glorious help(s)”; see comm. ad loc. Note that that in that ex. the *as-* stem adj. also modifies a fem., as it would here. Although the 2nd alt. requires more machinery, I mildly favor it, since it avoids supplying “wealth” out of nowhere.

V.8.5: *pururūpa-* returns from 2c, as does *vís-* found in both 2a and 3a. In fact, *puru-* is a signature word for this vs.: *purutūpaḥ* (a), *puruṣtuta* (b), *purūṇi* (c).

V.8.7: This vs. not only reprises part of vs. 1 in ring composition but repeats phraseology from the previous vs. The verb closing the first hemistich, *sám īdhire*, exactly repeats the final of 1a; *sám vidh* has surfaced several times in between (4c, 6a). It is reinforced here with the instr. *suṣamīdhā*, and the expressed subjects of 1a and 7b fall in the same general semantic domain and are morphologically parallel: *ṛtāyávaḥ* ‘seeking truth’ / *sumnāyávaḥ* ‘seeking favor’.

As for vs. 6, in 7a *āhutam ghr̥taīḥ* expands on / reconfigures 6c *ghr̥tá(-yonim) āhutam*; in d *jr̥áyāmsi* reprises (*uru-*)*jr̥áyasam* in 6c.

The *sá* beginning the 2nd hemistich violates my *sá figé* rule, in that it has 2nd sg. reference in a non-imperative cl. I do not have a good explanation for this; perhaps it's matching the *sá* of 4c, the first appearance of Agni in the nom., where the impv. *juṣasva* justified that usage.

V.9–10 Agni

These two hymns are attributed to Gaya Ātreya. Though another Gaya poet is found in the Anukramaṇī, his patronymic is different (Gaya Plāta); he is named as the poet of two All God hymns, X.63–64, which have nothing in common with the two here. Instead the name here has probably been adapted from V.10.3; see MM, PN 2.1.160.

V.9 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The hymn begins *t"vām agne*, concatenating with the previous hymn (V.8), six of whose seven vss. begin the same way. This opening is not repeated, however, and the two hymns are in quite different meters and different styles. In fact, this hymn has more in common with the tricky V.7, esp. in its use of constructions that breach verse boundaries and that run counter to phraseological parallels (see disc. ad vss. 2–5). Like V.7, it also contains repeated instances of *sma*, as well as a complex simile about livestock (see vs. 4).

V.9.1: Not only does the hymn begin *t"vām agne*, but the opening of the second pāda, *devām mártāsaḥ* recalls V.8.4d *devó mártasya* – though, to be fair, juxtapositions of god and mortal are not rare in the RV.

V.9.2: Although I am a champion of condensed expression – and I like the idea of a dwelling place that possesses both gifts and twisted barhis – I wonder if the genitives *dāsvataḥ* and *vr̥ktābarhiṣaḥ* are actually dependent on *kṣáyasya*, modifying the person whose dwelling it is: “... the Hotar of the dwelling of (the one) rich in gifts who has twisted the ritual grass.” (Re goes halfway there: he takes *dāsvataḥ* with *kṣáyasya*, but supplies a personal referent for *vr̥ktābarhiṣaḥ*.) Both those stems regularly modify animate beings. The stem *kṣáy-* elsewhere has such a genitive dependent on it: see, e.g., nearby V.12.6 *tásya kṣáyah* ..., and the gen. form of *kṣáyasya* would obscure the more complex NP. However, I would accept either alternative.

The position of the relative *yám* is quite anomalous for the RV, flg. all the rest of its clause, incl. both subj. and verb. I do not have an explanation, but wonder if it was so placed to allow the full parallelism of c and d to emerge clearly.

V.9.2–5: These four vss. contain multiple dependent clauses, whose affiliations have to be sorted out. These are 2cd with *yám*; 3, which entire vs. is a rel. cl. based on *yám* in pāda a; 4cd with *yáḥ*; 5ab with *yásya*; 5cd with *yád*. Of these, 2cd and 3 are parallel rel. clauses conjoined by *utá* (3a), both dependent on 2ab. Although vss. 3 and 4 both begin with *utá sma*, this parallelism is misleading, since vs. 4 represents a new beginning, with the main cl. in ab on which the rel. cl. in cd depends. Vs. 5 begins *ádha sma*, which seems to link it to vs. 4, and indeed the rel. cl. in 5ab can belong there (and is so taken by some; see below), but could instead start a new complex syntagm, which also contains the circumstantial dependent clause in 5cd, all culminating in a main cl. in 5e – quite fittingly one of two “extra” pādas in an otherwise Anuṣṭubh hymn; the

other is in vs. 7 and is an awkward add-on. On these structures see JSK (DGRV I.422–24; II.118 n. 38), as well as the publ. intro., and comm. below on individual vss. After this long stretch of syntactic fluidity, the hymn (mostly) settles down in the last two vss. (6–7).

V.9.3–5: As indicated above, ad V.7.4–5, 7–8, I do not think that *sma* means ‘again’, but rather ‘as always’ or just ‘always’.

V.9.3: As noted above, vs. 3, consisting solely of a rel. cl., depends on 2ab and is parallel to the rel. cl. in 2cd. Because it is parallel to a rel. cl. containing a pres. tense verb (*sám ... cáranti*) and is dependent on a nominal cl. that is inherently presential (“Agni is the Hotar ...”) – and indeed because all the verbs in this set of connected vss. (2–5) are presential – I would not interpr. the injunc. *jāniṣṭa* in 3b as preterital, as in most standard tr., incl. the publ. tr. “has again given birth” – but rather as a general statement of ritual habit: “to whom, as always, the churning stick gives birth.” So also KH (Injunc. 136).

V.9.4: The difficult word here is *hvāryá-*, derived from $\sqrt{hvr}$ ‘go crookedly’ (etc.) and found only once elsewhere (VI.2.8). Although I quite like the “snake” interpr. in the publ. tr. (see also Tichy, *Nomina agentis* 312), it is difficult to reconcile with the other occurrence of *hvāryá-*, which is found in a simile involving a horse (*átyo ná hvāryáh śíśuḥ*). And reconciliation is needed because the passages are so similar: not only does VI.2.8 also contain a word for young animal: *śíśu-* like *putrá-* here (and note that *śíśu-* is found in our 3a), but our pāda d is found identically in the next vs., VI.2.9b: *ágne paśúr ná yávase*. For *hvāryá-* in VI.2.8 I devised an interpr. “made to run in circles” reflecting horse-training practice, and I’m afraid I conceived an over-fondness for it. But I think I have to abandon it. In its place I would substitute “skittish,” a development of “move unpredictably” – against, say, JSK’s “meandering.” Race horses / steeds (*átya-*) are skittish by nature, and their colts presumably even more so. I would therefore change the tr. here to “Like the son of skittish (steeds) you are always hard to grasp.”

The publ. tr.’s ‘consumer’ for *dāgdhā* works better with the simile in d, but nevertheless, it should be rendered more literally as ‘burner’, though with a softening parenthetical explanation: “you who are the burner [=consumer] of much wood, like a grazing animal ...” In VI.2.9 the simile is also preceded by a pāda lacking the crucial ‘eat’ expression; see comm. ad loc. The shared characteristic of fire and the *paśú-* is their cropping and consuming of vegetation, as is also expressed in V.7.7, discussed in detail above – another point of contact between these two hymns.

V.9.5: As noted above, the first hemistich may either belong with vs. 4 as a rel. cl. parallel to the rel. cl. in 4cd, or it may mark a new beginning as a rel. cl. whose main cl. is found in 5e. In part the decision depends on how much weight to give to the *sma* that matches those in 3a and 4a, and what rhetorical function to assign to *ádha*. If we take *ádha* as a particle that advances the discourse (“(and) then, (and) therefore, (and) so” – JSK, DGRV II.92 and passim), it would seem to signal a break between vss. 4 and 5, as in the publ. tr. “Then ...” But JSK himself (DGRV II.119 n. 38), putting more weight on the parallel *sma*, claims that in this passage *ádha* is “a simple connective” as shown by “the tight nexus” of vss. 4 and 5, with 4cd and 5ab being “enjambéd coordinate relative clauses”: “thou who dost burn many pieces of wood / And whose flames ... unite.” If we follow JSK, we must assume 2nd ps. ref. for the *yásya* in 5a: “(you) whose flames ...,” matching *yáh ... asi* “(you) who are ...” in 4c -- with a switch to 3rd ps.

ref. in 5cde (or, to be more precise, 5e). But this is not a problem: nothing in 5ab ties Agni to either 2nd or 3rd ps. ref. Re's "toi dont ..." for *yásya* in 5a indicates that his 5ab leans backwards to vs. 4, though as often his punctuation pulls both ways. Most other tr. take 5ab as the publ. tr. does, as leaning forward, with *yásya* having 3rd ps. ref. (Old SBE "he whose ... flames ..."). I actually don't have a settled opinion about this, though I'm inclined to give more weight to *ádha* as a discourse-advancing particle than JSK does in his disc. of this passage, and weakly favor the publ. tr. (et al.).

As pointed out by several tr., Sāy. takes *dhūmínah* as gen. sg., so an alt. tr. would be "of which smoky one the flames ..." On the whole, the nom. pl. seems better.

Under the interpr of ab as leaning forward., the *yád* clause of cd specifies the circumstances under which Agni's flames come together in ab (by being blown on). The etymological figure *dhmāteva dhāmati* has a structure similar to *dātā ná dāti* in V.7.7, yet another indication of connections between these two hymns. The publ. tr. "blows upon him like a blower" captures the etymological bond, but "smelter" (as in Old SBE) would be somewhat clearer.

A last uncertainty in this vs.: the final, extra, pāda begins with the verb *śíśīte*. For most, incl. JPB, this verb is accented because it is pāda-initial, and it introduces a main cl. But Old (SBE) takes it as a continuation of the *yád* cl. of cd, with no completing rel. cl. (He also takes Trita as the subj., but the otherwise standard view that Agni is the subj. is more likely correct; see Ge's n. 5e.) The publ. tr. takes the verb as intrans. "becomes sharp"; this would match the usage of the part. *śíśānah* in X.87.1, with Agni as subj. and no expressed object. However, med. *śíśīte* etc. often takes an expressed obj. that belongs to the subj., like 'horns', and a tr. like "sharpens (his own flames)" would allow the *arcāyah* of ab to have some function in the vs. So Ge, Re, WG).

The continuation of the etym. figure in d, *dhmātārī*, belongs to the disputed class of *-tārī* nominals, on which see comm. ad X.61.12, V.41.10 and Tichy (*-tar*-stems 59–61 and passim). Here a locative infinitive function seems reasonable. As elsewhere, the Pp reads the final vowel as short, but a long *-ī* is metrically much superior here.

V.9.6: With this vs. we leave the treacherous quicksand of shifting rel. clauses, but the syntax springs one last trick: a false start leading to a number mismatch. The vs. starts with an overt 1st singular prn. *ahám*, but by the time we arrive at the verb, in d, it's 1st plural *turyāma*. The change of number may have been occasioned by the pl. *dveṣo-yútaḥ* in the simile, but of course nothing prevented the sg. *dveṣo-yút* from being used instead.

The publ. tr.'s rendering of *mitráśya ca práśastibhiḥ*, "and through my proclamations of (Agni as) Mitra," specifies considerably more than I think is justified by the text or its context – though I can see what it rests on. Agni is often identified as / compared to *mitrá-*, both the god and the common noun 'alliance' (as in the next hymn, V.10.2, also V.16.1). Several times this comparison is made in conjunction with *práśasti-*. See, in this Agni cycle, V.16.1 *yám mitráṁ ná práśastibhir mártāso dadhiré puráh* "whom [=Agni] mortals have installed to the fore, like Mitra, with their proclamations" (I would substitute "with their lauds"); also VIII.74.2 *yám jánāsaḥ ... mitráṁ ná ... / práśāmsanti práśastibhiḥ* "whom [=Agni] the peoples laud with their lauds like Mitra [/an ally]." Here I think the point is not, as the publ. tr. has it, that the poet proclaims that Agni is Mitra, but rather that he praises Agni like/as Mitra, perhaps for his ability to forge alliances that will enable the overcoming of the difficulties mentioned. I would emend

the tr. to “and with lauds of Mitra/alliance” or, perhaps better, “and with lauds of you (*táva*) (as) Mitra/alliance.”

V.9.7: A strange hodgepodge of 2nd and 3rd ps., whose referents are not always clear. This vs. is treated by KH (Injunk. 259–60 with n. 298), an interpr. generally fld. by the publ. tr., which avoids some of the difficulties in previous tr. – in particular what to do with *abhí* and *náraḥ* in pāda a. KH supplies a form of $\sqrt{as}$ with *abhí*, in the lexeme ‘dominate, surmount’, with *náraḥ* the nom. pl. subj. it appears to be – rather than gen. sg. or (worse) acc. pl. acdg. to others, or Ge’s unlikely bahuvrīhi (n. 7a; fld. by WG), nom. sg. **abhīnáraḥ* modifying Agni. However, the publ. tr. needs slight adjustment, because it reads *rayím* with pāda a and seems to begin a new cl. with the unaccented voc. *sahasvaḥ*. We can either read *sahasva* with what precedes: “O Agni, mighty one, (let) our men sur(mount) this wealth. Bring (it) here”-- or, with KH, distribute *tám* and *rayím* in two different clauses: “This (wealth) (let) our men sur(mount), o Agni; bring wealth here, o mighty one.”

The next question is who is the subject of cd, twice specified as masc. *sá* with three 3rd sg. verbs. Rhetorically the more likely referent is Agni (so, e.g., Old SBE, publ. tr.), but this involves a quick switch from 2nd to 3rd ps. ref. The other possibility is “wealth” (so most clearly Re; since Reichtum is masc., German tr. with “er” are ambig.), and this is perhaps the better choice – so I would emend the tr. to “it [=wealth] causes (us) to dwell in peace ...” (“us” in both clauses should be parenthetical). The third provision is awkwardly phrased in the publ. tr.; more economical is “it will be there for (our) winning of the prize.” This third provision does not sit comfortably with “wealth” as subj (unlike the first two): how would wealth help us win prizes? Agni might be better. The question is whether switching Agni from 2nd (ab) to 3rd (cd) to 2nd (e) is too costly. Moreover, in the 1st vs. of the next hymn (V.10.1) wealth is one of the means by which Agni is urged to create “a path for the prize” (*vājāya panthām*)

The fifth, extra pāda of the vs. seems only loosely attached, and if Agni is the subject of cd, switches him back to 2nd ps. (The publ. tr. has a clear error: 3rd sg. “let him be” for 2nd sg. “be,” which should be corrected.) However, the construction – “be for DAT INF.” – is the same as d, though with a form of $\sqrt{as}$ rather than $\sqrt{bhū}$. This syntactic parallelism may explain why we get this extra pāda here. Note that the same pāda has been appended to the final vs. of the next hymn (V.10.7), which has the same poet. There the 2nd ps. reference to Agni matches that of the rest of the vs., but the syntactic and thematic connection is looser.

V.10 Agni [SJ on JPB]

V.10.1: This vs. loosely concatenates with the final vs. of V.9, with *ā bhara* repeating the same phrase in V.9.7b and with “wealth” figuring later in the vs.

On the possible connection of *adhrigo* here and the hapax *adhrīj-* see comm. ad V.7.10.

The hapax impv. *ratsi* is a -*si* impv. to $\sqrt{rad}$ ‘dig’, though, despite being a likely member of an s-aor. paradigm (as a haplologized s-aor. subj.), it is not mentioned by Narten. (Wh Rts assigns it to a root pres., but an imperatival value is favored by context.)

V.10.2: On *adbhuta-* see comm. ad V.8.7.7. I would substitute “infallible” or “unerring” for “undeceiving,” which has a misleadingly active feel to it.

By most interpr. pāda c is a parenthetical; the question is why this remark is inserted here. I think it possible that the *krátvā* in the previous pāda was the trigger; see W. E. Hale (Ásura 54–56) on the association of *krātu-* and *asuryā-*.

V.10.3: The patrons have of course not achieved their bounties through their own hymnic compositions but through those of the speaker and his fellow poets, so inserting “our” before praise songs would clarify the sociological situation. As also noted in the publ. tr., it’s not clear whether we’re dealing with one group (patrons) or two (patrons and priests/poets) here.

V.10.4: As in a number of recent hymns in this maṇḍala, the distribution of rel. and main clauses is fluid. This vs. may consist of two rel. clauses, both dependent on vs. 3, with the *yé* cl. beginning 4 parallel to the *yé* cl. of 3cd. In this case 4c is part of that rel. cl. and 4de (or part thereof) consists of a diff. rel. cl. but with *yéṣām* coreferential with *yé*. Vs. 4 would then have no main cl. However, it is possible to take the nominal phrase in c as the main cl., with both preposed and postposed rel. clauses referring to this nom. pl. phrase: “the men are spirited with high spirits.” In a variant of this interpr., 4ab could be dependent on vs. 3, with 4cde consisting of nominal main cl. and postposed rel. I don’t have any strong preferences. However, in all of this it seems desirable that the *nāraḥ* of 3d and the *nāraḥ* of 4c should be the same “men”—but whether these are patrons or poets is unclear: see the publ. intro. for the question of whether *sūrāyaḥ* (3c) and *nāraḥ* (3d) name the same group (patrons) or different ones (patrons and priests/poets).

Whatever the answer to that question, I think the subj. of 4ab and of the verb *śumbhānti* must be the poets, not the patrons, because it is poets who beautify hymns for Agni. This in turn leads to my interpr. of *ásva-rādhās-* ‘having horses as bounties’ as meaning ‘receiving horses as bounties’, rather than ‘bestowing ...’ with the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.). This matches my interpr. of the other occurrence of this cmpd, in the same phrase (*śumbhānty áśva-rādhasaḥ*), in X.21.2 (see comm. ad loc.).

The last two pādas of the vs. present a different syntactic problem. The last two words, *bódhati tmánā*, are taken as a separate tag phrase by most (incl. the publ. tr.), on the basis of the identical phrase in II.25.2 and the similar *bódhatu tmánā* in II.32.4. By this interpr. the phrase is distinct from what precedes and has a different subj. (JPB: Agni; Ge [and WG?]: the pious man). The verb is then accented because it opens a new clause. However, it is somewhat uncomfortable to have the subj. of the preceding (now nominal) rel. cl., *sukīrtīḥ*, orphaned in the last pāda of this Paṅkti vs.; a sharp syntactic boundary within this pāda seems jarring, and it might be possible to take *sukīrtīḥ* itself as the subj. of *bódhati*. The verb is then accented because it is in a rel. cl. This is the solution of Old (SBE, though not Noten) and (differently) Re. Since the interpr. of *bódhati tmánā* as a tag depends on just two passages, and in both cases the subj. of *bódhati* (*I-tu*) is the same as the subj. of the preceding verb (unlike in this case), the independent tag clause interpr. here does not rest on strong foundations, and I prefer to seek an interpr. with *bódhati* as part of the preceding rel. cl. I would substitute “... the men, whose acclaim, loft(ier) even than heaven, will be attentive (to them) by itself.” The point being that they are perceived as prominent because of the acclaim they receive. This interpr. also has the merit of not requiring a different verb (JPB’s “(rises)”) with *sukīrtīḥ*.

V.10.6: Something needs to be supplied to ground the dative infinitives in ab, but I think “bring us wealth” is too specific and heavy, though it has the merit of anticipating vs. 7; I would suggest

rather “be there” (so, more or less, Ge, Re, Keydana [Inf. 157]) or “come” (Old, JSK [DGRV I.218–19], WG).

The 2nd hemistich is very like IV.37.7cd *asmábhyaṃ sūraya stutā, víśvā āśās tarīṣāni*, with the d-pādas identical and the c-pādas containing both a form of the 1st pl. prn. and one of *sūrí-*. But there the patrons are in the voc., and the dat. *asmábhyaṃ* can be the subj. of the infin. *tarīṣāni*. Here, by contrast, the nom. patrons must be subj. of a predicated inf.

V.10.7: On the mismatch of the *ca*-conjoined datives in d, with nominal *stotṛbhyaḥ* and infinite *stávase*, and the possible ways to read them, see disc. in JSK, DGRV I.258–59. I favor the publ. tr. over Re’s assertion that the conjoined phrase is really *stotṛbhyaḥ* and *naḥ*, or Ge’s attempt to make *ca* a subordinator.

V.11–14 Agni

These four hymns are attributed to Sutambhara Ātreya, a poet not found elsewhere in the RV. Although the name can be easily interpr. (“bringing the pressed [soma]”), it does not seem to be based on any phraseology in the hymns attributed to him. The closest we come is V.12.1 *gíram bhare* “I bring a hymn.” For further on the name, see Mayr PN 2.1.569.

V.11 Agni [SJ on JPB]

A simple hymn with standard Agni tropes and lexicon.

V.11.1: I would substitute ‘wakeful’ or ‘vigilant’ for ‘awakened’ in tr. *jāgrvih*.

V.11.3: The qualifier *ásammṛṣṭaḥ* “(though) ungroomed” seems to contrast implicitly with *śúciḥ*, which therefore might better mean ‘pure, clean’ rather than ‘blazing’. But see *śúciḥ* in 1d. WG (n.) also point out the play between *√mṛj* ‘rub, groom’ and the action of the kindling sticks, which generate fire by rubbing.

As Old (Noten) points out, given the caesura, *tvāvardhayan* is better analyzed *tvā vardhayan*, rather than *avardhayan* with the Pp.

V.11.6: The opening of this final vs., *t“vām agne āṅgirasah*, recalls the opening of the final vs. of the preceding hymn, V.10.7 *t“vām no agne āṅgiraḥ* -- except that *āṅgiraḥ* there is a voc. addressed to Agni, not an indep. nom. pl. However, voc. *āṅgiraḥ* is the final word of this vs. and reestablishes the phrase.

The 2nd ps. reference of *sá* with the indic. pres. *jāyase* is sharply contrary to my rules (“Vedic ‘sá figé’: An inherited sentence connective?” *Historische Sprachforschung* 105 (1992) 213–39); I have no explanation for this violation.

For the publ. tr.’s “to great strength” for *sáho mahát* (presumably an acc.), I would substitute, with the standard tr., “(as) great strength,” a nom. Pāda d then explains the epithet *sáhasas putrá-* on this basis, as Re points out.

V.12 Agni [SJ on JPB]

Considerably less generic and predictable than the preceding hymn, V.11. As Ge points out, there is considerable focus on *rtá-*.

V.12.1: The publ. tr. brings out the play between the “well-purified” (*súpūtam*) thought (verbal product) in the mouth of the poet and the well-purified ghee offered in Agni’s mouth.

V.12.2: The voc. pf. part. *cikitvaḥ* is well represented in the Agni hymns of V (V.2.7, 3.7, 3.9, and here). This is the only occurrence of this form with an object. WG (n.) in fact deny that *ṛtām* is to be construed with *cikitvaḥ* because it lacks voc. accent, taking it instead as an anticipation of the 2nd *ṛtām*: “Auf das Ṛta, Achtgebender, auf just dieses Ṛta gib acht!” But, though possible, this seems over-fussy; in any case, if the Urtext had had **ṛtaṃ cikitvaḥ* with putative voc.-type accent, it is hard to imagine that it would have survived redaction intact, with so many forms of *ṛtá-* in the hymn, esp. the identical pl. *ṛtām* in the same pāda.

V.12.3: I do not think that *ṛtāya-* has to be limited to *speaking* truth, and would suggest the alternative “pursuing truth by means of the truth.” However, Lü (361, 481) is quite insistent that it means ‘speaking the truth [=Kultlied],’ and so the publ. tr. could stand, alluding to the crackling of the fire. (Curiously, Lü [p. 444] tr. our phrase *ṛtāyann ṛténa* by “der du das Ṛta dem Ṛta zustrebst” without an overt verbal component.) See disc. of the other occurrence of this stem ad V.43.7. On the accent and the relationship between this stem and *ṛtāyá-* see my *-āya-* Formations (p. 50).

There are several different ways of analyzing *návyah*. Gr, Lub, WG take it as the nom. sg. of a them. stem *návya-*. Old and apparently Ge, Re, and JPB instead as the gen. sg. **návyaśah*, truncated in the cadence, to the comparative *návyaś-*, to be construed with *ucáthasya*. It could also be the neut. of the comparative, used adverbially. I favor this last solution and would substitute the tr. “become newly aware of our speech.”

The root noun cmpd *ṛtu-pā-* occurs 4x (see also *ánṛtupā-*) in the meaning ‘drinking at the right season, seasonable drinker’ (see Scar 310); however, that sense does not fit here, and the 2nd member must belong to *√pā* ‘protect’ instead (Scar 301). The ‘protect’ sense would be supported by *gopāḥ* in the immediately flg. vs. (4d) as well as the preceding hymn (V.11.1) by the same poet. Pace Old, the text should not be emended to **ṛtapā ṛtānām*. In this hymn, there is no way that any form of *ṛtá-* could have become corrupted! The phrase *ṛtupā ṛtūnām* belongs to the type *vásupati- vāsūnām* (see nearby V.4.1), a formulaic adherence reinforced by the *pāti-* in the next pāda. The publ. tr. “rites-guardian of the rites’ sequence” somewhat misrepresents the formulaic nature of the phrase, and I would prefer “rites-guardian of the rites,” though strictly speaking *ṛtú-* doesn’t mean ‘rite’. There is no reason, with Old (SBE) and Re (in different ways), to construe the gen. pl. with another element in the clause.

The interpr. of d is disputed; see Old’s disc. (Noten). The issue is how to construe *patīm sanitúḥ* and the related question whether *sanitúḥ* is gen. or abl. (or, least likely, with Re an adv. equivalent to *sanutár*). The most obvious way to interpret the pāda, with a chain of genitives, *sanitúr asyá rāyáḥ*, dependent on *patīm* (“the lord of the winner of this wealth”; so Lü 444), is not very satisfactory. One expects rhetorical complementarity with pāda c: “the god knows me, but I do not (know) X,” with X corresponding somehow to the god. Ge (n. 3d) takes *patīm* and *sanitúḥ* as parallel objects of gapped *veda*, one acc., one gen. (“I do not (know) the lord (nor) the winner ...”). But the parallels he adduces for this case disharmony are not so parallel after all. The most appealing possibility, reflected in Old SBE and the publ. tr., is also the boldest: to take *sanitúḥ* as abl. and essentially supply *anyám* with *patīm* (“(another) lord than (him,) the winner of this wealth”). The winner of wealth is Agni, and the poet acknowledges him as his only lord.

Although this makes the most sense, it does require some manipulation of the text and should be so recognized.

V.12.4: For the potentially ambiguous sense of *bāndhana-* in pāda a, see publ. intro. In fact, I prefer the ironically “positive” sense suggested as an alt. there: “what bond (of friendship/kinship) do you have for the cheat” – since the other three pādas are ironically positive.

V.12.5: This vs., esp. the first hemistich, is a partial answer to the questions of vs. 4, esp. its second hemistich. The bad actors of vs. 4cd are the fickle former companions who have turned hostile. To emphasize this, I would take pāda a as a separate nominal clause: “these companions of yours are fickle/inconstant: though ... they have become unkind.”

V.12.6: Because $\sqrt{īd}$ ordinarily takes a god (vel sim.) as object, in the sense ‘reverently invoke’, I would dispute the publ. tr. “summon you [encl. *te*] to the sacrifice [acc. *yajñām* as goal]” and substitute “reverently invokes your sacrifice” (or “the sacrifice for you,” or “the sacrifice with homage to you”). By this interpr., the sacrifice is the “truth” (*ṛtām*) of the main cl. of pāda b.

Pāda b is almost identical to 2d *ṛtām sapāmi aruśāsya vṛṣṇaḥ*, and starting with Roth the reading *sá pāti* has been almost universally corrected to **sápāti*, making the pādas more similar. (WG in fact assert that this is also the reading of the Pp, but it has *sáḥ / pāti*.) This impulse is understandable, and the unusual second position of *sá* might favor it. But once again (see ad 3 above), I do not see how – with the strong support of 2d – this corruption could have happened. Instead I think the poet is playing with 2d, but pivoting from service to protection, which has been the theme in latter part of the hymn (*ṛtupāḥ* 3c, *pāyávaḥ* 4b, *pānti* 4c, *gopāḥ* 4d), and is even willing to displace the *sá* to make this word play.

I don’t understand the intrusion of *nāhuṣa-* at the end of this hymn, esp. since this PN is found only once elsewhere in V (V.73.3 *nāhuṣā yugā*).

V.13 Agni [SJ on JPB]

Another somewhat featureless hymn, like V.11 of the same poet, reminiscent also of I.1, also in Gāyatrī.

V.13.1: As Old (SBE) points out, the first two pādas ends with parallel verbs, but with one in the indic. (or possibly subj; see subj. *manāmahe* in 2a), *havāmahe*, and one in the opt., *idhīmahi*. This may be the result of metrical pressure: an indic. root aor. should be trisyllabic **idhmahi*, a subj. **edhāmahe*; both would violate the metrical matching. (Neither of these forms is remotely close to being attested.)

V.13.6: On *ṛñjase* see comm. ad IV.18.1.

V.14 Agni [SJ on JPB]

And another.

V.14.5: The publ. tr. of b, “serve him, ghee-backed!,” is somewhat inelegant and indeed misleading, since the referent of “ghee-backed” is ambig.: I’d reorder to “Agni the poet to be invoked, the ghee-backed one —serve him!”

The accented subj. *śṛṇavat*, must be, as the publ. tr. takes it, an interjection between the impv. *vētu* and its obj. *hávam*, on which *me*, in Wackernagel's position, depends.

V.15 Agni [SJ on JPB]

This is the single hymn in the RV attributed to Dharuṇa Āṅgīrasa (or any Dharuṇa); the source for this name is not hard to find: the word *dhārúṇa-* appears three times in the first two vss. (1d, 2a, 2c), where it is found with several other forms of *√dhr̥* (*dhartā* 1d, *dhārayanta* 2a, *dhárman* 2c). The stem *dhārúṇa-* returns in the last vs. (5b), but perhaps surprisingly the intermediate vss. 3–4 have no associated forms.

V.15.1: The phrase *prá ... , gíram bhare* is also found in nearby V.12.1 (attributed to a different poet), though with three pādas between the preverb and the VP, rather than one here.

On the gerundive *védya-* as meaning '(worthy) to be acquired' rather than '... to be known', see comm. ad II.2.3.

V.15.2: The standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG; see also Kü 277, 542) consider all of cd to constitute the rel. cl. whose rel. prn. *yé* is the penultimate word of the hemistich. Placing the rel. prn. that deep in the clause, with so much varied material preceding it, is starkly contrary to RVic practice. With the publ. tr. (and seemingly Old SBE) I consider the phrase in c, with LOC phrase *divó dhárman dhārúṇe* and ACC *sedúṣo nṛn* to be parallel to the LOC – ACC phrases in ab, with all of them objects of *dhārayanta* in 2a. The rel. cl. then consists only of d. To make this structure somewhat clearer, I would insert a parenthetical "(support)" in the tr. of c: "and (support) the superior men ..." There is still somewhat too much stuff preceding *yé*, but because *jātaiṛ ájātān* doesn't fit semantically with c, though it could technically qualify *nṛn*, it must belong in the rel. cl.

The standard view of *ájāta-*, which occurs independently in the RV only here, is that it refers to the gods, while the instr. pl. *jātaiḥ* refers to humans (or, with the publ. tr.) fires. But describing the gods as "unborn" runs counter to the vast preponderance of RVic evidence that the gods regularly get born, often in striking ways: many deeds of Indra are ascribed to him when he has just been born, and there are several hymns that refer to or describe his birth, most notably IV.18; the birth of the Ādityas, whose parentage and birth are reflected in their very name, is a staple of later mythology and found already in the RV; the puzzling and troublesome birth of the Maruts is regularly mentioned; Agni and Dawn are of course born anew every day. And so on; *jātá-*, *jāyate*, *janáyati*, etc., are all regularly used with god as subj. bzw. obj., and the mothers and/or fathers of various gods are named (e.g., *Pr̥ṣni* and *Rudra* of the Maruts). If there are gods whose birth is never alluded to, this is probably just by happenstance. I also do not know of evidence in later Skt. that the gods are "unborn." I therefore think *ájāta-* cannot refer to the gods here and must have another referent – but what? I have no idea – perhaps it's the as-yet-unborn ritual fires to come, which they reach by means of the regular daily round of "born" fires; that Agni is referred to as *návajāta-* 'newborn' in the next vs. (3c) would support this interpr., as the publ. intro. suggests. Perhaps it's the unformed and not-yet-existent features of the cosmos that we meet in the description of ur-creation in X.129 (though that seems contrary in spirit to the ritual cast of this hymn). The word *ájāta-* does not appear independently in the AV, but it is fairly common in Vedic prose – where it never refers to gods, as far as I can see, but always something in the human sphere – esp. as-yet-unborn children whom we hope to have, unscathed, but also sometimes domestic animals or even plants. Given this somewhat later usage, perhaps

the idea is that the priests acquire unborn children along with or by means of already born ones (whatever that would mean).

V.15.3: This vs. is also difficult to interpr., but it seems to contrast the power of the newly kindled fire to spread beyond its hearth (abc) and the attempts of the ritual personnel to keep it confined (d).

The hapax *aṃhoyúvaḥ* is disputed. There are two competing interpr. of its structure, both of which are morphologically problematic: as a -yú- adjectival deriv. meaning ‘seeking *ámhas-*’ (AiG II.2.846 [Debrunner, who tr. “beängstigend”]). In this case we might expect internal sandhi **aṃhas-yú-*, but Deb aptly compares *duvoyú-* beside *duvasyú-*. We might also expect a pl. form **aṃhoyávaḥ*, not -yúvaḥ to the -yú-stem. Alternatively (and more likely) it is taken as a root-noun cmpd. with *√yu* ‘keep/send away’ (so AiG III.131 [Wackernagel] and the standard tr.). Here the problem is that a root ending in short resonant should add an empty -t to its root noun, as in the semantically parallel *dveṣo-yút-* ‘keeping hatred away’. (Scar does not mention this form in his cmpd. vol., but in the n. to his tr. in WG does briefly endorse the etym. with *√yu* while citing the expected but absent **-yut-* form.) The solution seems to me to lie in the likely gender of this nonce form; assuming it modifies *tanvāḥ* ‘bodies’, it would be fem. pl. – and indeed entirely parallel phonologically to *tanū-*. A putative fem. *aṃho-yū-* with long -ū- would be exempt from the “add a t to short resonant” rule and should make its pl. as -úvas, as here. The final question is what is its case. Old (SBE) takes *aṃhoyúvaḥ* as nom. pl. masc. (though in his n. he considers other possibilities), but as was just noted, taking it as fem. accounts for its otherwise anomalous form. Re and the publ. tr. take the phrase *aṃhoyúvas tanvāḥ* as acc. pl., obj. of *tanvate ví*, with unexpressed subj. or (with Re) supplied ‘gods’. With Ge and WG, I would instead take the phrase as nom. pl. and make b an independent nom. cl.: “(His) bodies spread themselves out, repelling constriction; there is great vitality, difficult to surpass, for the ancient one.”

pūrvyāya in b contrasts with *náva-jāta-* in c.

V.15.4: Although the general purport of ab is pretty clear – fire provides nourishment and light to humans (so Ge n. 4b) – the image is rather bizarre: fire spreading over the ground like oobleck, with a lot of people engulfed by it or riding on top of it. I don’t know how to make it significantly less bizarre; WG suggest that the image is of a mother bird, spreading her wings over her brood, but this doesn’t work well with either *bharase* or *cákṣase*. Given the middle voice of *bharase*, the tr. might be altered to “you bear, as your own, person after person, to suckle and to see.” With “bear” rather than the publ. tr.’s “carry,” the birth sense of *√bhr*, reinforced by *mātéva*, is triggered: fire, as provider of food and light, acts as a second mother.

As indicated in the publ. intro., JPB emends *jarase* to *járase*, flg. Old (SBE, Noten; so also Ge). This makes ab and c parallel *yád* clauses, with d as the main cl. This seems the most rhetorically straightforward way to deal with pādas a and c. However, the question then arises why the accent was erased on **járase*, when *bhárase* in pāda a retains it – perhaps because preceding *yád* seemed to trigger the accent in pāda a, while following *yád* in c did not? This hypothesis doesn’t seem very satisfactory. Alternatively, we can accept the accent-less form in c and take *yád* there as subordinating only the part. *dádhānaḥ*: “you awaken, while acquiring [/as you acquire] more and more vitality,” with c the main cl. to ab. (Although predicating a participle in a subordinate cl. is rare, it is not non-existent; however, this interpr. requires that the obj. of the subordinated participle was fronted around the main cl. *jarase*.) So WG, though in the

n. the alternative is considered. Re simply ignores the *yád* and makes pāda c a main cl. I weakly favor the non-parallel *jarase* version. Pāda d is then an independent main cl.

Old takes *jarase* to $\sqrt{gr}$ ‘grow old’ (and Ge considers the alternative; see also Bl, RR 247), but this rests on interpr. *vāyas-* as ‘lifetime’ rather than ‘life-force, vitality’.

On the near-exact repetition of pāda d and the last word of c in VII.84.1, see Bl (RRep) and comm. ad VII.84.1. With Bl, I agree that the phraseology fits this context rather better than VII.84.1 – though in that passage there is no subordinator and therefore no problem with verbal accentuation.

V.15.5: With the standard tr. I would construe *urúm* with *dógham*, not *dharúṇam* – hence, “... protect the limit of your strength, the broad milk stream, the support of wealth.” JPB’s “as you give as your milk” for *dógham* rests on Pischel’s interpr. of the form as an absolutive (see Ge n. 5b), which is worth considering, though *-am* absolutes are rare to non-existent in the RV.

On the phrase *mahó rāyé* see comm. ad IV.31.11. This last pāda is esp. reminiscent of VI.1.2 *mahó rāyé citáyantaḥ* ..., which I tr. “distinguishing themselves greatly for wealth.” A version of that here – “being greatly conspicuous for wealth” – might make more sense of this passage.

I would also substitute “you rescued Atri” for “you have rescued,” since the deed is set in the mythological past.

V.16–17 Agni

These two hymns are attributed to Pūru Ātreya, again a poet not otherwise named in the Anukramaṇī. The name *pūrú-* is fairly common in the RV, however, with an instance in V.17.1. On the similarities of the two hymns, see the publ. intro. to IV.16. Ge (n. 2b to V. 17) suggests that the three hymns V.15–17 are all by the same poet, and there are commonalities, esp. V.15.3b and V.16.1a.

V.16 Agni [SJ on JPB]

V.16.1: Against all the standard tr., which take ab as a single cl., JPB interpr. pāda a as a nominal cl. marked by *hí*, with the dat. *bhānāve* unconnected to the datives in b: “Because there is lofty vitality for radiance, chant to the god Agni.” Although this interpr. seems somewhat artificial, there are several reasons for preferring it to the standard. First, pāda a is very similar to the nominal cl. in V.15.3b in the immed. preceding hymn, *váyo mahád duṣṭáram pūrvyāya*, which I tr. (see above) “there is great vitality, difficult to surpass, for the ancient one.” Second, when the verb $\sqrt{rc}$ takes an acc., it is generally the verbal product being chanted or the god receiving the praise, and only very seldom the topic of the praise, as it would be here. Third, the standard tr. ignore the *hí*. My only disagreement with the publ. tr. is that I think *bhānú-* here is simply a characterization of Agni, not (as it ordinarily is) an abstract quality that Agni possesses – on the basis of V.15.3, where *pūrvyāya* refers to Agni. I would slightly emend to “Since there is lofty vitality for the radiant beam [=Agni] [/ since the radiant beam has lofty vitality], chant [/I will chant] to the god Agni.” (See VII.4.1 for a similar use of *bhānú-*.) I also prefer a 1st sg. subj. reading of *ārcā*.

In cd I would (with Re n.) bring out the secondary meaning of *mitráam* $\sqrt{dhā}$ “conclude an alliance,” which earthly activity seems to be accompanied by *prásasti-*; see comm. ad V.9.6. I

would therefore amplify this tr. to “whom mortals have installed to the fore like Mitra with lauds / as mortals conclude an alliance with proclamations.”

V.16.2: Like vs. 1, this vs. begins with *hí*, which reinforces the need to render the *hí* in 1a (see above).

“In the arms of skill” (*dákṣasya bāhvóḥ*) most probably refers in the first instance to the skill of the priest, but also to the minor Āditya, Dakṣa, which should be recognized in the publ. tr.: “in the arms of skill (/Dakṣa).” As Ge (nn. 2a, 1c) points out, in the first two vss. three Ādityas are named: Mitra (1c) and two minor figures, Dakṣa (2b) and Bhaga (2d).

On *ví ... ṛṇvati* see comm. ad I.58.3. On that basis I would emend the tr. here to “discloses,” against the publ.tr. “allots.”

V.16.3: The main cl. of this vs. consists of two locatives, each with a dependent gen. referring to Agni. The second hemistich consists of a rel. cl. with a loc. rel. prn. *yásmín*. The locc. of ab and cd cannot be superimposed, however, since the referent of *yásmín* is Agni, who is represented by the genitives in ab.

The various tr. supply a skeleton for the main cl: Old (SBE) “(We abide?)”; Ge sim. “(wollen wir bleiben)”; WG “(sind wir zugegen).” It is perhaps better, with Re and the publ. tr., to leave it hanging in air (though Re fudges somewhat).

“Full-flamed” might be a bit minimalist for *ṽṛddhá-śocis-*; perhaps “whose flame is full grown.”

A more minor ellipsis is found in pāda c, where the subj. of *ādadhūḥ* in d is apparently neut. *viśvā*, without further specification. All the standard tr. incl. the publ. tr. supply creatures or beings (presumably *bhūvanāni*). This seems reasonable, but of course other neut. pl.s would be possible (if less likely), and in this sandhi situation an underlying fem. *viśvāḥ* is not excluded.

V.16.4: The first hemistich of this vs. is syntactically puzzling, as well as having unspecified referents. In the end I think the interpr. of Ge, Re, and WG has the best chance of being correct. Although *maṁhāṇā* is usually instr. (though see IV.1.6), it seems best to take it as nom. here – filling the gap where we might expect a subject. The *maṁhāṇā* is presumably Agni’s and consists of his giving *suvīrya-* to “them” (*eṣām*), who might be “all (beings)” from 3c or more narrowly his worshipers. (I’m not sure where JPB gets “your companions.”) So, literally, “For then there is (your) munificence (consisting) of an abundance of heroes for them.” For a parallel expression see V.18.2 and comm. thereon. This may be what the publ. tr.’s “For then (you are) ready to give abundant heroes to these (your companions)” is meant to reflect, but it’s hard to wring that out grammatically.

Re tries to make *ná* the simile-marking particle here, but this seems forced.

V.16.5: The extra pāda in this Pañkti vs. is identical not only to the same in the final vs. of the next hymn, V.17.5e, but also V.9.7e and V.10.7e. In addition the first pāda, *nū na éhi vāryam*, is a variant of the first pāda of the last vs. of the next hymn, V.17.5a, *nū na íd dhí vāryam*; the responsion of *éhi* and *íd dhí* is particularly nice. Other agreements between these two final vss.: *sūrāyaḥ* (16.5c and 17.5b); *svastí* (16.5d) / *svastáye* (17.5d); *sácā* (16.5d) / *sacanta* (17.5b).

V.17 Agni [SJ on JPB]

This hymn is close to incoherent in places, esp. vss. 2 and 3, whose parts seem at first to have little to do with each other.

V.17.2–4: Vs. 2 begins with initially accented *ásya*, the emphatic form of the oblique, while the next two vss. begin with finally accented *asyá*. We ordinarily expect *asyá*, so accented, to be a demonstrative adjective (“of this X”), but in both cases it must be pronominal (“of this one”), referring both to Agni and to the poet. Of course, to take first position it has to be accented, and the default accent is final. Presumably the first, initially accented form points forcefully to the referent, and the next two simply carry it on.

V.17.2: As indicated above, vs. 2 is very difficult, and none of the varying tr., incl. the publ. tr., wrings much sense of it. Although I won’t be able to solve it all, I will suggest that an entry into the problem is provided by a better understanding of the voc. *vidharman* in b. The publ. tr. renders this as “distributor [=sacrificer],” sim. Old (SBE) “disposer.” (Ge, Re, and WG simply take it as a PN, which Ge identifies as the singer [n. 2b].) The Old/JPB interpr. presupposes an agent noun, but the well-attested stem *vidharman-* is otherwise only a neut. abstr. It is true that *√dhṛ* can mean ‘distribute’; there is, in fact, a clear agent noun with that sense, *vidhartár-*. And this is the problem: if the poet had wanted to say “o distributor,” he could have used that stem: the voc. *vidhartar* would exactly fit this metrical slot. Not only do *vidharman-* and *vidhartár-* have different functional profiles, but they embody two different senses of the lexeme *√dhṛ*: the agent noun to *√dhṛ* ‘distribute’, but the neut. *-an*-stem to *√dhṛ* ‘hold wide apart’, with the developed nominal sense ‘expanse’. (For further on the sense of *vidharman-* see comm. ad IX.4.9, 64.9.) That we should reckon with the ‘expanse’ sense here is well recognized in the n. to WG, though I find the actual tr. somewhat hard to follow. It is important to note (as the WG n. does) that *vidharman-* is often used of a cosmic expanse, esp. of the *rájas-* ‘(airy) realm’ and once is found nearby several occurrences of *nāke* ‘in the vault’ (the Vena hymn, X.123.8, with vss. 6 and 7). I therefore think that we must tr. the voc. as “o Expanse” or “o (cosmic) Expanse.”

This semantic reappraisal of *vidharman* allows us to connect it with *nākam* in pāda c. I do not think, with most tr. (though not WG), that Agni is identified with the *nāka-*, but rather that *nākam* should be construed with the postposition *parāḥ* ‘beyond’ (so already Gr *parás* II. Praep. mit Acc.; see also Thieme, KISch. 244 n. 14, cited by WG) as an integrated part of the clause found in ab; *parāḥ* should not be construed with *manīśáyā*, despite the agreement of the standard tr. (incl. JPB’s) save for WG (though I have to admit that *paró manīśáyā* forms a phrase in VIII.72.4). The *parás* phrase is functionally the comparandum that is missing with the comparative *sváyaśastaraḥ* in pāda a: the “Expanse” addressed in b is “more self-glorious” beyond (i.e., than) the vault of heaven, despite the brightness and delightful qualities of the latter -- thanks to “the mouth of this one” (*ásya ... āsā*) and inspired thinking (*manīśáyā*). In other words, thanks to the boost given by the mouth and inspired thinking, the Expanse outshines even the heavenly vault. What exactly the Expanse refers to is unclear – perhaps a further part of heaven or perhaps the spread of the fire on earth or in the midspace – this latter interpr. would make its greater glory even more striking: an earthly feature outshines a heavenly one. Although the b.v. *citrásocisam* ‘having bright blaze’ modifying *nākam* might seem to support the identification of Agni with the vault, see V.54.12 *nākam ... X-śociṣam*, where the vault is definitely the vault of heaven.

What I’ve just constructed is essentially also the WG interpr.; see Scar’s extensive n. I do agree with the publ. tr. that the “mouth” is both that of Agni and of the poet, with the latter

supported by *manīṣáyā* at the end of the vs. The oblations received by Agni with his mouth and the praises produced by the poet with his mouth both contribute to the glory of the Expanse and its successful competition with the vault.

I would retranslate the vs.: “For, it is by the mouth of this one [=Agni and poet], o Expanse, that you are considered to be more self-glorious, beyond [=than] the vault with its bright blaze [=sun, in this case], the delighting one – (and) by inspired thinking —”

V.17.3: The sequence *vāsā u* is read by the Pp. as *vaí asaú u*. The irreg. sandhi of *vaí* + *ā-* is no doubt correctly analyzed. The only other possibility would be to read *vā* (‘or’) + *ā-*, and this would require erasure of the accent on the syllable *vā*. Since *vā u* is quite well attested, it’s as though that sequence has simply been interrupted by the insertion of the nominal. As for *asaú*, however, this is now almost universally emended to *āsā*; though Old tr. *asaú* in SBE and only speculates on the possibility of *āsā* in the Noten, that suggestion has – rightly in my view – prevailed ever since.

I consider the double instr. phrase *asyá ... āsā ... arcíṣā* to be a continuation of vs. 2, which begins and ends with parallel instr. There is therefore no need to supply a main clause in pāda a on which to hang the rel. clauses of b and cd. So [vs. 2] “it is by the mouth of this one ... and (it is also) by inspired thinking — / [vs. 3] indeed (it is) by the mouth (and) the flame of this one, who ...”

The clearly augmented root aor. *āyukta* should be rendered as “who has been yoked up,” not “who is ...”

I would tr. the double root noun instr. phrase as “with a hymn as goad.” I do not see the sexual connotations that JPB sets forth in the publ. intro.

Contra the publ. tr. and WG, I do not think *yāsya* is dependent on *rétasā*, but (with the other standard tr.) on *arcāyaḥ* and would emend to “whose flames blaze loftily as if by the semen of heaven.” The position of *yāsya* in the middle of the NP *divó ná ... rétasā* is determined by standard RVic word order movement and has no implications for what noun it belongs with. The semen of heaven is, as Ge (n. 3c) points out, rain. (I do not think Heaven’s incest is at issue, as he alternatively suggests in that n.) Of course, rain ought to dampen the flames, not make them flame higher – but I think the missing middle term in this image is the shooting up of plants after the rain.

V.17.4: This vs. brings the sequence of *ásya lasyá* INSTR openings to an end, and it is also, abruptly, much easier to interpr.

Note *prá śasyate*, like *práśastibhiḥ* in the preceding hymn, V.16.1.

V.17.5: On the similarities to the final vs. of the last hymn, V.16.5, see ad loc.

Although Old (SBE, Noten) takes ab together and (n. to SBE) suggests accenting *sacanta* because of the *hí*, it seems best to take the two pādas separately. The standard tr. supply a verb “bring” or “give” with pāda a, but this ignores the *hí*. As I see it, pāda a indicates that something desirable comes to us because of our praise of Agni; pāda b explains that the patrons recognize that cause-and-effect and stay in close proximity to the “mouth” – in this case probably primarily of the poet, but also of Agni – in order to get the benefit from it. I would tr. “since now there is a desirable thing just for us, our patrons keep company with (our/Agni’s) mouth.”

I would emend “be capable ...” to “muster your ability for our well-being.”

V.18 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The hymn is attributed to Mr̥ktavāhas Dvita Ātreya, with the name extracted from the hymn: vs. 2a *dvitāya mṛktāvāhase*. The bahuvrīhi *mṛktāvāhas-* ‘having a broken [/damaged] vehicle’ belongs to the tradition of self-deprecatory nicknames. It is also reminiscent of the poorly functioning chariot in the Mudgalānī hymn (X.102), which nevertheless wins the contest. Ordinals as names, here *dvitā-* ‘second’, are not unknown – consider Trita Āptya – and indeed Dvita Āptya is said to be the poet of IX.103.

On this hymn as a dānastuti, possibly for the group of preceding hymns, see publ. intro. In fact, however, the only vs. that reads like a conventional dānastuti is the final one, vs. 5. Although “generous (patrons?)” are found in vss. 3 and 4, there is no straightforward “praise of the gift” there, and the only giver mentioned is, apparently, Agni in 3d.

V.18.2: This vs. lexically echoes V.16, with *dākṣasya* (16.2b), *maṃhānā* (16.4b) and *ānuṣāk* (16.2c).

Although in SBE Old tr. *mṛktā-vāhas-* as “who ... carries away injury,” in the Noten he recognizes the more likely bahuvrīhi interpr. imposed by the accent; see also EWA s.v. *MARC*.

Given the parallel expression in V.16.4b, GEN. *maṃhānā*, which I take as a nom. (see above), I take *maṃhānā* here as nom. as well, with gen. *svāsya dākṣasya* referring to what is being given, Agni’s skill. The dat. in pāda a substitutes for the gen. *eṣām* in 16.4a. I would tr., literally and awkwardly, as “There is munificence (consisting) of your own skill for Dvita of the damaged vehicle,” comparable to my tr. of 16.4ab “there is (your) munificence (consisting) of an abundance of heroes for them.” This is, I think, what the publ. tr. is conveying, though more idiomatically, with “Your own skill is at the ready for Dvita of the broken vehicle.” With JPB I think that the “own skill” is Agni’s, not the praiser’s.

V.18.3: This vs. contains a complex interweaving of referents in all three persons, with somewhat awk. results. The 1st sg. subject of the main verb *huve* “I call upon” is of course the poet. The obj. of the verb is *tām ... dīrghāyusociṣam* “him of long-lived blaze,” clearly Agni. There is then a 2nd plural. enclitic *vaḥ* in Wackernagel’s position, which probably refers to “the generous ones” (*maghónām*) in b, though it could be, separately, the priestly participants – but pāda d has a 2nd singular voc. *aśvadāvan*, which cannot be directly coreferential with the pl. *vaḥ* and which is generally taken to refer to Agni – who, as we saw, is referred to in the 3rd ps. at the beginning of the vs.

The bahuvr. *dīrghāyusociṣ-* is a rare example of a cmpd with more than two members, but the 1st member, *dīrghāyu-*, is lexicalized, and so the cmpd in essence has only two members.

The rel. cl. is introduced by a gen. pl. rel. prn. *yéṣām*, which must have *maghónām* as its antecedent. This is insufficiently marked in the publ. tr.: I would slightly change to “(you) whose chariot ...” I would also specify after the voc. “o giver of horses [=Agni].”

Their undamaged chariot (*āriṣṭaḥ ... ráthaḥ*) obviously contrasts with the *mṛktā-vāhas-* in 2 and reinforces the interpr. of the latter as a standard bahuvrīhi. The contrast may be meant to remind the patrons that though they have a fine vehicle, the poet is not so lucky. The pair is also a nice example of the fungibility of bahuvrīhis and full possessive phrases: *mṛktāvāhas-* 2a versus *āriṣṭo yéṣām ráthaḥ* 3c.

V.18.4: As with the previous vs., the fact that the rel. prns in ab are plural should be signaled. With the standard tr. (also JSK DGRV 2.186–87), I favor supplying a rel. prn. with c as well,

which allows abc to be a series of rel. cl. dependent on the main cl. in d. I would change the tr. to “Or (those) among whom there is brilliant visionary power, (those) who protect the recitations in the mouth, (those whose) ritual grass has been strewn in the realm of solar glory, they ...”

The “mouth” here (*āsán*) reprises the focus on the mouth in V.17 (2b, 3a, 5b). It is not clear whose mouth it is – the singer’s (so publ. tr.) or the subjects’ own (so most tr.), or even Agni’s.

On loc. *svàṇṇare* see comm. ad IX.70.6. This may recall the *nākam* of V.17.2, and since it presumably refers to the ritual ground as having solar glory, as in V.17.2 the earthly realm may be being presented as more glorious even than heaven.

V.18.5: The *dānastuti* proper. Here the giving of horses is firmly in the control of the generous ones, unlike the curious singular voc. in vs. 3.

V.19 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The last of the five-verse hymns, with a variety of meters. Its coherence has been questioned: Old (SBE) rather despairingly calls it “anything rather than an ordinary Agni hymn” and suggests that it “may be a collection of verses belonging to an *Ākhyāna*, or of verses serving another purpose we can scarcely hope to discover.” However, the publ. intro. sketches a plausible thematic trajectory. The poet’s name Vavri has clearly been extracted from the phrase *vavrér vavrīḥ* in 1b. It is suggested in the publ. intro. that *Brhaduktha* in 3c is the name of the actual poet, a view I concur with.

V.19.1: The hapax *avasthā(h)* in the first pāda is completely opaque, as all the standard tr. and comm. remark (see also Scar 646), and it is not even clear if it is nom. pl. or acc. pl., or adj. or abstract noun. The diverging transl. and interpr. available for this pāda are all over the map and none has even the slightest ring of plausibility – nor will mine. On the relatively rare lexeme *áva √sthā* see comm. ad X.48.5; its ordinarily meaning is additive: ‘stand/step/go down’, though see comm. ad V.53.8. Since a putative *abhí-prá √jan* seems to be found only here, I think it likely that the verbal lexeme is simply well-attested *prá √jan* and that therefore *abhí* functions as a directional particle/preposition. This in turn suggests that *abhiṣṭhāḥ* is acc. pl., to be construed with *abhí*. This leaves the subj. of *prá jāyante* unexpressed. If the vs. concerns the initial igniting of the fire, as the publ. intro. suggests, it may be that the subj. is flames, sparks, or smoke tendrils. Since igniting a fire with a fire drill involves having the smoke/fire generated by the drill *descend* to the fuel that will cause it to catch, it’s possible that the *avasthā-* are the deposits of fuel below the drill. With this string of tenuous speculations, we could tr. “The flames/sparks/puffs of smoke are born forth towards the (fuel) deposits (below)” – as a counter-intuitive image that precedes the shooting up of the fire. But I have no confidence in this interpr. – though the rest of the vs., with the coverings produced from coverings (b) and the infant fire peering out from its mother’s lap (c), is at least consistent with this interpr.

V.19.2: Another obscure vs., with unexpressed pl. subjects. Re and JPB take them to be priests, Old (SBE) worshipers; Ge fails to identify them, and WG suggest (in the n.) Agni and his flames, without explaining what it would mean for them to offer oblations. If *juhuré* is assigned to *√hu* ‘pour’ (as is the universal opinion; see standard tr. plus Kü 605), we encounter another problem: *√hu* never appears with *ví*, in the RV or later. Those who see such a lexeme here (Gr, Ge, Re, JPB, WG) render it with the flatfooted “have poured various oblations” (JPB) and the like. Old

(Noten) is more drawn to construing *ví* with the part. *citáyantaḥ* (at least this lexeme exists), but runs into the question of why there was no univerbation to **vicitáyantaḥ*. I have a potential solution that provides a more satisfactory sense, while also dealing with the preverb problem. I suggest that *juhuré* belongs to the root $\sqrt{hvar}$ ‘go crookedly’, which has a medial pf. (part. *juhurāṇá-*, etc.; for my rejection of the Insler, Kü assignment of these forms to $\sqrt{h\bar{r}}$ ‘be angry’, see comm. ad I.43.8, VII.1.19) and does appear with *ví*. The problem then is the morphology, since *juhuré* then appears to be a 3rd sg. in a plural context. However, I suggest that it reflects 3rd pl. **juhur-re*, with simplification of the geminate. In fact it is quite possible that this simplification resulted in compensatory lengthening to **juhūrē*: a heavy second syllable is the norm in dimeter vs. (see Arnold 153); the long vowel would have been redactionally shortened. If the verb belongs to $\sqrt{hvar}$, flames/smoke tendrils can be the subject, since the incompatibility of their pouring oblations disappears. Instead, the theme of the elusive first signs of the ignited fire is carried on. I would therefore emend the tr. to “They [=flames/smoke] have swerved / twisted as they come to light.”

As for the rest of the vs., I think pāda b indicates that the nascent flames husband their strength while not guttering (“unblinking”); I would slightly alter the tr. to “... they protect their manly power.” I’m not certain what “the firm fortress” in c refers to – perhaps the fireplace / hearth.

V.19.3: I take the first hemistich as a description of the successful catching of the fire after its slow beginnings in vss. 1–2. Although there is much speculation about the meaning/referent of *śvaitreyá-* (Ge: a racing bull!) (see comm. ad IV.33.1 for *śvaítarī-* etc.), I think it likely here that it means simply ‘descendant of the white/bright one’ and refers to Agni, and his *jantú-* and *kṛṣṭi-* are his flames. I would emend the tr. of ab to “The kin and communities [=flames] of the descendant of the bright one [=Agni] grow brilliantly strong.”

As for the 2nd hemistich, I accept the suggestion in the publ. intro. (sim. Ge n. 3c) that Bṛhaduktha is the name of the poet of this hymn (as it is in X.54.6, 56.7); further I suggest that this vs. is a sort of dānastuti and may be meant as a summary vs. For the *niṣkā-* Ge (n. 3c) adduces I.126.2, Kakṣīvant’s dānastuti, where he claims a hundred neck-ornaments (*śatām ... niṣkān*) as part of the bounty he receives from the king for his poetry. I suggest that the ornament on Bṛhaduktha’s neck is the prize he has received for his hymn, and in that sense he is like a prize-seeking race horse. The simile here, marked by *ná*, only involves *vājayúḥ*; the *ná* has taken penultimate position, as usual (see comm. ad X.111.7, etc., and my recent “Penultimate *ná* ‘like’ in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism” [ECIEC 2024]). The effort of the publ. tr. to include the phrase preceding *ná*, viz. *enā mādhvā*, in the simile has produced the over-fussy and unconvincing “With ornamented neck, Bṛhaduktha (is) seeking the prize with this (honey) [=soma?], like (a prize-seeking horse) with honey.”

As for “this honey,” I think it here refers to the poem whose reward is the neck-ornament that Bṛhaduktha now wears. I would emend the tr. to “Bṛhaduktha has an ornament on his neck (as prize), like a prize-seeking (horse), by reason of this honey [=this hymn].” I most definitely do not think (with Old) that this has anything to do with the Vājapeya.

V.19.4: Old tentatively supplies *rétas-* ‘semen’ as the referent of pāda a, and this suggestion, plus the word *ájāmi* ‘non-kin’ in b, which is used in the Yama-Yamī hymn (X.10.9, 10) to refer to incest, has given rise to an incest scenario here (Ge with nn. 4, 4b, Re, JPB); see the publ. intro. I think this interpr. is highly unlikely. To begin with, the adj. *kāmya-*, which Old renders in the

phrase *dugdhām ná kām̐yam* as “the milk of love” and JPB as “the milk of desire,” otherwise means just ‘desirable, to be cherished’, without sexual implications. I think the referent here is Agni, who is “dear like desirable milk” – another reference to his birth, and the apparent fluid nature of fire. He is then called *ājāmi* ‘non-kin’ with the “two kindred ones” (*jāmyóḥ*). With JPB I take this dual as a reference to the two kindling sticks, but not in reference to an incestuous pairing. Instead I think the point is that though the two sticks give birth to him, he is of an entirely different material nature from them. This is how WG take it (see the n.). This statement then gives further meaning to the simile in pāda a, for milk is produced by cows, but also is an entirely different substance. (Of course, milk only comes from one cow at a time, but I don’t think the dual is crucial for the simile.) There is of course one major problem with my interpr.: if I am correct that Agni is the referent, then why is *ājāmi* neut.? I think the neut. of the simile that occupies pāda a simply carries over into the next, related image. I would retr. the hemistich as “(Agni,) dear like desirable milk, non-kin with the two kindred (kindling) sticks.”

Why is Agni “the deceiver of each and every one” (*śásvato dābhah*)? I think because of the constant shape-shifting during his birth that has occupied the hymn so far.

V.19.5: The stem *bhásman-* with root accent should be a neut. abstract, not an adj., as it is usually tr. (See comm. at X.115.2, on the other occurrence of this stem in the RV.) Although in X.115.2 it clearly means ‘bite’, here there are 3 possible interpr. to three homonymous nouns: ‘bite’, ‘blast / blowing’, ‘ash’. See EWA s.v. The meaning ‘ash’ is found already in the AV and is well represented in MIA; Old (SBE) accepts that sense here. On the sense ‘blast, blowing’, see Th (KISch p. 79); it is accepted by Sch (Intens. 184 and n. 550) and WG. The standard older interpr. (Ge, Re, JPB) takes *bhásman-* to *√bhas* ‘gnaw’. Since “biting wind” is a normal English expression, it would raise no alarms here. In short, any of the three senses would work: ‘ash’ because it is, after all, fire we’re talking about; ‘blast’ because it’s associated with ‘wind’ in context; ‘bite’ because the inherent metaphor is widespread. But in any of these cases, it should be rendered as a noun. Although I could live with any of them, I slightly favor “with the wind with its blast” because it fits the violent context of the next hemistich well.

On the 2nd hemistich with its multiple hapaxes, see KH, Aufs. 375–76, who convincingly reads *saṁdhr̥ṣájah* for *san dhr̥ṣájah*, with no change in the Saṁhitā text. Hoffmann’s interpr. has been adopted by Re, WG, and JPB. On the hapax *vak̐syāḥ* ‘flames’, see EWA s.v. *vak̐ṣī-*.

For a radical reinterpretation of this vs., eliminating *vāyúnā* as a gloss of *bhásmanā* (flg. Arnold) and redividing the pādas, see Vine (IJ 20 [1978]: 180–81). Though ingenious, it does not convince me, esp. in the absence of a translation of the reconfigured vs.

V.20 Agni [SJ on JPB]

As noted in the publ. intro., the name of the poet of this hymn, Prayasvanta, has been extracted from the hymn itself, *prāyasvant-* (3d).

V.20.1: Although the Pp. reads the Saṁhitā form *panayā* as *panaya* and it is universally (save for JPB) tr. as a 2nd sg. impv., the 1st sg. subj. of the publ. tr. makes at least as much sense. It is true that the similar passage in X.21.4 adduced by Ge (n. 1ab) with *yām agne mán̐yase rayīm* follows that rel. cl. with a 2nd sg. impv. *ā bharā*, but “bringing” and “extolling” are different actions and can have different agents.

V.20.2: On the gen. with *vṛddhá-* see Old (Noten) and II.11.20. This does seem a minor but actual syntactic type.

The construction of the rest of the vs. is puzzling – particularly what to do with pāda c. The standard tr. (Old [SBE], Ge, Re, WG, Kü 539) construe c and d together (though in variant ways). There are two problems with this: 1) *ápa* does not otherwise appear with $\sqrt{sac}$, and 2) separating c from ab requires supplying an obj. to *īráyanti* in pāda a that in all cases is simply invented. JPB takes c with ab, but in a complex way that still requires supplying an obj. for *īráyanti* as well as extra machinery for the *ápa* phrases in c. I think the solution is simpler, though it runs into much the same problem as 1) above. I suggest that *ápa* is in tmesis with *īráyanti*, with the meaning ‘send/propel away’. Unfortunately *ápa* + *īr* is not an attested lexeme, and *ápa* $\sqrt{r}$ is rare and does not have this sense. Nonetheless, it is easy to construct the additive semantics of a transitive verb of motion with *ápa*, and that would give a satisfying sense to the whole passage: “Those who, (though) grown strong off your formidable power, do not propel away hatred, away crookedness, they follow (the commandments) of one who has other [=false] commandments.”

For this last phrase, note that the verb stem *saśc(a)-* a number of times governs *vratá-* (I.84.12, I.101.3, V.67.3, VIII.25.17), and so it is easy to pull *vratá-* out of the gen. compd. to serve as obj.

V.20.4: The first three pādas are elliptical, and what verb (and its accoutrements) to supply here is hard to determine – and somewhat beside the point. Whatever is being done is done “for (DAT) various rewards”: the supplied “strive for” (JPB), “be ready for” (Old SBE), etc., all do the trick.

It is not at all clear to me why in d *ṣyāma* is retroflexed after *góbhiḥ*, while in e *ṣyāma* after *vīraṭḥ* is not, and Old, uncharacteristically, doesn’t comment. Needless to say, neither environment should induce retroflexion. Otherwise *ṣyāma* is retroflexed after preverbs ending in *-i* or *-u* (*abhi* I.105.19, 178.5, II.8.6=IX.35.3, III.1.16, V.4.1, X.132.2; *anu* I.185.4) and once after *divi* (VI.33.5). There are also two other exx. like this one, both after instr. pl. in *-bhiḥ*, as here (VII.92.4 *sūribhiḥ ṣyāma*; X.64.11 *góbhiḥ ṣyāma*). Since no unretroflexed *ṣyāma* forms are found after such instr. pls., this must be the triggering environment. See also 1st sg. *sūribhiḥ ṣyām* (VI.63.11). But this is a description, not an explanation. Non-instr. pl. forms in *-iḥ* don’t trigger it: see *pātiḥ ṣyām* I.116.25. And forms to the same stem that end in a vowel that should trigger ruki do not: *sūriṣu ṣyāma* VII.19.7. Perhaps this has to do with simplification of geminates in a cluster – i.e., *góbhis sy...* → *góbhiṣ sy...* → *góbhi sy...*; this explanation would work in this passage, because *ṣyāma*, unusually, is not distracted. But not in the other cited examples, where we would have *-bhis s’y...* and therefore no initial cluster. The instr. pl. *-bhis* does not seem otherwise to cause an initial *s-* to retroflex, but I admit that I have not looked at all instances of this ending.

V.21 Agni [SJ on JPB]

Here, as pointed out in the publ. intro., the source of the poet’s name is found only in the last pāda of the hymn. The hymn is strikingly elementary, esp. in comparison to the many near-impenetrable Agni hymns in this maṇḍala.

V.21.1: Note the rhyming 1st pl. optatives to two different roots at the end of pādas a and b: *(n)ī dhīmahi # ... (sám) idhīmahi #*.

V.21.4: With Old (tentatively), I take *sasá-* ‘grain’ here to refer to the ritual grass, though in a semi-mystical manner. See IV.7.7 (adduced by Ge) and comm. thereon.

V.22 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The first pāda of the hymn contains the voc. *viśvasāman*, which is then taken by the Anukr. as the poet’s name. It may well be, but it is also a transparent bahuvr. meaning ‘having every sāman/melody’, so in the hymn it may simply be an epithet or descriptor. Another elementary hymn, though with a few more tricks than the last one. Several of its pādas are identical or very similar to ones found elsewhere (see Ge’s nn.).

V.22.1: Re takes *ārcā* in b as 1st sg. subjunctive, against all the other standard tr. Although this is morphologically possible, a 2nd sg. impv. addressed to the person identified by the voc. in pāda a fits the context better.

V.22.2: The 2nd pl. act. impv. of the redupl. pres. to $\sqrt{dhā}$ with strong stem (*dādhāta[na]*) coexists with the expected weak-stem form *dhattā*. Of course, *dādhāta* could possibly be a subjunctive (<**dādhā-a-*) (though in that case we would expect the primary ending *-tha*), but this stem ordinarily makes a short-vowel subjunctive (here expect **dadhatha*).

V.22.3: Note the play between vs.-initial X-*manasam* and final *amanmahi*, captured in the publ. tr.

In c the HvN text restores the initial *á* for *Samhitā té ’vasa*, flg. Arnold. Although we regularly need to perform this restoration elsewhere, in this case it results in a bad cadence (L L L x) and moreover requires an undistracted y in *vāreṇyasya*, which well-attested stem is otherwise read as distracted *vāreṇ’ya-*. Old considers both options and (weakly) supports retaining the abhinihta sandhi and distracting the *-ya-*, which solution I would favor more strongly than he does. The argument about the bad cadence is somewhat undercut by pāda b in the next vs., which must have the same cadence; nonetheless, on balance I prefer the solution just set out.

The Pp reads gen. *āvasaḥ*, and the standard tr. take this gen. as an alternative complement to *amanmahi*, in addition to the acc. phrase in ab. But better, with the publ. tr., to take the underlying form as dat. *āvase*, with gen. *vāreṇyasya* modifying *te*; *vāreṇya-* often characterizes Agni.

V.22.4: The impv. *cikiddhí* picks up the 1st cmpd member *cikivít-* from 3a.

Pāda a seems like a false start: the gen. *asyá* appears to be the complement of the verb -- $\sqrt{cit}$ can take either acc. or gen., though more frequently the former. But since *asyá* is accented, it should be adjectival, and there is no gen. noun for it to modify. In b the acc. phrase *idám vácaḥ* appears to be the real object of *cikiddhí*, or so the standard tr. take it. JPB instead takes that phrase as a nominal clause, which is also possible.

As was noted immed. above, distracted *sahas’ya* makes for a bad cadence.

V.23 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The poet’s full name is given as *Dyumna Viśvacarṣaṇi Ātreya*; the first of the given names comes from 1b, the second from 1c.

The root $\sqrt{sah}$ ‘overpower’ is prominent in the hymn, as Re points out. There are three occurrences in vs. 1 (a: *sáhantam*, b: *prāsáhā*, d: *sāsáhat*) and two in the first hemistich of vs. 2 (a: [*prtanā*]*sáham*, b: *sahasvah*). It then disappears until the final verse, 4b *sáhaḥ*, though *sa*-initial words fill in the gaps (2c *sa*[*tyáh*], 3a *sa*[*jósasah*], 3c *sá*[*dmasu*]). It thus provides a very salient ring and example of derivational variation in ring composition; this ring is reinforced by the matching of *viśvāḥ* ... *carṣaṇīḥ* in 1c with the bahuvrīhi *viśvācarṇasniḥ* in 4a.

V.23.1: Rather than making the rel. cl. of cd an apparent parallel to *sáhantam*, as in the publ. tr., I would prefer to represent it as a real rel. cl.: “O Agni, through the power of your brilliance bring here overpowering wealth, which ...” But see below.

The publ. tr. omits the *viśvā(h)* of c: “which will overpower all lands ...” Since the phrase recurs as a compound in vs. 4, it’s esp. important to insert the “all.”

The question in d is whose mouth (*āsā*) is referred to. JPB (with Ge [tentatively] and WG) takes it as the mouth of the singer – that is, the power of his speech; Re considers it Agni’s mouth. (Old [SBE] omits it.) I think it possible that it refers to both – with regard to Agni, it could be his mouth as the recipient of oblations or as wildfire devouring territory. Neither the singer’s mouth nor Agni’s seems to have much to do with wealth, and I wonder if the referent of *yáh* is actually Agni, not wealth. This would involve switching from 2nd to 3rd ps. reference in the middle of the vs., but this is quite common. I would suggest an alternative tr. of the whole vs.: “O Agni, through the power of your brilliance bring here overpowering wealth – (Agni,) who with his [my] mouth will overpower all lands when prizes are at stake.” Though I acknowledge that *rayí-* is called “overpowering in battles” (*prtanāśáh-*) in 2a, which might favor taking wealth as the subj. of the rel. cl. here, it doesn’t help with the “mouth” problem. Moreover, *viśvācarṣaṇīḥ* modifying Agni in 4a favors my suggestion here.

V.23.3: The rendering ‘tribes’ for *jānāsaḥ* is misleadingly specific; I’d substitute ‘people’ or ‘peoples’.

All the standard tr., including the publ. tr., take *vyānti* as construed with a double acc. (explicitly so called by Re in his n.): “pursue X for [i.e., to obtain] Y,” with Agni the X and the desirable things the Y. As disc. ad VI.2.11, I do not think this is a possible construction with $\sqrt{vī}$; instead the root takes a variety of objects, both animate and inanimate, and here I think we have both independently. I’d emend the tr. to “pursue you as Hotar (and pursue) many desirable things.”

V.23.4: The bahuvrīhi *viśvācarṣaṇīḥ* forms a ring with *viśvā(h)* ... *carṣaṇīḥ* in 1c – another reason to consider Agni, not wealth, the subject of 1cd (see comm. above). Note that the *abhí* that immediately follows *viśvā(h)* ... *carṣaṇīḥ* in 1c has been repurposed here, in the immediately following cmpd *abhímāti*. Because in vs. 1 Agni establishes his power over all lands, I would here change the tr. of the bahuvrīhi to “possessing/controlling all lands,” rather than “belonging to all lands,” to express his dominion over them. See JPB’s tr. of this same epithet in V.14.6 as “governing all territories.”

This cmpd and the pāda in which it’s found produce problems. The *-ti*-stem *abhímāti* (on the unetymological length of the root syllable, see reff. given ad X.27.11) otherwise behaves, as expected, as a fem. abstract noun, but here, on the surface, it appears to be an adj. in the neut. modifying the neut. *s*-stem *sáhaḥ* (so Gr). Not only is this conversion-to-adjective morphologically unlikely, but the sense of the pāda (“[Agni] acquires hostile power”) would be

aberrant. The problems are recognized in the nn. of all the standard tr. Ge and WG suggest slightly different (and not very plausible) haplological explanations; Old tries a variety of tactics in an ultimately inconclusive disc. All recognize the common Obj-V relationship of *abhīmāti-* and $\sqrt{\text{sah}}$, found not only in syntagms (e.g., III.62.15 *abhīmātīḥ sāhamānaḥ* ; cf. III.37.7, VIII.24.6, X.84.10), but also in the cmpds *abhimāti-ṣāh-* (6x), *abhimāti-ṣāhā-* (2x), *abhimāti-ṣāhya-* (1x)(all with retroflexed root initial). In the end the simplest solution seems to me to take it as a loose or would-be cmpd **abhimāti-ṣāhas-*, with the neut. *s-*stem as 2nd member. This requires the least alteration of the transmitted text – just the erasure of the accent on *abhīmāti-* and the likely retroflexion of the root initial. Unfortunately Old considers this “nicht besonders wahrscheinlich,” but none of his suggestions is appreciably better. Perhaps the fact that most cmpds with *-as-*stem 2nd members are bahuvrīhis led to the redactional (?) decoupling here of a tatpuruṣa based on a formulaic OV phrase, aided by the word play between this vs. and vs. 1. Although my analysis of this pāda differs from the one underlying the publ. tr., the tr. itself can stand.

V.24 Agni [SJ on JPB]

This brief hymn is in Dvipadā Virāj meter, acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, and, with its four vss., is properly situated after the four-vs. Anuṣṭubh/Paṅkti hymns that precede (V.20–23) – assuming, with Old, that the following two nine-vs. hymns, V.25–26, are comprised of ṛcas.

Despite the Anukramaṇī’s identification of the meter (fld. by HvN and the publ. tr.), the hymn cannot be in Dvipadā Virāj, as DG points out to me. Oldenberg (Proleg. 114 with n. 1 and Noten ad loc.) takes the verses here (as well as 10.172) to consist of two 8-syllable pādas plus a 4-syllable iambic extension, thus (restored) *varūthīyaḥ*, *rayīm daaḥ*, *samasmaat*, presumably also *sākhibhiyaḥ* in 4b. This seems to be the correct analysis. (Note that there’s apparently Sāmavedic evidence for the relatively independent status of the 4-syllable extensions.) Arnold (p. 230) takes the verses of 5.24 to consist of two 8-syllable pādas plus a 3-syllable extension — except 1b, which he takes as 8+4, restoring *varūthīyaḥ*.

Each of the vss. is attributed to a different poet, who jointly make up the Gaupāyanas or Laupāyanas, to whom X.57–60 are ascribed. For a change, the names are not derived from the text of the hymn.

The hymn itself is excessively banal.

V.25 Agni [SJ on JPB]

As noted in the publ. intro., the attribution of the hymn to the Vasūyava Ātreyaś is doubtless based on the nom. pl. adj. *vasūyāvaḥ* modifying the 1st pl. subj. in the last vs. (9a). The hymn consists of three ṛcas. On the use of ring composition to provide unity to these separate pieces, see publ. intro.

V.25.1: *gāsi*, found also in VIII.27.2, is traditionally (and most likely rightly) taken as a 1st sg. middle injunc. to an *s-*aor. of $\sqrt{\text{gā}}$ ‘sing’. The *s-*aor. is otherwise unattested, though a *siṣ-*aor. begins to be found already in the RV. See Narten (Sig. aor. 108–9), KH (Injunkt. 253), etc.; the identification as 1st sg. is already found in Wh’s Roots, though Old (SBE) tr. as a (*-si*) imperative (see also Ge n. 1a). It seems likely that this isolated *-si* 1st sg. is based on / inspired by the well-known medial 1st sg. pres. *-se* forms, clustering in the semantic domain “I (will) praise / sing,” of the type *stuṣé*, including, to this root, *gāyīṣe* (VII.96.1).

V.25.2: The tr. of *vibhāvasum* should be slightly altered to ‘bringing far-radiant goods’ to match the voc. in vs. 7.

V.25.3: Pāda c *agne rāyó didīhi naḥ* is reminiscent of the final vs. in nearby V.23: 4d *revān naḥ śukra dīdīhi*, though with a flip of the quantities of the redupl. and root vowels in the imperative. On these competing impvs. see comm. ad IX.108.9, VII.1.3. In our little complex, see also voc. *dīdivaḥ* in V.24.4.

V.25.7: This vs. is conceptually somewhat disjointed. To begin with, in pāda b the most natural way to read the impv. *arca* is as a self-address of the singer, but the immediately flg. voc. *vibhāvaso* ‘having far-radiant goods’ must surely refer to Agni, who is given this epithet in 2d. Ge’s (n. 7b) assertion that it is here addressed to the poet is ad hoc; instead I’m afraid we must assume double address, to both poet (*arca*) and god (*vibhāvaso*), with the further embarrassment that Agni is also present in 3rd ps. ref. in the dat. *agnáye* in pāda a. The publ. tr. attempts to deal with these issues by taking a and b as separate clauses (contrary to the standard tr.), but the result is abrupt and makes little sense. Among other things, in several of its occurrences *vāhiṣṭha-* qualifies *stóma-* ‘praise’ (e.g., *stómo vāhiṣṭho ántamaḥ* VI.45.30=VIII.5.18), and so it would naturally qualify the object of *arca* ‘sing, chant’ – though given the *yád ... tád* we do need a neut. instead of m. *stóma-*. A good candidate is *ukthá-* ‘hymn’, found in *ukthá-vāhas-* ‘whose conveyance is hymns’, but any neut. in this semantic domain would do. I would emend the tr. of the 1st hemistich to “(The hymn) that is the best conveyor, chant that loftily to Agni – o (Agni) of far-radiant goods.”

The problem in the second hemistich is the simile *māhiṣīva*, which is the comparandum for “wealth” (*rayīḥ*) and possibly for “prizes” (*vājāḥ*). But it is difficult to see what quality a buffalo cow or, under its developed sense, a chief wife would have in common with either of these, and the use of the rare fem. stem *māhiṣī-* (only twice elsewhere in the RV) makes the problem worse. If the point of comparison is power, one would expect the well-attested masc. *mahiṣá-* to be used instead, esp. since this would accord better with the standard gender of *rayí-*. However, it must be admitted that *rayí-*, very occasionally, must be taken as fem., e.g., in nearby V.33.6, and perhaps we should do so here as well. Even so, the semantics of the comparison is puzzling.

V.25.8: This vs., esp. the 1st hemistich, responds to 7ab in a complex way. The subj. of pāda a, *arcāyaḥ*, picks up the verb of 7b, *arca*, etymologically, but with quite distinct senses: *arcí-* only means ‘flame, beam, ray’ whereas *arca* in 7b means ‘chant, sing’. The visual description of pāda a (“your flames are brilliant”) is, however, superseded by an auditory one (“resounds”) in b. The publ. tr., with most others (but not Re, who supplies “you” as subj.), takes the *arcāyaḥ* as implicit subj. of b, compared to the resounding pressing stone – so the semantic mismatch between *arca* in 7b and *arcāyaḥ* in 8a is repaired by introducing in 8b an auditory dimension to the visual one in pāda a; the relationship between 7b and 8b is emphasized by their shared *bṛhát*. A syntactic problem is that *arcāyaḥ* is plural and the verb in b, *ucyate*, is singular. But there is presumably number attraction to the simile with sg. *grāvā-iva*, (so Ge n. 8b), esp. since this image is found elsewhere in expanded form: X.64.15=X.100.8 *grāvā yátra madhuṣúd ucyáte bṛhát*. (On this image and, esp., the accent on *ucyáte* in the repeated passage, see comm. ad X.64.15.) Moreover, note the potential gender mismatch between simile and frame in the preceding vs., 7c; the poet seems prone to such disharmonies.

The auditory imagery is reinforced in the 2nd hemistich.

V.25.9: On *sahasānā-* see comm. ad IV.3.6.

The image in the 2nd hemistich, *sá no víśvā áti dviṣaḥ, páṛṣan nāvéva ...*, forms a ring with the more condensed expression in 1d *parṣati dviṣáḥ*, as the publ. tr. indicates. But not only is the phrase in the last vs. expanded but it shows syntactic variation: the ending-accented *dviṣáḥ* in 1d is an abl. sg. (most likely), while root-accented *dviṣaḥ* in 9c is acc. pl., a grammatical identity anchored by *víśvā(h)* as well as the adposition *áti*, which takes the acc.

V.26 Agni [SJ on JPB]

Like V.25, this hymn consists of three ṛcas. It's a bricolage primarily assembled from pādas found elsewhere. The poet named by the Anukramaṇī is the same as that of V.25.

V.26.2–3: The use of the infinitival dat. *vītáye* in pāda c *devāṃ ā vītáye vaha* is somewhat ambiguous, depending on whether its subject is the gods or Agni (“convey the gods here for (them) to pursue ...” / “convey the gods here, for (you) to pursue (them)”), but this is quickly resolved by the first word of vs. 3, *vītí-hotra-* ‘having oblations (worth) pursuing,’ indicating that in 2c the gods are the subject and “oblations” is to be supplied as obj, as in the pub. tr. On *vītí-hotra-* and *√vī* more generally, see my “Vedic Evidence for the *dāti-vāra-* ‘type’” (IEL 2024), pp. 9–11 with nn. 12–14.

V.26.7: Scar (478) renders the hapax cmpd. *hotra-vāh-* as “die Opferschale [mit dem Opferguss] fahrend,” starting from the short-*a-* neut. *hotrá-* ‘office of Hotar’, with its semantic extension to ‘Hotar’s cup’. However, a meaning ‘conveying the oblations’ would make more sense and accord with the semantically identical cmpds *havya-vāh-*, *havir-vāh-*. Unfortunately the corresponding stem meaning ‘oblation’ is the long-*ā-* fem. *hótrā-*. Happily, this conundrum can be solved in the context of this hymn: the bahuvrīhi *vītí-hotra-* ‘whose oblations are worth pursuing’ in 3a, discussed above, clearly contains the long-*ā-* *hótrā-* (see n. 13 in the IEL art. cit.), but of course gender is neutralized in the final members of bahuvrīhis. The hapax *hotra-vāh-* here has been based on this nearby form, with short stem vowel.

V.27–28 Agni

Old considers both of these hymns to be additions to the original Agni collection.

V.27 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The hymn is a dānastuti, with the poet speaking in the 1st sg.

On the poets named by the Anukr. and their relation to the content of the hymn, see publ. intro.

V.27.1: The sg. *maghónaḥ* with the splv. *cétiṣṭhaḥ*, lit. “most illustrious of / than a/the generous patron,” is somewhat awkward. Old (SBE) emends it to gen. pl., but, as often, somewhat disavows this tampering with the text in the Noten. It seems likely that the occasional appearance of a singular with the splv. results from a conflation of the syntax of the superlative (with gen. pl.) with that of the comparative, which regularly takes an ablative singular. The conflation would be encouraged by situations, like this one, where the genitive singular and ablative singular would be identical.

V.27.2: The metrical restoration in HvN of *vāṛdhānó 'gne* to *vāṛdhāno ágne* is incorrect: *vāṛdhānó* should have final accent, in addition to the initial voc. acc. on *ágne*, which begins a new pāda.

V.27.3: The part. *cakānāḥ* appears to be predicated.

On the somewhat puzzling *navamām* ‘ninth’, enabled by word play with immed. preceding *nāviṣṭha-*, see publ. intro.

Since *tuviṣṭā-* is otherwise only used of gods, supplying “you [=Agni]” as the publ. tr. does (likewise WG; contra Old [SBE], Ge, Re), seems correct, though it requires slightly more machinery.

Note that *abhí* is oddly placed for a preverb in tmesis.

V.27.4: I would alter the tr. of the two short-vowel subjunctives *dádat* (c, d) from “let him give” to “he shall give.” WG supply Agni as the subj. of these verbs, but in the *dānastuti* context, it is much more likely to be the human patron, esp. given *áśvamedhasya dānāḥ* in the next vs.

The *medhā-* ‘wisdom’ in d is a play on the name of the patron.

V.27.6: I would slightly alter the tr. to better represent the loc. and the usual sense of $\sqrt{dhṛ}$: either to “uphold in A, the giver of 100s, an abundance of heroes and lofty dominion ...” or, with a type of loc. absol., “since A. is a giver of hundreds, uphold (for him) ...”

V.28 Agni [SJ on JPB]

V.28.1: I’d slightly emend the tr. of the verb in pāda a to “has braced ...” or “has fixed his flame in heaven.”

V.28.2: The somewhat displaced *ca* in d conjoins *dhatte* in c with its near twin *ní ... dhatte* in d, as JSK notes (DGRV I.124). This 2nd main cl. presents itself as an independent addition or afterthought, and so *yām ínvasi* is not really an embedded cl.

I don’t quite know what to do with the *íd*.

V.28.3: Old suggests (SBE), apropos of pāda c, that the hymns added to individual maṇḍalas are generally later than those of the Xth Maṇḍala, and therefore the poet here may be imitating the passage from the wedding hymn, X.85.23 *sām jāspatyām suyāmam astu devāḥ* “Let the united household be easy to hold fast, o gods.” The publ. tr. seems to have hewed too close to that passage in fact, omitting the 2nd sg. impv. *ā kṛṇuṣva*. The tr. should be corrected to “make our united household easy to control / hold fast.”

V.29 Indra

The poet assigned to this hymn by the Anukr. is Gaurivīti Śāktya, to whom two hymns in X (X.73–74) and two vss. in IX (IX.108.1–2) are also ascribed. See comm. ad X.73. The name *gaúrivīti-* appears in vs. 11 as the name of a poet, but apparently one in the past.

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is punctuated by expressions of soma-drinking, each slightly different and generally found in the 2nd half of an even pāda:

2b ... *papivāṃsam sutásya*

3b ... *sómasya súṣutasya peyāḥ*
 3d ... *papivām índro asya* [rhyming with 2b]
 5b ... *somapéyam* [cf. 3b]
 [7d *sutám pibat ... sómam*]
 8b ... *somyāpāḥ*
 11d ... *ápibaḥ sómam asya*

V.29.1: I follow Brereton (Ādityas, 165–66), who in turn followed Thieme (Mitra and Aryaman, 78–77), in taking *aryamā* not as nom. sg. masc. (as it is normally and as taken by the standard tr.), but as acc. pl. neut. construed with *trī* (like *trī rocanā* in the next pāda). Against Thieme’s “three hospitalities,” Brereton plausibly suggests that in this context the three *aryamā* must refer to “what governs the ritual,” perhaps the three soma-pressings or the three fires.

Pāda-initial *trī*, found here in a and b, recurs in 7c, 8a, b (also non-initial in 7b).

In c *pūtā-dakṣa-* (*lpūtā-dakṣa-*) is ordinarily Ādityan vocabulary (though used of the Maruts also in VIII.94.7, 10). Ge (/WG) supply the Ādityas as the subj. of *dhārayanta* in b and of course take Aryaman as the subject of pāda a. By contrast, I think the Maruts are subjects of all three pādas -- but they are identified with the Ādityas throughout, as the use of *pūtādakṣa-*, ordinarily a qualifier of the Ādityas, makes clear.

V.29.2: Ge (/WG) take *abhī yād āhim han* as subordinate to *ādatta vājram* in the same pāda. Although this fits the metrical scheme slightly better, it makes some trouble with the logical sequence of events (“he took the mace when he smashed the serpent,” almost implying that the smashing occurred first). It works better as subordinate to the main clause of d.

The word order *āhim hán* and the lack of augment on the verb scrambles the standard formula, producing almost a syncopated effect, which is repaired in 3d.

V.29.3: Ge (/WG) take *havyām* as the subj. of *āvindat*: “the oblation found the cows for Manu.” This interpr. accounts for the accent on *āvindat*, which would be generated by *hī*. But it is otherwise bizarre: *gāḥ √vid* ‘find the cows’ is a standard formula in the Vala myth, and the subject of the verb is always Indra or his agent(s)/companion(s) (e.g., Aṅgirasas I.62.2, Saramā V.45.7, 8); for Indra himself cf., e.g., I.101.5, II.19.3, VIII.96.17, and in a variant of the formula in the next hymn V.30.4 *vidó gavām ūrvām*. I know of no passages in which the oblation is credited with finding the cows, and in fact soma plays far less of a role in the successful outcome of the Vala myth than in that of the Vṛtra myth (though see 12a below). I therefore take *tād dhī havyām* as a nominal sentence completing b, with a clause break in the middle of c. I attribute the accent on *āvindat* to contrast with the immediately following verb *āhan*, which opens the next pāda. This hymn in fact shows a penchant for pāda-internal clause breaks: cf. in the immediately preceding vs. 2c, as well as 8d, 9d, 11d, 13b, all except the last right after the caesura as here.

V.29.4: For Indra enwrapped in the earth, cf. I.173.6 *sām vivya índro vṛjánam ná bhūma* “Indra has enwrapped himself in the earth like a girth.” Cf. also his wearing the earth III.32.11, VIII.4.8. Although here the enwrapping seems presented as a handicap, esp. given the *cid*, in the just cited passages the images seem rather to emphasize Indra’s vastness.

As noted also by Ge, Schaeffer, and WG, *jígartim ... apajárgurāṇaḥ* is a word play, but the words presumably belong to different roots. The first is universally assigned to *√gṛ* ‘swallow’, but the root affiliation of the second is disputed. Ge and EWA (s.v. *GAR*ⁱ p. 470)

assign it to a $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$ ‘hold out’, but I follow Schaeffer (Intens., 116–22) in taking it to $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$ ‘greet, extol’, with the negative sense contributed by the preverb *āpa*. So also WG and Oberlies (Relig. I.401). See also nearby *apagūrya* (V.32.6).

The etymological separation of *jígartim* and *apajárgurāṇaḥ* invites further scrutiny of the hapax *jígartim*. As noted above, this word is generally grouped with $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$ ‘swallow’ and interpreted as an agent noun ‘swallower’ (my ‘gulper’). However, with *apajárgurāṇaḥ* off the table, there is no particular contextual support for this interpr., though it is certainly semantically acceptable. Far more troubling are the serious formal problems. For one thing, *-ti-* is by no means an agent-noun suffix; it normally of course forms feminine abstracts, though AiG II.2.636–37 does register a number of such stems that have been reanalyzed “zur Bez. der persönlichen Träger des Verbalbegriffs zu verwenden.” Debrunner himself identifies our form as a 3rd sg. verb form inflected as a *-ti-* stem (AiG II.2.638), but this interpr. has nothing to recommend it. Not only is such a morphological transfer not a feature of the RV, but there is also no such verb stem available to be nominalized. The root $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$ ‘swallow’ does not have a redupl. pres. or in fact any redupl. stem save for the pf. *jagāra* and the intensive subj. *jalgulas* (I.28.1); the single form of the redupl. aor. *ajīgar* (I.163.7) supposedly belonging to this root (see Gr, and Whit. Roots) actually belongs with the other forms of this stem to the root $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$ ‘awaken’, and we just discussed intens. part. *járgurāṇa-* above. It is, further, a *seṭ* root; it’s hard to know what its pre-C full grade should be in a redupl. pres. formation since there are no parallel formations to roots in *-ṛ* that I know of (**jígarīti*? cf. VS *galgalīti* and EWA s.vv. *GAR*², *GAL*), but presumably not simply *gar*. In short, neither the nominal morphology nor the root formation of *jígarti-* is easily accounted for under the standard hypothesis, but I have nothing better to substitute. I therefore retain the rendering in the publ. tr., though with full awareness of its fragility. My thanks to Veronique Kremmer, who drew my attention to *jígarti-* and its many problems and discussed the issues at length with me. See also the illuminating disc. in Vine 2004 “PIE Full Grades in Some Zero-Grade Contexts,” p. 375.

V.29.6: Indra’s two actions in this vs. are expressed by injunctives (*vivṛścát* b, *bādhata* d), as in the preceding vs. (*kaḥ* 5d), but the middle verb, *ārcanti* in c, is emphatically present. The configuration here, *#ārcantīndram marútaḥ*, matches that of 1c *#ārcanti tvā marútaḥ*. See Hoffmann (Injunk. 165) on this vs., who seems to think the “timeless, mentioning” function of the injunctive can be so distant from a real preterite that it can drag in present indicatives. I would attribute it rather to the attempt in this hymn to associate the heroic deeds of the past with the activities of the present sacrificers. It is also barely possible that the text originally read **ārcantīndram*, that is, **ārcant īndram* with the underlying 3rd pl. ending *-nt* preserved before vowel, but later reinterpr. as pres. *-nti* after *-nt* regularly became *-nn*. The *-í-* could then have been lengthened, as if a sandhi product of *ārcanti īndram*, with no metrical consequences. The change would have been facilitated by the model of likewise *pāda*-initial *ārcanti* in 1c, as well as *arcanti* in 12b. Still, on balance I find this unlikely. Other examples of preserved *-nt* because of early misparsing as *-nti* occur before the enclitic pronoun *īm*, and the result in either case would be *-ntīm*. See disc. ad I.67.4, etc.

V.29.7: On neut. pl. *mahiṣā* in conjunction with the numerical expression *trī śatāni* see Old. Note the alternative phrasing with gen. pl. in 8a *trī ... śatā mahiṣāṇām*.

V.29.8: Gr and Ge [/WG] take both *ághaḥ* and *ápāḥ* as 3rd sg. Since *ághas* belongs to the root pres. to $\sqrt{ghas}$, either 2nd or 3rd sg. is grammatically possible. But for *ápāḥ* to be 3rd sg., an *s*-aor. stem *ápās-* has to be posited, for which there is no other support save for a med. *pāsta* in a *mā*-prohibitive in the AV (XII.3.43). Nevertheless, Narten does set up such a stem (Sig.Aor. 168). I see no reason to do so; the presence of nom. sg. *maghāvā*, adduced as evidence by Narten, is not sufficient, since nom. sg. appositives to 2nd sg. subjects are common. Also common is abrupt shifting between 2nd and 3rd ps., found already in this hymn between vss. 1 and 2, 4 and 5, 5 and 6. In our vs. we must assume that a shift happens between the hemistichs, given the 3rd sg. *jaghāna* in 8d, but this is hardly unprecedented -- and note that it returns abruptly to 2nd ps. in vs. 9. I therefore prefer to interpret 8ab as couched in the 2nd sg., as in the publ. tr. But if a 3rd sg. reading of *ápāḥ* is really desirable, I would prefer to consider the *-s* ending a local analogy to the precative *peyāḥ* at the end of 3b, reinforced by the ambig. parallel *ághaḥ*, rather than setting up an *s*-aorist stem to account for a single form.

I follow Ge in taking both *kārām* and *bhāram* as the direct speech expression of a victory cry. The former is appropriate to gaming contexts, while the latter is at home in battles. Our *ahvanta* ... *bhāram* has a compositional equivalent *bhāra-hūti-*, for which see comm. ad I.129.2; for *kārām* $\sqrt{kr}$, see I.131.5. It may be convenient to assemble here some passages containing both *bhāra-* and *kārā-* (or derivatives): I.112.1 *yābhir [ūtībhiḥ] bhāre kārām āmsāya jīnvathah;* VIII.66.1 (likewise an Indra hymn): (*īndram ... ūtāyel/*) *huvé bhāram ná kārīṇam;* IX.16.5 *mahé bhārāya kārīṇaḥ;* IX.14.1 *kārām bibhrat puruspṛṇam*. See also Wackernagel KISch. 340ff.

V.29.9: On *uśānā* as an indeclinable, see my 2007 “Vedic Uśānā Kāvya and Avestan Kauui Usan: On the Morphology of the Names” (Fs. Jasanoff).

On the basis of other mentions of this myth, 2nd du. *áyātam* must conceal a Vāyav Indraś ca type construction, with the other subject, beside voc. *indra*, being Kutsa. Cf. nearby dual dvandva *indrā-kutsā* (V.31.9). The gapping of Kutsa in the first half of the verse is repaired by cd *sarātham yayātha*, *kútsena*, with the same root $\sqrt{yā}$ as in *áyātam*. I do not understand the change in tense stem.

V.29.10: In the publ. tr. I take *kútsāya* primarily with pāda a, though syntactically and metrically it should go with b. I would now emend the tr. to “the other you made into wide space for Kutsa to drive” or “... for Kutsa for driving.” I’m not sure how a wheel can become a wide space -- what sounds like a kind of highway -- but the addition of Kutsa doesn’t make it any less comprehensible.

I take *anāsaḥ* ‘mouthless’ as proleptic, describing the state of the Dasyus after Indra has finished crushing them (sim. to I.32.6 **anāḥ pipiṣe*), while Ge [/WG] take it as a standing characteristic of the Dasyus (“mouthless Dasyus”). There is no way to tell.

V.29.11: The etym. fig. *pācan paktīḥ* is also a proleptic expression of sorts, “cooking (food, so that it is) cooked,” though since *paktī-* is not an adj./participle, but a noun identifying a type of food, the parallel isn’t exact. For other exx. of *paktī-* $\sqrt{pac}$, see IV.24.7, VII.32.8.

V.29.12: This vs. brings the third repetition of *arcanti* (1c, 6c [or *ārcan(t)*; see above]; cf. *ārcan* 2b).

I don’t quite understand the double *cid* construction in cd, where even one *cid* seems somewhat superfluous. Ge (/WG) take it as concessive and logically to be construed with

apidhānavantam (“the cowpen, although it had a cover” [Ge: “obwohl verschlossen,” sim. WG]). This is possible, though I don’t like the position of *cid*, and I would also note that #*gávyaṃ cid ūrvām* is also found in VII.90.4, where a concessive value is harder to wring out.

V.29.13: Gr, Ge (/WG), and Klein (DGRV I.219) interp. *pāri √car* as ‘serve’. Although this sense is found in later Vedic, the RVic instances of this lexeme only have the literal meaning ‘go around’ (e.g., III.7.2) with the developed sense ‘encompass’. (I.127.9 comes closest to ‘serve’, but the ‘surround’ sense is dominant.) Interpreting *pāri carāṇi* here as ‘serve’ requires the part. *vidvān* to take an obj. (“knowing your heroic deeds ...”), but pāda-final *vidvān* is almost always used absolutely. Moreover *áparītaḥ* (*pāri √i*) in the next vs. continues the thought of conceptual circumscription.

Ge (/WG) and Klein divide the vs. syntactically into ab / cd, with the rel. cl. of c expressing the obj. of d. By contrast I think the lexical parallelism and the conjunction *co* [=ca u] of ... *yā cakārtha* / *yā co* ... *kṛṇávaḥ* of bc mark those relative clauses as tightly conjoined, and I take them as subordinate to pāda a. Further, the last pāda *préd u tā te vidátheṣu bravāma* strikes me as a self-contained (pseudo-)refrain, reminiscent of the Gṛtsamāda refrain in II: *brhád vadema vidáthe suvîrāḥ* (II.1.16d etc.).

V.29.14: This vs. is structured somewhat like vs. 13, with (a) *etā víśvā cakṛvān* corresponding to (13b) (*vīryā*) ... *yā cakārtha*, though with pf. participle not rel. cl., and (c) *yā cid nú* ... *kṛṇávaḥ* corresponding even more closely to (13c) *yā co nú* ... *kṛṇávaḥ*. I would therefore now slightly emend the publ. tr. to reflect this parallelism more closely: “By your nature you cannot be circumscribed in heroism -- you, Indra, (as one) having done all these many (deeds) (as well as) those (deeds) that you will do even now in your daring. There exists no one to obstruct this power of yours.” In other words I take pādas a and c as parallel adjunct expressions, with b as their joint main clause, and d (like 13d) independent. Note that d has no overt referent for *yā* in c. The English is awkward, but this structure corresponds better to the Skt.

V.29.15: On the sandhi in *návyā ákarma* see Old.

V.30 Indra

The poet is Babhru Ātreya, acdg. to the Anukr., found only here. The name *babhrú-* is found in vs. 11, but apparently referring to a ritualist of the past. Babhru also appears as a client of the Áśvins in VIII.22.10.

There are a number of paired repetitions of words and phrases in earlier and later parts of the hymn, but not enough to define an omphalos: e.g., *-senāḥ*# 3d / *sénāḥ*# 9b; X Y *cakṛṣe* 4a / X Y *cakre* 9a; *yudháye* 4b / 9d; *áśmānam cid* 4c / 8c; *gávām* ... *usríyānām* 4d / 11d.

V.30.1: Despite the distance between them and the syntagms in between, I take *rāyā* and *ūtī* as parallel polarized instr. to be construed primarily with *gántā*. Ge and WG differently, though also differently from each other.

It is tempting to interpr *gántā* in d as a periphrastic future, a temptation yielded to in the publ. tr. A non-future sense, “is the one who comes to the house,” seems less satisfactory to me.

V.30.1–2: Note the reciprocal ‘seeking’ (*ichán*) of Indra (1c) and his devotee (2b).

V.30.2: WG take *sasvār* as ‘in sleep’, against the standard interpr. ‘in secret’, arguing that the latter does not make sense with *bubudhānāḥ* in d. But pāda d is not directly associated with pāda a, which, with b, compares the poet’s pursuit of Indra to the stealthy tracking behavior of a hunter. Moreover, the other three exx. of *sasvār(tā)* (in a tight knot in VII.58.5, 59.7, 60.10) clearly mean ‘in secret’, as opposed to ‘in the open’ (cf. the contrast in VII.58.5 with *āvīr* ‘openly’). It is true that the standard etymology of *sasvār* takes it from $\sqrt{\text{sas}}$ ‘sleep’ (see EWA s.v. *SAS*), but the semantic development to ‘in secret’ isn’t difficult to imagine -- esp. if Skt. $\sqrt{\text{sas}}$, which violates standard root structure constraints, was onomatopoeic for the shushing/hushing verbal gesture (English “shh,” etc.). From “keep quiet” to “keep secret” is a short step. Although $\sqrt{\text{sas}}$ is clearly an inherited root, with cognates in Avestan and Anatolian, the onomatopoeic interpr. could be regularly (re-)actualized by association with the (near-universal?) living “shh” interjection.

The position of *anyān* in b should, by my rules, make it definite (“the others”). Though both Ge and WG render it as indefinite, there is no reason why it can’t be definite: the poet consults with his priestly/poetic colleagues or with those “who know” (*vidvāms-*) Their answer, referring to “we men,” suggests that it is a defined group, quite possibly the priests performing the morning ritual. The action that qualifies them for attaining Indra -- waking up (early) -- is surely not simply reflecting a general sentiment like “the early bird gets the worm,” but refers to Indra’s attendance at the morning pressing; cf., e.g., IV.35.7 *prātāḥ sutām apibo haryaśva* “Early in the morning you drank the pressed (soma), you of the fallow bays.”

V.30.3: The syntax in the first hemistich is a little rough. *yā te kṛtāni* in pāda a appears to be an embedded relative clause, a construction that is rare to non-existent in the RV. Its position between the preverb and the verb of the main cl. (*prā ... brāvāma*) makes it difficult to interpret it any other way. The fact that it is a nominal clause, an NP serving as direct object, keeps the embedding from being a syntactic violation. See my 2022 “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto Izafe” (Fs. Mark Hale). (Note that Ge simply ignores the rel. prn.) The main verb *brāvāma* is accented because it is effectively in pāda-initial position: the initial accented voc. *īndra* is extra-clausal.

The second rel. clause *yāni no jūjoṣaḥ* “which of ours you will enjoy” appears to be parallel to the embedded NP, but it is a little skewed semantically. Indra should not *enjoy* his deeds, but rather enjoy *hearing* our recital of them (see Ge “die du von uns gern *hören* wirst” [my italics], with “hear” silently supplied). Alternatively it would be possible to assume that the 2nd rel. is (covertly) conjoined to the first and refers to different deeds, “(and) which (deeds) of ours you will enjoy” -- but it is hardly likely that Indra cares about what we do (besides pressing soma), so this interpr. is pragmatically blocked. WG supply “(in) unseren (Worten)” as the antecedent to the second rel. prn., such that what Indra will enjoy is our words, not his deeds (“(in) unseren (Worten), an welchen du Freude hast”); this seems to me to deploy too much machinery to repair what is simply a somewhat loose expression.

It would be technically possible to take the first hemistich as consisting only of relative clauses, with the main clause represented by c with an unexpressed resumptive “(those deeds)”: “Which deeds of yours we shall now proclaim at the pressing, which you will enjoy, (those deeds) he will learn ...” The accent on *brāvāma* would then be because it is in a dependent clause. Although this interpr. would save us from an embedded relative (see above), the rhetoric of the 1st hemistich, with *prā nū vayām ... brāvāma* reminiscent of I.32.1 *īndrasya nū vīryāṇi prā*

vocam and similar passages, strongly suggests an annunciatory declaration rather than a subordination.

V.30.4: Ge (/WG) assume that *c*, like *d*, refers to the opening of the Vala cave. They therefore either take *didyuto ví* ‘flashed forth’ as a stand in for ‘broke/split apart’ (Ge, flg. Sāy.’s *vyabhinaḥ*) or disjoin *didyutaḥ* from *ví* and supply another verb with the preverb (or so I understand WG’s “... blitzend, zer(sprengt)”). But *c* and *d* do not have to refer to a single feat: *a* and *b* do not, and the recital of *kṛtāni* promised in 3ab covers a number of different deeds in the vss. to come. Moreover, though *ásman-* ‘stone’ can refer to the Vala cave, it has a number of other possible referents (see 8c where Namuci’s head is equated/compared with an *ásman-*), including Indra’s own weapon. Cf. IV.22.1 *yó ásmānaṃ śávasā bíbhrad éti* “who [=Indra] keeps bearing the stone with his power,” with the *śávasā* found also here. Since *√dyut* is very commonly found with *ví* (including the common and lexicalized root-noun cmpd. *vidyút-* ‘lightning’) and since one of the sites to which a preverb in tmesis moves is directly after its verb (and here also adjoining a metrical boundary), it seems very likely that preverb and verb belong together -- and have their normal sense. In my interpr. this lexeme incorporates a simile: ‘cause to flash like lightning’ / ‘cause to lightning’ (unfortunately English does not have such a verb). In other words, with his power Indra can make even the dull and homely material stone flash like a lightning bolt.

However, I have since rethought this interpr., on the basis of Thiago Mendes-Vendurott’s disc. of this passage at the 2025 UCLA IE conference, in his presentation on “unselected object constructions” in the RV. He suggests an appealing alternative interpretation: “you flashed open the rock ...,” an interpr. that fits well with the Vala pāda that follows (as Ge et al. already noted). In fact this interpr. of *didyuto ví* matches mine of *ví ... dyaut* in IV.4.6 (which I failed to remember). I would now substitute “you flashed open the rock” for the publ. tr. “you made ... a stone flash like lightening.”

V.30.5: The Pp. interprets *paramá* as nom. sg. m. *paramáḥ*, and Ge (/WG) follow suit. I prefer the equally possible reading *paramé*, on the basis of several ‘born’ passages with this expression. Cf., e.g., I.143.2 *sá jāyamānaḥ paramé vyòman* (though the subj. is Agni there).

In my view *cid* often takes Wackernagel’s Law position, even when it seems to limit a different word in the clause. Hence my “even the gods,” though *devā(h)* is at the end of the pāda. Its positioning there may be to take advantage of its adjacency to *víśvā(h)* across the pāda boundary. Although the latter is fem. and must modify acc. pl. *apāḥ* ‘waters’, its position evokes the common locution “all the gods / the All Gods.” In fact, the expression “all the waters” is vanishingly rare — besides this passage I have found only VII.95.1 — and so “all” belongs more naturally with the immediately preceding “gods” than with its grammatical partner.

Note the switch from 2nd ps. ref. to Indra (rel. cl. 5ab) to 3rd ps. ref. (main cl. 5c, new cl. 5d).

V.30.6: Referent shift continues: 2nd ps. in ab, 3rd in cd.

V.30.7: There are several uncertainties in this vs.

As often the function and syntactic affiliation of *janúṣā* are unclear. I construe it with *mṛdhaḥ*, but Ge and WG (in different ways) take it with Indra. This is also possible.

The participial phrase *dānam īnvan* “stimulating giving” seems oddly embedded in the distracted VP *vī śú mṛdhaḥ ... āhan* “you hewed apart the negligent ones.” The positioning between the preverb and its verb in tmesis may be a kind of iconic reflection of the separation sense of the preverb (‘apart’). For a similar ex. see I.103.2. On the participial phrase see further below.

I have been puzzled by the phrase *gāvā ... saṃcakānāḥ*, though I think I now see a solution (see below). For one thing, $\sqrt{kā}$ [*/kan/*] is not otherwise found with *sām* (anywhere in Sanskrit, at least judging from Monier-Williams); for another, this root is not construed with the instr. (*pace* Gr, whose supposed exx. should all be interpr. otherwise). And finally I cannot think of a (solitary) cow that figures prominently in Indra mythology, either as a companion (as I took it in the publ. tr.) or as a source of enjoyment. Ge remarks (n. 7a) that Indra gives abundantly as long as he is “im Genuss der erbeuteten Kühe.” I suppose this is possible but it assumes a fairly extensive backstory. Like me, Kü (143) takes the cow as comitative: “mit Rindvieh ... dich zusammenwünschend.” I was happy to have company in this tr., but I frankly didn’t understand what either his or mine is actually meant to express. WG also seem to have a comitative reading, which is similarly opaque: “du erpicht darauf wirst, mit dem Rind beisammen zu sein.”

On reconsideration of the passage I now see a possible solution. It is striking that *gāvā* is the only apparent occurrence of the instr. sg. to this stem in the RV. In context it appears directly before *maghavan*. I now think the original form may have been gen. pl. **gāvām*, with simplification of the double *-m m-*. The meter is unaffected, and a gen. pl. would fit the sense much better, as I will now show. This hymn contains four other examples of this very gen. pl. (4d, 11d, 12b, 13b), as well as nom. pl. *gāvāḥ* (10a). The examples in 12 and 13 are in a *dānastuti*, but the others refer to the cows that Indra freed from the Vala cave (and are in the same metrical position as our form). I see two possible ways to construe my putative **gāvām*. Since forms of $\sqrt{kā}$ can take the genitive as a source of enjoyment (e.g., X.54.16 *drāviṇasaḥ*), it may go with *saṃcakānāḥ*: “enjoying the cows,” referring to Indra’s pleasure in his deed and its products. But in vs. 11 Indra, having drunk soma, *pūnar gāvām adadād usrīyāṇām* “gave again of the ruddy cows.” This seems to refer to a redistribution on the ritual ground of the cows that Indra had freed. Bringing together 11d *gāvām adadāt* with 7ab *dānam īnvan ... *gāvām*, I am inclined to think that the cows are the content of the gift and would now alter the tr. to “setting in motion the gift *of cows” vel sim. Under this interpr. *saṃcakānāḥ* is used without complement: “taking pleasure, enjoying yourself” (for a similar absolute use of this participle, see IV.16.15 and Kü 143). Thus the hemistich contains a brief précis of the myth: Indra hews apart those who block his freeing of the cows [I would now probably change my rendering of *mṛdhaḥ* as ‘negligent’ here], which allows him to set in motion the ultimate giving away of the freed cows, and he thoroughly (*sām*) enjoys the whole process. The occurrences of *gāvām* in the *dānastuti* (esp. 12b *gāvāṃ catvāri dádataḥ sahásrā*) simply replicate the mythic model provided by Indra’s generous sharing out of the freed cows.

I am not certain what *pāda d* is conveying. How is it that Indra’s setting Namuci’s head to rolling involves “seeking a way for Manu”? Unfortunately we can glean too little about Namuci from the RV (where he is mentioned only 9x) to know what threat he posed that required Indra to kill him. On the other hand, judging from the usual troubles caused by *Dāsas* and, particularly, from vs. 9 (see publ. intro.), these foes stand in the way of *Ārya* movement into new territory. Thus Indra by eliminating Namuci would open the way for Manu and the rest of the advancing *Ārya*.

V.30.8: Though this vs. follows thematically on vs. 7, it seems disjointed and has given rise to much discussion (see esp. Old and his skepticism about Ge's interpr.; Bl RR) and incompatible interpretations, which I will not treat in detail further here.

The first question that arises is who is the 1st-ps. speaker in pāda a. Ge suggests that it is Namuci himself, a suggestion rejected by both Old and Bl. I think the root aor. *ākṛthāḥ* is the clue. It is rare that the aorist, esp. the root aorist, is used as a narrative tense, esp. to a root well outfitted with other preterital possibilities. I take pāda a as a parenthetical interruption of the Namuci story, prompted by the last pāda of vs. 7, esp. the mention of Manu. With Old I take "me" as referring to the present-day priest, and in my view he is asserting his ancestral and vocational connection with the primal priest and representative Ārya, Manu. The speaker suggests that Indra's current partnership with him ("for you have made me your yokemate" with the aorist of the recent past) is evidence of Indra's active concern for his ancestor Manu in the mythological past. After this interruption *ād id* functions as a resumptive expression, returning us to and carrying on the story of the myth narrated in 7cd.

In 8c the referent of the "whizzing stone" (*āśmānam ... svaryām*) is disputed. I very much doubt that it is a mountain, despite the occurrence of the same expression in V.56.4, where it definitely is a mountain, and despite Old's championing of this identification. I think it more likely that the phrase resonates with I.32.2 *vājraṃ svaryām*, where *svaryā-* refers to Indra's mace. Namuci's whirling head is being compared to a weapon whirling through the air and making a whizzing sound.

The "rolling, whirling" image is carried further in the next pāda, with the simile "(rolling forth) like two wheels." The simile makes fine sense with *vārtamāna-*, but what are the two world-halves (*ródasī*) doing there? As it turns out, though it may seem counter-intuitive in real-world terms, the two worlds (under various designations) are regularly associated with the root *√vrt* (cf., e.g., V.43.2, VI.8.3, VII.80.1, VIII.6.5). In some of these passages the rolling out of the two worlds is part of a cosmogonic exercise; in some it refers to the visual (re-)appearance of differentiated earth and sky at dawn.

I have no idea what the Maruts are doing here.

V.30.9: For women as weapons see not only I.104.3 mentioned in the publ. intro. but also X.27.10 and disc. ad loc.

For my interpretation of the sense of this vs., see publ. intro. I am tolerably certain about my reading of the first hemistich, but pāda c is more challenging and has given rise to some curious interpretations. Ge tr. "denn er hatte darunter seine zwei Frauenbrüste entdeckt," commenting (perplexingly, at least to me) "Die beiden Milchbrüste für seine beiden Frauen" (n. 9c). (One would assume there would be four in all, at any rate.) Old thinks the two *dhéne* refer to the two liquids in the Namuci myth and ultimately (see his ref. to his own NGGW 1893 art. [=KlSch. 635ff.]) to the Sautrāmaṇī ritual and its two separate oblations, milk and surā. Schmidt (Ged. Nyberg), more or less flg. Bloomfield, suggests that Indra recognizes two streams within himself, songs and libations, but this linkage of the literal and metaphorical through an elliptical dual seems quite unlikely. WG's "Darunter aber hat er dessen beide Ströme erblickt" is literally close to mine, but they provide no guidance on what they mean by "his two streams."

My own tr. ("distinguished both his [=Dāsa's?] streams") is also not as informative as it might be. One problem is the meaning of the lexeme *antár √khyā*. To *√khyā* 'see' *antár* should add the sense of either 'look within' or 'distinguish between'. The similarly formed *antár √paś* seems to have both these meanings: 'look within' in I.132.3 and 'distinguish between' in II.27.3.

(In the latter passage JPB tr. ‘look within’, but I consider that the less likely sense in context.) In the only other occurrence of *antár √khyā*, I.81.9, I tr. ‘detect’ (flg. Ge’s ‘endecken’ for this passage, V.30.9), a sense that can be somewhat tenuously derived from ‘look within a mass of stuff — and visually locate’. It’s also possible in that passage, which concerns the possessions of the impious, which Indra is supposed to bring to us, that he is distinguishing between those possessions and the ones that belong to deserving people and should stay put. In our passage here we might in the first instance think that ‘distinguish between’ would be a promising candidate, given the dual object. But I don’t think Indra is supposed to be seeing a difference between the two streams, but rather perceiving that they are just streams and therefore not formidable weapons -- thus encouraging his advance to fighting in pāda d. I am tempted to emend the publ. tr. to “detected/recognized both of his (weapons) as (just) streams.” Though the weapons (*āyudhāni*) were plural in pāda a, I think that is a general statement about turning women into weapons, whereas pāda c concerns the particular situation Indra confronts, the two barrier rivers -- the same situation as in I.104.3, which also contains two troublesome rivers.

V.30.12, 14: The Anukr. takes *ṛṇamcayā-* as the PN of the king, and the standard interpr. follow this, incl. the publ. tr. I now wonder if it is at least a speaking name – and perhaps not a name at all but a descriptor: “requiting debts.” The royal patron who distributes largesse to poets and priests at a sacrifice is, from the point of view of the ritual economy, requiting his debts to them, who attracted the gods to the sacrifice and entertained them, leading them to grant tangible and intangible rewards to the patron.

V.30.13–14: The two pāda-final sequences *páritakmyāyāḥ* (13d) and *páritakmyā yām̐* (14a) in adjacent pādas are puzzling. The publ. tr. reflects emendations of both forms to loc. sg. *páritakmyāyām*. This loc. occurs 6x, always pāda-final, including in the next hymn, V.31.11 -- by far the most common form to this stem. Moreover, VI.24.9d is identical to 14d, save for having the loc. *páritakmyāyām* -- a variation that Bl (RVReps) finds “baffling.” The arguments in favor of emendation are the dominance of the loc. sg. and its appearance both in the next hymn and in the otherwise identical pāda in VI.24.9. However, these arguments cut both ways: it is difficult to understand how these forms would have become mangled – *especially* given the dominance of that same loc. sg. It cannot be claimed that the redactors misunderstood the forms because they had never seen their like. I therefore now feel that we must accept that the forms were in the urtext, deliberately produced by the poet, who was playing games with this well-known pāda-final temporal expression. I still believe that the intent of both forms is the same as the loc., but that the loc. has been deliberately altered, in two different ways, conditioned by the immediate context.

In 13d *aktór vyūṣṭau páritakmyāyāḥ* the form has been given a genitive ending to conform, superficially, to the gen. *aktóḥ*. Gr takes it to an adjectival stem (*páritakmya-*, which doesn’t exist) as a modifier of *aktóḥ*, which, as Old points out, would then have to be fem. here, rather than its normal masc. Old suggests it might be a gen. of time, though he prefers to supply *rātryāḥ* or to have it depend on *vyūṣṭau*. I consider this over-thinking: the poet gives us the loc. form we expect, right up to the very last segment (-ḥ rather than -m) and then springs the surprise, capitalizing on the superficial resemblance to the gen. sg. *áktóḥ*.

In 14a *aúchat sã rātrī páritakmyā yām̐* the final syllable of the loc. has been truncated and given an accent. The anunāsika can be taken as hiatus-breaking nasalization of a final -ā before ṛ; this is the standard interpr. (see esp. Old, Noten, with ref. to Prol.). This yields the nom.

sg. fem. rel. prn., which allows an interpr. as a nominal rel. clause *páritakmyā yā*, which specifies immediately preceding *sā rātrī*. A pāda-final rel. pronoun and the resulting nominal rel. clause (“... the night, which is *páritakmyā*”) would be highly unusual, but as a poetic trick involving re-segmentation of a well-known form it shows a proto-*śleṣa* sensibility.

The fact that the poet alters the expected form in two different ways in succeeding pādas should alert us to the fact that he is playing verbal tricks, secure in the knowledge that his audience would expect and interpret both as underlyingly locatival. For a different manipulation of the stem, see comm. ad I.31.6. In any case the publ. tr. should have an * before “at its final turn” in both instances.

V.30.14: The primary reading of *ajyámānaḥ* is surely “being driven,” as the standard interpr. have it. But it could also be the passive of *√añj* ‘anoint’ and inhabit the same semantic realm as “well-ornamented with thousands of cows” in 13ab: he would be anointed with prize cows.

V.30.15: The idiom *ā √dā* ‘take’ is ordinarily in the middle, whereas *ādāma* here is active. This active form reflects secondary spread of the apparent act. thematic stem, based on the (pseudo-)active *ādat* ‘took’, for which see comm. ad V.32.8, II.12.4.

V.31 Indra

The poet is named as Avasyu Ātreya, also supposedly the poet of V.75. In both cases the name has been extracted from the adj. *avasyú-* ‘seeking help’ (V.31.10, 75.8).

V.31.1: Against the Pp., which reads *vy ùnoti*, and despite Old’s objections, I read *v’yunoti*, that is, *ví yunoti* ‘keeps separate’ -- an idea that goes back to Wh’s Roots (s.v. *√u*)(see also Old’s other reff.) and is accepted by EWA (s.v. *YAV*²); see also Gotō IJ 31 (1988) -- even though a 5th class pres. is not otherwise attested to this root. Note the same lexeme, *ví √yu*, in the immed. preceding hymn, V.30.10 ... *gāvaḥ* ... *vatsaír víyutā yád āsan* “since the cows were separated from their calves.” This interpr. is, not surprisingly, reflected in WG’s tr., but not Ge’s “mustert” (survey, inspect, further glossed in n. 1c as “er wählt den rechten Wagen aus”), whose root affiliation is not clear to me.

This verb seems to work slightly differently in simile and frame. In the simile the herdsman is separating flocks, sorting them on some principle or other (sheep from goats? flock belonging to A from that belong to B? young animals from older? etc.). In the frame I supply *rátham* as object (from 1a) and, as I see it, Indra keeps his chariot separate from the other chariots in the race or chariot drive in order to be first, a position reflected in pāda d. WG slightly different: Indra drives the other, opposing chariots apart.

V.31.2: WG take *písāṅga-* in the cmpd *písāṅga-rāti-* as referring to the color of cows (“Gabe rötlichbraune (Kühe)”), whereas I follow Gr, Ge in taking it as a reference to gold. Either is possible, and it is true that the adj. qualifies other animals -- a dog (VII.55.2), horses (I.88.2, V.57.4) -- though not cows. Nothing rides on the choice.

V.31.3: Ge and WG take *sáhaḥ* as the only subj. of *ājaniṣṭa*, while I take *sáhaḥ* as an appositive qualifying the unexpressed subj. *índraḥ*. Again the difference is minor, but I favor my interpr. because the birth of Indra and the prodigious feats he performs immediately thereafter are frequent topics in the RV.

Since the 2nd/3rd sg. root aor. of $\sqrt{vr}$ always otherwise has a long augment ($\check{a}var$), it seems best to take the form here as injunctive *var*, contra the Pp. 'var. See Lub ("Vedic root $\sqrt{vr}$," 317).

V.31.5–6: Vs. 5 is syntactically problematic, in that it has two subordinate clauses, one marked by *yád* in pāda a and one marked by *yé* in pāda c, but no obvious main clause. The rel. cl. beginning in c must extend through d, which contains the accented imperfect *ávaranta*, but the extent of the *yád* clause is unclear. It must go as far as the end of pāda a because of the accented subjunctive *árcān*, but the status of b is in question. Since the vs. otherwise lacks a main clause, Ge and WG make b the nominal main clause, e.g., Ge "..., da waren die Presssteine, die Aditi einverstanden." This is possible, but seems conceptually weak, and both Ge and WG fail to render the subjunctive value of the verb in the *yád* clause -- Ge silently changing it into a preterite ("anstimmten") and WG using a simple pres. ("singen").

But I think the subjunctive should be taken seriously, esp. given its contrast with the impf. *ávaranta* in d. My solution is to assume the main clause is postponed till vs. 6, whose first pāda contains the familiar annunciatory pseudo-subjunctive *prá ... vocam* "I shall proclaim." Thus, vss. 5–6 depict a ritual situation in which the noise of the pressing stones is, as so often, configured as ritual speech (see, e.g., vs. 12c *vádan grāvā* in this same hymn), to which the poet responds in vs. 6. I now think that *vṛṣaṇaḥ* in pāda a is not a separate subject ("the bulls and the pressing stones" of the publ. tr.), but instead qualifies the stones ("the bullish pressing stones"; for pressing stones as bulls, see, e.g., III.42.6, VI.44.20), and I would change the tr. to "When for you the bull, o Indra, the bullish pressing stones will chant a chant ..." Sāy., cited approvingly by Ge in n. 5a, identifies the bulls of pāda a as the Maruts, and WG also accept this identification, but again the subjunctive makes difficulties: the actions of the Maruts should not be prospective, but located in the mythic past (hence, presumably, Ge's switch to the preterite).

So the skeleton of the sentence spread over two vss. is "When the pressing stones will chant a chant to you, I will proclaim your deeds."

A few loose ends remain in vs. 5. The presence of Aditi in b at first takes one aback, but as Ge points out (n. 5b), soma is said elsewhere to be prepared "in the lap of Aditi," so her proximity to the pressing stones is a ritual given. I take *áditiḥ sajóṣāḥ* as a separate mini-constituent, with the nom. sg. of the -s-stem adjective serving for the fem. as well as the masc., as usual. The second hemistich detours into a conceit -- involving an unexpressed comparison of the pressing stones with deadly wheel rims that have crushed the enemy; cf. a similar passage in X.27.6 *ádhy ū nv èṣu vavṛtyuḥ* "The wheel rims should now roll over them." In part the conceit responds to the chariot-focused theme of this hymn, esp. the chariot conflict depicted in vs. 11; in part it highlights the pressing stones' demon-killing power, found, e.g., in X.76.4. I would here change "which" to "that."

The subjunctive *vibhárā(h)* in the *yád* clause is potentially troublesome for my interpr. of *árcān* in 5a, for it seems to refer to past, cosmogonic deed(s) of Indra's -- the separation of the two world halves and the winning of water for mankind (two events not usually connected). This surprising usage of the subjunctive is noted by Delbrück (AiSyn 322: subjunctive where we expect the indicative of a narrative tense). Old is undisturbed by the subjunctive and points to 5a as similar, which is exactly what I would prefer to point away from; see my explanation of *árcān* above. Hoffmann (244–45) classifies it as "Konjunktiv in präteritalem Sachverhalt" and suggests that the subjunctive in its prospective use can take on a timeless sense ("... einen ausserzeitlichen Sinn annehmen kann"). Ge simply translates it as a preterite (trenntest) without comment, but WG take the subjunctive seriously here (though not in 5a): "... dass du ... trennen und ...

gewinnen willst,” without further comment. I do not have an entirely satisfactory answer, but I think the *yád* clause must be evaluated in the context of what precedes: 6ab announces that I will proclaim Indra’s previous deeds (*pūrvāṇi káraṇāni*) and “the current ones which you have done” (*nūtanā ... yā cakārtha*). This latter expression, which is found identically in VII.98.5, seems temporally incoherent: if they are his current deeds, he should not have already done them; *yā cakārtha* should limit only the first phrase, *pūrvāṇi káraṇāni*. A fuller expression of this proclamation announcement, with the time of action correctly sorted, is found in nearby V.29.13 *vīryā ... yā cakārtha / yā co nú návyā kṛṇávaḥ* “The heroic deeds that you have done and the new ones that you will do,” with the perfect *cakārtha* qualifying the deeds already done and the subjunctive *kṛṇávaḥ* the new ones. Immediately afterwards it is said *prá ... tā ... bravāma* “we shall proclaim these,” like our *prá ... vocam*. I think we should interpret our 6cd in the light of V.29.13. The rel. clause *yā cakārtha* should, properly speaking, limit only the *pūrvāṇi*, while the *nūtanā* “current (deeds)” are further specified by a single example (or perhaps two), expressed by the *yád* clause in cd using the subjunctive. A problem remains: as noted above, the separation of the two worlds is one of Indra’s standard cosmogonic deeds as is, in the Vṛtra myth, his winning of the waters. We should expect these to be classified among the *pūrvāṇi*. But of course one of the reasons for celebrating older, mythic deeds is to persuade / compel the god to perform these deeds again in the present for our benefit, and we can interpret the *yád* + SUBJUNCTIVE clause here in that way. The separation of the two world halves is, on a smaller scale, accomplished every morning when dawn reveals the horizon where the darkness had kept earth and sky undifferentiated. And winning waters is something that needs to be repeated at least yearly. The subjunctive here indicates that our focus is on the re-creation of these older deeds, not simply on celebrating their original performance. In this context *mánave* ‘for Manu’ would have the extended sense ‘for mankind’.

V.31.7–8: The recital of Indra’s deeds now reverts to the past tense, to a series of insistently augmented imperfects: 7b *ámimīthāḥ*, 7c *agr̥bhñāḥ*, 7d *asedhaḥ*, 8b *áramayaḥ*, 8c *ayātam*, *ávahaḥ*. (In 8d the Pp. reads unaug. *áranta*, but in its sandhi situation [*uśánādranta*] it could as easily be *āranta*; the accent should be on the augment because it’s in a subordinate cl., but *ā* + *áranta* would come out this way. Either way, it’s not an imperfect, but either a plupf. or a root aor., but this is a minor quibble.) However, note that this series is introduced by 7a *tád ín nú te káranam* “Just this now is your deed,” where the current situation (*nú*) remains in the forefront of the poet’s mind.

V.31.7: In c I would substitute “tricks” or “wiles” for “magical arts” and a more aggressive verb for ‘envelop’ – hence “even Śuṣṇa’s tricks you circumscribed.”

V.31.8: With Sāy. I was tempted to take *pārā-* in sandhi for loc. *pārē*, against the Pp., since well-attested *pārā-* otherwise just means ‘far shore’ and is common in the loc. But I was persuaded by Ge (n. 8b), who points out that the verb *pārāya-* is used several times in this same myth with Indra as subject, and by Old, who notes that *supārā-* is used several times of Indra (III.50.3, VI.47.7), in the sense ‘providing good passage, deliverance’. I would therefore take the simplex *pārā-* ‘deliverer, transporter’ here as a nonce extraction from the fairly common *supārā-*.

With Ge (and contra WG, who suggest Śuṣṇa), I take the strong one (*ugrám*) in c as Uśanā. This is the usual, if wispy, account of Indra and Kutsa’s journey to Uśanā’s house for advice before the Śuṣṇa battle; cf. X.22.6.

The 2nd sg. *ávaho ha kútsam* “you (sg.) conveyed Kutsa,” following immediately on the 2nd du. *ayātam* “you two drove,” seems a quick correction or explanation. The 2nd du. *ayātam* may have seemed to suggest an equality and mutuality between Indra and Kutsa that might have seemed insulting to Indra’s divinity and greater power -- though the return of *vām* in d and the dual dvandva *índrākutsā* and dual verbs of vs. 9 show that the attempt to reestablish hierarchy was momentary.

V.31.9: I take this as the direct address of Uśanā to Indra and Kutsa, with his advice and encouragement before they take on Śuṣṇa. In b both Ge and WG have complex and fanciful interpretations of the phrase *āpi kārṇe*. In VIII.97.12 the same expression seems to indicate close, intimate contact -- perhaps close enough to whisper into someone’s ear. In my interpr. Uśanā is recapping their journey to him, suggesting that they should come close enough to hear his intimate counsel.

Although of apparently identical (thematic) formation, *dhámathaḥ* and *varathaḥ* are modally distinct, the first being an indicative present, the second a subjunctive. Although it is tempting to take them both as subjunctives (as WG do), the stem *dháma-* is robustly enough supplied with diagnostic forms (a number of augmented 2nd/3rd sg.s) that it would be hard for a poet to mistake the morphology. I therefore assume there is a reason for the distinction in mood. Perhaps *dhámathaḥ* presents a successful attack on Śuṣṇa as a given (though it has not yet happened), and this success will have the further happy effect stated in d.

V.31.10: Ge supplies a separate verb (“Lenke”) in pāda a, but this seems unnecessary, since the subj. of b, the sage poet (*kavíḥ*) can have gone (*ajagan*) to the horses of a as goal. The identity of the *kaví-* isn’t made clear, but I think the best candidate is Indra. In I.121.12 he is urged to mount (*tíṣṭhā*) the easily yoked (horses) of the wind (*vātasya suyújaḥ*, as here), while in I.130.9, addressed as *kave*, Indra went (*ájagan*) to Uśanā, just as here. Indra is also said to be ‘seeking help’ (*avasyú-*) in IV.16.11 in connection with the same story, also as here. In other words, all the phraseology points to Indra as subject, with the sly twist that he is called *kaví-*, which evokes the patronymic of one of the other participants, Uśanā Kāvya, who is also on many occasions referred to as *kaví-*.

The plupf. *ajagan* may have anterior sense here. Kü (159) allows a value of “fernere Vergangenheit” in this passage.

V.31.11: The mixture of tenses and moods in this vs. is at first glance bewildering, but I think the uses can be sorted out. We get, in order, a root aor. subj. (*karat* b), a pres. injunc. (*bhārat* c), a pres. indic. (*riṇāti* c), and a future (*saniṣyati* d), as well as a pf. part. (*jūjuvāṃsam* b) and a redupl. pres. part. (*dádhat* d). The vs. seems to be a sort of “color commentary,” recounting the chariot race or contest with vivid immediacy. The first hemistich, as I see it, contains a general prediction of what is going to happen. Since *karat* is a subjunctive expressing prospective action, the perf. part., generally used to express anteriority, does so here, but as a present action/state (“[now] speeding”) anterior to the future expectation of *karat* (rather than a past anterior as is usual). The second hemistich lays out in sequence a past action (*bhārat* ‘bore’), a present action (*sám riṇāti* ‘restores’), and a future one (*saniṣyati* ‘will gain’), with the participial (*puró dádhat* ‘putting in front’) reprising what has gone before. Beyond this I cannot go, as I still do not understand what happens in the Etaśa and sun’s chariot passages. The perplexing nature of this fragmentary myth can be seen in the diametrically opposed translations it receives, with WG

exactly reversing the change in position of the chariot in b (from behind to in front, contra Ge and me: from in front to behind). I cannot judge which is right.

Adding to the uncertainty is the lexeme *sám √ri*, which occurs in the RV only here and three times in I.117 (4, 11, 19) of miraculous repairs of the *Aśvins*. Since *√ri* means ‘let flow, dissolve’, I take *sám* as a preverb that both implicitly reverses that action and expresses unity: ‘put back together’ → ‘restore’.

This is the last vs. before the return to the here-and-now, and the verbal fireworks may mark a poetic climax.

V.32 Indra

The poet’s name *Gātu Ātreya* seems to have been extracted from the difficult vs. 10, which contains *gātūḥ*. On the vs. see below.

As indicated in the publ. intro., although this hymn focuses on the *Vṛtra* myth, the standard formulaic encapsulation of that myth -- *áhann áhim* “he/you slew the serpent” -- does not appear in it. Instead there are formulaic transformations in the early verses: 1d *áva* (*dānavám*) *han* / 2cd *áhim* ..., *jaghanvān* ... (the closest to the standard formula, involving only morphological transformation of the verb) / 3b (*mṛgásya vádhar*) *jaghāna* / 4d *ní jaghāna* (*śúṣṇam*), (*tám* ...) *jaghāna* (6cd).

V.32.1: Old is disturbed by *aramṇāḥ* ‘brought to peace / to a stop’, when we would expect Indra to releasing the waters to flow. I’m not sure this is a problem: since the floods were hard pressed (*badbadhānān*), Indra could be soothing and quieting the tormented waters. Cf. also in the previous hymn V.31.8 *apāḥ* ... *áramayaḥ* “you brought the waters to rest,” the same sentiment with the same root. However, it could also be an example of alluding to a sub-surface word by the overt use of its opposite, like *bodháya-* for **svāpáya* in I.103.7; see comm. ad loc. In other words, *aramṇāḥ* could be signaling ‘set in motion’ by opposition to its literal sense ‘bring to a stop’. In any case the expected action is expressed later in the vs.: d *srjó ví dhārā(h)* “you set loose the streams,” in a species of poetic repair. See also comm. on vs. 2.

Note the stylistic quirk of post-verbal preverb in *ásrjo* [*/srjó*] *ví* OBJ (pādas a, d) versus *ví* ... *vāḥ* (c) and *áva* ... *han* (d). The latter VP also contains a phonetic figure in *áva dānavám*.

In c the usual placement of the rel. pronoun after at most one constituent is precariously observed (if at all), and in any case the *yád* is descriptively found deep in its clause. However, its placement (almost) conforms to the letter of the law: the voc. *indra* is extraclausal for these purposes, and *mahāntam* ... *párvatam* though heavy is a single constituent. It’s the *ví* that may tip the balance towards non-compliance. On the other hand, the configuration PREV *yá-* VERB is so standard that this may determine the position of *yád* here.

Technically speaking the opening clause of d may be part of the dependent clause in c (“when you pried apart ... (and) set loose ...”), with *áva dānavám han* the sole main clause, but since in *Vṛtra* narratives there’s usually a cause-and-effect relationship between opening the mountain and letting the waters flow, I think the publ. tr. is the better choice.

Note the echoing in *áva* ... *avá(m)* and the abrupt final near-rhyme ...*vám han*. This is the first variant of the basic dragon-slaying formula *áhann áhim*, and the unfamiliar preverb *áva* almost allows *áhan* to emerge: *á(va dānavám) han*.

V.32.2: The first hemistich redeploys vocab. from the 1st vs.: 1) The two members of the NP *útsān* ... *badbadhānān* in pāda a were both found in 1ab, but not in the same constituent. 2)

áramḥaḥ ‘you sent speeding’ in b rhymes with *aramṇāḥ* in 1b and is its antonym. This antonymic pairing might support the suggestion floated just above, that *áramṇāḥ* is meant to evoke its semantic opposite.

The function of the instr. *ṛtúbhiḥ* is unclear. I take it as an instr. of extent of time with the part. *badbadhānān* (so approx. also Ge; see his n. 2a, though I doubt that a ref. to menses is involved: *útsa-* is one of the few masculine nouns for water and water sources, so if the poet wanted to make that sort of reference, he could have his pick of fem. nouns). WG take the instr. with the main verb (“sent speeding”), with the sense that after their release the waters now flow regularly (“Du liessst die ... Quellen nach geregelten Zeitabläufen ... auslaufen”). This is certainly possible, though I somewhat favor the former because *ṛtúbhiḥ* is nestled in the middle of the NP *útsān ... badbadhānān*.

The form *ūdhaḥ* is contextually problematic. Formally it is the well-attested nom./acc. *ūdhar*, but I find it difficult to construe an acc. in this sentence. As an acc., it should be the obj. of *áramḥaḥ* ‘sent speeding’, but the udder of the mountain should not be subject to such an action, whereas it makes perfect sense as a locative expression. Both Ge and WG tr. as an acc. obj., but don’t explain what they think is actually happening. I am inclined to take the form as a nonce locative, though I recognize the strong arguments against this: 1) *ūdhar* is very well anchored as a nom./acc.; 2) this *r/n* stem has two reasonably well-attested locatives already, *ūdhan* and *ūdhani*. Nonetheless, I wonder if *ūdhar* could have been taken as belonging with the sporadic *-ar* locatives like *vanar* ‘in the wood’, *uṣar* ‘at dawn’ (though the presence of undoubted neut. acc. *vádhar* in the next vs. [3b] might make this harder). It might be worth noting that *ūdhan(i)* is confined to pāda end (except one late Xth book ex.), whereas *ūdhar* here is medial. Alternatively, and on second thought, if we take ‘udder’ as referring to the contents of an udder, namely milk, it is possible to interpret it as the acc. it appears to be. For a somewhat similar use of *ūdhaḥ* as ‘milk’, see IV.1.19. I would therefore suggest an alt. tr. by deleting the parenthetical “(in?)” and adding a comma after “seasons”: “you ... sent speeding the wellsprings that had been hard pressed through the seasons, the udder [=milk] of the mountain.”

The ppl. *práyuta-* is variously rendered: Gr ‘achtlos, sorglos’, Ge ‘nachlässig’ (careless, negligent), WG “(alle und alles) verscheuchend” (scaring away). However in all its occurrences it seems to mean ‘spread out, dispersed’. There are four attestations in the RV. Two passages involve cows wandering without a herdsman (III.57.1, X.27.8); in the third (III.55.4) Agni has been dispersed into various hearths and lies spread out at a distance (*śáye ... práyutaḥ*), very much like here (*práyutaṁ śáyānam*). Since this root *√yu* means ‘separate, keep apart’, my suggested meaning is closer to the root meaning than the suggestion registered above. It is also possible that it does mean ‘scattered, dispersed’ here, if it is interpreted proleptically: after having been smashed, the various parts of the serpent’s body lie spread across some distance. A similar picture is given in I.32.7 *purutrā vṛtró aśayad vyàstaḥ* “Vṛtra lay there, flung apart in many pieces,” with a form of *√śi* as here. I would then suggest an alternative tr. “having smashed the serpent (so it was) lying dispersed.”

V.32.2–3: An etymological sequence -- *táviṣīm* (2d), *táviṣībhiḥ* (3b), *távyān* (3d) -- that also builds to a climax, from singular ‘(a) power’ to plural ‘powers’ to the comparative ‘more powerful’, all associated with Indra.

The sequence of vs.-init. *t(i)yá- cid* ‘that very one’ discussed in the publ. intro. begins in 3a with *t(i)yásya cid* (and continues with *t(i)yám cid* in 4a, 5a, 6a, 8a). Note that it follows distracted vs.-init. *t(u)vám* in 2a and second-position *cid* in 2c: combining the two produces, by

variation, *t(i)yám cid*. That *cid* in 2c follows *áhim* ‘serpent’ provides the referent for the *t(i)yá-* forms to follow. The sequence comes to a temporary close in vs. 6, with *tám cid* opening pāda c a variant of *t(i)yám cid* opening 6a. There is then a brief revival of the phrase in 8a, after skipping a vs.

V.32.3: In c *ékaḥ ... apratīḥ* “alone (and) unopposable” applies to (the unnamed) Vṛtra, but these two words appear elsewhere similarly juxtaposed but applied to opposing referents: IV.17.19 *bhūrīṇy éko apratīni hanti* “alone he smashes the many unopposable things” and VIII.90.5 *tvám vṛtrāṇi haṁsy apratīny éka íd* “You, alone, smash the unopposable obstacles.” This is another example of this hymn taking standard phraseology and turning it on its head. Note that an almost identical phrase, *ékaḥ ... ápratītaḥ* (again with the two words in the same case with the same referent), is applied to Indra in 9b in the triumphant announcement of his universal superiority (see publ. intro.). Though Vṛtra *thought* (*mányamānaḥ*) he had these qualities in our 3c, Indra possesses them for real -- as shown by the phraseological transfer from the one to the other.

V.32.4: The major problem in this vs. is the identity and syntactic affiliation of the gen. pl. *eṣām*. The standard opinion, found in Ge, Scar (100), and WG, takes it as referring to the gods and construed with *svadháya*. There are several arguments against this. First, the gods are never mentioned or even alluded to elsewhere in the hymn (though goddess(es) are found in 9c and 10a). Second, though *svadháya* *√mad* is a remarkably common locution (I.64.4, 108.12, 154.4; III.4.7=7.8; VII.47.3; X.14.3, 7, 15.4, 124.8), *svadháya* never has a dependent gen. in those passages. The standard opinion is also hard-pressed to make sense out of the phrase. Ge takes *svadhā-* here as ‘Lebenselement’ and further glosses this as water, but even if “reveling in the Lebenselement/water of the gods” were a possible tr. of this phrase, it is a notion that seems foreign to the Vṛtra myth. Scar and WG have a more reasonable interpr. -- that Vṛtra is reveling in what actually belongs by nature to the gods, that is, as WG say in their n., “Der Dämon usurpiert die Natur der Götter.” But this still requires conjuring up the gods out of thin air and assuming that the audience could do so too, on the basis of an unemphatic, unaccented gen. pl. pronoun. And again the image produced is not a standard part of the Vṛtra myth.

My solution starts, appropriately, by seeking a referent in the context; *dānavásya* in the 2nd hemistich seems a reasonable choice. Although *dānavá-* never appears in the plural in the RV, this stem (related to *dānu-*, the name of Vṛtra’s mother, which I consider a backformation from the demonic ethnonym; see comm. ad I.32.9) names “eine Dämonen-Klasse,” as Mayrhofer remarks (EWA s.v. *dānu-*), and fluctuation between sg. and pl. can happen in such cases (as with the Maruts, plural, versus the Marut flock, singular). The pl. is found in the AV (AVŚ IV.24.2 [with vs. 1 referring to Indra as *vṛtrahán-*], X.6.10; AVP IV.39.3 [≅AVŚ IV.24.2], VII.12.8, XVI.43.2) and elsewhere in early Vedic as well as later (esp. epic) Skt., and the corresponding Avestan *dānauua-*, also the name of an inimical group, is found in the pl. in Yt. 5.73 and 13.37–38. In the latter it is associated with *vərəθra-* (*vərəθrəm dānunqm*). It therefore seems likely that even in the RV *dānavá-* is not simply a designation of Vṛtra but of the class of beings to which he belongs, and the absence of the plural in the RV is either due to accident or a desire to concentrate on the arch-Dānava, Vṛtra. The gen. here may be construed either with *t(i)yám cid* (“this one of theirs”) or be a free-floating indication of appurtenance, as the publ. tr. takes it. Or indeed, because *eṣām* is in (modified) Wackernagel’s position, it could have originated with any of the descriptors of Vṛtra found later in the verse.

With *svadháya* freed from its supposed genitive dependent, the phrase *svadháya mādantam* now makes sense in a Vṛtra context. He is “drunk on his own power” on the basis of his faulty assessment of this power presented in 3c. The locution recalls a similar one in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, where in 6a Vṛtra is described as *ayoddhéva durmādaḥ* “like a non-warrior badly drunk” (lit. ‘having bad intoxication’), foolishly challenging a far more powerful opponent. (I use ‘drunk’ in both instances, instead of our more usual ‘exhilarated’, because it better captures in English the state of mind of the one so affected.)

The sense of *vīṣa-prabharmā* is secured by 5c *prābhṛtā mādasya* “at the proffering of the invigorating (soma)” -- hence, as Gr takes it (sim. WG, Scar, and me), “dem der kräftige (Soma) vorgesetzt ist.” This also makes sense in context -- Indra needs to receive the soma before smashing Vṛtra -- and is reinforced by the usual sense of the lexeme *prā √bhṛ* ‘bring forward, present’. However, Ge renders it “wie ein Bulle angreifend (?)” and I was tempted somewhat in this direction, to ‘having the bearing/deportment of a bull’; *prā √bhṛ* can, esp. in the middle, mean ‘display, present oneself’. I think both possibilities are latent in this word, and we can view the anchoring 5c *prābhṛtā mādasya* as another example of poetic repair -- or perhaps a poetic thumb on the scales, pressing the choice of one of the options over the other. It is then itself somewhat undercut by 7c *vājrasya prābhṛtau* “at the proffering of the mace.”

In c note the echo ... *-prabharmā ... bhāmam*.

The last word of this vs. is *śúṣṇam*. Generally, of course, this is the name of a different opponent of Indra’s, and a number of tr. take it so here. But I think it has its etymological sense ‘snorter’ (*√śvas* ‘snort’; cf. EWA s.v.). Our poet is once again toying with us: withholding the real name of the opponent in this hymn, Vṛtra, he is falsely offering a different possibility here.

V.32.5: Unlike 4a where I separate the identically positioned enclitic gen. from the following instr., I do take *asya* here with *krátubhiḥ*, which, unlike *svadháya*, is frequently found with a gen. With Ge I think the referent is Indra (contra WG, who take it to be Vṛtra-Śuṣṇa).

I take *nīṣattam* as proleptic, depicting Vṛtra’s position after the action of *nī jaghāna* in the immediately preceding pāda (4d). With Ge I consider 5a essentially a continuation of 4d and supply the same verb.

In b I supply ‘thinking himself’ with *amarmāṇaḥ* on the basis of 3c and of the almost identical III.32.4cd ... *viveda, amarmāṇo mānyamānasya mārma*. The verb in b, *vidāt*, is accented because of the following *íd* (see Gr s.v. *íd* 5, though there are fewer clear examples than he presents, since many of them are also pāda-initial).

The Indra-reference shifts from 3rd to 2nd between the first and second hemistich, but this is scarcely novel.

V.32.6: Though Gr refuses to tr., *katpayám* seems to contain the pejorative *ka-* prefix; see EWA s.v. *ká*⁻¹, p. 285.

For *āpa √gṛ* ‘taunt’ see comm. ad V.29.4. As Oberlies (Relig. I.401) points out, this gerund depicts a pre-battle boasting/insulting match -- trash talk (needless to say, this last is not Oberlies’s formulation), flyting.

What to do with *uccāiḥ* is unclear. Most take it with the gerund *apagūrya*; so Ge “hoch ausholend,” with his interpr. of the gerund as belonging to a *√gṛ* ‘hold out’; with the assignment to *āpa √gṛ* ‘insult’, Schaeffer “nachdem er laut Schmähreden geführt hat”; Oberlies “nachdem er ihn [zuvor] mit lauter Stimme geschmäht hatte”; WG “indem er ihn von oben herab verspottete.” The Schaeffer / Oberlies interpr. of the adverb as ‘loud’ is appealing, but *uccā* is always

positional in the RV. The WG interpr. recognizes this fact, but insulting *from above* seems an odd activity. I take it rather with *jaghāna*. A fatal blow is more likely to come from above than a taunt, and it is notable how often in the hymn it is emphasized that Vṛtra was smashed *down*: 1d *áva ... han*, 4d *ní jaghāna*, 5a *nīṣattam*, 7d *adhamám*, 8d *ní ... āvrnak*. To depict Indra as correspondingly acting *above* provides the thematic complement. Note also *úd ... índraḥ ... vādhar yāmiṣṭa* (“... held up ...”) in the next hemistich, 7ab.

V.32.7: *vādhar* appears here in the same metrical position as in 3b. There the weapon was Vṛtra’s (which Indra struck away), while here it is Indra’s. Another example of vocab. first used of Vṛtra reassigned to Indra -- like *ékaḥ ... apratīḥ* in 3a and the similar expression in 9a. Indeed, *ápratītam* appears here in b, characterizing Indra’s weapon, which is ‘might’ itself (*sáhaḥ*). The use of *sáhaḥ* as an appositive here supports my view of the same usage of this word in V.31.3 (contra Ge [WG]). There it characterizes Indra himself. It is even possible that *sáho ápratītam* here is nominative and an appositive to *índraḥ*, rather than an acc. and appositive to *vādhar*, though the juxtaposition of the two terms in b makes that unlikely. In any case note the similarity in phrasing: 31.3a # *úd yát sáhaḥ ...* 32.7ab # *úd yád ... sáhaḥ*; the verbs in these clauses are also rhyming: 31.3 *ájaniṣṭa*, 32.7 *yāmiṣṭa*. On the injunc. *yāmiṣṭa* see also comm. ad V.34.2.

As noted ad vs. 4, the poetic repair effected by *prábhṛtā mādasya* in 5c is somewhat muddled by 7c *vájrasya prábhṛtau*. What exactly this latter phrase means is not clear. I doubt that Ge’s “im Schlag mit der Keule” is correct, since ‘strike’ is not a standard sense of *prá √bhr* (the closest we get is ‘bear down on’). WG’s “beim Vorführen des Vajra” is similar to my “at the proffering of the mace” (‘proffer’ having been chosen to match the tr. of this lexeme in 4c and 5c). The English idiom “present arms” is a direct correspondent, though the action in the English phrase is a gesture of respect, not (as here) of intimidation. The point of both *úd ... vādhar yāmiṣṭa* “held up his weapon” and *vájrasya prábhṛtau* seems to be to show Vṛtra the unbeatable power of the *vájra*-. See also the *mahatā vadhéna* in 8c.

V.32.8: The verb *ādat* ‘took’ is superficially active, though the idiom *ā √dā* ‘take’ is ordinarily middle. As was seen already by Wackernagel, the form must be a re-marked form of the older 3rd sg. middle root aor. The underlying form would be **āda*, which can represent either an old *-t*-less 3rd sg. mid. ending (as in impf. **āduha* → *āduha+t*) or, more likely, the simplification by degemination of an old **ād+ta* with an originally *-t*-full ending. Of course this preform should have yielded **ātta*, but the fact that all other forms of the root aor. have a single *d*- (*ādāt*, etc.) could have induced the geminate to simplify (in this metrically non-diagnostic position after *ā*) and restore the *d* of the root. (By contrast, Kü [Stativ 50–51] bases the *-d*-form on 3rd pl. *ādiran**.) In any case the *t*-less **āda* would have been activized like the *t*-less middle imperfects of the *āduhat* type. The resulting “active” stem could spread elsewhere; cf. 1st pl. *ādāma* in nearby V.30.15. For disc. and previous lit. see Kü ref. above. The form is very differently explained by Old, who assigns it to *ā √dṛ* ‘tear out’ by way of the sandhi form **ādaḥ* (< 2nd/3rd sg. **ādar*) and what seems to me a somewhat sketchy remarking with *-t* (as if 2nd sg. = **ādas*, so 3rd sg. should = **ādat*?). The morphological machinery required seems too complex for its purpose, to avoid a slightly aberrant use of *ā √dā*, and since *ā √dṛ* doesn’t take personal objects (Old finds one late ex.), its usage here would be aberrant as well. Ge assigns it to *ā √dā*, as do WG (with ref. to Kü, Stativ).

For the third time in the hymn, Vṛtra is described as *śáyānam* ‘lying’, each time in the same pāda-final position (2c, 6a, 8a), and pāda-final *nīṣattam* (5a) ‘sunk, lit. sitting, down’ may

be a sort of semantic pun on this positional characterization. In I.32, the Indra-Vṛtra hymn with clear phraseological and thematic parallels to this one, $\sqrt{si}$ ‘lie’ is also Vṛtra’s signature verb, esp. describing his position after his defeat, rather than before, as here.

Ge suggests that *árṇam* is an anticipatory haplology (not his term) for **arṇapám* ‘drinking the flood’, immediately before *madhupám*. He is followed by Scar (313 n. 444) and WG. I see no reason to accept this. The stem *árṇa-* exists; the stem **arṇapá-* (*/-pā-*) does not. More importantly, Vṛtra is known for confining the waters, not drinking them. As was just noted, $\sqrt{si}$ ‘lie’ is a defining verb for Vṛtra in both I.32 and this hymn. In the former he lies there as the released waters stream over him (I.32.8ab ... *amuyā śáyānam*, ... *āti yanty āpaḥ*; cf. also 8d, 10). Here, in complementary fashion, he is depicted as lying over them before his defeat.

Although most take *atrá-* as a PN, I still prefer the older derivation (see, e.g., Gr) from $\sqrt{ad}$ ‘eat’ with simplification of the geminate (**at-trá-*), pace EWA s.v. *átri-*. It does not have to have anything to do with the seer Atri (*átri-*), but *átrin-* ‘voracious’ is, in my opinion, derivationally connected.

V.32.9: As noted in the publ. intro., the question *káḥ ... varāte* “who can obstruct ...?” covertly introduces Vṛtra, the defeated enemy who remained unnamed in the first 8 vss., by way of the verb built to the root $\sqrt{vr}$ ‘obstruct’ that furnishes Vṛtra’s transparent name. The implicit answer is “no one, since Obstacle himself could not.”

V.32.10: The *devī svádhitih* in pāda a is much disputed, and for good reason. The stem *svádhitih* means ‘axe, hatchet’, but the presence of such an implement here is puzzling. Ge, flg. Sāy., wants to take this instance of the stem as independent and equivalent to *svadhā-* ‘autonomous power’. Given the occurrence of *svadhā-* in 4a and the derived possessive adj. *svadhāvan-* in pāda d of this same vs., it is hard not to suspect some connection. On the other hand, *svádhitih* ‘axe’ is too well established for that sense not to be the first reading, or at least to intrude, and, furthermore, pāda a is twinned with b, which also contains a thing not a quality (and is also a pun).

I therefore think we are dealing with a pun. On the one hand, even the “heavenly hatchet,” which sounds like a formidable weapon, bows to powerful Indra. The hatchet’s submission to Indra is a measure of his might and may also put this weapon into his hands. There may even be another intertextual reference to I.32, as Teigo Onishi suggested to me. In I.32.5c Vṛtra lies “like branches hewn apart by an axe” (*skándhāṃsīva kúliśenā vívrkṇā*). Though this is a simile, not a direct reference to the narrative, and though a different word for axe, *kúliśa-*, is used, this imagery may be a common trope in the Vṛtra story. As for the reading “the goddess Autonomous Power,” the phonological similarity and possible identical formation of *svádhitih* and *svadhā-* (with *sva-* looking like a first cmpd member in both, and *-dhi-* resembling *-dhā-*, with connection to $\sqrt{dhā}$ at least possible [the etymology of *svádhitih* is “nicht klar” acdg. to EWA s.v.]) make such a reading very easy in this context.

As just noted, pāda b also seems to contain a pun. The way (*gātú-*) yields to Indra, but, acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, Gātu Ātreya is also the poet of this hymn -- though since only this one hymn in the RV is attributed to him, the name is likely to have been plucked from this context.

This vs. contains another example of the transfer of vocabulary from Vṛtra to Indra. As we saw, in 4a Vṛtra was intoxicated by (his false assumption about) his autonomous power (*svadháyā mādantam*), but here it is Indra who possesses autonomous power (*svadhāvan-*) for real. With *svádhitih* in pāda a also (partly) expressing Indra’s acquisition of this power, his

triumph is complete. This sets the stage for the transition to the last two verses, where the poet announces his own contact with Indra's fame and what that will mean for his own good fortune.

V.32.11: I think that this vs. is structured by the implicit contrast between *jātá-* and *náviṣṭha-*, both used of Indra, but I seem to be alone in this (though see Gr's lapidary comment s.v. *náviṣṭha*). Ge (/WG) take *náviṣṭham* as adverbial (Ge "aufs neue," WG "zum letzten Mal"). This is certainly possible, but if it is taken as modifying Indra, the sense becomes more complex and interesting. In the first hemistich "I" announce the famous stable Indra of myth and authority, born (*jātám*) for these roles and continuously occupying them, but in the second hemistich it is the Indra of the ritual who's the focus -- the Indra who is newly brought to every new ritual and whose epiphany is like a new creation every time, caused by the ritual actions themselves.

V.32.12: I take *maghā* as object of both *yātáyantam* and *dádatam*; it is neatly positioned between the two participles. Ge renders *ṛtuthā yātáyantam* as "dass du pünktlich vergilst" (repay, requite), but this is not a standard meaning of *√yat*. WG's "dass du ... die (verdiente) Stellung verschaffst" is closer to the sense of the root, but lacks the obj. one expects with an *-áya-* transitive. A locution very close to my interpr. is found in IX.39.2 *jánāya yātáyann īṣaḥ* "arranging the refreshments for the people."

Contra Old, who assigns *garhate* to *√grabh*, I take it to *√grh* 'complain'; see EWA s.v. *GARH* and esp. Hoffmann "Vedisch grh 'klagen'" (MSS 14 [1959]: 35–38 = Aufs. 439–41) cited there. There is likely a phonological play between this verb and *jagr̥bhre* in the previous, twinned, verse.

V.33–34: Indra

These two hymns attributed to Saṃvaraṇa Prājāpatya are full of puzzles, many insoluble. Saṃvaraṇa does seem to be the name of the *ṛṣi-*; see the last vs. of the hymn, 10c. But even there it appears to be a pun on 'enclosure'. The patronymic *sāṃvaraṇi-* is found in the first vs. of the Vālaḥkilya hymn, VIII.51.1, along with a set of other legendary poets. As to the patronymic here, Prājāpatya, rather than Ātreya – I have no idea.

V.33 Indra

Although the general outline of this hymn is pretty straightforward, it is full of interpretational problems and grammatical and syntactic obscurities, and the meter is very messy.

V.33.1: The first hemistich begins and ends with an etymological figure: *#māhi mahé ... taváse átavān#*. The *taváse* also repeats the same form from the preceding pāda.

I supply *śrávaḥ* 'praise' with *māhi*, since this is a frequent collocation. Sim. Ge, though Kü (258) and WG take it as adverbial.

With Ge (/WG uncertainly) I reluctantly interpr. pāda-final *nṛ̃n* as a gen. pl. (or standing for a gen. pl.), as is sometimes necessary. Old interpr. it rather as a dat. pl., which I don't understand.

With Ge I construe *itthā* with *taváse*; I assume it adds strengthening to that repeated word. Kü (258) instead takes it as an expression of the method of praise: "auf diese Weise," so apparently also WG, though muted ("also").

In the 2nd hemistich the referent of *asmai* is at issue. The standard view (Ge, Old, WG) is that it refers to the singer, the "not so strong" I. In Ge's interpr. this involves rendering *asmai*

sumatīm ... cikéta as “der ... diesem (Sänger) seine Gunst zugebracht hat.” That *sumatī-* could refer to Indra’s benevolence is easy, but ‘zudenken’ as an interpr. of *cikéta* is hard. This pf. stem ordinarily means either ‘take note of’ or ‘appear as’ (latter generally middle). WG give the pf. its usual meaning but this leaves *asmai* without much to do in the clause. By contrast, I take Indra as the referent of *asmai*. It is not rare for enclitic forms of this pronoun to refer to the subject: a reflexive is not necessary. Under this interpr. *sumatī-* has its common meaning ‘good thought’ = poem, and Indra takes cognizance of this *sumatī-*, which is “for him.” Cf. VII.31.10 *prācetase prā sumatīm kṛṇudhvam* where the *sumatī-* of the poets is intended for a god (Indra, in fact) in the dative who is characterized as *prā √cit*.

V.33.2: The (pseudo-)participle *dhiyasānā-* clearly patterns with *dīdhīye* in 1a, hence my complementary ‘being conjured up’. I take it to mean that Indra’s epiphany at the sacrifice is brought about by our chants (*arkaiḥ*), that his appearance there is literally “thought up” by our thoughts. This notion is close to what is found in the previous hymn V.32.11 (at least by my interpr.), that every sacrifice brings a “newest Indra,” that the Indra of the sacrificial epiphany is newly created by sacrificial activity every time. The standard interpr. of *dhiyasānā-* by Ge [WG] is more pedestrian: Indra becomes attentive (“aufmerksam geworden”) through our hymns. The other occurrence of the stem, in X.32.1, in my opinion fits my interpr. (see comm. ad loc.), but, to be honest, neither passage is absolutely clear. As for the stem itself, *dhiyasānā-* does not pattern with the majority of *-asānā-* stems discussed ad IV.3.6, and I do not have a satisfactory account of it.

The *sá tvám* phrase does not conform to my rules for the use of *sá* with 2nd ps. reference (see my “Sá figé”), and I likewise can’t account for it.

The *yā(h)* beginning the 2nd hemistich is problematic. If it is a rel. prn. it has to be a fem. pl., and there is no obvious referent in the context (*hārīṇām* in b belongs to a masc. stem *hāri-*). Therefore with Ge (/WG) and, very cautiously, Old, I take it as a verb form, belonging to *√yā* ‘drive’. (Note the past part. *yātāḥ* in 5b.) Because it is followed by two subjunctives, *vākṣaḥ* and *sakṣi* (the latter a “*si*-imperative” derived from a subjunctive), I take *yā(h)* as subjunctive as well. Indeed, if it is read *yāah*, the extra syllable would fix the meter of this pāda -- but since the hymn is full of metrical disturbances, this is not a strong argument. Neither Ge nor WG indicates how they interpr. the morphology, but both tr. as an imperative, as they do the two following verbs.

Both Ge and WG take *aryāḥ* and *jānān* as parallel acc. pl., while I make *aryāḥ* a gen. sg. dependent on *jānān*. There is no way to tell; Thieme (Fremdl., 11 n. 2) refuses to deal with the passage at all.

V.33.3: The sense of the first hemistich -- that by reciting the (yoking-)formulation we will do our part to ensure that your (Indra’s) horses will be yoked -- is fairly clear, but the syntax is messy. First, it’s couched as a triple negative construction: “it is *not* that X will *not* happen because of *not*-Y,” which already puts it on the edge of parsability. The parsing problem is slightly increased by the fact that the content of the negative “that” clause is expressed through a periphrasis involving a negated participle+copula (*āyuktāsaḥ ... āsan* “will be/remain unyoked”). Then, the position of *yād* is utterly non-standard, being found deep in the clause, after several different constituents, right before the final word. I tried various ways to produce a conforming subordinate clause from the text, but failed. The publ. tr. “if it’s for lack of a (yoking) formulation” (as if *abrahmātā yād* were a separate embedded clausette) gives the appearance of (almost) succeeding, but it doesn’t accurately represent the text (though I still think it might

represent the purport of this odd word order). A more accurate tr. would be “Since these (horses) ... because of a lack ...,” as the dependent clause for the main clause in cd. However, emending the tr. would lead to impenetrable English, so I’ll stick with the somewhat inaccurate tr. I remain disturbed by the structure of this dep. cl.

A separate problem is the *abhí asmád* in pāda a. The *abhí* is stranded in the middle of the pāda (though immed. after the caesura) and in any case has no verb from which it could have been separated in tmesis. In the absence of anything else to do with it, the default option seems to be to construe it with *asmád*, and this phrase has long (see Old’s reff.) been compared to I.139.8 *asmád abhí*, likewise in the middle of the pāda though in opposite order. The problem is that *abhí* as a preposition seems otherwise only to take the acc. Nonetheless, connecting the two seems the best bet, with a meaning such as “with regard to us” or, better reflecting the ablative, my “because of us.” So Old, WG. Cf. also Humbach et al. (*Gāthās... and the Other Old Avestan Texts*, II.118), ad Y 35.5 (Yasna Haptaṅhaiti) *ahmaṭ hīiaṭ aibī*, a phrase meaning (in his view) “which is with us,” with which he compares both our passage and I.139.8. However, Narten (YH, 271–72), fld. by Hinze (*Zoroastrian Liturgy*, 77–78), interprets this three-word phrase, occurring twice in the YH (Y 35.5, 40.1), as containing a postposition *aibī* governing the neut. acc. *hīiaṭ* not the abl. *ahmaṭ*, with the whole meaning “from us towards which,” thus “as far as we are concerned” (Hintze, 78).

V.33.4: Another troubled vs., though the first hemistich is more transparent than the second. The first thing to notice is that the accent on *cakārtha* in b indicates that b must still be under the domain of *yád* in pāda a, as parallel dependent clauses. Ge (/WG) attempt to make initial *purū* a single-word main clause on which they both depend (“Viel ist, was ...”). This assumes that *purū* is a neut. sg. here. Although the existence of a neut. sg. in *-ū* is standard doctrine (see Lanman, *Noun Inflec.*, 406–7, AiG III.145, etc.), this grammatical truism rests primarily on Gr’s identification of twelve forms of *purū* as sg. (see Lanman and AiG), but in only one instance, the late X.94.5, does this seem the likely interpr. (There is also one form of *urū* and, for Lanmann, two of *mīthū*, which is better taken as an adv.) I therefore do not think that *-ū* is a possible neut. sg. ending, except, perhaps, in X.94.5. Here the most obvious way to construe *purū* is with pāda-final neut. pl. *ukthā*, the subject of *sānti*. The attempt to impose a singular interpr. on *purū*, as antecedent for the following relative clause with plural subject, yields the awkward rendering of Ge: “Viel ist, was deine Preislieder sind” with mismatch of number (WG more elaborate, but not less clumsy).

For b the only adjustment is to carry *purū* over from pāda a and supply a term like *kṛtāni* or *kārmāni*, easily generated from *cakārtha*: “many are (the deeds) you have done ...”

The 2nd hemistich is more problematic. The first question is how to relate pāda c and d. Ge takes them as parallel independent clauses with the same verb *tataṣṣé*, while WG takes it as a single cl. (also Kü 207). With Ge I take them as two clauses and agree that they share a verb, but think that c is a dependent clause still under the control of *yád* in pāda a and parallel to ab, with d the main clause resuming them all.

A related issue is the apparent change of person from 2nd sg. address to Indra in ab and (supposed) 3rd sg. reference to him in cd. The only evidence for this 3rd ps. reference is the verb *tataṣṣé*, which is one of only two medial forms of this pf. in the RV. It has no obvious medial value here, and in fact the presence of a dat. of benefit (*sūryāya*) eliminates one possible way of accounting for the middle form. (Kü [207] suggests a “Bedeutungskomponente” ‘(auch) in seinem eigenen Interesse’, which seems a bit desperate.) The puzzle of the middle is somewhat

reduced if we interpret the form as *second* sg. mid. The presumed preform **tataḥṣ-ṣé* would surely come out as our *tataḥṣé*, and it would make sense to substitute this nonce middle form for the non-transparent *active* 2nd sg., which should be **tatáḥṣ-tha* → **tataktha* -- whereas the active 3rd sg. *tatáḥṣa* is non-problematic and indeed well attested. So the supposed change of person and the middle form can be accounted for by the same explanation.

After confronting these formal issues, there remains the very knotty problem of what the hemistich is expressing, and part of this depends on whether the relations between Indra and Sūrya here are friendly or hostile: elsewhere they are sometimes one, sometimes the other. (Here I think they are friendly.) A syntactic question is whether *nāma* is the only object of *tataḥṣé* or if the clause in c (if it is a separate clause) has a different object. Ge opts for the former choice, I for the latter, and I also think that the verb is used in different senses in c and d, positive in c, negative in d.

In c I supply *purū* again from pāda a and tentatively supply ‘paths’ as the object, bringing to mind the various passages in which a god (usually Varuṇa) makes or digs out paths for the sun to follow through the sky -- e.g., I.24.8 *urūṃ hí rājā vāruṇaś cakāra, sūryāya pānthām ānvetavā u*, VII.87.1 *rādat pathó vāruṇo sūryāya*. In one late passage (X.111.3) it is Indra who is named as *pathikṛt sūryāya* “pathmaker for the sun.” It’s also worth noting that, leaving aside this one, 5 of the other 10 occurrences of the dat. *sūryāya* occur in a path-making context. Though, admittedly, I have no parallels using the root *√takṣ* ‘fashion, carve’, it seems in the right general semantic range. As for *ókasi své* this can refer either to Indra’s or to Sūrya’s “own home,” since both of them inhabit the same celestial realms; I favor the Sun’s.

As for d, as is recognized by all, the similarly phrased X.23.2 *áva kṣnaumi dāsasya nāma cit* must be compared. In that passage Indra says “I whet down even the name of the barbarian,” in my tr. Though this passage is the obvious comparandum, it is hardly transparent in itself or in its bearing on our passage, and in fact I think the two passages are less close semantically than their joint isolation invites us to think. In X.23.2 Indra seems to be boasting about his victory over the Dāsa, which is so complete that even his name is obliterated or at least violently ground down. But *√takṣ* generally refers to creating something by carving off bits or fashioning in some other way. Perhaps here it means that Indra, just by fighting (and presumably defeating) the Dāsa, has still made the latter’s name conspicuous, as if by carving it into a surface. (Or perhaps, closer to X.23.2, Indra has obliterated the Dāsa’s name as if by gouging it out of a surface.) But either of these interpr. raises a crucial question: what would it mean literally to carve a *name* into (or gouge it out of) a surface before the existence of writing?!

In any case I think that the contrastive positive/negative use of *√takṣ* in c and d makes the verb sit uneasily in both and poses special challenges to the audience to decode the metaphor in each pāda.

As should be obvious, I do not consider my interpr. of this vs. or most of its part settled and sure. I also don’t understand the sequence of ideas. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think that the first pāda, positing many hymns for Indra, may refer to the existence of competing (Ārya) sacrifices. The second pāda cites his activities as a warrior on earth; the dat. “for the cow” may either mean that Indra has fought in order to obtain cows (for the Ārya warriors he is fighting beside) or that he has won meadows for (the Āryas’) cows to graze in -- in either case advancing the Ārya cause. In contrast c sets out his beneficial cosmic activity -- keeping the sun on track (if my interpr. of the details of the pāda is correct), which in turn is beneficial to mankind. In at least the first two cases I think there’s an implicit Ārya presence, which contrasts with the explicit Dāsa in d.

V.33.5: What constitutes the predicate in ab is disputed. Flg. Old and the model of VII.30.4, I take ab as constituting an “X and which Y” construction, with doubled “and which Y” (more accurately schematized as “X and which Y and (which) Z”). The predication is simply *te* “of you, yours,” an assertion of possession. It is predicated of us (*vayám té*) as well as “which men” (*yé ca nárah*) and “(which) chariots” (... *ca ráthāḥ*) -- literally “we and which men and (which) chariots are yours.” Both of the latter two are further characterized in b, the men by a participial phrase (*śárdho jajñānāḥ* “having been born as a troop”), the chariots by a simple participle (*yātāḥ* ‘driven, driving’). WG seem to follow this interpr. as well, though with some filigree in the middle that seems over-elaborate. Klein (DGRV I.49 n. 10) sets out the schema as above and tr. sim. (I.196). Ge by contrast takes the predication to be *śárdho jajñānāḥ*, applied to both us and the men, with the chariots left hanging: essentially “we and the man are born as your troop, and the chariots.” Besides the syntactic isolation of the chariots in Ge’s rendering, it also unduly extends the reference of *śárdho jajñānāḥ*. The “men” of pāda a must be, as often, the Maruts, and it is only they who “have been born as a troop,” not also us. The word *gaṇá-* is almost exclusive to the Maruts, and the birth of the Maruts is a common topic (e.g., I.64.2, 4).

The phrase *rátho ná yātāḥ* appears in I.141.8. See comm. there, where I suggest that a *yātá- rátha-* is a particular kind of chariot, perhaps one meant for long journeys, rather than referring to the current state of motion of any specific chariot(s).

The problem with pāda c is the clash between the voc. *ahiśuṣma* and the 3rd sg. verb *jagamyāt* with its nom. subj. *sátvā*. The stem *sátvan-* in the sg. is almost always used of Indra, and in this context -- a hymn dedicated to Indra and both praising his powers and begging him to deploy them on our behalf -- it is difficult to imagine that we would then express a wish that some indefinite or at least unidentified warrior should come our way instead (as in Ge’s “Uns möge ... ein Krieger kommen”; WG almost identical). Surely Indra is the warrior we want! This would require a shift from 2nd to 3rd ps. ref. between ab and cd, but this is not problematic. What is problematic is the voc., which should also refer to Indra. Gr solves this by positing a bahuvr. *ahiśuṣma-sátvan-* ‘whose warriors have a serpent’s hiss’ (‘dessen Helden wie Schlangen zischen’). Unfortunately the accent is definitively against this interpr. I have no neat solution, but am firm in my belief that the *sátvā* is Indra. For a similar vocative/nominative cross, see *vasavānāḥ* in the next vs. (6a); these two problems may be connected.

I take the simile in d as an elaborate pun, playing on the double sense of the three members, *bhāga-*, *hāvya-*, and *prabhṛthá-*. The first can be both the name of the god Fortune and a common noun ‘portion’; *hāvya-* can belong to $\sqrt{hū}$, *hvā* ‘call’ or $\sqrt{hu}$ ‘pour, offer’; *pra* $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ can refer either to the presentation of arms (and the carrying off of booty) in a hostile situation or to the presentation of offerings at a sacrifice. Cf. the double sense of *prá* $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ in nearby V.32.4–5, 7 and comm. there. The first meanings just given for the three items coalesce into one simile, the second ones in another.

V.33.6: The first question about this vs. is the structure of the first hemistich. The standard interpr. (Ge, WG, also Old, Klein [DGRV I.263–64]; see also Kulikov -*ya-pres.*, 580) takes the two pādas as separate clauses with *ca* conjoining them. There are several problems with this division: 1) *ca* is not comfortably at home as clause-conjoiner and usually conjoins NPs; 2) with *ṇṛmṇāni* in the domain of the 2nd clause, it must be the obj. of the participle (or pseudo-participle; see below) *ṇṛtāmānāḥ*, but non-causative forms of $\sqrt{ṇṛt}$ ‘dance’ are never transitive. Both difficulties disappear if we take *ṇṛmṇāni ca* as conjoined with immediately preceding *ójah*

as joint subject of the first clause in the hemistich (so also Lowe, 251; see below). The phonological play between *nṛmṇāni* and *nṛtāmāṇaḥ* may account for the postponing of *nṛmṇāni* till the second pāda, inserting a pāda break between the two conjoined nouns. This phonologically driven positioning may also help account for the very late position of *hí*. The loc. prn. *tvé* ordinarily takes initial position in its clause/verse line, and *hí* would be expected to follow in Wackernagel's position. But the whole structure may have been shifted rightwards to allow *nṛmṇāni* to neighbor *nṛtāmāṇaḥ*.

nṛtāmāṇa- presents difficulties of its own, even after its supposed object has been eliminated. This participle is the only occurrence of the supposed them. aor. (or 6th cl. pres.) in all of Sanskrit. Although, since all forms of this root are poorly attested in the RV, this is not necessarily problematic on its own, the -ya-present (1x in RV) does continue post-RV (see Kulikov, *Vedic -ya-presents*, 578-80), and moreover all other verb forms to this root in Vedic are active. Lowe (*Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit*, 250–51) suggests that it is an artificial form based on the well-attested splv. *nṛtama-* 'most manly, most heroic'. This is an attractive hypothesis -- among other things, Indra is frequently called *nṛtama-*; the word regularly appears in immediate post-caesura position, as *nṛtāmāṇaḥ* does here; and it would be playing not merely phonologically but also etymologically with *nṛmṇāni*. Lowe (p. 152) tr. "being the most heroic," reflecting its nonce jury-rigged participial form. I do think, however, that the form also consciously references *√nṛt* 'dance'. Indra is regularly called a *nṛtú-* 'dancer, prancer', and note the pun involving *nṛ-* 'man' in VI.63.5 *nārā nṛtū* (of the Aśvins). I would therefore modify the publ. tr. to "As the most manly [/ the prancing] immortal ..."

In c *rayīm* must be fem., as occasionally elsewhere (e.g., IV.34.2), given the fem. adj. *énīm*.

The stem *vásavāna-* 'possessing goods, winning goods' (?) is attested 5x, once as an unaccented voc. sg. *vasavāna* (X.22.15), otherwise accented and with orthodox -a-stem forms, incl. nom. sg. *vásavānaḥ* (I.174.1). The form here looks of course like a nom. sg. but lacks accent. Gr calls it "fälschlich unbetont"; Lub. gives it an accent and a rightward star (*vásavāno**). This seems the best course; I think an attempt to assign it to different stem (perhaps an aberrant -as stem) is too elaborate, esp. in this hymn with numerous "off" forms: see esp. the voc. *ahiśuṣma* for expected nom. in 5c. The publ. tr. pays more attention to the lack of accent and tr. as voc.; it would be equally possible to weigh the nom. sg. ending more heavily and tr. it as an appositive subject: "as winner of goods, give us dappled wealth." Despite the tr. "winner of goods," I do not think the stem contains a form of *√van* but is rather a pseudo-participle (another one, but athematic) built to *vásu-* 'good(s)'. Elsewhere I render it 'goods-lord' and the like.

In d *prá ... stuṣe dānam* "I will start up the praise for the gift" is an analytic expansion of the noun *dānastuti*, which, however, is not attested in Vedic or, it seems, anywhere else in Sanskrit lit., though the term is in common use in Vedic scholarship. The last three (or possibly four) vss. in this hymn constitute such a *dānastuti*, and the poet seems to signaling that it is coming up. As for the *arí- tuvimaghá-*, I now think the phrase applies both to Indra and to the patrons praised in vss. (7 or) 8–10. See also *aryāḥ* in 9d.

V.33.7: This vs. provides a transition between the praise-hymn proper and the *dānastuti*. On the one hand, it straightforwardly makes requests of Indra, as hymn-final vss. tend to do, and it begins with *evā*, a frequent introducer of the final summary vs., but it also turns its attention in cd to those who facilitate the sacrifice, i.e., the patrons. The participle *dádataḥ* 'giving' that

characterizes them is telling. Ge suggests that the *dānastuti* begins with 7c and notes that like 7c the vss. of the *dānastuti* begin with *utá*.

The meter of the first hemistich is badly mangled. Old blames the poet “dessen Formgefühl unzweifelhaft schwach war.” But it may be a good strategy to mark the new section with a metrical jolt. Curiously the vs. is mostly free of the verbal knots that bedevil the earlier parts of the hymn.

Ge suggests plausibly that the “skin of the honey” is the skin on which the soma is prepared.

V.33.8–10: As just noted, 7c begins with *utá* as do vss. 8–10, but those vss. of the *dānastuti* proper are further unified, all beginning *utá tyé mā*.

V.33.8: It is unclear whether the horses in ab and those in c are the same or different. In the publ. tr. they are treated as the same; the standard tr. take them as separate groups. The two occurrences of *mā* (a, c) may support the standard view, in which case *vahantu* needs to be supplied in the first hemistich (so Ge, etc.).

I take *saśce* in pass. sense: “I am followed/accompanied.” Ge (/WG, also Klein I.425) take it to mean “be in agreement with,” but I do not know of other occurrences of $\sqrt{sac}$ with this meaning. (Ge’s overelaborate set of explanatory glosses in n. 8d and n. 2 to that n. may attest to his discomfort with it.) The ‘intentions’ by which I am attended are G’s intentions to give; see the expansion on *krātu-* in 9b. I think the point is not that the poet thinks it’s a good idea for G. to give horses to him (that is, agrees with G), but that G’s intentions to give are the poet’s escorts, as it were. (One is reminded of the curious beings known as *rātiṣāc-* ‘Gift-escort’.) Indeed these “intentions” may be the actual horses given; see 9b where the “bounties” produced by such intention are also actualized as horses. (One is reminded of the English maxim “if wishes were horses, then beggars would ride.”)

V.33.9: In pāda a the publ. tr. reads “And (let) these (convey me)”; the “me” should not be in parens.

The bahuvrīhi *krátvāmagha-* is curiously formed, with instr. *krátvā* as its first member, and the publ. tr. “the bounty of his intentions” oversimplifies its structure in order to avoid impossibly awkward English: a full tr. of b would be “(the horses displaying/constituting) the bounty (produced) by his intention at the time of giving in/[of] the ceremony.” In other words, the horses that the poet receives possess (that is, embody) Mārutāśva’s bounty effected by his intention (to give). See 8d.

Ge takes *vidāthasya* as a PN, the patron whose patronymic is Mārutāśva, and Mayrhofer (PN s.v.) seems to agree. But there seems no reason not to interpr. it as an example of the well-attested common noun ‘ceremony (of distribution)’, esp. since it fits this context so well. WG do not follow Ge.

The part. *dādānaḥ* appears to be the predicate of this clause. Though rare, med. forms of $\sqrt{dā}$ without *ā* seem to mean ‘give of oneself / one’s own goods’. See also IX.52.3.

I don’t entirely understand d. *ānūkām* is a hapax, but I follow Old in taking it as an adverbial meaning something like ‘afterwards’; so apparently also WG. Ge, fld. by Klein (I.425), takes it as the obj. of *ārcat*, as ‘last (song)’. See Ge’s n. 9d.

The standard interpr. (Ge [/WG], Old, Klein I.425) take *aryáḥ* as nom. sg., referring to Cyavatāna of c, and Thieme (Fremdl. 85) also thinks it’s probably nom. sg., but declines to

discuss the passage because of the obscurity of *ānūkām*. But a patron like Cyavatāna should not be chanting or singing; that is the province of the poet-priests he is patronizing. Moreover, *aryāḥ* echoes gen. sg. *aryāḥ* in 6d, which announced the dānastuti to come, and I think the form should be interpr. in the same way in the absence of evidence to the contrary. In 9d I think that the gift of the *arí-* is still in question (as in 6d). The unnamed poet praised (‘sang’ *ārcat*) his gift for the wonder (*vāpuṣe*) of it -- of its over-the-top munificence.

V.33.10: As in 9a “me” should be removed from parens.

The notion of enclosure in cd puns on the name of the Poet Saṃvaraṇa ‘entirely enclosing’ vel sim.

V.34 Indra

V.34.1: A personified (/divinized) form of Svadhā ‘autonomous power’ is found in this set of hymns; cf. the apparent ref. to her also in V.32.10.

V.34.2: The overall structure of the vs. is the first issue to address. The first hemistich begins with a rel. clause (in a) with accented verb *āpiprata*; the second pāda begins with another accented verb, *āmandata*, which can owe its accent either to its pāda-initial position or to being part of the rel. cl. of pāda a. I choose the former interpr., making b into the main cl. of the vs. (so also Hoffmann, Injunk., 244). Ge and WG choose the second, with ab containing two parallel rel. clauses. Since the 2nd hemistich consists of a dep. cl. beginning with *yád* in c, with its accented verb *yámat* in d, this leaves the vs. without a main cl. WG remedy this by providing a main cl. frame “Zur Stelle (war er) ...” This posited main clause consists entirely of the preverb *ā* that begins pāda a (see their n.), a slender reed indeed. Offhand I cannot think of any other examples where a preverb by itself constitutes a clause (which is not to say they don’t exist). This interpr. is esp. unlikely because *ā* is an extremely common preverb with *√pr / prā* ‘fill’, and its default interpr. here is as a preverb in tmesis with *āpiprata*.

This structural question is connected with the problem of *yámat* in the *yád* cl. of the 2nd hemistich. This form should be a subjunctive to the root aor., but it is difficult to construe it as such, viewed in conjunction with the augmented imperfects of ab. In order to hold onto the subjunctive interpr., Hoffmann (Injunk., 244) takes cd as a purpose cl. (“Der Freigeibige ... berauschte sich auf dass ihm ... Uśanā ... die tausendspitzige Waffe reiche”), but Indra doesn’t drink soma *so that* Uśanā will give him a weapon, but does so at the same time and occasion when Uśanā gives him the weapon (see, e.g., I.121.12). WG’s “Zur Stelle (war er)” is obviously designed to provide a better pragmatic foundation for the purpose cl. (see their n.), but I have just treated the weakness of their interpr. I therefore think that *yámat* here has to be a nonce injunctive with preterital value, rather than the subjunctive it appears to be. Two pivotal forms allow this reanalysis – 1st sg. *yamam* and 3rd pl. *yaman*. The latter form is morphologically ambiguous: it could be a subjunctive or an injunctive. Although those forms are normally differentiated by the grade of the root (e.g., subj. *gáman* versus injunc. *gmán*), a zero-grade injunc. **imán* is too radical and would be blocked. In fact, *yaman*, which occurs 4x (once as a rep.), is only found in *mā* prohibitives and therefore must be an injunc. in every case. As for 1st sg. *yamam*, it has to be an injunctive (subjunctive would be **yamā[ni]*). Since both *yamam* and *yaman* could also be injunc. to thematic stems, a 3rd sg. thematic-type injunc. *yámat* can be backformed. It is important to note that *yamam* is found in this very myth of the weapon used to

kill Śuṣṇa: cf. X.49.3 ... *vádhar yamam*# (1st sg. subj. = Indra) beside our *vádham yamat*, with Uśanā Kāvya as subj. For a more clearly marked injunctive in this phrase see nearby V.32.7 *vádhar yāmiṣṭa* with secondary *-iṣ-*aor.

On them. *ápiprata* see Narten 1969 = Kl. Sch. 108–24, esp. 109, 121–24.

V.34.3: On *ūdhar* / *ūdhan-* as ‘cold’, beside the homonym ‘udder’, see comm. ad VIII.2.12. Note the phonological echo at the end of pādas a and c: *ūdhani*# / *ūhati*#.

There is considerably more phonological play in the 2nd hemistich: *tatanúṣṭim ūhati*, *tanūśubhram*, enclosed within unbroken *a*’s: *ápāpa śakráś* ... *maghāvā yāh kavāsakhāh*. This phonological pattern may help account for some of the difficulties of interpr. this hemistich.

Before addressing the three hapaxes in cd, *tatanúṣṭim*, *tanūśubhram*, and *kavāsakhāh*, note that the āmreḍited preverb *āpa-apa* (that is, *ápāpa*) superficially reads as a stem ‘not evil’. I doubt if that is accidental, esp. since doubled preverbs are quite rare; we will return to it below.

The first two of the hapaxes form the object of *āpa* ... *ūhati*. The lexeme *āpa √ūh* means ‘pull away’. It is used of the extended penis in cosmic incest in X.61.5; more to the point, in AV XVIII.2.57 it is used of a garment that is to be removed (... *vāsaḥ* ... *āpaitād ūha yád ihābibhaḥ purā*). A garment could well be described as *tanūśubhra-* ‘resplendent on the body’; cf. I.85.3 *tanūṣu śubhrāh* of the Maruts’ ornaments. I therefore supply ‘garment’ as the obj. here. (For a possible variant of this see disc. below.)

Ge refuses to tr. or discuss *tatanúṣṭi-*; AiG is entirely silent on it; Old is non-committal. Nonetheless, the formation of *tatanúṣṭi-* looks fairly transparent, if quite unprecedented. As WG also suggest, it appears to be a *-ti-* abstract built to the weak grade of the pf. part. to *√tan* ‘stretch’. WG gloss ‘die Sich-ausgebreitet-haben-schaft’, which in their interpr. is then also applicable to someone who has this quality. They thus assume a personal object for *āpa ūhati*, a dandy (Geck): “den, der sich ausgebreitet hat ... den Geck.” I’m not sure what a “sich ausgebreitet” person would be, and there are other reasons to prefer supplying ‘garment’ or something similar as the referent of these two acc. First, there is the AV passage just cited, where ‘garment’ is the obj. of *āpa √ūh*. Second, garments are objects of *√tan* elsewhere (I.115.4, 134.4; X.106.1). And third, a personal object requires the meaning of *āpa √ūh* to be seriously attenuated (WG’s *abschieben*: ‘push away, get rid of’). I therefore take ‘spread-out-ness’ to be a quality attributed to a garment or garment-like object. However, this analysis causes problems of its own. For one thing, why not simply use the pf. part. alone to qualify the underlying ‘garment’? Forming a derivational monstrosity -- a *-ti-* abstract based on a pf. part. -- and then turning this stem into a possessive adj. seem a tremendous amount of bother to go to when the participle by itself would convey the sense. Further, the standard words for garment are neut. (*vāsa-*, *vāstra-*), and *tatanúṣṭim* must be masc. (see the adj. *tanūśubhram* agreeing with it). A proper neut. sg. adj. built to a *-ti-* stem should end in *-ti* (though as far as I can tell, there are no exx. in the RV), so if *tatanúṣṭim* is an adj., it is in the wrong gender for the posited noun it modifies. On the other hand, if we try to take *tatanúṣṭim* simply as the *-ti-* abstract, not an adj. based on it, the masc. gender of the qualifier *tanūśubhram* clashes, since *-ti-* abstracts are fem. I have only an ad hoc answer to these problems: assuming the form is an adj. whose underlying referent is neut., the bare neut. *-ti* ending may have seemed anomalous and a more orthodox looking acc. substituted for it, encouraged also by the fact that the next word begins with a vowel and an inserted *-m* would avoid the hiatus. Meter would be unaffected, and *tanūśubhram* can of course be neut. instead of masc. But I do not find this explanation compelling, and a different possibility is discussed below.

I have discussed the third hapax, *kavāsakhā-*, in some detail in Fs. Jasanoff (2007: 163), reviving the old, but generally now rejected, analysis of the first member as the old nom. sg. of *kaví-* matching the Aves. nom. sg. *kauuā* with its hysterokinetic inflection. That this inflectional type may be preserved here may be signalled by the 2nd member *-sakhāḥ*, whose inflection remains hysterokinetic in Vedic and whose nom. sg. is ordinarily *sákhā*. The current standard interpr. of *kavā-* here assigns it to a stem (*)*kava-* ‘humiliating, degrading’ (see EWA s.v. *kavatnú-*). So, e.g., Ge’s rendering of the cmpd. as ‘falsch Freund’, with some semantic weakening. Mayr’s “die Genossen erniedrigend” presupposes a verbal governing cmpd. to a “verloren” pres. stem **kava-* with transitive 1st member of the *trasá-dasyu-* type, but the accent is against it and the *-ā-* is unexplained. See also KH (Aufs. 412). However, he cites the YAvs hapax PN *kauuārasman-*, explained by Werba as “die (feindlichen) Schlachtreihen erniedrigend” – not the strongest piece of evidence.

How one analyses the cmpd. depends on what one thinks is going on in the hemistich in general. The first question is who is the referent of the cmpd.? It is found in a two-word nominal rel. cl. *yáḥ kavāsakhāḥ*. Both Ge and WG take its antecedent to be the obj. of the verb *ápa ... ūhati* (e.g., WG “... den Keck, der die Genossen geringschätzt”), but as was just discussed, it is not at all certain (and in my opinion unlikely) that the object of that verb is a person. Moreover, word order -- an often helpful, though of course not sturdily reliable guide in the RV -- favors Indra as referent: the verse ends ... *maghāvā yáḥ kavāsakhāḥ*.

If my analysis is correct -- that the cmpd. contains *kaví-* ‘poet’ and that it characterizes Indra -- how can I fit it together with the rest of the vs.? I think the cmpd. has a double sense. On the one hand, the *kavā* part refers to Uśanā Kāvya, who figures in vs. 2. In fact, note that in 2d *uśánā* appears in its usual position, immediately after the caesura following an opening of 5. If we superimpose 3d over 2d, *kavā-* would immediately follow *uśánā*: [x x x x x / *uśánā kavā(-sakhā)*], the composite yielding a simulacrum of his full name. And of course, as vs. 2 shows, Indra and Uśanā are partners and companions. Uśanā is referred to as *kaví-* elsewhere, with *kaví-* a substitute for his patronymic; see, e.g., IV.16.3, 26.1.

But the other sense I see here is more sinister and requires considering vs. 3 in connection with the flg. verse. Vs. 4 is a curious, counter-intuitive, and indeed dispiriting vs.: even if Indra kills all your relatives, he still expects you to continue to offer to him. The usual comforting notion in the RV -- that Indra will do well by you if you do well by him, while the non-offerer will get badly treated -- is overturned here. Indra can act cavalierly and arbitrarily to ruin your life no matter how devotedly you serve him. I think the same unsettling idea is presented in vs. 3. Though the standard interpr. of vs. 3 (see, e.g., Ge’s n. 3cd) is that the first hemistich depicts the pious man happily rewarded, while cd shows the impious one getting his just deserts, I take the whole vs. as referring to the ups and downs of the pious soma-presser. First, his labors pay off: he becomes *dyumān* ‘heaven-bright’. But in the second half Indra snatches away this brightness, which is spread across him like a garment, “resplendent on his body” (*tanūśubhra-*), an appropriate characterization of such brightness. In this reading *kavāsakhāḥ* is ironic; Indra was indeed a companion and partner of the poet, until he wasn’t.

If this interpr. is correct, it may help explain the use of the peculiar formation *tatanūṣṭi-* discussed at length above. In pāda b the lucky soma-presser is *dyu-mánt-*, lit. ‘possessing *dyu-*’. And by my analysis, it is this purported *dyu-* that is resplendent on his body. But the well-attested possessive adj. *dyu-mánt-* has become lexically separated from *div-/dyu-* ‘heaven’; there is no independent *dyu-* ‘brightness’ that can become the property of a person. (The root noun *dyút-* is rare without preverb and means yet again something different.) It may be that

“spreading-ness” is an attempt to capture the quality of heavenly light without having a firm grammatical base, an identifiable independent noun, to found it on. One of the standard tropes using the root $\sqrt{tan}$ is light or a source of light spreading through heaven and other cosmic realms; cf., e.g., X.88.3 of Sūrya *yó bhānúnā prthivīm dyām utémām, ātatāna ródasī antárikṣam*. And so *tatanúṣṭi-* may embody this whole complex of heavenly light spreading across the man’s body as if through heaven. By this analysis the *tatanúṣṭi-* is not a garment, as I first suggested, but *like* a garment.

Another piece of evidence may support my view of *cd* as expressing the undeserved and capricious reversal of fortune of the soma-presser who was riding high in *ab*. Remember that *cd* begins with the double preverb *ápāpa*, which could also be the voc. of an adj. ‘not-evil’. I suggest that this is a despairing address to the soma-presser of *ab*: “o un-evil [/blameless] one, see what can happen to you anyway.”

V.34.4: As noted in the publ. intro. and in the disc. of vs. 4 immediately above, the sense of this vs. -- which seems surprisingly clear -- is hard to square with our usual notions of Rigvedic reciprocal responsibilities, for the vs. states that Indra can kill all your relatives and still demand your offerings, with no attempt even to deny or distance himself from what he did. Ge and Old pass over this unsettling doctrine in silence; WG suggest that the vs. shows that Indra doesn’t fear a blood feud (*Blutrache*), but this seems to let Indra off too easily. There is no sign of the reciprocity that “blood feud” implies: the hapless man whose relatives have been slaughtered does not seem to have done anything injurious to Indra, nor did his dead relatives -- at least as far as the vs. allows us to see. The killings appear to be the arbitrary acts of a powerful god just because he *can*. It may be no accident that Indra is called *śakrá-* ‘able’ here and in 3cd, where he also arbitrarily exerted his power. (Of course, *śakrá-* is a common epithet of Indra in the RV and later, and I would not suggest that it is always used with this nuance -- only that our poet exploited the literal sense of the word.) The fact that the word *kílbiṣa-* is used of Indra’s deed supports the view that what he did was simply wrong; see publ. intro.

I take *práyata-* in its usual sense, referring to offerings or bounties ‘held forth’ or ‘presented’. Cf. nearby V.30.12 *práyatā maghāni*, X.15.12 *práyatā havīmṣi*, etc. I cannot get anything else out of this sentence than that Indra still wants the aggrieved man to keep making giving him oblations. WG tr. “Darreichungen,” but suggest in their n. that it refers to “Reparations-, Satisfaktionszahlungen.” But what right would Indra have to seek reparations when he was the one who inflicted the damage?

yataṃkará- is a hapax, and the identity of neither of its parts is as sure as the standard interpr. take them. Gr suggests *yataṃ* belongs to the ppl. of $\sqrt{yam}$, therefore morphologically identical to the immediately preceding (*prá-*)*yatā*, but this analysis is rejected, rightly in my view, by Ge and WG, who take it (the former implicitly, the latter explicitly) as the acc. sg. of a root noun to $\sqrt{yat}$, found also in the cmpd *saṃyát-* in 9c. Although the uncompounded root noun is not found elsewhere and it is not mentioned by Schindler in his Root Noun diss. or Scar in his disc. of $\sqrt{yat}$ (403-4), I think this must be the correct analysis, with the noun meaning ‘(proper) arrangement’ or the like. The publ. tr. ‘arranger’ reflects this analysis of *yataṃ*, while taking 2nd member *-kará-* from $\sqrt{kṛ}$, hence ‘make arrangements’ → ‘arranger’. I now think this interpr. of the 2nd member is wrong. This pāda-final compound matches final *ākarāḥ* of the next pāda, which, construed with preceding *vásvaḥ*, means ‘distributor of goods’. This *-kará-* does not belong to $\sqrt{kṛ}$, however, but to $\sqrt{kṛ}$, *kir* ‘scatter’, which occurs with *ā* in just this phrase: cf. IX.81.3 *ā naḥ ... kirā vāsu* “scatter/distribute goods to us.” This strongly suggests that the

parallel cmpd *yataṃkará-* contains the same form, which leads to a sense ‘scattering the arrangement’ -- viz., destroying it, blowing it to smithereens and scattering the resulting particles. This accurately reflects what Indra has done in this vs. -- violating the arrangement between men and gods -- worship and offerings in return for protection, aid, and material goods - - by smiting the family of his devotee, though he still provides goods. I would therefore change the publ. tr. from ‘the arranger’ to ‘scattering/destroying the arrangement’. The lack of the preverb *ā*, found in the lexeme *ā √kṛ*, may be analogous to the gapping of preverbs in root noun cmpds with direct object first members.

V.34.5: The usual arrangement between Indra and mortals is re-established in this vs., where Indra’s punishment comes only to the stingy and the non-worshipper, and the pious man gets rewarded.

There is a difference of opinion about the sense of pāda a, because of different interpr. of the acc. inf. *ārābham* and of the numerical expressions. Ge takes *ārābham* as ‘sich verbinden’ and the expressions of numbers as referring to people or gods -- the sense being that Indra doesn’t want to team up with others because he’s strong enough on his own. But *ā √rabh* does not have that meaning, but only ‘to grasp, grab hold of’. WG also take the numbers as personal: “Nicht wünscht er mit fünf, mit zehn (Leuten) das Erraffen (von Beute),” which I confess I don’t understand. Is the intent that he wants to pile up his booty all by himself? By contrast, I take the numbers as referring to the means of grasping the offerings/goods -- either by the number of gifts (=in increments of five or ten) or by handfuls: one (=five fingers) or two (=ten fingers) -- and he doesn’t want to acquire the goods in such trifling installments.

In c the question is the function of *amuyā*. I cannot identify a part of the WG tr. that represents *amuyā*. Ge’s interpr. is minimalistic: *íd amuyā* “nur so,” which Klein (II.160) helpfully expands to “only in that circumstance (viz. when a wealthy person does not have soma pressed for him).” This may well be right. However, I compare X.135.2 *cārantam pāpāyāmyā* “going along yonder evil way.” In our passage this may refer to highway robbery: the offending non-presser gets robbed as he makes his way along the road. Or it may be metaphorical: if the non-presser continues to pursue this behavior he’ll be punished.

V.34.6: There is puzzling agreement about the meaning of the hapax *cakramāsajá-*. The standard interpr. run counter to the clear structure of the cmpd: a tatpuruṣa with the first member the acc. sg. of *cakrá-* ‘wheel’ (the acc. blocking hiatus before a vocalic 2nd member) and the 2nd derived from *ā √sa(ñ)j*. The lexeme *ā √sa(ñ)j* means ‘attach, affix, hang’ (I.191.10, X.124.7); yet this cmpd is universally interpr. as meaning ‘impeding/stopping the wheel’ (Gr, Ge, AiG II.1.183, EWA s.v. *SAÑJ*) or, acdg. to WG, ‘die Wagen bremsend’ with *cakra-* as pars pro toto. I do not understand this consensus that the verbal portion should be given a meaning not found with the verb itself, particularly since the context does not impose it. (Sāy.’s gloss *rathacakrasyāsañjayitā* does not seem to be responsible for it either.) Only WG attempt to trace a semantic pathway to the meaning attributed to *āsajá-*, but it is not persuasive. I suppose all these interpr. are thinking of the myth in which Indra tears the wheel off the sun’s chariot, but there is no other indication in context that this myth is at issue -- and tearing off and stopping are quite different actions. Given these objections, I prefer to stick with the standard meaning of *ā √sa(ñ)j* and assume 1) that it refers to the *restoration* of the sun’s wheel mentioned in regard to Etaśa in nearby V.31.11, or 2) that it refers to an incident in an unknown story, or 3) that it refers to some pre-battle preparation or battle tactic. I prefer the first.

V.34.7: The lexeme *sám √aj* is used elsewhere of ‘driving together’ cattle (I.33.3); here the *bhójanam* of the niggard is presumably livestock. Though *pañéh* here is used oppositionally to *dāsūṣe* in b (see Ge’s n. 7ab), the word also summons up Indra’s opponents, the Paṇis, who stole his cows -- so stealing them back (*muṣē*) is only justice.

The syntax of c is quite challenging. Let us begin with *viśva ā purú*. The phrase *purú viśva-* appears to be an idiom, or at least is found twice in the RV, meaning “all the many”: I.191.9 *purú viśvāni* “all the many (bugs),” VII.62.1 *purú viśvā jānima* “all the many tribes.” Here, however, the words are in opposite order, with the preverb/adposition *ā* intervening, and the referent is singular (*viśva[h]* ... *jānaḥ*). Nonetheless, I think the locutions are essentially the same, though I tr. “each and every” to capture the singular number.

I do not know what to do with *ā*. It is possible that it is a preverb with *dhriyate*, but 1) though *ā* is found with *√dhr*, it is not common, and 2) preverbs in tmesis generally move to metrical or syntactic boundaries, and *ā* is not so placed here. The standard interpr. do not comment on it. I have no solution.

The last issue is the use of *caná*. Ge (/WG) take it as neg. ‘nicht einmal’ (not even). The sense of the clause, acdg. to them, is that a people that has provoked Indra’s anger can’t hole up for a long time even in a place that’s hard to penetrate. Thus by their interpr. *durgá-* is a desirable, fortress-like location for the offending people, but they can’t hold onto it. But *durgá-* is always otherwise an undesirable place, where no one wants to be -- where we wish Indra to send our enemies (VII.25.2) but from which we want to be rescued. I therefore think that the point of this clause is that Indra’s antagonists get confined to such a place and therefore *caná* does not have a negative sense here. Twice loc. *durgé* is followed by *cid* ‘even’ (VIII.27.18, 93.10), and *durgé caná* here may be a variant of this usage. Although he unfortunately does not discuss this passage, Klein’s general disc. of *caná* (DGRV I.285–92) as essentially borrowing negative value from the negative contexts in which it’s ordinarily found allows for an original underlying positive value ‘even’. For further disc. see comm. ad X.49.5, VIII.1.5, X.56.4. The publ. tr. should be slightly altered to “Even in a (place) ...,” though I’m not sure what sense ‘even’ adds -- perhaps that not only are the people confined but they are confined in a really nasty place.

V.34.8: The identity of the verb *ávet* in b is disputed. Gr takes it as an opt. to *√av* ‘help’; Old rejects that analysis but suggests that either *√vid* ‘know’ or *√vī* ‘pursue’ is possible. Ge and WG (see also Oberlies RdV I.535) opt for *√vid* and take the rest of the ab as indirect discourse controlled by this verb (“when he found out that ...”). This is possible, but I find it hard to integrate subordinate *yád* clause in ab (with plupf.) with the *hí* cl. of c (with root aor.) and the main cl. of d (with pres. indic.). I find that the sequence of tense works better if ab is a separate unit, with subord. *yád* cl. in a and main clause in b (*ávet* accented because pāda-initial). Then c is the causal grounds for the main cl. in d and expresses immed. past.

My analysis requires supplying a verb in pāda a, linked to the preverb *sám* (which by the other interpr. must be construed with *√vid*, a combination not found with ‘know’, though it is with *√vid* ‘find’). A good candidate for a verb to supply is given by *sámṛti-* ‘clash’ in 6a, and verbal forms to this idiom (*sám √r*) are fairly common. Cf. VII.25.1 ... *yát samáranta sénāḥ* “when armies clash together.” My analysis also depends on a different analysis of *ávet*, which I assign to *√vī* ‘pursue’. Note *vétī* opening 4c.

The def. *anyām* ‘the one’ in c, referring to one of the two opponents in ab, more or less demands a responsive ‘the other’, as Ge and I supply in d.

Old questions the existence of the stem *pravepanín-*, suggesting that *pravepanī* is an adverbial instr. to a *pravepanī-* (fld. by WG). I don’t see that a stem *pravepanī-* is appreciably better than an *-ín-*stem and follow the older analysis.

V.34.9: The sense of *saṃyát-* ‘continuous(ly)’, root noun cmpd. to *√yat* (see *yataṃ-* in 4c and disc. there), must have developed from ‘taking their places together, one after the other’. For further disc. of the stem, see comm. ad IX.86.15.

V.35–36 Indra

These two hymns are attributed to Prabhūvasu Āṅgīrasa, who is also named as the poet of IX.35–36. There is no immediate source for this name in these two hymns; the closest we come is *purūvásuḥ* in V.36.3; see also *vásūnām* in V.36.1.

V.35 Indra

V.35.3: *ābhūbhiḥ* ‘ready at hand’ lacks an overt referent. I supply ‘(forms) of help’ from context -- *ávas-* is the signature word of this part of the hymn. Ge takes it as a nominalized ‘Kräfte’, though he suggests the Maruts as an alternative referent in n. 3d; WG personified ‘helpers’.

V.35.4: The syntactic boundaries do not coincide with the pāda boundary in ab -- a welcome syncopation in this otherwise simple hymn. The hemistich is divided into three clauses: *vṛṣā hy ási / rādhase jajñīṣé / vṛṣṇi te śávaḥ*, but the pāda boundary breaks the second into two one-word halves. It might be possible to fold the third proposed clause into the second (“you were born as bullish strength”), if we were willing to be cavalier about the position of *te* and indeed its presence (“you were born as your bullish strength”?), but the nominal clause in VIII.3.10 *tád indra vṛṣṇi te śávaḥ* supports the analysis as a separate unit, if more support be needed.

On the anomalous form *vṛṣṇi* (for expected *vṛṣṇ(y)am*), see comm. ad VIII.96.19.

satrāhām is a neut. sg. qualifying *paúṃsyam*. It looks like a them. neut. and is in fact classified under *satrāha-* in Gr and Lub (see also Scar 697). Nonetheless, it belongs with the class of root noun cmpds with *-hán-*. The neut. sg. of such a stem should probably be **-ha* (like *nāma* to *nāman-*, assuming radical *-n-*stems work like, or get assimilated to, derived *-n-*stems). I might tentatively suggest that the final *-m* was first inserted (as *anunāsika*) to avoid the hiatus **satrāhá indra* and then reinterp. as a them. neut. ending (see also Lanman, *Noun inflection* 478, AiG III.239). But it is the case that such nasalizations are rare within pādas and almost always concern long *-ā* (see Old, Prol. 469–72). Moreover, the similarly formed neut. *vṛtrahām* in VI.48.21 precedes a consonant with the *-m* making position.

V.35.5: Ge takes *adrivaḥ* as ‘du Herr des Presssteins’, but in context a stone as weapon seems more likely (so WG ‘du mit den Schleudersteinen’, flg. Gr).

I interpr. *sarvarathā* as an adverbial accompaniment to the victim whom Indra runs over: “(him), chariot and all.” It is not clear from Ge’s “mit ganz Wagenzug” whose chariot he thinks it is, but WG take it to be Indra’s chariot, interpr. *sarva-* in its stronger lexical sense ‘hale, healthy’: “... so, dass dein Wagen heil bleibt.” This purpose-clause reading attributes more, and more unambiguous, structure to this single word than I think it can properly bear, and I also

don't understand the intended sense: should Indra endeavor to keep the victim's blood from splashing his wheels or his body from making dents?

V.35.6: Note the phonol. figure *pūrvīṣu pūrv(i)yām*, though the words belong to diff. stems. The referent of fem. *pūrvīṣu* is not clear. Gr suggests *ājīṣu* from 7b, and this seems to have met general acceptance (Ge, with ?; WG; Bloomfield RReps, 256), even though *ājī-* is actually masc., a fact no one remarks on. (Gr cites a single. fem. form, in I.116.15, but nothing in that passage signals that gender.) We could, of course, suggest a different word for 'battle' with fem. gender, like *pṛtanā* or *samād-*; there is weak support for both (/either) of these because they both are construed in the loc. pl. with *ugrā-*, which is also found here: *ugrām ... samātsu* in an oft-repeated pāda (III.30.22, etc.); VII.56.23 *ugrāḥ pṛtanāsu*, VIII.61.12, 70.4 *ugrām (...) pṛtanāsu*. An entirely different referent is also possible: 'peoples' comes to mind, picking up the *jānāsaḥ* of pāda b, with several different possible fem. stems as substitute: *kṣitī-* from 2c or the developed sense of *carṣaṇī-*, extractable from 1c (cf. III.43.2 *pūrvīḥ ... carṣaṇīḥ*) or *vīs-* (cf. VII.31.10 *vīsaḥ pūrvīḥ*).

V.35.7: This vs. has a riddle structure: the accusative qualifiers pile up until their referent, the chariot (*rātham*) is given at the very end, immediately preceded by the verb (*avā*) on which the preceding accusatives depend. It proved difficult to capture this effect in tr.

sayāvan- means 'drive along with' (the useful German 'mitfahren', for which there is no precise English equivalent). It is ordinarily either construed with an instr. of the fellow traveler or is in the instr. qualifying the fellow traveler(s). Here there is no such overt expression, but we can assume it is Indra.

V.35.8: The structure of ab mimics that of 7, which has (a) *#asmākam ... / (d) ... avā rātham#*, while 8 has (a) *#asmākam ... (b) #rātham avā ...*. Another verbal expression is inserted within this structure in pāda a: *éhi naḥ*. Ge tr. as two separate clauses, silently postponing the *asmākam* to the second one ("komm zu uns, begünstige unseren Wagen"). WG take *éhi naḥ* as an insertion: "Unserem -- Indra, komm her zu uns! -- (unserem) Wagen hilf ..." This interpr. seems possible -- save for the position of the voc. *indra*, which is unaccented and precedes *éhi naḥ* so cannot belong to that phrase. (A slightly altered tr. would be "Ours, Indra -- come to us! -- (our) chariot ...") By contrast I take *éhi ... avā* as a pseudo-serial verb construction ("come help"), though I admit that the *naḥ* might be problematic for that interpr.

Ge (/WG) take both instances of *diví* as 'today', but outside of *diví pāryé* 'on the decisive day', a phrase characteristic primarily of VI and VII, *diví* always refers to heaven, as far as I can tell. 'Heaven' makes fine sense here, and cf. the similar expression V.13.2 ... *stómam manāmahe ... divispṛśaḥ* "we shall conceive a praise-song (for Agni), who touches the sky."

V.36 Indra

V.36.1: The publ. tr. takes the phrase *vásūnām ... dāmano rayīṇām* as nested genitives (*vásūnām* and *rayīṇām* depending on *dāmanah*), whose head noun is *dātum*. Both Ge and WG break up the nouns into two phrases (though in different ways), with WG taking the verb *cíketat* in two different ways (pf. subj. / plupf. injunc.) with two different complements: "... der auf das Schenken von Gütern [i.e., *vásūnām ... dātum*] achten soll, weil er sich ja auf die Schenkung von

Schätzen [i.e., *dāmano rayīñām*] versteht.” This is more elegant than my pile-up of gifts and may well be right, though I’m not sure there’s sufficient signaling of the double meaning.

V.36.2: The simile in ab depends on the double meaning of the root $\sqrt{ruh}$, which means both ‘climb, mount’ and ‘grow’. It also hinges on two different senses of *sóma*-, as the prepared ritual drink and the plant from which it is extracted.

In cd there is mismatch in number between the simile in the singular and the frame in the plural, whose number is emphasized by *vísve* ‘all’. The point of the simile is that the person “driving his steeds” would be verbally urging them on to greater speed.

V.36.3: The slightly “off” nature of the similes in this hymn continues here. In ab the point of comparison between the rolling wheel and the poet’s mind is the trembling (*vepate*). The cause of the trembling -- fear -- is applicable only to the mind, not the wheel.

As disc. in the publ. intro., *ráthād ádhi* “from the chariot” is a curious phrase, and the standard treatments struggle with it. Both Ge and Old think that the singer is expressing a wish for a chariot, but it is hard to see how to make that work syntactically. WG (in n.) suggest that it’s either Indra’s chariot or that it represents the poet’s hymn, but neither of these fits the context well. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this is a punning allusion to the poet’s patron Śruta-ratha (lit. ‘having a famous chariot’), praised in the *dānastuti* in vs. 6. In this scenario the hemistich-initial ablative, referring to the patron, is linked to the hemistich-final word *purūvāsuh*, referring to the poet. Though Ge (/WG) take this as a PN, giving it its full lexical meaning (‘having many goods’) makes the verse work better. The singer praises Indra on behalf of his patron Śrutaratha, in order to become “One of many goods” -- from/because of (Śruta)ratha. As Mayrhofer points out (PN, s.v. *purūvāsu*-), *purūvāsu* is synonymous with *Prabhūvasu*, the name of the poet acdg. to the *Anukramaṇī*, so the vs. puns both on the name of the poet and on that of the patron. This might be clearer in the publ. tr. if it were reordered: “Surely the singer will now praise you ... (to become) one possessing many goods from the (Famous-)chariot?”

V.36.4: The semantically complementary expressions referring to giving with the left and right hands have different morphological realizations: instr. *savyéna* and the hapax adv. *dakṣiṇít*. The latter is, of course, anomalously formed; it appears also in the cmpd. *pradakṣiṇít* (6x), which may be the basis here as well -- note immediately preceding *prá*. Thieme (KZ 69 [1951] = KISch 71) suggests that it’s a cmpd with the root noun to $\sqrt{i}$ ‘go’ (with the expected empty *-t* stem final); others that it contains the relic of a PIE instr. ending in *-t /d*. For a full disc. see Scar (42–44). Since the first is not straightforward functionally (“going to the right” is not its sense) and the second depends on a highly dubious morphological reconstruction, I withhold judgment on the source of the form, but see *ubhayāhastí* (or *-ī*) in V.39.1 below. The lack of morphological parallelism in this passage is not surprising, since the hymn tends towards slightly skewed expressions.

V.36.5: I take cd as a single clause (contra Ge [/WG]), because the *sá* with 2nd ps. ref. that opens c is easily explained if it’s construed with the imperatival 2nd sg. injunctive *dhāh* at the end of d, but would otherwise be anomalous. See my “sa figé.”

Strictly speaking, *vṛṣakrato* is of course a voc. In the publ. tr. I render it as nom., because of the parallelism *vṛṣā vṛṣarathaḥ ... vṛṣakrato vṛṣā*, with 2 nom. *vṛṣā* adjoining 2 bahuvrīhis with *vṛṣa-* as 1st member.

V.36.6: The sudden intrusion of the Maruts here is somewhat puzzling, but final vss. often open out to a wider set of gods.

V.37–43

This series of hymns dedicated both to Indra and the All Gods is attributed to Atri Bhauma, poet of a number of hymns both in V and in IX (and one in X).

V.37 Indra

V.37.1: As was noted in the publ. intro., the first pāda of this first hymn attributed to Atri provides the clue to the solution of the mythical puzzle posed by the narrative in Atri's V.40.5–9 in which Svarbhānu (*svārbhānu-*) pierces the sun with darkness and Atri restores the sun to heaven. The name Svarbhānu means 'having the radiance of the sun', and here Agni aligns himself "with the radiance of the sun" (*bhānūnā ... sūryasya*). As I demonstrated at length in my book *The Ravenous Hyenas and the Wounded Sun*, Svarbhānu is simply an epithet of Agni, who inflicted the wound on the sun for cause (cosmic incest). This pāda signals the underlying connection of Agni and Svarbhānu with a minimum of fuss.

The dawns are 'non-neglectful' (*ámṛdhra-*) because they never fail to appear every morning.

V.37.2: Both Ge and WG take *jarāte* as 'be awake', even though Gotō himself (1st Klasse, 151 and 154) identifies this particular attestation of *jāra-* as ambig. between 'be awake' and 'sing'. Although both meanings are probably present, I think 'sing' is the primary one. The subject's yoked pressing stones speak (*grāvāṇaḥ ... vadanti*) in the next pāda (2c), and throughout the RV there is generally an equivalence between the noise of the pressing stones and the speech/singing of the priests. See in particular in the immediately preceding hymn, V.36.4 *grāveva jaritā ... īyarti vācam* "Like a pressing stone, the singer raises his voice," with the agent noun belonging to the same root.

On the Adhvaryu's trip to the river to fetch water on the morning of the pressing day, see Ge's n. 2c.

V.37.3: See the disc. of this vs. as omphalos and riddle in the publ. intro. As indicated there, I identify the bride as Dawn and the husband as the Sun, while the dominant opinion (see Ge [WG]) is rather Speech and Indra. The latter is certainly not excluded, and the fact that the stem *iṣirā-*, used to qualify the speech of the pressing stones in 2c, also characterizes the wife in 3b may give some support to that view. Cf. also IX.84.4 *vācam iṣirām uṣarbúḍham* "the vigorous speech awakening at dawn." Still, the Dawn/Sun interpr. follows naturally from the dawn ritual setting in the first two vss., and the long journey in d would refer to the daily trip across the sky.

As also noted in the publ. intro. *śravasyād ráthaḥ* "the chariot will seek fame" recalls the name of the patron in the immed. preceding hymn, V.36.6, Śrutaratha, which was also punned on in V.36.3.

With Ge I take *purū sahāsrā* as a measure of distance and *pāri vartayāte* as intrans./reflex., based on its middle form. This is disputed by WG, who take the verb as transitive (but “affektive” [whatever that means], the value that accounts for its middle form). They supply ‘men’ as the referent of *purū sahāsrā*. The idea is that the noise of Indra’s chariot will cause many thousands of them to turn around and look at it. I suppose this is not impossible, but again it requires supplying much more than is found in the context: a huge crowd of people and the presupposition that “cause to turn” implies “turn to look.”

V.37.4: “Whose comrades are cows” (*gósakhāyam*) modifying soma refers of course to the milk mixture added to soma to make it less unpalatable. (It is somewhat surprising that *sóma-* is also called *tīvrá-* ‘sharp’ in the same pāda, since this is usually of unmixed soma.) But the *gó-* ‘cow’ of this cmpd provides a clever transition to the next pāda. Pāda c contains a verb (*ā ...*) *ājati* ‘drives’, which ordinarily takes an object -- and indeed frequently that object is cows: e.g., I.83.5 *ā gā ājat*, V.2.5 *ājāti paśvāḥ*. I therefore supply ‘cows’ as the object in c, extracted from a different use of the ‘cow’ word in b. This then produces a reference to the Vala myth, with the *satvanāīḥ* ‘warriors’ representing the Aṅgirasas as elsewhere (cf. III.39.5, also nearby V.34.8 for association with cattle raiding). Thus pāda c depicts the king protected by Indra as performing a Vala-like deed (*ā satvanāīr ājati*) as well as the/a Vṛtra slaying (*hānti vṛtrām*), ascribing (equivalents of) the two signature deeds of Indra to this earthly king. Neither Ge nor WG make much sense of the *ājati* clause.

The accent on *ājati* is contrastive with the adjacent *hānti*.

Both Ge and WG take *kṣitīḥ* with *kṣéti* (“er bleibt in seinen Sitzen” and “weilt sicher in seinem Reich” respectively; see also Oberlies Relig. RV I.441, II.171–72), but *√kṣi* ‘dwell’ without preverb does not otherwise take the acc., whereas *√puṣ* ‘prosper, thrive’ can take a personal acc., and so I construe *kṣitīḥ* with *púṣyan*. In my interpr. the poet juxtaposes the cognate words (*kṣéti kṣitīḥ*), but separates them syntactically.

V.37.5: The pāda-framing *#kṣéti ... púṣyan#* of 4d recur adjacent at the beginning of 5a *#púṣyāt kṣéme* in different morphological form; *kṣéme* ‘peace(ful dwelling)’ is also paired with its opposite *yóga-* ‘hitching up, war’, with two contrastive clauses framed by the subjunctives *#puṣyāt ... bhavāti#* predicting success in both peace and war.

The war theme is further developed in the following pāda. I take *ubhé vṛtau saṃyatī* as an implicitly subordinated clause with pres. part. as main verb (an interpr. that WG come close to as an alternative considered in their n.). It would be possible to take this phrase as acc. obj. of *sám jayāti* (so Ge, WG, Oberlies [Relig. RV II.172]), but it doesn’t make sense that the king would conquer both clashing forces, when one of them is likely his own. Rather I think the point is that Indra will favor him over the opponent and therefore his side will prevail. See V.34.8, where Indra links himself to one of two opposing troops and helps his clients win.

V.38 Indra

For the general contents, see disc. in publ. intro. WG interpr. it as plea to Indra for rain -- a purpose that I find very hard to discern and that results in farfetched interpr. of details.

V.38.1: The first hemistich is somewhat awk., with (by my interpr. and Ge’s) a genitive phrase *uróḥ ... rādhasaḥ* “of your broad largess” dependent on an almost synonymous nom. phrase *vibhvī rātīḥ* “extensive giving.” WG apparently take the first not as gen., but as abl., indicating

the source of the giving: “Von deiner ... weitreichenden Gunst aus entfaltet sich die Gabe.” This seems like a good idea and mitigates the awkwardness. I would then change the publ. tr. to “Your extensive giving (comes) from your broad generosity.”

V.38.2: As in several instances in the last few hymns, WG impose extra structure on the first hemistich that is not supported by the phraseology. They supply a verb to govern *śravāyyam*, which then forms the foundation for a 2nd subordinate cl. consisting of *īṣam ... dadhiṣé*: “Was du ... Ruhmvolles (zustande gebracht), dass du dir die Labung ... verschafft hast.” In their introduction to the hymn they explain what lies behind this interpr., adding even further unsupported assumptions. The ‘praiseworthy’ thing that Indra accomplished was his action of freeing the life-giving liquid (*īṣ-*), which they presumably take both as the waters imprisoned by Vṛtra and (proto-)rain. But they give no justification for dividing ab into two clauses, separating the apparently parallel objects *śravāyyam* and *īṣam*, and providing a verb to govern the first that cannot be generated from context or formulaics. It is worth pointing out that *śravāyya-* is never used of a deed or action and most often modifies *rayí-* ‘wealth’ or *vāja-* ‘prize’. Although I can’t see any obstacle to qualifying a deed as *śravāyya-*, there are no familiar phrases containing that notion that would come to mind when encountering an undefined *śravāyya-*. Though I confess I can’t identify the referent(s) here, I find the WG interpr. implausible and forced. For further on this vs. see comm. ad V.39.2 below.

V.38.3: The WG interpr. becomes even more forced in this vs., which is summarized in their intro. by “Die Maruts lassen es regnen,” despite the absence of any reference to the Maruts or any verb for ‘rain’ -- the operative word for ‘rain’ is supposed to be the adverbial instr. *mehánā* generally taken as ‘in profusion’. The single word *śúṣmāsaḥ* is supposed to incorporate “Sturm, Drang, Blitz,” and the Maruts are supposed to be the other half of the dual expression *ubhā devāu* “both you gods” -- that is, Indra and the Maruts -- a highly unlikely use of the dual. The distortion of the text to fit the interpretational preconceptions goes much too far.

To stay closer to the actual wording, the question is how to distribute the various pādas in relation to each other. Ge takes ab as the subject of a clause whose object is in c, though with an unexpressed verb: “Deine Kräfte ... (bringen) beide Götter zur Übermacht.” I prefer to take ab as an extension of vs. 2, adding another quality of Indra’s (his tempestuous force) that extends itself along with fame. Then the two gods of c can be the subject of *rājathaḥ* in d, with *abhīṣṭaye* an infinitival complement. A similar interpr. is given by Scar (598), who takes ab as a nominal clause, “Die ungestümen Kräfte, die dir [sind, sind] in Menge [vorhanden] und gehorchen deinem Willen,” and cd more or less as I do.

As for who the other god is, besides Indra -- Old refuses to speculate, saying it’s an unknown ritual situation. Ge suggests Varuṇa, and this seems the likeliest possibility. Dual forms of *√rāj* generally have Varuṇa as one half of the subject, the other usually being Mitra; cf., e.g., in this maṇḍala V.63.2, 7. But VII.83.5, a hymn to Indra and Varuṇa, the verb has those two as subject: *yuvām hī vásva ubhāyasya rājathaḥ* “For you two rule over goods of both sorts.”

V.38.4: The brief excursion into the dual in vs. 3 is over, and Indra is the sole subject again.

The first hemistich is again syntactically incomplete. The standard interpr. construe the genitive phrase *asyā kasya cid dākṣasya tāva* loosely with *nṛmṇām* (e.g., Ge “von welcher deiner Geisteskraft es auch sei, ... bring uns Mut”). This is possible, but I prefer to take ab as an

extension of 3cd (as 3ab was to 2cd), supplying ‘rule’ to govern the genitives, using slightly different senses of ‘rule’.

V.38.5: I tr. slightly differently from the standard, supplying another form of *syāma* for ab, rather than making the whole vs. into a single cl. The difference is trifling.

Notice that *abhīṣtibhiḥ* echoes *abhīṣṭaye* in 3c.

WG suggest that this vs. is a joke: asking Indra to be in his *śárman* (‘protection, shelter’; German ‘Schirm’) is like asking to be under his umbrella (Regenschirm). This is a joke that may work in German but seems to have little to do with Sanskrit, which, as far as I know, does not have the concept of a rain-repelling umbrella. Shelters of that physical type are more likely used against the sun, and certainly I know of no use of *śárman-* in a rain context.

V.39 Indra

As was noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is twinned with V.38 in Vākhilya fashion, though it does not give as much help as it might in interpreting the previous hymn.

V.39.1: The poet re-uses *mehánā* from V.38.3 and *rādhah* from V.38.1, as well as *adrivah* (though that voc. is quite common in this run of hymns). Because of their commitment to *mehánā* as ‘rain’ in 38.3, WG are forced to insert rain here, though the context is hardly favorable.

The Pp. reads *ubhayāhastí* with short *-í*, which is assigned to an *-i*-stem by Gr, as a neut. modifying *rādhah*, though he also suggests that it might be read *-î*, as the masc. nom. sg. of an *-ín*-stem. The latter works better morphologically than the former: *hastín-* is well attested and well formed, whereas there is no straight *-i*-stem *hastí-* and no easy mechanism for producing one -- though a nonce back-formation from the well-formed adj. *-hastíya-* might be possible. See esp. *ubhayāhastíyā vāsu* in I.81.7. (A neut. to the *-ín*-stem would likewise probably come out as *-í*, and this may be an easier solution). I nonetheless tentatively suggest that *ubhayāhastí* here (if that is the reading) might be compared with the problematic *dakṣiṇít* ‘with the right (hand)’ in nearby V.36.4, which appears in the same kind of context, concerns hands, and has a problematic suffixal short *-i-*, followed there by a morphologically mysterious dental final.

V.39.2: Although this vs. is lexically and syntactically quite distinct from V.38.2, they seem to share a thematic core. First, note that *vāreṇíyam* at the end of pāda a is positioned identically to *śravāyíyam* in 38a, with the same type of formation and roughly the same meaning, and both are introduced by *yád* ‘which’ at the beginning of their pādas. Here the adj. clearly designates some good thing that Indra should bring us; recall that *śravāyíya-* also usually refers to wealth of some sort. In the second half-verse Indra’s limitless capacity for giving is expressed in a vivid image -- Indra as unbounded ocean -- while in 38.2cd the unidentified praiseworthy thing spreads itself out longest, also an image of unbounded expanse. The means of expressing the concept are quite different, but the concept itself seems the same.

V.39.3: I take ab as nominal rel. clause with a predicated grdv. *prarādhyam*, while Ge (/WG) simply take it as a nom. cl. (“what is your thought...”). My tr. should be modified slightly to make it clear that the *ásti* is accented: “Which thought of yours, famed and lofty, eager to give, is to [should] be realized, with it ...”

In cd both Ge and WG separate the two pādas and supply a second verb (or, as far as I can tell, a 2nd exemplar of the overt verb *ā darṣi* in different usage). I interpr. *ā darṣi* as taking a double acc. in a condensed expression: “split X for (its contents) Y.” The lexeme *ā √dr* can take as obj. either the container or the contained; for a similar double acc. with both see III.30.21 *ā no gotrā dardṛhi ... gāḥ* “Split open the cowpens for the cows.”

V.39.4: Ge [WG] take the enclitic *vaḥ* exclusively with pāda a where it is located (Ge: “Euren Freigebigsten der Freigebigen...”). In light of the next vs., I think that it refers to the Atris, who strengthen Indra with their words in 5, and that they are the subject of the infinitival dat. *prāśastaye* in c. It has migrated to Wackernagel’s position in the larger clause (as often), which accounts for its distance from *prāśastaye*.

As I have discussed elsewhere (e.g., *Rgveda between Two Worlds*, Chap. 4, esp. 146–48), the genre of *prāśasti*- and the verbal lexeme *prā √śam*s are associated with the praise of kings already in the RV; *prāśasti* is the standard term for royal panegyric in later Sanskrit and MIA. Note that here the term is used for Indra as king (pāda b *rājānām carṣaṇīnām*).

With the standard interpr., I supply a verb of calling in c.

In d Ge takes *pūrvībhiḥ ... gīraḥ* as co-referential, with *gīraḥ* acc. rather than instr. metri causa. This seems too tricky as well as unnec. With most (incl. Gr, Old, and WG) I supply *prāśasti*- with *pūrvībhiḥ* (cf., e.g., VI.45.3 *pūrvīḥ ... prāśastayaḥ*). WG in their n. suggest that *pūrvībhiḥ* is a “predicative instr” to *gīraḥ*, a construction that I don’t understand and that also seems unnec. Why not an instr. of accompaniment -- hymns along with eulogies? If I am correct that *prāśasti* is a specialized verbal product already in the RV, the differentiation between it and *gīr*- here would be perfectly understandable.

V.39.5: The distinction between verbal products continues here, with *kāvyaṃ vācaḥ* ‘poet’s/poetic speech’, *ukthām* ‘solemn word’, *brāhmaṇa-* ‘sacred formulation’, and *gīraḥ* ‘hymns’ all offered to Indra. For the connection between *prāśasti*- (here, 4cd) and *kavī-*, *kāvya*- see *RV between Two Worlds* cited above.

V.40 Indra and Svarbhānu

The hymn given as V.40 consists of two metrically and, more important, thematically ill-assorted pieces, vss. 1–4 and 5–9. The first three vss., in Uṣṇih, are a banal celebration of the word *vṛṣan*- ‘bull’ addressed to Indra. The fourth is in Triṣṭubh and does not contain any form of the word *vṛṣan*- (though see *vṛṣabhā-* in 4a), but the thematic connection is clear and it climaxes with the appearance of Indra at the Midday Pressing. The second part, vss. 5–9, is the exquisitely crafted account of the Svarbhānu myth, which on its own constitutes a perfectly balanced omphalos hymn. Metrically it consists of two framing vss. in Anuṣṭubh (5, 9), with the three internal vss. (6–8) in Triṣṭubh. Further evidence of the omphalos structure: the two outer vss. are multiforms of each other; the middle verse (7) is the only direct speech; the immediately surrounding vss. (6, 8) both mention Atri in the sg., both deal with the *māyā* of Svarbhānu, and have complementary vocab.: *divāḥ / diví, sūryam / sūryasya, gūḍhām / laghukṣat, brāhmaṇā / brahmā*.

All of the evidence points to a pair of originally independent hymns, which were later redactionally combined, and this hypothesis also fits their position in the maṇḍala. At four vss., the first part (V.40.1–4) would be the appropriate length to follow on the five-vs. V.39 as an independent Indra hymn, in accordance with the usual principles of Saṃhitā arrangement. The

Indra cycle of V would come to an end there; the seams between cycles are where later Anhangslieder get inserted, and V.40.5-9 can be such an Anhangslied, with no original connection to 1-4 at all. Although Indra has a bit part in the Svarbhānu saga (see 6ab, possibly 7c), the story is otherwise independent.

The idea that the two parts of V.40 were originally two separate hymns has a long scholarly history, going back at least to Bergaigne and Lanman, who both thought the division was rather 1–3 / 4–9. See Old, Proleg. 198 and, in detail, Noten ad loc. In the Noten Old seriously considers the possibility that the two parts formed an originally unitary hymn, primarily on the basis of V.78, which he sees as having a similar bipartite structure. I think this is unlikely: V.78 falls into three parts, not two, and in our hymn the Svarbhānu portion is far more intricately structured than anything in V.78. Nonetheless, it is possible that the two separate hymns were joined into V.40 on the model of V.78. For a possible reason for the introduction of the Svarbhānu account just here, see below ad vs. 4.

I treated the Svarbhānu portion at great length in my 1991 *Ravenous Hyenas* in conjunction with the brāhmaṇa prose versions of the myth, and I will not repeat all the details found there. In *Hyenas* (264–67) I identify Svarbhānu, the piercer of the Sun, as Agni, who is frequently said to have the *bhānū-* (‘radiance’) of the sun. For support for this identification see disc. there, as well as comm. ad V.37.1 above.

V.40.1–3: In the refrain (1–3cd) the pl. ‘bulls’ (*vṛṣabhiḥ*) accompanying Indra were identified with the Maruts already by Sāyaṇa. Since this section culminates in the Midday Pressing (4d), this identification makes sense, since that pressing is shared by Indra and the Maruts.

V.40.4: In *Hyenas* (pp. 249–51) I suggest that the Svarbhānu section is introduced after this vs., because there are several connections between the Midday Pressing and the Svarbhānu story. In later śrauta ritual a descendant of Atri (an Ātreya) is given gold at the Midday Pressing of the Aśvamedha. The gold is clearly a symbol of the sun (as often), and the Svarbhānu story is often told in brāhmaṇa prose texts to justify this ritual action. There is also a disguised ritual reenactment of the freeing of the sun (also symbolized by gold) at the Midday Pressing. The suggested connection still seems to me reasonable, but I was more inclined in that book to accept V.40 as a unitary hymn, not a secondary composite. I now think that the independent Svarbhānu hymn was slipped in here at the end of the Indra cycle because of the mention of the Midday Pressing in the final vs. of the originally separate hymn, now V.40.1–4.

V.40.5: On vs. 5 as a variant of vs. 9, see *Hyenas* 140–41.

V.40.6: On the “fourth formulation,” see *Hyenas* 251–60.

The “circling magic spells” (*māyāḥ ... vārtamānāḥ*) of Svarbhānu are the plumes of Agni’s smoke rising to heaven and obscuring the Sun’s light (*Hyenas* 271–73).

āpavratena ‘against commandment’ is generally taken to refer to the darkness deployed by Svarbhānu, but I argue (*Hyenas* 297–300) that it actually refers to the Sun’s original action, incest with his daughter, that led to his punishment by Agni Svarbhānu.

V.40.7: On this speech of the Sun’s, see *Hyenas* 281–88.

This vs. is usually taken as evidence for the “eclipse” theory of the Svarbhānu story, which aligns it with the later Rāhu myth in which Rāhu swallows the sun. But there is no other

evidence for this connection in Vedic, and ‘swallow’ can be accounted for by inner-Vedic parallels. See the cited disc. in *Hyenas*.

Although Atri is usually considered the addressee of the entire vs., for reasons having to do with the Vāyav Indraś ca construction in cd, I suggest (*Hyenas* 284–86) that Indra is the referent of the 2nd ps. in c, conjoined with Varuṇa in d.